

SIR ARTHUR SULLIVAN SOCIETY



Magazine No 42

Spring 1996

SIR ARTHUR SULLIVAN SOCIETY

Magazine No 42 - Spring 1996

Dear Member,

We regret to announce that Donald Adams died on 8th April. He was suffering from cancer, but apparently his death was due to pleurisy. An obituary notice appears in the centre pages of this Magazine.

The performance of *The Rose of Persia* scheduled for 12 August at the Buxton G&S Festival will not now take place. Instead the City of Durham Light Opera Group will present their recent revival of *The Grand Duke*. However Stephen Turnbull will deliver a talk on *The Rose of Persia* on 10 August. Sullivan interest will be maintained at the service on Sunday 11 August, when the York Chamber Singers will perform excerpts from *The Prodigal Son* and *The Martyr of Antioch*. The *Thespis* ballet music will feature in the concert on 4 August. Soloists in the professional *Ruddigore* on 10 August will include Gillian Knight and Patricia Leonard. Dr Ian Bradley will talk on the new edition of his *Annotated Gilbert and Sullivan* on 11 August.

The Sunday concerts at Oak Hall Manor will include a costumed performance of the full-length *Cox and Box* on 14 July, and on 28 July an Isabel Jay programme with Fiona O'Neill as Isabel Jay. Patricia Leonard and David Steadman present 'Here's a How de Do' on 16 June. For details contact Melvyn P. Tarran, Oak Hall Manor, Sheffield Park Gardens, Sheffield Park, Sussex, TN22 3QY. Tel 01825 790338.

Martin Yates and Generally G&S will present *The Beauty Stone* from 15 - 19 October 1996 at King Edward VI Grammar School, Retford. The spoken part of the libretto has been reworked by David Eden, and the opera will be presented as a Mystery Play performed by the people of Retford, which celebrates its 750th anniversary this year. The Sullivan Society will organise a weekend conference round the event along the same lines as the successful *Chieftain* weekend in 1994. Stephen Turnbull will announce details later but the cost, to include two performances of *The Beauty Stone* and a night at the West Retford Hotel, should be under £100. Ed.

Stephen Turnbull writes: Bookings for the 1996 Sullivan Festival in Oxford have gone well, but there are still a few places for latecomers. Contact me on 01388 710308.

W.S. GILBERT

A CLASSIC VICTORIAN & HIS THEATRE

Jane W. Stedman

After a long period of gestation and, reputedly, several encounters with reluctant publishers, Professor Jane Stedman's book on Gilbert has at last been issued under the most authoritative *imprimatur* of all - that of the Oxford University Press. In a less distinguished way it does for Gilbert what Arthur Jacobs' book did for Sullivan, that is to say it handles the subject with a breadth and quality of scholarship it had not previously received. There is however a fundamental misapprehension in the treatment of the Carpet Quarrel, which is dealt with in a separate article in this Magazine (p.18).

First and foremost the book throws light on the most obscure periods of Gilbert's career, namely the years preceding his work with Sullivan and those following the breach of 1890. Armed with a valuable permission to reproduce copyright material, and as a student of Victorian periodical literature, Professor Stedman brings unrivalled knowledge to Gilbert's early days in comic journalism. She knows the personnel, the politics and the publications of the 1860s, and is able to place Gilbert among them. She performs the same service for his early plays, with a short discussion and summary of each. The chapters on the 1890s bring forward a detailed account of Gilbert's life at Grim's Dyke, including the illnesses that did much to spoil the idyll. He suffered from a hernia, diabetes and arthritis besides gout, and seems to have been subject to occasional migraines throughout his life. The treatment of the central period of Gilbert's career, his collaboration with Sullivan, is carried out with the same degree of detailed scholarship but the material is necessarily familiar. As a result Professor Stedman's main achievement in this area is to support the established picture with fresh detail from the general theatrical and journalistic background.

Having said so much there is a further and paradoxical point to be made, which is that the book is anything up to 10,000 words too short. It seems to have been ruthlessly compressed or edited, often to the detriment of the subject under discussion. In a short 'Curtain Raiser' introduction Professor Stedman says she has not felt it necessary to quote letters and speeches in full when a few sentences are sufficient, or to discuss all of Gilbert's injunctions and lawsuits in detail. What this means in practice is that in spite of superior scholarly technique her work is almost as impressionistic and superficial as that of Hesketh Pearson. Time and again she omits precisely that part of a document or topic which might lead to a sharper and more interesting conclusion than the one she presents. She shows herself aware of the frequent unreliability of Gilbert's statements, but fails to recognise the historiographical problems involved in dealing with a man whose determination to stand the world on its head was by no means confined to his libretti. The book does however benefit from her decision, explained in the 'Curtain Raiser', to omit Gilbert's jokes and witticisms from the text. She says that many of these have been foisted on him while others, 'funny as quick retort, are less amusing in the reading than in the

telling'. Here, and long overdue, is an admission that Gilbert's spoken wit is not an authentic entrant in a field that includes Johnson and Wilde, not to mention Sydney Smith.

As part of her resolutely unintellectual and abbreviated approach Professor Stedman makes little attempt to enlarge on a rather pedestrian discussion of Gilbert's works. For example the burlesque tradition in which he wrote stretches into the eighteenth century and beyond. Gilbert is the last exponent of this tradition, but she does not explain it, or even properly discuss H.J. Byron, whose works are the foundation of the Gilbertian style. Writing of the *Bab* drawings she says that Gilbert's 'use of disproportion' makes him closer to William Brunton of *Fun* than to Tenniel. This typically Delphic observation conceals how close to Brunton Gilbert really was. Similarly she fails to explain exactly what he learned from Tom Robertson's stagecraft, even though he acknowledged a debt himself. We never discover the meaning of the term 'Classic Victorian' used in the title.

After the appearance of his study of Gilbert and Sullivan in 1935 Hesketh Pearson published some 'Confessions of a Biographer' in the *Gilbert and Sullivan Journal*. According to Pearson the biographer 'does not care whether his subject is great or good, and so does not try to make him out bigger or better than he is. The shadows are set down as fearlessly as the high lights, because the biographer is interested in his subject for his own sake, and therefore equally interested in his vices and virtues, neither condemning the one nor praising the other.' Professor Stedman does not give us her estimate of Gilbert's greatness, but she is very much concerned that he should be virtuous. As a result she has refused to contemplate the dark side of his character even while partially presenting it. Her deeply inadequate first chapter purports to deal with the formative years of his life, before 1861. And yet the single most important question for any biography of Gilbert is not addressed, namely what contribution did William Gilbert senior make to the personality and mind of Gilbert junior? What is the relationship between the eccentricity of the father and the eccentricity of the son? Why was he, the son, so thin-skinned, so easy to humiliate, so inflexible and so aggressive? Professor Stedman writes as if these questions can be driven out of court by mentioning that he was devoted to animals and gave freely to charity. Her Gilbert is a just man surrounded by knaves and fools, whom she is careful to expose; faced with such people, his exasperation sometimes gets the better of his magnanimity. His relationship with his wife is represented as happy and devoted, even though she was not his first choice of partner and he spent much of his time conducting unconsummated flirtations with other women. Precisely what sort of marriage was this? In Professor Stedman's imagination it becomes a kind of Sunday School picnic in which the possibility of tension has no place.

Believing that men of achievement must also be personally good-natured, the Victorians acted to suppress any evidence which pointed in a contrary direction. Gilbert has been a particularly unfortunate victim of this pretence. Dark and Grey, his early biographers, were so plous that they could not even bring themselves to mention the Carpet Quarrel. 'The grim Gilbert of tradition', they tell us, 'never existed.' Professor Stedman is not as fatuous as this, but she cannot quite face up to the possibility that Gilbert might after all have been something other than a second Bayard. In spite of sophistication and scholarship her book is essentially their book writ large. It is a necessary introduction for anyone who wishes to study Gilbert's achievement and method, but it is not a biography in any properly meaningful sense of the word. **D.E.**

Jane W. Stedman: *W.S. Gilbert - A Classic Victorian & His Theatre*; O.U.P. 1996. Illustrated. 374 pp. Price £20.00. ISBN 0-19-816174-3

Trial By Jury: The Critical Edition

By Marc Shepherd

Gilbert & Sullivan: The Operas
Volume 1: *Trial By Jury*
Edited by Steven Ledbetter
©Broude Brothers Limited, 1994
xliv + 208 pages

A new era has dawned.

The Broude Brothers *Trial By Jury*, the first volume of an anticipated thirteen-volume series, is the first critical performance edition of any Gilbert and Sullivan opera.¹ Directors and conductors now have available a copiously-edited libretto and orchestral score that responsibly presents the creators' intentions, together with a critical apparatus that identifies all relevant variants—and allows those who are so inclined to indulge their own informed "improvements" to the standard texts.

Critical editions of Beethoven or Brahms do not raise any eyebrows: the works of such serious composers seem to *demand* serious treatment. But, many people are perplexed by a new scholarly critical edition of Gilbert and Sullivan. What is there in these light, frolicsome operas that that requires such a fuss? With libretti, scores and recordings so readily available in the market place, what doubt could there possibly be about Gilbert's and Sullivan's intentions?

If you're enough of a G&S lover to take "original intentions" seriously, but you've never gone about comparing one edition to another, the answers may surprise you. From one libretto or vocal score to the next, there are surprising variations in wording and stage directions, with no guidance about where they came from or whether they are intentional or inadvertent.

The situation with Sullivan's orchestral scores is even more confused. The scores were never published in the composer's lifetime; his autograph scores were, for many years, either lost or inaccessible. Most sets of parts in use today, if they aren't pirated, are copies of copies of copies. To this day, most G&S performances are conducted from vocal scores, not from full scores, which means that the conductor doesn't even *know* what his musicians are supposed to be playing!

Producing a critical edition is not a simple matter. There are dozens of sources, including holograph materials, vocal scores, libretti, even contemporary press clippings; these materials are located in libraries and private collections in both the US and England. From these sources, the editor constructs an "ideal" text—representing the creators' intentions as best he can discern them—and a "critical apparatus" that thoroughly documents all his decisions.

