

Theatre in Post-Newtonian Era

Ion MIRCIOAGĂ*

Abstract: The development of the exact sciences imposed a new content of the concept of reality. It is necessary to revise everyday vocabulary and grammars in use in order to understand it. Obviously, it would be desirable to reconsider the means of expression of the theater. Two such attempts by prominent contemporary playwrights are described.

Keywords: reality, time, space, "Chunga", "Copenhagen"

This concept, *the reality* is damned. At first sight, it is easy to describe: everything that exists. That is, everything that I see, the display, the discs from the right and the books from the left, visible thanks to peripheral vision; and all that I hear, the noise of my fingers on the keyboard; and all that I smell, the aroma of hot coffee; finally, all I can sense with my sense organs. To which must be added those devices that diversify and increase my capabilities to research the world. Obviously, I don't perceive – God forbid! – the whole reality, and I am content to see a state of affairs around me. But which, changes as I am writing, for reality falls apart and is accomplished from the rows that I delete, or add, or alter, from the coffee that is dwindling and cooling, from the squeaking of the chair on which I toss, searching for my words. Defining the reality seems to be a bit complicated. The verb "to exist" is replaced by the verb "to happen". Physicists say categorically: "the world is a network of events." (Rovelli, 2019: 81.) (s.a.) It's hard, but we'll have to believe them and to live with the thought that "nothing *is*, things happen." (Ibid., *ibid.*) (s. a.) Even so, why should we avoid grasping the whole reality? One reason is at hand: it is unbearable considering the way we are now made up. Reality is not everything I'm looking at *right now*, but also what I saw yesterday; and what I shall see tomorrow if I see again. What can I understand from the overlapping of all these images? Wouldn't I fail to lose judgment? And what if we hear all the noises of the world at the same time? When the music of my neighbours is added to the recalled sound, of the keys I

* Professor PhD, Faculty of Theatre, UNAGE, Iași

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

touch to write, and a jackhammer is churning on the street, I cover my ears; which is why I must abandon this writing. Moreover, if I persevered, I would find that the usual tools of penetrating reality help us calculate how long we get from Bucharest to Iasi, but they are powerless when, on a cosmic level, it is found that “now” and “here”, “past”, “future”, “present” and “there” are concepts devoid of substance. (Idem: 40-41.) Understanding space and time, in a world extended from subatomic particles to black holes, forces us to abandon the preconceived ideas about reality. It's not just what it looks like. In these circumstances, it may be justified to try to propose an introduction to possible nuances of the concept of realism, of theatrical realism, in this case. It is a difficult process of penetration, for familiar new logic is hindered by the obligation to redefine concepts, to adapt the articulated language to the evolution of the physical sciences. Judgements use words, and it becomes important to note that the very contents of words need to be revised.

The grammar of many modern languages conjugates the verbs to the “present”, “past” and “future” tense. It is not adapted to talk about the real temporal structure of the world, which is more complex. Grammar developed based on our limited experience before we realized its imprecision in capturing the rich structure of the world.

What confuses us when we try to understand the discovery that there is no universal objective present is only the fact that our grammar is organized around an absolute distinction - "past/present/future" -, valid only partially, here in our immediate vicinity. The structure of reality is not the one involved by this grammar. We say that an event “is” or “was” or “will be.” We don't have a grammar adapted to say that an event “was” in relation to me, but “is” in relation to you. (Idem: 92-93.)

Scientists are used to the lack of certainty. Their concerns involve, by their very nature, unknown areas of existence. Uncertainties alarm us, other people, since they generate uncertainty. This is one of the reasons why, in order to make themselves understood, physicists are looking for unique means of expression.

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

In the atmosphere of conceptual catastrophe produced by early quantum discoveries, it has sometimes been suggested that it would be good to create a new language, or a new logic, or both. It was obvious that language and old logic did not lend themselves to the representation of the quantum universe. (Houellebecq, 2021: 72)

If everyday language needs to be rebuilt to have a chance to describe reality, what should happen to the means of expression of the theatre? The research can start from the realistic theater, which has been talked about a lot, in a special context, because the lack of effective grammatical instruments and the need to reconstruct the articulated language legitimizes the use of metaphors even in the exercise of rational capacities. The antecedents are provided by philosophy.

