

*The Actor Lost in Translation?
Competence vs. Presence in the Teacher-Director's Stage
Directions*

FILIP ODANGIU¹

Abstract: This article carries on a research approach started years ago by the author, investigating the necessary conditions for producing a creative environment, favorable for the development of the actor in the acting school. Aspects of the relation between the teacher-director with the student-actor are discussed, and a series of possible interacting means and effects of the orality between the two are revealed.

Keywords: actor training, directing, teaching art, stage directions, sidecoaching, shadowing, feedback loop, rehearsal, communication, status

On court coaching

Without being a very competent and assiduous fan of tennis matches - whose prevalence, in the general interest, seems to be replacing the traditional hegemony of football in recent years - there is a particular aspect of the game that captivates me, something which I watch for every game I see: the moment in the competition when a player, facing a difficulty, calls his coach from the platform to help him out of the stalemate.² The coach has only a minute or two to mobilize the player. In several whispered, often monologous

1. Faculty of Theatre and Film, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania. filip.odangiu@ubbcluj.ro

2. The "court coaching" procedure, adopted and accepted only in some competitions since 2009, provides that tennis players are allowed to talk with coaches during breaks between games.

words, the coach sums up objectively the situation on the court, amends uninspired playing decisions or motivates the player. Almost every time the player's game improves.

As a coach/ teacher of actors, I can only be fascinated by the effectiveness of this minimal interaction between the "actor" on the tennis court and the "director of his game". Often, indications do not concern the technique, but are rather stimulus for self-reflecting such as "play what your tennis", "relax" etc.

The person in front of us is and will always remain a mystery. We can never comprehend or predict, with absolute certainty, the effect our verbal and non-verbal signals will have on the Other. The more enigmatic is the effect of our actions when we try to change the Other. The teacher, as well as the director, is seen as a "guide in the darkness" (Peter Brook), a "fisherman" (Robert Cohen), a "fountain master" (Charle Dullin), or a "hunted-hunter" (David Zinder). These metaphors share the same idea: confrontation with the Unknown, the relationship with an unpredictable "target". Actor's pedagogy, as well as directing, involves the initiation or modification of behaviors of an individual towards another individual. Someone, "someone else", wants to change what you're doing. Resistance is a natural response in such a situation. As any learning situation implies an initial resilience of the subject, there are different techniques to address this problem. The famous reformer of theatrical pedagogy, Viola Spolin, suggests that the student-actor cannot be "put in motion" but by his/her very nature. He/she will not respond to manipulation: "To transform or alter an object requires total absorption without meddling." In conclusion, the author of *Improvisation for the Theater* urges the teacher: "Let it happen! Stay out of it!"³

The teacher's art and the art of the director. Correspondences and delimitation

The condition of the acting teacher is, as Viola Spolin wrote, a dichotomous one, the teacher being moreover a "teacher-director", as the directors are often pedagogues. We can also place under the sign of dichotomy the specific activity of the two related professions. Two interdependent

3. Viola Spolin, *Improvisation for the Theatre*, 3rd ed. (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1999), 46.

dimensions support them. The first is what could be called *the visionary dimension* - illustrated, in the case of the director, by the fantasy of the future show that haunts him and which he seeks to translate in terms of performance. Similarly, teachers aim to materialize a projection of an ideal model of the student. Each student-actor (as well as each actor in a casting situation) provokes, in the mind of the person who observes and guides him, a vision, an expectation - the teacher sees in his student a superior model, a potential still in a unmanifested state, "the hidden promise" (what the coach sees in some athletes). A second shared aspect of teaching and directing is *the interactive dimension* - the exploration of the way and means of materializing the initial "vision". As the well-known Romanian theatre specialist George Banu notes, communication - through oral and even direct physical activity of the director - is the basis of the meeting with the actor: "Orality - here is the destiny of the theater director! It can flood, drowning in the waves the actor, or it can be stingy, reduced to a few words. It may invade or perhaps almost disappear, but repetition outside of this orality, prior to any exchange, does not exist."⁴ (...) or "Any theater director produces and develops a physical activity (...) that conveys a secret energy that contaminates the team."⁵