The Broude (pronounced "Brow-dee") edition has been a long time in coming. I first heard of it in 1985, but the effort dates to 1971—long enough ago that two members of its original editorial board, Reginald Allen and Dinah Barsham, are now deceased. In addition to the usual issues of funding and politics that notoriously plague this kind of work, the editors evidently were seriously at odds over how to best satisfy the edition's varied constituency. The preface hints at the dilemma:

As it is now offered, the edition is intended as a pragmatic compromise between the scholarly and the practical. The editors recognize that the edition will be used by scholars, who expect a text that accurately reflects all the details of the sources and a form of presentation that identifies the exercise of various levels of editorial judgment. But they also recognize that the edition will be used by performers and conductors, some of whom may require far more guidance than would be provided by a literal transcription of the sources and some of whom would be distracted by elaborate typographical distractions identifying each instance of editorial intervention. Without being distractingly intrusive, the edition seeks to make the user aware of editorial processes and to provide him with the data necessary to follow the editor's reasoning—and, perhaps, to engage in second-guessing.

While the twenty-three year delay has unquestionably frustrated many people, I can say without qualification that it was worth the wait. The edition is impeccably thorough, and scholars who wish to pore over every note have all the ammunition they need. But, the editorial apparatus, copious as it is, will not interfere with directors and conductors who are preparing a production and are looking simply for the most accurate text that they can get.

The edition is in basically three parts: a thorough introduction, a libretto and a score. The twelve-page introduction by editor Steven Ledbetter includes a bit of everything: historical background, literary and musical analysis, production history, and a discussion of the opera's thornier textual problems. It's an outstanding piece of writing overall, though I was dismayed at the editor's uncritical acceptance of the old but dubious story that Gilbert's libretto was originally written for a collaboration with Carl Rosa.

The libretto has a unique presentation that I found especially clever, consisting of two independent, continuously-running streams of footnotes at the bottom of each page. The upper stream (the "critical apparatus") discusses textual variants, while the lower stream (the "commentary") explains terms that might be obscure to modern readers (like "Court of the Exchequer"). This approach keeps the more technical material separate from explanatory notes that help the reader understand the text.

For example, on the page where these lines are found:

On the merits of your pleadings,
We're entirely in the dark!

the critical apparatus says the following:

1.51 your] his **A, VS1, VS3**
1.52 entirely] at present **A, VS1, VS3**

while the commentary tells us this:

1.48 pleadings] the formal written arguments between the parties in a suit or action which develop and determine the exact points to be decided

The notation "1.51" directs us to the 51st line of the 1st musical number in the opera. The notation "your] his **A, VS1, VS3**" indicates that, in lieu of the editor's preferred reading ("your"), three of the sources consulted have the word "his" instead. Similarly, the note at line 1.52 indicates that the same three sources have "at present" instead of "entirely." (Line numbers in the main text appear at every fifth line.)

It is conventional in these editions to designate each source with a mnemonic abbreviation called a *siglum*. The three sigla cited above are: Sullivan's autograph score

(A), the first edition of the vocal score (VS1), and the re-issue of that edition prepared for the opera's 1884 revival (VS3). VS2, an earlier state of the vocal score, is generally not cited in the notes because it is so similar to VS1. In all, fourteen sources (all dating from within Sullivan's lifetime) are considered sufficiently interesting to be assigned sigla.

These two examples illustrate why the critical apparatus is just as important as the main text, for both are cases where the editor's judgment is likely to be second-guessed. All three of the sources that differ from the preferred reading are *musical scores*. The editor has decided, in these two cases, that the *libretti* sold at the theater in Sullivan's day should take priority over the words that the composer actually set.

Elsewhere, the editor draws the opposite conclusion. For example, in the Judge's song, all the cited libretti contain the line, "Though all my law is fudge." However, all the scores have, "Though all my law be fudge." In this case, the edition sides with the scores. (For what it's worth, my own view is that the scores should generally take precedence.)

Other readings that might well be questioned include:

- "Hearts with anxious fears are bounding" (scores have "rebounding").²
- "And, therefore, I haven't a scrap / Of sympathy . . ." (scores have "rap").
- "To marry two wives at one time" (scores have "at a time").
- "If faint you're feeling / Recline on me!" (scores have "O lean on me!").

Some cases are simply ambiguous. For example, in all the vocal scores, the chorus response to the first verse of the Judge's song is: "He'd a couple of shirts . . ." However, the libretti and Sullivan's autograph have, "A couple of shirts . . ." The edition adopts the latter, but it is certainly just as likely that Gilbert and Sullivan authorized the former. Sullivan would have been unlikely to amend his autograph for such a tiny change in wording, and there are certainly *dozens* of small changes like this that went uncorrected in Gilbert's libretti for years.

Similarly, the Broude edition gives the line, "To turn your attention to dinner" in the Defendant's second song. This comports with the libretti and Sullivan's autograph. However, all the vocal scores have "his attention." Here again, a plausible argument can be given for *either* reading.

In other cases where there is no evident ambiguity, the edition clears up some textual errors that have crept into the modern editions. For example, in the refrain to the 3rd verse of the Counsel's aria, all the modern scores give, "Breathing concentrated otto!— / An existence *à la* Watteau." However, all the relevant sources have, "Bless us, concentrated otto . . ."

Not all the footnotes are of such significance: even small matters, like punctuation, capitalization and placement of italics, are cited where appropriate. Reading through all of them will demand some patience. The main text itself does not include any signaling marks to indicate which lines have a footnote. Some people may feel that this makes the text itself easier to read, but I find it annoying: after reading each line, one must jump to the bottom of the page to see if there might be a note.

I've a couple of minor complaints about the typography. There are times in Gilbert and Sullivan when multiple characters sing different words simultaneously. In many editions, this is signaled in the text by writing the lines side by side or by enclosing them in a curly brace. This edition does neither, giving the impression, for example, that all of the Usher's "Silence in Court!" lines, or the Defendant's "No, no, no!" in the finale, are sung independently.

In most editions, the character who's speaking or singing is indicated by a caption on the left of the page, as in:

JUDGE. Yes, I am a Judge.
ALL. And a good Judge too!

This edition puts the captions *above* each line, as in:

JUDGE.
Yes, I am a Judge.
ALL.
And a good Judge too!

To my taste, this arrangement makes the libretto harder to read. However, these are small points. The libretto makes an important contribution to the field, and one can only hope that it will eventually be published separately. There are many readers who would benefit from it who cannot afford, or do not have the need for, a full score.

In preparing the libretto of a G&S opera, the editor's problem is mainly the existence of *so many* sources, differing in a multitude of often-subtle ways. In preparing a score, the problems are entirely different. On the one hand, the problem is easier, since Sullivan's autograph is the *only* relevant source for much of the material. (The only competing source, the modern orchestral parts in the D'Oyly Carte archives, are considered "too far removed from the originals to be regarded as authoritative.")

On the other hand, Sullivan was far from meticulous in the preparation of his autograph scores. For example, when more than one instrument plays the same notes, Sullivan usually wrote out only one part, leaving written instructions to his assistants to write the others later during copying.

Moreover, Sullivan's habitual use of shorthand and abbreviations leaves a variety of ambiguities in such matters as the articulation of doubling parts, while its presentation of the underlay is often cavalier—where there are several stanzas in a song, not all of the stanzas are underlaid (a problem particularly tricky when syllable counts in lines not underlaid differ from those in lines which are), and punctuation and orthography are inconsistent.

So, to prepare an orchestral score for a Sullivan opera, the editor has to fill in a lot of blanks. The edition employs several kinds of notational shorthand to signal the varying degrees of editorial intervention without being obtrusive. For example, a dynamic added from the vocal score is shown in square brackets (e.g. [**ff**]). Elements missing in all the scores, but which the editor feels are essential, are shown in angle brackets (e.g. <**mf**>). Finally, the edition uses corner brackets (e.g. [**mp**]) to indicate elements missing from one instrumental part that the editor supplied from another part.

The score itself is a model of beauty. Printed on large 10¼×13-inch paper, it has a roomy feel, with staves never jammed too tightly on a page. As a point of comparison, this edition comprises 146 pages of score, while the Kalmus full score comprises 122 pages. Anyone who's ever tried to squint their way through the Kalmus edition will appreciate the difference.

There are other nice touches not found in the Kalmus edition. Measure numbers appear at the top of each system. The head of each staff shows not only which instrument is playing, but also the key for transposing instruments (e.g. "Cl (A)" for "Clarinets in A"). The percussion line indicates what specific instrument is playing,

not a generic “D” (“Drums”) as in the Kalmus score. Musical instructions like *fermatas* and *rallentandos* are consistently noted in the part of each instrument.

The Broude score preserves the practice of Sullivan’s time, transposing the horns to a new key in almost every number. The Kalmus score follows the more modern practice of transposing the horns to *F* throughout. Conductors are hereby forewarned, since their players may well be using Kalmus parts!

The Kalmus edition “was prepared from a full conductor’s score believed to date from an early production of the work.” The Broude editors have evidently concluded that the score Kalmus relied on lacks authority, for they never so much as mention its existence.

The biggest difference between the two editions is that the Kalmus is scored for two flutes, the Broude for only one. Yet, there are good reasons to believe that the addition of a second flute may have had Sullivan’s approval. Later Savoy operas were *explicitly* scored for two flutes, and it’s easy to believe that, having paid for two flautists, Sullivan would have gone ahead and used them in the revivals. It is a possibility, at least, that the Broude edition should *acknowledge*.

With rare exceptions, the Broude edition assumes that the orchestration and part-writing in Sullivan’s autograph score is the best indication of the composer’s intentions. This seems sensible enough on its face but is likely to be second-guessed. All the internal evidence suggests that Sullivan was not over-careful about writing down every little change of which he approved. Therefore, it’s likely that *some* of the variants that appeared in the vocal scores *did* have Sullivan’s approval, but we’ll never know for sure which ones.³

Careful music readers will find the first surprise in the second measure of the piece! In modern scores, the melody line opens like this:



On the strength of Sullivan’s autograph and some earlier sketches for the work, the Broude edition begins the opera like this:



Another interesting difference comes just after the Defendant’s entrance, when the Chorus sings, “Monster, dread our damages,” which is given like this:

f
 Mon - ster, - dread - their - dam- a- ges.
f
 Mon - ster - dread - our - dam- a- ges.

