Through a Glass Darkly: The Many Sides of Paul Taylor's Choreography

Author(s): Angela Kane

Source: *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Winter, 2003), pp. 90-129

Published by: Edinburgh University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3594052>

Accessed: 04/12/2008 04:57

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=eup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Edinburgh University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research*.

THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY: THE MANY SIDES OF PAUL TAYLOR'S CHOREOGRAPHY

Angela Kane

The excitement and intrigue of working with primary dance resources was first revealed to me when Clement Crisp hired me to undertake archive research for his co-authored book, *London Contemporary Dance Theatre: The First 21 Years* (with Mary Clarke) during the late-1980s. Previously, I had been inspired by his dance history classes at the Laban Centre and it was through his encouragement that I began to write for *The Dancing Times* and other periodicals. This second Jubilee issue, celebrating 50 years of Clement's writing, is a fitting occasion for me to acknowledge his support and enthusiasm over the years. Dance's supreme word-smith, wit and *bon vivant*, it was through his not-too-subtle prodding during the early 1990s that I came to pursue doctoral research into Paul Taylor's choreography. One of the main aims of my thesis was to challenge the over-simplistic classification of Taylor's work into 'light' and/or 'dark' categories and, through analysis of different structural and thematic forms, to propose instead an alternative and more open approach to reading Taylor's dances. What follows is a revised version of the penultimate chapter of my doctoral thesis. Thank you, Clement: but for whom ...!

I would also like to thank Taylor company dancer, Orion Duckstein, for allowing me to use photographs from his personal collection to accompany this article and to Terence Kane for his technical help with all things photographic.

One of the oldest and most popular dances in Paul Taylor's current repertory is *Aureole* (1962). It was the success of this plotless, lyrical work at the 1962 American Dance Festival and soon after in New York which persuaded Taylor to focus exclusively on his own choreography and his own group of dancers.¹ *Aureole* was also the first of his works to be re-staged, initially by the Royal Danish Ballet in 1968 and by scores of ballet and modern dance com-

panies thereafter. However, the impact of *Aureole* on Taylor's subsequent career has tended to overshadow other important works created during the 1960s – the majority of which no longer survive in repertory² – and it has led to certain misconceptions about the range and sequencing of his dances.

It was undoubtedly the thematic, structural and dynamic contrasts between *Aureole* and Taylor's next American Dance Festival commission, *Scudorama* (1963), which prompted some writers to identify an alternating light/dark choreographic sequence. Arguably, Taylor himself initiated such a polarity when he decided to make *Scudorama* 'as dark as *Aureole* is sunny, fragmented rather than integrated'.³ Importantly though, he has also identified a third type of dance work within his one hundred-plus corpus:

I categorize my dances as pretty ones and ugly ones. ... Then there's an in-between category ... works that are just funny.⁴

Piece Period, first performed in November 1962, established Taylor's 'in-between' category, both chronologically and thematically, and it confirms that he was creating different types of dances – and not simply alternating between light and dark themes – as early as 1962–3. In contrast to *Aureole*'s formal lyricism and *Scudorama*'s dramatic, disturbing scenes, *Piece Period* was described at its première as 'a delicious lampoon'⁵ and 'a spoof'.⁶ Moreover, such choreographic diversity was recognised at the time. In reference to the sequence of works spanning *Junction* (1961), *Aureole*, *Piece Period* and *Scudorama*, Allan Hughes noted that,

Within a year, [Taylor] has created four pieces that are almost as unlike each other – outwardly – as they are from his previous works.⁷

I would argue that while *Aureole* can be seen as a turning-point in terms of Taylor's subsequent career, many of its dance-music ideas had been initiated in *Junction* the previous year – which, like *Aureole*, was choreographed to a compilation of Baroque music. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge Hughes as one of the first writers to distinguish between different types of Taylor choreography.

In order to demonstrate just how wide-ranging Taylor's 1960s choreography was, *Aureole*, *Piece Period* and *Scudorama* will be discussed separately, as three different types of dance work. A more recent work, *Roses* (1985), will then be analysed in order to show

how Taylor went on to create other types of dances later in his career. Discussion of each of these four works will also propose them as contrasting prototypes for four different strands of choreographic development. Respectively: *Aureole* established Taylor's plotless, lyrical style; *Piece Period* consolidated his humorous style – which had been initiated in *Three Epitaphs* as early as 1956; and *Scudorama* was a further development from *Insects and Heroes* (1961) in terms of what Taylor has described as his 'non-story stories'.⁸ *Scudorama* confirmed his interest in probing difficult subject matter – most particularly amoral behaviour and social malaise – through non-linear, often multi-layered, narratives. *Roses* established another prototype much later in Taylor's career, that is, it represented his first truly romantic work.⁹ In the same way that his Americana works can be distinguished from the 'non-story stories' of *Scudorama* and its successors – not only by their specifically American subject matter, but also through their contrasting treatment of themes and characters – *Roses* suggests a different kind of optimism and order than *Aureole* and, thus, it constitutes a different type of antithesis, both stylistically and philosophically, to *Scudorama*.

Two crucial disclaimers are necessary. First, because Taylor's choreography is so diverse, any categorisation of it can only be made according to certain types of works and/or certain patterns of progression. It is impossible to pigeon-hole either his style overall or any one of his dances because his choreography presents multiple possibilities – sometimes even within a single work. Significantly, as early as 1966, Taylor attempted to combine ideas from four types of dances – that is, from *Aureole*, *Piece Period*, *Scudorama* and *From Sea to Shining Sea* – in the hour-long work, *Orbs*, and thereby further confounded any simple classification of his work into dark and/or light categories. It follows, therefore, that while it is possible to identify key characteristics which distinguish particular prototypes from one another, such characteristics are not always exclusive to subsequent works created within each choreographic strand.

Secondly, the notion of four prototype works – *Aureole*, *Piece Period*, *Scudorama*, and *Roses* – spawning four strands of choreographic development is neither exhaustive nor finite. Similarly, the range of dance examples used in this article to illustrate certain

points is representative rather than comprehensive. The four categories focus specifically on Taylor's choice and treatment of subject matter and even this singular approach lends itself to a consideration of other categories or sub-categories. For example, an idea I have developed elsewhere is the use of ritual in several of Taylor's works¹⁰ and another categorisation could be based upon his use of social dance in works such as *Piece Period*, *Company B* (1991) and *Piazzolla Caldera* (1997). Other choreographic features could also form the basis for categorisation, for example, Taylor's recurrent movement preferences; his choice and treatment of music – an obvious sub-group here would be his extended series of works to Baroque music; or his association with particular designers. As Robert Greskovic proposes,

One way to sort out the dances of Paul Taylor is to group them according to initial motivation – to where they begin. One group could be made of works that come out of an intent to create a particular image. Another, out of, or around if you will, décor specifications. Yet another comes, seemingly, directly from the chosen piece of music.¹¹

A more recent classification should also be identified at this point, partly because it makes reference to some of the same works considered in the four strands below and also to highlight the potential for overlap in any categorisation of Taylor's choreography. In his review of *Spindrift* (1993), Bruce Fleming proposed four types of Taylor work, ranging from Column A: 'the pretty ones'; Column B: 'the ugly works'; Column C: 'the witty ones' and Column D: 'the movement-premise ones'.¹² While most of the dance examples cited by Fleming in Columns A, B and C correspond with those considered in the first three categories below, there are significant differences. For example, he includes *Roses* alongside *Aureole*, *Airs* (1978), *Arden Court* (1981), *Esplanade* (1975) and *Mercuric Tidings* (1982) in Column A; in Column B, he places *Big Bertha* (1970) and *Speaking in Tongues* (1988) alongside *Last Look* (1985), thus overlooking a distinctive Americana group of works in Taylor's corpus; and in his 'movement-premise' column, he includes *Images* (1977) – which will be considered below within Taylor's plotless, lyrical category – and *Snow White* (1983) which is driven more by Taylor's perverse story-telling and characterisation than by particular movement concerns.

In reference to *Spindrift* specifically, Fleming does acknowledge

the difficulty in classifying Taylor's choreography because many of his works manifest contrasting elements:

Part of *Spindrift* is a movement-premise work ... *Spindrift* is also a witty (Column C) work. It is, furthermore, at times an ugly work ... as well as a pretty one.¹³

However, I would question Fleming's view that *Spindrift* 'primarily belongs in Column B'¹⁴, that is, his 'ugly' category. As the following discussion aims to prove, there are important thematic, movement and musical parallels between *Spindrift* and both *Aureole* and *Airs*, thereby aligning it most closely to Taylor's 'A' trilogy.

I. THE 'A' TRILOGY AND BEYOND

Although *Aureole* was considered atypical at its première in 1962,¹⁵ in retrospect it can be seen as the prototype for a series of plotless, lyrical works in which the intrinsic nature of the dance medium is both the subject and substance of Taylor's choreography. Works in this category are characterised by a close contrapuntal relationship between dance and accompaniment. Almost all of them use pre-twentieth century music and a majority are choreographed to Baroque music. Significantly, Taylor's highly successful 'A' trilogy uses music by Handel (*Aureole* and *Airs*) and Boyce (*Arden Court*), and three more recent works, *Brandenburgs* (1988), *Cascade* (1999) and *Promethean Fire* (2002) are set to music by J. S. Bach. In all of these, Taylor has discerned not only the general style and mood of the Baroque genre but also many of its rhythmic patterns, melodic lines and complex textures. Spatial patterns and groupings match the sweep and weave of the music. The dancers' movements and inter-relationships echo its celebratory nature – including cadenza displays of technical skill which is another characteristic of this musical genre. (Another recurrent trait is that in *Aureole*, *Airs* and *Cascade*, the music is scored for solo instruments set against a *ripieno* orchestra.)

Even though Taylor cannot read a music score, his choreography corresponds closely with the formal structure of his accompaniment. As Clive Barnes claimed when comparing Taylor to other choreographers:

... few, if any, are so adept at what might be called dance orchestration – that perfect blending of dance with music so that the dance not merely reflects the music's moods and catches its rhythms, but actually mirrors its very structure.¹⁶

A clue to Taylor's acute aural response can be discerned in his choice and sectioning of music. Significantly, although he follows the general shape of Baroque music – that is, clearly delineated and symmetrically ordered sections in contrasting tempi and textures – his accompaniment is actually an arrangement of music from unrelated scores.¹⁷ In *Aureole*, he mixes two concerti grossi with two sections of Handel's oratorio, *Jephtha*; in *Airs*, he sets sections of four different concerti grossi alongside three of Handel's operas and the oratorio, *Solomon*;¹⁸ *Arden Court* uses sections from five symphonies by Boyce; and both *Cascade* and *Promethean Fire* combine sections from three different compositions by J. S. Bach.¹⁹ Taylor's ability to match the dominant key and instrumentation of one musical section to another without the aid of a score is uncanny. No music purist would attempt such 'boxing and coxing' but I believe that he has approached these hallowed scores in such a daring way most probably *because* of his lack of formal training.

