

Inden kommenteringen af de afsluttende diskussions-afsnit skal også nævnes Eva Badura-Skoda's referat »*Motiv- und Themenbildung in Wiener Sinfoniesätzen der 1760er Jahre und KV 16a*«. Dette bidrag giver et interessant sammenligningsgrundlag for bedømmelsen af »Odense-symfonien«s status, omend på præmisser der formodentlig er dette værk forholdsvis betydningsløse, nemlig ud fra den tvivlsomme synsvinkel at KV 16a enten er komponeret i Wien eller grunder sig på Wiener-forbilleder, hvoraf Dittersdorf her bliver fremhævet som det centrale sammenligningsgrundlag.

Den foreliggende beretning byder næsten overalt på inspirerende læsning, også for ikke-specialister. Den burde anbefales ikke mindst overfor de musikvidenskabelige studerende som studieobjekt i forbindelse med erhvervelse af indsigt i fagets strengere metoder. Som sammenfattende redegørelse for det koncentrerede 1-dags symposium er beretningen såre vellykket – bl.a. ved at gengive åbenlyst improviserede redegørelser (via båndoptagelser), og dette ikke blot i forbindelse med efterfølgende diskussionsrunder; se f.eks. s. 41 og 46, omend den også har sine problematiske sider. Det sidste gælder – foruden reproduktionen af nodeeksempler, der gennemgående er under al kritik – i særdeleshed rapportens redaktionelt udarbejdede slutkapitel »*Allgemeine Diskussion und Zusammenfassung*«, der er intet mindre end en rodet affære, hvor – formodentlig – Jens Peter Larsens hånd har grebet utidigt ind på mange og besynderlige måder. Dette kapitel burde i hvert fald have været klart adskilt i en afsluttende diskussion (den er her hverken „allgemein“ eller alle steder korrekt personmæssigt tilforordnet – se f.eks. s. 82 ff. og s. 87) og en sammenfatning. Hvad der skal forestille at læses som diskussion (eksempelvis afsnit IV: *Abschließender Meinungs Austausch*) er ofte rene resumeer; og i sammenfatnings-betonede afsnit indflettes i særdeleshed Larsen'ske diskussionsindlæg i alt for høj grad. Og så lader Jens Peter Larsen – ydermere – sig selv komme til orde endnu engang i et afsluttende *Nachwort*, en coda i tredje potens. Læseren efterlades på en mærkelig måde ikke så afklaret omkring symposiets videnskabelige problematik, som indlæggene egentlig disponerer for, men lægger beretningen fra sig i nogen grad fortumlet af alt for megen omhu fra redaktørens side med at uddrage essenser og fortynde dem igen.

Bo Marschner

DELIUS. A Life in Letters: I. 1862 – 1908; II. 1909 – 1934, edited by Lionel Carley (London, Scolar Press, 1983, 1988).

Frederick Delius (1862 – 1934) is probably, with the possible exception of Benjamin Britten, the English composer who has achieved and maintained the most general recognition on the continent of Europe in this century – which is as much as to say, since John Dowland (1563 – 1626). It is not necessary to try to argue that he deserves this distinction more than do a number of other British composers; the reason for his greater success in overcoming the isola-

