

**ON THEATRE DURING
ROMANIA'S 'GOLDEN AGE':
*Diorama Theatre.
Discourse on Theatrical Criticism
During Communism.
The Deceitful Spring 1965-1977.*
BY **MIRUNA RUNCAN****

Teatru în diorama. Discursul criticii teatrale în comunism
Vol. 2: Amăgitoarea primăvară: 1965-1977
Tracus Arte
2020 (paperback, 578 pp)
ISBN: 9786060231882
by Miruna Runcan (Author)

ANA-MAGDALENA PETRARU



“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași, Romania
alina.petraru@gmail.com

Abstract: This work is the second volume of a comprehensive ‘trilogy’ aimed at accounting for the theatrical discourse during the communist period. Covering more than a decade, a so-called ‘deceitful spring’ (1965-1977), comes after ‘the fluctuating thaw’ (1956-1964) tackled by volume one and is followed by ‘the blizzard’ (1978-1989) which ends just before the fall of the totalitarian regime in our country. The author’s endeavour is unprecedented, and the comprehensive research conducted on almost five hundred pages ranges from the education in the field to the party’s contribution and the magazines’, not to mention the theatres’ or the openness to the West. A sociological dimension is also envisaged, along with a rhetorical analysis that stirs interest in specialists, reviewers, theatregoers and others related to the world of theatrical performance to enlarge their horizons.

Keywords: theatre criticism, Romanian and international performances, drama studies.

How to cite: Petraru, A.-M. (2023) ‘On Theatre During Romania’s ‘Golden Age’: Diorama Theatre. *Discourse on Theatrical Criticism During Communism. The Deceitful Spring 1965-1977*. By Miruna Runcan’, *Concept* 1(26), pp. 270-281.

Professor Miruna Runcan’s book is an extremely detailed analysis of theatre criticism during the communist period, in general, and the period between 1965-1977, in particular. In her foreword on the circumstances of the present research, she blames the small steps of digitalisation in our country (seminal during the time of the pandemic when she mostly carried out her work), arguing that the material was stored inappropriately to the detriment of national cultural memory that needs investigating (p. 10). This second volume continues methodologically the first one that integrated politics in theatrical criticism, enriching it in a sociological stance and from the perspective of aesthetic history (p. 11). The volume also benefits from a rhetorical and stylistic analysis, an ‘archaeological’ attempt at decoding the structural, emotional and significance dimensions of stage performances (p. 12).

In the introduction, the author clarifies her choice for the subtitle given to the years analysed, 1965-1977 being remembered as the ‘sunniest’ and ‘most bearable’ period in the harsh history of Romanian communism; it was a time when the cities’ population grew, flats were built, stores had food and other merchandise and commercial relations were set with European and Asian countries (p. 13). Moreover, we were visited by many presidents from all over the world and it was even possible to leave the country based on a personal or professional invitation (p. 14). There was a time for various reforms to consolidate ‘a multilaterally developed socialist society’ (p. 16). The life of the theatre at all its levels, i.e., institutional organisation, repertoire, leadership and performance, was influenced by the changes from top to bottom during the twelve years researched herein; it was characterised by contradictory directives, an intricate process (‘Byzantine’, to employ M. Runcan’s words) where compromise in censorship was king affecting

stakeholders (both managers and artists). There is great effervescence in this period bringing new generations of reputed artists, a levelling between the gap of top performances in Bucharest and the most significant provinces since young directors and actors were forced to start their career all over the country facilitated by the amount of travel in-between (pp. 17-18). State income was satisfying, and theatre people were also allowed to collaborate with other institutions for additional pay (p. 21).

