

The Active Analysis Method as an instrument of modern theatre

1) The AAM's artistic nature and main versions

- The development of Stanislavsky's system and the AAM's formula
- AAM's main versions (Knebel-Popov, Efros, Fomenko — Moscow; Tovstonogov-Kazman, Korogodsky, Dodin — St. Petersburg)

2) AAM's functions and capabilities

- Functions: analytic, rehearsal, adaptive
- Capabilities: universalism and limitation

3) AAM's development

- AAM at the turn of play and psychological structures
- The possible synthesis of the method's individual parameters and other techniques

My report will probably be quite polemic, because on the one hand the ACTIVE ANALYSIS METHOD has been a tangled problem since its very appearance (it is known, that Stanislavsky's heritage doesn't include the perfect view of the author on the system he created, so we've got it with the help of various expositors), and on the other hand my understanding of the problem is the point of stage director and the starting teacher — both are subjectively oriented. The St. Petersburg's school, which I stand for, is quite skeptical and it seems doubtful for this school that the method itself is still alive and can be used as an instrument. It's paradoxical, but it was exactly St. Petersburg (or more precisely Leningrad) where one of the most strict and instrumental versions of the method was developed (anyway, it concerns the analytic part of the method). To run ahead, I speak about Georgi Tovstonogov. But every mature person knows that the life is a constant interchange of ebbs and flows, and this should be taken as a matter of course.

So let's move to the second quarter of the 20th century, to Moscow, to the Leontyevski lane where lived Stanislavski, whose life was so brilliantly and tragically described by Bulgakov. Then Stanislavski shut his doors for everybody except the selected ones and gave himself up to his research. But for a start let's recall the events that preceded this period of his life.

It was the end of the 19th century, when in Moscow appeared a theatre called an «Artistic public» one, and at the same time Stanislavski begins to investigate the organic nature of acting technique. It's essential, that at first the directivity of the theater's pioneers was an ETHIC one. At the beginning the first and foremost task of this theatre was to upgrade the whole theatrical culture. Stanislavski realized, that his intention to speak to the society avowedly required such figures, that would deeply understand their profession and realize their responsibility in the face of public.

As for Stanislavski's research itself, it can be divided into several periods. It's interesting that once I came across one curious «document» — Gogol's article dated back to 1842 and called «The forewarning for those who want to play «The Auditor» properly». Citation: “Most of all it's important not to fall into the parody... The less the actor will try to make the public laugh and seem funny, the more laughable traits will appear in his role. These traits will come out of exactly the seriousness peculiar to each hero of the comedy. *Everyone in the comedy acts hotly, like a hen with one chicken, fusses, as if was solving the most important problem in his life...* (italics is mine — A.S.). Before trying to copy all the small peculiarities of his hero, an intelligent actor should try to catch something universal in his character, should understand what his role is called for, *should know the principal and prior concerns of the person he presents on the stage, must find out the permanent subject of the thoughts that appear in the hero's mind. Having caught the main concern of the character, the actor should fill his own soul with this concern, so that the thoughts and aspirations of the hero became the actor's own ones and were sitting in his mind during the whole performance* (italics mine — A.S.). Certainly, it's possible to argue with Gogol: the history of Russian and world theatre knows diametrically opposite approaches. But we're talking about Stanislavski and the roots of his active

analysis method, so it's astonishing that Gogol phrased the corner stone of Stanislavski's system — the conception of super-task. We can assume, that watching the work of the luminaries of Maly and Aleksandrinsky theaters he intuitively discovered the nature of theater role's REALIZATION. So returning to Stanislavski we can establish that his «system», or more precisely the gradual forming and articulation of the latter has deep origins and traditions. It came the time when the experience had to be comprehended and turned into the instrument. The time needed Stanislavski.

So I'll try to be brief. In it's first period Mkhata was the theatre of long conversations about the play. At first they didn't have the necessary toolset for working with the play and role, so such way of working was optimal. Sitting at the table, the collective of the theatre tried to comprehend the motives of the acts of heroes, attempted to prepare the play. It's difficult to say, when the process became more producible — we know that from 1911 to 1916 Stanislavski started to write the book about working at role, but now we don't need the exact chronology. It's enough just to take the famous Stanislavski's 4th volume and analyze it.

Working at role («Woe from Wit» 1916-1920). Here the following features are essential for my topic:

1) THE SIGNIFICANCE THAT STANISLAVSKY ATTACHES TO THE FIRST ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE PLAY, TO THE FIRST READING OF IT.

“... The moment of the first acquaintance with the role is very important. The first impression is virgin and fresh. It is the best agent of artistic enthusiasm and delight... But the first understanding can be a mistaken one... For the actor it's highly important to find a point to look at the play from — the point where the author stands...” («The First Acquaintance»)

I can pick out three basic moments — the spontaneity of perception, the readiness to the further work with the first sensations and the tuning on comprehending the author's thought and super-task.

2) APPEARANCE OF THE FIRST PERFECT METHODS OF STRUCTURAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS.

“... How to analyze the life of the play's characters and understand the facts of this life? V.I. Nemirovich-Danchenko offers very simple and witty method... The method is to tell the play's content... Writing down all the facts of the play, we create their list, the protocol of one day of Famusov house' life. That is the «present» of the play, the life of it's facts...” (chapter «Analysis», p. 79-80) ... While transmitting the facts and the plot of the play, the actor also transmits inadvertently the spiritual contents they imply; he reproduces the life of human spirit... To analyze the facts means to comprehend the inner scheme of the hero's spiritual life. To analyze the facts means to make alien facts, events and the whole life created by artist your own, familiar ones. To analyze the facts means to

find a key to the mysterious spiritual life of the person depicted — the key, which is hidden under the facts and the text of the play.” (All the quotations are taken from K.S. Stanislavski Collected works in 8 vol., Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1957) Besides, Stanislavski attaches great significance to revelation of the role’s circumstances and to the PAST and FUTURE of the character. So we should move from objective protocol to subjective story, because when we analyze facts, considering their historical, stylistic and common nature, we use our own experience. And thus we make a step to the concrete basic idea, to the specific story.

3) THE PROCESS OF ABSORBING THE ROLE IS STILL ARTIFICIALLY STRATIFICATED.

Stanislavski marks out four periods — that of perceiving, that of emotional experience, that of realization and that of influence. To help you understand the dynamics of Stanislavsky’s ideas, I’ll pay your attention to the next citation: “The physical part of the role should be put off till the final step of the work, when the inner side of the role’s life gets firmly established and subdues not just the eyes, facial gesture, voice, but the whole body itself. Let the body act only when there is no possibility to restrain it”. (p. 179)

4) ALONGSIDE WITH THE PRESENCE OF SUCH AN AMORPHIC NOTION AS A «SPIRITUAL TONE», TWO POWERFUL TECHNOLOGICAL INSTRUMENTS WERE CREATED. THESE ARE «SUPER-TASK» AND «THROUGH-LINE ACTION».

“... The body of the performance should be made up of the living, active physical and psychological objectives; it’s essential to be able to summarize all the parts of this body into one all-embracing super-task, to strive for the super-task and realize it. So super-task (desire), through-line action (striving) and the realization (action) together arrange the creative process of emotional experience.” (p.154)

As a whole this part of Stanislavsky’s work is incomplete and transitional. To some extent it refers to all the three basic works of the 4th volume. It means, that Stanislavsky always tried to advance and was never pleased by theoretical understanding of his practical work. But it also rises our interest, because incomplete work can be interpreted and understood in many different ways.

Working at role («Othello» 1930-1933) What ideas changed and what remained firm?

1) QUALITATIVE REVOLUTION OF THE APPROACH TO ROLE EXECUTION.

The physical action, which used to be auxiliary and common becomes the primary instrument of the role’s creation. Gradually Stanislavsky comes up to the psychophysical understanding of actor’s nature and realizes the interdependence between PHYSICAL AND PSYCHIC. It turns out, that physical actions can not only express the internal life of the role, but also influence the latter. “... My method is based on the intimate unity of inner and outer and helps to feel the role by creating the

physical life of human body... Try to find the physical truth in all your actions and objectives on the stage. If you succeed, you'll immediately start to believe that your physical actions are correct. And in our profession belief is the best motive power and stimulus of feeling and intuitive emotional experience..." («The human body life creation», p.210-213)

2) GUIDED BY HIS NEW ATTITUDE TO PHYSICAL BODY, STANISLAVSKY OFFERS THE ACTOR TO TAKE TO THE STAGE BEGINNING FROM THE VERY FIRST REHEARSAL.

