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Abstract

By the 1870s music printing and publishing in Austro-Hungary was under considerable competitive pressure from major firms based in Leipzig and elsewhere in Germany. Using more recent printing techniques (most notably printing from engraved plates by transfer lithography) and often a more integrated system of production, firms such as Breitkopf & Härtel and Edition Peters were playing an increasing important role in the European market for classical music. By the late 1880s it had become apparent that this trend was being challenged by an innovative Viennese firm run by a lithographer from the Czech lands, Josef Eberle, who had built up a printing business that included a skilled and well-organised music department that could rival German competitors in the printing of complex scores. Moreover, Eberle sought to challenge German publishers’ dominance in the supply of music by Viennese composers of the Classical period: although this project failed commercially, it highlighted the challenges that the Universal-Edition would face a decade or so later. Despite this setback Eberle continued to publish major works, notably the music of Anton Bruckner, though not under his own imprint. At the same time, he established a brand of manuscript paper that was used by two or more generations of composers. Eberle’s career was notable in its own right, and tracing some of his activities sheds light on many less familiar aspects of the music business in Vienna, 1880-1920.
Beginnings

[1] In the first issue of 1888 the editor of the bi-weekly periodical An der Schönen Blauen Donau made a bold claim on behalf of the firm of Josef Eberle & Co., asserting that it was “the foremost and unrivalled music engraving business in Austro-Hungary.” However, since the purpose of the editorial was to announce that Jos. Eberle & Co. had taken over responsibility for publishing the magazine, it would be easy to dismiss this assertion as a mere publicity “puff” on behalf of the new owner. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that by 1888 Eberle owned the leading firm involved in the printing of music in Vienna; later, he effectively published some of the symphonies of Anton Bruckner (1824–96) and Franz Schmidt (1874–1939) as well as music by Franz Schreker (1878–1934) and others. Furthermore, in the first decades of the twentieth century, his original firm—by then often identified simply as Waldheim-Eberle or WEAG—was responsible for originating (mostly by engraving) and printing (by transfer or offset lithography) much of the music issued by Universal-Edition (UE). In addition, Jos. Eberle & Co. manufactured manuscript paper used by a whole generation of Viennese composers. For these reasons, and the fact that at one time there were two separate music printing businesses trading under the name “Jos. Eberle,” this previously little-discussed corner of Viennese musical and commercial history merits exploration.

Born in Falkenau an der Eger (Bohemia; now Sokolov in the Czech Republic), Josef Eberle (1845–1921) was trained as a lithographer from the age of twelve in the printing firm of his uncle, Haberditzl, in Rastatt, Baden-Württemberg. From 1861, he worked in various Austrian printing firms, including several Viennese lithographers, such as Eduard Sieger (fl. 1843–76), Wilhelm Zöller (fl. 1858–97), Friedrich Kaiser (fl. 1855–66), and Gustav Wegelein (fl. 1851–80). According to the print historian Anton Durstmüller, Eberle founded his first business in Vienna in 1873 and this was indeed the date that he advertised as marking the birth of his company (see, for example, figure 9). However, the exact sequence of events is by no means certain, and by late 1873 Eberle probably had a stake in two lithographic printing businesses: as the junior partner in Schmelka & Eberle, and in Eberle & Schipek, of which he was presumably the principal partner. In the final years of the Gründerzeit, and with the 1873 Weltausstellung in Vienna under way, the business and financial climate must have seemed propitious for such ventures, not least because by early 1873 the Viennese printing industry was struggling to meet demand for its products. But the boom proved to be a “temporary, pathological phenomenon,” the exhibition was a “pitiful fiasco” from a business perspective, and the first Great Depression was about to engulf Europe and the United States, leaving printers with an over-capacity that forced down prices. That both of Eberle’s partnerships survived the immediate aftermath of the stock-market crash of May 9, 1873, and one of the businesses flourished, is surely a tribute to his resilience and determination in an unexpectedly challenging economic environment.

Karl Schmelka (fl. 1866–81) and his partnership with Eberle are overlooked by Durstmüller and documentation of Schmelka’s early career as a lithographer in Viennese printing works is scarce, though it probably began at least as early as 1866. By 1872–73, he had established his own lithographic business at VIII. Wickenburggasse 3 & 9 and in late 1873 or early 1874 Schmelka took Eberle into the firm, which moved first to VII. Burggasse 45, and again, by September 1875 at the latest, to VII. Bandgasse 41. The business finally came to an end by mid-1879, when Schmelka retired to VIII. Laudongasse 33.

Details of Johann Schipek’s early career are scanty, but it is clear that he too was a lithographer by training. When his association with Eberle came to an end ca. 1878, he established his own
lithographic printing business at V. Spengergasse 23 before forming a new partnership, Schipek & Steinhardt ca. 1882.\[^8\] Little is known about the early history of his partnership with Eberle, but Durstmüller records its foundation as dating from as early as 1873\[^9\] and states that in 1875 Eberle and Schipek were joined by a businessman, Wilhelm Berndt (fl. 1875–?),\[^10\] whose role, at least initially, was probably to provide capital for the rapidly expanding business. Having begun with a single hand press, it had fourteen employees and five presses by that year, investing in its first mechanical press (\textit{Schnellpresse}) in 1876.\[^11\] On June 21, Eberle was granted a concession (Z 17993) to conduct business as a \textit{Buchdrucker} (as distinct from a lithographer).\[^12\]

After continuing to support Eberle for a number of years, Berndt left the firm (by that time trading as Jos. Eberle & Co.) in 1884, to create another printing business, G. Freytag & Berndt, which specialized in cartographic publications.\[^13\] It is striking that Eberle apparently had sufficient financial resources of his own—or access to credit—to be able to sustain his business after the departure of both partners. There is also evidence that he may not have been the most congenial of colleagues—later events reveal his autocratic personality—and that he worked most effectively when in sole control.

[2] By the mid-1870s, Josef Eberle had established himself as the partner in two lithographic printing businesses, which, among other jobs, occasionally designed and printed title pages for one of the major music publishers in Vienna. The firm of C.A. Spina could trace its history back to the foundation of Cappi & Diabelli in 1818.\[^14\] By the 1870s, it was still issuing substantial numbers of new publications, predominantly Viennese classics—Beethoven and Schubert—and modern Viennese dance music and operetta, and had assigned over 15,000 plate numbers.\[^15\] On the other hand, its publications were often redolent of a previous age: most (though not all) title pages were lithographed in a single color (usually black) and the music text was invariably printed from engraved plates, at least in the sample I have examined. This reliance on plate-printed music suggests that anticipated total print runs were small, consisting at most of no more than 1,300–2,000 copies.\[^16\] Moreover, the production process was complicated, involving three or four specialist artisans: a lithographer to design and produce the stone (or a zinc plate) for the title page, an engraver to punch and engrave the music text, and a printer; if any letterpress was needed (e.g. for a page of adverts), a separate printer, such as Otto Maass, would be used to set the type. Overall the business structure and the end product could not be more different from that of the most influential German music publishers, such as Breitkopf & Härtel, Schott, and Edition Peters, which were utilizing lithographic printing for all but a very few publications, enabling them to produce virtually unlimited total print runs. Moreover, they were either originating and manufacturing copies entirely in-house,\[^17\] or using a firm such as C.G. Röder that had an integrated production process, founded on the use of music printing by transfer lithography from engraved plates.

The sample of Viennese printed editions from the late 1860s and early 1870s I have examined suggests that by this period Spina had a preferred music printer, Anton Eckel (fl. before 1850–85);\[^18\] at this stage, the engravers of the music were not identified. The preparation of decorative title pages was not quite so monopolized, with Franz Jascha (fl. 1870–99) and Christian Höller (fl. 1868–95)\[^19\] undertaking some designs, though the main firms employed were, up to about 1870 that of Heinrich Meyer (fl. 1868–76),\[^20\] and from ca. 1870 to 1876 that of Gustav Wegelein (fl. 1851–80),\[^21\] who employed the young Josef Eberle (see above). It was presumably thanks to Wegelein that Eberle’s name appeared on at least three title page designs in 1870 and 1872,\[^22\] and he thus gained his \textit{entrée} into the printing sector in which he was to make a notable contribution.
In an announcement dated July 1, 1872, Spina reported that he had sold the business to his employee, Friedrich Schreiber, and the immediate effect was to alter the firm's imprint to C.A. Spina's Nachfolger (Friedrich Schreiber). In other respects production remained much as before, continuing the plate number sequence, with the same prefix (C.S.), title pages by Wegelein's firm, and printing by Eckel. From the autumn of 1873, the engraver Franz Hahn (fl. 1873–1914) is also often named on the first page of music. However, in August 1873, at least a couple of piano arrangements of dance numbers from the new opera, Der Carneval in Rom, by Johann Strauss II (1825–99) were issued with title pages lithographed by Eberle and printed by Schmelka. It is notable that they and their roles are identified separately, suggesting that at the time their firm had not yet been granted a concession. Early in 1874, the publisher's imprint was modified again, to Friedrich Schreiber (vormals C.A. Spina), and shortly afterwards—though with a few (presumably) accidental reversions—the plate number prefix was changed to “F.S.” But these relatively superficial developments coincided with one which, with the benefit of hindsight, can be seen as rather more significant: a threat to Wegelein's dominance as the supplier of lithographed decorative title pages.

Early in 1874 a small batch of works by Eduard Strauss (1835–1916) was published, adorned by designs by both of the new printing firms in which Josef Eberle was a partner: Angot-Quadrille, op. 110 (Eberle & Schipek) and Theorien Walzer, op. 111, Ohne Aufenthalt (Polka), op. 112, and Die Hochquelle (Polka-Mazur), op. 114 (Schmelka & Eberle). The date-stamped copies originally acquired by the British Museum and now in the British Library Collection usefully document the firms' histories: those of opp. 112–14 fit well with the other evidence of Schmelka & Eberle's business, both in terms of dates and the firm's address (see above). Moreover, Schmelka himself seems to have already contributed at least one title page to a Spina publication in late 1873. On the other hand, the British Library copy of Strauss's op. 110, date stamped by the Library “1874,” is of a work first issued early in 1874, lending support to Durtsmüller's chronology for the firm of Eberle & Schipek: it is the earliest example of their work for Spina, which is not otherwise represented by firmly datable copies until publications from the middle of following year. Like all other examples of work by Eberle & Schipek up to mid-1876, the first impression of the Angot-Quadrille gives their business address as VII. Burggasse 45, suggesting that the two partnerships may have shared premises for a time, before Schmelka & Eberle moved to Bandgasse in 1875. By that date, it seems the latter firm was no longer supplying title pages for Spina, and that such work was handled only by Eberle & Schipek. Although the nature of the personal and professional ties between Eberle, Schmelka, and Schipek is undocumented, it is remarkable that for a time Eberle should have been a partner in two competing businesses.

The reason that Eberle and his partners were contracted by Friedrich Schreiber on an apparently irregular basis is unclear: Gustav Wegelein continued to be the chief supplier of most lithographic work during 1875, and at this stage there may not have been any intention that his firm would be replaced in that role. Nevertheless, while Schmelka and Eberle appear to have supplied no more title pages after early 1875—the last in the sample being an unusual two-color cover for Eduard Strauss's op. 120—Eberle & Schipek began to supply such pages more frequently and from mid-1876 were wholly responsible for them. However, other changes were afoot. In the early summer of 1876, the Schreiber/Spina business was bought by Alwin Cranz, by then the proprietor of the firm of Anton Cranz in Hamburg, and the change of hands was formally announced at the beginning of 1877. The new ownership was reflected in a revised imprint, used from late 1876: Wien, Friedrich Schreiber – Hamburg, Aug. Cranz ... (vormals C.A. Spina). However, by mid-1877 this had in turn been replaced by Wien: C. A. Spina; Hamburg:
Aug. Cranz, which suggests that Cranz had decided that the Spina brand was strong enough to merit greater prominence.