The act of communication with the actor, beginner or advanced, takes place by virtue of that ideal pattern designed on him and which the teacher-director tries to bring him closer to. But if one looks closer it may find several possible differences: while, for the director, the referential "dreamt" model is the "character", for the acting teacher, the reference is the future artist. Despite the many resemblances, the fundamental purpose also seems to be different and, as a result, the means of approach must be distinct. Constrained by a contract to open a show within the time agreed with the producer, the director is working toward a certain type of response or - even if it sounds harsh - a "product". The acting teacher, instead, is about triggering a *psychophysical process*, setting up an *ethos*, a professional and artistic behavior. It is crucial *what*, and especially *how* we communicate with a beginner in order to stimulate him/her to "grow", to fulfill him/her "hidden promise".

4. George Banu, *Dincolo de rol sau actorul nesupus. Miniaturi teoretice, portrete, schițe* (Bucharest: Nemira, 2008), 162.

5. Banu, 168.

The methods of working with the actor have grown and developed steadily with the twentieth century so that Eugenio Barba rightly regards it as a phenomenon of modern history of the theater. Appearing with Stanislavski's research, the phenomenon has led to the unprecedented proliferation of studios, laboratories and, implicitly, methods of experimentation and theatrical training to this day. The tendency suggests some degree of autonomy of the practice or the actor's training towards the study of preparing a role for a show. The idea behind and generating this current is that exercises have begun to be considered as a set of practices necessary for the transformation of the actor's *daily body-spirit* into a *stage-body-spirit*.⁶

Obviously, these mutations have led to a reconsideration of the relationship between the teacher-director and the actor. Starting from the premise that the director's work with the actors inherently contains a pedagogical component, George Banu, in the issue no. 70-71 of the magazine *Alternatives Théâtrales* - dedicated to the theatrical pedagogy -, made a typological classification of the theater directors. Thus, according to Banu's view, one can distinguish two types of theatrical personalities: the "master", associated to the model of the oriental guru, and "the conceptual teacher" ("le penseur de l'enseignement"), the master's Western counterpart, each operating differently.⁷ The features of the two types, highlighted by George Banu, can be systematized as follows: in case of the "master", the experience is transmitted vertically in one way. The Master establishes himself as a model. He does not practice a pedagogy necessarily assumed and preaches certainty. The conceptual teacher, on the other hand, creates contexts and experiences that transform both the student and the teacher. The teacher, as a "guide in obscurity" (according to Peter Brook's formula), admits that he is no different from his students than by the degree of advancement in the territory of the Unknown. The teacher articulates his/her approach to a logic of the *process* and is always interested in the origins of creation, the creator and the conditions of maintaining creativity. He is concerned about the (re) birth of

6. The finding belongs to Eugenio Barba and appears in the chapter "The drifting of the exercises" in *O canoe de hârtie. Tratat de antropologie teatrală*, Editura Unitext, București, 2003, p. 165-171.

7. George Banu, "Les Penseurs de l'enseignement," *Alternatives Théâtrales*, no. 70-71 (2002): 2-4.

the artist in a student, but this process is not a one-sided process. The re-birth effort leaves traces both in student and teacher. Redefining the position of the teacher makes Keith Johnstone, one of the most authoritative voices in the improvisation technique, to proclaim the need for the acting professor to act as an “expert of the status”, turning off the traditional role of prescriptive and judiciary⁸. He/she becomes a “partner-player” (V. Spolin), facilitator / “witness” (Anatoly Vassiliev), of his/her student development.

Aspects of communication in rehearsals and training

How do you communicate with your student when you are his/her partner? How do you tell him that his/her answer is sometimes wrong and that he/she must try again and again, on new paths? How do you define the mistake? What are you reporting? To his own artistic experience, raised to the rank of general norm? Theoretical precepts? Are you a teacher or rather a director? Orality, remarks George Banu, is also defined by the intervention power of the stage directions, so far, it can become the main resort of of mutations: finding other words is to suggest to actors other tasks that have been inaccessible to them until then.⁹ Each student, says Viola Spolin, is a separate “development center”. Consequently, the pedagogical discourse is required to be tailored to individual needs of individuals and balanced between the indications given to the ensemble and those aimed at individuals. Possible solutions to these problems come from the current “Creative drama”, where a relationship is proposed between the assessment of the student's progress (assessment) and the evaluation of the effectiveness of pedagogical action.

