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Abstract

Multi-composer collections of keyboard pieces were issued regularly by English publishers over the course of the eighteenth century. These vary markedly in their scale, ambition and purpose, but they all provide a lens through which to examine contemporary music culture. One collection, however, stands head and shoulders above all others in terms of its quality and historical importance: Stephen Storace's Collection of Original Harpsichord Music, published in two volumes, each comprising six parts, between 1787 and 1789.

What little scholarship there is on Storace’s Collection has focused largely on its seven Mozart works on account of the well-attested friendship that existed between the two composers. But Mozart was not the only composer in Vienna with whom Storace was acquainted, and his publication of works to which he appears to have enjoyed unique access suggests that their composers may have been willing and active participants in the venture.

It is clear from the twelve individual parts that comprise Storace’s Collection that he made careful decisions about which composers and works to include and how they should be distributed throughout the Collection. This paper explores how the Collection was compiled and published, and argues that in spite of its obvious element of self-promotion, it can also be viewed on a deeper level as part of Storace’s wider personal mission to modernize English music in the light of his revelatory musical experiences in Vienna.
I. Introduction

All music collections tell us a good deal about their owners and compilers. In the case of large collections built up over many years, their contents present a rich and varied record of changing musical fashions, passing enthusiasms and occasional forays into systematic collection. Many historical printed collections, among them those published in London in the eighteenth century, typically have a narrower focus that reflects their commercial origins. To be successful, a collection needed to be attractive, topical, accessible to performers of relatively modest technique and include works by composers who were recognizable to the buying public. As such, these collections comprise a
unique lens through which to examine contemporary music culture and the aspirations of those who helped to shape it.

Multi-authored collections of keyboard pieces were issued regularly by English publishers over the course of the eighteenth century and varied considerably in ambition and purpose. It is likely that publishers themselves were largely responsible for determining the shape of these collections which often owed more to expedience than careful planning. Some printed collections were restricted to a single type of work such as lessons or voluntaries,¹ while others were more diverse in character. This is increasingly true of collections published after 1780 which not only include a wider range of works but also occasionally include parts for other instruments. A notable example of this approach can be seen in a collection published in London by Preston ca 1785 styled The Pupil’s Compendium or the Bee of Apollo. According to the title page of the first of its six projected numbers, this work was “to consist of Italian, French and English Music ... Adapted to the harpsichord with occasionally an accompaniment for the violin, flute or guitar. Half the music will be composed the remainder selected, and the whole published under the conduct and inspection of Mr Dibdin.”² Among the composers represented in this collection are Galuppi, Philador and Dibdin himself. One collection, however, stands head and shoulders above all others in terms of its quality and historical importance: Stephen Storace’s Collection of Original Harpsichord Music which was published in two volumes, each comprising six parts, between 1787 and 1789.³

¹ An early example of such a publication is A Concise Collection of Lessons, being excellently sett to the harpsichord, by...Dr John Blow and the late Mr. Henry Purcell... (London: H. Playford, 1705).

² See GB-Lbl Music Collections G.380.a.

³ The title page of Volume 1 Part 1 reads: Storace’s / COLLECTION / OF / ORIGINAL / HARPSICHORD MUSIC. / No1. CONTAINING / One Sonata with Accomp. For Violin and Violoncello ... KOZELUCH. / One Sonata with Accomp. for a Violin ... VANHAL. / One Quartet for Piano-forte, Violin, Tenor and Violoncello ... MOZART. / Printed for S. Storace N.23 Howland Street Rathbone Place / and sold by Mess. Birchall & Andrews N.129 New Bond Street.
Outside of Jane Girdham’s monograph on Storace’s activities as a composer at Drury Lane, the few references made to the Collection have appeared largely in source notes to critical editions of the seven Mozart works it contains. But Mozart was not the only composer in Vienna with whom Storace was acquainted. He certainly knew Wanhal, and among the five works of his published in the Collection there is a keyboard concerto and a set of variations that are otherwise unknown. Storace’s publication of works to which he appears to have enjoyed unique access implies that their composers may have been willing and active participants in the venture.

It is clear from the twelve individual parts that comprise Storace’s Collection of Original Harpsichord Music that he made careful decisions about which composers and works to include and where they should be placed in relation to one another. The inclusion of these works necessarily implies the exclusion of others which, in turn, implies that Storace had a grand design in mind for the Collection from the outset. This paper explores how the Collection was compiled and published and argues that in spite of its obvious element of self-promotion, it can also be viewed on a deeper level as part of Storace’s personal mission to modernize English music in the light of his revelatory musical experiences in Vienna.

II. Compiling and publishing the Collection

On 21 February 1787, three days before he left Vienna for London, Stephen Storace, temporarily incarcerated as a result of a misunderstanding on the dance floor, noted in a letter to his friend John Serres, the English maritime painter, that he had “made a pretty little collection of music.” This was the nucleus of his ambitious Collection of Original

---


5 Letter to J. Serres, 21 February 1787. Harvard Theater Collection, Autograph V 79. Quoted in Girdham, op. cit., 15. The letter was written while Storace was temporarily incarcerated as a result of a misunderstanding on the dance floor.
Harpsichord Music to which he added over the next two years through personal contact with composers working in London and on the Continent.

