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The concert programme collections held by the British Library include two sets relating to Manchester’s Grand Musical Festival of 1836. One is an anonymous bound collection of prospectuses, programmes and wordbooks from the Manchester festivals of 1828 and 1836.\(^1\) The other, also a full set of programmes from 1836, is distinguished by belonging to Sir George Thomas Smart, the conductor of that festival.\(^2\) In common with many of the programmes surviving from his long career, these are covered in his detailed handwritten annotations. As Christina Bashford has pointed out, when working with concert programmes it is generally necessary to take into account a number of limitations: the concert programme is a record of what was intended to happen, not necessarily what did; the repertoire details given were often vague and can be insufficient to fully identify the pieces today; and programmes were frequently changed at the last minute. Furthermore, if a researcher hopes to cross-reference programme information with reviews or other press commentary, they confront the issue that reviews of concerts were regularly written on the basis of advance publicity by people who did not actually attend the event.\(^3\) Smart’s annotations – loosely divisible into changes to programme and personnel, timings, and encores – often directly address such areas and therefore, when his annotated programmes are triangulated with other sources, they provide a wealth of information about what actually happened at an early nineteenth-century music festival, both on the stage and behind the scenes.

Sir George Smart (1776-1867), as John Edmund Cox described in his *Recollections* of 1872, ‘was so mixed up with all the prominent musical proceedings of the period […] that it is impossible to refer to one without continually mentioning the other’.\(^4\) He sang at the first Handel commemoration in Westminster Abbey in 1784 and conducted the last there in 1834. He played violin in Salomon’s concerts, was given tips on playing the timpani by Haydn, and later, as organist for the Chapel Royal, he conducted the music for the funerals of two kings, two coronations, and the marriage of Queen Victoria. He was a founder member of the Philharmonic Society, for whom he also conducted forty-nine concerts including the first British performance of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. He championed the music of Beethoven, Weber, Spohr and Mendelssohn, befriending the composers, and his journal account of his travels to Vienna to learn from Beethoven about what tempi he should conduct the composer’s music has received scholarly interest. Smart himself has received less attention, despite the frequency with which his papers have been consulted by researchers into nineteenth-century British music history. Ian Taylor has previously observed the possibilities inherent in Smart’s annotations to
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1. [Programmes, books of words, and regulations of the Manchester Musical Festival for 1828 and 1836]. BL, 1501/24.(1.)
2. [Programmes, Books of words, etc, of the Manchester Musical Festival of 1836. With M.S. notes by Sir G. T. Smart]. BL, C.61.g.13.
Fig. 1. Smart’s programmes for Manchester 1836. Wednesday Evening programme, part 1st, with annotations about timings, encores, accompaniment and key. BL, C.61.g.13.
allow exploration beyond the limitations of the unadorned programme, yet Taylor’s call for his preliminary survey of Smart’s annotations to be followed up with more detailed scholarly investigation has so far not been heeded.\footnote{Ian Taylor, ‘How to Read a Concert Programme: Programmes from the Papers of Sir George Smart’, \textit{Brio}, xliii (2006), pp. 7-22. I must thank the reviewer of my submission for drawing my attention to this article, of which I was unaware. It was striking to note the similarities between the points we made and the conclusions we reached, via independent investigations and considerations.} John Carnelly’s recent monograph gives Smart the recognition his life and career have long deserved, yet Smart’s programmes remain a source of tremendous untapped potential.\footnote{The British Library’s George Smart collection comprises his programmes, journals, account books and scores: Add. MS. 41771-9 and 42225, Sir George Smart’s papers; C.61.h.2 and K.6.d.3, annotated programmes. The collection has been invaluable to much research into music in nineteenth-century Britain, but apart from an article by Alec Hyatt King and a book by Percy Young, which although about Smart disguises itself as a book about Beethoven, George Smart has been surprisingly neglected as an important figure in his own right. John Carnelly’s book is a development of his Ph.D. thesis of 2008. See Alec Hyatt King, ‘The Importance of Sir George Smart’, \textit{The Musical Times}, xci (1950), pp. 461-2; Percy M. Young, \textit{Beethoven, A Victorian Tribute: Based on the Papers of Sir George Smart} (London, 1976); John Carnelly, \textit{George Smart and Nineteenth-Century London Concert Life} (Woodbridge, 2015); John Carnelly, ‘Sir George Smart and the Evolution of British Musical Culture 1800-1840’ (Ph.D. diss., London, 2008).}

