

About some disputed issues of the theory of dramaturgia

by *Sevda Novruzalieva*

Baku Slavic University

Abstract

The article discusses some controversial issues in the study of drama as a kind of literature. The specific features of the drama that distinguish it from the epic and lyrics, the characterological features of the drama as a dual art associated with the theater, with spectator perception and directorial interpretation are determined. The main determinants of the clan structure of the drama are called conflict and character and their interaction. It is emphasized that the evolution of conflict and character in dramatic art is closely related to the ideological and aesthetic demands of the time.

INTRODUCTION

At present, literary studies are represented by a fairly wide list of works devoted to dramatic works and individual problems of dramatic art, examining the most diverse periods of the development of dramatic art in one or another of these literatures. Among them are the works of Russian researchers - A.A. Anikst, B. B. Bakhtin, B.S. Bugrova, E.N. Gorbunova, M.I. Gromovoy, E.M. Gushanskaya, Yu.A. Zubkova, S.S. Imikhelova, A. Karaganova, Yu.I. Korzova, T.V. Laninoy, M.G. Merkulova, V.F. Pimenova, V.V. Frolova et al., In Azerbaijani literary criticism - the works of M. Arif, A. Alekperli, Z. Askerli, Y. Karaev, T. Mammad, B. Musaeva, I. Rahimli, A. Safiev, A. Sultanli and others. In addition, can be called the work of researchers on the work of one or another author in both Russian and Azerbaijani literary criticism. A study of critical works and studies on the theory and history of drama in Russian and Azerbaijani literary criticism allows us to establish some controversial issues in this field of literary criticism.

The theory of drama, unlike other types of literature, has a longer and richer history of its development, but despite this, it is still extremely complex and contradictory to this day. All this causes unceasing research interest in studying a wide variety of scientific, theoretical and methodological issues related to the dramatic genus, the history and theory of its development, the problem of the specifics of drama, its genre system, artistic conflict and character, etc.

In the history of the study of drama, a completely different scientific picture has developed than in the epic and lyrics. From Aristotle to the present day, although in varying degrees, the presence of a constant clan structure and unbreakable rules for a dramatic work is recognized. A wide and comprehensive study of the dramatic genus and its problems served as the basis for the emergence,

along with the history and theory of drama, of a new direction in the study of drama - the history of drama theory. In this sense, the works of A. Anikst are classic (1), in which he traces the history of the study of drama for a long time - from Aristotle to scientific research of the 19th – 20th centuries.

One of the controversial issues of modern literary criticism is the search for the reasons for the keen interest in drama. Summarizing all that has been said on this occasion, it can be noted that today these factors are mainly attributed to the following: the beginning of the study of the dramatic genus was laid back in antiquity (Aristotle's "Poetics"); dramatic genres have been dominant in literature since its inception; the theory of literature has long been understood as the theory of drama; The drama has features of a formal structural plan that facilitate its analysis and much more.

Aristotle's theory of drama, which was, first and foremost, the theory of the plot, was primarily led by the differences between the epic and the drama, which allowed him, first of all, to establish stable and obligatory components of the plot. In addition, it was in connection with the type of plot that Aristotle determined the specific intra-genus division of the drama into genres - comedy and tragedy. For the first time, he also has the concept of unity, which the classicists then developed into the doctrine of the unity of time, place and action. The Aristotelian theory of drama was not subjected to substantial revision, being an unshakable teaching, over the next period of more than two millennia.

All subsequent theories and doctrines only systematized, concretized and improved these or those provisions put forward by Aristotle. In particular, the provision on the main genre-forming line of the drama - action, or "imitation of action". Not without reason, the name "drama" means "action". "Most dramas are built on a single external action with its vicissitudes (which corresponds to the principle of unity of action, which dates back to Aristotle)," says one of the literary encyclopedias. And further: "The dramatic action is usually associated with a direct confrontation of heroes. It can be traced from the plot to the denouement, capturing large periods of time (medieval and eastern drama, for example, Shakuntala Kalidasa), or is taken only at its climax close to the denouement (ancient tragedies or many dramas of modern times, for example, "Dowry" A.N. Ostrovsky)."