Less publicly explicit was Cranz’s transformation of the printing arrangements: the introduction of the first Cranz imprint in late 1876 seems to have coincided with the transfer of all printing—title pages and the music text—to Eberle & Schipek at their new premises at VII. Westbahnstrasse 9 and the adoption of music printing by transfer lithography from engraved plates \[33\] for all the Cranz/Spina issues. These may not have been coincidences. Cranz seems to have wished to not only adopt the printing techniques already common in Germany, but also to establish a more easily coordinated and managed process of origination and production. If Durstmüller’s account is correct, Eberle & Schipek had already invested in plant and had a modest workforce: the guarantee of work from Spina/Cranz may well have encouraged them to expand the business further, and the move to Westbahnstrasse probably offered the extra space they required.\[34\] Their printer’s marks generally adopt the form Schnellpressendr. d. lit. Anst. Stein & Buchdr. v. Eberle & Schipek VII Westbahnstr. 9;\[35\] they thus not only identify the new location, emphasize the firm’s capital investment in relatively new technology, and indicate that the firm also undertakes letterpress printing, but also imply—by omission—that at this stage Eberle was not originating the music in-house. Up to the middle of 1877, a few issues include the name of an engraver—still Franz Hahn—on the (lithographed) copies, but these may simply have been transferred from unaltered plates prepared earlier; otherwise, engravers are not identified on Eberle music prints. However, it is likely that by the first half of 1878 at the latest Eberle & Schipek had at least established access to music engraving when needed,\[36\] and in the light of later events it seems probable that it was Eberle who was driving these developments. The evidence suggests that although he saw music printing as a business opportunity worth pursuing, his partners probably did not: after late 1874 Schmelka & Eberle contributed no title pages to the sample publications examined and the firm was wound up ca. 1879, while Johann Schipek left his partnership with Eberle in the first half of 1878.\[37\]

The history of the adoption in Vienna of lithography by transfer from engraved plates as a technique for printing music, and the significance of Eberle’s role in its uptake, deserve further exploration and analysis, though that lies beyond the scope of this essay. In the interim it is worth noting that a decade later, in 1888, it was reported that almost all music printing in Austria was from lithographic stones\[38\] and that the following year Eberle and his contribution to music printing in Austria were the subject of a short article that asserted his significance in revitalizing and expanding the industry.\[39\] Thirteen years after his death Eberle’s colleagues among Viennese lithographic printers recalled that he had been an important innovator in the printing of music in Austro-Hungary, but mistakenly claimed that it was to his credit that “music engraving and music printing” had been introduced into Austria.\[40\] Unfortunately, this astonishing error was repeated in the Austrian dictionary of national biography: “Through the introduction of music engraving and music printing, previously unknown in Vienna, he [Eberle] opened up to Austrian industrial life a new field of activity.”\[41\]

It is clear that Eberle was mindful of the advantages of lithographic processes for larger print runs and in the 1880s he developed a new technique to extend the runs even further: Brennätzverfahren, which involved melting a thin layer of rosin onto lithographic stones. It improved their robustness, removed the need to print on damp paper, and permitted larger print runs (of up to 20,000).\[42\] Eberle patented the process in Austro-Hungary in 1884 and subsequently internationally.\[43\] However, this was challenged by a rival Viennese firm, Emil M. Engel, on the grounds that they had been using a similar process as early as 1881, and on
August 2, 1889, the original patent was declared void by the Austrian Ministry of Trade.\[44]\n
One incentive behind Eberle’s interest in the process may have been his involvement with a growing market for music supplements issued with periodicals, a potentially regular source of income from relatively extended print runs. From late 1879, Eberle assumed responsibility for engraving and printing the supplements to one of the main Viennese music-oriented periodicals, Deutsche Kunst- und Musikzeitung:\[45]\nthis was presumably a valuable contract as the print run was about 10,000 copies every eight \[sic\] days.\[46]\n
The first supplement under his supervision appeared on October 13 (issue 6, no. 36) and the following month Eberle placed his first advert in the journal:
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Figure 1: Eberle advert in Deutsche Kunst- und Musik-Zeitung 6, no. 42 (November 30, 1879): 174; by courtesy of Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ANNO

Clearly, Eberle wished to emphasize that his “Musikalien-Druckerei” provided a comprehensive service, including music engraving, though it was only a year later that his printer’s device on the supplements was updated to bring it in line with his adverts:
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Figure 2: Eberle device in Musik-Beilage zur Deutsche Kunst- und Musik-Zeitung 7, no. 41 (November 16, 1880): 155; by courtesy of Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, ANNO

[4] It is not certain whether even at this date, he was employing engravers himself, or outsourcing the preparation of plates, but eventually the growth of this side of his business in the 1880s must have involved the recruitment of skilled music engravers, and presumably an in-house apprenticeship scheme. It certainly necessitated a further change of address, and at some date in 1883 the firm moved to a new location in the seventh district where it had its own property: \[47\]
This remained the center of the firm’s operations for many years. In the early 1890s, the adjacent property, Seidengasse 5, was acquired and by the end of May 1891 a planning application to add a further story and workshop on both sites was submitted. However, it was not until early in 1894 that the advert was altered to reflect an expansion of the premises on Seidengasse (see figure 4). There are other indicators of the firm’s success: its entry in the *Handelsregister* on January 1, 1881, and the fact that when, in 1888, the Lehmann *Adreßbuch* introduced a new category of business, *Musikalien-Druckerei*, Jos. Eberle & Co. was the only firm so listed and remained so until 1892.

**Publishing**

In the 1880s, having established himself in Vienna as a specialist in the printing of music, Eberle expanded into a new sphere of activity, publishing, with the assistance of two recruits to his staff, Josef Stritzko (1861–1908) and Ferdinand Rebay (1851–1914). They brought significant and relevant professional skills and experience, but despite this influx of expertise, the financial results appear not to have been particularly rewarding.

Stritzko, a young musician with some commercial training, was the brother of Eberle’s wife, Leopoldine (1859–after 1940) and was to play an increasingly significant, though ultimately
destabilizing, role in the management of Jos. Eberle & Co. up to 1907. Born on April 17, 1861, Josef Franz Anton Stritzko was the son of Leopold Stritzko (1823–76), at that time a junior partner, with his brother Josef, in a linen goods business, Jos. Stritzko & Co., in Hoher Markt, Vienna: Josef Franz's early education was intended to prepare him to join the family firm. However, at about the age of six Stritzko taught himself to play the piano and compose simple songs before commencing lessons with Frau Elise Schwarzmann. He was fifteen when his father died, so in order to pursue his musical training Stritzko started giving music lessons himself. He attended the Vienna Conservatoire (1880–81; 1882–83) where he studied piano with Anton Door (1833–1919) and composition with Franz Krenn (1816–97), who recommended a career as an orchestral conductor.

In 1880 Stritzko became the conductor of the Landstraße Sängersclub, but the following year he was called up for his military service in the k.k. Infanterie-Regimentskapelle 4, based first at Cattaro/Gattara, Dalmatia, then Innsbruck, and finally in Vienna where he was able to continue his studies. In 1885, following the end of his military service, he married Franziska Bauer (1862–1944) and joined Josef Eberle & Co. where he was soon a departmental director, presumably of the Musikabteilung. In 1884 Stritzko had resumed the conductorship of his old male-voice choir, renamed the Wiener Männerchor, and gained a reputation as both conductor and composer in this medium: he participated in the fourth Deutsche Sängerbundfest, held in Vienna in 1890, and was elected honorary member of both that organization and the
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Akademischer Gesangverein zu St. Pauli in Leipzig. As a composer, he began publishing in the early 1880s and focused on various popular genres including male-voice choruses and operettas.[54]

Stritzko’s colleague, Ferdinand Rebay (1851–1914) was born in Markow (Galicia), and for eleven years worked as an apprentice and employee of the firm of Buchholtz & Diebel (sellers and publishers of books and music) in Troppau and later also in Vienna, where he ran the Musik-Sortiment. When in 1877 the firm decided to give up the Vienna branch, Rebay, together with another member of staff with long experience in music retail, Florian Stenzl (n.a.), acquired the business,[55] but the partnership did not last long. On September 30, 1879, Stenzl resigned from the firm with immediate effect because of “personal circumstances” and Rebay was joined by a new partner, Adolf Robitschek (1854–1934).[56] They traded under the name “Rebay & Robitschek (Musiksortiment Buchholtz & Diebel)” for some years, and also published a modest number of music titles (many in Commission), before finally, in 1887, dropping the reference to the original owner. In October of the same year, Rebay sold his share of the business to Robitschek,[57] and began his brief association with Jos. Eberle & Co.

Given his existing role as a supplier of music supplements to arts-based periodicals in Vienna, it was perhaps not surprising that Eberle should have been tempted by an opportunity to publish such a journal himself and he acquired the literary and musical supplement to the daily newspaper Die Presse, An der Schönen Blauen Donau.[58] This bi-monthly periodical was first issued on January 15, 1886. The founder and publisher was Dr. Fedor Mamroth (1851–1907), the managing editor J. A. Hennig (n.a.), and the printing was done by the printing works of Die Presse of whose editorial staff Mamroth was a member.[59] However, from the first number of 1888 the ownership, publication, and administration were taken over by Josef Eberle & Co. (then at Seidengasse 7): Mamroth was listed as chief editor, still at the offices of Die Presse, which remained responsible for the letterpress printing.

[5] Throughout 1889, Mamroth continued to be identified as chief editor on the first page of each issue, but the colophon (usually at the end of the last page of letterpress) identifies a managing editor (verantwortlicher Redacteur) and a co-editor. The latter is consistently Dr. Paul Goldmann (?1865–1935), but the more senior post was shared between Mamroth, Josef Stritzko (from issue 4, no. 9), and Ferdinand Rebay (from issue 4, no. 14). These changes were undoubtedly the result of Mamroth’s move to Frankfurt to take up the post of feuilleton editor on the Frankfurter Zeitung. Eberle’s responsibility for the periodical came to an end in December 1890: Zacharias Conrad Lecher (1829–1905) took over as publisher, with Friedrich Eder (n.a.) assuming sole responsibility as editor, and (after the second music supplement of the year, probably engraved before the change in ownership earlier) the image and music origination was for a time transferred to other firms. The last supplement of the year was printed by Stern u. Steiner of Vienna,[60] and it is very likely that they were responsible for some or all of the earlier illustrations and music. The results lack the quality of Eberle’s work (the music is mostly lithographed from writing), which encourages a suspicion that cost-cutting was a major factor in the change of specialist originator. However, in the issue of November 1, 1892, Eberle was again supplying the music supplement, and, with a few exceptions continued to do so until the magazine closed in December 1895. Interestingly, early in 1893 the printing of the magazine was transferred—along with that of the parent publication, Die Presse—to the printing works of the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft, managed by Peter Garbeis (1850–1930),[61] a large-scale commercial business with which Eberle was about to be involved (see below).[62]
The bi-monthly journal was originally aimed at a middle-class audience, describing itself from May 1, 1886, as an *Unterhaltungsblatt für die Familie*. Most of the available space (24 pages) was devoted to new literary works of various types—feuilletons, short stories, poems, short dramas (*Haustheater*), and features, including a regular *Conversationszimmer*—one or two pages of puzzles and brain-teasers, a lithographed portrait of an eminent personality, and some music. Mamroth was both a prolific contributor himself and an astute editor who attracted contributions from new and notable figures, such as Theodor Herzl (1860–1904, contributed 1886–89), Ludwig Hevesi (1842–1910), Arthur Schnitzler (1862–1931, contributed from 1889), and Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1874–1929, contributed 1890–91). In comparison, music played a very limited role in the first two years of the magazine. A few portraits of musicians were included and some of the literary items related to music, but the music supplements were relatively modest in extent and were, at most, two pages long, though sometimes occupying only half a page. Nevertheless, there was some compensation in the content, as they included first editions of works by eminent figures in Viennese musical life, such as Johann Strauss II (1825–99), Anton Bruckner (1824–96), Alfred Grünfeld (1852–1924), and Eduard Kremser (1838–1914).

No doubt, the motivations behind Eberle’s acquisition of *An der Schönen Blauen Donau* were complex, but they were never made explicit. He had been associated with the periodical from the outset as the supplier of most of the portrait lithographs, one of which appeared in each issue. Interestingly, though, the musical supplements for 1886–87 bear no identification of engraver or printer, and only from 1888 do most bear the printer’s mark for Eberle’s *Musikaliendruckerei*. Ownership of the periodical enabled Eberle to ensure a further regular source of work for his music department. Accordingly, he immediately expanded the music supplement to four pages per issue, and the intention to significantly raise the provision of *Hausmusik* in the supplements was clearly signaled in an early newspaper article about the change in ownership. However, it seems probable that the acquisition of the periodical was also linked to Eberle’s plans to establish his own music publishing imprint.

The earliest announcement of this new venture appeared in the autumn of 1887:

> **(Vienna Popular Edition of Musical Classics).** The music printer Jos. Eberle & Co., to which firm Mr. F. Rebay (until recently in the firm of Rebay & Robitschek) belongs, is preparing an undertaking that will arouse justifiable interest in musical circles. First and foremost, Austrian and especially Viennese musical classics—Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, Schubert etc.—will receive, through worthy editions of their works, an enduring monument. The Vienna Popular Edition of Musical Classics will surpass all previous popular editions, the paper, title pages, and music text will be exceptionally fine, the latter especially because of its easy legibility and clarity. For accuracy and superb editing, the best local professors have been engaged and the price will nevertheless not exceed that of foreign popular editions. The first item in this patriotic undertaking will publish the most popular studies—soon to be out of copyright—of Carl Czerny, the most important Viennese piano teacher, in a thorough revision, partly rearranged by Prof. Hans Schmitt of the Vienna Conservatoire. It requires great courage to risk such a project—we wish it the best of success.

This report suggests that Eberle had recognized that although he had been associated with the music publishing industry for over a decade, he lacked any first-hand experience of either publishing or selling music: from this perspective the recruitment of Ferdinand Rebay—who had been a music seller for many years before becoming a music publisher—to work alongside Stritzko, would have seemed an astute move. On the other hand, it is striking that neither the content of the catalogue of Bucholtz & Diebel (of which Rebay had been joint owner) nor Stritzko’s own preferred genres as a composer were reflected in the twenty-five titles of the *Wiener Volkausgabe*, issued between January 1888 and June 1889: these were new editions of
standard pedagogical texts, a systematic edition of the music of one of the leading figures in the first generation of Viennese masters of the waltz, Joseph Lanner, and large-scale editions, with scholarly pretensions, of music by Beethoven and Schubert (the latter by Stritzko himself). This was an ambitious program focused entirely on the “serious” end of the repertoire, eschewing the low-cost popular music that was the bread-and-butter of the Vienna music trade.