During the 1820s and 1830s Smart was in constant demand as the leading conductor on the circuit of provincial festivals, including those at Liverpool, Bath, Newcastle, Norwich, Edinburgh and Manchester.\footnote{Smart conducted festivals at Liverpool in 1823, 1827, 1830, 1833 and 1836; Norwich, 1824, 1827, 1830 and 1833; Bath, 1824; Newcastle upon Tyne, 1824 and 1842; Edinburgh, 1824; Bury St Edmunds, 1828; Dublin, 1831; Derby, 1831; Cambridge, 1833 and 1835; London (Handel Festival, Westminster Abbey), 1834; Hull, 1834 and 1840; and Manchester, 1836. W. H. Husk and Nicholas Temperley, ‘Smart, (1) Sir George (Thomas) Smart’, \textit{Grove Music Online} (Oxford University Press), \texttt{http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/25981pg1}. [accessed 23 August 2017].} Pippa Drummond has detailed how such festivals brought international artists to the provinces and allowed new industrialized cities to demonstrate their wealth and improve their cultural standing, while also raising substantial amounts of money for charitable purposes.\footnote{Pippa Drummond, \textit{The Provincial Music Festival in England, 1784-1914} (Farnham, 2001).} The model was a festival of several days’ duration, centred on increasingly large-scale morning performances of religious repertoire in churches or cathedrals, with a similar number of concerts of miscellaneous vocal and instrumental repertoire in a theatre or hall in the evening, concluding with a fancy dress ball. In addition to directing the music, the role of conductor also generally encompassed related duties such as planning programmes, and engaging soloists and orchestral players.\footnote{Drummond, \textit{Provincial Music Festival}, p. 168.} In 1836, Smart also directed the Festivals at Liverpool and Norwich and there is significant overlap in personnel and programming across the three. Smart was dismissed by Nicholas Temperley as ‘not a “conductor” as the term is now understood’,\footnote{W. H. Husk and Nicholas Temperley, ‘Smart, (1) Sir George (Thomas) Smart’, \textit{Grove Music Online} (Oxford University Press) \texttt{http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/25981pg1}. [accessed 23 August 2017].} a perspective perpetuated rather disparagingly by Fiona Palmer in her discussion of Liverpool’s festivals and ‘George Smart’s involvement as so-called “conductor”’.\footnote{Fiona M. Palmer, ‘A Home for the ‘Phil’: Liverpool’s First Philharmonic Hall (1849)’, in Paul Rodmell (ed.), \textit{Music and Institutions in Nineteenth-Century Britain} (Farnham, 2012), p. 81.} However, Carnelly argues convincingly that Smart should be regarded as ‘the first British musician to make conducting his career’, presenting evidence that he used a baton as early as 1823, as well as presiding from the pianoforte or organ.\footnote{Carnelly, \textit{George Smart}, in particular pp. 52-9.}
Smart very nearly missed out on the Manchester engagement. This was to be Manchester’s Second Grand Musical Festival, the first having taken place in 1828. Smart was approached by the organizing committee to conduct in Manchester but it emerged that the dates chosen clashed with Liverpool’s festival, a well-established triennial event that had been conducted by Smart since 1823. The absurd situation arose whereby Liverpool had secured the principal instrumental talent and Manchester the leading vocal performers. During much heated discussion on the matter between deputations from Manchester and Liverpool, when the Manchester representatives reportedly highlighted how both festivals would be musically poorer if this situation was not resolved, the Liverpool committee are quoted as saying they ‘trusted more to their Fancy Ball than to musical performances for their success!’ Manchester eventually gave way and altered its dates to take place before Liverpool. Henry Bishop, who had in the meantime been engaged as conductor for Manchester, was informed he was no longer required and Smart took on the position.