The passage also appears this way in the first edition of the vocal score (**VS1**). But, by the 1884 revival, the vocal score (**VS3**) was revised thus:

f
 Mon- ster, dread their dam- a- ges.
f
 Mon- ster dread our dam- a- ges.

While following the autograph and **VS1**, the edition notes that it “is not clear whether [the later version] was an error, an attempt to simplify performance for less skilled purchasers of the vocal score, or an intentional alteration made without regard to performers’ abilities.” But, since **VS3** was printed from the same plates as **VS1**, an error seems unlikely, and the notion that the original vocal line was “simplified for the masses” is implausible at best.

The same comment might well apply in the Judge’s song, where all vocal scores since 1884 have presented the chorus refrains in unison, while the autograph and the first edition vocal score have them singing in harmony:

f
 A cou-ple of shirts and a col-lar or two, And a ring that looked like a ru- by!
f

Note that the Broude edition follows Sullivan’s autograph in providing “A couple of shirts,” even though the vocal scores have “He’d a couple.”

There are occasionally subtle differences in the way repeated words underlie the music. For example, in the traditional sources the “Trial-la-law” chorus ends like this:



The Broude edition follows Sullivan’s autograph and the first-edition vocal score:



Similarly, the end of Angelina’s verse in “I love him, I love him” is rendered thus in modern scores:



but thus in the Broude edition:



You’ll find differences like this in the orchestration, as well, of which I offer just one example illustrative. At the end of the first verse of the Counsel’s aria, the Broude orchestration includes the following solo for the flute:



while the traditional orchestration (found in the Kalmus score) has a few more notes at the end:



(There is a similar distinction at the end of the second verse.)

Here again, the editor is likely to be second-guessed. The piano accompaniment in the vocal score was changed in 1884 from the former version to the latter. Since the score was still being printed from the same plates as in 1875, such a change would have had to be deliberate. And, since Sullivan supervised the 1884 revival, it seems logical to assume that the change was at his instigation.

The editor describes two textual problems as being *Trial By Jury’s* “knottiest,” though both are resolved in favor of the text we know today. In the Judge’s song, the verse beginning “It was managed by a job” was orchestrated by Sullivan, but crossed out in the autograph score. We know this verse was performed on the first night,

since at least one reviewer commented upon it, but it seems to have been cut shortly thereafter, since it does not appear in the first-edition vocal score: evidently, the notion that a judge attained his position “by a job” was medicine too strong for those early audiences to swallow.

The verse does not, in fact, appear in vocal scores until an issue published at about the turn of the century—the exact date is uncertain. The verse was never cut from the published libretti, however, so they are no help in determining when it was reinstated. The most likely theory is that the verse came back in the 1898 revival—still within Sullivan’s lifetime—and so it is retained in the Broude edition.

The second knottiest problem comes in the finale, where the verse beginning “Though Defendant is a snob” is missing from all the early libretti, as well as in Gilbert’s *Original Plays*. Reginald Allen also omits it in *The First Night Gilbert and Sullivan*, suggesting that *he* believed it had not been sung on the first night. However, it is in Sullivan’s autograph, all the vocal scores, and the hand-written libretto Gilbert submitted to the Lord Chamberlain’s office for licensing. So, Ledbetter seems safe in his assumption that the verse *does* belong in the opera.

Since it is impractical to present footnotes on the same page as the music, the critical apparatus for the score is gathered at the back of the volume. This is surely the only sensible way to present the material, if the score is still to be usable in a performance setting, but it increases the demands on the reader. The critical apparatus for the music is also far more complicated, since there are so many more variations to consider.

The critical apparatus consists of four sections:

- A list of all the sources consulted, each described in considerable detail.
- A discussion “of the relative authority and interrelationships of these sources.”
- A long section (running 37 pages) enumerating all the musical variants between the orchestral score and any of the sources.
- A list of all parts that the editor supplied by following verbal instructions in Sullivan’s autograph.

About the only present drawback of the Broude Brothers edition is the lack of separately-published orchestra parts: the score presents a version of the work that is found nowhere else, and conductors will have a tall job in front of them, to collate all the differences with the standard orchestrations that are currently available.

The problem will only grow more acute as the Broude series continues. *Trial By Jury* is not only the shortest opera in the series; Gilbert and Sullivan also tinkered with it a lot less than many of their other works. Some of the Broude volumes yet to come are liable to be huge, and this will only imply a proportionately *larger* burden on directors who are really serious about mounting textually- and musically-accurate productions.

Apparently, Broude Brothers have recognized the magnitude of the problem (albeit belatedly): orchestra parts and a piano/vocal score for *Trial By Jury* are now in preparation, meaning that performers *can* present an authentic version of the opera without having to analyze the score note by note. Of course, societies that already own scores and parts, and don’t wish to buy new ones, may still be in a quandary.

But, on the bright side, directors now have an opportunity never available in the past—to make *informed* decisions about the version of the opera they wish to produce, with all the relevant information intelligently assembled in a single volume. No performing company that is serious about their G&S will want to be without this edition.

H.M.S. Pinafore is scheduled to be the next volume published and should appear sometime in 1996. The Broude edition of *Iolanthe* is far-enough along to be the basis for a recent production at Holy Cross College in Massachusetts, and it should appear sometime in 1997. Broude representatives tell me that the volumes thereafter will be published about one every year or two.

The Broude Brothers edition of *Trial By Jury* is available direct from the publisher for \$200.00 (£125) plus \$7.50 postage and handling. As a point of comparison, the Kalmus score sold in a New York store for \$60.00 a few years ago. Considering how much the Broude score gives you, it's a bargain at the price.

Write to Broude Brothers Limited, 141 White Oaks Road, Williamstown, MA 01267. New York and Massachusetts residents must add the appropriate sales tax. Send a personal check, as credit cards are not accepted.

¹ An exception might be claimed for the 1984 Eulenberg edition of *The Gondoliers*, but that was a miniature score, and hence not a "performance edition." (One could not easily conduct a performance from it.) While similar to the Broude *Trial* in some respects, the Eulenberg *Gondoliers* is more modest in scope and less thorough in its approach. For example, it ignores variants in the dialogue, being content to reproduce the modern Chappell libretto. It also does not cite "canceled passages"—material written for the opera but later deleted. The Eulenberg *Gondoliers* is an important edition (and the only full score of the opera currently available), but not in the same class as the Broude *Trial*.

² The edition speculates that Sullivan misread Gilbert's handwriting, the error being perpetuated in the first few issues of the vocal score.

³ It is likely that Sullivan reviewed the vocal score before publication—the first issue, at least—but we cannot be sure how carefully he did so.

THE SWING AND HOT MIKADOS

By

KENNETH M. GOLDSTEIN

In 1938 the United States had not yet recovered from the Great Depression. Three years earlier, as part of his New Deal, Franklin Delano Roosevelt had established Works Progress Administration (WPA), which would be renamed the Work Project Administration when it became part of the Federal Works Agency in 1939. The WPA was designed to increase the purchasing power of those on relief (public assistance) by employing them on useful projects. At its height the WPA employed 3,500,000 people, and a large part of its thrust involved construction and building projects. The WPA went out of existence in 1943.

One branch of the WPA, the Federal Theatre Project (1935-1939), was developed to provide employment for actors and theatre personnel, and provided the nation with successful high-level, inexpensive, and innovative theatre. The project also provided employment for musicians and singers, sponsoring an average of 4,000 musical performances a month. In 1938 the Chicago Federal Theatre sponsored an African-American jazz version of *The Mikado* known as *The Swing Mikado*. The production was conceived and staged by Harry Minturn, who collaborated with Gerry Warden on the swing arrangements. Baily described the production as "syncopated-Sullivan and jived-Gilbert."

In 1939, after its success in Chicago, *The Swing Mikado* was moved to New York. It was performed at the New Yorker Theatre on 54th Street (1), which was under the management of the Chicago Federal Theatre. At the March 1st opening, Eleanor Roosevelt and New York's Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia were in attendance. *The Swing Mikado*, which was eventually sold to a private producer, ran for 86 performances.

In 1938 Michael Todd, who had taken a version of *The Mikado* on tour several years earlier, had wanted to stage *The Swing Mikado* in New York City. But the show was federal property and Todd could not obtain permission to produce it. The following year, 22 days after *The Swing Mikado*'s New York premier, Todd opened his own African-American version, *The Hot Mikado*, at a nearby theatre. Staged by Hassard Short, this version's music was arranged by Charles L. Cook, and topical lyrics were written by Dave Gregory and William Tracy. An interesting story about the rival productions is contained in Peter Hay's delightful *Broadway Anecdotes*:

The Hot Mikado was Mike Todd's first major hit on Broadway. He won his producing spurs fairly with this all-black jazz version of the Gilbert and Sullivan classic, starring Bill Robinson. Todd was just preparing to open it in 1939 at the Broadhurst Theatre, when he found out that Bernard Ullrich, a Chicago producer, was booking something called *The Swing Mikado* into the 44th Street Theatre. This Mikado had been developed and subsidized by the Federal Theatre under the Works Project Administration, which enabled it to charge \$2.20 for the top ticket against Todd's \$3.30.

During the previous year, Todd had tried unsuccessfully to buy the rights to *The Swing Mikado*, which led him to develop his own version. Now he was completely outraged in seeing the same show booked across the street in direct competition with his Mikado. He despatched a four-page telegram to the White House: "Is this the New Deal?" he wanted to know from FDR. "Is this the way I, as a taxpayer, am supporting the Federal Theatre, so it can try to break me with cut-price competition on the same street?"

The White House did not reply (though in an unrelated move, Congress did abolish the Federal Theatre in the same year), but Todd's jungle survival instincts swung into action. Watching workmen putting up the letters on the marquee for the rival Mikado, the showman told his newly hired press agent, Bill Doll: "I want a flag made. The biggest flag you can get, with an arrow pointing to our theatre. And when you've got it, hang it over there," and Todd pointed to a fourth floor window of the Sardi Building, next door.

That window belonged to the De Mirjian Studio of Photography. Doll went to see him at once. "Mr De Mirjian," he said to the tenant behind the window, "Mr Todd is very much impressed with your work and would like to appoint you as the official production photographer." The man was overjoyed. "By the way," Doll mentioned casually as he was leaving, "I don't suppose you'd mind if we hung a little banner out of your window?"