tion endured by his countrymen is simply, as it was with Dowland, that he took up residence on the continent, established personal contacts and worked tirelessly to make his music known – on both sides of the channel – through publication and performance. He visited France for the first time in 1880 at the age of 18, fell in love with Scandinavia in 1881 and 1882 and abandoned England for good when he went to Florida in 1883. After studying at the Leipzig Conservatory, 1886 – 88, he settled in Paris, later moving out of Paris to Grez-sur-Loing, where he remained for the rest of his life, ultimately reaffirming his nationality, however, by requesting that his body be taken back for burial in an English churchyard after his death in 1934. So cosmopolitan was he that the legitimacy of assigning his music English nationality has been discussed – the earlier editions of *Baker's Biographical Dictionary* identified him, not as English, but as »born of German parentage [in] Bradford, England«, and Joseph Holbrooke wrote in his idiosyncratic *Contemporary British Composers* (1925): »His parentage is German, but his birth in England makes us discuss him as one of us. I see nothing of a British character in any of his music ...« (p. 156). In a letter to C. W. Orr (Vol. II, p. 217) Delius reported, concerning the omission of his compositions from a concert of English music in Paris in 1919, that »[Florent] Schmitt wrote to me saying they did not consider me as English, but as Neutral!«, and in a letter to Philip Heseltine in which he refers to the same concert he wrote »They ... took care to leave my name out of the program – Why? The real Britishers were all there. This is all very amusing – of course! I dont claim to be a British composer« (II, 218). So uncertain was his national identity that in *The Theories of Claude Debussy* (Oxford, 1929), Léon Vallas could write (p. 154), »Debussy gave his opinion of two Scandinavian composers« – one was Grieg, the other was Delius!

That Delius was cosmopolitan has, of course, long been appreciated. The impact of the various national influences to which his music was subjected in the course of his wanderings has been examined by Christopher Palmer in *Delius: Portrait of a Cosmopolitan* (London, 1976), however it is first now, with the publication of this remarkable edition of his letters (and of much else besides) that we are able to assess the true nature, the extent and the depth, of his cosmopolitanism. In Dr. Carley's exemplary presentation, painstakingly meticulous, knowledgeable, balanced, sensible and skilful, the selection of 610 (of „several thousand“) letters printed in these two volumes does indeed become „A Life“, by far the fullest, most well-rounded picture we have of this complex personality. Thanks to the thoroughness of Dr. Carley's documentation of even the smallest detail, it can be read with benefit by all who are interested, not only in the composer, but also in the period, the fascinating transition from the 19th to the 20th century, its art, literature, ideas and society, with which Delius, though undoubtedly egocentric and self-interested, was nevertheless richly in touch.

To edit the letters of so cosmopolitan a figure has been a formidable task: Delius corresponded with people who, whatever their original languages,

wrote to him in English, French, German, Danish or Norwegian and he wrote in all these languages himself. It is an interesting insight into his cosmopolitanism – or, to put it another way, his rootlessness – that he seems not to have mastered any of them really well. This is most surprising with regard to his English, of course, which leads to the thought that perhaps his first language was, after all, German. However, his wife Jelka undertook his translations into German because, as she wrote to Rodin (II, xxiii), »my husband does not know German well enough«. At the same place Dr. Carley quotes Percy Grainger to the effect that his German and Scandinavian were »as moth-eaten as his English. I think he grew up in a home where no language was mastered«. In another valuable work, *Delius: A Life in Pictures* (London, 1977, repr. 1984) (with Robert Threlfall), Dr. Carley cites (p. 69) Igor Stravinsky's recollection of his meeting with Delius, in the course of which Stravinsky remembers »... as I spoke almost no English, and he but little French, the conversation did not develop«. This meeting probably took place c. 1913, by which time Delius had lived in France for 25 years! It is also notable that, though he obviously knew Danish/Norwegian, Delius' Scandinavian friends seem to have preferred to correspond with him in German or, in the case of Helge Rode at least (I, 130 – 2), in English. However much Delius may have suffered from a „lack of ear for English“, Dr. Carley does not at all; he writes a polished English and, what is more, he studied French at Strasbourg and learned Swedish at Uppsala. Not only has he undertaken to present the entire polyglot correspondence in English translation, but his scholar's conscience has required that »there could be little scope for free versions of material which grammatically or stylistically in its original form was awkward and angular, obscure or oblique; original characteristics ought, if possible, somehow to be mirrored in the translation« (I, xxii).