Whereas Taylor's contrasting series of 'dark', dramatic works have tended to generate their own unique dance vocabulary and structures, works in this plotless, lyrical category manifest similar movement concerns. Thus, they not only constitute a significant strand of development in terms of his choice and treatment of formalist subject matter; they also represent the most continuous series of works through which key elements of the 'Taylor style' can be discerned. Importantly, many of Taylor's signature movements were first codified in *Aureole* and they recur in subsequent works in this category. For example, his characteristic contraction and spiral, 'C', 'V' and 'wrap' arms and 'overhead switches' are evident across his entire series of works to Baroque music; as are particular steps such as the 'piddly-poops', the 'pump step' and a low, skimming travelling step which is simply known as the 'Aureole run'.²⁰ Importantly, too, these works are all characterised by a sinuous, successive use of the torso. The initiation of movement comes from deep in the pelvis, emanates up through the spine and shoulders, and out into the arms – unlike the separate, shuddering torso movements and stiff limbs in works such as *Dust* (1977), *Last Look* (1985) and *The Word* (1998). Former dancer Victoria Uris describes Taylor's successive use of the torso as 'being iron from the hips down and willow from the waist up'²¹ while Cathy McCann describes it as moving 'from deep in your core'.²² When explaining how Taylor dancers execute these same torso-arm movements in

turns, Christopher Gillis says, 'your body becomes like the helm of a ship, your arms following in tow like seaweed'.²³

At its première, *Aureole* was described as a 'white ballet'²⁴ and as 'almost a *Les Sylphides* 1962'²⁵ because of its formalist choreography and simple design. However, as Deborah Jowitt argues,

A piece like *Aureole* may be formal, serene, musical, like the best sort of ballet, but it's couched in Taylor's highly idiosyncratic style – with parallel feet, loosely swinging arms, jutting hips, scrunchings-in of the whole torso. The weight of the dancer is also peculiar to him; it's spongy, yet buoyant, the gestures like small banners or huge sails fluttering or billowing in response to a gentle wind.²⁶

Jowitt identifies a crucial difference in Taylor's use of body weight. Similarly, former dancer Linda Kent, who has restaged Taylor's choreography for other companies and as part of her work at the Juilliard School, distinguishes between classical ballet's continual quest for the vertical and Taylor's initiation of movement and relationship to gravity as follows:

I love to set Paul's works on ballet companies, but it's an incredible challenge, extremely draining. It has to do with the use of the torso and the use of the back to make the arms move. It's more movement from the inside out, the use of weight going into the floor rather than rising from it or tippy-toeing across it.²⁷

Working with rather than against gravity is a fundamental concept of all modern dance styles and, in Taylor's choreography, the distribution and transference of body weight are crucial distinguishing factors. His use of body symmetry and of *plié* ensure a secure base for jumps and turns, and the contraction and under-curve are important features both in movements *sur place* and during travelling.

The contraction is seldom used as a dramatic statement in itself, unlike its highly expressive and connotative counterpart in Martha Graham's work. More often, it initiates a sustained, concave movement of the whole torso, which is echoed by rounded and inwardly-rotated arms. (This is in marked contrast, in terms of both contour and intent, to the use of the upper spine and arms – rotated outwardly with hyper-extended elbows and flexed wrists – in a Graham contraction.)

Similarly, in a majority of Taylor's choreography, the under-curve functions simply as a transitional device²⁸ but, in some of his plotless works, momentarily it becomes the main focus. It is seen

in its most definitive form in the Fifth Movement of *Airs*, during the opening section of the female double duet and again for two women in the 'Totem Birds' section of *Images*. In canon, one woman in each pair in *Airs* and both women in unison in *Images* slide first into fourth position *plié* and then step through into fourth *croisé en relevé*. The *plié* is initiated by a soft torso contraction, accompanied by a deep sagittal rotation in the pelvis – that is, a curving backwards and under – and the *relevé* is then initiated by a release. In Taylor's choreography, the undercurve is most often performed in the forward-backward plane but the 'little hip dance'²⁹ in the Third Movement of *Aureole* can also be seen as derivative. Here, a similar pendulum movement of the pelvis – this time in the lateral plane – and deep *demi-plié* are used to initiate a transfer of body weight from one foot to the other.

Taylor identifies another crucial difference between his choreography and that of classical ballet: 'people get lyricism and ballet mixed up together'.³⁰ He identifies the problem as follows:

If you look at some of the steps, we might share the occasional sauté, but [some people] see it as ballet because of an overall lyrical feeling.³¹

Taylor's early explorations of 'scribbles',³² which found their full form in *Junction*, were an important precursor to the long, seamless phrases which characterise his choreography – and most particularly, the extended adagio sections in many of his plotless works. However, Taylor's sense of flow differs markedly from the evenly-metred phrasing of much classical ballet. Whereas the latter constantly reaffirms certain codified positions, his choreography requires legibility *through* space and time. An obvious example of this is his solo in the Second Movement of *Aureole*.

Although an extended adagio solo for a single male dancer was atypical in 1962, this became a regular feature in several subsequent works. Other solos for Taylor himself include those in two sections of *9 Dances With Music by Corelli* (1965), solos in *Orbs* and a second 'earth father'³³ role in *Guests of May* (1972). After he retired from performing, he created contrasting adagio solos for two women in *Airs* and extended male solos in *Arden Court*, *Spindrift*, *Cascade* (which also has an entire section for a female soloist) and *Dandelion Wine* (2000). Similarly, several of Taylor's plotless, lyrical works contain extended adagio duets, as for example, his duet with Elizabeth Walton in the Fourth Movement of *Aureole*, and other

limpid male-female duets in *Airs* (Seventh Movement), *Arden Court* (Sixth Movement) *Mercuric Tidings* (Second Movement), *Cascade* (Fifth Movement) and in the central section of *Promethean Fire*.

In all of Taylor's plotless works, allegro sections also require a sense of on-going momentum – whether the movement is performed *sur place* or travelling, the emphasis is on patterning through space rather than on 'peak' moments. In the Second Movement of *Airs*, for example, three male-female couples perform a series of fast *port de bras*. Known as the 'semaphore section', the dancers alternate between standing and kneeling while moving their arms through 1st, 5th and 2nd positions. Executed correctly, this section should be a kaleidoscope of constantly changing whole body patterns. However, because of the quick, bouncy tempo, dancers unfamiliar with Taylor's style tend to over-emphasise the arms, striking and holding conventional ballet positions rather than originating each movement through the torso and making rapid shifts of body weight.

Jean Nuchtern describes Taylor's long series of fast movements as 'like run-on sentences'³⁴ and such clarity at speed is immediately evident in two of his most recent plotless works, *Cascade* and *Promethean Fire*. In the former, the curtain rises on five men grouped closely together at centre stage. In unison, they perform a flourish of fast tilts, turns and floor-based movements to Bach's tripping keyboard arpeggios. Although each of their movements is clearly defined, they form one long, unbroken phrase which, in typical Taylor fashion, crosses several bars of music before coming to a momentary pause. (Significantly, while echoing the shape and rhythmic detail of his accompaniment, Taylor tends to cross-phrase several bars of music rather than follow the structure of individual lines – which is another key difference from much classical ballet where both choreography and accompaniment regroup on the first beat, the downbeat, of each bar.³⁵) Similarly, in the opening and closing sections of *Promethean Fire*, the full force of all sixteen dancers running at break-neck speed in follow-the-leader lines and then criss-crossing within an inch of one another is both dizzyingly breathless and yet, spatially and musically, highly legible.

The most remarkable aspect of Taylor's musicality is his structural grasp of a wide range of musical styles. Other works in this first category include *Mercuric Tidings* and two works to twentieth

century music, *Polaris* (1976) and *Spindrift*. Of the three, *Mercuric Tidings* is the most closely related to Taylor's Baroque series in both its choreography and use of accompaniment. It is set to sections from Franz Schubert's first two symphonies, which were composed during the early-nineteenth century and which built upon many of the technical and structural developments of Baroque music and of eighteenth-century classicism. As Barnes suggested in his review of the première of *Mercuric Tidings*:

... even if Schubert lovers might wince at the mayhem committed on the truncated music, they must by the same token exult in the way that Taylor has captured the sheer exuberance of the youthful Schubert, and recognized how at times his style reached back in period beyond Beethoven to Haydn and even earlier.³⁶

Polaris and *Spindrift* also derive their formalist choreography from their accompaniment – respectively, a commissioned score by Donald York and Arnold Schoenberg's *String Quartet Concerto* (1933). Indeed, these two works epitomise how Taylor's choreography is not only influenced by his particular choice of accompaniment but also how some of his works in this first category, devoid of any literal or narrative theme, are also read in a particular way. Taylor's aim in *Polaris* was two-fold: he wanted to show how the positive and negative space of a proscenium arch stage is delineated by both dancers and design; and how individual dancers transpose movement through their different physiques and personalities. The defining spatial element is 'a kind of square cage made of metal piping'³⁷ designed by Alex Katz; its five cardinal points – the centre and each of the four corners – being the anchor points for the dancers' movements both in and outside the cube. York's score is in two contrasting styles and Taylor uses two different casts of five dancers for each section. (Jennifer Tipton's lighting is also different in each section.) While the music for Part I is 'much lighter and more lyrical' than Part II, which is 'more dynamic and heavier',³⁸ the choreography in both sections is identical. However, through the dancers' individual technical nuances and their response to the contrasting accompaniments, the two parts appear different. At its première, Barnes described *Polaris* as 'an experiment in focus' in which 'the very same dances take on quite different shades of kinetic significance'.³⁹

Spindrift, too, can be seen as a formalist work because of its emphasis on movement, musicality, complex spatial patterns

and the dancers' on-stage relationships. Moreover, as suggested previously when questioning Fleming's classification, Taylor's choice of accompaniment for *Spindrift* connects it most closely to *Aureole* and *Airs*. Schoenberg's concerto was a re-working of Handel's *Concerto Grosso*, opus 6, number 7 and it was one of several transcriptions of pre-twentieth century scores which the composer made following his development of atonal music during the early 1900s. The closest parallels, choreographically, in *Spindrift* are to *Aureole* rather than *Airs* (although Taylor's references to whirlpools, breaking waves, seaspray and marine life can also be seen as a water-based alternative to his exploration of clouds, gusts and currents in *Airs*). Taylor revisits previous territory in *Spindrift* but, like Schoenberg, he introduces a new twist to former ideas. In fact, his initial idea for *Spindrift* was the exact opposite of that for *Aureole*. Whereas the earlier work had set out to explore how only five dancers could fill a proscenium arch stage through their space-devouring travelling steps and numerous entrances and exits, Taylor's first idea for *Spindrift* was to keep the main protagonist (Andrew Asnes) on stage for the entire work.⁴⁰ Also, in the same way that Schoenberg introduced dissonance into Handel's original music, Taylor modifies some key movements from *Aureole* through an atypically asymmetric body stance. An example of such distortion is an oblique, one-handed version of the hands-on-hips motif which had accompanied many of the travelling steps in both *Aureole* and *Airs*. In *Spindrift*, it becomes a key motif in the opening Largo-Allegretto.⁴¹ It is used as a formal greeting between Asnes and two groups of dancers. Initially, their movements are conversational, but as Schoenberg's orchestration starts to shift key abruptly, the soloist-group relationship begins to fracture, too. (Another prominent example of re-worked movements from *Aureole* occurs in the Second Movement Largo where Asnes performs the same forward *développés* and *promenades* as Taylor himself did in the Second Movement solo of *Aureole*. In contrast to the control and seamless adagio phrasing in the earlier work, many of Asnes' steps are accompanied by extreme torsion and accentuated backward tilts which create an overall feeling of off-balance.)

