

## АРХИТЕКТУРА ТА МИСТЕЦТВОЗНАВСТВО

**Breus Iaroslava**

*Master Degree Student of Shanghai University, Film Academy,  
major – Television and Radio Art Studies*

**Lin Shao Xiong**

*Professor and Doctoral Supervisor in the School of Film and Television Arts  
and Technology of Shanghai University*

### **THE CONCEPT OF THE DANCE ON THE SCREEN (DANCE TELEVISION)**

The dance television is a hybrid of the performing and visual art and it produces the new synthetic audiovisual element called – the screen body. The dancing bodies that we see on the screen were constructed through the film and television technologies apparatus and different technical and aesthetic approaches in order to create a particular representation of dance. However, these are not just bodies transformed with the technical devices: they have economical, political and social meanings. Dancing in reality is a carrier of a some specific code or message, as lots of traditional national dancing has the particular “body language”, which can be decrypted and comprehended. Ukrainian traditional dancing involves the impressive multiplicity of dance movements, which have their roots far in the Slavonic totemism, animism, heathen rituals, later Christian ceremonials, and the Cossacks military activities.

For the audience the way choreography is filmed is actually the quintessence of the social, political and economical dance meaning. Television is one of the keys to perceive and consume the deep sense of any choreography in the world. Television gives us the fundamental instrument – huge audience, massification, wide and rapid spreading of dancing body. So television can also serve as an intermediary between the “art market” and consumer.

One of the most important structuring device within the television is narrative. However, understanding narrative as well as how the frame is composed is literally impossible without clarifying how the way television constructs the reality.

Wyver believes that television has a great capacity to make a reproduction of elements, objects and events from “the real world”. Television can possible create the images which would seem to be a duplicate of the original ones, almost like a cliché. For the dance, the original subject matter is a dancing body. At the first glance it might seem the television is a “re-presentation” of the dance, so television reflects the reality which is embodied in the dance. Is it a mirrored reflection or an image filtrated through the prism of television apparatus? Is the picture on the blue screen linked with the realism or feed audience with the fascinatingly elaborated fictive image? The

complexity between the image and reality was enlarged with the ontological questions of whether an objective reality ever exists [6].

If we dare to claim that reality exists in objects, situations or events of our routine life and dance is aimed to be a carrier of this reality, in this case the significant and relevant question is the image is monotype copy of the reality or the reality is contorted via television medium.

Within the image on the screen and the reality, the term “realism” comes to the surface. Wollen and Willeman believe that realism is a set of artistic conventions seeking to convey an impression of reality through specific codes and practices [8; 7]. Notwithstanding this, the convention of realism as the aesthetic concept is dispersed throughout the world as it was born under diverse social and cultural circumstances. In Ukraine “realism” was principally the “social realism”. Facts, events, situations were all supposed to be a televisual projection of the utopian world with the “cult of simple, ordinary people, equality, striking economical achievements etc”. This suggests that realist conventions are influenced by cultural, technological and historical conditions.

Television also employs realism means to fabricate a re-presentation of reality [9]. Usage of costumes, trained actors or dancers, meticulously selected setting and decorations – it is all beneficial to create the illusion of reality.

This latent resistance to realist strategies on television can be explained through the innovative interaction between television and dance. Television smashes all the possible technological barriers for creativity, it gives the impulse to cultivate abstract thinking in art, produce more symbolic or high-tech products. In addition, the postmodern stage of art ontogenesis augments the cognitive effects of artistic media products, introducing variety of new techniques for both television and dance.

Television narratives can be highly fragmented. This is partly due to the commercial breaks, news items, trailers and presenter announcements that regularly interrupt the narratives of television [3]. From a postmodernist perspective video dance is typical of the eclectic, repetitive and fragmented narratives that characterize television viewing practices and the flow of images on screen.

If dance television interspersed into the postmodernistic domain, the video dance is prone to be represented by repercussive, eclectic and fragmented narratives that define the flow of images on the screen and television viewing practices. Still, television media is dominated by realist practices.

Emergence of dance television also required the explanation of the term “performing body”. These are constructed and mediated via television apparatus all the players of television which can be defined as a character. The conceptualization of film and television characters varies as television possesses an illusion of “liveness” or “nowness” [3]. Fiske also affirms that spectator is involved and detached from the character the same time. The scholar determines this as “implication”, which construct the pleasure of television watching, rather than a type of “passive identification”, so the viewer can deliberately follow his imagination and play with fantasy. Even though television and film constitute different characters, they both are established through the hegemonic discourses (Kuhn, 1985). Structuralists analysis conceives the character as a signifying system that carries

specific economic and social values. Within the “performing body” arises the key question where the video dance lies in relation to the character. The technical manipulations with the “live on-stage body” give birth to “performing body” as a character with a social meaning and the “screen body” as the digitalized image of the character.

Next essential element is the shift from “live on-stage body” to “screen body”. The transition of one image into another is not a lineal process, it’s a sophisticated set of artistic and technical manipulations with the original choregraphical idea.

The distance between the camera and the subject matter, use of lighting and color, focus and some specific angles, also montage and style of material editing all contribute to this modification. What we actually see on screen is shaped by a number of factors. Film and television production is both labor and capital intensive and therefore much programming is dependent on economic decisions [5]. The construction of screen body does not only rely on television technologies, but it is also a very subjective process where the director mediates lots of transformations of the “live body”. Individual art “interpretation” or “vision” of one director and his idiosyncrasy can be completely opposite or even hostile to another. The directors decisions in relation to the parameters of television apparatus are paramount for dancing body representation on the screen. Even minimizing the individual influence, certain directorial decisions are required to be made.

Undeniably, the dance television does exist in Ukraine and briskly evolve, conquering more and more television channels but it has not find its “niche” in the theoretical and social biocenosis.

### References:

1. Dodds S. Video dance: hybrid sites and fluid bodies : Doctoral dissertation, University of Surre, 1997.
2. Dyer R. The Matter of Images: Essays on Representations. London: Routledge, 1993.
3. Fiske J. Television Culture. London: Routledge, 1989.
4. Fiske J., Hartley J. Reading Television. London: Methuen, 1978.
5. Monaco J. How to Read a Film. Oxford: OUP, 1981.
6. Williams C. Realism and the Cinema. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
7. Willeman P. On Realism in the Cinema. *Screen*. 1972. 13(1). P. 37–45.
8. Wollen W. Signs and Meaning in the Cinema. London: Secker & Warburg, 1969. Wyman M. Computer Program [sic] Aids Dance Makers. *Dance Magazine*. 1991. Vol. LXV. No. 3. P. 12–13.
9. Wyver J. Television and Postmodernism’, in L. Appignanesi (ed.). *Postmodernism: ICA Documents 4*. London: ICA, 1986.