ANOTHER KIND OF THEATRE

CONTEMPORARY PERFORMING ARTS BETWEEN THE EXHIBITION AND THE STAGE – AND THE QUESTION OF EDUCATION

Jette Lund

Introduction

The two topics of this article are for me like the two sides of a coin; they cannot be separated from each other: One side is my practical experiences as a dramaturge, a director, a teacher and an analyst of educational projects in performing arts, the other is my (practice based) research, trying to collect and generalize my experiences, and if possible find a common denominator, an understanding of the phenomenon, I discover. I am trying to find notions and relevant material – a theory – for my work as a teacher, director and dramaturge.

In the first part of the article, I shall present my thesis, arguing that there are two kinds of theatre: The traditional European dramatic theatre, rooted in ancient Greek drama, and characterized by *the changing subject* – and the contemporary performance theatre/performance art on the border between visual arts and stage arts, characterized by *the shifting subject/object relations*. I will try to give a brief outline of this thesis, using a framework of theatre science and psychology.

In the second part, I shall present some of my practical experiences, in the form of three reports, which I have produced.

• Report on the Basic Education for Puppet Makers, by the Technical School of Hanstholm, the first Year, from Autumn 1996 to Spring 1998.

Jette Lund

• The Education by School of Stage Arts, an Account 1999.

• Another Kind of Theatre, Report on an Experiment. Theatre School of Odsherred, Laboratory Project 2005–06.[1]

These reports might form a background for the thesis and for further investigations, my goal being to create an actual basis for the discussion of and the education for the contemporary performing arts.

This means that I am primarily taking the artist's and not the spectator's point of view.

1. The Theory
1.1. Background
It is well known that the modern stage art differs very much from the traditional dramatic theatre. The difference is primarily described in Hans-Thies Lehmann: *Postdramatic Theatre*, the German edition published in 1999. Sometimes it is labelled "performance theatre" or "performance art", sometimes – with Lehmann – as *post-dramatic* (Lehmann 2006).

As the conventions of the 'dramatic' theatre are still strong and dominating, it might be necessary to stress, that in the contemporary stage arts space, objects and performers, as well as lighting, sound, music and spoken or written words, the static and moving images, the motion of bodies and stage elements, are all seen as equal means of expression.

In some cases, this not only permeates the conventional borders between fiction and reality, but also the border between stage and audience space and between audience and performer. These borders may actually be dissolved, introducing notions such as *live art*, *interaction* and *audience participation*.

You can no longer expect just to be seated on a chair, but must actively be part of the formation of expressions. It can no longer be taken for granted or even intended that every member of the audience is experiencing the same *text*.

This tendency is also mirrored in the production of the play, where

formal hierarchies are broken down and all participants can be seen as members of a team, working together on equal terms. The linguistic texts are often created through improvisation and discussions in the production team, known as *devising theatre*.

As the visual expression is no longer derived from the dramatist's text, but constitutes an independent level of expression, the visual artists are entering the stage, devising objects and pictures for the performers to play with. Outside the theatres, in the exhibition rooms and galleries, the visual artists are no longer just making paintings and sculptures for walls, rooms and streets, but are staging events in which they might expect the spectators to take part.

The use of "New Media Objects" (Manovich 2001) as an artistic material, with their shifting, changing and fragile character, through the internet available to anyone, accentuates the shifting, changing and fragile character of these contemporary performing arts.

They are then – as stated by Lehmann – not just new examples of artistic and avant-garde ensemble theatre, as we have known it throughout the twentieth century. Compared with the theatre forms, which take their point of departure in written text, and are governed by traditional dramaturgy such as dramatic/Aristotelian, epic/Brechtian or other text-based constructions and conventions, there is a difference in quality, in the way of seeing and primarily in the way of *creating* performing art. Lehmann stresses that the postdramatic theatre has left "the primacy of the text" (Lehmann 2006: 21) and sets on: "Yet the step to postdramatic theatre is taken only when the theatrical means beyond language are positioned equally alongside the text and are systematically thinkable without it" (ibid.: 55).

However, the notion of 'postdramatic' still does not tell what it *is*; it tells us only what it is *not*. As Lehmann himself states (ibid.: 19), it is important to find a positive definition. The question is – as formulated at a seminar at the University of Copenhagen [2]: What is "the dramatic fuel", when it is no longer the traditional (dramatic) conflict of the protagonist

versus the antagonist?

