

## The Russian Reception of *Le Sacre du Printemps*, 1913

*Hanna Järvinen*

The Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts Helsinki

### **Abstract**

*Even a century after the premiere of Le Sacre du Printemps, Russian contemporary sources offer a wealth of material on the Ballets Russes and particularly on Nijinsky's 1913 choreography that are extremely rarely read and never really analyzed in detail. This paper will give an overview of some of these sources, their main points of criticism about Diaghilev's enterprise, and their varied but generally positive discussion on Nijinsky's work that contests much that has been said of Sacre in dance history. By ignoring these sources, dance historians have canonized Diaghilev and his company in ways that prove true many of the concerns of these informed Russian authors. However, I will end the paper with some contrasts with how Sacre was discussed in contemporary French and English press to attest that the Russians were actually mistaken in their condemnation of their Western colleagues' interest in dancing or ability to discuss the art form.*

### **A Preamble**

With a work that premiered a century ago, is there anything that has not yet been said? A single source that has not been used? If the work is by the Ballets Russes, the only answer is a resounding yes. Research on this canonized company is surprisingly weak on precisely the factor evident in the name of the troupe: Russia. Few dance researchers interested in this company read Russian or understand the sociopolitical or aesthetic concerns of Imperial Russia, which leads to odd statements and partial interpretations of works like *Sacre*.

Yet, I want to begin by assuring you that I have not, by any means, read through every Russian review: only about a dozen of the about 120 titles I have researched are in Russian - the vast majority are in French and English. In the following, all translations are mine and emphases in the original.

### **The Critics**

The people who wrote of *Sacre* in Russia included representatives of very different aesthetic styles, cultural positions and political inclinations - and again, this understanding of critics as coming from somewhere and writing for a particular paper is too often forgotten in dance history, which, when dealing with the Ballets Russes, seems to do things backwards and go to the archive to find sources they already know are there instead of actually reading the papers. Many of these Russian critics agreed on nothing much in terms of art or politics, but they tended to agree on three things about *Sacre*: 1) it

was something new, 2) it was something Russian, and 3) the bloody foreigners did not understand it. The latter in particular is the reason the bloody foreigners should read them. They explain much about how and why *Sacre* was made and became what it became.

What makes this reception of *Sacre* remarkable, however, is that prior to Nijinsky's *L'Après-midi d'un Faune* the year before, Russian critics had tended to be very critical of Diaghilev and the Ballets Russes. For most of them the Ballets Russes was *not* the revolutionary company it has been painted out to be – mostly by Diaghilev's collaborators. Prior to the 1911 season, most of the works in the repertory had already been shown in Russia. The decorative style or the use of concert music were similarly rehashing the Russian trend of the so-called "new ballet", which could be traced back to Gorsky's *Don Quixote* of 1900. That the fact that many of the vociferous defenders of this now decade-old trend were people who had, only a few years ago, furiously opposed this "new ballet" - Mikhail Fokine and Aleksandr Benois to name but two - made the enterprise an easy target for derision.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, Diaghilev's marketing, his "huckster art"<sup>2</sup> were seen as unfit for Artists of the Imperial Theatres and detrimental to the reputation of ballet in Russia.<sup>3</sup> This brings in another level, that of the division of the "high" from the "low" in form and venue. In Russia, Diaghilev was dangerously "low" in ways unsuited to the "high" art of the star dancers, including Nijinsky, who had grown up in these "low" provincial touring companies. So it is kind of fitting that the reception of Nijinsky's choreographies would complicate such simple divisions - "old" versus "new", "high" versus "low", and also "dancer" versus "choreographer".

### Critical Diffences

Russian reviews of dance are often if not longer than in the West, at least far more focused on dancing. It is remarkable how the staunchest defender of the "old ballet" in Russia, Andrei Levinson, *despite* his apparent dislike of Nijinsky's choreographic principles, appreciated the choreographic composition of *Sacre*. In his long and thoughtful review for the "thick paper" *Rech*, of which only an edited 1918 version has been translated into English, Levinson praises Maria Piltz's dance as the Chosen One as "very certain, brave, almost beautiful".<sup>4</sup> But let's return to Levinson a bit later.

