

Finding the Wooden Voice (unedited)

by Ian Grant

ian.grant@tvu.ac.uk

(Jan 2001) "Finding the Wooden Voice" in Puppetry Into Performance: A User's Guide. London: Theatre Museum, Central School of Speech and Drama and the Puppet Centre Trust. Published in Edited Form.

"The search for the wooden voice took us into a dark forest [of depression]" Duccio

Bellugi, performer with Ariane Mnouchkine's Theatre du Soleil

Introduction

It is an irony that actress/director Eleonora Duse said to puppet impresario Vittorio Podrecca that she envied his position as a director of a puppet troupe: "Your actors do not talk, but obey; mine talk and do not obey!" she said (von Boehn 1956:394-395). A big irony when there is a continual struggle by puppeteers to convince audiences that their puppets talk, and doubly ironic when late nineteenth and early twentieth century theatre theoreticians attempted to 'de-humanise' the actor.

Voice is a reliable indicator of breath and breath is a prerequisite for living. It is a short and logical step to assert that voice is a primary tool for the puppeteer when bestowing the impression of life on dead things. Why then are 'puppets speaking' such a problem for many puppet artists, trainers and scholars? For some it is a mantra that puppets should not speak. For others, the discovery and location of a puppet voice is a tricky but necessary creative journey. For others still, giving voice to an object is second only to moving it, as a defining aspect of puppetry.

By way of example of the disagreement inspired by this aesthetic conundrum, the following statements were made at the recent symposia: "Puppetry into Performance: A Users Guide" at the Theatre Museum, London, and "Visualising Text" at the Henson Festival of Puppet Theatre, 2000:

"Puppet theatre is not a text based theatre. Puppets do not speak. When you introduce a voice, it is a layer of illusion; one step removed from the essence of the object." Roman

Paska, Director of the Institut International de la Marionnette, Charleville-Mezieres

(London 2000)

Duccio Bellugi, a performer with Theatre du Soleil, took issue with Roman Paska's view that puppetry with voice was not about pretence or illusion: puppetry is intrinsically about giving 'voice to some *thing*'. The acts of giving voice and giving life (or animus) are related.

The present essay looks at both theoretical and practical issues about human presence and non-presence in puppet theatre; questions of illusion and anti-illusion; and about the location, dislocation and relocation of voice between performer and object. Practitioners are rightly impatient with academic headiness, so I hope here to begin a project that will eventually assist the 'lip-syncer', the polyphonist (or multi-voiced performer), writer and the sound-engineer in the practical analysis of Voice for puppets. I aim to offer an emerging solution where the puppet voice is discovered to be at once radical, abstract, musical, gestic and physical.

Voice is Not Necessarily Text

At the Henson Festival symposia Richard Termine posed the useful questions:

"Can the object speak? Can it be given language? Once we impose text, how can we make the object theatrically viable?"

It is a common position to hold that 'puppet theatre represents the flight into the visual, where image replaces the word' (Penny Francis, 2000). In the puppet sector many of the best artists are suspicious of the expressive limits imposed by words:

"I have a difficulty with talking. When you use words you lose a lot" (Phelim McDermot, 2000)

Problems of Voice in the puppet theatre are not only problems about enlivening literary text with wooden speakers. Marion Baraitser (1999) and colleagues have recently thoroughly looked at the puppet and text. In addition, there are many issues to do with the oral nature of puppet speech that are not centred around the written text. Even though puppet voices often have linguistic form: sound, breathing, noise and nonsense (like The Swedish Chef or Beaker from 'The Muppet Show') also form part of the repertoire for puppet voices.

Hanne Tierney, performance maker, at the Henson Festival, said:

"Puppets just aren't as interesting to watch speaking language written for humans."

Is this so? Is it necessary to simplify the system of speech for puppets? Are puppets capable of speaking poetry? What is distinctive about what puppets *can* speak? The theoretical and practical problems of relocating the human voice into the performing object raise unique issues and will be my primary concern in the present essay, not text.

