

MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF ARTS TÂRGU-MUREŞ
DOCTORAL SCHOOL

Role in the Actor –
The Actor's Work in the Repertory Theatre
Abstract of the PhD THESIS

Scientific advisor:

Prof. univ. dr. habil. Jákfalvi Magdolna

PhD Candidate:
Berekméri Katalin

2015

The dissertation examines the making of an actor and the unpredictable process of staying in the field, from the viewpoint of my personal career and teaching experience. The proposals are organized around the revelation that, in spite of the efforts of the profession and the educators to a direct approach to the question, it is impossible to predict who is going to become an actor, who will stay in the field and what he or she sacrifices for it.

My thesis is an attempt to formulate the experience induced by the existing professional opportunities and the less likely ones from the perspective of an acting class student in Targu-Mures and that of an actor's work in a repertoire theatre in Transylvania. I am focusing on the actor's work, with emphasis on building a character, the process of understanding the role in a production, the conditions and possibilities in a repertoire theatre. It also tries to identify the influences an actor needs to face in this professional environment, marking the revelations that cause changes in the actor's mentality and scale of values which, being as specific as they are can still be seen as typical for an actor's existence defined by the profession's tradition.

The mentality and possibilities of the repertoire theatre environment, the education- and playing traditions crucially define the actor's position, thoughts on the profession and playing conception. An actor socialized in our cultural circle „has no collection of mandatory rules to follow. He needs to create his own rules to lean on.”¹ Motivation and self-denial are the engine of an actor's life at every stage; however, the causal factors are others: the undefinable talent, abilities, theatrical tradition, environment and so on. The actor's thoughts on his profession and on his existence as an actor are clearly at the center of his professionalism. Is person practicing this metier capable to represent a mentality, different from that of his entourage's? Can an actor grow in an unprogressive environment with a profession-centered requirement system? Can he, in such an environment identify the elements that cannot be integrated with his professional mentality and, at the same time carry out the processes necessary to his development? These are general questions and problems that significantly influence the quality of Hungarian theatre in Transylvania: „cast in deep water, the actor gets no help, nothing to further develop his talent. This situation is most visible in commercial theatres but it does apply to permanent companies as well. After occupying a certain position the actor stops doing homeworks. (...) If he

¹ Eugenio Barba: *Papirkenu (The Paper Canoe)*. Transl. Andó Gabriella, Demcsák Katalin. Budapest, Kijarat Kiadó, 2001. 24.

wants to grow he must leave behind his current level and look for things harder to accomplish.”²

The basic idea of my research is that all parts exist in the actor. The dissertation is based on examples from my own acting career and I deal with the aspects of the profession that cannot be shaped at the university or in work-shops. I examine the routines integrated with the actor’s work during years of practice at a repertoire theatre from the perspective of the making of an actor and that of different theories on acting.

The dissertation is divided in 5 chapters: the question of leading an actor; his place relative to the possibilities offered by the educational system, then in performance and directing; the special case when the actor as a character and his empiric experience as dramatic material are part of the performance; the phenomena involved in performing in another language.

In my experience, leading the actor always involves a chance for aggression. The director, the stage partner and the actor himself all carry potential aggression. We are facing a paradox here in the Diderot-esque sense as well: the acting alternative is a constant vector for injury while the literature and professional experience tells us that the relaxation and openness needed for an actor’s work are only possible in a free, uninhibited and undefensive disposition. The actor must display his vulnerability and emotional openness while protecting his physique and psyche. In western cultural circles this stands for the building of every part; in the context of a repertoire theatre however, under the pressure of guest directors, financing, deadlines, 6 weeks long rehearsal periods trying to achieve a working atmosphere with conditions and methods that make the actor feel completely safe physically and psychologically, „to feel that nothing he does, even if unacceptable will make an object of ridicule”³ is a utopia. It is clear: under these circumstances the creator’s primary goal is to „deliver the goods”⁴ and, beyond his stage existence the actor’s work is influenced by many determining factors. From the perspective of performance building may even be confronted by the negligibility of his acting presence and activity. Still, even with this unlucky professional constellation, by sheer willpower he

² Peter Brook: *Az üres tér (The Empty Space)*. Transl. Koós Anna. Budapest, Európa Könyvkiadó, 1999. 34.

³ Jerzy Grotowski: *Színház és rituálé (Theatre and Ritual)*. Transl. Pályi András. Pozsony, Kalligram Kiadó, 2009. 55.

⁴ Andrei Șerban: *Életrajz (A Biography)*. Transl. Koros-Fekete Sándor. Kolozsvár, Koinónia Kiadó, 2010. 373.

can exclusively focus on carrying out the part, on achieving the moments that make up the chain of actions.

I have become aware that the actor can achieve an ideal working disposition by disconnecting his conscious planning and constantly maintaining his consciousness in the present. Disconnecting consciousness can be neither real nor necessary for an actor's work because by getting conscious planning out of the way open up the actor's consciousness for a real intention and willingness to accept and execute (instructions) under protection; in other words: consciousness exclusively selects the actor's spiritual, psychological and physical impulses while maintaining control only accompanies and oversees his capacity for action, without influencing it.