Manchester’s 1836 Festival was, as billed, a grand occasion, comprising some twenty-seven hours of concert over four days and concluding with the obligatory fancy dress ball. Many of the leading performers of the time were engaged to take part, playing to packed houses at the Theatre Royal and the Collegiate Church (now Manchester Cathedral). The latter of these was crammed with audiences of nearly 3000 people in addition to 400 musicians. There were seven concerts: four performances of sacred music in the mornings at the Collegiate Church, three Grand Miscellaneous Concerts in the evenings at the Theatre Royal. All the published programmes contain full lists of patrons, soloists, members of the orchestra, members of the chorus, and reasonably detailed information about the repertoire. Tickets were expensive, ranging for each concert from five shillings for the cheapest seats to twenty-one shillings in the patrons’ gallery. They were also not easy to obtain, requiring attendance at the Grammar School during working hours to purchase tickets and enter into the ballot for seats. In consequence, as might be anticipated, newspaper reports of concert attenders indicate an exclusive assemblage. Only the most illustrious figures were actually named in the press, but a full list of attenders at the ball was published together with details of the costumes they were wearing.

Maria Malibran de Beriot (1808-1836), then at the height of her fame, headlined a list of vocal soloists that also featured Mrs H. R. Bishop (Anna Bishop (1810-84), the young second wife of Henry Bishop), Mrs W. Knyvett (Deborah Travis (1795-1876), wife of the singer William Knyvett), the contralto Mrs A. Shaw (Mary Shaw (1814-76)), the famed bass Luigi Lablache (1794-1858), the soprano Maria Caradori Allan (1800-65), and the now elderly John Braham (c. 1774-1856), who had been the pre-eminent tenor of his generation. All were household names and festival regulars. A young Clara Novello (1818-1908) also appeared. The orchestra was engaged specifically for the festival and included leading players from London, musicians on the provincial festival circuit, and Manchester-based instrumentalists. Notable names include the celebrated partnership of the ‘cellist Robert Lindley (1776-1855) and the double-bass virtuoso

13 The Second Grand Musical Festival in Manchester, 1836: Some account of its origin and arrangements, a criticism of the musical performances, a description of the Fancy Dress Ball with a corrected and complete list of the company (Manchester, 1836), p. 3.
15 The Second Grand Musical Festival in Manchester, p. 6.
18 See for example ‘Manchester Music Festival’, Manchester Guardian, 15 September 1836, p. 1, for a selection of names of those present at the concerts.
19 The Second Grand Musical Festival in Manchester, 1836: Some account of its origin and arrangements, a criticism of the musical performances, a description of the Fancy Dress Ball with a corrected and complete list of the company (Manchester, 1836).
Domenico Dragonetti (1763-1846), the renowned flautist Charles Nicholson (1795-1837), and the clarinettist Thomas Willman (1784-1840), the leading exponent of his instrument at the time.

The morning performances were constructed around complete oratorios by Haydn, Handel, Bishop and Spohr, supplemented by selections and miscellaneous items. The Tuesday concert began with Haydn’s *The Creation* in full, followed by a selection from Mozart’s *Requiem*, before concluding with Henry Bishop’s cantata *The Seventh Day*. It was more common at the time to omit the third part of *The Creation*, and indeed Drummond has stated that this is how it was performed in Manchester.\(^{20}\) It was in fact performed in full without a break as Part One of this three-part concert.\(^{21}\) Henry Bishop directed his own oratorio from the piano, which perhaps provided some consolation for his having been removed as conductor of the festival. Wednesday morning’s concert took the form of ‘A Grand Performance of Sacred Music’, principally Handel, plus the first performance in England of *The Christian’s Prayer* by Spohr. Thursday morning was occupied by the customary performance of *The Messiah*. The Friday concert began with Beethoven’s *Christ on the Mount of Olives*, the first English performance of which had been conducted by Smart in 1814, continued with selections from *Martyr of Antioch* – an oratorio by the Manchester-based violinist and composer Richard Cudmore – and concluded with Spohr’s *Last Judgement*. Novelties of the sacred concerts included a song for Mrs Shaw composed for her by Sigismund Neukomm with Willman playing obbligato ‘on his newly invented basso clarionet’, mentioned in the review to say ‘the instrument, which is in fact a clarionet of so large dimension as to be of the same pitch as the bassoon, is yet capable of improvement’.\(^{22}\) The miscellaneous concerts given in the evenings at the Theatre Royal presented a mixture of orchestral pieces, instrumental and vocal solos, the last of these a combination of operatic arias and popular songs.

