

2-28-2017

Edward Gordon Craig's Übermarionette And Étienne Decroux's "Actor Made Of Wood"

Thomas Leabhart
Pomona College, Claremont, CA, USA

Sally Leabhart

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.claremont.edu/mimejournal>



Part of the [Acting Commons](#), [Other Theatre and Performance Studies Commons](#), and the [Theatre History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Leabhart, Thomas and Leabhart, Sally (2017) "Edward Gordon Craig's Übermarionette And Étienne Decroux's "Actor Made Of Wood"," *Mime Journal*: Vol. 26, Article 6. DOI: 10.5642/mimejournal.20172601.06
Available at: <https://scholarship.claremont.edu/mimejournal/vol26/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Current Journals at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mime Journal by an authorized editor of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

Edward Gordon Craig's Übermarionette and Étienne Decroux's "actor made of wood"

Thomas Leabhart, with Sally Leabhart¹

1. In search of ancestors

When I studied with Étienne Decroux from 1968 to 1972, he mentioned Edward Gordon Craig less frequently than he did Jacques Copeau, Charles Dullin or Louis Jouvet, but often enough that I considered Craig a member of Decroux's inner circle of influences. I read Decroux's comments on Craig in *Words on Mime* and, in later years, encountered a 1940s photo taken by Étienne Bertrand Weill of Decroux, Craig, Craig's daughter Daphne, and Decroux's company at that time (Marceau, Guyon, Verry, Decroux's son Maximilien and others) (reproduced in Leabhart 139).

In Craig's essay "The Actor and the Über-Marionette" in *On the Art of the Theatre*, I recognized aspects of Craig's thought in Decroux's project, especially in phrases like "[Actors] must create for themselves a new form of acting, consisting for the main part of symbolical gesture" (Craig, "The Actor and the Über-marionette," 30). The following excerpt in which Craig sets forth "The Art of Showing and Veiling," seems to adumbrate corporeal mime in its discussion of those phrased and articulate gestures, as embodied by a puppet. Or does he refer to the performance of a fully evolved living actor as übermarionette? In either case, Craig dissembles by attributing the account to "an old Greek traveller of 800 B.C.," underscoring the need to resuscitate the lost high art that he vividly evokes. Craig, thus veiled, presents his own suggestive and deliberately paradoxical view of acting—a portrait of and for the ideal future actor:

Coming into the House of Visions I saw afar off the fair brown Queen seated upon her throne—her tomb—for both it seemed to me. I sank back upon my couch and watched her symbolic movements. With so much ease did her rhythms alter as with her movements they passed from limb to limb; with such a show of calm did she unloose for us the thoughts of her breast; so gravely and so beautifully did she linger on the statement of her sorrow, that with us it seemed as if no sorrow could harm her; no distortion of body or feature allowed us to dream that she was conquered; the passion and the pain were continually being caught by her hands, held gently, and viewed calmly. Her arms and hands seemed at one moment like a thin warm fountain of water which rose, then broke and fell with all those sweet pale fingers like spray into her lap. It would have been a revelation of art to us had I not already seen that the same spirit dwelt in the other examples of the art of these Egyptians. The "Art of Showing and Veiling," as they call it, is so great a force in the land that it plays the larger part in their religion. We may learn from it somewhat of the power and the grace of courage, for it is impossible to witness a performance without a sense of physical and spiritual refreshment. (Craig, "The Actor and the Über-marionette," 40)

Does Craig's seated "fair brown Queen" tell a story with her hands and fingers, creating *mudras*, or are her movements "subjective mime," a kind of pure dance which suggests emotions without plot: "the passion and the pain ... caught by her hands, held gently, viewed calmly"?² Whether we imagine that she moves only arms, hands, and fingers or perhaps includes subtle sympathetic movements of head, neck, and upper body, her style of playing avoids expressionism in favor of classicism.