The main problem with puppets speaking is the voice is dislocated. The source is elsewhere. The human presence, with its weight of psychology, intelligence, feeling and intentionality is elsewhere or maybe, if recorded, elsewhere. The supposed identity strongly associated with voice is removed. The assumption is this: through conventions of puppet illusion and movement, the presence of character is relocated to the puppet. For many this transposition of identity is queer.

“One of the problems that has to be faced in the puppet theatre is that the voice comes from the human operator and the movements from the wooden actor. Is it possible to make an artistic whole of anything that incorporates such a queer divorce?” (Blackham 1948: 60)

Dealing with Puppet Presence and Human Non-Presence

According to Henryk Jurkowski (London, 2000) Heinrich von Kleist believed that the best actor is the actor without consciousness. Best remove all traces of the human. Let's find the 'puppetesque' in actors; let's dehumanise and stylise them! Here is the same zeitgeist expressed in contemporary puppetry practice, with special reference to voice:

“...a great actor may find it challenging and stimulating to come into contact with the puppet theatre and the puppet player’s intricate technique and feeling for movement. I remember how some actors, late one night, after they had completed the job of recording voices for a production, discussed the experience. They agreed unanimously that their encounter with puppet theatre had taken them back to the roots of dramatic art, to the roots of their profession. The reason was that the rehearsals had made demands on them that they had long ago ceased to encounter in their daily stage work: such as maximum clarity of diction, not allowing a trace of anything approximating “humanness”, incorrect breathing, or a wavering sense of rhythm to enter. The voice should be as pure as the puppet.” (Meschke and Sörenson 1992: 67 my emphasis)

The physical separation of presence and psychological entity from the speaking puppet/object need not be an insurmountable aesthetic hurdle, but simply a problem of *integration*. Ronnie Burkett, using still-faced marionettes, achieves a temporary *integration* of puppet and human presence in performance through his sympathy, pace, vocal quality, focus, precision, concentration and virtuosity. Jim Henson and the Muppeteers achieve *integration* with an elaborate use of moving mouths. More of this later.

“Aristotle suggests in the De Anima that only animated, or ensouled beings can produce voice, as opposed to mere sound.” (Conner 2000: 392)

So giving voice to objects, along with movement, is a principle tool of the animator when intimating the 'presence' of a soul.

Maurice Maeterlink, for one, questioned a human's right to speak on behalf of the inanimate: helping to breed a suspicion of puppets speaking. Maeterlink expresses the puppet theoreticians love for the marionette, and typical discomfort with the human presence and ego in the land of the object and the inanimate:

"I do not know: but the absence of the human to me seems to be essential. When a man enters into a poem, the great poem of his presence dims everything around. A man can speak in his own name only; he has no right to speak in the name of the whole world of the dead." Maurice Maeterlink translated by Jurkowski: 1988: 12-13

Perhaps the ethos expressed here informs those contemporary aesthetes who find the vocal presence of the human in puppet theatre a form of pollution.

I find it a bizarre position of those, along with Kleist and Maeterlink, who rationalise that the 'objectness of puppets' makes puppet theatre somehow non-human and somehow immune from the impurities of an actors' ego, psychology and falseness. Puppet theatre *requires* actor/manipulators: whether visible or invisible. Julian Crouch (2000) wryly observed: "puppeteers, who are the best at being invisible are often the most visible."

Herein: voice is philosophical problem. When it is disembodied, voice has spiritualistic associations. It is a ghostly non-human abstraction. We mostly hate hearing our recorded voice. Talking on the telephone is often erotic. It is weird. The distance from the "human" allows such a voice to possess the puppet. Should the speaker therefore be invisible? Or like a ventriloquist, simply disguise the act of speaking? This philosophical problem is actually a very practical one, with multiple solutions.

Roman Paska (London 2000) commented that a puppet presupposes the presence of a person otherwise it is an automaton. This assertion is a problem. What about solo performances, such as Ronnie Burkett's solo multi-vocal marionette play like "Street of Blood"? Such plays have to include the life and death of objects, as objects need to drift into and out of repose and stillness, to allow the polyphony to continue with other characters. Is a still puppet still a puppet?

