

- ESSAY -

Cecil Gray: The Last Romantic

Matthew McCullough
Durham University

The years between 1910 and 1930 mark an important pivot in the development of British music. Arnold Whittall describes the composers of this period as ‘the doomed generation’.¹ Due to the disruption of war, these composers were faced with directing the course of contemporary music in Britain. Figures such as Lambert, Warlock, van Dieren, Delius, Walton, and Moeran were all part of a debate which embraced serialism, post-Romanticism, neo-Classicism, and the rediscovery of older English music. This discourse, found in the periodicals and other publications of the time, gave rise to the importance of critics who, parallel with developments in musical style, formed the basis of aesthetic, anti-intellectual, and national discussions.² Amidst these critics, one stands aside: Cecil Gray.

Gray’s literary style is considered ‘inexhaustibly aggressive, [expressing] a deep fear of the unknown’.³ This fear is nowhere more evident than in his *A Survey of Contemporary Music*, the first in a trilogy published between 1924 and 1936 in which Gray attempts to ‘give an account of the art of the present and of the past’, and ‘to determine, so far as is possible, the course of development that the art is likely to follow in the immediate future’.⁴ The *Survey* begins with a discussion of music in the nineteenth century, in which Gray seeks to define Romanticism as a ‘disillusion and dissatisfaction with reality’,⁵ something which is evident in his own criticism. Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton profess the ‘detailed and complex interactions between critical journalism, aesthetics and scholarship’ in Britain as a lacuna which may provide insights into both nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship and the critical needs of the ‘British musical present’.⁶ In an attempt to contribute to this gap in scholarship, this article aims to examine Gray’s writings on

twentieth-century music, and the extent to which they mark him as a ‘Romantic’ by his own definition through an exploration of his idiosyncratic approach to criticism.

The Nature of Cecil Gray’s Criticism

Cecil William Turpie Gray was born in 1895 in Edinburgh to a well-to-do family.⁷ Little is known about Gray’s early years and education; Hubert Foss notes that Gray was ‘always reticent on personal matters’,⁸ although he attended the University of Edinburgh to undertake an arts degree after a spell at public school. Wishing to pursue a career as a musician, Gray attended the Midland Institute in Birmingham, where he was equally frustrated by the ‘anarchy’ overseen by Granville Bantock as he was with the orthodoxy which previous educational establishments that Gray attended had upheld.⁹ His first prominent appearance on the music scene was in association with a concert of music by Bernard van Dieren which Gray co-sponsored with Philip Heseltine (Peter Warlock) in 1917. This event carries particular significance in the lives of all three, who were to become outcasts in the early twentieth-century British music scene. Bernard van Dieren was to have an enormous influence over the two men. After their first meeting in 1916, both Gray and Heseltine wrote to van Dieren to express their delight at the compositions the latter had shown them. Heseltine notes:

I was so utterly overwhelmed by your music this afternoon that all words failed me. [...] It is always when I feel most deeply that expression is most completely denied me. And so I feel I have to write and tell you – inarticulately enough – what a profound impression my visit to you has made upon me. It has brought me to a turning-point, opened out a vista of a new world; it has brought to a climax the dissatisfaction and spiritual unrest that have been tormenting me for months past – in the last few days more acutely than ever. [...] Your music – [...] is nothing short of a revelation to me. I have been groping about aimlessly in the dark for so long, with ever-growing exasperation – and at last you have shown a light, alone among composers whom I have met; [...].¹⁰

Similarly, Gray wrote an equivalent exaltation:

I have seldom been so affected by art before. It is rather difficult to express the exact sensations I experienced, but I might almost say that it came to me not so

much as a revelation of undreamt possibilities, but rather as a consummation; a fulfilment of an ideal which I have been vaguely formulating for some years – the ideal of an art quite different from anything else that is being done today.¹¹

The coalition between the three continued for the rest of their lives. For Gray and Heseltine, van Dieren represented a new ideal in art, one for which they had been searching. Whilst van Dieren never purposely exerted his influence on the two young musicians—apart from the financial demands he placed on Heseltine—he became a worshipful hero and began to aid them with their compositional endeavours. Though Heseltine gained much from this experience, the same cannot be said for Gray, who admitted that the benefit from the lessons was negligible. The personal influence that van Dieren had on Gray, however, was substantial:

[...] his general cultural, educative influence on me was deep and profound [...]. To him I owe the greater part of whatever sense of values I possess. I find it difficult to imagine what I should have been, or how I would have developed, if I had never known him.¹²

It was here that Gray's public disillusionment with contemporary music was to evidence itself. Gray's compositions were only meant to be retained as a private store of his creative process, but his written ideas and criticism were to thrust him into the public eye. In advance of the 1917 van Dieren concert, Heseltine and Gray released publicity which extolled the music of van Dieren whilst also denigrating contemporary and historically prominent composers, including Brahms, in the concert's programme notes.¹³ The manner in which they publicly hailed van Dieren and rubbished other musicians set the tone for Gray and his future criticism as he began to believe that the world was against both his and van Dieren's artistic and aesthetic values. It was damaging both for van Dieren, whose music could not possibly live up to the standards foretold by Gray and Heseltine, but also for Gray himself, who now revealed to the public a possible blind-side fallacy. Frank Howes, in providing a summation of Gray's career, remarked of his often contradictory criticism, that 'while making for lively reading, [it] neither aided his chosen causes, nor conferred permanent value on his books'.¹⁴ It is precisely this question of 'chosen causes' which sparks the most interesting debate around Gray's criticism.

It is apparent that Gray's criticism is very much of a subjective kind. The preface to his *A Survey of Contemporary Music* (1924) acts in a twofold manner: as a display of disgust at the state of contemporary criticism; but also, apologia, something which is found throughout his writing and usually coupled with a brutal attack on his subject. Gray, in his preface, states that 'Mr Ernest Newman's opinions are nearly always wrong'.¹⁵ In December 1925, Newman wrote a short article for the *Musical Times* in response to his unresolved writing on objective and subjective criticism and used this example from Gray's book as a marker of 'subjective critics lay[ing] down the law'.¹⁶ Newman also uses André Cœuroy's review of Gray's *A Survey* to demonstrate the absurdity of 'apodictic certainty' in criticism when '[no one] is objectively "right" [or] "wrong"'.¹⁷ In Gray's reply the following February, he restates his assertion from the preface to his book that he makes no claim to infallibility,¹⁸ ignoring Newman's earlier statement in a similar vein, then proceeds to address Cœuroy's comments:

If I am unable to take M. Cœuroy's criticism of my book seriously it is not because he disagrees with me, but because he has no point of view of his own, and is only a mouthpiece for current clichés, the representative of an attitude of mind which happens to be fashionable at the moment. Secondly, he does not appear to understand English – a somewhat grave disadvantage in reviewing a book written in that language.¹⁹

This response from Gray is an exhibition of contempt for current criticism, coupled with a display of his reactionary temper for those in disagreement with him, as seen in the aftermath of the 1917 van Dieren concert. This somewhat validates Frank Howes' concerns regarding Gray's contradictoriness. The preface itself gives a more considered insight into Gray's frustrations in the form of articulate prose. Gray bemoans his fellow critics, who 'adopt an attitude of benevolent and almost obsequious neutrality towards their contemporaries', opining that contemporary art is too near for 'complete and dispassionate judgement'.²⁰ Whilst Gray admits that it is impossible to forecast the historical significance of contemporary figures and their influence on future generations, he believes that it is better to 'have the courage of one's convictions' in one's criticism.²¹ Gray draws an important

distinction between the historical and aesthetic judgement of the critic. Gray's criticism is to focus on the artistic, rather than on the materialism of the music itself. He notes that a comparative mediocrity are given a prominent place in history by birth or through circumstance, citing Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach as an example.²² The contrary aesthetic counterpart for Gray lies in the English madrigalists at the beginning of the seventeenth century, who he believes were shunned by history because of their lack of contribution to the development of musical form, and yet 'their music remains as fresh and as lovely as the day it was written, while it is impossible to listen to [C.P.E Bach's] at all'.²³ These hard-line and polarised opinions which would continue to pervade his writings were seen by fellow critics as provocative more than anything else; however, he too justifies these: 'no apology is offered for the outspoken manner' in which Gray's studies are treated. He goes on to say:

after all, it is only in the last generation or so that it has come to be considered almost indecent to hail a living artist as a genius, and ungentlemanly to suggest that another is an imbecile.²⁴