At the outset, Eberle used An der Schönen Blauen Donau as a tool in his promotion of the Wiener Volksausgabe, beginning with the first editorial following his takeover of the periodical, which praised the series:

> Through the establishment of a popular edition of the greatest native tone poets, [Jos. Eberle & Co. of Vienna] ... has now given an important new impulse to the musical life of Austria.\[^6\]

This was followed up in the next issue with the inclusion of Lanner’s Galopp L’osage (from the second volume of the Volksausgabe edition of his works) as one of the music supplements and a few weeks later, the first instalment of an unsigned, three-part article entitled Die Hausmusik in den Volksausgaben appeared. This offers a short—but rather well-informed—history of popular (i.e. cheap) music editions in mid-nineteenth century Germany, which, having criticized the Collection Litolff for the poor quality of its printing, identifies the crucial moment in the development of such publications:

> Then Peters Edition appeared on the map. The publisher had quickly perceived how a popular edition must exercise its greatest appeal, and devoted particular effort on the accuracy of both the external appearance and the inside, the engraving.\[^6\]

[6] This opening instalment continues by admitting that in Austria there was no publishing firm able to compete with Leipzig in quality of engraving and presentation, or price. Two weeks later the continuation was concerned mainly with an extended account of the Wiener Volksausgabe and how it sought to fill the gap in the Austrian music business. The final instalment emphasized aspects of the edition’s engraving and ended by stressing the patriotic Austrian nature of the undertaking in its repatriation of the monarchy’s greatest composers.

This willingness to deprecate a sector of the Austrian economy—music publishing—that provided a substantial amount of business to Jos. Eberle & Co. is notable, and the strategy was carried even further in a two-part report, signed by “Hans Sachs,” on music exhibits at the 1888 Niederösterreichische Jubiläums-Gewerbe-Ausstellung.\[^7\] This event, to mark the fortieth anniversary of Franz Joseph’s accession to the throne, should have offered a welcome opportunity for the promotion of businesses based in lower Austria. But the reviewer pointed out that only six publishers from the region exhibited, singling out some of the major firms that were absent—G. Lewy, A.J. Gutmann, Wetzler, Rebay & Robitschek, and Doblinger—for adverse comment. Of those that did offer displays, he considered the most impressive to be the younger firms: Edmund Weidl (Wiener-Neustadt), F. Rörich (Vienna),\[^7\] and the Wiener Volksausgabe.

It was not only An der Schönen Blauen Donau that provided plaudits for the enterprise: other local press notices of the publications were generally favorable,\[^7\] including a warm welcome for the Lanner collected edition from Eduard Hanslick in the Neue Freie Presse.\[^7\] Whether Eberle’s team had any success in promoting the edition in Germany and England—both target markets to judge from the references to the Vereins-Archiv and Stationers’ Hall on the title pages (see figure
it is not clear, but all the other evidence suggests the project was a failure. No new volumes were announced after June 1889, despite the fact that the *Hausmusik* article had indicated that volumes devoted to Haydn, Mozart, Mendelssohn, and others would follow quickly. It is also notable that very few copies of the Czerny, Cramer, Beethoven, and Schubert volumes survive in collections internationally, presumably reflecting very low sales figures. As sole owner of the business, Eberle seems to have acted quickly to minimize his losses. In November 1889 Breitkopf & Härtel announced the Lanner edition in the Hofmeister *Monatsbericht* and the Schubert volumes were also licensed or sold to the firm, while the Beethoven edition appeared in London under the Augener imprint; by the end of 1890 Eberle had also sold *An der Schönen Blauen Donau*.

Although at first sight, the choice of works by two central figures of the Viennese tradition and widely used pedagogic works by Czerny and J.B. Cramer can be seen as seeking to tap into well-established markets, this turned out to be a wholly over-ambitious strategy. Beethoven and Schubert were already staple sources of income for the European music trade in serious music and there was an abundance of editions of their most popular works by some large and active publishers, especially in Germany. It would have taken a costly and imaginative campaign for a small, new concern in Vienna to break the dominance of the big, established publishers in this repertoire. That no such obstacle was the case with the piano studies by Czerny and Cramer reflected their copyright status: in Germany their works were still covered by the *post mortem auctoris* protection established in Prussia in 1837 (ten years), extended to thirty years in 1845 and adopted by the German Reich in 1871. The listings in the Hofmeister *Monatsbericht* suggest that this protection was generally observed in both Germany and Austria, so it is hardly surprising that Eberle’s German competitors had also noticed that both composers—who died in 1857 and 1858 respectively—would lose such protection in 1887 and in January 1888. The result was that the market was somewhat overprovided with new editions of these titles. \(^{[74]}\)

The only exception to this pattern was Kremser’s “Gesamtausgabe” of Joseph Lanner’s music,\(^{[75]}\) which extended to 14 volumes: while some of Lanner’s music had appeared in new German editions, none matched the Eberle series in scope.
Apart from the choice of repertoire, marketing and distribution were probably also problematic: Eberle seems not to have had well-established or extensive international connections with music sellers, and it is probably symptomatic of his inexperience that apart from the listings along with other new music titles in Oesterreichisch-ungarische Buchhändler-Correspondenz (OUBC), the Austrian trade journal for music dealers, there appears to have been no advertising strategy for
the series. Perhaps it was in part a result of this low-key approach to marketing that the only review of any part of the Volksausgabe in *Die Lyra*, a Viennese specialist music periodical, concerned the Breitkopf & Härtel reissue of the Lanner edition:

Josef Lanner’s Waltzes, new complete edition, edited from the original manuscripts and first editions by Ed. Kremser, published: Breitkopf and Härtel [sic]. With this valuable and beautiful new edition of the waltz compositions that are so characteristic of Viennese musical history, the excellent and restlessly active publisher does a particular service to German music literature, and especially to that of Vienna and Austria. The first volume contains, along with an introductory sketch by H. Sachs with its appealing portrait of Lanner, 175 pages containing 30 of the once-popular dances of the Viennese master, which in the new arrangement by Ed. Kremser deserves the fullest appreciation of our demanding generation. May this new edition of Lanner’s waltzes, put in motion with such diligence, accuracy and expenditure—the presentation is of very high quality—find the widest dissemination, particularly in Austria! D.L.\(^76\)

This review, which makes no mention of the earlier Wiener Volksausgabe issue, clearly goaded Eberle into a response, not least, one imagines, because he was still supplying the music supplements to *Die Lyra*. The next issue of the journal rather grudgingly acknowledged that initially the Lanner edition had been a local, Viennese project, founded by Eberle:

A propos the new complete edition of Josef Lanner’s waltzes, whose first instalment we recently had an opportunity to discuss in the “Lyra,” it should also be noted that this undertaking owes its inception and realization to entirely indigenous efforts, namely those of the firm Eberle & Co., lithographic, book and music-printers in Seidengasse, VII. Vienna, which with considerable effort completed this edition and then passed it on to the Leipzig publisher Breitkopf & Härtel.\(^76\)

Eberle could at least take comfort from the fact that the original review had unwittingly heaped praise of the quality of his edition and its printing, but that a Viennese, music-orientated periodical should have been completely ignorant of the original edition and his role in its realization must have confirmed what he probably already knew: that whatever the value, usefulness and quality of his editions had been, his marketing strategy was seriously flawed.

[7] In one other respect Eberle seems to have miscalculated, that of cost: despite the assurance in the initial announcement that volumes would not exceed in price those of foreign popular editions, some volumes of the Wiener Volksausgabe were more expensive than comparable publications by significant competitors. In 1869, Edition Peters offered a complete edition of the Beethoven piano sonatas for 1 Reichsthaler (= 3 Marks after 1871), but Eberle’s edition retailed at 9 Marks. A more direct comparison can be made between the cost of some of the Czerny Editions issued in Germany and Vienna in 1888–89 (see table 1).

**Table 1: All prices are in Marks. From Hofmeister, *Monatsbericht*, passim**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eberle</th>
<th>Breitkopf &amp; Härtel</th>
<th>Störräuber</th>
<th>Ed. Peters</th>
<th>Ed. Peters (Bischoff &amp; Köhler)</th>
<th>Litoff</th>
<th>Simrock</th>
<th>Peterson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czerny, op. 139</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czerny, op. 299</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czerny, op. 740 vol. 1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czerny, op. 740 vol. 2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czerny, op. 740 (Complete)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite what looks like a major setback in the publishing world, in the 1890s Eberle was discretely involved in another expensive and potentially hazardous venture: a plan to publish monumental and controversial works by Anton Bruckner. The composer’s reputation was growing, and Jos. Eberle & Co. had already engraved and printed a number of his works for other publishers (see table 2).

**Table 2: Works by Bruckner engraved and printed by Eberle for Viennese publishers, 1880–91**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAB</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Composition</th>
<th>Date of Publication</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Symphony No. 3</td>
<td>1872–78</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>piano duet score</td>
<td>Adolph Bösendorfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Bussjäger &amp; Rättig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><em>Te Deum</em></td>
<td>1881–84</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>study score, orchestral parts,</td>
<td>Theodor Rättig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vocal score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Vier Graduale</em></td>
<td>May 1884 – August 1869</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>score and parts</td>
<td>Theodor Rättig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>score and parts</td>
<td>Theodor Rättig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td><em>Träumen und Wachen</em></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief source of information about the negotiations in 1892 between Bruckner and Jos. Eberle & Co. is the Göllerich-Auer biography of the composer, and although no sources are cited, the content of the anecdotes suggest strongly that the narrative was founded, at least in part, on details provided by Josef Stritzko, who led the discussions:

After the great success of recent years Bruckner’s reputation as a composer, even in Vienna, was so secure, that a local company, the printing establishment Josef Eberle & Co. (which later turned into Universal-Edition A.G. [not quite correct, see below]) announced its interest in printing the Master’s as yet unpublished works.

The negotiations with the publisher Josef Eberle were led by the latter’s Director of Publication and son-in-law, Josef Stritzko, who had been a student of Bruckner at the Conservatoire and who subsequently made a name for himself as a composer of operettas and choruses.

At the outset, major industrialists were to be persuaded to cover the printing costs, but they all withdrew. So Eberle resolved to print the works at his own cost—which amounted to 36,000 Gulden. When Stritzko reported this to the Master, he was overjoyed.

Initially Bruckner had the intention of having the First Symphony, dedicated to the University, printed. He received an estimate (dated July 1) from the firm, in which 100 scores were costed at 693.55 Gulden and 100 part sets at 717.12 Gulden, a total of 1410.67 Gulden. After further progress in the negotiations the following contract resulted on July 14: ...

The contract Jos. Eberle & Co. offered was generous and provided the composer with a modest income from his works for the rest of his life. Its main provisions were:

- That Jos. Eberle & Co. acquired exclusive publishing rights to the First, Second, Fifth and Sixth Symphonies, the E minor and F minor masses, Psalm 150 and some male voice chorus, as well as options on other works.

- The firm would complete the printing of the score and parts and a two- or four-hand piano arrangement within a year of the submission of a complete work.

- Once the production costs of a work had been recovered, Bruckner (and his estate, for 8 years following his death) would receive 25% of the gross income.

- Following his death, the firm would have the right to terminate the obligation for continuing
payment of the 25% share in profits on payment of a single payment of fl. 5,000 to the estate.

- During his lifetime the firm would pay Bruckner an annual sum of fl. 300 or, if it was greater, his share in the gross income from the contracted works.

Who at Jos. Eberle & Co. initiated the idea of printing Bruckner’s works is unclear, but Göllerich’s narrative indicates that it was Eberle himself who eventually made the decision to subsidize the venture. The motivation may have been partly philanthropic, but it is notable (especially in comparison with Eberle’s later activity as a publisher, see below) that by choosing to promote Bruckner in this way, Eberle was maintaining the Wiener Volksausgabe focus on serious, specifically Austrian/Viennese repertoire. Moreover, it is possible to discern a likely business motivation. In the 1880s, relatively few full scores of large-scale works were published in Vienna, and when they were, the engraving and printing was normally undertaken by German firms such as C.F. Röder, Breitkopf & Härtel or F.W. Garbrecht, the inference being either that no Austrian printer was capable of undertaking the origination of graphically complex music, or that their prices were uncompetitive. The publication by Bussjäger & Rättig of the 1877/78 version of Bruckner’s Third Symphony in 1879–80 may be seen as encapsulating such attitudes: the full score and parts were engraved and printed by Engelmann & Mühlberg in Leipzig, but the piano duet arrangement by Gustav Mahler and Rudolf Krzyzanowski was supplied by Jos. Eberle & Co. Although a much longer work than the firm normally printed at this date, the format—a piano duet—was familiar from their engraving and printing for the popular end of the Viennese market. However, it is clear that Eberle aspired to challenge the hegemony of Leipzig printing firms, and the successful preparation of complex, modern full scores by Bruckner would establish his firm’s competence in this field, while also functioning as promotional tools for the Musikaliendruckerei as a whole.

If in some respects this new venture can be seen as continuing aspects of Eberle’s publishing strategy in the late 1880s, there is some evidence that the earlier experience provided an important lesson: responsibility for the promotion and distribution of the Bruckner volumes was outsourced to one of Eberle’s regular clients, Doblinger. The exact nature of their business arrangement is unclear, and Doblinger has no documents that shed light on the matter. The works were assigned Doblinger plate numbers and listed in the firm’s Verlags-Bücher, but (presumably because of the exceptional publishing arrangements) no details of the print runs were recorded. On the other hand, Göllerich’s narrative does give an insight into one aspect of the music trade that is not normally easy to ascertain: publishers’ mark-ups. The work that provides the evidence is Bruckner’s First Symphony (first published in the autumn of 1893).

