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images of Glinka, Musorgsky, Tchaikovsky, and (on the ideological flip side) Shostakovich that have been created in the East and West—well, they aren’t real either. They’re pretend.

SIMON MORRISON


Across the humanities scholars are reveling in the centenary celebrations of Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes. In the last few years Slavists, art historians, and dance scholars have hosted interdisciplinary conferences, curated exhibitions, and published new volumes commemorating, documenting, and shining new light on Diaghilev’s revolutionary troupe.

The recent Ballets Russes publications are aimed at the specialist, as well as at the general reader. Almost all of these contributions seem to reach out to an interdisciplinary audience. These new publications indicate that it is no longer sufficient to discuss a Ballets Russes set design without at least mentioning the score and vice versa. Exhibition catalogs and larger-format art books about the company include sumptuous editions by John E. Bowlt, Jane Prichard, and Alston Purvis.1 Purvis, a graphic designer, explores the influence of the dance troupe on design (costumes, fashion, graphics, decorative arts, etc.) as does musicologist Mary E. Davis’s monograph on Ballets Russes dancers and Paris fashion.2 Conferences and symposia brought together scholars from around the world to the National Library of Australia (May 2008), Columbia University (April 2009), Harvard University (April 2009), Boston University (May 2009), and Macalester College (December 2009). The Ballets Russes anniversary year has produced studies on the famous and forgotten personali-

“The CD-ROM included with this volume contains all the images from the British Library collection (Figure numbers 1Za through 128Z) found on pp. 290–355.” From the final leaf in the book.


ties of the company and about its progeny as well. All of these contributions explore how the collaboration of Europe’s greatest artistic minds of the 1910s and 1920s captivated their audiences with spectacles that excited all the senses. The recent Ballets Russes books strive to give their readers the same sensual experience: they feature glossy pages, large formats, bright colors, and, for the most part use clear language devoid of specialized jargon.

This interdisciplinary trend is a good sign for the humanities in general. Andrew Wachtel’s *Petrushka: Sources and Contexts* presents essays by Janet Kennedy, a *Mir iskusstva* scholar; Slavic and dance historian Tim Scholl; and the ubiquitous Richard Taruskin, along with Wachtel’s own translations and commentary on the libretto. While Wachtel foregoes glossy images, as editor he commits to representing scholarly voices from across the humanities. The sources present *Petrushka* not as a ballet with music, or costumes with dancing, but as the locus of Diaghilev’s creative project.

Millicent Hodson’s and Maureen Carr’s Ballets Russes projects continue the dialogue between disciplines in Ballet Russes scholarship. Like Wachtel’s book, the two contributions reviewed here aim for a plurality of disciplinary voices (with varying degrees of success), but each author focuses on the sources and sketches of one specific work. They approach their respective works from neighboring disciplinary peaks, resulting in source and sketch studies that look quite different. They raise essential questions to the scholar working with archival materials: What is a source and what are we to do with it? Are they merely windows into compositional intent, or can they be used as blueprints for creativity? What is the best way to present these documents and the resulting research? Should they be bound and cataloged in academic libraries or presented in art galleries, or theaters?

Both editions offer detailed images of their respective works’ geneses. The creators of *Pulcinella* and *Jeux* produced mountains of sources (musical sketches, reviews, annotated scores, etc.). The editors have collected them for different reasons. Comparing the editions side-by-side allows us to take stock of the two disciplines: musicology and dance studies. What can we learn from each other as the walls in the humanities come tumbling down?