2. Craig's "inconsistencies": venturing beyond the "either-or"

The actor's bodily movements—we find no reference to the voice—provoke "a sense of physical and spiritual refreshment" in the audience whose response attests to the performer's artistry. And yet, now in his own voice, Craig's subsequent query as to "whether the puppet shall not once again become the faithful medium for the beautiful thoughts of the artist," raises other questions for us too: was that imaginary performer an inanimate object, controlled, directed, or in some way inhabited by a human? Craig leaves no doubt that his actor performed consummately, but was he advocating a wooden marionette or a living actor? How can we know, since during his long career, Craig envisioned various permutations of inanimate actors and animate ones?

The question—living actor or marionette—tantalizes theatre practitioners, since the human body and the body of the marionette pose dissimilar technical challenges. Patrick Le Boeuf, for example, reveals a host of technical problems facing an actor animating a large puppet from within (Le Boeuf, "On the Nature of Edward Gordon Craig's Über-marionette"). Theatre professionals quickly realize that the size, weight, and structure of a large übermarionette driven from inside by a living actor would greatly limit movement possibilities, making the actor a supernumerary or a stage hand assigned to move props but incapable of transferring variations of dynamo-rhythm to his load.³

Thus, the compelling musically phrased and articulated performance of the übermarionette described by Craig emerges as a feat far easier to imagine than to realize. For example, the phrase "With so much ease did her rhythms alter as with her movements they passed from limb to limb" highlights two things: the *trajectory* of the movement, *passing from limb to limb*, and the *alternating rhythmic qualities* of the movement. Only a finely articulated instrument can execute such a complex trajectory with ease, and no puppet Craig might have seen in Europe could have pulled off the sophisticated dynamo-rhythm of a performer whose "arms and hands seemed at one moment like a thin warm fountain of water which rose, then broke and fell with all those sweet pale fingers like spray into her lap."

Had Craig travelled to Japan, he could have witnessed *bunraku* puppetry, which since the 1600s has codified and polished an exemplary *total theatre* form. To each wooden entity, *bunraku* assigns three highly skilled puppeteers with decades of training, and two musicians, a singer-narrator, and a *shamisen* player. Thereby, the *bunraku* theatre successfully intertwines human and wooden elements, the fruit of centuries of development, allowing complex geometric trajectories along with intricately varied movement qualities of speed, weight, and vibrato.

Had Craig been able to look into the future, he might have enjoyed the work of South Africa's Handspring Puppet Company. Adrian Kohler and Basil Jones create finely articulated, lightweight and transportable cane figures, often manipulated by as many as three puppeteers. Their ability to move at once "realistically" and "poetically"—unencumbered, articulate, and variously dynamic—rivals the level of complexity attributed to the Egyptian Queen's fluid gestures.

The ingenious solutions brought to bear by Handspring or the *bunraku* were unknown to Craig; his theoretical writings, thus, expose valid technical limitations in European puppetry of his time. However we might well consider his proposals from another perspective, one that sees "living" or "wooden" as qualifiers designating opposite, yet co-existing, *qualities* for the performing agent (living or wooden) worthy of the title übermarionette. To the question "living or wooden," one must answer living *and* wooden, both at the same time, in the same space and in the same performer. From this standpoint, Craig's descriptive paragraph provides a treatise on magical performance with its indispensable components and their constantly changing organization. His undeniable ambiguity, then, reads more like

a provocation than a guessing game and more like a thoughtful delineation—a tutorial for the actor—than an obfuscation. From this reading, instead of Craig attempting to throw us off track, he holds nothing back. Or, as Kohler and Jones stated in their TEDTalk, "The [living] actor struggles to die on stage, the [wooden] puppet struggles to live" (Handspring Puppet Company).

