This paper briefly surveys dance criticism from the seventeenth century to the present. In order to provide a framework for discussing the various styles of writing and approaches, broad divisions of dance criticism as “journalistic” and “scholarly” and of the dance knowledge of the critic as “intrinsic” (experiential) and “extrinsic” (academic) are proposed and explored. Good critics exist in all such divisions. One conclusion reached is that dance critics have applied an increasingly sophisticated knowledge of dance in their writings and that the proportion of scholarly/reflective criticism has increased very markedly in the past decade. Whilst a critic may write poetic and beautiful literature about dance, without a thorough understanding of the discipline of dance and of the choreographic craft, such writing does not reflect the mainstream development of dance criticism. The future of dance criticism lies with critics who possess a sophisticated understanding of dance — along with a good appreciation of related art forms. It is crucial that the dance community address itself closely to the task of educating aspiring dance critics, since their writing is so important to the whole development of dance as a comprehensible and accessible art form. This branch of dance criticism will become part of the dancology of the future.

Introduction

Criticim aims to create a fuller aesthetic experience of a work of art. Good criticism illuminates one’s sensibilities and promotes the understanding of the specific art form experienced. In discussing criticism, Eliot has stated that the most important trait in a critic is a “highly developed sense of fact.” (1) This sense of fact is manifested differently depending upon the object of criticism. For a dance critic it particularly embodies precise, objective observation and refined memory. The ephemerality of dance adds to the complexity of dance criticism — along with the difficulty of invoking three dimensional moving images — and 80 it has relied more on a total, immediate apprehension than criticism of other art forms. Literary criticism is conducted in the same medium as the art object, and music, dramatic and fine art criticism also have technical advantages over dance criticism. This may change with developments in notation and video, but the printed page will surely remain the principal means of communicating criticism for some time. Yet, dance criticism has progressed well beyond the function of simply rendering the moment. Critics create and chronicle dance history and at times focus on a sense of accountability of artistic policies and direction. (2) They address both the immediacy and impact of single works yet often probe the relationships of entire groups of works and questions about dance forms as a whole. Other critics may be innovators of taste, directing the attention of audiences to new and unfamiliar artistic developments and thereby encouraging their recognition. Ruskin, for example, achieved this recognition for Turner as did Leigh Hunt for Shelley and Keats and as John Martin did for the American modern dance.

Dance critics exhibit a wide spectrum of knowledge, experience, standards and styles. To provide a working hypothesis it is proposed that two “types” of knowledge are available to the critic: extrinsic and intrinsic. Extrinsic knowledge, in the present context, may be defined as being composed of an historical knowledge of dance literature, choreography and technique, as well as a knowledge of aesthetic theories for the development of consistent artistic criteria. In addition to this “academic” exploration of the subject, extrinsic knowledge may also be seen to consist of continual viewing experience and a developed visual sensitivity. Intrinsic knowledge, on the other hand, may be viewed as being largely “experiential.” This does not necessarily require a fully rigorous pursuit or mastery of dance technique, but it does imply the sophisticated experience of technique and of the choreographic process. Intrinsic knowledge derives from a direct, practical understanding of the constraints of the dance medium and the way in which choreographers and dancers challenge and manipulate those constraints. Continual viewing experience is also a requirement for developed intrinsic knowledge, and kinesthetic sensitivity might be its particular characteristic. George Beiswanger, dance critic for Theatre Arts Monthly from 1939-1944 and for the Atlanta Journal from 1967-1972, wrote about the “doing and viewing” mind of the choreographer in the act of creating a work. (3) Critics who write from an intrinsic knowledge of
dance may be said to exercise a similar "doing and viewing" capacity. Clearly, a good critic should have as much artistic knowledge and acumen as possible. Equally, critics of a variety of types are needed, for good criticism is within the purview of any possible category of critic.

The practice of dance criticism ranges from the purely journalistic — reviewing a dance that has taken months to create in two or three paragraphs in a hurried hour after the performance, to reflective writing for journals and books. The range of knowledge and experience of dance critics is equally broad. A comparative example of this range might be made of the two dance critics, Linda Winer and Edwin Denby. Linda Winer, writing in 1970 about her experience at the Connecticut College American Dance Festival Critics Conference, admitted that she had "never really observed movement," although she wrote dance criticism for the Chicago Tribune(4) Edwin Denby, not only danced himself, but has been throughout his life an avid observer of movement behaviour in many cultures, a serious student of all the arts, and a poet. As a critic, he has published two of the most significant books in contemporary dance criticism. The point here is not to contest the capabilities of the critics but to recognize the dramatic range of dance knowledge and experience in practising dance critics.