At the level of criticism, the principle of continuity seems to be the prevailing one, about renewal which is slow and difficult to account for. New critics are trapped in party directives, hence the lack of change in stage life. The first part of the timeframe marks less party interventionism and acceptance of the 'socialist aestheticism'¹ paradigm. When they choose not to leave the country, critics prefer to keep a low profile, a tendency noticed from the previous period analysed, 'the fluctuating thaw' (1956-1964) (p. 22). An ideological migration towards European synchronicity under the pressure of the 'national epic' and the numerous feasts will influence criticism, along with the 'theatricality' of the social-political life directed to suit the purposes of the 'great ruler'. Torn between the duty to write texts that would please ideologically and one's real duties to properly evaluate theatre life, the critic finds oneself at the edge of schizophrenia (p. 23). Pluses can be seen at the increasing level of authority, which unfortunately remains insufficiently researched from M. Runcan's viewpoint (ibidem). Television has a say, as well, using the performances it broadcasts, those that it produces for the screen and the TV shows and interviews it makes available to the public, favouring the capital of our country (p. 24). Artists become TV stars, and the niche theatre critics that publish in magazines distinguish themselves from the anchors of cultural television shows (p. 25).

In chapter two, theatre criticism is regarded as a threshold between the party's instruments and performance institutions and the premise the author departs from is that, first of all, the critic is seen as a propaganda activist, and then as a professional (p. 27). Instances of circumventing political directives could be the samples of criticism published in *Secolul XX*, *Steaua*, *România literară* or similar magazines during the period (p. 28). *Teatrul* is of utmost importance among the periodical studies on performance, recording the premieres proposed from world literature (p. 31), the profile needed in theatre management (according to Nicolae Munteanu) (p. 32), or the actors' training (p. 33). M. Runcan dismisses some of the articles in *Teatrul* for lacking depth as in the case of the editorial team's visit to theatres (p. 34) or the transcription of a talk full of subjective remarks that was

1 See Martin, M. (2015) *Radicalitate și nuanță*, București: Tracus Arte.

supposed to be an interview (p. 35). Praise can be noted when initiatives like the following are encountered: cultural people such as ‘excellent translators, literary and drama critics or academics are invited to join the artistic councils of theatres, so far present only fictitiously or as consultants (...) with subscriptions to the most important international publications in the field’² (p. 38). (Applied) criticism of the unrealistic proposals in theatre repertoire of the choice for minor dramatists and the ignorance of major ones is labelled as ‘rather fatherly moralistic than brutally normative’ (p. 41). Complaints about the decrease of interest in the classics and preference for exaggerated sexual themes (e.g.: Tennessee Williams’s *Sweet Bird of Youth*, Barillet and Grédy’s *Cactus Flower* or the exceedingly played-on-stage Robert Thomas) are also documented (p. 42).

An interlude discusses a (less) friendly polemic in a decade of Romanian drama, an annual festival that took place in Bucharest at that time, covered by the magazine *Teatrul* in 1965 (pp. 43-44). The irony is brought into play, some failures admitted as having occurred in various stagings and the need for criticism to operate with gloves so as not to discourage young directors (p. 49). Valuable performances such as *Othello*, *Troilus and Cressida* and *Look Back in Anger* are saluted for their originality by Liviu Ciulei in *Contemporanul* (p. 50) despite voices rising against some of them, namely Vlad Mugur’s attack on *Troilus and Cressida* directed by David Esrig who supposedly ruined Shakespeare’s vision on Homer and Aeschylus’s great heroes (p. 52).

From an administrative viewpoint, interesting proposals are made such as Ștefan Talpalagă’s who talks about scenic movement workshops he hosted when he returned from Paris, coming with the initiative of professional culture courses and retraining sessions (pp. 73-74). The most visible activity is held by The Documentation Centre led by Mircea Mancaș and the idea of a complete performance database (with recordings) is advanced (a dream that has not come true to this day, according to the author) (*ibidem*).

The 1967 festival is praised for revisiting folklore sources, at international level pertaining to the trending flower power, a specific phenomenon of those years, showing in clothing, folk and pop music and at a larger scale, in a syncretic and abstract neo-romanticism. In socialist countries, it translated into a propagandistic nationalist ethos, an investment in a ‘national epic’ accompanied by a rewriting of the historical thread, work with multiple authors, be they playwrights, novelists, poets, movie directors or critics; the philosophical heroism of historical figures from Petru Rareș to Mihai Viteazul, Tudor Vladimirescu, Mircea cel Bătrân and Ștefan cel Mare is convincing and brings financial benefits and other perks to all the stakeholders (p. 78).

2 *Teatrul* (1965) no. 3, p. 13.

