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The phrase constituting my title comes from an anonymous writer in *The Musical Times*. A concert of British music held in Monte Carlo on 25 February 1894 received a short review in the ‘Foreign Notes’ section of the magazine, and the reviewer listed the composers as “Balfe, Mackenzie, Oakeley, Sullivan (“Overture di Ballo”), Parish Alvars, Godfrey (!), and one Delius, whoever he may be”.[[1]](#endnote-1) Balfe, Oakeley, Alvars, and Godfrey all have pretty much disappeared from musical life, while Mackenzie is mentioned now and again. Sullivan certainly remains popular within a circumscribed cultural world, with plenty of performances. Delius for his part is certainly a respected mainstream composer, but he has witnessed his star wax and wane at various times, and his music has been subjected to a somewhat chequered reception history. The work played in Monte Carlo in 1894, for example, *Paa Vidderne*, has yet to move to the centre ground of Delius reception. Even as we have reached in 2016 the centenary year of the Violin Concerto, the String Quartet, and the Cello Sonata, these pieces have not really been accepted as core repertoire in conservatoires and concert halls.

There is, in other words, an interesting knot of issues waiting to be untied and re-united in Delius reception. This constellation includes the following: the European geography of Delius’ life abroad and his eventual internment in a Surrey cemetery; the music’s complex aesthetic relationship with Euro-Modernism; the varying degrees of Englishness attributed to his music, both in academic writing and in more normal journalistic writing; Delius’ relation to the rise of the recording industry and music publicity more generally; and his idiosyncratically Nietzschean personal views on such things as religion, life and death, the role of art (music) in modern life, and the nature of the properly artistic life.

In this essay I will discuss a relatively minor topic in the reception history of Delius’ music. This is informed by my interest in the differing, and sometimes contrasted, perceptions of his music, and how these impact on the relationship between his life and art, man and music. I present some materials contemporaneous with Delius’s music, focussing on their juxtaposition less in terms of whether these perceptions and judgements were once true or remain true today, and more in terms of the kind of cultural work they may have been setting out to accomplish at the time and which may be felt as still active today. My case study is a minor and all but forgotten miniature from just after the end of the First World War.
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I begin with a comparison of two books published in 1923, both of which had a significant impact on their respective fields. These are Philip Heseltine’s *Delius* and George Dyson’s *The New Music*. Both books preceded Eric Fenby’s first proper article on Delius (1934) by more than a decade, and so had to write pretty much on their own. Obviously, Heseltine himself had known Delius well since he was a teenager, and Dyson was certainly *au courant* with developments, having been appointed temporary professor of composition, harmony and counterpoint at the Royal College of Music in 1923.[[2]](#endnote-2)

Heseltine’s *Delius*, the first English language book length study of the composer, remains a wonderfully perceptive assessment of the composer’s true worth. Eric Fenby described it as an “elegant exploratory book”.[[3]](#endnote-3) It is written from the perspective of a musician operating inside the composer’s charmed inner circle, is rich in evocative descriptions and comparisons, and contains a penetrating analysis of the music and its aesthetic – the spirit of Delius. Remarkably, Heseltine manages to maintain a degree of critical distance from the music and its composer, and is not afraid to criticise works or aspects of works where he feels that they fail to live up to their proper Delian potential. Published five years before Fenby entered Delius’ life, the book would make for an interesting comparison with Fenby’s *Delius as I knew him*, which was published after the composer’s death in 1936 as an act of exorcism. Their approaches to religious and metaphysical issues are quite different to Delius’ own proclaimed atheism or paganism, Heseltine being a little more sympathetic to the composer’s views than Fenby. Heseltine had a lot to say about Delius’ music over his short lifetime, as is clear from the collected texts in the special Heseltine issue of *The Delius Society Journal*,[[4]](#endnote-4) and his book remains a substantial and meaningful piece of work – and a rewarding read.

