

Jay Newman

The Gilbertianism of *Patience*

I am deeply grateful for having been invited to speak with you tonight on the subject of Gilbert's libretto for *Patience*.¹ When Savoyards meet to discuss the Gilbert and Sullivan operas, there is not only joy in the air but much reverence too, and I am pleased and honoured to have been entrusted with a major responsibility for carrying out tonight's rites.² But I am also grateful for a more specific and more "relevant" reason. Two events have occurred recently that seem to me to have imparted a certain urgency to our undertaking a particularly careful reconsideration of the importance of Gilbert's contribution to the Savoy operas. No sooner had we celebrated the hundredth anniversary of the first performance of *Patience* than that great guardian of Gilbertian orthodoxy, the D'Oyly Carte Opera Company, collapsed, having had crucial funds denied to it by the British Arts Council, which found the D'Oyly Carte's traditionalism to be aesthetically unacceptable in these exciting and adventurous times. At roughly the same time, and just a short distance away from where we are now meeting, the Stratford Festival initiated its remarkably well-received series of Gilbert and Sullivan productions. Brian Macdonald's lively and imaginative productions at Stratford lifted the spirits of many Savoyards, who now had concrete evidence by which to prove to detractors of Savoy opera that Gilbert-and-Sullivan was not as "dated" and "played out" as those narrow-minded British arts councillors claimed. But for some of us, the victory at Stratford has been a hollow one, for even Brian Macdonald's brilliant choreography cannot adequately compensate for the Festival's mutilation, distortion, even destruction of Gilbert's texts, which have been modernized, Canadianized, and made "relevant" to the point where we no longer are exposed to the achievement of Gilbert and Sullivan but are confronted instead with a wholly different animal. The conclusion that must be drawn is plain enough: even many would-be defenders of the Gilbert and Sullivan operas believe that the once "apparently immortal" works³ are rather "dated"

and in need of radical reconstruction, and that the problem with the original works lies more with Gilbert's words than with Sullivan's music. The libretto that we shall be considering, that of *Patience*, is one that has been especially vulnerable to the criticism of no longer being relevant to the interests of modern audiences, and so perhaps it is especially useful for us to reflect here on this particular libretto.

It must be admitted that there is nothing new about the claim that it is primarily the music of Sir Arthur that has kept the Savoy operas alive. This claim was made by many critics of the nineteenth century and has continued to be made by even some of the most devoted and passionate Savoyards. And in spite of the hopes of Gilbert's admirers that a substantial body of serious critical literature on Gilbert's work would eventually emerge,⁴ scholars have generally been reluctant to take Gilbert's work seriously, and Gilbert's star has been falling. To the few enthusiasts who have made an effort to understand Gilbert's literary project, it has soon become apparent that the project is rather more complex than one might have initially suspected, and expositors of the texts disagree on some rather fundamental issues. Was Gilbert primarily a satirist, or was satire only a secondary element in his brand of comedy?⁵ Was he a moralist or a writer lacking in moral conviction?⁶ Was he promoting liberalism or conservatism?⁷ Was he primarily a defender of Victorian values or an opponent of them?⁸ Was he writing primarily for the audience of his day or for posterity?⁹ Is the element of "topsy-turvydom" central to his world-view or merely an artificial plot-device?¹⁰ Was he essentially a cynical businessman or a dramatist with soaring literary ambitions?¹¹ Was he a Philistine or an Aesthete?¹² If one does not consider questions such as these, one is not in the position to understand what Gilbert is up to in his works, much less to make a sound evaluation of the importance of those works; and certainly some of these questions will emerge in a more concrete form when we examine the themes of *Patience*.

Though less familiar to modern audiences than *The Mikado* or *The Gondoliers*, *Patience* occupies a respectable place in the Gilbert and Sullivan corpus. In its initial production, it had an impressive run of 578 performances and was generally well-received by the critics. Gilbert and Sullivan were both clearly pleased with the work, which has never lost its place in the repertoires of professional and amateur light opera companies in the English-speaking world. Derek Hudson, who feels that *Patience* represents Gilbert at his best, reminds us that *Patience* was literally the first of the Savoy operas,¹³ for it was the success of *Pinafore*, *Pirates*, and similar works by other authors that enabled D'Oyly Carte to build the Savoy theatre, and theatrical historians rarely mention *Patience* without referring to Carte's technologi-

cal innovations at the new Savoy. Those of you who had the opportunity to see the March 1981 production of *Patience* by the University of Toronto's Faculty of Music will have a clear image in your minds of how well *Patience* can come off in a well-directed, well-acted, well-sung performance; this production led the music critic of the *Toronto Star* to attack the view that the Savoy operas "have died of theatrical old age and submitted themselves for entombment in the pages of history"; indeed, "There's life in the Savoy operas yet."¹³

The plot of *Patience* is, if only by Gilbertian standards, relatively simple. Some rapturous maidens, infatuated with the "fleshly" poet, Bunthorne, have abandoned their pleasant but uncultivated sweethearts in the Dragoon Guards in order to bathe in the aestheticism of their idol. Bunthorne loves the attention, and in one of the most famous numbers of the opera, he confesses to the audience that his "medievalism's affectation" is "Born of a morbid love of admiration." This self-confessed "aesthetic sham" loves the simple dairy maid, Patience, who, innocent that she is, has little interest in romantic love or Bunthorne. However, losing her innocence—in a Victorian sense—she agrees to wed Bunthorne as an "unselfish" act. A rival to Bunthorne has entered the picture in the form of the "idyllic" poet, Grosvenor, who becomes the new idol and love-object of the rapturous maidens. While a jealous Bunthorne plots to win back his former position, the military men dabble in the extravagances of "High Art" in order to win back their women. Then, Grosvenor, having been "threatened" by Bunthorne that he will be cursed by him if he does not consent to become "commonplace"—Philistine—allows himself to undergo a radical transformation in character, indicating that he has "long wished for a reasonable pretext for such a change." To Bunthorne's surprise, everyone but him follows Grosvenor's new fashion, the rapturous maidens return to their uncultivated sweethearts, and Bunthorne is left alone without a bride, forced to be content with a "tulip or lily". The text is filled with concrete, specific allusions to the extravagances of the Aesthetic Movement, which at the time of the writing of *Patience* was close to the height of its prominence in British life; and those extravagances offered Gilbert "unsurpassed opportunities" for satire, parody, and the "stage business" for which he is so justly famous.¹⁴

