

**BABEȘ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF THEATRE AND TELEVISION  
DOCTORAL SCHOOL IN THEATRE**

**Theatre Directors on Screen – Film Directors on Stage  
Directors Switching Places in Romanian Theatre and Cinema in the 20th  
Century**

**PhD THESIS ABSTRACT**

**Scientific Adviser:**

**Prof. Daniela GOLOGAN PhD**

**Doctor's Degree Candidate:**

**Daniel IFTENE**

**Cluj-Napoca, 2015**

## Contents

<b>I. Introduction. Theatre and film: pragmatic and theoretical delimitations .....</b>	<b>5</b>
I.1. Placing boundaries. A historical view .....	7
I.2. Specificity or contamination. Theoretical approaches .....	19
I.3. Major coordinates of Romanian theatre and film interrelations. A methodological proposal .....	28
<b>II. Acting companies and the first film attempts .....</b>	<b>32</b>
II.1. Romanian theatre before the first film projection .....	33
II.2. The man and the moving camera .....	35
II.3.1. Davila Theatre Company „fugitives” and their <i>Fatal love (Amor fatal)</i> .....	39
II.3.2. “Înșir’te, măgărite...” between theatre and film .....	43
II.3.3. National Theatre associates and the triumph of The Independence War (Independenta României) .....	46
II.3.4. The Great Shylock and the “most wonderful tragedienne” .....	54
II.4. Conclusions .....	62
<b>III. Inter-war Romanian theatre and film .....</b>	<b>65</b>
III.1. Guiding lines for theatre and film art upgrowth from 1920 to 1945 .....	65
III.2. The first theatre directors in film .....	75
III.2.1. Ion Sahighian and the transition to modern drama .....	75
III.2.2. Ion Sava amidst the competing theatre and film .....	82
III.2.3. Victor Ion Popa, the writer and playwright that managed ONC .....	90
III.2.4. Jean Georgescu, from young actor to film directing .....	92

III.2.5. Constantin Tanase and Stroe and Vasilache, from revue to comedy .....	98
III.3. Conclusions .....	102
<b>IV. Double-careers during the communist era .....</b>	<b>104</b>
IV.1 Main changes in theatre and cinema (1945-1965) .....	104
IV.1.1. The regimentation that came from the East .....	104
IV.1.2. Art for the sake of the people and the party .....	107
IV.1.3. Theatre and film creators and the censorship mechanism .....	111
IV.2. Several portraits of theatre and film directors .....	115
IV.2.1. Liviu Ciulei – uneven parallels .....	115
IV.2.2. Lucian Pintilie – the royal exile .....	158
IV.2.3. Alexandru Tatos and the theatricality of the reality .....	192
IV.2.4. Alexa Visarion between political theatre to screening obsessions .....	205
IV.2.5. Tudor Mărăscu, from theatre to film, through television .....	208
IV.2.6. Casual encounters: Andrei Blaier, Dan Pița, Nicolae Caranfil, Geo Saizescu, Mircea Daneliuc .....	210
IV.3. Conclusions .....	215
<b>Final conclusions .....</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>Addendum 1. The main researched directors .....</b>	<b>226</b>
<b>Addendum 2. Name index .....</b>	<b>238</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>241</b>

## Argument

Even though the study of theatre and film connections, regarded mainly in their artistic particularities, has never been uncommon for the historians and theoreticians of both fields that offered – especially through the last two decades – valuable individual or collective works, the Romanian researchers was never sufficiently perceptive to this particular type of approaches, aside from some essays and articles. Weighting up the parallel evolutions of theatre and film seems a mostly marginal concern for them, and this attitude may be explained by the rising distance between Romanian theatre and film and also the pressure to fill in a void space of what we know about the past of these two arts, especially about under the communist regime.

In spite of the innate risks of a complex comparative approach of the relations between the two arts, the results are always revealing in understanding significant moments in the development of both theatre and film, especially in Romania, where their upgrowth were subjects of similar equations. The urgency of this kind of approach is made clear also by the scarce dialogue between the two artistic fields that became a symptom for the contemporary break between Romanian theatre and film, which can also be seen in the appearance of more and more specialized professionals (authors, critics etc.) that appear to have already blocked this type of approaches.