The flag went into place. It not only directed people effectively to the Broadhurst, but also totally blotted out *The Swing Mikado* marquee from traffic going east, precisely the way Mike Todd intended. He also scored an immense critical success.

"Multiplication is the enemy of novelty," wrote George Jean Nathan in *Newsweek*, "but Todd's *Mikado* is a decidedly better job in almost every respect than the Federal Theatre's version." *Time* echoed: "As a show *The Hot Mikado* wins hands down over *The Swing Mikado*." John Mason Brown raved about Bill Robinson's performance as the Mikado, calling him "the most articulate man of our time . . . He is a titan, not of literature but with his feet, a superb master." When Bojangles, as the great tap-dancer was universally known, read this tribute, he said to Mike Todd: "I ain't been so happy since I was coloured."

Six years later, after the first atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, Mike Todd sent a telegram to General MacArthur: IF HIROHITO PROVES INTRACTABLE, PUT BILL ROBINSON ON THE THRONE OF JAPAN AND CALL HIM THE HOT MIKADO. (2)

The cast lists of the two New York productions were:

	SWING MIKADO	HOT MIKADO
Mikado:	Edward Fraction	Bill Robinson
Nanki-Poo:	Maurice Cooper	Bob Parrish
Ko-Ko:	Herman Greene	Eddie Green

Pooh-Bah:	William Franklin	Maurice Ellis
Pish-Tush:	Lewis White	James A. Lillard
Yum-Yum:	Gladys Boucree	Gwendolyn Reyde
Pitti-Sing:	Frankie Fambro	Frances Brock
Peeo-Bo:	Mabel Carter	Rosetta Le Noire
Katisha:	Mabel Walker	Rose Brown
Messenger:		Freddie Robonson
Redcap		Vincent Shields

Baily provided excerpts of reviews of *The Hot Mikado* from the *New York Sun* and the *New York World Telegram*. The *Sun* commented favourably on the music but was not that favourably disposed to the changes in lyrics. The *Telegram* noted that only the basic melodies remained from the original.

The Hot Mikado ran for 85 performances. The elaborate production - it included 60 girls, a waterfall of soap bubbles 40 feet high, and an erupting volcano - was a great success, but it lost money, and Todd soon transferred *The Hot Mikado* to the Hall of Music at the New York World's Fair in Flushing Meadows, Queens.

The Hot Mikado has been revived and revised several times after its 1939 premier, and there have been *Black Mikados* and *Cool Mikados*. In 1952, however, Martyn Green commented on the two original, unorthodox productions, *The Swing Mikado* and *The Hot Mikado*: "Let us hope that something may be done to prevent such a thing happening in England." (3)

NOTES

- 1) The D'Oyly Carte Opera Company was then in the final fortnight of its season at the Martin Beck Theatre. See *New York Times*, 1 March 1939, p.18.
- 2) Copyright 1989 by Peter Hay. Reprinted by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc. Hay has mistaken the theatre for *The Swing Mikado*.
- 3) *The Hot Mikado* opened at the Queens Theatre, Shaftesbury Avenue, London, on 18 May 1995. See *Times* review 27 May 1995.

REFERENCES

- BELL, D. *The Complete Gilbert and Sullivan*. Secaucus, NJ, Wellfleet Press, 1989.
- BAILY, L. *The Gilbert and Sullivan Book*. London, Cassell, 1952.
- CHERNOW, B.A. & VALLASI, G.A. (Eds) *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1993. Fifth Edition.
- GÄNZL, K. *The British Musical Theatre: Volume 1, 1865-1914*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- GREEN, M. *Here's a How-De-Do: My Life in Gilbert and Sullivan*. New York, W.W. Norton, 1952.
- HAY, P. *Broadway Anecdotes*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- MANDER, R. & MITCHENSON, J. *A Picture History of Gilbert & Sullivan*. London, Vista Book, 1962.

DONALD ADAMS

Donald Adams, who died on Easter Monday at the age of 67, was one of the great interpreters of Sullivan's bass rôles. Born in Bristol in December 1928, he sang in the Cathedral Choir and began an acting career there with the BBC Repertory Company. After military service he returned to repertory in Great Yarmouth, before auditioning in 1951 (apparently at the suggestion of Arthur Lucan) for D'Oyly Carte. He was accepted as a chorister, but soon progressed to secondary parts (Bobstay, Samuel, Second Yeoman, Antonio). In the 1952-53 season he added Cox, Counsel, Corcoran, Grosvenor and Old Adam, as well as going on for the ailing Darrell Fancourt in the principal bass parts (he was renowned as a 'quick study'). On Fancourt's death he succeeded to those rôles and played them until he left the Company in 1969.

With Thomas Round he founded Gilbert and Sullivan For All, which toured the country (and indeed most of the world) for more than twenty years giving lively concerts of G & S, sometimes employing an enthusiastic local chorus, as well as full-scale productions of the most familiar operas on Jersey and at the open-air theatre in Holland Park. It was at one of these in 1980 that I first saw him as the Mikado, and even in the less than ideal conditions of a freezing July night with an outdoor orchestra his performance stood out.

Having been largely associated with the works of one composer for thirty years, his career took a new turn in 1983, when he made his Covent Garden début in *Boris Godunov*. He went on to work with all this country's major opera companies and many abroad. His rôles included Doolittle and Bartolo for Scottish Opera; Monterone (*Rigoletto*), Ochs (*Der Rosenkavalier*), Frank (*Die Fledermaus*) and Meryll for Welsh National Opera; Don Alhambra and the Mikado for the sadly missed New Sadlers Wells Opera; and regular appearances at Glyndebourne, notably in Janacek and Britten. He sang with Lyric Opera of Chicago (not least as the Mikado), Washington Opera, Los Angeles Opera, San Francisco Opera, Canadian Opera, Geneva Opera and Netherlands Opera. The month before his death he won warm reviews for his performance in the title rôle of *Don Pasquale* for ENO.

Donald Adams made many recordings. For D'Oyly Carte he recorded the Notary, Arac (twice), Mikado, Pirate King (twice), Deadeye, Bouncer, Mountarat, Calverley, Sir Roderic, Usher, Meryll and Sir Marmaduke. He also appeared in Sargent's 1965 "G & S Spectacular" and in the 1962 Reader's Digest set singing parts not usually associated with him (Sergeant, Bunthorne, Willis, Ko-Ko, Don Alhambra). With Gilbert and Sullivan For All he made discs and films of *Trial by Jury* and *Cox and Box* (as Cox) complete plus seven more operas abridged. There was a particularly attractive recital record on the Enterprise label in 1969. In 1972 he took part in a Sullivan disc for Pearl, singing "The long day closes", a quartet from *Ivanhoe*, "Mary Morison" and the "lost" songs for Meryll

and Shadbolt. The same year he recorded live a variety of Sullivan songs and "Ho! jolly Jenkin" for an American company. From 1992 he re-created some of his best-known rôles in the definitive new Welsh National Opera CD series conducted by Sir Charles Mackerras (*Mikado*, *Pirate King*, *Deadeye*, *Meryll*). He appeared in films of *The Mikado*, *The Sorcerer* (an opera he never appeared in on stage), *Patience*, *Ruddigore*, *The Marriage of Figaro* and *Katya Kabanova* .

The obituarist of the *Daily Telegraph* (12 April) described his voice as "voluminous", adding: "with his impeccable diction he was able to project it into the largest theatres (...) (he was) an imposing presence on stage and an accomplished actor. A born caricaturist, he never allowed his comic gestures to degenerate into farce."

He was married to the soprano Muriel Harding, who predeceased him. **S.H.T.**

(Donald Adams' replacement in the cast of *Viva Sullivan!* will be announced later)



ANECDOTE OF DONALD ADAMS

In a letter to *The Times* of 18 April Gerard Noel writes: Your excellent obituary of Donald Adams reminds me of a story he told me of his train breaking down on his way to perform in a matinée of *The Mikado*. Becoming irritated by the loud complaints of some children next door that they would never get to see *The Mikado*, he hurled open the door of their compartment and boomed in his great bass voice: "Don't worry, children, I am *The Mikado!*" (*Times* obit: 16 April 1996).

THE LONG DAY CLOSES

Derek Hodgson writes: You may or may not have watched the film *The Long Day Closes* (Channel 4, Sunday 31 March). I watched the first part without connecting it in any way with Sir A.S.S. despite the title. As my eyes grew weary I taped what was to come. The very end, climax almost, was a superb rendering of Sir Arthur's music, the credits giving the name of Cantiea Antiqua for the singers. The background throughout was of a night sky.

An excellent CD performance of *The Long Day Closes* is by the Canzonetta Chamber Choir: SOMMCD 204 (Ed).

PAUL SEELEY

Valerie Bailey writes: Paul Seeley played an informal piano recital in a series of concerts promoted by Trafford M.B.C.. Nowadays he is busy teaching piano at Bradford Grammar School, Bradford and Ilkley College, as well as privately. In his spare time he is busy writing books. Among the works he played were five of Greig's *Six Lyric Pieces* and Sullivan's *Twilight*, dedicated to Rachel Scott Russell.

A GLIMPSE OF SULLIVAN

Basil Hood related the following story to me. Sir Arthur Sullivan reproached himself with his reluctance to begin his daily work, and in the effort to overcome this made a firm resolve that every morning after breakfast he would merely read *The Times* and at once sit down to composition. He did so. He kept faith with himself - but he began at the first page and read the paper, advertisements included, steadily through to the last page.

(Robert Courtneidge: *I Was An Actor Once*; Hutchinson, 1930, p.224.)

A NOTE ON THE CARPET QUARREL

By David Eden

In dealing with the Carpet Quarrel Professor Stedman says (p.275/6) that Gilbert's application to have the Savoy Theatre taken into receivership was lost 'because legally it could not be granted if there were outstanding expenses'. Sullivan, advised by Carte's solicitors, had sworn an affidavit saying that there were indeed expenses outstanding (those of the Lillian Russell lawsuit) thereby ensuring the defeat of the action and effectively accusing Gilbert, who had sworn the contrary, of perjury. Since the legal expenses were not outstanding in fact Sullivan's affidavit was false and he ought to have retracted it. This he refused to do, 'foolishly' (Stedman's word) asking why Gilbert should question his good faith when he had never questioned Gilbert's. As a result of Sullivan's refusal to retract Gilbert quite properly declined to accept tickets for the first night of *Ivanhoe*: 'You deliberately swore that the costs in Russell v Carte were still unsettled and by so swearing you defeated me and put me to an expense of £400 in costs . . . I decline your stalls.' Sullivan called this communication 'a rough and insolent refusal', unaware, says Professor Stedman, 'that his intransigence had made it so. . . (Yet Gilbert) went on writing, trying to drive through the composer's *Ivanhoe*-filled head that his affidavit was wrong and that he was honourbound to correct his error.'