The humanness of the Vocal: Grounding the physicality of voice

Voice is a physical gesture. It is borne of a breath and a muscular contortion of the larynx, the throat, the tongue and lips. The word is fundamentally an action. Voice humanises and 'grounds' figurative puppets as being nearly human. The puppet is imbibed with its own psychology just by association with human Voice. Speech gives identity. This is as true when the non-figurative object is given a voice.

"In so far as a sound is recognized as a voice, rather than a sound, it is assumed to be coming from a person or conscious agency." (Conner 2000:24)

Voice contains echoes of a past, of a tradition, of learning. It is a present-tense carrier of cultural inheritance, of the tradition of the cultural and theatrical past. As soon as a puppet speaks, it is cultured. It has a past. It is not only living, it has lived.

In contrast to this 'past-tenseness', the manipulated object has to play: it has to *be*. This is very present tense. Speech gives identity, a historicity to the speaking object. To have speech is to have past. So a performing, speaking object is both past and present tense. What a contradiction!

Location and Dislocation

When given a voice, the performing object suffers a temporal, time-based, dislocation - it is both present tense when playing, and past tense when envoiced. Add to this the spatial dislocation between the puppet object and the human source of voice and, voila!, it seems 'dislocation' has risen to be a creative principle of puppet/object theatre. This dislocation breeds oddness and what Steven Conner (2000: 7) calls a 'loss of anchorage' of the voice. Instead of this disruption appearing wrong - it is an alienation effect: engaging and strange. I propose we are at once fascinated, obsessed and repulsed by this queerness. The inter-play of presence and non-presence is what is ambiguous about the speaking puppet, we are surprised by the 'ugliness and alien qualities of the disembodied voice' (Conner 2000: 11).

Despite this cerebral theorising: Does it matter where the speaker/operator is positioned in relation the puppet? Should the design of a puppet reflect a drive to *integrate* the act of speech: What about the drive for naturalism, verisimilitude, and the animatronic? Does the puppet as symbol transcend the naturalistic? Should approaches to 'speaking' be stylised when a still, sculpted face speaks? Is it necessary to have a make an illusion of life through extended 'articulatedness'?

Illusion and Non-illusion

"The observation of these three rules:

- the right inclination of the head and body of the speaking puppet*
- the restriction of all movement on the stage to the puppet that is speaking and*
- synchronization of speech and action*

will go a long way towards creating the illusion that it is the puppet which is speaking." (Blackham 1948: 62)

I question the naturalistic basis of this 'illusion'. There is something unnatural about a convincing illusion of puppets speaking. Julian Crouch (2000): "the more you let them do, the less they can do". A lot of puppeteers feel this 'economy' in their guts. But the 'technocrazy' love mechanical complexity: blinking eyes, articulated eyebrows, articulated mouths, moving tongues and smoking pipes. This is an issue about staging and design. Is less more? I do not believe we are on a journey progressing towards the ideal 'synthetic thespian'. What do we value more? The mimetic or the abstract? The literal or the suggestive? The 'completed' or the unfinished? What is the object/puppet best at doing?

"There was also a need to utilise different forms of stylised speech to match the puppet's behaviour, something unusual in a theatre culture where naturalism predominates. A puppet that in itself is a "style", in other words a deviation from nature, can hardly have a naturalistic voice without creating discrepancy." (Meschke and Sörenson 1992: 67)

What would you rather your children played with? An inanimate doll, where the child's imagination 'finishes' the object through play, or an all singing, pissing, walking 'Amazing Ally' ('My mouth moves when I talk!', 'I say over 16,000 phrases'. 'I remember your birthday,') or a 'Baby Expressions' ('her face really changes')?

This is death for creative object play. Julian Crouch confirms:

"The creativity of limitations and mistakes: what objects can't do open up the possibilities, the gaps, the potentiality, where the audience can join in with the object." (Puppetry into Performance, 2000)

The fact objects can't speak but still allowing them to do so is part of their theatrical power.