If there is anything that qualifies as a conventional view of what the libretto of *Patience* is all about, it is the view that *Patience* is essentially a satire on the extravagances of the Aesthetic Movement; and while I shall argue that this is a simplistic and narrow view of the work, I shall not deny that throughout the piece, Gilbert deliberately, successfully, and instructively pokes fun at many of those extravagances. The effec-

tiveness of Gilbert's satire here has long been attested to by serious students of the Aesthetic Movement.¹⁵ It is a great mistake to assume, as it is all too often assumed,¹⁶ that *Patience* is an attack on the Aesthetic Movement as such; there is bountiful evidence that Gilbert, Sullivan, and Carte sincerely appreciated and respected the serious aspects of the Aesthetic Movement and indeed maintained cordial relations with some of the leading figures associated with the movement, such as Whistler.¹⁷ And it is hard not to see the satire in *Patience* as a very gentle satire,¹⁸ not in any way spiteful or malicious.¹⁹

It is not easy, even for serious students of Victorian literature, to give a clear and simple explanation of what the Aesthetic Movement was and what it stood for. Although he overstates the point, Hesketh Pearson sheds some light on this problem when he writes that, "What used to be known as 'the Aesthetic Movement' was no movement at all but a reaction against the stereotyped art and craft of the Victorian Age."²⁰ As Pearson goes on to observe, the major figures associated with the movement expressed their own individualities in totally different ways. It is not altogether helpful then to see such diverse personalities as Morris, Ruskin, Swinburne, Pater, Rossetti, Whistler, Burne-Jones, and Wilde as cut from the same ideological and aesthetic cloth. These were all high-minded, creative, visionary, and talented artists and thinkers, and Gilbert, himself a rebel against many of the trivialities and arbitrary conventions of Victorian art, undoubtedly had many points of agreement with the Aesthetes.²¹ *Patience* is not an attack on the Whistlers, Swinburnes, or even the Wildes but an attack on certain by-products of the movement. First, Gilbert disapproved of the unmanly oddities masquerading as aestheticism; the Art Movement did tend to attract certain peculiarly pretentious people whose weird manners and outrageous behaviour came to be associated with the movement.²² Secondly, "aestheticism" became a pretentious and often silly fad among certain parts of the British upper-middle-class.²³ (*Patience* itself to some extent promoted rather than retarded the fad.)²⁴ Gilbert's satire then is not so much an attack on genuine aestheticism as an attack on the aesthetic "craze" that the true Aesthetes generally viewed as negatively as Gilbert did.²⁵ It should be noted, however, that aestheticism itself, even in its purest form, did contain the seeds of cultism. Consider the following characterization of aestheticism by Walter Hamilton, a vigorous defender of the Aesthetic Movement who is writing here shortly after the first performances of *Patience*:

A great literary controversy has been going on in Germany for a century and a half, the chief topic in dispute being the question as to whether an object is actually beautiful in itself, or merely appears so to certain

persons having faculties capable of appreciating that which is *positively* beautiful.

From this dispute came the origin of the school, and the Aesthetes are they who pride themselves upon having found out what is the really beautiful in nature and art, their faculties and tastes being educated up to the point necessary for the full appreciation of such qualities; whilst those who do not see the true and the beautiful—the outsiders in fact—are termed Philistines.²⁶

This characterization of aestheticism would have made the more sophisticated of the serious Aesthetes wince; but we can see from it how easy it must have been for serious interest in “High Art” to give birth to a good deal of pretentious and faddish silliness.

Elizabeth Aslin, a serious student of the Aesthetic Movement and certainly no apologist for Gilbert, gives credit to Gilbert for “pinpointing the whole fashionable craze” in *Patience*; indeed, in her informed view, Gilbert “dealt with almost every aspect” of the craze.²⁷ She draws our attention to such details in the text as the following. “It is made quite plain throughout the whole piece that to be fashionably aesthetic it was necessary to droop despairingly, and to be visibly soulfully intense. The contrast between aesthetes and the others was made the more pointed in that their rivals for the affection of the rapturous maidens of the chorus were army officers whose attentions were rebuffed initially because their uniforms were of gay, bright primary colours.”²⁸ Again, “The transformation of the Dragoons into acceptably fashionable young men gave Gilbert the opportunity to pour scorn on the taste for the medieval, for blue and white china, lilies and all the other trimmings of the movement. . . .”²⁹ So while the pseudo-Aesthetes in *Patience* are caricatures, they are caricatures that have been carefully drawn on the basis of Gilbert’s keen and informed perception. No wonder then that, “The text was witty enough to amuse the converted and cruel enough for the Philistines.”³⁰

If Gilbert’s satire on the extravagances of aestheticism was perceptive and effective, it was not entirely original. *Punch*, principally through the work of George du Maurier, had been poking fun at the Art Movement for some time, and the editor of *Punch*, Burnand—known to Savoyards through his work done in collaboration with Sullivan—produced a satire, *The Colonel*, that appeared on the stage shortly before *Patience*. (Gilbert insisted on having his own audiences informed that the libretto of *Patience* had been completed prior to the appearance of the rival satire.) Burnand’s work was not only less well-crafted than Gilbert’s but also egregiously unfair and inaccurate in its caricatures.³¹ Yet, while finding *Patience* to be delightful, clever, and amusing, Hamilton felt that like *The Colonel*, a work to which it was literarily and morally superior, *Patience* had presented the man-

ners and customs of Aesthetes in a "highly-spiced and dangerously exaggerated form."³² And since the majority of the people who saw *Patience* did not know all that much about the serious aspects of genuine aestheticism, *Patience* had two very different but equally negative consequences for the conventional view of aestheticism. First, it led naive and ignorant members of the audience to assume that the leading lights of the Aesthetic Movement were not very different from Bunthorne and Grosvenor;³³ indeed, from the start—and even today—some people have assumed that Bunthorne and Grosvenor represent particular individuals, such as Wilde, Swinburne, and Whistler. Secondly, as Robin Spencer has pointed out, *Patience* became part of the aesthetic cult, and a large part of the public was "soon won over by *Patience's* superficial artistry, with its Liberty costumes and extravagant sentiments."³⁴ Hence, oddly enough, Gilbert himself, who did the greater part of the design work for *Patience*, actually set the standard for a particular phase of popular "aestheticism".

