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Abstract

As a multinational state with a population that spoke eleven different languages, the Austro-Hungarian Empire was considered an anachronism during the age of heightened nationalism leading up to the First World War. This situation has made the search for a single Austro-Hungarian identity so difficult that many historians have declared it impossible. Yet the Dual Monarchy possessed one potentially unifying cultural aspect that has long been critically neglected: the extensive repertoire of marches and patriotic music performed by the military bands of the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Army. This Militärmusik actively blended idioms representing the various nationalist musics from around the empire in an attempt to reflect and even celebrate its multinational makeup. Much in the same way that the Army took in recruits from all over the empire, its diverse Militärkapellmeister – many of whom were nationalists themselves – absorbed the local music of their garrison towns and incorporated it into their patriotic compositions. Though it flew in the face of the rampant ethnonationalism of the time, this Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik was an enormous popular success; Eduard Hanslick and Gustav Mahler were drawn to it, Joseph Roth and Stephan Zweig lionized it, and in 1914, hundreds of thousands of young men from every nation of the empire marched headlong to their ultimate deaths on the Eastern Front with the music of an Austro-Hungarian march in their ears.

This dissertation explores how military instrumental music reflected a special kind of multinational Austro-Hungarian state identity between 1867 and 1914. In the
first part of my dissertation, I examine the complex political backdrop of the era and discuss the role and demographic makeup of the *k.u.k. Armee*. I then go on to profile the military musicians themselves, describe the idiomatic instrumentation of the military ensembles, and analyze significant surviving works from this repertoire by Julius Fučík and Carl Michel Ziehrer. The results of this study show how Austro-Hungarian *Militärmusik* synthesized conceptions of nationalism and cosmopolitanism to create a unique musical identity that, to paraphrase Kaiser Franz Joseph, brought together the best elements of each nation for the benefit of all.
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Introduction: Whose Austria?

Ecstasy and hypnosis. Colors do not move a people. Flags can do nothing without trumpets.

Gilles Deleuze, *Mille plateaux*¹

When Gustav Mahler returned to Vienna in 1897 as the newly-appointed director of the Imperial and Royal Court Opera, he found that the cultural and political tenor of the imperial capital had changed significantly from his days as a student there some two decades earlier. The recent expansion of voting rights had created a new style of mass politics that was easily swayed by appeals to the public’s baser tendencies – something that Karl Lueger practiced masterfully, playing up anti-Semitic, anti-Slavic, and German nationalist rhetoric in his successful campaign for the Viennese mayoralty in 1895.² The intellectual pan-Germanist movement, with which Mahler had previously been identified through his connections to the Pernerstorfer circle,³ had moved towards ethnocentrism and anti-Semitism under the influence of radicals like Georg von Schönerer. By the end

---


² Because of the harshness of his campaign rhetoric, Lueger’s election was not sanctioned by the Emperor Franz Joseph until 16 April 1897 – less than six months before the beginning of Mahler’s tenure at the Court Opera.

³ Already a Wagnerian, Mahler associated with leading Viennese pan-Germanist intellectuals such as Victor Adler, Engelbert Pernerstorfer, and Siegfried Lipiner during his later student years, from 1878 to 1880. His ties to this group are described in William J. McGrath, *Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).
of the nineteenth century, German nationalism had left Mahler behind – as it had many assimilated Jewish intellectuals – once the movement transformed itself from a vehicle for enlightenment cosmopolitanism into a strain of divisive racism.

Not coincidentally, it was shortly after his return to Vienna that a major aesthetic shift took place in Mahler’s compositional output. With the completion of his Fourth Symphony in 1900, Mahler publicly renounced the narrative programs that he had previously circulated in order to explicate his complex symphonies. Thereafter, he declared, all of his works would follow in the tradition of absolute music. But while it might have seemed that Mahler was merely shunning a banal means of popularizing his symphonies, he was at the same time distancing himself from their ideology. His first four symphonies shared a common source for their programs and texts – namely Arnim and Brentano’s collection of German-romantic folk poetry, Des Knaben Wunderhorn – and as such, these symphonies also shared a common message of pan-Germanism. At the dawn of the twentieth century, these programs were more politically charged than ever.

This turn away from pan-Germanism took place around the same time that Mahler reportedly made a succinct yet powerful assessment of his own cultural identity. In his most famous quote, Mahler declared that he was “thrice homeless”: as a “native of Bohemia in Austria, as an Austrian among Germans, and as a Jew throughout all the world.” In one sentence, Mahler labeled himself with three distinct identities

---

4 Mahler reportedly said as much in a dramatic pronouncement at a dinner party in Munich on 20 October 1900; see Ludwig Schiedermair, Gustav Mahler (Leipzig: H. Seemann, 1900), 13-14.

Bohemian, Austrian, Jew) and alluded to a fourth (German) that remained beyond his grasp. Mahler was born in rural Bohemia, much closer to the imperial periphery than its cultural center, yet he and his family spoke German and adhered to German culture, eschewing the rising Czech nationalism. He was of Jewish descent but converted to Catholicism in order to take over the Court Opera. He spent his career moving from city to city within the Austro-Hungarian and German Empires in search of acceptance, but that acceptance always eluded him – nowhere more so than in Vienna, paradoxically the most cosmopolitan city in Central Europe.6

For someone with Mahler’s background and outlook, such a close association with German nationalism must have appeared unpalatable following the movement’s turn towards ethnocentrism. It is therefore not surprising that Mahler’s subsequent three symphonies abandoned programs and texts altogether, moving beyond nationalism and towards the universal.7 But despite their lack of overt programs, one of the most striking features of these three symphonies was their distinctive martial tone, exemplified by the funeral processional that opens the Fifth, the recurring drum cadences and trumpet fanfares that unify the Sixth, and the addition of the tenor horn to the first movement of the Seventh – followed by a second movement in the form of a march with trio. Of course, this was nothing new for Mahler; in his first four symphonies, he regularly employed the musical topics associated with the military to explicate his pan-Germanist

---

6 Mahler’s career included stints in the Austrian spa towns of Bad Ischl and Bad Hall, as well as Ljubljana (today the capital of Slovenia), Olomouc (in Moravia), Kassel, Prague, Leipzig, Budapest, and Hamburg prior to his appointment in Vienna.
7 Notably, however, Alma Mahler continued to ascribe German nationalist influences and programs to Mahler’s later symphonies in spite of the composer’s own intentions, as evidenced by her assertion that the Seventh Symphony was inspired by “Eichendorff-ish visions.” See Alma Mahler, *Gustav Mahler*, 89.
programs of rustic simplicity. Yet in Mahler’s next three symphonies, the military allusions extended beyond snippets of marches and fanfares to influence Mahler’s wind instrumentation and even the forms of some of his movements. These influences all had direct antecedents that would have been well-known to Mahler and his contemporary audiences alike through the unique repertoire and instrumentation of the military bands of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Typically, for a composer of Mahler’s generation, such blatant use of military music was a sign of nationalist sympathies, as exemplified by Mahler’s contemporary Charles Ives and his quotation of marches and other patriotic tunes in pursuit of a uniquely American musical style. This is why Mahler’s penchant for military music remains anathema to us today, and subsequent interpreters have had difficulty reconciling it with his cosmopolitan worldview. Yet it must be remembered that in the multinational

---

8 By *musical topics*, I am referring to what Leonard Ratner defined as musical elements that, by themselves, signify an extramusical association by evoking another musical style or a piece of socially functional music that was part of the composer’s and listener’s common culture. A topic could be a rhythm from a characteristic dance such as a minuet or a polonaise, or a march rhythm, or a melody that follows the intervals of a hunting horn fanfare, or even an instrumental texture aping an earlier musical style. During the late eighteenth century, composers incorporated topics as short, fleeting references that were combined or juxtaposed to give a large-scale work another layer of musical meaning. Composers of program music continued this practice into the nineteenth century, using topics as a guide for the listener to follow their musical narrative. Similarly, nationalist composers often drew their topics from recognizable folk idioms in order to link their otherwise abstract music to their own national identity. It should be noted that topics differ from quotations, in that the former are nonspecific evocations of a style or a genre of functional music, while the latter are recognizable melodies lifted wholesale from other musical works. See Leonard G. Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1980), 9-28; and, more recently, Robert S. Hatten, *Interpreting Musical Gestures, Topics, and Tropes: Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), and Raymond Monelle, *The Musical Topic: Hunt, Military and Pastoral* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006).

9 Mahler’s relationship to military music is one of the most prominent aspects of his compositional style, and many attempts have been made to account for it. Most biographers have attributed Mahler’s interest in *Militärmusik* to his childhood in Iglau (today Jihlava, in the Czech Republic), where the regular Sunday afternoon concerts of the regimental band were a cultural fixture – though it should be noted that a regiment was not permanently stationed in Iglau until 1882, and as such, Mahler would not have been able to hear a military band every year before his departure for Vienna in 1875. Nevertheless, according to authors ranging from Paul Stefan to Stuart Feder, Mahler must have sublimated this repertoire as a child, and it manifested itself almost subconsciously in his adult compositions. See, for example, Stefan, *Gustav
Habsburg Empire, nationalism was often at odds with state identity, and neither were straightforward propositions.\(^{10}\) Patriotic music was no exception to this: any musical repertoire that was so closely bound to Austro-Hungarian state identity during the turbulent years leading up to the First World War had to embody all the contradictions and complexities that everyday life in an empire of disparate nations entailed. When one looks beyond Mahler the composer and considers Mahler instead as a cultural observer, then the connections that he makes with Austro-Hungarian *Militärmusik* in his symphonies that aspire to universality give us a subtle clue that can help us to understand how patriotic music and imperial identity were conceived within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and how they were perceived by the public at large.

At first glance, the history of military music in the old Austro-Hungarian Empire may seem like an obscure and even parochial subject. It is well-known that the multinational empire had a vast repertoire of marches with names as saccharine as “O du mein Österreich,” and many Austrian and German musicians and musicologists have

---

\(^{10}\) Writing in 1918, the critic Egon Friedell went as far as to claim that, unlike a Frenchman or a German, “the Austrian views his fatherland with a sort of Strindbergian love-hate.” Quoted in Steven Beller, “Kraus’s Firework,” in *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*, ed. Maria Bucur and Nancy M. Wingfield (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2001), 46.
spilled a great deal of ink over the years assessing – and even advocating for – the artistic value of that repertoire. This is not within the scope of the present study, however. What interests me is not the importance of this repertoire for the development of the wind band genre – or as musical fodder for the works of other, better-known composers – but rather its significance for Austrian identity at the turn of the twentieth century. Given the Monarchy’s difficult political situation, the very existence of an extensive repertoire of military music in praise of the Austro-Hungarian Empire is a curious phenomenon indeed; the fact that this music – and the military bands that performed it – was extremely popular in virtually all corners of the Monarchy is even more perplexing in this regard. How did such politically-charged music manage to negotiate the minefield of diverse national identities that characterized the Habsburg Empire to become so universally popular? And why would someone like Gustav Mahler – along with so many other intellectuals from Eduard Hanslick to Joseph Roth – have been drawn to a repertoire that most critics usually dismiss on its face as trivial and banal? How did the political aims and musical characteristics of Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik complement one another? These are the issues I explore in this dissertation.

Though it is sometimes argued that Mahler’s tripartite sense of alienation contributed to his stature as a unique musical genius, his frustrations were, in fact, shared by many of his contemporaries. As exotic as Mahler’s story sounds to us, it was not all that uncommon within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, where identities flowed in abundance as people moved freely across what are today national boundaries. Seen in this light, Mahler’s multifaceted cultural identity and convoluted biography attests to the many opportunities for cultural interaction and hybridity afforded by the Austro-
Hungarian Empire at the end of the nineteenth century. Even many Austro-Hungarian Militärkapellmeister – the bandmasters in the direct employ of the Imperial and Royal Army – had similar life stories, and the complex of juxtapositions and contradictions that went into the creation of military music for the Austro-Hungarian Empire was certainly no less conflicted than Mahler himself. What Mahler is telling us in his pronouncements as well as through his music is no less than what being an “Austrian” meant at the beginning of the twentieth century. It was not a simple proposition, and by possessing so many identities, Mahler and his fellow countrymen effectively had no identities at all. These were men without qualities, to borrow a phrase, and indeed some aspects of their lives mirrored the story of Ulrich, the protagonist of Robert Musil’s incomplete two-volume philosophical novel Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften (“The Man without Qualities”).

* * *

The history of the late Habsburg Empire has traditionally been characterized as a struggle between a Germanized center and its peripheral nations yearning to break free. Austria-Hungary, so the story goes, was an ill-conceived polyglot state without any cultural or historical justification, and with the rise of nationalism, its days were numbered. Indeed, when explaining the Monarchy’s collapse, many historians cite the lack of – or resistance to – any kind of overarching sense of Austrian state identity beyond long-reigning Kaiser Franz Joseph’s own cult of personality as the prime cause. This identity crisis was spurred on by two major Central European political events: the
Ausgleich or compromise of 1867 – which effectively divided the Austrian Empire into two halves by recognizing Hungary as a semi-autonomous constituent kingdom – and the subsequent proclamation of the German Empire in 1871. Before 1871, there was no “Germany” to speak of, so the Germanized Austrian intelligentsia could stake a claim to their own kind of cosmopolitan German identity. After 1871, there suddenly was a real-world Germany, and the newly-minted Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary was not a part of it. When the initial shock of this finally wore off – and the idea of a German-Austrian Anschluss became increasingly unfeasible – the subjects of the Habsburg Empire had to start thinking about what being an “Austrian” meant for the first time. Yet at the same time, the very act of defining what was “Austrian” had suddenly been made infinitely more complicated as the result of the Ausgleich, and any concept of “Austria” now had to take all of its variegated peoples into account.

Naturally, such a complex political situation led to numerous problems, especially in the face of the reorganization of the German, Russian, and Italian monarchies into modern nation states, and the increasing desire for the empire’s eleven recognized national-linguistic groups to do the same.\footnote{The eleven languages that were given official recognition by 1914 were (in descending order of daily use): German, Magyar (Hungarian), Czech, Polish, Ruthenian (Ukrainian), Romanian, Croat, Slovak, Serb, Slovene, and Italian.} This crisis of Austrian state identity is best summed up by what the novelist Robert Musil (arguably the most influential historian of the Doppelmonarchiezeit) called the Sprachfehler: the sense of national confusion felt all Austrian subjects – from the lowest common soldier to Hofoperndirektor Gustav Mahler.
himself – who lacked a simple name for his home country and simply pretended it did not exist.¹²

We all talk as if nationalism were purely the invention of the arms dealers, but we really should try for a more comprehensive explanation, and to this end, Kakania makes an important contribution. The inhabitants of this Imperial and Royal Imperial-Royal Dual Monarchy had a serious problem: they were supposed to feel like Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian patriots, while at the same time being Royal Hungarian or Imperial Royal Austrian patriots. Their understandable motto in the face of such times was “United we stand” (from viribus unitis, “with forces joined”). But the Austrians needed to take a far stronger stand than the Hungarians, because the Hungarians were, first and last, simply Hungarians and were regarded only incidentally, by foreigners who did not know their language, as Austro-Hungarians too; the Austrians, however, were, to begin with and primarily, nothing at all, and yet they were supposed by their leaders to feel Austro-Hungarian and be Austro-Hungarians – they didn’t even have a proper word for it. Nor was there an Austria. Its two components, Hungary and Austria, made a match like a red-white-and-green jacket with black-and-yellow trousers. The jacket was a jacket, but the trousers were the relic of an extinct black-and-yellow outfit that had been ripped apart in the year 1867. The trousers, or Austria, were since then officially referred to as “the kingdoms and countries represented in the Imperial Council of the Realm,” meaning nothing at all, of course, because it was only a phrase concocted from various names, for even those kingdoms referred to, such wholly Shakespearean kingdoms as Lodomeria and Illyria, were long gone, even when there was still a complete black-and-yellow outfit worn by actual soldiers. So if you asked an Austrian where he was from, of course he couldn’t say: I am a man from one of those nonexistent kingdoms and countries; so for that reason alone he preferred to say: I am a Pole, a Czech, an Italian, Friulian, Ladino, Slovene, Croat, Serb, Slovak, Ruthenian, or Wallachian – and this was his so-called nationalism. Imagine a squirrel that doesn’t know whether it is a squirrel or a chipmunk, a creature with no concept of itself, and you will understand that in some circumstances it could be thrown into fits of terror by catching sight of its own tail. So this was the way Kakanians related to each other, with the panic of limbs so united as they stood that they hindered each other from being anything at all. Since the world began, no creature has yet died of a language defect, and yet the Austrian and

Hungarian Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy can nevertheless be said to have perished from its inexpressibility.\(^{13}\)

In this same volume, Musil famously coined the infamous moniker “Kakania,” from the initials of the *kaiserliche und königliche Monarchie*, to circumscribe an empire that was too impossible to exist – and would not exist much longer, as Musil knew all too well.\(^{14}\)

Subsequent readers have typically interpreted Musil through the lens of nationalism, which, in the aftermath of its dismemberment following the First World War, tended to treat the Habsburg Empire not as an historical curiosity but as an outright aberration, and a hindrance to the national aspirations of the peoples of Central Europe. Interpreted through this lens, Musil describes a useless relic of an empire, soldiering on past its prime only to deny its citizens their natural rights to national self-determination. As a result, the historiography of the late Habsburg Empire has traditionally spun a narrative of decadence leading to decline and collapse as a result.

But while it is *fait accompli* that the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy collapsed following the defeat of the Central Powers at the hands of the Allies in the First World War, this collapse does not necessarily presuppose a decline. While it is true that rising nationalist sentiment, fueled by U.S. President Wilson’s Fourteen Points, contributed to the dissolution of Austria-Hungary in 1918, war exhaustion and economic collapse...

---

\(^{13}\) Musil, *The Man without Qualities*, 1:490-91. Note that although Musil lived through the war and ultimate demise of Austria-Hungary, he began this novel long after contemporary critics and historians had begun to postulate the reasons for the empire’s collapse.

\(^{14}\) “Kakanien” is a play on the omnipresent initials “k.-k.” meaning “imperial and royal,” which formerly indicated the Habsburgs’ position as Holy Roman Emperors and Kings of Germany and other Central European realms. After the *Ausgleich* of 1867, it was amended to “k.u.k.,” or “Kaiserlich und Königlich,” whereupon the “royal” was understood to refer only to the Kingdom of Hungary. This effectively implied that Austria and Hungary were a separate but equal Empire and Kingdom, though as Musil reminds us, this was not the case. In German, “k.-k.” is pronounced “ka-ka,” which led Musil to the scatological “Kakania,” or as Janick and Toulmin translated it, “Shitland.” The sing-song quality of the name evokes some of the more obscure realms of the Dual Monarchy, such as Lodomeria. See Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein’s Vienna* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973), 13.
played a significant role as well. In recent years, however, many historians have come to conclude that the variegated ethnicities of the empire had reached a kind of balance during the years surrounding the turn of the century, and that it was only the tragic outcome of the First World War that upset this balance enough to force these nations to sue for full independence. As historian Alan Sked recently postulated, “in 1914 no one in the Habsburg Monarchy, save for a few hot-headed students who lacked popular support, was in favor of breaking it up or dismantling it.”

Indeed, the majority of the more than fifty million subjects of the Dual Monarchy came to accept and even support its multi-national character by 1914, buoyed by a history of a thousand years of more or less peaceful coexistence and a stable ruler in Franz Joseph. Musil himself hints at this multicultural détente; in his analysis of The Man without Qualities, critic Stefan Jonsson observes that Musil “appoints Ulrich to solve the riddle at the heart of the empire and its future: What is a cultural identity? What are the bonds that hold a people together?” The fact that identities within the Habsburg Empire were in flux meant that people of the time were, in a sense, free to define them however they saw fit. Jonsson cites Otto Bauer, the influential Austro-Marxist and the Republic of Austria’s second Foreign Minister after the war, who repositioned the nationality question on the personal level, arguing that “For the individual who is affected by the culture of two or more nations, whose character becomes equally strongly influenced by different cultures, does not simply unite the character traits of two nations

---

but possesses a wholly new character.” According to Jonsson, this is “why an individual who is the child of many nations becomes an object of suspicion, and in times of national struggle even condemned as a traitor and transgressor. Born in the Czech-German town of B., and fit to become a spy, Ulrich is one of these transgressors.”

Another interwar Austrian novelist, Joseph Roth, described an Austrian experience different from Musil’s version, one that reflects Roth’s own perspective growing up in the Imperial Crownlands – meaning the Habsburg territories beyond the ancient German Erzherzogtum Österreich. There, Roth saw an Austria not of the periphery against the center – the source of Ulrich’s unwitting transgressions – but an Austria of the whole, where the periphery actually helped to define the center, despite itself. In his novel Die Kapuzinergruft (“The Emperor’s Tomb”), Roth allows his character of Count Chojnicki – a Hungarian aristocrat and military officer – to speak for him, declaring:

Admittedly, the Slovenes, the Poles and Ruthenian Galicians, the caftan-wearing Jews from Boryslaw, the horse-traders from the Bacska, the Muslims from Sarajevo, and the chestnut-roasters from Mostar all sing the Kaiser’s hymn. But the German students from Brünn and Eger, the dentists, pharmacists, hairdressers’ assistants, art photographers from Linz, Graz, and Knittelfeld; the “goiters” from the Alpine valleys – they all sing “The Watch on the Rhine.” These Niebelungentreue will be the death of Austria, gentlemen! The Austrian essence is not of the center, but the periphery. Austria is not in the Alps – there you can find chamois and edelweiss and gentian, but hardly any trace of a double eagle. The Austrian substance will be nourished and forever replenished by the Crownlands.