Another signature work which needs to be considered in this first plotless, lyrical category is *Esplanade*. The mournful, enigmatic mood of the Second Movement Adagio makes this work extremely

THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY

Fig. 1. Esplanade: Michelle Fleet and Andy LeBeau. © Orion Duckstein.

difficult to classify. As Barry Johnson noted, *Esplanade* 'is an excellent example of the doubleness of Taylor's dances, their refusal to be one thing'.⁴² However, many of the gestures and dancer-to-dancer relationships in the Adagio are the same as those in other sections of the work. As with *Polaris* and *Spindrift*, Taylor confirms that when similar movements are performed in different contexts, they signify different types and/or layers of meaning. Essentially though, *Esplanade* manifests a majority of characteristics which allies it most closely to Taylor's other works to Baroque music. With reference to *Aureole*, *Airs* and *Arden Court*, Susan Reiter proposed that,

It may seem cavalier to group *Esplanade*, with its imaginatively non-step-oriented choreography and its ties to Taylor's early 'nightmare alphabet' focus on posture and gesture, with the other three works set to baroque music; it appears to have less in common with them than they appear to have with each other. It certainly stands on its own as a unique, groundbreaking Taylor landmark, yet at the same time *Esplanade* has links to the other three dances. It shares with them moments of calm and exquisitely tender partnering, seen most vividly in *Esplanade*'s fourth movement, a soothing mirror-image counterpoint to the equally meditative second movement's evocation of suffering and abandonment.⁴³

It is important to note that Reiter's article was published soon after the première of *Musical Offering* and that in a later article,⁴⁴ she excludes this work from Taylor's plotless, lyrical series to Baroque music. I would support such a separation because of *Musical Offering*'s overt ritual theme and its unique movement style, and a similar separation can be made within the series of works which Taylor has created to music by Claude Debussy, namely, *Guests of May*, *Images*, *Moonbine* (1994) and *Arabesque* (1999). Peter Williams argued that *Guests of May* is 'from the same family tree as *Aureole*'⁴⁵ and N. R. Gillespie deemed it 'another of Taylor's primarily lyrical essays with three entirely different moods to fit the three different pieces'.⁴⁶ Likewise, Taylor has described *Images* as,

more or less a lyric piece. At times there is an archaic side – to give the flavor of an early society. But it's in no way authentic.⁴⁷

Significantly, his starting point for *Images* had been music by Schubert but mid-way through the rehearsal process, he switched to three sections from Debussy's *Images*, which is where Taylor's title originated. Moreover, as the following statement confirms, his approach to the work was essentially formalist:

When I began this piece, I started on something completely different. ... Nothing happened. So then, I grabbed the first music I could find – several Debussy piano pieces – and started over. Without doing a lot of homework or thinking about it, it just came out.⁴⁸

Arabesque is, like *Esplanade*, essentially a plotless work, although the lyric style and Utopian mood are interrupted by

a single pantomimic incident: the lethal obscuring of vision. (Imagine the Dark Angel section of Balanchine's *Serenade* followed by Oedipus' final passage in Graham's *Night Journey*.)⁴⁹

While recognising a potentially dramatic connotation in the moment described by Tobi Tobias above, Anna Kisselgoff perceives *Arabesque* as a predominantly formalist work:

The imagery suggests one of Mr. Taylor's musings on the antiquity of his imagination; it has a familiar ritualized aspect with occasionally archaic postures.

At the same time the work's deepest values lie in its experiments with structure, extraordinary speed and music.⁵⁰

Conversely, in its treatment of both subject matter and accompaniment, *Moonbine* is closer to Taylor's other archaic works such as *Musical Offering* and *Runes* (1975), where one or more protagonists preside over some mysterious but highly-organised communal ritual. Significantly, although the Labanotation score indicates that 'There is no linear story line in *Moonbine*',⁵¹ it does reveal that,

When beginning to choreograph *Moonbine*, Mr. Taylor mentioned Shirley Jackson's *The Lottery* to the dancers. ... The dance may refer to the story obliquely. ... Games and ritual are hinted at, a 'Blind Man's Bluff game turned deadly serious', as Mr. Taylor put it.⁵²

Thus, while all four works draw inspiration from the impressionistic form and mood of their accompaniment and all of them acknowledge an historical connection between Debussy's music and the choreography of Vaslav Nijinsky – most particularly, because of the rigorous two-dimensional movement style which characterises each of the four works – only one work, *Guests of May*, can be described unequivocally as plotless and two others, *Images* and *Arabesque*, are – like *Esplanade* – only predominantly so.

2. NON-STORY NARRATIVES

Scudorama was the prototype for a series of dramatic works in which Taylor presents non-linear and often multi-layered narratives. Although it did not survive in repertory beyond the 1960s, it was succeeded by several key works which continued to explore a similar type and treatment of theme. Many of these concern ‘ugly’ characters (to use Fleming’s generic term) and ‘layered, elusive scenarios’.⁵³ Also, as previous discussion intimated, this group of works is characterised by a particularly wide-ranging movement vocabulary. Fleming acknowledges the latter characteristic thus:

Nearly every one of those Taylor pieces (usually from Column B) at which we turn to the person next to us and say ‘Wasn’t that strange?’ is in a new dialect.⁵⁴

Some writers consider Taylor’s vocabulary limited, as for example: Arlene Croce (‘he never used a lot of steps anyway’⁵⁵); Alastair Macaulay (‘The lexicon of Taylor dance steps isn’t large’⁵⁶); and Don McDonagh (‘Taylor’s dance vocabulary tends to be restricted to a small palette of movements which he combines and recombines in a variety of interesting ways’⁵⁷). Works considered in this category disprove such a view, especially when a distinction is made between the notion of a limited movement vocabulary and that of a wide one containing few codified steps. Moreover, while Taylor’s plotless, lyrical works manifest similar choreographic concerns (including some uniquely-named steps), the range of movements and dynamics in all of his other work is extremely varied. An important source for such diversity is his wide repertoire of postures, gestures and pedestrian movement – the antithesis of the lyric, virtuosic idiom in Taylor’s ‘A’ trilogy. Elizabeth Kendall suggests other key sources:

Instead of shutting himself up inside of it [modern dance], Taylor set out to discover all the things that have dancing in them; sports, vaudeville, circuses, melodrama, ballets, pageants, revels, tumbling and all kinds of human activity.⁵⁸

Taylor himself identifies another reason why his movement range differs from the highly-codified vocabularies of other modern dance choreographers:

Dance can be and is a composite of so many ingredients. I have no particular style or dance philosophy like rise and fall, contraction release. ... I like a broad palette to choose from.⁵⁹

This has resulted in what Laura Jacobs describes as ‘one of the most impersonal movement vocabularies in the history of dance’⁶⁰ and she goes on to explain that Taylor’s steps

are not pulled out of his own body or soul. In fact, the majority of them come from the school-yard – leaps, skips, dashes of the sort you might see in a game of tag, and an arm-pumping walk. To these, Taylor adds jerks, lurches, spasms, and other kinetic scraps when it suits him.⁶¹

Taylor’s dramatic works manifest distinct movement ‘dialects’ or ‘palettes’ but they can be grouped together according to certain types of movement and dynamics, as Marcia Siegel’s description of *Scudorama* helps to demonstrate:

Anonymous dancers, dressed sometimes in street clothes and sometimes in leotards, struggled and writhed in the impotent fury of nightmare. With its strong distorted movement, empty relationships, and shocking images – like a squirming pile of bodies on the floor – the dance gave an impression of the futility and isolation of modern life that was at once realistic and abstract.⁶²

Distorted, discordant types of movement and stark, disturbing images are common to all of the works in this second category. When returning to the movement content of *Scudorama* in a later account of the work, Siegel proposed that

Although he never again made a dance so intensely angry, so desolate, traces of *Scudorama* keep appearing, the goalless flailing and lashing motions; the frequent use of fast crawling and other earth-hugging locomotion that makes the dancers look not like animals but like tortured humans; the twisting, knotting body shapes and other grotesqueries; the forced speeds at which some risky things are taken; and the solemn but inexplicably sinister ceremonies that are so characteristic of his dances.⁶³

Kisselgoff makes a specific connection between the types of movement in *Scudorama* and *Nightshade*: ‘Both have a great deal of on-the-side, up-from-the-slime slithering on the floor’;⁶⁴ and in a review of *Last Look*, Daniel Jacobson’s description of the movement content closely resembles that of Siegel’s for *Scudorama*:

The piece opens and closes with the same image – a pile of twitching bodies, cast-off dolls in a human refuse heap, victims of some late-twentieth century scourge (pick your favorite catastrophe). These lost souls awaken from their cryogenic sleep, rise like zombies, and, as if driven by some mutation of the central nervous system, jerk, jump, whirl, and stamp like tangled marionettes, throwing themselves against the floor and one another. Their agonized spasms are infused with an intentional fury, anger grounded in despair.⁶⁵

Of greatest importance, however, in determining a connection between *Scudorama* and other works in this series is Taylor's choice and treatment of subject matter. *Scudorama* was his first representation of evil and social disintegration, and he would return to these or to the related themes of social oppression, prejudice and exclusion in many subsequent works. As indicated previously, Taylor had intended *Scudorama* to be the 'dark' antithesis in repertory to *Aureole* and in 'Down with Choreography', he revealed another intended polarity:

Scudorama is less concerned with style than with a slightly vulgar look. The nasty things the dancers do are related, in my mind at least, to Dante's *Inferno*, which he wrote in the coarse vernacular, rather than his *Paradiso*, which he wrote in a loftier manner.⁶⁶

Aureole and *Scudorama* can be seen, therefore, as the dance equivalents of Dante's heaven and hell. Importantly, though, whereas Graham chose allegory and ancient myths in order to critique human weakness, *Scudorama* initiated a series of works about the underside of contemporary society.

The overriding feature common to all of Taylor's dramatic works is his structuring of unrelated episodes as non-cumulative narratives. Their 'stream of consciousness' structure can thus be compared to the early-twentieth century developments in literature augured by Marcel Proust's *roman fleuve* style of writing and to the mid-1950s innovations in existentialist drama. In both, the notion of a 'plot' is either non-existent or secondary to the disparate, self-contained episodes which comprise the work. However, in the same way that much of Proust's writing is plotless but highly-structured, Taylor's non-story narratives are equally strict in form. Even though Barnes claimed that, 'it is surely illogical to expect dance to conform to the tenets of a well-made play',⁶⁷ the structuring of Taylor's dramatic works most closely resembles that of an existentialist play. Like Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, his non-story narratives are essentially event-less. There is no sense of cause and effect to determine why his choreography unfolds as it does. Moreover, in contrast to Taylor's Americana works where time is important – both in terms of locating events and characters in particular historical periods and in structuring scenes in chronological sequence – his dramatic works are more concerned with the 'here-and-now', that is, with a fluid juxtaposition of vignettes about the world as Taylor knows or imagines it.