Table 3: Derived from Göllerich, Anton Bruckner, 4/3:258

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Unit Cost to Bruckner (fl.)</th>
<th>Unit Retail Price (fl.)</th>
<th>Mark-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full score</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>18 fl.</td>
<td>260%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part set</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>18 fl.</td>
<td>251%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures need to be treated with some caution because the printing costs reported by Göllerich apparently pre-dated the contract with Bruckner, and therefore will probably have been based on the standard commercial tariffs for engraving and printing, rather than the net costs to Eberle. Nevertheless, it is striking that the profit margins were relatively low, since the publisher would normally offer music sellers a substantial discount (20% or more) on the retail price. It is also notable that although the parts were available for sale the performance rights were not
reserved. The legal framework for performance royalties on public performances of concert works in copyright was not yet in place in Austria or Germany and presumably neither Eberle nor Bruckner saw performance fees as a significant income stream (they are not mentioned in the contract). Even after 1897, when the necessary legal framework was established in Austria, Eberle did not join the newly formed collecting society, the Gesellschaft der Autoren, Komponisten und Musikverleger (AKM). In October 1898 he went further, and stated publicly that he was going to directly challenge performance fees by reaching agreements with composers and members of the Vereine der Etablissementsbesitzer (representing owners and managers of venues that offered live music) to supply fee-free repertoire, and soon afterwards the first press advertisement of such items appeared.

[8] That Eberle’s role in the publication of some of Bruckner’s music is known about at all is largely due to the fact that the composer’s life has been so assiduously researched: it was not made public at the time, and the printed copies all identified Doblinger as the publisher. So, there is a possibility that in the 1890s Eberle was discreetly acquiring other as yet unidentified works and issuing them through Doblinger or other publishers. In any case, it appears that at least one composer believed Eberle was continuing activity in this area of the music business. By September 1895 Hugo Wolf was preparing his opera Der Corrigidor for performance and wanted to have the vocal score printed or preferably published “In Commission,” so wrote to his friend and admirer, Richard Hirsch, asking him to open negotiations with Eberle about this project and also the possibility of his publishing some of Wolf’s songs. If such discussions with Eberle were begun, they were fruitless, and the vocal score was eventually published “In Commission” by K.F. Heckel of Mannheim in the spring of 1896. However, by the late summer of that year Wolf was seeking estimates of the cost of engraving and printing a hundred copies of the full score of the opera from C.F. Röder in Leipzig, the Lithographische Anstalt Sternfelder in Graz, and Jos. Eberle & Co. In this instance Eberle submitted a competitive quotation of fl. 1,422.39 that included the title page and finishing, while Röder’s quote of Mk. 2,415 (approx. fl. 1,449) did not include such extras, and, as Wolf realized, a contract with either Röder or Sternfelder (who had supplied the lowest quote) would have entailed significant additional delivery charges. On the basis of these figures, he decided to discuss an agreement with Eberle and was planning to visit the firm on October 29. In the event, for reasons that are apparently not recorded, these plans came to nothing.

The Corporate Phase

By the early 1890s, Eberle had enough status within the Viennese print trade that in 1894 he was elected to one of the representative bodies:
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By the early 1890s, Eberle had enough status within the Viennese print trade that in 1894 he was elected to one of the representative bodies:

The Committee of Stone and Copperplate Printers of Vienna. As already reported on the 11 instant the Committee of Lithographic and Copperplate Printers of Vienna held a well-attended Extraordinary General Meeting at which Mr. Josef Eberle, sole owner of the famous Jos. Eberle & Co., was elected by acclamation to the post of chairman. Mr. Eberle said he would gratefully accept the election only in consideration for the great majority [thirty-eight to eleven votes], but declined the usual remuneration for this honorary post in favor of the committee. He assured the audience it would be his “most earnest desire to defend vigorously in every way internally and externally the true interests of our art and the prestige and dignity of the committee.”

Eberle had been active in the committee for some years and he retained the post of chairman
until his death. From 1905 to 1908 he was also the senior representative of the Verein österreichischer Steindruckereibesitzer.\[88\] The professional status that accrued through his work for the committee, his evident business success and his technical knowledge were presumably some of the factors that lay behind an important invitation. In 1892, a joint stock company was established to print and publish one of the more successful Viennese daily papers and Eberle was invited onto the board of the firm, the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft (hereafter EWZG).\[89\] The new company had acquired not only the title *Illustirtes Wiener Extrablatt* but also the newspaper’s printing works and associated equipment at Berggasse 31.\[90\] It had, therefore, no need of additional printing capacity for its core business and in any case, Eberle, by then based at Seidengasse 5–7, had no experience in printing newspapers and relatively modest involvement in periodicals.

Whatever the reason for his appointment as a member of the board of directors, by late 1894 Eberle had agreed that his firm and its printing works would be acquired by EWZG:\[91\] the price—fl. 300,000 and 2,700 shares in the parent company (worth ca. fl. 270,000 and generating dividends of about 6% per annum)\[92\]—confirms that his was a flourishing business. From the summer of 1895, its official trading name was the Stein-, Buch-, Kunst- und Musikaliendruckerei Josef Eberle & Co.,\[93\] and the adjoining property at Seidengasse 3 was to be acquired to permit rebuilding.\[94\] All of this indicates an intention to expand capacity and to acquire expertise in specialist printing techniques and publishing, a process that was carried further in 1895 when the “artistische Anstalt, Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt R. v. Waldheim” and its premises at Taborstrasse 52 were acquired by EWZG. During the next five years, the two additional businesses, having been run initially as separate departments, were gradually merged on the Seidengasse site and the Taborstrasse property eventually sold in 1898.\[95\] The brand names survived, with “Josef Eberle and Co.” being used to advertise the music printing business, while nevertheless alluding in later years to its relationship with the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft. However, the integration of the two management teams did not go smoothly. The first public indications of change emerged in January 1897 when Alois Lauterböck was approved as the director responsible for the EWZG “Vereinsdruckerei,”\[96\] an appointment that at best would appear to have overlapped with Eberle’s area of responsibility; shortly afterward Peter Garbeis was replaced by Emanuel Wilhelm as head of the printing works at Berggasse 31.\[97\] A rather different indication of possible tensions came in March with the news that Emil Schwabe, who had been head of the lithographic department in the Waldheim business, went missing, and was presumed to have committed suicide. Schwabe had been with the firm for thirty-six years: overwork and other work-related problems were identified as contributory factors.\[98\]

The 1897 EWZG Annual General Meeting, held on April 30, was chiefly concerned with the generally positive outcome for the previous financial year, but in order to further the process of integrating the Waldheim and Eberle businesses, a revision in company statutes was proposed and accepted.\[99\] Major administrative changes soon followed: on July 12 Eberle had been replaced by Franz Hardtmuth as authorized signatory for the Eberle operation, and both Ludwig Berger and Josef Stritzko had been registered as signatories for the company.\[100\] The move to oust Eberle from his managerial responsibilities was soon successful, and from September 16 Ludwig Berger replaced him as manager responsible for Jos. Eberle & Co.\[101\] But this seems to have been only the first stage in a process to remove him from the board of the parent company, and the resulting dispute became acrimonious enough for it to find its way into the pages of the *Neue Freie Presse* on January 13, 1898:
At the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft held yesterday in the presence of the state commissioner, departmental councilor F. Nagy de [sic] Somlyo, the members of the same—namely the chairman, Baron Othon Bourgoing, vice-chairman, C. August Artaria, Joseph Binder, Dr. Heinrich Glogau, Franz Hardtmuth, Rudolf Freiherr v. Isbany and Stanislaus v. Kozmian—unanimously took the decision to convene an extraordinary general meeting on January 27. The only matter on the agenda would be "Proposal for the revocation of the appointment of Mr. Joseph [sic] Eberle as a member of the Board of Directors on the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft within the meaning of Article 227, line 3 of the H.G.B. [Handelsgerichtsbook]." Mr. Joseph Eberle, who was invited onto the Board of Directors by the founding general meeting in 1892, had on November 24, 1894, sold his book, art and music printing business in Seidengasse to the company by contract. In this contract, Mr. Joseph Eberle—who guaranteed a 10% return for 5 years—was appointed managing director of this department for the duration of ten years.

Already during the first two years of his management disagreements over Mr. Joseph Eberle's obligatory guarantee arose, relating to the identification of the necessary depreciation while at the same time he endeavored to push the company into continual expansion. Following, on the one hand, the demonstration of the necessary profitability of the department through maintenance of efficient financial management, and on the other, the recognition that the intervening acquisition of the Waldheim business meant that a unification of the print works under a common management was in the company interest, the previous year's AGM had decided, in agreement with Mr. Joseph Eberle, that the latter should be released from his obligation to provide any further guarantee. Therefore, on June 2 last year, a new agreement with Mr. Joseph Eberle came into existence, under which he stepped down from the management of the department in Seidengasse, but remained on the Board of Directors, and in consideration for annual settlement payments up to the year 1904 undertook on his signature and on his honor "not to create any similar sort of business whatsoever, nor to participate in any such in any way."

Shortly after the departure of Mr. Joseph Eberle unrest among the workforce in the Seidengasse department became noticeable, which was apparently influenced by Mr. Joseph Eberle, and in November of last year, under similar circumstances, several members of the workforce departed simultaneously and soon after were all found employed in a lithographic business, for the purchase of which, certain evidence suggested, the necessary capital had been provided by Mr. Joseph Eberle. These events compelled the Executive Committee of the Board, entrusted with supervision, to report to the board, and this, which was read by the vice-chairman of the company and the chair of the committee, Mr. C. August Artaria at the meeting of November 6 last year, culminated in the motions, "The Board of Directors wishes to express its deep regret that a member sits in its midst who threatened the interests of the company in such an unprecedented way," and subsequently "The Board of Directors declared that in the interest of maintaining calm in the workforce, the entry of Mr. Joseph Eberle into the Seidengasse building will not be permitted." Mr. Joseph Eberle felt his honor wounded by these motions—which were turned into resolutions—and initiated slander proceedings against Mr. C. August Artaria, about which the hearing took place on December 30 last year at the Alsergrund district court. At this Mr. C. August Artaria was acquitted and the costs awarded against Mr. Joseph Eberle.

In the judgement it is stated "that all the events, of which the board gained knowledge from the vice-president, must have aroused in him the well-founded conviction, that the accuser (Mr. Josef Eberle) indeed had broken his word that he would not in any way enter into competition with the company, and that he it was who had the threads of the whole agitation amongst the workers in his hands. On the basis of this, in the court's opinion well-founded view about the complainant held by the accused, it was within his rights as vice president of the company that in regard for the maintenance of peace among the numerous workforce Mr. Joseph Eberle could not be allowed access to the institution he had previously run, and that his mistrust was expressed." Given this explanation of the judgement, the Board of Directors of the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft, in the performance of the responsibilities entrusted to it, yesterday communicated the decision to call an extraordinary general meeting. Thanks to the energetic precautions of the board, the commercial performance of the company has remained completely undisturbed by the circumstances described above, and in particular the integrated management of the Seidengasse department and the Waldheim enterprise has proved to be particularly expedient. Overall, over the last year the commercial results in all the company's undertakings were in accordance with predictions, so that even in case of larger reserves, the final result of the previous year appears
This EWZG statement is necessarily self-justificatory, but nevertheless confirms aspects of the initial negotiations between Eberle and EWZG, not least the matter of the profit guarantee accepted by Eberle. One can only speculate on the motivations of both the parties to the contract: presumably Eberle, while happy to accept the cash and shares offered, was reluctant to relinquish management of the firm he had built up over two decades, while some of the EWZG board may have had doubts about his management skills and wished to ensure that the new acquisition made a significant contribution to the annual income of the firm as a whole. Nevertheless, as the statement admits, the Eberle business more than met its targets in the two financial years after the acquisition, and in fact it contributed fl. 77,795 in 1895 and fl. 74,476 in 1896, i.e. 44% and 42% of the consortium’s total income in those years. In this context, the EWZG complaint that Eberle “endeavored to push the company into continual expansion” is a curious one, especially since a policy of expansion motivated—at least in part—the acquisition of the Eberle and Waldheim businesses in the 1890s, and was continued (not always successfully) after 1898.