With respect to economical measures affecting the actors, in the paratext, the author brings into play her own experience as literary secretary, testifying to the practice of theatre managers that were attempting to save the actors' salaries after unfavourable legislative measures; even in the 80s, in the second part of the season, for actors that remained without roles, minor appearances were scheduled in groups, the number of soldiers or citizens witnessing a Shakespearean tragedy, thus increasing (p. 99).

Starting with the autumn of 1971, a major refracturing in Romanian social and political life can be grasped, similar to the 1945-1955 decade; it mostly shows in the practices of public discourse and control activity in relation to social and cultural life in its everyday motion as the 'cultural revolution' imposed and implemented by Ceaușescu comes in stages and forces citizens to protect themselves via ignorance of the 'cardboard culture' (pp. 121-122). An ideological shift is visible at all levels, artists of the people returning to theatre after retirement by presidential decree (p. 128).

Special attention is given to the scandal around Gogol's *Government Inspector* directed by Lucian Pintilie at Bulandra, overcoming its aesthetic value, echoing to this day (due to the special issue, 1/1990 of *Teatrul azi* and the director's subchapter in his book, *Bricabrac*, 2003, Buc.: Humanitas). 'A genius interpretation of a classic work' (Maxim Crișan) (pp. 133-134), 'a personal adaptation taken to a new philosophical level focusing on a dramatic situation of collective psychology' (Valentin Silvestru) (p. 136), the play was banned, marking a stronger intervention of censorship in the years to come (p. 137).

Year 1973 marks the building of theatres in counties, both large and small – The National Theatre of Craiova, The State Theatre of Târgu-Mureș, and The National Theatre "I.L. Caragiale" in Bucharest –, the critics acclaiming the events, pompously the one in the capital (counting six articles at the inauguration) (p. 165) and less so the ones in the country (*cf.* Ileana Popovici's reportage drawing attention to some organizational issues³) (pp. 163-164).

Year 1974 brings the fulfilment of three decades of communism, the insurrection on August 23rd being magnificently celebrated in our country throughout the year, echoes in the press mirroring the image of the brilliant ruler and socialist ideals (166-167). Theatre criticism makes no exception, actors being asked to debate on topics such as 'Communists, animators in theatre'⁴ within the investigation on 'Drama criticism and its role in contemporary Romanian theatre'⁵ (p. 169). Directors are required to produce 'a performance of ideas' since 'it is in

³ *Teatrul* (1973) no. 4, pp. 38-42.

⁴ *Teatrul*, (1974) no. 4, pp. 21-24.

⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 3-10.

the power of theatre as one of the most popular forms of artistic creation to turn each performance into a tribune of ideas without diminishing its potential. No random ideas are required, but coherent and convincing formulas, critical and creative attitudes meant to inspire and contribute to the general social-political and economic effort (...).⁶ (p. 177) Among the plays acclaimed between 1974-1975, there are Camil Petrescu's *Danton*, Liviu Ciulei's fourth version of *Aziul de noapte* at Bulandra or Alexandru Tatos's *Mutter Courage* in Cluj, M. Sorescu's *Matca*, D.R. Popescu's *Piticul în grădina de vară* and *Pasărea Shakespeare* and Iosif Naghiu's *Valiza cu fluturi* (pp. 181-182).

If 1976 is remembered for the National Festival 'Song to Romania' in which popular theatres mostly have a role (such as the one in Caracal which began its season with Paul Ioachim's *Nu suntem îngeri* directed by Paul Stratilat known for his radio performances) (p. 190), 1977 was shattered by a devastating earthquake which occurred on March 4, and took the lives of reputed figures, deaths recorded by the press, as well (actors Toma Caragiu, Eliza Petrăchescu, director Alexandru Bocănet) (pp. 193-194).

