



Open Research Online

Citation

Rowland, David (2020). Composers, publishers and the market in late Georgian Britain. In: Sala, Massimiliano ed. Music publishing and composers (1750-1850). *Speculum Musicae* (37). Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 85–112.

URL

<https://oro.open.ac.uk/71390/>

License

None Specified

Policy

This document has been downloaded from Open Research Online, The Open University's repository of research publications. This version is being made available in accordance with Open Research Online policies available from [Open Research Online \(ORO\) Policies](#)

Versions

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding

THE MARKET, THE RIGHTS AND PUBLISHING STRATEGIES

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

David Rowland

(OPEN UNIVERSITY, MILTON KEYNES, UK)

AMONG THE MAJOR CONSTRAINTS faced by composers in Britain during the period c1770-1830 were the demands of the ‘market’ on which they relied for their livelihood. Not only did composers derive income from publishing their music, but the reputations they gained from doing so fed other activities, such as teaching. Because a published presence was important for the career of composers in the period, they needed both to understand and to be able reach the market. In the process of doing so, composers relied on the agency of publishers, who knew probably better than they did the taste and purchasing ability of the music-buying public, and how to deliver what that public wanted at a price they were willing to pay. It is the interrelationship of all of these parties — composers, publishers and the ‘market’ — that this chapter explores.

MARKET DEMAND AND SUPPLY

Who were the music-buying public, where did they live, and what sort of music did they want? Unsurprisingly, they tended to be where the music-publishing industry was based, which was in London throughout the late Georgian period. Established outlets also existed in Dublin, Edinburgh, and to a lesser extent in some of the cathedral cities and spa towns, but the volume of publishing in these centres was significantly smaller than it was in the capital. During the period music publishing and retailing began to grow elsewhere, especially in fast-growing industrial cities, but there also remained places in Britain where very little commercial activity around music existed, for example Wales, where scarcely any music publishing took place until the second half of the nineteenth century¹. While

¹. See, for example, GRIFFITHS 1998, p. 59.

London's publishers took opportunities to satisfy these unevenly dispersed British markets, as well as capitalising on opportunities in Europe and the colonies, their efforts were chiefly focussed on the music-buying public in the capital.

The bigger publishers stocked a wide range of music, including pieces for church use, military music, dances, orchestral music and all sorts of domestic repertoire, but while music gained in popularity under a number of these headings it was the last — domestic music — where growth was most marked. An analysis of Clementi & Co.'s comprehensive catalogue of 1823 illustrates this trend. As David Wyn Jones observes: «the emerging picture of Clementi's catalogue of music publications is of one targetted significantly towards the home, catering for the huge burgeoning of genteel music making in the early nineteenth-century»². Yu Lee Ann makes a similar point: «the most important change in the music-publishing industry during the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries was the appearance of a new spectrum of instrumental music repertoires centred on a number of fashionable instruments, and chiefly developed to cater for the domestic amateur market»³.

Within the domestic market, works for solo piano were in particular demand and new types of popular repertoire were coming into fashion. Whereas the staple of eighteenth-century domestic keyboard repertoire was the sonata, in the nineteenth century there was an increasing emphasis on more obviously tuneful (and cheaper) works such as rondos, sets of variations and arrangements of marches and other works. Across the channel in a letter to Ignace Pleyel his wife explained that «nous ferons bien mieux de graver toutes sortes de petites oeuvres demandées tous les jours, qui exigent pas de grandes avancées et don't la rentrée est sûre»⁴. The finances of publishing bear out the truth of her observation, as we will see.

Clementi's 1823 catalogue also shows how four-handed arrangements of orchestral works such as symphonies were increasingly in demand, reinforcing the notion that many people experienced music primarily in a domestic setting. In addition, the catalogue contains titles of an astonishing c2500 songs with piano accompaniment, showing just how popular the genre had become. To cope with the increasing numbers of leisured society who consumed all of this music Clementi & Co. published instruction books in significant numbers, chief among them Clementi's own *Introduction to the Art of playing on the Piano Forte* (1801).

Compared with the expansion of the repertoire for the domestic market, other genres fared less well. For example, little new orchestral music was published by Clementi's company in the years prior to the printing of the 1823 catalogue and the list of chamber

². JONES 2006, p. 8.

³. AN 2008, p. 196.

⁴. Quoted in MÜLLER 1973, p. 92: «we will do far better to print all sorts of small works every day, which require no great advances and on which the return is sure». The date of the original letter is uncertain.

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

works without piano, such as string quartets and quintets listed in their catalogue, is both relatively small and dominated by music originally published in the eighteenth century.

Who purchased published domestic music in the late Georgian era? Some sense of the potential market that publishers hoped to reach is gained by assessing which sections of the population had the ability to fund leisure. A brief examination of incomes at the lower end of the social spectrum quickly rules them out as potential purchasers of music in this period. In 1800 many unskilled labourers and agricultural workers earned no more than around £30 per annum, while their more skilled counterparts might have earned twice that amount⁵. During the following three decades the wages of these workers fluctuated, but their purchasing power saw little change: «wage earners' average real incomes were broadly stagnant for 50 years until the early 1830s, despite the fact that in many parts of the country they were starting from a very low level, having been falling from the second half of the eighteenth century»⁶. There was little scope for purchasing musical scores among this sector of society, even if they had sufficient education to be able to read music notation⁷. It was only later in the nineteenth century that increasing income among the poor enabled publishers to begin to target them, in particular when Novellos began to publish cheap vocal scores for large-scale choral works in the 1840s and when the cost of music fell more generally later in the century⁸.

Late-Georgian publishers therefore catered more or less exclusively for the aristocracy, the gentry and the richer, leisured middle classes, and the increase in piano sales illustrates how this group grew during the period⁹. A few pianos had been seen in London prior to 1760 and a few makers began to set up in business after that, but the popularisation of the instrument began with Zumpe, who began to make square pianos in the mid-1760s. He was soon producing them in significant numbers and other makers followed his example. The production of grand pianos gathered pace more slowly and it was not until the mid-1780s that the best-known maker of English grands in the period, John Broadwood, began to make them. During the decades that followed the pace of piano making quickened dramatically and by 1830 thousands of new grands and squares were being sold annually, along with substantial numbers of second-hand instruments.

Clearly, within this period there was a major expansion of the market for domestic music, but we should be careful not to overstate its size, since the costs of buying the necessary equipment and instructions on how to use it was high. In the 1770s, and depending on the type of the instrument, a new piano would cost in the region of 20 to 70 guineas. By the 1820s those prices had risen by around 50%, as witnessed, for example,

⁵. BOWLEY 1900.

⁶. FEINSTEIN 1998, p. 649.

⁷. FLOUD – HUMPHRIES – JOHNSON 2014, pp. 253–256.

⁸. EHRLICH 1985, pp. 102–103.

⁹. For a comprehensive account of the early piano in England see COLE 1998.

in Clementi's 1823 catalogue (which listed the company's instruments as well as its music). Instruction books and music were expensive — in the middle of the period a piano tutor or a set of sonatas not unusually cost half a guinea — as were piano lessons, so the whole financial outlay was substantial for any household. Many of the less well-off middle classes would have found it difficult to afford this sort of domestic music.

The picture of growing, but limited middle-class involvement in music is echoed in the concert life of the capital. Citing the traditional view that the expansion of London's concerts in the closing decades of the eighteenth century owed a great deal to the growth of middle-class audiences, Simon McVeigh cautions that «the extent of bourgeois attendance at major subscription concerts remains a matter for debate», adding that «the growth of public concerts [in the late eighteenth century] does not necessarily represent as significant a shift in patronage as it might appear at first sight. It would be quite wrong to anticipate nineteenth-century developments by arguing that public symphony concerts developed in response to a new middle-class musical culture»¹⁰. A similar point is made by Robert Hume, who notes of eighteenth-century culture (literary, musical and visual) that «much of the culture we study was aimed at and principally consumed by the top 1 percent or 0.5 percent of the English population, a high proportion of it in London [...] Like the fact or not, the eighteenth-century "culture" we study is inarguably an elite culture»¹¹. Notwithstanding the access to elite music that some gained, for example, in the pleasure gardens, widening access to musical performances was a more prominent feature of a later period.