We can conceive a poem without philosophy, but not a philosophy without poetry, though not in the more radical sense of the romantics and their epigons. [...]The value of poetry is very great, its role in the life of the soul is overwhelming, but the energies that produce it are among the faculties that do not require a preparatory exercise. Philosophical thinking, however, is a laborious function, proceeding by successive meditations, so that its manifestations cannot be deprived of the forces within, in other words, more within the reach of the spirit. Thus, the philosophical reflection works in part with the poetic forces of the spirit, and that in the work of conquering the truth, the actions which derive from the latter become indispensable means for the most precise thinkers. (Vianu, 1971: 67.)

Obviously, figures of speech cannot be excluded from the realistic theatre. It is noted, however, that the reconsideration of the theatrical language has an importance that goes beyond stage art in its strict meaning, if the statement that the world is a stage is taken seriously into account, as does Evreinov. He amuses himself by proposing the analogy between the hero of Molière who unknowingly produced prose, and each of us who play theater without understanding that we play roles (Evreinov, 2020: 48-49.) The author argues that theater is for man an instinct as important as that of preservation. Moreover, he brings up mimetics to demonstrate that the faculty of transfiguration is found in both the plant and animal kingdoms. Histrionism is not

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

only defining for man, and *theater is more than an art, for it imposes a reality that includes stage art and everyday reality*. We allow ourselves to call this factuality a *theatrical reality*, and we hasten to show that it does not encompass all the existence, and that the concept does not exhaust the uncertainties about the nature of reality. These, old since man defied the divine prohibition and bit the fruit of knowledge, have been heightened at the beginning of the last century, when Einstein showed that time is not universal and space is a kind of flexible shell influenced by gravity. In the footsteps of Einstein's research on the nature of light, Louis de Broglie (<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Louis-de-Broglie>, accessed on January 31, 2022) demonstrated that matter has sometimes a corpuscular nature, sometimes a wavy one; more explicitly: sometimes it manifests as a substance, sometimes as a wave. The description of this world which seems strange to us, as it seemed strange to humans centuries ago that the Earth was a sphere rotating at a remarkable speed around its axis, was the object of the Copenhagen School, led by Niels Bohr, the founder of post-Newtonian mechanics. Mainly, Bohr's group showed that the laws of physics based on Newton's discoveries are approximations - more gently said, particular cases - of quantum physics. (<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Niels-Bohr>, accessed on January 31, 2022). The school's brightest representative, Werner Heisenberg (<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Werner-Heisenberg> accessed on January 31, 2022), founded the Uncertainty Principle, according to which *there are pairs of physical variables in the subatomic universe that cannot be measured accurately at the same time*. Based on this principle, Heisenberg argued that reality is a group of probabilities. "*It is as if God had not drawn reality with a firm line but had drawn only dotted contours.*" (Rovelli, 2021: 26) (s. n.) The thesis disturbed the followers of determinism, who rejected *in fact* the post-Newtonian mechanics. But what was surprising was Einstein's reaction, who, although proposed Heisenberg for the Nobel Prize, did not reconcile himself with the atypical universe depicted by Bohr's collaborators. Wonderful example of opening and *eloquent reading of an absurd theater text*. If Einstein lived, an exemplary controversy took place between him and Bohr through letters, articles, and conferences. (Idem: 27-29.) During these years, Bohr nuanced the principle of Heisenberg, replacing the uncertainty with complementarity. He admits that it is impossible to characterize a wave and a particle exactly at the same time but argues that their simultaneous description is richer in information than their separate presentation.