Neither of the authors is a newcomer to Ballets Russes studies. Maureen Carr has written on Stravinsky’s neoclassical works produced by Diaghilev in *Multiple Masks: Neoclassicism in Stravinsky’s Works on Greek Subjects*, and Millicent Hodson and Kenneth Archer have been at the fore of Nijinsky


studies for decades. Both of these volumes also represent “sequels” to earlier editions: A-R Editions published Maureen Carr’s compilation of sketches and sources to Stravinsky’s *Histoire du soldat* in 2005, and Pendragon Press issued Hodson’s reconstruction score of Nijinsky’s original choreography for *Le sacre du printemps* in 1996.\(^5\)

Perhaps it is best to first consider Maureen Carr’s editorial treatment of Stravinsky’s sketches in light of the composer’s own comments about the composition of *Pulcinella*.\(^6\) In his book *Expositions and Developments* Stravinsky highlights his own editorial process in fashioning “Pergolesi’s” music:

> I began by composing on the Pergolesi manuscripts themselves, as though I were correcting an old work of my own. I began without preconceptions or aesthetic attitudes, and I could not have predicted anything about the result. I knew that I could not produce a “forgery” of Pergolesi because my motor habits are so different; at best, I could repeat him in my own accent.\(^7\)

Maureen Carr’s impressive edition of Stravinsky’s musical sources and sketches for *Pulcinella* reproduces these important documents with the composer’s hand clearly visible, scratching rhythms, tweaking harmonies, and manipulating phrases of the eighteen-century sources. The accents laid bare, Carr refrains from hypothesizing about what the composer might have done differently with the materials.

The edition is in two parts: part 1 includes scholarly essays and commentary, and part 2 comprises the documents, the latter including musical sketches, sources, preliminary work by Pablo Picasso, texts in the Neapolitan dialect (with translations compiled by Dale E. Monson and translated by Charles E. Fantazzi), and an expanded scenario by Leonide Massine (in facsimile, with a transcription of the original Russian and an English translation).\(^8\) The volume neatly reproduces facsimiles from the Paul Sacher Stiftung (Basel, Switzerland) and the British Library and includes a CD-ROM of high quality color images from the British Library’s collection of *Pulcinella* manuscripts. It is particularly exciting to find so many documents bound together in one book, especially in light of the complex copyright maze of J. W. Chester and

---


8. Transcribed and translated into English by Roman Ivashkiv, Dina Lentsner, and Heinrich Riggenbach.
Boosey & Hawkes. The edition presents reproductions of the eighteenth-century sources used by Stravinsky and his musical sketches for *Pulcinella* from the collections mentioned above. Similar in format and layout to her 2005 volume of *L’histoire du soldat*, Carr begins with a collection of essays on the work’s context and chronology followed by voluminous tables explaining the organization, source, and correspondences of the sketches and sources to the printed editions as well as the facsimiles themselves, which are neatly reproduced in black and white.

Stravinsky’s own sources for *Pulcinella* consisted primarily of eighteenth-century music copied at the request of Diaghilev. Carr’s edition retains Barry S. Brook’s grouping of documents by composers Domenico Gallo, Carlo Ignazio Monza, Count Unico Wilhelm van Wassenaer, and even some real Pergolesi. Carr includes facsimiles of all the copyists’ sketches as well as two excerpts from printed editions available to the composer (notably the aria, “Se tu m’amici”). As reflected in her book’s title, Carr is most interested in Stravinsky’s contributions: his annotations and sketches. The edition does include six illustrations in black and white from the Musée Picasso to help illuminate the décor and costumes, but it is mostly about Stravinsky’s musical sources and sketches.

In her introduction Carr presents *Pulcinella* as a “mosaic” of precomposed material and Stravinsky’s unique style (p. 31). She identifies these mosaic effects in the score through the composer’s manipulation of the musical sources, but invites readers to extend the metaphor to their reading of essays in the book by Lynn Garafola, Ulrich Mosch, Jeanne Chenault Porter, and Taruskin. Including these wonderfully rich essays appeals to the interdisciplinary trend in Ballets Russes scholarship, and Carr has recruited some of the most important scholars to lend their voices. Each writer explores a facet of *Pulcinella* from his or her own disciplinary perch.

