



THE ROLE OF ACTION ANALYSIS IN DIRECTING

Makhmudova H.A.

Honored Youth Mentor of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Professor

Abstract: Literacy, high skill of the director depends on knowing the analysis of behavior, developing skills for it, gaining experience and realizing it on the stage through the method of physical movement together with the actors.

Keywords: composite device; behavior analysis; methodology of physical movements; laws of natural creation; topic; idea; system of events; condition - determination of conditions; the supreme purpose of the work; final and main event.

The laws of organic creativity, discovered by K.S. Stanislavsky, are uniform, but the concepts can be unique, subject to the laws of a specific theater troupe, studio.

This article aims to bring to a common denominator some discrepancies in the definition of terminology, the essence of the concepts of professional effective analysis of a stage work. Even within the walls of an educational institution, masters, relying on their own individual experience and knowledge, create their own definitions of concepts and principles of effective analysis. This leads to discrepancies, a violation of the compositional structure, the semantic indistinctness of the performance, creates difficulties in a situation when students from different workshops, due to circumstances, work in different theater troupes on some single theater project.

Let us turn to the legacy of K.S. Stanislavsky on this matter. First of all, any science is characterized by the fact that the laws that make it up are not invented, not composed, but discovered. They existed before they were discovered and continue to operate regardless of whether people know them or not, whether this or that person likes them or not. All this fully applies to Stanislavsky's system. Just like any other genuine science, Stanislavsky's system is not invented, not made up, not composed, but discovered in the living practice of acting. The same creativity that existed before K.S. Stanislavsky discovered its laws, and which exists regardless of whether people know or do not know, or to what degree of completeness and accuracy these laws are known. "Our artistic nature," wrote K.S. Stanislavsky, "has its own creative laws. They are obligatory for all people, all countries, times and nations. The essence of these laws must be comprehended. All great artists, without suspecting it, subconsciously followed this path in their work."¹

Many of us know the "system" of K.S. Stanislavsky approximately, and what is even worse, perceive it dogmatically. The science created by him can be known more or less, but it cannot be known completely and to the end. For the practical application of any science, especially concerning the psychology of acting, directing, is always a creative and individual process. A system based on objective laws is reflected in the consciousness of a creative person subjectively, depending on the needs of knowledge and practical creativity. K.S. Stanislavsky said: "I, Stanislavsky, know the system, but I do not yet know how, or rather, I am only beginning to know how to apply it. In order to master the system I have developed, I need to be born

¹ Станиславский К.С. Статьи. Речи. Беседы. Письма. - М., 1953 с. 336

a second time and, having lived to sixteen, begin my acting».²

K.S. Stanislavsky attached great importance to the effective analysis of a stage work. He divided the work into effective facts, pieces and episodes, defining the tasks of each piece, while emphasizing their further enlargement. "There are no sharp boundaries between conscious and subconscious experience. Consciousness often gives the direction in which subconscious activity continues to work - says K.S. Stanislavsky in his book "The Actor's Work on Himself". "I try to learn to excite superconscious creativity in myself - inspiration itself - with the help of conscious work techniques." K.S. Stanislavsky ³

Stanislavsky's teaching is based on the objective laws of the physical and spiritual nature of the actor's creativity. He proposed methods of working on a role and a play: the method of effective analysis and the method of physical actions, used not only by actors, but also being the pinnacle of Stanislavsky's directorial teaching. Both parts are inextricably linked. However, it must be remembered that at the time when the system was created, it underwent major and minor evolutions over more than thirty years. Stanislavsky carefully tested each of its provisions in practice before he decided to publish some of the results of his searches and discoveries. By the beginning of the 1930s, when Stanislavsky began to bring together all his observations, his archive had collected thousands of pages. The author managed to prepare for publication only the book "My Life in Art", which is essentially only a kind of introduction to the system. The second book that Stanislavsky worked on, "The Actor's Work on Himself", was supposed to consist of two parts: the first part - "The Actor's Work on Himself in the Creative Process of Experience"; the second part - "The Actor's Work on Himself in the Creative Process of Embodiment". Stanislavsky managed to read the layout of only Part I; Part II was published by researchers of archival materials after Stanislavsky's death. The published collected works of Stanislavsky are reconstructions of preparatory materials, nothing more. Stanislavsky's system, honed in all details, strictly constructed, does not exist in a literary version. "And no matter how much the so-called "propagandists of the "system" refer to these works, the fact remains: in Stanislavsky's books, his ideas and methods are not expressed clearly enough. Such concepts as an effective analysis of the play and role and the method of physical actions are not characterized at all, but it is known that in recent years Stanislavsky put these concepts in the foreground as the most important ones on the path to creating the "life of the human spirit" on stage," writes K. L. Rudnitsky in his introductory article in the preface to the book by G. A. Tovstonogov "Conversations with Colleagues."⁴

Stanislavsky was most afraid of the canonization of his teaching and was himself subject to doubts, contradictions, self-refutations. In the chapter summarizing the second part of the book "The Actor's Work on Himself", Stanislavsky warns: "The System" is a guide. Open it and read. "The System" is a reference book, not a philosophy. From the moment philosophy begins, the system is finished. The system can be viewed at home, but on stage, drop everything. "The System" cannot be played. It is nature. The concern of my whole life is to come as close as possible to what is called "the system", that is, to the nature of creativity.. ⁵ "There should be no textbook or grammar of dramatic art," he emphasized these words in 1906 in the preface to "The Dramatic Artist's Handbook."⁶ However, in the same 1906, due to Stanislavsky's own creative crisis, he had the idea of studying the actor's work. The desire to find ways to acting perfection nevertheless forced him to turn to the analysis of the psychological foundations of the actor's skill, to the nature of acting and directing creativity. Continuous self-reform, search - make up the soul of Stanislavsky's teaching. In 1933, he wrote to the Moscow Art Theatre actress N.V. Tikhomirova: "I lived a long time. I saw a lot. I was rich. Then I became poor. I saw the world. I had a good family, children. Life scattered everyone around the world. I grew old. I will die soon.