The extrinsic-intrinsic categories of knowledge do not align themselves consistently with any particular styles of criticism. From purely journalistic renderings of performed moments, to analytical journalism, to scholarly considerations of dance, critics possessing either or both types of knowledge can be located. The important question about criticism is its quality, for there will always exist critics who are technically limited yet poetic and appealing. The comparisons and parallels to be drawn between one critic and another are far more numerous than can be covered here. This paper attempts merely to shed some light on the range and texture of dance criticism. Often only one idea will be discussed in relation to a particular critic rather than acknowledging the full range of his or her critical powers. The critics selected quite naturally fall into categories, but again, no attempt has been made to discuss how many categories these critics can shape by their concerns, styles and knowledge. Rather, they settle into loose groupings of practice, shaped broadly by the notion of extrinsic and intrinsic knowledge. Referring to the critics in these various ways demonstrates that dance criticism also includes schools of thought, critics analysing critics and in particular, the creation of a language for understanding dance.

Dance Criticism from the Seventeenth Century Onward

The recent discovery that Leigh Hunt (1784-1859), (5) a close friend and school-fellow of the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge, was one of the first ballet critics of significance, lends an unexpected twist to the history of dance criticism. The body of Hunt's ballet criticism in the Examiner from 1817-1819 and in the Tatler from 1830-1 832, extends the history of significant dance writing. Other dance writers have also been unearthed through research, such as Jean Loret (1610-1 665), Sara Goudard (1744-1800) and Henry Robertson (1782-1 857). By and large such early dance writers possessed no formal knowledge of the technical or choreographic craft. For example, Jean Loret's writings in the Muze Historique during the French Court ballet under the reign of Louis XIV were first those of a poet, journalist and music lover. Loret's extensive coverage of dance was important for its social value at the time (the King's ballets were the height of fashion), and his sense of literary excellence, wit and poetic style provide vivid accounts for historians. These writers provided the early beginnings of dance criticism.

Traditionally, Théophile Gautier (1811-1872) has been recognized as the first significant critic, partly because his writings were made accessible by Cyril Beaumont when he collected, translated and published them as The Romantic Ballet as Seen by Théophile Gautier in 1932. Gautier's writings in La Presse in Paris in the 1830s and 1840s were poetic, vividly descriptive, and inventive. In fact, it is he who coined the phrase l'art pour l'art (art for art's sake). Gautier, unrelenting in his quest for l'art pur, was deeply susceptible to the feminine charms of the dancers whom he idealized in his writings. Gautier was at his best when writing about female dancers. His accounts of performances show how, in the words of Ivor Guest, "a poet's vision can suggest the almost indefinable essence of a dancer's art."(6)

In Gautier's description of Fanny Elssler the writing is dedicated to the dancer and the vivid image she creates:

How she twists, how she bends! What fire! What voluptuousness! What precision! Her swooning arms toss about her drooping head, her body curves backwards, her white shoulders almost graze the ground. What a charming gesture! (7)

His account in La Presse in 1840, contrasting the styles of Marie Taglioni and Fanny Elssler has become a classic. Gautier, the poet, focused his attention on the dancer, and the poetic language of his highly descriptive accounts was created to capture the dancer's personal appeal.

The philosopher-poets, Stéphane Mallarmé (1842-1898) and Paul Valéry (1871-1945), on the other
hand, created the language of poetry not to serve dancers, with whom they were not particularly concerned, but to express ideas about dance. Dance provided them with a useful, vivid, and concrete metaphor which they frequently used to illustrate the philosophical and metaphysical viewpoints of their own ideas. The examinations of these writers were significant in directing a different type of attention to dance — by extending an intellectual vision for it.