Carr’s own contribution, “Eighteenth-Century Sources and Stravinsky’s Use of These Models: *Pulcinella* (1919–20),” weaves together an impressive fabric of secondary materials, providing a rich narrative amplified by thick endnotes. The densely packed chapter builds on the work of other scholars: Barry Brook, Robert Craft, Eric Walter White, Helmut Hucke, and

---

9. Chester holds the rights to the vocal score, and Boosey & Hawkes controls the rights to the orchestral score for the ballet as well as the suites.
10. Carr’s table 2 identifies the copyists employed by Diaghilev in London and Naples.
12. [Domenico Gallo], Trio Sonata No. 7, 3rd mvt., in *12 sonate per due violini e basso numerato di Giambattista*, ed. Alessandro Longo, with a cello part by Luigi Stefano Giarda, 62–65 (Milan: Ricordi, 1903; pl. no. 108152); and [Pergolesi], “Se tu m’amici,” in *Arie antiche*, vol. 1, ed. Parisotti, 102–4 (Milan: Ricordi, 1885; pl. nos. 50250–51).
Taruskin. In a section of her introduction titled “Analysis: Evidence of Stravinsky’s Past in His Sketches for Pulcinella,” Carr investigates the composer’s use of the pseudo-Pergolesi. She argues that the composer’s work was a “balancing act between the precomposed sources and Stravinsky’s compositional techniques” (pp. 16–17). Using the sketches, Carr (referring to her own thesis from her monograph on Stravinsky) shows how “Stravinsky’s compositional process enabled the material to ‘transcend itself’” (p. 17). In her monograph Multiple Masks Carr contends that the composer’s neoclassicism relies on the borrowing of precomposed sources as “masks” for his “Russian compositional techniques.” Whereas in the monograph Carr made her argument based on the sketches of the composer’s “Greek” ballets, in this edition she applies this insight to Pulcinella. Clearly, Carr excels at uncovering the layers of Stravinsky’s manuscripts. She has thoroughly examined a sea of materials. Her detailed study allows her to note where and how Stravinsky departs from his eighteenth-century examples. Why he deviated is less clear. As she surmises, “Whenever it suits his purposes, Stravinsky either discards his musical sources or transforms them using techniques that are characteristic of his Russian past” (p. 17). The introductory essay does not identify the smoking gun, but does provide a few examples of what can be done with the impressive collection of sources and sketches now available.

The mask metaphor readily fits a work like Pulcinella. Carr argues that Stravinsky balanced the sources with his own style in Pulcinella and, “in so doing, transcended the [eighteenth-century source] material” (p. 31). She illustrates how the composer began this process with sketches of intervals, which he worked into a “montage” of melodic and contrapuntal ideas that “are sometimes derived from the musical sources, sometimes not” (p. 31). While she devotes her essay to documenting further her thesis on Stravinsky and musical masking (see her monograph), she does not entertain the idea that the real masking in the work resides in the costumes, the plot, and the story itself. The plot and scenario of the work receive scant attention. Massine’s extended scenario is buried at the back of the edition, and few of the authors (except Garafola) address issues of plot in this dramatic work. Compared to its peer Ballets Russes studies, Carr’s would have benefitted from a more thorough treatment of plot, costume, scenario, and choreography.

The stars of this edition are the facsimiles themselves. The number of sources alone gives the Ballet Russes scholar cause for celebration. Carr is correct in stating that the inclusion of all of the known sources and sketches in one volume enables scholars to “illustrate how Stravinsky’s balancing act worked” (p. 18). Examples of Stravinsky’s masking/balancing act technique in Carr’s introduction provide models of future studies for which this impres-