Chapter three tackles theatre criticism and education, M. Runcan arguing that artistic education and theatre specialism underwent various stages of organizational reform between 1946-1989 based on various cultural policies (p. 197). During the years analysed, there were only two higher education institutions for theatre studies, one in Bucharest, and another in Târgu-Mureş employing the inter-war model of masterclasses along with common courses of theatre history, aesthetics, Marxism, and scientific socialism. Acting classes were completed by speaking, canto, ballet, scenic movement, etc. (pp. 198-199). Theatre criticism is interested in what happens in these institutions, in terms of acting and directing and *Teatrul* magazine holds a primary position in relation to other publications (ibidem). Since 1966, critics have started to show their concern on some productions that lacked technical preparation and talent discrepancies among various graduates of the same class (p. 201). To be more precise, professors are blamed for teaching students genres and mannerisms, instead of approaching several theatrical typologies and stylistics; the horizon of expectations envisages thus a *total actor* as target of the educational process (p. 202). Among the reforms proposed in education, it is recommended for the first two years to be devoted to general studies, and the following three to a specialty field in theatre rather based on research and creation workshops, than masterclasses (p. 208).

Chapter four deals with cultural magazines, their authority and of their criticism; the author feels that the young generations of artists and spectators born

6 'Spectacolul de teatru, tribună de idei', *Teatrul* (1975) no. 1, p. 7.

after 1989 would find it hard to relate to the cultural periodicals from 1965 to 1977. It is worth mentioning that with the decrease in propaganda, the value of cultural goods in theatre included, increases systematically (p. 263). Under the pressure of format, theatre is awarded room only for reviews of plays that stirred local or regional interest reflecting the activity of the theatre in proximity benefiting from more and more festivals (p. 267). Among the new critics, M. Runcan lists Mihai Nadin, Monica Săvulescu-Voudouri, Florica Ichim, George Banu, Sebastian Costin, Cristina Dumitrescu, Aurel Bădescu, Dinu Kivu and Marius Robescu (pp. 268-269). During 1965-1970, stress fell on national and translated literature, *Theatre* magazine publishing a translation from Brecht's *A Short Organon for the Theatre* by Florin Tornea in 1968 (pp. 270-271). An investigation on the state of art criticism came out in 1965 in *Theatre* magazine, editors proposing questions on the functions and quality of criticism, its relation to artists and the audience, not to mention its visibility with respect to Marxist aesthetics. Some praise the high quality of criticism (Ion Cojar), others complain about the illusion of objectivity (the playwright Al. Morodan) (pp. 279-280). Generally speaking, there is desire for 'a newspaper mentality' to be replaced by 'a creative mentality' (Lucian Pintilie) (p. 281). Minutely, 'efficient criticism (...) should dissociate, in a performance: the exactitude of meanings (...), grammatical correctness of theatrical language (...) and the equivalence of values'.⁷ Attention is also drawn to the distressful distance between criteria of value judgement in direction criticism when it comes to theoretical consensus and its practical application (the reputed academic and cultural activist Andrei Strihan giving the example of Dinu Cernescu's performance of *Measure for Measure* and rising against Radu Popescu and his allegedly tyrannical critical attitude) (pp. 306-307).

An interlude sheds light on the debated authority of criticism as part of the Everac-Silvestru scandal, the former attacking the entire world of theatre of that moment for what he deemed to be a decay of drama, and professional limitations to realist plays, blaming the biased criticism for the failure of his philosophical plays *Patimi* and *Subsolul*. The latter accuses the former of narcissism and his lack of professional ethics in the dismissal of his colleagues' work (pp. 318-319).

In the fifth chapter which discusses criticism, artists' travels and theatrical formulas, along with the openness to the West, survivors' memory is brought into play to testify to the cosmopolitanism, cultural production and exchanges between 1965-1970 (p. 343). This allows critics, too, to view international performances and attend festivals abroad (p. 345). B. Ervin who returned from Paris writes a

7 Teodorescu, C. (1965) "Poziția de expectativă nu poate avea asupra artei decât un efect sterilizant", *Teatrul*, nr. 10, pp. 15-16.

