STUDIES IN IMPERIALISM

IMPERIALISM AND MUSIC

Britain 1876–1953

JEFFREY RICHARDS

STUDIES IN IMPERIALISM

general editor John M. MacKenzie

When the 'Studies in Imperialism' series was founded by Professor John M. MacKenzie more than thirty years ago, emphasis was laid upon the conviction that 'imperialism as a cultural phenomenon had as significant an effect on the dominant as on the subordinate societies'. With well over a hundred titles now published, this remains the prime concern of the series. Cross-disciplinary work has indeed appeared covering the full spectrum of cultural phenomena, as well as examining aspects of gender and sex, frontiers and law, science and the environment, language and literature, migration and patriotic societies, and much else. Moreover, the series has always wished to present comparative work on European and American imperialism, and particularly welcomes the submission of books in these areas. The fascination with imperialism, in all its aspects, shows no sign of abating, and this series will continue to lead the way in encouraging the widest possible range of studies in the field. Studies in Imperialism is fully organic in its development, always seeking to be at the cutting edge, responding to the latest interests of scholars and the needs of this ever-expanding area of scholarship.

Imperialism and Music

AVAILABLE IN THE SERIES

Britain in China
Community, culture and colonialism, 1900–1949
Robert Bickers

New frontiers
Imperialism's new communities in East Asia 1842–1952
ed. Robert Bickers and Christian Henriot

Western medicine as contested knowledge
ed. Andrew Cunningham and Bridie Andrews
The Artic in the British imagination 1818-1914
Robert G. David

Imperial cities
Landscape, display and identity
ed. Felix Driver and David Gilbert

Science and society in southern Africa
Saul Dubow

Unfit for heroes
Reconstruction and soldier settlement in the empire between the wars
Kent Fedorowich

Emigration from Scotland between the wars
Opportunity or exile? Marjory Harper

Empire and sexuality
The British experience Ronald Hyam

'An Irish Empire?'
Aspects of Ireland and the British Empire ed. Keith Jeffery

Law, history, colonialism
The reach of empire ed. Diane Kirkby and Catherine Coleborne
The South African War reappraised Donal Lowry

The empire of nature
Hunting, conservation and British imperialism John M. MacKenzie

Propaganda and empire
The manipulation of British public opinion, 1880–1960 John M. MacKenzie
Imperialism and popular culture ed. John M. MacKenzie
Gender and imperialism ed. Clare Midgley

Guardians of empire
The armed forces of the colonial powers, c. 1700–1964
ed. David Omissi and David Killingray

Married to the empire
Gender, politics and imperialism in India, 1883–1947 Mary A. Procida

Colonial frontiers
Indigenous–European
encounters in settler societies ed. Lynette Russell

Colonial masculinity
The 'manly Englishman' and the 'effeminate Bengali' Mrinalini Sinha

Jute and empire
The Calcutta jute wallahs and the landscapes of empire
Gordon T. Stewart

The imperial game
Cricket, culture and society
eds Brian Stoddart and Keith A.P. Sandiford
The French Empire at war, 1940–45
Martin Thomas
British culture and the end of empire
Stuart Ward

Travellers in Africa
British travelogues, 1850–1900 Tim Youngs

Imperialism and music

Britain 1876–1953

Jeffrey Richards

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS
Manchester

Published by **MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS**
ALTRINCHAM STREET, MANCHESTER, M1 7JA, UK
www.manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

ISBN 0 7190 4506 1 *hardback*

0 7190 6143 1 paperback

First published 2001

10 09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Typeset in Trump Medieval by Best-set Typesetter Ltd., Hong Kong

CONTENTS

For John Clegg

GENERAL EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Music is more than the food of love. It can also be the sustenance of patriotism and of ideology, the accompaniment of ceremony, conflict and acts of commitment. Throughout the world, those in authority and command have invariably revealed themselves to the sound of music. Political parties rouse their followers with musical invocations of the national sentiments and ideological nostrums to which they aspire. For music heightens the consciousness, often creating extremes of ecstasy or melancholy. It has the capacity to play upon the emotions and arouse its hearers to unaccustomed cheers or tears.

It is not surprising, therefore, that music should have played a major role in the life of a global ideological phenomenon like the British Empire. When the British were accused of being a people without music, the accusers invariably based their charge on the classical norms of continental Europe. As it happens, that accusation became more and more threadbare as the nineteenth century wore on, but in any case the British were exponents of many other forms of music that lay beyond those narrowly defined criteria. Jeffrey Richards explores these forms, and much else, in this refreshingly original book. It is full of material little known or understood hitherto.

It can truly be said that the sun never set on musical events in the Empire, in the characteristic contexts of the military, the Church, the theatre, the ceremony, the exhibition, the festival, and, as time wore on, the concert hall, the wireless and the cinema. Music and word settings carried complex layers of meaning, and these are thoroughly explored here. Music could convey the ideas and emotions that were supposed to bind the Empire together. Tours and other media carried such musical ideas to the further corners of the wider world. Imperialism disseminated western musical traditions as much as it did language, ideas, science, museums, sport and much more. But, as so often happened, it was modified in the process. Imperial sentiment was often counterpointed with developing national allegiances in the so-called white dominions, as the career of Peter Dawson neatly exemplifies. Sometimes it picked up the local colour of indigenous musical traditions, albeit converted for western ends. By the later nineteenth century, a world musicology (with some eighteenth-century antecedents) was beginning to develop which would be greatly extended in the course of the twentieth.

This is the first full-length study of the musical world of the British Empire. It stands for itself; but, as with so many pioneering works, it will also act as a remarkable quarry for future scholars. As it amply demonstrates, music has to be recognised as one of the central characteristics of the cultural imperialism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

John M. MacKenzie

INTRODUCTION

When I set out on this project, longer ago than I now dare to remember, I did so with a grandiose, one might almost say imperial, plan. I would research and write about music of all kinds, from high culture to popular culture, which expressed ideas about and promoted the concept of the British Empire. I would write about other music in the Empire and its links with the motherland. I would write about anti-imperialism in music. As the work unfolded, this proved to be an impossibly massive undertaking. So I reluctantly abandoned the third aspect and much of the second aspect of my grand plan, to concentrate on the first – the expression in music of the ideology of the British Empire.

Although such eminent scholars as Linda Colley and Patrick Brantlinger have argued passionately for dating the beginnings of the cultural expression of the British imperial idea to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries rather than the second half of the nineteenth century, where much previous work had been concentrated, I have opted to cover a period roughly bounded by the dates 1876 and 1953: 1876 saw the passing of the Royal Titles Act which created Queen Victoria Empress of India – she was officially proclaimed Empress at a grand imperial assembly in 1877; 1953 was the date of the last imperial Coronation that we in Britain have witnessed or shall witness. It was not only that constitutionally Britain's monarch became an imperial ruler after 1876 but that the last decades of the nineteenth century saw the final flowering of an imperial ideology which was to find full expression in popular culture. This development coincided exactly with the emergence of the mass market and the English Musical Renaissance, two events which had a profound effect upon the creation, production and dissemination of British music. This congruence of events pointed me towards the time period I should study.

I approach the subject as a cultural historian rather than a musicologist. Therefore my primary focus is not analysis of the music but its cultural impact. I was particularly concerned to recover the contemporary responses to the music of imperialism. I therefore made extensive use of both *The Times* and *The Musical Times* as organs of record, their intoxicating pages recreating in vivid and immediate detail the feel of events and of music often long forgotten. I also drew extensively on the autobiographies and contemporary biographies of composers, conductors and singers for an insight into their attitudes and values, particularly with regard to the Empire.

The book begins with an account of the imperial music of Elgar and Sullivan and the establishing of an imperial musical idiom. It is followed by a sequence of chapters on the music composed for or utilized by official occasions: coronations, jubilees, exhibitions, tattoos, Armistice Day and Empire Day. Next, the book examines the imperial content of a range of musical forms:

operetta and ballet, films, music hall songs, ballads, hymns and marches. The book concludes with a discussion of practitioners of imperial music: Sir Henry Coward and his Sheffield choir, the divas Emma Albani, Nellie Melba and Clara Butt, and the baritone Peter Dawson.

On the basis of cumulative empirical evidence, the book challenges a range of received views: the theory that neither Sullivan nor Elgar was inspired by the Empire; the assumption that the masses were uninterested in the Empire; the idea that Victorian hymns were not imperialistic; the belief that Britain after the First World War was anti-militarist and anti-imperial. The resulting volume will, I trust, help to open up to other researchers a hitherto neglected field of enquiry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have incurred many debts in the course of writing this book and have been substantially assisted by the librarians of the societies and institutions to which I have applied for information; I am grateful to them all. They include the British Library (Music Section); the Royal Commonwealth Society Library (Terry Barringer); the International Military Music Society (Philip Mather and Edward Bevan); the Vintage Light Music Society (Stuart Upton); the Theatre Museum, Covent Garden (Melanie Trifona Christoudia); the Sir Arthur Sullivan Society (David Eden, Stephen Turnbull); Sheffield City Library (Alison Derby); Cricklewood Library (Ian Johnston); the Peter Dawson Appreciation Society (Ron and Monica Hughes); the National Film Archive (Ali Strauss and Bryony Dixon); Aldershot Military Historical Trust (Mrs Sheila Noxon and staff); and Lancaster University Library (Thelma Goodman and staff). Professor Richard Taylor, Dr John Gardiner and Mr Philip Mather read individual chapters, and I am grateful for their constructive comments.

I am also indebted to the following individuals for advice and assistance of various kinds: Professor Harry Hanham, Dr Ruth Hanham, Professor Denis McCaldin, Dr Dave Russell, Professor Johanna Parry, Dr Andrew Spicer, Dr Mark Connelly, Dr James Chapman, Ms Dorothy Sheridan, Ms Pat Robinson, Dr John Wolffe, Dr Ian Bradley, Mr Bill Fuge and Mr Eric Norris. Professor John M. MacKenzie, my editor, has generously loaned me items from his own collection of books and imperial ephemera. I owe my greatest debt to my friend the pianist John Clegg, who gave up many hours of his time to play through for me imperial sheet music, recovered from second-hand book shops, which had lain unplayed and gathering dust for decades. The book is dedicated to him in gratitude. Bringing forgotten and neglected music back to life has been one of the pleasurable by-products of this investigation. All opinions, errors and omissions are of course my own.

Publication of this book has been made possible by a grant from the Scouloudi Foundation in association with the Institute of Historical Research.

I am grateful to Kim Latham for compiling the index.

CHAPTER ONE

Meanings: Empire and music

Far-called our navies melt away;
On dune and headland sinks the fire
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre

So wrote Rudyard Kipling in the poem *Recessional*, published in 1897 to mark the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, an occasion that retrospectively has been seen as the apogee of the British Empire. Kipling was concerned to warn his fellow countrymen against over-confidence and vainglory at this supreme moment of imperial celebration. Perhaps even he would have been surprised to learn that within a century all that imperial pomp would be 'one with Nineveh and Tyre' and that for the British population at large an Empire that was once ubiquitous in both popular and official culture has largely vanished from the public consciousness.

This was graphically confirmed in 1997 when the *Daily Telegraph*, to mark the centenary of the Diamond Jubilee, commissioned a Gallup Poll to discover the current extent of popular knowledge of British imperial history.[1] Asked in which countries General Wolfe and General Gordon died, 81 per cent and 80 per cent respectively either did not know or got it wrong. Asked who was on the British throne at the time of the American War of Independence and the Indian Mutiny, 79 per cent did not know or got it wrong. Asked who wrote the poem *Gunga Din*, 79 per cent did not know or got it wrong. When the answers were broken down by age group, it was discovered that among the minority getting the answers right, the highest proportion was in the 50-plus age group. For the young, the British Empire is now quite as remote as the Roman Empire – even more so, as Roman Britain is regularly taught in schools, the British Empire only rarely.

This present-day ignorance has been erroneously read back into the

past by some historians who persist in reiterating the judgement made by Henry Pelling: 'there is no evidence of a direct continuous support for the cause of imperialism among any section of the working class'.[2] On the contrary, there is abundant evidence – the evidence of the marketplace. It is there in the record of how and on what people spent their money.

Every aspect of popular culture contrived to instil pride in the British imperial achievement: the regular exhibitions highlighting the produce and artefacts of the Empire; novels, stage melodramas and, later, feature films about gallant imperial heroes showing the flag and quelling the rebellious natives in far-off dominions; genre paintings like those of Lady Butler and the illustrations in a raft of magazines, postcards, cigarette cards and commercial packaging and advertizing; daily newspapers with an explicit commitment to Empire (*Daily Mail, Daily Express*); popular biographies of imperial heroes; juvenile literature in books and magazines promoting such a consistent imperial line that George Orwell in 1939 famously saw them enshrining, not to say embalming, a distinctively Edwardian mindset.[3] It was an image further inculcated at school via history textbooks and geographies of the Empire, by the uniformed youth movements and by a range of invented traditions and public rituals designed to promote Empire, in particular Empire Day with its religious services, processions, concerts and imperial displays. Many of the volumes in the 'Studies in Imperialism' series have recovered and explored in detail facets of this cultural expression of Empire.[4]

Under the circumstances, it is scarcely surprising that John Julius Norwich should recall of his 1930s' boyhood: 'Empire was all around us … part of the fabric of our lives. We were all imperialists then'; or that James Morris should conclude of the same period: 'Most Britons still considered [the Empire] all in all, as a force for good in the world and only a minority could conceive of it actually coming to an end.'[5] The novelist George MacDonald Fraser, who grew up in India and later served there with the British Army, set the subject in context:

> It is probably impossible for anyone born since 1950 to understand what it was like to be, and to think, British of the 1930s; equally impossible for anyone over sixty to conceive what it is like to be young today and have no imperial outlook … The child of 1939 had an imperial view, whatever his class (it is a massive error to suppose that imperialism was confined to the middle and upper classes; if anything it was stronger among the working class, and I speak from personal experience of the old Raj, where a colonel's imperialism was as nothing compared to the private soldier's). The British child of the 1930s thought that the Empire was terrific, giving him and his country a status beyond all other nations – and he had the

> evidence to prove it on a world map that was one-fifth pink. The child of 1980 has no such evidence, but being a nationalist (and rationalist) of his own time, he takes his country's status as he finds it, without an Empire, so who needs it? It is a natural point of view, in which he may be encouraged by those revisionists who hold that imperialism was not quite respectable, and even positively evil.[6]

The fact that none of the major political parties seriously contemplated the Empire's dissolution until the 1940s suggests that such a policy would have commanded little electoral support, and even though the Labour Party gave India its independence in 1947, the Government expected to be ruling Africa for the foreseeable future.