Equally significant is the fact that although many of his dramatic works can be described as contemporary morality tales, Taylor is not a moralist. Conversely, as Jowitt proposes,

one of the most remarkable aspects of his work for me has been his rather medieval presentation of evil as an active force.⁶⁸

This is in marked contrast to works such as Graham's *Heretic* (1930) and *Clytemnestra* (1958), Humphrey's *The Shakers* (1931) and *With My Red Fires* (1936), and Limón's *The Moor's Pavane* (1949) where suffering or salvation are the thematic resolution to sin.

In Taylor's dramatic works, one or more leading characters are often 'outsider' figures, as are the male soloist in *Private Domain*, the deformed characters in *Dust* and the alienated victims in *Last Look*. Croce defined *Dust* as 'your basic Taylor *Totentanz* of cripples, lepers, and mutants'⁶⁹ while Taylor himself revealed it was the result of 'a subconscious stream of action that just bubbled up'.⁷⁰ Barnes suggests that a similar process influenced the creation of *Private Domain*. With reference to the 'the random bubbles' of Taylor's accompaniment, he proposed that

Xenakis treats music as a trampoline for his thoughts. Chumps of sound bounce upward with no normal – or rather traditional – structural relevance, and yet with an almost sculptural rightness. ... And this strange, structural insubstantiality has been seized upon by Taylor – he has understood these fugitive visual possibilities and given them the flesh of his dancers.⁷¹

Both the subject matter and structure of *Nightshade* also evolved from a spontaneous flow of unrelated ideas. As Taylor explained,

I left the work intentionally vague as to meaning. It's a kind of fevered dream inspired by a book of etchings by Max Ernst.⁷²

Hilton Als' proposition that *Nightshade* 'should be viewed as a danse and poème macabre with its own internal logic'⁷³ is particularly germane, both to a discussion of *Nightshade* and to all of Taylor's non-linear narratives. Much of the coherence – or 'logic' – in *Nightshade* revolves around three archetypal characters, all of whom function as surreal dream figures within a Victorian melodrama about social and sexual repression. Kisselgoff, after describing the secondary characters dressed in frock coats and bustles as 'fairly conventional on the outside', provides a more detailed delineation of the 'three key characters':

Elie Chaib too wears a frock coat, but he has a mop of hair and a brown mask

that makes him completely the terrifying and seductive figure that Victoria Uris, in a black negligee and a mane of loose hair, both desires and fears in her sexual fantasies.

And then there is Carolyn Adams, as the Noble Savage, in stylized African costume, whose fleeting passage among the characters immediately stirs up their repressed emotions.⁷⁴

Following Adams' retirement in 1982, Taylor removed any racial inference simply through a change of costume to:

a child in a sashed pink party dress, her character no longer that of the noble savage but still ambiguously innocent. The notion that her purity is actually destructive, still setting off evil every time she flits through or skims across, has been retained.⁷⁵

By focusing exclusively on the notion of innocence – thereby creating a character similar to that of Flora in Henry James' *The Turn of the Screw* – Taylor further highlighted the ambiguity of the dream characters in *Nightshade*, in terms of their real or imagined presence within the Victorian melodrama. Significantly, when asked to identify key aspects of Taylor's choreography, two former dancers, Raegan Wood and Andrew Asnes, cited his 'intentional ambiguity' as particularly important.⁷⁶

A later work in this series, *The Word*, is also intentionally ambiguous. The female protagonist represents an overtly corrupting force – 'In rehearsals, Mr. Taylor suggested that she was "a Devil".'⁷⁷ Yet her relationship to the rest of the cast (costumed identically in tight-fitting shirts, ties, breeches and leather boots, their slicked-down hair giving them a severe, schoolboy appearance) is never made explicit. It is only through studying the Labanotation score that Taylor's key themes and images can be gleaned, many of which are realised choreographically through solos for individual members of the ensemble. For example, in the opening section, Dancer A is an 'accolite' [sic] who

is announcing a procession or event led by Dancer C, the Warlord. A feels wrathful, unworldly and frightened by C. ... During the course of his solo, he works himself into a religious frenzy.⁷⁸

The Warlord 'represents unquestioning acceptance of dogma';⁷⁹ Dancer R performs a 'self-flagellation solo';⁸⁰ while Taylor described Dancer U as

a combination of the Virgin Mary and Joan of Arc; someone who sees visions and hears voices. In her solo, her body is repeatedly twisting or shifting in

opposite directions at once. ... U is picked up and carried offstage aloft, like an icon in a religious parade.⁸¹

An exhibition of Byzantine art – and particularly the painting, *Icon with the Heavenly Ladder of John Klimax* depicting ‘demons pulling down the faithful as they try to climb to heaven’⁸² – was the inspiration for *The Word*. Taylor and his composer, David Israel, visited the exhibition during the Spring of 1997 and both of them saw the painting as ‘a parallel to a present-day struggle with a loss of faith, not just in God, but in anything’.⁸³ As Mary Cargill recognised, *The Word* ‘is anti-authoritarian rather than simply anti-Christian’.⁸⁴

The Labanotation score of *The Word* also identifies some of the movement imagery used by Taylor in rehearsals, which corresponds closely to descriptions of several other works in this second category. For example, glossary information for the male quintet in the fifth section reveals that:

In this dance particularly, Mr. Taylor stressed the movement quality with adjectives such as hunched, twisted, contorted, ginched, punched, whiplash, and gargoyles-like.⁸⁵

Like any creative artist, Taylor’s choreography does not evolve in a vacuum. The randomness and indeterminacy of events and experiences in his daily life, together with his spontaneous approach during the rehearsal process, inevitably help not only to generate but also to shape a specific ‘stream’ of choreographic ideas and structures for each new work. Annette Grant defines the various sources and influences which help to shape a particular work as ‘circumstantial linkages’⁸⁶ and the term is particularly apposite regarding Taylor’s dramatic works. In the case of *The Word*, he came upon another important source by chance:

... one night, channel surfing on TV, I saw a ceremony inducting new officers into the police, and the candidates sat and stood and spoke, unsmilingly, in perfect unison. This struck me somehow related to the stiff formalism of Byzantium.⁸⁷

This latter source – which consolidated Taylor’s emphasis on contemporary issues about conformity – was a key determinant of the stiff, regimented movement style and homomorphic characterisation in *The Word*, both of which differ significantly from his other anti-religious work, *Speaking in Tongues*. (The latter is considered in the earlier *Dance Research* article as part of Taylor’s Americana category – see note 9.)

One final point needs to be made about Taylor's unconventional treatment of subject matter and structures in his dramatic works. Even though the origins of many of his ideas are random and unrelated, and he 'prepares tier upon tier of improbable ideas',⁸⁸ the decisions which he makes during the gestation of a new work ultimately impose a high degree of choreographic structure and coherence – which relates back to the earlier parallel proposed between Taylor's choreography and a Proustian novel. As Taylor acknowledges at the end of his autobiography:

each new dance is a new beginning, a new place to discover; and though each one may be related to a past one, at some point in the making, if I'm lucky, it shows me its own special face, though it's not always in the country that I had expected it to be. ... Most begin as a swamp; all pose a danger of slippery footing. The only firm ground seems to be a certain craft that I've learned by trial and error.⁸⁹

3. FIBLE-FABLE, FRIPPERY AND FUN

In his autobiography, Taylor also writes about the 'transforming alchemy'⁹⁰ which occurs during the creative process and which helps to determine the particular terrain or 'country' of a new work. This phenomenon is particularly relevant to a discussion of his humorous works because what emerges through the vicissitudes of the rehearsal process is often of a different subject and tone from his original conception. *Piece Period* is a prime example of this. Taylor had intended it to be a direct response to both the national and period styles of Beethoven, Haydn, Scarlatti, Vivaldi and other pre-twentieth century composers. Thus, like *Junction* and *Aureole*, it was musically-inspired. Initially, he had entitled the work 'Period Piece' because of his formalist approach to each of the seven pieces of music. However, when he realised that others found the work funny, he transposed the two words.

Barnes noted early on that 'Taylor never sets out to be funny'⁹¹ and this is confirmed by long-time Taylor associate Bettie de Jong:

his humor always comes from the movement and surprises us. He doesn't ask us to be funny ourselves ... Paul isn't by nature a funny, joke-telling sort of guy, but he knows when movements look funny.⁹²

Taylor has an ability not only to recognise and develop humour in his choreography; but also to distinguish between different types.

These range from 'dark' or macabre to witty, manic or slapstick. Barnes makes a further distinction:

There's a black humor that runs crooked straight down Mr. Taylor's artistic backbone – it is ghoulish, misanthropic and yet somehow funny. Occasionally it is funny-peculiar, and often funny-uncomfortable.⁹³

In the same way that Taylor structures separate scenes in sequential order in his dramatic works, many of his humorous works are also episodic in form. Since he more often than not adopts a 'stream of consciousness' approach during the creation of a new work and because he has a broad movement vocabulary to draw upon, it follows that, potentially, many of his works could evolve either as darkly dramatic or humorously so. Thus, there are certain structural and movement parallels between many of his humorous works and those considered in his 'non-story stories' category above. (The exception is a sub-group of works in this third category which were 'plotted' more schematically prior to the start of the rehearsal process and which tend to have a more linear narrative structure and specific characters – and, thus, they share some similarities with his Americana works. This sub-group of comic works, such as *Agathe's Tale*, *Snow White*, *The Sorcerer's Sofa* and *In the Beginning* will be considered later in this section.)

Taylor has categorised his humorous works thus:

There are all kinds of humor and I think through the years I've used them all – sheer humor, the biting kind, the snide, the ironic, the plain silly things we all do sometimes.⁹⁴

The most important question, however, is *what* qualifies *Piece Period* as 'a delicious lampoon';⁹⁵ *Party Mix* as 'a wickedly funny satire';⁹⁶ *Public Domain* as 'potentially one of [Taylor's] funniest works';⁹⁷ *Minikin Fair* as 'wacky';⁹⁸ and *The Sorcerer's Sofa* as 'a giddy and archly cartoonish demonstration of some of Taylor's most pun-happy thinking'.⁹⁹

In a review of *Public Domain's* first performances, Barnes identified three ways in which Taylor incorporates comic elements: through 'such dada devices as a large ball proceeding across the stage only to be chased by a very small ball' [which is similar to the predominance in *Piece Period* of 'pranks-with-props'¹⁰⁰]; 'private jokes, such as when Taylor himself, who broke his leg on the last European tour, comes whirling on with a crutch' and 'occasional

digs at other ballets'.¹⁰¹ In a later review, Jack Anderson's account of *Public Domain* spans two paragraphs but since this is one of the best hypotheses of Taylor's manipulation of comic material discovered to-date – and it includes specific dance examples to illuminate his ideas – I have included it in full here:

It's a funny dance set to a tape collage of musical snippets, all in the public domain, plus bits of *Medea*, *The Importance of Being Earnest*, and W. C. Fields. But now just try to answer this question: what makes these funny things funny? ... What makes a movement comic is the context in which it is placed. There are some imperturbable adagios which seem not in the least comic in themselves; but when they are followed by balls rolling across the stage, the incongruity of this juxtaposition makes the total effect comic. Sometimes Taylor will combine two types of movement, neither particularly comic in itself, but in such a way that the combination makes them seem comic. Thus, finger-snapping, in itself, may be jaunty, but it is not necessarily comic, while a mass of bodies oozing across the stage may be downright threatening; but when the bodies ooze and snap their fingers simultaneously, this amalgam of two dissimilar types of movement becomes comic because the movements are preposterously unrelated.