14. For that discussion see Carr, Multiple Masks: Neoclassicism in Stravinsky’s Works on Greek Subjects (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), xi–xiii and xviii–xix.
sive collection has opened the door. Navigating the material at hand, however, is a different story. Carr has unfortunately constructed a painfully complex system of abbreviations. For example, on page 19 of her book, Carr discusses the sketches and sources for the Tarantella. “The next level of sketching for the Tarantella is found on page 81 of the Zweig Sketchbook, reproduced in this edition as Fig. 85Z (BL), in the upper left-hand corner of the page, with the same pitches observed in the manuscript from Basel.” Figure 85Z (BL) happens to be on page 333 of Carr’s edition, and the comments about the Basel manuscript refer to figure 7C, which can be found on page 200. The helpful “Table 1. Overview of Tables,” on page 65 along with “Table 5. Sketch Pages in the Sketchbook,” clarified things a bit, but while referring to these tables I had to hold my place with one hand while searching for pages with the other. Another example: “Before looking at the specific sketch for the Minuet at the top of p. 90 of the London Sketchbook, Fig. 94Z (BL), I will examine an early sketch for this passage found among the sketches in Basel that are made on separate pages (see Fig. 15 (PSS))” (p. 22). Despite the confusing nomenclature (much more complex than the system for her edition of L’histoire du soldat due to the number of sources and sketches), tackling the charts, although tedious, will prove worthwhile. Confusion is inevitable, but a few parenthetical page number reminders would make the text easier to navigate, especially in the essays by contributors.

The collection of essays reflects the popular goal of interdisciplinarity, but the individual contributions do not fit neatly together. More accurately, the book is interdisciplinary for music scholars, but art historians, dance scholars, and theater scholars might find less to pique their interest among these pages. The essays are well written and important, but they do not all directly refer to the facsimile sources and sketches, the raison d’être of the book. Garafola’s contribution on Leonide Massine’s classicism reconciles the choreographer’s employ of gesture (“movement infused with discursive meaning”; p. 41) and modernist angularity. Both of these artistic traits are traced to Italian (particularly Neapolitan) influences. However, the sources that Garafola discusses (the ones most useful to a dance historian) are not included in Carr’s edition. In fact, Stravinsky’s musical sketches tell us little about the character of Pulcinella. Garafola’s discussion of Massine’s characterization of Pulcinella may be more valuable to the scholar seeking to chart the influences and sources of the ballet than the out-of-place, yet wonderfully rich essay by Jeanne Chenault Porter on the Neapolitan origins of the Pulcinella character. Ulrich Mosch, on staff at the Paul Sacher Stiftung in Basel, investigates the sketches and sources to demonstrate how Stravinsky played with modernism and classicism in Pulcinella. Mosch’s essay (translated by J. Bradford Robinson) most closely follows the challenge set by Carr in the introduction. He examines Stravinsky’s “balancing act” (to use Carr’s words, pp. 16–17) of “classicist modernity” (p. 52) in analyzing the composer’s handling of the eighteenth-century sources for the Toccata section of Pulcinella (pp. 186–87 in Carr’s edition).
Taruskin, in his short essay, predictably finds ways to strike out wittily against Stravinsky while praising him. He tells us how important the work became in Stravinsky’s career and shows us what a minimal role the composer played as arranger in *Pulcinella*. His conclusions elegantly reflect both the importance of this collection and its drawbacks:

As Stravinsky’s reputation grew, to the point where he outnumbered—and eventually outlived—practically everyone who worked for Diaghilev save Picasso (one of his *Pulcinella* collaborators), he claimed a greater share of credit for the music; and since the originals to a large extent still languish in obscurity, the claim went pretty much unchallenged. With the present edition, the truth can be laid bare at last. But as always with Stravinsky, the facts turn out to be far more bracing than the fictions. (Taruskin, in Carr, p. 62)

Stravinsky indeed surpassed all other Diaghilev collaborators in this volume as well.

One cannot fault Carr for casting aside plot and choreography in a work that was not entirely balletic and has become more familiar as a suite rather than a danced piece of theater. Some might accuse her of the same tendency: the edition minimizes the influence of Stravinsky’s collaborators in her examination of the ballet. The sources illuminate Stravinsky’s nascent neoclassical method, but Massine’s movements remain elusive.