In contrast, the usual Russian advocate of everything the Ballets Russes did, Valerian Svetlov, was unusually quiet about both the choreography and the music of *Sacre* in his review for the local gossip paper, *Peterburgskaia gazeta*.<sup>5</sup>

The girl begins a dance that lasts for four minutes.

The piece is unprecedented in the annals of choreography, and one remains astonished by the stamina and courage of the young Piltz, who kept to this choreographic torture, without giving up, only because it was required by the libretto and not actually.

Although he does not explicitly state it, Svetlov's text implies he was very uncomfortable with Nijinsky's choreography. In addition to emphasising Roerich's costumes over music or dance in the review, when he mentions the Chosen one, he describes the choreography as "torture", which moreover is, only necessary because of "the libretto and not actually".

However, Svetlov does end by stating that "All of this [second] act is full of some kind of Slavic mysticism and in Roerich's magnificent scenery [i.e. set design] one feels some kind of primal terror."<sup>6</sup> This Slavic mysticism crops up in numerous other reviews, pointing to a key reason for the positive Russian reception: *Sacre* was an inherently nationalist work to an extent unseen in the Ballets Russes repertory, and this nationalism oriented the work temporally towards the future - again, in complete contrast to how nationalism is usually presented as the antithesis of modernism and as a conservative tendency.

## Nationalism

The references to *kustarnost*, to native forms of art like icons and *lubki* - Russian popular prints, which could be woodcuts or engravings - as well as to contemporary Russian arts in the reviews of *Sacre* all show how, despite being set in ancient Rus, this was the first Ballets Russes work that could be aligned with contemporary political and aesthetic changes in Russian art at a time when the Social Realism of the 1860s and the Symbolism of the 1890s were coming together in new forms of Russian Modernism and when numerous Russian nationalisms imagined futures for all Russians and for the Empire.

In the theatrical paper *Teatr i iskusstvo*, Anatoly Lunacharsky, the future People's Commissar of Enlightenment in the Soviet Union, appraised these qualities in the novelty:

In order to find the key to the special features of primitive gestures or the herd's impulses, Nijinsky turned to embroideries, very old *lubki*<sup>7</sup> and in general to all kinds of primitive painting.<sup>8</sup>

Lunacharsky's political alignment with Russian socialism can serve to exemplify how *Sacre* could be interpreted in very different aesthetic and political traditions than any ballet before it and *as a ballet*, it could be interpreted in directly conflicting ways. Previously, ballet was only really relevant to the nation as imagined by the *zapadniki* - or Westernisers - many of whom were defenders of the "old ballet". *Sacre* evoked responses utilising the rhetoric of slavophiles and *narodniki* - or Populists - who sought for the Russian soul in the nation's history and the local traditions of the peasants and for whom ballet had been a fancy foreign import that could not engage in the political and social renewal of the nation and the state. With *Sacre*, which dealt with the coming of spring in pagan Russia, but which was also seen as a young and relatively inexperienced choreographer's work, this somehow seemed possible. There was a great deal of hope in the reviews, and a lot of emphasis on how *Sacre* was a modern, contemporary work, a great beginning - also for its young choreographer.