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

Bohr, his wife, Margrethe, and Heisenberg are the characters of Michael Fryan's play "Copenhagen".¹ *The playwright proposes a theatrical reality that starts from a historical reality.* In 1941 Heisenberg visited Bohr in Copenhagen and the two scientists took a short walk so that the discussion between them could not be intercepted by any microphones placed by the Hitlerite's in the house. The content of the conversation was not known for a long time. There were conflicting assumptions, justified primarily by the cold that occurred after that event between the coryphaei of quantum mechanics. The controversies were also emphasized by the fact that the clarification of the episode would impress a certain direction in the unravel of a mystery: what role did Heisenberg play as the head of German scientists engaged in the Nazis' attempt to achieve the atomic weapon? The author tends to argue that Heisenberg tried to sabotage the project. He is contradicted by historians and the academic Community. Important points of support for their opinion are variants of a letter which Bohr intended to send to Heisenberg, which remained in the Danish scientist's archive. The epistle, referring to the meeting in 1941, was never sent. According to the customs, all documents should have been made public in 2012, five decades after the death of the Danish scientist. Fryan's text prompted the family members to publish in 2002 the part of the archive that refers to the play. (Barad, 2007: 10) The most important passage from the perspective of our research is a fragment of a draft from 1962, in which Bohr denies that Heisenberg, in that meeting, suggested to him those German physicists are trying their best to prevent the atomic bomb from being made. The playwright notes that *while the intention Heisenberg declared to the Hitlerisms was not completed, Bohr helped the Americans to make the two bombs dropped on Japan at the end of the war, without having formally engaged in it.* Of course, Bohr has always stated that he intended to hasten the defeat of Germany; can he be charged with the murder committed by the Americans?

Heisenberg: Oppenheimer described you as the team's father-confessor. /Bohr: It seems to be my role in life. /Heisenberg: He said you made a great contribution. /Bohr: Spiritual, possibly. Not practical. /Heisenberg: Fermi says it was you who

¹ The views on this play are developments of the research projects that we have proposed in our thesis on empowerment, currently being drafted – February 5, 2022.

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

worked out to trigger the Nagasaki bomb. /Bohr: I put forward an idea. (...) I was spared the decision. (Fryan, 2000: 47)²

The debate is growing: do scientists have the right to make it possible for people to use atomic energy? Fryan doesn't answer the question. Instead, we allow ourselves to see that *the principle of indeterminacy has important implications when we judge in a moral perspective the relationship between facts and stated intentions.*

Heisenberg: explaining and defending myself was how I spent the last thirty years of my life. When I went to America in 1949 a lot of physicists wouldn't even shake my hand. Hands that built the bomb wouldn't touch mine. (Idem)

The theatrical situation is an expression of Heisenberg's principle. Bohr's pacifist intentions are not certified, but neither are they invalidated by the bombing of Japan; the certainty that the Germans failed to build the nuclear weapon does not clarify the existence or non-existence of Heisenberg's intention to sabotage the project.

The reason why Heisenberg went to meet Bohr in Copenhagen in 1941 remained ambiguous. Fryan proposes a space without the Newtonian coordinates we're familiar with, and a time when the historical flow is suspended. In this way, it is possible to confront the two physicists after their disappearance from Earth; in the controversy, Bohr's wife Margrethe also takes part. The stake of a directorial project with this text is the realization of a reality that questions and includes everyday reality, and which is based on uncertainty. "Heisenberg: ... I'm your enemy; I'm also your friend. I'm a

² "Heisenberg: Oppenheimer described you as the team's father-confessor. /Bohr: It seems to be my role in life. /Heisenberg: He said you made a great contribution. /Bohr: Spiritual, possibly. Not practical. /Heisenberg: Fermi says it was you who worked out to trigger the Nagasaki bomb. /Bohr: I put forward an idea. I was spared the decision." (translated n.)

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

danger to mankind; I'm also your guest. I'm a particle; I'm also a wave". (Idem, 2000: 77-78)³

Assuming reality as a theatrical reality, the characters create events. The network of these events does not depend on linear time. The reunion is initiated by Heisenberg, who, at the narrative level, wants to unravel the reasons for the visit. In the realm of meanings, the attempt is generated by the desire to explain himself. The inability to evaluate simultaneously, in moral order, intentions and facts forces Heisenberg to admit that all he can hope for is to understand himself. This is also impossible. Fryan uses one of the theories of the Copenhagen School, according to which the knowing subject vitiates the results of the examination of an object under investigation, to argue that a man cannot even know himself accurately.