Mallarmé made bold intellectual and linguistic contributions to dance literature. Close to the theatre, he observed La Cornalba, Loie Fuller and Diaghilev’s ballets. His writing in Ballets, Divagations and other works reveal exquisite, poetic dynamism. To Mallarmé ballet was the visualization of a metaphysical world, and poetry was its ideal language. Mallarmé described dance as “the whirl of fleeting impetus.” (8) Movement, change and flight were predominant themes in his work and directly shaped his concept of dance as “a perpetual illusion which suggests but never states.” (9) Mallarmé looked at the dancer as a traditional being, transcending human nature and moving into the ideal, the “element she incarnates.” (10) His critical conception of the dancer in physical terms was a necessary but inferior agent to some higher form. As ballet was, to Mallarmé, “a set of juxtaposed metaphors...” so, too, the language of Mallarmé was verbal rather than grammatical in its connection. (11) Mallarmé’s predominant consideration of the essence of dance and the language for realizing this essence was, for dance criticism, his most specific contribution, one that can be appreciated as “contemporary” even today.

The language that Paul Valéry shaped for the expression of both philosophical thoughts on dance and the description of dance was, like Mallarmé’s, richly poetic and vital. But, seeking explanation more than expression Valéry proposed a definition of dance and wrote in The Philosophy of Dance:

“What then is the dance?” ... A practical man is a man who has an instinct for such economy of time and effort, and has little difficulty in putting it into effect, because his aim is definite and clearly localized: an external object. ... As we have said, the dance is the exact opposite. It moves in a self-contained realm of its own and implies no reason, no tendency towards completion. A formula for pure dance should include nothing to suggest that it has an end. (12)

For Valéry, dancing was not only an intrinsically beautiful activity but one characterized by a particular notion of instability and stability. For Valéry it was the instability of dance that was so immensely thrilling and unnatural.

“We see in ballets,” says Valéry, “moments when the ensemble becomes motionless... a system of living bodies stopped dead in their attitudes, which gives a curious picture of instability... From this arises this amazing impression that in the Universe of Dancing rest has no place; immobility: something forced and unnatural, a passing and almost violent state while leaps, counted steps, pointés, entrechats, and giddy rotation are natural manners of being and doing.” (13)

The analysis of illusion might be regarded as Valéry’s unique and enduring contribution to dance criticism as well as his sheer output of dance writing in works such as L’ame et La Danse and Degas, Danse, Dessin.

As the attention paid to dance by Mallarmé and Valéry transcended the dancer, André Levinson (1887-1933) recorded the styles of many performers in Paris at the beginning of the twentieth century. But Levinson’s criticism departed significantly from the impressionism of Gautier. Richard Austin has said that to read, for example, Levinson’s description of the dancing of Pavlova, Spessivtzeva and Trefilova “is as close as we can ever be to the mysteries of their art.” (14) For Levinson, whose immense knowledge of dance was revealed in works such as Ballet Romantique and La Danse d’Aujourdhui, the penetrating analysis of performers was only one of many considerations. In 1925 he raised an issue that is still far from being resolved:

I cannot think of anyone who has devoted himself to those characteristics which belong exclusively to dancing, or who has endeavoured to formulate specifically the laws of this art on its own ground. ... But no one has ever tried to portray the intrinsic beauty of a dance step, its innate quality, its aesthetic reason for being... (15)

His extensive analysis of ballet technique and its aesthetic effect did aid the formulation of laws of the art and, in addition, contributed much insight and historical perspective to the development of style.

The attention Arlene Croce (1934- ) pays to dancers permits the values of choreography to come through and, in some cases, illuminate the abilities of a dancer to extend the capacity of choreography. For Croce, detailed analysis and criticism aimed directly at the dancer is a responsibility of the critic, and she sets the standard for such reviewing with the most substantial
and delicate body of “dancer analysis” in contemporary criticism. Croce has proposed that there is always a particular ‘quality’ in every dancer. Consistently probing the capacities of dancers as individual artists, she appeals to critics to illuminate the art through dancers with meticulous attention:

The critics are lazy and are also timid... compliments are apt to be vacant, the adjectives interchangeable; so-and-so’s “icy beauty” or “thoroughbred line”... just which icy thoroughbred is being evoked here? Blot out the name and you can take your pick.” (16)

As is the case with Levinson, Arlene Croce’s deep knowledge of her subject invites her to address many issues in dance, but most predominantly and widely she attends to the choreography:

Choreography is not all that dance is, of course, but if it is not to be the primary organizing impulse behind what we see then we have surrendered a medium to its constituent attractions. (17)

Levinson’s challenge to critics to devote themselves to the exclusive characteristics of dancing has been explored by Arlene Croce in her extensive criticism in The New Yorker and her book After-Images and by Marcia Siegel (1932-) in her collected criticism in At The Vanishing Point and Watching The Dance Go By. Siegel returns again and again to one of Levinson’s concerns, the chronicling of style.

