

Can the Art of the Actor or Theatre Be Correlated with Moral Good or Moral Evil?

Alexandru PAPADOPOL

UNATC "I.L. Caragiale" Bucharest, Romania
papadopolalexandru@ymail.com

Abstract: *Beyond religious concepts, in order to strengthen moral exigencies and the promise of metaphysical or practical compensation, morality could be interpreted as abstract. In the absence of moral goodness, everything is, in fact, allowed. This is the premise on which this research is based. Moral good and moral evil are fluctuating concepts and are the effect of individual actions, messages and ideas of specific processes determined by will, creativity or imagination. The concept of theatre, like the one directly related to the art of the actor, aims precisely at the idea of consent and the Grotowskian idea, taken from Artaud, of "piercing" the human nature. In addition, the audience is invited to make the effort to find out the truth about themselves. Both the good and the evil that we can recognize in the proximity of art, result from the way in which our inner make-up adapts to the experience of meeting the "other one". Hence the moral goodness-moral menace polarity. The art of the actor, as a concrete element, is firstly linked to the unique human nature and then, indirectly, through the transmitted emotional elements, to the necessary and universal moral law. This is why the only valid theatrical "ideology" is represented by the metaphysical human knowledge. When the actor processes and then transmits and the audience lets themselves be "pierced" – Grotowskian specific term – by the emotion transmitted by this higher court, only then the freedom of having honest self-interrogative hopes can be born.*

Keywords: *actor's art, "piercing" into human nature, moral good, moral evil, metaphysical human knowledge, Jerzy Grotowski.*

How to cite: PAPADOPOL, Alexandru (2020) "Can Acting or Theatre Be Correlated with Moral Good or Moral Evil?", *Concept* 2(21), pp. ??-??.



In order to create a link between the two notions, it is first necessary to specify that the notions of moral or immoral are often different from the notions of conforming or not

conforming to the rules. Important for the actor's art is precisely their use in ordering and correcting not the rules, but rather the actions and concepts. In this way it will be possible, perhaps even on a practical level, a connection with the effects on others, not necessarily with their individual logic, but with feelings and affect. In general, the thought that an act is morally good or evil depends on its influence, not only on the person who issues it, but also on the influence it has on other individuals. The message inseparable from my own visceral will could be translated into the question, *I want something – Why should I care about others?* There have been many attempts to justly answer the questions that contain within them the notions of moral good or evil. On the other hand, however, the main question can inevitably branch out with other legitimate questions: *Should I care?* Or *Why should I care?* Beyond the too many, too inflexible, and often abstract and diverse religious concepts, if there is no universal divine source to reinforce moral demands with the threat of punishment and the promise of metaphysical or practical compensation, morality could be interpreted as an abstraction. In the absence of moral goodness (with all its meanings) everything is allowed. This is a fairly direct formulation of the moral foundation. A more "seductive" statement on the issue could be that the reason why moral goodness must be achieved and propagated is not fear, but love. Hence, the Creator (whatever he may be) loves you, so you have to love him in return, and you have to do your best to obey his orders so as not to upset him. The main objection in interpreting such a motivation is, however, that if an action is generally accepted as moral evil, this is precisely why Providence forbids it, therefore there is no divine recommendation and permission to do it. In this way, it seems that there can be nothing concrete that completely replaces, as a basis of morality, the direct concern for other individuals, the "accomplishment" that was mentioned of involving the intervention of a human action. Moral good or moral evil are, after all, quite fluctuating concepts, ultimately turning into an effect of individual actions, messages and ideas and specific processes determined by will and, later, by creativity and imagination. In this sense, St. Augustine believed that:

[...] For the unclean in the sight of God is every one who is unrighteous; clean therefore is every one who is righteous; if not in the sight of men, yet in the sight of God, Who judges without error. [...] In general, it is never right to tell a lie for any man, such as may hurt another, even if the hurt be slighter than would be the hurt to him unless such a lie were told. Because neither must another man's bread be taken from him against his will, though he be in good health, and it is to feed one who is weak; nor must an innocent man, against his will, be beaten with rods, that another may not be killed. Of course, if they are willing, let it be done, because they are not hurt if they be willing (2016, p. 84).

