

DOI: 10.31866/2617-2674.9.1.2026.361878
UDC 791.633:[792:791]:008-028.22(73)**GENESIS OF AUTHORSHIP. STAGE AND SCREEN DISCOURSE****Halyna Pohrebniak***Doctor of Study of Art (Dr Sc.), Professor,
Professor of the Department of Directing and Acting named after Larysa Khorolets;
e-mail: galina.pogrebniak@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-8846-4939
National Academy of Management of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine***Keywords:**visual culture;
theatre;
cinema;
directorial creativity;
acting skills;
author;
television**Abstract**

The purpose of the research is to determine the specifics of the formation and development of authorship within American visual culture. **The research methodology** is based on the application of a set of complementary scientific approaches. To study the genesis of authorship in stage and screen space, systemic, comparative and textual methods were used. The analysis of various models of screen and stage authorship required the use of a structural-functional method, which enabled tracing their internal organisation and interrelationships. The biographical method was used to study the personal factors of the creativity of American director-authors. The method of generalisation was used to advance theoretical understanding and justify the uniqueness of the phenomenon of authorship in visual culture. **The scientific novelty** of the article lies in clarifying the conceptual prerequisites for the formation of authorship in American cinema through the prism of early models of cinematographic and theatrical creativity, as represented by prominent directors in American visual culture. **Conclusions.** It has been proven that the formation and development of authorship in American cinema occurred in close connection with screen and stage art. At the same time, the foundations of directorial authorial models were predominantly laid by acting practice and stage experience, which influenced the formation of an individualised creative style and an authorial strategy of visual expression.

For citation:Pohrebniak, H., 2026. Genesis of Authorship: Stage and Screen Discourse. *Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Audiovisual Art and Production*, 9 (1), pp.138-152.**Problem statement**

The problem of the genesis of the authorship of the director himself, both in the stage and in the screen arts, is quite

relevant today among both theorists and practitioners of theatre and cinema. Interestingly, the formation of authorship in directing European theatre took place in the process of separating the directing

© Halyna Pohrebniak, 2026

profession from the acting environment and is associated with the work of such prominent stage reformers as A. Antoine, E. Craig, L. Kroneck, O. Bram, M. Reinhardt, M. T. Kantor, L. Kurbas, L. Visconti and others.

It is noteworthy that in cinema (which in its synthetic nature arose at the end of the 19th century), the formation of authorship took place not only based on acting, writing, artistic activity, but also, one might say, production, since from the first steps it declared itself as a rather costly production of a cultural product. Moreover, perhaps the first authors in European cinema are Auguste and Louis Lumière, Georges Méliès and Léon Gaumont, who served as the bearers of the primary cinematic professions. Later, the founding of authorship will be taken care of by representatives of the French and German (and even Soviet) avant-garde, German expressionism (which also laid the basis for auteur cinema with the key figure of the director), which is a unique individuality, with its own 'worldview, original system of perception, evaluation, and unique depiction of the picture of the world and the image of man in it' (Pohrebniak, 2022, p.30).

However, the origins of authorship in US cinema (in its early period) remain unclear. In addition, the influence of early models of authorship in American cinema on the work of modern auteur directors has not been traced. This is a gap that we will try to close in our scientific explorations.

Recent research and publications analysis

T. Nechaienko (2023) devotes her research to the problem of the origin of authorship in theatre directing. In the article 'Meiningen Theatre of the Second Half of

the Nineteenth Century: Creativity of Ludwig Kroneck's Directing Mechanisms,' the researcher reveals the master's authorial innovations in solving mass scenes of productions, performing role material by each performer using all means and skills of high artistry.' The art critic finds out that 'the integrity of all methods of constructing a synthetic artistic and figurative stage canvas was achieved by the artist thanks to the complex skills of the director's design decisions – lighting, scenery, mise-en-scène, and the performance of the acting ensemble'.

In his work, O. Klekovkin (2015, p.126) calls Max Reinhardt the most outstanding master of authorial direction of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, who created 'a new type of synthetic spectacle that was 'based on the techniques of conventional art, enriched with free imagination, lyricism, bright spectacle and musicality.' The researcher adds that Reinhardt's authorial 'creativity synthesised the principles of pictorial direction and word direction'.

L. Oliinyk (2010), in the article 'Les Kurbas: Smart Harlequin Portrait Collage', shows the patterns of the director-author's exit from the stage space to the screen space. She writes that the innovator Les Kurbas 'is the first to open the stage to the viewer, shares energy with him, throws in courage and a fresh joke, destroys the template of pathos and arrogance. In the theatre, he is not afraid of syntheses that are incompatible for the viewer of that time'. The researcher points out that in the play 'Jimmy Higgs', Les Kurbas, as a director-author, 'introduces the screen not only as an element of scenery, but as a new platform for the continuation of the stage action. He is cramped within the narrow stage box, and the possibilities of cinema help

add to and supplement what is not conveyed on stage. Events on the stage and the screen are assembled in front of the viewer into a single film-performance' (Oliinyk, 2010).

I. Zubavina (2015, p.76) explores the problem of authorship in screen arts and, in particular, directorial means in auteur cinema. In the article 'Cinema archetypal as the core of screen narrative', she writes that, in contrast to simple archetypal sequences, which 'exploits mass cinema, acquiring the features of patterning, auteur cinema appeals to the unconscious of man with the help of more complex aggregates'.