On his return to London, Storace took up a position at the King’s Theatre where he began to establish himself as a composer for the London stage. He simultaneously started work on preparing for publication what was to be the first volume of the Collection. His initial motivation for undertaking this task so soon after his return may have been the desire to promote himself in the eyes of the public as a well-travelled, well-connected musician. By his own admission, he was not taking pupils at this time, so the publication can hardly have been intended to serve their needs or to attract new pupils. Within a year, however, his circumstances had changed and he advertised his availability for lessons at the foot of his proposal to publish a second volume of the Collection by subscription.

S. STORACE having been obliged, for the last two Seasons, to give up all his Scholars, owing to his late Engagement at the Opera-House, and his two former ones at the Court of Vienna, now wishes to inform his Friends that the ensuing Winter he proposes to teach Singing, Thorough-Bass (after the Neapolitan Method) and playing the Harpsichord, as usual.

Irrespective of his motivation, the publication of the Collection may have helped Storace to attract pupils from the circles most likely to subscribe to it or purchase it. As Jane Girdham observes,

The subscription list [for Volume 1] provides information about Storace’s circle of colleagues and friends. Fifteen names from Bath and its environs are listed, which include Storace’s uncle, the Rev. Dr John Trusler, and some unmarried women who were probably past students. Some names with London addresses may also have been students. Twelve names from

---

6 Volume 1, Part 6. The proposal is dated 1 July 1788.
Cambridge (eleven attached to colleges and many of them clerics) suggest Trusler's influence.7

One of the many things that distinguishes Storace’s Collection from virtually every earlier publication of its type, is his ownership of the venture. This is evident both in its title and in the circumstances of its publication. It is Storace’s Collection and nobody else’s with all that this implies. The London firm of Birchall and Andrews published the Collection for Storace and it was sold partly by subscription, but they were clearly not the instigators of the project. The size of the print run for the first volume is unknown, but information contained in the proposal to publish the second implies that it must have been over 200 copies.

July 1st, 1788/ ORIGINAL HARPSICHORD MUSIC./ S. STORACE, /PROPOSES PUBLISHING BY SUBSCRIPTION, / The SECOND VOLUME / OF HIS COLLECTION OF / Original Harpsichord Music, / By the First COMPOSERS in EUROPE; / CONSISTING OF / SONATAS, TRIOS, QUARTETS, CONCERTOS, &c. / The whole to be published under his immediate Inspection and Direction. / This Work is to consist of Six Numbers, forming one handsome Volume, to be completed by the 1st of July, 1789. Each Number to contain between 40 and 50 Pages of Music, engraved and printed in the best Manner. The First will be ready for Delivery about the Month of October next. / The Price to SUBSCRIBERS, will be as usual, 6s, each Number: the Money to be paid on Delivery: but as the Expence of the Work has by far exceeded the Expectations of the Editor, he is necessitated to limit their Number to Two Hundred, The price to Non-Subscribers will be 8s. / With each Number will be given a beautiful Title and Vignette, drawn and engraved by the most eminent Artists, whose names will be given in future Proposals. / S. STORACE begs Leave to return his best Thanks to his

Subscribers, for the generous Patronage they have given to his present Undertaking: and as he has enlarged his Correspondence since the Commencement of the Work, he will have it in his Power to give an even better Collection of Music in his Second Volume than in the First. Therefore [he] hopes for a Continuance of the Favours. / Subscriptions received at Mr. STORACE’s, No.23, Howland Street; and by Messrs. BIRCHALL / & ANDREWS, No.129, New Bond Street.\textsuperscript{8}

The printed list of subscribers to Volume 1 names 143 individuals who purchased between them 156 sets. Charles Burney and the firm of Longman and Broderip each purchased six copies, Miss Guest,\textsuperscript{9} three copies, and the composer Samuel Arnold, two copies. At six shillings per part, the subscription income for Volume 1 might have amounted to a little over £280. It is impossible to gauge how many additional non-subscription sales were made, but the limitation set on the projected print run for Volume 2 suggests that it might have amounted to somewhere in the order of £100. The profit margins on both volumes must have been slim, and it is unlikely that either Storace or his partners held great hopes for “the Collection as a commercial venture.” Its value, to Storace at least, lay in its prestige.