The entire debate that started at the beginning of the last century, which frequently ended with a rhetorical “assassination” of either theatre or film, all along with various other factors (economic, social, institutional), led to a certain death: that of the interest for a global perspective of two areas that, in Romania, are seen as part of the same performing arts field. It looks like the opponents of theatre and film connections have won. Scanning the places this kind of dialogue is

expected to outburst – from Theatre and/or Film students, to researchers, critics or practitioners – , one clashes against mild suggestions of violent outcries of extreme attitudes thought to have been extinct a long time ago: Whatever happens inside a theatre house concerns only theatre professionals and theatre spectators and what happens in film production and consumption should eat up only filmmakers and filmgoers. Theatre and film critics adventure beyond the comfort of their own specialization only when a creator (director, actor, playwright etc.) launches the indecent proposal to juggle with both theatre and film, trespassing the other artistic territory. Even the researchers tend to neglect this kind of approaches, many of them dwelling in the area they specialized in even when certain subjects where the theatre-film relation are asserted or extremely seductive. Consequently, diaries, (auto)biographies, interviews, readers published or edited by directors, actors, playwrights or screenwriters are frequently prove to be more concerned with discussing the connections between theatre and film experiences.

Our research is aligned to the rising international opening to discussing the relations between theatre and cinema, approaches that are appropriate in an era of inter- or transdisciplinary, and of artistic and theoretical debates on cross-media, transmedia or intermediality.

### **A methodological outline**

The comparative study of Romanian theatre and film, focusing on the double-auctorial aspects of some cardinal directors, falls under this theoretical area, which proves extremely necessary in the contemporary context.

Observations from researchers who approached, from various angles, the relationship between the two arts have revealed, beyond the initial rivalry specific to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a stimulating competition which turned later in a constant dialogue whose topics rely on the

nature of the representation. Usually, the approaches start from the mechanisms of film or theatre production or from the institutional, economic, technical, social, thematic, stylistic or aesthetic relationships and evolve up to the ideological aspects that influence contemporary theatre-film relationships.

For a clear view of the role played by the stage director's transfiguration in Romanian filmmaking, a historical reenactment was required. While, in relation to film experience, the finished nature of the film product is useful to the researcher, the same does not apply to the theatre performance. The absence of recordings from the repertoire of theatres across the country, which would have been important for this paper, was a serious impairment, which we have tried to overcome with the help of archived documents, of reviewers' notes and of opinions from specialized critics, as well as of several monographs which became the main instrument of monitoring and outlining the stage creation of the selected directors.

The reconstitution was concerned both with the retrieval (as toned as possible) of the historical context of these "contaminations" between the Romanian theatre and film, and with how the more than 20 Romanian directors considered here envisaged the contacts between the two arts. Thus, reflections on their plays and films attempt to reveal their intimate relationships, which exceed the limits of specificity of each separate type of artistic product. The analytical perspective helped the historical perspective look into special artistic destinies in the sphere of theatre and of film, destinies of directors who, in various forms, wore this "double existence" as labeled by Lucian Pintilie in an article dedicated to Alexandru Tatos.

When we try to cover almost the entire history of the Romanian fiction film, the timeline of these experiences becomes an essential element, because it describes perfectly the relationships between the seventh art and the theatre throughout more than one century. For the best

representation of this timeline, a segmentation in four large periods was required; from these, only the first three are the object of our research; the fourth one is only drafted, but it is worth the effort of a subsequent thorough study:

1. the phase of the predecessors, which overlaps the experiences before the First World War, when a series of actors and theatre company managers chose to commit, for various reasons, to film projects;
2. the phase of the first stage directors called to back up the construction and the validation of the Romanian filmmaking industry (1920-1945);
3. the calling or escape in filmmaking or theatre of some directors in the communist age, and the three important landmarks dictated by the contortions of the regime in the 1950s, '60s and '70s;
4. the sporadic transitions from theatre to cinema after the fall of the communist regime.

Each of these investigations will focus on a series of common interrogations, such as:

- a. to what extent did the cultural, economic or political context stimulate the involvement of theatre practitioners in film and the reverse?;
- b. which were the objective or subjective arguments that applied to their transition between the limits of their initial art?;
- c. how was the “double existence” managed and to what extent was it a pressure or stimulating point of the artistic creation?;
- d. to what extent do the principles of stage creation reflect in the film creation or the reverse, thematically or aesthetically speaking?;

e. which are the elements that outline the best portrait of each of the proposed stage and film directors?

The picture of the “theatricality of the Romanian film” (Bujor T. Râpeanu’s phrase that described the vast area of influence between the two arts in our space) is not, however, one that excludes later explanations for the situations which, for objective reasons, are not approached here.