For example, Lunacharsky spent some time discussing how *Sacre* overhauled traditional notions of beauty:

Only gradually the knowledge seeps even into opera and ballet that *the beautiful* is not entirely limited to *beauty*, much less to *the pretty*. Stravinsky and Nijinsky gave an artistic and *contemporary* work that has childish beauty, [a work] that in its refined guise cannot seem to us but to be ugly. They did not take the road of scientific accuracy, nor the road of balletic sugaring of the material.<sup>9</sup>

However, although it was clear to him that *Sacre* did not aim for archaeological accuracy or ethnographic authenticity, Lunacharsky did not actually consider the

possibility that Nijinsky would have taken to the primitive form *as* something beautiful *in itself*:

This, however, means forgetting one thing. Primitive dance was depicted by equally primitive artists. In this case, the image has to be as different from the original as a child himself from his self-portrait. Thus, in this case, the painting style conditions [lit. shows through in] the dance style.<sup>10</sup>

In other words, he resorted to a claim similar to those made of Nijinsky's *Faune* in Western Europe - that Nijinsky had looked at sources from the Antiquity and simply imitated in dance the conventions of a two-dimensional picture,<sup>11</sup> although obviously as a choreographer he also had to have some actually *choreographic* reasons for playing with space like this.<sup>12</sup> Yet, despite his reservations, Lunacharsky nonetheless thought *Sacre* "was on the level of the very great spectacles."<sup>13</sup> That is, he thought it a masterpiece.

Like the Socialist, the former Director of the Imperial Theatres, Prince Sergei Volkonsky, thought primitivism, or archaism, as he called it:

Archaism in movement [is] a dangerous element. Rarely is it believable on stage – it always looks like it has been made, searched for, intentional. But I should say that here, from the first moment it is *believable*, not once did it become 'intentional'. I should say that for the first time I believed in the naïveté on stage.<sup>14</sup>

Volkonsky thus praised *Sacre* for making him genuinely believe in itself as a work of art. A page later, he went on to explain what he found to be the most important quality of Nijinsky's choreography, the use of the chorus:

The great pedagogic significance [of *Sacre*] is this strengthening of the choric foundation in an art, which up to now has been the most 'solistic' of all. The forgetting of one's 'I' [is] the first imperative of art, and in this sense the new trend can only be welcome as an element of artistic health.<sup>15</sup>

Thanks to his interest in Dalcroze's eurhythmics, Volkonsky believed the "primitive" form – the choreographed repetition and mass movement, the de-individualization of the dancers and the emphasis on rhythm – could bring something new to dance as an art form. Particularly in comparison to Levinson, who disliked these "rhythmic gymnastics", this brings up another interesting division in the Russian dance discourse, the relationship of new forms of dance to the body culture of gymnastics, eurhythmics, sport, et cetera.

Similarly, E. Pann, writing for the theatre periodical *Maski*, found *Sacre* the most convincing work the Diaghilev company had ever produced.

must show as a great event in the so-far short history of the Diaghilevian enterprise: it signifies its determined stepping onto the path of Rhythm. Both young renovators, one in the area of music, the other in the area of choreography, give great and convincing artistic effort.<sup>16</sup>

In a manner reminiscent of Volkonsky, Pann went on to discuss this rhythm and the new form of choreography that he had not seen as necessary in Nijinsky's *Jeux* but found fitting to *Sacre*.

In contrast, André Levinson, who preferred the "old ballet" qualities of *Jeux* to the primitivism of *Sacre*, wrote against this excess of rhythm:

The sole aim he has invented for the movement [is] to realise the rhythm. Rhythm – here it is the only thing, a monstrous force harnessing the primitive soul.

The dancers incorporate the relative length, volume, speeding up and slowing down of the tempo in schematic gymnastic movements, bending and straightening

knees, rising and lowering their heels, stopping still, forcefully beating the accented notes.<sup>17</sup>

However, in his remarkable review, Levinson actually seems torn between his own preference for the graceful old ballet, its taste, elegance and refinement, and the lure of the new, alien formalism of Nijinsky:

But rhythm [is] only naked form, only the measure of movement in time, devoid of content. Unwisely used, bringing it in sacrifices the plastic. And this is where, as the savages everywhere chaotically throw [themselves] around possessed by the spring and drunk from the godhead, the circulation turns into a boring exercise lesson in rhythmic gymnastics. When the shaman and the possessed began to “walk the notes” and “divide the *accelerando* or the syncope” there begins the psychological collapse of the entire attempt, its legality and [to] the comic bafflement of the spectator. Naïve *kustarnost*<sup>18</sup> repels the reception.