So just how big was the market for published music in late-Georgian Britain? Book historians have asked the same question of the market for other sorts of published material. Michael Suarez has used the *English short-title catalogue* to analyse data about book publishing in the eighteenth century: he notes that a parallel study for the nineteenth century is impossible because data in a suitable form is simply not available¹². For good methodological reasons Suarez opted to examine the data for the number of imprints published in years ending with a '3' (1703, 1713, 1723, and so on). His results show a striking increase in the last decades of the eighteenth century, from 2,701 titles in 1763, to 3,333 in 1773, 3,924 in 1783 and 6,801 in 1793. This growth pattern is also recognisable in the sphere of published music, but we cannot put a figure on it because of the lack of reliable data. Some decades ago Donald Krummel noted «the absence of any attempt so far at a bibliographical record»¹³, and the situation is not much better now, even in a technological age. One source of potential information that might have been useful is the collection of copyright registrations at Stationers' Hall, but, as Krummel notes, «we cannot

¹⁰. McVEIGH 1993, pp. 20-21.

¹¹. HUME 2014, p. 415.

¹². SUAREZ 2009.

¹³. KRUMMEL 1981, p. 46.

really trust them»¹⁴ because of the inconsistency with which publishers registered works there. In the absence of reliable bibliographical data we have to examine other, related evidence to gain some sense of the growth that undoubtedly took place.

Publishers' catalogues provide us with a good sense of the way in which music publishing was developing during the period. Not only was the number of publishers growing, but the scale of their enterprises was increasing. In the 1780s the total number of works listed in a publisher's catalogue is typically a few hundred: some bigger firms list between 500 and 1000, but most contain fewer than 500. Clementi's catalogue of 1823, in contrast, includes around 6000 works. Newspaper advertisements show how these numbers were achieved. So, for example, Clementi's output of new works in the first full year of the company's operation in 1799 was about 100 titles¹⁵. (Around the same time the smaller firm of Dussek & Co. issued an average of about 60 new works a year during their six years of operation from 1794 to 1800¹⁶.) In order to achieve the back-catalogue of 6000 works in 1823 the firm almost certainly increased its outputs of new works, adding them to the stock inherited from Longman & Broderip and supplementing them with music purchased from other firms when their stock was sold.

As the scale of operations increased, so it became impossible to include on a single sheet, or a few sheets, all that a publisher had to offer. Yu Lee An explains how the growing number of items required a different approach:

The expansion of publishers' repertoires from the last decades of the eighteenth century brought major changes to the structure of catalogues. As might be expected, the long-continued, more-or-less effective organisation of a small number of publications was no longer adequate for medium- or large-sized listings with 200 or more items. To improve ease of use, publishers began to introduce more precise category designators [by composer or genre], and where a single heading had previously sufficed, sub-categories began to be added with increasing frequency. [...] This trend further developed as the nineteenth century progressed¹⁷.

Yu Lee An also points out that the segmentation of catalogues in this way enabled publishers to target particular areas of the score-buying public, as the market itself became ever more complex.

The number of titles on offer to the public gives us some idea of the scale of the music publishing industry, but for a fuller view we also need to know the number of copies of each work that were printed and sold. Print runs give us some idea of these numbers and

¹⁴. *Ibidem*, p. 48.

¹⁵. ROWLAND 2011, p. 164.

¹⁶. ROWLAND 2012, p. 94.

¹⁷. AN 2008, p. 179.

they also lay a foundation for understanding something of the finances of publishing (see below). However, although some evidence is available in the scarce publishing archives that still exist, as well as in composer correspondence and publishing firms' legal cases, it is insufficient to give us a comprehensive view of contemporary practice: a chronological approach which seeks to observe change over time is certainly not possible. Nevertheless, the evidence that does survive is sufficient to suggest that the market for many domestic works was small.

How small was 'small'? As we will see, initial print runs of a few dozen copies were not unusual, but there were clearly numbers below which an edition was simply not viable. The market for piano concertos illustrates the latter point. Many concertos were published with a view to their performance without a full orchestra, either as chamber pieces, or as solos¹⁸, and although the piano parts were printed, orchestral parts (or some of the orchestral parts) were often not. So, at the beginning of our period, in 1770, the keyboard and string parts of J. C. Bach's Op. 7 Concertos were printed and sold by Welcker, but the horn parts, which Richard Maunder describes as «apparently authentic» are only found in manuscript sources¹⁹. The situation had evidently changed for Bach's Op. 13 Concertos published in 1777 by Welcker: «this time woodwinds and horns are included in the published set of parts»²⁰. In c.1804 A. F. C. Kollman's published his own piano concerto, the title page of which announced that «the instrumental parts to be had in MS either for the whole orchestra, or arranged so that all the wind Instruments may be omitted». The implication of this sort of evidence is that publishers expected to sell so few orchestral parts to some piano concertos that they deemed it cheaper for these parts to be published in manuscript, rather than in printed form. It was a practice that became increasingly rare in the nineteenth century.

Publishers may have been able to limit their costs by disseminating some parts of works in manuscript, but another better-known way of minimising risk was to publish by subscription. This tended to happen with large-scale works which had an extensive number of pages — Haydn's *Creation* and Hummel's extensive piano tutor are examples — as well as for some smaller works by little-published composers. The issue was the same in both cases: publishers could not easily bear the expense of printing unless a return on their investment was reasonably sure.

During this period printing from engraved plates was by far the most usual method used by publishers, despite the availability of other technologies. The method had the advantage that no substantial financial benefit accrued from producing large numbers of copies in a single print run. On the contrary, initial small print runs could be made, thus reducing the risk of producing large numbers of unwanted copies, as Alfred Novello

¹⁸. ROWLAND 2005.

¹⁹. MAUNDER 1985, p. ix.

²⁰. MAUNDER 1987, p. ix.

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

explained in 1847: «the cost of producing a page of musick on a pewter plate is comparatively small; and there is the further advantage of being able to print fifty copies only from it as economically as any number of hundreds, thereby saving the accumulation of useless stock, and lots of interest on the cost of the paper — great advantages in a work of slow or doubtful sale, or the demand for which is likely to be limited»²¹.

Novello's figure of 50 copies was precisely what was printed in the initial run of Forster's 1787 edition of Haydn's *Seven last words*²². These copies must have sold very slowly, because it was only much later, in 1817/1818 that a further twenty-five were printed, and even then a number of those were evidently disposed of as waste. This work of Haydn's was of limited interest to the music-buying public, but the cost of printing this small number of copies was presumably defrayed by the subscribers, although no details of financial arrangements between them and the publishers are known, other than that they were able to purchase the edition at a discounted price when it was published²³.

Evidence from the Preston archive suggests that the initial print run of Joseph Corfe's *Treatise on Singing* in 1805 was similarly small, at 50 copies²⁴. The same source shows that 100 copies each were printed of Francis Linley's *Thirty Familiar Airs for two German Flutes* in 1791 and Thomas Goodban's *New and Complete Guide to the Art of Playing on the Violin* in 1812²⁵. We know nothing of subsequent print runs of any of these three works. The protracted court case in the 1770s between J. C. Bach and Longman & Lukey reveals the publishers' claims that they had initially printed 100 copies of a Bach solo keyboard sonata, but at least twice as many of a sonata for keyboard and viola da gamba²⁶. Although we must be circumspect about evidence given in these circumstances, the numbers must at least have been considered plausible to be offered as evidence in court. Michael Kassler calculates that 200 copies of the first volume of Wesley and Horn's edition of Bach's '48' were initially published. This was another lengthy publication, the expense of which would have been partially defrayed by the contributions from subscribers²⁷.

All of the works considered so far were printed on multiple pages and were expensive to buy, but there is some evidence that cheaper scores designed for wider circulation were

²¹. NOVELLO 1847, pp. 6–7.

²². SANDYS – FORSTER 1864, p. 312.

²³. *Ibidem*.