There is still a widespread and thoroughly mistaken view that the character of Bunthorne represents Oscar Wilde. Several factors have given rise to this misunderstanding. First, in comparison with the other leading lights of the Art Movement, Wilde was indeed personally extravagant in his manners, and since he also seemed to take a certain delight in turning himself into a living caricature, he would have been a highly appropriate candidate for being satirized. Secondly, D'Oyly Carte sent Wilde to America on a speaking tour that was widely interpreted at the time—and still is—as an attempt to promote interest in the Aesthetic Movement on the other side of the Atlantic so as to prepare American audiences for *Patience*. Thirdly, *some* of Bunthorne *is* Wilde; we need only think here of Max Beerbohm's famous sketch of Wilde, holding a lily, lecturing to an American audience. Nevertheless, on closer inspection, Bunthorne can be seen as combining qualities of various noted Aesthetes—certainly Swinburne and Whistler as well as Wilde—and probably also of unknown or lesser known devotees of the cult.³⁵ John Bush Jones has suggested that the character of Grosvenor, often mistakenly taken to represent Swinburne, may well be based primarily on a combination of the qualities of William Morris and Coventry Patmore.³⁶ Jones draws an interesting inference here:

Morris was somewhat on the fringe of the Pre-Raphaelites, the bulk of his poetry displaying few of the elements of the esoteric lyric flights of those men. Patmore, by anybody's definition, was a "popular" poet; the mundane, almost anti-poetic, nature of his subject matter and the mode of his presentation of the idyll of married love were directed at a public taste far different from, perhaps below, that of the people who really understood or blindly followed the Pre-Raphaelite and aesthetic poets.

Gilbert, in having the girls vacillate in their affections between the "aesthetic" Bunthorne and the "commonplace" and almost Philistine Grosvenor, is ridiculing the "popular" as well as cultivated poetic tastes of his day

The common accusation that Gilbert is militantly pro-Philistine in *Patience* no longer seems justified. Rather, the identification of the insipid Grosvenor with the commonplaces of Patmore's poetry makes the rivalry between him and the "highly spiced" Bunthorne more clearly defined, and the satire, now doubly edged, more pointed.³⁷

Whether or not Gilbert had Patmore in mind, it is clear both from the text of *Patience* and from the facts of Gilbert's life that Gilbert's attitude even towards the extravagances of the Aesthetic Movement was not wholly negative. For one thing, Bunthorne is no villain; he is the principal comedian of the piece, and his part was designed with comic actor George Grossmith in mind. He is, in other words, the equivalent in *Patience* of Major-General Stanley, the Lord Chancellor, Ko-Ko, and in a way, Jack Point. David Cecil declares bluntly that "there was nothing of Bunthorne in Gilbert"; and he sees Gilbert's satire on the Aesthetes as "a touch superficial" because Gilbert, unlike Max Beerbohm, could not get under the Aesthete's skin.³⁸ But I submit that Gilbert could well have empathized with Bunthorne up to a point, and on several levels. Like Bunthorne, Gilbert was a "commercial gentleman" who craved attention and admiration. In spite of his fidelity to his beloved wife, Gilbert, like Bunthorne, had a conspicuous fondness for attractive young ladies. It would not have been difficult for Gilbert to relate to the artistic rebel, the charming rogue, or the literary man surrounded by uncultivated men. Gilbert had breakfast with Whistler shortly before Whistler's famous suit against Ruskin was tried; and an interested Gilbert attended some of the hearings.³⁹ In Aslin's view, the costumes that Gilbert designed for *Patience* were truly elegant and artistic.⁴⁰ Aslin and Spencer are both impressed by the fact that Gilbert chose to live in a house designed according to basic principles of aestheticism.⁴¹

In the last analysis, Gilbert's satire on the extravagances of aestheticism is, as Caryl Brahms has suggested, a *very* gentle satire. There is, after all, nothing so terrible about being fond of blue and white china, or holding a lily, or reading silly poems, or wanting to impress attractive young women. If the typical Aesthete was, like Bunthorne, something of a poseur, perhaps so are we all, striving, as Dr. Adler tells us, to overcome feelings of inferiority, incompetence, and isolation.⁴² Oscar Wilde made a significant contribution to his society and was repaid in the end with venomous persecution; his real detractors were not as generous with him as Gilbert was. Wilde and Whistler were men of wit and sophistication, and it is hard to see them as capable of

resenting a work as mild and innocent as *Patience*. Besides, Gilbert's major point about Bunthorne may well be that, strange as such a fellow may seem to the rest of us, he is, after all, a human being with emotions and desires not so different from those of ordinary, less highly spiced people, and to be looked upon and treated accordingly.

Humorous though some of Gilbert's references to the Aesthetic Movement may still be, the fact remains that if *Patience* were essentially or even primarily a satire on the extravagances of a phase of Victorian culture, the piece would be hopelessly out-of-date. Most people who go to see and hear a Gilbert and Sullivan opera do not know a great deal about Pre-Raphaelites, blue and white china, and other such matters, and so they are not in the position to appreciate the topical humour that so amused the audiences of Gilbert's day. Some critics have suggested, however, that if one looks closely at the Savoy libretti, one finds that Gilbert was actually quite wary of topical allusions that might date his work.⁴³ Indeed, the continuing popularity of the Savoy operas suggests that Gilbert's satire was more universal than topical. In Leslie Baily's view, *Patience* is a highbrow comedy of manners whose real target is *affectation*, just as duty is the target of *The Pirates of Penzance* and discipline that of *H. M. S. Pinafore*.⁴⁴ This view is echoed by the leading Gilbertian of our own day, Jane Stedman, who suggests that the satiric effect in *Patience* is broad, "concentrating on principles more than persons and universalizing parody into a criticism of affectation as a motivating principle in human nature."⁴⁵ We may not know much about aestheticism, but we all know something about affectation, which is a trans-cultural phenomenon, and so perhaps that is why *Patience* properly performed, still amuses more than just the literary cognoscenti.