Dr. Carley has been uniquely qualified for this formidable task – certainly it could not have been carried out by anyone not competent in the Scandinavian languages nor sympathetically familiar with the history, culture and geography of Scandinavia. Through to the end of 1906, Delius' correspondence, as we have it here, shows him to have had a much stronger orientation towards Scandinavia than towards any other country: of the 203 letters, 76 – i.e., more than one in three – are either to or from Scandinavians. By contrast, only 15 are exchanges with English correspondents. In 1907, however, the balance shifts; though Delius' love of Scandinavia and friendships there continued throughout his life (in 1921 he even had a summer house built in Gudbrandsdalen in Norway), it is apparent that from this time he becomes more actively involved in British musical life. A number of things happened in 1907 which probably account for this change: the death of Edvard Grieg, two very successful London concerts, his meeting with his future champion, Thomas Beecham, and the organization of The Musical League, in which, as vice-president, his position in British music was recognized as second only to that of the president, Sir Edward Elgar. He remained living abroad, however,

and it is interesting to observe the range of his continental contacts in the grandiose promises he conveyed to the League for its first festival concert in 1908. In a letter to Granville Bantock (I, 378) he wrote »You will be pleased to hear that Gustav Mahler, Claude Debussy, Vincent d'Indy and Max Schillings will all come and conduct one of their works at our Festival«. In the event, he had promised more than he could deliver; the only work of these composers which came to figure in the festival was Debussy's *Nocturnes*, and it was not conducted by the composer. Still, the reference is interesting as being the only indication known to me of a personal contact between Delius and Debussy, whom he otherwise hardly even mentions.

Delius' attitude to letter-writing seems to have been largely practical – to keep in touch with friends, to advertise the progress of his work and to further his business affairs, rarely to unburden himself of his innermost thoughts and feelings. The written word is clearly not his medium and he seems to have been curiously inhibited from exposing himself thus to others – the more reason, therefore, that we must accept that the true Delius is to be found only in his music. It is a timely reminder now, for Delius' own letters do not, on the whole, reveal a particularly attractive or warm personality, though it is obvious from the letters written to him that he engendered affection and devotion in others. In particular, his letters to his wife, Jelka, both before and after their marriage, have a kind of matter-of-fact aloofness about them which stands in almost offensive contrast to the totally selfless dedication which she offered him. To begin with he apparently accepted this state of affairs as a matter of course – the imbalance in their feelings was her affair, not his; ultimately he was to become completely dependent on it and she seems never to have failed him. In the early days, before their marriage, Jelka obviously acquainted him with her unhappiness, for on 14 January, 1901 he wrote to her (I, 182): »I am not affectionate – and regret it also, but cannot alter myself«, and ten days later (*loc.cit.*): »I am trying to live so that I can accomplish something in art – *that is all* – the mere fact of my being able to work so well in your house ought to speak for itself – When I suddenly wake up to the fact that you are suffering a sort of hell then only have I ever thought of leaving«. Delius' seemingly cruel egocentricity has earned him much criticism and Jelka much sympathy. I would not suggest that both are not deserved – though perhaps only Eric Fenby now knows in what proportion – but among the rich documentation of this collection of letters is evidence which may be able to contribute to a more just appreciation of the situation. We are used to seeing Jelka only in relation to Delius, but there is one „scene“ in which she appears and acts on her own, independent of Delius. This is a series of letters which she, a talented artist, exchanged with the great sculptor Auguste Rodin, beginning in October, 1900. In a letter dated 21 February, 1901 (I, 185 – 6), written while she was living with Delius but before they were married, she expressed herself as follows: »I think so much about you – it saddened me to see you so worried by so very many unpleasant mat-

ters, to be unable to do anything for you. Only my thoughts are with you, wishing to surround you with a magnetism strong enough to banish all these cares – ... I know how you have struggled and I saw your soul in your works I found it so beautiful, naked before me. ... I know you so little and it seems to me that I have always known you. You are so rich in kindness and so unaffected, that I forget that I am really nothing myself. ...« One senses here a personality with a tremendous need to be of service, one who could find a kind of fulfillment of her – perhaps undervalued – lesser talent in assisting a greater. Had she not got Delius, perhaps she would have searched until she found another genius whom she could serve, or have felt herself unfulfilled. If this was her nature, and Delius' nature was to be „not affectionate“, then they were both being themselves – as Delius went on to say: »I defy you to put your finger on anyone who is more himself and herself« – though this does not alter the fact that most people will regard her nature as positive and his as negative in the sphere of human relations.