Let us begin by clarifying the nature of the case brought by Gilbert against Carte. Angered by Gilbert's probing of the Savoy accounts, Carte had withheld part (but not all) of the royalty or profit-sharing payments for the second quarter of the *Gondoliers* performances. Carte - convalescing in Devon - seems to have left the affair largely in the hands of his solicitors, who fiddled at leisure while Gilbert burned. On 30 July 1890 Gilbert applied to have the Savoy Theatre taken into receivership as the only way to recover the withheld royalties. At the court hearing on 3 September this application was rejected, but Carte agreed to pay the outstanding royalties. Affidavits were sworn by all parties in support of their respective cases, Gilbert's first being dated 6 August 1890. Sullivan's first affidavit was sworn at Carte's solicitors on 18 August 1890. The following summary omits the introductory paragraph (1):

2) 'The said operas have been represented by the defendant [Carte] under certain licenses granted by me and the plaintiff [Gilbert] upon the terms of payment of fees and royalties for such right of representation according to the amount of the profits from time to time gained by the defendant'.

3) 'The defendant is a theatrical proprietor and manager, and the freeholder of the Savoy Theatre, Beaufort Buildings, Strand, in the County of Middlesex, where the operas have been presented'.

4) The defendant has provided the capital for the production of the operas. The capital required for this purpose has varied from £3000 to £5000. Everyone working at the theatre is an employee of the defendant, and in the event of a loss 'such loss would fall entirely on the defendant inasmuch as neither I nor the plaintiff are liable to contribute to the capital required or to any loss'.

5) The defendant has paid Sullivan and Gilbert one third each of the profits after making up quarterly accounts. The time taken to make up

accounts has varied according to circumstances.

6) 'It was arranged and agreed between the plaintiff and the defendant that the accounts from time to time should be audited by a professional accountant and in accordance with such agreement Mr Frederick F. Cates of 28 Budge Row in the City of London was appointed to audit the said accounts and thereupon the accounts thus audited and signed have been delivered to me and I believe the plaintiff.'

7) 'During the whole period of the representations of the said operas by the defendant he has conducted the business of the said theatre and of the said representations to my entire satisfaction, and so far as I have overheard also to the satisfaction of the plaintiff.' The defendant has consulted Sullivan and Gilbert when necessary, 'and our opinions have been given to him, and he has always deferred to such opinions. In my judgement it would be most injurious to my interests and also to the interests of the plaintiff and defendant if the conduct of the business of the theatre were to be in any way interfered with by the appointment of a receiver or otherwise and as far as I am concerned I strongly object to such interference.'

8) 'I am well acquainted with the affairs of the defendant and I am able to say he is a responsible man and quite able to pay any balance or sum which may become payable to me and the plaintiff.'

9) 'I depose to the foregoing statements from my own knowledge of the same except where it otherwise appears in this my affidavit'.

The corresponding affidavit by Gilbert was sworn on 1 September 1890. Largely directed against Sullivan, it is too substantial to be reproduced in full. Gilbert's first task was to explain why he now objected to audited accounts which he had been accepting since November 1882, the agreed opening date.

1) I was aware that a professional accountant checked the accounts from time to time 'but I have no recollection of any arrangement under which Mr Cates or any other accountant was authorised to settle any accounts'

2) There is no reason why Carte should not pay the account for the July quarter because all production expenses were paid by the April quarter.

3) If there are any liabilities waiting to be brought into account, I refer to the agreement of 8 February 1883 by which Carte is liable for any losses. 'I deny that I have authorised any legal business involving bills of costs'; 'I deny that the defendant Richard D'Oyly Carte has not been allowed in the past for sums which he ought to have been allowed for' or that there are any outstanding claims which would justify him in withholding money; on the contrary, further proceedings will only increase Carte's liabilities.

4) Carte has produced the operas not as Sullivan's affidavit [paragraph 2] says, on the basis of fees and royalties but by a straight division of the profits.

5) With further reference to paragraph 2 of Sullivan's affidavit I say that the precise nature of our business relations has 'never arisen or been

discussed between us since the date of the aforesaid agreement'. Sullivan and I have directed which artists shall be engaged, decided their terms of salary, decided or designed the scenery and costumes, scored the music and directed the rehearsals, 'and in short discharged all the intellectual functions of management whereas the defendant Richard D'Oyly Carte had merely to attend to minor and inferior matters of organization and routine. I further say that I have always demanded to be recognised as one of the managers of the theatre'. It has been my habit since February 1883 to 'employ and direct the clerks and servants of the theatre from time to time as though they were my own clerks and servants, as I believe them to be'. . . . At the suggestion of Carte private telephone wires were laid between the Savoy and the homes of the three partners so that they could consult each other.

6) With regard to the statement in paragraph 4 of Sullivan's affidavit it is not true that Carte finances the production of the operas because these are so successful as to be self-financing. Sullivan's statement is 'in the highest degree misleading'. Only in the case of an 'ignominious failure' would Carte be liable for the loss. 'The position of the defendant Richard D'Oyly Carte in respect to the cost of production has simply been that of a guarantor in a case in which only an absolutely nominal risk has been involved'.

7) With regard to paragraph 8 of Sullivan's affidavit, Carte himself has told Gilbert that he has incurred liabilities of more than £100,000 in connection with the new theatre. Carte has also incurred liabilities in connection with the Savoy Hotel and other ventures 'of a highly speculative character'. Carte does not keep a separate bank account for the theatre, but has 'for the last eleven years invariably paid the very large receipts of the Savoy Theatre (averaging £70,000 per annum) into his own private banking account'. For these reasons 'I conscientiously believe that the moneys due to me on the account for the said three months are in jeopardy and I submit that I am entitled to the appointment of a receiver in this action.'

Already committed to oppose the receivership, and faced with an urgent plea to support Carte, Sullivan made a second affidavit on 2 September 1890. This is the affidavit which allegedly accuses Gilbert of perjury. Sworn at Carte's solicitors, Stanley and Woodhouse, the offending first paragraph runs as follows:

1) I have read a copy of the affidavit in this action made by the above named plaintiff [Gilbert] and sworn the 1st day of September instant and I say as follows: With reference to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the said affidavit I say it is within my knowledge that there are outstanding liabilities which have not yet been brought into account in the accounts referred to in the affidavits in this action and I am aware in particular that certain liabilities in respect of the legal matters in connection with the performances at the Savoy Theatre have been incurred and that such liabilities have not been brought into account as I am informed because Bills of Costs for such business have not yet been rendered. Such liabilities were incurred with the knowledge of the plaintiff as he had been present and taken part in the discussions of the matter in respect of which such liabilities were incurred.

As the reference to paragraphs 2 and 3 of Gilbert's affidavit makes clear,

this paragraph is a defence of Carte's decision to withhold royalties. Carte's argument (actually Stanley's) was that present liabilities and possible future losses (not reclaimable in the event of overpayment) made exact calculation of the due sums impossible; since the Savoy finances were now *sub judice* he should make payments only at the direction of the Court. Gilbert in return was seeking a *receivership*. In order to obtain it he had to show not that he was owed money but that the resources of the theatre might be insufficient to pay it. Here is a contemporary statement of the law on the subject (*Handy Book on the Formation, Management and Winding Up of Joint Stock Companies*; Jordan, 1899):

... if the property charged is in danger of being lost or diminished in value, the debenture holders should apply for the appointment of a receiver, and if they have a charge on the business or the "undertaking of the company", or "the undertaking and property", or "all the estate, property, and effects", for a manager. This may be done even before the principal or interest is in arrear if the assets are in danger (a), or a sale will be necessary in the near future (b).

It will be seen that the legal basis of Gilbert's application for receivership had to be a demonstration that the finances of the Savoy Theatre were in jeopardy. Sure enough paragraph 7 of his affidavit explicitly refers to the risk from Carte's mounting liabilities as the justification of his claim for a receivership. Unfortunately for himself he had simultaneously argued in paragraph 6 that the Savoy was so profitable that Carte did not even need to provide capital to finance new productions. Thus aided by Gilbert's own affidavit, Carte merely demonstrated that he kept the Savoy takings in a separate bank account, and proved the general soundness of his finances. The Court refused to grant the receivership because Gilbert was unable to bring forward sufficient evidence of impending financial disaster to justify his application. This decision cannot possibly have been based on Sullivan's paragraph one, which if anything supported the application by saying that Carte had outstanding liabilities. Carte eventually paid Gilbert's royalties under the direction of the Court exactly as Stanley had advised. In other words the infamous paragraph did nothing either to prevent Gilbert obtaining his royalties or to bring about the failure of his application for receivership. Gilbert was lawyer enough to realise this perfectly well, and yet he treated the paragraph as the reason for his failure in court.

One would like to know exactly what Stanley told Sullivan about the Lillian Russell case. Assuming that evidence attested by Carte, Sullivan and Stanley cannot have been simply fabricated, the explanation might be that the legal fees for the lawsuit and the out-of-court payment eventually made to Miss Russell were represented by two separate bills, only one of which (the legal fees) had been charged against the joint account. In that case both Sullivan and Gilbert would have been correct in their affidavits, but in respect of different bills. Sullivan offered an explanation from Stanley, but Gilbert refused: 'I have no faith in Stanley, and I want nothing from him.' Instead Gilbert sought a written apology, together with 'permission to make such use thereof as may appear to me desirable.' Sullivan however had no reason to apologise: a) because his paragraph one was correct; b) because it did not affect the outcome of the case; c) because the openly stated purpose of both his affidavits was indeed to defeat Gilbert and keep the Savoy out of receivership. In what sense then was his conduct dishonourable? Professor Stedman has fallen into the trap of supposing that a man who denounces other people as liars must of course be full of truth himself. She is not the first to have misunderstood the affidavit, but she has perpetuated the misunderstanding in a seemingly authoritative work. Members of the Sullivan Society are entitled to be aware of the fact.