"... How is it possible to begin to play so early? — the puzzled students asked. Of course, it's impossible to play the whole role straight away, but we can try to play some parts of it. For instance, the scene begins with the appearance of Rodrigo and Yago. So you should do it. Then they give the alarm. So are you. But it won't be the playing itself. It will be the action in the play's circumstances. Operating inside the outer sphere of the play. But it's a hard task, almost the hardest one, — to fulfill your physical task naturally..." («The human body life creation», p.210)

3) STANISLAVSKY FORMULATES THE METHOD OF SUBSTITUTION OF THE AUTHOR'S TEXT WITH THE ACTOR'S OWN WORDS DURING THE PSYCHOPHYSICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE SCENE.

"... If I wouldn't have taken the text away from you, you would have learned it by rote inanely and technically, without trying to go deeply into the subtext and follow the internal line... So your speech on the stage would have become just a senseless chatter... First of all, you must understand and confirm the subtext of the role, and feel the necessity of productive and appropriate action. Both word and the whole text will become necessary later on, and you will let them fulfill their true mission of acting, not just sounding... (ibidem, p.217-218)

Let's summarize. Stanislavski came to an EPOCHAL DISCOVERY IN THEATRE'S THEORY: INDISSOLUBLE CONNECTION BETWEEN PHYSICAL AND PSYCHIC, realized the interdependence between these two notions, and drew to a conclusion, that PHYSICAL BODY IS THE KEY to the analysis of hero's behavior and the instrument for role's further construction.

Stanislavsky's discovery helped him to work out the concrete technique — that of the ETUDE. Etude is the PHYSICAL realization of the episode with several impromptu words. (Though, according to some facts, it was 1905 when Stanislavsky began to use the etude technique while working at the play).

Such aspects as the first acquaintance with the play and the author's thought, analysis and estimation of the plot's facts, analysis of the given circumstances in the past, future and present of the hero, the construction of through-line action and super-task of the role and the whole play still remained significant for Stanislavsky.

As for theoretical studies, it's evident that Stanislavsky tried to create a massive work using his previous savings and new discoveries, but again he had to stop, because the revolutionary character of the new chapter as «The human body life creation» didn't fit to the others.

«Working at role. "The Auditor"». What did Stanislavsky come to?

1) HE BEGAN TO PROPAGANDIZE THE ABSOLUTE TRUST TO THE PHYSICAL ACTIONS, PERCEIVING THE LATTER AS A SIMPLE AND STRAIGHT WAY TO THE CREATION OF HUMAN SPIRIT'S LIFE THROUGH THE LIFE OF PHYSICAL BODY. HE FORMULATED «THE METHOD OF PHYSICAL ACTIONS » AND PROCLAIMED IT TO BE THE MAIN ACTOR'S INSTRUMENT THAT HELPED TO CREATE THE PSYCHOPHYSICAL LIFE OF THE CHARACTER.

“... We need the credibility of physical action not for the realism or naturalism themselves; we need it to provoke the emotional experience, to do it naturally and reflexively, without violating our feelings, so that we could reproduce the living spiritual essence of our hero... Stanislavsky notes: The method “... helps to use naturally the superfine powers of nature in our work... It helps to find the actor's own living internal material needed for playing the role...” (ibidem, p.342) Stanislavsky underlines, that physical method should be used from the very beginning of the work at role.

2) STANISLAVSKY BEGINS TO TAKE THE PROCESSES OF ANALYSIS|, EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCING AND PHYSICAL EMBODIMENT AS A UNITED INTERPENETRATIVE PROCESS.

“My approach to role is completely different...: I invite actors and begin the first rehearsal without asking them to read the play and without discussing it with actors. What do I mean? Moreover, it is possible to rehearse the play, which hasn't been written yet... Let's try. I have imagined the play, I will tell you its plot from one episode to another, and you'll play it. I will watch your improvisation and write down successful moments... Together we will play the work, that hasn't been written yet.” («Working at role. "The Auditor"», p.315) “...And soon after: «... You noticed, that all your physical and other actions demanded not only the work of imagination, but also made us divide scenes into parts and concrete objectives; we needed logical operations, the consequence of actions and feelings, had to search the naturalness, to make the audience believe us... But we didn't sit at the table, trying to find all these things inside us, we didn't divide the text into parts with the help of a pencil... We didn't analyze our actions theoretically... but we worked practically, using our nature and experience... You'll realize that it was an inner and outer analysis of yourself — of the person in certain circumstances of the role...” (ibidem, p.340) So we can see, that the analysis of the play is not just the process of thinking. For artist it is necessary to act, and while acting he begins to reveal the essence of the scenic episode and the complex of given circumstances. The actor must properly orient himself in the situation and communicate his partners smoothly.

So together with Stanislavsky we passed over about 20 years and now let's return to Leontjevsky lane again. It's amazing, but after many and many rehearsals at the table (Mkhat's firm sign) Stanislavski's method comes to the almost complete denial of them and passes on to reactive exploration of drama through the physical action. But we should specify. Stanislavsky was a nutty person. The fragmentarity of his work «Working at role. "The Auditor"» and his dedication to the physical action can distract us from other parts of the method. Many problems (such as that of through-line action, super-task, oral action, working on the author's text, etc.) weren't touched upon in this work. Stanislavsky didn't connect these problems into united system with the method of physical actions. There's only one brief document called «The plan of working at role» (an application to «Working at role. "The Auditor"»), which presents a summary of creating the role using new method. Reading this document, we understand, that many new elements would have been added to the global work by Stanislavsky, if he had time to write this work. But he didn't. Here we see, that he goes away from the initial attempts to divide the play into facts of the plot and play them physically and comes to new, more detailed analysis of plot and topic, their exploration with the help of physical action with the gradual clarifying of through-line action, super-task and the forward approaching to the author's text. Now we'll succeed Stanislavsky's students and try to find out the new aspects they added to his method.

It's known, that living at Leontjevsky lane Stanislavsky made his research works side by side with the group of Mkhat actors headed by M.N. Kedrov and gained experience in the Opera-dramatic studio. M.N. Kedrov and M.O. Knebel were one of those people who tried to conceive various formulating and approaches of the method and interpreted them in their own way after Stanislavsky's death. Kedrov thought that the method is actually «the method of physical actions», while Knebel stood for «the active analysis method». But I want to point out, that Kedrov was just an actor while Knebel was progressing as a stage-director and pedagogue. Such formula as «method of physical actions» doesn't imply an ANALYTIC basis, and actually it was the actor's role creation technique based on interrelation of physical and psychic aspects, that Stanislavsky used to mark out. «The active analysis method», formulated by Knebel, is on the contrary contains a powerful DIRECTIVITY TO RESEARCH.

Besides, reading Stanislavsky it's important to realize where he speaks as a researcher and pedagogue and where he speaks as a stage director. From my subjective point of view, all the latest fragments of his work are pedagogically oriented, that's why it's essential for him to inform his students about the importance of physical action and the actor's ability to turn the physical action into an instrument and use it while playing the role. Thus, the role of ANALYSIS AND STRUCTURE fades into the background but it doesn't mean, that Stanislavsky loses his interest of scenic episode, through-line action and super-task. They just moved to the periphery of his mind, because he becomes interested by actor and by the ability of the latter to work according the new principles. The history of Stanislavsky's system is the story of ACCUMULATION, NOT THAT OF REVOLUTION.

So let's be precise. We have been concentrated on actor so far, because we just followed Stanislavsky.

IN THE CONTRAST TO THE METHOD OF PHYSICAL ACTIONS, THE ACTIVE ANALYSIS METHOD IS THE TECHNIQUE DIRECTED TO STAGE DIRECTOR, OR, MORE PRECISELY, TO STAGE DIRECTOR AND ACTOR WORKING IN COOPERATION.

This new emphasis is highly important. Stanislavsky didn't care about the final result (or, most likely, he cared, but only as a stage director, not as a researcher). The active analysis method potentially implies objectives relating to production and the research potential of the method conforms to these objectives. So we've got a certain new hierarchy: analysis — realization, stage director — actor, active analysis method — method of physical actions.