Now ask me: what is happiness on earth?

In knowledge. In art and in work, in comprehending it.

2 Топорков О. Станиславский на репетиции. - М.-Л., 1949 с. 114

3 «Работа актёра над собой». М., Искусство, 1989 г. Стр.437

4 Товстоногов Г.А. Беседы с коллегами. М., 1988.

5 Станиславский К.С. Собр. соч., т. 3, с. 302

6 Станиславский К.С. Из записных книжек. Т. Т.1. М., 1986. с. 208 - 209.

By learning art in yourself, you learn nature, the life of the world, the meaning of life, you learn the soul - talent!

There is no happiness higher than this».7

I would like this definition to become part of the life and work of future directors.

It is the open nature of the master's legacy, far from the final results, from the ultimate truth, that arouses special interest in him, stimulates the search for ways of his development in the new theatrical time.

The teachers M.O. Knebel, B. Zakhava, A.M. Polamishev and others, recognized by all in the theatrical world, touched upon the analysis of dramatic works in detail in their books. 8 We will not focus on them, they are well known. We will only emphasize their differences from the methods of effective analysis proposed by us. M.O. Knebel, relying on the teachings of K.S. Stanislavsky, mainly reveals the second stage of the method of effective analysis, the so-called "reconnaissance by the body" - the method of physical action and, like B. Zakhava, very correctly insists on the mandatory preliminary definition of the theme, idea, event sequence, selection of proposed circumstances, the super-task of the work. However, these requirements are set out in text, linearly, and the event sequence is not named and not defined precisely. In the formulations of the key concepts of the theory, it is important to maintain accuracy, because, as modern psychological science asserts, "... awareness is unthinkable without naming, that is, without designating the conscious with an exact word, without verbalization." A special place is occupied by the book by I.B. Malochevskaya "Tovstonogov's Directing School" based on his lectures and practical classes. She, like A.I. Katsman, had invaluable experience of working together with G.A. Tovstonogov on directing courses. In her book, I.B. Malochevskaya asserts: "that pedagogy is both art and science. Much in theater education is still done in a makeshift, primitive manner, without proper scientific justification. The denial of technique by amateurs is not due to a conscious conviction, but to laziness, to licentiousness. The school gives its students a reliable compass so that they can independently go on a search, on an experiment. It does not protect, of course, from mistakes and falls, but in the hands of curious and patient people it becomes an instrument of knowledge. "The method of effective analysis of a play and a role, which is the basis of the directing school, is the most important professional tool: it is a compass in the hands of the director, but each time you need to choose new paths and paths and only your own. It is necessary to avoid copying other people's ideas, slavishly following the "letter", to apply a creative rather than a mechanical approach to various methods of directing technique, to maintain a free view of the profession, and independence of judgment.»9

In his book Conversations with Colleagues, A.G. Tovstonogov clearly, in detail and more than once insists on precise definitions of the concepts of action analysis. In his lectures, A.O. Katsman said that he and G.A. Tovstonogov revised their teaching methods every five years, analyzing, clarifying the terminology and deepening their method of action analysis. During the revision and more in-depth analysis, he came to the conclusion that it is more accurate to define the final event as the one that completes the plot or story of the main characters. And the main event is the last event of the play, where the fate of the initial proposed circumstances is resolved. The theme, idea, and super-task of the work are carved out of the main event. And this, in our opinion, is a more precise and correct definition. For the word MAIN concentrates the director's attention on the concept of the production, its super-task. The same applies to the concepts of the terms "event" and "fact". Both "fact" and "event" introduce new proposed circumstances. However, "event" is a change in the leading circumstance of the goal and action, while "fact" can change the state of health, but will not change the goal and action. Method and methodology should be considered as a living process subject to development and improvement. Each artist seeks his own path, generalizing and using the experience of knowledge in the field of director's and actor's creativity.

7 Станиславский К.С. Собр. соч., т. 8, 1961, с. 324 -325

8 Поламишев А.М. Мастерство режиссёра: Действенный анализ пьесы. М., 1982.

Кнебель М. [О действенном анализе пьесы и роли.](#)

Поламишев А. [Событие - основа спектакля.](#) /<http://www.krispen.narod.ru/>

9 Малочевская И.Б. Режиссёрские уроки Товстоногова <http://www.krispen.narod.ru>

References:

- 1 Станиславский К.С. Статьи. Речи. Беседы. Письма. - М., 1953 с. 336
- 2 К.С.Станиславский. Актёрнинг ўз устида ишлаши. Т. Ҳўжаев таржимаси. Тошкент 1965 й.
- 3 Н. Заҳидова. Тошхўжа Ҳўжаев. Тошкент. 1980.
- 4 Товстоногов Г.А. Беседы с коллегами. М., 1988.
- 5 Станиславский К.С. Собр. соч., т. 3, с. 302
- 6 Станиславский К.С. Из записных книжек. Т. Т.1. М., 1986. с. 208 - 209.
- 7 Поламишев А.М. Мастерство режиссёра: Действенный анализ пьесы. М., 1982.
- 8 Кнебель М.О. О действенном анализе пьесы и роли. /<http://www.krispen.narod.ru/>
- 9 Поламишев А. Событие - основа спектакля. /<http://www.krispen.narod.ru/>
- 10 Малочевская И.Б. Режиссёрские уроки Товстоногова /<http://www.krispen.narod.ru/>