Reconstructing lost choreography is very different from reconstructing musical works. Dance scholars have created a soup of terms to describe the contemporary performance of works that have been danced in the past: revivals, reproductions, reconstructions, recreations, restagings, and reworkings. The confusion between dance and music stems in part from the disciplinary differences in notation, standards of authenticity, and work-concept. The reliability of dance notation as a means to reproduce a choreographer’s piece for later audiences remains debatable. Out of fear of “the ossification of a lived tradition,” dance (like music) benefits from a work’s evolution, a conscious tweak to the original recipe with each successive reworking, restaging, revival, etc. Millicent Hodson and her husband and long-time collaborator, Kenneth

15. Stravinsky titled the work *un ballet avec chant*, and later described it as an *action dansante*. Cited in White, *Stravinsky, the Composer and His Works*, 284.


18. Helen Thomas, “Reproducing the Dance: In Search of the Aura?” in Jordan, *Preservation Politics: Dance Revived, Reconstructed, Remade*, 125–31, at 130. In contrast, the musicological volumes that continue to fetish the “composer’s intentions” in search of “authenticity” are too numerous to list here.
Archer, exemplify this evolving tradition in their dance reconstructions. The edition of *Jeux* presents critical essays on the sources for Nijinsky’s choreography to Debussy’s score and a revised and expansive chronology of the work’s genesis and performance history. These critical materials play a supporting role to the main attraction of Hodson’s edition: a meticulously annotated reproduction of Debussy’s printed piano score to the ballet overlaid with performance and rehearsal notes by Nijinsky, Debussy, Diaghilev, and Bakst found in two separate sources. Also found there are a few of Hodson’s own directions stemming from her reconstructed performances of *Jeux* from 1996 to 2004. Opposite each page of Debussy’s heavily marked-up score are Hodson’s choreographic descriptions and her own drawings, as well as pictorial and verbal commentary from contemporary sources including photographs, illustrations from magazines and other popular publications, reviews, memories of audience members, and the contributions of other dance scholars.19

Hodson’s edition of *Jeux* comprises five parts: a group of introductory essays on the authors’ process and research; a choreographic score reconstructed by Hodson; a selection of color images from Nijinsky’s 1913 production and Hodson and Archer’s reconstructions from 1996 to 2004; a series of scholarly essays on Bakst’s design and Nijinsky’s choreography; and finally a section of references (including an address on *Jeux* Hodson gave in Athens and transcriptions of the annotations to the printed score and copyists’ scores).

The annotated score that forms the bulk of the publication draws from two separate sources: a copyist’s score, and an early proof for a printed score. Yale University acquired these two sources in 2004 from a private collection, eight years after Hodson and Archer first presented their reconstruction of *Jeux*. This publication incorporates their own research and work from before the discovery and availability of the Yale manuscripts and includes the facsimile of the choreographers’ score bearing the annotations from both of the scores that Nijinsky annotated. Pagination of the two manuscripts housed at Yale is included for the scholar. As Hodson rightly explains, “[Nijinsky’s] notes reveal the choreographer’s original intentions but not the results he ultimately realized on stage” (p. 30). The edition presents both of these sometimes conflicting expressions of Nijinsky’s intentions as a palimpsest. Nijinsky’s writing in the copyist’s score appear in UPPER CASE, his entries in the printed score in lower case. Hodson’s designates eight dramatic/structural episodes of the work in UPPER CASE with a box surround, Debussy’s notes are in lower case French, Diaghilev’s writing is indicated by a note and Bakst’s handwriting could not be reliably identified.20

19. She used a similar layout in her reconstruction of *The Rite of Spring*, which premiered just weeks before *Jeux*; Hodson, *Nijinsky’s Crime Against Grace*.

20. The cover page of the printed score at Yale indicates that Debussy, Diaghilev, Nijinsky, and Bakst made annotations, but Hodson concedes that while it is possible that Bakst wrote in the descriptions of lighting and staging, her “attempts at identifying his handwriting with [those annotations] have been inconclusive”; 52.
The palimpsest edition presents multiple productions (imagined, reconstructed, and recreated). Facsimiles of the copyist/printed score with Nijinsky’s annotations would be helpful, especially when Hodson notes discrepancies, illegible handwriting, and macaronic texts (p. 45). Fortunately, both scores are indeed available online, although the legality of their availability is questionable. The sources in question can be downloaded from the International Music Score Library Project’s website (http://imslp.org). The Yale manuscripts have been accessible in high quality facsimile on the IMSLP site since 12 February 2007.