17 Otto Bauer, quoted in ibid., 264.
18 Ibid. Mahler, born in the Czech-German town of “K.,” would have been similarly positioned.
19 My translation; in the original: “Freilich sind es die Slowenen, die polnischen und ruthenischen Galizianer, die Kaftanjuden aus Boryslaw, die Pferdehändler aus der Bacska, die Moslems aus Sarajewo, die Maronibrater aus Mostar, die »Gott erhalte« singen. Aber die deutschen Studenten aus Brünn und Eger, die Zahnärzte, Apotheker, Friseurgehilfen, Kunst-Photographen aus Linz, Graz, Knittelfeld, die Kröpfe aus den Alpentälern, sie alle singen die »Wacht am Rhein«. Österreich wird an dieser Niebelungentreue
Roth’s Austria is much larger than the modern Austrian state, and extends far beyond the historical German-Austria. In many ways, the Austria Roth described should be considered an anti-nation – not just a political formation “beyond” or above nationalism, but a concept directly opposed to nationalism. Austria-Hungary was not a nation, and certainly not a nation-state, but rather a still-functioning relic of the days before nation-states evolved into being. Those who adhered to Austria as a larger concept in the late nineteenth century were often themselves opposed to the various nationalist movements within the empire and sought a more rational path.

* * *

The German ethnonationalism that Mahler encountered upon his return to Vienna was just one of many different forms of nationalism that flourished in the Austro-Hungarian Empire by the beginning of the twentieth century. The numerous nationalist movements in the Habsburg Empire were as different as the nations they claimed to represent – both in terms of individual character as well as political aims. The pan-Germanists originally sought to promulgate the German Enlightenment principles of Kultur and Bildung, through which it was thought that anyone could come to adopt

German culture. Following the formation of the German nation-state in 1871, however, German nationalism became increasingly ethnocentric, to the active exclusion of Jews and other “outsiders.” The Hungarian Magyar nationalists attempted to create national hegemony within their own half of the Monarchy in the years following the *Ausgleich* by imposing the Hungarian language and culture on the other linguistic minorities within the Kingdom of Hungary in a process known as “Magyarization.” Czech and Polish nationalists each sought to consolidate a language and a culture that was believed to be in danger of being wiped away by the ubiquitous German-Austrian influences. Pan-Slavic nationalists attempted to unite the Monarchy’s Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenians, Slovenes, Croats, Bosnians, Herzegovinians, and Serbs into one powerful bloc that could oppose the Germans and Magyars politically, creating in effect a Triple Monarchy.

This diversity of nationalist goals and methods was not unique to Austria-Hungary; indeed, it was typical of nationalism itself. Liah Greenfeld, in her book *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, contrasts nationalisms in England, France, Russia, Germany, and the United States, from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries, noting that despite their many external differences, nationalist movements often sprang

---

20 This formation of German nationalism was a political necessity at the time when many different German-speaking states and principalities each had their own claim to the authentic German national identity.
21 Prior to 1867, Magyar speakers were themselves a minority within the Kingdom of Hungary, which also included most of the empire’s Slovaks, Poles, Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Ruthenians (Ukrainians), and Romanians. Magyarization was primarily a nationalist attempt to equalize Hungary’s power with the Monarchy’s Germans by over-representing the number of Magyars. Many ethnic minorities considered this “forced” Magyarization to be a serious hardship – especially the Slovaks, among whom it is still regarded as a kind of ethnic cleansing to this day.
22 One nationalism often fueled another in Austria-Hungary. While none of these movements had the stated goal of dismantling the empire, they each jockeyed for position as its central culture. The Hungarian novelist Zsigmond Kemény argued, for example, that “the function of Hungary was to defend the multi-national nature of the Hapsburg Empire, splitting Germanism and Slavism and preventing either of them becoming supreme.” Quoted in Claudio Magris, *Danube*, trans. Patrick Creagh (London: Harvill, 1989), 242.
from similar political situations and motives. Typically, nationalism was the product of
the bourgeoisie, which, by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, found itself
suddenly flush with financial prosperity yet still lacking access to the traditional avenues
of power occupied by the ancient aristocracy. Bristling at their aristocratic overlords,
Greenfeld argues, they banded together virtually out of spite:

Commoners by birth, they found the traditional image of society, in which
upward mobility was an anomaly, uncongenial and substituted for at the
idea of a homogeneous elite people – the nation. Had they concentrated,
instead, on forging genealogies, a perfectly logical thing to do given the
circumstances, history could have taken an entirely different course.

It was the egalitarian sense of belonging offered by the nationalist movements that was
most appealing. “Nationality,” according to Greenfeld, “elevated every member of the
community which made it sovereign. It guaranteed status. National identity is,
fundamentally, a matter of dignity. It gives people reasons to be proud.” Status became
paramount, and nationalism quickly became a way for commoners to strike back at what
they now perceived to be the “foreign” aristocracy and royalty, seizing the respect they
felt their newfound economic prosperity naturally deserved.

Despite nationalism’s populist origins, however, in each of the five nation-states
Greenfeld studied – and in many others as well – the goals and methods of nationalism
were ultimately subsumed by the state itself. According to Eric Hobsbawm, the period

---

1992), 487.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid. (emphasis hers). Greenfeld also notes that “It would be a strong statement, but no overstatement, to
say that the world in which we live was brought into being by vanity” (488).
26 Greenfeld observes, “In all the five cases in this book, however, the emergence of nationalism was
related to preoccupation with status. The English aristocracy sought to justify it; the French and Russian
nobility – to protect it; the German intellectuals – to achieve it. Even for the materialistic Americans,
taxation without representation was an insult to their pride, more than an injury to the economic interests.
They fought – and became a nation – over respect due to them, rather than anything else.” Ibid., 488.
from the 1870s to 1914 was the time when most of the national symbols we now know were institutionalized – or “mass-produced” – in Europe, the Americas, and Asia. This included, notably, the canons of national and patriotic music that were an extremely important component of nearly all nineteenth-century European nationalist movements. Yet the process of turning regional songs into national works was far from a simple one, as the ethnomusicologist Philip Bohlman noted,

Within the European empires the distinctiveness of ethnic groups was increasingly sharpened as the symbols of ethnicity became tangible aspects of everyday life. Folk songs previously circulating in dialect and oral tradition were collected and set as art songs in the national language, indeed, encoding the national language through song. In the waning decades of the nineteenth century, the national musics of empire and the ethnic musics of growing ethnonationalism were competing for many of the same spaces.

Driving this official public nationalism was the rise of mass politics and universal male suffrage. Hobsbawm maintains that the political leaders of the time needed yet another means to control these unpredictable mass voting blocs in order to retain power, and the symbols of nationalism were duly pressed into service. The German Empire, for example, was legitimized “by the concept of a secular national enemy against whom the German people had defined their identity, and struggled to achieve unity as a state; and by the concept of conquest of culture, political and military supremacy.” In Vienna, this was a lesson Karl Lueger learned instinctively, linking his own rise to political power to his ability to rally the masses against the imaginary threat of the Jews and Slavic

---

nationalists – the “others” who were at the same time held to be the cultural inferiors of the German-Austrians.\textsuperscript{30}

In the face of such rampant and divisive nationalism – fanned by politicians who were willing to exploit it for their own gain – it is easy to dismiss Roth’s writings as wishful Habsburg nostalgia. But during the \textit{Monarchiezeit}, there were many who actually felt the way his Count Chojnicki did, and by the late nineteenth century, a greater Austrian identity began to emerge from a wide range of people. Some of them were intellectuals in the Kantian cosmopolitan spirit, who sought an end to what they saw as the inhumane, divisive strife of nationalism. Others were conservative pragmatists who wanted to justify the political arrangement that best preserved their own ends. And many were ordinary citizens who simply admired their Kaiser and believed in the integrity of their homeland. Notably, a supranational Austrian state was a favorite idea among the Monarchy’s Jewish population. As German nationalism became ethnocentric, many Jewish intellectuals, chief among them the politician Joseph Samuel Bloch, began to postulate an anational Austrian state in which they could participate freely. The idea of a cosmopolitan Austria also figured into the Socialist writings of Karl Renner and Otto Bauer, and it has even been shown to have influenced the social critique of Karl Popper.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30} One effect of this state-supported nationalism was to unite the sovereign with the people in an indivisible way. A kind of transubstantiation occurred, with sovereign in effect becoming the nation. According to Benedict Anderson, this was a two-edged sword: “If Kaiser Wilhelm II cast himself as ‘No. 1 German,’ he implicitly conceded that he was \textit{one among many of the same kind as himself}, that he had a representative function, and therefore could, in principle, be a \textit{traitor} to his fellow-Germans (something inconceivable in the dynasty’s heyday. Traitor to whom or to what?). In the wake of the disaster that overtook Germany in 1918, he was taken at his implied word.” See Anderson, \textit{Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism}, rev. and ext. ed. (London: Verso, 1991), 85.

\textsuperscript{31} See for example Ian Reifowitz, \textit{Imagining an Austrian Nation: Joseph Samuel Bloch and the Search for a Multiethnic Austrian Identity, 1846-1919} (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2003), and Malachi Haim Hacohen, \textit{Karl Popper, the Formative Years, 1902-1945: Politics and Philosophy in Interwar Vienna} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
These ideas were expressed variously as the *Gesamtstaat*, the *Vielvolkerstaat*, or the *Nationalitätenstaat*, but the end goal was the same: a hybrid Austrian state in which all the constituent nationalities were equal.

While none of these theories were able to be put into practice through any kind of synchronized effort – let alone one as ambitious as Musil’s Parallel Action Committee – the lived experience of Austria-Hungary often created a workable, local-level multinationalism on its own, and the kind of *Gesamtstaat* that Roth described was a reality for a large number of the Monarchy’s subjects by the turn of the twentieth century. Examples of it could be found in all of the Joint institutions of the empire: the Bureaucracy, the Catholic Church, and most especially, in the *kaiserliche und königliche Armee*. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Joint Army had in place a unique kind of patriotism – a *gesamtösterreichischen Patriotismus* – that was more than just dynastic loyalty but actually took account of all of the Monarchy’s constituent peoples. This multinational patriotism can be seen in all of the Army’s cultural aspects – especially in its musical establishment, which became an important symbol of the Monarchy for both the soldiers in the regiments and the public at large. The Imperial and Royal *Militärmusik*, heavily influenced by the contributions of *Militärkapellmeister* from the Imperial Crownlands, created a kind of musical multinationalism that – intentionally or not – reflected the political *Gesamtstaatsidee*.

* * *

18
This dissertation examines the military music of the Austro-Hungarian Army from the *Ausgleich* of 1867 to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, and it explores how this music attempted to evoke a single, multi-national Austrian state identity against the divisive social context of its time. Nearly all nineteenth-century nations and empires promulgated repertoires of patriotic music as part of their self-legitimating process, and through a process similar to the canonization of Western art music, specialized patriotic canons formed during this time, many of which remain intact today. Though the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire is often blamed on the Monarchy’s failure to forge a patriotic state identity uniting its ethnically diverse subjects into a cohesive nation-state like contemporary Germany or Italy, Austria-Hungary had a repertoire of patriotic music equaling and even surpassing that of any other state in Europe. This was music not just for the glorification of “Austria” but for its very definition, drawing almost indiscriminately from the disparate nationalist idioms of a broad cross-section of the empire’s peoples. This repertoire could be considered as a kind of multinationalism in music, obviously influenced by the contemporary nationalist currents of late nineteenth century Central Europe, but at the same time, paralleling the political thinking of those who wanted to preserve the multiethnic Empire in the years leading up to the First World War.

Just as in the traditionally nationalist armies of Germany, France, and Great Britain, the *k.u.k. Armee* had a body of music that evoked an idealized homeland – but in this case, it celebrated the diversity of this homeland rather than its imagined homogeneity. Austrian *Militärmusik* could be seen as a musical corollary to the political *Gesamtstaatsidee*, existing as an almost dialectical synthesis of the German
Enlightenment concept of cosmopolitanism and its antithesis, exclusionary ethnonationalism. Far from being an organized movement, however, Austrian Militärmusik became multinationalist as the practical outcome of the regiments being stationed outside their national boundaries: the Militärkapellmeister often simply absorbed and incorporated local popular styles into their own compositions for public concerts in a strange venue. But these Militärkapellmeister were not only composing a representative Austrian patriotism; from their diverse backgrounds, they could even be said to embody it. What is notable is how many of them – especially after 1866 – came from outside of German Austria. Some of them even had to negotiate nationalist hurdles on their path towards Austro-Hungarian identities. The music that these composers created embodied and articulated a complex identity that took account of all the empire’s constituent nations and helped to unite the empire through a difficult historical period, up to and beyond the outbreak of the First World War. Most of these bandmasters are unknown to us today but they were the pop icons of their own time, and their eclectic and ubiquitous music ultimately came to influence the Viennese modernists – including Mahler.

In what follows, I examine the theme of Austro-Hungarian multinationalism on each of five different levels, moving from the general to the specific: from the empire as a whole, to the Joint Army, to the army bands, to the army band repertoire, and finally to some representative long-form pieces of Militärmusik. My first chapter presents an historical overview of the last years of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, with an emphasis on the efforts that were undertaken to unify the empire’s disparate peoples and combat the divisive strains of nationalism that threatened its stability. Focusing on the period
from roughly 1848 to the start of the First World War, this chapter reexamines the conventional wisdom of a discordant and dysfunctional Empire and juxtaposes it against some more recent historical studies focusing on how it actually functioned as a multi-national entity, even if it may have lacked a suitable political philosophy to act as a guide. This chapter introduces the historical principles underlying the so-called Gesamtstaatsidee and the institutions that supposedly embodied and projected it, including the bureaucracy, the Catholic Church, the Emperor’s cult of personality, and even the Jewish intelligentsia – though I save discussion of the most successful institutional manifestation of the Gesamtstaatsidee for my next chapter. This chapter concludes with an examination of the Emperor Franz Joseph’s Fiftieth and Sixtieth Jubilee celebrations in 1898 and 1908, respectively, both of which established the basis of the popular support for both the monarch and the multinational idea itself.

My second chapter introduces the Imperial and Royal Austro-Hungarian Joint Army and presents information on not only the role of the Army during the prewar era, but also its multi-ethnic composition and outlook. It was in the Army where Imperial multinationalism actually became official with the Emperor Franz Joseph’s 1903 Chłopy Army Order, which mandated “utilizing the individual qualities of each nationality for the benefit of all.” As a result, the Joint Army was multinational in a way that would be largely unknown until the advent of the twentieth-century peacekeeping forces of the UN and NATO. The Joint Army spoke each of the empire’s eleven official languages, and it routinely stationed recruits far beyond their own ethnic homelands. In this way, I contend, the Joint Army became the primary vehicle for both the maintenance of imperial
diversity as well as its social homogenation, and here I am supported by the major secondary studies in this area, especially those of István Deák and Gunther Rothenberg.

Moving inward from the chapters examining the Monarchy as a whole and the Joint Army, my third chapter discusses the institution of military music in the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Here I provide the necessary background history of Austrian Militärmusik from its alleged Turkish origins up to World War I. I then describe the social role played by Militärmusik within the empire, drawing on concert programs and contemporary accounts from Eduard Hanslick, Joseph Roth and others. Finally, I profile the military musicians and Militärkapellmeister themselves, showing how they embodied the multi-ethnic Gesamtstaatsidee by highlighting their variegated backgrounds and cultural influences. An important primary source for this information is a biographical lexicon of Austro-Hungarian Militärkapellmeister from the year 1903-04 by Joseph Damanski. What we see from these biographies is that military musicians moved constantly all over the empire in a manner not unlike Gustav Mahler’s own early career. Although Mahler’s professional mobility is often considered to be exceptional – and is sometimes even attributed to the “Wandering Jew” stereotype – it turns out that his career was not atypical for his time, as many working musicians in Austria moved from city to city in an often vain search for musical success.

Chapter four moves from the musicians to the makeup of the canon of military music from the late Habsburg Empire. Here, I focus on the only official compilation of patriotic music ever sanctioned by the Imperial War Ministry: Emil Kaiser’s Historische Märsche und sonstige Compositionen für das kaiserliche und königliche Heer of 1895. This book uses marches to create a kind of idealized multinational Austrian history, as
shown by the inclusion of composers as well as dedicatees from all over the Monarchy. I then go on to discuss the primary unifying element of Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik during the nineteenth century: its characteristic instrumentation. The unusual constellation of wind and percussion instruments employed by the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle, which eschewed the instruments widely used by Western European and American bands such as the saxophone and cornet, gave this ensemble a unique timbre. This chapter also establishes the instrumental idioms that were widely in use at the turn of the century and which helped to create musical topics that the composers of large-scale Austro-Hungarian patriotic works could draw upon.

Chapter five examines some examples of long-form programmatic works that were composed in praise of the Habsburg Empire and its people near the end of the nineteenth century. Two major works will be discussed here; one is the four-movement tone poem cycle Österreicb Ruhm und Ehre (“Austria’s Glory and Honor”) by Julius Fučík. This work is a treasure trove of the contradictions of Austro-Hungarian multinational identity: it is a nationalist tone poem set in the tradition of Smetana, composed by a Czech student of Dvořák who was also an Imperial and Royal Militärkapellmeister stationed in Sarajevo. The music blends influences from the Czech nationalists as well as Wagner, Brahms, and Liszt, plus Italian and Hungarian folk idioms and even some functional army music such as trumpet calls and hymns with little regard to national purity, creating a proto-modernist musical portrait of the empire as a whole. The other work under discussion in this chapter is an 1890 potpourri-Tongemälde by Carl Michel Ziehrer called Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten (“The Dream of an Austrian Reservist”). This work, a forty-minute medley of popular compositions
arranged around an ambitious narrative program, was among the most popular pieces of its days, and in 1915, it served as both the inspiration and the score to one of Austria-Hungary’s first wartime propaganda films (sadly, now lost) by the same name. My conclusion then links the musical and sociological aspects of Austro-Hungarian "Militärmusik" to the wider discourses on political and musical nationalism and the European Union’s search for a post-nationalist common culture.

This dissertation presents but a few examples from a vast repertoire whose popularity cut across class and nationality within the diverse Monarchy. This music was both popular and functional, but it was underlain with a political message that stressed the equality of nations under the dominion of the Habsburg Dynasty. Much like the Imperial and Royal Army itself, this music spoke several languages: it was, at the same time, German and Czech, Hungarian and Italian, cosmopolitan and nationalist – combinations that were only made possible by the Austrian "Gesamtstaat." "Militärmusik" was, in this sense, the music of the Austro-Hungarian Empire as it was intended to be.

Previous studies of nationalism in music have all too often started from the idea that national self-determination is a natural human condition, and that multinational empires must therefore be a form of tyranny. As such, conventional musicology has not explored the idea of “multinational” European music beyond the conception of Germanic cosmopolitanism. But with the formation of the European Union and its search for a supranational cultural identity, the time has come for a fresh view of music history that is not predicated on exclusionary nationalist ideology. In this spirit, a closer examination of the music and culture of the Austro-Hungarian "Militärkapelle" will reveal much to us about the nature of musical and national hybridity at the crossroads of Europe during the
Monarchiezeit, and with the past as prologue, perhaps it can offer us hope for peaceful national coexistence in our own time as well.
1. The *Gesamtstaatsidee* and its Adherents

In the popular consensus, the Habsburg Empire is generally regarded to have been a failure. It was a medieval empire made up of many nations that foolishly attempted to soldier on (or muddle through) in the age of nationalism. Indeed, historians of this viewpoint usually point to the empire’s dissolution at the end of the First World War to confirm its status as both a failed state and a failed concept, and then create elaborate narratives of decline in order to explain the presumably inevitable collapse. The problem with these narratives of “decline and fall” is that they often fail to account for how the multinational empire was able to stay relatively intact for such a long time, through more than 640 years of Habsburg rule. Seen through the lens of nationalism, the Habsburg Empire was anathema; it subjugated the constituent nations and denied them their inherent right to self-rule. But seen through a contemporary post-nationalist lens – a perspective that no longer views the nation-state as the pinnacle of political achievement – we are able to make out a clearer picture of how and why the Habsburg Empire was able to survive up until the First World War.

For much of the long history of the Habsburg Empire, nationalism was not a factor. Loyalties to regional lords as well as to the monolithic Catholic Church prevailed over most of the bonds and divisions among the people. It was not until the empire’s last permutation, as the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary (1867-1918), that the forces of nationalism reached their fullest extent. Yet it was also during this time of heightened
nationalism that a compelling idea of an Austrian multinational identity began to emerge in an unconcerted and unofficial effort to unite the disparate national factions within the empire and compete with the more homogenous nation-states of Europe. This multinationalist philosophy of the entire Austrian state – sometimes called the \textit{Gesamtstaatsidee} – was a significant cultural undercurrent in the final decades of the empire; this chapter traces our understanding of the Austro-Hungarian \textit{Gesamtstaatsidee} through the secondary literature on the subject that has recently begun to come out.