The new rhythmic formalism should not crush the self-sufficient plastic; by itself it is empty and leaves little impression in itself.<sup>19</sup>

Notably, Levinson complains that rhythm “leaves no impression in itself” after having spent considerable time describing *how exactly* the dancers embody this rhythm. Despite or perhaps because of this ambivalence, Levinson praised *Sacre* for its bravery, its dazzling failure that, either despite or *because* of its downfall, was worth appreciation – it was only years later that he modified his opinion, writing that he had been “carried away”<sup>20</sup> by it all.

## New Realism

Yet, perhaps the most important difference in the Russian reviews to those in French or English is that in the West, Nijinsky’s works had been seen as “une phase nouvelle de la lutte de l’idéalisme contre le réalisme dans l’art scénique”,<sup>21</sup> a new kind of anti-realist art. In part because of the importance of Realism to Russian arts and to questions of national identity, the reverse was true with Russian critics.

One of Nijinsky's greatest admirers was the poet Nikolai Minsky, who had begun his career as one of the first Russian symbolists in the beginning of the 1890s, writing to *Mir iskusstva*, for example. However, by 1912-1913, when he wrote of Nijinsky's choreographies, Minsky had embraced the new Russian formalism known as Acmeism - the loose group that included Osip Mandelstam and Anna Akhmatova, authors who eschewed the florid language and flights of fancy of the Symbolist generation.

In an effort to connect this new style to what was already called the ‘Golden Age’ of Russian art - the social realism of the *peredvizhniki* painters and music of the *kuchkist* composers, the works of Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy - Minsky labelled it ‘neo-realism’, and for him, Nijinsky's choreographies were examples of this neo-realism in dance. Nijinsky's choreography was stylized everyday movement like Mandelstam's or Akhmatova's poetry was stylized everyday language.

Although the starting point for his ballet [is] clearly the real, his goal [is] - thoroughly aesthetic. Through rhythm, he tears real movement from the everyday [movement] and makes it not only the object of art but artificial, almost automaton-figurative.<sup>22</sup>

Thus, in striking contrast to how Western critics tended to portray simplification and

stylisation in Nijinsky's choreographies as ugly, unsuited to dance as an art form, and, more specifically, as a foreign tendency,<sup>23</sup> the Russian critics could immediately make the connection between *Sacre* and their native forms of avant-garde art, similar in their use of local peasant artefacts and old forms.

In addition to Lunacharsky, quoted above, also Levinson noted the "icon-like gestures"<sup>24</sup> of the girls in the round dance of the second act and, as we have seen, being a good *zapadnik*, ended up accusing the dance of "naïve kustarnost". Similarly, Volkonsky tells us how a colleague called *Sacre* "icon painting in Cubist style".<sup>25</sup> Although here it must be noted that in an interview, published in *Peterburgskaia gazeta* the previous year, Nijinsky himself had said his work was no longer ballet and that he applied to choreography the theory of Cubist painters.<sup>26</sup> Thus, belief in authorial intention may have influenced the similarities in the critical reception in Russia.

Having said this, these similarities in the cultural references and in analyses offered of the novelty reflect a shared cultural context. Notably, in Russia, the qualities of stylization and simplification were seen as inherently national and as such, positive qualities in the choreography. Together with the nationalist overtones of a work set in pagan Russia - ideas of *rodina*, the motherland, and of the *narod*, or the people - this familiarity of the modernist qualities of *Sacre*, the work's apparent references to native forms and contemporary concerns in Russian art, explains also the critics' indignation at the manner in which the French audiences greeted the work and how it was received by major papers in the West.