### **Contextual delimitations**

Even if the focus on our research in on the Romanian space approached in an ample historical perspective, which crosses nearly the entire history of Romanian cinema, one of the important concerns has become the inclusion of theatre and film personalities or discourse in the broader context of the artistic mind set in different periods.

For this reason, the first part of the thesis includes a mapping of the areas of influence between theatre and film, which starts from the very first years of existence of the seventh art, followed by a convulsive run that turned progressively in an area of debate; this was productive especially for the theorists or creators who are interested and available to approach the issues of dramatic or film representation that work despite the heated and uncompromising dismissal of junctures. As blasphemous as it may sound, the claim that, throughout the history of filmmaking, the encounter with theatre has always given a positive outcome, either by the acquisition of elements already perfected in the stage art, or by the demolishing reference regarding the contamination of film with stage elements, it can be supported at any time with arguments drawn from an overview of the seventh art. On the other hand, theatre itself could not ignore the appearance of the recorded



and projected image and it did built its own mechanisms of resistance and existence in a century of the motion picture.

If we go back to the beginning of fiction film, to the humorous-naïve notes of the Lumière brothers or to Georges Méliès' fantasy shorts, we may recognize this contamination will open the most important area of filmmaking as we know it by now: the visual representation of stories, by using actors, for the consumption by a general audience. This form of contagion, to which, of course, the experiences of the Americans, of the German expressionists or of the largely criticized formula of French Art Cinema are added, will justify the burst of theoretical and practical emphases on the definition of film specificity, which will have an impact on the entire artistic modernity. Similar movements will occur almost cyclically, at different time intervals and in different spaces. In their flight from theatricality and dramatic, as scars of the periods they wanted to escape, whole generations of filmmakers will be shaped, ranging from the Italian, French or Soviet avant-garde representatives to extremely contemporaneous film movements.

Furthermore, cases of contagion that do not relate to the pairing of film and theatre on this negative route, but instead to the assumption of common directions and principles are frequent in the short history of the seventh art. For example, once the filmmaking accepts the less educated audience and easier topics, the American theatre takes the step toward the Little Theatre formula which focuses on individual dramas illustrated in performances freed from melodrama and from the spectacular. In parallel, the American film starts the similar movement, called Little Cinema by the critics (with the first films based on plays by Elmer Rice, Eugene O'Neill, Lillian Hellman and, later, William Saroyan). As a matter of fact, Hollywood never ignores theatre and tries to gather shared or individual experiences from this field in order to maintain a connection with the theatre's condition of high art; American historians describe this form of reference even in the

case of the New Hollywood generation. No wonder the artistic biographies of some American directors who changes the history of film include, more often than not, theatre attempts or even careers: D.W. Griffith's desire to become a playwright, Orson Welles's stage experiments, Elia Kazan's (promoter of Stanislavsky's method across the ocean) unsettling experience at Group Theatre, Mel Brooks's migration to musical theatre, Woody Allen's collaborations as author, director or actor with several companies in the United States, Mike Nichols's success on stage and on screen, Kevin Spacey's managing and acting activity at Old Vic, and so on and so forth.

The same mechanism of the transfer of personality is seen in the European space, with the acclaimed film productions of the famous German director Max Reinhardt and his influence on the German expressionist movement, André Antoine's (initiator of the Théâtre Libre) involvement in filmmaking, the penchant for filmmaking of a series of important stage creators and theorists, such as Vsevolod Meyerhold, Antonin Artaud, Anton Giulio Bragaglia, Bertolt Brecht or, in the Transylvanian space, the legendary Jenő Janovics.

Beyond the simple strategy of recording the performances of some successful companies and of projecting them for a wider audience, a strategy used from the invention of film to the present day, various filmmaking areas have started to show much more intimate connections with the theatrical traditions of the spaces in which they developed. The most spectacular and conclusive examples seem to come from film created in cultures with specifically formed stage traditions, such as the Asian, African ones or, from the European space, the Mediterranean ones: the benshi phenomenon in Japanese film or the similarities between *commedia all'italiana* and *commedia dell'arte*. The "contagion" zone is completed in the film after the Second World War with other artistic movement that operate in parallel with their theatrical models: the "angry young men" in

the Great Britain, the undertaking of Brecht's approach by the member of the French New Wave or of the German New Cinema etc.