George Smart spent the week before the festival in Manchester, overseeing the final arrangements. On the Monday at the beginning of festival week there was a rehearsal under his direction for the daytime concerts from nine in the morning until five in the afternoon, followed by an evening rehearsal for the Theatre concerts which did not finish until eleven at night. The *Manchester Guardian* reported that Smart ‘was early at his post. His professional brethren, well aware of his punctuality on such occasions, were no loiterers […] Every composition that was new to the professional persons engaged, or that seemed to present any difficulty from its intricacy, or in which the same parties, including the leading London professors, had not been engaged together, was gone through’.\(^{23}\) A glimpse of the personality behind Smart’s popularity as a conductor on such occasions may be seen in his compliments to his assembled performers on this occasion, where his warmth and his people skills are equally evident:

> The rehearsal did not terminate till nearly five o’clock, and at its conclusion the conductor addressed the band, chorus, and solo singers, in a complimentary strain. He thanked them all for their attention, and the good feeling by which they were actuated. It was, he said, the most satisfactory rehearsal it had ever been his good fortune, in a long course of professional experience, to witness. All were at their posts, all had applied themselves to the business before them with zeal and assiduity, and the new pieces had been executed with an effect that almost astonished him.\(^{24}\)

The press allusion to Smart’s punctuality is a key feature of his professional practice and an important element of his annotations. He meticulously recorded timings on his programmes – starts


\(^{21}\) See n. 26 for the negative response of the *Manchester Guardian* reviewer to this programming decision.


\(^{23}\) ‘Manchester Musical Festival’, *Manchester Guardian*, 15 September 1836, p. 1. This quotation implies an interesting point of practice, as the subtext is of course the quantity of music not rehearsed immediately prior to the festival, even though the writer is keen to emphasize its familiarity through prior engagements.
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and finishes of parts of concerts, and durations of oratorios and symphonies in particular. The length of the concerts at the Manchester festival seems incredible now, though typical for such events in the early nineteenth century, each one averaging four hours. The Tuesday evening concert commenced at 7.30 p.m. and concluded at 11.29 p.m. The Wednesday morning concert ran from 11.04 a.m. to 3.16 p.m. Any anticipation that the length may have been due in part to extended intervals can be ruled out: Wednesday morning, for example, had a ‘5 minute stop’ from 12.58 until 1.03, then a twenty-four minute break between 1.48 and 2.12. While concerts of this length were standard, other sources generally contain some uncertainty over precise durations of pieces, cuts and breaks. Smart records all such details. He liked his concerts to commence on time, therefore the delay of four minutes to the start of Wednesday morning’s displeased him greatly. He notes at the top of the programme that this was ‘at the suggestion of Mr Willert [a festival steward] who said that the performance should be delayed Ten minutes as, in consequence of a Fire the streets were blocked up therefore the Patrons &c could not pass – but in a conversation with Earl of Wilton he recommended the delay of 2 or 3 minutes only’. The Earl of Wilton’s name appears regularly in the press and in Smart’s papers about the festival, suggesting that as well as evidently being enthusiastic musically he also made good use of his influence as an aristocratic patron.

In contemporary commentary, the length of the concerts occasioned less comment than the duration of certain pieces within them. Thursday’s evening concert began with Beethoven’s ‘Pastoral’ symphony, which caused the Manchester Guardian reviewer to suggest that the managers of the festival had committed a great mistake ‘in introducing a composition which occupied three quarters of an hour in its performance. It was, however, exquisitely played, and no doubt afforded extreme pleasure to those who were gifted with patience’.