One could argue that the multitude of expressions, characteristic for the contemporary "postdramatic" stage arts, makes it impossible to find a common denominator or a specific, which could be applied to every thinkable variation. After all, it is the business of the art to seek new ways of doing things, and not to restrict itself to well-known patterns. Lehmann states: "... to develop "the" dramaturgy of the postdramatic theatre is unthinkable [....] Recommendations, let alone prescriptions, are no longer possible, merely partial perspectives and stuttering answers that remain "work in progress". The task of theory is to articulate, conceptualize and find terms for that which has come into being, not to postulate it as the norm" (Lehmann 2006: 25).

This we can agree upon. The task of *practice* is to find the techniques and the possible means of expression to fulfil the intentions of the artist. But if we can 'liberate' the term of theatre from being bound to the classical notion of dramatic theatre to include this *other kind of theatre* – by Lehmann labelled as 'postdramatic' – it might be possible to 'liberate' the term of dramaturgy too – and to place it as what it was always meant to be – a tool, not fixed formulas or a set of laws.

Finding the necessary and sufficient means to realize an artistic goal will always be a struggle, as it is generally stated in the articles of this anthology. But even 'partial perspectives' and 'stuttering answers' might sometimes be helpful, if – and only if – they correspond to the specific of the art form in question.

1.2. *The theatre of the shifting subject/object relations*
I will offer the notion of *shifting subject/object relations* as a possible description of the specific of a rather big section of the contemporary 'postdramatic' theatre, performance theatre and performance art.

In my context it means, that there are two kinds of theatre: *The theatre of the changing subject* depends basically and specifically on the artist's *immersion* (Einfühlung) in the role-figure, as well as on the artist's

recognition of the figure's views, its intentions and its feelings. Even if there are different 'schools' and actor's techniques, the artist primarily uses her own body – her 'changed subject' – as a means of expression, stating: "I am!" In addition to that *the theatre of the shifting subject/object relations* depends on a specific consciousness of the role-figures shifting position in its world, expressed through the physical facts: *the 'things'* surrounding it. This theatre form depends basically and specifically on the *alienation* (Verfremdung) which can only appear on the background of immersion. The artist uses the shifts between being a subject and being an object as means of expression, asking the implicit question: 'Am I?'

The shifts between an 'I am!' and an 'Am I?' are shifts between a subject status and the status of an object. To explain, how these shifts work, one can use the metaphor of 'taking a step from one position to another': A step presupposes a hold, but the hold does not include the step, as the step is a negation of the hold. In the same way, the alienation will destroy the immersion. So the theatre of the shifting subject/object relations may include the theatre of the changing subject, not the other way round. 'Am I?' will always be the negation of the categorical 'I am!'

Erika Fischer-Lichte writes, seen from the spectator's point of view: "Between the observer and the observed is a continuous interchange […] [oscillating] between subject and object positions, permanently sliding between the two [...] subject and object is no longer oppositions, but are only marking different states or positions for the observer and the observed, which follow each other or sometimes could be taken simultaneously. This might be the case with everyday experiences too. But after all, we will first recognize it through the attention, we are producing during a performance. Here we experience ourselves in the act of observing as active observers, at the same time as being affected by the observations, as subject and objects at the same time" (Fischer-Lichte 2004: 301, my translation).[3]

In the theatre of the shifting subject/object relations, the artist has to produce this "oscillation" for the spectator as a means of expression. The

paradox of something being on the same time a 'subject' and an 'object' will – again as a metaphor – have to be taken as a springboard, not as an obstacle or a fence. The artistic disposition for this theatre form might perhaps stem from an ability to look upon a notion (= paradox) as a physical 'thing' (= a fence or a springboard) – and on the same time see physical things as 'notions' and all aspects as parts of oneself – and not least to have a persistent wish or perhaps need to transpose such relations to an artistic expression on stage.

In its substance this theatre form tends more towards the existential and poetic expression than towards the social, dramatic or epic narrative, more towards the inner life (and death) of the individual than towards the hero fighting his way towards the final victory or defeat. One may say that instead of – as in the traditional dramatic theatre – to create a fictive *reality*, this theatre form aims to create a *real fiction* (Lund 1995).

This might be seen as a matter of 'content'. The 'form' or means of expression is exactly that *the performer is shifting her status as a subject into the status of an object, by means of an object, which she in its turn let take a subject status*. Therefore the use of and the relation to the objects or 'things' on the stage is crucial for the artist dealing with this *other kind of theatre*; therefore there are often a very strong connection to visual arts.