The concept of theatre as well as the one related to the actor's art refers precisely to the idea of consent, including, however, Grotowski's idea borrowed from Artaud of the "piercing" into human nature. Lying for someone's sake can only gain significance and effect by exploiting and using the role. This tool, or perhaps only this tool, can reveal what is

hidden under the everyday mask, and the spectator will understand according to his own moral grid, responsibly or not, that he is invited to make the effort to discover the truth about himself, within a well-defined theatrical process witnessing the specific stage creation. The aesthetic solution in this process also becomes necessary in the perspective of the global composition to which it belongs. No one can see the full picture, both the spectator and the actor existing under the sign of fragment and separation. Through his will, or only through his will, the spectator will be invited to look closely and through someone else's eyes which describes himself in certain conventional conditions to give up the distant, detached way of approaching his own concepts and notions related to good or evil and to realize the confrontation with one's own truth or even one's own mission in life. The effect cannot be accurate, however, through detached calculation. The warmth towards what is human is vital, the process assuming, in fact, an understanding of human paradoxes, man being by nature a suffering creature, which is unclean (as argued by St. Augustine), but which does not deserve in any way disregard. Despite inconsistent variants of existence, evil is not an appearance and is not a human way of packaging what is real. Perhaps that is why Grotowski referred to the decline of theatre as inextricably linked to the decline of the church. The disappearance of the sacred and the ritual tasks of a performance can lead, however, to a secular sacredness. Perhaps this very sacredness will be able to honestly bring to light the concept of consciousness that can contain within it the moral goodness, and "faith becomes, perhaps, a true concept only when it is transformed into faith in this world, connecting instead of designing" (Deleuze și Guattari, 2020, p. 108).

Also familiar with duality of human nature, Jung appealed to individual consciousness, an approach he considered extremely difficult despite its futility. Consequently, the great Swiss thinker categorized this concept as indispensable, seen not only as a counterpart of the unconscious, but even as a defining element of the meaning of life. The evil seen in the outside world in our fellowmen can be acknowledged as a negative meaning residing in our own psyche, and this profound intuition would be the first stage of the radical change of attitude towards our fellowmen. Individual knowledge is linked to man and the deep meanings of the human being who will understand that his identity is partial, that it is a beginning and not the end of the road. The outside world voluntarily accepted in the theatrical convention that gives rise to human impulses and reactions can, in this way, (often, however, not radically) change something in attitude and personal evaluation of what each considers morally good or evil, both concepts still having common roots produced by consciousness and instinct. The common theatrical experience will be able to be, in this way, inextricably linked to a confrontation, not at all scientific or psychological, with one's own self and with an elementary-human exploration that contains everything related to moral good or evil and their observation through present actions embodied by living individuals. Thus,

[...] just as the philosopher behaves in relation to the reality of existence, so the artistically excitable man behaves in relation to the reality of dreams. He looks at

them precisely and with pleasure, for from these pictures he fashions his interpretation of life; from these events he rehearses his life. This is not merely a case of agreeable and friendly images which he experiences with a complete understanding. They also include what is serious, cloudy, sad, dark, sudden scruples, teasing accidents, nervous expectations, in short, the entire "divine comedy" of life, including the Inferno—all this moves past him, not just like a shadow play, for he lives and suffers in the midst of these scenes, yet not without that fleeting sensation of illusion (Nietzsche, 2018, p. 32).

The interpretation of life in the acute interest given to art (in this case the art of the actor and the art of performance) of which the German philosopher speaks may appear as a "denouncement" of the notions of moral good or evil, or as noted by a Romanian philosopher – a kind of replacement of the infinite outside the spectator with the inner infinity. The inner infinity is in direct connection with the primordial human nature and even with the "original sin" by which man is forbidden to taste the Tree of Knowledge and is punished for not listening. The Tree of Knowledge can also be interpreted as the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, instinct and discernment. In this way, space and time become pure forms of human sensitivity and the spectator standing in the vicinity of the artistic act of the actor accessing specific creative means, will be, perhaps, in the potential condition to experiment good or evil or their real representation with his own senses and not with his own intellectual grid. This means that any experience of human life, from the incomprehensible one to the moral and direct behavioral manifestation, can take place thanks to the functioning of a prior essential structure of the human being. Good, or in fact - the choice to do good and not to do evil that was talked about at the beginning of this article is a notion tainted by the fear of punishment. The good or evil that we recognize in the proximity of art results from the way in which our inner composition adapts the experience of meeting the "other". Hence the polarity of moral good – moral evil, examples and notions being infinite – Cain and Abel, God and Devil, Ormuzd and Ahriman (in Persian culture) and many others. The coexisting duo solution is not accepted by ancient philosophers, such as Plato or Aristotle, for them good is the strong element of the world, evil being considered a marginal element that can appear only by virtue of human mistake. For them, good is substantial, evil is just an accident. The spectator, but also the actor, carries the two entities in the soul, probably in equal weights. However, everything can start from the recognition of these "notions" following the meeting within the theatrical fiction. Everything starts from the *a priori* material of the human species, which can reform or falsify and gives the final version to the information related to each situation present in the creative act. In this way, the spectator, after perceiving the creative act, may have the chance to process in the *a priori* womb of the "human" it contains, the experimentation of the convention between him and his fellowmen. The change takes place, therefore, moving the notions of good or evil from what would be called "beyond us" into "us", that is, into our inner self. Humanity, but also suffering, and happiness can appear as a result of a person receiving honest acting emotions,