But let's return to M.O. Knebel. Her achievement consists in FORMULATING OF THE METHOD AS WELL AS IN RETURNING ITS ANALYTICAL PART TO THE PROPER PLACE OF THE HIERARCHY AND IN POPULARIZATION OF THE METHOD IN MOSCOW'S THEATRICAL PEDAGOGICS AND STAGE DIRECTION. It's worth mentioning that it was Maria Osipovna who popularized such term as «event» and propagandized etude as the rehearsal methodology.

Her book «About the active analysis of role and play» is in a way a key to the mature works of Stanislavsky. In this book we can find a simple account of the order of working at play and role directed to STAGE DIRECTOR AND ACTOR AS THE WHOLE ARTISTIC TANDEM. Being Stanislavsky's student, Knebel clearly felt the style and needs of new generation, and her research became a bridge connecting Stanislavsky with new theatergoers. She begins her study with the EVENTFUL ANALYSIS OF THE PLAY.

“... The main task during the first rehearsal period is to realize the main events of the play without paying attention to trivial matters, which can distract you, and to determine action and counter-action, so that you could make a profound analysis and determine the essence of dramatic conflict...” (M.O. Knebel «About the active analysis of role and play», Moscow, 1982, p.27) “It's important to remember, that before doing etudes we should analyze not only main and chief events, but also insignificant ones... The reason of the following: after switching to etudes the actor should not miss the inner and outer tasks set for the hero by the author of the play...” (ibidem, p.43) Following Stanislavsky, Knebel calls this process «an intellectual reconnaissance». Knebel states, that after the construction of the events system and estimation of all the events (facts) it is necessary to return to the notions of SUPER-TASK AND THROUGH-LINE ACTION.

“...According to Stanislavsky, the main objective of actor and stage director is to reproduce on the stage those ideas and emotions that inspired the author of the play ...» (ibidem, p.32) Knebel thinks that alongside with the determination of super-task there is one more highly important step of

working — the determination of emotional super-task of each actor individually. "... When you're trying to determine the super-task, it's very important to name it correctly, to find such words that will express the action... The super-task should be taken out of the very heart of the play, out of its secret penetralia..." (ibidem, p.33) "... The actor must string all of his acts on the united shank of through-line action, which carries him to a super-task; otherwise his role won't be spoken about and won't become his real artistic victory..." The idea of through-line action is counterbalanced by counter-action. That's a sort of system of coordinates: THE GOAL — MY STRUGGLE FOR IT — THE OBSTACLES I SURMOUNT ON MY WAY TO THIS GOAL.

Speaking about Stanislavsky's practical work, Knebel describes an interesting and effective method of helping actors to realize the eventful-active aspects of their roles. This method is based on the same principle as the plot analysis technique formulated by Nemirovich-Danchenko. The actor must consecutively tell the eventful-active line of his role. "... It's an extremely useful exercise, because it immediately helps to see if the actor understands and understands properly not only the words of his hero, but also the meanings of his actions, his objectives and the character of his interrelations with other dramatic personages..." (ibidem, p.36) This method helps to find out the gaps made during the «intellectual reconnaissance» and serves as an additional self-checking before and during the ETUDE REHEARSALS. The next step is to put yourself on the place of your character and while playing etude try to act on your own. "... Then, according to Stanislavsky, you'll find yourself immersed into your role and later you'll feel your role inside of you..." (ibidem, p.44)

Knebel mentions, that before going on to the etude rehearsals the stage director must create on the stage such scenery that will look like that of the future performance as well as to select the appropriate costumes... THE PROBLEM OF STAGE DIRECTOR'S SEEING is the least elaborated aspect of Knebel's version of active analysis method. She just gives a sort of system-defined description of the active analysis method taking the latter as a COMPLEX OF APPROACHES AND TECHNIQUES. That's why it's worth specifying that the analysis in a theatre is always subjective and the role of stage director here is highly important. But the question is that if the stage director is guided by the author's logic (and a talented author always creates insoluble conflicts, which can be comprehended in many different ways) or he just places the active-eventful system of the play under his own concept.

M.O. Knebel hasn't sufficiently studied the problem of etude's GENRE NATURE. She doesn't make any recommendation in this connection, she just states, that if you follow the author and use the active analysis method you automatically strike on the author's stylistics. "... Composing the etude, following the author's idea, the actor isn't able to ignore the features typical for the play's characters... and as the actor penetrates into the world of the hero's internal feelings in the process of active analysis, as he studies the shape of manifestation of these feelings, he will certainly master the system of genre features typical for the play..." (ibidem, p.49)

As for the etude's trial itself, here M.O. Knebel lays down some significant terms — the importance of confidential atmosphere during the creational process, the necessity of counterchecking the etude using the repeated analysis (returning to the play), the usage of improvised text with the gradual substitution of it with the text of the author.

Knebel pays much attention to such notions as «THE ROLE'S BACKGROUND» («THE WEIGHT OF SOUL»), «INNER MONOLOG», «SEEING». I suppose that «the role's background» in Knebel's understanding is much similar to Stanislavsky's «PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE of the role». "... The role's background is the hero's inner spiritual «baggage» that he enters the play with. It turns out of all the character's impressions, of all the conditions of his life and embraces all the nuances of his feelings, thoughts and emotions..." (ibidem, p.64) «The role's background» is closely connected with inner monolog. "... It's obligatory for the actor to think on the stage as his character does. To carry out this obligation the actor must think out inner monologs... and gradually they'll begin to appear automatically in his mind during the performance... (ibidem, p.72) Pleading Stanislavsky's opinion, that inner seeing preserves the life of the role, Knebel says that the actor should learn to accumulate his seeing and inspire his partner with it.

The «role's background», «inner monolog» and «seeing» are elements of actor's inner psychotechnique, which the actor must use during his work in accordance with active analysis method.

Casually Knebel speaks about the role of acting area in the process of using active analysis method. "...The etude rehearsals make great effect on the construction of acting area. Those actors who were taught to act and move naturally on the stage, who were taught to analyze their physical behavior, can easily participate in the process of acting area's construction..." (ibidem, p.87)

At last, Knebel emphasizes the importance of word and its birth, the oral action which Stanislavsky took as a «primary action». (That is quite natural, because we're talking about the LITERARY-ORIENTED theatre and the method I'm analyzing serves to organic birth of the author's text on the stage). It doesn't refer to my topic directly, so I want to pass from M.O. Knebel to Anatoly Efros — Knebel's student who managed to do a lot for cultivating of the active analysis method and etude rehearsals technique in repertory theatre. Efros didn't create his own detailed doctrine, but nevertheless I would like to cite some of his references and thoughts about the method. "... Only while working at Children theatre, where I got acquainted with M.O. Knebel, O. Efremov and others, I fully realized what this method was. First of all, I was amazed when saw that the rehearsal process at the Central children theatre didn't include idle literary talks. In that theatre they managed to define the essence of scenic event with the help of improvisation; actors began to play without knowing the text of their roles. When the rehearsal started we were sitting, but soon stood up because actor was expected to analyze the play by the means of action. What's going on there? Molier must beat Buton? Certainly. We played even the most complicated scenes using the language of action. It was like analyzing the role while going up to the stage... Thus we undoubtedly became easy to rise and more

mobile. We struggled against the scenic routine, against the habit of mechanical reading the text on the stage...” (A. Efros, «Rehearsal — the love of mine», Moscow, p.137-138)

I would like to make a comment, essential from my point of view. Efros describes the time when all the official theatres including Mkhata, marching under the banner of Stanislavsky’s ideas, suffered from great stagnation. But at the same time some groups of young actors didn’t want to loose their belief in Mkhata’s ideals they had been brought up on and sought for renovation and new artistic impulse in the works of the same Stanislavsky (and the managed to find these!). So we come back to «ebb and flow» situation and begin to think: is it possible for Stanislavsky’s works to go out of date? And what about Brecht? Mejerhold? I think the point is that of periodic wavy bursts of interest to different systems of views in theatre, when every new generation works out its own view of one or another method according to its own needs, ideals and passions. So let’s agree that Stanislavsky is «forever young» (as it was in Soviet times, when every national leader was forever young) and let’s go further. Here are some more cites from Efros. “... The method of etudes is a very practical thing. After the active analysis everything should be clear for actors... They should realize what’s going on, consider the profundity of the material, extract the professional framework and start improvisation on the stage... It’s necessary to think in psychophysical way. The base of such thinking is that the person looks at every event of the play in the light of action and collision... In the etude method action is like a trunk and words are like leaves. The analysis and etude shouldn’t stay separately. Both flow out of each other. Analysis is a half an etude while etude is actually an analysis. The stage director must be concrete, he must speak so that everyone could physically feel the sense of his words and could understand everything. Such ... «visibleness», create *intention* (italics mine — A.S.) Everything should be clear as intention were a subject that you could put on the table...”