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{9} Jane Mary (Jenny) Guest (1762–1846) is one of the more interesting subscribers to the Collection. Born in Bath, she studied with Rauzzini, Sachini and Thomas Linley before moving to London to study with J. C. Bach. She appeared regularly at the Hannover Square Rooms in the 1780s and was fulsomely praised in the European Magazine in 1784 for her “fleetsness and facility of finger, expression of touch, diversity of grace, and general mastery of the instrument [which] is without rivalship, and thrills the hearts of all who hear her.” European Magazine, July 1784, 6–7. Nicholas Salwey notes that after her marriage to Abram Miles, an accountant, in 1789, Mrs Miles “returned to Bath where she taught the piano and appeared in Rauzzini’s concerts in Bath during the 1790s and in 1804 and 1806 she was appointed teacher to the young Princesses Amalie and Charlotte”. See Nicholas Salwey, “Women Pianists in Late Eighteenth-Century London” in Concert Life in Eighteenth-Century Britain (ed.) Susan Wollenberg (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2017), 283. At the time Guest subscribed to Storace’s Collection she was active both as a performer and teacher. It would have provided her with invaluable material for both spheres of activity.
Storace’s description of the publication as a *Collection of Original Harpsichord Music* warrants further consideration. What, precisely, did he mean by the word “original”? There are two obvious interpretations: that the music was new or in some manner unconventional; or that the works were composed expressly for the harpsichord and were not arrangements made of other music as appears to have been the case with Charles Dibdin’s *The Pupil’s Compendium or the Bee of Apollo* published ca 1785. The term does not imply in any sense that the music is new to the public, but the absence of familiar publishers’ tropes such as “a selection of the most admired compositions”\(^\text{10}\) or “a choice collection of favourite lessons”\(^\text{11}\) suggests that this was the impression that Storace, Birchall and Andrews wished to convey. It is interesting to note that although the proposal to publish the second volume describes the music in the *Collection* as being “by the first composers in Europe,” neither volume includes this promotional text on its title page.

The final aspect of the title that is noteworthy is the term “harpsichord music” Storace used this catch-all descriptor to encompass a wide variety of genres. It was not intended to mislead since the title page of each part lists its contents and a table provides a list of the instrumentation required for every work in the volume. What the title and its relationship to the contents of the two volumes demonstrates, however, is how central the harpsichord and fortepiano were to domestic music-making during the late eighteenth century, and the diversity of the music performed in this context.\(^\text{12}\) Far from being a collection of solo sonatas, fantasies, variations and dances, Storace’s *Collection* extends to concertos that are technically challenging and with instrumentation that

\(^\text{10}\) For example, *A set of twelve miscellaneous lessons for the harpsichord or piano-forte being a selection of the most admired compositions of Haydn, Sterkel, Schobert, Kozeluch, Wanhal & Edelman compiled and adapted with others by J. Relfe [?]. Opera IV* (London: Longman & Broderip, 1786).

\(^\text{11}\) For example, *The Harpsichord miscellany being a choice collection of favourite lessons, matches, minuets, musettes, allemandes, airs & jigs from the works of Handel, Corelli, Geminiani, Pepusch, Boyce, Arne, Schobert, Edelman & others of the most approved ancient and modern composers* (London: J. Carr, 1780).

includes oboes and horns, as well as musically demanding works that are more modestly scored. The preference for accompanied sonatas is marked and additional parts are provided even for works that we know or recognize as solo sonatas such as Mozart’s Sonata in A, K.331.

**III. Contents of the Collection**

Tables 1 and 2 show the contents of the two volumes of the Collection.

Storace’s reference to his “pretty little collection of music” concerns the works he had acquired up to the point of his departure from Vienna. A cursory glance through the contents of the Collection reveals an overwhelming preference for works by living composers working in Vienna or closely associated with the city. Of the 34 compositions published over the twelve parts of the Collection, no fewer than 24 are by ‘Viennese’ composers: Leopold Koželuh (9), Mozart (7), Wanhal (5), Haydn (2) and Hoffmeister (1). It is by no means certain how many of these works were actually in Storace’s possession by February 1787 since, by his own admission, he corresponded with composers after his return. One such new acquisition was Mozart’s Trio in G, K.564, which was not completed until 27 October 1788.

Storace’s friendship with Mozart is well attested, but we also know from Michael Kelly’s account of the celebrated quartet party at Storace’s residence that he was also acquainted with Dittersdorf, Wanhal and Haydn.¹³ The extent of their acquaintance is unknown but he presumably knew each of these composers well enough to invite them to his apartment to play chamber music. No such anecdotal evidence connects him with either Hoffmeister or Koželuh, but in the close, interconnected world in which he lived