These sources (the two annotated scores acquired by Yale University in 2004) along with the troves of research conducted by the authors provide inspiration for the choreographic reproduction. For Hodson, the sources are a means to reconstruct a dance. Hodson does not concern herself with questions such as “What was Nijinsky thinking?” Elsewhere, Hodson and Archer have explained their guiding principles in reconstructing ballets: the preservation of masterworks, determination of authenticity to “ensure the reconstruction will be a reasonable facsimile of the original,”

clarification of authorship, identification of the original ballet, and (most importantly) the intervention as artists and scholars in the reconstruction.

The artistic/scholarly intervention begins with the examination of the descriptions of Nijinsky’s original choreography and the social and cultural environs of Jeux’s inception. Hodson’s writing shines when she describes and dissects the sources of the movements of Jeux. The choreographic description reveals not Nijinsky’s actual choreography but rather Hodson’s interpretation of the scenario. One of Hodson’s directions for the women in their early encounter in Jeux illustrates her attention to the score as well as her choreographic hand: “[Karsavina] juggles imagined tennis balls in flat hands and shifts from frontal relevé pointe into an arabesque balance—a dance figure echoing ornamental arabesques in Debussy’s score” (p. 88).

For the most part, Hodson’s choreographic descriptions forego balletic jargon (in line with Nijinsky’s descriptions). Readers would benefit from familiarity with the basic vocabulary of ballet to pull apart Hodson’s Turkey Trot assigned to one of the female dancers: “In the square and frontal style that characterizes her, she combines a tilting tendu, emboité and échappé to perform her own Turkey Trot solitaire . . .” (p. 138).

For the reconstructions made between 1996 and 2004, Hodson and Archer gathered together an outstanding quantity of historical sources relating to the choreography. Their revised chronology of the ballet corrects previous scholars with the help of the newly discovered Nijinsky notes. This amounts to


22. Ibid., 1–4.
what is, thus far, the most detailed chronology of the work’s inception and will be equally interesting to music and dance scholars. Hodson organizes myriad chronological sources (memoirs, diaries, interviews, biographies, rumor, innuendo) into a rich narrative.

Due in part to Nijinsky’s sojourn in London during the early working period of Jeux, Hodson and Archer introduce a Bloomsbury narrative into the ballet. The essays in part one present the work as a ballet à clef representing the complex pas de trios of Lady Ottoline Morrell and her Bloomsbury circle. Arguing that the “Bloomsbury attitude toward multiple relationships seems to have clarified for Nijinsky how to maximize the subject of Jeux as a trio” (p. 20), Hodson introduces this narrative in the title of her book. The emphasis on Bloomsbury in part one implies that the Central London environs will play a significant role in the reconstruction. Confusing statements about the heroes’ emotional investments seem to hint at a covertly instructive agenda: “Above all, the denizens of Bloomsbury and Jeux share the ethics of friendship, where jealousy is overcome by mutual concern and a connection that outlives rivalry. To really experience Jeux it helps to imagine Nijinsky, alert, intrigued and in the full possession of his artistic powers, taking the measure of this brave new world” (p. 21). Certainly, Central London was not the only site for tennis and sexual freedom in Europe.

When Hodson draws the work into cultural and social history her arguments do not hold together as well. Take, for example, an essay from part one of the edition. The extended examination of the Three Graces trope meanders through art history providing little substance. All of this setup is intended to shine light on Nijinsky’s entwined gesture, emblazoned on the front cover of the book. This configuration became an important structural motive throughout the reconstruction. Variations on the Three Graces reemerge in the choreography to fill in the gaps in Nijinsky’s missing gestures, but somehow, the discussion of this structural element became tied up with further examination of the sexual ménages à trois of Bloomsbury.