The full performance of The Creation also proved unpopular with this paper: It will be observed from the above bill of fare, that the whole of ‘The Creation’ was performed. This has been unusual of late years, and we cannot but think it was an error in judgment on the part of the committee. The public have latterly been satisfied with a portion of this work, magnificent as it is; the second and third parts contain some lengthy, not to say heavy compositions, and by their omission room would have been afforded for more novelty and variety.

George Smart noted encores on every programme but these are less exact, as they appear to comprise a mixture of actual and anticipated encores, and it is not completely clear as to which were given on the day. When compared with press reviews, however, they are illuminating. The sacred concerts record just one encore in each programme. Press commentary reveals the etiquette of not applauding in church, with praise awarded for ‘chaste’ and ‘correct’ performances, particularly by the female singers. Encores were requested politely from the patrons’ gallery, including on the Tuesday, when the ‘Benedictus’ from Mozart’s Requiem was reported to have been particularly desired by the Earl of Wilton. On Wednesday morning, a repeat of the duet Qual Anelante by Marcello was requested via a paper note passed to Smart, causing it to be encored some time after its first appearance in between two numbers from Israel in Egypt.

---

25 This is one area in which his papers have received prior attention, including an article by Nicholas Temperley comparing the timings indicated by Smart with those in modern recordings, in an exploration of tempo and observance of repeats in the early nineteenth century. See Temperley, ‘Tempos and Repeats in the Early Nineteenth Century’, Music and Letters, xlv (1966), pp. 323-36.
26 Thomas Egerton, 2nd Earl of Wilton (1799-1882).
29 The Manchester Guardian reviewer appears to have been particularly reserved in this regard, while the reviews in The Second Grand Musical Festival in Manchester, 1836: Some account of its origin and arrangements seem sympathetic to the more dramatic performances.
30 The scrap of paper is preserved in the programme: ‘The public is anxious to have Qual anelante again – Malibran will sing it before her song ‘Sing Ye to the Lord’ if you approve of it’. It was indeed repeated, but during Israel in Egypt, in between the Duet ‘The Lord is a man of war’ and the Chorus ‘The Lord shall reign for ever and ever’. 
Fig. 2. Wednesday Evening Programme, p. 12: consequences of a fire. BL, C.61.g.13.
Fig. 3. Wednesday Morning Programme, inserted note: ‘The public is anxious to have Qual anelante again’. BL, C.61.g.13.
Encores in the miscellaneous concerts were a different matter. Up to five pieces were repeated every evening, with a reviewer noting, ‘There was apparently no disposition on the part of this numerous auditory to be fastidious or hypercritical. They came there to satiate themselves with music, and scarcely a piece was sung or performed, without an attempt from some part of the house to procure an encore’. All the items against which Smart put a question mark in his programmes were called for, according to the press accounts, and several additional encores were also requested, the majority of these being vocal items divided equally between arias and popular songs. Conduct was not always polite: a duet by Mozart was repeated ‘after a sharpish contention between those who wished to hear it again, and those who did not’.

The importance of appropriate conduct at oratorio concerts indicated here is inseparable from contemporary discussions around the appropriateness of putting on a music festival in a religious venue at all. The sermons given at the Collegiate Church around the time of the festival, and subsequently published, took great care to justify the festival from a religious perspective, whether responding to, or pre-empting criticism. The Reverend J. H. Marsden spoke on the Sunday immediately prior to the festival, providing many reasons why the music festival was appropriate, before cautioning his congregation:

> When these sublime and awful mysteries, the sum of what we believe and the substance of what we hope for, are sounded in your ears, – when the words of inspiration are conveyed to your understanding, through the medium of an art, which has always an influence that elevates the soul; – beware, my brethren, of the gross and earthly mind, which finds in all this, nothing more than a gratification of the love of harmony, and the merely sensual pleasure, which that love produces: – for this would amount to little less, than a profanation of all that we hold sacred […] Let us not venture to make our religion, a mere handmaid to our pleasures […] If you can trace his presence, in all the works of his wonderful creation around you, […] forget him not, my brethren, when his praises are sung in the house where he loveth to dwell, and in the words which He Himself hath taught us.