Music

In view of the ubiquity of imperialism in fiction, painting, poetry and theatre, it would seem intrinsically likely that it has left its traces in music. Research indicates that there was a veritable ocean of imperial music from the classical to the popular during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most of it now forgotten. But music raises greater interpretative difficulties than the other arts.

There has long been a debate between the believers in pure or absolute music and those who believe that music is programmatic and referential. Stravinsky famously argued: 'Music is, by its very nature, powerless to *express* anything at all, whether a feeling, an attitude of mind, a psychological mood.'[7] Eduard Hanslick, the influential nineteenth-century Viennese musical critic, believed music was an end in itself and that listening to music involved the pure contemplation of beautiful sounds and not the representation, communication or stimulation of emotions. He wrote *The Beautiful in Music* to argue this case. This view has recently been revived by Peter Kivy, who argues that 'pure instrumental music, "music alone," as I have called it, is a quasi-syntactical structure of sound understandable solely in musical terms and having no semantic or representational content, no meaning, making reference to nothing beyond itself'.[8] Roger Scruton has taken a similar position. In his book *The Aesthetics of Music* he argues that music is 'not representational, since thoughts about a subject are never essential to the understanding of music … the meaning of music lies *within* it, it can be recovered only through an act of musical understanding, and not by an assignment of values'.[9] He understands music as a purely aesthetic experience, whose meaning lies in its structure and not in any outside associations.

The anti-representationalists thus comprise the formalists who believe that the internal structure of the music is what is important,

the aestheticians following Hanslick who believe in the pure beauty of sounds, and the purists who believe in the idea of 'absolute music' (a term coined by Wagner) and reject any extramusical associations. 'Absolute music' is seen as timeless, universal, transcendent, the product of individual genius.

But, as Lydia Goehr has shown, the whole idea of 'absolute music' is itself a historical construct, a product of the Romantic era.[10] Goehr argues that until the late eighteenth century

> theorists – philosophers, clerics, scientists – attributed to music specific 'extra-musical' meanings that rendered it a worthy contribution to a moral, rational, and religiously upright society. Music's meaning came from 'outside' itself. It derived either from music's cathartic ability to influence and sustain a person's religious, moral, and political convictions, or from its mimetic ability to imitate the nature of persons and the world.[11]

This continued to be an important strand in musical thinking throughout the nineteenth century. It is epitomised by the influential work of Rev. H.R. Haweis and is an explanation for the central role of music in the rational recreation movement, where concerts were promoted and choral singing encouraged in the belief that music was innately uplifting, improving and 'good for you'.[12] But in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and as a direct result of the rise of Romanticism, theorists began to argue that music was a fine art, transcending its surroundings and reaching to the sublime. Musicians were heroically individualist artists; their music free of outside associations. This doctrine was the ultimate expression of 'Art for Art's Sake' and the celebration of the solitary genius, alone and complete unto himself. It has continued to hold powerful sway.

But there was an almost immediate reaction against this by artists who positively wanted to use music to express extra-musical ideas and who believed that the market required them to indicate to their public what they were about. If a composer gives his music a title – say The Imperial March – then he is evidently seeking to convey something specific to the audience. Liszt coined the terms 'programme music' and 'symphonic poem' to describe the kind of music to which names were given and which were *about* something. William Wallace, the notable Scottish composer of symphonic poems, defined it simply as 'music which attempts to excite a mental image by means of an auditory impression'.[13] Malcolm Budd describes this position as 'humanist' because it sees musical works as having

> a significance that can be explained only by their relation to what we are familiar with outside music. In these works there are embodied, reflected,

> expressed, symbolised or in some other way presented phenomena that are integral to human life: we recognize moods, feelings, emotions, attitudes and various other states and activities of our inner life manifested in such a way that, if we are sensitive to their presence and responsive to the manner in which music makes them present to us, we value these musical works because of their essential human reference.[14]

By this definition, music can be used to communicate individual but universal feelings – love or loss of faith – or it can set out to capture more generally the spirit of a place, a time or a nation. In the nineteenth century, some composers, such as Elgar, felt the need for both types: absolute and programme music.

There are, however, those who believe that there really is no such thing as 'absolute music' and that all music is about something. Jacques Barzun wrote:

> Most Western Music has been composed 'about something' … the critical enthusiasm for the pure and absolute is the product of very recent estheticism. It belongs mainly to the second half of the nineteenth century … it appears as part of the hostile reaction to the modern world, as an expression of distaste for objective reality and common emotion. 'Pure form' in all the arts is meant to reinstate spirituality in the teeth of vulgar materialism and practical life.[15]

He compares music to literature. Both are necessarily programmatic, both acting to express something deeper than the events they contain, to express the essence of that experience.

Already in 1906 Professor Frederick Niecks had come to that conclusion. Having investigated the question at length in *Programme Music in the Last Four Centuries*, he concluded 'all good music has a programme … the artist whose forms are nothing but forms will always leave his auditor or spectator cold'.[16] He argued that just as vocal music necessarily has a programme in words, instrumental music does too, even if the composer chose sometimes to conceal it. He adduces the example of Weber's *Konzertstück* which the composer's correspondence revealed to have a specific and detailed programme of chivalric romance. Other examples might be cited, such as Sir Hubert Parry's *Overture to an Unwritten Tragedy*, which was precisely the opposite, being inspired by *Othello*, and Vaughan Williams's *Ninth Symphony* which was inspired by Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, though that was never made public.

Equally, as Barzun points out, certain musical conventions have specific associations – slow pace and deep tone suggest sadness, seriousness, majesty; high notes in rapid time equal gaiety, joy,

triumph, celebration; certain keys and the minor scale show an affinity with darker and more pensive moods; other keys and the major scale, the opposite frame of mind.[17] Common sense suggests that both absolute and representational music exist. But this study is concerned exclusively with the representational.

A key question is how music affects listeners. Anthony Storr, in the authoritative survey *Music and the Mind*, expresses the convictions that music causes emotional arousal, 'a generally enhanced state of being', and that there seems to be a closer relation between hearing and emotional arousal than between seeing and emotional arousal.[18] Music, he says is a 'way of ordering the human experience', finding patterns of tone and melody to which audiences can relate: providing order and structure; stimulating feelings. In fact it has always been designed for that purpose. Music began by serving communal purposes, notably religious ritual and warfare, and has ever since been used as an adjunct of social ceremonies and public occasions. Both at coronations and cup finals, singing connotes belonging. Storr writes that the idea that 'music causes a general state of arousal rather than specific emotions partly explains why it has been used to accompany such a wide variety of human activities, including marching, serenading, worship, marriages, funerals, and manual work'.[19] He argues that music structures time and that, by imposing order, 'music ensures that the emotions aroused by a particular event peal at the same moment'.[20] He points out that music and speech are separately represented in the two hemispheres of the brain, with language processed by the left hemisphere and music by the right. 'The division of function', he concludes, 'is not so much between words and music as between logic and emotion'.[21] So the parts of the brain concerned with the emotional effects of music are distinct from those that have to do with an appreciation of its structure. The fact that people experience the effect of having tunes running through their minds is part of their imaginative inner lives. Individuals will react differently to music. It is reasonable to assume that each person in an audience will react differently according to personality, age, gender, experience, temperament. But music also functions within a shared culture, and until the gramophone and the wireless created the possibility of the solitary listener, music was designed to be experienced communally – and for the most part was so experienced, allowing for the emotion of a shared experience based on common denominators. Scientific research has recently suggested that many emotional identifications in music are shared. John Sloboda reports that in one classic series of experiments, people were played musical extracts that they had never heard before and were asked to

choose, from a long list of emotional adjectives, the ones that best described the emotional character of the piece. It was found that there was broad general agreement between people of different backgrounds and age groups.[22] This is in part, he suggests, because music mimics certain aspects of life.

> For instance, when people or animals are dejected, they tend to move slowly, with drooping posture, and emitting low-pitched sounds. When they are exhilarated they move fast, with breathless high-pitched noises. And so on. If music displays some of these sound characteristics, we can't help but ascribe emotional characteristics to the music.[23]

Investigating whether or not listeners agree about the greatest points of emotional intensity within a work, Sloboda and his colleagues found that there was a common physiological response, a 'tingle' factor, at the same places in the music. They have identified ten musical features which have been found to recur again and again at moments of high emotion: harmony descending through the circle of fifths to the tonic, melodic appoggiaturas, melodic or harmonic sequences, enharmonic change, delay of the final cadence, new or unprepared harmony, sudden dynamic or textural change, repeated syncopation and a prominent event occurring earlier than the listener is prepared for. All this leads him to conclude that emotion is integral to our reception of music:

> It is rooted in our knowledge of the forms and structures within a musical culture, and the ways in which composers and performers manipulate these structures in order to fulfil or thwart expectations. Many of the processes we engage in when listening to music are semiautomatic responses which have built up in our brains by virtue of sheer immersion in the musical culture from birth.[24]

Nevertheless, music is not a universal language. The Western tonal system is only one of a number of different forms, and is very different from Indian and Japanese music. It is the product of specific cultural history.[25] Much more recently than in the other arts historians have begun to question the notion of art constituting 'an autonomous sphere, separate and insulated from the outside social world', the idea underlying much musical theory and musicology.[26] As Janet Wolff argues, 'culture … is a social product and the study of culture must accordingly be sociologically informed'. The history of art is the history of the circumstances which produced it.

In this context, what is the 'meaning of music'? Musicology can analyze the structure of a work but it cannot explain why it produced the effect it does. Music does not exist in a vacuum. The effect may change and the images the music produces may change as cultural

circumstances change. For instance, Puccini's aria *Nessun Dorma* means for millions not the opera *Turandot* but the World Cup Final for which it was the theme tune, and as a result became a hit record. Composers go in and out of fashion, as cultural values and perceptions change: Elgar is a perfect example of this.

Interpretations of music in performance may vary – simply by playing the score faster or slower, louder or softer. Interpreters may follow exactly or depart radically from the intentions of the composer. There is a whole genre of performance interpretation books. But this book is concerned with a different kind of interpretation. Christopher John Ballantine argues for the organic inter-relationship of music and society: 'What actually happens is that social structures crystallize in musical structures; that in various ways and with varying degrees of critical awareness, the musical microcosm replicates the social macrocosm.'[27]

The meaning of music within the culture is defined by the understanding of the values of the culture by the composer, the performer and the audience. The composer cannot be immune to what is going on around him. For he – composers usually were men – is operating in a context determined by the role, aspirations, interests and views of the composer; the role and constraints of patronage; the role of the State (censorship, funding, control of institutions): the demands of the market; the nature of the consumer; the influence of class or national perceptions. 'Art', says Wolff, 'is a historically specific fact, produced in particular and contingent social circumstances. It can also be shown that the division between "high art" and … "popular art" … is based on social, rather than aesthetic, distinctions'.[28] There are many examples of this: the dominance of the oratorio as a form in nineteenth-century Britain was due to the social and cultural demands of that society; the different versions of Verdi's operas in Italy and France were responses to the different cultural demands of the two countries: the alteration of the setting of *Un Ballo in Maschera* from eighteenth-century Sweden to seventeenth-century New England and the transformation of *Stiffelio*, the story of a contemporary church minister, into *Aroldo*, the story of a mediaeval English crusader, were dictated by censorship.

The idea of the autonomy of music is contrary to the demands of the market, and the need of composers to earn a living by catering to the requirements of their patrons: to provide parlour ballads for home performance, special music for great public occasions, background music for theatres. There is evidence for the cultural interpretation of the meaning of works of music in the writings of composers and performers, in the reactions of audiences and in the views of critics –

important because they play a key role in interpreting and mediating the music for the audience. A cultural interpretation of music requires an examination of the entire range of music from 'serious' to 'popular'. This book is part of the movement to contextualize music and in particular to relate it to imperialism. To understand this relationship it is necessary first to outline the nature and structure of musical life in Britain.

Dave Russell, who has written the definitive work on popular music in Britain in the nineteenth century, sees three key processes in operation in the second half of that century: expansion, diversification and nationalization.[29] There was a dramatic expansion in all aspects of musical life. The number of professional musicians recorded by the Census rose from 19,000 in 1871 to 47,000 in 1911. In 1840 a piano was a luxury item; by 1910 there was an estimated one piano for every twenty members of the population. By 1900 there were more musical instruments, journals and societies available than at any time in the nation's history.

Music-making was everywhere: it was being performed in the home, in church, in school, at the seaside, in the parks, even in the streets. There were music festivals in many towns and cities; symphony orchestras in most big cities. There were travelling opera companies, choral societies, brass bands, musical comedies in the theatres, songs in the music halls, promenade concerts.