Thus, while the inter-war period is marked by virulent approaches in the drawing of limits between the stage and the screen, the post-war period (the halcyon days of the director-auteur) is marked instead by a constant exchange between the two arts, a relationship in which the theatre-film and film-theatre transfers become, most of the times, implicit discourse on the performing arts.

From the theatre hall to film, the definitely oldest, most frequent and most visible form of contact is the inclusion of projection or of recorded audiovisual materials in the stage creations; we can find their traces back to the use of the magic lantern in Phantasmagoria performances which were popular across the world in the 18<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, or to the use of the continuous run of projections, which astounded Antoine during a representation of the Saxe-Meiningen. Two of the roles filmed materials will play in the structure of theatre performance had thus been shaped: the inclusion of fantastic elements and the acquisition of a more realistic dimension for the stage area. Among the personalities or groups open to the use of filmed material in performances we note Erwin Piscator, "father" of Political Theatre, or, later, scenographer Jan Svoboda, or even the aesthetic options of some contemporary companies or directors.

While up to the Second World War theatre and film were clashing on the territory of an audience on which the latter still acted with the help provided by the appeal of what was new, things changed fundamentally with the ripening of the "Film Generation" (Stanley Kauffman), which included individuals "since 1935, following a generation that had seen movies only in terms of escapist entertainment". Both theatre and film develop directions structured on the perpetual (re)definition of specificity, as well as on zones of intermediality, in which the two become

elements of a dialogue, in the same space of the performance. From this angle, the concept of cinematic theatre becomes extremely important; it connects with the complete redefinition of the notions of text and author, which we find at Robert Wilson or Richard Foreman. In the same area, we find formulae such as “multimedia theatre” or concepts such as “theatre intermediality”, heavily discussed especially since the integration of the new media.

### **Evolution of double experiences in theatre and film in the Romanian space**

The next chapters deal exclusively with the relationships between the Romanian theatre and film, by focusing on the double experiences of a number of directors with cardinal experiences in both fields; the timeline also provides a very precise phasing: 1911-1916 – the first contact of the theatre professionals with the film creation; 1920-1945 – the period of the first stage directors who also become film directors; 1948-1989 – theatre and film careers of directors who represent various modalities of reference to the realities of the communist regime.

Going back to the beginnings, we can note that, once the reluctance in relation to the invention of the cinematograph is overcome, the involvement of theatre professionals and especially of the stars of the most important Bucharest stages, becomes the decisive step that will guide the construction and support of the Romanian filmmaking for one century. Quantitatively, the number of films launched before the First World War does not seem significant; however, when we relate it to the production means, inferior to the great cinema industries, this minimization may seem unfair.

An offshoot of the enthusiasm of associates at the capital’s National Theatre, of the financial interests of the only local producer in the pre-war period and of the sensitivity of an audience

who exorcizes their 1848 “demons” only after 1918, the Romanian film takes a necessary leap in this period: the one toward acceptance, toward the evolution from an attraction between two horse races to a means of artistic, social and political expression which cannot be ignored any longer.

Perhaps the best means were not always used, since the most important fiction film producers in 1911-1918 were prompted mostly by the curiosity regarding a rival that was drawing a significant audience or by the financial profit they could later invest in theatre productions. It is important that, from the stages of national theatres, actors scarcely approached film; and they only did it when the topics aligned with the patriotic militant spirit which elevated them by contamination, while independent actors or private companies saw in film a way to cover an increasing audience, proportional to virtual financial profit.

Irrespective of the Romanian artists’ reasons to approach the recording camera, their contribution to the development of our film as art cannot be ignored. The first attempts at directing which came from start-actors rather than from professional directors do not reach the quality of a Feuillade, Griffith or Porter, but they do steer the Romanian film creation on the path of an illustration (as faithful as possible) of reality on the screen; realism has remained, to this day, one of the keystones of our film. As anticipated by V. Scânteie in 1911, the pre-war period is the one during which filmmaking, like Cinderella, will enjoy the opportunity of seeing open the gates of theatres, which allows it to evolve from “ham actor to a trained and sought after artist”.

