



## FEATURES OF THEATER -SPECTATOR INTERACTION

Dr. Azat A. Yusupov

Associate Professor National Institute Of Arts And Design Named After Kamoliddin Behzod Tashkent, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

In this article, the traditions of perceiving the relationship between the theater and the actor exclusively as a performance and the artists playing in it were studied and analyzed, that the theatrical product is perceived by the theater workers themselves not as a volumetric and stereoscopic phenomenon, but, as a rule, is traditionally one-dimensional. Meanwhile, in modern society, theater acquires significance for the public not only as an art phenomenon, but also as an element of fashion, prestige, social status, the context of certain behavior, as a way of spending leisure time, self-presentation, education, etc.

**KEYWORDS:** - Theater, direction, cultural semiotic space, decorations, theatrical space.

*"The theater is being built not only by those who work on the stage, even if they are very talented; the theater is also created by the will of the audience. The theater is two halves - if it's safe in one half, it doesn't mean that it's safe in the whole theater."*

**V. E. Meyerhold**

### INTRODUCTION

Theater is a kind of art, a feature of which is the artistic display of the phenomena of life through dramatic action that arises in the process of actors playing in front of the audience. In the course of historical development, three main types of theater were identified, differing in specific features and means of artistic expression - dramatic, opera and ballet.

The theater not only produces performances, it constantly reproduces a qualitatively new

audience [3.-P.79].

Refuting the widespread notion that theatrical art is of interest only to highly educated people, a certain intelligentsia, in the professional theatrical sphere the issue of attracting as many spectators as possible, expanding the social profile of the audience, raising and educating an audience open to artistic contacts is emphasized.

### THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

One of the most important problems in the theater's activities is its own professional



language with its artistic features, which have been introduced in the practice of theaters around the world. Such a statement may seem contradictory, because if you take it for the truth, then you need to believe that the established theatrical order has no right to count on some special creativity, in view of the fact that other types of art (music, painting, 12 choreographies etc.) possess such a language. Be that as it may, it can be assumed that theater in this sense is a rather unique phenomenon - as a special result of creative activity, it is not endowed with a personal universal and professional language.

By “professional language” is meant the fact that there is a specific language intermediary between groups of people working in the theater, thanks to this language they can communicate with each other in the same way when they are working on the production of a certain project and which gives guarantees for a perfect assessment of this project. For example, in the art of music there is such a language (notation, nuance, laws of musical form, etc.).

Such professional languages have become entrenched in many other art forms. But unfortunately, theatrical art cannot have such a single language. The need for it undoubtedly arises when a difficulty arises in the perception of a work in the theater, where it is difficult to see the author's intention and understanding of this dramatic work precisely because of the acute lack of such a linguistic mediator between the one who puts the play and its author. While a musical genre, a conductor is a musical notation that helps to form a correct presentation and does not allow the listener to misinterpret the original “text” of some work [2.- P.48].

In directing, often with insignificant observance of the original work, there can be a serious replacement of the initial dramatic text by the director's very free treatment of the text, which

may even indicate a serious violation of copyright. In this regard, now everywhere, without fail, in the accompanying materials, a kind of annotation appears, drawing attention to the fact that the performance was staged not according to the author's text, but based on the motives of his work. Even though it is a minor crime in most cases, it is difficult to convict in legal terms, but it is possible to give an ethical and aesthetic assessment, provided that the assessors are endowed with a personal system of assessment criteria defined in 13 cases. In particular, strongly similar violations and alterations are revealed when staging a repertoire from the classics with a swing at something innovative and giving drama to the original text.

In addition, when assessing the artistic and aesthetic advantages of a performance by theatergoers and professionals, there can be no unambiguous criteria for this assessment, since again there is no intermediary language between listeners, spectators and authors of the work.

As a result, these value judgments can consist of frivolous claims, someone's social order, and other things. The topic we are observing lies not only in the field of art history, but also has great cultural significance, because without a developed professional language, the real life of the theater and its culture is impossible, the owners of which are everyone involved in theatrical performance: directors, actors, craftsmen, spectators, theater critics, students of theater schools, etc. [1.-P. 80].