The claim that Eberle had surreptitiously funded a new printing venture was serious—not least because his existing official printing concession had been transferred to EWZG in August 1895—and this assertion was not challenged in his lawyer’s reply that appeared in Neue Freie Presse the next day:

I allow myself, on behalf of Mr. Joseph Eberle, to take the liberty of requesting the favor of the inclusion of the following reply. Above all, it is not correct, that the differences that have developed between Mr. Joseph Eberle and the Board of Directors over the guarantee liability have arisen in relation to the recognition of necessary depreciation and from his desire to continue to expand the corporate business. However, differences have arisen, but only because some members of the Board of Directors opposed Mr. Eberle, founder and director of the company, and supported measures for change, in which he perceived severe damage to the company. Also, these same gentlemen—after Mr. Eberle had been displaced by them from the management of the company, but who as a member of the Board of Directors worked responsibly towards a rational management, to which he was all the more inclined since he had a holding of more than 2,000 shares—made an attempt to also compromise his place as a board member, attacked his honor, and the presentation by Mr. C.A. Artaria mentioned in today’s article also served the same purpose; to which Mr. Eberle could do nothing other than respond with the lawsuit for slander. It is certainly true that Mr. Artaria was acquitted, but this was because for procedural reasons the judge refused to allow the presentation of the evidence sought by Mr. Eberle to establish the objective falsity of the allegations made against his person. Mr. Eberle has not only now registered the appeal and plea of nullity against the district court judgment but has also delivered a protest and complaint against all unlawful resolutions of the administrative council of November 6, 1897, to the Ministry of the Interior, and furthermore, will raise the procedure of the Board of Directors at the scheduled Extraordinary General Meeting. Until then we will refrain from further discussion relating to the case.

Although the tone is firmly combative, there are few specific rebuttals, and within four days Eberle had resigned from the board and the matter had been settled:

Since Mr. Joseph Eberle voluntarily resigned from his position as a member of the administrative council and also the reciprocal legal actions were withdrawn by mutual agreement, the reason for the Extraordinary General Meeting called for the 27th of this month has lapsed and therefore, at same time, the Board of Directors of the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft declares, that its action against Mr. Joseph Eberle related exclusively to the exercise of its statutory supervisory duty and that it by no means had any intention of encroaching on the personal integrity of Mr. Joseph Eberle.
New Beginnings

The EWZG claim that even before his resignation Eberle was preparing for the establishment of a new business is lent considerable support by the speed with which, following the resolution of the dispute, he was able to complete some of the necessary formal procedures: on March 1, 1898, he was granted a concession to set up as a book and lithographic printer at VII. Schottenfeldgasse 38, by mid-April he had applied for permission to extend the building at Schottenfeldgasse[106] and in August the business was added to the Register für Einzelfirmen.[107] So, for a number of years there were two quite separate specialist printing businesses operating in Vienna, both founded by the same entrepreneur and trading under rather similar names.

The establishment of Eberle’s new printing company must have required considerable capital expenditure in terms of equipment, and, while the recruitment of printers would not have been too problematic, finding suitably experienced music engravers would have been more difficult. Perhaps, as the EWZG management feared, he was able to lure away some of their team, but another factor was the extent to which Eberle was able to draw on the skills and support of family members when establishing the new firm. Emanuel Eberle (n.a.) had been working as a lithographer in Vienna since at least as early as 1896 and seems to have joined his uncle, Josef, as technical director of the new firm from the start and may have taken skilled employees with him. Hans Eberle (d. ca. 1936) apparently joined a little later as head of the music department: his address, presumably his home, was at VII. Zieglergasse 34, a three-minute walk from the Eberle premises.[108]

However, Eberle must have missed the expertise, musical skills, and contacts of his two most senior colleagues in the Musikabteilung of his old firm, the director, Josef Stritzko and the editor, Josef Venantius von Wöss (1863–1943), both of whom remained with EWZG at Seidengasse. Under their direction Jos. Eberle & Co. had developed a house style that was visually pleasing and generally well-laid out. Although the small-scale publications issued by Eberle’s new firm at this time are competently engraved, the full scores suggest that the skills base (and perhaps the stock of engraving tools) was constrained. The full score of Schreker’s Schwanensang, op. 11, published in 1903, for example, suffers grievously from a congested layout, with clefs overlapping in the chorus and wind staves, because of lack of space: it appears that the punch set used is too large for a work calling for such large forces to be engraved on the size of plate selected. In any case, having assembled his core workforce, the next challenge for Eberle was to win market share in fields in which other firms had well-established positions, and which in some cases were becoming more crowded: in 1889, Jos. Eberle & Co. was the only Viennese firm specializing in music engraving and printing, but by 1899/1900 Carl Anfried and EWZG were competitors that Eberle had to confront.[109]

Whatever the organizational and financial challenges, by October 1898 Eberle was able to advertise a small batch of publications in the local trade newspaper, the OUBC, which, despite its brevity, gives an indication of one of the markets that Eberle was to cultivate with some vigor: Unterhaltungs-Musik (entertainment music).[110] In fact, it seems likely that the firm’s initial output of publications was rather larger than the published listing implies. The solo piano version of J.F. Wagner’s op. 332 has the plate number 1, Louis Roth’s Reclame-Walzer for piano is plate number 29 and Schams’s Das Erste Lied has the plate number 61. A year later Eberle was able to make serious statements of intent, not only submitting entries to Hofmeister in Leipzig for the first time since 1889, but in November also sending two long lists to OUBC: 121 piano pieces and eighty vocal works.[111] Other methods of raising brand awareness were tried: on November 20, the Band
of the 71st Infantry Regiment gave a concert in the Prachtsaal of the Hotel Bairischer Hof, consisting entirely of works available from Eberle and in the following year he teamed up with the _Neues Wiener Journal_ to issue a “Muskalienschatz des ‘Neuen Wiener Journal’” that could be purchased from newspaper sellers on January 9. Admittedly, the majority of works published by Eberle were small-scale publications—most cost under 1 Krone—but they represented a substantial investment and suggest that he had successfully built up a core production team. Over time, the quality of work was such that the business expanded, and Durstmüller reports that by 1907 the company had ninety-one employees and 120 by 1914, making it one of the larger privately owned printing concerns in the Dual Monarchy.

[10] It is noticeable that in later years, alongside the part sets and piano arrangements of popular music, zither music and Schrammel-Quartet arrangements also figure prominently in the lists Eberle sent to the Viennese trade press. But concert and chamber music was not entirely absent from his catalogue and in December 1903 he included Franz Schreker’s _Schwanengesang_ op. 11, for chorus and orchestra (full score), and his Symphonic Overture _Ekkehard_ op. 12 (score, parts, and piano duet arrangement), along with Franz Schmidt’s First Symphony. There are no strong patterns to Eberle’s listings and at the moment it is not possible to correlate them with his total publishing activity: they probably (but by no means certainly) represent only a part of his total catalogue. Nonetheless, it is striking that following a substantial announcement in 1906, there were none in 1907.
Alongside his renewed activity as a printer and publisher of music, Eberle re-entered another market that he had previously dominated in Vienna—the production of manuscript paper. The exact date that he originally started manufacturing this specialist stationery is not quite certain, but adverts dating from the turn of the century (see below, figure 9) suggest it was ca. 1883/84. One of the distinctive features was a registered trademark.
By 1889, the text on the shield had been simplified and placed on a bend sinister. The device seems to have ensured a degree of brand recognition and for Hugo Wolf was a guarantee of quality, to the extent that he complained when paper dealers supplied manuscript paper without Eberle’s trademark. On the other hand, he recommended the lower of the two grades of paper supplied by Eberle, since it was cheaper and very useable.\textsuperscript{[118]}

When Eberle began producing manuscript paper at Schottenfeldgasse, he seems to have quite deliberately set out to challenge the market leader, his old firm, Jos. Eberle & Co. The course of the paper war that followed may be traced in the advertisement pages of the Viennese music journal,\textit{Die Lyra}.\textsuperscript{[119]} Jos. Eberle & Co. advertised sporadically and without challenge in its pages from 1882 (if not earlier) until 1900, when a second advert, placed by Eberle himself, sought to trump his old firm’s claims.
Fortunately both adverts include the firms’ respective trademarks, and it is notable that Eberle also seems to have intentionally created the potential for confusion by retaining elements from the original registered trademark for Jos. Eberle & Co. in his own new design: the bend sinister with the same initials, and the lion (though it is now couchant rather than salient):

For musicologists working on manuscript sources these may be important and useful distinctions since paper with maker’s mark (a) dates from 1883/84 to ca. 1887/88, mark (b) from ca. 1887/88 onwards, and mark (c) can only appear on paper manufactured after ca. 1899 by Josef Eberle’s Musikaliendruckerei.

The response from the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft was to simply insert a second advertisement for their music printing business on the following page (see figure 11).
In the following issue, it was Josef Eberle who paid for a second advert:

This pattern of the companies taking it in turns to pay for a second advert continued for some time, though Eberle eventually invested in a more striking—and more contemporary—design:
With a growing catalogue and stocks of manuscript paper, it was natural that Eberle decided sooner rather than later to sell his products directly as well as through existing music dealers, and towards the end of 1899 Eberle was granted a concession to trade as a music dealer at the Schottenfeldgasse address. However, his ambitions extended further and in 1903 he bought the business of Jungmann & Lerch which had a much more central location, at Augustinerstrasse 8. An additional attraction in this acquisition was that the firm could trace its history back to C.A. Spina (for whom, it will be recalled, Eberle had been a supplier in the 1870s) founded in 1852, and through him directly to Diabelli & Cappi (founded in 1818). Interestingly, though, it was the historical link to Spina that Eberle chose to use in his advertising (see figure 14) and his title page imprint, reflecting not just the fact that the later firm was a more recent local memory, but also, perhaps, his own connections with it.
Wien, im Juni 1903.

P. T.

Mit Gegenwärtigem beehre ich mich, Ihnen die Mitteilung zu machen, daß meine unter der Firma:

Albert Jungmann & C. Lerch
vorm. C. A. SPINA
Wien, I., Augustinerstraße Nr. 8
betriebene Musik-Verlags- und Sortiments
handlung mit allen Aktiven durch Kauf an die Verlagsfirma:

Josef Eberle, Wien
übergegangen ist.

Für das mir bewiesene Vertrauen sage ich hiermit freundlichen Dank und bitte Sie, das selbe der Firma auch fernerhin bewahren zu wollen.

Clemens Lerch.

Wien, im Juni 1903.

P. T.

Unter höflicher Bezugnahme auf die oben stehende Mitteilung beehre ich mich, Ihnen anzuzeigen, daß ich die Firma:

Albert Jungmann & C. Lerch
Musik-Verlags- u. Sortimentshandlung
Wien, I., Augustinerstraße Nr. 8
mit allen Aktiven künstlich übernommen habe und mit meinem eigenen Verlage vereint unter der protokollierten Firma

Josef Eberle's Musikalienhandlung
weiterführen werde.

Sämtliche Außenstände ersuche ich auf mein Konto zu übertragen und deren Begleichung an mich erfolgen zu lassen.

Die Firma Fr. Kistner in Leipzig hatte die Freundlichkeit, meine Vertretung und die Auslieferung meines gesamten Verlages zu übernehmen.

Mit der Bitte um Ihr Wohlbwollen zeichne ich hochachtungsvoll

Josef Eberle.
The extent that Eberle involved himself in the retail side of his business is unknown, but his training and subsequent commercial experience lay in other areas. Moreover, although music selling was potentially profitable, it was a relatively volatile sector in the Viennese economy in the early years of the twentieth century as is evidenced by the relatively numerous changes in ownership of music shops recorded in the pages of the OUBC, as well as the consistently glum annual reports (based on the annual reports of the Handels- und Gewerbekammer to the Handelsministerium) it printed: even popular music and operetta were failing to attract the desired consumer interest.

Perhaps Eberle’s lack of retail experience may help to explain why his proprietorship was relatively short lived—on December 6, 1907, his business in Augustinerstrasse was removed from the Handelsregister—but another factor may have been the competition. Vienna was well provided with specialist music sellers in 1907–8: at least thirty in the first district and thirty-five in the immediately adjacent central districts (II–IX, XX).[122] Although at this later date the music trade in Vienna was generally looking up, thanks to a sudden resurgence of the Viennese operetta as a vibrant and audience-pleasing genre, Eberle seems to have owned the copyright of no significant success, so may have benefitted relatively little. Fortunately, he was able to find a new firm willing and able to take over the retail premises: Nickau & Welleminsky, established as a registered business on April 15, 1907, by Alfred Gustav Nickau (d. August 21, 1910) and Ignaz Michael Welleminsky (1882–1942).[124] Presumably they took over the existing stock, as Eberle is not listed thereafter as a music seller in Lehmann’s Adressbuch, and it is notable that in the Haydn centenary year they were identified as distributors for some Eberle publications marking the event (see figure 15).

[11] Eberle’s printing business survived the First World War and, following his death on January 13, 1921, the “Kunst-Anst.[alt], Stein-, Buch-, Musikalien-Druckerei u. Verlagshandlung” was managed throughout much of the 1920s by his widow, Leopoldine Eberle and their son-in-law, Franz Schmutterer. Although Leopoldine lived until at least 1940, there were major
changes in the constitution and ownership of the firm in 1929, perhaps reflecting the exigencies of the post-crash economic environment, or changes in her personal circumstances. Having been an Einzelunternehmen since 1898, the business was turned into an Offene Gesellschaft in the names of Josefine Rietsch (née Eberle) and Christine Schmutterer, with Franz Schmutterer as Prokurist. This arrangement survived until 1933, when the business was split into two: Josef Eberle, Kunst-Anst., Druckerei u. Verlagshdl., at Schottenfeldgasse 36–38, in the names of Josefine and Christine; and Leopoldine Eberle, Buch- u. Steindruckgew. u. MusikalienhdI. in the names of Franz and Christine Schmutterer at Schottengasse 38. The motivation for this change is unclear: there may have been plans to sell off one or other of the businesses, or simply divide the business in a manner more agreeable to the members of the family. Whatever the intention, by the following year only the firm of Josef Eberle remained, though the Schmutterers were now the two named partners in the firm, with Leo Schmutterer joining in 1935 as Prokurist; this ownership and management structure continued to at least 1941. In post-war years, until at least 1981, the firm remained at Schottenfeldgasse and was using offset lithography, especially in the production of advertising materials.