This broader interpretation of *Patience* seems plausible even simply on the basis of a consideration of the text, but as Stedman has observed, it becomes even more plausible when we consider the circumstances surrounding the genesis of Gilbert's project.⁴⁶ The plot of *Patience* is based partly on that of one of Gilbert's early "Bab Ballads," "The Rival Curates," which was first published in *Fun* on 19 October 1867. (Gilbert frequently drew on material from the "Bab Ballads" when working out his ideas for the Savoy libretti.) In the 1867 piece, "a man's image is at stake: the Reverend Clayton Hooper insists upon being known as 'the mildest curate going.' He therefore prepares to assassinate the Reverend Hopley Porter. Bloodshed becomes unnecessary, however, because Porter is weary of his own clerical mildness."⁴¹ Hopper is the prototype of Bunthorne, Porter of Grosvenor, a rivalry between curates is replaced by one between poets, consideration of assassination is replaced by consideration of a curse, and concern

about appearing particularly mild is replaced with concern about appearing particularly aesthetic. As Porter joyfully undergoes a transformation under "compulsion," so too does Grosvenor in the later work. Now, other material went into *Patience*,⁴⁹ but it is the religious element that is of special interest to us here. Gilbert had been toying with the idea of making his new opera after *Pirates* an opera about the rivalry between two clergymen (along the lines of "The Rival Curates"), and among Gilbert's papers in the British Museum there is a draft of about two-thirds of what later became Act I of *Patience* but concerns clerics rather than aesthetes.⁵⁰ Stedman has reproduced this draft for us and pointed out that it may well have been Gilbert's hesitation between High Church and High Art that gave rise to the breadth of the satiric effect in *Patience*.⁵¹ The draft is in many ways remarkably similar to the final version of the first part of *Patience*: Gilbert had little trouble in moving from the image of rapturous maidens pursuing an ecclesiastic to that of rapturous maidens pursuing an Aesthete. This fact in itself would suggest that the satire of *Patience* is more universal and less topical than might initially appear.

Gilbert prudently dropped the idea of satirizing clerics. "I mistrust the clerical element," he wrote to Sullivan. "I feel hampered by the restrictions which the nature of the subject places upon my freedom of action, and I want to revert to my old idea of rivalry between two Aesthetic fanatics, worshipped by a chorus of female aesthetics, instead of a couple of clergymen worshipped by a chorus of female devotees. I can get much more fun out of the subject as I propose to alter it, and the general scheme of the piece will remain as at present."⁵² The "general scheme" remained the same, and in fact, as Stedman has pointed out, much of what Gilbert originally wrote, and much of what he left in the text, apply equally to the Oxford Movement of Victorian theology and to the Aesthetic Movement of Victorian art, with his treatment of medievalism being the most obvious case in point.⁵³ I would be prepared to argue at some length that Bunthorne has almost as much in common with Cardinal Newman as he does with Swinburne.

I am not convinced, however, that Baily and Stedman are right in believing that affectation is the principal target of the broader satire in *Patience*. A strong case can be made for the position that the real target of the broader satire is romantic love. Gilbert may well have regarded romantic love—and I use the term "romantic" in the pregnant rather than the prosaic sense—as a form of affectation. Nevertheless, in *Patience*, the theme of affectation as such is subordinate to the theme of how people let romantic ideas disrupt healthy, satisfying male-female relationships. I consider this fact important for two reasons.

First, it seems to me that in spite of his exaggerated but not wholly unjustified reputation for prudishness,⁵⁴ Gilbert comes closer in *Patience* than in any other Savoy operas to dealing with issues related to sexuality. (He does deal more directly with these issues in some of his serious plays.) If we ignore this fact, we fail to appreciate the significance of a character like Lady Jane, whose charms are fading but whose passions are not. Gilbert has often been condemned for his "cruel" portraits of elderly ugly ladies,⁵⁵ but I personally find his portraits of Lady Jane, Katisha, and their sisters in the other operas to be among Gilbert's most touching, most sympathetic, and most perceptive. Secondly, when we see *Patience* as a study of romantic love, we find it easier to understand what I shall later characterize as the "utilitarian" cast of Gilbert's mind.

It is time now to move to a higher plane of analysis. According to an old and serious school of Gilbert interpretation, represented by such scholars as Archer, Dark, and Grey, it is unwise and inappropriate to think of Gilbert as a satirist, even if his work has satirical touches.⁵⁶ I cannot endorse all the arguments of these scholars, and I think that satire is an important element in many of Gilbert's works and particularly in the Savoy libretti. However, I have myself lamented elsewhere⁵⁷ that Gilbert's work has often been misunderstood because the satirical aspect of his comedy has been overemphasized. Although Gilbert has traditionally been viewed as a Victorian Aristophanes, few literary critics have appreciated the full implications of Gilbert's "classicism." One who has is Max Keith Sutton, who in his highly professional and complex analysis of Gilbertianism makes observations like the following:

The vitality of the Savoy Operas, decades and oceans away from their original time and place, suggests an inner strength that is far more potent than topical satire. Part of their life springs from the ritualistic quality they share with the comedies of Aristophanes. The operas appeal to our delight in ceremonial behavior, to the fun of wearing masks, playing games, and watching contests in which the participants must not violate the most inhibiting rules. As the object of a Gilbert and Sullivan cult, the operas in performance have some kinship with an elaborate form of public ritual.⁵⁸

In his analysis, Sutton draws our attention to concerns of Gilbertian comedy that have relatively little if anything to do with satire in the strict sense: fantasy, topsy-turvydom, behavioural compulsion, problems of personal identity, the struggle with the law, and ritualism.⁵⁹ He invites us to consider, for example, the scene in *Patience* in which Bunthorne assumes the victim's role by putting himself up as a prize in a raffle. Here Bunthorne is garlanded like a bull or heifer, led by a

procession of rapturous maidens, and what we have, as in other Savoy operas, is a particular ritualistic motif, the vestige of a sacrificial rite.⁶⁰ (Sutton has been influenced here by Frye.⁶¹) This is pretty high-powered analysis, but there is no *prima facie* reason why it should be less applicable to the works of Gilbert than to those of Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Moliere, or Neil Simon. I see no *prima facie* reason why a disciple of Freud, Jung, Sartre, or Roland Barthes could not have a grand old time analyzing away a text like *Patience*. But these are, I admit, high matters far beyond the understanding of a narrowly-trained academic philosopher like myself.