Taylor also employs movements which are indeed related to each other, but which no 'serious' choreographer would include because of associations they have in other contexts. In a sequence of arm gestures Taylor throws in the familiar hitch-hiker's gesture; it's certainly an arm gesture and therefore theoretically appropriate to the sequence, but because it has such a specific meaning its presence renders the otherwise abstract passage ridiculous. Finally, Taylor fashions comedy by showing movements which might very well occur during a theatrical performance but which (like preparations for and recoveries from steps) audiences are not ordinarily expected to see. Thus, after imposing groupings and displays of movement, the dancers walk casually away: dancers might do this backstage or with the curtain down, but they don't usually let an audience see them doing it, for seeing it makes their 'serious' emoting seem foolish.¹⁰²

By comparing and combining the elements outlined by Anderson and Barnes, it is possible to propose six crucial ways in which Taylor shapes a comic work. These are:

- i) the context in which he sets a particular series of movements or tableaux;
- ii) the manner in which he combines different types of movements;
- iii) the inclusion of pedestrian gestures which have specific cultural connotations;
- iv) the inclusion of esoteric dance activities [Anderson] and 'in jokes' [Barnes];

- v) the manipulation of props;
- vi) intertextual references to other dance works – drawn from Taylor's own repertory and from the classical and modern dance canons.

Lost, Found and Lost is arguably the work which best illustrates all of these elements and, thus, it has been chosen as the main work for analysis in this third section. It incorporated *Events I* from Taylor's *Seven New Dances* concert (1957), thus creating an intertext and also highlighting – as previous discussion of *Polaris* also demonstrated – how similar movements are perceived differently in different contexts. Although Taylor's original idea was simply to create a work 'about Ennui and Alienation',¹⁰³ at its première, critics described *Lost, Found and Lost* as 'the most civilised hoot in years – glossy, sophisticated'¹⁰⁴ and as 'zany and elegant at the same time, and just possibly a gibe at today's avant garde'.¹⁰⁵ Importantly, even before a single movement has been performed, an aura of sophistication and satire is conveyed through the context in which Taylor has placed this particular work. The curtain rises on a cast of ten dancers all dressed identically in 'black spangly and whispily veiled unisex costumes'.¹⁰⁶ They are seen against a stark white background and floor (designed by Alex Katz), and

over the whole thing Taylor's composer, Donald York, pours a sludge of fifties Muzak ... played in the style of Mantovani.¹⁰⁷

Although *Lost, Found and Lost* does not incorporate props *per se*, a humorous design element is that of odd shoes. Most of the dancers wear matching black jazz shoes but a few – in what appears to be a random distribution of colour – wear only one black shoe paired with a brightly-dyed one.

The manner in which Taylor combines codified dance movements with a wide range of pedestrian stances and gestures is the most significant and pervasive reason why *Lost, Found and Lost* can be categorised as a humorous work. Tobias believes that 'Most of our laughter ... comes from the wry juxtapositions Taylor engineers'.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, the types of movements which Tobias identifies in her review of *Lost, Found and Lost* closely resemble those in Anderson's description of *Private Domain*:

[Taylor] culls movement from ordinary body language: arms folded, arms akimbo, chin resting thoughtfully in cupped hands. These 'found' fragments

already look peculiar – seen in isolation or joined with no logical transitions. Imagine them, then, mixed arbitrarily with short takes from several dance worlds: Martha Graham's, Taylor's own, Broadway, classical ballet – Odette's wingspread, for one thing, and classroom jump practice.¹⁰⁹

Taylor includes quotations in *Lost, Found and Lost* from both his own repertory and that of other choreographers – although Tobias' reference to *Swan Lake* is tenuous. The 'wingspread' arms motif is more likely a quotation from Taylor's *Cloven Kingdom*. Additionally, in *Lost, Found and Lost*, Taylor satirizes some of the more mundane aspects of contemporary western culture.

The choreography includes recognizable situations which inspire laughter, such as a hilarious waiting line the dancers form leading toward one of the wings. Each adopts his or her own withdrawn, impatient pose as they slowly edge forward one by one. Other moments are more fleeting yet similarly striking – one dancer sizing up another with a disdainful glance; a tight cluster pulling itself together as if to perform some grand flourish, and then merely bending over slightly.

Although poses play a large part in the work, there is also a great deal of busy, antic movement. Mostly, it erupts without warning and stops just as suddenly.¹¹⁰

It is also interesting to note the very different ways in which Taylor quotes from his own repertory in *Ab Ovo Usque Ad Mala* (*From Soup to Nuts*) and in his Americana work, *Danbury Mix* (1988). The former is 'an exploration of total silliness set to the music of P.D.Q. Bach'¹¹¹ and Jacobson identifies some of the work's key comic element thus:

Ab Ovo gives us the inspired silliness of a Max Sennett comedy goosed up with the free-ranging libido of Mel Brooks. Taylor mocks his penchant for glamorous, hypermasculine men by having the boys in *Ab Ovo*, absurdly hairy body-builders in ridiculous Greek tunics, mince and scurry about like squirrels, while one of them, in leopard-skin cape and jock strap ... does a campy flamenco to the strains of 'Hernando's Hideaway'. Taylor also mocks the sentimental excesses of a work such as *Sunset* in the lovesick swooning of the men.¹¹²

It is the tongue-in-cheek manner in which the intertextual references in *Ab Ovo Usque Ad Mala* are made that renders them comic puns rather than critiques of other dance forms. Conversely, although *Danbury Mix* was considered 'introspective with every Taylorism from crawls to pretzels in the air'¹¹³ and it re-presented images and phrases from *Junction*, *From Sea to Shining Sea*, *Esplanade*, *Szygy* and other works, the references were intended more as a

serious retrospective – both of previous Taylor choreography and of past historical events – than as a parody or Dadaist pastiche.

In *Ab Ovo Usque Ad Mala*, the puns are presented

in one-liners, each seemingly a non sequitur in terms of what went before. A beatific attitude turn, for example, provokes (what else?) the low-down-hands-crisscrossing-over-knees of the Charleston. The high point of this nutty excursion is a series of three little pas de deux in the course of which every ludicrous impulse and accident that has befallen a couple with pretensions to exaltation – be it in the studio or bedroom – duly makes a five-second appearance.¹¹⁴

As in *Lost, Found and Lost*, it is the collective impact of the six comic elements cited previously which enables *Ab Ovo Usque Ad Mala* to be categorised as one of Taylor's humorous works.

In reference to *Piece Period*, *Public Domain*, *Foreign Exchange* (1970) and *Sports and Follies* (1974), Siegel notes that 'the comedy comes from what the dancers do rather than any prearranged plots or situations'.¹¹⁵ This is also the case in *Lost, Found and Lost* and *Ab Ovo Usque Ad Mala*. There are, however, a few humorous works in which Taylor adopts a more conventional story-telling approach. *Agathe's Tale* (1967) and *In the Beginning* (2003) are arguably his most linear narratives and both involve clearly defined characters: Agathe, Satan, Raphael and Orphan Pan in the former, and in the latter, Jehovah and Adam and Eve. *Snow White* (1983) also re-tells a well-known story but here, Taylor subordinates the traditional fairy tale in order to focus on the theme of narcissism. In so doing, he not only subverts the original concept of good (Snow White) transcending evil (the Wicked Stepmother); he also gives greater prominence to other themes, such as the alter-ego representation of the Queen (Taylor's Wicked Stepmother) and the Prince, who 'disconcertingly doubles, in some frighteningly Freudian life, as the wicked irredecently [sic] cloaked Queen'.¹¹⁶

In a preview of *Snow White*, Rob Baker noted that

Martha Graham may have done a Greek legend or two, but she and her fellow moderns never got around to fairy tales by the Brothers Grimm, and their dances seldom had a smile to them.¹¹⁷

and, as Terry Teachout suggests laconically, 'How dare a modernist be so much fun?'.¹¹⁸

4. LATE-FLOWERING LOVE

Although Taylor had incorporated quasi-romantic duets into earlier choreography – as for example, in the fourth movements of both *Aureole* and *Esplanade*, and in the ‘dream’ sequence of *Le Sacre du Printemps* (1980) where the Girl appears to the Private Eye in his prison cell – *Sunset* (1983) was the first of his works to explore different types of male-female relationships as one of its main themes. As Croce noted, *Sunset* was

a study of sexual relations (men and men as well as men and women) ... and it is also a long look at a side of Taylor – a defenselessly [sic] emotional side – that doesn’t often emerge.¹¹⁹

Both *Sunset* and *Equinox* (1984) can be seen as the precursors to Taylor’s first truly romantic work, *Roses*; a connection which Taylor himself acknowledged:

from the time I made *Sunset* – a notion of another kind of love has been creeping up on me. I felt that *Sunset* was a very revealing dance as far as emotional climate is concerned, not just about romance between men and women but about camaraderie among men.¹²⁰

Reiter suggests an earlier starting-point for this emotional expression in Taylor’s choreography. She regards *Mercuric Tidings* not only as the transitional work, both choreographically and musically, between his series of Baroque works and ‘his romantic trilogy’;¹²¹ she also suggests that the work

enters a deeper, more maturely romantic mode in its second movement that prefigures Taylor’s more deliberate focus on romance and passion in the later works.¹²²

Reiter does have a point regarding this particular adagio section in *Mercuric Tidings* and other writers also concur. For example, Kisselgoff described it as ‘a romance by three successive couples’¹²³ and Tobias deemed it ‘an extension of Taylor’s ongoing commentary on the character of love’.¹²⁴ However, as earlier discussion demonstrated, *Mercuric Tidings* is essentially plotless. Like the duets of *Aureole* and *Esplanade*, the main emphasis in the choreography for all three couples is on formal elements rather than on different facets of a male-female relationship. The distinction is difficult to demonstrate, particularly since the romantic subject matter of *Roses* and the more recent *Eventide* (1997) is conveyed through formal elements rather than by a conventional narrative or specific

characters. Nevertheless, the crucial difference is that in *Mercuric Tidings*, any romantic connotation is incidental. The main aim of the second section adagio is to create a dynamic contrast to the two quicksilver allegro sections and, as Mindy Aloff suggests, the dancers ‘seem not to have switched genres so much as lowered their idling times’.¹²⁵

