

RESEARCH ESSAY

When Materials Seem to Answer: Puppetry and Distributed Agency

Christoph Luitpold Frommel^{1,*}

¹Research Department for Italian Art History, Bibliotheca Hertziana – Max Planck Institute for Art History, Rome, Italy

Correspondence: c.l.frommel@biblhertz.it

A puppet appears to answer because materials delay, rebound, sag, and surprise the person moving them. Agency in puppetry is distributed through practiced responsiveness, even though ethical responsibility does not belong to wood or cloth. What do performers mean when they describe a material object as if it possessed intention? Material agency in puppetry names a disciplined encounter with affordance and resistance, not the disappearance of human choice. A useful account must keep formal detail beside social impact. Here, material properties, repair history, operator roles, failed movements, tactile feedback, rehearsal language, and audience attribution of life disclose the interdependence between material resistance and performative intervention as a process rather than a fixed attribute.

To investigate the question, procedure assessment that separates physical causation, perceived invitation, coordinated control, and narrative attribution offers a better route than treating finished works as self-explanatory. The evidence base consists of material properties, repair history, operator roles, failed movements, tactile feedback, rehearsal language, and audience attribution of life. These sources answer unlike questions and should not be collapsed into a single archive. Their force depends on whether agency language clarifies how the object changes action without excusing choices made by people and institutions, a test that ties inference to observable practical result.

A marionette's loose shoulder converts a planned salute into a wavering gesture. The puppeteer repeats the motion and discovers a character trait through the fault rather than repairing it immediately. This first case matters because it reveals a mechanism at human scale. The decisive detail is not simply the artifact or action, but the order in which stakeholders encounter its features. Read

through the connection between material resistance and performative selection, the scene shows that significance is assembled by choices that can be recovered, compared, and challenged.

A large fabric figure requires three operators whose breathing synchronizes through tension in the cloth. No one controls the whole movement, yet their roles remain unequal because one performer calls transitions. Unlike the first example, the second foregrounds the cost of successful form. Its coherence depends on labor or restriction that can be hidden from the final audience. Bringing that cost into examination changes how the alignment between material resistance and performative commitment should be judged and who must be included in the account.

Authority is distributed unevenly across the scene. Some actors can define the vocabulary, others can alter form, and still others appear mainly through effects recorded in material properties, repair history, operator roles, failed movements, tactile feedback, rehearsal language, and audience attribution of life. The interpretation of the dynamic between material resistance and performative choice must keep those powers distinct. Its boundary is whether agency language clarifies how the object changes action without excusing choices made by people and institutions, which stops visibility from being mistaken automatically for influence.

Juxtaposition introduces necessary friction into the argument. The connection between material resistance and performative judgment names a pattern only after differences in position, timing, and capacity have been retained. Using procedure assessment that separates physical causation, perceived invitation, coordinated control, and narrative attribution, the inquiry separates constitutive conditions from features that are merely frequent. That distinction provides a basis for transfer while protecting local mean-

ings from being flattened.

Romantic accounts of responsive materials can hide fabrication labor, safety problems, cultural appropriation, and hierarchical rehearsal structures. The objection changes the proposal by making its boundary explicit. The concept is useful only where the record demonstrates whether agency language clarifies how the object changes action without excusing choices made by people and institutions. Elsewhere, it may remain a descriptive possibility, but it cannot carry the ethical or historical conclusion that a stronger case would support.

The evidence base must also account for survival. Records of material properties, repair history, operator roles, failed movements, tactile feedback, rehearsal language, and audience attribution of life are more likely to remain when an institution recognizes their value, yet absence from an archive does not prove absence from undertaking. A balanced corpus should therefore combine preserved materials with prospective documentation and should state how collection decisions shaped the apparent distribution of the tie between material resistance and performative selection.

Companies should document makers and repairs, include operators in authorship discussions, and use material surprise as evidence subject to ethical and technical review. Adoption should not be measured by the presence of a policy alone. The relevant evidence is whether stakeholders can understand the process, alter it in time, and obtain a reasoned response. Regular review should include cases of refusal and failure, since those cases reveal limits that successful examples rarely disclose.

The case remains limited in three ways. Material properties, repair history, operator roles, failed movements, tactile feedback, rehearsal language, and audience attribution of life cannot capture every informal commitment; stake-

holder accounts may change after outcomes are known; and mode of work analysis that separates physical causation, perceived invitation, coordinated control, and narrative attribution produces situated rather than universal conclusions. These limits do not invalidate the inquiry, but they require claims about prevalence, intention, and long-term effect to be stated separately and supported at the appropriate scale.

Experimental cross-case reading could alter one condition at a time: sequence, scale, interface, access route, attribution,

or revision rights. Combining those trials with actor account would show which changes affect the link between material resistance and performative resolution and which merely alter appearance. The goal would be an evidence-based repertoire of choices rather than a universal best work.

The topic also demonstrates why form and ethics cannot be separated cleanly. Resolutions about sequence, scale, timing, access, and revision are simultaneously aesthetic and social. Evaluating them together produces a more exact ac-

count than either moral praise or formal description alone.

What appears to be a problem of representation is also a problem of mode of work, access, and impact. The puppet seems alive because skilled performers let matter constrain them publicly while remaining responsible for the resulting figure. When materials answer, they do so through a conversation whose wonder depends on keeping both resistance and responsibility discernible.