Z. Alforova (2004, p. 216), in her work 'The Image of the World' in Virtual Reality Films', writes that auteur cinema 'is an art form in which there is no semiotic gap between form and content, an art form in which not only the narrative creates its content, but also the content produces the narrative'. In the article 'Auteur Cinema', L.L. Kornieieva (n.d.) writes that 'since the creation of artistic images and worldview, ideological searches are the prerogative of the creative individual (in contrast to collective and mass commercial, economic perspectives of film production), such films are mainly the result of significant creative independence of the author-director and his personal vision of the topic or problem. Hence, the concept of 'director's cinema' is synonymous with auteur cinema.

Thus, the analysis of publications on the problem of the essence of authorship in theatre and cinema directing provides grounds for asserting the possibility of creating original directorial models of creativity.

The purpose of the article. To substantiate the statement that directorial theatre and cinema are the basic models of authorship in stage and film art, in which the

figure of the director prevails at all stages of production of a performance and film.

Main research material

Let us recall that each historical period of time gives birth not only to a unique art, but also, so to speak, its reader, listener, viewer – an educated, inquisitive, socially active person of its era. The liberation and recognition by society of the author's personality as a self-sufficient value was observed, for example, in the literature and art of the Romantic era. At this time, the author-creator is able to give birth to works in which he does not hide the presence of his own individuality, his own 'I'. Works appear marked by the personal nature of their perception of the world; they produce socially significant ideas, ideals, and meanings in the context of the corresponding worldview model. The tendency to form and develop a model of freedom of authorial self-expression is also traced in the works of the realistic direction, where the author's social vigilance in the choice of material and his social accuracy in his moral assessments will be fully realised. At this time, only the author-creator will be recognized as the foremost interpreter and interpreter of the content aspect of the theme and idea of his work, will stimulate the actualization of the perception of the system of images, characters' characters, appearing, according to the definition of literary critics, in the role of the so-called 'omniscient' author – a kind of center of world relations of objective reality.

At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, the modernist desire to justify and affirm the prevalence of artistic form over content was realised in the dominance of a subjective, sometimes deliberately deformed worldview and absurd repro-

duction of the world over the objective, which at the same time led to the transformation of the realistic author's model of creativity. In the author's model of the modernist era, the creator, as a bearer of personal qualities, not only can, but to a certain extent is obliged to strive for such an extraordinary self-expression through the original form of the work, which would give grounds to speak of a specific, characteristic only for him reflection of the artistic picture and image of the world. N. Zhukova (2010) in her monograph 'Elitism as a Component of Cultural Formation: The Experience of Non-Classical Aesthetics' articulates the idea that it is thanks to reflections on the nature of intuition and its significance in the process of creativity in the 20th century that a new understanding and interpretation of the concept of 'picture of the world' emerges, which is manifested in scientists overcoming the duality of subject and object and further defining the unity of life, creativity, and art. This approach became evidence that the world acquired a new ontological interpretation. The researcher emphasises that the idea of the ontological nature of art was substantiated in the 1930s by the Russian theorist A. Gabrychevsky, who in turn developed the tradition, the expression of which was presented in the works of F. Schelling and J. Goethe. Summing up her considerations, N. Zhukova (2010, p.167) concludes that A. Gabrychevsky understood the ontological nature of artworks as a deep and primary reflection of the world, in which intuition plays a prominent role.

Therefore, the fundamental concept of 'picture of the world' should be interpreted as one of the forms of 'worldview representation of objective reality in social consciousness' and directly represented

through the image of reality mastered in practice, which constitutes 'the initial condition of human existence, created in the process of practical activity of people' (Shynkaruk, 2002, p.271), and in addition, appears as the psychological reality of the physical world and as the result of mental reflection and generalization of reality (Kralia and Bertash, 2016).

In the era of modern cinema, it actively forms its own language, partly borrowing it from theatrical art. At the same time, it also brings out the author-creator, who first forcibly unites the cinematographic professions and demonstrates his own vision of reality, and sometimes unreality, tries to assert himself in the environment, to qualitatively distinguish the world of nature from the world of culture.

Film production in the USA began later than in Europe and essentially borrowed ideas and a technological base from producers in France and Great Britain. In 1910-1920, the foundations of authorship were laid in American cinema (under the influence of theatrical art), and specific authorial film models emerged based on influential figures. Developing considerations regarding the concept of 'personality', let us agree with the opinion of L. Hrinberh, who believes that the maximum provision of the integrity of the personality throughout life in historical conditions that are constantly changing is, in fact, the primary purpose of individuality as a psychological function. The researcher is convinced and consistently proves that, 'on the one hand, individuality appears as a somewhat closed and relatively stable system that performs a specific internal function that regulates all human properties, ensuring their integrity, and on the other hand, individuality should be considered as a special system open to interaction with the world

that performs the external function of environmental regulation.' Analysing and comparing such concepts as 'personality' and 'individuality,' the author concludes that 'not only the psychological, but also the historical function of the personality determines its systemic properties, which serves as a strong basis for considering the historical and cultural aspects of the individualisation process' (Hrinberh, 2016, p.126).

David Griffith can be called the first to lay down the basic principles of the auteur model in American cinema. The artistic contribution of this playwright, director and actor to theatrical and screen art is quite significant. Let us note an interesting fact about this artist's life. Griffith did not initially show any particular enthusiasm for cinema; he sometimes visited cinema illusions in his free time from working in the theatre. He was a travelling theatre actor haunted by continuous failures, leading to low earnings and a life in poverty. Griffith began working with filmmakers not because he saw his calling in the screen sphere, but because he hoped to find a new source of income.

