Olexander Klekovkin

Doctor of Art Studies, Professor, Head of the Department
of Aesthetics, Modern Art Research Institute of the National
Academy of Arts of Ukraine

Олександр Клековкін

Доктор мистецтвознавства, професор, завідувач відділу
естетики, Інститут проблем сучасного мистецтва
Національної академії мистецтв України

e-mail: olehander@gmail.com | **orcid.org**/0000-0002-3481-2790

Theatre Directing System
The Scope of the Concept

Режисерська система
Межі поняття

Abstract. In Ukrainian, the online search for "*theatre directing system*" provides over seventy thousand results, while the search for "*theatre system*" over four thousand, which is proof of these concepts to be quite widespread. However, comparing the content of the search query is disappointing, as it reveals the oversaturation of art history with various terms that serve as shallow labels: different scholars use these terms differently under different circumstances and in different periods. This can be illustrated with many examples, yet, the most elementary would be the most telling: anyone can count the number of some objects, for instance, of apples in a basket, as we know the features that distinguish an apple from a non-apple. Nevertheless, no proper theatre researcher or practitioner would dare to name the number of theatre directing systems, as the boundaries of this concept are too vague. At most, what could be listed is the number of popular, "iconic" systems; and yet, any given number would be true and false at the same time. The same is accurate for the concept of an "*artwork*": according to Marcel Duchamp, it is enough only to label any object as art and place it in the "*art space*." This paper addresses a "*(theatre) directing system*": the history of the concept, its essence, and its features that define the scope of its use.

Keywords: history of theatre, history of directing, directing system, theatre system, method of directing, invention in art, discovery in art.

Introduction

Though in the time of war determining the scope of art terms and concepts may seem slightly too academic, it is still relevant, as the pronounced repetition of both art terminology (*highly artistic work, great Russian culture*) and political memes (*brotherly nations, good Russians, art beyond politics, great Russian culture*) is of the same nature—being an *imitation of reflection and its approximation*. The memes, including those promoting *artistic discoveries, great cultures*, and *universal theatre systems*, are an instrument of the war of cultures.

Aim of the paper

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to outline the features of the *theatre directing system*. While the *subject matter* of this paper—a theatre directing system—is intangible, this nevertheless does not eliminate the need to set the boundaries for this concept, as well as for the features of a theatre directing system that define these boundaries.

Literature Review

Reviewing past literature on the subject is, in fact, a choice of perspective: with a wider perspective

encompassing all the previous classifications of theaters (public and private, school and amateur, etc.) and a narrow perspective including only the classifications of late-nineteenth-century and later ones, when theatre was commonly acknowledged as a separate art and *director's theatre* emerged: *theatre of imitation* and *theatre of feeling* (Konstantin Stanislavski), *deadly, holy, and rough* theatre (Peter Brook), *theatre of accentuated influence* and of *accentuated manifestation, analytical and empirical theatre* (Les Kurbas). This list may be continued with the classifications by Vsevolod Meyerhold, Pavel Markov, Yakiv Mamontov, and other theoreticians or with the definitions such as *academic theatre, art theatre*, etc. (Klekovkin, 2010). This, is essence, would not change the situation but will only reinforce the point: *the concept of "system" in theatre studies is used haphazardly* and, thus, is not a concept but a label-term for demarcation of relatively unrestricted area of personal semantic creativity.

The practitioners of theatre used the concept of a *system* mostly in the sense of a *method*, i. e. the technique and consequence of conducting the professional activity, a professional algorithm that may be recorded as such. Les Kurbas utilized the concept of system in various

Художня культура. Актуальні проблеми. Вип. 19. Ч. 1. 2023

• 10 •

Artistic Culture. Topical issues. Vol. 19. No. 1. 2023

meanings: as a general order (of aesthetic principles, operations); as a technique of acting; as a way of actor's training; as a method of director's work on a play. Therefore, for the practitioners of theatre, "system" is primarily an algorithm or a set of elements of the actor's (Stanislavski) or director's (Kurbas) trade; for Stanislavski it was *reincarnating and creating the life of the human spirit on stage*, for Kurbas—*theatre show as a transformation*, for Brecht—*alienation effect* and, as a result, *defamiliarized world*, etc.