¹³ “Storace gave a quartet party to his friends. The players were tolerable; not one of them excelled on the instrument he played, but there was a little science among them, which I dare say will be acknowledged when I name them: The First Violin: Haydn; The Second Violin: Baron Dittersdorf; The Violoncello: Vanhal; The Viola: Mozart… I was there, and a greater treat, or a more remarkable one, cannot be imagined.” See Michael Kelly, *Reminiscences of Michael Kelly, of the King’s Theatre, and the Theatre Royal Drury Lane* (London: Henry Colburn, New Burlington Street, 1826), Vol. I, 237-238.
First editions or works that are otherwise unknown are shown in bold type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Storace</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kozeluch</td>
<td>Sonata in G [pfte,vln,vlc]</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 1 No.1 Stationers’ Hall 23/9/1787</td>
<td>= P.IX:10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozeluch</td>
<td>Sonata in c [pfte,vln,vlc]</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 2 No.4 Stationers’ Hall 9/1/1788</td>
<td>= P.IX:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozeluch</td>
<td>Concerto in D [pfte,2ob,2cor, 2vln,vla, b]</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 2 No.5</td>
<td>= P.IV:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Sonata in A [pfte,vln,vlc]b</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 3 No.7</td>
<td>= K.331, ‘Summer 1778 (Paris)’. First edition, Vienna: Artaria, Op.VI (No.2) 1784. This sonata, and its companions K.330 and K.332, are now believed to have been composed in 1793.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storace</td>
<td>Sonata in D [pfte,vln,vlc]</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 3 No.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clementi</td>
<td>Sonata in F</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 5 No.12 Stationers’ Hall 3/6/1788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanhal</td>
<td>Concerto in D [pfte,2ob,2cor, 2vln,vla, b]</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 5 No.13</td>
<td>Paris: Barbieri, 6.9.1788; Offenbach a/M: André, 23.12.1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storace</td>
<td>Trio in C [pfte,vln,vlc]</td>
<td>Vol.1 Part 6 No.16</td>
<td>The Rondo is based on the aria ‘Care donne che bramate’ written for Nancy Storace by Stephen for Paisiello’s opera <em>Il re Teodoro in Venezia</em>. (London: Longman &amp; Broderip, 1787)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Poštolka’s numbering has been used to identify Koželuh’s accompanied sonatas and the Concerto in D. See Milan Poštolka, *Leopold Koželuh Život a Dílo* (Praha: Státní Hudební Vydavatelství, 1964).

b Köchel notes that additional parts for vln and vlc are also found in an edition of the work printed in London ca 1809 by Th. Monzoni. These may derive from Storace’s edition.

Table 2: Storace, Collection of Original Harpsichord Music, Vol.2
First editions or works that are otherwise unknown are shown in bold type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Storace</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>Minuet with Var in A (Vol.2 Part 1 No.4)</td>
<td>= Hob.XVII: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hüllmandel</td>
<td>Sonata in G (Vol.2 Part 2 No.5)</td>
<td>Stationers’ Hall 19/1/1789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanhal</td>
<td>Concerto in B flat (Vol.2 Part 2 No.6)</td>
<td>Weinmann deest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydn</td>
<td>Arietta with Var in E flat (Vol.2 Part 2 No.7)</td>
<td>= Hob.XVII: 3 (1774)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozeluch</td>
<td>Sonata in B flat (Vol.2 Part 3 No.8)</td>
<td>Stationers’ Hall 19/1/1789</td>
<td>Op.25 No.1 = P.IX.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozeluch</td>
<td>Sonata in G (Vol.2 Part 3 No.9)</td>
<td>Stationers’ Hall 19/1/1789</td>
<td>Op.25 No.2 = P.IX.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanhal</td>
<td>Variations in A (Vol.2 Part 3 No.10)</td>
<td>= P. IX.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozeluch</td>
<td>Sonata in A (Vol.2 Part 4 No.11)</td>
<td>Stationers’ Hall 30/14/1789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krumpholtz</td>
<td>Concerto in F (Vol.2 Part 6 No.18)</td>
<td>= Concerto No.6, Op.9. ‘A Favorite Harp Concerto with Accompaniments for Violin, Tenor, Bass, Flute, Oboes &amp; Horns adapted for the Harpsichord’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The second opus number quoted for Koželuh’s solo sonatas is taken from the thematic catalogue in Christopher Hogwood’s critical edition of complete sonatas. (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2010–). 

\(^b\) The opening of this sonata famously bears a strong resemblance to the theme Mozart was to employ several years later in the overture to Die Zauberflöte. There is no evidence that Mozart owned a copy of Storace’s edition but it is possible that it was one of a number of pieces listed in his estate under the rubric “Verschiedene Musikalien.” Cliff Eisen, personal communication.
and worked, it seems improbable that he would not have encountered them in one context or another. He would certainly have been familiar with their professional reputations.

The remaining composers represented in the *Collection* tell a similar story. Thomas Attwood was another member of Mozart’s “English” circle and even travelled back to England with Stephen and Nancy Storace and their mother. Johann Samuel Schroeter and Muzio Clementi were both well-established pianist-composers based in London whom Storace presumably knew. The inclusion of works by Hüllmandel and Krumpholz, however, is less readily understandable. Burney notes that Hüllmandel’s name was well-known in England and alludes to the excellence of his playing, factors which perhaps explains Storace’s decision to include one of his works in the *Collection,* but the popularity of the composer does not seem to have been a major factor elsewhere. Jean-Baptiste Krumpholz is an equally mysterious inclusion in the *Collection* in spite of the apparent popularity of this particular harp concerto. Moreover, it is the only work in the *Collection* which is patently not an example of “original harpsichord music.”

