

THE MAIN RULE OF THE THEATRE DIRECTING

Serghei BLĂNIȚĂ^{1*}, Maxim CERNETCHI¹, Tudor SÎRGHI²

¹Department of Software Engineering and Automation, group FAF-212, Faculty of Computers, Informatics and Microelectronics, Technical University of Moldova, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

²Department of Software Engineering and Automation, group FAF-213, Faculty of Computers, Informatics and Microelectronics, Technical University of Moldova, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

*Corresponding author: Serghei Blăniță, serghei.blanita@isa.utm.md

Abstract. Theater is a momentary art, where human destinies are decided anew each time and in different ways. The presence of other viewers in general plays a huge role. Theater is not only the art of an actor, director, composer, set designer, but also art of the viewer. Cinema and Internet art are, one way or another, a monologue, broadcasting from the podium. Theatre is not an obsessive art – it cannot come to the viewer as an add on YouTube. The theatre must be spectacular – spectacular from the very entrance in the building.

Key words: Theatre, audience, art, directing, drama, author.

Introduction

The problems of the modern theatres are now extremely actual. The importance of theatres and their places in cultural life of the people was realized exactly when humans had lost theatres due to the pandemics. Suddenly, it appeared that attending performances is essential for the “healthy” life activity. Today audience returns to the foyer, and problem of interaction with it touches directors as never before. Will we be able to renew relations with the audience, will the theater continue to exist at all and if yes, then what is the main rule of communication with people sitting in the hall?

The secret behind the dialogue with the audience

Why does theatre exist, why the culture of theatres still interests the audience, although there is a huge number of other ways to spend time: watching fascinating blockbusters or series, where you can even choose the plot-twists, or playing virtual reality games? The answer is easy and at the same time difficult. The main reason is openness. Theater is a momentary art, where human destinies are decided anew each time and in different ways [1]. When the film is shot and edited, it remains forever in the form in which it was released. When the performance is staged, when the last run is completed, when the premiere is played - a new living organism is born. It changes from show to show, is understood by the artists, the director and the audience in a new way. Intonation, gesture, look - are always born once and die after a bow. If the performance is played three times a week, then three different performances are brought to the audience. The artist improvises, feels differently, the viewer comes in a different mood, the weather outside is different, the conversation with the director before the performance is unique every day. The presence of other viewers in general plays a huge role, it seems to me. The whole hall becomes one organism, the audience breathes together, influences each other [2]. Yesterday the viewer was tensely silent, and an atmosphere of thoughtfulness and breathlessness was born; today the scene did not touch the viewer so much, and sounded simpler. So, the first reason: theater is not only the art of an actor, director, composer, set designer, but also the art of the viewer. Cinema and Internet art are, one way or another, a monologue, broadcasting from the podium, because the artist in the frame does not know about the viewer's reaction, and the theater is a dialogue, a conversation when the interlocutors influence each other, argue, prove their point of view.

So, the point is that nothing but pure, sincere, living human experiences can excite the viewer more. When we consume the information through a screen, we build a wall between us and the characters - we are protected. When we sit in a chair in the theatre – we are vulnerable, as well as are the actors. That's the main reason why theatre will never stop to exist.

Now we move to the next problem which appears on our way: why would spectators at all come to theatre [3]? Theatre is not an obsessive art – it can't come to the viewer as an ad on YouTube. The audience should come to the theatre by itself. How is that possible? By means of competent directing. The theatre must be spectacular – spectacular from the very entrance in the building. It must captivate the spectator – if not, he would never come again. The viewer should not leave the feeling of celebration, solemnity for a second. An ordinary principle works here, when a person "judges a book by its cover." However, this is only luring the viewer inside, and a real miracle should happen inside.