Despite regional variations, which remained strong, and the ever-present north-south divide, there was a process of musical nationalization underway. From the 1870s onwards, encouraged by the railways – which enabled music-hall artists, concert artists and orchestras to travel the nation with their repertoires and permitted the establishing of national contests for choirs and bands – there was an increasing unification of national musical tastes. The growth of the music publishing and instrument-making industries led to the promotion of national hit songs and hit music. Music was industrialized and commercialized as a genuinely national music culture emerged.

Musical life was organized on class lines and there was musical snobbery; but there were significant cross-class exchanges: music-hall songs sung in middle-class drawing rooms, operatic tunes sung in working-class music halls and concerts. There was a range of musical material which appealed to all classes: hymns, ballads, Gilbert and Sullivan operettas, marches, operatic arias.

Industrialization brought benefits for the working classes in terms of a reduction of the working week and an increase in wages, which gave them more time and money for leisure. The middle-class concern

for 'rational recreation' led to the promotion of cross-class musical activities on a large scale.

The Great War proved to be a watershed in the musical life of Britain, for after it active music-making entered into a decline. The slaughter of the Great War reduced the available pool of male recruits for choirs and bands. The Depression cut the amount of money available for instruments, sheet music and the other necessities of musical life. The decline in religious observance and the growing secularization of society blunted the Protestant impetus towards religious music-making. Alternative leisure pursuits drew people away from the making of music to the consuming of entertainment: football, cinema and music hall.

There was still as much music around as before, though much of it was now generated mechanically by wireless, gramophone and cinema. There was a decline in concert-going, and the rise of modernism opened up a gulf between 'art music' and 'popular music' that has never been bridged. But there continued to be cross-class national music taste, fostered by the new mechanical media, and much of the standard Victorian and Edwardian musical fare – classical, popular and religious – could be heard on the BBC and on gramophone records. It continued to hold sway until the mid-1950s when the rock music revolution changed the world of popular music forever. As Simon Frith has suggested, popular music has social functions: it provides ways of managing the relationships between our public and private emotional lives; it shapes popular memory and organizes our sense of time; and it creates collective identity.[30] This could reasonably be broadened to include all music. For music plays a significant role in helping to define and foster a sense of national identity.

Musical identity

The nineteenth century was the century of musical nationalism, when countries like Russia, Hungary, Bohemia, Norway and Poland each developed a musical style that was seen to reflect the national identity. In Britain there began to be insistent calls for the promotion of English national music. But there was considerable prejudice against English music in Britain. Italian music dominated the opera, German music the orchestral field and French music the operetta stage.[31] However, more and more voices began to be raised in favour of English music.

Typically an editorial in *The Musical Times* (1 January 1887) set out the case for nationalism in music. 'This is an age of revived national feeling. On every hand we behold signs of a mighty movement of peoples towards a fuller appreciation of blood

relationship, a common origin, and, as in fond hopes, a common destiny.' The writer pointed to the unification of Germany, the aspirations of the Slavs and Irish nationalism as evidence. He rejected the idea that music was universal. Racial, temperamental and climatic differences separated northern Europeans from southern Europeans, and these differences were reflected in their music.

> The roots of national music … lie deep down in the nature of the people to whom it belongs, and can only be eradicated by destroying the nationality. It is useless, therefore, to insist upon the claim of any 'classics' to be regarded as a universal standard … Each country, recognizing its own nature in its own music, should cultivate the art for itself, seize upon whatever is most distinctive and valuable in its own conception and expression, and endeavour to complete the edifice upon that best and surest foundation.

The writer admitted that we had no national music that was distinctive 'by peculiarities of structure' and which 'can instantly be recognized, like that of Scotland or Hungary'. The nearest thing we had was English folk-song.

> The tunes are simply constructed, of a manly and straightforward character, emphasized by definite, well-marked rhythm and regularity of phrase; and they combine strength and tenderness to a degree approached by no other national airs, save the kindred Germans, in which, however, sentiment predominates over strength … We have, therefore, a national style of melody, which has grown out of our temperament and circumstances, and is the natural musical expression of our feelings … But, as far as we are aware, no efforts are being made to infuse the English melodic spirit into works of higher culture.

Since the national music of the Slavic and Scandinavian countries was strongly based on folk music, and since the Welsh, Irish and Scots were recognized to have strong folk traditions, there was a natural and inevitable insistence on English folk music as the source of national music.

The Musical Times' editorial was echoed by Sir Hubert Parry's influential book *Style in Musical Art* (1911), in which he declared: 'the fact remains that when any people have strongly marked characteristics and any aptitude for musical expression, their music bespeaks them more truly than any other manifestation of the mind of man'.[32] He too turned to folk-song as most truly expressive of the English temperament, which he characterized as marked by 'simplicity, sincerity, tenderness, playfulness, innocent gaiety, healthy vigour'. To folk-song he added the music of Tudor and Jacobean England, which like folk-song was characterized by 'simplicity and

unaffected tunefulness' and by the absence of 'passionate violence of intervals or rhythm or accents'.[33]

By the time Parry was writing, these ideas had become articles of faith, strongly upheld within the English Musical Renaissance, of which Parry was a leading member. It was the vision and energy of Sir George Grove and his campaign to promote English music and the notion of 'Englishness in music' which launched the English Musical Renaissance. Grove edited the monumental *Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (1879–89), which gave prominence to English music and became the bible of the English musical world. Repelled by the brutality and ruthlessness shown by the Germans in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71, he sought to break the stranglehold of German music on British cultural life. Grove's efforts, backed by the Prince of Wales and his musical brothers the Dukes of Edinburgh and Albany, led to the establishing in 1883 of the Royal College of Music, which became the powerhouse of the English Musical Renaissance. The Prince of Wales put this enterprise securely in an imperial context when, in a speech supporting the venture, he sought to involve in the enterprise leading figures in the colonies. He argued that the College could enhance 'colonial co-operation and sympathy' and promote imperial unity 'by inspiring among our fellow-subjects in every part of the Empire those emotions of patriotism which national music is calculated so powerfully to evoke …'. For he believed that music could provide 'an elevating source of enjoyment which is at the same time calculated to strengthen those emotions that have so much influence in perpetuating a common love of country'.[34] The Royal College of Music forged important links with the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the Royal Academy of Music, the music publisher Novello, *The Musical Times*, the Carl Rosa Opera Company and the royal court. Grove became the first rector of the Royal College, but its leading musical influences were professors Sir Hubert Parry and Sir Charles Villiers Stanford. The Carl Rosa Opera Company was founded in 1875 to produce English opera and opera in English. Important concert series, like those of Sir August Manns at the Crystal Palace and Sir Henry Wood at the Queen's Hall, made a point of promoting new English music. Significant music critics and journalists campaigned for English music. The Purcell Society was founded in 1876 to resurrect the music and reputation of Henry Purcell as the last English composer of genius. In 1898 the English Folk Song Society was founded with Parry, Stanford, and Sir Alexander Mackenzie, principal of the Royal Academy of Music, as vice-presidents. It was to retrieve the folk-tunes which were to inform the music of a younger generation of composers like Gustav Holst and Vaughan Williams. But there were

important figures outside the magic circle of South Kensington who also played their part in the assertion of English music, notably Sir Edward Elgar and Sir Arthur Sullivan.[35]

So if music represented the national identity, what was that identity? Prior to the English Musical Renaissance, the most successful and enduring English music was church music, in particular the oratorio, and this was the staple fare of the choral societies and provincial music festivals. Any composer who sought to earn his living from music was compelled to write oratorios. Their number was legion. The great master of the oratorio was Handel, and he, although German by birth, became a naturalized Englishman. His *Messiah* remained the most popular English oratorio of the nineteenth century and set the pattern for succeeding composers. But the whole structure of requiems, te deums and Anglican Church music, plus the host of hymns, Anglican and Nonconformist, established a definite and indisputable musical Protestantism as one key aspect of English identity.

The second element was the one created by the Musical Renaissance: 'Merrie England', an historical-pastoral tradition which drew its inspiration from folk music and folk dance and which looked to an idealized pre-urban England of the village but also to Elizabethan England, the first age of Empire, the age of Raleigh, Hawkins and Drake, the seadogs and the merchant venturers, of Shakespeare and Spenser, the masters of the English language, of the Protestant Reformation and the defeat of the Armada, and of a long-lived and revered queen, Gloriana, precursor of the Queen–Empress. It appealed across the political spectrum: to the Left with its celebration of the peasantry, the village community and the golden age before industrial capitalism; and to the Right with its glorification of the sea-borne Empire, the plucky little Protestant island under the presiding genius of the Virgin Queen standing alone against a tyrannical Catholic Empire. This historical-pastoral tradition was espoused by Vaughan Williams, Gustav Holst and George Butterworth, on the one hand, and by Edward German on the other.[36]

There was a third element – as popular in England as in Scotland, Wales, Ireland and Cornwall from where it drew inspiration – and that was the Celtic, the music of mists and mysticism, magic and mystery, gods and legends, fairies and giants, a kind of rejection of modern industrial society different from the construct of 'Merrie England'. This again appealed both to Left and to Right and inspired among others Sir Arnold Bax, Rutland Boughton, Sir Granville Bantock, Josef Holbrooke and George Lloyd.

But the great revival in English music, which some musical historians have dated to 1880 and the première of Parry's cantata

Prometheus Unbound and others to Parry's *Blest Pair of Sirens* in 1887, coincided exactly with the high point of the British Empire. One of the functions of music therefore was to express a British imperial identity. It presented a far more difficult task than that faced by the exponents of Protestantism, 'Merrie England' or Celtic mysticism, for it had to embrace England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, as well as India, and the colonies, dominions and dependencies overseas. But what values were to be embodied in the music of imperialism?

Empire and imperialism

Belief and pride in Empire were steadily inculcated throughout the second half of the nineteenth century as a result of the development of the mass market and of well-developed and commercialized leisure industries, responding to the wishes of consumers as expressed through their purchases. The preconditions of the mass market were all in place by the second half of the century: rising real wages and greater leisure time for the mass of the people; concentrated urban markets; an efficient and integrated transport system in the railways; a breed of capitalist entrepreneurs willing to develop new leisure industries; and technological developments facilitating cheap mass production.[37]

The mass market sought to generate maximum profit by appealing to the lowest-common-denominator views of the majority. This development coincided with the growth of a specific doctrine of British imperialism. There can be little doubt that the primary motive in the growth of the British Empire was economic. The desire for profit can be seen to lie behind such diverse activities as the search for the North-West Passage, the foundation of the East India Company and the acquisition of Hong Kong. As the Empire grew, strategic imperialism developed, explaining the acquisition of the Cape of Good Hope and the expansion of British power in India, initially to protect the trading interest in Bengal. Altruistic imperialism played a very small part in the first phase of Empire, but with the need to develop a doctrine to justify the acquisition of Empire, it took on a major importance. The missionary impulse, the desire to bring the 'heathen' to the light of God, and the leadership principle, the idea that the British being the greatest race in the world had a duty to provide government and justice for 'inferior races', intertwined to create a continuing theme in imperial writing: the idea that the British ran their Empire not for their own benefit but for the benefit of those they ruled.[38]

The early Victorian attitude – consistent with the liberal philosophy of *laissez-faire* – was informal or free-trade imperialism.

The Manchester School of Cobden and Bright viewed territorial Empire as a liability and saw 'imperialism' (with its Napoleonic overtones) as the antithesis of the English democratic tradition and of free trade. But there was a seachange in the 1860s and 1870s. The Earl of Carnarvon drew a distinction between false imperialism – Caesarism, personal rule, militarism, vast standing armies, endless expense – and true imperialism – maintaining the peace, developing areas productively, educating the people towards self-government. This concept of duty and service merged with the evangelical desire to bring the 'heathen' to the light of God, with Dilke's popularisation of 'Greater Britain', the union of the Anglo-Saxon races in Britain and the white dominions, linked by common institutions, language, culture and traditions, and with a revived chivalry (service, duty, *noblesse oblige*). This was promoted by key figures of the age to produce a code for the ruling elite, who would be inspired by noble and selfless values, and to counteract the materialism of and the philistinism associated with the new industrial society. There was a rare convergence of belief between the intelligentsia and the masses as such leading figures as Ruskin, Froude, Seeley and Carlyle advocated the values and virtues of Empire.

A succession of great imperial events captured the public imagination: the suppression of the Indian Mutiny in 1857; the search for Livingstone; the purchase by Disraeli of the Suez Canal; the Abyssinian, Ashanti and Sudanese campaigns; and the proclamation of Queen Victoria as Empress of India in 1876. This was accompanied by a transformation in the standing of the army. Once regarded as 'brutal and licentious soldiery' and 'the scum of the earth', the army, like much of Victorian England, felt the impact of evangelicalism. The result was, as Olive Anderson has pointed out, that, by the mid-1860s, '[t]he British Army was … more obtrusively Christian than it had been since the Restoration'.[39] Tommy Atkins the soldier came to rival Jack Tar the sailor as the popular icon of British masculinity. The arena for both to demonstrate their manliness and their Britishness was the Empire.

All of this reinforced and strengthened an idea of Britishness which had emerged in the eighteenth century, as Linda Colley has demonstrated.[40] She shows that a sense of specifically British identity was forged in the eighteenth century by a combination of historical forces. The United Kingdom of Great Britain was actually created in 1707 by the Act of Union which linked England, Wales and Scotland (Ireland was added in 1800). This unity was strongly reinforced and underpinned by a shared Protestantism. The succession of wars against France had the effect of emphasizing and consolidating British nationality and drawing a pointed contrast between Britain, defined as

Protestant, democratic, parliamentary, commercial and progressive, and France, defined as Catholic, aristocratic, absolutist, agrarian, backward and poor. The result of the wars was the acquisition of a vast overseas Empire – India, Canada, the West Indies – into which the Irish and the Scots enthusiastically opted as generals, rulers, traders and missionaries. Britain, as it emerged in the eighteenth century, was the product specifically of Protestantism, Empire, war and free trade.