In the final chapter of the book, titled ‘The Music Viewed as a Whole’, Heseltine writes of Delius’ gradual development of a personal style and approach to formal procedure, a process of “realisation, by experience and not in theory”. Through experience the composer came to develop ways of creating music that unfold not just formally (or better: formalistically) but organically, motif by motif, out of its initial presentation, “as the flower is latent in its seed”. “Thus”, says Heseltine, “through formality he [Delius] attains to form.” In this respect, Heseltine argues that in each work Delius must work through the musical materials towards a moment of self-transcendence in order to arrive at his true style; there is a loose resonance here with the concept of ‘estrangement’ familiar from Russian Formalism, by which the world is discovered anew at a renewed perceptual level. Aside from identifying and discussing a panoply of cross-references between various scores where materials are reused, Heseltine spends much time seeking out the secret of the “inner vitality” of Delius’ music. He finally locates it in a polyphony of a higher order, in a “division of the harmonic web into these component strands of melody which are never parallel but subtly interwoven with one another, one rising where another falls”. He summarises Delius’ musical language as governed by a Wordsworthian aesthetic of “*emotion recollected in tranquillity*.” This is in contrast to contemporary music, which is “impatient, unreflective, restless and impetuous”.[[5]](#endnote-5)

Dyson for his part wrote a number of books and a personal memoir over the course of a long and successful career. *The New Music* was his second book, written while he was convalescing after the First World War; his first book had been a short educational pamphlet published while he was a serving officer, with the title *Grenade Warfare* (1915). *The New Music* was well received and influential for some time, judging by critical responses to it.[[6]](#endnote-6) For its time, it is an admirably non-partisan study, preferring to focus on problems of artistic judgement as these are thrown up by contemporary music, and to highlight what Dyson believes to be the “futility of innovation which does not grow out of a living tradition”.[[7]](#endnote-7) As with Heseltine, Dyson turns to organicist metaphors in order to account for change both at the internal level of musical syntax and the external level of historical process. This is in contrast to, say, Constant Lambert’s *Music Ho! A Study of Music in Decline*, published barely a decade later (1934), which is highly partisan and much more idiosyncratic, and in which Delius is mentioned several times, but only ever in passing as an example of a stylistic trend or a compositional approach.

We might reasonably not expect to find Delius occupying centre stage in a book about ‘new’ music (even before Adorno appropriated the term ‘new’). Indeed, there is only a single score example from Delius’ music excerpted in the book, the Dance for Harpsichord (1919),[[8]](#endnote-8) and why this particular work might have been chosen is unclear, other than for the simple fact that its two staves made it a relatively easy target for discussion of harmony. The majority of Dyson’s score examples naturally come from Stravinsky, Debussy, Bartok, Strauss, Scriabin, Elgar, Vaughan Williams, Bax, and others. In this broad artistic context, then, it is a little surprising that Dyson, who as a composer was himself more influenced by Tchaikovsky, Rachmaninov, Strauss, and Sibelius,[[9]](#endnote-9) should be somewhat distracted by the case of Delius at the end of his final chapter. This final essay is titled ‘The Problem of Architecture’. Dyson devotes the final four pages of the chapter to a detailed general assessment of Delius’ broader significance. Given that out of 117 music examples there is only the one from Delius, and even then not perhaps the most obvious choice, it might be suspected that there was a personal motive for Dyson’s concluding digression (though the two composers seem not to have known each other). In his discussion Dyson notes that Delius’ position in musical culture “is a curious one” and that opinion remains divided about his significance. “He is not aggressively an innovator, yet he distinctly belongs to the modern school.” Acknowledging that Delius “has no facile tricks, no seductive emotionalism, no nervous intoxication to offer”, Dyson’s most insightful perception about Delius’ music is about its rhapsodic quality. On this matter he writes that Delius’ “texture as such has aesthetic values of its own which may be derived neither from those of the single line nor yet from the reflected light of powerful harmonic themes.”[[10]](#endnote-10)
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Both Heseltine’s and Dyson’s books sit within a wide-ranging discourse of contemporary ideas about how to listen to music. This discourse is characterised by a distinctive moral tone: the focus is acutely on how listeners *should* listen to music, especially in *apologia* for specific composers and treatises about the ‘new’, and education and morality are consistently, deliberately, and explicitly intertwined. Within the historical context relevant to Delius, “whoever he may be”, and the studies by Heseltine and Dyson, we can turn to an article by Arthur Clutton-Brock commissioned specifically by the editor for the inaugural issue of a new magazine called *Music and Letters*, dated January 1920.[[11]](#endnote-11)