The viewer is sitting in the hall. Now it's important to talk to him. To reason with him. About what? Of course, about today, but better about how today will affect tomorrow. To share with him those questions that during the months of the production - acquaintance with the play, readings, sketches, rehearsals and runs - worried the director and actors. And at this stage, the central question arises - what is the best way to do this? More than one generation of directors has been looking for answers to this answer, and obviously, there simply cannot be a universal answer in nature, because the theater is as multifaceted as life, and it is very important to discover a single method of presenting material to the auditorium that is suitable for this play. It is impossible to apply the same methods to the heroic drama "Egmont" and the commedia dell'arte "The Innkeeper" by Carlo Goldoni, to the song drama "Mother Courage and her Children" by B. Brecht and the satirical comedy "Suicide" by Nikolai Erdman. However, one general rule that would work and be effective in working with any genre and materials can still be formulated, in the opinion of the authors of this article. This rule is extensive, it can be differentiated into several rules, but in general it can be formulated as follows: "the theater should be about human". Next thing we intend to do is to explain this abstract rule.

The first component of this rule consists in respect for the author's text and the modesty of the director as a creative person [4]. This means following the idea of the author - director, as an independent creator, in no case should you try to, as they say, "pull the owl on the globe." The basis of the play, anyway, is drama. It is the playwright who lays the foundations, the foundation of the conflict, the relationship of the characters, the main events [5]. And the director who has taken this or that play into work simply does not make sense to change them, otherwise it will turn out to be the most ordinary surrogate, artificiality, unnaturalness. The personality of the director should appear in the correct finding of the artists' way of existence in the proposed circumstances, in the correct plastic solution of the performance, in the construction of the most comfortable and expressive *mise en scene* (note, in no case spectacular - the effect should not be an end in itself) [6]. A sign of the correct and filigree work of the director is the absolute organicity of everything that happens on stage. Therefore, the most important quality of a director is unselfishness. Theater is a collective art, and therefore it is necessary to think about the disclosure of the author and the artists. And the director's work will not remain unpaid - the audience's reaction will be a consolation and reward for him.

The second part of this rule is the following wording: "to broadcast a thought through an actor." It is impossible to solve a performance through scenography, through bizarre constructions - only through gesture, word, intonation, for the simple reason that only this is understandable to a person sitting in the hall. Therefore, it is also unimaginably important to listen to your emotions - not to overwhelm the performance with metaphors, visual images, not to dress the artists in strange costumes - all this is the prerogative of incompetent vain directors. A real artist works with the word, revealing the meanings in it. The art of the director still consists, at the stage of embodiment, in order to formulate a thought based on emotions, to give emotions a verbal appearance after the fact, and not vice versa. Of course, when working with text, everything is exactly the opposite - to be able to give the text the right sound.



Figure 1 – Hamlet by William Shakespeare



Figure 2 – Tovstonogov G. leads the rehearsal



Figure 3 – Cherry Garden by Chekhov A.

Conclusions

Thus, the performance only excites the viewer when the viewer hears and sees the revelation about himself. Not intricate images and dances, but simple human relationships, feelings, suffering, joy and pain. When he sees on stage a concentration of modern problems, topical and eternal issues, when he observes the birth of new types and characters on stage. Only then the entertainment of the audience's reception and marketing will not be in vain - having touched the viewer's soul, the director can be sure that the viewer will return to him, finding in him a friend and an honest interlocutor.

And summing up, it's worth mentioning that avant-garde directing is a passing thing. Therefore, the main rule of theatrical directing is to listen to life, be a sensitive psychologist and give it an effective, scenic form, modestly hiding your own persona and not giving free rein to your own maximalist and bold ambitions. According to the deep conviction of the authors, only such a director will certainly become great.

References:

1. TOVSTONOGOV, G., *Proscenium opening – the mirror of the stage*, 1948, p.120-121.
2. STANISLAVSKY, K., *Actors's work on himself*, p.89-101.
3. MOCHALOV as *Hamlet*. In the collection: *Belinsky on drama and theater*. M.-L., 1948, p.241-251, p.23-25.
4. BROOK P., *Empty space*. (Any edition)
5. *Pushkin and the theater. Dramatic works, articles, notes, letters*. M., 1953., p.34-36.
6. *Russian Drama Theater*. M., 1976
7. POPOV, A., *On the artistic integrity of the performance*. M., 1959, [5] p.100-104.
8. RUDNITSKY, K., *Vs. Meyerhold*. M., 1981, p.45-48.
9. CHEKHOV, M., *Literary Heritage*. M., 1995, vol. 1,2.