*The flow of the narrative contradicts the linearity of time; the text proposes three endings, each following a draft, analogous to the drafts of Bohr's letter, and each concept is the effect of the finding that uncertainty persists. "Heisenberg: Why did I come to Copenhagen? Yes, why did I come...? /Bohr: One more draft, yes? One final draft?"*⁴

Historical reality is the basis of theatrical reality thanks to the characters, and it is useful for the proposed theatrical project to note relevant details of their ways of being, and to outline the dynamics of the relations between the three. In 1933, when Heisenberg won the Nobel Prize in Physics, the Nazis' rise to Germany began. Their policies prompted the dismissal or resignation of several academics, the best-known name being Einstein.⁵ Considering that the situation would not last long, Heisenberg did not take public positions. (<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Werner-Heisenberg> accessed on September 14, 2021) It is also worth noting that he himself was the target of violent attacks, being labeled a "white Jew" for his connections with Jewish scientists. Using the connections his mother's family had with Heinrich Himmler's family, Heisenberg managed to get an end to the harassment. At the same

³ "Heisenberg: ... I'm your enemy; I'm also your friend. I'm a danger to mankind. I'm also your guest. I'm a particle; I'm also a wave". (trad. n.)

⁴ Idem, ibidem, pg. 86 "Heisenberg: Why did I come to Copenhagen? Yes, why did I come...? /Bohr: One more draft, yes? One final draft?" (trad. n.)

⁵ It is considered that one of the reasons for the failure of the German project for achieving the atomic weapon is precisely the hemorrhaging of scientists generated by the Hitlerist racial policy.

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

time, however, the head of the SS sent him a letter warning him not to mix the results of the research with personal and political attitudes. Heisenberg was obsessed with calculations and a very good piano player. He was a nice man, he made friends easily. However, Margrethe never liked him. She thought he was too sensitive, she appreciated that he was difficult, too inward. Heisenberg's visit to Bohr worried her at the time and preoccupied her thorough all her life. Bohr confessed that she agreed to Heisenberg being invited into the house only after the men had pledged not to discuss politics.

Bohr's kindness and humanity were notorious. (<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Niels-Bohr> accessed on September 14, 2021) He spoke many languages fluently, but sometimes he was unaware of what language he was using. He had a poor diction, hesitated in statements out of respect for the possible opponent: he did not want the other one to feel that his own opinions were not respected. In the institute he led, he created a very special, relaxed social environment. Concerned about the rise of Nazism, Bohr used his relationships to help the physicists prosecuted in Germany reach the USA via Copenhagen. In the autumn of 1943, he was warned that he would be arrested and ran in Sweden with his entire family. A little later, passing through Scotland, he arrived in America.

The historical characters animate a fiction that, through their incarnation by the actors, becomes reality. The directorial stake of such a project is the research of this reality, of the relations between it and the daily reality, and the use of the information provided by history to articulate a discourse on the imprecision of this science.

Fryan's text proposes a kind of dramaturgy associated with a reality governed by uncertainty, and at the same time speaks of this principle, fundamental to post-Newtonian mechanics. In "Chunga" (Llosa, 2005), Mario Vargas Llosa is not concerned at all with the presentation of reality but presents *several complementary realities. Each hypothesis, taken separately, is logical but proves incomplete. Reality has chances to complete if it is constituted by the conjugation of presumptions, but attempt is impossible in rational order.* It's a way of the Newtonian mechanics of showing its limits.

We talked about "Chunga" in a volume published a few years ago. (Mircioaga, 2016) Here, we briefly take up some aspects, in order to develop them, which will allow us to open up new and bidding topics of research. Chunga, of undefined age,

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

and with an ambiguous past, is the owner of a dance hall, whose loyal customers are José, Lituma, Josefino and Maimuta (Monkey). The four call themselves “The undefeated.” One evening, Josefino, for lack of money, leaves the beautiful Meche, whom he had just seduced, as a pledge to Chunga, in exchange for a loan. Meche stirs the minds and blood of The undefeated, but also of Chunga. She convinces the young woman that with any of the four, an unjust destiny awaits her and makes her disappear.

