
HERMENEUTICS AND PHENOMENOLOGY OF “SPECTACLE”

Karzhaubayeva Sangul Kamalovna

Doctor of arts, professor at the T. Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts, kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the analysis and interpretation of the “theatre spectacle” as a cultural-historical expression - the specific world of experiences and the connection of the peculiar text. The only novelty that opens the new problem is the connection between “masses” as mass media communication, shaping the mass of the masses, as well as the current social life, politics and economics. Every time a person walks in a spherical sphere, he / she personally moves to a collective type of prejudice and fertility. When a society has a structure, it has a lot of mass organization, a total of all its members, no matter what it is, in the realm of media-elements, the active and passive role of the subject. It is clear that the world can be extinguished from the ignorance of the world, and it does not give way to the public. H. Gadamer, having found the fundamental moments in the transformation of modern practitioners, considers the universal use of aesthetic and instrumental evidence for the exceptionable nature of the phenomenon.

Keywords: phenomenological analysis, theatre spectacle, aesthetics, interpretation, aesthetics, catharsis.

INTRODUCTION

In the phenomenological paradigm, the analysis of the spectacle as a specific way of experiencing the world, from the antiquity occupied the minds of scientists and made wonder about the essence of this phenomenon. Even today, the topic is relevant as modern philosophical and research thought moves away from the habitual propensity to rationalism and turns to comprehension of other, non-rational ways of being of a human in the world, becomes more clearly outlined. To a large extent, the actualization of such a development is also connected with the globalization processes of our time. Amidst the backdrop of avalanche production and the spread of visual images, in a situation in which the lifestyle, the principle of which is focused on visibility and accessibility to the view, on the creation and consumption of appearances has become dominant, there are constantly questions about the further development of civilizational processes and the cultural consequences of such changes. Spectacles today, thanks to the media, electronic mass media, are the dominant core trend of modernity, provoking us to take a

spectator position. This ability to be a spectator is cultivated and used by power mechanisms to replicate active consumers and obedient subjects. Such a turn can be regarded as a kind of a return of society to the “pre-alphabet” culture, when the word means less and the image is bigger. The inner world of man dissolves in the external; the isolation of the individual from the world disappears. With a kind of “expansion” of visual images, today only text that is extremely concentrated on the subject of knowledge can compete. If, from social problems, to address the problems of human existence, the analysis of the grounds of the spectacle is necessary to reveal the daily existence of man and the impulses that make him break away from everyday life, in order to enrich it with meanings.

In a broad structural plan, spectacles always reproduce human life. All they are filled with is the events that revolve in the existential field of love and hatred, conflicts and reconciliations, that is, those always-topical issues that are directly relevant to the way people live in the world. Spectacles repeatedly return us to these questions, but in a special way, allowing to get into their affective meaning.

In the European tradition the analyst of the spectacle was first proposed by Aristotle in “Poetics.” He dwells in detail on the ways of constructing a dramatic action, reveals the sense of experience for the upbringing of the soul, and introduces the term “catharsis,” an important for understanding the structure and action of the dramatic spectacle. This term is still successfully operated by the humanities, one way or another referring to shows and to theatrical art: psychology, sociology, art history, philosophy. This term Aristotle applied precisely to the dramatic action and not to any art in general.

Roman philosophical schools and Christian thinkers of the Middle Ages talk about spectacles, resorting to their imagery, in order to demonstrate their philosophical views or raise questions about the requirements of morality and abstinence from vices. Augustine of Hippo, addressing the question of spectacles, raises complex questions of the psychology of human behavior in the crowd. In the era of the Enlightenment, research appears that addresses the theory and practice of the theatre. At this time the theatre acquires a special status in an educated society, it is placed on a par with recognized art trends, such as music and painting. Playwrights J.B. Molière, N. Boileau, J. Racine and others wrote not only plays for the stage, but also tried to articulate the basic principles of theatre art in their theoretical works. The main problems that they raise were the ratio of the sensible and rational component in the theatrical presentation, the ways of representing the event on the stage, the likelihood problems, the relation to reality, the spatiotemporal unity of the composition, the awakening of the spectator’s imagination to “intelligent” contemplations and so on.

A special tool for revealing the essence of the spectacle as an exceptional event: the experience of an exalted feeling that allows us to represent the ideas of the mind in a symbolic way-gives us the Kant's Critique of Judgment. In it, I. Kant opposed the dogmatism of speculative metaphysics and skepticism with a dualistic doctrine of the unknowable "things in themselves" and cognizable phenomena that form the sphere of an infinite possible experience. The condition of knowledge, according to Kant, is the universally valid a priori forms that order the chaos of sensations. Analyzing the cognitive abilities of the subject, Kant focuses on the states that he calls the experience of the beautiful and sublime. These states specifically indicate the connection between the sensory and cognitive spheres in the process of cognition. The situation in which the subject gets an opportunity to contemplate the idea in a sensual manner and at the same time experience the effect of "enhancing the sense of life" in the experience of the beautiful, in fact, is the situation of the spectacle. Although for Kant this fact is of secondary importance, nevertheless, the conditions for the birth of sublime feelings just suggest the possibility of looking at some unusual phenomenon from a certain distance. That is, take in relation to her the position of the viewer, detached from this reality and at the same time emotionally involved in it.