3. Contraries are Complementary

Influenced by the poems and prints of the mystic-Romantic William Blake, to whom he dedicated *On the Art of the Theatre*, Craig's visionary and poetic writings on the übermarionette sometimes baffle scholars who find them "contradictory" (Le Boeuf, "Gordon Craig's Self-Contradictions," 402). The dedication to Blake—"the ever living genius of the greatest of English artists"—calls to mind that creator's highly theatricalized rendering of human figures. Often in opposition, lunging, kneeling, leaning, dancing and swooping, struggling with spirits and demons, these vigorously and fluidly committed embodiments seem to illustrate Blake's belief that a "man who never alters his opinion [or in this case, position] is like standing water and breeds reptiles of the mind" (Blake, line 138). To guide us further in considering whether the indiscernible in Craig's writing represents an omission or a gift, we might remember the now almost worn-out words of Saint-Exupéry's *Little Prince*: "It is only with the heart that one can see rightly; what is essential is invisible to the eye" (Saint-Exupéry, ch. 21)—or of F. Scott Fitzgerald's oft-quoted lines, "The test of a first rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function." Similarly, some entrepreneurs and scientists cultivate a "tolerance for ambiguity" as a key to success, while physicist Niels Bohr adopted as his motto "*Contraria sunt Complementa*," later borrowed by Eugenio Barba's International School of Theatre Anthropology (ISTA).

I find Craig contradictory only in the same invaluable way that artists frequently juxtapose disparate elements to create Dadaist poems, or to assemble Surrealist collages, to edit films, or to write jokes, Zen koans, Christian parables, and Sufi stories. For example, in lines adjacent to those quoted above, Craig describes the übermarionette as not "flesh and blood but rather the body in trance—it will aim to clothe itself with a death-like beauty while exhaling a living spirit" (Craig, "The Actor and the Über-marionette," 40). This presence-and-absence, a performer simultaneously alive and dead, conjures a marionettized actor who, like a Dervish dancer or one of Blake's energetic figures, embodies the ambiguity of that double consciousness: the ability to move with stillness, and to stand still while moving within.⁴

In the "Actor and the Über-Marionette," Craig delineates four versions of animate and inanimate actors. Clearly, Craig seeks to banish the degraded approximation of the living actor, led by personality and ill-equipped to induce "physical and spiritual refreshment" in audience members. Such an actor offers "flashiness" rather than the "flash of genius." He remains vulnerable to the pull of the ego, having failed to cultivate the physical and mental resources that would save him from distraction; thus, applause or the lack of it guides his performance down a less than noble path. Craig lays out for us what a living actor could learn from the highest manifestation of the art of the marionette (Craig, "The Actor and the Über-marionette," 39–40).

Yet, in proposing a non-human performer, Craig issues a warning rather than offering a panacea, since even the admirable and noble marionette has a degraded counterpart: comic-looking (and only seeking a laugh), with an expression of blank stupidity instead of gravity, with a body displaying angular deformity instead of calmness (Craig, "The Actor and the Über-marionette," 39). Craig found that these demeaned variants of their estimable wooden forbears "have forgotten the counsel of their mother the Sphinx. Their bodies have lost their grave grace, they have become stiff. Their eyes have lost that infinite subtlety of seeming to see; now they only stare" (Craig, "The Actor and the Über-marionette," 40).

Craig's texts invite us to consider the possibility of a performer manifesting "living qualities" (whether in an actor of flesh and blood or in a wooden marionette), along with "puppet qualities" (in an actor of flesh and blood or in a wooden marionette). Every person alive does not possess stage-worthy "living qualities." Craig warned against the failed (human) actor, doomed because subject to personality. Likewise, not every marionette demonstrates stage-worthy "puppet qualities." As we have seen, Craig railed against a banal and comic version of a marionette. The highest actorly "living qualities" exist thus

only through their perfect marriage with the highest artful "puppet qualities" *within the same performer*. They require each other, emerge through a negotiated co-existence of opposites, in the way that a flickering candle flame vacillates between light and darkness: this "intermittency" gives to its light, paradoxically, a fragile vibrancy, a vibrant fragility, while conferring to its darkness an explosive potential that accords vulnerability and therefore more depth to its shadows. The "and-and" transfixes and delights in a way that the "either-or" does not. The "and-and" depends on muscular respiration⁵ and the constantly changing, flickering candle flame named dynamo-rhythm.

Thus Craig, never arguing simply for the "either-or," the fleshly versus the wooden, presents both failed and noble versions of the marionette as well as the failed and noble versions of the actor. Even if the Greek Traveler's account of "The Art of Showing and Veiling" leaves us to wonder if he chronicles a *puppet* performance, Craig unequivocally identifies a multi-faceted performer embracing commonalities in acting/puppetry/ritual/performance.