\textbf{The construction of the Dual Monarchy}

In \textit{The Man without Qualities}, Robert Musil famously described the contradictions and convolutions of his seemingly mythical homeland of “Kakania” with the hindsight of some fifteen years since its demise at the end of the First World War:

All in all, how many amazing things might be said about this vanished Kakania! Everything and every person in it, for instance, bore the label of \textit{kaiserlich-königlich} (Imperial-Royal) or \textit{kaiserlich und königlich} (Imperial and Royal), abbreviated as “k.k.” or “k.&k.,” but to be sure which institutions and which persons were to be designated by “k.k.” and which by “k.&k.” required the mastery of a secret science. On paper it was called the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but in conversation it was called Austria, a name solemnly abjured officially while stubbornly retained emotionally, just to show that feelings are quite as important as constitutional law and that regulations are one thing and real life is something else entirely. Liberal in its constitution, it was administered clerically. The government was clerical, but everyday life was liberal. All citizens were equal before the law, but not everyone was a citizen. There was a Parliament, which asserted its freedom so forcefully that it was usually kept shut; there was also an Emergency Powers Act that enabled the government to get along without Parliament, but then, when everyone had happily settled for absolutism, the Crown decreed that it was time to go back to parliamentary rule. The country was full of such goings-on, among them the sort of nationalist movements that rightly attracted so much attention in Europe and are so thoroughly misunderstood today. They were so violent that they jammed the machinery of government and
brought it to a dead stop several times a year, but in the intervals and during the deadlocks people got along perfectly well and acted as if nothing had happened. And in fact, nothing really had happened. It was only that everyone’s natural resentment of everyone else’s efforts to get ahead, a resentment we all feel nowadays, had crystallized earlier in Kakania, where it can be said to have assumed the form of a sublimated ceremonial rite, which could have had a great future had its development not been cut prematurely short by a catastrophe.¹

The peculiar formation of the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary that Musil lampoons here was the culmination of a long trajectory of Central European identity politics. Following Napoleon’s dissolution of the mediaeval Holy Roman Empire in 1804, the last Holy Roman Emperor Franz II proclaimed the Austrian Empire out of the contiguous portions of Central and Eastern European that were under the direct hereditary rule of the House of Habsburg. This newly-formed Austrian Empire barely lasted 60 years before it came into direct conflict with a surging Bismarckian Prussia, and its defeat in the disastrous Austro-Prussian war of 1866 left the Austrian government even weaker than it was during the revolutions of 1848-49. The dissent of the Hungarian nobility, whose dissatisfaction with more than three centuries of Habsburg rule² boiled over with Lajos Kossuth’s insurrection in 1848, seized the opportunity to assert their rights to autonomy. They were supported, in part, by liberal German-Austrians who had grown frustrated with nearly two decades of on-again off-again absolutism instituted by Franz Joseph and pushed for constitutional limits on the Kaiser’s power. This odd political constellation took advantage of the Monarchy’s deflated standing following its defeat at the hands of

² The Habsburgs inherited most of Hungary – which was never technically part of the Holy Roman Empire – after the 1526 Battle of Mohács, when the land was partitioned between the House of Habsburg and the Ottoman Empire. The entirety of the Kingdom of Hungary gradually fell into Habsburg hands as the Ottoman Empire retreated from Central Europe in the wake of their two failed sieges of Vienna.
Prussia and ultimately forced the *Ausgleich*, or compromise, of 1867, which remade the Austrian Empire as the Imperial and Royal Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary.

The basic goal of the *Ausgleich*, according to one historian, was to attempt to “cut the Habsburg Monarchy in two while leaving it in one piece.”\(^3\) The terms of the *Ausgleich* did effectively cut the empire into two halves, each with its own democratically-elected parliament. Franz Joseph ruled over both halves as Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, but his centralized government had direct control in only three areas: foreign policy, defense, and finance. All other aspects of government were handled locally by the two parliaments, which met in Vienna and Budapest, respectively.

The line of demarcation between the two spheres of influence partially followed the course of the Leitha River, giving the unofficial name “Cisleithania” to the half of the Monarchy on the Viennese side and, less frequently, “Transleithania” for the Hungarian half.\(^4\)

---


\(^4\) During this period (1867-1918), “Austria” was often thought to refer to Cisleithania, as opposed to Hungary, but as the historian A.J.P. Taylor spells out, this is not entirely accurate: “Technically, the ‘Empire of Austria’ still meant the whole; and Austria-Hungary, to use a British analogy, is not ‘England-Scotland,’ but ‘Great Britain-Scotland’; and ‘the common Monarchy’ was a Hungarian device to avoid the hated word ‘Empire’ or ‘Reich.’ The non-Hungarian lands had no name; they were ‘the other half of the Empire’ or, strictly, ‘the lands represented in the Reichsrat.’” Taylor adds that the non-Hungarian lands – i.e., Cisleithania – were only informally called “Austria” until they were formally designated as such in 1915. See A.J.P. Taylor, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 134 n.2. Robert Musil offered a similar, if more poetic, description of this complex nomenclature: “This sense of the Austro-Hungarian state was so oddly put together that it must seem almost hopeless to explain it to anyone who has not experienced it himself. It did not consist of an Austrian part and a Hungarian part that, as one might expect, complemented each other, but of a whole and a part; that is, of a Hungarian and an Austro-Hungarian sense of statehood, the latter to be found in Austria, which in a sense left the Austrian sense of statehood with no country of its own. The Austrian existed only in Hungary, and there as an object of dislike; at home, he called himself a national of the kingdom and lands of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy as represented in the Imperial Council, meaning that he was an Austrian plus a Hungarian minus that Hungarian; and he did this not with enthusiasm but only for the sake of a concept that was repugnant to him, because he could bear the Hungarians as little as they could bear him, which added still another complication to the whole combination.” See Musil, *The Man without Qualities*, 1: 180.
Though many historians consider the Ausgleich to be the beginning of the end of the Habsburg Empire, what in effect happened was a complete renegotiation of the concept of empire. The Ausgleich accomplished the political goal of preserving a more or less unified Habsburg Empire in Central Europe for another fifty years. By redirecting revolutionary fervor towards parliamentary squabbles, the Ausgleich succeeded in pacifying the Hungarians, who were at the time the most unified – and therefore the most dangerous – national group within the empire. The Hungarians were given a large measure of legal autonomy, yet they were denied any real control over the means of waging war or conducting foreign relations, thus ensuring their continued dependence on the Kaiser.

The Dual Monarchy functioned quite differently in both its halves; as the British historian Alan Sked has recently argued: “The Austrians assumed the existence of some sort of ‘overall state’ or Oberstaat called the ‘Austrian Monarchy’ to which the two ‘halves’ or Reichshälfen were to be subordinated. Yet such an interpretation was totally alien to Hungarian constitutional thought, which was still anchored to the concept of a separate, constitutional Hungarian state which shared a ruler – or rather the person of a ruler – with the Austrians, and which had merely entered into certain specific constitutional arrangements with them.” Animosity between the German-Austrians and

---


6 According to Sked, “the Hungarians had no influence on the army. Indeed, this body was distinctly apathetic towards the Hungarians and often appeared to act within Hungary as an army of occupation. It was an independent power within the Hungarian state and made Hungary dependent on the dynasty.” See Sked, Decline and Fall, 197. Sked quotes one source who called the army the “Achilles’ heel of Dualism” for this very contentious reason.

7 Ibid., 193.
the Hungarians ran quite high at times; “Hungarian public opinion still considered Hungary to be oppressed,” Sked noted, while “Austrian public opinion resented what it took to be the sinister and predominant role of Hungary within the Monarchy.”

Yet even if the power-sharing situation between German-Austria and Hungary was at least marginally successful – or at least marginally functional – the Ausgleich was, at bottom, an arrangement between only two of the national groups that comprised the Habsburg Empire. It must be remembered that the Austro-Hungarian Empire was much more than the union of Austria and Hungary; it was, in one historian’s words, “a collection of formerly independent or potentially independent historical-political entities that came under the sway of the Habsburgs.”

By 1908 – the sixtieth year of his reign – Franz Joseph ruled over eighteen crown lands encompassing 257,478 square miles as Apostolic King of Hungary; King of Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia, and Galicia and Lodomeria; Archduke of Austria; Duke of Salzburg, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, Bukovina, Upper and Lower Silesia; Margrave of Moravia, Istria (Küstenland); Princely Count of the Tyrol and Vorarlberg, and as direct ruler of the newly-annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina (see Figure 1).
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8 Ibid., 198.
Figure 1: Map showing the constituent Crownlands of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1908. The administrative possessions of the Kingdom of Hungary are shaded; recently-annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina had a special intermediate status.

The population, which reached some 50.8 million by 1910, was divided into eleven officially-recognized linguistic nationalities according to the following distribution (Figure 2):

11 According to the 1910 census; see Sked, *Decline and Fall*, 335.
This was, effectively, an empire without a majority population, nor even a centralized core elite, since the Austrian Germans were, for various historical reasons, found scattered throughout the empire’s crownlands. To make matters more complicated, few of the ethnic groups listed above (Figure 2) were wholly contained within the boundaries of Austria-Hungary; as the historian Robert Kann noted, the Austro-Hungarian Empire “was comprised of parts of nations rather than all inclusive national groups,” and most of them had important cultural centers lying outside of Habsburg territory. Moreover, the territorial boundaries for these nations were rarely neatly defined. With the possible
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12 Sources: 1910 Census results in ibid., 335 ff. Percentages are based on a total population of 50.8 million, as cited above, and include Bosnia-Herzegovina.

13 Besides Jews, who did not constitute a discrete national group at that time, the Germans were the most diffuse and least centralized of all the nations of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. See Stefan Jonsson, *Subject without Nation: Robert Musil and the History of Modern Identity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 222. It should be noted that even the semi-autonomous Hungarian half of the Monarchy was far from ethnically homogeneous – a situation the Hungarians sought to correct by attempting to “Magyarize” their ethnic minorities.

exception of the Magyars – who tended to remain close to their native Hungary – few if any of the empire’s ethnic groups were confined to one centralized locality within the empire, not even to their traditional or ancestral homelands. As one author has subsequently noted, “individuals of most [ethnic] groups lived in both parts of the Dual Monarchy, the exception being Poles, Czechs, and Italians, who were found only in Cisleithania, and the Magyars who populated only Transleithania.”

Further complicating matters, the rise of industrialization brought about a massive increase in internal migration, as disadvantaged Austro-Hungarian subjects moved and resettled throughout the empire looking for economic opportunities. Thus, even when a group did congregate in one geographic location for cultural, historical, or political reasons – as the Magyars did in Hungary – they still frequently came into contact with people of other nations, who spoke a foreign language and adhered to an alien culture.

Governing such a disparate collection of ethnic groups during an era of heightened nationalism proved difficult, to say the least. In 1879, after more than a decade of mixed results, Austrian Minister-President Count Eduard Taaffe established what he would call the Iron Ring, a coalition government that stuck a pragmatic yet precarious balance among the various nationalities of the empire, often at the expense of the German-Austrian Liberals. Political historian John W. Boyer noted that Taaffe’s stance “reestablished a temporary equilibrium within Austrian party politics, not unlike that state of political equilibrium which had existed before 1848. Appropriately, Taaffe described his goal as that of ‘keeping all of the nationalities of the Monarchy in a condition of even and well-modulated discontent.’ Not surprisingly, his enemies viewed
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15 Jonsson, *Subject without Nation*, 222.
the style of his regime as one of ‘muddling through’ (*fortwursteln*).”16 In the words of another historian, the Austro-Hungarian political system “actively encouraged rivalry and distrust among the ethnic groups by placing them in a zero sum game in which they battled each other for slices of the pie.”17 This kept every group in what has been described as “a more-or-less balanced and equitable distribution of dissatisfaction,”18 wherein they were perennially squabbling amongst themselves instead of rebelling against the Emperor.

These looming challenges – along with the *fait accompli* of the empire’s dissolution at the end of the First World War – have created a certain sense of fatalism among historians. Since even before the outbreak of the war, the historiography of the late Habsburg Empire has traditionally been a narrative of decline and collapse. One prominent historian, Solomon Wank, has put forward his own thesis that the only reason Austria-Hungary continued to exist was in order to play at being a Great Power. “It was the determination of the ruler and his advisers,” Wank argued, “to preserve the shaky imperial structure and restore the empire’s reputation as a Great Power that motivated them to seek salvation in war in 1914, as they had in 1859 and 1866.”19 The other European Great Powers essentially conspired to keep Austria viable – with at least one of them always taking Austria’s side in war – all the way up until 1914, keeping the
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Habsburg Empire on life support for much of the years it “should” have been in decline and hiding its defects until the very end.\(^\text{20}\)

The primary criticism directed towards the Austro-Hungarian Empire during this time has been its perceived lack of a defining, centralized idea that united its citizens. Describing the absence of a formal *Staatsidee* as early as the 1880s, Count Gustav Kálnoky complained: “Since the time when the Habsburg territorial possessions were first united, the monarchy has developed more in the sense of a power (*Macht*) than in the sense of a state (*Staat*). Power and purpose in external matters were more recognizable than its purpose as a state.”\(^\text{21}\) Another of the earliest proponents of this anti-Habsburg school was the British historian Wickham Steed, who clearly had a nationalist axe to grind and in fact considered this binding of nations to be something of a moral failing on the part of the Dual Monarchy:

Austrian Germans speak of their ‘nation’ and mean primarily the Germans of Bohemia, the Tyrol, Upper and Lower Austria, Moravia, Styria and Carinthia, and secondarily their brethren *draussen im Reich*, that is, in the German Empire. Czechs, Croatians, Serbs, Slovenes, Poles, and Ruthenes or Little Russians, nay, even the Jews of the Zionist persuasion, likewise refer to their several ‘nations’ in an ethnical sense. The idea of an ‘Austrian’ nationhood, with its uniting virtue, is lacking, nor is the want supplied by what is called the ‘State idea.’ True, Austrians and Hungarians alike employ the term ‘Fatherland,’ but they usually limit its application to their own half of the Monarchy; *Gesamtpatriotismus*, or patriotism embracing the whole Monarchy, is the privilege of a few.\(^\text{22}\)

Writing in the first decade of the twentieth century, Steed probably saw his nationalist viewpoints vindicated by the verdict of the First World War. Indeed, as Steed’s writing indicates, much of this conventional wisdom regarding the breakup of Austria-Hungary

\(^\text{20}\) Ibid., 52-3.
\(^\text{21}\) Ibid., 48.
has been influenced by nationalism itself. According to the historian Peter M. Judson, “So completely has the idea of nation come to dominate our ways of understanding modern society that it requires a superhuman effort on the part of scholars, politicians, activists, or informed observers to imagine a world not shaped by the overpowering categories of the nation-state and its global system. Despite – or perhaps because of – decades of scholarship, nationalism’s origins are almost always debated in terms that naturalize the prior existence of nationalism’s own object – the nation.”

While it is true that Austria-Hungary collapsed in 1918, this collapse does not necessarily presuppose a decline. Following the defeat of the Central Powers at the hands of the Allies in the First World War, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy broke apart into several constituent nation-states, due in no small part to the stipulations of President Woodrow Wilson’s Fourteen Points. Yet this breakup was hardly preordained, and to claim that all the warning signs were present would be “misplaced determinism,” in the words of one revisionist scholar.24 Author and eyewitness to much of Austria’s twentieth-century history Gordon Brook-Shepherd agrees, claiming that “Nothing could be further from the truth than the impressions given by many republican leaders at the time (and cherished by Europe’s left-wing ideologues ever since) that, in the autumn of 1918, the Habsburg empire imploded from within, destroyed by the mass rebellion of its peoples.”25
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24 Sked, Decline and Fall, 191.
Alan Sked, one of the foremost proponents of the idea of a thriving and growing Dual Monarchy – and not a shell of a state limping along only with the support of its allies – has taken this argument farther than most, arguing that “What happened was that in 1848, the Monarchy almost fell apart but thereafter recovered and in many ways rose rather than declined before 1914. It can even be argued that there was no domestic or even foreign threat to its integrity until 1918.”

Sked goes on to describe his revisionist position on the Dual Monarchy:

Most students appear to believe that the Habsburg Monarchy was ‘in decline’ between 1867 and 1914. The common view among them seems to be that in 1914 it was on the brink of ‘collapse’ and that the First World War merely brought about the inevitable. In fact, almost nobody inside the Monarchy was working for a republic during this period and practically no one wanted to see the Monarchy break up. Ironically, perhaps the most militant dissidents were the German nationalists led by von Schönerer, who advocated that Austria’s Germans should break away and join the German Empire of the Hohenzollerns. It was only defeat in a war, therefore, which was to precipitate collapse, and that defeat was not certain until the early summer of 1918. Even then, the Habsburg Army went on fighting until the bitter end. However, had the Central Powers actually won the First World War, the Habsburg Monarchy would have survived not merely intact, but almost certainly expanded.

Agreeing, Gordon Brook-Shepherd claims that “The picture sometimes painted of the Dual Monarchy limping along on crutches towards its inevitable doom is a totally misleading one” and cites the fact that there was actually an economic upturn in the first years of the twentieth century that bolstered the case for the empire. Historian Robin Okey has similarly argued that “our view of nationalism in the Habsburg Monarchy
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26 Sked, *Decline and Fall*, 6.
27 Ibid., 191.
29 Brook-Shepherd argues from this position; ibid.
might be overshadowed by hindsight” and seeks a more balanced view of the nationalities problem in the last decades of the Monarchy:

There is empirical evidence for such surmises. Radical nationalism á la Schönerer never came near winning majority support. The level of ethnic violence in the Habsburg Monarchy was low compared to modern or nineteenth-century Belfast, let alone the thousands of fatalities in the social movements of Tsarist Russia. … Alongside the powerful working-class movement, the Church was an even more influential force for national forbearance, whose diocesan boundaries ignored linguistic lines. Its official view saw the nation, as an extended family, as a legitimate object of love but condemned over-emphasis on it as un-Christian.  

Citing the contemporary scholars such as Barbara Jelavich, István Deák and István Diószegi, Sked maintains that although the nationalist fervor and rhetoric of the Austro-Hungarian subjects of the inhabitants may have been strong, the reality was that none of the movements’ leaders – not even the Hungarians – actually wanted full independence from Habsburg rule. None of these nationalists believed that their nations could compete with the dominant empires of Europe. Echoing similar lines, Alon Rachamimov submitted that “A Czech nationalist from Bohemia might dream about an independent Czech homeland, yet at the same time support a strong, viable Austria-Hungary as a necessary bulwark against German and Russian expansionism.”

As Gordon Brook-Shepherd maintained, “The Habsburg dynasty was multi-national or it was nothing.” If, therefore, the fractious Austro-Hungarian Empire needed to survive – whether for historical reasons or because of the realities of European politics – then some attempt had to be made to unite its disparate peoples. The nationalist

---

31 See Sked, *Decline and Fall*, 301.
33 Brook-Shepherd, *The Austrians*, 142.
awakening could not be undone, but it could be redirected and channeled towards the preservation of the Monarchy rather than against it. Attempts were made to unite the many nations of Austria-Hungary into some kind of cohesive whole during the decades before the war; these attempts were hardly ever official – though the Imperial and Royal House certainly benefitted from them – and as such, they took many forms.

**Dynastic Loyalty: the Cult of Franz Joseph**

The importance of Franz Joseph for the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy could not be overstated. Even before its collapse, Wickham Steed recognized that Austria-Hungary depended “upon the Crown more fully and more truly than any other European realm. The dynasty is not only the pivot and centre but the living force of the body-politic. The Army, the Navy, the Bureaucracy and, in a sense, the Church are dynastic projections.”

Pieter Judson considered Austro-Hungarian dynastic loyalty to be “the cornerstone of a vigorous Austrian patriotism.” According to László Péter, “Kaisertreue and [its Hungarian equivalent] királyhűség were, in the nineteenth century, powerful sentiments.” As Gordon Brooke-Shepherd argues, in the years just prior to Franz Joseph’s death in 1916:

> By now in his seventies, the Emperor had ruled for longer than most of his fifty million subjects have lived. None of them – not even the restless Czechs and Magyars – could imagine a world without him, or even a morning which would not begin without him rising from his iron army bed at 4 a.m. and beginning that daily routine – set like tramlines over the decades – of giving his audiences and signing his mound of papers. Not everyone who crossed themselves at the mere thought of their Emperor’s
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36 László Péter, quoted in Sked, *Decline and Fall*, 197.
passing felt affection, as opposed to awe, towards him. Many were not even loyalists at heart, as opposed to being monarchists out of habit and careerism. But they all felt in their bones that, whatever doubts they had about the world of Francis Joseph, whatever came after him would be far worse – a premonition that most of the twentieth century was to fulfil all along the Danube’s banks. Thus the Emperor became both talisman and metronome of his empire.\(^{37}\)

One sure sign of the strength of this cult of personality, as contemporary authors from Schnitzler to Roth have pointed out, were the ubiquitous portraits of the Kaiser that could be found virtually everywhere in the empire: in private houses and in coffeehouses, in barracks and in bordellos. Even the history books themselves were rewritten to focus on the importance of Franz Joseph in world events. As one historian noted, “Education in post-1867 Austria continued to concentrate on strengthening the devotion of the subject to the dynasty, as demonstrated by the title of the history textbook commonly used in Austrian schools, *What the Emperor Francis Joseph Did for his Peoples*, and failed to inculcate a sense of civic identity based on common citizenship and active participation in the state and society in which the peoples lived.”\(^{38}\)

Though he certainly relied heavily on his celebrity status in the final decades of his rule, Franz Joseph’s resistance or reluctance to transform this widespread popularity into some kind of overarching sense of Austrian state identity has been singled out as a failing by many contemporary and subsequent interpreters. One contemporary observer, a Major Ulrich Klepsch, “found it very worrisome that loyalty to the old emperor, to the extent that it existed, was to him personally not part of a larger loyalty to a Habsburg or Austrian state.” As Major Klepsch noted, “It seems to me as if only the love of the

\(^{37}\) Brook-Shepherd, *The Austrians*, 133-34.