Nevertheless, most of the times, it will be considered either an accessory or an instrument theatre will be able to use in the future, too, and with which local artists and their art will become known everywhere in the world or will be able to enter their spectators’ homes. The tension between theatre and cinema finds its first solutions in this period. Actors, directors, reviewers discuss the

newly-emerged rivalry and, most often, their opinions focus on how the appearance of film would stimulate theater: 1. by the formation of a new audience which, until then, had not approached theatre, but which, not, was using film as an antechamber to the theatre hall; 2. by exterminating, at the theatre managers, a “state of drowsiness which damaged the institution both materially and (especially) morally”; 3. by improving acting; 4. by challenging playwrights to pay more attention to actions and to dismiss “wilting additions”, in a way that will allow their survival against the simplifications operated by a potential adaptation for the screen. On the other hand, theatre provides to film not only actors and directors, but also material resources (spaces, settings, costumes) and topics that can be adapted for the screen.

We cannot neglect repertoire and stylistic consonances between stage and film creations given by the handful of theatre professionals on whom the Romanian filmmaking of this age relies.

While national theatres turn their eye on Romanian history (by the projects of the trio made from Aristide Demetriade, Grigore Brezeanu and Petre Liciu, in Bucharest, or by Emil Gârleanu’s plan, in Craiova), independent companies choose to adapt for film a series of sensationalist plays or texts, loaded with melodrama and with elements that allow the audience’s easy seduction (the project of the pair Marioara Voiculescu – Constantin Radovici).

Until the war, film inflation will generate in Romania also the definition of a much more selective audience, the (re)turn of some of them toward theatre, as well as the certainty that the appearance of the screen would not lead to the disappearance of the stage. Filmmaking-actors’ concerns are not, however, isolated from the entire movement of theatricalisation in the first decades of the last century. On screen, they display the expression of that age of the Romanian theatre and, with the critics, they raise issues relating to the specificity of the stage and of the screen, to acting, dramaturgy or director’s art. The First World War suspends an encounter that

had a promising start. Given the problems of the theatre companies during the refuge to Iași (1916-1918) and the blockade of Bucharest, the main center of film production, Romanian film and theatre need to separate until after the war.

In the inter-war, theatre and film experiences becomes a lot more toned, owing to the involvement of important theatre personalities (directors, playwrights, critics) in film projects; some of them show special readiness for the seventh art and grasp it as a substantial phenomenon in the development of Romanian theatre: Ion Şahighian, Ion Sava, Victor Ion Popa, Constantin Tănase, Camil Petrescu.

Although their impact on the history of the Romanian film was only peripheral, some film experiences of the stage directors become representative for attitudes and interrogations later specific to each subsequent period. On the other hand, a stage director such as Ion Şahighian will prove that, despite the tiring improvisation that marks the inter-war, the border between the two arts is not impassable and, with the assumption of inherent difficulties, experience in a new artistic environment can become a form of complementary expression. Moreover, in the Romanian theatre and filmmaking, the inter-war is a vital space for the defining of the director's art. Debates regarding the theatricalisation of theatre and re-theatricalization will focus especially on the director's work. At the same time, despite the instability of state institutions or private film enterprises of the age, the two decades overviewed in the chapter will bring to the fore of the discussion the same presence which often found its redeeming model in the theatre professionals. The director's independence in relation to the other members of these arts, whose common creation has always challenged those who wanted to study them, becomes, in the inter-war, one of the main benefits.

In fact, the pace of these effervescent encounters had been set since the beginning of the 1920s all across the world, and the new perspective on film as art would attract the curiosity of the most diverse creators: theatre, painting, photography, literature etc. From among all, however, the theatre-film dialogue, its naiveties and excesses included, will stay, perhaps, the most important in the quest for the defining essences of each art. Beyond the mere curiosity, the aforementioned creators' interventions in filmmaking (creators completed by the hundreds of people included by this debate) become an experimental investigation of these specific elements. Their eyes on the reflexes of an ever-changing audience, the (theatre or film) performance creators will have to reposition and to provide a series of clear and bold answers to the artistic modality they choose. "In fact, the theatre and the film (...) are the art of the event experiences before the spectators' senses"; concludes Camil Petrescu in *Quidditateea artei (reprezentatiei)* [Quiddity of Art (of the Representation)] in an attempt to find an end for the heated debates surrounding the Romanian theatre and film in the inter-war.

In retrospect, we can say that, while the inter-war was the most substantial period in the development of coherent and defining discussions relating to the relationship between theatre and film, materialized in the short list of project, the communist regime, in 1948-1989, generates a considerably wider opening regarding the proximity of the two arts. Of course, initially used as a method to draw professional screenwriters and directors in the flimsy film industry whose construction begins in the 1950s, the procedure is then used as a way to recruit successful names of the stage directing in filmmaking, in order to improve the artistic level of the Romanian industry often suffocated by the pressures of the five-year plans, by ideological requirements and by the constant fight with institutions and people involved in the process of compliance.