Some Practical Issues Regarding Voice and Puppets

In the following sections, I want to mention some more practical issues that emerge from what has been quite a cerebral discussion of puppets and voice. What of the lip-syncers? And those that are so convinced puppets should speak that the mouth becomes an absolute defining design characteristic of a puppet? What of the polyphonist? The solo, vocally virtuosi puppeteer who brings multi-vocalness to a higher artistic discipline? How should we train the speaking puppeteer?

Lip-Syncing and The Mouth Puppet

Lip-syncing with mouth puppets is a relatively unstudied and non-systematised performance skill. It is hard to train. It involves a psycho-kinetic performance problem of relating sound to very specific hand movements.

“One final pointer about good lip-sync manipulation: the words are supposed to look as if they are being formed in and coming out of the puppet’s mouth. Try to make small forward movements for each syllable as the mouth opens. It’s almost as if you are throwing the words out of the mouth.” (Ten Eyck Hanford 1981: 119)

The puppeteer should enjoy the feeling of blowing the 'voice' through the puppet. A puppet with presence is created when there is a visual *integration* of the human and the object. Shari Lewis, with Lamb Chops, is a very good example of this process. It is almost inevitable that the human voice needs to be live, co-present in the moment with the lip-syncing puppeteer.

“Keep in mind that it is hard to achieve excellent lip-sync when using prerecorded dialogue and puppets with articulated mouths. No matter how well you know the tape, you’ll usually be half a beat behind the dialogue. This is especially noticeable at the end of a pause, when the speaking resumes but the puppeteer can’t time the start exactly.”
(Ten Eyck Hanford 1981:91)

The performance problem where the lip-syncing puppeteer is not the source of the voice is not often analysed. How should a puppeteer train for the situation, common with complex TV puppets, where more than one performer needs to operate the same mouth - one on the upper lip and one on the lower?

The Polyphonist, or multivoiced performer

Puppet theatre is often host to polyphonic performance, where one single performer provides multiple voices. We are probably more familiar with the skills of the polyphonist from watching the impressionist, ventriloquist, or Warner Brothers cartoons. Ronnie Burkett's 'The Memory Dress Trilogy' (London, 1999. New York 2000) is a most elaborate recent example in puppet theatre. In 'Street of Blood' a lone performer routinely enacts conversations between three separate personas, represented by marionettes, some still-in-repose, others, animated. Occasionally the puppeteer interrupts these three way conversations with his own voice representing Christ.

The artistry involved in this kind of performance is not often part of the training for puppeteers. In my future writing about voice and puppetry, I intend to form a programme of exercises for the aspiring polyphonist, and help contribute to the development of this rare performance discipline. Such a programme must begin with an analytical listening to

different voices, particularly studying voice dynamics and voice qualities. The would-be polyphonist understands that psycho-physical investment is needed when developing multiple-voiced performance personas. Also such a student should understand voice has a corporeal centre first and a mental centre second.

"...the larynx contains the highest ration of nerve to muscle fibres of any organ in the body and is therefore 'exquisitely responsive to interorganismic changes.'" (Conner 2000: 8).

Beginning an Analysis of Voice Dynamics and Voice Qualities

More or less fixed aspects of our physiology make certain qualities of voice beyond the control of a performer. I list below some aspects of voice dynamics and voice qualities that are within the performer's control. Puppeteers can consciously practice a trained 'set' of vocal configurations and nurture others through exercise. Lip shape, tongue position, throat tensions, 'imagined location' of air and voice, air quantity and pressure, tensions and 'stressing' of the vocal chords all bring variety to different voices.

Voice Dynamics describe a range of aspects a puppeteer can control largely to add stress, but also can be manipulated to mimic other voices and disguise one's own voice. I have loosely adapted this list from Abercrombie 1967: 89-110.

Loudness: A scale of possibilities

Tempo: One can vary from 'normal' conversational tempos;

Continuity: When do pauses happen?; Do they happen consciously for effect, or when one runs out of breathe? Talking during physical activity, nervousness, calmness, speaking through a breath, sighing all have different dynamics of continuity. The more thought behind speech makes one less fluent.

Rhythm: In ordinary conversation, rhythm relates making 'emphasis'; essentially related to the 'breathing' muscles (particularly chest pulses). This can be manipulated, controlled and creatively played with.