In the theatre history of the Soviet era, the first to attempt adding a theoretical basis to this concept was Alexey Gvozdev: according to him, a theatre system is a "…relation between the form of the stage, the composition of the audience, the structure of acting, and the nature of the nature of drama that serves the viewer" (Gvozdev, 1926, p. 21). Still, Gvozdev's conception encountered a slashing criticism, including that of Yakiv Mamontov, who considered a theatre system to be "a coordination of artistic and technical factors (rooted in playwright's or actor's nature)" that serves society by organizing its mass reactions (emotional and ideological) (Mamontov, 1930, p. 26), while the analysis the theatre system should be rooted in "*ideology and thematic range* of a certain type of theatre systems" (Mamontov, 1930, p. 28), though in his earlier works, Mamontov proposed a typology of the systems of Ukrainian theatre that was far from this very criterion (Mamontov, 1926). Since the mid-1930s, the lexemes *system* and *method* have been used uniquely with regard to Stanislavski's experience and the socialist realism in the Soviet Union, with all the others rejected as *bourgeois*, *pernicious*, etc.

However, this lexical unit failed to become a proper term in European theatre studies as well, as it received rather excessive interpretation (as a star cast, repertoire theatre, dramatic dynamics of a certain playwright, lighting, wages, repertoire's revenue, rehearsals, etc.) or, on the contrary, a narrow interpretation, as it was with the series of thematic papers on the system of *stepped stage* by Leopold Jessner ("Jessner treppen < … > Jessner('s) steps." A system of stage levels or platforms, sometimes used in expressionistic staging. Named for the German director Leopold Jessner" (Bowman & Ball, 1961, p. 187) or papers on *Stanislavski method* which was equated to *Stanislavski system* (Bowman & Ball, 1961, p. 356). Some European academic editions simplify the problem and use the term *system* in a single meaning only: "*System* according to work by K. S. Stanislavski is a system theory and methodology of dramatic play, which is based especially on the actor's work on himself" (Humar et al., 2007, p. 177). Patrice Pavis offers a superacademic definition of a system (not theatre directing but nevertheless a system), which is yet very far from practice: "A stage system (or signifying system) brings together a set of signs of the same kind (lighting, gesture, scene design), which establish a semiological system of oppositions, redundancies, complementarity, and so on" (Pavis, 1998, p. 362). Moreover, dramatic theory

in English, with two terms wrongfully used as synonyms, *Method* or *System*, most commonly signify *Stanislavski method*, or *Stanislavski system*. Erika Fischer-Lichte, Christopher Balme, Liudmila Sofronova, and others mostly use the term in a semiotic approach (without the transcription of the meaning).

By comparing the most general formulas, it becomes evident that Stanislavski's approach (theatre of feeling and imitation) in its canonic interpretation is, in fact, the narrowest, as it takes into account only the acting technique. Meanwhile, the formulas of Bertolt Brecht, Vsevolod Meyerhold, and Les Kurbas are significantly broader in scope, as they distinguish not only the acting technique but also the practice of staging. These formulas are overly generalized; thus, they are not applicable for defining theatre directing systems. Furthermore, in the practice of many scholars, the lexical units *theatre system* and *director's system* are often used as synonyms, though there existed theatre systems in the *pre-directorial theatre*, during the times of *proto-directing*. Therefore, it is more expedient to delineate theatre systems (produced) by a collective tradition and directing (personalized) systems, and, in addition, their subsystems: types of roles, genres, etc. In order to avoid further confusion, in this paper the two concepts—*theatre system* and *directing system*—will be used as identical.

The *method* underlying this paper is based on one of the key ideas of the *theory of system and system analysis*: the foundation of any system is the *crossroads*—the *situations of choice* between different possibilities. The choice made at these *intersections* defines the features of directing systems.

The *working hypothesis* for the concept in question would initially be the formula: *new directing system* is a language narrating the new world model that uses the new means of creation and functioning of the language, world, and their means of creation.

1. Hence, *invention is the first feature of the original theatre directing system* (though originality is not a feature of art, at least, it was not until the 18th century).

2. Acknowledged by the artistic circles and audience, *directing system are often eponymous, inextricably linked to the names of their creators*, while in practice the names themselves are sometimes omitted (as is the case of (Brecht's) epic theatre) or the term coined by a certain director receives a much wider coverage (Piscator's political theatre). When *the name of the author of the system is starting to be used for mockery*, it is also a sign of the popularity of a directing system, as it was with the Meiningen Company (*Meiningenism, Chronegkism*), Stanislavski (*stanislavshchina*, "the Stanislavski sickness"), Meyerhold (*meyerholdovshchina*), Kurbas (*kurbalesennia, kurbalesiia, kurbasyzm, kurbasiada, kurbasivshchyna*). Usually, these systems were *self-proclaimed*, and later, as a result of various reasons, including cognitive inertia, the status of a system was entrenched. However, what about the directors whose

practice was not labeled as a *system*?.. Should they be considered *non-systemic*? I. e., Hnat Yura swore by Stanislavski, still, the video recordings of his stagings show a discrepancy between idolization and theatre practice that produces a question if his shows are truly based on the Moscow Art Theatre system? Or was he out-of-system?