Even if at the beginning of the 1950s the list of those “recruited” includes names such as Marietta Sadova or Sică Alexandrescu, the one who will mark this form of “elevating” contamination between theatre and film is undoubtedly Liviu Ciulei; thus, he verifies both the viability of crossing from theatre to filmmaking and the possibility to obtain spectacular results. In the immediately subsequent period, Ciulei’s example will be followed by Lucian Pintilie, and, in the 1970s-1980s, many of the stage directors who approach film production will relate, overall, to the two directors’ experiences. The reasons for a choice of a filmmaking career range from the consolidation of their own position in the Romanian cultural institution, such as in Ciulei’s case, and the need to “keep the door open”, which he mentioned given the ban on the right to director’s signature in the 1950s, to the financial stability the existence of a film project could provide, such as in the declared case of Alexandru Tatos. Certainly, this conclusion is not meant to overturn the strictly artistic motivations that led to the frequent crossings of stage directors to the Romanian filmmaking (the aforementioned names are joined by Alexa Visarion or Tudor Mărăscu, and, from the same generation, with debut projects after 1990, Tompa Gabor, Silviu Purcărete or Horațiu Mălăele). Despite the disappointment some of them will face, each of them will approach the film creation in full understanding of film as artistic experience; they will cause important discussions and opinions on the shared and different aspects of the two arts, either by their theoretical positions or by the comments and debates their performances or film generate.

While in the 1950s and beginning of the 1960s discourses the idea of specificity still has an influence, which peaks in the movements of re-theatricalization of theatre and de-theatricalization of film, once the “Film Generation” (Kauffman) begins its activity, the need of self-definition by contrast is replaced with the need to think in relation to and in co-existence

with the tradition of each separate art. Even in the rare cases in which he denies the film's artistic potential, the theatre creator can no longer ignore the existence of film, while, as the film author abandons the equivalence of film and the faithful reproduction of reality and attempts to enter the great family of universal culture, he exorcizes his fear of literature and theatre. Therefore, the post-1950 period becomes a space of dialogue based on content and on the ways in which it reaches the spectator, a clear transition from the knowledge of specific "tools" and functionalities to the emphasis of modalities, purposes for which they can be used. Obviously, however, each of the directors who travel artistically between theatre and film will bear testimony of their of transition through these stages, from learning new languages with different codes to how they relate (personally) to the artistic and cultural tradition or to the aesthetic of the age, up to – in the most fortunate cases – the awareness of their own form of expression in theatre and cinema.

Like the European or American space, the Romanian one is also marked especially by the transition of stage directors to film and only in isolated cases is the shift made in reverse. Here, too, the reasons of the shift from film to theatre can be assigned to two complementary directions: an attraction for the stage and for the challenge to also give a try to a career in theatre (Mircea Daneliuc), which is completed by a break in the activity caused by the issues with censorship or with the form of accession to filmmaking (Dan Pița, Nicolae Caranfil) or by the capitalization of the known director's signature (Daneliuc, Pița, Saizescu).

Nevertheless, the aspect that sets apart the Romanian territory from the Western one, at least until 1990, is the (stage or film) director's relationship with a state- and censorship-controlled cultural production industry. While beyond the Socialist Bloc, the rule of the game is contained in the operating mechanisms of the great theatres or film studios and by their positioning based on rigorous audience surveys, or in the capacity to oppose this system with very clear rules, by

choosing the formulae of independent theatre of film, in Romania, like in many of the neighboring countries, the artist of that age cannot be without the state's financial and institutional endorsement. This is granted in a politicized, often corrupt or corruptible system, in favor or against the artistic product. Going through its own periods of thawing and repositioning, depending on the external political context or even on the contemporary interests of the country's leaders, censorships acted as an important pressure factor for the artistic sphere. In retrospect, we may say that, because of the concentration of the film production in the capital (with the exception of the cine-club or of amateur groups), the effects of censorship were more devastating in cinema, where the banning of a film before its premiere meant the destruction of the entire project, while the pyramidal multiplication of the decision-making factors at the level of the theatres across of the country would have ensured greater possibilities of negotiations (and, implicitly, of compromise). However, the few testimonies and investigations cited in this chapter reveal, especially in the 1970s and 1980s, the censor's fear reflex in relation to their superior, doubled by the various interests in the existence or dismissal of the performance.