placing him deep in his own self. The aesthetic way in which contact takes place is in this context, often, quite unimportant, the truth not having to be sacrificed at any cost for the sake of conscientiousness or ideologisation. Therefore,

[...] goodness and badness being the distinguishing marks of moral differences), it follows that we must represent men either as better than in real life, or as worse, or as they are. It is the same in painting. Polygnotus depicted men as nobler than they are, Pauson as less noble, Dionysius drew them true to life. [...] In literature, Homer, for example, makes men better than they are; Hegemon the Thasian, the inventor of parodies, and Nicocharēs, the author of the *Deiliad*, worse than they are. The same distinction marks off Tragedy from Comedy; for Comedy aims at representing men as worse, Tragedy as better than in actual life (Aristotle, 2000, p. 24).

If reason and language do not have the power to change the conceptual perception of good and evil, they can at least attack the mortified part of the protagonists of the encounter through direct senses and instinct. Perhaps nothing can better stimulate humans with all their anatomy or inner soul as the ongoing theatrical process. Spectators may be amazed, frightened, shaken, disturbed, but perhaps the production of a moral outcry will partly demolish the preconceptions about the supposed moral good or evil, in which everyone believes. Therefore, the distinct marks of human goodness or evil that the great philosopher, scholar and professor of Ancient Greece spoke of, can gain valence as a result of spectator-actor forms of meeting, perhaps even compulsive and extravagant ones, containing caricature and idealization, generating in this manner primary energies that can modify or replace preconceptions and moral systems. Thus, the emotion and the substantiation that the actor's art puts into play, ends up taking the real theatrical circumstance out of its pragmatic limitation and conditioning, bringing it to that degree of its intrinsic substantiality, transforming it into a true object of direct knowledge. Without the existence of actors and their creative-specific processuality, theatrical art could not be transformed from an artistic event into a dramatic phenomenon, not being able to achieve the separation of the illusion of the spoken text, in subtext, thus transforming art into a good or evil message, morality or immorality. Once the object of knowledge is finalized, an inherent conflict between consciousness and limit will probably be triggered through immediate affect, the subtext operating directly to capture moral phenomena as such, which later leads to the decommissioning of reality and the conversion of theatrical performance into something broader than just an aesthetic cultural phenomenon. If the reason of the spectator, but also of others, refers to personal protection, on the one hand, and to history and culture, on the other, and instinct keeps man in the vicinity of his own intimate-deep nature, then, the real theatrical struggle can be considered the one between the authentic human "pulsional" and the rational being who in a balanced way tries to define concepts that can be evaluated without affective involvement, the two entities living, in fact, inside the same individual. It follows that moral good or evil refers to intense, educated people, but at the same time, instinctive behavior can refer to the protagonists of the play, not as

individuals, but as representatives of man and nature in general. "In this sense, it is not just about seducing the public. It is a more complicated problem to create works that arouse among the spectators a hunger and an undeniable thirst" (Brook, 2014, p. 197). The actor's art is linked as a concrete element, first to the unique human nature and then, indirectly, through the transmitted emotional elements, to the necessary and universal moral law. That is why the only valid theatrical "ideology" is metaphysical human knowledge, and actors and spectators can be recovered as essential human figures or profiles converted into their own "eternity". The hunger and the undeniable thirst of which Peter Brook speaks suppose that a moral concept could also be the result of the transition of emotion from the surface layers to the deep layers of the human, from mixed to concrete and constant, actors as well as spectators relating to each other, for a moment, as a supreme axiological instance.