²⁴. A document in the Preston archive signed by Joseph Corfe reads as follows: «There having been fifty copies of the Treatise on Singing printed on my Account since the Plates of that Work have been placed in Mr Preston's hands, it has been decided, that no charge whatever shall be made to me, on Account of the printing of the said Work, but that twelve Copies, which have been delivered to me shall be free of all change, & that the remainder of the Copies shall be the Property of the said Tho Preston». British Library Add. MS 63814 item 102.

²⁵. British Library Add. MS 63814 items 130 and 141.

²⁶. SMALL 2011, pp. 369–370.

²⁷. KASSLER 2004, p. 339.

published in larger quantities, echoing Madame Pleyel's comments (see above). One such example was the subject of a court case in 1809 in which Clementi & Co sued Goulding & Co over the publication of a single-sided song from William Shield's opera *Two Faces under a Hood*. In the course of the evidence both publishers claimed to have printed 1000 copies²⁸. Again, this testimony may, or may not, have been literally true, but it at least needed to be believable and it shows that these sorts of popular works probably had significantly higher print runs than those written for the intended market for the works listed in the previous paragraph.

Further evidence of print runs can be inferred from the way in which publishing plates were replaced when they wore out. Here we must make a distinction between individual plates of an edition that needed to be replaced when they were broken, or cracked, and whole sets of plates that needed to be replaced because the continuous wear resulting from the printing process eventually meant that the engraved text was no longer legible. According to Alfred Novello, re-engraving of the latter sort typically happened after 1300 to 2000 impressions had been taken: «the disadvantages of this mode [publishing from engraved plates] are, the early wearing out of the plates (from 1300 to 2000 impressions, according to the goodness of the workmanship), and also the comparatively high cost of printing»²⁹. D'Almaine's figure of «upwards of two thousand impressions» that could be taken from a set of engraved plates is slightly higher than Novello's³⁰ and a still higher figure was provided in 1768 Charles Dibdin: «I make a set of plates, at this time, take off about three thousand five hundred impressions»³¹. There is some discrepancy between these figures, but they are sufficient, nevertheless, to show that plates needed to be replaced when several hundreds of copies has been made from them.

Complete re-engraving of whole works was a relatively rare occurrence and for virtually all works in this period a single set of plates was sufficient. Exceptions include Clementi's *Introduction to the Art of Playing on the Piano Forte*, which was first published in 1801, and which went through one more-or-less complete re-engraving prior to an entirely new edition being published in 1811³². But despite exceptions such as this, publishers of the period must have assumed that a single engraving would suffice for everything they published, since they persevered with engraving as their standard method of preparing scores for publication. It was only later that different methods needed to be used, as exemplified in the cheap, mass-produced copies of choral music that Novello published, as Alfred Novello noted in 1847: «of the disadvantages formerly existing musick types, an important one has been removed by the increased varieties of characters [for

²⁸. SMALL 2011, p. 381.

²⁹. NOVELLO 1847, p. 6.

³⁰. D'ALMAINE 1848, [page ref to come].

³¹. DIBDIN 1803, vol. I, p. 71.

³². For details see ROWLAND 2019.

moveable music type]; and any musick, however complicated, can now be produced with them. The great object with the publisher of a work from moveable type being to sell a *very large number* of copies, he usually marks the price of his work proportionately low to increase the sale»³³.

The use of short print runs opened up the possibility of niche publishing ventures which, although financially risky (see below for the finances of publishing), were at least potentially viable. One of the most intriguing examples is the Spanish edition of Clementi's *Introduction*, about which I have written in more detail elsewhere³⁴. A few details here will illustrate how this major London publisher catered for a very limited local market.

The *Introduccion a el Arte de tocar el Piano Forte* was the sixth edition of Clementi's *Introduction* (the original English edition had been published in London in 1801). It was dedicated to the Spanish nation and advertised in Spanish in *The Morning Post* on 25 September 1811. It was priced at one guinea, whereas all of the English editions of the *Introduction* published in Clementi's lifetime cost half that amount. London's Spanish community had been established in the sixteenth century, and in the early nineteenth century it became a haven for Spaniards forced to seek sanctuary outside of their own country for political reasons. In the 1820s the community was described by Thomas Carlyle as living in Somers Town and meeting in a group of 50 or 100 around Euston Square and St. Pancras new church. The community also held events at the Spanish Embassy and a few Spanish musicians settled for a while in London.

The fact that the Spanish edition of Clementi's *Introduction* was advertised in the London press (but not, it seems, in the Spanish press) and was priced in the British currency strongly suggests that it was intended for consumption in London, rather than in Spain, or in Latin America. The view that it was aimed at this limited, local market is reinforced by its inflated price (one guinea — twice that of the English editions), which the publishers must have calculated was in reach of London's well-to-do Spaniards. It shows how the publishing processes used by London publishers could be tailored to a very small, local constituency when appropriate.

Niche markets aside, the overall picture presented in this section is of a growing market for printed music, especially for short, popular works for domestic consumption. The number of copies printed of individual works was often small, but there was, nevertheless, money to be made. But who made it? Was it the composers or the publishers? And how much did they make? In order to answer these questions we first need to understand copyright law and how it affected music publishing contracts. Then we will consider the financial figures relating to publication.

³³. NOVELLO 1847, pp. 7-8.

³⁴. ROWLAND 2019, pp. 74-75.

The development of copyright law in this period is complex, but well documented³⁵. The essentials are these. The copyright Act of Anne, designed primarily with the printed word in mind, was enacted in 1710, but only in 1777 was it established that the Act applied to music. The resolution of other issues followed in the ensuing years. Having previously been disputed, in 1785 a ruling was made that copyright would last for 28 years unless a 14-year period had been explicitly stated in a contract, but the extent to which this ruling was understood, or followed in practice, is questionable. Particularly difficult issues also dealt with in the courts were debates about the rights of words set to music, ownership of rights of arrangements, and theatre practices.

No such thing as international copyright existed until later in the nineteenth century, although tentative moves were made to put in place informal agreements, and some of the larger publishers found ways of working together across national borders in order to protect their interests. One of the chief ways in which publishers worked together was to coordinate publication dates in different countries. This process worked because ‘pirate’ publishers — individuals and companies who worked within the law, but who avoided paying any fees to musicians because they simply copied music published in other countries — had insufficient opportunity to purchase music in one country immediately after its publication in order to have it re-engraved and published in another before the authorised publisher in the second country could do so. Other more formalised arrangements were negotiated in the early decades of the nineteenth century³⁶.

In order for a work to be protected it was obviously crucial to know who owned its copyright. There were three possible arrangements between composers and publishers³⁷. The first was the most usual, in which the composer handed over to a publisher the manuscript and its copyright in return for a fee. Since royalties for music did not exist until the end of the nineteenth century, the composer received no further income from the work. Having taken all of the financial risks of publication, it was the publisher who stood to make the profits and these resulted either from sales of the printed copies, or from the sale of the copyright. The arrangement in which the publisher owned the copyright is usually signalled on title pages by the text ‘published by’ or ‘printed by’ followed by the name of the publisher.

In the second arrangement the composer shared the copyright with the publisher. This was rare, but some examples exist³⁸. Generally, these examples are of large works which were expensive to produce, such as operas, or collections of church music, but there

³⁵. See, for example, MACE 2016 and SMALL 2011.

³⁶. The development of international agreements is described in SACHS 1973.

³⁷. These arrangements are discussed in more detail in ROWLAND 2018, pp. 34–39.

³⁸. KASSLER 2004, pp. 334–335.

are also a few examples of shorter works³⁹. In all of these cases the risks and rewards would have been shared in some way between the publisher and the composer or editor.