I would, however, support Reiter’s view that *Equinox* was ‘a sort of way station between *Sunset* and *Roses*’¹²⁶ – and I would then argue that *Roses* was the prototype for *Eventide*. The duet material for the two main couples in *Equinox* – Elie Chaib and Linda Kent as the ‘lovers-in-experience’ and Kate Johnson and Kenneth Tosti as the ‘lovers-in-innocence’¹²⁷ – presaged the distinction which Taylor would make in *Roses* between the ‘White Couple’ and the five preceding duets¹²⁸ and between the main couple and the other duets in *Eventide*. Croce’s first review of *Roses* identified another important distinction between the ‘White’ and ‘Black’ couples, one which she believes added another layer of romanticism to the work. In her analysis of the two pieces of music used – Richard Wagner’s *Siegfried Idyll* (1870) followed by Heinrich Baermann’s *Adagio for Clarinet and Strings* (1820s) – she noted that:

If Taylor had used the white couple (Cathy McCann and David Parsons or Kate Johnson and Thomas Evert) at the start of the piece, the music for the duet ... would have compelled him to build *forward* to the music of the *Siegfried Idyll*, which accompanies the ensemble section. Instead, he builds backwards, contradicting the chronology of the two pieces of music and the chronological implications of their respective musical idioms.¹²⁹

The major significance of this is that:

We seem to have moved backwards in time to another era and another range of sentiment. Thus juxtaposed, the two scores do not just form a meditation on two periods of Romanticism spanned by Wagner, they also provide the basis for Taylor’s essay in retrospection.¹³⁰

This sense of looking back in time in *Roses*, as represented by the relationship of the ‘White Couple’, and by the half-century gap in his choice of accompaniment, is coincidental. However, it was certainly an aspect of *Eventide*. This is confirmed by the Labanotation score, which identifies the subject matter thus:

It is the memory of a long relationship and the pain of leaving remembered. It is all in the past. The costumes evoke a period piece – the exact period is unimportant – the fact that it is in the past is the important point.

(a)

(a) Heather Berest and James Samson
(with Julie Tice and Michael
Trusnovec behind).

(b) Heather Berest and James Samson.

(c) Julie Tice and Michael Trusnovec.

(d) Amy Young and Takehiro Ueyama.

(b)

(c)

(d)

Fig. 2. Roses. © Orion Duckstein.

Fig. 3. *Roses*: The 'White Couple', Silvia Nevjinsky and Patrick Corbin.
© Orion Duckstein.

Each duet could be seen as the same couple, or different couples with similar types of relationship at different stages. The fact that each duet is dressed identically is a way of indicating that each duet presents different aspects of the same relationship.¹³¹

There are five pairs of dancers in *Eventide* and the main clue, choreographically, to Taylor presenting them as the same couple at different stages of their relationship can be found in the two duets for the main couple (originally, Francie Huber and Patrick Corbin). Their first duet occurs in the second section of the work, the 'Carol'. Here, Corbin represents the attentive, supportive partner to Huber who appears distant and disinterested. Their next duet occurs in the penultimate section, 'Musette' – that is, after the changing state of their relationship has been alluded to by the duets for four other couples.¹³² Corbin begins in the same position as the female dancer from the previous section had finished (Rachel Berman in 'Ballad Part II'), but this time, 'the roles have been reversed'.¹³³

Some critics recognised Taylor's intended double reading on first sight of *Eventide*. Kisselgoff, for example, described the five couples as

ghosts of the past or aspects of the same pair; very obviously, they amplify an idea, which traces the course of life and loss. Courtship at its beginning, ecstasy and passion; all these are distilled in five contrasting duets.¹³⁴

Gia Kourlas, however, noted a subtle difference from *Roses*:

it's a darker and more melancholic side of love than *Roses* depicted. Four couples drift in and out of the scene, portraying lovers filled with an unsettling sense of regret or loss.¹³⁵

I believe that the reason why Taylor turned to romantic subject matter during the mid-1980s and then returned to it again a decade later was because of his relationship with two distinct groups of dancers. By 1983, his company consisted of several senior dancers who had worked with him since the mid-1970s. By the late-1980s, these same dancers had retired or left to work elsewhere. (That Taylor created the 'White Couple' in *Roses* on Cathy McCann and David Parsons is also significant because, at that time, they were also a couple off-stage.) With *Eventide*, Taylor came full-circle, with the next generation of dancers who had joined his company in the late-1980s and early-1990s. (By the late-1990s, Huber was the most senior female dancer, having joined the company in 1987, while Corbin, who joined the company in 1989, is currently the company's senior male dancer.)

This article has considered four different types of works in Taylor's corpus and, in so doing, it has sought to highlight just how diverse his choreography is. Discussion has addressed some wider aspects relating to Taylor's choreography, as for example, the debates concerning the lyricism – as opposed to classicism – of his plotless works and the extent of his movement vocabulary. Models and criteria for analysing his dramatic and humorous works have also been considered.

Alan M. Kriegsmann has described Taylor's diversity as 'poly-dexterity'¹³⁶ and it is this aspect of his choreography which makes it so difficult to classify. Moreover, as Anderson suggested when reviewing a recent New York season:

Taylor has done more than create different kinds of dances. He often has different kinds of things happen in a single dance. He has devised a few total puzzlers. More often, however, his dances are easily accessible at some level: no wonder they are so popular. Yet his creations also have underlying mysteries or contradictions.¹³⁷

The aim of my doctoral thesis – and of this reworked article – has been to unravel some of those mysteries and contradictions.

NOTES

¹ Taylor created his first choreography, *Jack and the Beanstalk*, in 1954 and although he presented concerts of his own work regularly in New York, he was most acclaimed during the 1950s as a leading member of the Martha Graham Dance Company (1955–61) and for his solo in the 1959 Graham-George Balanchine co-production *Episodes*. The latter led to Taylor making several guest appearances with the New York City Ballet during its 1959–61 seasons.

² Although *Junction* (1961) and *Private Domain* (1969) were revived as recently as the 1990s, other key works such as *Insects and Heroes* (1961), *Piece Period* (1962), *Scudorama* (1963), *From Sea to Shining Sea* (1965), *Orbs* (1966), *Agathe's Tale* (1967) and *Public Domain* (1968) have not been performed for many years.

³ Taylor (1987), p. 169.

⁴ Taylor, cited in Brown (1980).

⁵ Terry (1962).

⁶ Hughes (1962b).

⁷ Hughes (1963), p. 30.

⁸ Taylor in Anderson (1980), p. 69. He first used the term to describe the subject matter of *Insects and Heroes* which initiated his interest in developing non-linear narratives.

⁹ My doctoral thesis also analysed a fifth work, *From Sea to Shining Sea* (1965), and proposed it as the prototype for a series of Americana works such as *Big Bertha* (1970), *American Genesis* (1973), *Speaking in Tongues* (1988), *Company B* (1991) and *Oh, You Kid!* (1999). This section of the thesis was developed and published as 'Heroes and Villains: Paul Taylor's *Le Sacre du Printemps* (*The Rehearsal*) and other American Tales' in the Winter 1999 issue of *Dance Research*. (Kane, 1999) The article considered both the problematic use of the term 'Americana' and Taylor's choice and treatment of American themes. Recent works which I would add to this category are *Black Tuesday* (2001) and *Dream Girls* (2002).

¹⁰ Kane (1995). In a paper presented at the 1995 CORD conference, I considered four types of ritual in Taylor's choreography:

- i. The dance-specific rituals of *Sports and Follies* (1974), *Le Sacre du Printemps* (*The Rehearsal*) and *Fact and Fancy* (1991), where the daily cycle of rehearsal and performance is presented as highly organised, habitual activity.
- ii. The ceremonial pastiches and parodies of *From Sea to Shining Sea*, *Danbury Mix* (1988) and *The Sorcerer's Sofa* (1989).
- iii. Works such as *Party Mix* (1963), *Orbs*, *American Genesis* (1973), *Cloven Kingdom* (1976) and *Speaking in Tongues* (1988) which provide a critique of specific social contexts and practices
- iv. Works such as *Runes* (1975), ... *Byzantium* (1984), and *Musical Offering* (1986) which present ritual as ancient and solemn process.

¹¹ Greskovic (1982), p. 33.

¹² Fleming (1994), p. 16.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ *Aureole's* subject matter, enhanced by its simple white costumes and lighting, and mellifluous Handel music was certainly different from the work of other American modern dance choreographers, which at that time was synonymous with social comment, sombre accompaniment and 3-D design. It was also in marked contrast to the nascent postmodern dance with its pedestrian, task-oriented, mixed-media explorations of non-proscenium stages.

¹⁶ Barnes (1982b).

¹⁷ The exception is *Musical Offering* which, because of its underlying theme of death and farewell, does not fit comfortably in this first category.

¹⁸ In *Airs*, the sixth movement allegro from Handel's *Concerto in F major* is preceded by part of the overture from *Berenice* and followed by the 'Musette' of the overture from *Alcina*. Taylor then uses the 'Arrival of the Queen of Sheba' from *Solomon* before returning to *Alcina* for the closing adagio finale.

¹⁹ The three concertos chosen for *Cascade* are numbers 4, 5 and 7. Taylor uses a modern piano transcript of Bach's orchestration, which was scored originally for harpsichord and orchestra. In *Promethean Fire*, he uses Leopold Stokowski's transcriptions of *Toccat & Fugue in D minor*, *Prelude in E flat minor* and *Chorale Prelude*, BWV 680.

²⁰ Taylor admits that this 'run with flyaway arms' was 'a direct and intentional steal from Martha's *Canticles for Innocent Comedians*' (Taylor, 1987, p. 135).

²¹ Uris in Lobenthal (1987), p. 30. Significantly, current company dancer Patrick Corbin reiterates Uris' metaphor for Taylor's contrasting use of the upper and lower body: 'Legs like an oak and arms like a willow'. (Correspondence with author, August 1994.)

²² Correspondence with author (February 1994). When asked to identify particular characteristics which she considered to be typically 'Taylor' in style, McCann's full description was:

First: a sense of moving from your torso involving your back in all arm, chest, pelvis and ultimately leg moves – you move from deep within your core.

²³ Gillis in Lobenthal (1985), p. 14.

²⁴ Hughes (1962a).

²⁵ Horst (1962), p. 104.

²⁶ Jowitt (1979a), p. 76.

²⁷ Kent in Steele (1985) p. 11. C. Kent has been teaching at the Juilliard School since leaving Taylor's company in 1989. Importantly, it was stagings of *Sunset* in 1995–6 and *Roses* 1997–8 for her Juilliard students which were the basis for the two Labanotation scores by former Taylor company notator, Sandra Aberkals.

²⁸ Here, I would like to acknowledge former Taylor dancer, Mary Cochran, as the first to identify the term 'undercurve' in this context. (Correspondence with author, 1994.)

²⁹ Dan Wagoner in Tobias (1978).