Each member of the gang experiences his own reality of the events that took place that night; the account of how the two women met and the appearance of the four realities is the epic matter of the play. (Mircioaga, 2016: 42)

It's possible that of the four assumptions, José's, is close to what happened: Chunga and Meche made love. The hypothesis is plausible, but irrelevant. The story is made up of two conflicts. The first, erotic, with minor importance in the circumstances of our research, determines the relationships between Chunga and her clients and, implicitly, influences the relationships between them. The second, parallel, opposes a reality that does not want to be revealed, that of Meche's fate, the realities of each of the undefeated.

Most of Llosa's plays propose as a theme the relationship between the world and the artist-creator that closes his intimate reality around his own perceptions, judgments, memories. "Chunga" is an exception, because it is populated by characters without ambitions, but this does not reduce the importance of their memories and fantasies, on the contrary, because the universe of the play is characterized primarily by a lack of horizon. In such a world, fiction is the source of important weapons in confronting the merciless sense of the failure of existence. Relevant is the case of Lituma, a starving man who does not reconcile with his state of drifter.

He demands a necessary support for an ideal capable of ordering his life; (it is assumed that) the stake of his relationship with Meche is very important. As a result, his presence in the reality of belonging to the group of slothful people, obviously apathetic, differs radically from the behavior in the reality of meeting with her:

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

temperamental, full of passion. The connection between the two types of conduct is made by his conviction that Josefino murdered the young woman. (Idem: 44)

In the stage construction of this character, one cannot escape uncertainty; Lituma is animated by aspirations, but he is also the servant of a weakness in which he feels comfortable. It remains the task of the actor-director couple to establish the stage situations in which *Lituma manifests himself as an irrelevant micro-object in an environment that is in turn indifferent to him, and as the propagation of some aspirations that can give meaning to the world and to himself*; and the stake in this approach is the fragile balance between the two states.

Josefino has a better financial situation than the others and a higher social status. So, the gang is divided – and agglutinated! not only because of the passions aroused by Meche, but also because of the pecuniary states, the positions occupied in the community, even in the neighborhoods in which they were born and live, the luck in the dice game, and the relations with women.

The moments when the focus is on women come into the shadows when the spirits are heated up around the table: realities constrain by their power; their power depends on the relationship we form with them. (Idem, 44-45)

Complementary views accompany the relationship between the object of knowledge and the subject acting on it. The contradiction between them is solved by our options. In Chunga, the elementary thought is advanced that man lives what is important to him – in the case discussed, either love or gambling. Love, gambling, etc., each has the value that each gives it, and according to these values the reality of the character is born.

Realities glide easily when they contain love, for it is futile to challenge subjectivism in this situation. “Chunga” proposes the essence of love as a theme through Meche, a fascinating woman who troubles everyone knowing her. Candid, slutty, almost exhibitionist, tempted by lesbianism, very young, she is not interested in the future, for she wants to live love, and “love is the happiness of a moment, of the present moment.” (Llosa, 2005: 223) Meche is therefore a human being for whom,

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

especially in youth, reality knows only the moment experienced here and now. *The times turn out to be only grammatical concepts*; the hedonism of people like Meche is founded on such intuitions; their joy in living is founded on innocence, and when her native sensuality is added to this, the attractiveness of the girl becomes irresistible. Chunga asks her what she found at Josefino; she breathes before⁶ saying: “Well, when he kisses me and caresses me, I feel shudder.” (Idem, ibidem) She laughs ringing, with lust, then suddenly stops and completes: “I see stars.” (Idem, ibid.) Her harmonious presence is a repercussion of cosmic harmony. In the absence of Meche, the universe is infected by cacophony - men cough, blow their noses, burp; a shutter creaks, a transistor radio works with parasites. The young woman is subordinated to Josefino, she has to give up the pleasure of seeing a movie, because he imposes his appetite to play dice. The woman’s pregnancy can explain the kind and force of the bonds between her and the man. It's a circumstantial justification. In fact, she's a dependent person, she needs protection. Lituma offers it to her, in a reality that he is temporarily building. The two decide to leave the city, she has to get some clothes from home, he descends to the peak of happiness on the stairs – but the thick swearing and laughter impose the reality that Lituma does not have the strength of Chunga.