In the third arrangement, which was used more frequently, the composer retained the copyright, paid for the production, retained the publishing plates, and took the financial risk. When a composer self-published in this way the work was often sold from his own home, although sometimes the composer came to an arrangement with a publisher who sold the work at his music shop. Either way, the wording on the title page would usually be ‘published’ or ‘printed’ for the author ‘and sold at’ either the composer’s or the publisher’s address, or both. Composers at the beginning of their careers sometimes self-published because no publisher would accept the financial risk of publication, but established composers also self-published, most likely when they thought there was a good chance of making a significant profit. J. B. Cramer’s publication of several of his didactic works probably falls into the latter category. Composers also self-published when they had grown tired of a publisher’s behaviour (such as Clementi, who had been owed money by more than one publisher — see below⁴⁰). Sometimes, having initially self-published a work a composer then sold the rights to a publisher: the Birchall archive contains examples of this practice⁴¹. For instance, in April 1823 J. B. Cramer published two airs with variations which he dedicated to the Princess Augusta. Cramer is identified on the title page as ‘the proprietor’ (the copyright owner) and Birchall is named as the publisher at whose shop the music was available. On 21 October of the same year Cramer sold the copyright of the work to Birchall for £31 10s. Since Cramer had paid for the production of the work and was the original copyright holder, he had retained the engraved plates, which he passed to Birchall as part of the deal⁴².

Whenever rights were exchanged a contract was signed and from these contracts we learn much about the commercial environment in which composers operated. A few complete contracts from this period survive, but equally important information is found in composers’ correspondence and in the very rare and slender, but important publishing archives of Preston and Birchall⁴³.

Publishers and composers sometimes negotiated contracts for multiple pieces of music. In 1786 Haydn acknowledged receipt of £70 from the London publisher Forster for an impressively large number of works, including 7 symphonies, one overture, 6 divertimenti and two sets of three trios⁴⁴. A similar bundle of works was the subject of

³⁹. For some unknown reason, Woelfl seems to have come to this arrangement with his publishers for some of his domestic music.

⁴⁰. See ROWLAND 2018, pp. 42–45.

⁴¹. Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52.

⁴². Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52, fol. 8^v.

⁴³. The Preston archive is found in the British Library, Add. MS 63814 and the Birchall archive is at the Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52.

⁴⁴. British Library MS Eg.2380, fol. 12: see also LANDON 1978, pp. 680–682.

Beethoven's contract in 1807 with the publishers Clementi & Co., who agreed to pay the composer £200 for three quartets, a symphony, an overture, two concertos and a concerto arrangement⁴⁵. Later, in 1816 Beethoven agreed with Birchall a fee of £65 for his *Battle Symphony*, a piano arrangement of his *Seventh Symphony*, the *Piano Trio*, Op. 97 and the *Sonata*, Op. 96⁴⁶.

Evidence of over 50 contracts for multiple works of all kinds are found among the copyright receipts of the Birchall archive — short, dated documents from the period 1781 to 1833 that mostly contain text assigning copyright to the publisher and recording the amount paid to composers for the specific works listed. Sometimes, the total amounts paid to composers were considerable: In the Birchall archive the three highest amounts in single transactions were £325 paid to Pietro Carlo Guglielmi on 12 July 1810 for three operas and his *Scotch Divertimento*, £200 paid on 21 July 1808 to the internationally-renowned pianist J. B. Cramer for a series of piano compositions, and £190 paid to the popular piano music composer Louis von Esch on 14 October 1805 for seven works, presumably of piano music (the copyright slip is pasted into the volume in such a way that the titles of the individual works are obscured)⁴⁷. More normally, only two or three works at a time were purchased by the publisher, for more modest fees. Alongside the receipts for bundles of works published by Birchall are a roughly equal number of receipts for single works — 'single works' meaning individual rondos, variations, but also sets of sonatas, songs, and so on — some of them for small amounts as low as two or three guineas.

In contrast, the Preston copyright receipts, which cover the period 1773 to 1843 contain a significantly larger proportion of receipts for payments relating to single-work contracts. The fact that Preston issued a higher proportion of single-work contracts than Birchall may indicate varying practices among publishers, but since neither publisher's archives are in any way complete, and since no other publishers' archives of this nature survive from the period, it is impossible to know.

All of the contracts mentioned so far were one-off agreements, but there is also evidence that publishers sometimes negotiated a lengthier contractual relationship in which a composer was committed to a publishing house for a number of years. These sorts of arrangements seem to have been quite rare and I am aware of only a small number dating from around the turn of the century. Probably the best-known of these is Haydn's contract agreed on 30 July 1796 with Frederick Augustus Hyde (see above). Hyde was by this time an experienced music publisher. He had worked for Joseph Buckinger and Longman & Broderip, in 1795, he had been a partner in the music firm Lewis, Houston & Hyde (successors to John Bland), and in 1798 he became a partner in the firm Longman,

⁴⁵ Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung, MS autogr. 35,8: see also ROWLAND 2010, pp. 405-407.

⁴⁶ ANDERSON 1961, vol. III, p. 1428.

⁴⁷ Guglielmi's contract is on fol. 20^v, Cramer's on fol. 7^v, and von Esch's on fol. 35^v.

Clementi & Co. Hyde's contract with Haydn was for all the music the composer would produce for the British market in the following 5 years. A price list for various sorts of works formed part of the contract and certain conditions were also attached which gave both parties a degree of flexibility within its confines. A similar contract, but this time lasting 7 years, was put in place between Dussek and Clementi & Co. On 29 November 1799 Clementi wrote to the Viennese publisher Artaria that «we have entered into a contract with Dussek for everything he will compose in future» and on 4 October 1806 Dussek wrote to the publisher Birchall «my contract with Clementi & Co. finishes the 4th. November this year». The same letter to Birchall continues «I shud [*sic*] be very glad to continue with you the publication of all my works in future [*sic*]», suggesting that Dussek envisaged signing a contract with Birchall similar to the one he had previously signed with Clementi, although in the event no such arrangement with Birchall was ever made⁴⁸. Similarly, Clementi tried to secure a long-term contract with Beethoven, but failed. More evidence is needed to assess whether these long-term contractual agreements between composers and publishers existed in any numbers during the period, or whether they were exceptional.

In addition to the names of composers, titles of works, and details of fees paid, some contracts also specified the geographical reach of the agreement: whether this was normal is impossible to say, since so few contracts survive. Beethoven's contract with Clementi in 1807 specified that the works were sold to the publisher «avec le droit de les publier dans les royaumes unis britanniques, en se réservant la liberté de faire publier ou de vendre pour faire publier ces memes ouvrages hors des dits royaumes»⁴⁹. Other formulations of contract discussions use the term 'British dominions', rather than 'United Kingdom'. Whatever the precise formulation, the message in Beethoven's contract was clear: he had the right to pursue publication in continental Europe of the works mentioned in his contract with Clementi & Co. There was a caveat in the contract, however: «Monsieur L[udwig]. V[an]. Beethoven promét de ne vendre ces ouvrages soit en Allemagne soit en France soit ailleurs, qu'avec la condition de ne les publier que quatre mois après leur depart respectif pour l'Angleterre»⁵⁰. This was aimed at ensuring that there was no time in the publication schedule for any of the works to be published in Europe and brought to England to be published in a 'pirated' edition prior to Clementi & Co. publishing them in London: as already mentioned, more-or-less simultaneous publication in different countries was the

⁴⁸. ROWLAND 2012, pp. 104-105.

⁴⁹. «with the right to publish them in the United Kingdom of Great Britain, while reserving the freedom to publish or sell for publication the same works outside of the said kingdom». See ROWLAND 2010, pp. 408-410.

⁵⁰. «Mr Ludwig van Beethoven promises not to sell these works, whether in Germany, whether in France, or elsewhere except on condition that they are only published four months after their respective departure for England». ROWLAND 2010, pp. 409-410.

usual way of thwarting the ‘pirates’, but it was not always successful, especially when postal services were interrupted during the Napoleonic wars.

Haydn’s contract with Hyde did not specify any details regarding international publishing, although it noted that the works Haydn was to send to London would become the «absolute Property» of Hyde, and that Hyde would have first refusal of any music composed by Haydn over and above that specified in the contract «before the said Joseph Haydn shall offer the same to sale to any other Music Seller whatsoever». These passages seem to have been interpreted as including publishers outside of the UK, according to what happened after Haydn’s Op. 77 String Quartets were published in London. In 1801 Clementi & Co. (with whom Hyde was by then a partner), rather than Haydn himself, offered to sell them to the Parisian publisher Pleyel, along with some works by Dussek and Viotti. This sort of exchange of music between some of the major publishers in Europe such as Breitkopf & Härtel, Pleyel and Nägeli was fairly common, and relied on the good relationships that existed between publishers such as these⁵¹.