Good-natured and tolerant apathy breed complacent self-satisfaction for Gray and spell the death of art, the devil of which is mediocrity: 'there is no purgatory in the world of art, only heaven and hell'.²⁵ Gray maintains that in order to keep balance (for there are only a handful of geniuses in every generation) he must 'condemn at least twice as much as he commends' and admits that he has perhaps 'overpraise[d] the objects of [his] sympathy and admiration [rather than] under-estimat[ing] those of [his] dislike and antipathy'.²⁶ One might infer that even if we take his favoured composers with a pinch of salt, his condemnations should be read as accurate.

Rather than providing clarity, the preface somewhat muddies the waters regarding Gray's criticism, though perhaps that is the intention. A guide is provided by which one is to follow and judge Gray's writings. They are intended for the 'ordinary, cultured music loving public, rather than [for] the professional musician', to focus on the aesthetic rather than the material or historical in contemporary music, as that which makes a great work of art 'does not intrinsically differ from age

to age', and are polarised to avoid the devil in art – mediocrity.²⁷ In essence, the apologia in the preface might seem to provide fresh guidelines for criticism and, as Hubert Foss wrote in Gray's obituary, 'a new attitude towards the history of music—one much needed [...]'.²⁸ On the other hand, Gray's justifications, not just in *A Survey*, show a deeper frustration in his writings. The submission to infallibility, coupled with the aggressive literary style that expresses his opinions so definitely, offers him both a sword and a shield in the same measure. In addition to the reply to Newman above, Gray is seen elsewhere returning his own ambiguities and defences in order to parry the comments of reviewers; in a 1928 *Musical Times* response to a review of *The History of Music*, Gray points to the reviewer as misreading what he 'should have thought was made sufficiently clear by the context'. He continues, stating that the reviewer 'has evidently not read carefully enough the passages on which his accusation is ostensibly based', and accuses him of being drunk, all of which eventually elicits an admission of disservice on behalf of the reviewer.²⁹ It is in Gray's verbosity and apologia in defence of criticism directed at him that makes one question the persuasive nature of his work. Indeed, such directed criticism is met with either an 'as I said earlier', or an 'actually ...' and a reference to a humble declamation of fallibility, leading often to the assailant being told that he is mistaken. Gray's general style of criticism is therefore set up to be both persuasive to those who agree with him and impenetrable to those who do not. His frustration with both contemporary music and fellow critics is perhaps evidenced by provocative writing and a willingness to not only defend his own views, but also to discredit those writers and critics that disagree with him.

Gray's Romanticism

Beyond Gray's article, the aforementioned dilemma which faced musicians and music-lovers throughout the early twentieth century may be seen in his critiques of individual composers and works (meaning, his more general writings on music). *Predicaments, or Music and the Future* (1936) is a titular example, but more widely his writings have been described as 'prophetic',³⁰ and on his book on Sibelius, published in 1931, a reviewer had described Gray as a 'successful and convincing

apostle'³¹ in the projection of Sibelius' works. An 'R. C.'³² reviewing Gray's autobiography, *Musical Chairs, or Between Two Stools: Life and Memoirs*, notes an obsession with 'dichotomy' and a man 'aware of the duality of his own nature'.³³ We see this duality in the aggressive polarity of his criticism, and more so in his biography of Philip Heseltine, one of the first to perpetuate the composer's twin personalities.³⁴ Furthermore, this duality is present in his predictions for where music was 'going'. For Gray, musical development – as seen from the aesthetic, not technical, viewpoint – was cyclical. He believed firmly in only two styles of music: Classical and Romantic. These two styles would alternate continuously throughout Gray's historical reading, with the Classical focusing on melodic invention, formal construction, and 'modesty',³⁵ and the Romantic upholding 'the predominance of emotion over intellect, content over form, expression over thought, and colour over design'.³⁶ It was Gray's belief that the Baroque period upheld romantic values, thus making it a Romantic era; likewise, the Renaissance before was a Classical era, and so on. This alternation would show that progression and regression do not exist in art *per se*, but that both go hand in hand – Romanticism standing as the 'colonisation of new territory' and Classicism, the 'reflection following upon inspiration, selection upon receptivity, order upon disorder'.³⁷ He also uses this to sustain his theory of eternally valid aesthetic judgement:

Excellence is not relative but absolute. No period is good or bad in itself; there are only good and bad works, the latter always greatly predominating.³⁸

Gray acknowledges the turning point through which he is living. He marks his present as the closing of a Romantic period, adding that *Predicaments* stands to explore music's route into the next Classical period through the various approaches prevalent in contemporary compositions. Whilst the exact detail of the ensuing Classicism is, to Gray, uncertain, his most comprehensive description of the preceding Romanticism may be found in a chapter on the nineteenth century in *A Survey*.

Disconcerted with the loose and indiscriminate application of the adjective 'Romantic', he considers its definition to be precise.³⁹ Gray notes that its early

meaning in art and literature had taken its departure from mythology. When introduced in France, the term gained a Teutonic connotation; 'the revolt against convention and authority whether civil, ecclesiastical, or artistic, the vindication of personal freedom [...] in art'.⁴⁰ The third, 'English', definition, Gray suggests, lies 'primarily in the feeling for nature, in the rediscovery of the beauty and strangeness of things'. The fourth relates to 'the curious perpetual oscillation between the extremes of cynicism and sentiment [...]'.⁴¹ Gray notes that whilst Romantic art can be neither all nor a synthesis of these things, it is the common theme which runs through them:

It is true [...] that we can find a common factor in the spirit of disillusion and dissatisfaction with reality [...]. And the art of the period, whether it takes the form of a reversion to the ideals of the past, of a prospect for the future, or of a return to nature, is all an attempt to escape from the present and actual [...]. This in fact constitutes the spirit of the age, and of our own age too, for that matter [...].⁴²

For Gray, Romantic art was therefore a swansong, 'the final expression of civilisation, [...] the flaming comet heralding the approach of anarchy and dissolution [...]'.⁴³ Romantic music was then the height of all Romantic art. Whilst the classical arts revolved around sculpture and, further, literature, music was to become *the* Romantic expression of art, 'the music of passion, emotion and sentiment'. By Gray's ruling, 'it follows that the greatest music has been, is, and always will be, romantic'.⁴⁴ That Gray would see in Romanticism emotion, sentimentality, a dissatisfaction with the present, and an element of revolt seems to bring reminiscences of his own criticism. The lack of appreciation shown by the wider music community for many of Gray's favoured composers brought in him an aggressive revolt in the form of his writings. Alongside the influences of the two men themselves, the music of van Dieren – and later – Delius, whose formal constructions of music by means of their autodidacticism, would have appealed to Gray's tastes. (He disliked his own orthodox musical education, evincing a supposed turning away from the formal obedience of the Classical eras.) The most striking link may be found in Gray's 'perpetual oscillation between the extremes of cynicism and

sentiment'.⁴⁵ Despite acknowledging the newly-developing Classical era and the close of the Romantic era, it seems that, given his own explanations and definitions, Gray's writing is persuasive in an attempt to cling on to the departing Romantic ideals in art, at the same time releasing a provocative frustration at being 'the last Romantic' in an era of transition; something which Arnold Whittall, rather presumptuously, claims was a factor in Philip Heseltine's supposed suicide.⁴⁶ It would now be apposite to examine this Romantic element in Gray's criticism through some case studies, namely of Frederick Delius and Edward Elgar. Both are considered, in some form, nationalistic by Gray. While Gray was a close friend and enthusiastic admirer of Delius, his dislike for Elgar could not be more apparent.