It was not until the nineteenth century that intellectuals and ideologues caught up with popular instincts and ideas. When they did, they refined and articulated a doctrine of imperialism whose basic ideas, simplified and reiterated, percolated into popular consciousness: that the Empire was Britain writ large; that it was the embodiment and expression of a British character comprising of individuality, stoicism, a sense of duty, a sense of humour and a sense of superiority; that Britain was in the Empire for the good of its native peoples.

There were 'Little Englanders' on the Left and the Right. Little Englanders of the Left with their international perspective, idea of class war and detestation of jingoism saw Empire as a sham, a fraud and an exploitative despotism. Little Englanders of the Right, like Belloc and Chesterton, saw Empire as a plutocratic Jewish conspiracy that detached Britain from its true nature: Catholic, peasant and European. But both were minority views.

In his pioneering book *Propaganda and Empire*, J.M. MacKenzie identified 'an ideological cluster … which came to influence and be propagated by every organ of British life in the period'. He identified this ideological cluster as militarism, monarchism, hero-worship, racialism and social Darwinism. 'Together these constituted a new type of patriotism which derived special significance from Britain's unique imperial mission.'[41]

This requires refinement in the light of subsequent historiography. We should certainly add Protestantism, with its doctrines of missionary impulse, the idea of the British as an elect and the sanctity of hard work, and perhaps substitute for militarism chivalry (which can be interpreted militaristically but also pacifically and defensively). Also Paul Crook recently has persuasively questioned the inclusion of social Darwinism, arguing that 'the myth of a Darwinized imperial discourse seems largely the creation of inventive new liberals … who feared the authoritarian implications of an invasive social science based on biology'.[42] That cluster of monarchism, racialism, Protestantism, hero-worship and chivalry structures and informs the music of Empire just as much as it did other cultural forms.

The First World War marked a watershed in the depictions and promotion of the Empire. Before the war imperialism could be

militaristic, expansionist and jingoistic, as represented in songs, stories and plays about scarlet-coated military heroes showing the flag. After the war, Empire was equated with stability, produce, peace and order, as epitomised by the BBC Empire Service, Imperial Airways, the Empire Exhibitions and the Empire Marketing Board. While juvenile literature continued to laud its military heroes in pre-war terms, films until 1939 more characteristically saw Empire's heroes maintaining the peace rather than pursuing aggressive expansion. But in either guise Empire remained resolutely a 'good thing', and integral to national identity. That was how the majority of the population understood it and such was the ideological context within which imperial music was to be produced.

Notes

1 The *Daily Telegraph*, 26 August, 1997.
2 Henry Pelling, 'British labour and imperialism', in H. Pelling, *Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian Britain*, London: MacMillan, 1979, pp. 82–100. See also Richard Price, *An Imperial War and the British Working Class*, London: Routledge, 1972; John Bekhem *Industrialization and the Working Class*, Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990, p. 243; Bernard Porter, *The Lion's Share*, London: Longman, 1975, p. 200.
3 George Orwell, 'Boys' weeklies', *Complete Works*, London: Seeker & Warburg, 1998, vol. 12, pp. 57–9.
4 John M. MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984; John M. MacKenzie (ed.), *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986; John M. MacKenzie (ed.), *Popular Imperialism and the Military*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992; Jeffrey Richards (ed.), *Imperialism and Juvenile Literature*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989; Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988; J.S. Bratton, et al. (eds), *Acts of Supremacy*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991; Robert H. MacDonald, *The Language of Empire*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994; see also Paul Usherwood and Jenny Spencer-Smith, *Lady Butler, Battle Artist 1846–1933*, Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1987; Martin Green, *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire*, London: Routledge, 1980; H. John Field, *Towards a Programme of Imperial Life: The British Empire at the Turn of the Century*, Oxford: Clio Press, 1982; Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983; John Springhall, *Youth, Empire and Society: British Youth Movements, 1883–1940*, London: Croom Helm, 1977; Thomas Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England*, London: Verso, 1991.
5 MacKenzie, *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, p. 8; James Morris, *Farewell the Trumpets*, London and Boston, MA: Faber & Faber, 1978, pp. 315–16.
6 George MacDonald Fraser, *The Hollywood History of the World*, London: Michael Joseph, 1988, p. 137.
7 Igor Stravinsky, *An Autobiography*, New York: Norton, 1963, p. 53.
8 Peter Kivy, *Music Alone*, Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1990, p. 202.
9 Roger Scruton, *The Aesthetics of Music*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997, pp. 138, 211.
10 Lydia Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992; and 'Music has no meaning to speak of: on the politics of musical interpretation',

in Michael Krausz (ed.), *The Interpretation of Music*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995, pp. 177–90.

11 Goehr, 'Music has no meaning', pp. 180–1.

12 Reverend H.R. Haweis, *Music and Morals*, London: W.H. Allen, 1888; and *My Musical Life*, London: W.H. Allen, 1886.

13 Frederick Niecks, *Programme Music in the Last Four Centuries*, London: Novello, 1906, p. 381.

14 Malcolm Budd, *Music and the Emotions*, London and New York: Routledge, 1992, p. 52.

15 Jacques Barzun, *Critical Questions*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1984, p. 81.

16 Niecks, *Programme Music*, p. 536

17 Barzun, *Critical Questions*, p. 82.

18 Anthony Storr, *Music and the Mind*, London: Harper Collins, 1992, pp. 24–5.

19 Storr, *Music and the Mind*, pp. 187, 182.

20 Storr, *Music and the Mind*, p. 30.

21 Storr, *Music and the Mind*, p. 35.

22 John Sloboda, 'Brain waves to the heart', *BBC Music Magazine* 7, 3 (November 1998), p. 32.

23 *Ibid.*

24 *Ibid.*, p. 33.

25 Richard Norton, *Tonality in Western Culture*, Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1984.

26 See for instance Richard Leppert and Susan McClary (eds), *Music and Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989; Christopher Norris (ed.), *Music and the Politics of Culture*, London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1989; Alan Durant, *The Conditions of Music*, London and Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1984; Robert Stradling and Meirion Hughes, *The English Musical Renaissance: Construction and Deconstruction*, London and New York: Routledge, 1993; Dave Russell, *Popular Music in England*, 1840–1914, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

27 Christopher John Ballantine, *Music and its Social Meanings*, New York: Gordon & Breach, 1984, p. 6.

28 Janet Wolff, 'The ideology of autonomous art', in Leppert and McClary (eds), *Music and Society*, p. 5.

29 Russell, *Popular Music in England.*

30 Simon Frith, 'Towards an aesthetic of popular music', in Leppert and McClary (eds), *Music and Society*, pp. 140–3.

31 Nicholas Temperiey, *The Lost Chord*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989, p. 6.

32 C. Hubert H. Parry, *Style in Musical Art*, London: Macmillan, 1911, p. 155.

33 *Ibid.*, pp. 156–7.

34 James Macaulay (ed.), *Speeches and Addresses of HRH the Prince of Wales*, London: John Murray, 1889, pp. 404–5.

35 Stradling and Hughes, *The English Musical Renaissance.*

36 Georgina Boyes, *The Imagined Village: Culture, Ideology and the English Folk Revival*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993, pp. 63–93.

37 W. Hamish Fraser, *The Coming of the Mass Market, 1850–1914*, London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1981.

38 George Bennett (ed.), *The Concept of Empire*, London: A & C Black, 1967; Richard Faber, *The Vision and the Need*, London: Faber & Faber, 1966.

39 Olive Anderson, 'The growth of Christian militarism in mid-Victorian Britain', *English Historical Review* 86 (1971), p. 64.

40 Linda Colley, *Britons*, New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1992.

41 MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire*, p. 2.

42 Paul Crook, 'Historical monkey business: the myth of a Darwinized British imperial discourse', *History* 84 (October 1999), pp. 633–57.

CHAPTER TWO

Sullivan's Empire

If there is one classical composer who has become identified with the Empire and the imperial idea, it is Sir Edward Elgar. But there was an imperial dimension also to the work of the man Elgar succeeded as the acknowledged leader of the British musical world – Sir Arthur Sullivan. Reporting his death on 22 November 1900, *The Times* declared:

> The death of Sir Arthur Sullivan, in his 59th year, may be said without hyperbole to have plunged the whole of the Empire in gloom; for many years he has ranked with the most distinguished personages, rather than with ordinary musicians. Never in the history of the art has a position such as his been held by a composer; and it was earned simply and solely by his own achievement, unaided by interest or side influence of any kind. For all the English-speaking races … Sullivan's name stood as a synonym for music in England.[1]

This being so, it is fascinating to find that Sullivan perfectly embodies the constellation of ideas that makes up the British imperial identity: patriotism, monarchism, chivalry, Protestantism, hero-worship and racial superiority. But he is also a clear example of the operation of multiple identity. Every person is a bundle of identities. Every individual describes himself or herself as being from a particular family or class, from a particular faith or political party, from a neighbourhood, town, county, country, nation, race, empire. Different aspects can be expressed at different times; but they can also fit together like a set of Chinese boxes.

Sir Arthur Sullivan was born in 1842 in Lambeth, his Christian name suggesting the influence of the revived cult of King Arthur and the memory of the great hero of the Napoleonic Wars, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington. Sullivan's grandfather was an Irish soldier from County Cork, who died a Chelsea Pensioner; his father, a

military bandsman who later became chief Professor of Clarinet at the Royal Military School of Music at Kneller Hall. His mother, Mary Clementina Coghlan, was half-Irish and half-Italian. His biographers Herbert Sullivan and Sir Newman Flower claim that he inherited 'the tough Irish spirit of his grandfather', veteran Savoyard Henry Lytton calls him 'a warmhearted Irishman' and critic Hermann Klein talks of his 'Irish nature' and 'genuine Irish mother-wit'.[2] Sullivan was to acknowledge his Irish roots in his *Irish Symphony*, composed after a visit to Ireland though it is a work which owes as much to Mendelssohn and Schumann as to Irish folk-song. His final, uncompleted, operetta *The Emerald Isle* took him back again to the land of his forbears. Yet Sullivan thought of himself as English, and patriotically so. It can be seen in his fury at an episode which occurred when he was visiting Cairo in 1882. An English officer, challenged to a duel by an Austrian baron, bolted. Sullivan wrote to his mother: 'It has been a humiliation to all of us English here … Isn't it enough to make one's blood boil.'[3] His friend, Edward Dicey, the editor of *The Observer*, who was travelling with him, noted that the atmosphere in Cairo was extremely volatile and hostile to foreigners. There had been a revolt in the Egyptian army led by Arabi Pasha, and later in the year the Royal Navy bombarded Alexandria and General Wolseley crushed the rebels at Tel-el-Kebir. Dicey feared that Sullivan's 'staunch loyalty to England might get him into trouble'.[4]

This English patriotism extended to his devotion to and defence of English music. When the German Hans Richter was appointed in 1884 conductor of the Birmingham Festival, Sullivan wrote to Joseph Bennett, editor of the musical journal *The Lute*, calling the appointment 'a bitter humiliation for all us English' and suggesting that they should have appointed Cowen, Stanford, Barnby or even the Italian Alberto Randegger ('who is one of us, for all practical purposes') who 'would all have done the work well – a hundred times better than a German who cannot speak the language, who had never had any experience in dealing with English choruses and who knows none of the traditions of those choral works which form a large element in the Festival'.[5]

Signing himself 'A British Musician' he wrote to *The Times* during the Diamond Jubilee complaining bitterly about the lack of British music in the festivities' programme being played by the military bands. He was particularly incensed at the programme of the music for the review of colonial troops by the Prince of Wales at Buckingham Palace. It consisted exclusively of French, German and Austrian music: F. Wagner's march *Under the Double Eagle*, Herold's overture *Zampa*, two waltzes by Joseph Gung'l, *Weiner Reigen* and *Immortellen*, and a

selection from Offenbach's *Orpheus in the Underworld.* Sullivan wrote:

> The above might be an appropriate selection of music for a military review in Berlin or Paris, but it is not so apparent why such pieces should be chosen to welcome our colonial kinsmen to their Fatherland. I have examined several other similar programmes, and find to my astonishment that British music on these occasions (with two or three exceptions) has been totally ignored, the preference in all cases having been given to foreign productions. I have no idea of deprecating either German or French military music; some of the marches in particular are rich in melody and in accent … nor am I so exclusive as to wish that British music only should be performed at British musical entertainments; but on great national occasions it is not unreasonable to expect that the public should be reminded that British tunes do exist. I know of nothing more inspiring than *I'm Ninety-five, The Girl I Left Behind Me, Hearts of Oak, The British Grenadiers*, and our whole rich collection of Scotch, Irish, and Welsh national tunes; but most of these, at the recent Jubilee celebration, were conspicuous by their absence.[6]

Sullivan's most recent biographer Arthur Jacobs noted that his diary contained few references to public affairs or politics.[7] But Sullivan was conservative (with a small c), a monarchist and a patriot at a time when patriotism also embraced Empire. Having visited America, he expressed his distaste for that country its system and values: 'ill-bred, rough and swaggering … no real lady or gentleman to be found … Republicanism is the curse of the country. Everyone is not only equal to but better than his neighbour and the consequence is insolence and churlishness in all the lower orders.'[8]

Sullivan had been an infant prodigy, already composing anthems and psalm settings while still one of the children of the Chapel Royal. He won the Mendelssohn Scholarship to the Royal Academy of Music and at Leipzig Conservatory earned his diploma with a highly praised suite of incidental music to Shakespeare's *The Tempest.* When it was performed in 1862 at the Crystal Palace, it caused a sensation and Sullivan was widely hailed as the great white hope of British music. His *Irish Symphony*, premièred in 1866 when he was still only 23, was proclaimed by *The Times* as 'the best musical work … for a long time produced by any English composer'.[9] There followed a cello concerto and the immensely popular *In Memoriam* overture. Then in 1871 he was teamed with W.S. Gilbert to produce the comic opera *Thespis*, initiating one of the most celebrated musical partnerships in theatrical history, Gilbert's brilliant wordplay and pungent satirical shafts being perfectly matched by Sullivan's gift for memorable melody and

inspired musical parody. The Gilbert and Sullivan operas came to overshadow the rest of his work. Sullivan always maintained: 'My sacred music is that on which I base my reputation as a composer. These works are the offspring of my liveliest fancy, the children of my greatest strength, the products of my most earnest thought and most incessant toil.'[10] Seventy-six hymns were set to his tunes either original or arranged. They included alternative tunes to such standards as *Nearer, My God, to Thee* and *Rock of Ages*. But it is *St Gertrude*, his setting of *Onward Christian Soldiers*, which is best-remembered today. In his own lifetime, his oratorios *The Prodigal Son, The Martyr of Antioch* and *The Golden Legend* were much admired. But posterity has preferred the Savoy Operas. Both at the time and subsequently Sullivan was criticized for frittering away his talent on the operettas as well as on sentimental songs and ballads.[11] But he was a man without the inherited wealth of a Vaughan Williams or a Parry. He had to work for his living and to turn his hand to what the public wanted. However, he remained profoundly conscious of his position as the leader of English music, knighted by the Queen on the recommendation of Prime Minister Gladstone in 1883. So he continued to turn out his religious music, and he composed an English opera, *Ivanhoe*; he was planning another, *King Arthur*, at the time of his death.