Today it is difficult to provide a convenient version of an intermediary language for each of the participants in the theatrical process, although there are some working developments that bring such a language closer. One of such important developments is considered to be the study of the cultural and semiotic space in the



theater, which is built on the basis of cooperation between the categories “spectator – theater”, “character – character”, “director – playwright”, etc. Thanks to such cooperation, logical chains of symbolic series are built in the cultural semiotic space of the theater.

Director's tests find themselves in one or another cultural and semiotic space of theatrical activity, and the vector of these searches was the reduction to a single “mediator language” for all in the chain “playwright - director - performer – spectator”, which, in turn, would guarantee the merger social and cultural in theatrical creativity. But in spite of some major directorial discoveries in this industry, 14 the “intermediary language” sought by many interested parties is still in the open search.

Semiotics came to the rescue as a theoretical discipline that arose at the beginning of the XX century, it was such a universal science that promoted the idea of a sign. The well-known domestic scientist Yu. M. Lotman actively studied it. In his works, the theater acts as a great variety of stage “texts” and cultural codes (playwright, director, actor, set designer), united into a single branch of cultural semiotic theater space. “Texts” and codes give rise to a special level of quality of theatrical space, according to Yu. M. Lotman, “semiosphere”. Those. such a space, which is a kind of agreement, a necessary prerequisite for the implementation of communication and the existence of languages and their work. Taking this into account, absolutely any reality affecting a part that lies in the semiotic sphere will necessarily be embodied in a sign and being in this position will already be a secondary system [4. - P.68].

The fullness and integrity of the content of the play are satisfied from these sides thanks to the work of a single provision for its development as a system of certain “texts” and “grammar”. But

for all that, Yu.M. Lotman divides the theatrical space into two complexly constituent fragments that oppose each other - this is the territory of the stage and the territory of the auditorium (both conditional and real). Therefore, according to Lotman, the dialogue of the authors of the play with the audience should not destroy this confrontation, but rely on it. Nevertheless, numerous researchers and practitioners of theater, in search of a language for actors and spectators, have not brought clear methodological provisions for the prerequisites for the emergence of such a language. In this regard, the construction of a unified cultural-semiotic space of the theater should begin with the stage space, excluding the (even if not visible) viewer from it. In fact, we are talking about the need to develop a professional semiosis within the cultural-semiotic space of the stage by analogy, for example, with musical art (for example, with an orchestra). Stage grammar can be discussed in two directions: analogies with music theory and methods of verbalization in literature. And only then can we consider the possibilities of enlarging the main text by means of decorations, costumes, musical arrangement, props and other things - as components of the theater semiosphere, which together make up the presence of an intermediary language between the theater and the audience [5. -P.23]. The correctness of the comparison in this respect of musical and theatrical art (the comparison of theatrical and literary languages is beyond doubt) is evidenced by some phenomenological characteristics of the theater. Both of these arts have tempo, rhythm, composition, melos (voice acting) and other characteristics.

Disagreements in the “external” and “internal” rarely lead to unity in the cultural semiotic space of the theater, to which directors and actors have often paid attention to. In a way, this circumstance turned into the starting point of the



emergence of two main acting schools (the "school of experience" and the "school of performance"), each of which was looking for its own ways of solving these problems.

As a result, the grown school of V. Meyerhold only brought to its logical conclusion the course on the prevalence of "material" theatrical space (the "external" turns out to be the bearer of symbolic meanings, while taking into account the cognitive state of the artist). The director, playfully handling the theater's working space, acting and "masquerading", turned them into scenic graphics of artistic symbolism and fruitful bodily models ("biomechanics"), with the use of which social meanings arose, aimed at the reaction of the audience [6.- P. 89].

If we compare theater with the gallery sphere, then, for example, when we come to a modern exhibition, we first of all pay attention to the accompanying text to the work, where the artist explains the keys of perception, because polystylism existed in art at the beginning of the XX century. In the theater, this role is played today by the very beginning of the performance, where the first 15 minutes, when the author establishes a dialogue with the audience in advance, helping him to read the codes and the rules of the game are decisive. And the art of the viewer is to be ready for any convention and be receptive to what and how the artist dictates.