If the acting process is "personified", and the conscience carrying moral convictions eventually takes the form of a theatrical character, namely the hero, then the moral good or evil becomes visible under the clear appearance of the terms within which the meeting can take place. The theatrical phenomenon is born in relation to the logic of consciousness, but especially to the moral meanings related to what is human and real, thus consciousness gaining value by removing any so-called philosophical system that is not constituted on anthropological grounds, which may include the naturalness, the authenticity, and the individuality of the human being. The authenticity of each actor will force him not to evolve on stage, but to reveal himself following creative processes specific to his art, not altering his identity, not betraying the imposed metaphysical theme and entering, at the same time, in an "epidemic" vibration with the spectators. The essentialization of the notions of moral good and evil can find a current correspondent in Heidegger's theory that made a clear distinction between reason and visceral vibrations, transforming the essence of life into the difference between being able and being in the present, thus the spectator no longer having to subject to cruel realism, identifying the characters only through stories or concrete actions. Being in the present, updating potentialities, will bring to light something stronger than the events presented, helping processuality and creativity, namely, decrypting the system of the human condition and exposing the universally accepted and moral principles liberated of dramatic appearance.

The divine intelligence, being nurtured upon mind and pure knowledge, and the intelligence of every soul which is capable of receiving the food proper to it, rejoices at beholding reality, and once more gazing upon truth, is replenished and made glad, until the revolution of the worlds brings her round again to the same place (Plato, 2018, p. 76).

However, beyond the theatrical-spiritual perspective, the concept of the unconscious and of inner suffering transformed into consciousness can also be discussed, thus, from a psychological point of view the problem can be presented in terms of decline, dissolution, but also as the victory of the human element in front of an artistic act. A brief definition of art that Jung gave in *Psychological Types* was – "union between man and man

reaffirmed, but nature which has become alienated, hostile, or subjugated, celebrates once more her reconciliation with her lost son, man" (2004, p. 152). According to the anthropological-psychological research developed by Jung, and to a greater extent by his descendants, if the unconscious is not balanced by the experience of the conscious, it will inevitably show its opposite aspect, namely the negative – evil aspect. Thus, the acting proposal can develop positive meanings (moral good), being the expression of a magical and deep mysticism of nature, or it can be interpreted only as an expression of notions related to concepts or conceptualizations less digestible, unpleasant, unfavorable, associated with the destructive spirit that destructures the self, that contains moral evil. The two elements can even, paradoxically, depend on one another, knowing that the paradox is one of the main elements, a primary characteristic of the actor's art, but also of its unconscious and its composition. As for the natural, visceral, instinctive or atavistic aspects, it must be emphasized that it rarely relates entirely to aesthetic, symbolic or cultural considerations, there are psychologists who even consider that libido in its primary form takes over the individual, transforming him in an animal limited to itself, to its own being. The unconscious can manifest as a purely physiological phenomenon or, perhaps, as a psychological affiliation determined mainly by physiology. This impulse may call into question the fact that the actor's art, as an integral part of the theatrical process, can serve other, somewhat inconclusive moral truths, which should either exclude each other or encompass one another, or, why not, refer to a higher-ranking unit that constitutes the essence of moral good or evil. The substance of the theatrical encounter does not seem to be conceptually or ideologically related to any stage of civilization or to any doctrinal form concerning the world and its composition. At least at the end of the process, these things should disappear. The theatrical reality, not the dramatic one, the world in front of the spectator cannot be culturally contested, not being an abstract entity. Even if it speaks or contains and highlights abstract messages such as goodness, moral evil, truth, beauty, it still cannot deny its own nature. Dramaturgy can certainly be understood intellectually, and it will also be demolished or placed on a pedestal, often in view of its aesthetics and cultural message, but, as Chekhov said, it can be understood. with the soul only through the actions of the characters, even if

[...] sometimes the poet feels more deeply than the actor; sometimes, and perhaps oftener, the actor's conception is stronger than the poet's; and there is nothing truer than Voltaire's exclamation, when he heard Clairon in a piece of his, "Did I really write that?" Does Clairon know more about it than Voltaire? Anyhow, at that moment the ideal type in the speaking of the part went well beyond the poet's ideal type in the writing of it [...] The poet had engendered the monster, Clairon made it roar. (Diderot, p. 437).