The Bloomsbury subplot proves problematic when it becomes entangled with the Three Graces argument and Hodson’s identification of the dancers. Her reconstruction of Jeux recasts the three original characters of Nijinsky’s libretto (un jeune homme, première jeune fille, and deuxième jeune fille) as the three originators of the roles in the 1913 production (Vaslav Nijinsky as the young man, Tamara Karsavina as the first young girl, and Ludmilla Schollar as the second young girl). Naming her characters after the dancers “emphasizes the commitment to history of everyone involved in the reconstruction, including the performers, whose dramatic identification with this trio of Ballets Russes artists we encourage, asking them to work, in that sense, like actors” (p. 55). Unfortunately, Hodson does not further explain this aspect of her reconstruction. Nijinsky’s annotations to Debussy’s printed piano score for Jeux identify the female dancers (Schollar [Шоллар] and Karsavina [Карсавина]) as Ш (Sh) and К (K) from pages 27–29 to plot out the women’s battle for the
man’s attention. Hodson’s brief paragraph on the naming of her characters proves insufficient to the critical role this assignment of roles might play in the reader’s appreciation of the edition. For example, when Hodson describes the coda of the ballet after the tennis ball interrupts the three-way kissing: “The trio jump quickly to their feet. Schollar turns and runs out of the park. Karsavina, frozen with fear, covers Nijinsky then backs away. He picks up his racquet, holding it as a mask to ward off danger. He treads slowly back then, on the last notes, he turns and runs” (p. 227). Is she describing Karsavina or “Karsavina”? Juxtaposed against the historical descriptions of the dance from reviews, anecdotes, and other sources, the identity of the characters becomes murky. Matters get more complex when Hodson introduces the plot within the plot of her reconstruction. After the women’s first interaction, Hodson brings the Bloomsbury backstory into the choreographic descriptions, “Schollar makes badinage gestures, as if speaking in Virginia Woolf’s typical manner, with a cigarette in hand [. . .]. As elder sister (Vanessa Bell to Virginia Woolf), Karsavina listens. Sisters at the net: clasp hands over imagined net to do movements in canon and unison” (p. 94). The little badinage sequence looks charming, but where is its source? This insistence on the Bloomsbury program brings new characters into the ballet. The critical essays and commentaries included in the volume argue for a greater importance for the Bloomsbury program, but the choreographic descriptions do not convince the reader that the apocryphal Virginia Woolf character belongs in the ballet.

Hodson’s own annotations—from her work as choreographer of reconstructions of Jeux—are written from the point of view of an artist/scholar. The reassignment of dancing roles allows the dancers to play a role in Hodson’s reconstructed view of history. The original choreographer’s shorthand, reminders to himself of which dancer goes where, materialize into fully embodied roles for the choreographic reconstructionist. The trio of fictional characters becomes Nijinsky, Karasavina, and Schollar. Thus, the artistic decision to name her “characters” N, K, and Sh allows Hodson to sidestep history to present her scholarly reconstruction of Jeux simultaneously as an artistic reimagining of Jeux.

She writes that “Nijinsky called Jeux a poème dansé, and the annotations are a kind of exegesis, by the dance poet himself, of the image in his scenario” (p. 50). Her goal is to offer practical advice and rehearsal techniques (p. 51) to the reader, but she does not pretend that this edition is a complete blueprint for recreating her reconstruction. It is more of a documentation of her artistic process, which (from merely reading the score and her annotations) I find compelling. Hodson readily admits: “Not every measure of the reconstructed ballet is documented. The reader is given the location of key actions, together with various reconstruction sketches to capture moments of the choreography, plus specific visual and verbal proof from the period” (p. 55). Donning headphones, cueing up my favorite recording of Jeux, and immersing myself in Hodson’s score reconstructed the choreography in my own imagination.
If the historical creativity and choreographic additions do not bother all readers, other problems will. The volume is filled with glaring typographical errors. Accents in the French are often missing, measure numbers in the choreographic description were left out in a few instances, footnotes are misplaced, in one place “page” is misspelled. The editors mistakenly skipped page 27 of Debussy’s piano score (with Hodson’s annotations), accidently duplicating page 28 on pages 164 and 176 of Hodson’s edition. This sloppiness tries the reader’s patience. It is laudable that Hodson provides dueling English translations of the original French libretto, but where is the original libretto?