His critics remained vociferous, however, as demonstrated by published correspondence responding to this sermon from the Reverend R. Frost, Curate of St Stephen’s Church Salford, who, in the course of fourteen pages of angry prose, attempted to refute any possible religious justification for the music festival, attacking not just the performances but the preparations, the character of the performers and the ‘ungodly exhibition’ of the fancy dress ball. He was particularly incensed by the modifications made to the Collegiate Church:

> If we add the consideration of the previous preparation, the tearing down of pews, and the entire removal, for the time, of the pulpit and the desk, the conclusion, I think, cannot be resisted, that on occasion of the Musical Festival, the Collegiate Church has been subjected to an act of solemn desecration.

Smart made some reference to missing musicians, crossing the odd name out of the chorus list and noting late arrivals. His records here are not comprehensive. For example, he did not mention the ophicleide player, who had been injured in a stagecoach accident. The press could not resist the pun, lamenting the absence of Mr Ponder and his ponderous instrument.

---

33 A Sermon preached in the Collegiate Church of Manchester on the 11th of September 1836, being the Sunday preceding the music festival, by the Rev. J. H. Marsden, B.D., clerk in orders of the collegiate church and fellow of St John’s College, Cambridge (Manchester, 1836), pp. 14-15.
34 A Letter to the Very Reverend The Warden of Manchester on the subject of the late Musical Festival, with especial reference to two sermons recently preached in the Collegiate Church and since published. By the Rev. R. Frost, M.A., Curate of St. Stephen’s Church, Salford (London & Manchester, 1836), p. 11.
often Smart noted next to their intended arias singers who arrived late to concerts or who were indisposed, necessitating the piece being given by another singer. During the Tuesday morning concert, he recorded that ‘Mrs A. Shaw did not come into the orchestra until past 2’. Given this second part of the concert had begun at ‘21m to 2’, and she was due to sing in the vocal quartet which comprised the second piece, this no doubt caused a few moments of upset. Similarly, on Wednesday morning during the five-minute stop mentioned previously ‘The Performers did not leave the orchestra except Madame C. Allan who ought to have remained. The other principal singers going was not so material’.

Central here too were the events concerning Maria Malibran de Beriot, the story of her appearance at this Festival having occasioned much popular commentary at the time and scholarly attention since. Smart’s notes and comments, placed as they are on the programme as the situation developed, give a fascinating insight into the impact on the performances of the goings on and the steps taken to mitigate the situation. In July, two months prior to the festival, Malibran had suffered a riding accident. She never recovered, but nevertheless continued to fulfil all engagements up to the Manchester Festival regardless of her deteriorating health. Smart’s programme from Tuesday morning notes, next to her first appearance, that ‘Madame De Beriot was very unwell but sang well tho she commenced feebly’. Reviews of her performances over the next three concerts were each more positive than the last, the highest praise given to the duetto by Mercadante that she sang with Caradori Allan on the Wednesday evening. They were each determined to outdo the other, the press noting:

Malibran, being second, took it upon herself to oversing the principal in the graces and shakes of Caradori’s own choosing. This may have been a joke. It looked very like earnest. Malibran’s eyes, let us hope, do not always shoot those fires to her friends.36

The piece was enthusiastically encored, at the end of which Malibran collapsed. Smart records that she was unable to sing again and was carried to her inn. His programme from this evening contains notes next to the last song she sang summarizing subsequent events. It also contains a paper note given to the audience during the course of the performance informing them of Malibran’s indisposition, and announcing consequent changes to the programme. On Thursday morning, Smart notes, Malibran came to the church but was too weak to come into the orchestra. Smart seems to have been on stage while the situation developed, as he was kept informed by notes from the committee on scraps of rough paper. The first: ‘Mrs Knyvett is not yet come’. The second, referring to Malibran, ‘She is in hysterics & fits – quere if she comes?’ It seems that while attempting to conduct the early stages of the concert, Smart was faced with the indisposition of one soloist and the late arrival of a second. In the same concert, he had to send someone in search of the singer Phillips, as he was not in the orchestra and had a solo fast approaching. He has written on the programme ‘Mdme Malibran came to church but was too ill to remain. Had Mrs. W. Knyvett arrived in time she would have been requested to have sung the song’, the song in question being ‘Rejoice greatly’ from The Messiah, which was instead taken by Caradori Allan. Malibran was not to sing again. She was reported to have declined sharply and died in Manchester the week after the festival.