I want to pay your attention to the following moment: here, in the «ANALYSIS — ETUDE system» the third and, more correctly, primary part — INTENTION — appears. The work of Knebel was connected with pedagogical popularization of the method. While Efros was one of those stage directors who used the method and the method got a new life. Certainly, each stage director must hear the life around him, and his work is an artistic PRONOUNCEMENT about life. This pronouncement is based on the work of literature (of course I am speaking about the theatric model I stand for). And here the connection point between INTENTION AND ANALYSIS is located.

TO UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF INTENTION WE MUST UNDERSTAND WHAT KEY POINTS ARE TO BE HIGHLIGHTED IN THE GIVEN LITERARY WORK, SO THAT THE PUBLIC, WHILE WATCHING THE PERFORMANCE BASED ON IT, COULD SEE THE IMPERISHABLE RELEVANCE OF THIS LITERARY WORK.

THE STAGE DIRECTOR’S ANALYSIS as I see it should have a kind of starting point connected with feeling or pre-feeling of the key points. Here is an example from A.V. Efros’ es practice. “Working at «Marriage» don’t try to create a comedy, try to find tragedy in this work of

literature!” — he said speaking about the play which had traditionally being perceived as a comedy without any attempts to find some profound philosophical ideas there. And suddenly the play blew up, started, acquired the idea of panhuman struggle for happiness. Podkolesin jumped up, began to toss about the room, and alongside with comic effect a new idea was born: happiness is just a myth! So the displacement of key points creates a new living breath of the performance.

So here is the triad «INTENTION — ANALYSIS — ETUDE». The sequence of steps wasn't changed, but the active analysis of the play (during etude rehearsal or that at the table) started to be controlled by the stage director's ideas.

I'd like to turn to the review of some versions of the method created in St.Petersburg. But at first I want to pay your attention to such an outstanding phenomenon of today's theatrical Moscow as «The studio of Petr Fomenko» theatre. This theatre was originally organized within the walls of GITIS Academy and was developing as a theatrical studio, where several generations of actors and stage directors grew up; now we can say that this theatre is a real national patrimony of Russia. The role of Petr Fomenko here is really great. Generally, the interrelations between a prominent Artist and a school, method is a particular subject — vast and complicated one. But nevertheless, when I talked to Fomenko I understood that he really cared about such things as EVENT, ACTION, ETUDE, SUBJECT, THE SYSTEM OF EVENTS et cet. Of course, Fomenko's theatre is a modern theatre and it often uses such techniques as mountinge, game principles, gaudy forms, but nevertheless this theatre follows Stanislavsky and his active analysis method.

So now we proceed to the active analysis versions genetically connected with St. Petersburg. You'll see that the Petersburg's version of the method is a very strict one, as the northern capital itself.

The name of Georgy Tovstonogov is still exciting the minds of theatric Petersburg, because this name is connected with the animation of Big Dramatic theatre and the whole theatrical school of Leningrad. Tovstonogov died before the very end of the soviet epoch, in 1989, but before this he managed to create his own version of the active analysis method. But here was the same story: Tovstonogov's principles were interpreted by his students and this caused discussions and misunderstandings. I remember the times when several pro-Soviet books by Tovstonogov were published («The Proscenium Opening», «Sphere of Thoughts»), where Tovstonogov's personal considerations alternated with ideologic rubbish. I felt myself very unhappy when I studied the actor's course, two aged actors were my teachers, but I felt propensity to the profession of stage director and to the active analysis method itself, and had to study millions of books and communicate many and many people to understand how to operate the method. Today the conditions are not so sad — a lot of views and books have appeared, but there are also a lot of skeptics who say that nothing new has been invented in theatre since Soviet times. I think the point is that the next generation will come and it will HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY and invent. And then the question «if the method has gotten old or it's

still alive » will no longer be relevant. However we've come to an agreement that «Stanislavsky is always yang».

As I have already said, Tovstonogov's methodology is very strict and instrumentally oriented. Tovstonogov invented the approach to the revealing of the play's unique nature — «the nature of feelings» — and made this problem a fundamental one. "... The nature of feelings is not a performance's component, it's a unique notion that determines all of the components..." (G.A. Tovstonogov «The proscenium opening», vol. , p.442) M.O. Knebel urged to follow the author and his style, but Tovstonogov made an attempt to come up to the complex sphere of the author's subconsciousness. The nature of feelings as the method's principle is closely connected with «the rules of game» in every concrete performance and finally with the determination of genre, which was always unique for Tovstonogov, was always connected only with the concrete performance.

"... Working at each play we face the difficulty of discovering the nature of the actor's performance. It's important to distinguish stylistically one performance from another. Different performances must differ not only in décor, music, illumination — these are obvious components. My idea is that each play should be performed according to its own rules... The main difficulty in staging of a play is to find the individual way of behavior... Once Shukshin read out «Energetic people» for us. We laughed until cry. But when we began the rehearsal of this work all the humor had gone. But when we discovered the nature of *scenic feuilleton* (italics mine — A.S.) the author's humor began to return to us in various details, and the laughter came back too. So the hardest objective in drama is to reveal the correct way of the actor's behavior..." («G. Tovstonogov rehearses and teaches», St.Petersburg, 2007, p.173) «The feuilleton» has probably become the key word for Tovstonogov in that play. Not long ago I heard the lecture of A. Bartoshevich — a prominent Russian Shakespeare researcher — about the interpretations of Shakespeare by P. Brouke. He told us, that Brouke had put into use such term as «the subconsciousness of the play» and that his performances production used to be divided into two long periods: 1) The revelation of the play's subconsciousness and connecting it with the actors' subconsciousness 2) The restraint of the actors subconsciousness' «black vortexes» and putting them into shape. So we see two approaches that are quite alike. That's because there's only one way for the stage director — it concludes in the looking for vivid, organic behavior of actor in the limits of author's artistic laws.

Together with the attempt to formulate the RULES OF GAME for actors, Tovstonogov suggests several techniques of gradual motion to the revelation of the performance's laws.

1) THE SELECTION OF THE GIVEN CIRCUMSTANCES AND DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHOR'S ATTITUDE TO THEM.

"... The selection of circumstances is an integral term of genre's existence. Each author offers his own unique way to reflect the world, and it depends only on him, what suggested

circumstances to choose for each hero. Tovstonogov considered, that Chehov, for instance, used to attach significance to such circumstances as bad weather, or headache, but in Shakespeare's comedies the weather is always perfect and heroes never suffer from headache. But if Shakespeare uses the picture of bad weather — that is certainly that of a storm! The stage director's desire to unify the selection of given circumstances according to laws of life's likelihood takes him away from the author's world with its concrete human fates, takes him away from the road leading to genre..." (ibidem, p.103)

2) THE DETERMINATION OF THE WAY OF COMMUNICATING WITH PUBLIC.

"... There two wide spread principles: actors can act according to the «fourth wall» law or they can interact with public. Such division is very rough... The stage director's palette can be enlarged: at the expense of the «fourth wall's» shifting (it can be placed at the edge of the stage or at the end of hall, or at the center of the universe where God lives); «the fourth wall» may be destroyed and built several times during the performance; some characters (actors) may obey the laws of «the fourth wall», while others can be given the right to break them. In the case of «the fourth wall's» absence there are lots of the ways to interact with public — from physical contacts with public (happenings) to unpretentious oral action (cues addressed to public)... Considering that direct interaction with public is always a dialogue (not necessarily oral), the most essential task is to determine what the actor or his character wants from public: advice, protection, cover for his actions... — the number of variants is endless..." (ibidem, p.104)

3) THE DETERMINATION OF THE ACTOR'S INTERRELATIONS WITH HIS OWN ROLE.