However, it was in the cinematic field that he managed to express his philosophical views on the world and on man in it. Working in the cinema, he managed to accumulate existential experience and create a system of his own principles, ideals and values. Working at the Biograph and Edison studios allowed him to accumulate significant creative experience and to acquire certain subjective beliefs that contained the main motive of his attitude to the world. He managed to form his own unique worldview, which is the basis of his personality. For some time, he combined work in theatre and cinema and played numerous episodic roles in unpretentious films ('Rescued

from the Eagle's Nest', 'Old Usman Isaac', etc.) anonymously.

However, D. Griffith earned considerable income as a film playwright, and an anonymous one at that (these were the times when the film credits did not yet list its creators). He believed that 'art should serve beauty and truth' (Ebert, 2003), so he tried to adapt literary texts to screen aesthetics and wrote scripts based on the novels of C. Dickens, D. London, E. Zol, Guy de Maupassant, poems by R. Browning, A. Tennyson, plays by W. Shakespeare, A. de Lorde, F. Coppe and others. However, despite the significant improvement in his financial situation, David Griffith continued to treat cinema rather condescendingly (Sadoul, 1955, p.102). He was convinced that film work was temporary and still hoped to make a career in theatre.

Having received an offer from the producers of the Biograph studio to try his hand at directing the film *The Adventures of Dolly* (1908), he, oddly enough, was afraid of ruining his acting career in the theatre, and therefore hesitated for a long time and was tempted only by the fee (it was \$ 50 a week). Paradoxically, the artist did not even realise that he would be able to realise himself as a creator-author, as a founder of authorship in the directorial model, precisely thanks to cinema, albeit with the support of the theatre base.

Despite pessimistic expectations, the first directorial experience captivated D. Griffith. From 1908 to 1912, he successfully filmed dozens of short films each week. He accumulated knowledge of achievements in the field of screen, mainly in European art schools and trends, and borrowed foreign cinematic experience. Gradually, he became interested in the director's profession and began developing his own authorial style. Through images, ideas, experiences, beliefs, the artist mo-

bilized all his essential abilities, sought to comprehend the picture of the multifaceted world, connect its disparate parts, use potential opportunities to realize, reflect and try to change in the field available to him, and also gradually build his own author's world, which should appear, according to E. Sydorovska (2016, p.166), as 'a personally experienced and experientially comprehensive world, given in the richness of sensory and mental perception, experiences and values, in which the entire life of each person unfolds'.

D. Griffith boldly combined in his work the skills of a playwright, director, and actor, allowing him to engage in interesting experiments with the content and form of screen works. Working in partnership with a brilliant cinematographer (G. W. Bitzer), D. Griffith demonstrated his unique genius and experimented with light, camera capabilities, frame scale, and editing techniques. William M. Drew (2002) writes that 'his use of close-ups and medium shots allowed the viewer to empathize with the emotions expressed by the characters; his rhythmic editing style enhanced the drama; his panoramic long shots created an impression of epic grandeur; and his innovations in lighting with the help of cinematographer Bitzer added mood and aesthetic quality to the images'. The researcher adds that 'by attaching great importance to the use of locations for realism, he sought to enhance the dramatisation of events. Griffith, without even suspecting it, laid the foundations of authorship in Hollywood when, in 1910, he began to annually transport his troupe from New York to California for seasonal filming' (Drew, 2002). The studio management was not pleased with the young director's experiments, but his films sold well, so the artist was not forbidden to experiment.

In our opinion, a significant contribution of the master to the development of his own screen language should be seen in the reform of the system of acting. The director paid considerable attention to the development of the plastic culture of performers – mimicry, gesture, gait (dramatic, tragic, comedic, lyrical), the art of dance, horse riding, and the actors' strict adherence to tempo and rhythm. William M. Drew (2002) points out that the director-author assembled a team of young actors and actresses, including Mary Pickford, Blanche Sweet, May Marsh, Lillian and Dorothy Gish, Robert Harron, Henry B. Walthall, and Lionel Barrymore, among others. To convey his artistic vision, D. Griffith formed in his actors a new, more restrained performing style, completely different from the theatrical one.

E. Toeplitz (1955, p.84) wrote that D. Griffith 'was in love with the expressiveness of the body, facial expressions and gestures of the actors he trained, and therefore boldly forced them to 'play with their backs'. To educate young talent, he created his own training workshop and carefully selected actors for film and theatre productions. Interestingly, D. Griffith invited young performers who had no theatre experience but could learn quickly to work organically in front of the camera on his own film projects. As a teacher, D. Griffith carefully monitored their physical training and developed his students' acting skills and abilities to achieve natural behaviour in the frame. The actors needed this skill to expand their roles. D. Griffith was famous for his undoubted talent for forming a harmonious acting ensemble. To do this, he used his stage experience working with performers. As an experiment, he tried to approve (as in theatrical practice) understudy roles that had been rehearsed in the same way.

Today, we can discuss the unique creative contribution of D. Griffith to the formation and development of the American model of auteur cinema, with a particular focus on its picture of the world. At the same time, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the picture of the world, which is constantly changing and appears in numerous variants in space and in human life. It is she who, at each historical stage of the development of humanity, is entrusted with the performance of several important functions, such as: orienting a person in the turbulent flow of social phenomena, filling his perception of surrounding things with cultural content (Pohrebniak, 2020), 'mediating human communications, promoting the development of a program of practical behavior' (Rosul, 2012, p.296) regarding the implementation of the chosen lifestyle.