There is a rich variety of information on matters great and small to be gleaned from this correspondence. For example, one is struck by the immediacy of Grieg's report from Copenhagen on 22 December, 1890 (I, 53) in which he tells of the death of N. W. Gade the previous day and that Ibsen has just produced *Hedda Gabler* in Munich. And it is interesting to find Delius referring to his own music (*In a Summer Garden*) as »impressionistic« (I, 363). Delius' letter to one of his German publishers (II, 273 – 4) makes real for us the economic crisis in Germany in 1923 when he says he is returning a check in the amount of 8372 Marks since at the exchange rate of the previous week it was worth »about 6 pence in English currency«. This letter will also disillusion all notions of the otherworldly artist, helpless in the affairs of the „real world“. In addition to the letters, there is a generous bonus in the series of appendices to Vol. I, which include Delius' recollections of his childhood, his summer diaries for 1887 – 91 (of which 1887, 1889 and 1891 were spent in Norway), his recollections of Grieg and of Strindberg, Jelka's memories of her husband and a brief study of C. F. Keary's book *The Journalist* (1898). This last is of interest because Delius recognized features of himself in the title character, Sophus Jonsen, a Dane who writes plays »heavily laced with Symbolism« and who had also studied art and painted in Paris. Keary was the librettist of two of Delius' operas and there would seem to be good grounds for suspecting that he has indeed »taken a lot of sayings out of my mouth for Johnson«, as Delius wrote to Jelka. At the same time, it would seem to me worth investigating the possibility that Keary has also known the Danish Symbolist poet, playwright, novelist, painter, journalist and later newspaper owner, Sophus Claussen, who was in Paris 1892 – 4. Claussen was a friend of Verlaine and very much a part of the bohemian literary circle in Paris and it is a little surprising that Delius makes no mention of him (in the edited letters, at least). Nevertheless, Claussen's and Delius' circles overlapped in the person of Herman Bang, if not otherwise. Claussen and Bang were friends in

their Paris days (Bang's desperate situation at the time of his letters to Delius in 1894 (I, 82) developed after Claussen had gone on to Rome in January) and in 1898, the year of Keary's book, Bang directed the production of Clausen's play *Arbejdersken* [The Factory Girl]. Much later Claussen wrote an important poem on the death of Herman Bang in 1912.

The edition is richly illustrated and splendidly produced by The Scholar Press, which is to be warmly congratulated. So carefully has the work been done by both editor and publisher that it is something of a challenge to the reviewer to find an imperfection. For that ignoble purpose only I include mention of one or two small points amongst the following random comments:

I, 79: Princess Alice was married to Prince Albert of Monaco from 1889 to 1902, not 1922.

I, 183: John Runciman's letter in note 2 must have been written in 1900, not 1901.

--- : In note 6 Dr. Carley attributes the German translation of the *Danish Songs* to one Bamberger. Is this a correction to R. Threlfall's *A Catalogue of the Compositions of Frederick Delius* (London, 1977), p.79, where Jelka is named as the (chief) translator?

I, 306: In his note on Vaughan Williams Dr. Carley has him »move on to Oxford and Cambridge« after the Royal College of Music, – Cambridge, yes (Trinity), but Oxford had to award an honorary D. Mus. in 1919 in order to honour itself and establish some small claim to him.

II, xxx – i: It is by no means an imperfection of this book that Dr. Carley makes a plea for accuracy in the spelling of Scandinavian names and the correct identification of the languages, illustrating his point with the observation »Danes ... must certainly find it galling to see Delius' song 'Let Spring-time come' still published to, words from the *Swedish* of J. P. Jacobsen'.« This may be the place, however, to protest that it is even worse to find this poem attributed to another poet, Ludvig Holstein, on a record of Delius' *English, French & Scandinavian Songs* produced under the auspices of the Delius Trust (Unicorn/Kanchana DKP 9022)!