"... You should remember, that the interrelations between actor and his role may be different: from absolute fusion to the Brecht's «suspension», when the actor distances himself from his role. Of course, between these two opposite points there are lots of transitional cases of the actor's moving away from his role and his closing to it. The distance between the two points can decrease or increase depending on the genre's matter, on the principle of performing chosen by stage director. Finally, the actor may (if needed) completely fuse with his role during one part of the performance and during another part he may move away from his role and demonstrate the gap through his attitude to the character he plays..." (ibidem, p.103-104)

Alongside with the listed factors, many parameters play their important role here: the first impression about the play, the comparison of the material's vivid sources with the author's fiction (it helps to feel the author's style), the atmosphere during the rehearsal (it should agree with the play's atmosphere), the stage director's ability to formulate metaphorically the actor's objective, a proper special solution, the order of pictures and moves that can be born only with the help of the actor's improvisations, etc.

Another analytically developed sphere of Tovstonogov's active analysis method is that of the play's analysis. But before starting to talk about it I'd like to mention one essential detail: though Tovstonogov's analytical method is firmly formulated, the master always emphasized the importance of creative non-dogmatic approach to his methodology. "... In no circumstances you shouldn't follow any given regulations, theories or methods blindly, it's important to reveal their spirit in your own way... The objective of the method is ... making the creative process to be animated and joyful... I think, that everyone must discover Stanislavsky's method and do it in his own way... It will become your own and personal property. Only then you'll master the method..." («G. Tovstonogov rehearses and teaches», St.Petersburg, 2007,p.168-169)

So Tovstonogov managed to formulate the principle of «intellectual reconnaissance» and find such parameters that can help the stage director to investigate the play's conflict and dramatic material of the play. He proposed, that each play includes five highly important events, which set the plot going. (Of course, there are much more events in every large-scaled play, but now we talk about those events, at the expense of which the plot makes a big «step forward»). These events are INITIAL, PRIMARY, CENTRAL, FINAL and PRINCIPAL ones. The INITIAL EVENT is a kind of performance's tuning-fork, the emotional tuning. It starts outside the performance and ends before the public's eyes. It reflects («like a drop of water reflects the whole ocean» -- Tovstonogov) the initial given circumstance — the environment, that all the play's conflicts are immersed in, and that absorbs all the author's pain and stays permanent during the whole play right up to the principal event. The principal event helps up to understand – what happened with the initial given circumstance. Tovstonogov said, that the environment at the beginning of the play is always «pregnant» with problem, and gradually this problem grows and thus it happens the collision of initial given circumstance with the BASIC GIVEN CIRCUMSTANCE. This collision takes its place in the following event, a PRIMARY one. For example, in «Romeo and Juliette» the initial event is the «creeping fight». Here the initial given circumstance, or the environment (that of hostility and hate), reveals itself. In this environment Romeo, who is ready to great love, comes to the ball organized by his enemy and meets Juliette — that's the PRIMARY EVENT of the play. Thus happens the collision of initial given circumstance (hostility) and the basic given circumstance — the love between children from two families hostile to each other. Here the source of the performance's through-line action springs from, here begins the struggle for the right to love. The next step of the conflict is the CENTRAL EVENT. Here the struggle according to through-line action reaches its peak and the action swivels to 180 degrees. In «Romeo and Juliette» the central event is the death of Tibald. All the conflicts are exposed, Romeo is banished, the struggle for love meets serious checkout, it's hard to resist. During his practice Tovstonogov never used such term as «counteraction». For him the environment of the play itself had all the counteractive potential. The next step is the FINAL EVENT. Here the struggle of through-line action finishes. In Shakespeare's play the final event is «Juliette's suicide». Both lovers are dead, there's no one to struggle for love. But the environment still resonates

the preceding events, so during FINAL event we find out, what happens to itself, to the initial circumstance of the play, to the HOSTILITY itself. Montekki and Kapuletti become reconciled with each other or maybe just accumulate their potential of revenge (this is another interpretation of the play's finale and it requires another super-task of the performance. Efros chose the second variant) Tovstonogov said, that the through-line action's development was always a spiritual way of progression (the person's making) or degression (the person's collapse), and during principal event the stage director should «soar into the super-task».

It stands to mention that in Shakespeare's play it's not difficult to determine the system of events, because the plot of the story is being set forth in prologue by Lorentso, so the backbone of events isn't really important for Shakespeare. Shakespeare's complexity is probably concluded in his poetics and in the tension of passion. But in the case of Chehov, for example, it's extremely hard determine the system of events in his plays, because the plot there folds out according to the characters' inner life.

The system of events should be adjusted by the approximate super-task (that later will be defined more exactly), but this approximate super-task is obliged to be fully realized and felt keenly by the stage director and should be directed to the today world's problems. "... The eventful structure of the play is the core of the active analysis method. Each event has its objective and subjective character, and it is the plot based on the artist's individual point of view that helps to approach the play's super-task, the through-line action, the main conflict's understanding and the initial and basic given circumstances..." (I. Malochevskaya «Tovstonogov's school of stage-direction», 2003, p.61)

Tovstonogov marks out three circles of circumstances — GREAT one (connected with the super-task and exceeding the bounds of the play — the STAGE DIRECTOR'S CONTEXT), MIDDLE one (closely connected with the circumstances and the through-line action of the play) and SMALL one (connected with local event and local action). Analyzing the play, the stage director goes from the general (great circle) to the special (small circle) and then backwards. "... The great circle is the play's atmosphere, while the middle one is the type of people's interrelations inside this atmosphere. The middle circle's circumstances don't induce to any action, but they determine the action inside the small circle. The middle circle checks the local circle of circumstances' logic..." («G. Tovstonogov rehearses and teaches», St. Peterburg, 2003, p.222) Tovstonogov thought, that the most important task of the stage director in the process of working with actor is to reveal the text's local event and to understand the character's action during this event. Knebel used to rely on ETUDE, on improvisation (and composed the scene due to the etude and its further analysis), while Tovstonogov maximized the significance of analytical work, tried to cultivate in his students the ability to analyze and considered the etude to be just an auxiliary method. "

I want to say some words about what the preliminary analysis gives to the stage director. If the stage director has already analyzed the play, it doesn't mean that he must talk about the results of

this analysis to his actors. Tovstonogov advised the stage directors to keep the actor inside the small circle of circumstances and give him an impulse to start an effective action inside the local event. Such way of work will hold the stage director inside his own SUBJECT and IDEA, and will let this idea (super-task) DEVELOP THROUGH THE DRAMATIC CONFLICT AND THE PERFORMANCE'S EVENTFUL SYSTEM. "... If the stage director manages to understand at least one of the method's principles, then he discovers new mysteries in the play, because all the play's principles are interrelated..." (I. Malochevskaya, «Tovstonogov's school of stage directing», St.Petersburg, 2003, p.64) Tovstonogov advised to start with the determination of performance's subject and idea, as well as with the creation of «the novel of life» (Stanislavsky's «past, present and future») — with the detailed recreation of hero's life.

As I have already said, Tovstonogov thought, that the main stage director's objective in the process of working with actors is to search the precise psychophysical action within the local episode. He also emphasized that such work demands the stage director's ability to feel the «pulsing» of his super-task, of the episode's through-line action, because all the complicated philosophy of the method concludes in the correct psychophysical action found by stage director. This fact Tovstonogov took as one of the most remarkable formulae created by Stanislavsky. On stage director's advice, the actors know what they are looking for, and the actor's business is that of «how». During rehearsals the stage director together with his actors tries to find the vivid artistic expression of the events' meaning and does it through the improvisational collision of partners within one scenic event. And here the METHOD OF PHYSICAL ACTIONS BECOMES INSTRUMENT OF THE ACTIVE ANALYSIS METHOD.

SO READING TOVSTONOGOV WE FIND OUT, THAT HE HAS DEVELOPED A HIERARCHICAL STRUCTURE OF THE ACTIVE ANALYSIS METHOD — INTENTION — ANALYSIS — SYNTHESIS, WHERE EACH OF THESE THREE STEPS REQUIRES ITS OWN INSTRUMENTS, BUT AT THE SAME TIME ALL OF THE INSTRUMENTS AND STEPS ARE UNITED.

Now I want to finish the part of my work dedicated to Tovstonogov. I want to give a short review of one more version of active analysis method, which also was created in St. Petersburg, but to my opinion it includes some principles of Knebel's Moscow school. I'm talking about the active analysis in the interpretation of Z.Y. Korogodsky — a splendid teacher and stage director who has organized a prominent child theatre in Leningrad. He tried to carry out the idea of studio theatre, and his theatric model was organic for the active analysis method, because it was also created for company theatre and implied the co-working of actor and stage director. It was Korogodsky who actively used etude in the process of teaching the young actors and while analyzing the events and action of the play (the so-called «scout etude»); with the help of etude he used to analyze the character's «novel of life» — its past ; when actors or students couldn't understand the episode's meaning, he practiced etudes

«by analogy», etc. He created a whole classification of etudes. He believed that etude was a universal instrument and his belief was boundless.