As a director-author, D. Griffith boldly changed contemporary approaches to the development of acting skills; he created the basis for the now-famous system of 'star' actors. In addition, his passion for literature led him to seek to introduce narrative form into screen dramaturgy. It was D. Griffith who, for the first time in the history of American cinema, successfully adapted the genres of the novel and the play to the screen. This practice remains relevant to this day. It was from literary forms and genres that the master borrowed the techniques of narration, the ability to develop a plot in multiple planes, and a happy ending. It is noteworthy that the imitation of novel forms of narration in the presentation of both events and images of heroes prompted D. Griffith to resort to using the 'narrative function of the cinematographic apparatus' (Toeplitz, 1955, p.84). A subjective film camera imitates the author's view of on-screen events, of the reproduction of reality by on-screen means.

It is important that the director made a creative experiment as the basis of his authorial work. In the early period of its formation, film production in the United States developed under the strict rule of imitation of European cinematic experience. D. Griffith also partially borrowed screen techniques. However, the master did not unthinkingly copy the findings of European filmmakers, but adapted them to his own work and gave them an authorial identity. It is noteworthy that he adopted and reinterpreted some of the means of his screen language from fine art, in particular, composition, perspective, and light and shadow. Almost the key expressive means of his authorial language were the close-up and detail, taken from British filmmakers from Brighton. D. Griffith creatively presented the possibilities of scaling in the frame (for the maximum plastic expressiveness of the characters) in such, undoubtedly, author's paintings as, 'The Birth of a Nation', 'Intolerance', 'Hearts of the World', 'Broken Shoots', 'The Road to the East', 'The White Rose', 'America', 'Dream Street', 'Isn't Life Wonderful?' and others. D. Griffith himself noted that 'museums around the world show such works of fine art that captivate the public primarily by enlarging faces' (Smith, 2008).

William M. Drew (2002), in his article 'D. W. Griffith (1875-1948)', points out that 'contrary to legend, most of Griffith's films made money in Mamaroneck, but because of the debts the director had accumulated while running the studio and his incompetence in business matters, he was unable to make a profit from the films made after 'The Road to the East.' The researcher clarifies that 'the Hollywood establishment, which had lauded him as the greatest cinematic genius of the 1910s, increasingly resented Griffith's Eastern

defiance of the West Coast industry. It was increasingly said that Griffith was committed to an old-fashioned Victorian worldview and out of step with the times'.

D. Griffith gradually formed his own authorial style. His authorial style was a demonstration of his worldview, which became 'a prerequisite for the desire to find answers to important life questions. It was also a determining factor in the successful implementation of the master's worldview, their embodiment in a reproducible picture of the world' (Pohrebniak, 2020, p.10).

As a director-author, D. Griffith confidently and quickly improved his screen language. He constantly changed the rhythm and used various editing techniques – sequential, parallel, cross, associative, montage-chorus, etc. It was through authorial editing techniques that he could simultaneously develop several storylines, each with its own protagonists. Such means of filming as inflows, enlargement (zoom), blackouts, and catches allowed the master to create an emotional background for the narrative. It is noteworthy that, devoted to the theatre, D. Griffith developed his creative method as a contrast to stage culture. For this purpose, the master used an original compositional frame structure. In this way, he emphasised the subtle psychological nuances of his characters. Today, we can say that D. Griffith, as a director-author, laid the foundations of authorship in American cinema, presenting his unique system of screen images.

So, at the time of his acquaintance with cinema, Ch. Chaplin had considerable experience in the theatre. He worked in the theatre enterprise of F. Karno and was considered an unsurpassed and, above all, recognisable master of pantomime. The audience admired the expression in

his images, like D. Griffith and Ch. Chaplin was not going to connect his life to cinema; he adored the theatre, but the contract for 75 dollars a week with the Keystone studio proved too tempting. Just as Griffith did, he considered work in cinema temporary, meant only to improve his financial situation. However, gradually the possibilities of the screen captured him, because 'if you combine the conventional world of the theatre with the real one, he will certainly die in a collision with the latter' (Pohrebniak, 2020, p.17).

E. Toeplitz (1955, p.105) argues that, despite his desire, Ch. Chaplin, when creating his directorial model, was not, and did not want to be, a reformer of the artistic form, unlike D. Griffith, who created a new screen language. Ch. Chaplin, on the contrary, was considered old-fashioned, because he preferred general plans, shooting with a fixed camera and transferred his heroes from the world of grotesque and buffoonery to the real world of American reality'. In his authorial screen model, he always (from early to late films) remained faithful to theatrical principles – from the internal foundations of the characters' grotesqueness, to external manifestations – make-up, costumes, exaggerated acting, especially facial expressions. C. Chaplin (1992, p.65), actively using theatrical gestures, said that he resorted to general shots in order to show how 'the hero works in the frame in full growth: not only his feet, but also his legs, face, hands, because in pantomime the actor expresses the essence of the scene with his whole body, so there is no need to highlight his face in close-up'.