Dancing today, writes Siegel, is remarkable for its technical excellence and for its ready adaptability to classical, modern, or abstract themes. But I find a certain erosion going on everywhere, a smoothing out of differences, a subtle neglect of detail... When a dance style begins to change, once the weightiness or the accent or the particular roundedness of gesture begins to lose its definition, history starts to slip from us... (18)

For many critics, dance was an art that they learned about and developed a passion for as they wrote about it, mainly as part of their journalistic duties. One of the finest of such journalist-critics was Carl Van Vechten (1880-1964). As associate music critic for the New York Times from 1906-1913, Van Vechten also reviewed dance and was fortunate to have written about it during the most formative years of dance in North America. Pavlova and Mordkin were introducing Russian ballet to New York; Isadora Duncan was at the peak of her inventiveness; Maud Allan’s Salomé was performed in New York after its successful European run. (19) Van Vechten, like Martin after him, played a major part in the creation of public taste, an important function of criticism. Van Vechten, knowledgeable about and attentive to many arts throughout his life, wrote essays on music, drama, and literature as well as dance. A successful novelist himself, Van Vechten possessed considerable literary gifts, and his criticism was considered by some to be art itself.

Surely the sophisticated enthusiasm and knowledge that critics like Van Vechten acquired for dance was propelled by their involvement and creativity in other related disciplines. B.H. Haggin, for example, whose work in music and music criticism is extensive, writes about dance from his own clearly defined perspective, and has contributed observations on dance of great perception. In a review in The Hudson Review in 1958, Haggin wrote:

Since I don’t have the dancer’s eye Denby has, my reports don’t include things he would have described... (20)

Seeing through the dancer’s eye is, perhaps, something that more and more writers are able to do. The exposure to intrinsic knowledge is increasing, whether it be in the capacity of professional dancer and choreographer, the mere physical experience of technique, observations of choreography in progress, or the more analytical knowledge of movement through Effort-Shape and notation.

Jean-Georges Noverre (1727-1810), author of Lettres sur la Danse et les Ballets, was both a dancer and an insightful critic of other dancers. Furthermore, Noverre’s writings on production and expression formalized a theory of ballet d’action, while he himself was a choreographer of stature and extraordinarily knowledgeable in the area of dance. This was a combination of perspectives that was not repeated for long stretches of dance history – perhaps not until Edwin Denby whose poetic language and analytical mind enabled him to grasp the unique paradox of writing about dance. Says Denby:

The sharper he (the dance critic) formulates a theory of the technique of expression, of how dance communicates what it does, the further he gets from the human vivacity of dancing, without which it communicates nothing at all. (21)

Having formulated this hypothesis, the critical writings of Denby remain perched between the two poles, charging his writing with the tension of this delicate, electrifying balance. His direct poetic responses are contained within an astute, analytical frame. The brilliance of his perception and
communication can unveil sensibilities within the reader that had never before been discovered. Clive Barnes, the celebrated New York critic, reflects the view of many when he writes that Denby's style shames him, his insights shame him and his understanding shames him. In Denby, the poetry of Gautier has been retrieved and fortified by far-reaching precision of observation and an enormously knowledgeable dance mind.

Denby the poet, becomes Denby the philosopher and analyst, as he follows up imagery with understanding:

Again, in Pillar of Fire a chaste and frenzied young woman sees a vigorous young man. He looks at her suggestively. She leaps at him through the air in grand jeté. He catches her in mid-leap in a split and she hangs against his chest as if her leap continued for ever, her legs completely rigid, her body completely still... the stopped leap has a startling effect — like a fast tennis ball that goes dead. And the shock of the stop is heightened by the contrast to an onward full surge of the music... all the resources of what the cinema calls visual rhythm have been used to direct the eye to the special instance of bodily contact...

(22)

Denby has the capacity to take in whole regions of relationships between dance and other arts and between layers of the dance fabric itself. His thrilling perceptions reflect in full the very reason one goes to the ballet; "they are closest to the emotion one feels when looking at dance."(23)

As is the case with critics whose writing is particularly inventive, precise and insightful, Denby demonstrates that dance criticism can itself be a work of art.