II, xxxiii: Is the mistake in the quotation from the *Musical Standard*: »Let Mr. Delius re-study ... and try to understand ... « part of the original?

II, 297: Dr. Carley's reference here to the first performance in America (29 December, 1925) of Delius' Cello Concerto, played by Herman Sandby (1881 – 1965) with Percy Grainger conducting, draws attention to the absence of any mention of Sandby by Delius himself. In view of Delius' long attachment to Denmark and his close friendship with Grainger, it is odd that he should appear unaware of this excellent Danish musician who was one of Grainger's oldest friends and musical colleagues from their student days in Frankfurt. The reason can hardly have been a lack of musical sympathy (which may account for his even more disappointing silence with regard to Carl Nielsen); I have in my possession one of Grainger's compositions which he sent to Sandby with the characteristic inscription: »To darling Herman, from Percy, in

memory of our harmonic likemindedness (Grieg, Delius, Sandby, Grainger). Nov. 1948«. Indeed, in the record notes accompanying a recording of Sandby's 4th Symphony recently issued (together with Louis Glass' 5th, Hakon Børresen's 2nd and Rudolf Simonsen's 2nd) by Danacord Records in a double album *Danish Symphonies of the Late Romantic Period* (DACO 139-140 Mono, but soon available on CD), he is described as representing »probably ... the closest approximation to a 'Danish Delius'«.

Dr. Carley is not a musician, but his sensible, intelligent, imaginative and scholarly way of discharging the duties of honorary archivist to the Delius Trust has contributed enormously to promoting a true understanding of Delius in our time. It would perhaps be wrong to say that this edition is a model of how an edition of letters should be done – different problems require different solutions –, but it is at least a model of how the letters of Delius should be edited, and at long last it is done.

John Bergsagel

*Laurits Pedersen Thuras Højsangsparafrase 1640 og dens melodier.
Hymnologiske Meddelelser 1988/5 (side 195 – 252).*

Med ovenstående titel har i Christian IV-året Eduard Nielsen, Erik Dal og Henrik Glahn med bistand af Karen Skovgaard-Petersen i *Hymnologiske Meddelelser 1988/5* (s. 195 – 252) udgivet en afhandling om Laurits Pedersen Thuras bearbejdelse af Højsangen i Gammel Testamente, der i hovedsagen menes at have fungeret som en festgave eller festkantate i anledning af den udvalgte Prins Christians »store bilager« (formæling) med Prinsesse Magdalena Sybilla i 1634 (hvor også Heinrich Schütz var musikalsk bidragsyder).

Det kongelige par fik residens i Nykøbing Falster, og det er måske en af grundene til, at Thura, stedets præst og en lærd polyhistor i tidens ånd, gav en så ejendommelig kraftprøve på sin videnskabelighed. Praktisk anvendelse har værket nemlig ikke haft, men indirekte giver det værdifulde oplysninger om en teologisk, hymnologisk og musikalsk tradition. Det er også baggrunden for, at afhandlingen i smuk forening er forfattet af fire specialister i henholdsvis Gammel Testamente, metrik, salmetradition, musikvidenskab og klassisk filologi.

De stærkt erotiske digte i Højsangen (der er tillagt kong Salomon) fik lov til at stå både i den jødiske og kirkelige kanon, fordi man tolkede digtene allegorisk om Guds forhold til sit folk eller til sin „brud“, kirken. Tolkningen kender vi i dag bedst fra Brorsons salmer, f.eks. »Her vil ties, her vil bies«. Denne tolkningstradition gøres der på fremragende vis rede for, hvorefter Thuras levnedsløb og bogens baggrund, udstyr og disposition klarlægges, og fortalerne og de traditionelle æredigte oversættes i uddrag med kommentarer.

Efter denne indledning i Thuras bog følger på de næste 40 sider Højsangens