In comparison with composers such as Ignaz Pleyel, Joseph Martin Kraus and C. P. E. Bach, none of these composers, with the possible exception of Clementi, could be considered in any way to rank among the first composers in Europe. Their inclusion in the *Collection* seems likely to have come about as a result of personal contact. This is especially true of Attwood. The omission of even a single works by Pleyel, one of the most celebrated and successful composers in Europe and one about whom he must have

---


15 “Keyed-instruments are perhaps no where on the globe better played, in every different style, than at present in this country by Burney, Clementi, Cramer jun., Miss Guest, Hüllmandel, the two Wesleys, and many others, not only professors but dilittanti, who though not public performers, are heard with great pleasure in private. It gives me great concern that I am obliged to strike out of this list the name of Mr. JOHN SAMUEL SCHROETER; but this distinguished musician, whose neat and exquisite performance on the piano-forte will be long remembered with regret, died 1 November 1788, while this sheet was printing!”, 682.
heard a great deal, suggests that he did not meet him when he passed through Strasbourg on the way back to England and this may have ultimately led to his exclusion from the *Collection*. If this were indeed the case, then it reinforces the notion of it being essentially a personal collection, an anthology of works by composers whom Storace knew and who possibly presented or recommended works to him in the course of his travels and subsequent correspondence.

**IV. Mozart’s works**

The composer with whom we know Storace was best acquainted in Vienna was Mozart. The Storaces and Attwood were all enthusiastic about Mozart visiting London and this was apparently reciprocated. Reporting on the visit paid to him in Salzburg by Storace’s party, Leopold Mozart wrote to his daughter Nannerl: “As I gathered, [Wolfgang] wants to travel to England, but ... [Attwood] is first going to procure a definite engagement for him in London. I mean, a contract to compose an opera or a subscription concert etc.”

Storace was deeply impressed by Mozart’s compositions and clearly chose carefully which works he brought back with him to England. It is possible too that he discussed these choices with Mozart even if, at this time, no fixed plan existed to publish the *Collection*. Of the six works that presumably formed part of his “pretty little collection,” most had been composed or published recently in Vienna. The range of works — solo sonatas, a rondo, a piano duet, a piano trio and a piano quartet — suggests that Storace wanted to demonstrate Mozart’s versatility as a composer as much as the peerless quality of his keyboard writing.

Since Artaria’s first edition of the Piano Quartet in E-flat, K. 493 did not appear in print until July 1787, it is likely that Storace’s publication was based on a manuscript copy.

---


17 For a brief account of the background to the work see *Neue Mozart Ausgabe* Serie VIII Kammermusik Werkgruppe 22: Quintette, Quartette und Trios mit Klavier und mit Glasharmonika. Abt. 1: Quartette und
acquired in Vienna. Further support for this theory can be found in the variants between the two editions which argue strongly that Storace’s edition of the work cannot have been based on Artaria’s print. It is tempting to posit that he acquired it through Mozart who surely would have kept close control over the work as he sought a new publisher for it following Hoffmeister’s cancellation of the contract for three piano quartets following the publication of K. 478. If the work were copied from a source close to Mozart, then the question arises whether the most important variants — the interpolation of a repeat mark after the third beat in bar 4 of the first movement and the omission of fourteen bars in the Rondo (bars 174-187) — is evidence that the composer revised the work prior to its publication by Artaria and possibly after Storace’s return to London. In the absence of Mozart’s autograph this question is unlikely to be resolved, nor whether the first and second-time bars in the first movement (bar 241) also represent an afterthought on the composer’s part. The other variants are less significant but, in several instances, their replication in parallel passages appear to rule out simple engraving errors. The keyboard part is comparatively lightly marked with slurs and articulations, but contains dynamic markings that possibly represent editorial emendations made by Storace himself. The impression the edition gives the reader is that it was based on a set of parts whose relationship to the composer’s autograph is uncertain.

Storace’s publication of the Piano Quartet naturally invites the obvious question why he chose this work in preference to the G minor Quartet, K.478. Was the choice Storace’s own or was it Mozart’s suggestion? Its placement in Volume 1 Part 1 of the Collection implies that he attached great value to the work and used the first opportunity presented

---

According to Georg Nissen, Hoffmeister complained after the publication of the first piano quartet that nobody would buy the work; Mozart voluntarily released him from his contract and Hoffmeister in turn allowed him to keep the advance payment of the fee on condition that he did not complete the other two works. [“...daß er die zwey anderen accordierten Quartette nicht schrieb und Hoffmeister seines Contractes erbunden wäre.”] See Georg von Nissen, Biographie W.A. Mozarts (Leipzig, 1828), 633.
to him to introduce one of Mozart’s finest and most original chamber works to the English public. If this were part of a wider strategy intended to prepare the ground for Mozart’s projected visit to London, then it is possible that both composers felt the E-flat Quartet was likely to be received more favourably than its turbulent companion.