THE GILBERT & SULLIVAN JOURNAL

56-YEAR INDEX

By Geoffrey Dixon

Following on his admirable Index to the Sullivan Society *Magazine* and *The Gilbert & Sullivan Photofinder*, Geoffrey Dixon has undertaken the mountainous task of indexing the *Gilbert and Sullivan Journal* from 1925-1981. As he himself points out in the Preface, perfect accuracy cannot be guaranteed in a work such as this, but he has come as near as makes no difference. Basing himself on the same principles as the earlier works, and omitting relatively unimportant material such as Reports of Branch Meetings, he has concentrated on the articles of substance. The result is a comprehensive guide to the contents of the *Journal*, which is particularly useful in helping to track down elusive dates. As valuable as the Index itself is a list of places where the *Journal* can be read, from which it emerges that the U.S.A. seems to have more holdings than the U.K. In short the Index is an invaluable research tool for anyone seeking to understand the history and nature of 'Gilbert and Sullivan' as a subject. Was Leicester Tunks Eric Campbell? Are we unfair to Sullivan? Which are the six best lyrics? Consult Geoffrey Dixon, and he will tell you how to find out. **D.E.**

The Gilbert and Sullivan Journal 56-Year Index by Geoffrey Dixon is published by Rhosearn Press, 93 Carclute Crescent, Ayr, Scotland, KA7 4SZ. Price post paid in U.K. £11.00; post paid airmail U.S.A. \$19.50. Make cheques payable to G.Dixon. ISBN 0 9525532 IX (150 pp).



THE LOST CHORD

The Lost Chord was performed as the climax of *A Royal Gala*, a variety show at the Albert Hall given on 27th March in celebration of the 10th Anniversary of the Prince of Wales's Youth Business Trust. Held in the presence of the Prince of Wales, the show was introduced by David Frost and Joanna Lumley. Celebrities taking part included Shirley Basey, Eric Clapton, Barry Manilow, Stephen Fry, and the Chinese State Circus. *The Lost Chord* was accompanied by the band of Kneller Hall and by an unfortunate lapse on the part of the anonymous soloist at the climax.

THE PARROTS OF PENZANCE

The Michael Barrymore show on Saturday 6th April included a performance of the Pirate King's song by the inimitable Mr Barrymore, complete with a plethora of parrots.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The review of *Trial By Jury* is reprinted by kind permission of Marc Shephard and the editor of *Gasbag*. The picture of Donald Adams on the back cover was made available by Pat & Peter Gibbons. The picture of Grand Duke Rudolph on the front cover appears by permission of the City of Durham Light Opera Group.

A NEW IVANHOE

The BBC is to make a six-part serial of Scott's *Ivanhoe* as part of its new-found devotion to the classics. This will be the fourth TV version, besides the well known film version starring Elizabeth Taylor, Joan Fontaine and Robert Taylor. *The Times* 23 Oct 1995.

SONGS OF PRAISE

Songs of Praise (BBC 1) Sunday 22 October 1995 from the Chapel of Prior Park College, Bath, included an arrangement of Sullivan's *Lux Eot*: 'Alleluta! Alleluta!' (Information David Jacobs).

FOR SALE

David Wilmore has *Vanity Fair* cartoons for sale as follows: W.S. Gilbert £250; Sir Arthur Sullivan £100; D'Oyly Carte £250; J.L. Toole £40; C.H. Workman £55; George Grossmith £40. Also a Brock poster for *The Sorcerer* £160, and a large number of the *Savoyard* Magazine plus binder. Contact: David Wilmore, The Lodge, Braistly Woods, Summerbridge, North Yorkshire, HG3 4DN. Tel/Fax 01423 780497.

BROWNING CELEBRATION

On Saturday morning a service was held in the parish church of St Marylebone in commemoration of the marriage of Mr & Mrs Browning at that church 50 years ago. . . . Before the service the organist, Mr F.B. Kiddle, played Sullivan's "Royal Wedding March" as a voluntary. The service, which was the ordinary service of the church, included Psalm xiv, "My heart is inditing of a good matter"; the *Te Deum* and *Benedictus* in E (Barnby), and the anthem "Who is like unto Thee, O God?" (Sullivan). **The Times, 14 December 1896.**

MERRIE ENGLAND

The Bronhill/McAlpine/Glossop recording of German's *Merrie England* has been reissued for the second time on CD. EMI CFP Silver Doubles: 7243 5 68917 2 2 (2 CDs). Also reissued: *The Beggar's Opera* (Pepusch/Austin). Morrison/Sinclair/Cameron/Brannigan/Sargent. EMI CFP Silver Doubles: 7243 5 68926 2 0 (2 CDs).

WHO ARE YOU?

The question 'Who are you?' sung by the chorus to the Defendant in *Trial by Jury* may not be as casual as it seems. In his *Extraordinary Popular Delusions and the Madness of Crowds* (2nd edition 1852) Charles Mackay has a chapter, 'Popular Follies of Great Cities', in which 'Who are you?' is described as the next great catchphrase to appear after 'Does your mother know you're out?'. It sprang up, says Mackay, 'like a frog in Cheapside' . . . 'One day it was unheard, unknown, uninvented; the next it pervaded London'. At the height of its popularity the phrase caused great amusement at the Old Bailey, when an innocent judge asked of a witness *Who are you?* 'The court was convulsed; the titter broke out into a laugh; and it was several minutes before silence and decorum could be restored.' According to Mackay 'the phrase was uttered quickly, and with a sharp sound upon the first and last words, leaving the middle one little more than an aspiration.' The enquiry occurs so naturally in its place in *Trial by Jury* that it is difficult to be sure of Gilbert's intentions in using it. Sullivan however has certainly remembered the obligatory pronunciation and reproduced it in his setting. It is a comic touch whose significance would have been apparent to contemporary audiences. Mackay's work was published before the advent of *Pinafore* mania or he would no doubt have included it. **Ed.**

TWO SULLIVAN LETTERS

FROM THE TIMES 29 JANUARY 1897 (Also in Musical Standard 6 Feb 97)

May I, on behalf of music, ask the same liberality as that extended by you to the Duchess of Devonshire, in regard to women's work, and Sir Henry Irving, in reference to the drama, in connection with the Victorian Era Exhibition, which is to be held at Earls Court in May, and beg, as Chairman of the music section, the favour of your space in which to briefly explain what share the illustration of the art will take in this important exhibition?

It should be pointed out that in no other great exhibition has music played so prominent a part as that allocated to it in the forthcoming celebration of the Queen's reign - a period during which the English people have encouraged the art to an extent unprecedented in the history of the United Kingdom.

We, therefore, appeal for the loan of all articles which will help to illustrate this portion of the Exhibition, and the committee will gladly receive such exhibits as portraits of famous composers, singers, impresarios, musical conductors and others connected with this noble art; also autograph letters, photographs, original MSS, scores and libretti; musical instruments of early and late manufacture, as well as models of scenes of operas, operettas etc, produced during the period of her Majesty's reign, and any other objects which may help to make this section complete in every possible way.

The colossal "Empress Theatre" will be largely devoted to musical festivals, competitions of choral and orchestral societies, military and wind bands, vocal and instrumental concerted music, soloists, etc, for important prizes, and we cordially invite the co-operation of the various societies throughout the kingdom who have not been communicated with already. In reference to loan exhibits, every possible protection will be offered in way of insurance against loss by fire or otherwise, police supervision, etc. I append the names of the gentlemen who will form the honorary committee of the music section.

Sir Alexander C. Mackenzie Mus. Doc. (Principal of the Royal Academy of Music) Vice Chairman; W. Bendall Esq; F. Bridge Esq, Mus. Doc. Gresham Professor; C.I. Boosey Esq; F.H. Cowen Esq, Hon. RAM.; F. Cellier Esq; T. Chappell Esq; R.M. Cocks Esq; W.H. Cummings Esq, FSA Hon. RAM. (Principal of the Guildhall School of Music); J. Spencer Curwen Esq, FRAM (President of the Tonic Sol-fa College); H. Enoch Esq; Edward German Esq; Otto Goldschmidt Esq, Hon. RAM RCO; Arthur G. Hill Esq, MA FSA; Arthur Frederick Hill Esq; Alfred Littleton Esq; Hamish McCunn Esq; Hubert Parry Esq, Mus. Doc. (Director of the Royal College of Music); Cavaliere Alberto Randegger Hon RAM; George Rose Esq (Messrs John Broadwood & Sons); C. Villiers Stanford Esq, Mus. Doc. (Professor of the University of Cambridge); Albert Visetti Esq; Henry J. Wood Esq.

All who may be willing to help in our endeavour to make the music section interesting, educationally valuable and worthy of the high place and influence which at the present day music holds in our midst, will oblige by communicating with our Hon. Secretary, Mr Pellust Delsart, from whom also any further information may be obtained.

Yours truly,

Arthur Sullivan

Chairman of the Music Section,

Earls Court S.W.

It is with great satisfaction that I read your appreciative article in *The Times* today on the performance of my young friend and pupil, Mr Eugene D'Albert, at the Richter concert; but there was one phrase in the notice which I cannot but think was inadvertently introduced - that in which Herr Richter is credited with the introduction to the public of the rising young British composer and of teaching us the true meaning of the term 'encouragement of native talent'.

Mr D'Albert had already appeared before the English public with brilliant success, both as a composer and pianist, and with reference to the 'encouragement of native talent' it is hardly just to credit one gentleman who has been with us for a comparatively short time [since 1877] only with accomplishing that to which several institutions and individuals in this country for many years past have successfully lent their efforts. A glance at the programmes of the provincial music festivals will show that scarcely one meeting has taken place for years without the production of works of native composers. Coming nearer home, Mr Manns, of the Crystal Palace, has often been praised in *The Times* for his steady and loyal devotion to the interests of English musicians. On this last head I may be pardoned for speaking with some personal feeling, since my first steps in my profession were taken under the fostering care of the Crystal Palace, where my earliest orchestral works, *The Tempest*, etc. were produced with as much real care as if they had been by Beethoven himself.