reportage drawing on echoes of the French press on Ionesco's *Rhinoceros* directed by Lucian Giurchescu, Evgheni Şchvarţ's *Shadow* and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* directed by David Esrig, against the background of the award-winning performances, mentioned by M. Lovinescu's diary, as well (pp. 346-347). Less impact seem to have foreign theatre companies in our country; this is the case of the Vieux Collombier in 1966 with two plays from the French heritage, namely Paul Claudel's *Hostage* and Victor Hugo's *Lucrezia Borgia* (according to the author, Dana Crivăţ politely reviews them) (p. 348). Ecaterina Oproiu's *Nu sunt turnul Eiffel* was translated into ten languages and staged in several Western European countries according to the Austrian and German press cited by Romanian critics (p. 350). The interlude on Royal Shakespeare Company in Bucharest is considered the event of the year and of the period analysed in the book due to the legendary performance of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* directed by Peter Brook, a tour subsidised by British Council for Eastern European countries (p. 355). However, ARIA (The Romanian Agency for Artistic Business Management) suggested that the scene with Bottom (Phallic Bottom) should be changed but the manager refused to censor it in any way; as a result, criticism is moderate in praise and *Scânteia* sharply rises against the play, dismissing it for its vulgarity, obscenity and 'shade of excessive naturalism' (pp. 356-357). The author argues that during the years studied, the Romanian theatre, via the voices of its critics and artists, takes an ascending parabolic path from 1965 to 1970, only to descend at an alarming rate after 1971. This partially owes to Ceauşescu's directives from 1971 and to the economic constraints determined by the oil crisis after 1973 (pp. 407-408).

Chapter six analyses research, focusing on theatre criticism and its scholarly dimension which developed significantly between 1965 and 1974, yet it does not compare to the field of literature, aesthetics or fine arts despite the individual and collective syntheses published, i.e., *Istoria teatrului românesc*, Ed. Academiei RSR (vol. I, 1965, vol II, 1971, vol III, 1973) by Simion Alterescu (ed.), Anca Costa-Foru, Olga Flegont, Ion Cazaban, Mihai Florea, Letiţia Gîţă, Liliana Ţopa, Ana-Maria Popa etc., *Teatrul românesc contemporan. 1944-1974* published at Meridiane and edited by Simion Alterescu and Ion Zamfirescu, *Istoria universală a teatrului* by Ion Zamfirescu in several volumes since 1966 and *Istoria teatrului universal* by Ovidiu Drîmba which came out in consistent volumes in 1971 at Meridiane, among others (pp. 412-413). Many international theatre critics have neither been translated during the period studied, nor to this day. Structuralism and semiotics seem to find a way to penetrate theatrical criticism influencing Solomon Marcus's *Poetica Matematică* (1970, Ed. Academiei RSR) which contains new and revealing models of structural interpretation of theatre applied to one of Caragiale's works

with insignificant echoes in our country despite the ones abroad (pp. 418-419). There is an investigation devoted to research by *Contemporanul* in August 1968, Dina Cocea advocating for three directions of urgent development for historical and theoretical Romanian theatre studies: a theatre individual's work, theatrical movement overall and the theoretical issues of performance arts (pp. 420-421).

Chapter seven examines research from another viewpoint, that of sociology and theatre with insights on Pavel Câmpeanu's studies. M. Runcan assesses the sociological investigation of theatre in Romania as a Morgana girl that distances itself along with the horizon; this is because in the past thirty years several theatres ordered surveys to account for the structure and preference of their audience and the mystery around the lack of sociological interest, apart from financial troubles, remains unsolved (pp. 451-452). The Institute of Sociology closed in 1976 and Pavel Câmpeanu's sociological studies on theatre between 1969-1974 are unique in the field perhaps due to his position at the Office of Studies and Polls in Radio and Television where he led a small team of researchers (*ibidem*). He surveyed on 392 people from Bucharest, a 'pre-test for future research'⁸ (p. 462). He found out that 30% of the respondents preferred Caragiale, 20% Baranga and 10% Shakespeare, since the playwrights were introduced to them at school and then through performances (p. 465). Theatre goes favour The National Theatre in Bucharest (60%), followed by Bulandra (21%), Teatrul de Comedie (7.5%), Nottara (7%), Giulești (5%), Mic (2%), yet they might have been unable to make a difference (either because of the questionnaire or their lack of knowledge) between drama theatres and the musical ones, which is another problem that needs solving (p. 467). Narrowed down to the type of audience, some theatres score at viewers over 35 (the National Theatre and Bulandra), and others at those below this age (Nottara, Giulești), yet there is maximum dispersion regarding preferences for actors (pp. 468-469).