Conclusion

It is likely that towards the end of Eberle’s troubled time on the board of EWZG, preliminary discussions were already beginning that would culminate in the establishment in 1901 of Universal-Edition. This new concern was planned initially as a cartel of Austro-Hungarian music publishers, music dealers, and a music printer, the latter the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft, more specifically, its Musikabteilung. It was this successor to Eberle’s original Musikaliendruckerei that provided the new publisher with an essential infrastructure element: a locally-based business that could match the integrated production process provided in Leipzig by firms such as Röder, and had the capacity to engrave about 20,000–25,000 plates and also provided high quality printing and finishing of large print-runs of 250–350 volumes per annum. EWZG was the only firm in the Monarchy that could aspire to such an output, although it seems unlikely that in the mid-1890s even it had the spare capacity to supply this additional customer. If this latter supposition is correct, it may provide an explanation for the firm’s purchase of yet more property, at Seidengasse 9, in 1898.

However, now that Eberle’s career can be viewed in more detail, it seems that while he laid the foundations for the printing capacity to supply the end product of the new publisher, his failed Wiener Volksausgabe of 1888–89 had additionally not only anticipated a number of the salient features of the new Edition, but had also provided a cautionary example of the potential pitfalls. Even if Eberle did not contribute to the early planning for the new venture, Josef Stritzko, who was the Director of EWZG until 1907, had been involved in the work on the Volksausgabe, and would have worked closely with Josef Weinberger, the driving force behind the formation of Universal-Edition, during the initial stages.

Both editions offered as their raison d’être a similar analysis: namely, it was unsatisfactory that despite the fact that many of the greatest classical composers had lived and worked in Vienna, most printed copies of their music were supplied by publishers in the German Reich, as an early prospectus for UE expressed it:
It is a striking, repeatedly discussed and quite unjustifiable fact that Austria, or rather Vienna, which played so prominent a part in the history of music, where most of the classical composers [lit. heroes of sound] have lived and worked, and that especially in recent times has set the trends in the field of lighter music, dance music and operettas, remains behind in terms of the music publishing and has been surpassed by Germany in particular. The great editions of classical music were established and sold by German publishers with unprecedented material success. We refer here to the well-known, internationally distributed editions by Peters, Litloff, Breitkopf and Härtel, Steingräber etc.\[103]\n
The list of German competitors looks remarkably like that included in Hans Sachs's 1888 article on *Volksausgaben*. The UE *Prospectus* also followed the Wiener Volksausgabe's example in claiming the repatriation of Viennese classical repertoire was not only a “patriotic requirement of international competition” but also emphasizing the fact that this was an “Austrian publishing project” and that it was expected that such an “indigenous [heimisches] undertaking” would be welcomed by the local public. Moreover, the first twenty-five UE volumes were entirely “serious” works, predominantly by “Austrian” musicians such as Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Mayseder, and Kalliwoda alongside some German masters such as Bach, Mendelssohn, Cramer, and Kuhlau, and numbered standard repertoire items alongside pedagogic volumes. Furthermore, the *Prospectus* makes it clear that it was envisaged that in another respect UE would emulate the Volksausgabe repertoire by including music by some of the established figures in Viennese dance music and operetta: Johann Strauss, Franz von Suppé, Carl Millöcker, Carl Michael Ziehrer, and Carl Komzák. Nevertheless, the very similar and predominantly serious, canonic repertoires of both projects guaranteed them distinctive places within the Viennese music trade, where all other publishers were overwhelmingly concerned with new, popular music.

In other respects, the plans for Universal-Edition can be understood as addressing issues that may have contributed to the failure of the Wiener Volksausgabe. To begin with, Eberle’s attempt to challenge the international dominance of Litloff, Peters, and Breitkopf & Härtel—to name but three—with a first batch of twenty-five titles (thirty-two volumes) published over a period of eighteen months was bound to have a trifling impact in a market where a company such as Breitkopf & Härtel had a catalogue containing over 20,000 titles. By contrast, UE planned to publish 800 volumes within its first three years. With such an ambitious program, it was hardly surprising that the editors and arrangers were not solely drawn from Viennese musical circles, but also included musicians from Hungary, Germany, and France.\[104]\n
[12] One consequence of this necessarily ambitious planning was that in order to fund the substantial engraving and printing costs that would be incurred before significant income from sales would be received, the Edition needed access to far greater capital resources than Eberle had in 1889. The 1898/99 UE *Prospectus* indicates that from the start it was recognized that no single firm could provide the necessary investment capital, and that the venture would have to be a collaborative one. It was envisaged that the capital required, of up to 800,000 Kronen, would be made available in stages by a Kommanditgesellschaft (limited partnership), with the Erste Wiener Zeitungsgesellschaft guaranteeing 5% interest on the capital raised for the first ten years. This was presumably a very favorable arrangement for UE: it had not only secured access to the resources of the only major music printer in Austria but EWZG was both investing in its own capacity to meet demand from UE and providing valuable financial underpinning. The other partners were the six music publishers (all of whom were also involved in the music retail trade) that had pledged their support for the project:

- Josef Weinberger
All had agreed to sign purchase agreements for varying quantities of the projected volumes over a period of ten years, the value of which already amounted to 730,000 Kr. This arrangement had the merit of contributing to the marketing strategy of the new brand, by encouraging the participating publishers to promote UE with vigor, and it also appeared to give the Edition some financial security in the difficult early years. However, these payment terms apparently did not solve the problem of the start-up capital that was needed: when the new firm was eventually established in 1901 it was as an Aktiengesellschaft (joint stock company) that included investors from outside the music business.¹³³

The extent to which Eberle had been able to put in place international distribution for the Wiener Volksausgabe is not clear, but it may be significant that no foreign agencies are listed on the two wrappers and title pages that have been located and the editions have textual material in German only. Universal-Edition, though, was clearly aware of the need to develop international markets, as is made explicit in the Prospectus, which claims that leading music sellers in England and France had already entered into purchase agreements; later it was agreed that publications would be tri-lingual (German, French, and English). In many cases, this meant little more than the use of three languages on the front cover, but some were initially ordered in June 1900 in three separate editions:

Table 4: Selected first issues of early UE volumes¹³⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed. no.</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>German print run (1901)</th>
<th>French print run (1901)</th>
<th>English print run (1901)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Piano Sonatas (ed. Door: Volksausgabe)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Piano Sonatas I (ed. Schenker: Prachtausgabe)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>Piano Sonatas II (ed. Schenker: Prachtausgabe)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Piano Works</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Piano Sonatas (Volksausgabe)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mozart</td>
<td>Piano Sonatas (Prachtausgabe)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kühla</td>
<td>Sonatinas</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was unnecessarily expensive and added a layer of complexity to the logistics of production and distribution. After 1903, no further publications were issued in separate languages. When a further 4,000 copies of the Volksausgabe of the Beethoven Sonatas were ordered in 1902 they were all of a single new trilingual issue, a format gradually adopted as other early titles were reprinted from 1903 onwards. Given its target markets and overall aims it was hardly surprising that, like the Wiener Volksausgabe, Universal-Edition aimed to be no more expensive than German Volksausgaben, and a comparison based on the first 25 UE publications suggests that it was more consistently successful in achieving that goal than its predecessor had been.¹³⁵

By any measure, Josef Eberle’s career was remarkable. One of the many thousands who moved from the Habsburg monarchy’s provincial lands to Vienna in the last third of the nineteenth century, he established himself as a successful entrepreneur, and as a leading figure in the
Austrian printing industry. If, during the last twenty-five years of his life he occupied a less prominent position in Viennese commercial and cultural life than the one he held at the height of his success in the 1890s, he could nevertheless look back at some notable achievements: he had single-handedly revitalized and modernized music printing in Vienna, established the dominant brand of manuscript paper and had published the music of Bruckner, Franz Schmidt, and Franz Schreker. However, paradoxically, his greatest legacy may be one that stemmed in part from the most significant of his failures, the Wiener Volksausgabe, which helped to define the challenges that had to be faced and overcome by the founders of one of Austria’s most notable contributions to 20th century musical culture: Universal-Edition.

Appendix 1

Publications of the Wiener Volksausgabe (Jos. Eberle & Co.) 1888–89 as listed in Hofmeister’s Monatsbericht (with dates of listings in OUBC in parentheses).

February 1888 (January 14, 1888)

Czerny, op. 139, 100 Übungsstücke f. Pfte, Zu charakteristischen Vortragsstücken umgearbeitet u. m. instruktiven Zeichen versehen v. Hans Schmitt.


Czerny, Carl, op. 740, Die Kunst der Fingerfertigkeit. 50 Studien f. Pfte, Revid., theilweise umgearbeitet u. m. Fingersatz versehen v. Hans Schmitt.


March 1888 (February 11, 1888)


April 1888 (February 11, 1888/April 14, 1888)\[^{[137]}\]

Beethoven, L. van, Sonaten f. Pfte, Nach G. Nottebohm’s Aufzeichnungen revid. v. Eusebius Mandyczewski, 3 Bände

June 1888 (June 9, 1888)


July 1888 (July 7, 1888)

Lanner, J., Sämtliche Werke f. Pfte, nach den Originalen bearb. v. Eduard Kremer. 5. u. 6. Band

September 1888 (September 1, 1888)


Lanner, J., Sämtliche Werke f. Pfte, nach den Originalen bearb. v. Eduard Kremer. 7. Band
November 1888 (January 5, 1889)

February 1889
Lanner, Jos., *Sämmtliche Werke f. Pfte*, nach den Originalen bearb. v. Eduard Kremser. 9. u. 10. Band

March 1889 (March 23, 1889)
Cramer, J.B., *84 Etüden f. Pfte*, revid. u. m. Fingersätzen versehen v. Hugo Reinhold. 4 Hefte

May 1889 (May 4 & 25, 1889)

June 1889 (June 22, 1889)

July 1889 (June 22, 1889)
Sachs, Hans, *Josef Lanner. Ein Lebensbild*

Appendix 2

The contract between Anton Bruckner and Jos. Eberle & Co.

Verlags-Vertrag
welcher am heutigen Tage zwischen Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner einerseits und der Firma Jos. Eberle und Compagnie anderseits abgeschlossen worden ist, wie folgt:
Herr Professor Dr. Anton Bruckner überläßt der Firma Jos. Eberle u. Cie. das ausschließliche Verlagsrecht seiner ersten, zweiten, fünften und sechsten Symphonie, seiner zweiten und dritten Messe, des 150. Psalms und einiger Männerchöre und räumt derselben das Vorkaufsrecht auf sämtliche musikalische und noch zu komponierende Werke ein, wogegen die letztgenannte Firma sich verpflichtet, diese sämtlichen Werke des Herrn Dr. Anton Bruckner im Stiche und Drucke herzustellen, sobald dieselben ihr von letzterem übergeben sein werden.
Hierbei gelten insbesondere folgende Bestimmungen:

Publishing Contract
which is concluded on this day between, on the one side, Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner and on the other, the firm Jos. Eberle and Company as follows:
Professor Dr. Anton Bruckner assigns the exclusive publishing rights to his first, second, fifth and sixth symphonies, his second and third Masses, Psalm 150 and some male-voice choruses to the firm Jos. Eberle & Co., and grants the same an option to publish for all, including still to be composed, musical works, whereas the above-named company undertakes to produce, engraved and printed, these complete works of Dr. Anton Bruckner, as soon as these same have been passed to it by the last-named.

In this connection, the following provisions shall apply in particular:
Herr Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner räumt der Firma Jos. Eberle u. Cie. für sich selbst und ihre Erben und sonstigen Rechtsnachfolger unbedingt und vorbehaltlos das ausschließliche und unbeschränkte Verlags- und Betriebsrecht im weitesten Sinne und für die Dauer seines ganzen Bestandes an den vorangeführten und bezeichneten Werken ein, u. zw. sowohl am Originale als an allen beliebigen Bearbeitungen des Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner selbst, wodurch auch alle Vorteile, welche etwa in Bezug auf das Urheberrecht an den Werken Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckners durch Veränderungen in bestehenden Staats- und Landesgesetzgebungen und bereits abgeschlossenen internationalen Verträgen, oder auch mit Ländern oder Staaten in Zukunft noch abzuschließenden internationalen Verträgen erwachsen sollten, ohne weiteres und ausdrücklich an die Firma Jos. Eberle und Cie., ihre Erben oder Rechtsnachfolger als mitübertragen gelten sollen.


Weiters ist es ihre Aufgabe, für die möglichste Verbreitung der Werke zu sorgen und jedes Jahr 4 Wochen nach der Leipziger Ostermesse dem Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner eine Abrechnung zuzusenden, zu deren Controlle dem Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner die Einsicht der betreffenden Contis offen stehen soll.

Sind die Herstellungskosten eines Werkes durch dessen Vertrieb gedeckt, so gebühren Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner für seine ganze Lebensdauer und auch seinen Erben durch weitere acht Jahre nach seinem Tode 25% sage zwanzig fünf Perzent des weiteren Brutto-Erlöses von jenem Werke.

Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner grants the company Jos. Eberle and Co., for itself and its heirs and other legal successors, the exclusive and unrestricted publishing and business rights in the broadest sense and for the duration of his whole life, in the above-mentioned and designated works, both the originals and in all or any arrangements by Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner himself, so that all the benefits, for instance in relation to the copyright in the works of Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner that might arise from changes in existing state and provincial laws and international treaties already concluded, or in the future from yet to be concluded international treaties with countries or states, should be considered as unambiguously and specifically transferred to the company Jos. Eberle and Co., their heirs or successors.

On the other hand, the firm, Jos. Eberle and Co. is required to produce within one year after delivery of a complete work the engraving and printing of the score and parts of the same and also one year after complete delivery, a two- or four-hand piano arrangement.

Furthermore, it is its duty to ensure the greatest possible dissemination of the works and 4 weeks after the Leipzig Easter Fair each year should send Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner a statement of account for the checking of which the relevant accounts should be open to examination by Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner.

If the production costs of a work are met by its sales income, 25% (twenty-five percent) of the subsequent gross revenue of that work will be due to Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner for his whole life and to his heirs by a further eight years after his death.
Sollten aber für die Kosten der Herstellung eines einzelnen Werkes Subventionen, sei es durch Sr. Majestät den Kaiser oder durch ein Consortium gegeben werden, welche die Höhe von mindestens 50% sage fünfzig Prozent der Herstellung von Partitur und Stimmen in Stich und Druck erreichen, so gebühren dem Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner für die oben angeführte Zeidauer 50% sage fünfzig Prozent des durch den Verkauf erzielten Erlöses des betreffenden Werkes von dem Moment an als die Kosten gedeckt sind, welcher Zeitpunkt für den Fall als die ganzen Kosten durch Subvention gedeckt sind, mit der Fertigstellung des Werkes zusammenfällt. Die Firma Jos. Eberle und Cie. verpflichtet sich, Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner vom Jahre 1893 ab während seiner ganzen Lebensdauer in dem für die Abrechnung festgesetzten Zeitpunkte — 4 Wochen nach der Leipziger Ostermesse — jährlich Fl. 300.– zu bezahlen und ist[,] wenn die Abrechnung der in diesem Vertrage festgesetzten, zu Gunsten des Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner entfallenden perzentuellen Anteile einen höheren Betrag als Fl. 300.– ergeben, dieser Mehrbetrag gleichzeitig Herrn Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner zu erfolgen, dagegen derselbe einen eventuellen Minderbetrag zu ersetzen nicht verpflichtet sein soll.

Die Kosten der Errichtung dieser Urkunde samt Stempel tragen beide Vertragsteile je zur Hälfte.

Urkund dessen der vertragsschließenden Teile eigenhändige Fertigung.

Wien, 14. Juli 1892. [139]

However, should subventions towards the costs of the production of an individual work be given—whether by His Majesty the Emperor, or through a consortium—which amount to at least 50% (fifty percent) of the production [costs] of the engraved and printed score and parts, then for the above-mentioned period Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner will be due 50% (fifty percent) of the proceeds from the sale of the work in question from the moment when the costs are covered, in the situation that all the costs are covered by subvention this moment will coincide with the completion of the work. The firm Jos. Eberle and Co. undertakes to pay Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner from 1893 onwards throughout his life at the date fixed for the accounts—4 weeks after the Leipzig Easter Fair—annually fl. 300, and if the reckoning of the attributable percentage share set out in this contract results in an amount higher than fl. 300 in favor of Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner [payment] of this additional amount be made at the same time, however, on the other hand, the latter should not be required to make good any shortfall.

After the death of Prof. Dr. Anton Bruckner, the firm Jos. Eberle & Co. shall be entitled to free itself at any time from the further payment of the percentage share of the gross revenue from the date of death of Prof. Anton Bruckner onwards, by the payment to the estate of Dr. Anton Bruckner of a one-off settlement of fl. 5,000 (five thousand Gulden) for all the works, inclusive, whereby any further rights of the Estate and any other obligations of the firm Jos. Eberle & Co. would lapse.

Both parties to the contract waive the right to challenge for breach of the foregoing contract for more than half of the true value.

Both parties to the contract will pay half of the costs, including the stamp [duty] of preparing this deed.

In witness thereof the contracting parties’ handwritten completion:

Vienna, July 14, 1892.
1. Josef’s surname was Eberl, but he used the form Eberle for many years before changing it officially in 1885. I am most grateful to Dr. Michael Lorenz for drawing my attention to this fact, and for his help generally in sorting out various family histories. ↑

2. Anton Durstmüller and Norbert Frank, 500 Jahre Druck in Österreich: Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der graphischen Gewerbe von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart, vol. 2, Die österreichischen graphischen Gewerbe zwischen Revolution und Weltkrieg 1848 bis 1918 (Vienna: Hauptverband der graphischen Unternehmungen Österreichs, [1986]), 2:204–5. This is the most detailed previously published account of the firm’s history and forms an important source for the present essay. Sadly, its usefulness is compromised by the almost complete absence of source citations for specific items of information and the narrative here, while drawing on Durstmüller, differs in a number of important respects. ↑

3. This summary is based on and quotes from “Die Krisis im Wiener Buchdruck-Gewerbe,” an unsigned article in the printers’ trade journal, Oesterreichische Buchdrucker-Zeitung 2, no. 23 (June 9, 1874): 139 (hereafter OBDZ). ↑

4. See the obituary for the one-year-old Ludwig Schmelka—almost certainly his son—who died at Grüngasse 34, V. Margareten, on September 23, 1866; “Verstorbenen,” Wiener Zeitung, September 28, 1866, 885. Schmelka’s wife died of tuberculosis at the age of 36, in November 1871; “Verzeichnis der Verstorbenen in Wien,” Die Presse, November 21, 1871, 4. ↑

5. This history of the firm is based on entries in the relevant issues of Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger: nebst Handels- und Gewerbe-Adreßbuch für die k.k. Reichshaupt und Residenzstadt Wien und Umgebung Wien (Vienna: A. Hölder, 1859–1942); see also the admirable symposium Die Vermessung Wiens: Lehmanns Adressbücher 1859–1942, ed. Sylvia Mattl-Wurm and Alfred Pfoser (Vienna: Metroverlag/Wienbibliothek im Rathaus, 2011). The first entry for Schmelka is in Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger, 1874, 474, material for which would have been submitted between late 1872 and September 1, 1873. In this list of householders, Schmelka is described as the owner of a lithographic works, for which he must have applied for a concession. The partnership Schmelka & Eberle first appears in the 1875 issue, pp. 140, 477, and 819. The move to Burggasse must have been in late 1873/early 1874 as it is this address that appears on publications issued in the first three months of 1874 (see below). For a small online sample of their work as printers of pictorial lithographs, see Moravská Zemská Knihovna (Moravian Regional Library). ↑

6. Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger, 1876, 474 and 793. ↑

7. There are no entries for Schmelka after the 1881 issue of Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger. Whether Eberle played any significant role in the firm in its later years is uncertain, but it is worth noting that after 1875 it is only Schmelka’s individual entry that cross-references to the business: from the 1876 issue onwards, Eberle’s entries refer only to his partnership with Johann Schipek. It is curious that the firm and Schipek himself receive separate entries for the first time only from 1877 onwards. ↑

8. Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger, 1883, 1375; the firm also traded as Schipek & Cie. This was a successful concern that later acquired the firms of Victor Domek and Karl Hirschl: Durstmüller and Frank, 500 Jahre Druck in Österreich, 2:326, 339, and 365. ↑
9. Durstmüller and Frank, *500 Jahre Druck in Österreich*, 2:204. This date was given for the foundation of Jos. Eberle & Co. in a list of the most significant lithographic printers founded in Vienna during the century, appended to an anonymous article, “Hundert Jahre Lithographie IV,” OBDZ 27, no. 10 (March 9, 1899): 115. ↑

10. Berndt was first listed as a partner in *Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger*, 1877, 166. ↑

11. Durstmüller and Frank, *500 Jahre Druck in Österreich*, 2:204, 235. According to Lehmann’s *Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger*, 1877, 1215, the address of the business was then VIII. Josefsgasse 5. ↑

12. Anton Mayer, *Wiens Buchdrucker-Geschichte* (Vienna: W. Frick, 1887), 2:358; Mayer reports that book printing was subsidiary to Eberle’s main activity in the fields of music printing and lithography, but he makes no mention of the partnerships with Schipek and Schmelka. ↑

13. Durstmüller and Frank, *500 Jahre Druck in Österreich*, 2:235; and Lehmann’s *Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger*, 1885, XL, 307, 1457. It was probably only in 1881 that Berndt became an active partner in the Jos. Eberle & Co.—he is named as such in the published listing of the firm’s registration in *Die Presse*, May 22, 1881, 9. Durstmüller gives the date of Berndt’s departure as 1885, but in November 1884 Eberle had already become the sole proprietor of Jos. Eberle & Co., and the firm had been removed from the register of jointly owned companies (Gesellschaftsfirmen): *Neue Freie Presse*, November 20, 1884, 9. Freytag & Berndt has survived and flourished to the present day. ↑


15. The actual number had extended beyond 20,000 by 1870, but numbers 10,901–ca. 16,000 had never been used: Weinmann, *Verlagsverzeichnis*, 216. For a searchable database of over 3,000 Spina publications listed in the monthly Whistling-Hofmeister *Musikalisch-literarischer Monatsbericht über neue Musikalien, musikalische Schriften und Abbildungen* (Leipzig, 1829–1907), see Hofmeister XIX, which offers both a transcription of the original entries and links to the online facsimile hosted by the Austrian National Library (A-Wn). The earliest Spina listings date from April 1852. ↑

16. This was the figure given by Alfred Novello in *Some Accounts of the Methods of Music Printing* (London: Novello, 1847), 7, reprinted in *A Century and a Half in Soho: A Short History of the Firm of Novello, Publishers and Printers of Music, 1811–1961* (London: Novello, 1961), 69–75. However, since the point of Novello’s pamphlet was to extoll the merits of printing music from stereotypes derived from movable type, he may have underplayed the longevity of engraved/punched pewter plates. ↑

17. This was also the business structure adopted by Spina’s Viennese rival, Haslinger. ↑


25. Johann Strauss II, op. 358 (GB-Lbl h.3193.j.(31)) and op. 359 (GB-Lbl h.3193.m.(10)). ↑
26. From 1859 until the end of the Dual Monarchy printers, publishers, and sellers of printed material were among the types of business required to obtain a concession from the authorities. See the Patent of December 20, 1859, in the *Reichs-Gesetz-Blatt* 65 (December 27, 1859): 619–21, and in particular paragraph 16; also Murray G. Hall, *Österreichische Verlagsgeschichte 1918–1938* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1985), 1:22. ↑
27. Shelfmarks GB-Lbl h.3209.d.(23.), h.3209.d.(24.), h.3209.d.(25.), and h.3209.e.(25.). The date stamps on all these copies indicate that these are early, probably first, impressions. ↑
29. It was listed in OBC 15, no. 8 (February 21, 1874): 61 as having recently appeared. ↑
30. GB-Lbl h.3209.h.(4.). ↑
31. In the September listing of new music in OBC, the firm was listed as Friedrich Schreiber (Alwin Cranz) for the first time. ↑
32. OBC 18, no. 6 (February 10, 1877): 49. The announcement is dated January and explains that Cranz has bought the firm outright and will run it under the name C.A. *Spina Verlags- und Kunsthandlung* (Alwin Cranz); Schreiber’s subsidiary firms had been disposed of: Schrottenbach & Co. to his son, and the Pressburg branch to Carl Wolff. ↑
33. For a detailed account of this and other techniques of lithographic printing of music in the nineteenth century, see Michael Twyman, *Early Lithographed Music* (London: Farrand Press, 1996), 113-15 and 502-4. Twyman prefers the more general term “transfer from printed work.” No examples of music printed by Eberle using direct lithography or transfer from writing have been located to date. ↑
34. *Der Cataster: Handbuch für Ämter, Architekten, Baumeister, Capitalisten, Hausbesitzer etc., etc. über sämmtliche Häuser der K.K. Reichshaupt- und Residenzstadt Wien*, ed. Joseph Schlessinger (Vienna: Schlesinger, 1875), 196 and 216; this also includes a useful street map of the seventh district, showing individual plots of land with street numbers. Burggasse 45, built in 1811, was a two-storey structure divided into eighteen units, with a footprint of 231 Quadratklaftern (i.e. 438 m²) and a total floor area of 876 m²; Westbahnstrasse 9 was built in 1823 with three stories divided into nine units, with a footprint of 567 m² and a total floor area of 1,701 m² suggesting that some of the individual units in the latter may have been rather larger than those at Burggasse 45. ↑
35. From the copy of Strauss’s op. 145, *Schön Rohbraut*: the OBC entry (17, no. 43 [October 21, 1876]: 406) for the work suggests a publication date in September or October 1876, and the British Library copy (GB-Lbl h.3209.10.) is date-stamped “28 DE 76” (i.e. December 28, 1876). ↑