\(^{38}\) Reifowitz, *Imagining an Austrian Nation*, 15.
peoples for the person of the emperor was the bond, the *only* one, which held Austria together… *that is not good.*”

The inherent problem with the cult of Franz Joseph was that it did little to combat nationalism on its own, for reasons having to do with the Emperor-King’s vast array of titles. When Hungarians, for example, venerated Franz Joseph, they were pledging allegiance to the King of Hungary – not necessarily the Emperor of Austria. As the Habsburgs had been the rightful and hereditary rulers of Hungary since the early sixteenth century, it was only natural for the sitting King to play a role in their sense of national identity. This is an important reason why the Hungarians sought only to restructure the empire in 1867 rather than declaring their independence – and why, immediately after the First World War, a group of Hungarian Habsburg loyalists tried, unsuccessfully, to have the recently deposed Emperor Karl crowned as King of Hungary. Similar sentiments existed in the Czech and Polish portions of the empire, as well as Slovenia and parts of Croatia. This explains much of the divided loyalty that many Habsburg subjects freely expressed at the time – a divided loyalty that, from our perspective, juxtaposed fealty to a multinational sovereign with zeal for a local autonomous linguistic nation.

Many modern historians have chastised Franz Joseph and his inner circle for failing to create a single Austrian Imperial state identity comparable to the German and Italian nationalisms emerging at the same time – one that could have been powerful enough to forestall the sundering of the empire at the hands of its various internal
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nationalist movements\textsuperscript{40} – but in light of this political situation, such criticism is not entirely fair. It is certainly true, however, that it would have been preferable to transform this cult of personality into widespread support for supranational authority. In fact, this transformation did take place within one significant portion of the empire’s population – the only group for whom loyalty to Franz Joseph was not part of a nationalist equation.

**The Jews of Austria-Hungary**

The one ethnic group that consistently showed direct allegiance to the Emperor and the supranational power structure he represented was the Jews. The Jews of Austria-Hungary considered themselves “the only unconditional Austrians,” in the sense that their state identity was drawn from their relationship to the empire itself unmediated by membership in any constituent nation or part. This is what the historian David Rechter called “a Jewish version of the Austrian ‘mission’ or ‘idea’”:

As a supranational entity Austria was deemed uniquely situated to be a force for reconciliation between nations and peoples, to mediate between eastern and western Europe. Within the confines of its own borders, this was often expressed as a mission to bring enlightenment and western (which in this context meant German-language) culture to the eastern reaches of the empire.\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{40} Ian Reifowitz, for example, is unequivocal on this point, arguing that “Franz Joseph and his predecessors, because they acted to preserve their dynastic power at the expense of the state, must be held responsible for the inability of the multiethnic polity to survive the fall of the dynasty.” See Reifowitz, *Imagining an Austrian Nation*, 17.

Marsha Rozenblit has similarly argued that the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy “permitted Jews to be as modern or as traditional as they chose. Moreover, the monarchy gave all Jews, traditional and modern alike, space to be just Jews.” She later elaborated:

Indeed, Jews in the Austrian half of the Monarchy in the last decades before the First World War developed what I have labeled a *tripartite identity*. They espoused a fervent Austrian political identity, supporting the multinational empire with genuine conviction, believing only it could guarantee their legal and civil rights, only it could protect them adequately from the anti-Semitism rampant in many of the nationalist movements, and only it allowed them the latitude to develop Jewish identity as they saw fit.… Jews praised the emperor (rather than the German liberal parties) for having granted them emancipation and freedom, glorifying him as the embodiment of decency, and middle-class virtue, and in the words of the Hungarian Jew Charles Fenyvesi, for having ‘made our world whole.’ Alongside this patriotic political identity, one shared just as fervently by modern, acculturated Jews in Vienna and Prague as by traditional, small-town Jews in Galicia (who affectionately called the emperor Froyim Yousel), modernizing Jews also adopted one of the cultures of Habsburg Austria, often embracing German, but sometimes also Czech or Polish culture. Those who adopted German culture – largely the Jews of Bohemia and Moravia, the Jews who immigrated to Vienna, and many Jews in Bukovina – saw themselves as members of the German *Kulturnation* and identified with the rational, humanistic values of the Enlightenment. Their sense of the superiority of German culture notwithstanding, they did not regard themselves as members of the German *Volk*. They were Germans both by culture and by identification with the Austrian supranational state, but they did not see themselves as Germans in the same way as the German nationalists saw themselves as Germans.

This situation, which easily recalls Mahler’s “thrice homeless” exhortation, was shared by virtually all the Jews of the empire, who had a special place as a religious and ethnic minority, yet were never fully designated as a constituent “nation” by the Austro-Hungarian authorities. As a result of this special, nationless status, the Jews of the
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42 Quoted in ibid.
Habsburg Empire came to regard the social contract quite differently than their nationalist fellow citizens, as Rozenblit argues:

Although they did not use the term, Jews imagined Habsburg Austria as a “civic” nation [in the style of the United States, England, and France], to which they could be loyal. This Austrian state upheld the rule of law and guaranteed its impartial administration… This Austria guaranteed that the Jews could exercise their rights as citizens. The Jews may have adulated Franz Joseph as the personification of this state, but they were not old-fashioned dynastic loyalists. Rather, they espoused a vigorous Austrian patriotism and an Austrian identity, a framework that enabled them to avoid the pitfalls of ethnic nationalism… They could be Austrians, and Germans (or Czechs or Poles), and Jews all at the same time.44

Though the relationship between the Jewish Kaisertreu and Franz Joseph could be called a “one-sided love affair,” this situation was entirely pragmatic. As the historian Malachi Hacohen observed, the Jews’ affection for the empire “reflected their recognition of Austro-Hungary as a ‘kingdom of grace,’ contrasted with the realm of pogroms and ‘evil decrees’ across the Russian border.”45 In a way, the Monarchy’s national squabbles may have even allowed the Jews a slightly better social position than what was available in some of the more racially homogeneous nation states of the time. Steven Beller goes as far as to say that the Monarchy “offered a model of citizenship and identity that allowed Jews to remain Jews as well as loyal citizens; by comparison, in Germany this option did not exist.”46 The ambiguous national situation of the Habsburg Empire even helped bridge the difficult divides that often existed between Jews of different cultural

44 Ibid., 180.
46 Steven Beller, “The World of Yesterday Revisited: Nostalgia, Memory, and the Jews of Fin-de-Siècle Vienna,” Jewish Social Studies 2, no. 2 (1996): 42. Beller goes on to observe that “The Monarchy was so pluralist, it has been pointed out, that Jews could become at lease reserve officers in the Habsburg army, even at times active officers, whereas Jews were completely banned, albeit unofficially, from the Prussian officer corps.”
and sectarian backgrounds, as Hacohen notes, with the result that “poor Galician traditionalists and refined Viennese assimilationists, orthodox rabbis and liberal scholars, Zionists and socialists, all declared their loyalty to the dynasty and the supranational empire.” Indeed, for this reason, Jews remained Austrian patriots even beyond the empire’s viability at the end of the First World War.

Hacohen maintains that the multinational empire “seemed to offer a patriotism whose underlying rationale was not ethnonational but multinational, making Jewish participation unproblematic. Jews hesitated not a moment to use this short-term opportunity,” and the writings of several leading Jewish intellectuals and authors from the Monarchiezeit echo this viewpoint. Adolf Jellinek (1821-1893), the Viennese chief rabbi from 1865 to 1891 and proponent of an anational monarchy, held that Jews “are Austrians first and last, they feel and think Austrian, they want a great, strong, and mighty Austria … Hence the Jews are thoroughly dynastical, loyalist, Austrian…. The Jews of Austria are therefore a very important constituent part of the multinational empire. For they are the standardbearers of the Austrian identity of unity.”

Adolf Fischhof (1816-1893), physician and 1848 revolutionary, went even further and believed that a sustainable Austrian state has to be reorganized into a federalist Nationalitätenstaat (instead of an einheitlicher Nationalstaat) along cultural and not territorial lines.
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48 Ibid.
50 Hacohen, “Dilemmas of Cosmopolitanism,” 116-17. Fischhof’s solution was very much rooted in traditional German Aufklärung philosophy, and Hacohen claimed that his “multinational program was the single most consistent expression of Austrian liberal cosmopolitanism.”
Another contemporary, Joseph Samuel Bloch (1850-1923), an orthodox Jews, member of the Reichsrat and publisher of the Österreichische Wochenschrift, maintained “If one could construct a specifically Austrian nationality, then the Jews would constitute its foundation.” The Jewish embrace of the Monarchy that Bloch described went farther than simple loyalty to Kaiser Franz Joseph, and it functioned in direct response to the rise of ethnocentric (rather than cultural) German nationalism. Bloch theorized extensively about a multinational Austrian state, and saw the nationless Habsburg Jews as the foundation not just because the Jews were “the most loyal supporters of the monarchy,” in Bloch’s estimation, and it was he who articulated the notion that they were “the only ones who were unconditionally Austrian.”

According to Ian Reifowitz, Bloch’s supranational Austrian patriotism had a major impact on how Austrian Jews identified themselves: “Throughout his career Bloch sought to cultivate a dual-layered Austrian identity that contained two components, one based on an individual’s ethnic, cultural, and/or religious background, and a second based on being an Austrian citizen.” Bloch’s position vis-à-vis the Monarchy was an entirely pragmatic belief that reflected the special situation faced by the Jews, as opposed to a philosophical solution. As Reifowitz writes:

Jews, perhaps more than any other Habsburg people, had to actively think about their identity and their loyalties in a society in which it was unclear whether they belonged. Bloch reasoned that Jews needed a multiethnic,
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53 Reifowitz, Imagining an Austrian Nation, 6.
anational Austria because they would always be a minority in any European state defined by ethnicity, culture, language, or religion…. Bloch sought to define what it meant to be Austrian in such a way that no one could claim that Jews, because they were of a different Stamm and religion, were somehow ‘less Austrian’.  

Though their need to create a niche in an increasingly nationalized and anti-Semitic Monarchy made their activities much more pressing, the Jews were not the only people attempting to find a workable solution to the divisive threat of nationalism. Many other thinkers and philosophers were seeking their own solutions to the so-called nationalities problem that were grounded in the spirit of liberal German culture, although many of the proponents of those solutions were in fact assimilated Jews. These alternatives were based on the German Enlightenment ideal of cosmopolitanism, and as such, they represented a much more utopian and therefore less workable approach to such an entrenched social situation.

**Cosmopolitanism**

This search for a cosmopolitan Austrian identity that was not tied directly to any one nation followed two fundamentally different paths. Malachi Hacohen described those paths using the works of two prominent post-imperial Jewish authors, Stefan Zweig and Arthur Schnitzler observed through one of his characters that Jews had been at the center of every political and social movement in Austria – and were subsequently betrayed by all of them. Addressing Georg von Wergenthin’s coffeehouse circle, the assimilationist Jew Oskar Ehrenberg declared, “Who created the Liberal movement in Austria? … the Jews. By whom have the Jews been betrayed and deserted? By the Liberals. Who created the National-German movement in Austria? the Jews. By whom were the Jews left in the lurch? … what – left in the lurch! Spat upon like dogs! … By the National-Germans, and precisely the same thing will happen in the case of Socialism and Communism. As soon as you’ve drawn the chestnuts out of the fire they’ll start driving you away from the table. It always has been so and always will be so.” See Arthur Schnitzler, *The Road to the Open*, trans. Horace Samuel (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1991), 78.
Joseph Roth, both of whom saw the Habsburg Monarchy as a lost golden age following its demise in 1918, yet for very different reasons, each relating to their respective class and upbringing:

Exiles who had been brought up in affluent bourgeois families in fin de siècle metropolitan centers recalled a thriving metropolitan culture. Stefan Zweig recounted their loss in *The World of Yesterday*. Others who had grown up in the eastern provinces were nostalgic about a vanished multiculturalism. Joseph Roth’s *The Radetzky March* expressed their yearnings. All wrote under the impression of the triumph of ethnonationalism and the collapse of Central Europe. They set forth two models of Austrian cosmopolitanism. The first emphasized the Enlightenment heritage, universal humanity, and internationalism. The second stressed the imperial idea of supranational unity in multinational diversity. Both recognized that the Habsburg Empire advanced cosmopolitanism by mediating between universal humanity and cultural particularity.56

These two schools of thought shared the same goal of national reconciliation.

Universalism, the true product of the Enlightenment, denied nationalism altogether, and sought to cultivate a cosmopolitan, international idea of humanity. Zweig, who grew up in a bourgeois household in Vienna and received a humanist education there far removed from the rhetoric of ethnonationalism, became a natural proponent of this kind of German liberal cosmopolitanism. Multinationalism, on the other hand, is the dialectical synthesis of Enlightenment cosmopolitanism and the various strains of exclusive ethnonationalism. Multinationalism attempts to mediate a hybrid shared reality that respects all the divergent nationalisms, giving each one a space to engage in dialogues with one another. By the late nineteenth century, multinationalism was the more pragmatic of the two, and Roth, who grew up in the provinces and learned the virtues of multinationalism from his time in the Joint Army, would later become its fluent advocate. The fundamental

difference between cosmopolitanism and multinationalism is that the former denies the
distinctions between national groups – something of a Pollyannaish idea by 1900 – while
the latter attempts to meld the cultural characteristics of the various nations into some
kind of workable whole, though with characteristics of each part remaining recognizable.
This pragmatic concept of *e pluribus Austria* was a multinational state that was exactly
equal to the sum of its parts – and not necessarily greater.

In his book on the collapse of Austria-Hungary, Oscar Jászi lists “eight pillars of
internationalism” that helped to hold the Monarchy together for so long. These are
groups that Jászi considered to be essentially anationalist or cosmopolitan, to varying
degrees – or, at the very least, they were believed to have been above the nationalities
fray. These pillars were the Habsburg dynasty itself, the Jews (whom Jászi puts together
with the capitalists), the aristocracy, the Roman Catholic Church, the Imperial
bureaucracy, the socialists, the institution of free trade, and the Joint Army. We have
already discussed two of those pillars; the Habsburg dynasty had the unique position of
being both a supranational and a national institution for most subjects of the empire (with
the notable exception of the Serbs, for whom Habsburg dominion was a relatively recent
phenomenon), and thus the Kaiser’s contributions towards a cosmopolitan state were
limited. Certain Jewish thinkers, on the other hand, made real progress towards a
workable cosmopolitan ideal, but the rise of ethnic nationalism and anti-Semitism meant
that the Jews as a whole lacked the political clout to effect any real social change.

133-214.
The Roman Catholic Church represented a universality all its own. As the official state religion of the majority of the Austro-Hungarian subjects since the days of the Holy Roman Empire, the Universal Church was in a unique position to bind the nations together under the Emperor. Several German Austrians, including Hugo von Hofmannsthal and future chancellor Ignaz Seipel, sought to use the Church as an engine to mediate between the nationalities. The fact that Franz Joseph himself was such a devout Catholic and that several of the rituals of state had overtly Catholic overtones was an enormous asset in this regard. Yet the Monarchy and the Church had a strained relationship going back to the days of the Empress Maria Theresia, who had routinely suppressed papal bulls and edicts that conflicted with her own agenda, and Joseph II, who declared the Catholic institutions in Austria to be independent from the direct control of the Pope. As religion became a significant part of some nationalist movements, the Church itself could not long remain a truly cosmopolitan influence, however. Radical German nationalists under Georg von Schönerer were beginning to espouse a strong anti-clerical bent over what they perceived to be the Church’s pro-Slavic stance. Moreover, as the empire expanded into the Balkans and came into increased contact with Orthodox Christians and, in Bosnia, Muslims, the power of the Catholic Church to soothe national differences waned considerably.

The bureaucracy, which was created in the late eighteenth century by Joseph II, was never a unifying force per se; rather it was a common experience shared by the entire empire. Like the Peace Corps of our own time, the bureaucracy took in young men of a

59 Játsi, Dissolution, 158-59.
certain disposition, gave them an Imperial commission and sent them out into the provinces, where living conditions could be very different from what they had previously experienced. Even more than the army, as we will see, the bureaucracy was historically German in character and disposition, having been created as much as an Enlightenment-era Germanizing institution than as a functional necessity of state. Although laws were passed that allowed business to be carried out in the local languages by the end of the nineteenth century, the bureaucracy still maintained an exclusivity that set it apart and often against the remainder of Austro-Hungarian society.

The aristocracy was also problematic in its own regard. While the ancient feudal aristocracy that had long helped to legitimize the Habsburg throne remained in place in the nineteenth century, its power and influence – and especially its wealth – had largely declined. Families whose names had commanded respect long before the rise of nations were relegated to their land holdings in the remote provinces as a new bourgeoisie began to reap wealth from new markets and innovations. This ancient, non-national aristocracy soon became irrelevant and a nouveau aristocracy arose in its place – one that was, in many cases just as nationalized as the common people from which they came. Even the one place that the ancient aristocracy was always accepted – the army – was becoming closed to them as modernized, mechanized warfare replaced the pluck and dash of old campaigns. Crown Prince Rudolf himself, writing anonymously in 1878, heaped scorn on the aristocracy for staying out of touch on this regard, even going as far as to suggest that the aristocracy’s indifference to modernity was directly responsible for the disaster at
Königgrätz in 1866. Ultimately, the aristocracy did nothing to prevent the collapse of the Monarchy – something for which Jászi reserved special condemnation:

In this hothouse atmosphere, aristocracy became a really artificial creature in the state which became quite manifest in the days of the catastrophe of the monarchy. This almighty, overwealthy, and haughty class did not make even the slightest effort to maintain the sovereign, the unique source of its privileges, when popular public opinion after the collapse embraced the idea of the republic.

Hacohen, too, dismisses the level of commitment that the supposedly anationalist aristocracy had to a cosmopolitan ideology, arguing that “Their frame of mind was usually traditional, looking backward to prenationalism rather than beyond it. Their commitment to supranational ideals remained superficial: they could not quite agree on a unified strategy for confronting varieties of ethnopolitics, usually preferring accommodation and divide-and-rule measures to an all-out attack.”

As for the Austrian socialists, the idea of a non-national cosmopolitan Austrian state could be found in the writings of Karl Renner (1870-1950) and Otto Bauer (1881-1938). Socialism is by definition a non-national movement, and anational cosmopolitanism figured prominently in Karl Renner’s books Staat und Nation (Vienna, 1899), Der Kampf der Oesterreichischen Nationen um den Staat (1902), and Die Nation als Rechtssidee und die Internationale (1914). According to Hacohen, Renner developed
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60 Rudolf’s pamphlet, entitled Der österreichische Adel und sein konstitutionelle Beruf. Mahnruf an die aristokratische Jungend (“The Austrian Nobility and their Constitutional Duty. An exhortation to the aristocratic youth”), was co-written with the economist Carl Menger, and could ultimately considered to be another one of the Crown Prince’s unheeded warnings regarding the inability of certain segments of the Monarchy to cope with the changes brought by modernity. See Jászi, Dissolution, 151-3, as well as William M. Johnston, The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History, 1848-1938 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 35.
61 Jászi, Dissolution, 154.
63 It should be noted that, not coincidentally, Renner and Bauer were both of Jewish descent, as were many of the founders of the Austrian Social Democratic movement, such as Friedrich Adler, Max Adler, and Rudolf Hilferding. This undoubtedly influenced these authors’ understanding of the nationalities question.
a concept of “ex-territorial nationality” wherein “Residents of different parts of the empire could declare their allegiance to a nationality and enjoy autonomous cultural development.” Renner’s colleague Otto Bauer also espoused a brand of socialism that “emphasized the objective historical determinants of nationality” revising Marxism in favor of what he called a “‘community of character’ (Charaktergemeinschaft) whose individual members manifest collective traits.” Both Renner and Bauer “agreed that socialist internationalism entailed a global federation of nations.” In this way, the socialists saw the Austro-Hungarian Empire as a multi-national laboratory for the promotion of the socialist cause. “Of all the Austrian political parties,” Hacohen concludes, “the socialists alone advocated a multinational solution.” But this pragmatic multinationalism would prove problematic for the Austrian socialists. The fiercely anti-nationalist Lenin, and later Stalin, both strongly denounced Renner for his perceived soft stance towards nationalism. In order to survive, Austrian socialism had to embrace nationalism, to a degree, but at the point when it did, it ceased to be socialism in the minds of many.