3. Implementing a new world model, new language, new way of their organization and functioning, the artist (director) faces the terminology problem—when it is impossible to describe a new phenomenon within the system of existing terms; this gives *impetus for implementing a new system of terms*. The ones who coined new terms were: *Konstantin Stanislavski* (theatre of feeling, theatre of imitation, superobjective, inner action, tempo-rhythm, lure, etc.), *Bertolt Brecht* (epic theatre, alienation effect), *Vsevolod Meyerhold* (biomechanics, pre-acting), *Jerzy Grotowski* (stage equivalent, total act, objective drama, transgression, poor theatre), *Eugenio Barba* (pre-expressivity, scenic bios, third theatre, barter), *Les Kurbas* (transformation, staying in a role, turning the role "on" and "off", plan—principle—aspect, etc.). The same was true for the traditional theatre systems: the terminology system of the Ancient Greek theatre turned out to be of little use for the Ancient Roman theatre, which developed its own system of terms, as did subsequently the theatres of the Middle Ages, Classicism, etc. Still, what mattered was not only the body of established terms but also their origin: for instance, Brecht drew attention to the mystical, cult-like nature of the lexicon of the Stanislavski system, where an actor was a *servant of art*, where *the truth* was a vague fetish, and faults were *sins*, etc. Were these neologisms truly necessary, was it possible to do without them? It turns out that no; it was not possible, as they were not synonyms but new functions, forms, genres, methods, techniques, etc.

4. The newly emerged system of (theatre) directing significantly *corrects or implements a new function of theatre art, forming a new status of art*. It broadens the system of its devices, techniques, genres, types of roles, methods of preparing the show, and touring conditions. It also expands the idea of theatricality and what theatre is, what it could be, and what it must be. For instance, Stanislavski's theatre and the system implemented by him are functionally oriented at recreating "the life of human spirit" of a certain individual, while the systems of Kurbas, Piscator, and Brecht mostly study the behavior of a certain social type in a given political situation. Similarly, the *metaphor of art as a temple*, widespread during the second half of the 19th century, as if priests worshiped some pagan deity, is substantially different from the metaphors that circulated in Ukrainian theatre during the 1920s—*show factory, integrated-theatre-factory of culture (teacombinat kultury)*—and signified the change of theatre functions.

5. Accordingly, the *criteria of success* were reviewed: financial success, attention of certain audience (theatre critics, colleagues, authorities), etc. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, for some artists, the number of female viewers who fainted during the show was a marker of success, while Italian futurists would not imagine true success without some scandal and physical altercation.

6. In the systems of different masters, the *main material of stage art* also differs. In the 18th century, when theatre was not still perceived as an art of its own right, there was no question about the material of art: as a tacit convention, *actors performing a dramatic play* were considered a main feature of theatre; however, by the end of the century, the cult of "stars" evolves (the age of stars), of child prodigies, of virtuosos, of touring performers that switches the attention to the performers instead of performance or a play. When theatre directing becomes an independent profession, a division occurs: some artists, such as Kurbas and his disciples, considered the actor's body to be a material of theatrical creativity, they categorized the material as "actor" and "not actor," or even promoted the theatre, "where the main element, main means is depicting … evolution of the conflict between abiding energies, either personified or linked to certain phenomena … *There can also be not only the human theatre but also the animal theatre as well*" (Les Kurbas, 1988, p. 90). Meanwhile, the adepts of psychological theatre were convinced that the main material of a theatre act is an actor.

7. The *technique of processing the material*, which is the most specific element in various theatre systems, also undergoes changes. It includes: a) *a working method and features of the organization of the rehearsal process* (stage-setting, run-through, read-through, action analysis, etc.); b) *an expected result or principle of actors' performance* (masking, transformation, ease into the role, alienation, staying in a role, etc.). This is one of the key elements that reveals the specifics of the trade in the practice of a certain director (for the features of rehearsal work in the practice of different masters see (Klekovkin, 2017)).

8. Protecting its interests, every community initiates various propaganda shows aimed, on the one hand, at glorifying itself, and, on the other hand, at desecration and exposure of the "enemy," thus, at reinforcing the opposition between "We" and "Them." The path of stage art, its system of genres and forms are defined by this confrontation. The latter, mobilizing society, embodies the mythology of its community—its value system, its *sacred* and forms a phenomenon that Lloyd deMause introduced as "*historical group-fantasies*."