Tessitura and Register: A term borrowed from music, tessitura is the potential range of pitches a voice might fluctuate though while speaking. We all have a 'natural' range, but are able to play with other ranges. Register gives terminology to describe such ranges: For example: 'head', 'chest', 'thick', 'thin', 'natural', 'falsetto' (sometimes known as 'head-voice'), 'upper', 'middle', and 'lower' is a fairly exhaustive list of possible registers. Each refers to a relative tonality of voice and potentially to an imaginary, visualization of where such a voice is 'located'.

Pitch Fluctuation: Voiced melodic patterns that subtly accompany speech. We tend to notice the sing-song quality of dialects, accents, and languages unfamiliar to us. One quick step to polyphony is to 'sing' the melodic quality inspired when hearing particular accents.

The speaking puppeteer could use the following descriptive terminology of voice qualities, and develop others: high, low, sharp, flat, acute, grave, tight, heavy, small, large, thin, or thick.

'Affective' attitudes are revealed primarily through pitch fluctuation. Pitch fluctuation is sometimes known as 'vocal gesture'. A concept of 'voice gesture' is exemplified in the glove puppet with an articulated mouth. It is an integration of the vocal and the gestural.

Conclusions: The Radicality of Puppetry and the tendency towards abstraction

I have hopefully established that it is an assumption that to be vocal, is to be human. But puppetry has always revealed in the possibilities for the anthropomorphic, or as Dennis Silk, might have put it: 'objectomorphic'. Scissors and combs have voice. It is radical transgression of what it is to be human when we see a typewriter or a sock speak.

Phelim McDermot, (London, 2000) in dialogue at the symposia, made a comment that could take this discussion about objects and voice to another level: where the object stands in an imaginative, creative relationship to the actor / puppeteers pre-expressivity:

"Watching a performer using newspaper [in object improvisation] is very revealing.

You sometimes see the actor dominating the paper, rather than interacting with it and

letting it 'speak to you'" (Puppetry into Performance, 2000)

Through their play with objects, puppeteers seek to discover voices. The encounter is not based on a dogmatic assertion that 'no puppet should speak', but an exploration of its potential vocality.

"Some puppets are made to speak, others are not. Some seem to have a voice within

them; in others, no voice can be found. I think it is part of the job of the puppeteer to

discover what voice, if any, his or her puppet has." (Bass 1999:39)

An emerging Solution: Finding the Puppets Voice in Musicality, the Gestic and the Physical

Finding Musicality

Duccio Bellugi, (London, 2000) told an anecdote of an elaborate journey undertaken as research for Theatre du Soleil's latest show: Narrator or puppeteer? Where should the puppeteer / speaker be located to give the puppet a voice? What should the voice sound like? The company experimented with fundamental simplicities: the speaker to the side, or behind. Yet they felt things didn't work.

'Puppets could not take such complicated poetry' Duccio asserted. They need simplicity. So Hélène Cixous' poetic text was cut.

The experimenting actors enjoyed the 'feeling' of the voice of the puppeteer coming from behind, blowing the voice 'through' the puppet. Bellugi described the joy of discovering an uncomplicated manipulation where 'spiritual significance explodes from physical ease.' When wood breathes from suggestive movement. The wood moves up, it stops in suspension. Pregnant stillness. It is that contradiction, the dialectic of the silent sound (or silent scream), or of animated stillness, that makes puppets attractive. But still their puppet couldn't speak.

In retrospect the puppet only found its voice, in the opinion of the actors, when it stopped talking naturalistically, and when it found melody. Not song. But 'spoken-song'. The puppet needed to find a drone. Singing is an abstraction from the spoken word and, Bellugi probably felt, this abstraction fundamentally suited the puppet.