Before considering Clutton-Brock’s article, however, let us conduct a fanciful little thought experiment. Suppose that you had been handed a copy of this inaugural issue, or found it lying on a coffee table in a large London house, or on the racks in your Club. What might you have made of the short piece of sheet music included at the end? This was the same short piece that Dyson quoted in his book, namely Delius’s Dance for harpsichord, which he had composed the previous year while he and Jelka were guests of the flamboyant performer and society hostess Violet Gordon-Woodhouse. The Dance was hardly representative of Delius’ normal musical style, however that might have been understood in 1920, almost a decade before a real understanding of Delius’ significance was afforded by Beecham’s encyclopaedic composer festival of 1929. The Dance’s very instrumentation would have made for a strange listing in the composer’s catalogue. That said, given the initially wide range of articles in the new magazine dealing with all periods of music (as broadly accepted at the time), the Dance might equally have been perceived simply as nothing more than eccentric, as a representative of a recent compositional trend or as resonating with the cultural world of Arnold Dolmetsch, alongside whom Gordon-Woodhouse sometimes played. The score’s bedfellows in the new magazine made for a lovely diverse bunch, reflecting the catholic taste of the new magazine’s editor and presumably its target market: educated, keen, and with some practical facility. Thus, to mention a few of the items, there was an essay on Elgar by George Bernard Shaw (stylistically of a piece with Delius, one might think; the controversy thrown up by Shaw’s claims led to Elgar himself writing a corrective note to the magazine); an essay on church music (perhaps not the most obvious place to locate Delius’s aesthetic); a short and rather charming two-verse poem by Laurence Binyon (somewhat closer to a Delian aesthetic); part one of an extended essay on the future of English song by the well-known Irish baritone Harry Plunket Greene (Delius was not mentioned); and an essay by Gordon-Woodhouse (the dedicatee of Delius’ Dance) on ‘Old Keyed Instruments and their Music’.[[12]](#endnote-12) This last essay would at least have afforded the music some kind of stylistically appropriate foil. No doubt the placing of the score at the end of the inaugural issue lodged in Dyson’s mind when he was compiling score examples for his own book a couple of years later.

*Music and Letters* was set up, financed and edited by Arthur Henry Fox Strangways (1859-1948), a critic from *The Times*. It seems that Delius was quite dismissive of Strangways’ musical judgement.[[13]](#endnote-13) Nevertheless, his decision to publish his piece in this new outlet, and thus his implicit subscription to its educational mission, would not have led anybody, least of the composer himself, to predict a flurry of interest in either the man or his music, especially not the Dance, however widely anticipated the new magazine might have been. Delius received a complimentary copy of *Music and Letters* some time before 24 March 1920, by which time he had arrived back home in Grez-sur-Loing. In fact, had Delius chosen to wait a few months and persuade the keen Heseltine to publish the Dance in another new magazine first published in May 1920, *The Sackbut*, the surrounding discourse encouraged by that other new magazine’s guiding lights may well have been more naturally sympathetic to Delius.[[14]](#endnote-14) In any case, in the following June Delius’ publisher, Universal Edition, agreed to accept the score for publication.[[15]](#endnote-15)