9. Artistic activity is always determined by its *environment* (political system, national traditions, etc.), *time* (generation), *events that are formative for the generation*, and by the respective *conflicts—ethnic, political*, and/or *generational*. All of the above draws the scope of issues that life and theatre have to address and find comprehensive answers.

10. It is rare for the *choice of play space* (performative space) to be random or based on technical aspects. Most

often, this choice results from the cults (religious or secular) that the theatre engages the audience in. These features of the cults define the *chronotopes* of the shows during each era. In Ancient Greece, theatron had a cult nature, while in the 19th century, there was a cult of pubs and coffee shops, where the small forms of theatre developed. Some directors preferred the the chronotope of the country estate, while others opted for factories, dumps, backstreets, or abandoned factories. The popularity of theatre space depends on the current forms of public communication and spaces, where they can occur. For that reason, the established and familiar space of the 17th-century musical theatre is grounded more into habit rather than the topical forms of public communication. Therefore, it enters an undeclared conflict with the cultural space, and art itself—as a component of culture—a conflict with the social dimension of culture.

11. *The features of game space define the relations with the viewers*. This influences the formation of *new genre systems and, hence, new relations with the audience*, as well as *the rules of conduct of the viewer in the theatre, and his role expectations* (the viewer's etiquette in the theatre of Ancient Greece and in commedia dell'arte allowed to loudly express emotions and comment the events on stage, while in Stanislavski's theatre, even the applause was forbidden during the performance, and Brecht dreamed of a theatre allowing the audience to smoke cigars; similarly, the conduct of the audience of the opera and ballet theatre is not the same to the audience of drama theatre).

12. The set of the above-mentioned features dictates *thematic and genre features of the repertoire* that is basic for a certain director: for example, most of the plays from the Moscow Art Theatre repertoire are unimaginable in the Kurbas's theatre. On the contrary, sometimes it was the repertoire that dictated the performing techniques. The theatre of Ancient Greece at first was the theatre of tragedy, later comedy was added; the Ancient Roman theatre, with the ideas of the Greeks, implemented a different system of genres, both in the style and formal features. The theatre of the Middle Ages also formed its own system of genres, as well as school theatre, theatre of the Classicism era, or national theatre cultures. Similar genre differences exist in the directing systems of the twentieth century, and not only because it was not possible for the theatre of Coryphaei to stage the repertoire of the Moscow Art Theatre (and vice versa) but also because the *very nature of scenic genre* was perceived differently in different systems of directing.

13. Genre systems form respective *stock character systems*, the classification of which are based on different criteria: social status (king, servant, etc.); costume (mantle role, corset role); function (ingenue, juvenile lead, noble father, duenna, etc.). Despite some types of theatre (Andre Antoine, Stanislavski) declaring repudiation of stock characters, in fact, what they repudiated was the obsolete system of stock characters.

14. *Lexis* is the smallest unit of artistic language, and applied to stage art—it is everything possible to create with this material. For instance, the textbooks of the early twentieth century listed declamation as the main "*element of stage performance*" (including elocution, facial expression, and movements of hands, legs, and the whole torso). The set of "lexical units" also varied. In early 19th-century theatre, an actor did not have a right to turn his back to the audience but by the end of the century, this became one of the highlights of Andre Antoine's theatre. Actionism of the 1960s had its own characteristic lexical units, using cardboard, plywood, paper, newspapers, plastic, straw, etc. for stage design.

15. *Architectonics* (the overall plan of the structure of the piece and the connections between its parts, formal division of the play on the acts, scenes, dialogs, monologs, author's remarks, songs, etc.; correlation of the plot and extra plot elements, as in the Ancient Greek theatre—*prologue, parodos, epiparodos, episode, stasimon, kommos, exodos*) and *composition* (inner structure of the piece, be it "Aristotle's type", fragmented, mounting, module in the commedia dell'arte, etc.).

16. By the type of *identification / non-identification of the actor with the role*, there are three possible conventional groups: a) actors relive the thoughts and feelings of their heroes (school of feeling), b) actors demonstrate the thoughts and feelings of their heroes (school of imitation), c) actors do not hide to be living with their own thoughts and feelings, to be simply performers or playing with the mask and using the elements of various techniques. Consequently, these techniques have a common denominator or variable "corridor of the role," thus, the actor has a right to improvise.

17. *Director's copy or a staging plan*, its absence or presence hints at the correlation of having a pre-existing detailed project of the show or a tendency to improvisation in the director's practice; it is also a marker of the dominance of the pre-existing objectives of staging or having challenges that are possible to solve only in cooperation with the actors. Hence, it is an indirect sign of the type of theatre: either director's theatre or actor's theatre. Director's copy and staging plan are the most important documents for the analysis of the director's creative legacy and his system that indicate the *relations that an artist seeks to have with future generations*.