Sullivan was devoted to the Queen ('Bless her, she is so kind and gracious'[12]) and took seriously his role as musical celebrant of crown and Empire. In this his career ran curiously parallel to that of the Poet Laureate Alfred, Lord Tennyson. Both men enjoyed the confidence and affection of the Queen. Both made their names and their fortunes by their artistic talents. Both appealed to the middle-class sensibilities of the age. Their work also overlaps at significant points. Sullivan set several Tennyson verses as songs: *St Agnes Eve, O, Swallow, Swallow, The Sisters, What Does Little Birdie Say*? and *Tears, Idle tears*. He provided incidental music for Tennyson's Robin Hood play *The Foresters* and set Tennyson's *Ode* for the opening of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition.

Both Sullivan and Tennyson produced work hymning monarchy and Empire. In Tennyson's case, this involved his celebrated poem *The Charge of the Light Brigade*, an epitaph for General Gordon, odes on the Golden Jubilee of Queen Victoria and the death of the Duke of Wellington, and the Arthurian epic *The Idylls of the King*, dedicated to Prince Albert and, according to Victor Kiernan, with 'an imperial dimension … visible throughout'[13]. Significantly, when Tennyson took his seat in the House of Lords, he sat on the cross-benches, explaining that he 'could not pledge himself to party thinking', wanting to be 'free to vote for that which to himself seemed better for the Empire'.[14] Monarchy and Empire cannot be seen as in any way separate. For, after

1876 and the proclamation of Victoria as Empress of India, Britain had an imperial monarchy, buttressed by ceremonial, which was the focus not just of national but of imperial sentiment.

Sullivan became a particularly close friend of the Queen's second son Prince Alfred, the Duke of Edinburgh, himself an amateur musician and strong supporter of English musical life. He dedicated his sacred cantata *The Martyr of Antioch* to Alfred and his oratorio *The Light of the World* to the Duchess of Edinburgh, Marie Alexandrovna. He dedicated his song *I Would I Were King* (1878) to Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany, Queen Victoria's youngest son.

His role of royal celebrant had begun as early as 1863 when, to mark the wedding of Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, to Princess Alexandra of Denmark, he composed *The Princess of Wales March* (dedicated to the Prince of Wales, and based on Danish airs), the song *Bride From the North* (to words by Henry Chorley) and the *Royal Wedding March*. But his role was confirmed spectacularly when in 1872 he composed his *Festival Te Deum* to celebrate the recovery of the Prince of Wales from his near fatal attack of typhoid. It was scored for soprano soloist, chorus, orchestra, organ and military band and divided into seven movements. It was dedicated to the Queen and performed at the Crystal Palace with 2,000 performers before an audience of 26,000. This genuinely joyous piece opens with Dr William Croft's solemn and sonorous *St Anne*, traditionally played to the Isaac Watts hymn *O God, Our Help in Ages Past* but here set to the new words of *God Have Mercy*. Sullivan, having provided confident and rousing choruses (To *Thee All Angels Cry Above* and *Glorious Company of the Apostles)*, returns to *St Anne* for the climax and in a wonderfully bold and daring stroke counterpoints it with a jaunty military march, performed by military band. It somehow encapsulates the Victorian age musically: the devotion of the Protestant Church interwoven with the military swagger of imperial pomp, all in a work dedicated to the recovery of the Prince of Wales.

The Musical Times (1 June 1872) reviewed the *Festival Te Deum* with huge enthusiasm.

> With much of the breadth of Handel, some of the grace of Mozart, and an orchestral colouring almost unique in its masterly handling, this Te Deum ought to serve as a gratifying promise that English Music is blossoming into a Spring to be succeeded by a Summer, such as this land has not experienced since the death of Purcell.

It has rarely been heard since, which is a great pity as it is a bold, inventive, exuberant work.

But it was not just pieces directly related to royal events that encouraged Sullivan to display his monarchist sympathies. His opera

Haddon Hall, set during the Civil War, displays Cavalier sympathies, satirizes the republican Roundheads and culminates in the restoration of King Charles II. His opera *Ivanhoe*, which was dedicated to Queen Victoria, culminates in the arrival of King Richard I, the raising of the royal banner and the hymning of monarchy. The Gilbert and Sullivan operetta *The Gondoliers* more directly satirizes republicanism and affirms the system of monarchy.

Both monarchy and Empire were deliberately promoted in the series of great exhibitions held in Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. The International Exhibition of 1871, marking the twentieth anniversary of the Great Exhibition, took place in the exhibition galleries of the Royal Horticultural Gardens, South Kensington. Thirty-two countries had been invited to display examples of their fine arts, manufactures, horticulture and scientific inventions. Among the examples were jewellery, mosaics, armour and carvings from India, but the principal emphasis was on Europe and the hope for peace.

The Exhibition was formally opened on 1 May by the Prince of Wales but was characterized by the confusion and disorganization that has been shown by Jeffrey Lant to characterize much of the public pageantry in the early and mid-Victorian periods.[15] A total lack of signposting resulted in many visitors failing to find the entrance; the unrehearsed performance of the 148th Psalm, sung to the tune of the Austrian national hymn, was disastrous, as the band and the choir performing it were so far apart that they were unable to coordinate their performance properly; the Lord Mayor of London tripped on his robes and fell down the steps of the platform; and the State Trumpeters drowned out the Prince's declaration of the opening. *The Graphic* pronounced the ceremonies 'flat and feeble'.[16]

There followed a concert, or 'Exhibition of Musical Art' as it was described by the official programme. The intention was to symbolize the friendship between Britain, France, Italy and Germany. The organizers had invited four leading national composers, Verdi, Auber, Wagner and Sterndale Bennett, to compose and conduct a work specially for the occasion. Verdi and Auber declined; Sterndale Bennett suggested that they get a younger composer, and Wagner did not reply. So, the works were commissioned from Ciro Pinsuti (Italy), Charles Gounod (France), Dr Ferdinand Hiller (Germany) and Arthur Sullivan (Britain). However, the whole thing took place in the shadow of the Franco-Prussian War, with new atrocities daily reported and France in turmoil.

The concert opened with Sir Michael Costa conducting the Overture to Weber's *Der Freischutz* ('a splendid performance', thought

The Times[17]) and closed with him conducting the overture to Rossini's *Semiramide*. In between came the special pieces. First was Pinsuti's unaccompanied chorus to words specially written by Lord Houghton, a second-rate piece of versifying extolling the virtues of peace and hope. *The Graphic* thought the music 'ineffective and weak throughout'.[18] Gounod's *Gallia* was a setting for soprano, choir and orchestra of words from Psalm 130 – 'Out of the deep have I called thee, O Lord' – and the Lamentations of Jeremiah: 'How doth the city sit solitary, that was so full of people.' It was all too plainly a lament for the state of France. Gounod conducted it in tears and the piece received a standing ovation from the audience. He was followed by Dr Hiller, who conducted his *Triumphal March in D Major*. *The Times* thought it 'vigorous, rhythmical and to the purpose'.[19] But he was less warmly received than Gounod and left the building immediately after his performance.

Sullivan's contribution was the cantata *On Sea and Shore* to words by the playwright Tom Taylor. The theme was 'the sorrows and separations necessarily incidental to war', but to avoid contemporary resonances, the programme said, it had been deliberately set in the sixteenth century, against the background of the conflict between the Genoese and the Moors of North Africa. Opening with music that emulates the motion of the waves, like Mendelssohn's *Fingal's Cave* Overture, it has the Genoese sailors singing of their mission: 'Joys of the shore we must forego/ But ours are the joys of the sea/ To brave the storm and to sink the foe/ And the spoil of victory.' There is a yearning chorus of lament from the women at the departure of their men. The most striking part of the score, employing the instrument known as a Jingling Johnny, is the 'Moresque', Sullivan's exotic Moorish interlude which leads into a Moslem chorus of triumph and the call to prayer as the Moors vanquish the Genoese. The sailors, chained in the slave galleys, sing their defiance: 'Hold to Christian manhood, firm in Christian faith/ Faithful hearts make fearless hands, and faithful hearts have we/ The Christians 'gainst the infidel, chained though we be.' They break their bonds, seize the galley and sail home to joyous songs of reunion.

Although the theme, the wars of the cross and the crescent, is proto-imperial, the finale of the cantata is a paean to peace: 'Sink and scatter, clouds of war/ Sun of peace, shine full and far.' Selwyn Tillett sees it as Sullivan's *Land of Hope and Glory*.[20] It was certainly sung separately from the cantata as *The Song of Peace* in concert programmes. But unlike *Land of Hope and Glory*, it would never have been sung at football grounds, being far too elaborate and operatic in its trills, flourishes and repeats. There is no record of any performance

of cantata or song between 1914 and 1984 when it was staged by Imperial Opera.

Far more full-bloodedly imperial were the events surrounding the Queen's opening, at the Royal Albert Hall, of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition on 4 May 1886. John MacKenzie has called it 'the first of the imperial "official" exhibitions, developed and funded with Government support, that culminated in Wembley and Glasgow'.[21] The proceedings at the 1924 and 1938 Empire Exhibitions at Wembley and Glasgow were to follow the pattern established at the Colonial and Indian, where music and pageantry were used to dramatize the idea of Empire. *The Times (5* May 1886) observed that 'no public ceremonial honoured by the presence of Her Majesty has been surrounded by so much pomp or by such gorgeous accessories of State Pageantry as that witnessed yesterday in South Kensington'. It rhapsodized about the scene which presented itself in the entrance hall:

> Hardly a colour that could be mentioned was absent from it. The Yeomen of the Guard, in their picturesque costume, were drawn up to the right and left; the pursuivants and heralds, in their gorgeous silken tabards, stood near the vestibule; the State Trumpeters, in their tunic of ruby velvet, covered with heavy gold embroidery, and with their silver trumpets ready, were stationed behind the Prince of Wales's statue; a body of Lascar sailors, dressed in white and wearing red turbans, awaited the arrival of the Queen in the vestibule; and to and fro between these varied groups statesmen in Windsor uniforms, officers of high rank in scarlet tunics, and civilians in levée dress continually passed and repassed.

The Establishment was out in force, with the royal court, the aristocracy, politics, the Church and the colonies fully represented. Colonial flags flew at the entrance of the Exhibition. The Prince of Wales, President of the Commission which organized the Exhibition, welcomed the Queen by putting the Exhibition in context:

> In the Great Exhibition of 1851, your Majesty's colonial and Indian possessions were indeed represented, but their importance was then but little realized as their present greatness was at that time unforeseen. During the years that have elapsed since 1851 few greater changes have been wrought than the marvellous development of the outlying portions of your Majesty's Empire.

The Queen, in opening the Exhibition, expressed the hope that

> this undertaking may be the means of imparting a stimulus to the commercial interests and intercourse of all parts of my dominions, by

> encouraging the arts of peace and industry, and by strengthening the bonds of union which now exists in every portion of my Empire.[22]

Music was to be used to consecrate the aims of the Exhibition, and so a concert was programmed as part of the opening ceremonies. It opened with the national anthem, the second verse being sung in Sanskrit. There followed an ode, specially written by the Poet Laureate Lord Tennyson, and set to music by Sullivan, who was conducting. With the hortatory refrain, 'Britons, hold your own', it celebrated the displays of colonial produce, reminded listeners of Britain's folly in fighting and losing the American colonies ('Unprophetic rulers they – / Drove from out … the mother's nest/ That young eagle of the West') and made a rousing call for imperial unity ('Sons, be welded each and all/ Into one imperial whole/ One with Britain heart and soul!/ One life, one flag, one fleet, one Throne'). It was sung by the Canadian diva Madame Emma Albani and chorus. *The Times* reported that 'after each verse Her Majesty smiled her thanks to the singer and clapped her hands'. *The Musical Times* pronounced the music 'bright and spirited enough, but without much originality of idea'.[23] But with its stately main tune, rousing final verse and bold, repeated, recitative setting of the last line, it is a fitting *pièce d'occasion.* It was never to be performed again during the life of the Empire, but has now been recorded on CD.[24] The *Hallelujah Chorus* followed a prayer by the Archbishop of Canterbury for the continued unity of the Empire. Madame Albani then performed *Home, Sweet Home* which, said *the Musical Times*, 'was sung with such touching expression … as almost to reconcile us to Bishop's sickly and commonplace ditty'.[25] *Rule, Britannia* was performed as the royal party left. The musical programme was in fact an appropriate blend of the royal, the imperial, the Protestant and the domestic sentiments that characterized Victorian public culture.