Throughout the work together, the teacher-director and student-actor are constantly engaged in a feedback loop (as stated by the American pedagogue and director Robert Cohen), in which *observer and observed* hypostases are relative and interchangeable. Both are alternately and simultaneously positioned as *observed observer* and *observer observed*. The director watches what the actor does, but also the actor, during the interpretation of his role, is noting the

8. Keith Johnstone, *Impro. Improvizația Și Teatrul* (Bucharest: Tracus Arte, 2014), 41.

9. Banu, Dincolo de rol sau actorul nesupus. *Miniaturi teoretice, portrete, schițe*, 164.

director's reactions in order to meet his expectations.¹⁰ In the theater school, this dual conditioning has a determining role. The tension of the relationship presupposed by the social situation of learning makes the mutual attention between the two actors involved often reach significant odds. Everything gains importance in this informational exchange, at the verbal level of the discourse and especially at the paraverbal and corporeal level.

When interacting with the student-actor, it seems that having the "vision" is less problematic than to find the ways to share this vision in order to spark off a living reaction, but also to reinforce in the student a certain type of attitude in the theatrical environment, teach him how to *receive* and *use creatively* the stage directions.

We could consider that, during the training/rehearsal, the communication between Observer and Observed, has three forms of manifestation, each with its specificity and determined by their chronological layout during the process of creation. We will have this as follows:

- I. **The *prospective stage direction***, which precedes and guides the act / interpretation, formulated by the teacher-director as a suggestion, exploration theme, task, working hypothesis, direction, desideratum, target etc. George Banu speaks of "Guidelines to root the fiction (...) "¹¹ classifying the directors orality in "**novelistic orality**" - characterized by a continuous discursivity, an abundant accompaniment, an orality driven by formative intentions (as examples, are indicated directors like Patrice Chéreau, Peter Stein and Giorgio Strehler) - and "**poetical orality**", developed through brilliant metaphorical stage directions, a fragmentary, enigmatic and discontinuous orality (the chosen example is Klaus Michael Grüber).¹²

10. In this context, I recommend an excellent doctoral thesis devoted to this subject, Observer and Observed in the casting process. Socio-psychological determinations of the "face-to-face" relationship, a thesis written by Diana Aldea, Faculty of Theater and Film, Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca.

11. Banu, *Dincolo de rol sau actorul nesupus. Miniaturi teoretice, portrete, schițe*, 164.

12. Banu, 163.

- II. **The simultaneous stage direction** - the famous “sidecoaching” or “shadowing” (Viola Spolin), which involves the teacher / director's intervention simultaneously with and parallel to the stage action through a stream of whispers in the actor's ear, or from the sides, without the actors interrupting their playing. In this situation, the teacher / director himself undergoes a transformation, being forced to live at the same level of energy or even higher than the actor, in order to be able to adjust the interpretation. Tadeusz Kantor, the director – conductor, acting among the actors, is the emblematic example. Interruption of the scene by the teacher-director and the demand to resume parts of variable length, sometimes even one word, although it is a frequent method, is an event that fractures the actor’s interpretation and is one of the most problematic aspects of the interaction between the teacher-director and actors. While, for some actors, interruption act as an inhibitor, for others may be stimulating. The decision to interrupt the play, requires responsibility, depends on the professional experience of the director, the knowledge of the actors and the stage of work.
- III. **The subsequent feedback** – known as the “debriefing” or “discussion” is a mandatory step in the act of forming the actor, the epilogue of each exercise, rehearsal or show. This retrospective analysis, meant to enhance the quality of future interpretations, is of crucial importance in forming the actor's self-monitoring mechanisms. Often, actors at the beginning of their career, accustomed to such assessment, develop a form of addiction to it, and are disconcerted when it is lacking. In the case of castings and auditions, the absence of this kind of reflection is one of the most often cited reasons for frustration of actors. Another interesting point to be made here is that movie actors are apparently less attached to feedback than those working in the theater. In the theater, actors are accustomed to benefiting from both an immediate response from the director / audience (applause, laughter, sigh, tension), and then through subsequent feedback. Asked how he actually felt this difference, the famous film director James Cameron confessed,