So let us turn now to philosophy, which is something that I do know something about, and which lies at the heart of any "-ism," even, I suggest, Gilbertianism. What I would like to look at here is Gilbert as a moralist and commentator on the human condition, and secondarily, as a social theorist. A case could be made for the more exotic position that Gilbertianism has a metaphysical dimension; Gilbertian fantasy, particularly insofar as it invokes a vision of topsy-turvydom, seems to be inviting us to reflect in some way on the nature of reality and on the logic that apparently governs reality. I shall not make that case, however, and shall focus here exclusively on Gilbert's practical wisdom. That Gilbert thought of himself as something of a popular philosopher, even in the Savoy libretti, is evidenced by certain lines that he has come from the mouth of his alter ego, Jack Point, in *The Yeomen of the Guard*. "For, look you, there is humour in all things, and the truest philosophy is that which teaches us to find it and to make the most of it," the apologetical Point suggests, remarking later that,

When they're offered to the world in merry guise,
Unpleasant truths are swallowed with a will—

For he who'd make his fellow-creatures wise
Should always gild the philosophic pill!

Gilbert himself is very much the apologist here. Much has been made of Arthur Sullivan's dismay at the fact that the popularity of the Savoy operas had detracted from his image as a "serious" composer, but little attention has been given to Gilbert's parallel frustrations. The aged Gilbert was sufficiently troubled by his status in the literary world to be moved to dismiss his most popular works as trivial;⁶² and to the very end, he remained convinced that his greatest works were his serious, moralistic plays like *Broken Hearts*, *Charity*, and *Gretchen*.⁶³ It would appear at this late date that poor Gilbert was even more self-deluded than Sullivan, who, after all, had far stronger grounds for believing

that his real abilities lay in the realm of “serious” art. But what Gilbert and Sullivan both failed to appreciate in their more regretful moments was that there is a significant continuity between their popular works and their “serious” works. That Gilbert had Point offer the apology for his art that Point does indicates that Gilbert was at least occasionally prepared to entertain the view that his lighter works had a certain “seriousness” of their own. And in the view of an interpreter like Chesterton, here Gilbert was not guilty of self-delusion:

It is always possible to appeal to the audience with success, if we appeal to something which they know already; or feel as if they knew already. But if we have to get them to listen to a criticism, however light, which they have really never thought of before, they must have a certain atmosphere of repose and ritual in which to reflect on it. How many of Gilbert's best points were in a sense rather abstruse points.... To take only one example; there has crept into our common speech and judgement a very evil heresy, one of the dingy legacies of Calvinism; the idea that some people are born bad and others born so solidly good that they are actually incapable of sin; and can never even be tempted to cowardice or falsehood And Gilbert struck that heresy to the heart . . . [with a verse from *The Mikado* that] is a pure piece of logical analysis and exposure; a great deal more philosophical than many that are quoted among the epigrams of Voltaire.⁶⁴

Chesterton's respect for Gilbert is significantly limited, however, for he feels that “Gilbert had no particular positive philosophy” to support his negative criticisms;⁶⁵ indeed, in Chesterton's view, Gilbert shared with many of his contemporaries a “relative lack of moral conviction.”⁶⁶ This view of Gilbert was shared by Bernard Shaw.⁶⁷

But Chesterton was a Catholic bigot—as even the passing references to Calvinism and Voltaire above remind us—and Shaw was knee-deep in ideology, and so both would be inclined to overstate their point against Gilbert. Dark and Grey are closer to the mark when they point out that unlike Aristophanes, to whom he is so often compared, Gilbert never felt fierce indignation about gross evils and was content to emphasize the absurdity of smaller foibles.⁶⁸ Sutton is yet closer to the mark when, contrasting Gilbert with Shaw, he observes that, “Unburdened by a constructive program, Gilbert could indulge in parody and satiric ridicule without pausing to explain or defend a ‘positive’ social or economic theory. Anyone who wanted to know his values could find them stated clearly at the end of *Charity* (he did not invent them) and could realize that honesty and a charitable concern for others were the values implied by the ironies of his comic works.”⁶⁹ Sutton goes on to suggest that, “Gilbert may have achieved some of Shaw's own social-political ends, perhaps with equal effect.”⁷⁰

Gilbert's heavy, moralistic works like *Charity* are permeated with a sentimentalism not unlike the kind that the dry-eyed, comic Gilbert was so often inclined to satirize. But underlying both the heavy and the light works is something more concrete than sentimentalism, something that can be seen as either a "positive" moral philosophy or at least a moral outlook. That philosophy or outlook is essentially the liberal utilitarianism that was one of the major standpoints of the Victorian age. Lord Cecil helpfully compares Gilbert to Thackeray: "They both laughed at their fellows from the same point of view: that of a typical masculine representative of the liberal middle class that gave the tone to Victorian England. . . ."71 From this point of view, "a normal reasonable man does not devote his life to blue china and Botticelli," or for that matter, to any form of political extremism.⁷² To be sure, it was prudent for Gilbert to write libretti that "flattered" the average Englishman of the period in all his pet prejudices against lords and aesthetes, and democrats and feminists, and slippery lawyers and blustering generals.⁷³ But these indeed were the "prejudices" of Gilbert himself, a hard-working member of the professional part of the Victorian middle-class.⁷⁴

The values of middle-class professionals are in some ways more ambiguous than those of other groups in society, and the ambiguity is quite clear in Gilbert's case. To *Dark and Grey*, Gilbert was at heart a Tory;⁷⁵ Baily sees Gilbert as having moved slowly from a youthful liberalism to a more conservative position;⁷⁶ and Cecil, as we have seen, is impressed by Gilbert's fundamental liberalism. Setting aside whatever political views Gilbert might have had in the narrower sense of "political" and allowing for the complexity of Gilbert's personality, we can appreciate Cecil's point. It is important to bear in mind, however, that the liberalism to which Cecil is referring is the "classical" liberalism of nineteenth century England. The historians Palmer and Colton have painted this vivid portrait of classical liberalism:

Liberals were generally men of the business and professional classes, together with enterprising landowners wishing to improve their estates. They believed in what was modern, enlightened, efficient, reasonable, and fair. They had confidence in man's powers of self-government and self-control. They set a high value on parliamentary or representative government, working through reasonable discussion and legislation, with responsible ministries and an impartial and law-abiding administration. They demanded full publicity for all actions of government, and to assure such publicity they insisted on freedom of the press and free rights of assembly. All these political advantages they thought most likely to be realized under a good constitutional monarchy. Outside of England, they favored explicit written constitutions. They were not democrats; they opposed giving every man the vote, fearing the excesses of mob rule or of irrational political action. Only as the nineteenth

century progressed did liberals gradually and reluctantly come to accept the idea of universal manhood suffrage. They subscribed to the doctrines of the rights of man as set forth in the American and French Revolutions, but with a clear emphasis on the right of property, and in their economic views they followed the British Manchester school or the French economist J.B. Say. They favored *laissez-faire*, were suspicious of the ability of government to regulate business, wanted to get rid of the guild system where it still existed, and disapproved of attempts on the part of the new industrial laborers to organize unions. Internationally they advocated freedom of trade, to be accomplished by the lowering or abolition of tariffs, so that all countries might exchange their products easily with each other and with industrial England. In this way, they thought, each country would produce what it was most fitted for, and so best increase its wealth and standards of living. From the growth of wealth, production, invention, and scientific progress they believed that the general progress of humanity would ensue. They generally frowned upon the established churches and landed aristocracies as obstacles to advancement. They believed in the spread of tolerance and education. They were also profoundly civilian in attitude, disliking wars, conquerors, army officers, standing armies, and military expenditures. They wanted orderly change by processes of legislation. They shrank before the idea of revolution.⁷⁷

It is hardly surprising that Gilbert should have felt so much at home with most features of this point of view. Grandson of a tea merchant, son of a naval surgeon who turned to writing, himself a trained barrister educated not at Oxford or Cambridge but at King's College on the Strand in London, a commercial gentleman, a man of the world, in many ways a self-made man who was always mindful of how far he had come through his own talented efforts, a man who did not share his famous collaborator's comfort with the company of the "higher" classes and the "beautiful people": such a man was virtually destined to take on the point of view of classical liberalism. If sceptical about misguided reformers, he was nonetheless concerned with the ills of the social order.⁷⁸ If unsympathetic to socialism, he was nonetheless contemptuous of callous aristocrats.

Patience, however, dealing as it does with such themes as aestheticism, affectation, faddish crazes, and romantic love, contains relatively little in the way of political subject-matter in comparison with many of the other Savoy operas, even if "political" is interpreted in a rather broad sense. One could, I suppose, read some political content into the work: one might, for example, see Gilbert as encouraging the middle class not to allow itself to have its tastes manipulated and its purses raided by a cultural industry guided by a supercilious Oxford-educated elite.⁷⁹ One could see *Patience* as a study in the politics of culture. But such an interpretation would be somewhat contrived. In order to appreciate the connection between *Patience* and Gilbert's

liberalism, then, we must consider another factor, the association of liberalism with utilitarianism.

The connection between classical British liberalism and British utilitarian philosophy is as much historical as philosophical. The leading lights of British liberal theory, Bentham and the Mills, were also the leading lights of the utilitarian movement in the period when Gilbert was formulating his moral and political attitudes. John Stuart Mill, author of the great liberal manifesto, *On Liberty*, was also the author of the equally famous philosophical monograph, *Utilitarianism*. The younger Mill, as did his father and Jeremy Bentham before him, saw liberalism and utilitarianism as complementary doctrines. To a contemporary historian of ideas, the connection between classical liberal theory and the utilitarian ethic may well not seem as tight as it seemed to so many leading thinkers of Gilbert's age. But that is a point that need not concern us here, for what really interests us is that Gilbert's outlook seems generally to conform to the pattern of what I have called "liberal utilitarianism," a philosophy in which liberalism and utilitarianism are fused together almost seamlessly. In Gilbert's time, this was more than just an academic philosophy; it was very much "in the air," and someone in Gilbert's situation would have had ample opportunity to breathe it in, even without being aware that he was doing so.

Utilitarianism is a philosophy that associates morality with the promotion of happiness and the diminution of unhappiness, with happiness being understood more or less as pleasure, and unhappiness being understood more or less as pain. Utilitarian moralists have traditionally rejected ethical systems based on duty or on self-realization, as they have seen such systems as being, among other things, impractical, inflexible, elitist, and rooted in an unsound psychology. The utilitarians of Gilbert's day generally saw liberalism as freeing people from traditional obstacles to their happiness, such as an exaggerated sense of duty,⁸⁰ acceptance of an arbitrary system of class distinction,⁸¹ revolutionary propensities,⁸² and a romantic conception of war.⁸³ The liberals of Gilbert's day tended to see utilitarianism as providing a much-needed secular underpinning—conceptual and justificatory—for the social programmes that they were advocating.

The utilitarian aspect of liberal utilitarianism is as pronounced in *Patience* as in any of the other Savoy operas, with the exception of *The Gondoliers*. Something that clearly fascinates Gilbert in *Patience*, as in so many of his works, is the remarkable and deplorable capacity of otherwise normal, healthy human beings to make themselves miserable by playing out a role that they mistakenly take to be "socially appropriate" for them. Gilbert's attitude towards such people com-

bines equal measures of contempt, humour, bemusement, and pity. In contrast, the heroes of the Savoy operas are those independent men and women whose common-sensical pursuit of their own happiness and the happiness of their fellows has led them to throw off the shackles of some social role that has been assigned to them or invented through self-delusion. Therein lies the charm of the judge and the defendant in *Trial By Jury*, the Pirate King and Mabel in *Pirates*, the Lord Chancellor in *Iolanthe*, Nanki-Poo and Ko-Ko in *The Mikado*, the Duke of Plaza-Toro in *The Gondoliers*, and so many of Gilbert's most vivid creations. In their will to self-determination, which is often earned through great effort, these characters take on an almost existential heroism; and the successful resolution of the complications of the various operas comes about as much from the wit, courage, and ingenuity of these characters as from the remarkable circumstances of fate in the world of topsy-turvydom.

