

THEATRE EDUCATION IN UZBEKISTAN

Yusupova M.R.^{1,*}

¹*Candidate of Art History, Associate Professor,
Professor of the Department of "Art of Variety and Mass Performances" Uzbekistan State Institute
of Arts and Culture, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.*

Abstract. This article highlights the formation of the Uzbek theatre school. Influence on the performing arts of the traditional fun-loving (a performer on the stage who entertains people) theater and vocational training for improvisers of the folk spectacle; on the opening of the first theatre institute in Central Asia in Tashkent. The best forces in the face of such masters were involved in teaching directing and acting skills, such as: Mannon Uyghur, Yatim Babadzhanov, Iosif Radun and Alexander Ginsburg. The article speaks about the initial university pedagogy, the development of skills for the actors to control their emotions and feelings. It is no secret that modernity abounds with technogenic means of recording and broadcasting art. This ability of humanity to perceive audiovisually, what until recently was the subject of classical culture, both in embodiment and transmission, becomes a kind of superpower. How do the creator and the viewer adapt to the new conditions of transformation? And what are the new conditions of creation changing in people's minds? These questions remain open to knowledge and study. There is no consensus yet on whether everything that happens in the world of beauty is good or bad. There are opinions of scientists, researchers and art historians that audiovisualization is a way to oblivion and denial of the traditional development of culture with established dogmas and rules. However, the issue is controversial and subject to in-depth study. The main task is to preserve the traditional Uzbek theater. Knowing its history and modern innovations, we can say that the theater of Uzbekistan will preserve traditions and will be in demand in the future.

Keywords: *Traditional theatre, uzbek theater, system, improvisation, gesture, character, director of the traditional theater, Uzbekistan, art, audiovisualization.*

1. Introduction.

Uzbek performing arts is distinguished by the richness of national traditions, forms and phenomena, reflecting different eras in the development of artistic culture. Mamadjon Rakhmanov in his book "The Uzbek theatre from ancient times to 1917 years, speaking about the origins of the syncretic nature of the theatrical art of Uzbekistan, emphasized: "Central Asian monuments of archaic visual arts help us understand the process of the birth of the simplest elements of the future theatrical art" [1, p. 270].

Contemporary stage art is continuously connected with the traditional maskharaboz-kizikchi theatre. Much attention in this truly folk theater was paid to expressive means and performance techniques. The actor had to know the techniques in the song, in acrobatic movements, dance, improvise, as the audience became participants in the performances and the plot acquired the flavor of the place where the play was going on. It was necessary to instantly respond to the cues of the audience, showing quick wit, looking not only for a cue, but also a plastic answer to the question. At the same time, without burdening the performance, but entertaining, portrays the character being played succinctly, with large strokes (in a word, text).

The basis of creativity was oral dramaturgy. The actors of the traditional theatre knew in advance the general scheme, the script of each performance, its main episodes and characters, individual dialogues and the general direction. Such actors were trained for a very long time and there were two methods for their education. Some masters did not conduct special classes with students, but limited themselves to advice, comments, assessments and approvals based on the results of direct performances of students who, from the very first steps, had the opportunity to take part in performances. Naturally, that is, then they appeared in episodic roles. A student ('apprentice') for several years (training lasted from 5 to 10 years), watched the game of his teacher ('master') and other experienced actors. Remembering everything he saw and heard, improving from role to role, he mastered the repertoire of his native troupe and the technology of acting, gaining experience.