The actor „must find and pass by his own point of resistance”⁵, work from this intention. By giving up his resistance he can put himself at the disposal of the director, his stage partner, he can stay in the moment, not refusing but living the fear that, conscious or not, through acceptance stops being fear. This phenomenon comes from a change in the quality of defense, resulted from creating an adequate or even ideal work ethics, avoiding trauma and the assuming of victimhood in the actor's mentality. The occurrence of unwanted situations creates plying opportunities in the actor's mind, so that his will is focused on really accepting any situation. He controls himself under directions, does not endanger his or his partner's physical integrity and, by absolute intentional acceptance and without resisting the offer to play at any given moment he opens up to playing and achieves the aptitude to stay in the present. In this instance, the fear of trauma and pain and the positioning of the ego ceases; as a result, the occurrence of awkward, uncomfortable situations and the pressure to perform are eliminated.

My research brought me to the conclusion that reaching a creative state is possible not by disconnecting conscious thought (impossible when working on stage) but by suspending the process of conscious planning and thus keeping perception and reactivity in the present. Suspending his conscious planning the actor will stop looking for a way out of a stage situation through controlled techniques, he physically, psychologically and cognitively activates himself more intensely than in a planned execution of his work. A whole register opens up in achieving the moment, in the functioning of the actor, a register unpredictable and unknown even to himself which can provide a specific, absolutely personal solution. We could call this process thinking with the whole being of an actor: the

⁵ Jerzy Grotowski. op. cit. 55.

psyche is fully active (often accessing the pre-conscious⁶ and sometimes, registers of the subconscious), as is the physical (muscle) „intelligence or memory”⁷ while the conscious applies controlled surveillance, choosing from the surfacing impulses the most adequate for a solution on stage. In conclusion, the actor perceives and reacts with his whole being. His conscience maintains the probability of the situation (meaning: the actor is doing an actor’s work in a theatre) and the process does not cross into the reality of the dramatic space and the stage character. In all cases, the moment is activated through disconnecting conscious planning, keeping consciousness in the present and through motion, real action. Understanding (consciously or not) the configuration situation/goal grants the actor’s body the intelligence that makes it move and feel without thoughtful planning. In this case, the body is faster than the thought and a new situation/goal hits the actor’s conscious mind with a delay, through his body’s perception and reaction.

The actor’s humility and ignorance towards his problem-centered mentality strengthens the creator in his attitude that anything is possible, feasible; this is the adequate mentality for creative work and, from an actor’s point of view can be the engine behind the rehearsal process. An actor’s humility, acceptance and devotion is the way to surpassing himself, to passing by volition, a kind of accumulation of it; it is, in fact a state of absolute non-defensiveness produced by spontaneous moments unbound through the will, energy and work invested. When surpassing himself, the actor is free of strong will or conscience, in the instantaneous perception the effect is achieved with no apparent cause while conscious recognition of the connections happens later because the solution comes as a reflex, an automatism in his body. In this case, to learn, to know, to believe means to achieve valid movements and reactions with the body; otherwise it will be incapable of real on-stage communication.

My analysis showed me that the desired acting experience is a state of resistance-free essence, of absolute submission but not absolute capitulation. In fact, the actor must reach a pure state in which he wants to react, to accept and execute (instructions). The ideal state can be reached by forgetting the self and opening up curiously to living the present moment, not refusing anything of what comes next.

⁶ In the Freudian model the preconscious is an intermediate realm of the soul between the conscious and the unconscious; its registers are occupied by content (memories, thoughts, feelings, sensations etc.) that is directly unavailable but indirectly available for consciousness and can be imported to it.

⁷ Jan Kott: *A lehetetlen színház vége (The End of the Impossible Theatre)*. Transl. Balogh Géza, Cserevits Jolán et al. Budapest, Országos Színháztörténeli Múzeum és Intézet, 1997. 498.

Beyond the situation/goal determinism, „The actor’s concomitant sentimental reality and technique”⁸ are defined by rules that convert the character’s behaviour into stage language since, from the perspective of on-stage validity „what counts the most for the actor is not mastering his feelings but making the emotions intelligible, since those are interpreted through the spectator”⁹. The actor’s emotional and technical intensity is not directly related to the validity of his on-stage existence which only means that „the actor is capable to direct and translate sentiment”¹⁰ respectively, the way he achieves this process from the perspective of taste. At the same time, he has a „triple responsibility”¹¹ on stage: to himself, to his partner and to his audience.

Developing one’s self-directing capacity is mandatory in theatrical practice but in accepting and executing directorial instructions the actor must follow external directions, completely ignoring his own vision. A valid execution of the directorial directive means that the actor’s body notices and understands the situation/goal configuration: „thinking is not only done rationally, in the head, it is a corporeal experience. Thought is achieved exclusively through the balance between spirit and body”¹²; reproduction ensures the conscient understanding of the context.

I agree with the statement that, although a theorizing directing broadens the possibilities of acting projection, it also causes the actor’s body to play a fixed partiture, a consciously planned chain of actions, while an improvisation, initiated in knowledge of the situation/goal configuration and through the director’s instructions concerning the action, the body can instantly connect into the play to produce real responses, ie since understanding (physical and/then mental) comes through experience, a less conscious control, the body is able to spontaneously and creatively participate in the creative process. The driving force of the process is the factual recognition and identification of the situation/goal; although not always consciously, this causes the adequate stage reaction in the actor. In order to keep the impulse it is necessary to make the moment conscious but identification itself is strictly linked to empiric knowledge. The actor’s practice cannot

⁸ Robert Cohen: *A színészmesterség alapjai (Acting One)*. Transl. Márton András. Pécs, Jelenkor Kiadó, 1998. 6.

⁹ Patrice Pavis: *Előadáselemzés (Analyzing Performance)*. Transl. Jákfalvi Magdolna. Budapest, Balassi Kiadó, 2003. 61.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Peter Brook: *Változó nézőpont (Changing Perspective)*. Transl. Dobos Mária. Budapest, Orpheusz Könyvkiadó–Zugszínház, 2000. 270.