Jászi’s last pillar, internal free trade, had the potential to be the most successful of all. Free trade explicitly allowed the unrestricted movement of people within the empire, it brought the nations into direct contact with one another on a regular basis, and it could have helped to equalize the wealth of the disparate crownlands, bringing prosperity to the more remote and economically depressed regions. Unfortunately, this latter ideal never
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64 Hacohen, “Dilemmas of Cosmopolitanism,” 113.
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came to pass in reality, and this proved to be free trade’s Achilles’ heel. As Jászi decries, the richer nations of the empire were able to exploit the poorer ones at will, in effect increasing the economic divide between them and undoubtedly contributing to even more nationalist antagonism.\textsuperscript{68} This left the Joint Army as the final supranational pillar of the empire – and as we will see, the Army was a special case.

The idea of an officially decentralized multinational empire from the Imperial government level down never received much support from Franz Joseph or his circle, but his successor, the Emperor Karl (1887-1922, ruled 1916-18), actually countenanced plans for a federated Austrian state – sort of a “United States of Austria,” or, in one author’s opinion, more a loose association like the British Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{69} This was Karl’s proposed solution to allow the Monarchy to survive the peace negotiations that followed the First World War relatively intact. Reality unfortunately intervened before this proposal could be put to the test, however, and by the time this solution was proposed, the situation in the provinces had so deteriorated that any attempt at re-instituting direct rule – even federal rule – from Vienna would have been impossible.

**Austrian Multinationalism and the Gesamtstaatsidee**

Even if none of the attempts at creating a theoretical model for a cosmopolitan Austria managed to get off the ground, a kind of workable multinationalism began to emerge from the ground up, as the practical result of the lived experience of the diverse Austro-Hungarian Empire. The chief problem with Germanic cosmopolitanism was that its

\textsuperscript{68} Jászi, *Dissolution*, 212.  
\textsuperscript{69} See Brook-Shepherd, *The Austrians*, 186.
proponents grossly underestimated the strength of ethnic nationalism. Not even German nationalism in Austria was homogenous, as one author maintains, “German nationalists in the Tyrol, for example, defined their particularly German identity in terms of their Catholic faith, their loyalty to the empire, and the myth of Andreas Hofer’s opposition to foreign (French) invasion during the Napoleonic Wars. This understanding of what it meant to be German diverged sharply from that of the Styrian German nationalists who celebrated their independence from the Catholic clergy.”

The practical solution, then, was to try to smooth over these national distinctions so that the people of these various national groups to work together in relative harmony. According to historian Robert A. Kann:

The idea which had guided the multinational empire consciously and, even more so, unconsciously was something very different, namely the concept of the supranational union. This concept of supranational union means rallying the diverse national forces on the basis of their ethnic-cultural organization but under a political idea reaching across the national groups and beyond the national idea itself. There is nothing mystical in this idea. It simply means that a complex political body like Austria, composed of so many diverse elements, might have proved that the political organization of mankind can be established on higher principles than the national idea, with its determinist dogma of subordination under one exclusive principle alone. The national state, superior in the dynamics of its political ideology, though not necessarily morally superior, to the supranational empire, cannot offer this proof, since it is not built on the premise of national diversity. Neither can the great empire type, stretching, with its overseas possessions, over several continents. Though it may comprise many races, its foundations are based on the supremacy of a mother country with a longer tradition, greater resources, and greater power than the other domains. The supranational state organization of Austria did not recognize the notion of a mother country and a master race. When Renner and Bauer conceived strong supranational ties
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between the Austrian nationalities in the establishment of an equal social order, they had such an idea in mind.\textsuperscript{71}

By the end of the nineteenth century, a commitment to diversity became a kind of de facto Austrian patriotism. The forward-looking Crown Prince Rudolf had so devoted himself to the idea of celebrating the diversity of the realm that he one day hoped to rule that he created the encyclopedic \textit{Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild} in celebration of that ideal. The \textit{Kronprinzenwerk}, as it was known, appeared in twenty-four volumes between 1886 and 1902, each one documenting the various peoples of the empire, as well as their customs and culture.\textsuperscript{72}

Unfortunately the Crown Prince took his own life in 1889, long before his multivolume work – let alone his idea of a truly multiethnic and multinational Austria – could be realized. Yet although no one else in the imperial government would propose any serious attempt at official national reconciliation or reorganization during the remainder of the Emperor Franz Joseph’s lifetime, the experience of so many nations living together under one monarch was not an unpleasant one. We can get a sense of how the empire worked – and, more often, why it should have worked better than it did – through the novelists that chronicle the era. This is the multinational Austria that was hinted at in the aforementioned novels of Roth and Zweig, and it would receive its fullest exploration in the works of Robert Musil, who decreed that Austria-Hungary was, “without the world’s knowing it, the most progressive state of all.”\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{72} For a concise modern reprint of selected entries, see Christiane Zintzen, ed., \textit{Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild: aus dem “Kronprinzenwerk” des Erzherzog Rudolf} (Vienna: Böhlau, 1999).
\textsuperscript{73} Musil, \textit{The Man without Qualities}, 1: 30-1.
In his analysis of *The Man without Qualities*, Stefan Jonsson reassesses the traditional view of Musil’s philosophical novel and judges it to be a not-altogether-unflattering commentary on the nature of everyday multinationalism in Austria-Hungary. Ulrich, the main character, becomes Musil’s main avenue of inquiry into the nature of nationalism and identity; thus, *The Man without Qualities* depicts the emergence of what we now call identity politics.\(^74\) What seems to be Ulrich’s personal journey is in fact his – and Musil’s – exploration of the limitations placed upon us as actors by the category of national identity.\(^75\) Musil, Jonsson writes, “lived and worked in a historical moment when cultural identities had become so fixed that they appeared to predetermine the destiny of every citizen and to reduce men and women to their status of belonging.”\(^76\) Jonsson continues,

In this situation, then, every act, statement, institution, organization, or political proposal is instantly filtered through the nationality issue and categorized as an *expression of belonging* to one of the rivaling groups. Every aspect of social life turns into a manifestation of a national or cultural essence. Just as every trait is “sexualized,” that is, classified as either masculine or feminine, so every character is “nationalized” and taken as a sign of ethnic membership. This ideological predicament offers two alternatives: either solidarity with a national community, or an existence without identity, that is, a condition of madness. Musil’s novel ingeniously highlights the logical, existential, and political conclusions of this dilemma: if every quality is defined in sexual, racial, ethnic, or national terms, a man wanting to resist sexism, racism, ethnocentrism, or nationalism must become a man without qualities.\(^77\)

In this stifling atmosphere, a subject yearned to be free from the yoke of identity – to become a man without qualities. And Austria-Hungary, though its lack of a national

\(^{74}\) Jonsson, *Subject without Nation*, x.
\(^{75}\) Ibid., 2.
\(^{76}\) Ibid., xii.
\(^{77}\) Ibid., 248.
identity of its own allowed this – though Musil himself would not realize the meaning of this freedom until after the Monarchy dissolved.78 “Kakania’s lack of national identity,” Jonsson argues “is affirmed as a negativity which, in its turn, is converted into possibilities.”79

Centuries of comingled history and ample opportunities for cross-cultural exchanges meant that being Austrian during the Monarchiezeit meant being of mixed heritage – either literally by one’s ancestry, or figuratively through one’s outlook and experiences. In a way, this kind of multinationalism imitated the ancient aristocracy, who, through intermarriage, were never “racially pure” – thus earning the enmity of the racial nationalists. This runs completely counter to the entrenched contemporary ideals of nationalism, however, which is likely why Austrian multinationalism remains critically neglected. Nevertheless, there were documented occasions in the years prior to the First World War when the Austro-Hungarian people came together to celebrate their diversity in public, and although the internal politics fostered by the “divide and rule” enforced by politicians like Taaffe ensured that these occasions would not be entirely without strife, two such celebrations of Imperial unity deserve special mention.

The Jubilee Celebrations of 1898 and 1908

In The Man without Qualities, Ulrich had the job of serving as secretary to the Parallel Campaign, a committee comprising an eccentric yet representative collection of Viennese characters attempting to organize the theme and festivities for Franz Joseph’s upcoming

78 Ibid., 267.
79 Ibid., 269.
seventieth jubilee. Musil, with a strong sense of irony, had his characters planning a celebration that would have culminated on 2 December 1918 – two years after the Kaiser’s own death, and nearly a month after the destruction of the empire he ruled. Yet this ambitious, fictionalized jubilee celebration had actual historical precedents. Franz Joseph had been feted twice before, in the 1898 and 1908 jubilees that celebrated fifty and sixty years of his rule, respectively. It is not unusual that these two celebrations stressed dynastic loyalty, but what is interesting about them is how they also celebrated a kind of diversity that we might today call multiculturalism. These were multinational festivities, where virtually every group in the empire came together to honor the ruler who kept them united.

The goal of the 1898 Jubilee, according to historian Daniel Unowsky, was not “to supplant national identity with state identity, but to project dynastic loyalty as an essential aspect of ethnic identity within a harmonious Austria.” Public events were planned that were intended to “bolster state patriotism and to agitate against ethnic and social division by blending together traditional elements of Habsburg legitimacy with reminders of concrete achievement in the present” Unfortunately, the celebratory events of the fiftieth jubilee year, which were to include a series of parades, pageants, and national tableaux, were cut short by the assassination of the Empress Elizabeth in Switzerland by an Italian anarchist on 10 September. The shock of the tragedy and the outpouring of grief at the funeral of the very popular Empress utterly transformed the public’s image of

their emperor during what should have been a cause for celebration. Having already endured the suicide of his only son and heir, the Kaiser reportedly exclaimed “So I am to be spared nothing in this world” at the news of his beloved Sissi’s death. The event and its aftermath – and the emperor’s characteristically stoic response – only helped to grow the cult of Franz Joseph as he was transformed into a tragic figure who suffered on behalf of his people. The nations united around their emperor in tragedy, possibly in a stronger way than they otherwise might have in triumph.

The 1908 Jubilee was at once more celebratory and more controversial. One of the highlights of the year’s festivities was a parade that took place on the Vienna Ringstrasse on 12 June 1908. This parade included various ethnic groups marching in national costume, historical tableaux representing the history of the Habsburg dynasty and its achievements – the overwhelming majority of which were prior to 1848 – and military regiments and their bands from around the empire. Unfortunately, the parade itself was boycotted by several of the organizing groups, largely for short-term political gains. The Hungarians, who dated Franz Joseph’s reign to the 1867 Ausgleich and not his 1848 ascension, refused to send an official delegation. The Czechs stayed away over a feud with Viennese Mayor Karl Lueger, and the Italians were reportedly offended by the inclusion of a tribute to Field Marshal Radetzky, who was famous for subduing the Italian revolutionaries of 1848. Yet even though these squabbles between the nations
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83 See Unowsky, Pomp and Politics, 93-4.
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have often been interpreted by historians as evidence of the dysfunction of the Austro-Hungarian Empire as a whole, they did not necessarily represent the true feelings of the empire’s diverse subjects. It should be remembered that these boycotts never originated from the grassroots level; they were not the spontaneous demonstrations of the people themselves but were instead hatched and directed by their often self-appointed national representatives, who were willing to exploit any available controversy in order to advance their own agendas.

Though great pains had to be taken to find subject matter that would be agreeable to the remainder of the participants – Steven Beller observed that the ultimate emphasis of the official jubilee parade was on the unspoken and mandatory allegiance that was owed to Franz Joseph, and not on the achievements or reforms of his reign\(^\text{86}\) – the 1908 jubilee came to be regarded as a multinational success. Seeing the people celebrating sixty years of their emperor’s reign, an editorial in the *Neue Freie Presse* noted: “These were not the nationalities; this was Austria, the colorful mix of peoples with all the different national and cultural levels, and yet held together by a unifying band, which is perhaps stronger than one thinks.”\(^\text{87}\) The editorial continues,

> Austria is, however, a state, which has to include within itself different nations in a political unity, if it wants to survive, and whose condition for existing is the uniting that was made so palpable in the parade today. It was the coming together and going together of people of different tongues, who often have hardly anything that unites them apart from the state and the respect for the head of that state, who holds all of it together, solidifies it, and transfigures it through his person.\(^\text{88}\)

\(^{86}\) Ibid., 69.

\(^{87}\) Editorial in the *Neue Freie Presse*, 13 June 1908 (morning), quoted in ibid., 61.

\(^{88}\) Ibid., 64.
Writing only a few years after the 1908 Jubilee, Wickham Steed had a very similar impression:

No eye-witness of the procession of the Austrian peoples that passed before the Emperor on his Diamond Jubilee in June 1908 can have failed to realize the immense reserves of devotion to the Crown and its wearer that lie accumulated even in the farthest districts of the Hapsburg dominions; nor can those who lived through the annexation crisis of the following winter have failed to hear the strong, regular pulsations of ‘Austrian’ hearts, glad of an albeit insignificant pretext to beat in pride and unison. The Hapsburg peoples are not very wise, not over-cultivated, not overburdened with political sense, but they have in them at their best moments, be those moments of defeat or of triumph, a unitary instinct that seems to draw nourishment from their common past.89

These monumental efforts should not be underestimated. As official celebrations, vast sums of money were lavished on these jubilees, and their effects extended to virtually every corner of the empire. As Pieter Judson observed, “They are not necessarily the functional equivalent of nationalist rituals and symbols, but their collective effects may actually have been more far-reaching than those of the nationalists’ efforts.”90 One notable aspect of these imperial celebrations, however, was the highly-visible role played by the Austro-Hungarian military. Unowsky noted that during the 1898 jubilee year, “military bands paraded through the streets of towns and villages, awakening the population (as early as 4:30 a.m.) with the sounds of military marches on the emperor’s 18 August birthday.”91 Beller also identified a militaristic quality in the 1908 parade, which seemed to contradict Franz Joseph’s moniker as the “peace emperor,” and he noted how even the youth and folk groups seemed to exude a paramilitary character.92

89 Steed, The Hapsburg Monarchy, xxi.
Embodying the *Gesamtstaatsidee*

The high profile that the Austro-Hungarian Army had in these mass imperial celebrations – in spite of the relative peace enjoyed by the Monarchy over its last half century – should not be so surprising. The Joint Army was perhaps the best practical example of the *Gesamtstaatsidee* applied in real life. The Army was one place where cross-cultural exchange occurred frequently within the controlled structure of military hierarchy and
order. Moreover, unlike some of the more cloistered and exclusive non-nationalist
groups within the empire, such as the Catholic clergy and the Imperial bureaucracy, the
Imperial and Royal Joint Army functioned largely as an educational institution, taking
thousands of new recruits each year from every national group and indoctrinating them
with not only a fanatical dynastic loyalty, but also a sense of commonality and
brotherhood with fellow soldiers from other nations. By 1900, the Army was a virtual
laboratory of multinationalism, taking in recruits who had been exposed to nationalism
practically from birth and instilling in them a workable philosophy that allowed their
ethnonationalist beliefs to coexist with their support of a multinational Austrian state.
Then, following their tour of duty, the recruits were subsequently returned to the
population at large, functioning as stabilizing elements amongst the nationalist turmoil.
And every now and then, their nostalgia for their younger lives and their memories of
cross-cultural interactions with soldiers from all over the vast empire would be rekindled
by a parade, or an official commemoration, or by one of the many concerts given by the
Imperial and Royal military bands, which served as the public face of the Joint Army and
all that it represented.
2. The Culture of the Joint Army

In 1848, at the height of the revolutions that threatened to destroy the Monarchy itself, Franz Grillparzer composed a poem in honor of its newest hero, Field Marshal Joseph Radetzky von Radetz (1766-1858). Grillparzer’s poem, which soon became synonymous with the Army itself, began:

Glück auf, mein Feldherr, führe den Streich!
Nicht bloß um des Ruhmes Schimmer,
In deinem Lager ist Österreich,
Wir Andern sind einzelne Trümmer.\(^1\)

The oft-quoted line from this stanza, “In deinem Lager ist Österreich,” has two significant meanings: first, of course, is the fact that at a critical juncture, the future of the empire itself rested in the hands of its soldiers. But the second meaning is more profound: that the Army is itself Austria – a microcosm of the entire multinational Empire, and in many ways, the real-world manifestation of the theoretical Gesamtstaat as well. It was an army made up of soldiers from ethnicities that were in the process of nationalization, making it a spiritual predecessor to the multinational forces of the late twentieth century such as NATO and Eurocorps. The Austro-Hungarian Army represented every culture and religion in the empire and utilized all eleven of its major languages. It protected a territory stretching from the Alps to the Carpathians from foreign and domestic threats, and its soldiers would get to see much of this land as their

\(^1\) “Good luck, my general, lead the charge!/ Not only for the shimmer of fame,/ In your camp is Austria,/ The rest of us are just pieces.”
regiments were routinely shuttled between the Monarchy’s major cities and frontier outposts.

By the late nineteenth century, the Imperial and Royal Army (\textit{kaiserliche und königliche Armee}) of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was not a particularly effective or renowned fighting force. To be sure, the Austrians had won their share of important victories following the last Ottoman siege of Vienna in 1683; notably over the Prussians at Kolin (1757), over Napoleon at Aspern (1809) and Leipzig (1813), and twice over the Italians at Custozza (1848 and 1866). But they had also suffered embarrassing and costly defeats at Solferino (1859) and Königgrätz (1866), both of which cost the empire in lost territory and prestige on the European stage. One important reason for the Army’s decline in the nineteenth century was the conservative stance taken by the Emperor Franz Joseph and his aristocracy, who wanted to adhere to a romantic notion of warfare as a dashing adventure in an increasingly mechanized age. Adding to this were the recurring budgetary squabbles between Vienna and Budapest, which ensured that Austria-Hungary’s annual military expenditures were consistently among the lowest of the great powers of Europe.\footnote{As A.J.P. Taylor noted, “In the thirty years after the Congress of Berlin [in 1878], German expenditure on armaments increased fivefold; British, Russian, and French threefold; even Italian increased two and a half times. Austro-Hungarian expenditure was not doubled.” A.J.P. Taylor, \textit{The Habsburg Monarchy, 1809-1918} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 229, n.2. Norman Stone noted that the failure of Austria-Hungary to compete on the same level as the other European powers “had little to do with the monarchy’s financial resources, which permitted much extravagance in other spheres,” such as the opulent Viennese Ringstrasse project of the late nineteenth century, which was financed to a large degree by imperial funds. See Norman Stone, “Army and Society in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1900-1914,” \textit{Past and Present} 33 (1966): 96.} By the outbreak of the First World War – following half a century of relative peace and prosperity in Central Europe – the Austro-Hungarian Army had won
more accolades for its uniforms and its military bands than for its weaponry or discipline or tactical skill.

Yet the Austro-Hungarian Army was more than just a fighting force. It played an important role within the multinational empire that went beyond defending its borders from external enemies or internal agitators. According to Gordon Brooke-Shepherd, “The imperial army was the cement-mixer, as well as the actual cement, for the multi-racial Monarchy. It still worked in peacetime, and before long was to work in battle: not many recruits emerged from their two years’ compulsory service without feeling that they were something more than just a Pole, a Slovene, a Roumanian or a Croat.”3 During an age of heightened nationalism, the Austro-Hungarian Army was an important center for the creation of an identity that went beyond the empire’s many nationalities. Some have claimed that this gave the Army an almost feudal quality, evocative of medieval armies. According to one contemporary French military observer, the Austro-Hungarian Army was “the last refuge of the old imperial spirit of blind devotion to the supreme and sacred lord.”4 To Oskar Jászi, the Army functioned as both a “dynastic body guard” and “a school of loyalty,” adding that “whatever our feelings may be concerning this institution we cannot deny that it attained its purpose during a long period.”5 Historian Norman Stone called the Army “a bastion of imperial rather than national loyalties,” noting that “Its officer-corps was loyal to the emperor alone, and it was remarkably free of that
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4 Stone, “Army and Society,” 95.
nationalist intolerance which flourished elsewhere in the Monarchy.”

Military historian Gunther E. Rothenberg praises the wide range of experiences that the Austro-Hungarian officers would have accrued in serving at posts from urbane Vienna to the Slavic borderlands, which created a kind of cultural education unparalleled in Europe. And the historian István Deák, whose reevaluation of the function and the success of the multinational Habsburg officer corps as an instrument of Austro-Hungarian imperial patriotism that was “beyond nationalism” has been perhaps the most influential, observed, “In an age when the monarchy’s inhabitants were inundated by every conceivable type of nationalist and social propaganda, when parliamentary deputies engaged in fist fights rather than legislation, the army and its foremost soldier, the emperor, offered a vision of peace, order tolerance and continuity.”

The establishment of conscription meant that service in the Austro-Hungarian Army was an important unifying or even bonding experience for many of the empire’s subjects. Though corporal punishment had been banned, life in the turn-of-the-century Austrian regiments could still be difficult – largely because of the poor pay and the inadequate barracks in the more remote locales. Nevertheless, many who served – from Sigmund Freud to Prime Minister Max Vladimir Beck – looked back on their Dienstzeit with a special pride. As contemporary observer Wickham Steed noted, “There results a personal relationship that renders the Army in Austria-Hungary a more human and
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8 István Deák, Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848-1918 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 8. Deák’s research has been a major point of departure for my own, and I am greatly indebted to this book in particular for his observations on multinationalism in effect.
9 Rothenberg, Army of Francis Joseph, 108.
humanizing organization than in Germany. Race feeling may be noticeable here and there, but, broadly speaking, the Army is the greatest asset not only of the Crown but of the Monarchy at large.”