Yes, it took me a long time to realize that [for these actors] you have to give the 'Atta boys'. But you can't go too far because if you do, no one will believe what you're saying. The second I say, 'Cut', is when my work begins. We've just done a take, now what worked and what didn't work? The first thing to say to the actor is, 'What did you think about that?' never, 'Oh baby, that was great!' because after a week of that, nobody's going to believe a damned thing you say.¹³

As Stephen Nachmanovitch, a well-known jazz musician - author of a book dedicated to improvisation¹⁴- put it, feedback may be *constructive*, based on "what worked", "what should be developed / avoided", making positive predictions, or obstructive – the well-known "criticism" - focused on errors, confusions, and making negative predictions. The first type of evaluation advances simultaneously with the time of creation, in a parallel flow of consciousness facilitating action, the second is interposed as a perpendicular line on the axis of creation.¹⁵ Both evaluation methods have advantages and limitations of effectiveness. There are student actors who respond better to one or other of the methods, but also situations where either one or the other approaches can become operational.

The information content of the stage direction and its emotional effect

One cannot deny the stimulating or destabilizing potential of feedback. On the other hand, the value of the stage directions is not an intrinsic one, it cannot be detached from the situation and purpose of the value-judgement emitter. For the feedback receiver, the information has a strong emotional impact almost always, so it's useful for actors to be trained to handle this circumstance correctly.

13. Karen Kondazian, *The Actor's Encyclopedia of Casting Directors* (Hollywood: Lone Eagle Publishing Company, 1999), 449.

14. Stephen Nachmanovitch, *Free Play: Improvisation in Life and Art* (New York: Penguin-Tarcher, 1990).

15. Nachmanovitch, 134.

The way in which students learn to take over and apply a stage direction or a critique is of paramount importance in their artistic development and in the configuration of their future communication attitude during rehearsals. The ideal desideratum is that of a *creative actor-director partnership* in which the two engage, in a spiral of *improvisational offers and counteroffers*. In many cases, however, this model proves to be a utopia. Repetition or show seem all too often to be rather a field of status dispute. The inspired director and theatrical pedagogue Radu Penciulescu once confessed: "At one point, teaching directing has ceased to interest me. Teaching direction is to teach students how to take power."¹⁶

Actors deprived of the power to influence the performance, lacking confidence in their own capacities, may either seem inert, not making proposals, or take "mechanically" the stage direction - to translate it literally without "artistically" digesting it, or to offer an avalanche of irrelevant solutions for the meaning and purpose of the scene. Instead, an inspired stage direction is like a seed in a fertile land, it gives fruit. The response of the talented actor, confident in his own powers as well as in the direction indicated by the director, has the beauty of germination. The highly acclaimed Ukrainian theatre director Andriy Zholdak comes up with a radical perspective on this, talking about the director of the "god of insemination, of fire" who has to enter the "vagina actor", leaving the actor "pregnant"¹⁷. More nuanced than this masculine vision of the relation between the director and the actor, Stephen Nachmanovitch states that:

The work comes from neither one artist nor the other, even though our own idiosyncrasies and styles, the symptoms of our original natures, still exert their natural pull. Nor does the work come from a

16. Radu Penciulescu, "Să predai regia înseamnă să-i înveți pe elevi cum să ia puterea," Yorick, 2017, https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&ei=uAnQXNmBM6WLjLsP9IWKoAg&q=Les+penseurs+de+l%27enseignement+alternatives+theatrale&oq=Les+penseurs+de+l%27enseignement+alternatives+theatrale&gs_l=psy-ab.3.33i16014.4617.9764..9875...0.0..0.184.2842.0j22.....0....1..gws-wiz.....35i302i39.nlqXcGEqNjM.