¹² Robert Wilson: *Testtel gondolkodni (Body-thinking)*. Transl. Kékesi Kun Árpád. *Theatron*, 1998. winter, 71.

produce professional quality along the lines of value judgement and ordinary mentality. His stereotypical thinking on the value categories of a given cultural circle must permanently be attacked and demolished, then reorganized, otherwise his personal experience cannot achieve the impulse of recognition that gives birth to a movement, a specific yet typical on-stage gesture.

My presumption is that knowledge comes about before the physical reaction, though often in a moment unnoticed and unrecognized by the actor. In this sense, the moments produced from body memory are the result of previous experience, i.e. of real knowledge as well. The actor's work includes the configuration knowledge (awareness/recognition) – physical response – consciousness. In this sense, an invalid gesture cannot be the consequence of the lack of previous knowledge and experience but that of a failure to truly recognize and identify the situation-goal that activates the different registers of the actor's body, spirit and psyche. The failure to complete the process is considered to be caused by the lack of adequate acting aptitudes, a deficiency in the staged situation or in the directorial conception or, in the students' case the failure to identify the situation-goal, i.e. the lack of life experience.

In the next chapter, in the context of rehearsing the play *Three Sisters* with 2nd year students, I am looking to answer the question: what can a 20 year old understand from the world view of Tschechov's characters? Can they really understand the problematics of the characters or they are just facing an exercise at school? How will their recognition of the situation-goal be achieved in order to activate their on-stage creativity and reactivity that leads them to a valid stage solution? Are there any real chances for something like this?

In my experience, in the first register of role-building the actor lays down the character's chain of actions, in the second he arranges the thoughts and nuances through which he projects his opinion on these actions, getting a stable effect and making it work. This is the role-building technique used in the repertoire theatre.

The teaching tradition originates in the local and regional particularities, in the requirements of Transylvanian repertoire theatres. The Târgu-Mureş Academy for Arts is meant to serve the needs of these institutions. The students' work opportunities and the tradition represented by the teachers determines the education which includes the needs of directors' theatres. The Târgu-Mureş Academy is a nursery for Transylvania's repertoire theatres that are directors' theatres by definition. The Târgu-Mureş National Theatre is no exception: an institutional framework and directives and, beyond that a company activity tending towards a collective theatre. The work style, shaped by the rehearsal process is not

defined by conscious conception but it is the product of local conditions and the the directors' traditional education. During the frequent rehearsal periods that transform into collective directing and company creation processes the actor crucially influences the dramaturgy of the text, the director's conception, the role-building, his place in the performance, even the costume. Involving the actor this deeply in the work process is not always beneficial; however, the practice of repertoire theatres with stable companies demonstrates that a well-trained company with a valid, uniformly materialised way of thinking is capable to create performances that sell out, work processes and directing. On the other hand, such a company cannot and is not meant to replace the professionally valid, specifically theatrical way of thinking of a director's personality. Educating students on this is not a priority but covering this need is part of the tradition, as much as accepting instructions and integrating them with the actor's work, with role-building is.

It is important that the students find their own interpretation of a drama in class: why is a certain material worth to be put on stage? The goal is to search for one's own vision (as a student) or the director's vision (as an actor), melting the two and their representation on stage together, if possible. At that age, they find it difficult to accept an ideology or interpretation strange from their own; they will rather accept something that relates to their life experience but then they have to work exclusively from that experience.

Working in class on the chekhovian text taught us that a validly constructed situation and a chain of events result in a form that can function autonomously in our acting practice. In our case, using the age-specific, direct or indirect deficient experiences personalizing did not become essential because it created itself or was able to leave the impression that it did. However, the real goal (the students learning the methods of role-building) was reached to a lesser degree: because of their lack of experience the functioning form was primarily through the presence and directions of the educator, just the way it happens in a repertoire theatre.

Still, during the education process centered on the actor and later, in the practice of the repertoire theatre the moment comes when the actor is forced to admit: his ambitions about a role are not justified in a directors' theatre. Although there is a chance to materialize these motives in the context of a performance and along the lines of the director's conception, when there are contradictions, his impulse cannot be legitimized. The gradual realization of this revelation during the rehearsal process is presented in a new chapter of the dissertation, illustrated with multiple journal notes.

It is here that I discuss the hypothesis of the dissertation: all roles exist in the actor. It is a frequent experience that one of the decisive elements in leading the actor by the director is focusing on the actor's practical offer. Accepting this offer often creates a conceptional framework for the character which grants it its stage validity. For instance, I'm referring to the leading style in which the director tests the validity of a scene directly: the actor's body signals inform him on the spot about the feasibility of the situation and the probability of building the character. In this case, since the existence of the character can be created out of his own being through the directorial conception the actor does not need to produce a rigorously defined, illusory form of the stage character. Given the collective base of the character and the actor, he can avoid having to wear an aversive existence and establish a real connexion with the stage character. And this is, in fact the essence of an adequate distribution.

In the repertoire theatre environment where the actor has no influence on the distribution, the role-building often remains unaccomplished because of the impossibility to form a common base with the character along the directorial conception: the actor lacks the necessary foundation and the excessively rigorous directorial conception does not involve the alternative role-building, originated in the actor's being. There is no multilateral actor who can accomplish a role-building utopia without a director's conception on situation- and role-building. To the degree in which the director consciously chooses an actor for a specific role he has a chance to find the base necessary to the role in the actor during improvisation. It is likely that he will need to modify his conception en route but, working together they can achieve a valid role-building that is different from the one the director imagined (before rehearsals). This method proves that all roles exist in the actor.