18. Religion, politics, power—with these and other social practices an artist has to interact. Therefore, following tradition and logic, this would be the first problem to start with—the *formula of art*, as it is a basic issue. Nevertheless, being basic does not necessarily make it stable and first to solve. In fact, *an individual, artists, theatre, and even society—all experiment with their own formulas of adjusting*. Depending on the ability to engage with various social practices and adapt to them, the features of ideas and themes inherent to certain directing systems are formed. An infantile

idea of art being able to exist beyond politics (beyond society, beyond morals, beyond art, and over life) is a schizophrenia of art history, and not a harmless one, because it reinforces the myth of the uniqueness of art activity and an addiction of sorts—both to tradition and power (the same is true regarding the idea that "art requiring sacrifice"; in fact, everything requires sacrifice, and often far greater than art).

19. *Not every director has the motivation to reflect and describe his own experience (an intuitively formed method), not every director had a chance to do so, and not every director lived during the time when such experience was sought-after.* With no sufficient network of Ukrainian theaters in existence, neither the coryphaei of Ukrainian theatre (Marko Kropyvnytskyi, Mykhailo Starytsky, Maria Zankovetska, etc.), nor their audience felt such a need. It emerged only with the younger generation—Panas Saksahansky and was captured in his printed writings on theatre. In this regard, illustrative are the experiences of Les Kurbas and Vsevolod Meyerhold, whose relatively short educational practice forced them not only to formulate the principles and methods, applicable to meeting the objectives of a new—director's—theatre but also the problem of *reflection, generalization, and codifying both their own experience and the borrowings from other masters.* Nevertheless, this period was relatively short and their systems remained as if incomplete, because, unlike Stanislavski, they did not have an opportunity to work on formulating the main principles of his system (experimenting with techniques and testing them, literary fixation, editing, editors' suggestions, and later on—state support, publication, and reprint of his works, as well as hundreds of dissertations on them, meaning, essentially, an entire infrastructure around him that almost reached the status of a sect). The way of *sharing their experience* chosen by the masters, including willingness and desire to have disciples, indirectly indicates the existence of a unique system. Equally telling is the way of fixation of this experience (video or audio recordings), as it points out at the elements, which directors consider their strong side or, on the contrary, the ones not recorded are probably assigned to become a myth.

20. Different groups of consumers have varying needs and interests—they depend on fashion, strive for quality or originality of a product, for demonstrating their involvement with some imaginary intellectual (spiritual) center with their choice, etc. Accordingly, the objectives of an artist undergo changes as well. Including the objective of creating an original piece of art, and even more so—*an original trademark system.* Historically, the aim of creating an original art product was formed rather late, as anonymity of the work of art, plagiarism, reworking the piece, and contamination were common occurrence in the culture of Ancient Greece and the Middle Ages. The objective marker of the new requirement—originality—may be was registered only

during the 17th century, when the problem of the author's copyright was formulated. Nevertheless, even without this requirement, as a side products of the craft, systems (more or less original) existed; there was a signature style, indistinct style, and banalities, that did not impede being skillful within the framework of specific system of ideas about art, which differed in time.

21. Originality is not the only way to conquer the market. Banal, easily recognizable topics, plots, and characters—it is also a lure involved in the process of *organizing oneself a fame*—at least, if it seems newsworthy to the mass media. In general, the artists whose system became eponymous actively engaged mass media in *organizing their fame and monopolization of the market* that becomes especially noticeable in the mass society, during the era of mass media, theatre criticism, and, naturally, highly publicized scandals, which becomes an almost dominant feature of art during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A variety of *contests, festivals, and awards* played a significant role in organizing fame; this secured an artist his place of honor in the overall chart of fame. The more aggressively an artist entered the information space, the higher his chances were to change a status from *notable* to *renowned*, and his pieces to be considered *high art* or be granted some other adjectives, depending of the terms in vogue. This poses a question: is directing system something that objectively exists or something that we systematize / structure in our mind?

22. One of the features of the system is its *predictability in choices and procedures* (a tendency for unpredictable choice also is a predictability). Along with the *homogeneous* (with stable features), there exist *heterogeneous* (non-uniform, consisting of the parts with different features), *exogenous* (with external motivation), and *endogenous* (with inner motivation) systems. Without dwelling into the reasons of variability, it also should be noted that along with the predictable systems, there are *changeable, dynamic* systems (the artists of this type, such as Max Reinhardt, were sometimes accused of eclectics, however, this very *eclecticism* is a signature feature of the director's theatre of the second half of the twentieth century, unlike the theatre, where a director always stages the same shows, regardless of different plays).