Dancers and musicians on the hunt for other/new expressions often seek the technique of the shifting subject/object relations, and it seems easier for them as for (traditional trained) actors: Dancers, because they might be used to see themselves as 'objects', musicians, because they might be used to seeing their instruments as a part of themselves.[4]

However, the technique of creating the shifting subject/object relations is very well known from the puppet theatre where the puppeteer can be experienced as a 'motor' – an object – for the seeming 'subject', the puppet. The archetypical example of a situation of shifting subject/object relations is the ventriloquist with her puppet, where the shifts between subject and object status for the performer and the puppet alternately are continuous and direct visible for the spectator.

1.3. The puppet theatre as a model

Seen from outside and in the more conventional view, the theory and practice of the puppet theatre has no obvious connection to the modern 'postdramatic' theatre, performance art or performance theatre.

Looking at the examples mentioned above, the instrument of a musician is no 'puppet', even if the musician might regard it as a living being, or a part of herself. Equally, a dancer in the hands of the choreographer is no 'puppet', even if the choreographer uses the dancer as an object for her composition of a living picture.

However my claim is, that when a visual artist (by adding time) or a dancer or a musician (by adding things, pictures or objects) wants to go beyond the limits of her profession and make 'performance art', she cannot use the tools and the terminologies of the classical dramatic theatre (the theatre of the changing subject), but she can use the theory and practice of the puppet theatre *as a model*, because *the shifting subject/object relations* are so very obvious there. This applies to the use of new media as material too (Callesen 2005). Here the performer will have to relate to the virtual objects as if they were 'real' (see photo example in Gritt Uldall-Jessen: "Creating with Words").

1.4. Being a human, adapting the world

One might say that the theatre of the shifting subject/object relations depends on the artist's ability to 'think' the world and her relation to the world in a special way. Looking at theatre from the outside in order to find a *meta language*, there are interesting psychological and anthropological theories, which give evidence to the assumption, that the two theatre 'species' are mirroring two aspects of human thinking.

The ontogenetical approach would suggest that an Ego, the 'I', is built through the play with a (transistorial) object (Winnicott 1971). This 'being an I' is thematized in the theatre of the shifting subject/object relations. 'Being an I' is a precondition for the change of the 'I', practised through children's role-play.

This role-play is anticipating the adult citizen's deliberate and necessary adjustments of behaviour in relation to different societal functions, and is thematized in the theatre of the changing subject.

Seen from the anthropological (phylogenetic) perspective, the human thinking might stem from the acknowledgment and acceptance of "somehing being what it is not" (Engelsted 1984). According to this theory, it is this recognition, which makes language possible and necessary and forms the precondition for the human ability to change and exploit the world, as well as forms the precondition for philosophy, religion, rituals and theatre: A is not B, but is playing B, while C looks on (Bentley 1984).

1.5. Conventions and concepts and the contract of fiction

We may conclude that even if performance art and this other or postdramatic theatre might be new in relation to traditional theatre thinking, it is not new to mankind. On the contrary, you might say that it is the rigid construction of formal genres and the Aristotelian drama theatre, which is 'only' 2.500 years old. Theatre history often neglects, that in the Aristotelian times – and before – there too was another kind of theatre, rooted in the use of the human body and the use of objects/ puppets. The crux of the matter is the human ability to recognize 'something being what it is not' and on this background to define what we call a fiction. Unlike *an illusion*, which can be defined as a concept about reality, which cannot pass a reality test, *the fiction* can be defined as an (outspoken) concept about reality, which is not challenged by a reality test (Engelsted. quoted in: Lund 1995:19, note 82). As such a concept has to be recognized by the partakers and/or has to be object of negotiation, we might chose to call it *a contract of fiction* (Szatkowski 1989).