Now I want to pass to the next section and talk about the FUNCTIONS OF THE ACTIVE ANALYSIS METHOD AND ITS CAPABILITIES. As for the functions, I have already illustrated two of them — the rehearsal and analytic ones.

As for adaptive function, I would like to describe it in details. According to my understanding the adaptive function is a number of possibilities that appear for stage director who works with scenically unadapted material. It's prose, lyrics, song, document...and others.

In the 20th century stage directing became an independent artistic profession and since that time it has been trying to become independent from literature, from text. The history of the profession knows extreme manifestation of this revolt in the face of Arto as well as the tradition of cautious transposition of the material from literary language into theatrical one (this tradition begins from Stanislavsky). Each epoch, each cultural sphere require their own revelations and prophecies. But according to Peter Brook's famous maxim, theatre cannot finish, he can become «dead» or stay «alive». I'll take the risk and voice my own creative creed: I think, that in our epoch of great cultural shifts, total glamour and hi-techs, it's the most interesting and complex task for us — not to break with traditions, but to try to develop them in a new way. I want to cite Lev Dodin: "... I think that even when art speaks about extremely common things, it actually speaks in the context of eternity... But the art is not just an instrument of memory... it's also the instrument that helps to get in touch with the yesterday's and future events... There're two ways of realizing oneself in the context of eternity — religion and art. And when we refuse such terrific possibility, such terrific pleasure and say, that we don't resemble any other, we are completely peculiar, we are «another», we actually refuse the art itself. And thus we destroy our culture, thinking, that we really oppose the happening destructiveness, and provide a service for the most destructive powers both in our nature and in social environment." (L. Dodin «The Endless Journey», St.Petersburg, 2009, p.360-362) Dodin's theatre, by the way, has referred to large prosaic forms on repeated occasions — to novels, and created scenic canvases lasting several hours. I think it's nonrandom. If we don't want to break with tradition, we often feel unsatisfied when we work with the modern drama. So classical and modern prose and poetry contain great working balances in this situation.

THE ACTIVE ANALYSIS METHOD CULTIVATES THE DRAMATIC WAY OF THINKING OF ACTOR AND STAGE DIRECTOR, AND IT CAN BE HELPFUL DURING WORKING AT TEXT AND IN THE PROCESS OF SEEKING FOR SCENIC EQUIVALENT.

"... The possibility to use the active analysis method while translating a prosaic text into the scenic language is one of the best proofs of the method's fruitfulness. The stage director's working at prose during the formation of literary text is indivisible from the process of selection of events and

given circumstances for the future performance... The performance's super-task determines the principle of choosing events and episodes, all of which must agree with the super-task. The absence of clear landmarks in the stage director's intention (and such landmarks can be acquired with the help of the active analysis method) has a baneful influence on the performance..." (I. Malochevskaya, «Tovstongov's School of Stage Direction», St. Petersburg, 2003, p.126)

And of course, the improvisation play of actors is an important moment in the process of adaptation of the material for the stage. Omission of certain events, their brief account — all these rest on the shoulders of actor and stage director. To be a success, they must rely on the active analysis method and be able to operate the method professionally and in their own unique way.

As for the method's OMNITUDE and LIMITATION, I think it's essential to look into the following aspects:

1) WHAT CONDITIONS ARE REQUIRED FOR THE METHOD TO GIVE THE RESULTS NEEDED (both in pedagogical and practical kinds of work)?

2) WHAT ARCHETYPICAL FEATURES SHOULD HAVE THE LITERATURE AS A MATERIAL FOR USING THE ACTIVE ANALYSIS METHOD?

I can note, that all the masters and pedagogues I have spoken about emphasized the atmosphere of CONFIDENCE and HOSPITABILITY as one of such required conditions. The active analysis method is the method of co-creation of actors and stage director, the method, where the interchange of thoughts, energies, feelings and images is extremely intensive. That's the method for the ENSEMBLE theatre and it fits for STUDIO theatres as well. Mihail Chehov made a brilliant pronouncement about the nature of the scenic ensemble: "... The scenic ensemble is a spiritual phenomenon. It can't be arranged with outer means. Ensemble is a result of harmony between souls, the result of a spiritual understanding between actors. The rehearsal itself won't create an ensemble when actors are alien to each other..." Today it's hard to meet such conditions: market relations make actors and stage directors work in many organizations simultaneously and always make compromises. But I can give two positive examples as well: the theatre of P. Fomenko and S. Zhenovach's Theatre art studio in Moscow.

Another necessary condition is the UNITY OF PRACTICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL VIEWS OF THE TEAM'S MEMBERS, THE ELECTORAL APPROACH TO THEM AND THE SENSIBLE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE EXTERIOR INFLUENCES. In our epoch of interculturalism, of cultural synthesis and cultural interpenetration it's difficult to feel where the mutual enrichment changes into self-definition loss. The school's purity and the conscious committal to traditions are the conditions difficult to meet but nevertheless obligatory.

And the final thing about the conditions. When Tostonogov answered the question about the ultimate goal of his art, he said, that this goal is «to fright the conscience». It may be done by different way. Petr Fomenko, for instance, who has the same ingenuity as Pushkin had, brings up his public with the help of high flavor, and Dodin's team often emphasizes the social problems and the problems of definite people inside the society seeking shocking influence). I call this third obligatory condition to be a need for CONFESSION.

As for the literature that can serve as the material for the active analysis method, I can say, that it shouldn't be the literature of postmodernism (I mean the character of the literature, not the time it was written). It shouldn't contain only formal playing, citations, the superposition of contexts and so on. The literature that can be subjected to the active analysis is that of TRUSTWORTHY RELATIONS BETWEEN HUMAN BEINGS. It's the literature with certain PLOT (which can be complicated, but his presence is obligatory), with STRUGGLE (dramatic conflict) and with such coordinates as GOOD — EVIL. *The method can examine the interrelations of man with himself, man with man, man with society.*

Its interesting to compare the active analysis method (and the psychological theatre connected with it) with the analytical method of ludic theatre, to compare the theatre of «struggle» with the theatre of «game». The concept of LUDIC theatre is much more popular today and many people apprehend it as a theatre of future.

I must repeat, that the active analysis method is absolutely modern and actual (and it will stay actual until the narrative theatre and cinema disappear), but the point is that the historical justice has triumphed and Mejerhold appeared alongside with Stanislavsky. It's natural, that formalistic approaches repressed in soviet times (while the active analysis method impetuously developed) has to progress now. In this connection the most interesting figure of the russian and world theatre is Anatoly Vasiljev. Now we'll pass to the final part — to the active analysis method's development.

Anatoly Vasiljev — the stage director, who was a student of M.O. Knebel and who managed to combine the psychological theatre with the theatre of ludic during his longstanding practical work.

Having begun his activity as a true adept of the detailed psychological school, Vasiljev in his first works after «Mkhat» period\ «The first version of Vassa Zheleznova» - Stanislavsky theatre, 1978, «The adult daughter of the young man» - at the same place, 1979, «Serso» - Taganka Theatre, 1985\ progressively became to contribute some exploratory interest. There was an own «sum of violations» in each of these performances, move «against the rules» of the classical active analysis method, and every time it took artistic effect, which exploded a mine in theatrical environment. This period of Vasilev's work was an evident joint of psychological theatre' school and some new principles, new approaches, which later formed into the methodology of the ludic theatre.

There were some such moves in «The first version of Vassa Zheleznova», the performance, which Vasiljev would call an «atmospheric theatre». Besides that performance didn't contain any «sociality» and was director's personal thought of sin, besides that the third act suddenly moved in aesthetics, in atmosphere, went down to imagery of surrealism and incubus, even in the methodology of work with actors Vasiljev managed to venture. We know that etude work with actors should be progress in the approximate planning of the performance; in the classical active analysis method the best mise en scene is the mise en scene, being born in etude.