This theme operates in *Patience* on many levels, of which the following seem to be the most important: 1) The rapturous maidens, swept away by aestheticism and romanticism, spurn their lovers, the Dragoons, who have been satisfying companions, and drift through Act I parading the misery that results from unrequited love for a "suitable" love-object. 2) In contrast, *Patience* and Lady Jane, the heroines of the piece, stake out an independent position. *Patience*, the greater heroine (and appropriately the title character), rejects the aestheticism and romanticism of the rapturous maidens, and boldly affirms her confidence in her judgment with the utilitarian observation, "For I am blithe and I am gay, / While they sit sighing night and day. / Think of the gulf 'twixt them and me, / 'Fal la la la'— and 'Miserie!' " When Lady Angela suggests that poor *Patience* has never known *true* happiness, *Patience* innocently but perceptively replies, "But the truly happy always seem to have so much on their minds. The truly happy never seem quite well." As for Lady Jane, mindful of her disadvantages in relation to her younger, more attractive rivals, her willingness to chart a somewhat independent course enables her to land on her feet time and time again. 3) Grosvenor is essentially a weak character, whose compulsive commitment to maintaining an image and ideology with which he is clearly uncomfortable leads initially not only to his own unhappiness but also to *Patience*'s. Only when Grosvenor is freed from his compulsion by the acts of more assertive characters, Bunthorne and Lady Jane, is he capable of making himself and his fellows happy. 4) The Dragoons are basically simple, hedonistic fellows who are understandably befuddled by the aesthetic craze and its influence on their women. Yet, they are deservedly victims of their own role-playing. In Colonel Calverley's famous numbers in Act I, it is made

clear that the Dragoons see themselves as attractive not because of their personal qualities but because they are impressively uniformed Heavy Dragoons. They unsuccessfully attempt to solve their problem by attempting to play a role that is wholly inappropriate for them as individuals, the role of the Aesthete. They appear, inevitably enough, comically foolish, and they only recapture happiness when they follow a reformed Grosvenor and their reformed sweethearts in becoming "commonplace," "matter-of-fact," "every-day" young people. 5) In the end, it is the simple, utilitarian virtues of Patience, the dairy maid, that win out. From the start, Patience represents health, normality, common sense, joy, and the gracefulness of simplicity; and though Grosvenor temporarily causes her to stumble, she has the satisfaction of seeing everyone but Bunthorne come around to her point of view. But what of Bunthorne himself? Bunthorne is something of a "sham," but we can empathize with him: mindful of his limitations—he lacks the *machismo* of the Dragoons and the physical beauty of Grosvenor—he has cultivated a certain pose with the aim of attaining the simple pleasures of life that he rightly perceives as embodied by his proper love-object, Patience. And he almost pulls the project off successfully. In the end, however, he has to some extent become the victim of the role that he has taken on. Unlike Grosvenor, he has nobody to free him from the pose that he has come to be associated with even by himself. He alone is left without the joys of companionship, holding his flower, his "vegetable" love. Yet, what saves him from being the tragic figure that Jack Point is at the end of *The Yeomen of the Guard* is that we are left wondering whether perhaps Bunthorne has somehow found his true role in life, a role that will provide him with the happiness appropriate to his own unique personality.

We have come then to what seems to me to be the very core of Gilbertianism. When Gilbert, in *The Gondoliers*, had Marco Palmieri advise his dissatisfied brother to take a "pair of sparkling eyes" and a "pretty little cot," he was only stating more directly than usual what he took to be the common-sensical, utilitarian solution to the psychological and social problems of his fellows, problems rooted in their fruitless commitment to role-playing. He took his own advice seriously, and he could never have fully understood why people like Arthur Sullivan and Oscar Wilde declined to heed it. In spite of his gruff demeanour, Gilbert was—and saw himself as—living proof that one can enjoy the simple satisfactions of life without losing one's individuality, compassion, vitality, and imaginativeness.

I grant that there is nothing profound about this Gilbertianism; but then again, there is something about the whole tradition of liberal utilitarianism that represents a more or less conscious escape from the

realm of ideological grandeur. The bolder Victorian ideologists found inspiration in the quasi-mystical reflections of weighty Teutonic minds like Hegel, Marx, and Nietzsche. From Gilbert we get instead the home-grown moral sentimentalism that the German philosophers loved to denigrate. Whatever its vices, the Gilbertian form of liberal utilitarianism is not without its virtues, and it deserves its own place in the sun. And with that point in mind, let us turn to a practical consideration.

The performances of the Savoy operas that small groups like our own⁸⁴ put on are in many ways inferior to those put on in Stratford and on Broadway. Our productions cannot offer the brilliant choreography or stage technology that recent "major" productions have offered. Maureen Forrester will not sing for our little company, and the Toronto and New York critics will not pay our productions much attention. But what companies like ours can offer, perhaps, is the authentic Gilbertian article. We can offer audiences the unadulterated wit and wisdom of one of the four or five most frequently quoted authors in the English language, of one of the most celebrated dramatists of his day, of someone who has brought not a little joy and consolation to several generations of confused Aesthetes and Dragoons like ourselves. We have become, in effect, the guardians of the authentic Gilbertian tradition, and as devoted Savoyards, we should approach our obligation with pride and with care. And this last point holds even if my own analysis of Gilbertianism is somewhat artificial and perhaps somewhat inaccurate. I am not a literary critic by temperament or training, and I must echo the plea of the Dragoons of *Patience*: "If this is not exactly right, we hope you won't upbraid; / You can't get high Aesthetic tastes, like trousers, ready made."