Composers who chose to negotiate their own publishing arrangements across international borders faced formidable difficulties in communicating effectively with their publishers, because of the unpredictability of the postal service, especially in war time, and because of the difficulties of needing to understand the nuances of their publisher’s language. In addition, composers were often travelling, and because of the obvious advantages of being ‘on the spot’ when contracts were discussed, composers did not always deal with their own contract negotiations. Composers sometimes sought help in the form of personal friends, colleagues and agents. As yet, there is only a relatively small amount of evidence of agents at work, some of which I have summarised elsewhere⁵². Suffice it to say that there was sufficient work for agents who worked across international barriers for some of them to make money from their enterprise. The shadowy figure of Johann Rheinhold Schultz is currently the best example. He worked between Vienna and London as an agent for Beethoven, Hummel, Weber and others, sometimes working on their behalf and sometimes acting in his own right, buying their copyrights and selling them to publishers as his own property.

Except for income derived from self-publishing (for which we have no financial detail), contract fees were the main way in which composers made money from publishing. These fees were a major element of publishers’ costs, as the following paragraphs demonstrate.

As with many aspects of publishing in this period, we know very little of the financial details involved in producing an edition, but a few scraps of information at least give us some insights. Information about the costs sustained by Forster for the publication of Haydn’s *Seven Last Words* in 1787, derived from the firm’s account books, are as follows⁵³.

⁵¹. For a more detailed discussion of international publishing see ROWLAND 2018, pp. 45-48.

⁵². ROWLAND 2018, pp. 39-42.

⁵³. SANDYS – FORSTER 1864, p. 312.

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

The pewter plate on which the music was engraved cost 1s 6d and the cost of engraving each plate was 4s 6d, making a total of 6s. The costs of engraving the title page was greater, at £1 11s 6d. Forster's costs for paper and printing, which were based on the production of 75 copies (although the initial print run was in fact 50), work out at about 0.37d per page of music. We can use this figure for calculations of various print-run sizes since the cost per page of paper and printing must have varied very little according to the size of the run, as almost all of the component costs were directly related to the number of pages printed, such as the paper, the ink and the labour cost of setting up each page on the printing press. 0.37d is therefore the figure used in the calculations that follow.

Forster's figures for the cost of plates and engraving are corroborated by other evidence cited by Michael Kassler. According to a letter of 3 October 1778 from Stephen Paxton to Thomas Robinson, 2nd Baron Grantham, «if [a composer] chooses to run the risk of publishing his compositions at this own expence, he may have them engrav'd at about 6 a page; then there wou'd be the addition of paper, printing &c besides, which however wou'd not be much»⁵⁴.

Costs rose a little over the following decades. In 1815 Thomas Preston charged 15 shillings for the engraving of two music plates⁵⁵, the figure perhaps reflecting not just an inflation increase (from the 6s per plate cost of the 1780s), but also some commission. On 27 October 1819 Samuel Webbe Junior wrote to Birchall outlining the costs incurred by his father for the printing of his three-volume collection of glees, which amounted to 7 shillings for each engraved plate (slightly less than Preston's 1815 figure) and £3.11s.6d for the elaborate title page⁵⁶.

Taking Forster's figures for his 1780s Haydn edition along with details relating to Clementi's income from publishing in the 1770s we can begin to understand in more detail how publishing finances worked in the early part of our period. Given the relatively small rise in engraving costs in the early nineteenth century these calculations are also relevant to the early decades of the nineteenth century.

On 1 August 1784 Clementi wrote to his father complaining of his treatment at the hands of some of London's publishers, in particular about the sums that he was owed by Welcker and Blundel. At the time of his bankruptcy Welcker evidently owed Clementi 300 guineas, some of which related to a set of six sonatas: «I went to Welcker with six sonatas in manuscript form, for him to get printed, he gave me a promissory note to receive 50 guineas at a certain point in the future, since he had no cash»⁵⁷. The 50 guineas must have been Clementi's copyright fee, but for which works? Only three publications by Welcker fit Clementi's description; the two sets of six sonatas, Opp. 1 and 2, and the

⁵⁴. KASSLER 2004, p. 338, note 97.

⁵⁵. *Ibidem*, p. 339.

⁵⁶. *Ibidem*, p. 337.

⁵⁷. ROWLAND 2010, pp. 13–16, and also to the chapter in Rosemary's book, pp. 42ff.

DAVID ROWLAND

Op. 3 set of three duets and three sonatas. (The Op. 4 set of six sonatas might also have been a contender, but no copyright fee would have been due to Clementi since it was printed for the author and only sold by Welcker.) For our purposes, it does not really matter which of Opp. 1-3 Clementi was referring to, since they each sold for the same amount — 10s 6d, or half a guinea.

The table below summarises the approximate cost of printing 100, 200 and 500 copies of these works according to Forster's figures. The number of copies is for illustration purposes only: we do not know how many copies were actually printed. Op. 1 has a title page and 26 pages of music, Op. 2 has a title page and 44 pages of music, and Op. 3 has a title page and 46 pages of music. The cost of engraving the title page for each publication is assumed to be the same as that of Haydn's work.

	OP. 1	OP. 2	OP. 3
Music plate engraving	£7.16s	£13.4s	£13.16s
Title page engraving and printing	£1 11s 6d	£1 11s 6d	£1 11s 6d
Paper and printing 100 copies	£4 3s 3d	£6 18s 9d	£7 4s 11d
Paper and printing 200 copies	£8 6s 6d	£13 17 6d	£14 9s 10d
Paper and printing 500 copies	£20 16s 3d	£34 13 9d	£36 4s 7d
Total for 100 copies	£13 10 9d	£21 14s 3d	£22 2s 5d
Total for 200 copies	£17 14s	£28 13	£28 17s 4d
Total for 500 copies	£30 3s 9d	£49 9s 3d	£50 12s 1d

These figures include only the costs of engraving and printing an edition. They do not include other publishing costs associated with marketing, solicitor's contract work, or the overheads of running a music shop. Neither do they include the small Stationers' Hall fee and the cost of printing the associated deposit copies that would have been incurred had the works actually been registered, which they were not. However, were the additional costs taken into consideration, the real expense of publishing would be greater than the table above suggests. And in addition to the figures presented, the one cost that would have made the most substantial difference would have been the composer's copyright fee — 50 guineas (£52 10s) in the case of at least one of Clementi's Opp. 1-3. If this fee is added to the costs outlined in the previous table we can work out the number of copies that needed to be sold at the full rate of 10s 6d in order to recoup the engraving and printing costs.

	OP. 1	OP. 2	OP. 3
Engraving, paper, printing and copyright for 100 copies	£66 0s 9d	£74 4s 3d	£74 12s 5d
Engraving, paper, printing and copyright for 200 copies	£70 4s	£81 3s	£81 7s 4d
Engraving, paper, printing and copyright for 500 copies	£82 13s 9d	£101 19s 3d	£103 2s 1d

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

Break even sales for printing 100	126 copies	142 copies	143 copies
Break even sales for printing 200	136 copies	154 copies	155 copies
Break even sales for printing 500	158 copies	195 copies	197 copies

Imperfect though they clearly are, these figures at least give us some basis for understanding the sorts of calculations publishers must have had to make when producing an edition. With small print runs and a limited market for these sorts of works, the figures emphasize the tight margins under which publishers operated, which presumably account for why bankruptcies were common among music publishers.

One of the calculations made by publishers must have concerned the number of pages in each publication: large numbers of pages obviously made an edition expensive to produce. It seems likely that there was a notional upper limit on the number of pages an edition of this sort might have included. It turns out, for example, that Clementi only rarely broke the 50-page barrier for his domestic works — sonatas, etc. Excluding the didactic works and the collected editions of other composers' music, only Opp. 12 (58 pages), 13 (63 pages), 25 (55 pages) and 50 (61 pages) exceed 50 pages. And in order to contain the number of pages in each publication as individual compositions grew longer, the total number of individual works within a single publication diminished. After his piano duet, two accompanied sonatas and three fugues Op. 6, it became the norm for Clementi to include up to only three works (typically sonatas) in a single publication, rather than the six works contained in opuses one to six.