Beyond this institutional dimension, the 1948-1989 period includes the most important – and not only in numbers – segment of stage and film directors in the history of the two arts. Nonetheless, pressured by the right of signature, by the author's relation to performances or film, by the management of some institutional problems, by the politically controlled climate, these directors' capacity of having actually parallel careers in theatre and film became problematic. As seen, Liviu Ciulei's film director career is suspended by the size of his theatre projects (managing the Bulandra theatre, the success of his own staging and the international attention he receives); Lucian Pintilie manages to make theatre and film in parallel until the forced exile after the banning of *Revizorul*, and later chooses theatre, until 1989 (with the break for *De ce trag*

clopotele, Mitică?), and goes back to film for the entire period after 1990; Alexandru Tatos will be caught by film projects after several instances of success in theatre. As for other examples, at least in numbers, things become easily negotiable, like in the case of Alexa Visarion or Tudor Mărăscu, where the critics note a quality disparity between the theatre creation and the film one.

As to theatrical and film aesthetics, the period described in this chapter, especially after 1965, is the one that operates the crossing, in film, from naïve drama to assumed forms of theatricality, by a series of stage-specific conventions or by the speculation of the dramatic nature of some real aspects. Furthermore, stage critics note a series of audio-visual elements contained in the staging of some of the age's directors (additional to those mentioned in this chapter), which certifies their inclusion in the post-film theatre area we are mentioning in the first chapter of the thesis.

Thus, many of the directors of the 1960-1990 time interval describe a series of complex solutions to the double existence and to artistic communication in and between theatre and film, in the Romanian space. To paraphrase Lucian Pintilie, we may talk about several generation at which, if you like theatre and if you like film also, you can consider a “love triangle”.

### **Several difficulties and further research subjects**

The thorough research of Romanian theatre and film connections between 1911 and 1989 offers multiple challenges to the study of this phenomenon in a post-1990 era. As stated before, it reveals a complex synopsis marked by vast and almost impossible to capture small historical details. This observation relies on the careful parallel approach of theatrical and cinematic landscapes of the past century, and its urgencies is provoked by consulting the already published Romanian studies. When concerned with data offered by official documents, the researcher runs the risk of ignoring a “secondary” history, comprising individual relations that shaped important

moments, to mere coincidences or accidents that, at certain moments, seemed too unexciting to be covered by such documents. In the past years, young historians began to look into the recent past of theatre and film by seeing into archives, and thus supplemented the few diaries, autobiographical novels or interview books published after 1990, but there is still room for more intense approaches on this matter.

In order to present complex perspectives on these directors with particular careers in both theatre and film we tried not only to ignite the interest for the comparative approach on theatre and film history, but also invite others to use similar instruments when discussing or researching these and many other relevant moments in Romanian artistic history, and also to further take up similar endeavors or projects.

In our opinion, one of the first urgent opening would be conducting of multiple interviews with theatre and film makers on the already discussed subjects, in order to bring to light significant data and details. This activity has been projected for our research, but the large period of time that had to be covered (over 80 years of theatre and film history), the numerous directors to be studied and other occurrences have made such enterprise impossible. These interviews can also rise the interest for more monographic approaches on Romanian film and theatre directors that we inexplicably lack at the moment.

Another subject that we outlined but not thoroughly conducted, as it was not the main interest of our research, is the delicate relations of Romanian writers to writing for theatre and film, a project that could be conducted with interdisciplinary research teams. It is of high interest the understanding of the particular mechanisms that brought Romanian writers to scriptwriting after decades of sheer indifference for such activities and the power they were given in the last years

of the Ceausescu regime. For the same comparative perspective, one should look more closely into the evolution of original playwriting after 1960.

Lastly but not least important should be a research on the strategies used from the inter-war era to our days for training theatre actors for film, which has a strong links to our own study of Romanian theatre and film directors.

The process of our research from the first sketch of the framework to the final conclusions triggers a realistic adjustment: all these projects have urgencies and difficulties that can be more easily surpassed building interdisciplinary research teams. Fortunately, the last years have shown a new rising interest of young Romanian researchers for theatre and film history.

**KEYWORDS:** theatricality, film specificity, theatre directing, film directing, theatricality in film, film in theatre, theatre aesthetics, film aesthetics, romanian performance arts