Researchers emphasize that drama is the dominant element in drama - "a property of the human spirit, awakened by situations when the cherished and urgent for humanity is unfulfilled or is threatened" [A.N. Nikolyukin. (2003), st. 243]. At the same time, drama is considered by some researchers as one of the varieties of pathos. Among those theorists of the past who touched on this topic, one can name Aristotle, Schiller, Belinsky, etc.

Most of all in this direction was made by Hegel. In his "Aesthetics", he claims that pathos is "universal forces that act not only on their own, in their independence, but also live in the human chest and move the human soul in its innermost depths." It was pathos, in his thought, "forms a true concentration, a true kingdom of art; its embodiment is the main both in the work of art and in the perception of the latter by the viewer, "he is" a powerful force of human existence "[Hegel.(1971), p. 240-241].

Modern scholars also very often turn to the analysis of the specifics of drama as a kind of literature, to the questions of generality and differences between drama and epic, emphasizing the advantages of this kind of literature over others. So, for example, V.Khalizev, speaking of such features peculiar only to a dramatic work as "the lack of a detailed narrative-descriptive image", "a certain limitation of artistic possibilities", "less freedom and fullness" of revealing the characters of actors ",

etc. writes: "At the same time, the author of the play has significant advantages over the creators of short stories and novels. One moment depicted in the drama is closely adjacent to another, neighboring. The time played by the playwright of events during the stage episode is not compressed or stretched; the characters of the drama exchange remarks without any noticeable time intervals, and their statements, as noted by K.S. Stanislavsky, make up a continuous, continuous line. " And most importantly, V. Khalizev addresses such an important issue for the drama as "action", emphasizing the specific differences between the "action" of the drama and the epos: "The action is recreated in the drama with the utmost directness" [Halizev V. (1986)., p. 318].

Thus, the main genre-forming characteristic of the drama throughout the history of its study, up to the 20th century, was considered to be precisely "action" or "imitation of action", as Aristotle put it. As you know, having posed in his *Poetics* a question about the varieties of "imitation of life", he singled out various "methods of imitation", on which, in his opinion, the division into the kinds of literature is based. And for a long time this postulate, this approach remained unshakable for many researchers of the subsequent time, up to the 20th century. This was the case in theory, but in artistic practice, in the development of the theater as a conductor of dramaturgy to the audience, there were processes that shook some of the provisions of the Aristotelian theory of drama, provoking new appeals to it, a revision of certain provisions.

Along with the tragedy and comedy that have existed from antiquity to this day, such genres as liturgical drama, mystery, miracles, morality appear in the Middle Ages. In the 18th century, people started talking about drama as a genre that later prevailed over tragedy and comedy. Over time, the development of the genres of melodrama, farce, vaudeville, tragicomedy and tragifars, and later - the "theater of the absurd", etc. So, the development of dramaturgy, theater and, most importantly, the emergence of new genre formations within the dramatic genus, as well as the synthesis between different forms of dramatic genres, intergeneric synthesis led to the fact that the researchers, along with those listed above, started talking about other, no less characteristic features of the drama.

This, for example, features of dialogical and monologue speech in drama, a game, audience perception, directorial interpretation, the range of which is very wide, etc. The problems faced by researchers at different stages of the development of dramatic art have led to the fact that various versions of drama theory have appeared and exist at present. Some are based on the perception of a dramatic work as experiences (Aristotle, Schiller, Nietzsche, Vygotsky), others, starting from the turn of the XVIII-XIX centuries (Hegel, Goethe), use separate central concepts, such as conflict, character. In the 20th century, a theory of the dramatic word appears, in which we are talking about the dominance in one or another theory of different aspects of the artistic whole, for example, a plot or a plot. Characteristic in this sense is the statement by Yu.Olesha that "the so-called effectiveness is not in the plot, that is, in the event chain of the play, and in something else, in some, maybe, in time, the word sounded "[Olesha Yu. (1968), p. 322].