P. Câmpeanu's volume, *Oamenii și teatrul. Privire sociologică asupra publicului* (1973, Meridiane) comprises a piece of research conducted on a large sample of 7.500 people in its first chapter only aiming at investigating how the title of a play sticks to memory. 500 titles are brought into play and the results are common, similar to the ones in his shorter study mentioned above: *O scrisoare pierdută*, *Apus de soare*, and also satirical comedies by Aurel Baranga, *Mielul Turbat* and *Opinia publică*. He makes the same mistake as in his previous study, to assimilate the tickets sold to the number of spectators (pp. 475-476). He also conducts experiments in the final part of the book, on mimicry that fails and on performance, which is more successful, to test the reception and critical thinking of those without previous

8 Câmpeanu, P. (1970) "Studii de sociologie a teatrului. Autori și piese", *Teatrul*, nr. 11, p. 81.

experience of going to theatre (p. 492). M. Runcan argues that we are left with the impression of Câmpeanu's overinterpretation of the influence of extra-artistic experience of apprentices concerning performance processes as long as psychological analysis elements are absent from the study (p. 494).

Chapter eight is devoted to rhetorical analysis and critical archaeology against the background of textual centrism and the freedom of hermeneutical visionary direction, the official position adopted by the author of the book (p. 507). Critical archaeology is particularly meant to give us a vivid picture of the performances during the period studied (p. 508). Several dimensions are brought into play: the contextual emphatic one covering the reviewer's immediate reactions within his own reception process, the effect of the performance on the audience included (the example provided is Ileana Popovici's review of *Cinci schițe de I.L. Caragiale și Cântăreța Cheală* which came out in *Contemporanul*, 1965); the contextual-comparative one which comprises views on the specific history, the intrinsic intentions of the dramatic text and the way in which the performance is made and whether it circumscribes to the current aesthetic and ideological landscape (the instance of *King Lear* staged by Penciulescu in 1970 and discussed by Mira Iosif in *Teatrul*) (p. 512); the hermeneutical dimension of critical discourse deriving from the previous one covers with arguments how the critic attempted to perceive and summarize the general intentions of the performance and how its system of significance sticks together (the instance of *D'ale carnavalului* directed by Lucian Pintilie and reviewed by Andrei Strihan) (pp. 513-514); the descriptive dimension, seminal for the imaginary reconstruction of the performance can be divided into the scene with its costumes, decorum and the atmosphere herein and the descriptive-interpretative dimension for actors' roles, be they individual or in a team, how they play their roles and their contribution to the performance dynamics (pp. 515-516). Gheorghe Dinică and Stela Popescu are mentioned here for their outstanding qualities as actors (p. 517). The final dimension is the axiological one (illustrated by a critical passage on *The Bald Soprano* from B. Elvin in *Teatrul*, 1965) (p. 518). David Esrig's *Rameau's Nephew* is the performance chosen to account for the intertwining of the dimensions described above and the productivity of interferences in the critical pieces of various authors (pp. 523-526). Radu Penciulescu's version of *King Lear* is also considered from the viewpoint of its archaeology and reconstruction as it has benefited from the largest number of chronicles during the period studied (p. 527). *Hamlet* played at Nottara was an event worth discussing for the hermeneutical stance it triggered in the director and his analyst, labelled as 'a performance of culture and a political one. It is a performance of theatrical culture since we find in it, Shakespeare's enormous exegesis filtered by Cernescu's thought and sensibility. It is a political performance

because the entire system of directing and though draws on firm political attitude towards the truths of the text⁹ (p. 544).

To conclude, as compared to the previous period researched, between 1965-1977 theatre criticism became more professional as its authors employed more references and brought into play clearer arguments, hence the more scholarly dimension, according to M. Runcan (p. 565). However, the comparative dimension continues to remain a marginal one (p. 566). Criticism gains in prestige and authority due to a constant relationship between theatre institutions and critics, along with the increasing number of publications hosting cultural columns (p. 568). There are no cases of dissidence or rebellion, just some discrete compromises (at the level of censorship), and, as a step forward from the 50s when the critic aimed at a position in the party, there appears to be sincerity in the critical evaluation and higher self-controlled freedom in one's professional destiny (p. 573).