Within the inaugural issue of *Music and Letters*, Delius’ Dance is, in terms of its instrumental genre, somewhat grotesque. Had the piano been specified at the head of the score, it would probably have come across as nothing much out of the ordinary, as just another charming piece of Delius, albeit for an instrument for which he seemed to have little genuine affinity, and for which he wrote only a handful of relatively minor pieces. As an essay in keyboard writing, the Dance may have been a catalyst for his Five Pieces and Three Preludes four years later, given the slowly growing interest in his music by performers like their dedicatee, Evlyn Howard-Jones, who would be Beecham’s favoured pianist in the 1929 festival. As a harpsichord piece, though, the textures of the Dance are not really idiomatic, especially given that Delius seemed to be unaware of interest in the instrument from composers on the continent like De Falla and Poulenc, who would later wrote pieces for Wanda Landowska in 1923-26 and 1927-28 respectively.

And yet, there is a curious resonance between the Dance and a contemporary piece of European piano music. Delius composed the piece hot on the heels of the premiere of Ravel’s *Le Tombeau de Couperin* (1914-1917), which had just been given by Marguerite Long in Paris on 11 April 1919. Delius and his wife Jelka had been staying with Gordon-Woodhouse in Belsize Gardens, NW3 since late 1918, and did not depart for Cornwall until the end of May / early June 1919.[[16]](#endnote-16) He is unlikely, then, to have known about *Le Tombeau de Couperin* first hand, though he would make a note of Ravel’s talent in a letter to Heseltine on 17 July.[[17]](#endnote-17) Delius wrote to Henry Clews in December 1918 that “He had listened to her [Gordon-Woodhouse] playing Bach, Scarlatti and the English composers of the 15th and 16th centuries”,[[18]](#endnote-18) and this adds some additional home-grown ideas about the musical style conjured up in the Dance, which we can juxtapose alongside the Ravel.

The composer C. W. Orr wrote about meeting Delius during this period and hearing the composer play through his work-in-progress. No doubt Gordon-Woodhouse played the Dance to Delius and select others in a private premiere at her home. Its official public premiere, however, went to Evlyn Howard-Jones, who performed it on the piano,[[19]](#endnote-19) and he went on to play it in concert, for example in Paris on 25 January 1922,[[20]](#endnote-20) and to record it in 1929.[[21]](#endnote-21) All the more curious, then, that Delius’ Dance is as deliberately archaic and self-historicising as Ravel’s *Le Tombeau de Couperin*. The Dance can even be characterised as Delius’ only essay in Neoclassicism, complete with mock-Baroque ornaments, albeit something of a slightly abortive pastiche. Delius’ own pithy description, writing in *The Sackbut* a year later, of the period as an “age of anarchy in art: there is no authority, no standard, no sense of proportion”[[22]](#endnote-22) (Heseltine termed it “an age of disintegration”),[[23]](#endnote-23) can be used to position the Dance as an inter-war gesture of parody-cum-homage. This aligns the Dance with the work of many other composers of the time and the kinds of specially composed scores published in special issues of magazines such as *La Revue Musicale*. Certainly it was unusual for Delius to hark back deliberately and unashamedly to a Baroque dance form rather than to aim for an intuitively satisfying *sui generis* formal shape, but the music seems not to be bothered by the aesthetic constraints imposed by the formal shaping of the phrases.
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This said, even with the kind of suggestive context afforded by the Ravel, all of the above historical discourse around Delius’ Dance leaves us in something of a quandary with respect to Delius, “whoever he may be”. Robert Montgomery and Robert Threlfall write of the years following the Dance that, “With the waning of Delius’s physical powers in the 1920s a number of inevitably smaller projects were carried out, with the increasing assistance of Jelka.”[[24]](#endnote-24) Although I do not wish to elevate the Dance above its place within the Delian oeuvre, I am not convinced that it deserves this kind of assessment. It is not a major work, measuring by any criterion relevant to Delius (or Ravel, for that matter), or any criterion relevant to twentieth-century harpsichord composition, but on its own terms I think that it is aesthetically successful, “whatever it may be”, so to speak. So, in a further act of juxtaposition, and continuing to seek out aspects of Delius’ identity through his Dance, I now turn to Clutton-Brock’s essay in *Music and Letters*, introduced in passing above. Read in the round, this otherwise unassuming article draws together several contemporary threads, including the artistic context surrounding the books by Heseltine and Dyson. It also points outwards towards the wider world of English *Belles-Lettres* and the discourse of modernism and cosmopolitanism.[[25]](#endnote-25)