Hegel applied the philosophical concepts of the object and subject of knowledge to elucidate the antithesis of the genera, in particular the epic and the lyrics. Hegel's dialectical idea of the development of life according to the law of the "triad" - from the "thesis" to the "antithesis", and from it to the "synthesis", was applied by him to the theory of literary genera. Hegel recognized the epic as the thesis of life and boiled down to pure objectivity, lyrics as the antithesis reduced to pure subjectivity, and drama as their synthesis, i.e. a combination of objective and subjective. "The third

method of invention finally combines both of the first into a new whole, where we are presented with both objective deployment and its origins in the depths of the individual's soul, so now everything objective seems to belong to the subject and, conversely, everything subjective is contemplated ... in its transition to real revealing ... Here, as in the epos, before us is a wide-spread action with its struggle and outcome, spiritual forces express themselves and challenge each other ... "[Hegel.(1971), p. 420-421].

Following Hegel, Belinsky, adhering to the Aristotelian scheme of constructing a dramatic work, emphasizes the crucial role of character collisions in drama as a clash of opposing impulses. In drama, the ups and downs of life situations, the character of a person is manifested, at the same time, these events are colored by the features of his character, their outcome is predetermined. That is why Belinsky writes: "in the drama there should not be a single person who would not be necessary in the mechanism of its course and development." And most importantly, he argued that "the decision in choosing a path depends on the hero of the drama, and not on the event," moreover, "not an event dominates the person in it, but the person dominates the events, giving free rein to one or another denouement this or that end "[Belinsky V.G. (1964). p. 10].

But one thing is undeniable, it is the effectiveness of the drama that determines its content as a special kind of literature. That is why, quite naturally, the main role in the drama is played by conflict, conflicts. All this arises from the desire of the heroes to resolve the contradictions of life. The characters of the people in a dramatic work are given in a collision, or, in other words, in a conflict that gives effect to the work. Quite a lot has been written about this aspect of the study of drama, the problem of conflict. Today, quite a lot of research material has been accumulated on the problem of conflict, which is fundamental for drama, there are different views on the definition of its essence and role in a dramatic work (works by Belinsky, Hegel, E. Gorbunova, I. Kiselev, V. Sakhnovsky-Pankeev, V. Halizeva and others).

The problem of the conflict, which caused the greatest disputes, discussions, was considered from a variety of points of view, and a wide variety of opinions were expressed on this issue. The first theory of conflict (collision) was developed by Hegel. Following him, B. Shaw, L. Vygotsky, M. Bakhtin and others addressed this problem. Each of them gave his own understanding of the conflict. Today, conflict in literature is defined in one of the most complete, modern literary encyclopedias, as "a clash between characters or between characters and the environment, the hero and fate, as well as a contradiction within the consciousness of the character or subject of the lyrical expression" [A.N. Nikol'yukin. (2003), st. 392].

The concept of conflict has narrowed, being reduced only to an open clash of antagonistic characters, then expanding and becoming vague. All sorts of different interpretations of this concept were given, classification of the conflict was derived, for example, internal and external, dramatic and epic, etc. Along with this, issues related to character in a dramatic work, its differences in comparison with the characters of heroes in epic works were widely debated, but most importantly, the problem of the relationship between character and conflict in drama. Researchers emphasized the great interconnectedness and interdependence of conflict and character in dramatic works.

The relationship of characters and conflict has been repeatedly emphasized in studies on the problem of conflict. Belinsky determined the essence of the conflict, also proceeding from the

characters, focusing on the collision “between the natural attraction of the hero’s heart and his concept of duty” [Belinsky V.G. (1964), p. 62]. Along with this, the conflict in the dramatic work was also defined as a means of revealing the characters. As I. Becher noted: “Conflict touches the very essence of man” [Becher I.(1965), p. 156]. Conflict and characters in their interaction give rise to the plot outline of the work. The plot scheme proposed by Aristotle was not disputed for a long time either, since it remained effective in artistic practice. As E. Roberts wrote: “It is very important to begin the development of the storyline immediately after the start of the play.” Thus, the most important place of the plot in the dramatic work was emphasized [Roberts E. (1967)., p. 130]. But with the advent of the plays of Chekhov and Ibsen into the world drama, this situation is changing somewhat.

Researchers are beginning to talk about the weakened plot of the drama, or rather, the right to the existence of such a drama. As B. Musaev notes, “Chekhov and Ibsen were innovators who were the first to encroach on the self-existence of the plot” [Musaev B.(1991)]. Emphasis in the work of researchers begins to shift to mood, style play. In connection with the advent of the plays of Meterlink, the main place begins to take a symbol, an allegory. Later, a modernist drama appears, which thoroughly destroys the existing scientific schemes regarding the essence of drama.