The two sonatas K. 330 & 331, which Alan Tyson assigned to 1783 on the basis of the paper type used in Mozart’s autographs, had been published in Vienna in 1784. Once again, Storace took with him recent works that either he or Mozart considered to be of high merit. The Sonata in A, K. 331 may well have been selected on account of its brilliant finale, the *Rondo alla turca*, which Storace was later to use as the basis of his overture to *The Siege of Belgrade*. As with the Piano Quartet, Storace’s version of K. 331 differs markedly from Mozart’s original: it has additional parts for violin and violoncello transforming it into that most ubiquitous of eighteenth-century instrumental genres, the accompanied sonata. It is unlikely that Mozart was responsible for these additional string parts; Storace was more than capable of writing them himself and, as Example 1 demonstrates, the task involved was not particularly onerous. The violin part compliments the keyboard part rather than competes with it, adding additional weight to the scoring where the musical texture invites it and otherwise remaining largely unobtrusive. The violoncello part, as is typical of the accompanied sonata, is very undemanding but adds a subtle of colour to the bass line.

Of the remaining works, the Rondo in F, K. 494 was the most recent composition and by far the most interesting. In a market that included publications such as Hodgson’s *A Collection of Six Easy Lessons with Rondo’s for the Harpsichord or Piano-Forte Composed by Different Authors* (London, 1780), Mozart’s Rondo in F offered a glimpse into a parallel musical universe of almost improbable richness.

---

19 See Table 1.

20 For a description of Storace’s use of Mozart’s material in his overture, see Girdham, 211-212.

21 See GB-Lcm G67/1.
Example 1: Mozart, Sonata in A, K.331 (Rondo) with Storace’s additional string parts.
Badley, Allan. “Storace’s Collection of Original Harpsichord Music as a Harbinger of Modernity.”

Storace seems to have gravitated or been directed towards Mozart’s most technically demanding or highly original works even when these were still in manuscript. Nonetheless, it begs the question why he did not include in the Collection at least one of Mozart’s concertos, which surely represented the composer at his finest. Although composer-performers often kept strict control over their concertos to ensure that nobody else could perform them, Mozart had published five keyboard concertos in recent years, including K. 413-415 of 1782-1783 and K. 451 of 1785. One of these works, the Concerto in A, K. 414, had even been published in London and advertised in the Morning Post on 17 January 1786 as having been performed by Johann Baptist Cramer.
at the Anacreontic Society. This omission is even more puzzling in view of Storace’s inclusion of concertos by Wanhal, Koželuh and Krumpholz. Had Mozart visited London as planned, he would surely have performed concertos as the centrepieces of his public concerts, and it is curious that neither Storace nor Mozart, if he were directly involved in the selection of works, took the opportunity to introduce the London public to these works through the medium of the *Collection*. Mozart may not have travelled to England as planned, but his decision to send Storace a copy of the Trio in G, K. 564, is possibly proof that he still intended to do so at some point and wished to maintain professional links with his English friends. Artaria’s edition of the work did not appear until October 1790, fully two years after its completion and a year after its publication in the second volume of Storace’s *Collection*. The timing of the two editions is interesting. The delay of one year between the two editions of the work may constitute proof that Mozart granted Storace rights to K. 564 for one year only, after which he was free to publish it elsewhere.

I have dwelt at some length on the Mozart works in the *Collection* because I believe they offer proof that in selecting them, Storace was acting in part as the composer’s advocate, and as such, their inclusion was part of a larger if rather nebulous plan. The grounds for reaching similar conclusions with other Viennese composers represented in the *Collection* are considerably weaker, but in the case of Johann Baptist Wanhal, the inclusion of two otherwise unknown compositions argues that he too was also closely involved in Storace’s choice of works.

**V. Wanhal, Koželuh, and Haydn.**

Wanhal, a prolific and highly respected composer of instrumental works, was an automatic choice for inclusion in the *Collection*, but the selection of works was no means as clear cut. As a freelance musician, he derived a high proportion of his income from

---

teaching and he also composed and published a great deal of music for the fortepiano. By the time of Storace’s sojourn in Vienna, he would have been confronted with a formidable choice of works ranging from easy sonatas for beginners through to impressive multi-movement capriccios and concertos. His choice of works is therefore particularly interesting: a sonata, a duetto, two concertos and a set of variations.

Storace’s edition of the Sonata in C (Weinmann XIa:14) is the earliest known print of the work and he may have acquired the composition in manuscript directly from or through Wanhal himself. This argument is strengthened considerably by the inclusion of two unknown works in the Collection: a Concerto in B-flat (with an accompaniment of 2ob 2cor 2vln vla b) and a set of variations on the arietta, “Viva, viva la Regina” from Martiny Soler’s dramma giocoso, La cosa rara. From its premiere at the Burgtheater on 17 November 1786, La cosa rara had proved a sensational success in Vienna and it is unsurprising that Wanhal was quick to compose a set of variations on one of its many popular melodies. The choice itself, however, may be of special significance since the duet “Viva, viva la Regina” was sung by Nancy Storace who created the role of Lilla in the production. This apparently circumstantial detail strengthens the argument that the Variations were composed expressly for inclusion in the Collection: as such, the choice of theme might be interpreted as a personal gesture on Wanhal’s part, a graceful tribute to Nancy united in a personal gift for Stephen.