Other masters, especially in cities, conducted special classes with students according to a pre-designed system. An example of this is the training of the teacher Saadi Makhsum, who conducted it in two stages. The first stage began with the study of imitation and parody. This developed in the student observation, a special aesthetic sense, and the ability to

select the funniest, comedic from what he saw, to reproduce it with the help of voice, body movements, gestures and facial expressions. After the student acquired skills in imitation and parody, he moved on to the study of lyrical and comedic dances. All this constituted the first stage of the school of Saadi Makhsum. At the second stage, the student learned the art of words, wit ('askia'), composing stage stories and monologues. When a student achieved the desired result, both in stage movement and stage speech, Saadi Makhsum allowed him to perform in comedy performances. Why only in comedy performances? Yes, because the essence of laughter at all times remains unchanged, that is, through it a person appears in a specific perspective, and with the help of laughter, his real "I" is revealed. Moreover, both the one who is laughed at, and the performer himself is. But this required special skill. Vocational training was closely connected with practical activities and moral and ethical education of future actors. Pupils were brought up on the basis of the rules of traditional morality, partly fixed in the charter ('risolya') of the workshop of artists and musicians. These rules obligated not only students, but all actors to thoroughly know the customs, manners, psychology of all strata of society, to have a purposeful creative program and develop a cutting-edge theme in their work, to be modest, honest and devoted to their profession.

Materials and methods. The actor-improviser was required not only to have a deep knowledge of the life of society and nature, which were the object of display, the source of themes and plots, but also knowledge of classical poetry, professional folk music, dance art, folklore, as well as the ability to use all these riches of culture in their creative work. "Culture as a whole, emphasizes Margarita Ivanovna Sosnova, plays the role of a genetic program for a person, helping him to form the abilities and skills that people of previous generations possessed, who created culture and passed it on to their descendants" [2, p.10]. The history of the formation of the theatre school in Uzbekistan is full of stormy, unpredictable, and sometimes tragic events, however, like the entire 21st century. A special place among the important phenomena in the development of national art is occupied by the Jadids movement ("enlighteners of the beginning of the century"), which included Abdulla Avloni, Nizametdin Khodzhaev, Mukhamadzhan-kary, Shakirjon Rakhimi and others (about 20 people in total).

New dramaturgies, European-style theatre, nascent scenography, the search for expressive means of modernity were tasks that were waiting to be resolved and formalized into an art form. In 1914 in the theater "Coliseum", located in the new part of the city of Tashkent, there was a play by Makhudhodzhi Bekhbudi "Padarkush". The evening performance was divided into three parts. The first is the play "Padarkush". The second is a one-act comedy by the Azerbaijani troupe (Alioskar Askarov, Guluzorim, M. Shahbalov). The third is "national reading and accompaniment, consisting of 8 performances. On this significant day, a professional theatre was founded on the purely traditional foundation of the maskharaboz-kizikchi theatre; in 1924, the Moscow Uzbek Studio, the Baku Uzbek Studio (1925), as well as youth training schools at theatres and a number of episodes testifying to major undertakings in the development of theatre in Uzbekistan. Back in 1920, the issue of opening a theatre studio named after Komisarzhenskaya was discussed at a meeting of the Commission of the People's Commissariat of Education with three-month courses for representatives of the Uzbek stage. In our country, great attention was paid to theatre education and various options for professional training were considered. But we will dwell in more detail on the opening in 1945 of the only theatre institute in Central Asia. Naturally, we do not accidentally describe the work of M. Uyghur both at the institute and in the theatre. The practical activity of this talented director-teacher, director-artist confirms his desire to master new ideas, new knowledge to enrich the artistic consciousness of the actors of his theatre. It is no coincidence that M. Uyghur is considered the first professional director in the Uzbek stage art. The 2nd World War had not yet ended, and preparations had already begun in Tashkent for the opening of a theatre institute. In the autumn of 1945, it was opened the doors to its first students in three departments at once - acting, directing and theatre studies. In defining the meaning of the word, "director", Patrice Pavy, in his Dictionary of the Theatre, refers to it as follows: "The person who is responsible for staging a play. The director takes responsibility for the aesthetic side of the performance and its organization, the selection of performers, the interpretation of the text and the use of the stage tools at his disposal" [3, p. 285].