Deborah Jowitt (1934- ), a dance maker and dance writer, has achieved success as a critic, not by the novelty of her situation, but by the freshness and inventiveness of her style. That she has continued to choreograph while maintaining and developing her position as a major American critic writing for The Village Voice has received mixed responses from her colleagues. Clive Barnes (1927- ) for example, has responded with a negative view, saying

I am doubtful whether the critics should come from the normal ranks of the professional dancers; personally I do not think so. I would rather have a perfectly fulfilled critic than a disappointed dancer... (24)

To Jowitt, the "dancer-critic" is someone who can understand the "looking at dance" with a keener sensitivity to the enhanced regard for the endeavour of others:

Dancers themselves do not in fact find this particularly odd, [ she says] perhaps, too, having seen me sweat and heard me curse, they know that — however my taste may differ from theirs — I can never forget how much thought, care and work goes into the making of a dance. That is, I'm interested in thinking about the bad dances — although I'd rather think about the great ones — rather than simply stomping on them and sweeping them under the rug. (25)

Jowitt's style, casual in structure, achieves a colloquial elegance in description. She writes about dance in the order that impressions imprint themselves upon her in the performance — without strict regard for sequence. Her writing reflects the rhythm of her seeing and the pace of the action. Jowitt has been a leader in what Nancy Moore calls the "New Criticism," (26) resolving the challenges that new dance makes about the boundaries of dance. The extraordinary kinesthetic sensitivity that leaps out in the writings of Jowitt and Denby derives not only from their observational skill and experience, but from their physical experience as well.

Nancy Goldner (1943- ) dance critic for the Christian Science Monitor, Dance Newsand The Nation, and author of The Stravinsky Festival of the New York City Ballet is another writer whose visual and kinesthetic perceptions are immense. In contrast to the "ready to look at anything" critical posture of Jowitt, Goldner is at her best when writing about dance within her clearly demarcated aesthetic preference. Balanchine is one of them. She seems able to take in so many aspects of the activity she views — of the whole of the dancing— and at the same time quietly "tame" her observations under an efficient, orderly style of writing.

Writing about Violin Concerto performed by the New York City Ballet at the Stravinsky Festival in 1972, she said:

Violin Concerto is without formal steps, while the superstructure is quite formal... The first duet is unhappy and tortuous. Never has so much bodily contact been achieved so unnaturally, against the laws of simplicity, against the will of the dancers, and even against standards of good taste (von Aroldingen does a handstand to disengage from one embrace). As their limbs interlock, their faces are turned in opposite directions. They struggle to unlock at the very moments when they are going through contortions to
The intricate detail and depth of some of Goldner's critical studies is impressive. She has, in fact, contributed analyses of the structure of steps in the works of choreographers such as Petipa, Fokine, and Balanchine, locating not only the sources of their effectiveness but defining the aesthetic of their overall output. In the hands of such a capable writer, the fund of extrinsic and intrinsic dance knowledge can only be used to great advantage.

Jill Johnston, whose dance writings appeared in *Art News, The Village Voice* and in her collection of reviews, *Marmalade Me* represents what Gregory Battcock called a "radical departure from existing notions concerning the role and function of art criticism."(28) Her dance criticism, largely sympathetic to the contemporary dance scene of the 1960's, was continuously self-revelatory. She seemed as conscious and questioning of the art of her criticism as the work she viewed.

The future of dance criticism is being shaped by a growing number of critics, who, if not dancers themselves, possess a vast storehouse of dance knowledge. These critics extend the implications of their predecessor's questions and ideas and formulate new issues in the perception and appreciation of dance. It has been seen that dance critics have approached their subject from many vantage points and have written on many themes within a relatively short history. Steadily a tradition of dance criticism is establishing itself through a stream of critics and criticism which is increasingly attentive to the formulation of an extensive and enduring critical dance language.

**Future Directions in Dance Criticism**

The future of dance criticism naturally depends upon the future of dance, as discussed by Clive Barnes at The Twenty-Fifth anniversary conference of the National Ballet of Canada in November, 1976. In fact, this conference had a session on the future of dance criticism, and papers by William Littler and John Percival, as well as Clive Barnes, were published in the proceedings. The 1970's have been proclaimed a "dance boom". Genevieve Oswald reported at the New York Dance History Conference in February, 1979 that more tickets were sold to dance performances in the USA in 1978 than to NFL football. Clive Barnes observed at the 1976 National Ballet Conference that television has created a visually oriented generation — indirectly expanding an audience for dance. The vital state of the art and its audience demands an increasingly conscientious and knowledgeable dance critic. As William Littler stated, "It's time for the critic to become as much a professional as the artist he views and reviews."(29) In this context it is relevant to note that in 1976 the Pulitzer Prize Committee first awarded one of its prestigious literary awards to the field of dance criticism — to Alan Kriegsman, dance critic of the *Washington Post*.