I hope, sir, that my words will not appear ungracious towards Herr Richter, of whom on the contrary, I would speak in high terms of praise for his encouragement and kindness to the young composer, but your critic's words seem to imply that there has hitherto been neglect and indifference to native talent on the part of those who have power and influence in the musical profession, and that it has been left to foreigners to give the first real encouragement to a native composer. This I am most anxious to deny, and I know I am but expressing the unanimous feeling of my brother musicians.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Arthur Sullivan

9 Albert Mansions, Oct 25.

THE TIMES CRITIC (FRANCIS HUEFFER) REPLIES, 28 OCTOBER 1881

Mr Sullivan's letter, published in *The Times* of today, in which he declares himself perfectly satisfied with the treatment of English music in this country, shows a degree of good temper and easy contentment worthy of all praise, but perhaps he is scarcely able to realize the hardships of the case. Mr Sullivan's career has been exceptionally fortunate. His talent was recognised almost from the first, and later on his popular ballads and his delightful comic operas carried his name to circles where serious music seldom penetrates. No wonder, therefore, that even his higher efforts meet with a degree of attention vouchsafed to none beside him, and that, for example, his "Martyr of Antioch", the marked success of which at Leeds was duly reported in *The Times*, was eagerly taken up by the most conservative choral societies in London.

Unfortunately other English composers are not in the same position. The

neglect of English music by Englishmen has been for years a notorious grievance, and nothing is more common than to hear from the lips of a rising composer the despairing question 'How can I afford to employ months or years of serious labour on a symphony or an oratorio, and go to considerable expense in having the parts copied, with very little chance of seeing my work performed, or with the certainty almost that, if it is performed, it will be damned with faint praise and shelved for ever?'

That English composers, in spite of all their disappointment, still continue to do serious, in some cases excellent, work is highly to their credit. But to imply that English art has met with due acknowledgement at the hands of the Sacred Harmonic Society, the Albert Hall Choral Society, the director of the Monday Popular Concerts and others 'who have power and influence in the musical profession' implies an opinion of the merits of that art from which I am happy to differ in toto. Mr Carl Rosa and Mr Manns, both, like Herr Richter, foreigners, are a laudable exception to the general rule. At the Crystal Palace many English works have, off and on, been heard, and it would be easy to fill a column of your space with a list of their names. At the same time, these works have never been 'a feature' there, in a sense, for instance, that Schubert and Scumann were a feature, the appreciation of those great masters in England being mainly due to the untiring efforts of Mr Manns and Mr Grove. Certain it is that it would be difficult to point to a single British work first produced at a Saturday concert which has met with such immediate success and exhibited such promise of permanent vitality as Mr D'Albert's pianoforte concerto. No sooner was Herr Richter informed that a young Englishman, unknown to fame as a composer - for the performance of a juvenile overture at a student concert does not count for much - but of high promise, had written a work of this class, than he expressed his desire to see the score. Seeing the score and recognising its merits were simultaneous and no time was lost in turning theoretic admiration into practical advocacy. The concerto, played by the composer himself, received the place of honour in the first concert of the season. Not satisfied with this Herr Richter is determined to take the work with him to Vienna to prepare them for another triumph in the city of Mozart and Beethoven. This is indeed 'encouragement of native talent'. Let us hope that Herr Richter will continue to show his gratitude for the generous reception he has met with in this country by teaching us to appreciate the talent in our midst.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your Music Critic

*

In the event only the first movement of D'Albert's concerto was heard in Vienna. The apparently straightforward exchange of views between Sullivan and Hueffer is in fact highly political. Hueffer, German-born himself, was a leading representative of what might be called the Germanising tendency in English music. Sullivan took the view that the appointment of outsiders to leading positions in England must inevitably depress the professional interests of native musicians. As a champion of those interests he took it upon himself to object to foreign intervention on several occasions. For example, when Richter was appointed conductor of the Birmingham Festival in 1885 Sullivan gave an interview to the *Daily News* (10th January) in which he delivered himself of the following:

The knowledge and appreciation of music have enormously increased in this country during the last twenty years, and will probably go on

increasing; but I am not so sure that the position of the professional musician will improve in proportion. In England there is still a curious preference for musical foreigners. Italians, Frenchmen, and, above all, Germans, are preferred both as teachers and executants. For instance, the direction of the Birmingham Musical Festival is considered a sort of blue ribbon among English musicians. It has been given to a foreigner who speaks very little English, against whose ability I have not a word to say, except that a German who cannot speak English appears oddly selected to conduct English choruses.

The opposition of Sullivan had little effect. Richter rapidly established himself as an idol of the English musical market place and Sullivan, for whom conducting was, after all, a marginal activity, made no personal attempt to compete. He resigned the conductorship of the Philharmonic in 1887, citing Richter as a major cause:

I found it a hopeless, up hill fight with the press. They were determined that the Philharmonic should not rival their God Richter, & they damned everything with faint praise. So as I am getting too old to stand up as a target for the Hueffers, Engels, Prouts and other similar marksmen of the press, I thought I would let someone else [Cowan] have a try. [Letter of 12 Oct 1887. Sold Christies 4 May 1976]

A year later Sullivan found himself in opposition to Richter again, when *The Golden Legend* was given at the Birmingham Festival. Not only did the Festival authorities neglect to ask Sullivan's consent to perform the work, they allowed the news to go forth that 'under the direction of Herr Richter', *The Golden Legend* 'would be executed probably for the first time in all its grandeur and beauty'. Sullivan protested:

I cannot, I regret to say, accept this statement in the humble spirit in which, perhaps, it would be becoming on my part to do; for in my pride I had imagined that the first performance of the work at the Leeds Festival, under my direction, and subsequent ones under Mr Barnby at the Albert Hall, and other distinguished conductors, had, through the splendid means afforded us, more than realised the intention of the composer.

Richter for his part is said to have apologised to the Birmingham chorus for putting them through such a worthless work as *The Golden Legend*. His alleged championship of English music was in fact of a very restricted kind, being confined essentially to English music written according to German symphonic principles; Elgar, from his point of view, counted as a German master:

Richter's repertory was limited largely to the German classics: he said there was "no French music" (doubtless meaning orchestral music), he had little interest in modern developments and, although he admired and engaged many contemporary British performers, thinking very highly of the orchestral players, he did much less to support British composers than an older foreign conductor - Manns at the Crystal Palace - had done. [Grove 5: *Richter*]

In spite of the widespread determination to worship at the shrine of Richter, it is clear from contemporary comment that the Leeds Festival under Sullivan was recognised as a more distinguished event than the Birmingham

Festival. Even so Sullivan lost ground at Leeds because of his resistance to the Germanic tendency in general, and to Brahms in particular. Sullivan dismissed Brahms' fourth symphony as 'full of scholastic padding', remarking that anyone would prefer to hear Mendelssohn's *Italian* symphony as an alternative. Here now is the pro-German *Yorkshire Post* on the Leeds Festival of 1901; the work under discussion is Brahms' second piano concerto, of which Richter had conducted the first performance in 1881:

Hitherto Brahms has not had either a full or a fair hearing at the Leeds Festival. Sir Arthur Sullivan who, like every artist, nourished his strong likes and dislikes, had admittedly little sympathy with a composer whose deep feeling, reticence of expression, and frequent austerity of mood, had little or nothing in common with his own nature. The result, naturally enough, was that the infrequent appearances of Brahms's music in the Leeds programmes were unsatisfactory both to his admirers, and those who dislike his music. The latter are, of course, the vast majority, for Brahms, like Bach, is something of caviare to the general . . . [10 Oct 1901 p.5]

The long-term consequence of the position taken by Sullivan has been the destruction of his reputation by writers of the opposing and ultimately victorious Germanic school. When the Wagnerite Hueffer died in 1889 his place as *Times* musical critic was taken by J.A. Fuller-Maitland, 'a dangerous man', according to Sullivan, 'who admires Brahms.' Fuller-Maitland was indeed a dangerous man. His vicious obituary notice of Sullivan in *Cornhill* set the tone for a century of abuse whose party-political origin still remains unacknowledged by the British musical Establishment. It was and is a blatant case of history being written by the winning side.

Eugene D'Albert (1864-1932) was known as Mac D'Albert because he was born in Glasgow. He was Newcastle Scholar at the National Training School, being taught harmony and composition by Stainer, Prout and Sullivan. In 1881 he won the Mendelssohn Scholarship, going to Vienna at the suggestion of Richter. He became a pupil of Liszt, and progressively identified himself with German musical life. As a corollary he denounced his English teachers, saying that Sullivan's lessons were perfunctory, and that if he had stayed at the National Training School much longer - he left at 17 - he would have gone to utter ruin. His change of heart did him no good at first. Appointed Court Conductor in Weimar in 1895, he was driven out of office by German xenophobia and had to return to England. However in 1907 he succeeded Joachim as Director of the High School for Music in Berlin, where he attained great influence as a teacher.

Like his fellow-traveller Houston Stewart Chamberlain, D'Albert did not live to witness the rise of Hitler. He did however declare firm allegiance to the German cause in the First World War, saying he regarded himself as a totally German artist. Of his 20 operas, *Tiefland* (1903) is still sometimes heard, but his most enduring achievement as a composer seems to be his contribution to the overture to *Patience*, made while still a pupil of Sullivan. He was a great pianist, who left a number of gramophone recordings. A modern recording of his 1st & 2nd piano concertos is on Hyperion CDA 66747. The fifth edition of *Grove* says he had six wives, but according to Percy Scholes it was seven. **Ed.**

The letters of Sullivan and Hueffer's reply were researched by John Gardner, who also supplied information about D'Albert. **Ed.**

TITANIC HALL

The first-class dining room [of the *Titanic*] is decorated in the style of Hatfield House and Haddon Hall, the reception room is Jacobean, and the restaurant is Louis XVI in style. [**Daily Express** 1st June 1911].