17. Diana Armăsar and Alina Mazilu, "Matrioșca gigantică: Andriy Zholdak," in *Repetițiile Și Teatrul Reinnoit. Secolul Regiei*, ed. George Banu (Bucharest: Nemira, 2009), 310.

compromise or halfway point (averages are always boring!), but from a third place that isn't necessarily like what either one of us would do individually. What comes is a revelation to both of us.¹⁸

Authentic creation depends to a large extent on the artist's ability to access resources from the subconscious and unconscious. In psychoanalytic therapy, the revelation of truths buried in the underground of the self requires long and careful preparations of the patient, while in rehearsal, often by ignoring the natural mechanisms of self-protection, the actor is required to react "spontaneously" and totally. Self-revelation is a sacrificial act and the actor will be willing to do so as long as he trusts the honesty and professional competence of the person who asks him to completely surrender to his project. Sometimes, during the actor's training period, the teacher-director's unprofessed mental schema is: *I know the "right" solution, I want to lead the student actor there. And then he uses indirect, manipulative means to attain this goal. But one cannot stop to ask oneself how would it be if genuine curiosity and patience will prevent the teacher-director to lead the student-actor directly to the target, letting the later to find and reveal unexpected solutions on his own? What if the teacher would "improvise" with what the actor-student has to offer now and here? Stepen Nachmanovitch, convincingly pleads for an "art of teaching" that requires connection in real time with the living bodies of the students and the living body of knowledge.¹⁹ The musician encourages the teacher: "use your training; refer to it, understand it, ground yourself in it, but don't allow your training to blind you to the actual person who is sitting in front of you. In this way you pass beyond **competence to presence.**"²⁰*

The range of resources and means available to the teacher-director is very varied, ranging from concrete indications to cryptic suggestions, from briefs to extensive theoretical exposures, from questions and heuristic to parental advice. In the extreme and much disputed are the approaches by which the teacher-director takes full control, intervening directly, physically,

18. Nachmanovitch, *Free Play: Improvisation in Life and Art*, 94.

19. Nachmanovitch, 20–21.

20. Nachmanovitch, 20–21.

on the student's body, or by taking temporary the actor's place; when the teacher-director takes over the interpretation and "shows how to do" directly.

George Banu addresses this problem uncompromisingly:

Let's say it from the very beginning: any director, at one moment or another, *shows how to do it*, and thus manifests itself corporally in order to shape a character or to suggest a relationship, either to be imitated, or to help the actor overcome a jam. Then, for a moment, the director acts as a double of the actor. He knows what to do and dares to do it(...) For a long time publicly challenged, especially under the pressure of ideological arguments inspired by the optimism of playwrights or the hopes of "collective creation", the custom that the director "exemplifies" using his own body was charged as a reactionary ... In reality, never really disqualified or finally banished, the method persisted, more or less camouflaged. Today, the director shows again *how to do it*. The famous director Giorgio Strehler serves as the best example.²¹

In the actor's training period, "to show how to do", the traditional method of teaching, frequently used even today, risks, through its authoritarian character, to lead to the emergence of teacher's clones. When teaching acting means transmitting "ready-made" knowledge, the teacher is just a "monkey trainer", warns Jacques Delcuvellerie.²²

Of course, some methods favor concrete indications, physical themes meant to stimulate an emotional response, the *outside-in* path. Others use the opposite technique, like the *inside-out*, by calling to the artist's personal memory, to his imagination, in order to generate forms, expressiveness. But the question that generated this article concerns aspects beyond the method, related to the "directorial" type of stage direction versus "trainer's" stage direction in the first years of the actor's formation, aspects related to the opportunity and effectiveness of one or the other. For example, how extensive and permissible is the use of sensitive information the teacher has about the private person of the student-actor with whom he/she works?

21. Banu, Dincolo de rol sau actorul nesupus. *Miniaturi Teoretice, Portrete*, Schițe, 170.

22. Jacques Delcuvellerie, "Le Jardinier," *Alternatives Théâtrales*, no. 70-71 (2002): 40.

Every teacher-director establishes, from the first meeting, a code of communication with those with whom he will work, and proposes himself in one of the roles mentioned above: master, partner, more experienced colleague, friend, etc. Actors / students must accept this code in order to work with that teacher/director. The stage directions are part of this code, and the type of stage direction preferred by a teacher-director is a brand of his/her personal style. George Banu, aware of the fact that the future working climate depends on this director's communication code, suggests: "It is desirable that each director, before forming a team or a cast, tests the impact of his stage directions on the actors he has chosen. Otherwise, there is the risk of lack of productivity and failure, because his orality does not work effectively."²³ By transferring George Banu's call in the field of acting studies, one can say that the admission exams should also be understood as a double choice, in the sense that not only the master selects his future disciples, but also that they get to choose their future guide. In particular, replacing the traditional admission exam, practiced today, with a longer-lasting workshop system, would facilitate such a double choice, so necessary for a fruitful journey to both sides.