### **Revanche, Revolution, Rejection**

Nearly all of the Russian reviews attacked the French reaction, but precisely because of this reaction, Russian critics could also see *Sacre* as a *revanche* – an example of a Russian ballet that upset the French snobs rather than catering to them an unacceptable view of Russia as a nation (which was what Russian critics had attacked in Fokine's Orientalist works).<sup>27</sup> This was because - regardless of whether anyone had thought of this in advance - the theme of a re-birth, of spring ritual ensuring the return of the sun, could be understood as explicitly propagating the idea of a Renaissance of Russian culture.

Nijinsky's alleged revolution also seemed more sincere than Stravinsky's simply because it bore less obvious a resemblance to his known predecessors, and he never denied or renounced this connection or spoke ill of Russian audiences - unlike Stravinsky. Consequently, the reviews of his contribution were generally positive - with *Sacre*, the notable exceptions were Binshshtok in *Rampa i zhizn*, who thought the work was "musical and choreographic betrayal"<sup>28</sup> and deserved all the booing, and the critic of *Novoe Vremia*, who concentrated on depicting the French reaction and thought that Nijinsky would do well to heed his audience and "dance out his repentance" to regain public adoration.<sup>29</sup> However, unlike the above-quoted critics, neither of these authors had actually seen *Sacre*.

### **Conclusion**

Of all the choreographies performed by the Ballets Russes, *Sacre* was the first one that

was seen as quintessentially Russian in Russia – and it was liked precisely for the aesthetic qualities that disturbed contemporary Western critics. In its references to Russian art that were not simple attempts at archaeological authenticity, *Sacre* implied that national colour was not just an exotic addition or piquant setting for entertaining dances. The work was sufficiently different from the Russia that had previously existed on ballet stages that a desired revolutionary force – whatever that would be for the critic in question – could be read into its stylised form. However, the same was true in reverse: for foreign audiences, *Sacre* was not as much a continuation of the established agenda of the Russian company as an escalation of barbarian excess that became a threat, even a danger to social order itself, a premonition of a coming war.

### Acknowledgements

This paper is based on an article recently published in *Dance Research*.<sup>30</sup>

Copyright 2013, Hanna Järvinen

### Notes

1. ... and boy, did they seize that opportunity! See Järvinen 2008 for some examples.
2. "барышники искусства" *Obozrenie teatrov* 30.5./12.6.1909. Baryshniki was a term for people selling (black market) tickets to the performances of the Imperial Theatres at exorbitant prices.
3. again, more on Diaghilev's image in Russia in Järvinen 2008.
4. "очень увѣренно, мужественно, почти красиво" - Levinson in *Rech* 3./16.6.1913.
5. "Дѣвушка начинаетъ танецъ, который длится четыре минуты.  
Вещь вельханная въ лѣтописяхъ хореграфіи, и остается удивляться выносливости и мужеству молоденькой Пильць, которая выдерживается эту хореграфическую пытку, обезиливая лишь по требованію либретто, а не на самомъ дѣлѣ." *Svetlov in Peterburgskaia gazeta* 23.5./5.6.1913.
6. "Весь этотъ актъ полонъ какого-то славянскаго мистицизма и въ великолѣпной декорации Рериха чувствуется какая-то стихійная жуть." *Ibid*.
7. Lubochnaia kartina or lubok (pl. lubki) = traditional Russian popular print, usually woodcut or engraving.
8. "Для того же, чтобы обрѣсти ключъ къ особенностямъ примитивнаго жеста или стаднаго порыва - Нижинскій обратился къ вышивкамъ, очень старымъ лубкамъ и вообще разнаго рода примитивной живописи." Lunacharsky in *Teatr i iskusstvo* 9./22.6.1913.
9. "Постепенно лишь просачивается даже въ оперу и балетъ сознание, что прекрасное далеко не цѣликомъ сводится къ красивому, а тѣмъ болѣе къ красивенькому. Стравинскій и Нижинскій давши художественное и современное произведение, имѣющее своею цѣлью возсоздать еще младенческую красоту, которая въ необработанномъ видѣ не можетъ не показаться намъ уродствомъ, не пошли ни по пути научной точности, ни по пути балетнаго обсахариванья матеріала." Lunacharsky in *Teatr i iskusstvo*