Clutton-Brock (1868-1924) was a widely respected essayist and journalist of his day. Educated at Eton and Oxford, he played a major contributory role to the early success of the *Times Literary Supplement*, when it was founded in 1902. In 1908 Clutton-Brock became the art critic for *The Times*, writing prolifically for it (as the editor of *Music and Letters* would do later). Over the following decade he published several books, including one on Shelley (1909), an extremely widely disseminated collection of essays under the title of *Thoughts on the War* (1914-15), *The Ultimate Belief* (1916), and several miscellaneous volumes of essays on art and literature that show him to have had broad interests and deep knowledge of the history of artistic currents. It is more than likely that Dyson would have known *Thoughts on the War*.

Clutton-Brock’s essay in *Music and Letters* had the disarmingly simple catch-all title, ‘On Listening to Music’. While much of the essay’s content has been long since superseded by more sophisticated empirically grounded theories in psychology and cognition, there remain some core points and underlying attitudes of mind that are worth pausing to emphasise. The essay sets out a common-sense approach to listening grounded in a Christian metaphysics, and written in a clear, easily readable prose (C. S. Lewis and many others readily acknowledged the influence of Clutton-Brock’s writing style on their approach to writerly communication).[[26]](#endnote-26) The essay can be interpreted as a manifesto for what the fledging magazine was setting out to accomplish in the lives of its readers: to enlighten them about important musical matters and to aid in the formation of their critical capacities, and to do so through, as the first Editorial put it, a “real *commercium mentis et rerum* – an exchange of pertinent thought”.[[27]](#endnote-27)

Clutton-Brock begins his essay with the seemingly innocent – though in fact quite provocative – remarks that “no one could have less technical knowledge of music than I have and yet enjoy it”, and that “what I enjoy is the music itself and not ideas about it”.[[28]](#endnote-28) Later on he advocates listening and “enjoy[ing] music without such principles”.[[29]](#endnote-29) His approach synthesises the classical Kantian terms for aesthetic judgement with the aesthetics of Benedetto Croce.[[30]](#endnote-30) A recurrent motif of Clutton-Brock’s work is his focus on the proper “enjoyment” of art (in this case music): what it should mean to enjoy music; how music should be enjoyed; and what music should mean when it is enjoyed properly. The term itself appears thirty-nine times in the essay’s six-and-a-half pages, and is used in ways that strongly suggest that its function is that of a surrogate for the titular term “listening”: to listen properly to music is to enjoy it. There is also a modernist resonance to the aesthetic ideology underpinning Clutton-Brock’s opening remarks about enjoying “music itself and not ideas about it”, perhaps bringing a certain kind of Stravinskyian formalism to mind; but I will bracket this issue here.

Clutton-Brock’s deliberately clear-sighted and non-condescending claims about “enjoyment” and listening “without principles” resonate with Heseltine’s polemical foreword to the first issue of *The Sackbut* (issued later in the same year), which positioned that new publication as “a new musical journal in whose pages composers, critics, and plain men-in-the-street can meet on equal terms.”[[31]](#endnote-31) Clutton-Brock’s claim in *Music and Letters* is that whether the music is good or bad is not the point, bad music simply maintaining “the pretence of expression, the imitation or incitement by sound of emotions unfelt”.[[32]](#endnote-32) It is better simply to enjoy listening to music, to “let the music flow by”,[[33]](#endnote-33) and not to worry about the kinds of epistemological claims that listening and thinking about listening might be making. He goes on to claim, in a manner similar to Heseltine’s assessment of Delius,[[34]](#endnote-34) that “You cannot enjoy any kind of art without some mysticism about all art”, that music embodies a “transmigration of souls”.[[35]](#endnote-35) By this he means something like empathy or sympathy, and that the value of art is directly correlated with the intensity of delight it provides. Echoing the title of Binyon’s poem, ‘The Shyness of Beauty’, Clutton-Brock’s conclusion runs as follows: “that is how we ought to listen to great music, emptying the mind of all expectations and all memory of verbal descriptions, trusting in the power of the artist to fill our minds with his own beauty, which will assuredly be unlike any other.” “[F]or by listening”, he argues, “we do attain to a kind of knowledge which is real though it lacks precision.”[[36]](#endnote-36)