In the history of the theory of drama, in different periods there have been attempts to highlight one or another problem secondary to drama. So, for example, in the work of V. Khalizev, “theatricality” becomes such a problem [Halizev V. (1986).] E. Bentley in his book declares “aggression” as the main engine of dramaturgy [Bentley E. (1987)]. Thus, sometimes in the research literature on the dramatic genus Aristotle’s position on the main category of drama - “action” is questioned.

One of the most frequently discussed problems of the poetics of dramatic work is also the problem of national identity and national character, the connection of modern works, modern drama with literary tradition, national folklore, folk theater, the problem of archetypes, etc. It must be admitted that without this, understanding and comprehension of the true essence of a work, its ideological and artistic structure, a system of conflicts and characters, plot schemes, and even genre design cannot take place. Moreover, without knowledge of dramatic works, of the folk theater, of the conflicts at its center in any national literature, the idea of this literature is incomplete.

Another important issue is related to the fact that a dramatic work is usually written for staging in a theater. Although, as you know, along with them there are so-called “plays for reading” (lesedrama), created primarily for reader's perception. It must be said that Goethe's Faust, Byron’s dramatic works, and Pushkin’s small tragedies were considered as such, paradoxically as it may seem. Often, writers themselves emphasized the undesirability of staging their plays on stage, for example, I.S. Turgenev. But this did not exclude the possibility of staging them on stage, which was proved by the following time, when many of these “reading plays” found their successful stage embodiment.

And this is not accidental, because any work written according to the canons of a dramatic kind, potentially has an intention to be put on stage. Hence the duality of the dramatic work, as well as two ways, two approaches to the study of drama - theatrical and literary, differently answering the question of whether the text of the dramatic work should be considered a full-fledged literary phenomenon or only a “script” on the basis of which it will be created the final “directorial version” is a theatrical production. It seems that both of these approaches have a place to be, and this is one of the features of the drama - the duality of its nature.

Another major difference between drama and other types of literature, about which much has been written and interpreted differently, is the originality of the theatrical chronotope. Researchers give this definition: "The time distance is absent and is completely replaced by a spatially distant position of an emotionally and intellectually interested witness of what is happening wholly before his eyes -" here and now "[Tamarchenko. T. (2004), p. 308].

The idea of the "timeless present" of the dramatic work was reflected both in the doctrine of the three unities, the beginning of which was laid by Aristotle, and in the "Poetic Art" of Boileau. Goethe and Schiller address this question in their famous Correspondence. The first noted that "the epic poet sets out the event, transferring it to the past, and the playwright portrays it as being accomplished in the present," the second "that the epic poet embodies his event as absolutely finished, and the tragic poet as absolutely empathic, seems to me quite obvious "[Goethe (1988), p. 468].

At the same time, the researchers emphasize the limitedness of the dramatic action, in which, as V.E.Khalizev notes, there is no "narrative-descriptive image". "Actually the author's speech here is auxiliary and episodic", the playwright "uses only part of the subject-visual means that are available to the creator of a novel or an epic, short story or novel" [Halizev V.E. (2005),, p. 317]. Researchers and the plays inherent in the author emphasize the significant advantages that are expressed in the fact that "the action is recreated in the drama with maximum directness" [Halizev V.E. (2005), p. 318]. In addition, the dramatic work "unites in close space, in the interval of some two hours, all the movements that even a passionate creature can often only survive in a long period of life" [Talma F. (1988), p. 33].

The plot is the organizing principle in both epic and dramatic works. But there is a specificity of the dramatic plot, about which the authors of the textbook on the theory of literature argue, relying on all previous research experience. They argue that "in the center (not necessarily in its geometric sense) the plot of the drama is the only turning point dividing the plot into two parts." "The special function of this event, as well as its uniqueness, should be explained from the specifics of space-time." This leads to the concept of conflict in a dramatic work, its connection with the limitation of space and time: "When people talk about conflict, they emphasize the sharpness of the contradiction underlying the dramatic plot, in contrast to the plot of an epic work, which may be based on a situation "[Tamarchenko. T. (2004), p. 315-316]. The situation does not require resolution, while the conflict, which is a confrontation of human positions, aims to resolve.