The reality of Chunga excludes Meche's hedonism. The purpose of her existence was uncertain until she met Meche, because Meche is passing through her life. *The existence of Chunga ignores the usual grammar because it is based on the faculty of living a special time, which includes a gray, monotonous, mediocre present, exclusively daily, a rousing yesterday, ennobled by love, and a tomorrow, open by definition and therefore generous*. It is an important task for man to discover, characterize and validate this time by his very existence, because in this way his existence can acquire meaning.

The seduction of the two women on each other is facilitated by the aggressive environment in which they live. It is to be assumed that a deficiency of virility makes Lituma an exception: the gentle man. The world of Chunga is populated by women forced to prostitute themselves, to slavish their men, to be their sex toys. Josefino is the prototype of the sufficient male, without scruples. Meche plays his game because that's how she adapts to an absurd normality. Unfortunately, we must admit that this normality reflects the social plan of the play, a plan that requires discussion of the

⁶ We turn to this graph to suggest some possibilities for stage concretization.

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

miserable condition of the woman in everyday reality. In the second act the story no longer feeds exclusively, as in the first act, from the past-present pendulum, and reality is free from the servitude imposed by the daily; as a result, Llosa suggests, the fate of the woman has chances to get out of the area of determinism, if she, the woman, rebels against a reality walled with prohibitions and inscribed between arbitrary milestones.

The reality built by leaving the perimeter of everyday reality is constituted by the association of the realities of each character, and they gather around the answers to a fundamental question: How is Chunga? Is that a pimp with a skirt? a lesbian? a sadist, a masochist? Is she a woman who hides her sensitivity and generosity in order to survive in a hostile environment? an intelligent woman who correctly assesses her forces and knows how to use them? a woman who refuses to associate herself with a pimp, so that her own unfortunate destiny does not repeat itself? *Any of the answers are correct, but none exhaust the character's nature. In order to describe Chunga, the complementarity of solutions is required, which allows uncertainties to hover on her, and in this way protect her mystery and gives her a human appearance.* The undefeated answer each in his own way to the question, and thus reveal their secret needs, hopes, pleasures, the incompleteness.

The disappearance of Meche remains an enigma. The men do not have the means to force Chunga to tell them what she knows? Of course, she had the intelligence to refuse to learn anything about Meche's plans, just so that death threats or spazes wouldn't work, but the relevant thing is that, in fact, her clients are content to threaten and act expeditiously; thus, everyone's reality remains valid and the one who experiences it has increased possibilities to escape daily mediocrity and to experience the sense of dignity. Josefino keeps his knife around Chunga's neck, sighs, puts the blade in the sheath and leaves: "How bitches' women can be, Lord God..." (Idem: 282) Men may also party in other taverns, but nowhere like that of Chunga does the presence of Meche become a natural element of reality, and for them this reality is vital.

Chunga herself did not want to know Meche's intentions not only from circumspection, but also so that she could write her own history, in which love would be the structure of resistance of existence. Upon leaving, José makes sure that the next day the young woman's absence will be explained. The owner hurries him, but alone imposes Meche's presence. *Creates a reality stronger than the realities of men.*

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

José lives feverishly the relationship between Meche and Chunga. Inhibited by obsessions, he deepens into a barren reality. The erotic game between Chunga and Meche goes until the moment when the man's utopia does not access the measure of feelings between them. The women pull a curtain behind which nothing seems to be happening, and, troubled, José returns to the gambling table.

The epic is generated by Josefino's good will, an ordinary, arrogant gambler, a pimp. He enters with Meche relying on fact that the girl will charm the gang. In other words, he brings the girl to make an impression. The charm is sabotaged by Lituma, who invites Josefino to gamble; Maimuta, hiding behind a thick laugh, threatens Josefino to lose all his money and will have to pledge Meche. It is to be assumed that Lituma and Maimuta already think that the "haughty" will soon be put on the market. In everyday reality, for Lituma it would be the only chance to get close to the young woman because he suffers from shyness, he does not know how to get a rendezvous from a girl on the street, so he had sexual contact only in houses of tolerance. In his reality, Lituma is a nice man, a sensitive man, and that's why he proposes to Meche to marry him. The character's nature explains his hard-hidden enmity to Josefino. Lituma is the hypostasis of a bovarism without quality, of the person who escapes deplorably, only to the point where reality only lets its depths to be seen. He may be very affected by Meche's disappearance, at least that's what he says about the possibility that Josefino killed her, but he's also the most pleased: if the dream had materialized, Lituma could no longer hide his innate fear, which strains and impoverishes his reality.