As a talented person, he was convinced that his directing and acting skills were unique. Paradoxically, and perhaps precisely because of his original talent, he refused to use innovative filming techniques,

which were extremely popular in European cinema. He deliberately subordinated the then screen capabilities to the plastic expressiveness of the actor's body. It is interesting that, in building an author's directorial model in the screen space, C. Chaplin consciously avoided mass scenes to avoid distracting from the protagonists' actions. For example, in his unsurpassed films (*The Immigrant*, *The Pilgrim*, *The Kid*, *The Parisian*, *Gold Rush*, *The Circus*, *City Lights*, *New Times*, *The Great Dictator*, *Monsieur Verdu*, *Street Lights*, and others), the master uses close-ups only when the character's facial expressions make more sense than the plastic expressiveness of the entire body.

As a director-author, he relied on techniques of acting expressiveness rather than on screen technologies. He showed the actors as if he were looking at them from a seat in the theatre hall.

Chaplin, the director, boldly and irrevocably changed the ideas of both his colleagues in the art department and the audience about acting on the screen. He presented the audience with an eloquent image of a unique, benevolent hero with refined manners. His little tramp, who captivates from the very first appearance in the frame, constantly finds himself in various awkward situations, but the audience sympathises with him, cries, smiles, and suffers. The audience identifies with the screen image, their lives, and their aspirations. This happens because Chaplin builds the author's presentation of the screen narrative so that the main thing is not the direct action on the screen, but the audience's reaction to it: fear, sadness, despair, crying, and laughter. In this way, the director-author, within the framework of his cinematic model, for the first time in the field of American visual culture, unites the artist and the audience and introduc-

es into 'mechanical screen entertainment the humanistic values of high art' (Sadoul, 1955, p.132). It should be noted that Ch. Chaplin, the actor, while nurturing his favourite image, did not even assume that the image of a small and sincere tramp would be so widespread in the artistic culture of the 20th–21st centuries.

In his films, Ch. Chaplin showcased various facets of the director's craft, yet was constantly reminded of his theatrical origins. The artist built a theatrical and cinematic author's model and, in all his films, tried to demonstrate respect for the performing arts. After all, it was the theatre that did not let him die of hunger in his youth. This was manifested in how he initially worked with the artist on the construction of heavy, even bulky, scenery structures; how he demonstratively emphasised the unique, eccentric component of performing skills; and how he built dialogues and monologues for his grotesque heroes.

Charles Chaplin incorporated acting, directing, composing, and producing into his cinematic work, and also actively gravitated towards biographical work. This can be confirmed by his autobiographical film *'Street Lights'*, which was nevertheless dedicated to the theatre. It was to the theatre that the master owed his formation as a person. In the film, the artist is shown growing old alone, abandoned and forgotten by his family and friends. At the end of his creative and biological life path, he suffers from social oppression and harassment, but gives valuable advice to the young choreographer. J. Sadoul (1955, p.373) wrote that in this film, Ch. Chaplin 'in his deep self-expression was extremely close to the work of W. Shakespeare. It was in this film that the key theme of Chaplin's human dignity and humanity was recreated with enormous power'. Ye. Morieva, and

A. Maslov-Lysyckin (2022, p.26) in the article 'The Birth of a New Type of Comedy in Charlie Chaplin's Films' write that 'the director's own life experience allowed him to create unique screen works based on humanism and love of life'.

Hard work across many studios and numerous successful productions allowed him to quickly achieve independent status as an author-director, screenwriter, actor, and producer. In addition, 'a feature of Chaplin's 'phenomenon' is that almost all production and post-production was concentrated in his hands; he saw the perspective of the entire process, competently managed the budget, and learned to flexibly plan each shooting day' (Morieva and Maslov-Lysyckin, 2022, p.29). This approach is quite relevant in modern practices of directors-authors. In his authorial work, Ch. Chaplin aspired to achieve extraordinary visual accuracy in the depiction of each character. To this end, for the sake of a high-quality screen product, he could shoot many takes of the same frame without saving on film.

In his auteur films, Ch. Chaplin usually left the ending open for the audience – his hero is rapidly going to meet his fortune along a deserted road to an unknown destination. In this way, Ch. Chaplin 'incited the audience to think about the heroes, themselves, social problems and the world around them' (Wada, n.d.). Theorists of auteur cinema will soon define the director's innovative approaches as a key feature of the movement. According to L. Kornieieva (n.d.), 'auteur cinema requires a certain concentration and effort from the average viewer, encourages reflection and intellectual analysis, a more complex, higher, more spiritual level of interaction with the film text'.

The phenomenon of the outstanding artist's work is that he managed to combine

stage and screen eccentricity in a new authorial form for a film franchise and also a successful merchandise line based on the sad adventures of the unfortunate tramp Charlot Chaplin. In the author's work, Ch. Chaplin (1992, p.106) drew on the experience of his own difficult life, and he always sought to add a particular flavour of biographicalism to his films. The declaration of 'war on Hollywood' did not prevent him from producing one of the most popular images in the world. A small but robust and tenacious character was endowed with high moral qualities and therefore remains recognisable today.

The strengthening of authorial principles in American cinema occurred at the turn of the 1960s and 1970s, as the visual culture of New Hollywood began to take shape, with one of its brightest representatives being Martin Scorsese. Intensely studying the work of both American directors (D. Griffith, C. Chaplin, O. Wells, F. Capra, D. Ford, G. Hawkes, D. Cukor, A. Hitchcock), and representatives of the French New Wave, M. Scorsese formulated his author's credo. He believed that 'the most successful musicians, artists and writers in the world recognise that in order to have the freedom to create the art they want, they must have the necessary funds. Moreover, to obtain these funds, they must be ready to compromise on something' (Halmakov, 2023).