Another calculation made by publishers was the size of the copyright fee paid to composers. In the calculations above, even the costs of engraving, paper and printing for a print run of 500 copies of the longest opus (Op. 3 - £50.12s.1d) was cheaper than the cost of Clementi's copyright fee of £52.10s. So was this copyright fee particularly high? The answer is possibly 'yes'. Few, if any composers were able to command such a high price. (It is, of course, possible that Clementi inflated the amount of his fee for his father's benefit). The size of Clementi's copyright fee may be compared with those of another prominent member of the London Piano School, Johann Baptist Cramer, several of whose copyright agreements feature in the Birchall archive. For his three piano sonatas Op. 23, consisting of a title page and 34 pages of music, he was paid £40 in 1800. In 1805 he was paid £13.6s.6d for his Grand Sonata Op. 36. In 1809 and 1810 he was paid £21 each for the Grand Sonatas Opp. 42 (title page and 19 pages of music) and 46⁵⁸. These fees put the amount paid to Haydn for his *Seven last words* into perspective. Haydn received a copyright fee of 10 guineas for the work: no doubt the reason for the low fee was the work's length (66 pages) as well as the limited sales Forster thought it would attract, as reflected in the small initial print run of 50 copies and the low number of copies sold thereafter.

⁵⁸. Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52, fols. 7^v (Opp. 23, 36), 8^r (Op. 42) and 8^v (Op. 46).

In spite of the restrictions on publishers' budgets, well-established composers could expect to receive significant, if not huge rewards from contract agreements, assuming that they continued to compose a regular stream of published music that was likely to appeal to the public. It is impossible to work out how much a composer such as Clementi, or Cramer received in any detail because we have incomplete data, but we may at least gain some idea of the kinds of sums they received with a few simple (and very approximate) calculations.

There are thirteen copyright receipts for Cramer in the Birchall archive. The sorts of sums that he received for works found in numbers in the complete catalogue of his music are as follows:

- Single sonata = £20
- Set of 3 sonatas = £40
- Single divertimento = £25
- Set of variations = £15
- Duet sonata = £40

In his most active years, from 1796 to 1831, he published a total of 237 editions, including transcriptions, making an average published output of just over 6.5 publications per year⁵⁹. Based on these sorts of fees, Cramer might have made an income of, say, around £150 a year on average. Of course, these figures are very approximate, if not entirely speculative. We simply do not know how much he received for all but a fairly small minority of his compositions and neither do we know anything about the finances of works that he self-published, such as his studies and other didactic works, some of which were popular. But the figures at least give us some idea of the kind of amount that a well-known composer such as Cramer might have received from publishing.

In addition to these very rough income figures a composer of Cramer's stature may have received additional income, or gifts from dedicatees. The expectation that this would happen lies behind Beethoven's request to Charles Neate in a letter dated 18 May 1816: «perhaps you [will] find some lover of music to whom the Trio, and the Sonate with the violin, Mr. Ries had sold to Mr. Birchall, or the Symphony arranged for the harpsichord might be dedicated, and from whom there might be expected a present»⁶⁰.

Of course, less well-known figures than Clementi and Cramer received much smaller sums for many of their compositions. For example, George Frederick Pinto received just three guineas from Birchall for a sonata in 1802⁶¹. However, although the copyright fee for a sonata by an obscure composer might be small, there was still money to be made from the publication of overtly popular, short pieces (the sort referred to by Madame Pleyel — see above), or from arrangements of well-known music for domestic performance (which

⁵⁹. Data taken from MILLIGAN 1994.

⁶⁰. ANDERSON 1961, vol. II, p. 582.

⁶¹. Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52, fol. 31^r.

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

some of the more prominent figures also did). Three examples from the Birchall archive illustrate what was possible, first for a composer of popular piano works, second for an arranger, and finally for a composer of domestic vocal music.

Louis von Esch was known mainly as a composer of short, lyrical piano pieces. In 1799 he received £20 for his Second Divertimento with a Religious March for piano with violin or flute, and 'cello accompaniment. In 1808 he was paid 10 guineas in cash and 5 guineas in copies of music for *Un Moment de Loisir* for piano with flute accompaniment (von Esch was paid by Goulding, Phipps, D'Almaine & Co., who sold the copyright to Birchall at a later date). He also received £25 in 1806 for *La Délibération avec L'introduction de l'air Come Every Smiling Liberty*. There are also two receipts for multiple works, one of £190 from 1806 and another for £70 from 1805⁶².

The violinist Federigo Fiorillo made substantial sums by arranging popular works for domestic performance. Twenty-three payments to him are recorded in Birchall's archive in the years 1803 to 1820, many of them for arrangements of opera arias by Mozart. The years 1811 to 1818 were particularly lucrative, during which he received the total payments listed in the following table⁶³.

1811	£70.18s.
1812	£106.5s.
1813	£110.0s.
1814	-
1815	£46.5s.
1816	£115.5s
1817	£30
1818	£60

A demonstration of the popularity and profitability of domestic song is found in the receipts for sums paid to William Knyvett, whose four payments, one in each of the years 1806, 1807, 1809 and 1829, totalled £353.6s for a number of glees, solos, duets and a madrigal⁶⁴. The best rate he received seems to have been his £100 fee paid in 1809 for four glees, whose publication prices were 1s.6d, 2s, or 2s.6d. These works must have sold in significant quantities to justify the high copyright fee he received.

In summary, within the copyright system of the day, composers could make a reasonable amount from publishing, although it is unlikely they ever grew rich from its

⁶². These sums are mentioned at Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52, fols. 35^r and 35^v.

⁶³. Fiorillo's copyright receipts are found at Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52, fols. 15^r-17^v.

⁶⁴. Newberry Library, Chicago, Case MS fV 209.52, fol. 24^r.

DAVID ROWLAND

proceeds. How much they earned depended on their status, their work rate, and the popularity of the genres in which they wrote.

Publishers, on the other hand, stood to make a lot of money from the growing market. Their success depended on their 'reading' that market and purchasing works of which they could sell multiple copies while at the same time keeping composers loyal to their businesses by paying them competitive copyright fees. The prospect of substantial riches is no doubt the reason why musicians such as Clementi, Cramer and Dussek all entered into publishing partnerships in the period. Those who could manage their businesses well (Clementi certainly did so) probably ended up earning a great deal more than they would have done as musicians, but those who were less competent ended up in bankruptcy and, in the case of Dussek, fleeing the country.

THE MARKET AND MUSICAL STYLE

How were musical styles influenced by the market in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries? We have already seen how the pressures exerted by a growing domestic market, as well as the realities of publishing finance, drove decisions about repertoire away from traditional forms and structures such as sonatas and other large-scale works towards a flood of smaller, popular pieces. But it was not just the relative popularity of genres that changed in response to market demand: musical styles and textures also developed according to changes in the market. This section will provide some examples from the piano repertoire at a time when the instrument was changing more quickly than at any other period in its history. This was the period during which the piano displaced the harpsichord as the standard keyboard instrument, when the keyboard compass grew from five octaves to six-and-a-half, or seven, and when pedals became standard on all instruments. The discussion that follows presents some case studies of the way in which piano music changed in response to market forces.

The first example concerns the speed with which the piano displaced the harpsichord on title pages of music in the late eighteenth century. From J. C. Bach's Op. 5 Sonatas, published in 1766, it became usual in Britain for title pages to include the text «for harpsichord or pianoforte», reflecting the fact that both instruments were in use and that keyboard music could be played on either. The presence of dynamics, even crescendos and diminuendos, did not necessarily prohibit the music being played on harpsichords, because dynamic effects could be achieved on many of those instruments through manual changes, through the use of the 'machine stop' which engaged registers by means of a pedal, and through various swell mechanisms which opened or shut to produce louder or softer sounds. The 'machine stop' and swell mechanisms were developed at around the same time that the piano was beginning to be introduced into London's musical life.