- 9./22.6.1913.
10. "При этомъ однако забывается одно обстоятельство. Примитивный танецъ изображался примитивнымъ же художникомъ. Въ этомъ случаѣ изображеніе должно было быть столь же непохожимъ на оригиналь, какъ не похожъ на ребенка имъ самимъ сдѣланцый автопортретъ. Затемъ, танцевальный стиль пропускался въ этомъ случаѣ сквозъ живописный стиль." *Ibid.*
  11. see e.g. *Pall Mall Gazette* 18.2.1913; Johnson 1913, 186.
  12. see e.g. Acocella 1987.
  13. "сталь (sic) въ уровень вообще хорошихъ спектаклей". Lunacharsky in *Teatr i iskusstvo* 9./22.6.1913.
  14. "Архаичность въ движеніяхъ – опасный элементъ. Рѣдко ей вѣрится на сценѣ она всегда кажется чѣмъ-то дѣланнымъ, исканнымъ, нарочнымъ. Но я долженъ сказать, что здѣсь, съ перваго мгновенія вѣрилось, ни разу не было ‘нарочно’. Я долженъ сказать, что въ первый разъ я повѣрилъ наивности на сценѣ." Volkonsky in *Apollon* 6/1913. *Apollon* was an important culture periodical.
  15. "Большое воспитательное значеніе имѣетъ это подтвержденіе хористического начала въ томъ искусствѣ, которое до сихъ поръ было самое ‘солистическое’ изъ всѣхъ. Забвеніе своего ‘я’ – первое условіе искусства, и въ этомъ смыслѣ новое направленіе нельзя не привѣтствовать, какъ элементъ художественнаго здоровья." *Ibid.*
  16. "можно разматривать какъ самое крупное событіе въ молодой пока исторіи Дягилевскаго предпріятія: она ознаменовала собою рѣшительное вступленіе на путь Ритма. Оба молодыхъ новатора; одинъ въ области музыки, другой въ области хореографіи, дали крупное и убѣдительное художественное усиленіе." Pann in *Maski* 7-8/1913-1914.
  17. "Единственная цѣль придуманныхъ имъ движеній - осуществленіе ритма. Ритмъ - такова здѣсь единственная, чудовищная сила, обуздающая первобытную душу. Танцовщики воплощаютъ относительную длительность, силу звука, ускореніе и замедленіе темпа схематической гимнастики движеній, сгибаютъ и выпрямляютъ колѣни, поднимаютъ и опускаютъ пятки, топчутся на мѣстѣ, съ силой отбивая акцентированныя ноты." Levinson in *Rech* 3./16.6.1913.
  18. i.e. something made in (or in the style of) a *kustar*, a peasant manufacture.
  19. "Но ведь ритмъ - только голая форма, только мѣра движенія во времени, лишенная содержанія. Неблагоразумно было приносить ему въ жертву пластику. И вотъ, всюду, гдѣ хаотическія метанія одержимыхъ весной и опьяненныхъ божествомъ дикарей, обращались въ нудный показательный урокъ ритмической гимнастики, когда шаманы и бѣсноватые начинали “ходить ноты” и “дѣлать *accelerando* или синкопы”, - тамъ начинался психологическій провалъ всего замысла, самое законное и самое комическое недоумѣніе зрителя. Наивная кустарность приѣма отталкивала. Новый ритмическій формализмъ не по праву подавляетъ самодовлѣющую пластику; къ тому же онъ пусть и мало впечатляетъ самъ по себѣ." Levinson in *Rech* 3./16.6.1913.
  20. Levinson 1982, 54. This is a translation of Levinson's 1918 book. In addition to significantly rearranging the text and changing quite a few of his wordings, in 1918 Levinson also makes a specific reference to Dalcroze's system.
  21. Vuillermoz in *S.I.M. Revue musicale* June 1913.
  22. "Если исходная точка его балета чисто реальная, то цѣль его - насквозъ эстетическая. Посредствомъ ритма онъ отрываетъ реальное движеніе отъ дѣйствительности и дѣлаетъ его не только объектомъ искусства, но искусственнымъ, почти автоматомъ"