Good or evil, ethics or morality, are, however, inextricably linked to something that is probably worth emphasizing, namely, the spirit of the times. It is known that events do not define an epoch, but rather its dogmatic immateriality. Very often, the fundamental

notions collide or merge with the dynamics of social and, of course, cultural life and the changes that result from the natural course of rational and spiritual messages. A concrete example in favor of this theory, about how the spirit of the times manifests its "grandeur", is Meyerhold's epoch, also characterized by the declamatory style of the actors animated by the deepening of the workers' vision. Moral good or evil was abusively embedded in the discourse that the actors addressed directly to the audience. The audience was sometimes enlivened by the real news from the front, the mood of the actors and spectators enhancing the transmission and "color" of the message. Of course, this is an extreme example of the ideology of the time imposing its authority on the transmitted moral good or evil, the processuality of the "new actor" sought and invented by Meyerhold seeming to be at least questionable or misinterpreted in some cases. Perhaps the changes do not involve revolutionary transformations that would mean rebuilding art and its foundations and messages; there are, however, certainly artists (actors) who will have formulated their goals in ways not heard or accepted until then, thus, implicitly, the subjective representation of reality involved the direct and personal delivery of elements related to moral good or evil. The representation of ideological nature was no longer important, but the expression of one's own affective perception of human nature could conceptually prove new valences. A great French painter, for example, spoke of contemporary art as a recovery of human solidarity, but also emphasized the reality of his own being. The actors can consider now the lucid assembly of their own inner reality with the reality of those who watch and try, in a meeting through which the actor's art is used as a binder, to unite matter with spirit. More specifically, in some cases, the rupture between the abstractionism that the theatre performance will propose and the pure realism that the actor releases through play, following creative processes specific only to his art, can be healed, cured or at least repaired. Perhaps, for the audience, this will be noticed or very difficult to perceive through the modified atmosphere of a performance, but at an intimate-deep level the actor's art will be perceived as sensory and imaginative. A great film director said that through acting you can deny or at least accept and not treat as a triumphant or decrepit enemy even the deepest evil. So, in the actor's play, maybe only in the actor's play, the spirit can be mirrored, because regardless of the proposed theme, it is not matter, thus breaking the temporary limits of physical existence. Atmosphere, perceptions become possible and, above all, intelligible. Therefore, in seemingly irrational conditions, the actor's art will decipher to rational beings the moral meanings and codes, replacing a cold cultural phenomenon with a biological function, adding an essential characteristic to a direct instinctual phenomenon. Nicolae Steinhardt spoke precisely in this sense about the immeasurable power of transfiguration contained in the seemingly ordinary word "between", characterizing the art of writing, but also theatre, as an act of generosity of actions accomplished together. He considers that the actor has, in fact, a special condition and even if the playwright or director adopts superior cultural or dramaturgical messages, these are fulfilled through the specific process of the

actor's art that is found in the same measure and in the viewer's desire to experience. Steinhardt speaks of a

[...] kind of interspace, a no-man's land at equal distance from receiver and performer, where the drama of audition is actually consumed. In this way, both the literary text and the spoken text no longer belong exclusively to the "producer" [...] reading becomes a complex act, a communion between the "reader" and the "writer". Hence the "active" character of a "careful reading"... a meeting between two temperaments (2009, p. 135).

The active character and the collision between the different temperaments that the Romanian philosopher and later theologian talks about, can give birth in theatrical practice, something experienced by great directors and acting teachers, to a message containing moral good or evil. Many practicing directors, who later developed proper laboratories and theatre schools, tried to communicate the message of goodness using the relationship between acting vibration and the emotions of the spectators, rather than their explicit words or meanings. They rightly assumed, most of the time, that human beings have a special, instinctive receptivity to tones, emotions and intensities, and that, in fact, sounds contain the redemptive message. There is also the belief that resonance can include to some extent the "offspring" of emotional conditions that actors can arouse in any soul, regardless of the understood and spoken language. The meeting of temperaments "carrying" messages that can influence moral good or evil, as well as the actions arising from these concepts, is considered, however, by teachers who teach the art of the actor quite eccentric, precisely because of the specificity of this dual art. At a philosophical level, but also practical level, the testing of this highly original claim can be achieved by abstracting a validly formulated concept, of which Professor Cojar argued that, unfortunately, cannot really translate the essence, or by confronting, this time theatrically, the actor with an audience made up of totally different spectators in terms of structure from cast members. A great American director, for example, often moved his own successful company from the centre of New York right into the heart of Africa and forced his actors to improvise performances in predominantly unconventional spaces, on mats, using a minimum of props and giving up specific costumes intended for the original performance. Thus, through the performance, but also through honest relation to "something else", the specific mechanism of the actor's art acquired the value of theatrical essence, but also made room for the direct transmission of good or evil, moral or immoral, ethical or dishonest messages. The actors gained value precisely by the fact that they were intentionally "stripped" of any trace of sophistication, of any security and of any typical theatrical and cultural aspects accepted in their country of origin. In front of the defenseless actors, the audience also changed, being amazed and being able to endure and, later, to metabolize the accuracy of a message and an event shared with sincerity.