References:

1. Câmpeanu, P. (1970) "Studii de sociologie a teatrului. Autori și piese", *Teatrul*, no. 11, year XV, pp. 81-89.
2. Martin, M. (2015) *Radicalitate și nuanță*. București: Tracus Arte.
3. Munteanu, V. (1974) "Hamlet", *Teatrul*, no. 3, year XIX, pp. 41-43.
4. *Teatrul* (1965) no. 3, year X.
5. *Teatrul* (1973) no. 4, year XVIII.
6. *Teatrul* (1974) no. 4, year XIX.
7. *Teatrul* (1975) no. 1, year XX.
8. Teodorescu, C. (1965) "Poziția de expectativă nu poate avea asupra artei decât un efect sterilizant", *Teatrul*, no. 10, year X, pp. 14-19.

Miruna Runcan is a writer and theater critic, full professor at the Faculty of Theater and Film of Babeș-Bolyai University since 2004. She has also been director of the Doctoral School of Theater (since 2009) and director of the Theater Department at Babeș-Bolyai University Cluj-Napoca (since 2014) and of the Center for Research and Creation in Theatre, Film and Media "Vlad Murgu" (since its establishment in 2007). She is a member of the Romanian Writers' Union and general secretary of the Romanian Section of the International Association of Theater Critics.

Among others, she published the following works: *Cinci divane ad-hoc* (1994, Buc.: Unitext), *Introducere în Etică și legislația presei* (1997, Grupul editorial All), *A patra putere. Legislație și etică pentru jurnaliști* (2001, Dacia), *Modelul Teatral Românesc* (2000, Unitext) – volume for which she was awarded the prize for the best theater book of AICT in 2001; *Teatralizarea și Reteatralizarea în România. 1920-1960* (2003, Eikon), *Pentru*

9 Virgil Munteanu, V. (1974) "Hamlet", *Teatrul*, no. 3, p. 41.

o semiotică a spectacolului teatral (2005, Dacia), *Fotoliul scepticului spectator* (2007, Unitext), *Habarnam în orașul teatrului. Universul spectacolelor lui Alexandru Dabija* (2010, Limes), *Actori care ară fără rest* (2011, Cheiron/Fundația Camil Petrescu), *Signore misterioso. O anatomie a spectatorului* (2011, Unitext), *Critica de teatru: Incotro?* (2015, Presa Universitară Clujeană), *Odeon 70. O aventură istoric-omagială* (2016, Oscar Print), *Club 70.Retro* (roman, 2017, Cartea Românească).

She founded the research group *Laboratorul Dramaturgia Cotidianului/ The Daily Dramaturgy Laboratory* (2004) with C.C. Buricea-Mlinarcic, a group that carried out several inter and transdisciplinary research and creation projects, financed by AFCN and CNCS.

Co-founder and associate editor of the magazine *ultimaT. Alternative în cultura teatrală*, 1998-2000. Editor in chief of *Man.In.Fest, Trimestrial de cultură a spectacolului* (2003-2011)/*Man.In.Fest, Performing Arts Quarterly* (2003-2011) edited by ArtReSearch Association. Founder and member of the editorial team of *STUDIA DRAMATICA* (2006-present). Initiator and coordinator of the collection of *Studii de teatru și film/Theater and Film Studies*, edited by the Center for Research and Creation in Theatre, Film and Media "Vlad Mugur" (2006-present).

She was nominated for the Award for the best theater critic, UNITER Gala 2003, in 2011 for the Program *Dramaturgy of the Mundane*, to receive the LPTW Prize (League of Professional Theatre Women, New York) Gilder/Coigny International and she was awarded the UNITER prize for theatre criticism in 2021.



Miruna Runcan, © Cătălin Grigoriu,

Photo source:

https://www.google.com/search?sca_esv=572078159&q=miruna+runcan+cv&tbn=isch&source=lnms&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjo5Y3bw-qBAxWBgv0HHQWgBUIQ0pQJegQIDBAB&biw=1920&bih=923&dpr=1#imgrc=ls-Ku9CMXyCS2M