

Performance Research >  
A Journal of the Performing Arts  
Volume 14, 2009 - Issue 2: On Training

390 | 5 | 0  
Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

Original Articles

# Wood and Waterfall: Puppetry training and its anthropology

Cariad Astles

Pages 54-59 | Published online: 03 Nov 2009

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/13528160903319521>

Sample our  
Arts  
Journals  
>> **Sign in here** to start your access  
to the latest two volumes for 14 days

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

Read this article

## We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 845 partners store and/or access information on a device, such as unique IDs in cookies to process personal data. You may accept or manage your choices by clicking below, including your right to object where legitimate interest is used, or at any time in the privacy policy page. These choices will be signaled to our partners and will not affect browsing data. [Privacy Policy](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device characteristics for identification. Store and/or access information on a device. Personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development.

List of Partners (vendors)

I Accept

Essential Only

Show Purpose



# Wood and Waterfall

## Puppetry training and its anthropology

CARIAD ASTLES

### PREMISES AND PARADOXES

Little has been written in English about training for the puppeteer, and what has been written focuses predominantly on understanding the nature of the puppet, not that of the puppeteer, or concentrates on exercises and techniques.

During the twentieth century, the pioneering Russian director Sergei Obraztsov suggested experimenting with the qualities of 'puppet-ness' (in contrast to the puppet as imitator of the human) (Obraztsov 1938: 78). The Swedish puppeteer and director Michael Meschke later elaborated a 'grammar' for puppetry action, through dividing and classifying types of training techniques. These included exercises such as the dead point, which he referred to as the state of concentration necessary in order to initiate clearly defined action, achieved through four clear steps: emptying the mind, abstracting the thought, focusing on the immediate task and initiating the task with passion (Meschke 1988: 54); he also analysed different categories of looks and leans, extensions, counterbalance, rhythmic and balance exercises and patterns of speed and focus engineered to develop the dynamic potential of the puppet (Meschke 1988: 48-68). Puppetry training, however, clearly goes beyond technical exercises (although these are very useful) and can be considered as a deep approach that seeks to understand the basic essence of the art of the puppeteer and their approach towards the animated object.

It is apparent that the practice of puppetry is

inherently the practice of paradoxes. These paradoxes differentiate puppetry from live theatre since, generally speaking, actors wish to be seen and to have the audiences identify them as performing presences within a dramatic context. Puppet theatre presents us with a wholly different set of stylistic intentions: the puppeteer's intention is generally not to be seen, or if seen, as is usually now the case in contemporary puppetry, then not perceived as the primary focus of attention. Despite the puppeteers' so-called scenic 'invisibility', signified semiotically in contemporary theatre through devices such as the wearing of 'blacks', covering the head with caps, not making eye contact with the audience, and so on, they are required by the dramatic purposes of the performance, to generate and transmit huge amounts of energy towards the inanimate figure, material or thing, to create a sense of presence beyond their own bodies. This is the first paradox, and consequently the main question for consideration here: what is the training of a sensibility that requires the performer to locate their focus of expression outside the body while keeping the source of energy *within* the body?

A further paradox concerns the presence, absence or projection of ego on stage: how can the puppeteer successfully work with a sense of self while serving something else? Lastly, for the purposes of this article (in the Western context, notwithstanding the claims of animism, shamanism and so on), how can the puppeteer work with opposing concepts of inanimate



Log in

> Account

Log out

> Log in

Restore

> Restore content access for purchases made as guest


## Purchase options \*

Save for later

### PDF download + Online access

- 48 hours access to article PDF & online version
- Article PDF can be downloaded
- Article PDF can be printed


USD 53.00

 Add to cart

### Issue Purchase

- 30 days online access to complete issue
- Article PDFs can be downloaded
- Article PDFs can be printed

USD 244.00

 Add to cart

\* Local tax will be added as applicable

## Related Research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by  
5



Information for

- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up



✕