Delius and Elgar

Gray opens his study of Delius with another apologia. Acknowledging Heseltine's considerable study of Delius (1923), Gray forewarns any reproaches, stating that much of his book had been written prior to Heseltine's publication.⁴⁷ The opening defence is not only one against accusations of plagiarism, as is explicitly stated by Gray, but also claims of overappraisal:

But in any case the reproach of plagiarism which such striking coincidences may possibly call forth cannot diminish the pleasure one experiences in finding one's conclusions so strikingly confirmed and supported by a critic who has probably a more intimate knowledge of the music of Delius than anyone else at the present time in this country.⁴⁸

Gray suggests that Heseltine's in-depth knowledge of Delius' music denotes authority, thus lending similarities between Gray's opinions and Heseltine's monograph a sense of authenticity. This takes immediate effect in the opening of the study, where Gray marks commentary on Delius as, till that point, failing to convey a true sense of his significance and importance, always being of that 'unflattering, indiscriminate variety which is paid to a large number of comparatively, sometimes superlatively, unimportant figures', identifying Heseltine's study of Delius as the single exception.⁴⁹ We are given a glimpse of figures unimportant to Gray in his study of 'minor composers', these include Puccini,

Mahler, all of *Les Six*, Kodály, Prokofiev, Stanford, Parry, Bliss, Holst, and Vaughan Williams, perhaps highlighting that this study of Gray's criticism of Delius and Elgar is an examination of two composers he considered important. The Elgar study opens in a very different vein – almost immediate slander. Gray draws a distinction between Elgar the symphonist and Elgar the 'self-appointed Musician Laureate of the British Empire'; the former, a musician of merit, and the latter 'only a barbarian, and not even an amusing one'.⁵⁰ Gray follows with an acknowledgement of his conscious neglect of Elgar's 'smaller' works,⁵¹ focusing instead on more significant compositions. Gray is disgusted by the fact that Elgar took the nationalistic aspect of his composition seriously, regarding it as jingoism:

'Land of hope and glory' [...] may at some time or other have aroused such patriotic enthusiasm in the breast of a rubber planter in the tropics as to have led him to kick his ne[—]o servant slightly harder than he would have done if he had never heard it, and served to strengthen his already profound conviction of belonging to the chosen race; [...].⁵²

Gray saw this, and other works such as *Imperial March*, *The Music Makers*, and *Crown of India*, to be an imperialistic 'tribal fetish', which 'has no basis in reality'. Nationalistic art, which, dedicated *ad majorem Dei gloriam*, is on the other hand 'one of the most powerful of all external incentives to artistic creation', and thus cites Elgar as a parasite on nationalism. Gray offers little by way of example or explanation for his judgements, other than to remark on one of Elgar's textual choices in *Caractacus*.⁵³ This imperialistic tendency has, for Gray, a 'subtly contaminating influence over [Elgar's] whole work'. The nationalistic character of Delius, on the other hand, is treated with more dignity. Gray deems a national idiom as proverbially difficult to define, but that it is something which is more readily felt. He credits his comparison between Delius and Elizabethan composers to a 'spiritual affinity', not mere coincidence, and lists works such as *Dance Rhapsody* no. 1 and *In a Summer Garden*, remarking that 'nothing could sound more English' in spite of the *Dance Rhapsody's* basis in Norwegian folk song.⁵⁴ Gray refutes criticism of Delius' music as too 'sweet' or 'over-ripe', stating that it 'is so largely a matter of personal taste that it is impossible to argue about it',⁵⁵ adding that 'sweetness and

sensuousness is perhaps the most noteworthy characteristic of English art'.⁵⁶ Gray's literary treatment of both composers is vastly different. It is evident that he sees nationalism as an aesthetic or spiritual quality in music. The nationalism in Elgar is born of the materialism in music to which Gray is averse, labelling it imperialism, whereas Delius he finds nationalistic on many accounts by spiritual affiliation alone. Gray considers expression as 'the whole artistic aim and purpose of Delius', noting that:

The music of Delius belongs essentially to the same phase of romanticism as the art of Flaubert, Gauguin, Verlaine, and Baudelaire. They are all alike possessed by the nostalgia of the infinite and the unappeasable longing for an impossible bliss.⁵⁷

The emphasis placed on expression seems to cloud Gray's vision when assessing the music's faults. It is perhaps his treatment of the two composers' negative attributes which shows the starkest contrast in his writing style, and tells one much about his longing for those Romantic ideals of aesthetic expression and his frustration with contemporary music.