Literature Review. Undoubtedly the best local forces were involved in teaching directing and acting skills. Of the Uzbek masters, M. Uyghur and Y. Babadzhanov were the first. Out of the directors of the Russian stage in this initial period of the institute's life, the following were already working: I.V. Radun, subsequently a prominent teacher, who for many years headed the department; also later the outstanding director of the Uzbek stage A.O. Ginsburg, chief director of the Tashkent Russian Theatre A.G. Rydal, a native of the "Habima" Theatre and, one might say, Vakhtangov's student M.A. Rubinstein.

It would seem that everything went very well. But, unfortunately, even at the beginning, during the formation of the educational process at the institute, the connection between the Uzbek Theatre and the modern theatre school weakened. M. Uyghur and Y. Babadzhanov worked at the institute for a short time and, of course, far from being at full strength due to their state of health. As for I. Radun and A. Ginsburg, they were still too young and only were determined their own paths in pedagogy. Their strength lay in the presence of firm principles and strong convictions, taken out of the walls of

SITA (GITIS) named after A.V. Lunacharsky; learned from the outstanding teachers of the Moscow Art Theater direction. However, its own confident theatrical pedagogy is born only when real professional knowledge is backed up by real practical experience. Naturally, the experience of I. Radun and A. Ginsburg did not appear immediately, although surprisingly soon.

It is no coincidence, therefore, that at the newly created department of the institute, where, it would seem, peace and harmony should have reigned, warmed up by the enthusiasm that usually arises when starting a new exciting business, sharp disputes arose almost immediately, and then a whole war broke out. Irresistible opponents here turned out to be: on the one hand, I. Radun, A. Ginsburg and, so to speak, their followers, on the other, the no longer young and very experienced A. Rydal.

In the book "The Way to the Stage", published much later, in the early 80s, I. Radun testifies: "The Institute was born in a real environment and had to rely on Tashkent theatres. And if the complex processes that took place in the life of theaters were of a veiled nature and often disappeared from attention in the stream of daily rehearsals and nightly performances, then at the institute, especially during exams, everything surfaced, became the subject of careful analysis".

By "certain figures" here is meant, first of all, of course, A.G. Rydal. A person who is not familiar with this person, after reading Radun's book, may have an opinion about Rydal as a provincial figure who worked in the old fashioned way without any interest in modern scientific theories. He was not modern enough, but he could not be considered a provincial. Therefore, the disputes that arose at the department were by no means simple, because on the one hand (I. Radun, A. Ginsburg) the principles of the school that had been passed quite recently, before the war itself, were put forward, and knowledge of life, education, experience of many years of practical work and observations were opposed to them. Arseniy Grigoryevich Rydal, born in the mid-1900s (which means he was almost two decades older than his main opponents), graduated from the Brussels Conservatory in 1913 with a degree in composition and conducting, and in the summer months of 1912-1913 studied directing in Germany under Max Reinhardt. He began his creative activity in the famous theatre "Crooked Mirror", led by the famous critic A.R. Kugel. In different years before Tashkent, Rydal headed the Russian theatres of Voronezh, Baku, Kuybyshev (Samara), Yerevan, Tbilisi, and Krasnodar as artistic director. In the early 30s, he again worked in Moscow. For many years (1919-1960) Rydal taught at theatre schools in Voronezh and Baku, as well as at Central College of Theater Arts (CETETIS) - the predecessor of SITA(GITIS) in Moscow.

Results. It is absolutely clear that it was not at all easy for young teachers to argue with such an experienced person who had seen a lot. By all appearances, the first director of the institute M.P. Verkhatsky, a director and theatre critic who came to Tashkent from The Ukraine (after Tashkent, a professor at the Kiev Theater Institute), was more inclined to the position of Rydal. However, the dispute began, flared up, because it was about the initial, fundamental principles of directorial pedagogy, directing in general. Ultimately, the central question in the dispute was whether the Tashkent Institute, with the total amount of knowledge it gives, with its focus on introducing the ideas of the Moscow Art Theatre School and the system of psychological theatre, will be a solid step on the path to professional creativity, or will subsequent work in the theatre "cancel" learned at the institute? In other words, are the Tashkent theatrical institute, which has embarked on the responsible task of training personnel, and the theatres of different genres and nationalities of the republic united in their views and aspirations, or do they profess different faiths?