4. Decroux and Craig

Decroux first encountered Craig's ideas, filtered through Copeau, while a student at the École du Vieux Colombier in 1923.⁶ Craig and Decroux began a mutually respectful acquaintanceship in Paris in the 1940s: not only did Craig write perceptively and appreciatively of Decroux's performance in 1945, he also lent his name as President to Decroux's school the following year (Craig, "At Last a Creator in the Theatre, From the Theatre," 95–7). He actively undertook a search for an impresario to help book tours for Decroux's troupe; and sent his daughter Daphne and his apprentice Harvey Grossman to study with Decroux—signs of admiration and affection perhaps unmatched in Craig's life of single-minded focus on his own work.⁷

In recent years, I have attempted to identify influences leading to various strands of Decroux's work. Although a Darwinian chain, echoing the biblical "begats," fails to explain everything, it associates nonetheless certain personalities and movements. For example, passages in Craig's biography of his godfather, Henry Irving, suggest that Irving's singular, hypnotic acting style served as a partial and indirect source of Craig's and, later, I argue, of Decroux's aesthetic (Craig, *Henry Irving*, 52–4).

In Craig's subsequent writing about the übermarionette, he trades the borrowed historical voice for his own, and relates what he *saw* rather than only imagined:

[Henry] Irving was the nearest thing ever known to what I have called the Übermarionette.

Now an Übermarionette is all sorts of things at which I have hinted in books and drawings which I have made since 1907. I only hope that I have not wearied anybody with the notion of *an actor who should be all that a marionette is and much more*—and that I do not weary you now. But there is a point that I never touched on. It is a human point, and it is related to Irving, for *from Irving the whole notion receives corroboration*. (Craig, *Henry Irving*, 52–4. Italics added)

"We have done well in choosing him as our leader," Decroux wrote of Craig in 1947 (Decroux 9). He deals with the perplexing parts of Craig's text by suggesting that these "contradictions" are unimportant:

[I]s it really important to know whether Craig declares himself for the marionette or for the human body; for the actor alone or as complemented by the other arts? Does it matter if he contradicts himself or if I have misunderstood his thinking? It does not matter that he writes sometimes as a pamphleteer, sometimes as a philosopher, and sometimes as an artist; what counts is the idea suggested by the central current of his thought. (Decroux 8)

5. Decroux's "actor made of wood"

Decroux, as much a pamphleteer, philosopher and artist as his subject, and not to be outdone by Craig, defends the idea of a literal übermarionette—a wooden articulated figure—as a *potential* instrument for true drama, for high art. He proclaims, however, that the art of the marionette was not yet sufficiently evolved in that direction. Moreover, corporeal mime, through its continued development, could eventually richly inform the art of the marionette, providing a training ground wherein it could reach those dramatic heights. Decroux writes:

I personally wish for the birth of this actor made of wood. I envision this large-scale marionette arousing, by its appearance and its movements, a feeling of seriousness and not of condescension. The marionette that we desire must not make us laugh or feel moved as does the playing [stage acting] of a young child. It must inspire terror and pity and, from there, rise to the level of the waking dream Is it not obvious that our way will have been substantially paved when the practice of corporeal mime becomes learned? (Decroux 8)

Whether a marionette-like living actor or an inanimate puppet that seems alive, Craig spoke of (and inspired in Decroux) the notion of an absent-present performer, a dual presence on the stage, showing by veiling, and art as vibration (muscular respiration and dynamo-rhythm). These irreducible, non-negotiable, qualities of the new/old actor, whether live or wooden, constitute, for Decroux, the essence of Craig's doctrine. Decroux considers the question of whether Craig advocated a living or a wooden übermarionette irrelevant and perhaps unknowable. More pertinent for him is the fact that theorizing does not suffice. The wooden übermarionette has yet to be constructed and he had yet to elaborate completely his actor art. As for the living übermarionette, Decroux labored in that field until the end of his life. The construction and performance of a wooden übermarionette, like Decroux's corporeal mime, would require a detailed study of geometry's possibilities for the body. And geometry sets a high standard.