Vasiljev HAS CONSCIOUSLY GONE AGAINST RULES AND WORKED IN TWO STAGES: «HE WAS ENGAGED IN ANALYSIS OF ACTION AND PROBUILDING OF ROLES BY THE ETUDE. AND WHEN THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE OF PERFORMANCE HAD BEEN BUILT STRONGLY, HE PASSED TO THE STAGE, IN SPACE OF SCENERY, AND THERE BUILT A PATTERN, WHICH WAS PUT OVER THE CONTENT ... THE PATTERN GOT A CERTAIN INDEPENDENT VALUE. IT NOWAY DESTROYED THE CONTENT OF THE PERFORMANCE, BUT INTERFACED WITH IT VERY INTERESTINGLY...»\ P.Bogdanova, «The Logic of changes. Anatoly Vasilev: between the past and the future», M, 2007, p.30\ It's evident that there is a consciously planned break between the METHOD and the AESTHETICS, figurativeness. Vasiljev searched for reserves in methodology \ consciously or intuitively \and found them.

«The adult daughter of the young man» became the next burst, the performance which made Vasiljev known. Here the innovation was expressed much more widely: IN WASHING OUT OF THE DRAMA CONFLICT, IN COMBINATION OF THE DETAILED CONDITIONS OF ACTOR'S LIFE AND THE FOLLOWING EXPLOSIVE STAGE ADAPTATION, IN PLAY WITH STYLES, IN REFUSAL OF THE SOCIALITY, WHICH, AS IT SEEMED, THE MODERN PLAY PULLED IN. Vasiljev has sensitively heard - how drama of that time varies, how the environment becomes stratified, varies structurally and changes the structure of the person and his soul. His performance was cinematic. Speaking about "violations " in methodology - the director pulled out the conflict not from the past, but from the present. The first half an hour actors existed in such a way that held non-committal conversations and closely cooked food for a forthcoming meeting of old acquaintances. Just that plunged the spectator into a shock. And only gradually, before audience's eyes the «initial event» and the prevailing conflict were formed. And the ending of the performance was again dissolved in a life stream – the heroes were reconciled, the conflict went off. The director left the possible ideologizing and the vulgar social estimation of heroes.

Instead of telling story about the former Komsomol leader and successful member of bureaucratic elite got square with were the dandy and the oppositionist, he put trust in a variety of life, its basic irreducibility to ideologies. To modification of actors play the director again approached unconventionally — taught them to play is a washed way, on semitones, unlike "Vassa", at first gaining external behaviour, and then plunging into depth. And this method also was nonrandom, it was the strategy. It is significant that the CLASSICAL ACTIVE ANALYSIS, AS THE WAY FROM

A TO Z, REMAINED IN THIS PERFORMANCE AS IF WRITTEN IN OTHER STRUCTURE – OPENED, WITHOUT THE BEGINNING AND ENDING. Vasiljev as if would made sure that time of classical drama construction has come to an end. And the following performance, "Serso", was turning.

"Serso" – is the story how the casual company has gathered in the country old house, has dreamt-dreamt, read the old letters, played an ancient game serso\well remain all together here! \and have departed... , The story of generation of the eightieth, about dissociation, about lost dreams ... About search of the beginnings, history, HOME, ... And about loss by the modernity of fragile non-utilitarian beauty, fine, harmonious PAST... It was unusual performance. It didn't contain the NARRATIVE DEVELOPING HISTORY. Anatoly Vasiljev developed here a new type of the conflict, having overheard and felt it in the present. «... According to Vasiljev's classification: the conflict of the first sort – the person resists to the person; the conflict of the second sort – the person resists to a life ... The heroes in "Serso" have no complaints to each other. But everyone have one protest – against everything that is around... Me and all others. Me and life. Me and everything, that's not me. The conflict is plunged deeply inside. The crack passes not between them, but through everyone...», - these are Victor Slavkin's words, the author of the play. And here that Vasiljev told in interview of 1986: «... I began to try for myself the "other" theatre. Just that was the leaving from «the Adult daughter». The leaving from the «struggle theatre» to the «ludic theatre». From the box-theatre to the theatre of an arena.... I searched for myself a way to rise over struggle ... A person in modern life does not exist in the closed structures. He was disappointed in the closed structures \was disappointed in struggle \... »\In the same place, p. 163-165\

Later Vasiljev will formulate the concept of RELATIVISM OF MODERN CULTURE, and the BEAUTY will become its cult, its constant and its criterion of artistry. The Social theatre will cease to interest him definitively.

The scenography of "Serso", nevertheless, said that the director was still in territory of synthesis of two approaches. All occurred on the arena, on which there was the living, breathing house, the terrace of which represented a frame. The Scene-box was synthesized with a scene-arena. A LUDIC THEATRE APPEARED WITHIN PSYCHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE.

These three performances drew general attention to Anatoly Vasiljev. Here is he told about his understanding of action, methodology of finding out new conflicts and changes in work with actors: «...The approaches to find out a subject of theatre of Stanislavsky and Arto, in effect, a little differ ... Action ... is regarded as some act.

Later, in soviet time the heritage of Stanislavsky was deformed and also deformed was that fact that he understand as an action. The action is complicated, *subconscious* \here is my italics- A.S.\ act, which is *impossible to define by any word* \ here is my italics- A.S.\... At the beginning of the theory of direction it appeared the method of physical actions, which was the rude reflection of the

Stanislavsky's system. After that... there was the system of tasks. The system of tasks renews the theater for some time. But this period was short ... I consciously escape from traditional system of tasks, as a system which doesn't involved the man to the real act of actions..." In the same place, p.174\

I will let myself to comment one fact. Vasiljev, the director of post-soviet generation TURNS OVER ALL THE COORDINATES OF ACTIVE ANALYSES.

All Tovstonogov's pathos was hold on CREATION OF SYSTEM OF CONSCIOUS PARAMETERES, on conscious nature of action and aims, on masterful VERBAL DEFINING OF ACTION. All subconscious life of character was opened by framework, which was consciously built. More then that, we used to \and I think, that we can agree here with Anatoly Vasiljev\, that all Stanislavsky's pathos we can express in short form " from conscious to subconscious". It doesn't seem to me, that it was only unwillingness to agree with the ideological machine. Stanislavsky met with different theatrical systems. May be, Vasiljev was right in one thing : there exist DIFFERENT EPOCHS and A PERSON IN EPOCH, being displaced, epoch and the person should displace something in methodology. And, maybe, just a paradox what the great, universal methodology is subject to universal displacement?

Obviously that – Vasiljev with the intuition of the genius had a presentiment of cultural, political and psychological displacement of big scale and in this difficult situation of MORAL RELATIVISM when one ideals – romantik and soviet - have already been destroyed, and others haven't arisen yet, has selected to itself worthy respect support- RELATIVISTIC AESTHETICS, it means BEAUTY, AS THAT. It is natural, that all methodology was reconstructed - the ABSOLUT of PRIMACY of CONSCIOUSNESS was withdrawn from it.

This is what the director said next in the interview in 1986: "... I always tried to review in such way, that the actor could see the behavior from my review. I don't call the behavior, I sketch the situation, the history, the atmosphere. I try to strain the situation, the atmosphere in a such way, that they could elbow out the action. It is necessary the action to be heard by the actor. By the way it corresponds to the method, that was offered by Stanislavsky in his last years, he called it the method of active analyses. The system appeared in theatre in that time, when the man heard his heart and his reason which was made by society... It takes many years to one feature to appear. This feature separated reason from heart within the society. And when this feature appeared, then appeared problems, which connected with the life of heart ,with the life of the subconscious, with unknown life. In the "Artistical entirety of performance" – the book written by A.D. Popov\ Moscow pedagogue and director\ the structure of artistical image builds as a cone. There are the aim and the main event of the play at the peak of the cone. Under the force of reason and intellect the character is going to his aim as to the peak. So, it is a move to his aim and for his aim. It is direct perspective or simple perspective. There is a notion of backward perspective in the theory and structure of my artistic thinking. Here the initial event is more important than the principal event. The initial event takes to

pieces so that it can elbow out the action. The character is going to his aim under the powerful circumstances within the initial event. He does it *instinctively by groping every following step* \ italics is mine- A.S.\ ...”

Thus, the director Vasiljiev observing the disintegration of conscience of post- absolutist epoch, studies AN AMBIVALENT man. For the record, I want to say that the Chekov’s drama begins from the sense of global drifting absolutist world of Russian empire.\ And it absolutely didn’t mean that the early MKHAT, had the keys from this drama\ . And we return again to the situation of flows and ebbs. The psychologists said that human conscious is eager to ideology, for something that is above me- biological man.