In addition, in the research literature the "generic" content of the conflict in the dramatic work is emphasized, expressed in the peculiarities of artistic speech in drama. It is enough to cite the terms denoting speech in the drama - monologue, dialogue, remark, remark, insertion text. S. Balukhaty was the first to speak about the specifics of the drama in this regard. He wrote that direct speech is present in the drama "both as a means of characterizing the speaker's face, and as a method of visual development of the speech topic, and as a bearer of dramatic power moments". He also emphasized that the drama "also works with the pronunciation word and builds on this its calculation on the great expressive power of the word "[Balukhaty S.(1927), p. 8].

A somewhat different understanding of the specifics of the drama's speech organization is distinguished by V.E.Khalizev, who believes that the uniqueness of dramatic works in this regard is determined by "primarily their speech organization", the dominated "continuous line" of characters's

verbal actions and the particular activity of these speech actions, "often exceeding that which is inherent in the behavior of people in primary reality." He means here the vastness and abundance of statements, informative functions not justified by circumstances, declamationalism, forcing, sometimes exaggeration, etc [Halizev V. (1986), p. 8-13].

Speaking about the "generic" specifics of the drama hero, it should be noted, first of all, that the category "character", closely related to the category "conflict" arose for the first time in relation to drama. The category of conflict to a greater extent, as all researchers emphasized, starting from the earliest stages of studying the generic division of literature, is associated with drama, dramatic action. Lessing and Hegel also noted the special acuteness of the clashes, primarily characteristic of drama. But they denoted these collisions by the word "conflict".

Later, the term "conflict" in literary use began to be supplanted by the term "collision". But nevertheless, in modern literary criticism both of these terms are used, but they are already implied, with all their proximity, and certain differences between them, although cases and perceptions of them as identical are not uncommon. So, for example, V.E.Khalizev in his "Theory of Literature" constantly emphasizes the identity of these concepts, in particular, speaking of the tragic, he uses them as synonymous concepts, although he prefers the word "collision rather than" conflict ", the pack his first: "At the heart of the tragic are collisions (collisions) in a person's life (or a group of people) that cannot be resolved, but which cannot be reconciled with" [Halizev V.E. (2005), p. 82].

Some modern scholars define the collision "either as the plot form of the manifestation of the conflict, or its most global, historically large-scale variety", thereby emphasizing the difference in the content of these terms [A.N. Nikolyukin. (2003)p. 393]. In addition, during the development of the science of literature, the attitude to the concept of collision (or conflict) in literary criticism has changed and remains ambiguous.

It must be said that M. Bakhtin also spoke out against excessive categorization in affirming the universality of the conflict. And the infamous "theory of conflict-freeness", generated by the totalitarian regime and widely used in the 1940s, completely denied the conflict as the basis of a literary work. Its supporters proceeded from the belief that in socialist reality the conditions for conflict situations completely disappear. They recognized only one conflict - "the conflict of the best with the good." This was followed by criticism and the overthrow of this theory, which, however, led to even more discrediting of this concept.

But most scientists rightly believe, based on samples of world literature, that conflict is the basis and one of the most important means of character development, which is revealed through contradictions, conflicts, internal or external. Conflicts become more complicated if the nature of the contradictions is associated with dramatic upheavals and cataclysms. In our opinion, the attention of writers to complex conflicts, conflicts, processes that reflect the struggle outside and inside a person is determined by their desire for the best embodiment of the character of a contemporary, for the disclosure of copyright ideas, and in general the disclosure of the conflict of being itself.

Very often, to identify the specifics of dramatic conflict, comparisons are made with conflict in lyrics and epics. Researchers emphasize that the lyrics contain almost no conflict, and if they contain, then to a lesser extent than the epic, and even more so the drama. Gorky, who also linked the dramatic conflict with the problem of character, turned to the specifics of the dramatic work in its comparison

with the epic. In his article "On plays", he wrote: "A play is a drama, a comedy is the most difficult form of literature, it is difficult because the play requires that every unit acting in it be characterized by word and deed self-servingly, without prompting from the author. In the novel, stories, the people depicted by the author act with his help, he is always with them, he tells the reader how to understand them, explains to him secret thoughts, hidden motives for the actions of the figures depicted ... "[Gorky M. (1953) p. 594]. And only later did it spread to other kinds of literature.