Like Christian Comte’s resurrection of Nijinsky’s *L’après-midi d’un faune* through computer animation of the famous still photographs from the 1912 ballet taken by Adolf de Meyer, Hodson’s work does not try to pass itself off as “the real thing,” but it is a slippery slope. By her own account, Hodson figures that her reconstruction of *Jeux* represents 65 percent of Diaghilev’s original production. She based this approximation on “the density of information . . . in each area; choreography and performance style, costumes and decor, music and lighting.” There is nothing wrong with filling in gaps, musicologists have often played this game of musical reconstruction and then criticized each other for it. Choreographic reconstruction becomes a form of dramatic and historical reenactment, the actors dance historical characters who in turn danced characters in the original performance. The author takes interpretive license of the original movement to an extreme that many musicologists might find uncomfortable. Then again, the creative freedom may serve as a model to an adventurous musicologist who does not mind mixing a liberal dose of fantasy into the pot of historically informed performance.

Sources and sketches serve very different purposes in these two Ballet Russes editions. For Carr they form the basis for discovering the composer’s intentions and modes of operations. In contrast, sources provide Hodson an opportunity to create. Where Carr’s model may be more familiar to the music scholar, Hodson’s approach to archival sources more closely resembles the work of historian Natalie Zemon Davis. Davis has successfully navigated the


terrain between history and fiction in the research, subsequent film adapta-
tion, and writing of her book *The Return of Martin Guerre*. In her study she
had to rely on archival research as well as conflicting first-hand accounts of the
events in question. As she tried to sort out the discrepancies between the vary-
ing accounts in relation to the archival data she had accumulated, she notes
where facts were stretched to fill in the holes to create the story the authors
wished to tell. Likewise, when Davis found herself missing certain pieces of
critical information, she felt very comfortable delving into the world of fiction.
Using phrases such as, “As a ‘thought experiment,’ let us imagine what might
have taken place if the heir from Artigat became friends with the golden-
tongued peasant from Sajas,” Davis employs imagination and perhaps her
own subjective fantasies in her reconstruction of the past.26

For musicologists, the two projects (writing history and performing works
from the past) are commonly subsumed into one act—the act of writing his-
tory. When music history is no longer only written, but subsequently per-
formed and recorded, we find ourselves engaged in the historiographic
process of impressing our historical imagination back onto the documents of
history. Musicians have long strived to “perfect” this process of reinscribing
fact onto past musical events. This process took on “scientific” importance in
the mid-twentieth century (as discussed by Richard Taruskin); however, the
roots of staging the musical past in the musical present reach much further
back than our last century.27

Concerning *Pulcinella*, Louis Laloy wrote, “In art, the only politics is that
of results, and a masterpiece executed at the price of a slight sacrilege is no less
admirable for it.”28 The availability of these critical Ballets Russes sources and
sketches are very welcome additions despite their flaws. One can only hope
that this recent push for interdisciplinarity in the world of Ballets Russes schol-
arship will fuel more creative ways of documenting, displaying, and recon-
structing the sources of the past.

SAMUEL N. DORF

27. See Peter Kivy, *Authenticities: Philosophical Reflections on Musical Performance* (Ithaca,
NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); Nicholas Kenyon, ed., *Authenticity and Early Music: A Sym-
Historical Approach to Musical Performance* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge Uni-
versity Press, 2002); and Richard Taruskin, *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance*
d’après Pergolèse, décors et costumes de M. Picasso, chorégraphie de M. Léonide Massine,”
*Comœdia*, 17 May 1920; cited, as trans. by Lynn E. Palermo, in Carr’s *Stravinsky’s “Pulcinella,”*
16.