Organization and Role
The armed forces had long been the exclusive provenance of the Emperor, and this situation did not change following the Ausgleich of 1867. In fact, the compromise itself was structured specifically to ensure that the Emperor Franz Joseph and his successors would retain direct control of the Joint Army as part of the mechanism of statecraft. The Ausgleich that created the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary also created the Imperial and Royal Army – the Joint Army – and placed it at the direct disposal of the Emperor himself, though its operations were entirely dependent on financing from the parliaments in Budapest and Vienna. Two limited national guard forces – one Hungarian and one Cisleithanian – were created as a concession to the Hungarians. Some historians have argued that control over the Army was really the most important power Franz Joseph hoped to preserve, and he was willing to exchange quite a bit of domestic control to the Hungarians in order to do so. Control over the army still afforded the Emperor a great deal of power; as one historian argued, “The sovereign’s control over the army –
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11 In István Deák’s estimation, it was this constitutional arrangement that kept the Joint Army functionally under one ruler, but financially tied to the whims of the two Ministers of War and the respective parliaments “marked the end of a unified Habsburg dynastic army, and it was duly perceived by most observers as the beginning of the end of the Habsburg Monarchy.” See Deák, “Comparing Apples and Pears: Centralization, Decentralization, and Ethnic Policy in the Habsburg and Soviet Armies,” in *Nationalism and Empire: The Habsburg Monarchy and the Soviet Union*, ed. Richard L. Rudolph and David F. Good (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 231.
operating largely outside the constitutional-legal sphere – normally enabled Franz Joseph to retain a free hand in whatever affected the Monarchy as a great power: foreign policy, defence, and imperial finance. In the highest sphere of state policy Franz Joseph remained an autocrat even after 1867. He took decisions after taking advice from the 
Ministerrat für gemeinsamen Angelegenheiten, sometimes referred to as the Crown Council, an advisory rather than an executive body with uncertain membership and without formal constitutional status.”

From the late 1880s up to the First World War, the Joint Army consisted of 102 infantry regiments (which were further subdivided by tradition into 62 “German” and 40 “Hungarian” regiments, though this was only for display purposes); four Bosnian-Herzegovinian infantry regiments, four elite Tiroler Kaiserjäger regiments drawn primarily from the Austrian Alps, 27 Feldjäger or light infantry battalions, 44 cavalry regiments, and 56 field artillery regiments, in addition to the numerous fortress artillery, pioneer, medical, and logistical units. Of the two aforementioned national guard formations, the Cisleithanian k.k. Landwehr, consisted of 39 infantry and 3 cavalry regiments; and the Hungarian k.u. Honvéd 24 infantry and 9 cavalry regiments. The Landwehr and the Honvéd were nominally under the control of the parliaments in Vienna and Budapest, respectively, but they could be seconded to the Joint Army if necessary. The creation of a local Hungarian national guard was an important concession bitterly
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14 See Eugen Brixel, Gunther Martin, and Gottfried Pils, *Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik: von der "Türkischen Musik" zu den Philharmonikern in Uniform* (Graz: Edition Kaleidoskop, 1982), 325-62; also István Deák, *Beyond Nationalism*, 18. During World War I, many additional numbered regiments were created as needed in order to replenish losses in the field. Any Austro-Hungarian infantry regiment numbered 103 or higher was one of these wartime regiments.
won in the negotiations for the *Ausgleich* of 1867, but the animosity felt by the War Ministry over what was perceived to be an attempt at usurping the emperor’s powers meant that both of these guard formations would remain poorly equipped, and would be denied their own artillery, as well as other technological advancements. In addition to the land forces, there was also a moderately-sized *k.u.k. Kriegsmarine* based out of the Adriatic port city of Pola (today Pula, in Croatia) that, by 1914, consisted of sixteen battleships, fourteen cruisers, a half-dozen submarines, and approximately 180 smaller vessels.\footnote{Fritz Rathner, *Die Bewaffnete Macht Österreich-Ungarns 1618-1918 in ihren Märschen* (Berlin: Arbeitskreis Militärmusik in der Deutsche Gesellschaft für Heereskunde, 1983), n.p.}

The history of the Austrian and Austro-Hungarian armies shows that reform and change always came slowly; this situation led Napoleon reportedly to quip that “Austria is always one man, one idea, one army behind.” Generals such as Eugen von Savoy (1663-1736) and the Archduke Carl (1771-1847), victor over Napoleon in the Battle of Aspern, each had moderate success in bringing the armies of their eras up to the contemporary standard.\footnote{Oscar Jászi noted that “the genius of Eugene of Savoy was a powerful influence in replacing the old feudal character and mercenary spirit of the army with a more modern one.” Jászi, *Dissolution*, 141.} The empire’s most famous soldier of the nineteenth century, the hero of the 1848 revolutions Field Marshal Radetzky, was himself a staunch traditionalist, and served as a stabilizing influence throughout the latter part of his seventy years of military service. Between Radetzky and the young and romantic Emperor Franz Joseph, it was virtually assured that the Habsburg Army would maintain its pre-Napoleonic character well into the late nineteenth century. Franz Joseph’s own son, the Crown Prince Rudolf (1858-1889) was known to have been frustrated over the
slow rate of progress in the Army, and these frustrations may have even contributed to his suicide. Even the otherwise forward-thinking Archduke Franz Ferdinand (1863-1914) refused to counter many of the Army’s most entrenched traditions. In Gunther Rothenberg’s assessment, Franz Ferdinand and his inner circle ignored the lessons of the recent Boer and the Russo-Japanese wars, which exposed the failings of traditional nineteenth century tactics and equipment in the modern age. Instead, Rothenberg observed, the often stubborn Franz Ferdinand “retained great faith in the effectiveness of parade ground drill to instill loyalty and confidence in his troops.”  

Changes eventually did come to the Army; universal conscription was finally introduced in 1868, in the aftermath of the empire’s resounding defeat at the hands of a Prussian conscript army two years before. The percentage of the population conscripted in Austria-Hungary was not particularly large compared to Germany or France, and approximately seventy percent of these conscripts went into the infantry, with the cavalry, artillery, and other branches relying more heavily on volunteers. Also in 1868, the soldiers’ term of service was reduced from eight to three years. This high turnover rate among the private soldiers meant that the career officers comprised the true backbone of the Austro-Hungarian Army, performing many of the roles performed by

---

19 Stone, “Army and Society,” 99
non-commissioned officers in other armies,\textsuperscript{22} and even taking on “the main burden of maintaining morale and discipline.”\textsuperscript{23}

The regiment was the most important unit of the Austro-Hungarian Army, as it was in many European states at that time. An officer might serve in the same regiment for his entire career, and the close-knit nature of the regiments helped to foster what one contemporary observer called the “corporate loyalty”\textsuperscript{24} of the Austro-Hungarian Army, with the regiment itself serving as both the surrogate for the nation and the natural bridge towards a loyalty directly to the Emperor himself. A typical Austro-Hungarian infantry regiment – if such a thing existed – was commanded by a colonel (\textit{Oberst}), and was comprised of four battalions of 400-600 officers and men each, plus a staff of approximately 100.\textsuperscript{25} This resulted in a peacetime strength that was often much lower than the 3-4,000 men that typically formed a regiment in other armies. Each regiment had an “\textit{Inhaber}” or colonel-in-chief, typically royalty or nobility, who served as a patron and lent the regiment its nickname. This practice had its origins in the sixteenth century, when the \textit{Regimentsinhaber} actually financed the raising of the regiment itself, and could direct how it could be used in wartime as a result. Unlike in other countries, however, \textit{Regimentsinhaber} in the Austro-Hungarian Army had no special privileges whatsoever by the mid-nineteenth century, and their role was extended hardly beyond simply giving their name to the regiment.\textsuperscript{26} Some regiments, such as those named for Austrian

\textsuperscript{22} Rothenberg, \textit{Army of Francis Joseph}, 83.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 127.
\textsuperscript{24} The Swiss Colonel Wilhelm Rüstow, quoted in Rothenberg, \textit{Army of Francis Joseph}, 56.
\textsuperscript{25} Cavalry regiments were smaller, totaling up to only around 1,000 men, and were divided into two squadrons; artillery regiments comprised two sections, which were further divided into two to four batteries.
\textsuperscript{26} Deák, \textit{Beyond Nationalism}, 17.
historical figures of members of the House of Habsburg, kept their names for years or even centuries, while those named for living persons often took on a new *Inhaber* on the death of the old. Often there was no political logic to this: the 61st Infantry Regiment “Kaiser Alexander III. v. Rußland” took on another *Inhaber* – the Austrian Freiherr von Hold – on Emperor Alexander’s death in 1894, while the 2nd Infantry Regiment “Alexander I., Kaiser v. Rußland,” kept its honorary name from 1814 though the First World War.

While each regiment in the Austro-Hungarian Army had its own traditions, very few of them had the same kind of privileges that were enjoyed by the regiments of the other colonial empires at the time. The regiments that were designated “Hungarian” were able to wear a variant of the uniform that incorporated certain aspects of Hungarian national dress (notably, a tighter-cut set of trousers), but beyond that, the differences in regimental uniforms were very slight. Each regiment had its own color facings, but so many variants of red or yellow were used that only an expert could tell them apart at sight. Some regiments were allowed a little leeway in how they wore their hair, mustaches, and beards, but this was the extent of Austro-Hungarian regimental distinction during the prewar era.27

Each regiment was recruited from a particular home region, with the goal of ensuring a certain amount of demographic and linguistic homogeneity. For much of the late nineteenth century, however, the regiments were stationed far away from these home regions for fear of fraternization with the locals. In fact, the battalions of these regiments were very rarely stationed together, and they might only stay at a particular garrison for a

27 Ibid.
few years before receiving orders transferring them to another town. All of these garrisons were nominally within the empire’s borders; the only foreign territory to be occupied by the Austro-Hungarian Army after 1866 was Bosnia-Herzegovina, which was ceded from Ottoman to Austrian control by the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, and formally annexed in 1908.

This frequent shuffling of regiments reflects what had become the Army’s primary role by the late nineteenth century. Though the Joint Army ostensibly existed to defend the homeland against outside invaders, the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 was the last major fighting Austria-Hungary would engage in until 1914, aside from two minor campaigns undertaken in the Balkans between 1878 and 1881. Many k.u.k. officers still held a grudge against Prussia right up until 1914, and several expressed hopes of resurrecting the old alliance with Russia to make Germany subservient to Austria again.

The Archduke Albrecht (1817-1895), cousin to Kaiser Franz Joseph and the victor over the Italian nationalists in the 1866 Battle of Custozza, reportedly declared in 1875 “that he would not die happy unless he could once defeat the Prussians in battle.” Similar tensions remained high with the Italians, despite the alliance they had entered into with Austria-Hungary from 1882, and eventual war with Italy came to no one’s surprise in
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28 Tradition had it that each regiment was entitled to be garrisoned in Vienna every five years. This was considered an honor for the soldiers, as well as an important career opportunity to the musicians of the regimental bands.
29 Though Bosnia-Herzegovina would be something of a quagmire, the loss of the Italian provinces in 1866 and the consolidation of Germany in 1871 left Austria-Hungary with only one avenue of possible expansion: southward, into the Balkans, which were newly-liberated by the retreating Ottoman Empire. Austria took advantage of this power vacuum to grab additional territory, though this angered the Slavic nationalists and ultimately brought the Monarchy into conflict with the Russian Empire.
A thaw in Austro-German relations finally came about in 1909 as a result of Germany’s stance supporting Austria’s annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, but this realignment further angered the Serbs and their Russian allies, and set the stage for the First World War.

This long period of stability, however, meant that by the late nineteenth century, the Joint Army found itself more often in the role of securing the internal peace against various agitators – including the various nationalist movements, as well as the so-called “red menace” of socialist agitation. As the Archduke Franz Ferdinand wrote in 1896, “the army’s main task is not the defense of the fatherland against an external enemy but the protection and maintenance of the throne and the dynasty against all internal enemies.”

The upswing in nationalist fervor was especially problematic for a multinational army, and mistrust and paranoia reigned among the Imperial General Staff. During his earliest years on the throne, the young Kaiser Franz Joseph was quite suspicious of his own people, writing to his mother in 1853 that the situation in Vienna “is steadily getting worse, though the people are afraid to attempt an armed collision…. Last Sunday there was a great church parade on the glacis to impress the Viennese that troops and guns are still at hand.” Following the revolutions of 1848-49, the general staff began to suspect that the local Viennese infantry regiment – the famous “Hoch- und Deutschmeister” regiment – might be getting a little too friendly with the local
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33 Brook-Shepherd, *The Austrians*, 171.
36 Quoted in Rothenberg, *Army of Francis Joseph*, 129.
37 Quoted in ibid., 45.
38 Traditionally based in Vienna, the 4th Infantry Regiment “Hoch- und Deutschmeister” took as its name from its historic Regimentsinhaber and founding colonel Damian Hugo Freiherr von Viermund zu Neersen
population, and may not be able to do its duty in case of an uprising. This paranoia was ultimately what led to the practice of stationing battalions and regiments far from their own regions, and transferring them around the empire frequently.

Perhaps the greatest internal threat to the empire in the last decade of the nineteenth century came from the German nationalism, with several violent confrontations between nationalist demonstrators and Austro-Hungarian soldiers taking place during that time. In November 1897, one such demonstration in Graz was met with troops from the local garrison, which in this case were from one of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian infantry regiments that happened to be stationed in Graz – far from home, as per Imperial policy. The Bosnians, under orders from their German-Austrian superiors, opened fire, killing one demonstrator. In the immediate aftermath of this incident, tensions in Graz and elsewhere in German-Austria remained high, with many decrying the “black-yellow Moslem mercenaries,” whom the parliament delegation from Graz denounced as “strangers to the country.” Yet in the view of the Emperor himself, the Bosnians had performed admirably; indeed when a similar incident took place in May 1898, Franz Joseph actually chastised another commander for using restraint against the demonstrators, wondering why their attempts at violence were not answered by the “use of arms, including firearms.”

(1666-1722), who was Grandmaster of the Teutonic Order at the time of the regiment’s founding in 1696. The “Deutschmeister” distinguished themselves against the Prussians in the Battle of Kolin in 1757, a victory that was referenced prominently in the words to Wilhelm August Jurek’s popular “Deutschmeistermarsch” nearly 150 years later.

39 Rothenberg, Army of Francis Joseph, 45.
40 Ibid., 129-30.
41 Quoted in ibid., 130.
This situation underscores the reality that the Joint Army received a very different reception in each part of the empire. In Hungary, even after 1867, the Army was not especially popular. According to Alan Sked, this was for political reasons, since “the Hungarians had no influence on the army. Indeed, this body was distinctly apathetic towards the Hungarians and often appeared to act within Hungary as an army of occupation. It was an independent power within the Hungarian state and made Hungary dependent on the dynasty.”42 On the other hand, the Austrian soldiers were relatively well-liked on their garrison in Galicia, despite the fact that some of the officers were actually quartered in private homes there at times. This was likely, as historian Jolanta T. Pekacz noted, because the multinational regiments “diffused the perception that they symbolized ‘Austrian’ rule and give no grounds for mutual hostilities between them and the Poles. In fact, some of these soldiers who came from countries under Austrian domination might have even shared the same attitude to the Austrians as did the Poles.”43 Through the introduction of conscription, and the practice of sending regiments far from home, it would be assured that the Galician Poles would see an Austrian army representing many of the empire’s nationalities. While this situation created many positive benefits – notably, that it helped to soften the image of the Habsburgs as a homogenizing foreign force – it also led to numerous practical difficulties. More proactive steps would ultimately have to be taken to ensure that all these newly-conscripted recruits would be able to function together as an army must.

42 Sked, Decline and Fall, 197.
Demographics and Languages

The Emperor Franz Joseph considered his direct and unquestionable command of the army as an absolute dynastic right, yet even he came to recognize the functional problems caused by the increase of nationalism. Rather than persist in denial, however, the aging Kaiser came up with an uncharacteristically pragmatic and politically sensitive solution to these modern problems. On 16 September 1903, while the army was on maneuvers in Galicia, Franz Joseph promulgated the famous Chłopy Army Order, which confirmed and even celebrated the uniquely multinational character of his armed forces. Taking advantage of yet another parliamentary crisis in Hungary to exert his own authority unilaterally, the Emperor wrote:

> The better founded my favorable judgment of the military value, the self-sacrificing delight in service, and the single-minded co-operation of all parts of my total Defensive Forces, the more must and will I hold fast to their existing and well-tried organizations. My Army, in particular, must know that I will never relinquish the rights and privileges guaranteed to its supreme War-Lord – my Army, whose stout bonds of union are threatened by one-sided aspirations proceeding from misapprehension of the exalted mission the Army has to fulfill for the weal of both States of the Monarchy. Joint and unitary as it is shall my Army remain, the strong power to defend the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy against every foe. True to its oath, my whole Defensive Force will continue to tread the path of earnest fulfillment of duty, permeated by that spirit of union and harmony which respects every national characteristic and solves all antagonisms by utilizing the special qualities of each race [Volkstämme] for the benefit of the great whole."\(^{44}\)

It should be noted that this Imperial pronouncement did not represent a change of ideology; rather it embodied the course that the Austro-Hungarian Army had been on since at least 1867, if not the very beginning of the Habsburg Empire itself. The Emperor was only articulating this sentiment in 1903, but a commitment to preserving national

traditions over the creation and enforcement of one particular state identity had been the
overriding organizational principle of the Army as early as the seventeenth century.
Writing only a few years after the Order was circulated, Wickham Steed noted “Although
the Emperor Francis Joseph has allowed the Hungarian regiments of the joint army to be
differentiated from the Austrian regiments in some details of uniform and facings, he has
repeatedly declared, and has proved by his action, that he will never allow the unitary
organization of the army to be seriously impaired.”45 Some of Franz Joseph’s
contemporary political rivals saw this Order as little more than a pretext for a power grab,
however. According to the historian István Deák, the Chłopy Army Order was
particularly unpopular in Hungary, in part because it rejected Hungarian as a possible
language of command outright, but also because the translators ended up rendering
“Volkstamm” (“ethnic group”) as “néptörzs” (“tribal group”), implying an inferior
relationship between the Germans and all the other ethnicities of the empire.46

Of course, the denial of nationalism had long been the understood policy of the
Monarchy. Only a few years before Chłopy, shortly after that 1897 confrontation
between Bosnian troops and German nationalists in Graz, the Imperial War Minister
Edmund von Krieghammer (1832-1906) reportedly observed, “it will never make a
difference whether the regiment comes from the north or the south of the monarchy, or
what language it uses, because in the army every nationality is equal and is equally
respected. No officer recognizes national differences.”47 This sentiment was modified
for the new nationalist environment by the Army Chief of Staff General Conrad von

47 Rothenberg, Army of Francis Joseph, 130.
Hötzendorf (1852-1925), who wrote in 1907, “Only in an army in which each of the various nationalities can have the conviction of being regarded as equal in right and value can there be a common spirit and a united attachment to the great Common Cause.”\(^{48}\)

Conrad added that “All officers must uphold the basic concept that within the army all nations enjoy equal rights,”\(^{49}\) noting further “that every recruit, whatever his nationality, should feel that he has equal rights in the armed forces, and that nothing should give rise to an impression that there exists in the army a privileged Herrenvolk.”\(^{50}\)

This diversity can be seen in the demographics of the military, which were fastidiously compiled each year by the Imperial War Ministry. In 1865, before the institution of conscription and just prior to the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War, the peacetime strength of the Army of the Austrian Empire stood at just over 493,000 men; during the crisis of 1866, it was able to raise only 528,000.\(^{51}\) With the Italian provinces of Lombardy and Venetia still a part of the empire at that time, and the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina more than forty years in the future, the army had the following demographic breakdown (Figure 4):

\(^{49}\) Quoted in Rothenberg, *Army of Francis Joseph*, 148.
\(^{50}\) Quoted in Stone, “Army and Society,” 98.
Following the Austro-Prussian War, the Monarchy lost most of its Italian possessions, and the demographics of both the empire and the army shifted. Moreover, after the Ausgleich of 1867, more Hungarians had returned to the army, which had a poor reputation in Hungary in the years following the revolutions of 1848-49. By 1910, the ranks of the regular k.u.k. Armee had grown to just over 1.5 million men, including approximately 17,800 career officers, and the demographic breakdown had changed (Figure 5):
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52 Source for this data: Rothenberg, *Army of Francis Joseph*, 61.
The 1910 graph, coming long after conscription had been established throughout the empire, now shows a striking similarity to the overall population demographics. Also by this time, certain ethnicities had become popularly linked with certain military specializations, either by tradition or by coincidence: the Jäger regiments largely consisted of Alpine Germans and Italians; the cavalry was predominantly Hungarian (though it included many Czechs and Poles), drawing on Hungarian traditions of horsemanship that were popularly believed to extend back to the time of Attila the Hun. Technical fields such as artillery – and, as we will see, music – were mainly the provenance of the Germans and Czechs, who were the most industrialized and best
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54 Source for the data: Deák, *Beyond Nationalism*, 183.
55 Compare Figure 2, in Chapter 1.
educated nationalities. The career officers, too, were largely German-Austrian, as we can see from their 1910 demographics (Figure 6):

![Figure 6: Demographics of the Austro-Hungarian Army, 1910: Career Officers](image)

While it is true that the German-Austrians dominated the officer corps, as István Deák observed, the officers of the Joint Army should be considered a special case unto themselves. Deák is careful to point out, as Jászi had noted before, that because of their nationally-hybrid origins, “an enormous number of Joint Army officers had, for all intents and purposes, no nationality.” Therefore, regarding these carefully-compiled statistics on officer birthplaces, Deák warns,
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57 Source for the data: Deák, *Beyond Nationalism*, 183.
58 To Oskar Jászi, “The joint army formed a real state within the state, the members of which – especially its officers and under-officers – breathed first of all throughout their whole life the spirit of the military colleges or their regiments and not that of their mother-nations. Indeed the fatherland of the officers’ staff was the whole monarchy and not the territory of a particular nation.” Jászi, *Dissolution*, 144.
In any case, place of birth was not as decisive in a corps in which two-thirds of the officers were born to fathers in public service: bureaucrats, officers, NCOs, gendarmes, policemen, customs officials, employees of the state-owned railways, and Protestant ministers. These people often served in places far away from home. True, in 1867, all public services were divided between Austria and Hungary, and thereafter, only members of the Joint Army served throughout the monarchy. Still, it did little for a boy’s national identity when, to give one example, his railway official father was transferred from Italian- and Croatian-speaking Trieste to Romanian-, Ukrainian-, and Yiddish-speaking Bukovina. Both places were “Austria.”