Such contracts of fiction might apply to a performative event, a 'game', or a play, and they apply to the status of the participating *subjects*, who are 'transformed' for the said time and space. However, there are other "contracts of fiction" applying to the status of certain *objects*. In the

frame of theatrical contracts of fiction, it is first and foremost the puppet theatre. In relation to the theme of this article it has to be stressed, that the notion of a 'contract of fiction' is an important element in every art form. In literature, it is Don Quixote, the famous work of Cervantes,[5] that in an unsurpassed way thematizes the importance of understanding fiction as fiction and the problems of not doing it. When the artist Marco Evaristti uses blenders as aquariums, puts goldfishes in them, and leave the spectator the choice to press the button or not, he is challenging the traditional contract of fiction for 'an exhibition', and entering the contract of fiction of 'the performing arts' by 'adding time'.[6] The tension – or 'fuel' – of this situation arises from the shifting subject/object relations: Every spectator will have to decide whether she will be an object for the temptation to kill the goldfish or an independent subject rejecting that possibility – whether to be an independent subject ruling over life and death – or a passive object of conventions. Working with shifting subject/object relations on stage, any theatrical illusion and the resulting immersion is continuously broken and re-established, in a constant play between fiction and reality.

It is therefore – in my opinion – necessary for the contemporary performing arts and especially dealing with educational issues, to realize, that in challenging the borders between fiction and reality you are not denying or abolishing these borders: You are challenging the traditional contracts of fiction and replacing them with new and unconventional ones.

This will be an important theme, if the performing arts are aspiring to mirror the societies of the third millennium, where the borders between fiction and reality are constantly challenged in various ways.

1.6. Discussion
In the article of Fia Adler Sandblad: "The Actor's Knowledge. An actor's reflection on practice", there is a wonderful description: "…I worked by moving and sounding, letting the songs sound, letting my body move. I

pressed myself to the floor, touched with my fingers […] The work awoke the feeling of grains of dust. I asked myself how I related to these grains, as to what they are or as to living creatures"

This effect might not only seize an artist, working intensively with her material; it is an effect very often used in stage arts, primarily in performance art and in what is commonly known as puppet theatre or object theatre.

Reading this sentence I wonder, why the artist in her article do not describe her artistic use of the room and its 'objects': e.g. the floor and the grains of dust. I have not seen the performance, but I find it hard to imagine the artist not relating to these objects, which are intruding themselves on her, as aspects of the life of her role-figure?

In other articles in this anthology, I find descriptions of phenomenon, which might in some way be similar: While Rose Parekh-Gaihede refers to an *inverted V-effekt*, Larissa Tiusainen refers to *split subjectivity*. In the theory concerned with puppetry and New Media, I have found equal phenomenon named as: *opalescence* (Jurkowski 1988), *double vision* (Tillis 1992), *Subjektsprung* (Knoedgen 1990), *oscillation* and *metafiction* (Manovich 2001).

I prefer to use the notion of *shifting subject/object relations*, with reference to Konstanza Kavrakova-Lorenz (1989).

It is tempting to attribute the lack of attention on such 'scenic objects' to the traditional preoccupation with 'the words' – with which we are all brought up. In the traditional dramatic theatre the room and the objects are just 'scenography' and 'props' and it is not questioned if one can – or must – relate to them as if they were 'living beings'.

It is perhaps no coincidence that the most of the artistic stage work described in the articles in this anthology could be defined as *another kind of theatre*. It is in this area more research is needed, and this can only be 'practice based' as it relates to an actual artistic practice and a resulting artistic need for descriptions and terminology.

2. Experiences with education for another kind of theatre

2.1. The reports

The future artists are in no doubt, that there is a difference between that kind of theatre which is passed on by the traditional actor's schools, and the kind of theatre facilitated by for instance by (in Denmark) *School Of Stage Arts (SOSA)*[7] They consciously seek different production methods and different means of expression, and reject – sometimes with contempt – the traditional 'psychological theatre', grounded on the methods of Stanislavski and his successors. But what is put in its place instead? What is the real difference of the various offers in education? To my knowledge, it is neither studied nor described, even if there has been an attempt: A big comparative study on a Nordic level has never been finished.[8] Therefore, my conclusions are solely grounded on my own practical experiences, including three reports, which I have produced, as mentioned in the introduction. As the reports are only available in Danish, I shall give a short summary of their showings. Because of their differences in purpose and preconditions it is not possible on hand of these reports to make an overall or in any aspect final conclusion, e.g. on the educations in this area. But it might be possible to extract some central elements, which could be valuable to try out as laboratories in practice based research projects.