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

Both the harpsichord and the piano were mentioned on title pages of keyboard music until the 1790s, but from 1792 the term 'harpsichord' was no longer found in Cramer's published music and the same happened with Clementi's in 1793 and with Dussek's in 1794. What exactly was happening in the intervening years, between the mid-1760s and the mid-1790s? To what extent were the harpsichord and piano real alternatives to each other in this period?

The answer has to do with the technological capabilities of the piano as well as market conditions. In fact, reference to 'the piano' is somewhat misleading, since there were in effect two distinct types of piano; the rectangular, domestic version commonly known as the square piano and the grand piano. Square pianos were being made in numbers by the late-1760s. They were conveniently compact, domestic instruments, but their sound could not compete with the large harpsichords then being made. Grand pianos arrived on the scene a little later⁶⁵. Backers was the first to make them in any number in London and he exhibited his «new invented Instrument» at the Thatched House on 1 March 1771. An instrument made by Backers in the following year is numbered «21», so it is likely that the maker had produced a few grands in the preceding years. One of the criticisms of the grand pianos from the first half of the eighteenth century was their lack of carrying power compared with harpsichords of the same period, and experience of playing Backers' and others' instruments suggests that it was also something of a factor in later instruments. It may have been this issue which inclined Clementi to use the harpsichord, instead of the piano, for his solo and concerto performances in London to the end of the 1770s while other keyboard players were using pianos in the same context, including J. C. Bach, who more-or-less consistently used the piano throughout the decade. However, by the 1780s only the lesser-known keyboard players were still using the harpsichord while the leading figures had evidently been won over to the piano. The picture was somewhat different in opera houses, where the harpsichord lingered a little longer⁶⁶.

So why was the harpsichord not excluded from title pages prior to the 1790s? Although 'professional' pianists may have abandoned it by the end of the 1770s, harpsichords were still being made in the 1780s and there were plenty of them in general circulation. Given the cost of a new piano, uptake of the new instrument was initially limited. It was only by the 1790s that the piano was overwhelmingly used domestically to the extent that publishers could name it as the sole keyboard instrument on title pages and composers could write music freely for it, without having to take into account the older instrument.

The continuing existence of the harpsichord in London constrained the use of some keyboard textures, as the slow introduction of pedal markings into published scores in London demonstrates. By contrast, pedalling was adopted earlier in Paris, presumably

⁶⁵. For a history of the early piano in Britain see COLE 1998.

⁶⁶. For information on keyboard performers in late eighteenth-century London see SALWEY – McVEIGH 1997.

because pianos displaced harpsichords more quickly. In the French capital harpsichords seem to have gone out of favour because of their association with the opulence of the Ancien Régime — many harpsichords were burned during the Revolution and it was the square piano for which much of the keyboard repertoire was written. In Paris pedalling was first published in Steibelt's *6^{me} Pot Pourri* and *Mélange* Op. 10, both of 1793, but it was only in 1797 that the earliest pedal markings were published in London⁶⁷. Prior to 1797, Daniel Steibelt, in whose music some of these markings occurred and who had travelled from Paris to London probably at the very end of 1796, had withheld from London publishers some of the works that depended on the pedal, which he had previously published in Paris. His Sonatas Op. 27 are example of what appears to be a very clear decision by Steibelt and/or his publishers to withhold music with pedalling from the London public: the Parisian edition contains pedalling only in sonatas one and six, the very sonatas that were omitted from the London edition, which was published not long after Steibelt's arrival in the English capital.

Whether it was the London publishers or the composers who decided the moment at which pedalling could be incorporated into scores is unknown, but it presumably had to do with the continuing presence of harpsichords in the possession of the keyboard-music purchasing public. A glance at some of the scores published in London demonstrates the significance of the decision to include pedalling in scores of piano music. Steibelt's Concerto, Op. 33 (ILL. 1), published in 1798, for example, contains left-hand textures that are completely unrealisable on the harpsichord, and not included in keyboard music before the late 1790s in Britain.



ILL. 1: Steibelt, *Concerto*, Op. 33, first movement.

⁶⁷. For a history of piano pedalling see ROWLAND 1993.

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

The 1790s saw a further major development that distinguished pianos from harpsichords — the extension of the keyboard's compass beyond five octaves. In 1790, apparently at Dussek's request, five and a half octaves were included on some London instruments and in 1794 the first six-octave pianos were made⁶⁸. However, not all new pianos were made with one of the new compasses, and makers continued to make five-octave instruments alongside the extended models. This, and the fact that there would still have been many old pianos in circulation, accounts for why the additional notes were not found in scores immediately: it was only when there was a critical mass of the new pianos in circulation that music was published for the additional keys. This happened in late 1793, three years after the piano compass had first been extended, and it was Dussek and his publishers who took the initiative.



ILL. 2: Dussek, Concerto, Op. 22, first movement.

Dussek's Concerto Op. 22 (ILL. 2) was one of the first two works to be published with the additional notes and it was published with an alternative version for the smaller, five-

⁶⁸ For details of the extension of the piano's compass see ROWLAND 1999.

octave keyboard. ILL. 2 shows how the inclusion of these extra notes required additional space on the page which would have added to the printing costs, but the publisher must have judged that the extra expense of a small number of extra pages was justified by the additional sales of copies that was projected as a result. Printing alternative versions for five and five-and-a-half octave pianos must have been a successful strategy, since other publishers followed the model. But by the end of the 1790s publishers and composers evidently saw no need to include alternatives and only the five-and-a-half octave versions were published.

Market pressures operated differently in respect of the introduction of six-octave pianos. Despite the fact that six-octave pianos were made from 1794, virtually no music was published for the compass. There are two possible reasons why this was so. Having spent money replacing their five-octave pianos with five-and-a-half octave instruments, buyers were probably not inclined to spend again, just a few years later, in order to acquire an additional half octave. In addition, six-octave pianos in continental Europe had a different compass based on F, as opposed to the C-based compass of English pianos. The situation was resolved in the early nineteenth century with the introduction of six-and-a-half octave pianos, but in the interim the market evidently could not easily accommodate the existence of so many different compasses. Virtually all composers chose for some years to continue to write music solely for the five-and-a-half octave compass.

Meanwhile, a further problem emerged regarding the additional keys in the 1790s. Some of the music composed in London at this time was written with a view to its publication abroad. However, the piano was developing more quickly in London than elsewhere, and five and a half octave pianos were not available in all of Europe's major cities until a few years later. This situation posed a dilemma during the preparation of the Viennese edition of Clementi's Sonatas Op. 33, which had originally been published in London in 1794. For the Viennese edition the engraver, having first included passages with the additional keys, removed them: we know this because the original impression of the notes for the additional keys is still just visible in the edition where the engraver has later tried to erase them by hammering on the reverse side of the engraved plate.

Beyond the issues that relate specifically to technical matters there were other stylistic considerations that composers took into account. I have already commented on the way in which repertoire changed during the period to include a greater number of short, popular instrumental works and songs. Many of these works required only limited technical skills in performance and from the difficulty of a work it is often easy to see for which part of the market it was intended. The kind of conversations about technical difficulty that must have occurred routinely between composers and publishers is illustrated in correspondence between the Edinburgh publisher George Thomson and Hummel.

On 3 April 1826 Thomson wrote to Hummel asking him to provide accompaniments and short instrumental interludes to some Scottish melodies. Thomson was clear to stress

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

that «the ladies like the Pianoforte Accompt. to their National Melodies to be rather in the simple Cantabile»⁶⁹. Hummel duly fulfilled the brief and was asked by Thomson to provide accompaniments to 12 more. Once again, Hummel agreed, but this time Thomson was only satisfied with 7 of them. In a letter dated 14 December 1829 Thomson wrote «the others I am sorry to say are not at all suited to that class of person here who sing and play those little national melodies; for they will not look at a piano forte accompaniment to those melodies, if it is learned or recherché, or if it is not perfectly easy for the fingers: and therefore it would not be advisable for me to offer any such to the public»⁷⁰. Far from objecting, Hummel re-wrote the music to Thomson's satisfaction. One wonders how many other conversations of this sort took place between publishers and composers in an era when both parties relied so crucially on their ability to judge what would be acceptable in the marketplace.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AN 2008

AN, Yu Lee. *Music Publishing in London from 1780 to 1837 as Reflected in Music Publishers' Catalogues of Music for Sale: A Bibliography and Commentary*, unpublished Ph.D. Diss, Canterbury, Canterbury University, 2008.