Conclusions

What are the conclusions to be drawn from this analysis and sketchy outline of features?

Back to the initial question of the paper about the number of theatre directing systems, it should be admitted that, at present, the answer to this question depends on too many variables, including the statuses, formed by traditions, which are not that deeply rooted for it to be impossible to track these roots in each case. At first glance, without answering the question about the principal feature of the system—a hierarchy

of elements—there is no chance to "decode" what a system is. It resembles a logical trap, as, for instance, the *theory of systems and system analysis* are based on a hierarchy of elements. However, directing system is an open system, with not only an artist making his choice but other stakeholders as well: audience, mentors, sponsors, etc. Even when by the applauses they encourage the use of certain techniques or search for a new target for bullying. For that reason, avoiding the temptation of straightforward application of the theory of systems to directing but nevertheless contemplating on the prospects of systematization and prognosis for the domain of art René Descartes's remark about Cleopatra's nose should be mentioned: if it had been shorter, the face of the earth would have changed. This means that if some other god, not Dionysus, was a patron of the Ancient Greek theatre, the history of world theatre and the theatre itself would have been different; similarly, if Kurbas would not have returned to Ukrainian from Vienna, the history of Ukrainian theatre would have taken another course. All of the above was a *choice*, and not isolated but a repeated one. As a result, very specific art systems were formed, as well as very specific aesthetic habits and addictions, very specific pantheons of heroes, and very specific *behavioral scenarios*, incompatible with the ideal world (Klekovkin, 2020).

Every directing system secures the production of a specific art product and is aimed at only one function, as a pan is for pancakes, a glass is for drinking, and a spoon is for soup. Correspondingly, directors have their own system, even they are not patented and this fact was not advertised and publicized. The real question is about if this system is truly widespread, and if it is popular—as a result of what. If its ardent proponents actually implement it in their practice, or they only worship it in their speeches. The 1950s discussion about Stanislavski system between his disciples and apprentices (Mikhail Kedrov, Vasiliy Toporkov, Pyotr Yershov, and Georgy Tovstonogov) and not less authoritative and influential Maria Knebel proved the existence of at least two Stanislavski systems among his followers. With American, Polish, Ukrainian, and other versions of this system, there are in total a couple of dozens of systems bearing the name of Stanislavski. So why do they, being so different, hold Stanislavki's name? Because of their effectiveness? Or they turned out to be the most relevant for certain countries, periods, worldviews? Are they universal? In fashion? Profitable? Meeting certain needs?

What is the practical conclusion in the end of this scholarly journey?

First of all, it is the answer about *a system and a method.*

Director's method is a consistent repeated choice between several possibilities offered by external circumstances or the artist himself. It is an artist's algorithm for his professional activity. When activity occurs in the situation of no choice, it is also a method, as is it an acceptance of no alternatives.

Director's system is the strings to pull for the internal or external motives for a certain choice; they are advantages of making such a choice. *A system* is a combination of intertwined rules that define the choice between different possibilities. When there is no choice, the emergence of the original system is also impossible, the only prospect is the choice between slavery and rebellion. *A situational choice* between several rules is also a rule, as *the lack of principles in order to achieve some goal, for instance, a material one, is also a principle.* Answering the question, of whether he has a methodology, Giorgio Strehler said, "*My methodology is the lack of methodology. I do not exclude the possibility of creating a theory of method based on my work in theatre, though, it would be very hard. Our era, as it seems, rejects the methods*" (Skornyakova, 2012, p. 244)

By the end of the 19th century, feeling their dependency on politics, state, religion, money, morals, audience, and million of other circumstances, the most avant-garde, emancipated, free European artists proclaimed separation of art of all the obstacles and professed creation of independent art systems. During the second half of the twentieth century, these calls were repeated in a much more pronounced manner. However, quite predictably, it ended up with nothing. Because *a system is a configuration addressing the challenges of heterogeneous social powers*. In other cases it is only pleasing someone's tastes, be it experts, trend-setters, or others. Therefore, the fates of the systems vary. If they managed to outlive their creator, the reason for that is not its universal nature or effectiveness but meeting the needs of certain groups, who nourish the interest in the system. Other systems—according to the interests of these groups—should give way, step aside or leave the room altogether. Systems do not perish, like their creators, they continue their struggle for their place in Eternity.