In the creation process at a repertoire theatre, if he loses his co-creator status the actor can land in the vulnerable situation where he is prevented from achieving his professional possibilities. Rejection, modification, momentary or periodic reform of role-building theories is a rule; yet, this difference in status is traditionally defining to the actor's professional mentality. A real reform of his own world view can only be achieved through a stable existence in a professional environment that is different from the present one, through a significant practice that is determined by a different set of principles. The feasibility of the directorial instruction is guaranteed by a truly submissive actor's execution of it, using his possibilities at that time. In this sense the actor's ideal working

disposition is an active and immediate experiment-oriented, judgement-free attitude that can enrich the acting experience with apparently unreal, yet accomplishable impulses.

Although the whole preparation of a performance is defined by the actor's attitude towards work and his communication with the director, the necessities of the dress rehearsal period are more influenced by other aspects, like flows of organizing in the theatre. Analyzing utopic situations is counterproductive at any stage in theatrical creation: what should be and how it should be in order for the artist to work in an ideal state. It is paradoxical that in the most illusory profession, that of the actors' the optimal execution is achieved by relating to an absolute, almost trivial reality and the alternatives of the present moment using the habit of determined focusing on necessities. In the actor's experience, defined by the characteristics of the repertoire theatre, „jumping in” for a role is the most relevant situation in creating a routine that leads to forming the actor's habit to do adequate and goal-oriented work. Out of the total rehearsal period (6 weeks) the actor only needs a short time (a few days) to complete his role-building.

The essence of an actor's work in a repertoire theatre is to function on his spot in the construction of the performance, in a position and way to exist defined by the director; this is his primary role.

I can definitely put forth that, although in our theatrical practice the foundation for constructing a performance and of role-building is the dramatic text, in the last few years there were several productions based on the actors' experience, off-stage empiric knowledge and improvisation. Our experiments in Târgu-Mureş, labelled as documentarist theatre are defined by the fact that, beyond writing the dramatic text and the documentation necessary to the construction of the performance, the actor's experience and improvisation were used as primary elements. The next chapter discusses the aspects of the actor's work in this situation.

In our practice valid acting work can be accomplished by knowing the theme (situation) and depending on the necessities of the construction (the goal achieved through role-building), while the actor's preconceptions about the theme are irrelevant. From this viewpoint the actor's construction is the same as in any other role-building process or improvisation.

In the reproduction of one's own experience the concept of on-stage efficiency gradually replaces the principle of exact recalling. Using the actor's experiences is a productive method, but during the rehearsal process it must be seen as raw material to be worked over according to the more valid needs of theatricality. It cannot constitute an

organizing principle of the scenes or the text. Which phrase was said in the real-life situation or what psychological state did the situation induce to the person experiencing it: the impulses included in the texture of the performance must be reorganized depending on their on-stage validity. A relevant on-stage construction is only achieved when the creators realize that a valid construction must be based on the rules of the performance and those of the stage. The primary goal is not to exploit the criteria of *truth* and *that's how it happens in real life* but to materialise the moments in a way that make it sound like the *truth* and *that's how it happens in real life*; it is not about the actor experiencing the problem but giving the viewer the chance to experience it through construction. In this sense the actor's experience is only important in bringing the experience to the surface, while it is negligible during performances. The construction of on-stage acting can only be a guaranty if the effect-producing mechanisms are imposed upon it; this is exclusively a question of professionalism and has nothing to do with the actor's experiencing, the traumatizing theme, sensitivities towards the problem or the methods of solving the tension. It is not the actor's opinion on the theme that is defining but achieving the impulses derived from necessities, like maintaining the dynamics of the scenes, constructing characters that are different from the actor's civilian habits and so on. The actor must assume and finalize these roles while his position on the problematics of a documentarist performance (rooted in his habits and personal ideology) is irrelevant.

After completing the documentation for a performance in preparation it is beneficial if the construction involves improvisation; the success of the improvisatory moments depends on *what and how much does the actor know about the theme*. And this is how we return to the instance of identifying the situation-goal configuration, based on empiric knowledge; though it can constitute the focal point of the actor's creativity and reactivity, does not depend on his direct experience.

The axiom: everything the theatre touches turns to theatre is relevant for documentarist theatre as well; that is how we must view everything we see on stage. Even more relevant from the creator's perspective is that the rules of the theatre exclusively define everything that happens on stage; it is the only context that makes everything functional and valid.

Beyond choosing a theme, documentarist theatre (and not only) brings the possibility to break taboos through the scenic construction techniques used by the creators. Compared to the classical theatre performances, the ones using fictionalized facts are more ordained to maintain the possibility to break taboos. However, achieving this phenomenon

depends exclusively on the creators' ability to convert the valid idea into valid stage language needed to break a taboo.

During performances the experience made likely according to the actor's cognition activates the emotions he will gradually exploit based on theatrical rules. However, while *experiencing* the stage situation, it is knowing the behaviour to be made likely, as well as possible and applying the adequate mechanism to produce the effect define the on-stage validity, not transfiguration or intensity. The process can involve intense emotions on the actor's part but those are not the essence of the impulse.