In this same sense, Oskar Jászi argued that the officers of the Joint Army, “constituted something like an anational caste the members of which lived even in their private lives ordinarily distinct from their national environments and spoke very often a special language, the so-called ärarisch deutsch (“fiscal German”) as it was ironically named by the representatives of literary German, meaning a strange linguistic mixture which does not take the rules of grammar very seriously.”

Language was, in fact, the most significant hurdle in such a diverse, multinational army. The language of the Joint Army was the subject of contentious debate between the Imperial War Ministry and the civilian governments in Vienna and Budapest, and the compromise that was reached – requiring a cursory knowledge of German in the field, but allowing the regiments to use the mother tongue of the majority of their soldiers for everyday activities – came to the consternation of all parties. Even before the Chłopy Order, there were effectively three languages used in each regiment: the “language of command” (Kommandosprache), the “language of service” (Dienstsprache) and the “regimental language” (Regimentssprache). The Kommandosprache and typically also

59 Deák, Beyond Nationalism, 184.
60 Jászi, Dissolution, 144 (emphasis in original).
the *Dienstsprache* were both German, though the required vocabulary for each was very small, extending to some eighty commands and a thousand technical terms. The *Regimentssprache*, or everyday language of the barracks, was always the mother tongue (or in some cases, tongues) of the majority of the soldiers in the regiment. 61 Often the burden for learning the regimental language fell on the overwhelmingly German officer corps, the members of which were commonly posted to regiments outside of their own national group. For this reason, according to statistics compiled by István Deák, as much as 90% of the officer corps was effectively multilingual by 1904. 62 Failing to learn the *Regimentssprache* within a certain span of time − typically three years − would often result in an officer’s dismissal. 63 Indeed by this time, concern over the integrity and equality of the different national groups within the *k.u.k. Armee* had reached such a point that officers caught hurling racial or cultural epithets at their men faced imprisonment. 64

Even though attempts were made to segregate regiments of the Joint Army by region, this did not necessarily lead to ethnic or even linguistic homogeneity in each regiment. According to surviving statistics from the year 1914, only a handful of regiments had even 80% or more of their members who spoke any single language. 65 As a result, many regiments had two or more widely-spoken languages. According to Gunther Rothenberg, “In 1901 out of 256 units of the common army, 94 employed but
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61 Stone, “Army and Society,” 100. Stone adds that “use of the German language remained largely a matter of convenience rather than prejudice.”
63 Deák noted that the multinational army succeeded in overcoming this linguistic barrier in part “by devoting a considerable amount of time in military schools to the study of languages and by forcing its officers to become veritable artists in linguistic inventiveness.” See Deák, *Beyond Nationalism*, 102.
64 Ibid., 107-8.
65 See statistics in Fritz Rathner, *Die Bewaffnete Macht Österreich-Ungarns 1618-1918 in ihren Märschen* (Berlin: Arbeitskreis Militärmusik in der Deutsche Gesellschaft für Heereskunde, 1983) passim. These statistics have been reprinted online at www.austro-hungarian-army.co.uk/nationality.htm.
one language, 133 used two languages, and 28 authorized the use of three or even four languages. And in Hungary, except for the purely Magyar units, there were 26 units employing their various national languages.”

66 This often gave rise to some interesting linguistic ironies, including one instance during World War I when a German-Austrian commander had to use English with his Slovak troops because many of many of the men had emigrated to the United States and subsequently returned to enlist in the Army when they felt their homeland needed them.

67 It should be noted that Jews were allowed to serve in the Austro-Hungarian Army with relatively few restrictions right up to the time of the First World War. This is completely different from their status in Prussia and Germany, and reflects the special construction of Austrian identity in comparison to nineteenth-century nation-states. As Steven Beller noted, “The Monarchy was so pluralist, it has been pointed out, that Jews could become at least reserve officers in the Habsburg army, even at times active officers, whereas Jews were completely banned, albeit unofficially, from the Prussian officer corps.”

68 Marsha Rozenblit amplified this, observing that, “The Austro-Hungarian military assumed that the Jews were a profoundly loyal element and saw no reason to bow to anti-Semitic demands… Jews felt that both the army and the multinational state deserved their unreserved support and affection, and they fervently hoped for their survival.”

69 __Rothenberg, Army of Francis Joseph__, 128.


The “School for the Nation”

During the nineteenth century, as the historian Eric Hobsbawm observed,

> For governmental and ruling classes, armies were not only forces against internal and external enemies, but also a means of securing the loyalty, even the active enthusiasm, of citizens with troubling sympathies for mass movements which undermined the social and political order. Together with the primary school, military service was perhaps the most powerful mechanism at the disposal of the state for inculcating proper civic behaviour and, not least, for turning the inhabitant of a village into the (patriotic) citizen of a nation.”

The armies of nineteenth-century Europe were, effectively, schools for indoctrinating peasants from far-flung corners of a country into a single culture. Nation-states like France and Italy used this to great effect, even going as far as to unite disparate dialects into one language, or distinct regional eating habits into one national cuisine through the influence of the conscripted army. This educational role of a conscript army was especially important to the multinational Austro-Hungarian Empire, which sought any available means to unite its disparate peoples.

In the late nineteenth century, Austria-Hungary found itself in the unenviable position of combating spreading nationalist movements among virtually all of its constituent nations. Making matters even more complicated, literacy rates among the new conscripts hovered at only around 22 percent around 1900, and when they could read or write, it was rarely in German – a primary language to not more than 25% of the Monarchy’s inhabitants. As Franz Ferdinand’s military adviser Alexander von Brosch-Aarenau (1870-1914) wrote in 1911:
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71 Famously, spaghetti – which was previously only a Southern Italian regional specialty – became the de facto national dish of Italy because of its association with the Italian Army during the nineteenth century.  
Every year in October we conscript men who have, as often as not, undergone a preliminary training in nationalist, anti-Austrian atmospheres and have been educated as irredentists or anti-militarists, or who, being illiterate, know less than nothing of the world; and out of such material we have to fashion intelligent responsible individuals and enthusiastic patriotic citizens.\textsuperscript{73}

Thus, by the end of the nineteenth century, the Joint Army came to be seen as the “school for the nation” in both a figurative and a literal sense. Within their two-year period of service, new conscripts learned a basic German vocabulary, and they were taught to read and write in the regimental language if they could not already. With recruits from the Hungarian half of the Monarchy, this training and service in their own native languages effectively countered the Budapest government’s culture-stifling attempts to “Magyarize” their national minorities. And of course the recruits were indoctrinated into the culture of the regiment itself, including its traditions and its music. As Oskar Jászi noted, the Joint Army’s “supreme purpose” was “to inculcate an exclusively Habsburg patriotism and to maintain the nationalism of the members of the army in a state of an apolitical nationalism, in a state of a linguistic, family, or, at most, of a racial nationalism which would have nothing to do with the political and state struggles of the single nations.”\textsuperscript{74}

In this educational role, the Austro-Hungarian Army was actually quite effective, and by isolating the soldiers from their nationalist environments, it succeeded instilling in them a sense of a Greater Austrian fatherland. Writing before the First World War, Wickham Steed noted that the influence of the Joint Army “is, on the whole, educative both in a pedagogical and in a political sense. It is, in the case of recruits from the less advanced races, veritably a primary school, teaching not only the ‘three R’s,’ but

\textsuperscript{73} Letter to Franz Ferdinand, dated 12 January 1911; quoted in Stone, “Army and Society,” 101.
\textsuperscript{74} Jászi, Dissolution, 143-44.
cleanliness, self-control, and habits of discipline. It inculcates, moreover, unitary
sentiment and devotion to the dynasty. In spirit it is far more democratic than the German
army.” 75 Even the practice of routinely stationing regiments in far-flung corners of the
empire had an educational value; according to Oskar Jászi, “These men who lived now in
Vienna, now in Budapest, now in Prague and then in Zagreb, in Galicia, in Transylvania,
in Bosnia, or in the Bocche represented a certain spirit of internationalism confronted
with the implicit and hateful nationalism of their surroundings.” 76 In Steed’s estimation,
the educational process of the Austro-Hungarian Army created officers that were “as a
rule, held to be the superior of the average German officer. He is more intelligent, more
readily adaptable to circumstances, in closer touch with his men, less given to dissipation,
and remarkably free from arrogance. He is a good fellow and a lovable being.” 77

The Great War

The Austro-Hungarian Army’s precarious nationalities situation was met with skepticism
by some, notably Austrian Minister-President Count Kasimir Badeni (1846-1902), Count
Taaffe’s successor, who maintained that “a state of nationalities cannot wage war without
danger to itself.” 78 Ultimately Badeni would be proven correct, though not for the
reasons he might have suspected. Although the multinational army was tenable in
peacetime, it was not well-suited for war – especially a modern, mechanized war. The
outpouring of patriotism following the declaration of war on 28 July 1914 brought
together the nationalities of the empire as no single event had before, yet despite this

75 Steed, *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, xxv.
76 Jászi, *Dissolution*, 144.
78 Quoted in Rothenberg, *Army of Francis Joseph*, 128.
enthusiasm, Army mobilization was made much more difficult by the practice of stationing regiments far away from their homes. This meant that the reservists had even farther to travel to meet their own regiments. Additionally, the mobilization posters themselves had to be printed in as many as fifteen different languages in order to reach the variegated populace.79

Ultimately, this multinational makeup proved to be too unwieldy to wage a modern war, and World War I would be not only the empire’s undoing, but more specifically, the Army’s as well. “In peacetime the problem of languages was not insuperable, but in 1914, when reserve officers entered the army in great numbers, the difficulty began to interfere gravely with the army’s flexibility in the field,”80 observed Norman Stone, who added that “in the middle of the war, an officer of the German army noted that the Austro-Hungarian army ‘is too much of a patchwork, with each patch hating its fellow; it often happens that the officers neither speak nor understand the languages of their men, and think themselves too civilized to bother learning them.’”81

This situation was another tragically unforeseen consequence of the language issue: the very high number of casualties that the officer corps endured in 1914 and 1915 meant that replacement officers had to be rushed to the front without the luxury of a three-year probationary period in which to learn a regiment’s language. Instead, as István Deák noted, “command over the smaller units … would gradually pass into the hands of reserve officers who were linguistically unprepared, in part at least because of the

79 Stone, “Army and Society,” 100.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid.
growing nationalism of Hungarian, Croatian, Polish, and even German high-school education.”

Nevertheless, the multinational army held together longer than any of its detractors imagined, surviving four years of war and hardship on the strength of their bonds of regimental loyalty. In fact, the Joint Army actually outlasted the Monarchy it was tasked to protect; in what Norman Stone called “a fitting conclusion to the history of the Habsburg Monarchy,” the Imperial standard was flown for the last time “not by politicians in Vienna but by a military commander in a remote part of Albania.”

According to military historian John Keegan,

This was an unhappy destiny for an army which, for much of Franz Josef’s reign, had been a successful and even popular multi-ethnic organisation. Commanded in their own languages, spared the brutal discipline of the Kaiser’s army, prettily uniformed, well-fed, loaded with traditions and honours that ascended to the seventeenth-century Turkish siege of Vienna and beyond, the regiments of the imperial army – Tyrolean Rifles, Hungarian Hussars, Dalmatian Light Horse – made a kaleidoscope of the empire’s diversity and, for three years of a young conscript’s life, provided an enjoyable diversion from the routine of workshop or plough. Annual manoeuvres were a pleasurable summer holiday. Regimental anniversaries, when the band played, wine flowed, and the honorary colonel, an archduke, a prince, perhaps the Emperor himself, came to visit, were joyous feasts. The return home, time expired, brought more celebration and adult respect. The reality of war was a distant eventuality.

The Army’s “school for the nation” had an important musical component as well, one that also took advantage of the respective strengths of the various nationalities of the empire, molding musicians from far-flung lands into a cohesive ensemble. These were the Militärkapelle – the so-called “Bandas” – that every regiment sponsored out of the

---

82 Deák, *Beyond Nationalism*, 102.
83 Stone, “Army and Society,” 95.
pockets of its own officers. The music of the regimental bands not only reinforced the
corporate loyalty to the regiment itself though the repetition of its marches – which every
regiment, famous or otherwise, had in abundance – but to the multinational Monarchy as
a whole. Like the regiments themselves, the Militärkapelle effectively embodied the
entire Monarchy, and its Kapellmeister composed music that reflected this diverse
heritage – music that represented the coming together of forces in Viribus Unitis, as per
the Emperor Franz Joseph’s apt motto. Through their many free public concerts, these
military bands became the most visible face not just of their respective regiments or the
Army, but the empire itself, going like missionaries, as one commenter observed, and
spreading the gospel of music to all corners of the Monarchy. As we will see, the
military bands of the Imperial and Royal Joint Army cultivated the Monarchy’s ties with
its civilian population through their regular public performances and – most importantly –
their ever-expanding repertoire, which gave voice to the virtues of multinationalism
within the empire at large.
3. The Institution of Austro-Hungarian *Militärmusik*

The idea of combining the best elements of each nation of the empire for the benefit of all recalls the image of a choir of disparate voices singing together in harmony. For a concrete example of this, one needs only look at the *de facto* national anthem of the Dual Monarchy – Joseph Haydn’s *Kaiserhymne* – as it was performed in the years prior to the First World War. Like “God Save the Queen,” the *Kaiserhymne* was less a “national” anthem than a hymn of praise for the emperor himself. Originally written at the end of the eighteenth century in honor of the Emperor Franz,¹ the last of the Holy Roman Emperors and first Emperor of Austria, with the lyrics “Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser,” the hymn was adapted for subsequent emperors with the less specific words “Gott erhalte, Gott beschütze, Unsern Kaiser, unser Land.” Yet although the most famous lyrics were in German, in practice, the hymn was sung in all of the local languages of the Monarchy by the end of the nineteenth century. If several local languages were commonly in use, they were sung in unison as a show of imperial unity. From time to time, a four-voice arrangement of the *Kaiserhymne* was sung in each of the empire’s four main languages – German, Hungarian, Czech, and Polish – at once, and the

¹ Philip Bohlman has shown the *Kaiserhymne* to be similar to – and perhaps even based on – a Croatian folksong that Haydn may have heard when he lived in Eisenstadt, adding to the multinational character of the piece. See Bohlman, *The Music of European Nationalism: Cultural Identity and Modern History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2004), 51-2.
Phonogrammarchiv of the Austrian Academy of Sciences has several World War I-era recordings of soldiers singing such arrangements.²

But the multilingual Kaiserhymne was not the only example of the Emperor’s variegated subjects making music together in relative tranquility. For hundreds of years, musicians and composers from all over the empire came together to create one specific genre of instrumental music that could be said to represent the Monarchy as a whole. This was the military music of the Imperial and Royal Joint Army, which evolved over a span of some three hundred years from humble beginnings into a full-fledged institution that fulfilled an important cultural and social role in large cities and small towns in each corner of the multinational empire. The decades prior to the First World War were considered the glory days of Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik, when the regimental bands were famously described as “musical missionaries” spreading music and culture throughout the imperial hinterlands, as attested in the contemporary accounts by men like Eduard Hanslick, Hugo Riemann, and others. The story of these Regimentkapelle and the musicians who comprised them is both a significant antithesis to the commonly-accepted paradigm of a fractious Austro-Hungarian Empire and, at the same time, a microcosm of the Imperial Gesamtstaatsidee in actual practice.

² One such example, sung by a quartet of soldiers representing each of the four nationalities, was recorded at the Phonogrammarchiv of the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (today the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften) on 25 September 1915, and is catalogued in their collection as Ph 2512. It can be found in the Phonogrammarchiv CD compilation “Soldatenlieder der k.u.k. Armee” (OEAW PHA CD 11, 2000).
**Militärmusik in Austria**

The history of Austrian Militärmusik has been well-researched and documented over the years by many Austrian musicologists and historians; it is not within the scope of this project to supplant those studies, but rather to use them as the basis for a second level of musical-cultural critique.\(^3\) These popular ensembles inspired a wide following during the latter years of the Monarchy, when the Militärkapelle “formed as it were the most natural link between the soldiery and the population, and [their] sounds already drowned out some clearly audible national dissonances elsewhere.”\(^4\) Indeed, in the years after the dissolution of the Monarchy, military bands became almost synonymous with a kind of popular Habsburg nostalgia, not least because of their frequent appearances in the local Habsburg-themed historical films of the 1950s and 60s. Since them, Militärmusik nostalgia has grown into something of a niche industry, as evidenced by the numerous reenactment bands active in Austria today, staffed by enthusiasts and operating entirely

---

\(^3\) The most prominent historians of Austrian Militärmusik from the Monarchiezeit were the former Militärkapellmeister Emil Rameis (1904-1973), whose book Die österreichische Militärmusik, von ihren Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1918 (Tutzing: H. Schneider, 1976) is the standard history of the genre, and whose Nachlass in the Kriegsarchiv of the Austrian State Archives is an important repository for source information on the activates of the Militärkapelle. Another important contributor to this field was the late Eugen Brixel (1939-2000), an Austrian musicologist and expert in wind band music, who had written a large number of books and articles on the history and practice of Militärmusik, including Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik: von der “Türkischen Musik” zu den Philharmonikern in Uniform (Graz: Edition Kaleidoskop, 1982), which he co-authored with Gunther Martin and Gottfried Pils. Though many other scholars have written about the musical quality and significance of this repertoire, Brixel was perhaps the first to examine the social and cultural role of Militärmusik within the Habsburg Empire, and my own work would not have been possible without his groundbreaking research.

independently from the official military bands of the modern Republic of Austria’s Bundesheer.\textsuperscript{5}

Music has been associated with armed forces and conflict since ancient times, albeit only in a very limited sense for much of that history. Trumpets and drums have long been used to convey signals to soldiers in battle, but the idea of marching into battle with melodic accompaniment gained particular utility with the invention of gunpowder – or, more precisely, with the invention of firing-line tactics for infantry armed with muskets instead of melee weapons. One of the principal tenets of early gunpowder warfare was the line formation, but this formation could be easily broken – and thus rendered tactically useless – by soldiers who marched too quickly or too slowly. In order to unify their movements into a cohesive whole, the men in formation had to find a way to keep the same tempo, and this was made significantly easier by the playing of some kind of cadence or marching tune. Since drum beats alone would have blended in to the sonic confusion of a battle, alternative sound sources had to be found.

One alternative was to use wind instruments such as fifes and shawms, whose high-pitched timbre could be heard easily above the din of battle. Significantly cheaper and easier to play than brass instruments, these woodwind instruments formed the basis of the first military music ensembles in Europe. The Austrian musicologist Eugen Brixel claimed that official military music in Central Europe can be dated back to 1555, when a regulation for “\textit{Spielleute}” (typically pipes and drums) was recorded for a German regiment. The continuous military music tradition in Austria goes back to the Thirty

\textsuperscript{5} See for example the Original Hoch- und Deutschmeister (www.deutschmeister.at), the k.u.k. Regimentskapelle Nr. 84 (www.schwanzer.at), and the Original Tiroler Kaiserjägermusik (www.tirol-kaiserjaegermusik.at).
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Years War (1618–1648), at the latest, when the use of wind bands to reinforce the soldiers’ marching tempo was first documented.\(^6\) By tradition, however, these early bands of *hautbois* were forever altered following the Turkish sieges of Vienna, when, according to Brixel, “Austria came into contact in a lasting way with Janissary music, which, it was said afterwards, had a strongly psychological effect, that is, intimidating the enemy and cheering the Turkish soldiers.”\(^7\)

As early as the fourteenth century, the Ottoman Empire maintained one of the only standing armies in all of Europe. This army consisted of their famous Janissaries, who, by the mid-fifteenth century, had been among the first armies to adopt the rudimentary firearms of the day. This army was accompanied by a band of musicians – called *mehterhane* – which is largely considered to have been the first military marching band in Europe. These *mehter* ensembles were made up of large numbers of middle-eastern wind instruments and, perhaps most characteristically, idiophonic percussion instruments such as cymbals and bell trees. Using their Janissary army, the Ottomans mounted two unsuccessful sieges of Vienna: the first in 1529, shortly after the Habsburg dynasty first came into the possession of their Hungarian territorial holdings, and then again in 1683. It is this 1683 siege that still looms the largest in the collective Austrian historical memory. The siege that was broken by the combined efforts of King Jan III Sobieski of Poland, Duke Charles V of Lorraine, and the Austrian general Prince Eugen von Savoy, is remembered not only as the last time the Ottomans would threaten a major

---


European capital, but also for the numerous – if largely apocryphal – cross-cultural influences that sprouted up in its aftermath. As anyone who has visited Vienna knows, sacks of coffee beans were said to have been left behind by the vanquished Turkish invaders, and as legend would have it, coffeehouses appeared all over the city soon afterwards, creating a cultural revolution. But most importantly for our purposes, a number of Turkish percussion instruments, including cymbals, triangles, and bell trees, were also left behind as the Ottoman army retreated hastily. These instruments from the mehter bands became immediately popular in the hands of their vanquishers and transformed Austrian and European military music indelibly.  