Working in both film and television, M. Scorsese created a number of films (feature and documentary) in which he expressed or recreated biographical moments from his passion for cinema. For example, the film *The Time Keeper* (based on the novel by B. Selznick, *The Invention of Hugo Cabret*) is dedicated to the life and work of J. Melies, whose films made an unforgettable impression on the young Martin. It is noteworthy that M. Scorsese,

like D. Griffith, resorted to the adaptation of literary works, in particular novels. It is noteworthy that in the documentary film *A Personal Journey with Martin Scorsese Through American Movies*, the master demonstrated his personal view of how a director-author should be formed, adapting the achievements of prominent screen masters in his work, transforming technological achievements in his films, creating his own screen language, and, most importantly, establishing channels of communication with the audience.

In the documentary film, M. Scorsese's exceptional attention to the socio-political direction of Chaplin's films is striking. Interestingly, M. Scorsese filmed his full-length debut (*I Call First*) in 1967, while Chaplin released his last film, *A Countess from Hong Kong*, in the same year.

M. Scorsese can rightfully be called (like D. Griffith and Chaplin) an actor-director, and this is undoubtedly the key authorial feature of his work. He can create a unique acting ensemble that allows deep penetration into the characters' emotional spheres and psychology. At the same time, he skillfully creates long-term director-actor tandems, particularly with Robert De Niro and Leonardo DiCaprio. Moreover, part of his authorial style is the appearance of the master himself in numerous episodic roles.

It is significant that in the author's films by M. Scorsese (*Raging Bull*, *The Colour of Money*, *Goodfellas*, *Cape Fear*, *The Age of Innocence*, *Casino*, *Gangs of New York*, *The Aviator*, *The Departed*, *Island of the Damned*, and others), just as in Ch. Chaplin's films, the 'brilliant image of America, which Hollywood usually created' (Myslavskiy, 2024, p.123), were deliberately destroyed by reproducing themes

of violence, crime, and the moral and religious choices of archetypal heroes.

Interesting are M. Scorsese's thoughts on the profession of a director. He was convinced that it was impossible to 'teach a person how to make a movie' (Lopes, 2017, p.268). The director was sure that any educational institution in cinematography could provide only initial knowledge to a young talent. However, 'you can only become a director by making many films, giving it your all and constantly taking care of your self-development' (Lopes, 2017, p.270) in a marathon called creative life.

Evaluating his numerous works and himself as an author-creator, M. Scorsese, a prominent experimenter and innovator of the authorial form of cinematic narrative, said without exaggeration: 'I am my cinema, and for the sake of maximum self-realisation, cinema should become the meaning of life' (Lopes, 2017, p.275).

Conclusions

The study of the genesis of authorship in the screen and stage space of American visual culture showed that the author's experiment in the field of form and content, the experiment in mastering a variety of topics, genre palette, director-actor methods of cooperation does not hinder the profitability of authorial films, but on the contrary can attract the viewer and incline them to active communication. In addition, the uniqueness of the formation of authorial directing in American cinema lies in the fact that its foundations were laid by actors who mastered the roles of director, screenwriter, and producer, thereby presenting a modern model of authorship.

СПИСОК БІБЛІОГРАФІЧНИХ ПОСИЛАНЬ

- Альфьорова, З.І., 2004. «Образ світу» у фільмах про віртуальну реальність. *Мистецтвознавство України*, 4, с.214-221.
- Гальмаков, Ю., 2023. Концепція Мартіна Скорсезе у мистецтві. *Galmakov.com*, [online] 11 жовтня. Доступно: <<https://galmakov.com/konceptcija-martina-skorseze-u-mistectvi/>> [Дата звернення 18 січня 2026].
- Грінберг, Л.Ф., 2016. Проблема національного у картині світу Пантелеймона Куліша. *Мистецтвознавчі записки*, 30, с.123-130.
- Жукова, Н.А., 2010. *Елітарність як компонент культуротворення: досвід некласичної естетики*. Київ: Парапан.
- Зубавіна, І., 2015. Кіноархетипіка як ядро екранного наративу. *Науковий вісник Київського національного університету театру, кіно і телебачення імені І. К. Карпенка-Карого*, 16, с.75-83.
- Клековкін, О., 2015. «Еклектика» Макса Райнгардта. *Сучасні проблеми дослідження, реставрації та збереження культурної спадщини*, 11, с.118-143.
- Корнєєва, Л.Л., б.д. Авторське кіно. В: *Велика українська енциклопедія*. [online] Доступно: <https://vuc.gov.ua/Авторське_кіно> [Дата звернення 18 січня 2026].
- Миславський, В.Н., 2024. *Західний кінематограф. Концептуально-термінологічний словник*. Харків: Точка.
- Морева, Є. та Маслов-Лисичкін, А., 2022. Зародження комедії нового типу у фільмах Чарлі Чапліна. *Вісник КНУКіМ. Серія: Мистецтвознавство*, [e-journal] 47, с.26-32. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2410-1176.47.2022.269545>
- Нечаєнко, Т.В., 2023. Мейнінгенський театр другої половини ХІХ століття: креативність механізмів режисури Людвіга Кронєка. *Вісник Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв*, [e-journal] 2, с.249-254. <https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.2.2023.286911>
- Олійник, Л. 2010. Лесь Курбас: Розумний Арлекін. Портретний колаж. *Teatre*, [online] 02 марта. Доступно: <<https://teatre.com.ua/portrait/les-kurbas-rozumnyj-arlekin/>> [Дата звернення 18 січня 2026].
- Погребняк, Г.П., 2020. *Авторський кінематограф у культурному просторі другої половини ХХ – початку ХХІ століття*. Київ: Національна академія керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв.
- Погребняк, Г.П., 2022. Режисерські моделі авторського кіно в сучасному фестивальному просторі. Частина 2. Фестивальний формат фільмів українських режисерів-авторів. *Науковий вісник Київського національного університету театру, кіно і телебачення імені І. К. Карпенка-Карого*, [e-journal] 30, с.29-36. <https://doi.org/10.34026/1997-4264.30.2022.259496>
- Росул, Т.І., 2012. Наукова і художня картини світу: тенденції взаємодії. *Гілея*, 58 (3), с.295-298.
- Сидоровська, Є.А., 2016. Життєвий світ людини: до історії проблеми. *Мистецтвознавчі записки*, 30, с.156-169.
- Шинкарук, В.І. ред., 2002. *Філософський енциклопедичний словник*. Київ: Абрис.
- Крала, І.В. та Берташ, В.О., 2016. Мовна та концептуальна картини світу як відображення свідомості нації. В: *Актуальні проблеми філології та методики викладання гуманітарних дисциплін*, [online] с.32-35. Доступно: <<https://surl.li/lyaidv>> [Дата звернення 18 січня 2026].
- Chaplin, Ch., 1992. *My autobiography*. New York : Plume.

