

all that in the coldness and distance of a professional relation in which each party knows their limits, preserves their “correctness” and only approaches work on the product from a technical angle.

There have been many situations in which the result has been more than positive when the limits of a personal relation were exceeded – there are many instances where the project only benefited from the abyss of feelings unleashed. However, most often, since it was all chemistry, after the project ends the personal relation fades away. We often read, hear or see in the media stories about such couples (actors and actors, directors and actors, stage designers and directors etc.) but, as often as not, we also read or hear that those couples have broken up after a great scandal or have given questionable statements about each other.

That is why the transition from the professional to the personal becomes delicate – of course, we can hardly do without the personal, but its limits must never be disregarded and should be kept to the coordinates of pure friendship, without other emotional implications. Easy to say, hard to do.

The status of discipline when a relation turns from professional to personal becomes very sensitive – it will be hard to relate to things the same way in the long term and preserve discipline in working on a role when your tongue is looser, you can take more liberties, your behaviour is less restricted – whether by social norms or context.

5. Conclusions

Creative freedom and discipline are two concepts which, though at first sight complete opposites, are related by the mere fact that they are powered by the same motor – the actor’s “common sense”. (In a previous paper, I have spoken of this “common sense” not necessarily as what you acquire through proper education, but rather as that professional decency combined with a humility of the senses. The paper was inspired by David Mamet’s book *Heresy and Common Sense for the Actor*.)

Discipline is something without which I doubt one can achieve performance and go beyond a certain amateurism. Personally, I see no way of moving forward if the creative freedom an artist needs (whether a painter, a writer, a musician, an actor in theatre or film) is not supported by steely discipline – which involves reliability, punctuality, respect for the schedule and everything related (such as, in the case of actors, learning their lines, being respectful to their fellow actors, following the director’s indications). I have seen talented people with no discipline, people who quickly broke down in this complex line of work which is the Art of Theatre or the Art of Film, people who wasted their talent in unmemorable endeavours, in Bacchic or nocturnal adventures, in inappropriate situations or in falling into self-worship. When we rehearsed with Mr. Ciulei, he used to tell us “this job is a marathon, not a sprint” – and understood the final line is drawn much, much later.

I believe picking just one of these two paths can face you with a Fata Morgana, and that misunderstood “creative freedom” can lead you down a road from which it is very hard to return – whether as an actor or as a director.

If in his professorship Gottfried Semper considered the work of art as a "product of practical purpose, raw material and technique" Alois Riegl opposed his vision of the work of art as "the result of a categorical will of art aware of its goal" ⁵

Regarding those thoughts about „a work of art” – considering that what an actor does is „a work of art”, and not taking in consideration a director’s job, what I think about that is that the