By promoting some system, *people become, sometimes unconsciously, disseminators of ads, a part of someone else's business strategy and geopolitics*: when authorities, their art and research circles, as well as the communities involved, make efforts to promote Stanislavski system, they oppose the promotion of other systems. In the end, *promotion of the trendy system is also a lucrative business*, the proof of which is the price of the books on trendy systems and publication fees in the Western indexed periodicals. Promotion of a directing system is always a sect of sorts, a club of interests, a party-building—worshiping an intellectually, morally, and emotionally narrow world and ignoring the dependence of the art systems of the political, economic, ethical, and other layers of reality. In addition, it means limiting the *system of stage genres*, as the system (a pan, a glass, a spoon) always serves only one type of product; universal systems are not possible.

There is only one criterion for determining the quality and true significance of a system, method, procedure, technique, product, etc. Unfortunately, the application of this

criterion—*effectiveness*—in the art world is only conditional, as it is impossible to measure it. The only measurable success could be financial, in order to determine the correlation between, for example, the method and the number of rehearsals, or between the method and the popularity of the show, its revenue, etc. Still, these criteria are too vague.

Often, when the significance of a certain artist is emphasized, the exact wording is "*discovery in art.*" Yet, is it a true discovery, comparable to the *discoveries of Columbus, Copernicus, or Newton*? Do they truly reveal something that was previously unknown but turned out to be an undeniable fact? Or is it just another loophole for art history: to use this lexical unit in some secret sense? In a very narrow sense, art may be associated with discoveries, *topical for a certain period and time*: if an artist *discovered* new subject matter, new layers and meanings of reality that were concealed from the audience. Though these *discoveries* are not art-specific, as publicists, economists, politicians, and civic activists also can *discover* new themes, unchartered territories of social reality. Art innovations are always related to technology, it means creating a new language or techniques, involving new media, and this is *an invention, not a discovery*. *Inventions* are all the devices used by a modern individual, while discoveries are the natural laws (as those of physics) based on which these devices are produced. *Discoveries* are the laws independent of our desires, like our planet will be turning around the Sun, and not otherwise. Still, this *discovery* was made with *inventions—measuring devices*, created by a man. When one of these two concepts (*discovery or invention*) is used in regard to the art system, this means that it is attributed the status of something either *universal* (discovery, an unbreakable rule) or *local* (invention, used optionally).

To enter or not to enter this semantic labyrinth is a choice of precise or approximate mindset. The approximate mindset is satisfied with formulas such as "*brotherly nations,*" not comprehending neither the true meaning of these mems nor the reasons why they were introduced, spread, and maintained. *When some variables are presented as universal constants*, it is a manipulation and eventually a fundamental feature of all totalitarian systems because these variables are rooted in the artificial worlds created by art and art history.

References

1. Bowman, W. P. & Ball, R. H. (1961). *Theatre Language. A Dictionary of Terms in English of the Drama and Stage from Medieval to Modern Times.* New York, NY: Theatre Arts Books.

2. Gvozdev, A. (1926). O smene teatralnyih sistem [On the change of theatre systems]. In *O teatre: Vremennik Otdela istorii i teorii teatra Gosudarstvennogo instituta istorii iskusstv: Sbornik statey* (pp. 7–36). Leningrad: Academia [in Russian].

3. Humar, M., Sušec Michieli, B., Podbevšek, K., Lokar, S. (Eds.) (2007). *Gledališki terminološki Slovar* [Viewer's dictionary of terminology]. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU [in Slovenian].

4. Klekovkin, O. (2010). Elementy teatru (Morfolohichnyi etiud pro "systematyzovani systematychni systemy") [Elements of theatre (A morphological sketch on the 'systematized systematic systems')]. *Mystetstvoznavstvo Ukrainy, 11,* 102–115 [in Ukrainian].

5. Klekovkin, O. (2017). *Mise en scène: Idei. Kontseptsii. Napriamy* [Mise en scène: Ideas. Concepts. Trends]. Kyiv: Feniks [in Ukrainian].

6. Klekovkin, O. (2020). *Teatralna kultura Ukrainy: Stsenarii. Roli. Statusy: Monohrafiia* [Theatre culture of Ukrane: Scenarios. Roles. Statuses: A monograph]. Kyiv: Art Ekonomi [in Ukrainian].

7. Klekovkin, O. (2022). *Chaiuvannia zi Stanislavskym: Istorychnyi narys* [Tea with Stanislavski: A historical outline]. Kyiv: Art Ekonomi [in Ukrainian].

8. Les Kurbas (1988). Suspilne pryznachennia mystetskoho tvoru i etapy rozvytku suchasnykh teatriv. Molodyi teatr. Lektsiia 25.02.1926 [Social aim of the work of art and the stages of development of contemporary theatre. The Young Theatre. Lecture. 25.02.1926]. In *Les Kurbas. "Berezil": Iz tvorchoi spadshchyny* (pp. 87–91). Kyiv: Dnipro [in Ukrainian].