The sense of the appropriateness of the 'musical', the rhythmic, to puppet voices had been discovered before:

"Too often people think that they need to put on funny voices for puppets but it is not so. Instead you need to breathe properly and to project the voice well and clearly. Barry Smith, an expert voice teacher, emphasizes that you must be very crisp and clean on your speech tunes and rhythms. You must have very clear changes of intervals in the voice (in the musical sense) to match the changes of thought. A radio actor, he argues, can slide through tunes but not a puppet voice. It has to be on this level, then on that level; then the next thought comes, then another thought – and those intervals have got to be very clearly defined... ." (Currell 1985: 280-1)

Puppet language can be spoken, sung, chanted, or whispered. The Japanese have recognised this musicality for a long time in Bunraku's orchestration of speakers, singers and puppets. Dennis Silk had an odder, surreal way of putting the same sing-song quality of the actor/puppeteer's voice:

"The Actor thingifies his voice. He converts it into a thing to be exhibited to the audience. It runs up and down the register, is preternaturally fast or slow, conveys the heaviness of a basin of water, the lightness of a pencil, glides its way tentatively through cupboards and drawers. Because his voice is scarcely a personal instrument, there is little distance between him and things." (Silk 1996: 231)

There you have it all: A dehumanised, de-psychologised voice, that sings rather than 'means' and the actor is closer to being an object, without an identity.

Gestus and Physical Attitudes

When making puppets speak: sound equals gesture equals movement. Bertolt Brecht's Gestus, his theory / practice of exploring story through discovering physical attitudes is profoundly useful to the puppeteer when seeking puppet 'voice-gestures'.

Consider Merleau-Ponty's point that "the spoken word is gesture" (cited in Conner 2000: 4). Then make a cursory observation of the expert lip-syncing and writing in 'Sesame Street'. Here, the physicality of sound, the accentuation of breath, voice and body rhythms through a hand *dictates* a distinct, relatively new, writing style. The relationship of both gesture and physical body attitudes to speech and narrative has not been fully explored in puppetry. Brecht, with gestus, I feel, provides the conceptual armoury to allow a new rationalisation of how and why puppets should be allowed to speak.

In mapping out the theoretical and practical terrain inhabited by envoiced puppets, I hope to have established a valid and rich area of research and practical exploration. One thing is inevitable. No matter how much some performers, scholars and trainers dislike puppets speaking, puppets and objects will be given and will find their voices. Regarding how mistaken it is to let speaking and the mouth dominate a puppet's physicality, the American puppeteering legend, Bil Baird warns:

"I could write a book on this, but one thing to avoid [when performing] is talking too much and depending on lip-sync rather than the action of the whole body." (Cited in *Ten Eyck Hanford 1981:136*).

Unfortunately Bil Baird didn't write that book. Maybe I will.

References

Abercrombie, David. (1967). Elements of General Phonetics. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Baraitser, Marion. (1999). Theatre of Animation: Contemporary Adult Puppet Plays in Context 1 and 2 (Contemporary Theatre Review Special) Issues 9 and 10.

Bass, Eric. (1999). "Notes on Puppetry as a Theatrical Art." Contemporary Theatre Review: Theatre of Animation- Contemporary Adult Puppet Plays in Context 2 10(1): 35-39.

Blackham, Olive. (1948). Puppets into Actors. London, Rockliff, Salisbury Square.

Conner, Steven. (2000). Dumbstruck: A Cultural History of Ventriloquism. New York, Oxford University Press.

Currell, David. (1985). The Complete Book of Puppet Theatre. London, A & C Black.

Bellugi, Duccio, Julian Crouch, Penny Francis, Phelim McDermot, Henryk Jurkowski and Roman Paska (2000) All participants at "Puppetry into Performance: A User's Guide". Conference held at the Theatre Museum, London.

Latshaw, George. (1978). The Complete Book of Puppetry. Mineola, New York, Dover.

Ten Eyck Hanford, R. (1981). The Complete Book of Puppets and Puppeteering. New York, Sterling Publishing Company.

Termine, Richard and Hanne Tierney (2000). Participants at "Visualizing Voice: A symposia". Held at Henson International Festival of Puppet Theater 2000: The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art, New York. (Symposia Papers Available)

von Boehn, Max. (1956). Dolls and Puppets. Boston, Charles T Branford co.

Ian Grant is a lecturer in Modern Drama Studies at Brunel University and has his own start-up puppet and animation company, 'eMotion'.