- образнымъ." Minsky in *Utro Rossii* 30.5./12.6.1913.
23. Exceptions include Mauss *L'Art Moderne* quoted in Bullard 1971, ii:72-76; and Marnold in *Mercure de France* 1.10.1913.
24. Levinson in *Rech* 3./16.6.1913. For some reason (perhaps stage lighting?), Levinson spoke of these girls as dressed in red.
25. "One of our critics in all amity favourably described it as "cubist icon-painting" where the archaic angularity of the movement unravels itself in front of us to the pipes of Slavonic Pan." "Одинъ изъ нашихъ критиковъ, изъ дружественно расположенныхъ, охарактеризовалъ именемъ 'иконописнаго кубизма' ту архаическую угловатость движений, которая развертывается передъ нами подъ звуки 'славянскаго Пана'." Volkonsky in *Apollon* 6/1913.
26. Nijinsky in *Peterburgskaya gazeta* 15./28.4.1912 quoted in Zilberstein-Samkov 1982, i:448; similarly, Nijinsky in *Comœdia* 18.4.1912.
27. Creatively forgetting he had already complained of the Western tendency to speak of Russians as barbarians (in *Utro Rossii* 1./14.8.1910), Minsky began his *Sacre* review with a sneer: "Is it not curious that European critics acclaimed Diaghilev as a bold innovator and reformer of choreography all the time when he was staging old ballets with romantic plots and classical technique, adorned, quickened by Fokine's temperament, Bakst's taste, inspired by Borodin and Rimsky-Korsakov. But as soon as Nijinsky, and Stravinsky in his wake, set themselves the task of radically transforming the technique and content of ballet, the public fled and the critics began to speak of northern barbarians." "Любопытно то, что европейская критика провозгласила Дягилева смѣлымъ новаторомъ и преобразователемъ хореографіи какъ разъ тогда, когда онъ ставилъ старыя, романтическіе по содержанию и классическіе по технику балеты, прикрашенные, пришпоренные темпераментомъ Фокина, вкусомъ Бакста, вдохновениемъ Бородина и Римскаго-Корсакова. Но какъ только Нижинскій, а вслѣдъ за нимъ и Стравинскій задались цѣлью кореннымъ образомъ преобразовать технику и содержание балета, публика озвѣрѣла и критики заговорили о сѣверныхъ варварахъ." Minsky in *Utro Rossii* 30.5./12.6.1913.
28. "музыкальная и хореографическая чепуха". Binshshtok in *Rampa i zhizn* 9./22.6.1913. This was another major theatrical paper in Russia.
29. "Нижинскій долженъ оттанцовать свое покаяніе, чтобы вернуть прежнія симпатія парижанъ..." I.e. "Nijinsky should dance out his repentance, and perhaps the previous sympathies of the Parisians would return..." *Novoe Vremia* 28.5./10.6.1913.
30. Järvinen 2013.

## Bibliography

- Acocella, Joan. "Photo Call with Nijinsky: The Circle and the Center." *Ballet review*, Winter 1987, 49–71.
- Bullard, Truman Campbell. 1971. *The First Performance of Igor Stravinsky's Sacre du Printemps*. PhD thesis, 3 vols, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester.
- Järvinen, Hanna. "'The Russian Barnum': Russian opinions on Diaghilev's Ballets Russes, 1909-1914." *Dance Research* 26:1, 2008, 18-41.
- Järvinen, Hanna. "'Great Horizons Flooded with the Alien Light of the Sun': Le Sacre du Printemps in the Russian Context." *Dance Research* 31:1, 2013, 1-28.
- Johnson, A.E. 1913. *The Russian Ballet*. London: Constable & Co.