ANDERSON 1961

ANDERSON, Emily. *The Letters of Beethoven, Collected, Translated and Edited with an Introduction, Appendixes, Notes and Indexes*, 3 vols., London, Macmillan, 1961.

BOWLEY 1900

BOWLEY, Arthur L. *Wages in the United Kingdom in the Nineteenth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1900.

COLE 1998

COLE, Michael. *The Pianoforte in the Classical Era*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998.

D'ALMAINE 1848

A Day at a Music Publisher: A Description of the Establishment of D'Almaine & Co., London, D'Almaine & Co., 1848.

DIBDIN 1803

DIBDIN, Charles. *The Professional Life of Mr. Dibdin, Written by Himself, together with the Words of Six Hundred Songs Selected from His Works*, 4 vols., London, The Author, 1803.

EHRlich 1985

EHRlich, Cyril. *The Music Profession in Britain since the Eighteenth Century*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985.

⁶⁹. SACHS 1970, p. 273.

⁷⁰. *Ibidem*, p. 280.

DAVID ROWLAND

FEINSTEIN 1998

FEINSTEIN, Charles H. 'Pessimism Perpetuated: Real Wages and the Standard of Living in Britain during and after the Industrial Revolution', in: *The Journal of Economic History*, LVIII/3 (1998), pp. 625-658.

FLOUD – HUMPHRIES – JOHNSON 2014

The Cambridge Economic History of Modern Britain. Volume 1: 1700-1870, edited by, Roderick Floud, Jane Humphreys and Paul Johnson, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014.

GRIFFITHS 1998

GRIFFITHS, Rhidian. 'Swansea's "Mr Music"', in: *Y llyfr yng Nghymru*, 1 (1998), pp. 59-90.

HUME 2014

'The Value of Money in Eighteenth-Century England: Incomes, Prices, Buying-Power — and some Problems in Cultural Economics', in: *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, LXXVII/4 (2014), pp. 373-416.

JONES 2006

JONES, David Wyn. 'Some Aspects of Clementi's Career as a Publisher', in: *Muzio Clementi: Compositore, (Forte) Pianista, editore: Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi (Perugia, Conservatorio di Musica, 4-6 ottobre 2002)*, edited by Bianca Maria Antolini and Costantino Mastroprimiano, Lucca, LIM, 2006 (Strumenti della ricerca musicale, 9), pp. 3-19.

KASSLER 2004

The English Bach Awakening Knowledge of J. S. Bach and His music in England: 1750-1830, edited by Michael Kassler, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2004 (Music in 19th-Century Britain).

KRUMMEL 1981

KRUMMEL, Donald. 'Music Publishing', in: *Music in Britain: The Romantic Era*, edited by Nicholas Temperley, Oxford, Blackwell, 1981, pp. 46-59.

LANDON 1978

LANDON, H. C. Robbins. *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. 2: Haydn at Eszterháza 1766-1790*, London, Thames and Hudson, 1978.

MACE 2016

MACE, Nancy. 'Music Copyright in Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Britain', in: *Research Handbook on the History of Copyright Law*, edited by Isabella Alexander and H. Tomás Gómez-Arostegui, Cheltenham-Northampton (MA), Edward Elgar Publishing, 2016 (Research Handbooks in Intellectual Property), pp. 139-157.

MAUNDER 1985

The Collected Works of Johann Christian Bach 1735-1782. 33: Keyboard Concertos II: Eight London Concertos for Harpsichord or Pianoforte, edited by Richard Maunder, New York-London, Garland Publishing Inc., 1985.

MAUNDER 1987

The Collected Works of Johann Christian Bach 1735-1782. 35: Keyboard Concertos IV, edited by Richard Maunder, New York-London, Garland Publishing Inc., 1987.

COMPOSERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE MARKET IN LATE GEORGIAN BRITAIN

MCVEIGH 1993

MCVEIGH, Simon. *Concert Life in London from Mozart to Haydn*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993.

MILLIGAN 1994

MILLIGAN, Thomas B. *Johann Baptist Cramer (1771-1858): A Thematic Catalogue of His Works*, Stuyvesant (NY), Pendragon Press, 1994 (Thematic Catalogues, 19).

MÜLLER 1973

MÜLLER, Gottfried. *Daniel Steibelt. Sein Leben und seine Klavierwerke*, Baden-Baden, Verlag Valentin Koerner, 1973 (Sammlung musikwissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen, 10).

NOVELLO 1847

NOVELLO, Alfred. *Some Accounts of the Methods of Musick Printing, with Specimens of the Various Sizes of Moveable Types; And Other Matters*, London, Novello, 1847.

ROWLAND 1993

ROWLAND, David. *A History of Pianoforte Pedalling*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993 (Cambridge Musical Text and Monographs).

ROWLAND 1999

ID. 'Piano Music and Keyboard Compass in the 1790s', in: *Early Music*, xxvii/2 (1999), pp. 283-293.

ROWLAND 2005

ID. 'Performance Practice in the Nineteenth Century Concerto', in: *The Cambridge Companion to the Concerto*, edited by Simon Keefe, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005 (Cambridge Companions to Music), pp. 227-246.

ROWLAND 2010

The Correspondence of Muzio Clementi, edited by David Rowland, Bologna, Ut Orpheus Edizioni, 2010 (Muzio Clementi Opera Omnia, 14).

ROWLAND 2011

ROWLAND, David. 'Clementi as Publisher', in: *The Music Trade in Georgian England*, edited by Michael Kessler, Farnham-Burlington, Ashgate, 2011, pp. 159-191.

ROWLAND 2012

ID. 'Dussek in London's Commercial World', in: *Jan Ladislav Dussek (1760-1812): A Bohemian Composer «en voyage» through Europe*, edited by Roberto Illiano and Rohan H. Stewart-MacDonald, Bologna, Ut Orpheus Edizioni, 2012 (Quaderni Clementiani, 4), pp. 87-111.

ROWLAND 2018

ID. 'Composers and Publishers in Clementi's London', in: *The Music Profession in Britain, 1780-1920: New Perspectives on Status and Identity*, edited by Rosemary Golding, New York and Abingdon, Routledge, 2018 (Music in Nineteenth-Century Britain), pp. 32-52.

DAVID ROWLAND

ROWLAND 2019

ID. 'Clementi's Introduction in European Musical Life, 1801-1830', in: *Muzio Clementi and British Musical Culture: Sources, Performance Practice and Style*, edited by Luca Lévi Sala and Rohan H. Stewart-MacDonald, New York-Abingdon, Routledge, 2019 (Ashgate Historical Keyboard Series), pp. 69-83.

SACHS 1970

SACHS, Joel. 'Hummel and George Thomson of Edinburgh', in: *The Musical Quarterly*, LVI/2 (1970), pp. 270-287.

SACHS 1973

ID. 'Hummel and the Pirates: The Struggle for Musical Copyright', in: *The Musical Quarterly*, LIX/1 (1973), pp. 31-60.

SALWEY – McVEIGH 1997

SALWEY, Nicholas – McVEIGH, Simon. 'The Piano and Harpsichord in London's Concert Life, 1750-1800: A Calendar of Advertised Performances', in: *A Handbook for Studies in 18th-Century English Music*. VIII, edited by Michael Burden and Irena Cholij, Oxford, Burden & Cholij, 1997, pp. 27-71.

SANDYS – FORSTER 1864

SANDYS, William – FORSTER, Simon Andrew. *The History of the Violin and Other Instruments Played on with The Bow from the Remotest Times to the Present*, London, John Russell Smith, Addison and Lucas, 1864.

SMALL 2011

SMALL, John. 'The Development of Musical Copyright', in: *The Music Trade in Georgian England*, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-386.

SUAREZ 2009

SUAREZ, Michael. 'Towards a Bibliometric Analysis of the Surviving Record, 1701-1800', in: *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Volume v: 1695-1830*, edited by Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 39-65.