Sullivan was back on Empire duty in 1887 for the laying of the foundation-stone of the Imperial Institute. The Institute was built in South Kensington to provide a permanent exhibition, a library and information services of various kinds on the resources, social conditions and development of the Empire. Its purpose, as stated in its charter of incorporation, was 'to strengthen the bonds of union between all classes and races in Our Dominions and to promote a feeling of mutual goodwill, of a common citizenship'.[26] The Prince of Wales was an enthusiastic supporter of the project, seeing it as a chance to allow the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, which he had chaired, to continue on a permanent basis. Queen Victoria saw it as the completion of the work of the Prince Consort, the logical outcome

of the 1851 Great Exhibition. Its funding by public subscription was one of the major projects of Golden Jubilee Year: £440,000 was raised, the money coming equally from Britain and the various territories of the Empire. A magnificent building in the Renaissance style was commissioned from T.E. Colcutt.

There was a glittering and prestigious foundation-stone laying ceremony on 4 July, 1887, attended by 10,000 people, including European monarchs, Indian princes and other great personages of the day. It was, declared *The Times*, 'a great event, an event in significance, in grandeur, and in the interest it excited', second only to the Golden Jubilee itself.[27] The Queen laid the foundation-stone with a silver trowel and the Archbishop of Canterbury gave thanks to God, 'for the abundance of dominion, loyal majesty and might of India and the colonies, wherewith even in this year of the jubilee, Thou hast multiplied the Empire of Our Queen and fortified it'. Sir Arthur Sullivan was once again conducting choir and orchestra. He conducted his own grand processional march from *Henry VIII* for the arrival of the royal party and *Rule, Britannia* for their departure. But the great set piece of the occasion was a new ode. The words were provided by Lewis Morris (1833–1907), a poet who is quite forgotten today but was sufficiently well-known to figure in eminent poetic company in Gilbert's lyrics for *Ruddigore*, when Robin Oakapple sings:

> As a poet, I'm tender and quaint –
> I've passion and fervour and grace –
> From Ovid and Horace
> To Swinburne and Morris
> They all of them take a back place.

He was a disciple of Tennyson and disappointed not to succeed him as Poet Laureate. But it was probably politics rather than poetry which kept him out. The job went to the Conservative Alfred Austin.[28] Morris was a radical Welsh lawyer, a Liberal who favoured Welsh home rule, disestablishment of the Church in Wales and social reform. He composed odes for the first Cooperative Festival in 1888 and the Trades Union Congress in Wales in 1901. He several times failed to get into Parliament but was knighted in 1895 at the nomination of Lord Rosebery. For all his political radicalism, he was a fervent imperialist; and, although not Poet Laureate, composed odes to mark royal and imperial occasions, *A Song of Empire* for the Golden Jubilee, odes on the marriage of the Duke of York, the death of the Duke of Clarence and the death of Canadian Premier Sir John Thompson, for instance.

His ode for the opening of the Imperial Institute was set to music by Sullivan and it was an even grander affair than the ode for the

Colonial and Indian Exhibition. In consultation with Morris, Sullivan trimmed and paraphrased the ode here and there for ease of setting and he omitted an entire verse encouraging emigration ('Guide we their feet to where/ Is spread for those who dare/ A Happier Britain 'neath an ampler air'). Sullivan also interestingly substitutes 'England' on several occasions for Morris' 'Britain', but he retains 'Britain' for the final verse. This confirms the fact that for Sullivan, as for most nineteenth-century Englishmen, Britain and England were synonymous. Morris, as a patriotic Welshman, thought differently. But their collaboration is a celebration of the British imperial achievement, with the repeated chorus 'Worthy is she of praise', and beginning:

> With voice and solemn music sing,
> Loud let the pealing trumpets ring!
> Today our hands consolidate
> The Empire of a thousand years.

It acknowledges the role of war in the creation of the Empire:

> Soldier and sailor side by side,
> Her strong sons bravely dared and died.

Now it is not by war but by peace that 'we seek our realm's increase' and imperial unity, as embodied in the Institute. It ends with a paean of praise to the Queen ('First Lady of our English race'), her 'lost consort' and her son 'who has seen all thy Empire face to face', and asks God to 'Keep this Our Britain Great'. Herbert Sullivan and Sir Newman Flower in their biography of Sullivan, although claiming that Tennyson wrote the ode, presumably confusing it with the ode for the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, nonetheless note:

> Into the setting of the Ode Sullivan had woven the spirit of majesty and greatness of an Empire. Just as the mighty Handel before him had composed special music for coronations, royal weddings, for peace celebrations, so did Sullivan carry anew his mantle and reflect in his notes the dignity of a Queen.[29]

The music has an appropriate grandeur and soaring sense of triumph about it. The Prince of Wales wrote to Sullivan the day following the ceremony to thank him for composing the music: 'it met with universal approbation and the Queen was specially delighted with it'.[30] Once again, unheard for a century, it was given a concert performance in 1986 and has also been recorded on CD.[31]

The formal opening of the Institute by the Queen was on 10 May 1893. Twenty-five thousand people attended the event, and once again Lewis Morris composed an ode. It was printed in *The Times* and

published in the official programme but not set to music this time. Rhapsodizing on the building and its contents, it called for imperial brotherhood and unity. Sullivan's contribution to the proceedings was his new *Imperial March.* It opens with an arresting fanfare theme, which is reworked with variations, but then goes distinctly off the boil as the middle section lapses into Verdian operatic mode before returning to the heroic declamatory style of the opening. Sullivan's *Imperial March* failed to provide the imperial march idiom that was needed; Elgar would do that with his *Imperial March.* Madame Emma Albani sang the national anthem and the royal procession left to the popular *Coronation March* from Meyerbeer's *The Prophet*, which had more of a swing and snap about it than Sullivan's.

The Times declared:

> It has been often said that the English people have none of the dramatic and pictorial instincts which enable Continental nations to organise imposing pageants and to give a bright touch of colour to the dullness of everyday life. The stupendous popular demonstration on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee was a sufficient refutation of this theory. But the brilliant success which attended the ceremony of yesterday … afforded even more incontestable proof that Englishmen can, if they please, produce effects beyond the reach of communities in which pageantry is regulated by an omnipotent and omniscient government.[32]

The reception accorded the Queen and the royal family was 'an expression of a deep and durable sentiment that political theorists would be unwise in discrediting or deprecating'. Equally, while the public may not know too much about 'the nature, the advantages and the obligations of the British Empire', there was no doubt that 'the popular feeling is entirely in favour of maintaining the Empire, and of drawing closer the bonds of union between its component parts'.

The Imperial Institute was to suffer from underfunding throughout its history, was taken over by the government in 1899 and shunted from department to department, but did achieve some success in its propaganda and educational activities, particularly through the use of film during the 1930s, when it had its own cinema, opened in 1927, and an extensive film library for use by borrowers. The magnificent building housing the Institute was shamefully demolished in 1956, apart from the campanile, and its activities transferred to the newly established Commonwealth Institute.[33]

Sullivan made further contributions to the music of imperialism, however. He composed the music for a Canadian national hymn, *God Bless Our Wide Dominion*, to words by the Governor-General of Canada, the Marquis of Lorne, who was the Queen's son-in-law.

God bless our wide Dominion,
Our fathers' chosen land;
And bind in lasting union
Each ocean's distant strand;
From where Atlantic terrors
Our hardy seamen train,
To where the salt sea mirrors
The vast Pacific chain:
O bless our wide Dominion.
True Freedom's fairest scene;
Defend our people's union;
God Save our Empire's Queen.

It was published in 1880, but was not adopted as the national hymn.

In 1897, for the Diamond Jubilee, he composed the official Jubilee Hymn, *O, King of Kings, Whose Reign of Old.* He rejected the verses offered by the Poet Laureate Alfred Austin, choosing to set instead the verses penned by William Walsham How, Bishop of Wakefield.

But his major contribution to the Jubilee celebrations was his ballet *Victoria and Merrie England.* It was commissioned by Alfred Moul, General Manager of the Alhambra Theatre, Leicester Square, who wanted him to provide something 'exceptionally splendid' for the Diamond Jubilee. The result was *Victoria and Merrie England*, 'a grand national ballet in eight tableaux', to a scenario created by Balletmaster Carlo Coppi. It opened on 25 May, conducted on the first night by the composer. It ran for six months, and Sullivan was paid £2,000 and a share of the nightly takings. Not only was it popular with the public but members of the royal family attended on nineteen occasions. From 8 July the entertainment also included a cinematograph film of the Jubilee procession.[34]

Two of Sullivan's most eloquent and well-informed advocates, David Eden and Selwyn Tillett, insist that he was a romantic nationalist rather than an imperialist.[35] There is no doubt that he was a romantic nationalist, something clearly reflected in his work. He composed incidental music to Shakespeare's *The Tempest, The Merchant of Venice, Macbeth, Henry VIII* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor.* He turned to the works of Walter Scott for his opera *Ivanhoe*, his cantata *Kenilworth* and the overture *Marmion.* He provided incidental music for Lord Tennyson's Robin Hood play *The Foresters* and for Sir Henry Irving's production of *King Arthur.* Tillett cites *Victoria and Merrie England* as being nationalistic rather than imperialistic. But this establishes a wholly false dichotomy between nation and Empire, whereas the two were closely intertwined. In fact, what *Victoria and Merrie England* makes clear is that the whole

romantic history of Britain was leading up to its triumphant culmination in the Empire.

The early episodes are mythic and romantic. The ballet opens in ancient Britain with the processions and rituals of the Druids. The Genius of Britain enters and sees Britannia sleeping beneath an oak and predicts her future greatness, while the High Priest announces that Britannia is 'predestined to be the mother of a race which shall be mighty amongst the Nations of the world'. It is the same idea as that developed by Elgar in *Caractacus*. The sequence ends with Britannia awaking and embracing Britain's Genius.

The second sequence is a celebration of a May Day coming of age in Elizabethan England. The young heir is presented with a sword by his old uncle: 'With this I fought for Queen and Country.' There is a historical quadrille of Britons, Romans, Saxons and Normans, celebrating the racial mix of Britain. Robin Hood, Maid Marian and Friar Tuck, Morris dancers, hobby-horses, knights of the sword and rose maidens all dance and the sequence culminates in a dance around the Maypole.

A supernatural interlude has Herne the Hunter and his followers appearing during a storm in Windsor Forest. They set about a Yule Log Procession which is bringing home the symbol of Christmas. But Herne and his followers are routed by the Snow Fairy. 'Christmas in the Olden Time' has the Lord and Lady of the Manor entertaining guests during the reign of Charles II, with a procession of Boar's Head and Roast Beef, the peasants and retainers admitted to participate in the Christmas cheer and Father Christmas arriving to distribute gifts.

So far the scenes have stressed the inevitability of Britain's ultimate imperial glory, the joys of Merrie England (May Day and Christmas festivities), communality and aristocratic paternalism. The ballet evokes a mythic past (Druids, Robin Hood, Herne the Hunter) but links it to a heroic present. Sequence seven is a *tableau vivant* realization of the painting by E.T. Parris depicting the coronation of Queen Victoria in 1838. The final scene, 'Britain's Glory', has a military procession, headed by the Grenadier Guards, the Royal Irish Regiment and the Gordon Highlanders, followed by the Artists Volunteer Corps, 22nd Bombay Infantry, the Cape Mounted Infantry, Canadian Troopers and Australian Rifles. Then four groups, representing Europe, Asia, Africa and America and exactly reproduced from the sculptures at the base of the Albert Memorial, Hyde Park, enter. There is a procession of British sailors, Britannia enters, and finally the entire ensemble gather for the national anthem. The imperial intentions and dimensions of the climactic scene are inescapable. They represent the fulfilment of the destiny predicted in the first scene – an imperial destiny.

The delicacy, wit and inventiveness of Sullivan's score was widely praised, even though he had extensively re-used material from his 1864 ballet *L'lle Enchantée. The Era* described it as

> one of the most splendid achievements which have ever been made at this popular place of amusement. It is not only a beautiful and gorgeous spectacle; it is a lesson in history and historical costume, accompanied by some of the best music ever written for ballet purposes … *Victoria and Merrie England* is a triumph, and is likely to be immensely popular during the forthcoming Jubilee.[36]

The Sun declared:

> Sir Arthur Sullivan's music is the music for the people … the melodies are all as fresh as last year's wine, and as exhilarating as sparkling champagne. There is not one tune which tires the hearing … All through we have orchestration of infinite delicacy, tunes of alarming simplicity, but never a tinge of vulgarity.[37]

Even *The Musical Times* called it 'a very pleasant example of his genius' and noted that 'there is an atmosphere of refinement and finished craftsmanship about … the ballet which can scarcely fail to exercise a salutary influence'.[38] The variety and joyousness of the score lies in the variety of dance forms that Sullivan introduces, his waltz, mazurka, galop, Morris dance, Maypole dance, quadrille and hornpipe, a mixture of the ballroom and the village green, all treated with inventive delicacy. *The Musical Times* singled out the storm music and the Yule Log Procession as the best music but observed that the Waltz of the Wood Nymphs was more popular with the audience. Familiar tunes were quoted in the music: *Rule, Britannia, The Roast Beef of Old England, A-Hunting We Will Go, A Fine Old English Gentleman* and *The Boar's Head* carol (*Caput Apri Defeo*).