Delius is hailed as 'an artist before he is a musician' for whom there are 'no such things as technical or formal problems'.⁵⁸ This point of view evidently lends itself to Gray, given his dislike of contemporary ('orthodox') conservatoire teaching and his wonders at the supposed autodidacticism of van Dieren. Where Delius' compositional technique is criticised, it is countered by Gray, who cites these shortcomings as deliberate for the purpose of expression and only appearing in the later stages of his life, for 'Delius's faults [...] are positive'.⁵⁹ The defects of *A Village Romeo and Juliet* are blamed on the stage production. Gray's acknowledgement of 'slight faults' in the work is concealed by the claim that he judges it on a few unsatisfactory performances, and that the impression might be different if heard according to the composer's intentions. And the imperfections of *A Song of the High Hills* are 'those which only a great work can have; they hardly seem to matter'.⁶⁰ Any attempt to acknowledge weakness in Delius' music is accompanied by defence. Even discussion of the 'Pagan' Requiem, which Gray forfeits as possessing all of Delius' most characteristic faults, is treated with dignity; the discussion is short,

eleven lines exactly, and half of it points to some minor redeeming features of the work.⁶¹ The lack of aggression and particularly the lack of hyperbolic analogy in Gray's treatment of Delius is striking, particularly when it is such a common factor in his studies of other composers.

Elgar, it is fair to say, is not treated with the same respect. 'Undiluted jingoism' aside, Gray's first discussion is on *The Dream of Gerontius*, in which 'the air is too heavy with the odour of clerical sanctity and the faint and sickly aroma of stale incense'.⁶² The formal constructions which were not a problem for Delius' art now present as detriments in Elgar's: 'the repetition of thematic material throughout robs the individual scenes of freshness and spontaneity, and at the same time fails to knit them together into a whole'. He achieves 'monotony without unity'.⁶³ Elgar's inability to depict 'anything in the nature of sin or evil' is put down to a narrow emotional scope, and whilst the composer's continuity and flow are lauded, his inability to create themes suitable for organic development, and his lack of direction in formal construction are presented as irredeemable.⁶⁴ Comparing the two composers more generally, Gray notes the simplicity of Delius as evincing refined thinking, and considers the technical complexities of Elgar as dissatisfying and banal.⁶⁵ It is the extremity of Gray's criticism which evinces his frustration; his love for Delius, both man and music, and his dislike of Elgar are shown willingly, even in remarks on their similarities.

Conclusion

Séamus de Barra points out that the all-or-nothing approach in Gray's writing is one of the principal weaknesses of his criticism and his abstract argumentation yields an abandonment of 'subjective' and 'objective', as well as a presentation of 'half-truths as whole truths'.⁶⁶ He also notes Gray's ability to provide 'penetrating insight and nonsense in more or less equal measure';⁶⁷ for an example of the latter, one might refer to *The History of Music* (1928) and to the statement that 'it is at least undeniable that the Romantic movement was largely the creation of pulmonary consumptives in all the arts, and in music almost entirely so'.⁶⁸ Whilst de Barra's observations are largely accurate, they do not necessarily provide grounds for the

dismissal of Gray's criticism as much as strengthen its place in British musical history. Gray's criticism is provocative, polarised, aggressive, and defensive, but it provides us with an insight into that 'Isolationist' group of composers described by Whittall. The nature and style of Gray's writing shows a love of aesthetic artistry through his defence of autodidacticism and his dismissal of Elgar's technical craftsmanship. It provides a measure of subjectivity which was unparalleled in contemporaneous criticism, an important faction at a time when criticism was so readily responded to in periodicals. It shows Gray as a Romantic by his own definition in his disillusion with both contemporary criticism (his dismissal of Newman's opinions) and contemporary music (the relegation of many lauded contemporary composers to 'minor'). Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Gray places his contrary opinions, Romantic desire, and repulsion of the present-day within the larger context of the inter- and post-war trajectory. As composers and critics tried to decide on where music was 'going', Gray's writing stood aside from fellow critics in its challenging and provocative style, its persuasion through apologetic guidelines, and its unapologetic proclamation of the death of a Romantic and aesthetic art.

Matthew McCullough is the current Van Mildert College Trust PhD Scholar at Durham University where he also holds an Associate Fellowship of the college and has links with The Centre for Death and Life Studies. His current research explores British composers' responses to WWI and the ways in which they helped to shape cultural and collective memories of the war.