"Acting is not theory. Theory is something unproven, but acting is full and true. Our work is aesthetics, which each person has his own" [4, p.57], Bartow wrote. Disputes in the department arose, as I. Radun writes, around the exercises. Without entering into all the details of this issue, since in this case we are still talking about the initial, university pedagogy, and this is another topic, let us pay attention to the evidence of I. Radun, which is essential for us. "The situation was aggravated by the fact," he writes, "that we, young teachers, could not oppose this practice of confident craft "professionalism" with confident pedagogical skill; while working on the exercises and etudes, we were most concerned with their truthful performance" [5, p. 69].

So, young teachers, as follows from I. Radun's statement, somewhat "go too far": the sketch, its truthful embodiment, became for them, as it was, an end in itself; they sometimes lost sight of the auxiliary significance of the etude. Experienced teachers denied working on the sketch ("lost time"), and in the end they planted a craft, albeit confident. It is no coincidence, as I. Radun writes, "one of the course leaders already in the first year of study worked with students on excerpts from the play "At the Bottom" by Gorky, and at the end of the second year he showed the entire play as a graduation performance." [5, p. 72].

Radun appropriately recalls that all this happened at the end of the 1940s, when "fierce disputes and discussions were going on around Stanislavsky" [5, p. 59]. As you know, at the very beginning of the 1950s they gave rise to a long, but generally ineffectual controversy about the Stanislavsky system in the pages of the periodical press. This controversy could have ended in any way at that time, including the condemnation of the "method of physical actions." In the course of the controversy, it is no coincidence, because from time to time there were hints: what kind of "method of physical actions" was there with its subsequent application, trying to give an unreasonable name to this action. But the question

logically arose why this was necessary, if we have only one method - aimed at the natural human nature of the actor for organic creativity in the proposed circumstances, in accordance with the super-task of the role. When, as I. Radun narrates, at one of the most acute moments of the dispute at the department, A. Ginsburg, an active supporter of scientific methodology, stated that "in one educational institution there cannot be training in rough handicrafts and creativity", offering to invite representatives of the Moscow Theatre Institute to Tashkent, then the deputy director for educational and scientific parts retorted like this: "I consider A. Ginzburg's proposal harmful and unsuitable for this collection, for Soviet art as a whole!" [5, p. 71]. The meaning of the authorities' refutation was precisely that Marxism-Leninism is a guide to action; they should be guided and not by Stanislavsky, Sakhnovsky and other incomprehensible personalities ... Let's not forget that there was very little time left before the reprisals against the so-called cosmopolitan critics, only two years. Here again we must ask ourselves the question, to whom it is impossible to remain indifferent: well, what about M. Uyghur, Ya. Babadzhanov. What position did they take in disputes in the chair? Satisfied with fragmentary evidence that both masters already lacked the strength to work with students - not just for disputes, and that Babadzhanov was usually silent and did not indulge in theoretical reasoning, Uyghur, on the other hand, preferred not general, but substantive conversations at rehearsals, of course, it was difficult. This is only part of the truth, although a large part.

Discussions. Ideological and aesthetic totalitarianism played at that time an ambiguous role in the development of the Stanislavsky system. Many who did not understand the essence of this work considered it to be something legalized, which means that they limited freedom. In this regard, they made it an object of struggle, and not study. Uyghur made the discovery of the "system" step by step for himself, and then for his actors.