The field of geometry opens untold possibilities ignored by a body (living or wooden) moving randomly or without benefit of a scientific approach. At the same time, a living body or a wooden portrait of a living body inevitably encounters limitations that lines on paper or disembodied sticks in three dimensions do not. The richness of the actor's art form will lie: (1) in the working out of the untold geometrical possibilities as they confront the limitations of the human form whether of flesh and blood or of wood and (2) in the vibration (muscular respiration and dynamo-rhythm) that inhabits the form. The way geometry meets vibration (in the same way that "puppet qualities" meet "living qualities") allows, on the one hand, for a *quality of movement within stillness* and, on the other hand, a *quietness or stillness*—a level of control, a lack of reactive corporeal agitation—*within movement*. These qualities provide an other-worldliness to a living actor as well as a breath, a lifelike *élan*, to a marionette.

However, just as the prospect of a wooden übermarionette, animated from within by an actor, poses perhaps insoluble technical and therefore artistic problems for the marionette, likewise, the more the living actor wears cumbersome matter (large costume, mask), the more severely these burdens or obstacles limit his range of movement, geometrically and dynamically.⁸ Whereas Decroux, on occasion, advocated masked and nearly nude performance, Craig sometimes envisioned massive and elaborate body masks that would have restricted an actor's movement and thus thwarted a partnership between geometry on one hand and vibration, muscular respiration and dynamo-rhythm on the other.

Despite the pertinence of Decroux's "actor made of wood" to his thought, it remains conspicuously absent in the transcriptions of his subsequent lectures and in his other writings. The evocative metaphor of an actor made of wood, as such, a notion that nourished corporeal mime's essential qualities, retreated from Decroux's vocabulary, while remaining the invisible but ever-present guiding metaphor in his teaching. His convictions regarding the development of the actor never wavered: the effect of the image endured.

6. Connecting the Dots

Decroux told three stories to illuminate his thoughts on acting:

1. Look at the pointillist painters. They place side by side a blob of blue and a blob of yellow paint. From a distance, and in the spectator's eye, this juxtaposition creates the color green. For the viewer, this color-event vibrates with vitality.
2. Examine the Sistine Chapel ceiling. Note that God's finger does not touch Adam's: in this space between the two digits, the spectator's imagination comes alive in striving to complete the circuit.
3. The actor's job consists of throwing a handful of dots into the sky; the audience, in connecting those dots, sees the Great Bear of the Ursa Major constellation.

In each story, the artist deliberately leaves a gap that the spectator must fill, constituting true "audience participation." Jerzy Grotowski explained the Principle of Induction, another story about a gap, as illustrative of the actor-audience relationship. We attach to a board two parallel wires only one of which connects to a source of electricity. Yet, the current passes through *both* wires, including the disconnected one, albeit with a weaker charge. The electrical power, thus, bridges the gap between the two wires; the disconnected wire appropriates, to some degree, the energy conducted by the live one.

For Grotowski, the actors represent the live wire, connected to the energy source developed through years of training and rehearsal. The audience represents the second wire through which "current" may be induced. In Henry Irving's late-Victorian England, one might have described the same situation as the actor hypnotizing the audience.

In Decroux's stories, the active audience weaves discrete elements into "meanings" which could differ for each spectator. In Grotowski's story, the audience participates through their openness, their pure receptivity, their "unblockedness," their ability to let go, to dream. They fail to receive the "current"—to participate as active receivers—in the creation of the drama, as long as they remain "blocked." By this term, Grotowski designated analytical audiences who strive to attribute a literal "meaning" to the drama while viewing it or who wish to "comment" on the dramatic proceedings through applause, laughter or by participating in an intrusive way (i.e. foot tapping to the music or singing along).⁹ For Grotowski, the actors are not performing to or for the audience. Rather, the audience witnesses the actors' performance for God.