36. The evidence is the British Library copy of Strauss’s op. 163, *Teufels-Quadrille, nach Motiven der F. von Suppé’schen Operette Der Teufel auf Erden* (GB-Lbl h.3209.22.), which is date-stamped “09 May 1878,” and has the printer’s mark “Notenstich u. Druck v. Eberle & Schipek VII. Westbahnstr. 9.” However, this is the only use of this formulation in the sample: later publications continue to use the earlier form of the mark. It is also rather striking that in his advertisement in *Fromme’s Musikalische Welt: Notiz-Kalender für 1879* (Vienna: Carl Fromme, 1878) Eberle describes his business as a *Musikalien-Druckerei* but makes no mention of music engraving. Hence the caution adopted here over whether in 1878 Eberle had in-house engravers or was outsourcing such work as required. See also below, “Publishing.” ↑

37. The last Eduard Strauss work to be printed by the firm was his op. 168 with plate number C. 24571; the first work printed by Jos. Eberle & Co. was his op. 169 with plate number C. 24572; both were announced in OBC 19, no. 18 on May 4, 1878: 166. ↑


39. Gustav Kühle, “Der Musikalien-Stich und Druck in Oesterreich,” *Oesterreichische Musik und Theaterzeitung* 2, no. 22 (August 15, 1890): 9. The brief references to technical matters are not entirely unproblematic, in particular, the reference to “music engraving, which Eberle executes on zinc (contrary to foreign engraving auf Masse [?]).” One might wonder to which stage of the printing process this comment refers. Is it the original engraving or the transfer to zinc lithographic plates? The latter is certainly plausible as on some of his early title pages Eberle refers specifically to zincography. However, it may reflect a misunderstanding on the part of the author: Gustav Kühle (1858–1914) was a composer, violinist, journalist, and the founding editor of the periodical but may have had limited practical knowledge of music origination and printing. ↑

40. “Auch die Einführung des Notenstiches und Notendruckes in Österreich ist sein Verdienst,” in Wielinger and Stockinger, *Fünfzig Jahre Gremium*, 28. The error is all the more remarkable since on page 73 the authors provide a brief, but accurate description of the transfer process used by, among others, Eberle. ↑

41. “Durch Einführung des bis dahin in Wien unbekannten Notenstiches und Notendruckes eröffnete er dem österr. Erwerbsleben ein neues Arbeitsgebiet.” “Eberle, Josef,” in *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950* (Graz: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1956), 1/3:209. The error may be the result of inept editing, but more likely, it derives directly from Wielinger and Stockinger, *Fünfzig Jahre Gremium* and perhaps more indirectly from Kühle’s article. ↑

42. Eberle’s reputation in this respect extended as far as France: OBDZ 15, no. 48 (December 1, 1887): 489. For details of earlier, similar techniques, see OBDZ 19, no. 19 (May 7, 1891): 191. ↑
43. The patent was issued on July 27 but backdated to May 1: Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung, September 4, 1884, 361. ↑

44. Durstmüller and Frank, 500 Jahre Druck in Österreich, 2:203-5. For details of the annulment of the Austrian patent, see OBDZ 17, no. 48 (November 28, 1889): 483. Eberle apparently continued to advocate the technique, and gave an illustrated lecture about it during a tour of his works for the students on a course at the k.k. Lehr- und Versuchsanstalt für Photographie und Reproductionsverfahren in Wien, January 28, 1894: OBDZ 22, no. 5 (February 1, 1894): 53. ↑

45. Imogen Fellinger, Verzeichnis der Musikzeitschriften des 19. Jahrhunderts, Studien zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts 10 (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1968), 182, no. 677 (the ownership and editorial history recorded there is fragmentary). Unfortunately, the digitization of the journal on the online portal ANNO is incomplete, lacking (among other lacunae) all issues for 1878 and 1883, and many of the music supplements. The periodical was originally published by Carl Michael Ziehrer, but from issue 2, no. 40 (November 8, 1875) the publisher and chief editor was Carl Krause; from issue 3, no. 20 (May 13, 1876) these roles were assumed by Dominik Habernal. By January 1879, the publisher was Blasius Weiss, and by January the following year, it was Johann Kiebeck, from whom, in 1889 the journal was acquired by the music publisher Adolf Robitschek (trading under the name Rebay and Robitschek). It was edited by him from issue 16, no. 12 (May 1, 1889). Thereafter many of the music supplements were of works published by Rebay and Robitschek, and since some of these publications had been manufactured in Germany, Eberle’s role in supplying the music supplements declined. In 1900, the Wiener Musikverlagshaus AG was formed as a successor to the firm of F. Röhrich and took over ownership of the periodical from issue 27, no. 4 (April 12, 1900): from that date the printing of the music supplements was undertaken entirely by the new owner. ↑

46. See the announcement in OBC 15, no. 39 (September 26, 1874): 322. The regular engraver of the supplements had previously been the ubiquitous Franz Hahn. ↑

47. Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger, passim. The firm had purchased the property for fl. 32,000 in early January 1882, a step perhaps initiated after Berndt became an active partner in the firm in mid-1881: endnote 13 and Der Bautechniker 2, no. 3 (January 20, 1882): 29. Presumably Eberle did not acquire vacant possession—hence the delay in the relocation of the firm—and it was not until early 1883 that Eberle’s planning application to create a workshop and living accommodation on the site was made public: Der Bautechniker 3, no. 5 (February 2, 1883): 44. ↑

48. Der Bautechniker 11, no. 22 (May 29, 1891): 349. Eberle’s regular adverts were updated in a rather haphazard way. After December 1892, the firm appears to have cancelled its regular advertising in the Deutsche Kunst- und Musik-Zeitung. However, it was also advertising in Die Lyra (Fellinger, Verzeichnis der Musikzeitschriften, 201, no. 772) from 1882, although it was not until April 1, 1885, that the firm’s initial move to Seidengasse was reflected in its adverts in that magazine. Musical supplements were regularly included in Die Lyra and Jos. Eberle & Co. undertook the origination and printing of many (if not all) from January 1883 and possibly earlier, although by early 1885 some supplements were being supplied by Röder (Leipzig). (Unfortunately, the digitized version on ANNO is incomplete and it is not clear whether the scans include all the music supplements issued.) ↑

50. Josef and Leopoldine were probably married ca. 1877, and had two daughters, Josefine (September 23, 1878–August 11, 1970) and Christine (September 26, 1879–October 8, 1964), both of whom would play roles in the management of the family firm (see below). ↑

51. *Deutsche Kunst- und Musik-Zeitung* 20, no. 3 (February 1, 1893): 33. By then the periodical had been taken over by Rebay and Robitschek (see above, endnote 45), one of the firms that published Stritzko’s music. A more extended biography and a work list prepared by the present author are available online. ↑

52. Interestingly, the article does not corroborate Göllerich’s assertion that he was a Bruckner pupil at the Conservatoire, cf. August Göllerich, *Anton Bruckner: Ein Lebens- und Schaffensbild*, ed. and completed by Max Auer (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1936), 4/3:257. This statement is repeated in Franz Scheder, *Anton Bruckner Chronologie* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1996), 2:343, but Stritzko’s files at the Archive of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna do not offer evidence that he studied with Bruckner as part of his training there. Göllerich is also incorrect in describing Stritzko as Eberle’s son-in-law. ↑

53. Now Kotor in Montenegro. ↑

54. *Der Hofmeister* (Theater an der Wien, March 12, 1903), *Tip-Top* (Theater an der Wien, October 5, 1907), and *Die Hochzeit auf Sacramento*; see Franz Stieger, *Opernlexikon* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1977), 2/3:1084. ↑

55. OBC 18, no. 30 (July 28, 1877): 273 (the circular is dated May 13, 1877). ↑

56. OBC 20, no. 41 (October 11, 1879): 402. ↑

57. OBC 28, no. 46 (November 12, 1887): 595. For a short biography, see *Österreichische Musik- und Theaterzeitung* 2, no. 22 (August 15, 1890): 11 (hereafter OMTZ). Rebay’s subsequent career can be traced in the pages of *Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger*: he ran a number of small Musikalienhandlungen and was active as a writer (he briefly edited the *Wochenschrift für Kunst und Musik*, see Fellinger, *Verzeichnis der Musikzeitschriften*, 349, no. 1654), founded the Wiener Meistersinger-Innung, and served as a long-standing member of both the Sangrat of the Schubertbund and the board of the Buchhandlungsgehilfen-Verein “Buchfink.” See also his obituaries in *Neue Freie Presse*, March 22, 1914, 11, *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, March 29, 1914, 15, and OBC 55, no. 12 (March 25, 1914): 95 and 97. ↑

58. Fellinger, *Verzeichnis der Musikzeitschriften*, 243, no. 1009 (this erroneously gives the date of the final issue as August 1893). The periodical is available online. ↑


60. This firm, originally owned by Ignaz Stern (fl. 1875–1914) and Wilhelm Steiner (fl. 1875–?), was registered on October 1, 1876: *Lehmann’s Allgemeiner Wohnungs-Anzeiger*, 1890, 1347. For an outline of the history of this long-lived and substantial business, see Durstmüller and Frank, *500 Jahre Druck in Österreich*, 2:374. This account makes no reference to the firm’s activity as a music printer: this was probably only a minor part of its output, and it was not referred to in the Lehman entries for 1890. ↑

61. For an obituary of Garbeis, who worked closely with Eberle in the 1890s, see *Der
62. See the colophon to the second issue of the year: 8, no. 2 (January 15, 1893): 48. Die Presse was in terminal decline and ceased publication in October 1896.

63. The annual subscription (which was ¼ of the cost of four quarterly subscriptions) was fl. 3.60, the equivalent of €20–25 today.

64. One was a piano piece of modest ambition and achievement, Die Sehnsucht, dedicated to Josef Eberle by the otherwise untraced (and perhaps amateur) composer, Thomas Sedlaczek: 5, no. 24 (December 15, 1890): supplement, 93-96.

65. Die Presse, December 28, 1887, 4.


70. An der Schönen Blauen Donau 3, no. 11 (June 1, 1888): 264 and 3, no. 12 (June 15, 1888): 288; the name of the contributor is almost certainly a pseudonym.

71. The successor (from ca. 1885) to F. Wessely, so a firm of some standing.

72. See, for example, OMTZ 1, no. 3 (November 1, 1888): 6–7 and 1, no. 20 (July 15, 1889): 6–7.
73. *Neue Freie Presse*, September 30, 1888, 1. ↑

74. Complete editions listed in Hofmeister in 1888: Czerny op. 139: 4 (in January: Breitkopf & Härtel, Peters, Steingräber; in April: H. Petersen); op. 299: 4 (in January: Breitkopf & Härtel, Peters, Steingräber; in September: Schott); op. 740: 3 (in January: Breitkopf & Härtel, Peters, Steingräber). There were two new selections of Cramer Études published in Germany in 1888, with four more the following year. Thus, the Cramer and Czerny editions were probably unsaleable: the market was already over-supplied. ↑

75. Kremser, like Stritzko, was closely connected as conductor and composer to the male-voice choir tradition in Vienna, and also composed operettas. Stritzko’s *Kling, klang, Gloria!* op. 67 (Vienna: Rebay & Robitschek, [?1892]) was dedicated to Kremser. ↑


Die Verhandlungen mit dem Verleger Josef Eberle führte dessen Verlags-Direktor und Schwiegersohn Josef Stritzko, der seinerzeit Bruckners Schüler am Konservatorium
gewesen war und sich später als Komponist von Operetten und Chören einen Namen gemacht hat.


80. The firm appears to have supplied A.J. Gutmann with a number of full scores in the 1880s. ↑

81. I am most grateful to Doblinger, and in particular Martin Sima, for help during my research for this article. ↑

82. The retail prices are from the title page of the first edition. It is worth noting that the cost of engraving and printing a part set was only slightly more expensive than that for the full score. ↑

83. See Eduard Strauss’s interesting letters to Johann (July 17 and 26, 1898) in which he discusses the issue of performance rights and mentions Eberle—who had just set up a new company—as a publisher who was not a member of AKM: Franz Mailer, Johann Strauss (Sohn): Leben und Werk in Briefen und Dokumenten (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 2002), 9:66–68. Interestingly, when in 1898 the EVZG signed a publishing contract with Mahler it included a stipulation that he should join AKM, see Paul Banks, “Mahler and the ‘Newspaper Company’: A Newly Discovered Draft Contract,” Nineteenth-Century Music Review 15, no. 3 (December 2018): 329–52. ↑

84. “Kampf gegen die Tantième,” Neues Wiener Journal, October 7, 1898, 4. However, by 1903 Eberle was reserving performance rights on some large-scale works that he published. ↑


86. For the correspondence relating to this narrative, see Hugo Wolf Briefe 1873–1901, ed. Leopold Spitzer (Vienna: Musikwissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2010), 2:713–15; 3:198, 222, 228, 241, 244–45. ↑

had been involved with the committee’s administration for at least two years: OBDZ 20, no. 21 (May 26, 1892): 208. ↑

88. Durstmüller and Frank, 500 Jahre Druck in Österreich, 2:208. Eberle may also have been a member of the Graphische Klub in Vienna; he certainly gave a lecture at a meeting in 1888: OBDZ 31, no. 43 (October 22, 1903): 538. ↑


90. OBDZ 21, no. 18 (May 4, 1893): 177; the official announcement was dated April 29. ↑

91. The decision of the EWZG board to make this acquisition was reported in OBDZ 22, no. 49 (December 6, 1894): 548. At the same time, C. August Artaria was co-opted onto the board. ↑
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