But it is not Josefino who opposes Lituma firmly, but Chunga. The woman who holds the tavern and dominates the four drunkards is, like Josefino, a strong character, which, along with her hatred of men and her loneliness, favors speculation about her sexual preferences. But she is fundamentally different from her clients; they are troglodytes; she is of a rich, tender nature in essence, deeply feminine, sensitive and humane. Although she knows that she will come into conflict with a dangerous man, she does not hesitate, from her first contact with Meche, to warn her that she will have to sell her body to support the pimp, a villain who, using the "parrot", makes women lose their minds. The viril self of Chunga excites Meche, just as the naivety of the young woman excites the tavern maid. Chunga refuses to fall in love because the man who loves becomes vulnerable, can be easily dominated, a position she refuses to accept. Meche cannot live without love, and her judgment

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

cannot help but think: If we live in a world where the birth of a child is a foolish act, then man must live only the moment – that is, to love. The complex personality of Chunga allows each of the undefeated to relate to that dimension of the character that favors his reality. Llosa thus suggests that the richness of the reality lived depends on the one who makes it. *Realities are not excluded, they are complementary, together they give the measure of a situation which is governed by uncertainty.* Reality remains immediate, poor, one-dimensional, if in the middle of it is a dry, small-sized being. Reality opens, it acquires fascinating amplitudes and depths, if it is galvanized by pluralistic, fecund people. The show with “Chunga” can provide research ways for this phenomenon and possibilities to understand how the complementarity of realities allows us to live in the vicinity of the miracle.

Fryan and Llosa are evidence that some playwrights have intuited that reality is not confined to everyday reality, and that theater, understood as an essential human dimension, allows us to probe a world that is not plausible at first sight, but perfectly supported by experimentally proven physical laws described by mathematical equations. It is a world whose materiality lies in a network of events that calls into question the time variable. This is replaced by the capacity of man to create history by becoming aware of the theatrical reality in which he lives; a reality that does not exclude everyday reality but augments it. Noting that this is how the content of the concept of realism changes, we express our hope of having the opportunity to talk about what might change in the theater’s directorial approaches.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barad, 2007: Karen Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway – Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, London, 2007, Duke University Press

Evreinov, 2021: Nikolai Evreinov, *Teatrul în viață*, translation Nicolae Manda, Bucharest, 2020, UNATC Press

Fryan, 2000: Michael Fryan, *Copenhagen*, New York, 2000, Anchor Books

Llosa, 2005: Mario Vargas Llosa, *Teatre*, translation Mihai Cantuniari and Alina Cantacuzino, Bucharest, 2005, Curtea Veche Publishing

Mircioaga: 2016, Ion Mircioaga, *Realitatea și realismul în teatru*, București, 2016, UNATC Press

THEATRICAL COLLOQUIA

Houellebecq, 2021: Michel Houellebecq, *Interventions, 2: traces*, translation Alexandru Matei, Iasi, 2021, Polirom

Rovelli, 2019: Carlo Rovelli, *Ordinea timpului*, translation Vlad Zografi, Bucharest, 2019, Humanitas

Rovelli, 2021: Carlo Rovelli, *Șapte scurte lecții de fizică*, translation Vlad Zografi, Bucharest, 2021, Humanitas

Vianu, 1971: Tudor Vianu, *Filosofie și poezie*, Bucharest, 1971, Editura enciclopedică română

<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Louis-de-Broglie>, accessed on January 31, 2022

<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Niels-Bohr>, accessed on January 31, 2022

<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Werner-Heisenberg> accessed on January 31, 2022