Therefore, it would not be a mistake to wish to guess what Mannon Uyghur thought, or what he might have thought about the ever-increasing controversy? But for such an assumption, everything must be taken into account: and the character of the master, and his habits, and mental and physical state at that time, and with what artistic faith he entered the final period of his life. To take all this into account is the task of the author of a special book about the Uyghur. Let's touch only directly related to our topic. About what convictions M. Uyghur came to in the most mature period of his activity, when he focused his interest on Shakespeare as a playwright "for all time" or, more precisely, on Shakespeare's system, it was said above. One of his convictions, as the facts say, was that specific ways in creativity, methods of creating an image, a performance can be different, - there would be a result, that is, a truthful realistic reflection of reality, "the life of the human spirit" according to Stanislavsky. It has already been said above that Uyghur attracted very different directors as co-authors of his later performances, but necessarily followers of realistic art, and obviously watched them at work with great interest. He was also interested in the "strong professional" V. Chirkin, who did not know how to "theorize", but could always show the actor how to play in this or that episode; and a good speaker N. Ladygin, who was able to clearly explain the director's idea, the director's wish. Undoubtedly, Uyghur got new impressions from his communication with Michoels in the process of joint production of Khamid Alimdjani's drama "Mukanna". This partnership was very fruitful. The outstanding master of the theatre S. Michoels introduced into the interpretation of the drama a high philosophical thought about the inevitability of the victory of good over evil, a wise optimism that was characteristic of all his work. Knowledge of the history, traditions and culture of the Uzbek people was brought to the performance by the magnificent master of the Uzbek stage M. Uyghur. This characterization is certainly true, if it is further clarified that Mannon Uyghur was fully close to the philosophical thought of the work, - otherwise he would not have felt a co-religionist in S. Michoels and would not have attracted him to a joint production. But here are some methods of director's work, used then by S. Michoels, for M. Uyghur could be new. Very interesting in this sense is Sara Ishanturayeva's report on the fruitfulness of the "union", as she puts it, of Uyghur and Michoels in the production of the play "Mukanna". In her conversation with the author of the monograph on October 5, 1992, she reported the following exceptional facts; for example, that M. Uyghur was a good connoisseur of Uzbek life and national traditions; in addition, he knew the nature of the Uzbek actor well, and here his role as a director was invaluable. Michoels brought grandiosity to the production through new staging techniques. This duet of directors had a very beneficial effect on the actors. The rehearsals were very busy, without preparation it was impossible to attend them. "I played the role of the heroine. This is a gentle, very poetic image, and at the same time Gulyoin is courageous and resolute. She had to take up arms. How to combine all this, merge into one organic image? There was an episode when Gulyoin jumped onto the stage on horseback. A barrier was specially placed for this horse and, jumping over it, it really flew out on the stage in front of the audience. For half a month, if not more, I went to the circus for dressage to cope with the task of the directors. I was tired incredibly. The performance was historical, and here it's like: warriors without horses are not warriors. But the main thing, of course, is not a demonstration of a live horse, but a technique that helps the actor to fully feel the well-being of the heroine [6]. And then the Uyghur in this work paid great attention to the word, intonation, gesture, A. Michoels framed everything, as it were, finding an interesting form.

Michoels was very mobile. He could not be seen sitting quietly at the rehearsal. Almost every minute he jumped onto the stage and he himself checked the convenience of the mise-en-scene. And here is another interesting feature of his

work with actors. With him was a pianist who never missed any rehearsal. At his request, she played something, setting the actor to the required rhythm. It helped a lot, as it created a certain well-being, atmosphere. In addition, being a good pianist, she picked up a variety of interesting works. A. Michoels continued to run all over the hall during the rehearsal, examining the stage from all angles" [6]. It can be assumed that M. Uyghur was very impressed by such a professionalism of the director, who did not leave anything without attention - neither the actor's devices that help to immerse him deeply in the authenticity of circumstances, events, nor the conditions of the audience's "existence" and the most complete complicity in the action.