Moral good or moral evil are, probably, either very didactic or extremely insignificant concepts at a social level. The essence of theatre found only through the

processes and elements specific to the actor's art, involves reaching the core that will organize these concepts at a human level, the essential condition for things to come to an end being the removal of formalism and affectation. Peter Brook, an almost fanatical follower of non-verbal experiments, wrote that there were similarities even between the distancing effect imposed and created by Brecht and the effect of happening on the senses of the spectators. In fact, if the happening removed the barriers naturally imposed by reason and culture, the distancing invariably constituted of a sum of shocking elements, but, paradoxically, improved the message transmitted and enhanced the authenticity of this message.

A normal stage action will appear real to us if it is convincing and so we are apt to take it, temporarily, as objective truth. A girl, raped, walks on to a stage in tears—and if her acting touches us sufficiently, we automatically accept the implied conclusion that she is a victim and an unfortunate one. But suppose a clown were to follow her, mimicking her tears, and suppose by his talent he succeeds in making us laugh. His mockery destroys our first response. Then where do our sympathies go? The truth of her character, the validity of her position, are both put into question by the clown, and at the same time our own easy sentimentality is exposed. If carried far enough, such a series of events can suddenly make us confront our shifting views of right and wrong (Brook, 2014, p. 110).

The spectator part of this game is "tempted" to feel, investigate, and interrogate inward, claiming his own human nature and, as Brook said, even his own views as a being on this earth. In this way, the word "temptation" may no longer take on a negative biblical-religious connotation but become a call and a viable probability. Good can become through the actor as tempting as absolute evil, the choice being an instinctual one, indeterminate by any duty, on neither side, therefore, morally legitimate. In these terms the freedom of both parties, actors and spectators, appears possible towards what they want, that attracts them, and towards something they do not necessarily logically want, but they can't be indifferent for. In other words, there is a kind of fracture that apparently finds its solution at a certain moment and in a certain sense, good or evil appearing contextually against the explicit will of the spectators in full "procedural" interaction with the actor who thinks and acts in front of them. In this way, there is an assumed risk of a real search through the ocean of one's own beliefs, the result being often disturbing, but also unsettling from a moral point of view. Probing one's own interior will find something truly "own" directly related to interiority and subjectivity. When someone reaches the limit of his own interiority by sincerely questioning his own moral grid, he wakes up in a space where he is alone. Everything that is not directly related to one's own person, everything that is outside the ego is considered instinctive, more or less foreign, appearing as something distinct, inevitable, but the interaction will create a new dimension more assimilated to intuitive thinking, and less to reason.

Ancient philosophers spoke of will as the main vector of placing principles, emphasizing the theory that the path to free will is often liberation from one's own will. As a result, when the actor processes and transmits and the spectator is "pierced" (Grotowskian specific term) by the emotion transmitted by this "higher court", only then can the freedom providing honest self-interrogative hopes be born. Freedom presupposes, in this way, enlivening and renouncing egotistical intellectual desires on the part of the other, thus creating, not transcendent, but inner unity as an *a priori* principle of one's own moral conduct. Aristotle's writings in his *Poetics of Imitation (Mimesis)* are well known, which, in fact, has nothing to do with copying an external model. When art imitates nature, it can mean for the actor or spectator that art recreates the basic creative principle of things already created. In this way, the unity or substance of the unique transformation through art appears, which implies, of course, the serious investigation of the changes that can be related to the moral good or evil, as well as to the intrinsic transforming force of the substance. In other words, the acting and theatrical process carries in its own substance an "antagonism" that makes it move from what is to what is not, depending on the transmitted and received moral perception. It can be concluded that the actor's art can be linked to both moral good and evil only if it recreates the creative principle through clear facts and not through simple possibilities, but only through faculties that have become concrete passions and acts. In this way the "rational soul" referred to by sages, philosophers and artists from different eras, will react and be able to turn its attention to its own virtues or to what can be considered moral behavior or, on the contrary, can be constituted as weakness and mistake. Perhaps the theatrical process is linked precisely to the basic circumstances of moral good or evil by highlighting the indispensable conditions for cataloging principles as good or bad: freedom, knowledge, consistency and voluntary character.