The order in which Storace published the two Wanhal concertos in the Collection possibly indicates that he brought a copy of the Concerto in D (Weinmann IIa:D1) back with him from Vienna in 1787 and acquired the B-flat Concerto later. But the publication of editions of D1 in Paris by Barbieri, three months after it appeared in Volume 1 Part 5 of Storace’s Collection, and three months after that, in December 1788, by André in Offenbach am Main, could also constitute evidence that the work was already in circulation. Only a close study of the extant sources would be able to determine their relationship to Storace’s first edition.
The absence of any other sources for the Concerto in B-flat, however, argues that like the Variations, Storace may have acquired the work directly from the composer while its publication in Volume 2 indicates that it was composed later than Concerto D1 and was sent to Storace after his return to London. We know nothing of any contractual arrangements that may have existed between Storace and the composers he published, but the absence of other sources for the B-flat Concerto could indicate that he had exclusive rights to the work, something he clearly did not have in the case of Mozart’s compositions. If Storace’s relationship with Wanhal was not as close on a personal level as it was with Mozart, he nonetheless regarded him as an important representative of the dynamic musical environment in Vienna that he wished to showcase in the *Collection*.

The composer whose works feature most prominently throughout the two volumes of the *Collection* is Leopold Koželuh. On moving to Vienna from Prague in 1778 to advance his career, Koželuh, like his older compatriot Wanhal, chose to work as a freelance musician. That he was an excellent fortepianist is evident in all of his keyboard works, but unlike Mozart he did not perform in public. An enterprising musician who quickly saw the potential in establishing himself as a publisher, Koželuh founded the firm Musikalisches Magazin in 1784, which was later managed by his brother, Antonín Tomáš. Koželuh used the firm, often in combination with partners in other countries, to publish a great many of his own works, and the wide dissemination of his compositions made him one of the best-known composers in Europe. In 1790, Ernst Ludwig Gerber wrote that “Leopold Kozeluch is without question with young and old the generally most loved among our living composers, and this with justification.”\(^{23}\) The prominence Storace gave to Koželuh’s works is proof, if any were needed, that he was acutely aware of who were the most important and progressive composers of keyboard music in Vienna. By the same measure, it is inconceivable that Koželuh allowed Storace to
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\(^{23}\) Quoted in Roger Hickman, “Leopold Kozeluch and the Viennese Quatuor Concertant,” in *College Music Symposium* 26 (1986), 42.
publish nine important and recent works without some kind of financial recompense.\textsuperscript{24} There must have been a business arrangement from the outset or one that quickly followed since Koželuh’s works continued to appear in Volume 2 of the \textit{Collection}. The inclusion of these works was commercially advantageous to Storace but it also undoubtedly played an important part in helping Koželuh establish a foothold in the lucrative British market.

Beyond the obvious contemporary popularity of sets of variations, the choice of the two Haydn works in the \textit{Collection} is difficult to explain. Given the shape of the \textit{Collection} as a whole, it would have been more logical for Storace to include several solo sonatas or trios rather than the two sets of variations that appear in Volume 2. Neither work was new: Hoboken assigns the \textit{Minuet with Variations in A} (Hob. XVII: 2) to before 1771 and the \textit{Arietta with Variations in E-flat} (Hob. XVII: 3) to before 1774.\textsuperscript{25} In both cases, the first edition was issued in Vienna by Artaria: PN 185 (1788-1789) for the \textit{Variations in E-flat}, and PN 186 (1789) for the \textit{Variations in A}. Storace’s edition is noted by Hoboken but not given precedence over Artaria’s as the earliest printed source. The timing and sequence of Storace’s publication of the two works is intriguing. The publication dates are closely related to those of Artaria but the works were issued in reverse order, the \textit{Variations in A} (in Vol.2 Part 1, 22 November 1788) and the \textit{Variations in E-flat} (in Vol.2 Part 2, 19 January 1789). This raises important questions about the provenance of Storace’s engraving copies and whether he brought them with him from Vienna or acquired them after his return.

Unlike the other works Storace acquired in Vienna or was later sent, these works were, by the standard of the time, quite old, and being in manuscript, they may not have been

\textsuperscript{24} Koželuh’s later dealings with George Thomson over his arrangements of Scots Songs show him to have been very astute in protecting his own interests. The correspondence between the two is preserved among Thomson’s letters in The British Library under the call number Add Ms 35263.