A thorny issue in the documentarist (again: not only) work process is that healing individual or social trauma can only be an indirect goal: this is neither psychotherapy nor dramatic pedagogy, it is theatre. In any context of genre involving the actor's professional work, he can only indirectly apply this therapeutic goal to himself; it cannot be the primary objective of his activity. In attaining the construction of a documentarist performance, in the first step the actor's goal is to reconstruct his personal memories and experiencing, then activate his acting reflexes developed by tradition; shaping a character during rehearsals can move towards a relative polarisation, towards an emphasis on traits and impulses that will be important in the context of the performance. Role-building moves in the same way towards fiction in documentarist performances, making the character's behaviour in the context of the basic problematics more evident, more intelligible.

In both, classical and documentarist theatre performances „there must be a basic idea, then millions of overlapping ideas to comment or question it”¹³. The basic conception of the performance can be nailed down in a simple sentence, the guiding idea that constructed the directorial conception, maintained the coherence of the *mise en scène*, created the performance. Every element of the performance, every scene, every moment of acting must relate to the basic problematics, even by counterpointing it.

In constructing a documentarist performance where the actor's experience and improvisation make up the primary requisites for the rehearsal, the common thinking between actor and director on the conception of role-building can result in a lucky professional constellation, similar to the premise of an adequate distribution: the author-director creates a stage character based on the actor and this special situation gives the actor the possibility for valid role-building.

¹³ Robert Wilson: *Testtel hallani, testtel beszélni* (Body-hearing, Body-speech). Transl. Kiss Gabriella. *Theatron*, 1998. winter, 70.

Every second while on stage the actor carries the identity of the stage character, even when the *mise en scène* does not intentionally put him in this position: “through the simple fact that he’s being watched he seems to represent someone or something”¹⁴. The constructions of documentarist performances discussed in the dissertation consciously avoid to open a gap between actor and stage character, approaching this boundary from a permeable angle: the actors tell their own stories and the created situation often willingly puts an equal sign or a question mark between actor and character.

For the validity of the necessary improvisations in rehearsing a documentarist performance or of other genres the actor must have the same attitude: to own the problematics. In a documentarist theatre improvisation with a personal touch this is an absolute possibility; it is rare with both genres. However, from the perspective of the creation process, the actor must be able to activate his personal touch regarding any problematics. In the documentarist genre the actor’s personal story can be an impediment to representation. Since the frequent representation of the performance moves the process towards a lessening of the personal touch, the actor must go through the experience of depersonalizing his personal story to himself, he must reverse the process. When playing a scene that is not constructed from a personal story he creates a modified relationship with the problematic moment, in order to activate his internal relating. He cannot do it differently in the documentarist theatre either: he drifts away from his story in order to relate to it as he does to any problem to be represented. Through work the personal story loses its special status. This moment can occur in rehearsal, when the actor changes his internal relation to his own story but the moment does not get degraded in terms of on-stage validity.

Despite the differences in the role-building process, finality in a documentarist performance must be the same as in any creative work of an actor: through improvisation he must add his personal problematics to the texture of the performance, then he must take distance from it. Beyond this step, the problematics works as the actor’s task, it becomes Lear’s problem, Richard III.’s, Nora’s or Anna Petrovna’s problem. This way, the process of including, through the actor’s relating the sentimental experience in the performance creates a special situation: while in other genres, for the actor the rehearsal means getting closer to the character/bringing the character closer to himself, in the documentarist

¹⁴ Eugenio Barba: *Papirkenu (The Paper Canoe)*. op. cit. 28.

theatre, if a trauma of the actor appears in the performance, he must take distance from it during work.

The last chapter of the dissertation examines the problematics of changing the language and the phenomena it causes in the actor's work. Having to give up playing in his mother tongue can lead to the collapse of the actor's elementary sense of security. Eliminating his mother tongue from his set of expressive tools can be compared to the situation when the actor is forced into partial immobility, inactivity, reduced to a limited use of his facial expression and gestures, denied eye contact, in other words: we block the tools and channels that enable him to pass on information. In the beginning of the rehearsal process, playing in another language pushes the actor toward a more intense interpretation of the stage situation and the character's attitude, to a livelier gesturing and facial expression. Although an opportunity for bravado, changing the language can be a serious disadvantage for the actor. We do not even need to think in terms of text centered theatre to realize that he experiences (even subconsciously) the disappearance of the full possession of one of his most important instruments as a loss.

When changing the language, even if he knows and speaks the other language well, the actor experiences the narrowing of his communications channel: he understands the meaning of the words only mentally but not viscerally, as does his mother tongue. When speaking in one's mother tongue, besides the object of the speech the quality of it plays an important role: the speaker masters the language, the channel and the practice of speech causes no problems at all. When changing the language, the actor loses the safety of a quality speech, which causes compensating processes in his acting behaviour; the on-stage projection of these leads to some special phenomena. Unsure of the weight of his words, he strongly mobilizes his other means of expression. In a first step he intensifies his situation play to strengthen his intentions; to achieve this goal he emphasises his basic attitude: fear, anxiousness, rage, all held up by lively gesturing and facial expression. Both the object and the process of his communication are enlarged and fragmented; in an effort to pass on information he tries to make the object more palatable to the receiver (partner, viewer). He is creating this phenomenon for himself, actually, making sure of the fact of communication. He will only be able to open up and collaborate with his partner in the second step, after accomplishing and owning the situation mentioned earlier. Only at a later stage (often in full performance) will he be able to moderate his compensation process caused by switching to another language.