Clutton-Brock’s broad position in ‘On Listening to Music’ can be interpreted as an educated and concerned listener’s loose and baggy definition of the term ‘rhapsody’. This is a characteristically Delian term, and it is used all over the primary and secondary literature, both positively and negatively, and sometimes defensively as a means of rehabilitating Delius’ compositional technique. An extreme example from later can be read in Arthur Hutchings’s 1948 book on Delius, which went so far as to assert rather bluntly that the Violin Concerto would certainly have been a more successful work if, *inter alia*, its title had been Rhapsody for Violin and Orchestra.[[37]](#endnote-37) Heseltine uses the term rhapsody liberally and frequently in his book, proposing that “One might almost say that the *chord* is to him [Delius] what the *note* was to the polyphonic composers, and that the melodic *line* is always seen in a higher dimensional aspect, so to speak, of changing chords.”[[38]](#endnote-38) – of rhapsody. Neville Cardus would echo this polyphonic idea twenty years later, in his conclusion that “There is no prose in it [Delius’ music]; it is all vibrations, vibrations of happiness, ecstasy, foreboding, pity, loneliness, resignation.”[[39]](#endnote-39) Dyson, too, uses the term. Like Heseltine, he concludes that Delius’ art “is often a rhapsodic art, but still more is it at times an art of pure contemplation. And an art of pure contemplation is not easy to practise in this twentieth century of ours.”[[40]](#endnote-40)
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In this essay I have juxtaposed some related things that were contemporaneous with Delius’ Dance for Harpsichord, and set in motion their various interactions. Much more could be said about, for example, the cultural significance of the fledging magazine *Music and Letters*; and there is some interesting work to be done on the manuscript materials for the Dance. This said, however, I hope to have at least suggested that the quirky Dance deserves another listen; that there is a wealth of detail that remains to be explored in the minutiae of the reception history of Delius’ music; and that a fuller picture of how Delius’ own contemporaries understood his music is going to require a certain amount of archaeological digging around in the broader music-related literature of the period (brilliantly modelled in Daniel Grimley’s work on the composer).

Doing this might help us to make sense of certain claims, such as the following two examples of assertive ideology. First claim: in an introductory text in 1915, Heseltine wrote about “the almost complete absence of any other composer’s influence” in Delius’ music.[[41]](#endnote-41) Second claim: in a review of the 1929 Delius Festival, the music critic of *The Times*, Henry Cope Colles, remarked that Delius “belongs to no school, follows no tradition and is like no other composer in the form, content or style of his music”.[[42]](#endnote-42) Notwithstanding the fact that Heseltine’s comment was penned four years before Delius composed the Dance, it seems to me that, to the extent that these kinds of claims – several others could have been cited – are still today believed to be true and “campaign” free (to borrow Percy Grainger’s felicitous term),[[43]](#endnote-43) and to the extent that, trapped within a Romanticist ideology of genius, we insist on ignoring the curious resonances in Delius’ music with Ravel and others beyond the usual suspects, we fail to apprehend the artistic significance of Delius’ music, we lag far behind its beauty (*pace* Binyon: “her steps will be lost in the dew”), and we remain in search of “Delius, whoever he may be”.
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