References

- Collins, Sarah. "'Never Out of Date and Never Modern': Aesthetic Democracy, Radical Music Criticism, and 'The Sackbut'". *Music & Letters* 95, no. 3 (August 2014): 404-28. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24549499>.
- Davies, Hywel. "Bernard van Dieren, Philip Heseltine and Cecil Gray: A Significant Affiliation". *Music & Letters* 69, no. 1 (January 1988): 30-48. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/855464>.

- de Barra, Séamus. “Chosen Causes: Writings on Music by Bernard van Dieren, Peter Warlock and Cecil Gray”. In *British Musical Criticism and Intellectual Thought, 1850–1950*, edited by Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton, 235–54. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2018.
- Dibble, Jeremy, and Julian Horton. “Introduction: Trends in British Musical Thought, 1850-1950”. In *British Musical Criticism and Intellectual Thought, 1850–1950*, edited by Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton, 1-7. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2018.
- Engel, Carl. “Views and Reviews”. *Musical Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (April 1935): 230-40. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738839>.
- Foss, Hubert. “Cecil Gray, 1895-1951”. *Musical Times* 92, no. 1305 (November 1951): 496-98. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/935418>.
- Gray, Cecil. “Antonio Caldara (1670-1736)”. *Musical Times* 70, no. 1033 (1 March 1929): 212-18. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/917247>.
- . “Arnold Schönberg—A Critical Study”. *Music & Letters* 3, no. 1 (1 January 1922): 73-89. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/726830>.
- . “Cecil Gray’s ‘History of Music’”. *Musical Times* 69, no. 1027 (1 September 1928): 833. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/915561>.
- . “Concerning César Franck”. *Musical Times* 56, no. 868 (1 June 1915): 341. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/910726>.
- . “Sibelius Scores”. *Musical Times* 73, no. 1073 (1 July 1932): 644. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/918321>.
- . “S[u]bjective Criticism”. *Musical Times* 67, no. 996 (1 February 1926): 160-61. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/912969>.
- . “Zoltan Kodaly”. *Musical Times* 63, no. 951 (1 May 1922): 312-15. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/910162>.
- . *The History of Music*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1928.
- . *A Survey of Contemporary Music*. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- . *Peter Warlock*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1934.
- . *Predicaments, or Music and the Future: An Essay in Constructive Criticism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

- Maine, Basil. "Personalities Among Musical Critics. IX.—Ernest Newman". *Musical Times* 68, no. 1007 (1 January 1927): 27-28. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/913572>.
- Newman, Ernest. "A Postscript to a 'Musical Critic's Holiday'. III. (Concluded)". *Musical Times* 66, no. 994 (1 December 1925): 1076-79. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/912036>.
- . "Mr. Ernest Newman on French and English Music". *Musical Times* 59, no. 908 (1 October 1918): 471-72. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/909802>.
- R. C. Review of *Musical Chairs, or Between Two Stools: Life and Memoirs*, by Cecil Gray (London: Home & Van Thal, 1948). *Music & Letters* 30, no. 3 (July 1949): 266-67. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/731012>.
- Whittall, Arnold. "The Isolationists". *Music Review* 27, no. 2 (1966): 122-29.

Endnotes:

- ¹ Arnold Whittall, "The Isolationists", *Music Review* 27, no. 2 (1966): 124.
- ² See Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton, "Introduction: Trends in British Musical Thought, 1850-1950", in *British Musical Criticism and Intellectual Thought, 1850-1950*, eds. Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2018), 1-7.
- ³ Whittall, "The Isolationists", 124.
- ⁴ Quoted from Cecil Gray, *Predicaments, or Music and the Future: An Essay in Constructive Criticism* (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), 1.
- ⁵ Cecil Gray, *A Survey of Contemporary Music* (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), 16.
- ⁶ Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton, "Introduction: Trends in British Musical Thought, 1850-1950", 7.
- ⁷ Hubert Foss, "Cecil Gray, 1895-1951", *Musical Times* 92, no. 1305 (November 1951): 496, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/935418>.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹ See Cecil Gray, *Musical Chairs, or Between Two Stools* (London: Home & Van Thal, 1948), 98.
- ¹⁰ Cecil Gray, *Peter Warlock*, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934), 139.
- ¹¹ Quoted in Hywel Davies, "Bernard van Dieren, Philip Heseltine and Cecil Gray: A Significant Affiliation", 34, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/855464>.
- ¹² Gray, *Musical Chairs*, 109.
- ¹³ Davies, 39.
- ¹⁴ Quoted in Séamas de Barra, "Chosen Causes: Writings on Music by Bernard van Dieren, Peter Warlock and Cecil Gray", in *British Musical Criticism and Intellectual Thought, 1850-1950*, eds. Jeremy Dibble and Julian Horton, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2018), 254.
- ¹⁵ Cecil Gray, *A Survey of Contemporary Music*, 7.
- ¹⁶ Ernest Newman, "A Postscript to a 'Musical Critic's Holiday'. III (Concluded)", *Musical Times* 66, no. 994 (1 December 1925): 1077, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/912036>.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ Cecil Gray, "S[u]bjective Criticism", *Musical Times* 67, no. 996 (1 February 1926): 160, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/912969>.
- ¹⁹ Cecil Gray, "S[u]bjective Criticism", 161.

²⁰ Gray, *A Survey of Contemporary Music*, 5.

²¹ Ibid, 7.

²² Ibid, 6.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid, 9.

²⁵ Ibid, 7.

²⁶ Ibid, 9.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Foss, "Cecil Gray, 1895-1951", 496.

²⁹ Cecil Gray, "Cecil Gray's 'The History of Music'", *Musical Times* 69, no. 1027 (1 September 1928): 833, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/915561>.

³⁰ Foss, "Cecil Gray, 1895-1951", 497.

³¹ Review of *Sibelius* by Cecil Gray (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), in *Musical Times* 73, no. 1073 (1 July 1932): 618, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/918292>.

³² I'm very grateful to Dominic Daula for his note that this was likely Richard Capell (1885-1954), who was proprietor and, from 1950, editor of *Music & Letters*.

³³ R. C., review of *Musical Chairs, or Between Two Stools: Life and Memoirs* by Cecil Gray (London: Home & Van Thal, 1948), in *Music & Letters* 30, no. 3 (July 1949): 266, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/731012>.

³⁴ See Cecil Gray, *Peter Warlock* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1934).

³⁵ Gray, *Predicaments, or Music and the Future*, 210

³⁶ Ibid, 215

³⁷ Paul Valéry, preface to *Fleurs du mal* by Charles Baudelaire, quoted in Gray, *Predicaments*, 214.

³⁸ Gray, *Predicaments*, 50

³⁹ Gray, *A Survey of Contemporary Music*, 13.

⁴⁰ Ibid, 14.

⁴¹ Ibid, 15.

⁴² Ibid, 16-17.

⁴³ Ibid, 18.

⁴⁴ Ibid, 32.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 13.

⁴⁶ Whittall, "The Isolationists", 124.

⁴⁷ Gray, *A Survey of Contemporary Music*, 58.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 59.

⁵⁰ Ibid, 78.

⁵¹ Gray uses an incredibly dated analogy, referring to art being 'like a true woman, generally kindest to those who treat her with the least respect'. Whilst today considered veritably outlandish, this comparison—being one of Gray's tamer depictions—serves as a good example of the tone of many of his passing comments.

⁵² Ibid, 79-80.

⁵³ Ibid, 81.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 72.

⁵⁵ Ibid, 73.

⁵⁶ Ibid, 74.

⁵⁷ Ibid, 76.

⁵⁸ Ibid, 61.

⁵⁹ Ibid, 62.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 71.

⁶¹ Ibid, 71-72.

⁶² Ibid, 82.

⁶³ Ibid, 83.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ See Ibid, 89. 'The style and method of Delius is simple to an extreme degree, almost primitive; the quality of his thought generally extremely subtle and refined. Elgar's technique is complex and highly organised, his thought often undistinguished to the point of banality'.

⁶⁶ Séamas de Barra, "Chosen Causes: Writings on Music by Bernard van Dieren, Peter Warlock and Cecil Gray", 247.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 249.

⁶⁸ Cecil Gray, *The History of Music*, (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1928), 240.