Unlike dancers, critics have very few places to learn. Other than the schooling derived from continuous viewing, little formal or systematic education in dance criticism exists. Fortunately, this state of affairs is beginning to improve in several ways. Universities are, more and more, including dance criticism in their dance degree curricula. Ideal environments for the theoretical, historical and to some degree, practical study of dance criticism, universities have the potential to play a major role in the development of the discipline of dance criticism. Dance criticism is arguably the very core of any scholarly study of dance. In fact a branch of it will likely evolve as the dancology of the future. Dance criticism/dancology is thus an essential and important component of any degree programme in dance.

*Formal organizations* for criticism have quite suddenly taken root and are an important indication that critics are seeking environments where they can "subject their opinions to debate and counter-criticism," (30) as well as work towards a definition discipline, creating standards and exchanging ideas. The *Connecticut College American Dance Festival Critics Conference* now taking place at Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, the *Texas Institute for Dance Criticism* in Austin, and the *Dance Critics Association* are some of the formal organizations that have begun to make an impact on the development of dance criticism. In addition, more and more dance conferences are including dance criticism panels or forums whereby the dance community can learn more about the role and practice of dance criticism and their relationship to it.

In scholarly terms, perhaps the most valuable development that can take place is the publication of collections of critical writing and the access to archival material granted by libraries, newspaper offices and the like to researchers and students. Bridging extrinsic and intrinsic knowledge, the need for the study of *Effort-Shape* is becoming increasingly apparent as the technical and stylistic prowess of dancers and dance companies extends. In fact, the ability to read a notated dance score is becoming a requirement for any literate dance critic. (31)

Beyond the organized, academic needs of dance criticism is a need for major change in the policies of newspaper editors and theatre management — the public media. Peter Brinson argues...
the case plainly and effectively:

the abolition of the first night review... How is it possible for a critic to judge fairly at a single viewing something he has never seen before? How can he ignore the fact that every theatrical production acquires its finished form only after a number of performances? To overcome this problem there ought to be a news announcement of the first night and a considered criticism later. (32)

This change will not, however, be the responsibility of newspapers and theatres alone. It will require that performers perceive a fuller capacity for criticism and its relationship to their activity as an organic rather than antagonistic one. It will require of audiences a less commercial approach to criticism — as opposed to the bold face title and one-liners for quick, mass consumption and opinion setting.

The development of dance as a comprehensible art form will be shaped by those critics who possess a sophisticated and technical understanding of dance; who can anticipate significant changes in dance induced by choreographers of genius;(33) who can recognize the relationship these changes have and the influence they bear upon other arts; and who can create a language with which to record, analyse and share these insights. It is a profound curiosity which drives us to attempt an understanding of dance. Curiosity and creativity are the two paramount human characteristics. If one can say, echoing Gautier, La danse pour la danse then equally the search for an understanding of dance (which is the purpose of dance criticism) is undertaken for the sake of understanding — and in order that great choreography may endure. (34)

Notes

1 T.S. Eliot, Aesthetics and History(Purdue University: Open Court, 1962).
9 Pridden, p. 66.
10 Pridden, p. 65.
11 Pridden, p. 64.
13 Valéry, pp. 197-211.
17 Croce, p. 319.
24 Barnes, p. 76.
32 Brinson, p. 647.
34 On May 5, 1979 the first Philosophy of Dance conference was held under the chairmanship of Maxine Sheets-Johnstone at Temple University, Philadelphia, U.S.A. One of the major ideas to emerge from this conference (which was attended by many of the leading philosophers and critics) was the close interrelationship between aesthetics and criticism and the applicability to dance. The proceedings of this conference are to be published in due course.

Bibliography


Eliot, T.S. Aesthetics and History Purdue University, Open Court, 1962.

Friedman, James. Dancer and spectator: an Aesthetic Distance San Francisco: Ballet monographs, 1975


Guest, Ivor, "Ballet Criticism and the Historian’s View, Ballet Annual, 16 (1962).