2.1.1 Hanstholm, an experiment with puppets

The Basic Education for Puppet Makers 1996–2000 in Hanstholm[9], was a four-year experiment for which I worked as a teacher in puppetry and theatre theory. For technical/administrative reasons the project could not be continued and is now closed down. This education had no equivalent anywhere in the world, and the documentation of curriculum, didactics and experiences presents valuable knowledge. The education was inspired by experiences from the German Hochschule für Schauspielkunst *Ernst Busch* Abteilung Puppenspielkunst in Berlin, and had a number of German teachers, among them the late professor Dr.phil. Konstanza Kavrakova-Lorenz.[10]

The 1 1/2 year course was meant as an introduction to different film- and theatre educations. As a part of a polytechnic school its topic was puppet *making*. However, to build an instrument you will have to know how to play it. So besides modelling, drawing and construction of puppets in different materials the course included acting, puppetry, voice and body training. This approach clearly attracted a certain predisposition by the students, a certain talent, which takes its point of departure in the object on the stage, the puppet, and *the shifting subject/object relations* between the actor/puppeteer and this object.

In Hanstholm, the puppet theatre was the point of departure, and the themes for the education were all in some aspects related to puppetry. However, the students of Hanstholm have – as it was intended – afterwards chosen very different educations and occupations. The Hanstholm experiment shows the consequences and the value of taking puppet theatre as a model. In this aspect it could present a key to a coherent education plan for not only puppetry, but for the contemporary 'other' or 'postdramatic' theatre and performance art as well.

2.1.2 School of Stage Arts

The description of the education at the private *School of Stage Arts (SOSA)* 1997–99 (Lund 1999, SOSA), is made on behalf of the school as a documentation. The existence of the school is now uncertain. The education was established and led by Nullo Facchini, was closely related to the theatre *Cantabile II*, and relied on international artists as well as former students as teachers. The school existed since the middle 80-ties and has attracted students from all Europe (Haff et. al 2008).

To my mind, the education focused on three central aspects:

1) The physical element of theatre: The presence of the performer, her ability to change, and her ability to create, exploit and redefine spaces and objects. In this aspect, the performer uses the same means as the puppeteer, namely the ability to work with shifting subject/object relations.

2) A deliberate request to the students to use the right half of the brain and it's non-verbal, synthetic, associative functions, rather than the left half with its deductive, analytical, verbal functions.

3) The ability to be an independent and creative co-producer in a team, and so to be able to create one's own material. An important and to a certain extent problematic part of the didactics was the use of personal material called 'Life Stories', which stresses an aspect which we may call 'the personal engagement'.

The report from SOSA describes an education plan, which has been functioning over a long period of time and clearly aimed at the contemporary 'other' or 'postdramatic' theatre. The education plan differs principally from the Hanstholm plan by prioritizing the education of the performer's physical abilities and by not including any notion of puppetry. However, a theme like 'work with objects' clearly addresses equivalent abilities. In every aspect the whole didactic seems to differ very much from that of the traditional schools (in Denmark Statens Teaterskoler ST) and it will – in my opinion – not be possible to integrate methods from one school in the other approach, even if the meetings of the schools are useful to the students on both sides. A student, who has attended both schools, puts it this way:

"In SOSA we are trained like a homogeneous group, everyone doing the same, and we end up as individuals. In ST we are treated as very different individuals, and we end up more or less the same".[11]

If this statement is a bit provocative, it carries an important message, namely about the difference between adapting the work from a physical point of view, from 'outside', or from a psychological point of view, from 'within'. Another problem might be the paradox mentioned above: When the theatre of the changing subject tries to adapt elements from the theatre of the shifting subject/object relations, it will negate itself and transform, whereas the theatre of the shifting subject/object relations can (and literally must) include the theatre of the changing subject.

Jette Lund

2.1.3 'The Lab' at Odsherred, Institute of New Stage Arts
At the experimental 'Laboratory' at *Institute of New Stage Art*, Odsherred 2005–2006[12], a small group of performers got the opportunity to develop their own projects for the stage, under guidance of the artist and director Catherine Poher and my self as dramaturge, over some months.

The participants were chosen at an audition, where two aspects of their projects were asked for:

The physical, material expression of the stage (the performers *playing material*), and the conscious wish for and need for support in a search for new expressions – a 'personal engagement'. The role of the coaches was not intended to be that of a director or a traditional dramaturge, but to support the performer in the search of the real core of the project, and in parallel, a search of that particular 'language', which would release the performer's perhaps not yet outspoken desires. The function has been called a *reflector*[13] – that is to reflect on the work of the performer, to give her the possibility of her own choice, to make it possible for the performer to act as an *auteur* on own project. If something like 'a life story' turns up, it is material for the performer's personal project; it cannot as in SOSA be expropriated for someone else's.