It means that the society is incline to the life full of aims in one periods and there appears PRIMATE OF ACTION, but in the other periods in the periods of decline of ideals the society is eager to reflection as a style of life and in this moment appears PRIMATE OF PERCEPTION.\ When the director Vasiljiev said that classical active analyses was formed in the period “of Stalin’s drama”, it seems to me that he overdid this situation, because today these classical versions gave birth for two local theatres: by Fomenko and Jenovach, which are positive not in the ideological sense, but in the sense of simple Christian virtues- charity, love, honor and so on. \ See “ War and World”, “ One absolutely happy country” by Fomenko, “Decayed family” by Genovach and so on.\ May be it was the destiny of this director- to show on the contemporary play the reflection of his generation and push off the modern theatre. “I don,t understand movement on the through-line action as an aspiration to the aim, but I understand it as a pushing to my back...All what happens to me after the action is done are reflect in the initial event. Because there are sources of my life. In the system of Stalin’s drama everything is going to the super-task ... My artistic system of analysis where is perception is stronger then action...In our analysis the action is realized at the moment of doing, but not in the sense of perspective. All is other.”\ See p.192\ These are fragments of Vasiljiev’s analysis “Duck’s hunt” by Vampilov, it was in the same period when he directed “Serso”. Vasiljiev takes to pieces the character with broken inner world. He doesn’t interesting in Zilov’s good or bad sides, because the reality around him is polysemantic. He is interesting in how is THE PERSON IS DROWN DURING THE LIFE BY THE LIFE and how he runs away because he can’t live through the inner conflicts. Vasiljiev did such analysis when he was a teacher in the course of Efros. It is interesting from the point of method of two Knebel,s pupils of different generation. “ Efros was on the way to his aim. I went from the beginning... The Efros’s way to aim was more rational. These techniques are different, there are different moods and times. My way was more subconscious then his. Because I had already known that people’s aims were not defined, as it sometimes seemed to be. Efros didn’t change his point of view.” \See p.197\

Vasiljiev was a director of EPOCH OF GREAT SHIFT \ I want to repeat that this brilliant artist noticed the first “earthquake” before soviet romanticism died\.

He had to shake the soviet men's subconscious and held on dim buoy of BEATY in the ocean of foreign elements. But, may be, it helps him to make new principles of theater. Because THE LUDIC THEATER to which he came became an entrance to the OPEN SITUATION OF WORLD ARTISTICAL CULTURE.

Anatoly Vasiljiev created his own laboratory theater and researched there LUDIC STRUCTURES from 1987 to 2007. It was the theater of improvisation, of mystery, the theater of thought and text... At the same time the psychological theater instead of communist absolutism put on the peak of the pyramid simple human Christian virtues. Vasiljiev has changed too: he started "the fight" with the authorities and agreed that it was in vain that he didn't give his pupils tradition. Today in Europe Vasiljiev is teacher of active analyses and his own CONCEPTUAL analyses.

P.Bogdanova writes that, Vasiljiev studied technique of the active analysis for a long time «... has created its new version which he named CONCEPTUAL analysis ... Why does Stanislavsky's method Anatoly Vasiljiev name the situational analysis? Because it is based on detailed and careful studying offered \vital and drama \circumstances of a drama. This technique opens all drama products which the psychological theatre undertakes. And psychological theatre stages first of all a drama ...» Vasiljiev came to a conclusion that, opening by the active analysis tragedies of Shakespeare, Moliere's comedy, directors apply SITUATIONAL analysis and «... shift a genre of the drama product, opening characters of heroes...»

We ...don't see the substitution. We consider that this works of literature are written as dramas. Although, surely, it is far from being so. Drama as genre appeared in the time when the interest to a human, his character, his inner world, his consciousness, psychology and fortune came into existence in the art. Dramatic genre proceeds from the believe, that human's personality creates history. There isn't anyone above or more interesting than human for this genre. Human's consciousness and soul embrace the whole world. The world is in human's soul. The thing that Vasilev identified as CONCEPTUAL drama or literature \that can be a tragedy, a comedy or a novel as well\ doesn't enclose the whole world into the human's soul. Conceptual literature studies the world of ideas, CONCEPTS... To compare two types of literature one can give an example of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. Tolstoy represents a person, a human soul as a receptacle of the whole world. Tolstoy also writes about the ideas, but they are secondary. Dostoevsky's ideas are primary, they only refracts through the human, which becomes «the function of idea»... Situational analysis builds up on the so-called STRAIGHT PERSPECTIVE, in other words from the initial event - to the basic \remind you that in Tovstonogov's terminology – «the main» - A.S.\ Initial event reveals something that was happening in the PAST, before the beginning of drama. The basic reveals the situation that was formed in the result. Conceptual analysis builds up in a REVERSE PERSPECTIVE. And here the movement is going on not from the past to the future, but from the FUTURE \the basic event\ to the past\ to the initial event\.. The playing actor moves from the basic event, or like Vasilev says, plays FORWARD, plays FROM THE FUTURE \ibidem 323-324\.

On the one of Plato's dialogues «Crito» Vasilev demonstrates, how it is possible to analyse the text both situationally and conceptually. Socrates is sentenced to death. His pupil comes to him and offers him to run away. Socrates refuses. He is ready to take the capital punishment. «...In the case of situational analysis we'll say how Socrates was faithful to his study, we'll say how he didn't betray his study, and how in the last moments of his life he gave a lesson to his pupil. It can be named in different ways, but it always will be the history of person Socrates and society, the history of the relationship between the teacher and the pupil etc. This is called horizontal relations. On no saying that it is bad. You must understand, that there is no moral appraisal in my talk. The same story can be told conceptually, but in this case we will tell about the existence of the soul... The basic event will be another. Now for me it is important that you would understand how one and the same text can be build in the different structures...»

Socrates knows, that the soul is immortal, here of that he knows due to his dream – that is important in conceptual analysis. «... It is played a conflict of IDEAS AND SIGNIFICATIONS in the conceptual history. That's why when Vasiljiev explains the essence of conceptual drama, he tells, that conceptual texts were the texts with a veiled meaning. It were the texts of meaning of itself. It was a road to the truth»... It is necessary to understand another circumstance. Socrates is a person in conceptual analysis not a character. And he knows that the soul is immortal as an actor. It is allowed him to play FROM FUTURE . It is not psychological reasoning, it's not human views of character. He does,t exists in a horizontal cut, where people operate with concrete presentation about the world, about a human with his inside motives. He is taken in a vertical cut, notably he is interrelated with some superior, transpersonal meaning. . . The person plays at the other level, not at that where situation and subject take place, but at the high level where meaning and philosophy take place. That's why it's easy to say that the actors play about the soul and it's immortal in the conceptual analysis, but not about themselves as a characters...»\ In the same place,p.325\

The method of conceptual analysis can examine the interrelations between ideas and conceptions.

Let us try to finish. I want to say a few words about Mikhail Butkevich, who was one of Vasiljiyev's teachers, who matured the concept of ludic theatre as a pedagogue and a theorist for many years. Some years ago GITIS has released his book posthumously “ To the ludic theatre. Lyrical tractate.” It is the educationally\ I, using Vasilijev's terminology, would tell "horizontally"\ developed concept of the ludic theatre with great number of described methods, approaches and POSSIBLE SOURCES OF THE PLAY – from traditions of buffoonery, to multilevel\ from character psychology, to an archetype of situation\ Shakespeare and Chekhov.

It's clear that pushed out by the 20th century M.Chekhov, V.Mejerhold, A.Tairov, E.Vahtangov actively come back to Russian culture and Russian theatre. Through ideas, elements of play, through A.Vasiljiev and M.Butkevich's long-term activity. And what with the active analysis? I

quote Vasiljiev's pupil Igor Jatsko:«...The drama fabric of psychological construction are interrelations between people. The drama fabric of ludic construction are interrelations between ideas ... Human interrelations ... - are horizontal. Interrelations between ideas ... - are vertical. There are *synthetic* \ italics is mine - A.S.\ structures which unite both this and that. So we can take one, the second and create synthesis. Certainly, great works of art represent synthesis ... »\In the same place, p. 343\

I think that the answer is in it. The epoch of synthesis has come, with its own pluses and minuses. By the way, Mejerhold, and Vakhtangov, and Michael Chekhov- are figures of the theatre, who synthesising their theatrical systems and sights in the beginning of 20 centuries. And, if one may say so, a liquid in which they dissolved their components, was, without any doubt, Stanislavsky.