M. Uyghur greatly appreciated Michoels' analytical talent and, obviously, during the preparation of the performance, special analyzes of what had been done were not often, but arranged. One of the students of S. Michoels, later a director, Leonid Okun, who was evacuated in Tashkent, recalls Sara Ishanturayeva, who once witnessed Michoels: "I was about to go to the Uzbek Theatre "Khamza" to talk with the actors about the play "Mukanna" by Kh. Alimdjani. The conversation was interesting and exciting, and especially the specific analysis of the performance. After the discussion, the theater management and the actors generously thanked Salomon-aka in the oriental way. Some time later after this conversation, the Uzbek authorities, as "Sign of Friendship and Gratitude" to Salomonu-aka's, harnessed a camel to a cart with watermelons, melons, grapes and other fruits, and brought all this to Michoels' apartment" [6]. It should be added that all this was immediately sent by Michoels to the theatre for distribution to the children of the actors and employees.

Conclusions. It seems that speaking about the collaboration between Uyghur and Michoels in the work, it is permissible to mention this touching episode with a gift, and it is hardly necessary to explain that such unusual attention to Michoels from the Uzbek Theatre was not ostentatious, but really deserved. As for the Uyghur, one can be firmly convinced: Michoels turned out to be not just close to him, but truly related, primarily in the desire to summarize in a Shakespearean way significant phenomena and entire layers in the history of the development of peoples. It seems that it was no coincidence that Uyghur, who was very close to himself in creativity, later found Uyghur in young Ginsburg, became the initiator of inviting him to the theatre named after "Khamza" for permanent work and appointment during his lifetime to the position of chief director. Together with him, Uyghur staged the last two performances - Trenev's "Love Yarovaya" and Khikmet's "Legend of Love" (1952 and 1953). Uyghur was not mistaken when he saw Ginzburg as a director capable of not only leading, but leading the Uzbek academic theater, although he could not foresee the full scope and all the significance of this master's activity on the Uzbek stage.

Naturally, we do not accidentally describe the work of M. Uyghur both at the institute and in the theatre. The practical activity of this talented director-teacher and director of the artist confirms his desire to master new ideas, new knowledge to enrich the artistic consciousness of the actors of his theatre. It is no coincidence that M. Uyghur is considered the first professional director in the Uzbek stage art[11].

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Natalia Yusupova for her research and articles on contemporary Uzbek theater [7][8]. Because today many scientists rely on her research in the field of audiovisualization of modern theater [9][10]. And much in our research in the field of the relationship between traditional and new theater from this articles[12].

References:

- [1]. Rakhmanov.M. Uzbek theatre from ancient times to 1917. T. 1981
- [2]. Sosnova.M.L. The art of the actor. Academic project. M. 2005.
- [3]. Pavi P. Dictionary of the theatre. Translation from French M. Progress. 1991
- [4]. Bartow A. Acting: The American School. "Alpina non-fiction", 2013
- [5]. Radun I.V. Path to the stage. T. 1983.
- [6]. Interview with Sara Ishanturayeva, October 5, 1992. Author's archive.
- [7]. Yusupova Natalya. (2023). Audiovisual means of broadcasting classical art in modern reality. Periodica Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities, 14, 1–4. Retrieved from <https://www.periodica.org/index.php/journal/article/view/374>
- [8]. Yusupova Natalya (2019). The evolution of audience's perception of the artistic image in the screen arts. European science review, 1 (1-2), 43-44.
- [9]. Yusupova, N. (2019). Audiovisual technologies in scenography as a factor in the development of the production process. Culture and Arts of Central Asia, 9(1), 86-89.
- [10]. Yusupova Natalya (2021). Functional and technological characteristics of audiovisual arts components. <http://science.nuu.uz/uzmu.php>.

- [11]. Yusupova, M. R. (2020). Development of acting skills in modern training at the variety department. *Central Asian Problems of Modern Science and Education*, 2020(1), 114-121.
- [12]. Akbarova Mohigul, & Tadjiboyev Dilmurod. (2022). The role and importance of the art of national maqom in the development of pedagogical competencies of future professionals in the field of vocal art traditional singing. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(7), 111–114. Retrieved from <https://www.involta.uz/index.php/iv/article/view/249>