For the Coronation tableau, Sullivan used his own *Imperial March* which received three curtain calls before the final sequence could unfold. This featured his *Union March*, in which Sullivan ingeniously combined *The British Grenadiers* (England), *St Patrick's Day* (Ireland) and *Scots Wha' Hae* (Scotland). Try as he might, he had been unable to fit in, as he had planned, *Men of Harlech*, so Wales remained unrepresented. *Home, Sweet Home* followed this march, then the delightful sailor's hornpipe from *Ruddigore, Rule, Britannia* for the entrance of Britannia and finally a rousing version of the national anthem.

But Sullivan's reputation rests still on the operettas he produced with W.S. Gilbert. They were toured regularly all over the United Kingdom, and they were popular all over the Empire and provided a potent musical link between the colonies and the motherland. The

D'Oyly Carte Company toured South Africa in 1896, 1902–3 and 1905–6. Australian impresario J.C. Williamson obtained a license to perform the Savoy Operas in Australia, where they were performed regularly from 1879. In 1927 the D'Oyly Carte Company made its first coast to coast tour of Canada playing to full houses and eulogistic reviews. There were further Canadian tours in 1928 and 1934. There were amateur performances of the operas all over the Empire.[39]

The Empire itself came in for the Gilbert and Sullivan treatment. One of the enduring points of appeal of Gilbert and Sullivan operas along with their memorable melodies and witty lyrics is that they are celebrations of England, Englishness and English institutions. There is satire, but it is largely affirmative and affectionate. Gilbert and Sullivan carefully cut out anything from their work which they thought might cause offence. Also, as J.B. Priestley has pointed out, it is a characteristic of the English to laugh at what they love most.[40] The application of self-deprecating humour allows the patriotic sentiment to be enjoyed and engaged in with gusto. A classic example of this is the rousing song *He Is An Englishman* from *HMS Pinafore.* It went round the Empire as a song of celebration so that when Sullivan accompanied the Duke of Edinburgh on his flagship *HMS Hercules* on a trip to Russia and sang *He Is An Englishman* in a ship's concert, Sullivan recorded that 'the whole crew to my astonishment sang the chorus'.[41] It is one of a series of resoundingly patriotic songs – *A British Tar Is a Soaring Soul* from *HMS Pinafore, When Britain Really Ruled the Waves* from *Iolanthe, The Darned Mounseer* from *Ruddigore* and the finale from *Utopia Limited*: *There Is a Little Group of Islands Beyond the Wave.* It is part of a tradition of apparently humorous patriotic songs which start out as satire and end up as celebrations. Noël Coward's *Mad Dogs and Englishmen* and Flanders and Swann's *Song of Patriotic Prejudice* ('The English, the English, the English are best') are other examples. As David Cannadine writes, the operas were 'a paean of praise to national pride and the established order'[42] The opening nights of the Savoy Operas were great social events, and certainly received the stamp of approval of the Establishment. Queen Victoria had a command performance of *The Gondoliers* at Windsor. General Sir Garnet Wolseley, who inspired the song *I Am the Very Model of a Modern Major General*, used to perform the song as his party-piece. Two real-life Lord Chancellors, Lord Birkenhead and Lord Elwyn-Jones, were to perform the Lord Chancellor's song from *Iolanthe.* Admiral Lord Fisher, 'Jacky Fisher', went several times to *HMS Pinafore* and adored it. Even Oscar Wilde loved the send-up of himself in *Patience.*[43]

After the army, the navy, education, the law and politics, the Empire and the imperial mission came in for its dose of satire in

Utopia Limited (1893), which was the penultimate collaboration and came after a period of estrangement. Sadly it was perhaps the weakest of the Savoy Operas. The music was pleasant enough but lacked any hit songs, although the depiction of the Utopian cabinet meeting as a Christy Minstrels' show was a lively interlude. It is hard to quarrel with the verdict of David Eden that the score 'in general terms fails to impress'.[44] This was due partly to the fact that Gilbert's libretto was lacking in drama or narrative drive and clearly failed to inspire Sullivan in the way that earlier works had done. Although many contemporary critics were so glad to see them reunited that they were indulgent – and Bernard Shaw with typical perversity pronounced *Utopia Limited* the best Savoy Opera yet – the *Pall Mall Gazette* was unsparing in its criticism.[45] It complained that Gilbert was merely imitating himself. 'It gave his book not merely a sense of cheapness, but a sense of fatigue, of weariness even to exhaustion. *Utopia Limited* is but the scrapings of the platter, the rinsings of the cup.' Others hinted that perhaps both Gilbert and Sullivan were beginning to repeat themselves. *The Musical Times* said of the opening night: 'the libretto of *Utopia Limited* seems a trifle dull, particularly in the first Act, and the music for the most part reminiscent rather than fresh'.[46] The critic thought the best of Sullivan's music came in Act 2, with its 'well built up *Finale*, a song caricaturing a tenor with a cold, an amazingly funny parody of a Christy Minstrel entertainment, and an unaccompanied concerted piece in which the composer is almost, if not quite, at his best'. This seems to have been the verdict of posterity, for after a first run in London of 245 performances it was to receive no professional production in the capital until 1975, a production which was recorded and which interestingly used Sullivan's *Imperial March* as overture, to create the right mood, given that the short existing prelude had been deemed 'meagre' by contemporary critics. It has been performed by amateur companies over the years and selections from the score have been available on records since as early as 1900.[47] As John Wolfson points out the imperial parallels would have been immediately apparent to contemporary audiences.[48] The South Seas were in the news as Britain had recently annexed Fiji and Tonga and the appearance of a Life Guard in full uniform in Utopia had a precedent in the presence of three Life Guards in a delegation to King Lobengula of Matabeleland several years earlier.

Utopia is a South Sea Island kingdom ruled by an absolute monarch, King Paramount I, whose inhabitants are languorous lotus-eaters whose every need is supplied by their monarch. But he has sent his daughter Princess Zara to Girton College, Cambridge, to gain mastery of 'all the elements that have tended to raise their glorious

country to her present pre-eminent position among civilized nations'. Princess Zara returns to Utopia with representatives of those aspects of British society that have made the country great. They are the 'Flowers of Progress' who gave the opera its subtitle: 'Six representatives of the principal causes that have tended to make England the powerful, happy and blameless country which the consensus of European civilization has declared it to be'. They are Captain Fitzbattleaxe of the First Life Guards ('A British soldier gives up all. His home and island beauty/ When summoned by the trumpet call/ Of regimental duty'); Captain Sir Edward Corcoran KCB of the Royal Navy ('I'll teach you how we rule the sea/ And terrify the simple Gaul./ And how the Saxon and the Celt/ Their Europe-shaking blows have dealt/ With Maxim Gun and Nordenfelt'); Mr Blushington of the County Council ('All streets and squares he'll purify/ Within your city walls/ And keep meanwhile a modest eye/ On wicked music halls'); Sir Bailey Barre QC, MP, representing the legal system; Lord Dramaleigh, the Lord Chamberlain ('He'll cleanse our Court from moral stain/ And purify our stage'); and Mr Goldbury, company promoter. Their objective is to Anglicize the inhabitants of Utopia, who are 'when compared with Britain's glorious race/ But little better than half-clothed barbarians'.

The visitors are welcomed by the grateful natives:

> All hail, ye types of England's power –
> Ye heaven-enlightened band!
> We bless the day, and bless the hour
> That brought you to our land.
>
> Oh teach the natives of this land
> (Who are not quick to understand)
> How to work off their social and political arrears.

The country is now organized as a limited company (Utopia Limited), and completely Anglicized, the Army and Navy reorganized, the city beautified, social life purified. A law of libel is introduced which has the editors of scurrilous newspapers publicly flogged. But the reforms have left everyone too happy and healthy: the reform of the armed forces has ended war; the sanitary laws have been so successful that the doctors are out of work; the new legal system has abolished crime and litigation, so the lawyers starve. But Princess Zara remembers the missing element – government by party, 'at once the bulwark and foundation of England's greatness'. Once this is introduced, 'there will be sickness in plenty, endless lawsuits, crowded jails, interminable confusion in the Army and Navy, and, in short, general and unexampled prosperity.' So in future Utopia will no longer

be a monarchy (Ltd) but a limited monarchy, which is much better. The would-be rousing finale begins with the opening bars of *Rule, Britannia*, which elsewhere in the score accompany any mention of Britain, and is a celebration of Britain and her world role:

> There's a little group of isles beyond the wave –
> So tiny, you might almost wonder where it is –
> That nation is the bravest of the brave,
> And cowards are the rarest of all rarities.
> The proudest nations kneel at her command;
> She terrifies all foreign-born rapscallions;
> And holds the peace of Europe in her hand
> With half a score invincible battalions.

It is, however, unmemorable – like much of the rest of the score.

Sullivan's final year was dominated by matters imperial. His most notable imperial contribution was a practical one, providing the rousing music for a setting of Kipling's poem *The Absent-Minded Beggar*, the proceeds of which went to Boer War charities. Kipling had given Sullivan the exclusive rights to set *Recessional* but Sullivan had found it too difficult. However, he provided a tune for *The Absent-Minded Beggar.* Sullivan and Flower record:

> The song took England by storm; it drove all other songs from the barrel-organs; tens of thousands of copies were rushed from the presses and sold for the benefit of soldiers' dependants, a fund the *Daily Mail* started and carried to a very successful conclusion. The Queen wrote to Sullivan for a copy; troops marched away to the troopships singing it.[49]

It received its first performance at the Alhambra Theatre on 13 November 1899. Sullivan recorded in his diary: 'conducted "Ab.M.Beg." at the Alhambra in the evening – packed house – wild enthusiasm. All sang chorus! I stood on the stage and conducted the *encore* – funny sight.'[50] In support of the fund, a patriotic brass band concert was held before an audience of 10,000 at the Albert Hall on 20 January 1900. It was organized by brass band impresario J.H. Iles, owner of *The British Bandman*, with ten brass bands and a cast of star singers; the proceeds to be devoted to the support of wives and children of soldiers recalled to the colours, and to relieve sick and wounded soldiers and sailors. The programme gives an insight into the kind of musical fare deemed appropriate for a patriotic concert at the height of an imperial war. It opened with musical selections played by the Band of the Royal Engineers, then moved on to *Onward, Christian Soldiers*, sung by Clara Butt, with massed bands, drums, grand organ and the audience joining in the second and third verses. Sullivan conducted.

Later Clara Butt sang Sullivan's *The Lost Chord* with organ accompaniment and Part One ended with Sullivan conducting the massed bands and drums in a vigorous march arrangement of *The Absent-Minded Beggar*.

Of the star singers, Edward Lloyd sang Thomas Moore's Irish ballad *The Minstrel Boy* and Braham's *Death of Nelson*, Andrew Black sang *Hearts of Oak* and Samuel Liddle's setting of *The Gay Gordons*. Emma Albani sang *The Blue Bells of Scotland* and Mozart's *Non mi dir* from *Don Giovanni*. Clara Butt sang Frances Allitsen's *There's a Land* ('There's a land, a dear land, where the rights of the free/ Though firm as the earth, are as wide as the sea') with an additional verse by Agnes M. Sibly:

> There's a Queen, a dear Queen, whom no Briton forgets,
> And upon whose dominion the sun never sets: –
> Who has governed by love, and has helped us to fight
> For conquest of evil and succour of right.
> Best reign! Blest reign! Longest! Strongest!
> This year of all years we'll sing and we'll pray!
> 'Glorious! Victorious! Thy Queen! My Queen!
> God bless her and keep her to-night and for aye.'

The individual brass bands played their usual repertoire: the overture to *William Tell*, selections from Weber's *Oberon*, Rossini's *Moses in Egypt* and Mendelssohn's *Elijah* plus a selection, *Wales*, arranged by J. Ord Hume. The London Kymric Ladies' Choir sang *The March of the Men of Harlech* and *Yr Haf (Summer)*. Part Two of the concert opened with a specially composed fantasia on *God Save the Queen* and *Rule, Britannia*, arranged for bands by J. Ord Hume, and ended with *God Save the Queen*, Sir Michael Costa's version of the national anthem arranged for bands by J.M. Rogan of the Coldstream Guards, with Clara Butt and Emma Albani singing and the massed bands conducted by Sullivan, the audience joining in the last verse. It was a blockbusting patriotic extravaganza, and one which involved the whole spectrum of Victorian music, with brass bands, choirs, solo singers, and a programme which was careful to celebrate Britain and its component parts (Scotland, Wales, England and Ireland) individually, the monarchy, the army and navy and popular Protestantism, all in aid of a song and a fund to support the forces fighting an imperial war. It raised between £2,000 and £3,000 for the fund.

In February 1900 Sullivan conducted another massed military band concert at Her Majesty's Theatre in a 'patriotic picture' of Britain and her dependencies, again for charity. His last completed work was to be his *Boer War Te Deum*, commissioned in 1900 to celebrate the peace. Sullivan built it around his most popular hymn, *Onward, Christian Soldiers*, thus imbuing the Boer War with the idea of a Christian struggle against the infidel. It was eventually performed at St Paul's

Cathedral in the presence of the King and Queen at a Thanksgiving service for the end of the war on 8 June 1902.[51]

Incomplete at the time of his death was a final comic opera, *The Emerald Isle*, set to a book by Basil Hood, the best of the librettists he had tried since the split with Gilbert. Sullivan's sketches were orchestrated and the remainder of the opera set by Edward German to create a charming and tuneful work which opened at the Savoy Theatre on 27 April 1901 and ran for 205 performances.