On the other hand, as some directors often seem interested in the iconographical rendering of their vision and less in their interaction with the actors, let's take, at least theoretically, the hypothesis of replacing the director with a directorial tandem, analogous to that of the playwright-dramaturg, in which the first is the author of the play and the second one deals with the adaptation of the dramatic text to the needs of the cast and the director. In the "directorial tandem" we could have a director who assumes the translation of spectacular fantasy into an architecture of ideas and images, and another director who, having an additional training, acts on a micro scale, reformulates the requirements of the visionary director in terms and stage directions that take into account the human material with which they work. The second director would be called to translate the director's "dream" into the "actors' language". I have successfully experienced this kind of creative tandem in my personal pedagogical practice for over 15 years.

23. Banu, *Dincolo de rol sau actorul nesupus. Miniaturi Teoretice, Portrete*, Schițe, 165.

“Actors’ language” vs. “directors’ language”

A certain director knows/doesn’t know how to speak in the “actors’ language”, this is a frequently heard expression in the jargon of theatre practitioners and refers to something that directors either know instinctively or through studying acting, either learn with experience or choose to ignore. It is nothing more than a concrete translation of the principle of *presence* that prevails over competence. One can also speak of a “language of the directors”, which contains some key words including most probably the verb “I want”. Anne Bogart, the inspirational theoretician and practitioner of the Viewpoints discipline, points out the shortcomings of this way of expression:

The word “want” is generally used too often and too carelessly in our working environment. Is it correct to assume that the actor’s job is to do what the director “wants” and the director’s job to know above all else what s/he wants and demand it? The specific language used during a rehearsal impacts the quality of relationships between people as well as the tone of the environment. The word “want” —much overused and abused in our American-system-of-rehearsing a play—implies a right and wrong. It encourages artists search for a single satisfying choice, driven by seeking approval from an absolute authority above them. (...) How often can an actor ask a director: “Is this what you want?” before the contribution of that actor is completely negated? Why not ask instead what the play wants? The director and the actor are then united in a mutual endeavor. The word “want” used habitually and without consciousness of the consequences, constructs a parent/child relationship in rehearsal. This parent/child relationship limits resiliency, rigor and maturity in the creative process and inhibits true collaboration.²⁴

The constant reference the “good-bad” category pair is also a disruption factor for the climate needed to grow an actor. Viola Spolin unreservedly attacks this method of evaluating interpretative performance, warning that:

24. Anne Bogart and Tina Landau, *The Viewpoints Book: A Practical Guide to Viewpoints and Composition* (New York: Theatre Communication Group, Inc., 2006), 16–17.

In a culture where approval/disapproval has become the predominant regulator of effort and position, and often the substitute for love, our personal freedoms are dissipated. Abandoned to the whims of others, we must wander daily through the wish to be loved and the fear of rejection before we can be productive. Categorized “good” or “bad” from birth (a “good” baby does not cry too much) we become so enmeshed with the tenuous threads of approval/disapproval that we are creatively paralyzed.²⁵

As Keith Johnson observes, differences in status, between teacher and student, that interfere with learning, can jeopardize the workplace and evolution. Using the “like-dislike” categories as value judgements for an artistic act is so frequent that has almost become a reflex. Sensible to this reality, researchers at the Academy of Theater and Dance at Amsterdam University of Arts have set up a collective evaluation protocol called Feedback Method – affirmative, not critical feedback, whose stated aims are:

to empower the artist who is getting feedback on his or her work, to go beyond the pronouncement of judgments, to allow fundamental criticism, to create a sense of (self-) discipline for the sake of precision and clarity, and, last but not least, to increase the enjoyment of giving and receiving feedback.²⁶