\textsuperscript{25} The authority for these dates rests on solely on listing of the works in the \textit{Breitkopf Catalogue: Minuet with Variations in A} (Hob.XVII: 2) in Supplement VI, 1771 and the \textit{Arietta with Variations in E-flat} (Hob.XVII: 3) in Supplement IX, 1774.
especially easy to find. Did he choose these works himself or were they recommended to him? He clearly met Haydn, if only at the quartet party, but did their conversation extend to his keyboard music? It is an attractive conceit to consider the possibility that Haydn’s memory of the *Arietta with Variations in E-flat*, which takes as its theme, the Minuet from the String Quartet in E-flat, Op.9 no.2, was triggered by a conversation on that very occasion and, when questioned by Storace about his keyboard music, mentioned this particular work. On the other hand, it seems more likely that Haydn was happy to contribute a couple of works to Storace’s *Collection* but nothing he considered to be of the first importance such as a new set of solo sonatas or piano trios. But this is of course pure conjecture, and Storace might well have come across the two works in some other way. What is of fundamental importance, however, is that the inclusion of these Haydn works in the *Collection* represents yet another decision made by Storace concerning a composer whom he had met.

VI. Storace’s curation of the Collection: modernizing English keyboard music.

Storace’s *Collection* represented a dramatic shift in emphasis from other recently published anthologies. It offered challenging music by living composers, most of whom, but not all, were widely recognised as among the leading figures in Europe. It also seems likely that all of these composers were known personally to Storace, otherwise the exclusion of a figure as important as Pleyel makes little or no sense. The proposal to publish the second volume of the *Collection* advised that it was to “published under his immediate inspection and direction,” but Storace’s relationship with it went far deeper than that. Its contents reveal not just his musical choices, but a whole network of friendships and professional acquaintances; in this sense, it is as much a musical memoir of his time in Vienna as that of his friend Michael Kelly.

Although Storace might have believed at the outset that the *Collection* would make him money, he had surely been disabused of this idea by the time he began planning the second volume. Nonetheless, it is unlikely that his primary motivation had ever been financial, or, in spite of his friendship with Mozart, that he had embarked on the venture
to promote his music or anybody else’s in England. This could have been achieved more easily by other means and without substantial financial risk. Storace’s motivation is far more likely to have been a desire to position himself in the eyes of the public as a composer of similar stature to these figures, his music gaining in reputation by its proximity to that of Mozart, Haydn, Wanhal and others. His inclusion of works by Attwood, Schroeter and Clementi ensured that the *Collection* also contained material by composers familiar to the English public, but while Clementi was an obvious choice, the inclusion of Attwood and Schroeter might well have been due to personal or diplomatic considerations.

There was another important and far more ambitious motivation for Storace to publish the *Collection*. The richness and incomparable quality of the music he encountered in Vienna converted him into an apostle of the new, and when he returned to London in 1787, he was filled with ambition to revolutionize the sclerotic state of English music. London audiences were of course already familiar with some of the music of Vienna’s leading composers. Simon McVeigh’s study of the Professional Concerts and the series of its rivals records 113 performances of works by Haydn, forty by Pleyel, thirteen by Mozart as well as occasional performances of works by Dittersdorf, Wanhal and Koželuh during the years 1783-1789.26 On the basis of this evidence, one might expect the *Collection* to be dominated by the compositions of Haydn and Pleyel yet it is not. One possible explanation for this is that London audiences largely associated these two composers with symphonies and string quartets, the instrumental genres most commonly featured in these concerts.27 But it is surely intentional that Storace

26 McVeigh, 51.

27 Out of Haydn’s 113 performances during this period, 97 works are listed as either overture or symphony and eleven as string quartet. Pleyel does not appear in programmes until 1785 and from that year until 1789, forty performances are listed which include nine symphonies, four symphonies concertantes (all performances of Benton 111) and nineteen string quartets. The only composer whose keyboard works are featured on regular basis is Clementi with sixteen performances in total, seven of which are sonatas.
championed composers who were less familiar to English audiences and in genres suitable for domestic performance.

Although Mozart’s symphonies were beginning to be performed in London in the 1780s — McVeigh records twelve occasions on which a Mozart symphony was played — the only other major work to be performed before 1789 was a piano concerto. Storace, returning to London with first-hand experience of the full gamut of Mozart’s musical genius, became his public champion. More importantly, he set himself the task of modernising English theatre music which, even in the hands of accomplished composers such as Samuel Arnold and William Shield, lacked anything like the complexity and sophistication of the music he had encountered in Vienna. Storace was initially cautious in his innovations, continuing to incorporate popular borrowed material alongside his own music, and it was not until the following decade with works like The Siege of Belgrade (1791), the lost Dido, Queen of Carthage and The Pirates (both 1792), that he really began to transform the style of English theatre music. In the light of these developments, the Collection of Original Harpsichord Music might also be considered a harbinger of modernity, the means by which Storace stealthily began the process of influencing musical taste and expectations in England, in order to prepare the way for the works he wanted to compose in the future.

28 Second Professional Concert (Hanover Square, 13 February 1786): soloist J.B. Cramer. McVeigh postulates that this may have been the Piano Concerto in A, K.414, which had recently been published in London and performed by Cramer on 17 January at the Anacreontic Society. 51.
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