The main point shown here is the importance of relevant production methods. In the descriptions of the individual processes, a rich material for educational considerations and a lot of experience, which might be shared, can be identified.[14]

2.2. The results
The three reports are very different in their topics and their purpose and span over a period of 10 years.

The projects described all relate to theatre forms, which often not only are far from the common notion of theatre or what you might call 'mainstream', but which also require quite different talents and skills from their performers than those, on which the traditional theatre schools are grounded and which they teach.

All three reports show evidently the importance of the physical material – the room, body, the things as objects for the performing subject, and so point to the use of *shifting subject/object relations*.

As I personally take great interest in and specialize in this 'kind of theatre', the similarities are of course no coincidence.

A question that cannot be left undisputed is the problem with practice based research: the researcher becomes a participant, and might tend to realize factors supporting her theories and overlook the factors speaking against it. Nevertheless, the experiences of the third project, combined with the showings of the first two, at least present a rich material for further studies of the idea of *another kind of theatre.*

3. Conclusions

3.1. Another kind of theatre

It will not be possible for me in this article neither to exhaust the theme of *another kind of theatre*, nor to answer all possible questions. Practice based research will be necessary to understand how these different art and theatre forms are created and how they are perceived, in order to create a *new vocabulary for the theatre*: Notions and terminologies which allow us to speak about the phenomenon of these 'other' theatre forms.

However, it might be possible to outline some typical characteristics:
– priority of the physical elements of theatre, using all means of expression, not resting on the words
– use of 'the right half of the brain'
– use of alienation (Verfremdung) as a means of expression, and immersion (Einfühlung) as a precondition, not as an end in itself
– the use of objects on stage
– working *site-specific* also in the theatre rooms
– priority of the non hierarchical production methods
– the artist becomes auteur, the director becomes 'reflector'
– challenging the known concepts and conventions through new 'contracts of fiction'

– using shifting subject/object relations as a central means of expression

Thank to the thesis of *another kind of theatre* I have been able to present the many students and performers, with whom I have been working in the past twenty years, with tools, of which they have been able to make practical use. These tools primarily being

– the object used called into attention
– the possible use of all means of expression as 'objects' for the performer 'subject'
– the conscious quest for and definition of (outer) subject/object relations and the (inner) subject/object connections.
– the theory and practice of the puppet theatre used as 'model'.

3.2. Two kinds of theatre and the education as practice based research

Are there two kinds of theatre – or three or seventeen? It might all depend on definitions. What is fascinating about the theory of two kinds of theatre is the relation to psychological and anthropological research. Further research will be needed on this field. What supports my understanding of two kinds of theatre is my practical experience. It works.

If our practice and theory give us reason to recognize these two different theatre forms, it will have a strong influence on the way we should organize educations for the performing arts.

Education in the Arts was always contested. But if we want to create modern educations in the artistic fields at all – and do not want to leave the field to master led apprentice teaching and the sheer notion of 'talent' – not to forget the talent of using your elbows – and if we insist on discussing art from a point of quality too – then education for me is practice-based research, as research is education.

Any actual educational programme for an actual person is a research project, for the person and for the teacher. This might be seen as banal, but it is a necessary precondition for an acknowledgement of the educational situation.

Both the practitioner and the teacher need to legitimize and question their praxis, in order to find new inspiration, to gather and generalize the accumulated knowledge about the process of education, which they have gained, and to compare it to the knowledge of others.

It demands continuous, concrete research, and it necessarily has to be nothing other than practice-based. This is true both for the traditional schools working with the changing subject as well as for the alternative offers of an education for *Another Kind of Theatre*.

Acknowledgement

Notes

[1] The reports can be found (in Danish) on >www.jettelund.dk<, under "articles".

[2] Ass. professor Michael Eigtved, October 2008 as moderator.