The rehearsal process or multiple performances usually solve the problem of the actor's sense of security: his psyche accepts and passes by the handicap of changing the language, limits the compensating phenomena keeping them from dominating the acting, allowing the language, the bearer of ideas to fulfill its specific role in the actor's perception. The invalid emphasis on the situation-goal centered playing (and implicitly the attitude, gesturing, facial expression) stops being a necessity, making a stable, moderate to become possible through the actor's internal control as well. With the necessary stage practice his verbality becomes sufficient to re-create itself and the acting gains back its normal parameters, previous to the language switch, eliminating the actor's need to compensate through means other than language to establish communication.

To the degree in which switching languages is justified and manifested by the *mise en scène*, speech palpably remains an instrument of acting, one that stays in a strengthened, accentuated register, and this is the on-stage goal. The actor's playing changes in the same manner when he switches to a language entirely unknown to him; regulating during the work process is impossible because passing on meaning cannot be achieved with a sense of security. As a result, using speech as instrument, compensated by extra-verbal means remain permanent in the actor's play.

In a given linguistic environment the actor's unusual accent becomes a signal. Not speaking or speaking poorly the language of his entourage (partners, audience) gains extra significance in performance, surpasses the person-who-doesn't-speak-the-language status. By switching to another language the musicality of the speech will gain a more important role as well.

The conclusions of my research can be formulated this way: although the education and playing tradition crucially determine professional mentality and the actor's work moral, he must do his work in such manner that, even in the repertoire theatre's environment he can focus all his knowledge and will on creating the possibilities of a quality work through surpassing his own points of resistance. During rehearsal, by disconnecting his conscious planning and maintaining his consciousness in the present, he can reach an ideal working disposition, while in performance, using the mechanisms of producing effect according to the parameters defined by the rules of scenic validity he can accomplish valid acting work. On stage, the actor's sentimental reality, his consciously controlled technique, the precisely identified situation-goal configuration, knowledge, ideas, opinions, faith etc. are exclusively equal with a movement or response produced by

the actor's body and perceivable by both stage partners and audience. The actor's quality work is, in fact the valid on-stage conversion of a valid idea.

During performance construction and role-building, through continuous offers, the actor must create situations that bring his common base with the role to the surface for himself, his partners and the director, to make it evident that the role exists in him. In rehearsal, the actor must influence the director and his stage partners, in order for his practical offers to be taken as an alternative for the construction. Though the actor can benefit from the possibility to materialise his ambitions in the context of the performance and along the directorial conception, in an opposite situation those ambitions cannot be legitimized. His offer must fit into the director's conception or modify the conception through the director, in order to legitimize his character and acting offer, ie to bring on-stage validity to the character and his work.

The actor can only establish a real relationship with the character on a common, identical emotional and empiric, collective, direct or indirect base. However, the success of role-building in a given scenic construction depends on the validity of the actor's on-stage existence in the context of the representation of a fictive character, of an adequate professional mentality and the effect producing mechanisms between actor and actor and actor and viewer. In conclusion, according to theatrical rules, only the construction of the performance and the role-building are valid, nothing else is.

Bibliography

- Almási Miklós: *Mi lesz velünk, Anton Pavlovics?* Budapest, Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1985.
- Arisztotelész: *Poétika*. Transl. Sarkady János. Bukarest, Irodalmi Könyvkiadó, 1969.
- Artaud, Antonin: *A színház és az istenek*. Transl. Betlen János, Fekete Valéria et al. Budapest, Orpheusz Kiadó, 1999.
- Assmann, Jan: *A kulturális emlékezet*. Transl. Hidas Zoltán. Budapest, Atlantisz Könyvkiadó, 2004.
- Bakk-Miklósi Kinga: *Kétnyelvűvé válásunk útjain*. Kolozsvár, Ábel Kiadó, 2009.
- Banu, Georges: *A felügyelt színpad*. Transl. Koros Fekete Sándor. Kolozsvár, Koinónia Kiadó, 2007.
- Banu, Georges: *Szeretni és nem szeretni a színházat*. Transl. Székely Melinda. Kolozsvár, Koinónia Kiadó, 2013.
- Banu, Georges: *Színházunk, a Cseresznyés kert*. Transl. Koros Fekete Sándor. Kolozsvár, Koinónia Kiadó, 2006.
- Barba, Eugenio: *Papírkenu*. Transl. Andó Gabriella, Demcsák Katalin. Budapest, Kijárat Kiadó, 2001.
- Bergson, Henri: *A nevetés*. Transl. Szávai Nándor. Bukarest, Kriterion Könyvkiadó, 1992.
- Birkenbihl, Vera F.: *Testbeszéd*. Transl. Nagy Imre, Zádor László. Budapest, Trivium Kiadó, 2001.
- Boros Kinga: *Kényelmetlen színház. Politikusság napjaink román és magyar színházában*, Dissertation. Marosvásárhely, Marosvásárhelyi Művészeti Egyetem, 2014.
- Brecht, Bertolt: *Színházi tanulmányok*. Transl. Eörsi István, Imre Katalin et al. Budapest, Magvető Kiadó, 1969.
- Brook, Peter: *Az üres tér*. Transl. Koós Anna. Budapest, Európa Könyvkiadó, 1999.
- Brook, Peter: *Változó nézőpont*. Transl. Dobos Mária. Budapest, Orpheusz Könyvkiadó – Zugszínház, 2000.
- Cărbunariu, Gianina: *Regizorul – Dramaturg (Rendező – dramaturg)*, Dissertation. Bukarest, Universitatea Națională de Artă Teatrală și Cinematografică "Ion Luca Caragiale", 2011.

Cohen, Robert: *A színészmesterség alapjai*. Transl. Márton András. Pécs, Jelenkor Kiadó, 1998.