HIGHLIGHTS DISC

Telarc have issued a Highlights Disc of the five operas so far recorded by Sir Charles Mackerras and Welsh National Opera. Their next full-length recording is rumoured to be *The Gondoliers*. Given the magnificent standards of all the new Mackerras recordings, this Highlights Disc must be regarded as the best in the market as far as performance is concerned. The contents are as follows. **The Mikado**: A wandering minstrel; Behold the L.H.E.; Three little maids; Braid the raven hair; The flowers that bloom; Tit Willow; 2nd Act Finale. **H.M.S. Pinafore**: We sail the ocean blue; Little Buttercup; My gallant crew; When I was a lad; Things are seldom; Never mind the why & wherefore. **The Pirates of Penzance**: Climbing over rocky mountain; Poor wandering one; How beautifully blue; I am the very model; When the foeman bares his steel; Ah leave me not to pine; With cat-like tread. **The Yeomen of the Guard**: Is life a boon?; I have a song to sing-0; Were I thy bride; Oh a private buffoon; When a wooer goes a-wooing; **Trial by Jury**: When I good friends; A nice dilemma; Finale. **Telarc CD-80431**.

ST CLEMENT

The article by Lord Horder on the Hymn tune *St Clement* (Mag 41 p.28) casts doubt on the authorship of the Rev Clement Scholefield. This doubt is reinforced by consideration of the name of the tune: Why, if he was the composer, did Clement Scholefield call his tune *Clement*? It is not etiquette for a composer to claim sainthood by naming his tune after himself - as a clergyman Scholefield would have been the less likely to do so. It follows that the tune was named by someone else, in this case the editor of *Church Hymns With Tunes*, Arthur Sullivan. Whoever composed the tune Sullivan almost certainly named it. But why should the editor have taken over the composer's prerogative of naming the tune? Why did not Scholefield himself simply give it a different name? These questions are answered at once if Sullivan wrote the tune and gave it the name of his friend, as he did in the case of *St Gertrude*. But why, if he wrote it, did Sullivan allow the tune to be published as the work of Scholefield? The likeliest answer would be that Sullivan was helping Scholefield financially at a time when the potential royalties on a hymn tune were considerable. Neither man could have foreseen the huge success of the tune, but once the deception had been practised it would have been difficult to reveal the truth.

A second possibility might be that Sullivan did not compose the tune entirely but wrought so great an editorial transformation in Scholefield's original that it became a new work. In either case the name must be ironical - an in-joke on Sullivan's part, hinting at the secret of the tune's authorship. Finally we may consider the sound Holmesian hypothesis that what is left after the impossible and unlikely have been eliminated must be the truth. Who is more likely to have composed an enormously popular and successful tune? A man who showed no sign of the ability to do so, except in this one instance, or a man who wrote such tunes every working day? Since the two were associated at the time of composition the hypothesis of Scholefield's authorship is actually less plausible inasmuch as it requires a special theory to explain how he acquired an ability he did not otherwise possess precisely when he was in close contact with Sullivan, whose ability is self-evident. Is Sullivan therefore the real composer of *St Clement*? All one can say is that to deny his authorship is to incur a greater burden of proof than to accept it. **D.E.**

THE ADVENTURE OF THE DRAMATIST'S PRIDE

(A Footnote To *Jane Annie*)

By Selwyn Tillett

Even on the first night of *Jane Annie* (13 May 1893) it was apparent that a full-scale disaster had occurred. Both librettists, J.M. Barrie and Arthur Conan Doyle, left the theatre before the final curtain and took refuge in a philosophical hearty dinner. Within seven weeks the unfortunate girl had vanished from the stage.

Conan Doyle afterwards played down his share in the debacle and blamed Barrie for a weak plot and poor lyrics; Barrie, whose desperation with his own script had brought him a nervous breakdown and Doyle's uncertain help, returned to surer ground and sent Doyle a superb pastiche Sherlock Holmes story as an act of reparation and gratitude. Both then did their best to forget all about *Jane Annie* as quickly as possible. (1)

The more pointed contemporary critics reckoned that the introduction of Sherlock himself as a major character might have saved the opera - one even began to write his patter song (with obligatory encore). Indeed it looks strange that in a text which bristles with self-references on the part of both collaborators, there is not the slightest hint of Doyle's most famous and enduring creation.

On the other hand, Doyle's share in the libretto reveals a strong taste for the whimsically comic which is amply reflected in unguarded moments throughout all the corpus of Holmes stories. After working on the details of the many enforced changes in the text of *Jane Annie*, I found myself wondering in vain whether there might not be some reference to *her* hidden wryly away in the narrative of a familiar Holmes case - a gentle in-joke as a riposte to Barry's story of the detective coming to the aid of two authors in the throes of a complete disaster. Fool that I am - as Sherlock himself would have said - I had forgotten *Gloria Scott*.

The "*Gloria Scott*" is a tale told by Holmes to Watson one dull winter's evening. It narrates the development of the first case in which he was ever engaged, while still an undergraduate. The mystery hinges on the unsuspected criminal past of the father of his one college friend, Victor Trevor. Mr Trevor many years previously has contracted a debt of honour, used his firm's money to pay it off, and been sentenced to transportation to Australia. The *Gloria Scott*, in which he and other convicts sail, is blown up en route in the course of a mutiny.

Only three men including Trevor escape, and two of them are eventually able to settle down in a blameless and respectable life as English gentlemen. Their cover is blown when the third man, still a rogue, turns up at Trevor's door intent on blackmail. "Trevor", of course, has been nothing but an alias all along.

The story of the *Gloria Scott* first appeared in the *Strand Magazine* for April 1893, a matter of a very few weeks before *Jane Annie's* unhappy debut at the Savoy. (2) If Conan Doyle worked to something approaching his normal timetable, the story will have been submitted to the published several months before this - probably as long ago as late summer or autumn 1892.

As the ease with which printed libretti were revised makes clear, small or even major alterations to an agreed text could be made right up to a printing deadline. By the time the deadline for *Gloria Scott* drew near, Conan Doyle will have been under no illusion as to the reception of *Jane Annie* or the reaction of Barrie and himself afterwards.

So it is that at their first meeting, the senior Trevor asks Holmes to attempt on him some of those feats which he has heard about from his son. (3) Holmes makes a few perfunctory remarks regarding his longstanding fear of personal attack, considerable boxing experience in youth, hands hardened by digging in goldfields, travel to New Zealand and Japan, and the like; but he has also observed Trevor with his sleeves rolled up during a fishing expedition, and noted his unsuccessful attempt to remove a tattoo from the skin in the bend of one elbow. Trevor pitches forward in a dead faint on to the dining table as Holmes casually reveals

And you have been most intimately associated with someone whose initials were J.A., and whom you afterwards were eager to entirely forget.

How terribly convenient that Mr Trevor's real name is James Armitage - unless, of course, we permit ourselves a thin-lipped Sherlockian smile and decide that Conan Doyle himself has been unmasked.

NOTES

1) For the full story of *Jane Annie*, see article with that title by the present writer, in *Utopia Limited: A Centenary Review of the Year 1893* (Sir Arthur Sullivan Society, 1993), pp. 5-22. The same review also reprints Barrie's story on pp.27-28.

2) W.S. Baring-Gould, *Sherlock Holmes*, (Panther Paperback edn., 1975), p.320.

3) *Penguin Complete Sherlock Holmes* (1981), p.375.

*

PROFESSIONAL PIRATES

A professional performance of *The Pirates of Penzance* will be given at Billingham Forum from 23 - 27 July. The Sergeant of Police will be John Noble. Box Office telephone 01642 552663.

THE BEAUTY STONE

CONCERT PERFORMANCE

By the York Chamber Singers

All Saints Church, Pavement, York

Sunday 10th March 1996

PHILIP - Malcolm Jennings; GUNTRAN - Ian Thomson-Smith; SIMON - Dale Turner; DIRCKS - Peter Busby; LORDS OF SIRAUT, VELAINES & St SAUVEUR - Anthony Gardner, Andy Gledhill, David Bignell; DEVIL - Philip Bloomfield; LAINE - Susan Blenkiron; JOAN - Berenice Hopkins; JACQUELINE - Donna Sharp; SAIDA - Julia Ledger; LOYSE - Susan Curry; SAIDA'S MAIDENS - Mhairi Sheail, Joanne Warburton; PIANO - Toby Sharp; NARRATOR - Mark Denten; MUSICAL DIRECTOR - Berenice Hopkins

The Beauty Stone has not been heard in concert since 1983, when The Prince Consort made the recording issued by Pearl. The York Chamber Singers therefore showed considerable enterprise in bringing it forward again, and are to be congratulated for this reason alone. All Saints Church on a bitterly cold March evening is not necessarily the place one would most wish to be, but the quality of the performance soon cast out the demons of cold and draught.

The York Chamber Singers are able to cast in depth, so much so that all the identified singers proved fully equal to their parts. Malcolm Jennings as Philip sometimes sounded underprepared, but everyone else came through a difficult task with flying colours. Like Rowena in *Ivanhoe* Laine is a heroine whose rival, in this case Saida, is altogether more worthy of the hero than she is. Susan Blenkiron sang Laine's music beautifully, but Sullivan was of Saida's party without knowing it. This being so the great music of the opera fell to Julia Ledger, who gave a powerful and committed performance. In her act 2 scena 1 thought she did not quite capture the heartbreaking potential at the words 'North blows the wind that shall bear us to the sun' but she caught the full emotional force of 'Ride on, my Lord'. Philip Bloomfield, obviously longing to act the part on stage, was sardonic and authoritative as the Devil; he was nicely matched by the Jacqueline of Donna Sharp. Susan Curry made Loyse suitably alluring, and Ian Thompson-Smith did as much as good singing can to give life to the knightly pieties of Guntran. Dale Turner and Berenice Hopkins as Simon and Joan were moving in both of their duets.

All the principals sang with the chorus, contributing to a vigorous and incisive sound. In spite of the valiant efforts of Toby Sharp at the (electric) piano the orchestra was necessarily missed - what would we think of *The Yeomen of the Guard* if the accompaniments were known only through the piano version, and the story was known only through a narrator, even one as effective as Mark Denten? These unavoidable considerations should not however be allowed to cast doubt on the success of a courageous and worthwhile enterprise. **D.E.**

Ring **01904 647531** for information about the cassette recording.

YORK CHAMBER SINGERS

SIR ARTHUR SULLIVAN

The Beauty Stone

CONCERT PERFORMANCE

AN OPERA IN
THREE ACTS

BY

ARTHUR WING PINERO
J. W. COMYNS CARR

MUSIC BY
ARTHUR SULLIVAN



Sunday, March 10th At 8:00pm
All Saints' Church, Pavement, York

PROGRAMME 20p