German romanticism see scenic art as a special world in which the ethical and aesthetic principles of man are mobilized. Goethe I., Schiller F., Schlegel F. turn to literature and theatre as a means where ideas can develop in free poetic images, moving away from the crude naturalism of everyday life. In the art of theatrical spectacle, the Romantics see a way to penetrate the sphere of spiritual life, the field of subtle psychological experiences of the subject.

Thanks to a deep analysis of such cultural data as a symbol and a myth, the value of spectacular practices for a man is re-discovered in a new way. Theatre as an entertaining enterprise was originally an attempt to make inseparable words written and words spoken. In addition, in the writings of philosophers this fact received its wide interpretation. The idea of myth as a special, energetically saturated way of thinking and worldview can be found in the works of European and Russian researchers of theatrical art. The largest of the known, the schools of theatrical art, are rooted in religion or metaphysics. For example, the school of K.S. Stanislavsky, with its complete reincarnation of the actor into a literary image, is related to the Orthodox liturgy, which for believers is a real experience of sacred events. The direction given by Berthold Brecht is the detachment of the performer from the image and the public, close to the Protestant ethic - moralism and edification. Antonin Artaud, who sought to use the maximum number of visual effects (sound, light, gestures, facial expressions) in his "Crown Theatre" and move away from logo centrism (the use of non-verbal elements of the theatre was subordinated to the main task - to end the "dictatorship of speech").

The introduction of phenomenological method at the beginning of the 20th century was the beginning of fruitful philosophical and anthropological research, which could not but touch upon this topic. This rich experience can serve as an excellent basis for reflection on the spectacle, in its integral meaning for man as a cultural being.

In the orientation towards a certain methodological program, we aim to determine the relationship and connection of the two thematic elements of the problem under study - theatre and reality in a certain historical context. To date, there are several common approaches, among which, the hermeneutic, structuralist and phenomenological traditions are of particular importance. The phenomenological way of describing - as it was given in the works of the founder of the phenomenology of E. Husserl - in "Ideas for Pure Phenomenology," in "Phenomenology of the Internal Consciousness of Time," in "Cartesian Reflections," is most definitely expressed in the so-called theory of reductions and in the phenomenological setting based on it. The meaning of the first is that everything that we can define by the concepts "reality," "reality," "the world" is nothing else but a way of realizing this reality, the variety of meanings that consciousness attributes to its immanent contents and what consciousness determines as an external, transcendent reality.

According to the phenomenological interpretation of the problem of reality, the latter is the result of the sense and object-forming activity, and therefore it would be reasonable not to compare consciousness with reality, but to compare the various ways of its comprehension, reconstruct the process of generation of meaning and the various correlations within the sphere of consciousness. The reality, which is wholly and completely problematic, needs to be reduced and turned to the source from which it flows, i.e. in fact, the activity of consciousness and then reality appears in the true light - not as a factual substance of reality, reality, life, the life world, etc., but precisely as a form of comprehension. This is precisely the meaning of the phenomenological setting based on reduction. Indeed, in the theatrical production from the very beginning to the end reality shows itself produced by the consciousness generated and fostered by it. The play, replicas, monologues, the whole of the original literary basis of the play being staged, is nothing but a work of consciousness.

At the heart of the hermeneutic practice of interpreting cultural material is the understanding of every cultural and historical phenomenon as a coherent whole text. Hans-Georg Gadamer in her fundamental hermeneutic work "Truth and Method" considers the universal sphere of the aesthetic, for understanding which the concept "spectacle" is of particular importance. It is obvious that Gadamer, in contrast to phenomenologists, relates and describes two completely different in nature and origin - the world of nature, or reality as such, and the world of art, in particular, theatrical art. For us it is fundamentally important to state that theatre and reality are not opposed as two complete opposites, in the spirit of two closed spheres, natural (natural) and

artificial, but are understood as having the same producing basis in man. In Gadamer, a comparison of the things of art and the things of the world (defined as “so-called reality” or as “unimaginable”) goes in favor of art - because it is “the removal of this reality in truth” (Gadamer H.-G. M. Progress, 1988 – p. 156).

The second important for us position of the hermeneutic theory of Gadamer is the rules of interpretation. Being “closed in itself by the world,” the product finds its value only in front of the viewer. Here we are talking about the problem of identification, the identity of the work itself, more specifically about the ontological status of the work of art and the variability of its interpretations. Since the “correct representation” is associated with the continuity of the work, as far as Gadamer believes, it is “highly movable and relative” (Gadamer H.-G. M. Progress, 1988 – p. 156).

An important position of the theory of H.-G. Gadameris that it is not necessary to contrast the various parts of the single process of the work of art, its image, execution, and perception, i.e., oppose the work of the author, actor and viewer. He finds his own existential realization in the final analysis only in the presence and in the work of the spectator.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the fact that art is understood by Gadamer as a kind of changing experiences, the subject of which every time anew is subjectively filled with meaning both empty form and theatre as stage art turns out to be bound work in several centers, forming the meanings and meanings of what is happening and exposing them in a work art. Thus, building up the relationships that form within the work of art, Gadamer concretizes the connection between the elements of phenomenological analysis. Instances that determine the final result are the author of the work, the actor, who corrects and varies the meanings originally embedded in the work, and the viewer, who collects everything and fills the primary material with his aesthetic experiences.

As for the reality contained within the work of art, according to Gadamer, its significance is not reduced only to comparison with reality, since the truth contained in art is perfect.

WORKS SITED:

Gadamer H.-G. *Truth and Method: The basics of philosophical hermeneutics*. M. Progress, 1988.