Replacing the director with a team that evaluates the actor's interpretation is useful as an indirect instructional tool during the actor's training and sometimes in rehearsals but cannot become operative as a general method. The basic training of the actor can never be achieved by an equal distribution of power, rightly remarked Jaques Delcuvellerie.²⁷ But, as I pointed out earlier, the mission of a teacher-director is to make his students acquire an *ethos* that involves two paradoxical dimensions: the madness of throwing him/herself “in the gulf with his/her eyes bound” (the

25. Spolin, *Improvisation for the Theatre*, 7.

26. “Feedback Method,” Amsterdam University of the Arts. Academy of Theatre and Dance, n.d., <https://www.atd.ahk.nl/en/theatre-programmes/das-theatre/feedback-method/>.

27. Delcuvellerie, “Le Jardinier,” 39.

expression belongs to the well-known Romanian director Mihai Măniuțiu), but also the awareness that the actor is ultimately an artist, partner of the director, co-author of the show.

The work of the teacher - the director is a tantalizing grope in the dark, the blind leading the blind - as in the Brueghelian parable, but unlike the painting, the two do not go to the abyss, but must guess when they reach the crossing, to correctly choose the road that goes up toward enlightenment. The inspired stage direction appears as a revelation to the director when it generates an epiphany.

REFERENCES

- ARMĂȘARU, Diana, and Alina Mazilu. "Matrioșca gigantică: Andriy Zholdak." In *Repetițiile și teatrul reînnoit. Secolul regiei*, edited by George Banu. Bucharest: Nemira, 2009.
- BANU, George. *Dincolo de rol sau actorul nesupus. Miniaturi Teoretice, Portrete, Schițe*. Bucharest: Nemira, 2008.
- — —. "Les Penseurs de l'enseignement." *Alternatives Théâtrales*, no. 70–71 (2002).
- BOGART, Anne, and Tina Landau. *The Viewpoints Book: A Practical Guide to Viewpoints and Composition*. New York: Theatre Communication Group, Inc., 2006.
- DELCUVELLERIE, Jacques. "Le Jardinier." *Alternatives Théâtrales*, no. 70–71 (2002). "Feedback Method." Amsterdam University of the Arts. Academy of Theatre and Dance, n.d. <https://www.atd.ahk.nl/en/theatre-programmes/das-theatre/feedback-method/>.
- JOHSTONE, Keith. *Impro. Improvizația Și Teatrul*. Bucharest: Tracus Arte, 2014.
- KONDAZIAN, Karen. *The Actor's Encyclopedia of Casting Directors*. Hollywood: Lone Eagle Publishing Company, 1999.
- NACHMANOVITCH, Stephen. *Free Play: Improvisation in Life and Art*. New York: Penguin-Tarcher, 1990.
- PENCIULESCU, Radu. "Să predai regia înseamnă să-i înveți pe elevi cum să ia puterea." Yorick, 2017. https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&ei=uAnQXNmBM6WLjLsP9IWKoAg&q=Les+penseurs+de+l%27enseignement+alternatives+theatrale&oeq=Les+penseurs+de+l%27enseignement+alternatives+theatrale&gs_l=psy-ab.3..33i160l4.4617.9764..9875...0.0..0.184.2842.0j22.....0....1..gws-wiz.....35i302i39.nlqXcGEqNjM.

FILIP ODANGIU

Spolin, Viola. *Improvisation for the Theatre*. 3rd ed. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1999.

FILIP ODANGIU is one of the promoters of a new approach in the Propaedeutic of the actor's art, based on exploring the mechanisms of imagination and metacognitive. He undertook his undergraduate studies at Timisoara (painting) and Cluj (acting), where he was granted a doctorate in Theatre in 2013, with a thesis dedicated to the formation of the actor. He obtained his master's degree in Philosophy of Culture and Performing Arts at the Faculty of Theatre and Television, Babes-Bolyai University of Cluj, where, since 2003, he teaches acting, improvisation, puppet theatre. His work, besides teaching, includes several directions: acting, theater directing, stage design, fine arts, theatre journalism.