Cojar, Ion: *Színművészeti poétika*. Transl. Albert Mária. Marosvásárhely, Színművészeti Egyetem Kiadó, 2006.

Csehov: *Drámák és elbeszélések. Három nővér*. Transl. Kosztolányi Dezső. Budapest, Európa Könyvkiadó, 1998.

Csehov, Mihail: *A színészhez*. Transl. Honti Katalin. Budapest, Polgár Kiadó, 1997.

Diderot, Denis: *Színészparadoxon. A drámaköltészetéről*. Transl. Görög Livia. Budapest, Magyar Helikon, 1966.

Efrosz, Anatolij: *Szerelmem, a próba*. Transl. Szekeres Zsuzsa, Neumark Anna. Budapest, Színháztudományi Intézet, 1981.

Féral, Josette: *Íntálniri cu Ariane Mnouchkine (Találkozások Ariane Mnouchkine-nal)*. Transl. Raluca Vida. Nagyvárad, Artspect Kiadó, 2009.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *A dráma története*. Transl. Kiss Gabriella. Pécs, Jelenkor Kiadó, 2001.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika: *A performativitás esztétikája*. Transl. Kiss Gabriella. Budapest, Balassi Kiadó, 2009.

Fodor László, Göndör András (editor) et al: *A kommunikáció alapjai*. Budapest, Perfekt Kiadó, 2006.

Georgescu, Bogdan: *Teatrul comunitar și arta activă (A közösségi színház és az aktív művészet)*, Dissertation. Bukarest, Universitatea Națională de Artă Teatrală și Cinematografică "Ion Luca Caragiale", 2013.

Griffin, Em: *Bevezetés a kommunikációelméletbe*. Transl. Szigeti L. László. Budapest, Harmat Kiadó, 2001.

Grotowski, Jerzy: *Színház és rituálé*. Transl. Pályi András. Pozsony, Kalligram Kiadó, 2009.

Háy János: *A Gézagyerek*. Budapest, Palatinus Kiadó, 2005.

Hull, S. Lorraine: *Színészmesterség mindenkinek*. Transl. Pavlov Anna. Budapest, Tericum Kiadó, 1999.

Johnston, Keith: *Impro*. Transl. Honti Katalin. Tatabánya, Közművelődés Háza, 1993.

Jouvet, Louis: *A testét vesztett színész*. Transl. Bereczki Péter, Lombár Izabella, Matyelka Tímea. Budapest, Kijarat Kiadó, 2005.

Kékesi Kun Árpád: *A rendezés színháza*. Budapest, Osiris, 2007.

- Koppett, Kat: *Training to imagine (Képezni a képzeletet)*. Stylus Publishing, LLC, 2001.
- Kott, Jan: *A lehetetlen színház vége*. Transl. Balogh Géza, Cservenits Jolán et al. Budapest, Országos Színháztörténeti Múzeum és Intézet, 1997.
- Lehmann, Hans-Thies: *Posztdramatikus színház*. Transl. Kricsfalusi Beatrix, Berecz Zsuzsa, Schein Gábor. Budapest, Balassi Kiadó, 2009.
- Magyar Bálint: *A Vígszínház története*. Budapest, Szépirodalmi Kiadó, 1979.
- Măniuțiu, Mihai: *Aktus és utánczás*. Transl. Zsigmond Andrea. Kolozsvár, Koinónia Kiadó, 2006.
- Moreno, J. L.: *Scieri fundamentale. despre psihodramă, metoda de grup și spontaneitate (Alapvető írások. a pszichodramáról, csoportmódszerről és spontaneitásról)*. Transl. Ioana Maria Novac. Bukarest, Trei Kiadó, 2009.
- Pavis, Patrice: *Előadáselemzés*. Transl. Jákfalvi Magdolna. Budapest, Balassi Kiadó, 2003.
- Ruszt József: *Színészdramaturgia – A Színitanoda*. Zalaegerszeg, Hevesi Sándor Színház, 2010.
- Șerban, Andrei: *Életrajz*. Transl. Koros-Fekete Sándor. Kolozsvár, Koinónia Kiadó, 2010.
- Spiró György: *Shakespeare szerepösszevonásai*. Budapest, Európa Könyvkiadó, 1997.
- Strehler, Giorgio: *Az emberi színházért*. Transl. Kardos Gitta, Lajos Mária, Schéry András. Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 1982.
- Sztanyiszlavszkij, K. Sz.: *A színész munkája. Egy színinövendék naplója I-II*. Transl. Morcsányi Géza. Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 1988.
- Sztanyiszlavszkij, K. Sz.: *Életem a művészetben*. Transl. Gellért György. Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó, 1967.
- Terestyéni Tamás: *Kommunikációelmélet*. Budapest, Akti-Tipotex Kiadó. 2006.
- Tompa Gábor: *A hűtlen színház*. Bukarest, Kriterion Könyvkiadó, 1987.
- Zinder, David: *Test – hang – képzelet*. Transl. Hatházi András. Kolozsvár, Koinónia Kiadó, 2009.

Newspaper articles:

Balassa Péter: „Dolgozni, dolgozni!”? A munka Csehov négy darabjában. *Színház*, 1993. July, 34-38.

Cărbunariu, Gianina: X mm din Y km – Despre o posibilă arhivă performativă (X mm az Y km-ből – Egy lehetséges performatív archívumról). *Scena.ro*, nr. 17., 2012/1., 30-34.

Craig, Edward Gordon: A színész és az übermarionette. Transl. Szántó Judit. *Színház*, 1994. September, 34-45.