Smart recalled in his journal:

Malibran’s death may have been accelerated by her extraordinary exertions while singing in a duet with Madame Caradori Allen; they settled the manner at rehearsal as to how it was to be sung, but when the time came Madame Caradori Allen made some deviation; this prompted Malibran to do the same, in which she displayed the most wonderful execution. During the well-deserved encore she turned to me and said, ‘If I sing it again it will kill me’. ‘Then do not,’ I replied, ‘let me address the audience.’ ‘No,’ said she, ‘I will sing it again and annihilate her.’37

36 An Historical Account of the Grand Musical Festival held in Manchester the Second Week in September 1836: Taken from the Manchester and Salford Advertiser of September 17 (Manchester, 1836), p. 18.
Fig. 4. Wednesday Morning Programme, beginning of Part 2: "The Performers did not leave the orchestra ...".
BL, C.61.g.13.
DUETTO.

Irene. Vanna! se alberghi in petto,
Alma sublime e forte,
Affronta della sorte,
L’ingiusta crudeltà.

Andr. Vado, del mio destinato,
Tienfa un cor che adora!
Dimmi che m’ami ancora.
Abbi di me pietà.

a Duce. O voce affrante d’un tenore afflitto,
Che mormetrici in petto, che tocchi il mio cuor.
Sei voce d’amore.

Irene. Che colpa, o Cara !

Ma in il Padre?

Ah! fuggi il fiumo...

Andr. Che! tu fuggi?

Al mio periglio!

Mi adì!

Irene. Vanna! Oh Col! mi lasca!

Solo un detto,

Io…tu…chiamo…che umanità!

Andr. Fui! i vili auror tremar!

Irene. Ah! non resta più a sperar!

Quanto è barbaro il mio fato!

Ah piange più non deggi’ in!

Da lui grida il piangere sb. Dio!

Và felice a trionfare.

Andr. Quanto è barbaro il mio fato!

Ah lasciati ah risiedi!

La tua man potessi sb. Dio!

Và felice a trionfare.

Fig. 5. Wednesday evening programme, p. 12: ‘The last piece in which poor Malibran ever sung’. BL, C.61.g.13.
Despite this unfortunate occurrence, the festival was deemed a great success musically, socially and financially, making a profit of around £5000 to be distributed for charitable purposes.\textsuperscript{38} Smart was praised by the Manchester press and festival committee alike for his efforts. As the \textit{Manchester Guardian} put it:

\begin{quote}
The musical proceedings have been of a first-rate character, and have been attended with eminent success. We have no hesitation in saying that this is partially attributable to the zeal in the cause that has animated all parties, and to the talent that has been engaged for the occasion, and above all to the perseverance, industry, and extraordinary tact and skill in professional matters, of the worthy and talented gentleman who was fortunately selected by the committee to superintend the musical arrangements. Our readers will be at no loss to understand that we allude to the conductor, Sir George Smart; for we have no hesitation in saying that the success referred to has been mainly owing to his exertions.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

George Smart’s role as a festival conductor would benefit from further research. Carnelly’s biography is excellent as far as it goes, but retains a London focus, and a detailed account of this aspect of Smart’s career remains to be written. Moreover, given that the findings in this paper arise from just one set of programmes for one festival, the potential of an analysis of all his festival programme annotations is enormous. While Taylor addressed Smart’s broader programme collection, he emphasizes the fact his article was intended to identify topics worthy of further investigation.\textsuperscript{40} Such investigation remains to be pursued. A more detailed or systematic study of Smart’s annotations would certainly deepen our understanding of a wide range of topics, including the practicalities, the hidden stories and the sheer vitality underpinning British concert life in the nineteenth century.

\textsuperscript{38} Foreman, ‘Twilight of an Age’, p. 58

\textsuperscript{39} ‘Manchester Musical Festival’, \textit{Manchester Guardian}, 17 September 1836, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{40} Taylor, ‘How to Read a Concert Programme’, p. 10.