- Drew, W.M., 2002. D. W. Griffith (1875-1948). *Gilda Tabarez*, [online] August 10. Available at: <<http://www.gildasattic.com/dwgriffith.html>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Ebert, R., 2003. The Birth of a Nation. *Roger Ebert.com*, [online] March 30. Available at: <<https://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/great-movie-the-birth-of-a-nation-1915>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Lopes, P., 2017. The power of Hyphen-Nationalism: Martin Scorsese's sojourn from Italian American to White-Ethnic American. *Social Identities*, [e-journal] 23 (5), pp.562-578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2017.1303373>
- Sadoul, G., 1955. *Histoire de l'art du cinéma des origines à nos jours*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Smith, M.W., 2008. American Valkyries: Richard Wagner, D. W. Griffith, and the Birth of Classical Cinema. *Modernism/modernity*, [e-journal] 15 (2), pp.221-242. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/mod.2008.0040>
- Toeplitz, J., 1955. *Historia sztuki filmowej*. Filmowa Agencja Wydawnicza. T. 1-4.
- Wada, L., n.d. Charlie Chaplin's Wives. Part 2. *Edna Purviance*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.ednapurviance.org/chaplininfo/chaplinwives.html>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].

REFERENCES

- Alforova, Z.I., 2004. "Obraz svitu" u filmakh pro virtualnu realnist ["The Image of the World" in Virtual Reality Films]. *Art Research of Ukraine*, 4, pp.214-221.
- Chaplin, Ch., 1992. *My autobiography*. New York: Plume.
- Drew, W.M., 2002. D. W. Griffith (1875-1948). *Gilda Tabarez*, [online] August 10. Available at: <<http://www.gildasattic.com/dwgriffith.html>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Ebert, R., 2003. The Birth of a Nation. *Roger Ebert.com*, [online] March 30. Available at: <<https://www.rogerebert.com/reviews/great-movie-the-birth-of-a-nation-1915>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Halmakov, Yu., 2023. Kontsepsiia Martina Skorseze u mystetstvi [Martin Scorsese's concept in art]. *Galmakov.com*, [online] October 11. Available at: <<https://galmakov.com/koncepcija-martina-skorseze-u-mistectvi/>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Hrinberh, L.F., 2016. Problema natsionalnoho u kartyni svitu Panteleimona Kulisha [The problem of the national in picture of the world Panteleimon Kulish]. *Notes on Art Criticism*, 30, pp.123-130.
- Klekovkin, O., 2015. "Eklektyka" Maksa Rainhardta [The "Eclectic" by Max Reinhardt]. *Suchasni problemy doslidzhennia, restavratsii ta zberezhenia kulturnoi spadshchyny*, 11, pp.118-143.
- Kornieieva, L.L., n.d. Avtorske kino [Author's cinema]. In: *Great Ukrainian Encyclopedia*. [online] Available at: <[https://vue.gov.ua/Avtorske kino](https://vue.gov.ua/Avtorske_kino)> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Kralia, I.V. and Bertash, V.O., 2016. Movna ta kontseptualna kartyny svitu yak vidobrazhennia svidomosti natsii [Linguistic and conceptual picture of the world as a reflection of the consciousness of the nation]. In: *Aktualni problemy filolohii ta metodyky vykladannia humanitarnykh dystsyplin*, [online] pp.32-35. Available at: <<https://surl.li/lyaidv>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Lopes, P., 2017. The power of Hyphen-Nationalism: Martin Scorsese's sojourn from Italian American to White-Ethnic American. *Social Identities*, [e-journal] 23 (5), pp.562-578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2017.1303373>
- Morieva, Ye. and Maslov-Lysyckin, A., 2022. Zarodzhennia komedii novoho typu u filmakh Charli Chaplina [The Birth of a New Type of Comedy in Charlie Chaplin's Films]. *Bulletin of KNUKIM. Series in Arts*, [e-journal] 47, pp.26-32. <https://doi.org/10.31866/2410-1176.47.2022.269545>