Ostermeier, Thomas: E timpul să dăm înapoi actorilor puterea, iar ei să o conștientizeze (Itt az idő, hogy visszadjuk a színész erejét, ők pedig tudatosítsák ezt), interview by Pompilius Onofrei. *Scena.ro*, nr. 28., 2015/1., 4-8.

Pavis, Patrice: A lapról a színpadra. Transl. Sipócz Mariann. *Theatron*, 2000. summer-autumn, 93-105.

Piscator, Erwin: A politikai színház. Transl. Gál M. Zsuzsa. *Korszerű színház*, 56-57. Budapest, Színháztudományi Intézet, 1963.

P. Müller Péter: Tér és dráma. *Theatron*, 1998. winter, 28-30.

Siegmund, Gerald: A színház mint emlékezet. Transl. Kékesi Kun Árpád. *Theatron*, 1999. spring, 36-39.

Szabó Attila, Tompa Andrea (editor): Újrahasznosított valóság a színpadon. Dokumentarista láttelek Közép-Kelet-Európából és a nagyvilágból. Transl. Szabó Attila. *Színház* (annex), 2012. November.

Wilson, Robert: Testtel gondolkodni. Transl. Kékesi Kun Árpád. *Theatron*, 1998. winter, 71-72.

Wilson, Robert: Testtel hallani, testtel beszélni. Transl. Kiss Gabriella. *Theatron*, 1998. winter, 69-70.

Websites and other online references:

Bilciu, Crista: 57 de idei răzlete despre teatrul lui Bob Wilson, adunate pe marginea repetițiilor la „Rinocerii” (57 egyedülálló gondolat Bob Wilson színházáról, a Rinocéroszok próbáin gyűjtve). <http://yorick.ro/57-de-idei-razlete-despre-teatrul-lui-bob-wilson-adunate-pe-marginea-repetitiilor-la-rinocerii/>. Downloaded: 2015. 07. 03.

Cărbunariu, Gianina: Bonele filipineze suntem noi (A Fülöp-szigeteki nevelők mi vagyunk), interview by Iulia Popovici. http://www.observatorcultural.ro/TEATRU.-Bonele-filipineze-sintem-noi*articleID_28854-articles_details.html. Downloaded: 2015. 07. 28.

Cărbunariu, Gianina: Fac teatru pentru cei care nu cred în teatru (Azoknak csinálók színházat, akik nem hisznek a színházban), interview by Dana Ionescu. <http://yorick.ro/gianina-carbunariu-fac-teatru-pentru-cei-care-nu-cred-in-teatru/>. Downloaded: 2014. 09. 10.

Déres Kornélia: Múltba ragadva? <http://ujnautilus.info/multba-ragadva1>. Downloaded: 2014. 05. 09.

Ionescu, Dana: Thomas Ostermeier în 10 gânduri despre teatru (Thomas Ostermeier 10 gondolatban a színházról). <http://yorick.ro/thomas-ostermeier-in-10-ganduri-despre-teatru/>. Downloaded: 2015. 08. 18.

Jászay Tamás: Az arany ára. http://www.revizoronline.com/hu/cikk/2922/gianina-crbunariu-verespatak-fizikai-es-politikai-vonalon-kolozsvari-allami-magyar-szinhaz/?label_id=2510&first=0. Downloaded: 2012. 06. 01.

Keresztes Franciska: Double Bind. <http://www.nemzetiszhaz.ro/eloadasok/uj-bemutatok/spect/double-bind.html>. Downloaded: 2015. 08. 28.

Keresztes Franciska: Dupla interjú a Double Bind előadás szerzőivel. <http://www.nemzetiszhaz.ro/eloadasok/uj-bemutatok/spect/double-bind.html>. Downloaded: 2015. 08. 28.

Măniuțiu, Mihai: Euripidész – Médeia. http://www.tamasitheatre.ro/hu/21.html?eloadas_id=1767. Downloaded: 2013. 11. 30.

Papp Tímea: Ma már csak emlék? http://www.revizoronline.com/hu/cikk/1977/20-20-yorick-studio-marosvasarhely-dramacum-bukarest-kdf-2009-poszt-2010-kisvarda-2010-dunapart-platform-2011/?label_id=2510&first=0. Downloaded: 2012. 06. 01.

Rockwell, John: Staging Painterly Visions (Festői látomások színrevitele). <http://www.nytimes.com/1992/11/15/magazine/staging-painterly-visions.html>. Downloaded: 2015. 08. 19.

Rusu, Mircea Sorin: Punct triplu. Umanitate. Etnie. Documentare (Hámaspont. Emberiesség. Etnikum. Dokumentálás). http://www.observatorcultural.ro/Punct-triplu.-Umanitate.-Etnie.-Documentare*articleID_29316-articles_details.html. Downloaded: 2014. 09. 10.

Sepsiszentgyörgyi Tamási Áron Színház: Szophoklész – Antigoné.
http://www.tamasitheatre.ro/hu/21.html?eloadas_id=759. Downloaded: 2013. 11. 30.

Teatrul azi: Spectacol de Gianina Cărbunariu la Târgu-Mureș (Gianina Cărbunariu előadás Marosvásárhelyen). <http://www.teatrul-azi.ro/teatru-opera-dans/spectacol-de-gianina-carbunariu-la-targu-mures>. Downloaded: 2014. 05. 09.

Ziarul de duminică: Martie negru în 18 scene (Fekete március 18 jelenetben).
<http://www.zf.ro/ziarul-de-duminica/martie-negru-in-18-scene-de-ziarul-de-duminica-9543872/>. Downloaded: 2015. 09. 06.