Researchers are unanimous in their view of understanding character in drama as a "role" and a "type." If the former is related to masked characters, then the latter is related to behavior. In both cases, they are associated with intrigue, with conflict, with plot action. Hegel contrasted with the schematic "types" the characters necessary for genuine drama, which should have been closely associated with conflict. Opposing opinions were expressed by S. Balukhaty, V. Khalizev and some others who did not distinguish character and type in the field of drama, spoke about the adherence of the drama to the single-line characters of pre-realistic art.

In our opinion, those researchers are right who argue that "the installation of drama on the extra-narrative functions of utterance is associated with its desire to portray a clash of positions, and not just the interaction of momentary mental movements or ready-made volitional impulses. Positions, on the other hand, are the result of the character's self-determination in a given situation (that is, his "independent activity"), and not a ready-made, previously known form of his personality "[Tamarchenko. T. (2004), p. 331]. B.V. Tomashevsky also wrote about the connection of "speeches and deeds" with the "typical character" in drama [Tomashevsky B.V. (1996) p. 215].

A dramatic work by its nature, by its generic qualities, implies the comprehension of such vital material, which is based on the most acute contradictions, conflicts, which requires the creation of appropriate characters. It is with this that researchers connect the uneven development of drama in different periods and the evolution of conflicts and characters throughout the history of its development. Any outbursts, unrest, disasters occurring in society entail the creation of dramatic works, in the conflicts and characters of which these problems of public life and public consciousness are most sharply posed and solved.

Therefore, one of the main problems in the analysis of the content and formal structure of plays designed for spectator perception is the problem of historical development, the evolution of conflicts and characters in connection with socio-historical factors that determine the periodization of the dramatic art of one or another national literature. Even a cursory analysis of the drama of a given period allows us to see in it a connection with the general ideology of the era, the atmosphere of the time, and the urgency of the problems posed and solved. Although the truth of life and the truth of art are not identical concepts, they constitute a single whole. The history of the development of society is also the history of the development of dramatic and theatrical art.

References.

1. Anikst A. (1967) Theory of drama from Aristotle to Lessing. M.: Nauka, 1967; Theory of drama in Russia. From Pushkin to Chekhov. M., 1972; The theory of drama from Hegel to
191 *MESTER*, Vol. XXXVIII, SV (2019)

Marx. M., 1983; The theory of drama in the West in the second half of the XIX century. M., 1988 and others.)

2. Balukhaty S.(1927)Problems of dramatic analysis. Chekhov. L.,, p. 8).
3. Belinsky V.G. (1964)Full Sobr. Op. in 13 vol. T. 5. M.,, p. 10).
4. Bentley E. (1987)Life Drama. M.
5. Becher I.(1965)My love, poetry. M.,, p. 156.
6. Hegel.(1971)Aesthetics. In 4 vols. T.3. M.,,p. 240-241.
7. Goethe (1988)IV, Schiller F. Correspondence. In 2 vol. T.1 // History of aesthetics in monuments and documents. M.,, p. 468).
8. Gorky M. (1953)About the plays // Gorky M. About the literature. M.,.
9. Literary encyclopedia of terms and concepts. Ch. ed. and comp. A.N. Nikolyukin. (2003)M .: NPK Intelvak,.
10. Musaev B.(1991). Contemporary Azerbaijani dramatic art. Baku,.
11. Olesha Yu. (1968)Plays. M .: Art, , p. 322.
12. Roberts E. (1967)Television drama. Tips for a young playwright. M.,, p. 130).
13. Talma F. (1988)On stage art. M., , p. 33).
14. Theory of Literature, 2 vol. Ed. N.D. Tamarchenko. T. (2004)1. M .: Academy,, p. 308).
15. Tomashevsky B.V. (1996)Theory of literature. Poetics. M.,, p. 215).
16. Halizev V. (1986).Drama as a kind of literature. M., p. 318).
17. Halizev V.E. (2005)Theory of literature. M .: Higher school,,S. 318).