There is an opinion that a theater is a museum of perceptions, a place where all assessment systems are stored and archived, and a performance is not only a product that the artist makes, but also their repository. The culture of the XXI century. functions have changed, art has ceased to present people with any aesthetic model of ways of seeing beauty. But the main function is to study the ways of perception. How a particular image is formed in a person's head from factors of external nature or art, through

what and how the reaction to reality passes before it is transformed into an image of a thing in our head and how the viewer's consciousness works. All this becomes an important factor characterizing art at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries. Structuralists and semiotics speak from the fact that any reading is a translation into the language of the individual. And theater is a very important and accurate tool for observing how human perception works, because the attributes of theater are associated with giving several points of view on the same subject. Therefore, a good theater can never become propaganda, because theater is always a conflict, and since there is a conflict, there will always be at least two or more points of view on it.

At the same time, a very important mechanism is triggered in the theatrical genre, which is rarely found in other related industries, namely, the mechanism of self-identification. A person comes to the auditorium for a performance and necessarily correlates himself with one of the characters, and sometimes empathizes with everyone in the course of the action. If he does not recognize himself in any of the heroes, does not identify himself with him or with them, then trust does not occur.

Another important and main philosophical lesson of modern theater is that anything in the world is changeable and mobile. According to the laws of the theater, the one who does not change - dies under the influence of certain events, time, space and ideas.

As can be seen from the practice of the theater, the cultural and semiotic space of the theater can transform, turning into a cozy, modest room, into a basement, into an open area for discussing certain problems, into a funeral home, etc. There are many such examples, and each case gives the work a different, specific cultural-semiotic spatial atmosphere, which to a certain extent



controls the artist's well-being, sets the contextual reading of the stage material by the viewer.

## CONCLUSION

The main features of modern theater include topicality, democratic orientation of the performances and pronounced social themes. If earlier the theater was accessible only to the elite strata of the population, today from large theater venues a language is heard that is understandable to the majority and popularizes current topics.

## REFERENCES

1. Denisov S.F. Postmodernity, or culture in a state of untruth / S.F. Denisov // Life and anthropological meanings of truth and untruth. – Omsk, 2017. – 219 P. 34
2. Krivtsun O. A. Psychology of art / O. A. Krivtsun. - Moscow: Publishing House of Literatures, in-ta im. M. Gorky, 2000. – P. 294.
3. Kuzin A. S. Modern meanings of theatrical "school" / A. S. Kuzin // Yaroslavl Pedagogical Bulletin: scientific journal. - Yaroslavl: Publishing house of YAGPU, 2013. – № 1. – P. 191–196.
4. Lotman Yu. M. Conversations about Russian culture / Yu. M. Lotman // Life and traditions of the Russian nobility. - SPb: Art, 1996. – P. 399.
5. Lotman Y. M. About art / Y. M. Lotman // The structure of artistic text. - SPb: Art, 1998. – P. 750.
6. Meyerhold V.E. To the project of a new drama troupe at the Moscow Art Theater / V.E. Meyerhold // Articles, letters, speeches, conversations. - Moscow: Art, 1968. – P. 208.
7. Рашидов, Ж. Х. У. (2020). СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ И ТЕНДЕНЦИИ РАЗВИТИЯ КНИЖНОГО ДИЗАЙНА. Вестник науки и образования, (24-1 (102)).
8. Utanova, U. A. (2020). FOLK CULTURE IS A SOCIO-HISTORICAL PHENOMENON. International Engineering Journal For Research & Development, 5(9), 5-5.
9. Makhkamova, N., & Tashkenbayeva, D. (2018). THE ROLE OF ISLAM IN REGULATING OF THE PRODUCTION SPHERE OF THE TURKESTAN SOCIETY. Theoretical & Applied Science, (4), 67-71.
10. Sayfullaev, N. (2021). The Name Of Our Country Will Be Praised By The Followers Of Kamoliddin Bekhzod. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 3(04), 402-408.
11. Kurbanova, D. A. (2016). ANCIENT PEARLS IN GREAT WORLD MUSEUMS WHICH BELONG TO THE HISTORY OF UZBEKISTAN AND LEARNING THEM. Социосфера, (3), 55-61.