[3] "Zwischen dem Wahrnehmenden und dem Wahrgenommenen geht ein be-ständiger Austausch vor, das heisst, eine Differenz zwischen Subjekt und Objekt erscheint hier keineswegs als ein so fundamentaler Gegensatz, als den Philosophie und Geistesgeschichte sie ausweisen. Vielmehr oszielliert die autopoetische *feedback*-Schleife ebenso wie die Wahrnehmung zwischen Subjekt- und Objektposition, gleitet permanent zwischen beiden hin und her. „Subjekt" und „Objekt" bilden hier nicht länger einen Gegensatz, sondern markieren lediglich verschiedene Zustände bzw. Positionen des Wahrnehmenden und des Wahrgenommenen, die nacheinander und zum Teil auch gelichzeitig eingenommen werden können. Dies mag auch in einer alltäglichen Wahrnehmung der Fall sein. Wir werden uns dessen allerdings erst durch die Aufmerksamkeit, mit der wir Aufführungen wahrnehmen, bewusst. Hier erfahren wir uns in Akt der Wahrnehmung als aktiv Wahrnehmende und zugleich vom Wahrgenommenen Affizierte, als Subjekt und Objekt zugleich".

[4] Compare with Lehmann (2006: 31), seen from the audience's point of view.
„It is not surprising that fans of other arts (visual arts, dance, music) are often more at home with this kind of theatre that theatregoers who subscribe to literary narrative".

[5] Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra (1547–1616) *The Ingenious Hidalgo Don Quixote of La Mancha*. The novel was published in 1606, second part 1616. >http://da.wikipedia.org/wiki/Miguel_de_Cervantes<

[6] >http://www.evaristti.com/iweb/---Helena%20%20-%20The%20GoldFish.html<

[7] A review over educations for "other theatre forms" in Europe can be found in Karen Kipphoff: "utdannelse i norge og i europa"
> http://www.performancekunst.no/nb/magasin/artikkel/utdannelse-i-norge-og-europa<

[8] Torunn Kjølner 1952–2008.

[9] Lund 1998, Hanstholm.

[10] Professor, dr. phil Konstanza Kavrakova-Lorenz, 1941–2005. Teacher at Hochschule für Schauspielkunst *Ernst Busch* in Berlin, Abteiling Puppenspielkunst, from the foundation of the department in 1972, from 1986 permanent staff, leader of the two year "main study".

[11] Private interview with student, Lund 1999.

[12] Lund 2006, Odsherred.

[13] Lene Kobbernagel in lecture, Børneteaterfestivalen Silkeborg 2004.

[14] A DVD with extracts from the projects can be required on info@jettelund.dk

Literature

Bentley, Eric (1984) "The Life of Drama", London.

Callesen, Jørgen (2005) *Beyond the Screen, The Puppet Theatre as a Model for Communication, Representation and Aesthetics in Mixed Reality Environments*, PhD, Århus University.

Engelsted, Niels (1984) *Springet fra dyr til menneske*, with English abstract, København: Dansk psykologisk Forlag.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika (2004) *Ästhetik des Performativen*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Haff, Siri Facchini et al, (eds.) (2008) *Cantabile II 1983–2008*, Vordingborg: Cantabile II.

Jurkowski, H (1988) *Aspects of Puppet Theatre*, London: Puppet Centre Trust.

Kavrakova-Lorenz, Konstanza (1989) "Das Puppenspiel als synergetischer Kunstform" in Manfred Wegener (ed.) *Die Spiele der Puppe*, Köln: Prometh Verlag.

Knoedgen, Werner (1990) *Das unmögliche Theater*, Stuttgart: Urachhaus-Verlag.

Lehmann, Hans Thies (2006) *Postdramatic Theatre*, London and New York: Routledge.

Lund, Jette (1995) *Die fiktive Wirklichkeit – und die wirkliche Fiktion, Elemente zur Theorie des Puppentheaters*, Master thesis at the University of Copenhagen

Manovich, Lev (2001) *The Language of the new Media*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Szatkowski, Janek (1989) "Dramaturgiske modeller" in Christoffersen, E. Exe et.al. *Dramatisk analyse: en Antologi*, Århus University.

Tillis, Steve (1992) *Towards an Aesthetic of the Puppet*, New York: Greenwood Press.

Winnicott, D.W. (1971) *Playing and Reality*, London: Tavistock Publications.

The reports from Hanstholm, SOSA and Odsherred can be found on >www.jettelund. dk< under "articles" (in Danish)

– En anden slags teater, rapport om et forsøg. Odsherred Teaterskoles Laboratorieprojekt 2005–06

– Undervisningen ved School of Stage Arts, en beskrivelse, 1999

– Rapport om uddannelsen af den 1. årgang på Dukkemagergrunduddannelsen ved Erhvervsforskolen i Hanstholm, efteråret 1996 til foråret 1998