³⁰ Taylor in Berman (1988), p. 21.

³¹ Taylor in Ulrich (1988), p. E-6.

³² The Labanotation score for *Public Domain* (1968) includes the following introductory note by Moekle (1980–2), p. ii:

A scribble is a characteristic movement style of the choreographer. Scribbles are defined by the notator, from rehearsal notes, as fast, free, rough, messy, broken, wild, loose, bursts of pure energy, nonlinear and without shape.

³³ Taylor saw his role in *Aureole* as 'some kind of earth father who goes round blessing things' (1987, p. 136). Similarly, Kisselgoff (1972) described his role in *Guests of May* as that of 'a benevolent jolly green giant, an earth father'.

³⁴ Nuchtern (1979), p. 30.

³⁵ Another dance-music difference which Taylor tends to use as a visual and kinetic contrast is to maintain a steady dance rhythm across a musical retard. An obvious example of this occurs in *Airs*. Following the 'Flower' formation in the First Movement, the dancers begin walking in different directions on the third count of the bar. While the Largo of Handel's *Concerto in B major* is in $\frac{3}{4}$ time, the dancers' phrase is counted in sixes, i.e. it crosses two bars. After twelve bars, the music retards but the dancers 'continue to keep the same tempo established previously till the end of the movement'. (Introductory notes to the Labanotation score; Moekle, 1978–81, p. 16.) A similar contrast occurs at the end of the next section when, once again, the dancers keep their current tempo as the music retards.)

³⁶ Barnes (1982b).

- ³⁷ Taylor in Rosen (1979), p. 90.
- ³⁸ Susan McGuire (1996). Conversation with author, London, 4 September.
- ³⁹ Barnes (1976).
- ⁴⁰ This was what Taylor originally intended. However, as the work progressed in rehearsals, 'he got bored with this idea'. (Bettie de Jong – interview with author, San Francisco, 10 April 1999.) In the completed work, Asnes exits briefly at the end of the second section.
- ⁴¹ The Largo and Allegretto are two separate sections of Handel's concerto but they have been elided by both Schoenberg and Taylor.
- ⁴² Johnson (1999).
- ⁴³ Reiter (1986), p. 65.
- ⁴⁴ Reiter (1993). When discussing Taylor's 'angelic' works, Rieter argues that *Musical Offering* 'sits uncomfortably in this category', p. 6.
- ⁴⁵ Williams in Goodwin, Percival and Williams (1973), p. 34.
- ⁴⁶ Gillespie (1972), p. 26.
- ⁴⁷ Taylor in Kisselgoff (1977).
- ⁴⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁹ Tobias (2000), p. 62.
- ⁵⁰ Kisselgoff (2000), p. E1.
- ⁵¹ Ferguson (1994), p. v.
- ⁵² Ibid., p. viii. *The Lottery* is one of Jackson's short stories about a small-town community's behaviour on the day of its annual lottery. By a process of elimination, drawing names out of a black box, one villager is 'chosen' (as in *Le Sacre du Printemps*) as the victim to be stoned by the rest of the community.
- ⁵³ Jacobson (1989), p. 69.
- ⁵⁴ Fleming (1994), p. 17.
- ⁵⁵ Croce (1977). [Restated in *Going to the Dance*, p. 32.]
- ⁵⁶ Macaulay (1988), p. 110.
- ⁵⁷ McDonagh (1990), p. 141.
- ⁵⁸ Kendall (1980), p. 11.
- ⁵⁹ Taylor in Rosen (1979), p. 88.
- ⁶⁰ Jacobs (1988), p. 22.
- ⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁶² Siegel (1973), p. 203.
- ⁶³ Siegel (1985a), pp. 301–2. It is important to note that Siegel was writing several years before the creation of *Last Look* (1985). In a subsequent review, she recognised that '*Scudorama* is gone, but the new *Last Look* could be its older, flashier but equally desolate cousin' (Siegel, 1985b, p. 452).
- ⁶⁴ Kisselgoff (1979b), p. D28.
- ⁶⁵ Jacobson (1989), p. 70.
- ⁶⁶ Taylor in Cohen (1965), p. 100. Taylor made public this connection to Dante's epic poem, *Divine Comedy*, in late-1963. By the time of *Scudorama*'s New York première in December, the programme included a verse from the *Inferno*, Canto III, 34–6:
'What souls are these who run through this Black haze?'
And he to me: 'These are the nearly soulless
whose lives concluded neither blame nor praise.'
- ⁶⁷ Barnes, in Barnes, Goodwin and Williams (1965), p. 24.
- ⁶⁸ Jowitt (1979a), p. 77.
- ⁶⁹ Croce (1977). [Restated in *Going to the Dance*, p. 33.]
- ⁷⁰ Taylor in anon. (1977).
- ⁷¹ Barnes (1969b).
- ⁷² Taylor in Welsh (1980), p. B-5. The book to which Taylor refers is Ernst's *Une Semaine de bonté*. Jowitt (1979b, p. 77) describes the book as,
A terrifying collection of etchings of opulent, half-naked women in bondage preyed upon

by bird-headed or lion-headed gentlemen, violence in railway carriages, whispered conversations and witnessing eyes.

- ⁷³ Als (1984), p. 41.
- ⁷⁴ Kisselgoff (1979a).
- ⁷⁵ Kisselgoff (1984), p. C15.
- ⁷⁶ Correspondence with author (both 1994).
- ⁷⁷ Hoffman (1998–2000), p. v.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 2. The score also identifies the dancers on whom these roles were created: A: Andy LeBeau; C: Richard Chen See; R: originally Rachel Berman and now Amy Young; U: originally Francie Huber and now Heather Berest. The leading female role was created on Lisa Viola (who is identified in Labanotation score as dancer V).
- ⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 22.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid., p. vi.
- ⁸¹ Ibid.
- ⁸² Ibid., p. v.
- ⁸³ Israel in Grant (1998), p. 4, AR.
- ⁸⁴ Cargill (1998), p. 24.
- ⁸⁵ Hoffman (1998–2000), p. vi.
- ⁸⁶ Grant (1998), p. 4, AR.
- ⁸⁷ Taylor in Grant (1998), p. 4, AR.
- ⁸⁸ Macaulay (1988), p. 115.
- ⁸⁹ Taylor (1987), p. 360.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 213.
- ⁹¹ Barnes in Sorrell (1966), p. 65.
- ⁹² de Jong in Steele (1986), p. 2C.
- ⁹³ Barnes (1977).
- ⁹⁴ Taylor in Rosen (1979), p. 90.
- ⁹⁵ Terry (1962).
- ⁹⁶ Barnes in Sorrell (1966), p. 65.
- ⁹⁷ Anderson (1969), p. 80.
- ⁹⁸ Greskovic (1990), p. 4.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁰ Hering (1963), p. 28.
- ¹⁰¹ Barnes (1969a), p. 24.
- ¹⁰² Anderson (1977), p. 40.
- ¹⁰³ Taylor in Moekle (undated). Unfortunately, this partial score is simply a brief series of notes about the work.
- ¹⁰⁴ Barnes (1982a).
- ¹⁰⁵ Tobias (1982), p. 73.
- ¹⁰⁶ Barnes (1982a).
- ¹⁰⁷ Croce (1982b), p. 164.
- ¹⁰⁸ Tobias (1982), p. 73.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁰ Reiter (1982), p. 29.
- ¹¹¹ Shapiro (1986), p. 84. P. D. Q. Bach is a pseudonym used by the contemporary American composer, Peter Schickele.
- ¹¹² Jacobson (1989), p. 68.
- ¹¹³ Kisselgoff (1988), p. 16.
- ¹¹⁴ Tobias (1986), p. 87.
- ¹¹⁵ Siegel (1974), p. 71.
- ¹¹⁶ Barnes (1983), p. 57.
- ¹¹⁷ Baker (1983), p. 6.
- ¹¹⁸ Teachout (1993), p. 3.

- ¹¹⁹ Croce (1987), p. 75.
¹²⁰ Taylor in Tobias (1985), p. 54.
¹²¹ Reiter (1986), p. 65. The trilogy to which Reiter refers is *Sunset*, *Equinox* and *Roses*.
¹²² Ibid.
¹²³ Kisselgoff (1982).
¹²⁴ Tobias (1982), p. 74.
¹²⁵ Aloff (1982), p. 33.
¹²⁶ Reiter (1986), p. 68.
¹²⁷ Ibid. The point being made here is a development from Reiter's original idea, particularly since she singles out the Johnson-Tosti duet as the one in which 'Taylor confronts passion more openly than he has before'. In *Roses*, it is the White Couple who are the 'lovers in experience'.
¹²⁸ The Labanotation score of *Roses* identifies the main couple as the 'White Couple' and the other five as the 'Black Couples' (Aberkals, 1997–9).
¹²⁹ Croce (1985), p. 119.
¹³⁰ Ibid.
¹³¹ Ferguson (1997), p. vi.
¹³² The Labanotation score includes specific reference to these stages. For example, the couple in 'Christmas Dance' is the youngest: 'movement is playful and light' (Ferguson, 1997, p. vi). The couple in the 'Moto Perpetuo' section are like 'two butterflies playing tag'; they are 'sexually mature, more knowing what the game is' (p. vii).
¹³³ Taylor in Ferguson (1997), p. vii. In 'Ballad Part II', the female dancer is first wooed by her partner then rejected.
¹³⁴ Kisselgoff (1997), p. C13.
¹³⁵ Kourlas (1997), p. 59.
¹³⁶ Kriegsman (1978), p. D1.
¹³⁷ Anderson (2000), p. 739.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberkals, Sandra (1997–9). *Roses*, New York: Dance Notation Bureau. [Labanotation score]
Aloff, Mindy (1982). Reviews 3: Mindy Aloff, *Dance Magazine*, Vol. LXVI, No. 8, August, pp. 32–4.
Als, Hilton (1984). Big Bertha and Nightshade, *Ballet Review*, Vol. 12, No. 3, Fall, pp. 41–2.
Anderson, Jack (1969). Paul Taylor Dance Company, *Dance Magazine*, Vol. XLII, No. 1, January, pp. 79–80.
Anderson, Jack (1977). Paul Taylor: Surface and Substance, *Ballet Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 39–44.
Anderson, Jack (1980). Choreographic fox: Paul Taylor, *Dance Magazine*, Vol. LIV, No. 4, April, pp. 68–73.
Anderson, Jack (2000). New York Newsletter, *The Dancing Times*, Vol. 90, No. 1076, May, pp. 739, 741.
Anon. (1977). The Terrific Tempo of Paul Taylor, *Time Magazine*, 18 July. [Incomplete cutting, Paul Taylor Dance Company archive.]
Baker, Rob (1983). The man who made Snow White dance, *Daily News*, 3 April, pp. 5–6 [Leisure section].
Barnes, Clive (1969a). Private View: Transatlantic commentary, *Dance and Dancers*, Vol. 20, No. 1, January, pp. 22–4.