Through his marionettized body, the corporeal mime suggests rather than explains, by having the studied movement of one part of the body function as a portrait or emissary for another part, thus replaced. In this way, he amplifies, through transposition, what would otherwise go unseen; he creates an artistic or defamiliarized version of the original. In denying "voice" (in this case, *movement*) to the original "speaker" (in this case, *body part*), and by managing, through study, to regenerate that voice in an unexpected body part (otherwise ill-suited—not "naturally" trained for the task), the voice manages to speak more powerfully. The portrait of the thing touches the receptive audience member more potently than would have the original. For example, if an actor uses his own lungs to present a stylized or exaggerated version of breath by altering the respiratory activity in rhythm or volume, he performs a banal facsimile of breathing instead of creating art (artificiality, transposition). While the human actor must breathe with his lungs or die, his marionettized body (in corporeal mime) depicts breathing in subtle, rapid-fire alternating currents in "muscular respirators": biceps, buttocks, and pectorals. He renders his own natural breathing as invisible as possible while casting a spotlight on the artificial, articulated breathing of the non-lungs. To give another example: for the *act of looking*, Decroux assigns it to parts of the body other than the eyes (in fact, to *any* other part of the body), contending that looking with the eyes lacks poetry, indirection, discretion.

One might describe the cherished and fertile gap between the blue and yellow blobs, or the one between the two wires on the board, as a metaphor for the dynamic state of mind to which Craig's and Decroux's actor aspires—a version of “emptying out your apartment so that God can come to live there.”¹⁰ The space between the two wires—the territory across which the electric charge navigates—constitutes the “empty apartment,” the anticipatory space between Adam's finger and God's, the space between the blob of blue paint and the blob of yellow. Electric current jumping from one wire to another, or the vibrating color green (vibrating because in a continual state of becoming), or breathing with the arms (defamiliarizing and therefore heightening the respiratory act), is “God coming.” This advent constitutes the very subject of drama rather than its window dressing. This appearance takes center stage, placing plot and literature in a subservient position to action and presence: *the Wooden Actor* becomes the only thing we want to see in the theatre. Neither wooden marionette nor living actor, but an amalgam of the two, the Wooden Actor transports us in the *noh*, in Flamenco dance, in Dervish turning, in *bunraku* and in Craig's imagined “performance” in Egypt.

7. Theory and Practice

Every day, corporeal mime students in Montreal, in Barcelona, in London, in Paris, in Los Angeles, in Sao Paulo and elsewhere, begin their lesson with a conceptually simple, yet difficult to execute, geometric scale. They incline the head, then the hammer (head plus the neck), bust (head through chest), torso (head through waist), trunk (head through pelvis) successively around three different axes, finally inclining the whole body as one unit. The class continues as students move forward and back, in rotation, and in rotation on an inclined plane. They study drama in walks, in figures of style and in repertory created by the founder of their discipline. Slowly and over a period of years, with the help of their teachers, they marionettize and puppetize their bodies through a study of geometric and poetic forms with accompanying dynamo-rhythm. The enormous physical possibilities of this technique, created by Decroux under the influence of Copeau and Craig (and certainly through “fertile misunderstandings” of them as well) slowly erodes the paradigm Grotowski mocked: “Is the actor only someone who says the author's words and makes appropriate gestures?” This family, this tribe, has chosen Craig as their grandfather, even if Craig would not have chosen them. They esteem his provocative writing, not minding—even embracing—areas of apparent contradiction.

Often invisible to scholars and ordinary theatre practitioners, Decroux's subversive, subterranean work has proceeded day after day, year after year, in an unbroken chain since 1931. Though some may have heard of it, most have never seen these lessons that influence the way some perceive Craig and his *oeuvre*.

Decroux and Craig, different in physiology, political views, class, and education, had two things in common: their lives encompassed both theory and practice, and they moved freely back and forth from one to the other. I recall Decroux curved forward over a desk in the study of his modest home, one hand clasping his clay pipe, the other holding his quill pen or an open book—it might have been one of Craig's. Then, crossing his miniscule kitchen and descending the stairs to the basement studio, Decroux greeted students from far and wide, to join them in marionettizing the body: head, neck, chest, waist, and pelvis.