- Myslavskiy, V.N., 2024. *Zakhidnyi kinematohraf. Kontseptualno-terminolohichniy slovnyk* [Western Cinema. Conceptual and Terminological Dictionary]. Kharkiv: Tochka.
- Nechaienko, T.V., 2023. Meinhenskiy teatr druhoi polovyny XIX stolittia: kreatyvni mekhanizmy rezhysury Liudviga Kroneka [Meiningen Theatre of the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century: Creativity of Ludwig Kroneck's Directing Mechanisms]. *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, [e-journal] 2, pp.249-254. <https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.2.2023.286911>
- Oliinyk, L., 2010. Les Kurbas: Rozumnyi Arlekin. Portretnyi kolazh [Les Kurbas: Smart Harlequin. Portrait collage]. *Teatre*, [online] March 02. Available at: <<https://teatre.com.ua/portrait/les-kurbas-rozumnyi-arlekin/>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Pohrebniak, H.P., 2020. *Avtorckiy kinematohraf u kulturnomu proctori druhoi polovyny XX – pochatku XXI stolittia* [Authorial Cinema in the Cultural Space of the Second Half of the 20th – Early 21st Century]. Kyiv: National Academy of Culture and Arts Management.
- Pohrebniak, H.P., 2022. Rezhyserski modeli avtorskoho kino v suchasnomu festyvalnomu prostori. Chastyna 2. Festyvalnyi format filmiv ukrainskykh rezhysyrov-avtoriv [Directing models of author cinema in modern festival space Part 2. Festival format of films by Ukrainian directors]. *Academic Bulletin of Kyiv National Karpenko-Karyi University of Theatre, Cinema and Television*, [e-journal] 30, pp.29-36. <https://doi.org/10.34026/1997-4264.30.2022.259496>
- Rosul, T.I., 2012. Naukova i khudozhnia kartyny svitu: tendentsii vziaimodii [Scientific and artistic pictures of the world: tendencies of interaction]. *Hileia*, 58 (3), pp.295-298.
- Sadoul, G., 1955. *Histoire de l'art du cinéma des origines à nos jours*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Shynkaruk, V.I. ed., 2002. *Filosofskiy entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk* [Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary]. Kyiv: Abrys.
- Smith, M.W., 2008. American Valkyries: Richard Wagner, D. W. Griffith, and the Birth of Classical Cinema. *Modernism/modernity*, [e-journal] 15 (2), pp.221-242. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/mod.2008.0040>
- Sydorovska, Ye.A., 2016. Zhyttievyi svit liudyny: do istorii problem [Human life world: the history of the problem]. *Notes on Art Criticism*, 30, pp.156-169.
- Toeplitz, J., 1955. *Historia sztuki filmowej*. Filmowa Agencja Wydawnicza. T. 1-4.
- Wada, L., n.d. Charlie Chaplin's Wives. Part 2. *Edna Purviance*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.ednapurviance.org/chaplininfo/chaplinwives.html>> [Accessed 18 January 2026].
- Zhukova, N.A., 2010. *Elitarnist yak komponent kulturotvorennia: dosvid neklasychnoi estetyky* [Elitism as a component of cultural formation: the experience of non-classical aesthetics]. Kyiv: Parapan.
- Zubavina, I., 2015. Kinoarkhetypika yak yadro ekrannoho naratyvu [Cinematic archetype as the core of screen narrative]. *Academic Bulletin of Kyiv National Karpenko-Karyi University of Theatre, Cinema and Television*, 16, pp.75-83.

Received: 20.01.2026; Accepted: 23.02.2026

The article was first published online: 26.05.2026

ГЕНЕЗА АВТОРСТВА: СЦЕНІЧНИЙ ТА ЕКРАННИЙ ДИСКУРС**Галина Погребняк**

*доктор мистецтвознавства, професор,
професор кафедри режисури та акторської майстерності
імені народної артистки України Лариси Хоролець;
e-mail: galina.pogrebniak@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-8846-4939
Національна академія керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв, Київ, Україна*

Анотація

Мета дослідження – визначити специфіку становлення та розвитку авторства в контексті американської візуальної культури. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на застосуванні комплексу взаємодоповнювальних наукових підходів. Для вивчення генези авторства в сценічному та екранному просторі використано системний, порівняльний і компаративний методи. Аналіз різних моделей екранного та сценічного авторства зумовив залучення структурно-функціонального методу, що дав змогу простежити їхню внутрішню організацію та взаємозв'язки. Біографічний метод застосовано для дослідження особистісних чинників творчості американських режисерів-авторів. Метод узагальнення використано з метою теоретичного осмислення та обґрунтування унікальності явища авторства у візуальній культурі. **Наукова новизна** статті полягає у з'ясуванні концептуальних передумов формування авторства в американському кіномистецтві крізь призму становлення ранніх взірців кінематографічної та театральної творчості, репрезентованих визначними режисерами у візуальній американській культурі. **Висновки.** Доведено, що становлення та розвиток авторства в американському кінематографі відбувалися у тісному взаємозв'язку екранного й сценічного мистецтва, тоді як підвалини режисерських авторських моделей значною мірою були закладені акторською практикою та сценічним досвідом, що вплинуло на формування індивідуалізованого творчого стилю та авторської стратегії візуального висловлювання.

Ключові слова: візуальна культура; театр; кінематограф; режисерська творчість; акторська майстерність; автор; телебачення