Література

1. Гвоздев А. О смене театральных систем // О театре: Временник Отдела истории и теории театра Государственного института истории искусств: Сб. ст. Ленинград: Academia, 1926. С. 7–36.

2. Клековкін О. Mise en scène: Ідеї. Концепції. Напрями / Ін-т проблем сучас. мистец. НАМ України. Київ: Фенікс, 2017. 800 с.

3. Клековкін О. Елементи театру (Морфологічний етюд про «систематизовані систематичні системи») // Мистецтвознавство України. 2010. Вип. 11. С. 102–115.

4. Клековкін О. Театральна культура України: Сценарії. Ролі. Статуси: Монографія. Київ: Арт Економі, 2020. 232 с.

5. Клековкін О. Чаювання зі Станіславським: Історичний нарис. Київ: Арт Економі, 2022. 96 с.

6. Лесь Курбас. Суспільне призначення мистецького твору і етапи розвитку сучасних театрів. Молодий театр. Лекція 25.02.1926 // Лесь Курбас. «Березіль»: Із творчої спадщини. К.иїв Дніпро, 1988. С. 87–91.

7. Мамонтов Я. Сучасний театр в його основних напрямках // Нове мистецтво. 1926. № 14. С. 4–6; № 15, С. 4–6; № 18. С. 4–6; № 22. С. 2–3.

8. Мамонтов Я. Драматургія в театральному аспекті (до питання про наукове вивчення драматичних творів) // Радянський театр. 1930. № 3–5. С. 20–28.

9. Скорнякова М. Г. Джоржо Стрелер и «Пикколо театро в Милане». Москва: Гос. ин-т искусствознания, 2012. 352 с.

10. Bowman W. P., Ball R. H. Theatre Language. A Dictionary of Terms in English of the Drama and Stage from Medieval to Modern times. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961. 428 p.

11. Gledališki terminološki Slovar / Urednice Marjeta Humar, Barbara Sušec Michieli, Katarina Podbevšek, Slavka Lokar. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, 2007. 271 s.

9. Mamontov, Ya. (1926). Suchasnyi teatr v yoho osnovnykh napri-amkakh [Modern theatre in its main trends]. *Nove mystetstvo, 14,* 4–6; *15,* 4–6; *18,* 4–6; *22,* 2–3. [in Ukrainian].

10. Mamontov, Ya. (1930). Dramaturhiia v teatralnomu aspek-ti (do pytannia pro naukove vyvchennia dramatychnykh tvoriv) [Drama in theatre aspect (on the problem of research of dramatic works)]. *Radianskyi teatr, 3–5,* 20–28. [in Ukrainian].

11. Pavis, P. (1998). *Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis.* Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

12. Skornyakova, M. (2012). *Dzhorzho Streler i "Pikkolo teatro v Milane"* [Giorgio Strehler and Piccolo Teatro di Milano]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennyiy institut iskusstvoznaniya [in Russian].

12. Pavis P. Dictionary of the Theatre: Terms, Concepts, and Analysis. University of Toronto Press Toronto and Buffalo, 1998. 469 p.

Клековкін О.

Режисерська система: межі поняття

Анотація. На запит *режисерська система* пошукові системи видають понад сімдесят тисяч посилань, на запит *театральна система* — понад чотири тисячі, що свідчить про достатнє поширення словосполучень. Однак зіставлення змісту отрима-них відповідей розчаровує, адже свідчить про перенасиченість мистецтвознавчої термінології термінами-наліпками: у різ-ний час, у різних країнах, різними авторами терміни вживано у різних значеннях. Прикладів, які можуть оголити проблему, багато, але зупинимося лише на найелементарнішому: кожен може підрахувати кількість якихось об'єктів — скажімо, яблук у кошику, адже нам відомі ознаки, котрі відрізняють яблуко від неяблука, однак жоден притомний театрознавець або прак-тик театру не наважиться назвати кількість режисерських систем, адже межі поняття надто хиткі; хіба що наважиться на-звати кількість популярних, «хрестоматійних» систем; отже, хоч би скільки назвав, все буде правдою і брехнею одночасно. Та сама ситуація і з поняттям «*твір мистецтва*» — достатньо, за прикладом Марселя Дюшана, причепити наліпку і ви-ставити якийсь об'єкт у *мистецькому просторі*.

Пропоновану розвідку присвячено «*режисерській (театральній) системі*»: історії поняття та його змістові, а також ви-окремлено ознаки, які визначають межі його застосування.

Ключові слова: історія театру, історія режисури, режисерська система, театральна система, режисерський метод, винахід у мистецтві, відкриття у мистецтві.