Craig, like Decroux, read and wrote. Yet when he worked practically, Craig usually employed gauze and muslin, wood-blocks and carving tools, models and diagrams, and only practiced rarely (certainly not every day for sixty years, as did Decroux) with living human beings. In his daily brief passage—less than a minute—from his study to his studio, Decroux translated theory into practice, his thoughts and visions manifesting directly through him onto the bodies of his expectant students. It's not surprising that his version of the übermarionette, while having a similar origin, might not resemble Craig's in its realization. Some, however, see a similar root and similar intentions in both men's work: the Wooden Actor.

NOTES

1. Sally Leabhart significantly edited drafts of this article, and added substantially and invaluable to its content.
2. In nineteenth-century story-telling ballets, pure dance sequences alternate with mimed scenes that provide a literal framework or plot. In Decroux's equivalent he calls "objective mime" movements which replace speech (pantomime) and "subjective mime" (corporeal mime) movements which deal with emotions, states of being, and thought.
3. Decroux coined the term Dynamo-Rhythm to describe the trajectory, the speed, and the weight of movements performed with the human body. See Leela Alaniz.
4. While dictionaries don't yet contain the verbs "to marionettize" and "to puppetize," the meanings are clear to scholars and artist currently using them.
5. Muscular respiration is Etienne Decroux's term for alternating currents of tension and relaxation the actor produces in buttocks, biceps and pectoral muscles.
6. *On the Art of the Theatre* was published in French in 1920.
7. See Decroux/Craig correspondence, Bibliothèque national de France, Département des Arts du Spectacle, Richelieu-Laouvois, Paris.
8. Dutch corporeal mime and student of Decroux Will Spoor (1927–2014) created a larger-than-life sized wooden figure within which he performed. From photos I have seen it seems heavy and difficult to move, limiting the actor's movement possibilities considerably.
9. Instructions to spectators, given by a Grotowski associate before presentation in Pontedera, Italy, June 1996.
10. Decroux often described the first step in a performance or improvisation as "emptying out the apartment so that God could come to live there."

WORKS CITED

- Alaniz, Leela. "The Dynamo-Rhythm of Étienne Decroux and his Successors." *Mime Journal*, vol. 24, August 2013, pp. 1–50.
- Blake, William. *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, <http://www.bartleby.com/235/253.html>
- Craig, Edward Gordon. "At Last a Creator in the Theatre, From the Theatre." *An Étienne Decroux Album*, *Mime Journal* 2000/2001, ed. Thomas Leabhart, vol. 21, Jan 2001, pp. 95–7.
- Craig, Edward Gordon. "The Actor and the Über-Marionette." *On the Art of the Theatre*, ed. Franc Chamberlain. Routledge, 2009.
- Craig, Edward Gordon. *Henry Irving*. Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- Decroux, Étienne. "Words on Mime," *Mime Journal*, 1985.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. "The Crack-Up." *Esquire Magazine*, 1936. <http://www.esquire.com/news-politics/a4310/the-crack-up/>
- Grotowski, Jerzy. Lectures at ISTA (International School of Theatre Anthropology). Copenhagen. 3–8 May 1996.
- Handspring Puppet Company, "The Genius Puppetry behind *War Horse*," TED Talks, uploaded March 30, 2011, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h7u6N-cSWtY>
- Leabhart, Thomas, and Sally Leabhart, eds. *An Étienne Decroux Album*, *Mime Journal* 2000/2001, *Mime Journal*, vol. 21, Jan 2001.
- LeBoeuf, Patrick. "Gordon Craig's Self-Contradictions," *Brazilian Journal on Presence Studies*, vol. 4, no. 3, Fall 2014, pp. 401–424.
- LeBoeuf, Patrick. "On the Nature of Edward Gordon Craig's Über-Marionette." *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 2, May 2010, pp. 102–114.
- Saint-Exupéry, Antoine. *The Little Prince*. 1940. http://srogers.com/books/little_prince/ch21.asp

Thomas Leabhart, Professor of Theatre and Resident Artist at Pomona College in California, studied with Etienne Decroux from 1968 to 1972. He started *Mime Journal* in 1974 and has authored two books on corporal mime. For more than a decade he was a member of Eugenio Barba's ISTA (International School of Theatre Anthropology) artistic staff, and he often teaches corporeal mime in France, Spain and Japan.