- Barnes, Clive (1969b). Paul Taylor's 'Private Domain', *The New York Times*. [Incomplete cutting, c.8 May, Paul Taylor Dance Company archive. The review cites 'Private Domain, given for first time last night'.]
- Barnes, Clive (1976). Dance: Paul Taylor's 'Polaris' Is Given Premiere in Newport', *The New York Times*. [Incomplete cutting, c.29 August, Paul Taylor Dance Company archive. The review cites 'The 1976 American Dance Festival ... ended here last night'.]
- Barnes, Clive (1977). Dance: Taylor Tale, *The New York Times*, 3 June.
- Barnes, Clive (1982a). Paul Taylor dancers with their sensuous 'lost-found' images, *New York Post*, 15 April.
- Barnes, Clive (1982b). Taylor: master at work, *New York Post*, 21 April.
- Barnes, Clive (1983). Taylor adds a wild touch to fairytale, *New York Post*, 14 April, p. 57.
- Barnes, Clive, Noel Goodwin and Peter Williams (1965). Taylor from Three Sides, *Dance and Dancers*, Vol. 16, No. 1, January, pp. 22–30, 47.
- Berman, Janice (1988). Paul Taylor: Still Battling With Ballet, *Newsday*, 3 April, Part II/pp. 11, 21.
- Brown, Alan M. (1980). The Diverse Styles of Paul Taylor, *The Los Angeles Times*, 2 January, Calendar section.
- Cargill, Mary (1998). The Word, *Dance View*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 24–6.
- Cohen, Selma Jeanne, ed. (1965). *The Modern Dance – Seven Statements of Belief*, Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, pp. 91–102.
- Croce, Arlene (1977). Taylor in Excelcis, *The New Yorker*, 20 June. [Reprinted in *Going to the Dance*, pp. 31–4.]
- Croce, Arlene (1982a). *Going to the Dance*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Croce, Arlene (1982b). Finders Keepers, *The New Yorker*, 10 May, pp. 163–7.
- Croce, Arlene (1985). Modern Love, *The New Yorker*, 29 April, pp. 119–21.
- Croce, Arlene (1987). Zeitgeist, *The New Yorker*, 6 July, pp. 70, 75–6.
- Croce, Arlene (1989). Sun and Shade, *The New Yorker*, 1 May, pp. 78–80.
- Ferguson, Sian (1994). *Moonbine*, New York: Dance Notation Bureau. [Labanotation score.]
- Ferguson, Sian (1997). *Eventide*, New York: Dance Notation Bureau. [Labanotation score.]
- Fleming, Bruce (1994). Towards a Theory of Taylor; or, Why We Love Paul, *The New Dance Review*, Vol. VI, No. 4, Summer–Fall, pp. 16–19.
- Gillespie, N[oe]l R. (1972). Reviews – Paul Taylor Dance Company, *Dance Magazine*, Vol. XLVI, No. 7, July, p. 26.
- Goodwin, Noel, John Percival and Peter Williams (1973). Monsters and Minstrels, *Dance and Dancers*, Vol. 24, No. 9, September, pp. 33–6.
- Grant, Annette (1998). In a Departure, A Plunge Into Darkness, *The New York Times*, 1 March, p. 4, AR [Arts and Leisure section].
- Greskovic, Robert (1982). Brooklyn, *Ballet News*, Vol. 3, No. 7, January, p. 33.
- Greskovic, Robert (1990). Ashes of Roses, *The New Dance Review*, Vol. III, No. 1, July–September, pp. (1)–5. [The cover page is unpaginated.]
- Harris, Dale (1989). Dance: The Two Faces of Paul Taylor, *The Wall Street Journal*, 25 April.
- Hering, Doris (1963). The Paul Taylor Dance Company – Hunter Playhouse, *Dance Magazine*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1, January, p. 28.

- Hoffman, Robin (1998–2000). *The Word*, New York: Dance Notation Bureau. [Labanotation score.]
- Horst, Louis (1962). The American Dance Festival, *Dance Observer*, Vol. 29, No. 7, August–September, pp. 104–5.
- Hughes, Allen (1962a). Dance: Debut of ‘Aureole’, a Modern ‘White Ballet’, *The New York Times*, 6 August.
- Hughes, Allen (1962b). Paul Taylor Dancers at Hunter College, *The New York Times*, 9 November.
- Hughes, Allen (1963). Paul Taylor – Dance or Dada?, *Dance* 62, Vol. 1, January, pp. 30–1. [The publication included the following note: ‘Dance 62 is a bonus offering for subscribers to Dance Perspectives and is not for sale’.]
- Jacobs, Laura (1988). Taylor-Made and Frillery, *The New Leader*, 2 May, pp. 22–3.
- Jacobson, Daniel (1989). Private Domains in Public Spaces, *Ballet Review*, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring, pp. 67–75.
- Johnson, Barry (1999). Beneath the clever steps, The Paul Taylor Dance Company tangles with the American spirit, *The Oregonian*, 22 October. [www.oregonlive.com]
- Jowitt, Deborah (1979a). A Fishy Conversation with an Obliging Giant, *The Village Voice*, 23 April, pp. 76–7. [Reprinted in *The Dance in Mind*, pp. 45–50.]
- Jowitt, Deborah (1979b). How Do You Like Your Nightmares?, *The Village Voice*, 14 May, p. 77.
- Jowitt, Deborah (1985). *The Dance in Mind*, Boston: David R. Godine.
- Kane, Angela (1995). Rites of purpose – the relevance of ritual in Paul Taylor’s choreography, *Dance, Myth and Ritual: The Americas and the Caribbean*, 1995 Congress on Research in Dance conference paper.
- Kane, Angela (1999). Heroes and Villains: Paul Taylor’s *Le Sacre du Printemps* (*The Rehearsal*) and other American tales, *Dance Research*, Vol. 17, No. 2, Winter, pp. 47–72.
- Kendall, Elizabeth (1980). American Mongrel, *Ballet News*, Vol. 1, No. 10, April, pp. 11–14, 35–6.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1972). Dance: 4 by Paul Taylor, *The New York Times*, 1 December.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1977). Paul Taylor’s Creative Surge Is Still Going Strong, *The New York Times*, 29 May.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1979a). Dance: Paul Taylor Presents Nightshade Premiere, *The New York Times*, 21 April.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1979b). Paul Taylor’s Ambiguities, *The New York Times*, 29 April, pp. D8, D28.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1982). Dance: Taylor’s Troupe ‘With Mercuric Tidings’, *The New York Times*, 22 April.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1984). Dance: Paul Taylor, *The New York Times*, 26 March, C15.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1988). Dance: City Ballet Acts as Host to Paul Taylor’s Troupe, *The New York Times*, 14 May, p. 16.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (1997). Expanding the Trite to Reveal New Poetry, *The New York Times*, 27 February, pp. C13–14.
- Kisselgoff, Anna (2000). Paul Taylor Tickles Eyes and Ears, Seriously, *The New York Times*, 2 March, p. E1.

- Kourlas, Gia (1997). Taylor-Made, *Time Out* (New York), 27 February–6 March, p. 59.
- Kriegsman, Alan M. (1978). Imagination in Motion – The Unexpected Moves of Paul Taylor, *The Washington Post*, 27 January, pp. D1, D3.
- Lobenthal, Joel (1985). Christopher Gillis: Dancing for Paul Taylor, *Ballet Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2, Summer, pp. 10–22.
- Lobenthal, Joel (1987). Victoria Uris: Dancing for Paul Taylor, *Ballet Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1, Spring, pp. 26–37.
- Macaulay, Alastair (1988). The Music Man, *The New Yorker*, 2 May, pp. 110, 113–15.
- McDonagh, Don (1990). Paul Taylor – Advanced Ideas and Conventional Theater, *The Rise & Fall & Rise of Modern Dance*, London: Dance Books, pp. 138–46. [First published in 1970.]
- Moekle, Janet (1978–81). *Airs*, New York: Dance Notation Bureau. [Labanotation score.]
- Moekle, Janet (1980–2). *Public Domain*, New York: Dance Notation Bureau. [Labanotation score.]
- Moekle, Janet (undated). *Lost, Found and Lost*, New York: Dance Notation Bureau. [Incomplete Labanotation score.]
- Nuchtern, Jean (1979). Taylor's Domain, *The Soho Weekly News*, 26 April, p. 30.
- Reiter, Susan (1982). Reports – New York, *Ballet News*, Vol. 4, No. 1, July, pp. 29–30.
- Reiter, Susan (1986). Baroque and Beyond with Paul Taylor, *Ballet Review*, Vol. 14, No. 3, Fall, pp. 65–71.
- Reiter, Susan (1993). Celestial In Spite of Itself, *DanceView*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Spring, pp. 6–11.
- Rosen, Lillie F. (1979). Talking with Paul Taylor, *Dance Scope*, Vol. 13, Nos. 2–3, Winter/Spring, pp. 82–92 ['Special Double Issue'].
- Shapiro, Laura (1986). Dancing's Mr. Sunshine, *Newsweek*, 21 April, p. 84.
- Siegel, Marcia B. (1973). *At the Vanishing Point*, New York: Saturday Review Press. [First published in 1968.]
- Siegel, Marcia B. (1974). Liberation in a cocoon, *Dance Magazine*, Vol. XLVIII, No. 12, December, p. 71.
- Siegel, Marcia B. (1985a). *The Shapes of Change*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. [First published in 1979.]
- Siegel, Marcia B. (1985b). Thirty Years in Eden's Dustbin, *Hudson Review*, Fall, pp. 449–54.
- Sorrell, Walter (1966). *The Dance Has Many Faces*, New York: Columbia University Press. [First published in 1951.]
- Steele, Mike (1985). Taylor dances merely venerable at 30, *Minneapolis Star and Tribune*, 1 March, p. 11C.
- Steele, Mike (1986). Leading dancer turns spectator, *Minneapolis Star and Tribune*, 18 January, p. 2C.
- Taylor, Paul (1987). *Private Domain*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Teachout, Terry (1993). Notes Toward the Definition of Paul Taylor, *The New Dance Review*, Vol. V, No. 2, Winter, pp. 3–6.
- Terry, Walter (1962). Dance – Paul Taylor, *New York Herald Tribune*, 9 November.
- Tobias, Tobi (1978). *Interview with Dan Wagoner*, New York: Dance Collection of

THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY

- the New York Public Library. [Audio tape, MGZTC 3-971, Reel 4.]
- Tobias, Tobi (1982). Finders Keepers, *New York*, 3 May, pp. 73–4.
- Tobias, Tobi (1985). A Conversation with Paul Taylor and George Tacit, *Dance Magazine*, Vol. LIX, No. 4, April, pp. 54–60.
- Tobias, Tobi (1986). A Few Green Leaves, *New York*, 21 April, pp. 87–8.
- Tobias, Tobi (2000). To Pay Paul, *New York*, 20 March, p. 62.
- Ulrich, Allan (1988). Taylor-made, *San Francisco Examiner*, 23 October, pp. E–1, E–6.
- Welsh, Anne Marie (1980). The life of Paul Taylor: Creativity amid adversity, *The Washington Star*, 13 January, pp. B–1, B–5.