NOTES

1. This paper is a slightly revised version of a lecture delivered to the Waterloo regional branch of the Gilbert and Sullivan Society on 26 February 1985. I am grateful to members of that group for their helpful critical comments.
2. Max Keith Sutton, *W.S. Gilbert* (Boston: Twayne, 1975), p. 94.
3. Donald Jay Grout, *A Short History of Opera* (2nd ed.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1965 [1947]), p. 338.
4. Cf., e.g., John Bush Jones, "Introduction," in John Bush Jones, ed., *W.S. Gilbert: A Century of Scholarship and Commentary* (New York: New York University Press, 1970), pp. xiii-xix; and Jay Newman, "Dimensions of Gilbert's Comedy," *Gilbert and Sullivan Journal*, X, no. 18 (Spring, 1980), 380-2.
5. Contrast, e.g., David Cecil, "Introduction" to W.S. Gilbert, *The Savoy Operas*, I (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), xiv-xvi with William Archer, "Mr. W.S. Gilbert," in Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 47, or Sidney Dark and Rowland Grey, *W.S. Gilbert: His Life and Letters* (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1972 [1923]), p. 229. The Archer piece first appeared in *St. James Magazine* 49 (1881).

6. Contrast, e.g., Jay Newman, "Gilbert and the Utilitarians," *The Savoyard*, XVI, no. 2 (Royal Command Performance Supplement), 13-14 with G.K. Chesterton, "Gilbert and Sullivan," in Jones *op. cit.*, p. 203. The Chesterton piece first appeared in *Cornhill Magazine* 69 (1930).
7. Contrast, e.g., Cecil, *op. cit.*, p. x with Dark and Grey, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-33.
8. Contrast, e.g., Cecil, *op. cit.*, p. xii with Isaac Goldberg, "W.S. Gilbert's Topsy-Turvydom," in Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 145. The Goldberg piece first appeared in *Bookman* 67 (1928).
9. See Arthur Quiller-Couch, "W.S. Gilbert," in Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-1. This piece first appeared in the author's *Studies in Literature, Third Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929).
10. Contrast, e.g., Sutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-2 with Cecil, *op. cit.*, pp. xii, xvi.
11. Contrast, e.g., Hesketh Pearson, *Gilbert: His Life and Strife* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 109 with Quiller-Couch, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-5.
12. Contrast, e.g., Cecil, *op. cit.*, pp. xi-xiii with Chesterton, *op. cit.*, p. 204 and Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
13. William Littler, "Gilbert and Sullivan a hoot and a holler," *Toronto Star*, 9 March 1981.
14. Leslie Baily, *Gilbert and Sullivan: Their Lives and Times* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1979 [1973]), p. 67.
15. Walter Hamilton, *The Aesthetic Movement in England* (3rd ed.; London: Reeves and Turner, 1882), pp. 6-7; Elizabeth Aslin, *The Aesthetic Movement: Prelude to Art Nouveau* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 126; Robin Spencer, *The Aesthetic Movement: Theory and Practice* (London: Studio Vista; New York: E.P. Dutton, 1972), p. 115.
16. Cf., e.g., Spencer, *op. cit.*, p. 117.
17. Baily, *op. cit.*, p. 67; Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p.v.; John Bush Jones, "In Search of Archibald Grosvenor: A New Look at Gilbert's *Patience*," in Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-44; Pearson, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 109-10. The Jones piece first appeared in *Victorian Poetry* 3 (1965).
18. Caryl Brahms, *Gilbert and Sullivan: Lost Chords and Discords* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown, 1975), p. 100.
19. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-7.
20. Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
21. Dark and Grey, *op. cit.*, p. 81; Chesterton, *op. cit.*, p. 204; Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 109; Jones, "In Search," pp. 253-4.
22. Baily, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
23. *Ibid.*; cf. Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
24. Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 112; Aslin, *op. cit.*, pp. 127, 157-8.
25. Aslin, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
26. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. vi-vii.
27. Aslin, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
31. *Ibid.*; cf. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. viii.
32. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. viii.
33. *Ibid.*, p. v.
34. Spencer, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 100-1, 115.
35. Jones, "In Search," pp. 243-7.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 247-54.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 254-5.
38. Cecil, *op. cit.*, pp. xiv-xv.
39. Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 100.
40. Aslin, *op. cit.*, pp. 125, 162.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 46; cf. Spencer, p. 10.
42. Cf., e.g., Alfred Adler, *Understanding Human Nature*, trans. by W. Béran Wolfe (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928).
43. Quiller-Couch, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-1; cf. Jane Stedman, "The Genesis of *Patience*," in Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 309. The Stedman piece first appeared in *Modern Philology* 66 (1968).
44. Baily, *op. cit.*, p. 70; cf. Dark and Grey, *op. cit.*, p. 82.
45. Stedman, *op. cit.*, p. 309.
46. *Ibid.*
47. W.S. Gilbert, *The Bab Ballads*, ed. James Ellis (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 120-1, and the editor's notes on pp. 333-4.
48. Sutton, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
49. Stedman, *op. cit.*, p. 286.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 285.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 290-305, 309.
52. Letter from W.S. Gilbert to Arthur Sullivan, November 1880, reprinted (complete) in Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
53. Stedman, *op. cit.*, p. 308.
54. E.g., Cecil, *op. cit.*, p. xi; Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 228, 246.
55. E.g., Quiller-Couch, *op. cit.*, pp. 171.
56. Cf. n. 5 above.
57. Newman, "Dimensions," pp. 380-82.
58. Sutton, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
59. Sutton, *op. cit.*, *passim*, esp. pp. 94-108.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
61. Cf. Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* Princeton, N.J.: (Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 46.
62. Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 237; Sutton, *op. cit.*, p. 123.
63. Pearson, *op. cit.*, pp. 247-8.
64. Chesterton, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-1.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 202.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
67. Sutton, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-5.
68. Dark and Grey, *op. cit.*, p. 230.
69. Sutton, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
70. *Ibid.*
71. Cecil, *op. cit.*, pp. ix-x.
72. *Ibid.*, p. x.
73. *Ibid.*, p. xi.
74. Dark and Grey, *op. cit.*, p. 229.
75. *Ibid.*
76. Baily, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
77. R. R. Palmer and Joel Colton, *A History of the Modern World* (3rd ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), pp. 432-3.
78. Sutton, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
79. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-6.
80. Cf. Gilbert's *The Pirates of Penzance*.
81. Cf. Gilbert's *H.M.S. Pinafore*.
82. Cf. Gilbert's *The Gondoliers* and *Utopia, Limited*.
83. Cf. Gilbert's *Princess Ida*.
84. Cf. n. 1 above.