The conditions of realization and perfection would be multiple, but one thing can be considered certain, namely that the actor's art can be related to moral evil or good in certain situations where the inner self of participants will be faced with effort, (sometimes) mental pain, and the voluntarily surrender of social masks. A great English director sincerely investigated the actor's condition, crying out:

What effect did the work have? It caused each actor a series of shocks - the shock of facing himself in the face of irrefutable challenges, the shock of capturing his own evasions, tricks, clichés, the shock of feeling something of his vast and untapped resources (Mitter and Shetsova, 2010, p. 140).

The privilege of the live process, on the other hand, the "beneficiary" of acting conflicts and confrontations with one's own self, i.e. the audience, updates, at the same time with the actor, the working conditions, discovering a reality that can overcome any function, extracting with one's own senses what Joe Bousquet called "conceptual realities". As director Aureliu Manea, often considered by his contemporaries an Artaud of the Romanian theatre, poetically concluded referring to the actor, spectator and, most of all, to the moral meanings,

[...] the pleasure to participate in the game comes from solving the enigma. In its depths, the performance encloses moral philosophies. It happens, however, quite rarely, that theatre builds the so-called model worth following. In its dialectic, more than the affirmation of what is morally good, the performance is the denial of what is characterologically bad. There is no exemplary history of heroes in theatre. Rarely does the one who enforces the law appear [...] The supreme human judgement at the end of the performance will choose between what is good and what is evil [...] The director will hide in the shadow of the actor, called to inspire fear or joy (2018, p. 201).

References:

1. ARISTOTEL (2000) *Poetica*. București: Editura Științifică.
2. BROOK, Peter (2014) *Spațiul gol*. București: Editura Nemira.
3. DELEUZE, Gilles și GUATTARI, Felix (2020) *Ce este filosofia*. București: Editura Hecate.
4. DIDEROT, *Paradox despre actor*. Biblioteca UNATC.
5. JUNG, Carl Gustav (2004) *Tipuri psihologice*. București: Editura Trei.
6. MANEA, Aureliu (2018) *Spectacole imaginare*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Eikon.
7. MITTER, Shomit și SHETSOVA, Maria (2010) *50 de regizori cheie ai secolului XX*. București: Editura Unitext.
8. NIETZSCHE, Friedrich (2018) *Nașterea tragediei*. București: Editura Cartex.
9. PLATON (2018) *Phaidon sau Despre suflet*. București: Editura Humanitas.
10. SFÂNTUL AUGUSTIN (2016) *Despre minciună*. București: Editura Humanitas.
11. STEINHARDT, Nicolae (2009) *Primejdia mărturisirii*. București: Editura Polirom.

Alexandru Papadopol is a film, stage and TV actor. He has a degree in the Art of acting and is currently a final-year doctoral student at UNATC "I.L. Caragiale". He was a student of the great professor Dem Rădulescu, graduating from the Faculty of Theatre, Acting Department, in 2002. He made his film debut in college with the lead role Ovidiu, in "Stuff and Dough", directed by Cristi Puiu, film that was the starting point of the New Romanian Wave. He made his theatrical debut in his third year of university at the Casandra Theatre Studio, playing one of the main roles in "Night of the Assassins" by Jose Triana, directed by Alexandru Berceanu. Alexandru Papadopol is also famous for the main roles in films such as: "Occident", directed by Cristian Mungiu, "Back Home to Dad", directed by Andrei Cohn, "Two Lottery Tickets", directed by Paul Negoescu, "Love Building", directed by Iulia Rugină, "Arrest", directed by Andrei Cohn, being one of the most representative actors of his generation. Since 2014 he has been part of the Odeon Theatre team, where he plays in successful plays, directed by: Alexandru Dabija, Andrei Șerban, Dinu Cernescu, Andrei Măjeri, Peter Kerek and others. Since 2010 he is one of the initiators of the "ActoriedeFilm.ro" project, producing independent films and holding film acting classes. He was also present in television series, some of them very successful among the general public.