It marked Sullivan's first and last operatic foray into the Ireland of his forbears and it took on a number of serious and highly contentious elements of British imperial rule in Ireland (the suppression of the Irish language, the expropriation of Irish landowners, the employment of informers, the sentencing of captured rebels to be shot) and gave them a comic and romantic treatment in a bid to neutralize their offensiveness.

The action takes place in 1800 against the background of the attempt by the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Newtown, to eliminate the Irish brogue and Irish customs. He has achieved a good deal of success by the offer of prizes for proper elocution: 'There is not a man nor a colleen here that could dance an Irish jig correctly, and say "Begorra" at the end of it with any conviction', complains the fiddler 'Blind' Murphy. The Lord Lieutenant's scheme is opposed by rebel leader Terence O'Brian. Unfortunately for him, his parents sold their estate to the Earl and had him educated in England at Eton and Oxford, so he too speaks with an English accent. So he hires elocutionist Professor Bunn to re-educate the locals in their Irish brogue. To complicate matters further, Terence is in love with the Lord Lieutentant's daughter Lady Rosie Pippin. She discovers that her father has been informed of a secret meeting of Terence and the rebels at the caves of Carrig-Cleena. He orders the 11th Regiment of Foot to arrest the rebels. But local colleen Molly O'Grady and Professor Bunn convince the soldiers, who are simple, superstitious, Devonshire peasants, that the caves are haunted by fairies, and they flee. Eventually, however, their courage returns and, rejecting Terence's claim that thay are 'playthings of unprincipled politicians', the soldiers arrest the rebels, who are sentenced to be shot. Lady Rosie reveals that she loves O'Brian, presenting her father with a dilemma. But this is actually resolved and reconciliation is achieved in the context of royalty and aristocracy. O'Brian reveals that he is descended from Brian Boru and the ancient Kings of Erin. The Lord Lieutenant reveals that Rosie is partially American, like much of the aristocracy – a reference to the trend of late nineteenth-century English aristocrats to marry wealthy American heiresses. Professor Bunn then resolves the dilemma by

announcing that since America is the friend of Ireland and the English aristocrats are partially American, there is no need for the Irish to rebel. It would be absurd to shoot the rebels under the circumstances. The Lord Lieutenant agrees, and all ends happily.

Sullivan furnished a score full of catchy Irish jig tunes ('Have you heard the brave news that's goin' around?', 'If you want to appear as an Irish type', 'Oh, have you met a man in debt and almost out at elbows'?) and lilting romantic fairy music ('On the heights of Glantaun', 'Many years ago I strode/ Down the Carrig-Cleena road'). Edward German contributed the *Song of the Devonshire Men* in his best English pastoral vein, a Gilbertian patter song, *'Oh, the Age in Which We Are Living'*, and several charming romantic ballads. It never achieved the success either of the classic Gilbert and Sullivan operettas or of Edward German's subsequent collaboration with Basil Hood, *Merrie England*.[52]

An important part of Sullivan's output, then, had been imperial; an even larger part had been patriotic, and in the nineteenth century patriotism embraced not just Britain but the Empire. His patriotism may even have cost him his life. His cousin B.W. Findon reported that, already ill with bronchitis, 'he exposed himself to a piercing wind in order to see the return of the City Imperial Volunteers' from South Africa on 29 October 1900.[53] His bronchitis worsened, his heart failed and on 22 November 1900, St Cecilia's Day, he died.

Despite being the leader of English music, the Queen–Empress's favourite composer, and an undoubted monarchist and patriot, he had failed to provide the musical idiom for the Empire. Neither his imperial Savoy Opera *Utopia Limited* nor his imperial ballet *Victoria and Merrie England* found a lasting place in the repertoire. His imperial odes were performed once, and then forgotten. His dominion hymn for Canada was not adopted as the country's national anthem. His *Imperial March*, while it did retain a place in the repertoire, was to be eclipsed by the *Imperial March* of the man who definitively established the musical idiom of the Empire – his successor Sir Edward Elgar. It may be that the musical world which produced Sullivan – his initial inspiration being Schubert and Mendelssohn, and his later influences Gounod, Bizet, Massenet, Delibes and Offenbach – was simply too light for the heavy business of Empire.[54] However, if he did not provide an imperial idiom, it certainly is true to say, as did *The Times* when he died, that his music was known and loved all around the Empire and provided an important musical link. The sacred choral works, the orchestral pieces, the songs, the hymns, the comic operas were all part of the musical life of the Empire at all levels, and that in itself is a major imperial contribution. Nothing is more symptomatic

of the centrality of Gilbert and Sullivan to imperial culture than the fact that their operettas were performed during the Siege of Mafeking to keep up the spirits of the defenders.

Many of the British composers of Sullivan's generation have been deeply unfashionable until quite recently, when new recordings of their music have been allowing for a positive reassessment of their achievements. Many of them contributed to the stock of imperial music. Sir Alexander Campbell Mackenzie (1847–1935) was born in Edinburgh and was a proudly patriotic Scot. His music celebrated his Scots' heritage, yet he drew on Dickens and Shakespeare for inspiration and also hymned the Empire in his 1887 *Jubilee Ode*, his 1902 *Coronation March*, his 1894 nautical overture *Britannia* and songs such as *The Empire Flag* (1887) and *An Empire Song* (1908). He toured Canada to enhance the musical links between Britain and the Empire and composed as a result a *Canadian Rhapsody* (1905) and four 'Canadian songs' (1907).

Sir Charles Villiers Stanford (1852–1924) was an equally passionate Irishman. He too composed a Jubilee ode (1887), *Carmen Saeculare*, and the ode *East to West* (1893). He made the magnificent settings of Henry Newbolt's *Songs of the Sea* and *Songs of the Fleet*, and he set to music imperial poems by the likes of W.E. Henley (*The Last Post*) and Conan Doyle (*The Frontier Line and A Ballad of the Ranks*).

Sir Frederic Cowen (1852–1935) was a true child of the Empire, born in Jamaica. He also spent six months as conductor of the Melbourne Centennial Exhibition in 1888–89 at which he conducted 260 concerts and performed his *Song of Thanksgiving*, specially written for the event. He composed the 1897 Jubilee ode *All Hail the Glorious Reign*, a *Coronation Ode* and a *Coronation March* (1902) and *Indian Rhapsody* (1903).

Sir Edward German (1862–1936), born in Shropshire of Welsh antecedents, completed Sullivan's opera *The Emerald Isle*, wrote his stirring fantasia on march tunes *In Commemoration* for the 1897 Jubilee, a 1911 *Coronation March* and several notable settings of Kipling poems (*Have You News of My Boy Jack?; Rolling Down to Rio; The Irish Guards; Big Steamers*), as well as the patriotic hymn *Canada* by Sir Harold Boulton. For none of these composers was the Empire central to their musical inspiration. It was, however, for Sir Edward Elgar.

Notes

1 *The Times*, 23 November, 1900.

2 Herbert Sullivan and Newman Flower, *Sir Arthur Sullivan: His Life, Letters and Diaries*, London: Cassell, 1927 (1950 edition], pp. 6–7; Henry A. Lytton, *The Secrets*

of a Savoyard, London: Jarrolds, 1922, p. 58; Hermann Klein, *Thirty Years of Musical Life in London*, New York: Century, 1903, pp. 192, 201.

3 Arthur Jacobs, *Arthur Sullivan: A Victorian Musician*, Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992, p. 175.

4 Edward Dicey, 'Recollections of Arthur Sullivan', in Harold Orel (ed.), *Gilbert and Sullivan: Interviews and Recollections*, London: Macmillan, 1994, p. 83.

5 Jacobs, *Arthur Sullivan*, p. 199.

6 *The Times*, 20 July, 1897.

7 Jacobs, *Arthur Sullivan*, p. 58.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 135.

9 Quoted in Percy M. Young, *Sir Arthur Sullivan*, London: Dent, 1971, p. 41.

10 Jacobs, *Arthur Sullivan*, p. 223.

11 Ernest Walker, *A History of Music in England*, London: Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 293, 295.

12 Jacobs, *Arthur Sullivan*, p. 383.

13 Victor Kiernan, 'Tennyson, King Arthur and imperialism', in Raphael Samuel and Gareth Stedman Jones (eds), *Culture, Ideology and Politics*, London: Routledge, 1982, p. 138.

14 Robert Bernard Martin, *Tennyson: The Unquiet Heart*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983, p. 546.

15 Jeffrey Lant, *Insubstantial Pageant: Ceremony and Confusion at Queen Victoria's Court*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1979.

16 *The Graphic*, 6 May, 1871.

17 *The Times*, 2 May, 1871.

18 *The Graphic*, 6 May, 1871.

19 *The Times*, 2 May, 1871.

20 Selwyn Tillett, 'On shore and sea', Sir Arthur Sullivan Society (nd), p. 13. This pamphlet gives a full account of the performance of the cantata.

21 John M. MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984, p. 102.

22 *The Times*, 5 May, 1886.

23 *The Musical Times*, 1 June, 1886.

24 Sir Arthur Sullivan, *The Masque at Kenilworth: Music for Royal and National Occasions*, Symposium, CD 1247.

25 *The Musical Times*, 1 June, 1886.

26 MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire*, p. 125.

27 *The Times*, 5 July, 1887.

28 Karl Beckson, *London in the 1890s: A Cultural History*, New York and London: W.W. Norton & Co., 1992, pp. 95–109.

29 Sullivan and Flower, *Sir Arthur Sullivan*, p. 171.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 172.

31 Sir Arthur Sullivan, *The Masque at Kenilworth*, Symposium, CD 1247.

32 *The Times*, 11 May, 1893.

33 MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire*, pp. 122–46.

34 For a full account of the ballet see Selwyn Tillett, *The Ballets of Sir Arthur Sullivan*, London: Sir Arthur Sullivan Society, 1998.

35 David Eden, *Gilbert and Sullivan: The Creative Conflict*, London: Associated University Presses, 1986, pp. 168–70; Tillett, *The Ballets*, pp. 22–3.

36 *The Era*, 28 May, 1897.

37 *Sun*, 26 May, 1897.

38 *The Musical Times*, 1 July, 1897.

39 Tony Joseph, *The D'Oyly Carte Opera Company 1875–1982*, Bristol: Bunthorne Books, 1994, p. 248; Martyn Green, *Here's a How-De-Do*, New York: Norton, 1952, pp. 57–65.

40 J.B. Priestley, *English Humour*, London: Longman, 1930, p. 16.

41 Jacobs, *Arthur Sullivan*, p. 164.
42 David Cannadine, 'Gilbert and Sullivan: the making and unmaking of a British "tradition"', in Roy Porter (ed.), *Myths of the English*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992, p. 19.
43 Ian Bradley (ed.), *The Annotated Gilbert and Sullivan*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982, pp. 118, 192, 214.
44 Eden, *Gilbert and Sullivan*, p. 194.
45 Bernard Shaw, *Music in London 1890–94*, London: Constable, 1950, vol. 3, pp. 58–62; *The Pall Mall Gazette, 9* October, 1893.
46 *The Musical Times*, 1 November, 1893.
47 Stephen Turnbull, 'Utopia Limited and the gramophone', in David Eden (ed.), *Utopia Limited*, London: Sir Arthur Sullivan Society, 1993, pp. 61–4.
48 John Wolfson, *Final Curtain: The Last Gilbert and Sullivan Operas*, London: Chappell & Company, 1976, p. 58. The 1975 production of *Utopia Limited* is on Decca London, CD 436 816–2.
49 Sullivan and Flower, *Sir Arthur Sullivan*, pp. 252–3.
50 Ibid., p. 252.
51 The *Boer Wat Te Deum* is available on *That Glorious Song of Old: Choral Music of Arthur Sullivan*, Cantoris, CRCD 2368.
52 There is a recording of this comic opera: *The Emerald Isle*, Sounds on CD, VGS 207.
53 B.W. Findon, 'Sir Arthur Sullivan: his life and music', in Orel (ed.), *Gilbert and Sullivan*, p. 314.
54 Eden, *Gilbert and Sullivan*, p. 168.

CHAPTER THREE

Elgar's Empire

Few composers have become so encrusted with myth and misrepresentation as Sir Edward Elgar. He burst on to the English musical scene in the 1890s, was hailed as the greatest English composer since Purcell and, by 1910, had established for himself an international reputation. That reputation dipped after his death in 1934. This was not unusual; it regularly happens to great composers. Sullivan, Parry, Vaughan Williams and Britten all suffered from it. But the process of reviving Elgar's musical fortunes has resulted in distortions of the man and his music that have taken on the status of orthodoxies.

First, there is the idea that Elgar was not really an imperialist or that he renounced imperialism or that his imperially inspired works are minor works. Michael Kennedy, who has taken the lead in seeking to downgrade Elgar's imperial inspiration, writes that for a long time Elgar the imperialist 'obscured the real Elgar, who was someone very different'.[1] Second, there is the assertion that Elgar's music – and by implication the Empire – was unpopular in the interwar period. Third, and linked, there is the theory that he dried up creatively after the death of his wife. Recent research has demonstrated all these orthodoxies to be untrue.[2]

The first thing to say is that Elgar was a patriot, a monarchist and a Conservative, and his imperialism was a logical extension of these values. After all, he signed a letter along with Milner, Roberts and Kipling protesting against Irish home rule and resigned from the Athenaeum Club when it elected Labour leader Ramsay MacDonald as a member. All this has been a profound embarrassment to his latter-day defenders. The revival of Elgar derived from two landmark events in the 1960s; Ken Russell's BBC television documentary *Elgar* (1962) and Michael Kennedy's book *Portrait of Elgar* (1968). The depth and sincerity of Russell's and Kennedy's love of Elgar are not in doubt; nor is the sensitivity of their interpretation. But in seeking to exculpate Elgar from imperialism, they seriously distort the picture. If the idea