The turbulent decades that began the eighteenth century were marked by a series of continental wars, and standing armies remained a part of everyday life in Austria throughout this era. This led to the creation of standing military bands, and the Turquerie that followed the 1683 siege continued to exert a particularly strong influence on them. Even the uniquely Austrian term for a military ensemble – “Banda,” popularly used in place of the more formal “Regimentkapelle” – is thought to be a result of this Turkish influence.  

A famous story has Major Franz von der Trenck, who would go on to distinguish himself in the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748), organizing a parade of “Janissary musicians” in 1741 in honor of the recently-crowned Empress Maria Theresia. Later that same year, the Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle – the band of the famous “Hoch- und Deutschmeister” infantry regiment of Vienna – was formed in

---

8 Werner Honig discusses the Turkish origin of Austrian military percussion at some length; specifically the bell tree, which he related to Islam, as the bell trees were in the characteristic shape of a crescent. See Werner Honig, “Die Musik Kommt: Notizen zur Militär-Musikgeschichte,” Neue Zeitschrift für Musik 129, no. 5 (1968): 223.

imitation of von der Trenck’s Janissary musicians. This group, in turn, served as the progenitor for many of the military bands that sprouted up throughout the empire.

From the 1740s onward, these early Militärkapelle were ad hoc collections of musicians, with no set instrumentation beyond an emphasis on high-pitched woodwinds and percussion. In some corners of the empire, these “Turkish” bands continued to persist on into the early nineteenth century. In the more urbane centers of the empire, these military ensembles started to resemble the contemporaneous wind divertimento group – albeit one augmented with trumpets and drums. The Napoleonic Wars made these ensembles a routine sight in Vienna and elsewhere throughout the empire during the early nineteenth century, playing not only an important tactical function but also a vital cultural and propaganda role as well. In some parts of the empire, the years between the Congress of Vienna and the midcentury revolutions (1815-1848) were considered a kind of golden age of Austrian Militärmusik. With the formation of sustainable professional orchestras still some years in the future, the military bands were among the most prominent musical groups to entertain the public outside of the noble and imperial courts. Benefiting from the free publicity generated by their official public appearances,


this was an era in which an enterprising *Militärkapellmeister* could make a substantial living by hiring out his ensemble for private engagements.

Yet this golden age did not extend far beyond the large cities, and musical standards in the small, far-flung barracks towns of the empire could be quite poor, if any such standards existed at all. This made it difficult for musicians to move from one group to another, because, according to musicologist Werner Honig,

The many, small groups that came into being in the course of the development [of German-Austrian military music] were different from one another in instrumentation and intonation [or character]. Therefore, it was at the beginning of the nineteenth century difficult to standardize *Militärmusik* in the states of the German League so that one could make music together. This is the era of the *Kapellmeister* as the educator of his musicians.\(^\text{12}\)

This last point has been amplified more recently by Friedrich Anzenberger, who noted:

Each director of a military band normally had to train the musicians himself. While one could count on ‘skilled’ musicians from the conservatories in the larger cities, this opportunity was completely lacking in a small garrison town. The situation was somewhat better if the band could play at private events, as the possibility of additional income attracted better-qualified musicians.\(^\text{13}\)

It was during this time, from the 1830s to the 1860s, that two prominent *Militärkapellmeister* attempted to remedy this situation by raising and standardizing the quality of Austrian *Militärmusik*. The first of these two reformers was Andreas Nemetz (1799-1846), an accomplished *Militärkapellmeister* from Moravia who, in 1844, published a guidebook intended for other *Militärkapellmeister* entitled *Allgemeine*...


This manual included technical tutors for all of the instruments in the wind bands of the day – including some of the first instructions for valved brass instruments in all of Europe – along with a few sample arrangements of marches and other patriotic melodies, including Haydn’s *Kaiserhymne*, as well as the national anthems of a few other European states. Nemetz’s work long served as both an unofficial guide for training military musicians and a template for *Militärmusik* instrumentation.

As significant as Nemetz’s contribution was, however, he would be far outshone by his archrival, Andreas Leonhardt (1800-1866), who, in 1851, was named as the Austrian Empire’s only *Armeekapellmeister* by the Emperor Franz Joseph himself. This newly-created post was analogous to the contemporaneous position occupied in Prussia by Wilhelm Wieprecht (1802-1872), whose own tenure was widely regarded as a high point for German military music. From this lofty posting as inspector of all the army’s bands, which he occupied until 1862, Leonhardt was in a position to carry out some much-needed reorganization. Leonhardt himself was born in the Sudeten-German town of Asch (today Aš) in Bohemia. He studied composition in Vienna and Naples, and his career as a *Militärkapellmeister* saw him stationed in northern Italy (then part of the empire) and Graz. In addition to his official duties as *Armeekapellmeister*, Leonhardt was well-known as a composer from his marches such as “Prinz Eugen,” “Jung
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14 Some biographical details on Nemetz can be found in *Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik*, 317.
Österreich,” and “Kronprinz Rudolf,” as well as his arrangement of the official Austrian military Zapfenstreich or tattoo ceremony music.\textsuperscript{15}

Taking charge in the immediate aftermath of the revolts of 1848-49, Leonhardt’s reforms as Armeekapellmeister extended to musical, organizational, and disciplinary matters. He fixed the Austrian marching tempo at 108 beats per minute – a tempo that may have been originally introduced several years earlier by Nemetz – and he took a stab at regularizing the instrumentation of the various Militärkapelle themselves by reducing the maximum allowed number of musicians. He also authorized a standard musicians’ uniform for the first time and created a special pension system for military musicians, who were often left out of the regular army pension scheme.\textsuperscript{16} Yet despite his attention to the mundane details of his post, Leonhardt kept a flair for the dramatic; he quickly became known for his “monster concerts,” or massed performances by several regimental bands at once, usually taking place during the annual imperial maneuvers attended by the Kaiser himself alongside important foreign dignitaries, and involving up to a thousand musicians or more.\textsuperscript{17}

Leonhardt’s reforms were so successful that some thought they could never be surpassed – a recurring theme in the later years of the Habsburg monarchy. Even before Leonhardt’s tenure as Armeekapellmeister ended, one contemporary observer despaired,

\textsuperscript{15} Biographical details from Elisabeth Anzenberger-Ramminer, Friedrich Anzenberger, and Walter Schwanzer, Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit: Märsche der Donaumonarchie von Achleitner bis Ziehrer (Vienna: Walter Schwanzer Musikverlage, 2004), 82-3; and Stephan Vajda, „Mir san vom k.u.k....“ Die Kuriose Geschichte der österreichischen Militärmusik (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1977), 159-61.
\textsuperscript{17} For a description of one such event, see Brixel, “Kulturfaktor Militärmusik,” 18-19.
Military musicians soon will have reached their culmination point, and a step backwards might become noticeable within a short amount of time. The monetary requirements will continue to increase, so that many regiments will not be able to afford the sum anymore, then only a few regiments will still pay it, and their capital collected under favorable circumstances will keep their musicians on the current state of the art: the others, however, will slowly go back to a lower level, and the nimbus and renown, yes the pride of the Austrian army with regard to its military music will slowly decline and perhaps leave first place to the military musicians of other countries.\footnote{"Die Militärmusiken bald ihren Kulminationspunkt erreicht haben (werden), und daß ein Rückschritt in kurzer Zeit bemerkbar werden dürfte. Die pekuniären Anforderungen werden immer größer werden, so daß viele Regimenter die Summen nicht mehr werden erschwingen können, dann wird es nur doch einige Regimenter geben, die durch ihre, durch günstige Umstände gesammelten Kapitalen ihre Musiken auf dem jetzigen Kunststand erhalten: die anderen aber werden auf eine geringere Stufe zurückgehen und der Nimbus und Ruhm, ja der Stolz der österreichischen Armee in Bezug auf ihre Militärmusik wird langsam schwinden und endlich vielleicht wieder den ersten Platz den Militärmusiken anderer Staaten überlassen müssen." Emil Urban, Militär-Zeitung 1857/8, 57, quoted in Brixel, “Musiksoziologische Aspekte,” 84.}

Despite this pessimism, however, Leonhardt’s reforms bolstering the performance standards and visibility of the Militärkapelle – while at the same time limiting their private engagement opportunities and the size of the ensemble – successfully reinvented the institution of Austrian Militärmusik, creating in effect the familiar image and performing style that was known throughout the empire in the decades leading up to the First World War, and even beyond.

**The Social Role of Militärmusik**

In his novel *Radetzkymarsch*, Joseph Roth painted a vivid portrait of an outdoor Militärmusik concert by the Regimentkapelle of a fictionalized 10th Infantry Regiment stationed in the Moravian town of “W” – a scene such as Roth himself might have witnessed, growing up in eastern Galicia around the turn of the century:

> By the time the band had stationed itself in the prescribed round and the dainty little feet of the frail music desks had dug into the black soil of the
cracks between the wide paving stones on the square, the bandmaster was already standing at the center of his musicians, discretely holding up his ebony baton with the silver pommel.

Every one of these outdoor concerts – they took place under the Herr District Captain’s balcony – began with “The Radetzky March.” Though all the band members were so thoroughly familiar with it that they could have played it without a conductor, in the dead of night, and in their sleep, the kapellmeister nevertheless required them to read every single note from the sheets. And every Sunday, as if rehearsing “The Radetzky March” for the first time with his musicians, he would raise his head, his baton, and his eyes in military and musical zeal and concentrate all four on any segments that seemed needful of his orders in the round at whose midpoint he was standing. The rugged drums rolled, the sweet flutes piped, and the lovely cymbals shattered. The faces of all the spectators lit up with pleasant and pensive smiles, and the blood tingled in their legs. Though standing, they thought they were already marching. The younger girls held their breath and opened their lips. The more mature men hung their heads and recalled their maneuvers. The elderly ladies sat in the neighboring park, their small gray heads trembling. And it was summer.19

An outdoor concert in the summer afternoon air with the band forming a circle in a palace courtyard; Austrian literature on the fin-de-siècle period is replete with images like this one. Though Roth treated the subject perhaps more lovingly than any of his contemporaries, military bands form part of the cultural backdrop in works by many of his contemporaries, including Arthur Schnitzler, Robert Musil, and even Karl Kraus. Stephan Zweig, reminiscing about fin-de-siècle Vienna’s musical life, from Gustav Mahler’s Philharmonic concerts on down, observed that “in the Prater the crowds knew exactly which military band had the best ‘swing’, whether it was the Deutschmeister or the Hungarians; whoever lived in Vienna caught a feeling of rhythm from the air.”20

What is interesting about these literary appearances is that the military ensembles are

20 Stefan Zweig, The World of Yesterday (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 20. These military bands reappear on cue in chapter 9, during his description of the atmosphere of the mobilization of 1914.
always described in the context of a public concert – and very rarely, if ever, in a parade or any kind of military exercise. This is not without reason: it was primarily in this concert setting that most Austrians came into contact with *Militärmusik* as part of their daily lives.

In Vienna, the Prater gardens and the Imperial residence at the Hofburg served as the primary venues for *Militärmusik* performances. Elsewhere, these concerts took place in public squares and on palace courtyards, on promenades and in wine gardens, at outdoor skating rinks, on marketplaces, and anywhere else people would gather. This was a special role performed by the Austrian military bands that had few analogues in Europe at that time. Writing in 1909, the German musician and critic Hermann Eichborn noted that while industrialized Germany’s numerous cities could support a large class of professional musicians, the many small towns and hamlets that dotted the agrarian Austrian countryside could not. In those cases, the only musical ensemble that could fill that niche was the town’s garrison band, giving the Austrian military musicians a cultural significance much greater than their German counterparts. For this reason, Eichborn notes that while the German army had a contingent of around 18,000 musicians in 1909, the Austro-Hungarian army had significantly – if not inestimably – more.21

21 According to Eichborn, “Rechnet man hierzu, daß in Deutschland jeder selbständige Truppenteil seine Musik hat, neuerdings sogar die Trainbataillone und Schwadronen Musikkorps gebildet werden, die sich ungeniert dem gewerblichen Betriebe widmen, so ist es nur durch die in Deutschland so viel mehr als in Österreich entwickelte musikalische Massenkultur, die sich hauptsächlich auf den größeren Städten stützt, also durch die riesige Nachfrage nach Orchestermusik zu erklären, daß nicht längst schon der letzte Zivilmusiker seinen Beruf mit einem anderen lohnenderen Metier vertauscht hat. In dem städtearmen Österreich, dessen einen so weiten Flächenraum einnehmende Alpenländer auffallend wenig größere Orte haben und in allgemeiner wie musikalischer Kultur rückständig sind, haben die Berufsmusiker trotz der relative geringen Zahl der konkurrierenden Militärmusiker einen ebenso schweren Daseinskampf zu kämpfen wie ihre Kollegen in Deutschland und, zieht man die große Anzahl der in Deutschland engagierten österreichischen Musiker in Betracht, scheint es einen noch schwereren.” Hermann Eichborn, *Militarismus und Musik* (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1909), 105.
In many parts of the empire, the entire musical life of the town or even the region was dependent on the military band.\textsuperscript{22} Perhaps nowhere was the cultural role of the military bands more pronounced than in the far-flung province of Galicia, which included the Polish city of Krakow as well as the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) city of Lemberg (Lviv). The Habsburg dynasty came into the possession of Galicia through a series of three partitions distributing the territories of the defunct Kingdom of Poland among the Austrian, Prussian, and Russian Empires between 1772 and 1795. One would expect that foreign lordship and division of what was once a sovereign nation would excite feelings of nationalism, yet the Poles of western Galicia remained relatively receptive to their new Austrian rulers virtually up until the empire’s collapse during the First World War.

Writing on musical culture in Polish Galicia, the cultural historian Jolanta Pekacz noted that the national identity there “was characterized by a double loyalty – to Poland and to Austria” and although they continued to adhere to local traditions and speak their own language following the partition, “Poles in Galicia viewed themselves as part of the bigger family of Habsburg peoples, rather than as part of historical Poland.”\textsuperscript{23} As a result, the Polish Galicians were not hostile to cultural influences from outside their own nation, and Viennese tastes continued to set all the trends among the cosmopolitan elites in Galicia, especially in terms of the theater, fashion, and music.\textsuperscript{24}


\textsuperscript{23} Pekacz, \textit{Music in the Culture of Polish Galicia}, 181.

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 180.
The first Austrian military bands arrived in Galicia in 1772, and were a mixture of imported and local musicians.\textsuperscript{25} According to Pekacz’s research, the Austrian military bands in Galicia adapted into their public role over time, moving from strictly military functions to more cultural ones, and came to perform such roles as “celebrating royal birthdays, namedays, weddings, funerals, and religious processions, as well as entr’acte music in a theater and indoor and outdoor concerts available to the general public” – all functions that were typically performed by civilian musicians in the larger cities.\textsuperscript{26} Some of these military bands even put on concerts for the benefit of local charities, which further helped to ingratiate them to the Poles.\textsuperscript{27} According to one contemporary observer, the Austrian military bands “used to play tattoos in the market by the light of lamps held on high poles. They also habitually played serenades at the windows of dignitaries visiting Cracow, or at dinners in their honor, sometimes by the light of torches. Every year on 1 May military music welcomed the spring, playing all over town from 5 o’clock in the morning; this nice custom survived until the First World War.”\textsuperscript{28}

Of course, this deep level of social integration had unfortunate side effects: as the local music scene grew – having been germinated by the success of the military bands – the Militärkapelle inevitably came into conflict with the local professional musicians trying to make a living of their own. In Polish Galicia, the competition between the civilian and military musicians rose throughout the nineteenth century, and as Pekacz noted, “special regulations issued by the authorities to limit the monopoly of the Austrian

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 192.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 195.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 195-6.
\textsuperscript{28} Quoted in ibid., 196.
bands proved ineffective in practice.” One of those special regulations was a reform undertaken in the 1850s by Andreas Leonhardt, which was intended to reign in some of the more high-profile *Militärkapellmeister* who seemed to be using their *Militärkapelle* as their own private orchestra. To this end, he passed a famous order on behalf of the Emperor Franz Joseph, stipulating:

> Although the use of the military music bands for private purposes generally is left to the judgment and the correct tact of the commanders concerned, it is My will nevertheless that the use of the music bands in public hotels is permitted only exceptionally under supervision and the music bands under all conditions must show the character of a military institution.

This order hardly resolved the situation, however, and many military bands continued to take advantage of the vagaries of this edict for decades, causing Hermann Eichborn to note in 1909,

> Concerning the use of the musicians (officially called bands) a short imperial ordinance from the beginning of the 50s exists as a base with which several later War Ministry regulations do not quite want to agree. All these regulations by no means prevent the abuse of the music bands to the disadvantage of the civil professional musicians but rather nominally “preserve the military character.” In reality, they perform neither the one nor the other and belong only to the category of laws that is so popular

---

29 Ibid., 194.
31 “Obschon die Verwendung der Militärmusikbanden zu Privatzwecken im allgemeinen der Einsicht und dem richtigen Takte der betreffenden Kommandanten überlassen bleibt, so ist es doch Mein Wille, daß die Verwendung der Musikbanden in öffentlichen Gasthäusern nur ausnahmsweise unter Aufsicht gestattet und den Musikbanden unter allen Verhältnissen der Charakter einer militärischen Institution gewahrt werde…” Order from Gustav Leonhardt (Armeeverordnungsblatt Nr. 53 (M.K. 2079g), 11 April 1851), quoted in Brixel, “Musiksoziologische Aspekte,” 61. Regarding the effectiveness of this edict, note that the famous Deutschmeister-Regimentsmarsch premiere took place in a casino in the Viennese suburbs on one of these “extracurricular” concerts (see Chapter 4).
paper in Austria, with which one knows to make such a beautiful “plant” before the public.\footnote{Pekacz, \textit{Music in the Culture of Polish Galicia}, 197-8.}

By 1903, some of the local musicians working in Vienna were frustrated by the competition from the military ensembles to the point that they published a titled \textit{Ein Notschrei der Zivilmusiker über die gewerbliche Tätigkeit der k.u.k. Militärmusikbanden} (“A cry for help from the civilian musicians on the commercial activity of the military music bands”). In it, they attacked the military band establishment, decrying what they perceived as unfair preferential treatment given to the military musicians.\footnote{Brixel, “Musiksoziologische Aspekte,” 60.}

From 1848 on, the Austrian military bands became an increasingly visible part of Galician musical life, just as in other provinces as well, serving as the only professional musical ensemble in some of the smaller towns where they happened to be stationed.\footnote{Eichborn, \textit{Militarismus und Musik}, 99-100.}

To please the Polish audiences, the bands incorporated local favorites and works by Polish composers, and even according to one source the highly nationalist song “Jeszcze Polska nie zginęła” (“Poland is not yet lost”), which was written in protest of the partitions and ultimately became the Polish national anthem.\footnote{Ibid., 196-8.} Their ingenious mix of repertoire was the secret of the bands’ successes; according to Pekacz, the appearance of local musical selections on the concerts “concealed the fact that they were part of the
political and coercive apparatus, and yet they eventually became a point of social cohesion in the province.”\textsuperscript{36}

\textbf{Repertoire}

These integrated programs were not unique to Polish Galicia, and the situation Pekacz describes held true for most of the empire. Thousands of programs and concert notices from the decades around the turn of the twentieth century survive, allowing us to see exactly what repertoire was performed at these events. What we can see from those programs is that the repertoire of the \textit{Militärkapelle} was quite diverse. Marches were to be expected, of course, and arrangements of recent opera, operetta, and concert overtures were also very common. The potpourri – a kind of long-form medley often arranged around a specific extramusical program or some other unifying theme – was another genre frequently seen in these programs; it was possibly the most important vehicle for popularizing opera and operetta arias beyond the metropolitan centers at the time. Popular operettas came swiftly from Vienna out to the provinces, often appearing in potpourri form as soon as the very next year following their Viennese premiere.\textsuperscript{37}

Sometimes solo arias were performed with a singer, or a solo theme and variations by a

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 192. Another reason for the warm reception given by the Poles in Galicia to the occupying Austrian soldiers, according to Pekacz, was that “the troops consisted of nationalities from all over the monarchy, which diffused the perception that they symbolized ‘Austrian’ rule and give no grounds for mutual hostilities between them and the Poles. In fact, some of these soldiers who came from countries under Austrian domination might have even shared the same attitude to the Austrians as did the Poles” (195).

\textsuperscript{37} Pekacz cites one example where a potpourri of tunes from the operetta \textit{Die Puppenfee}, by Josef Bayer, was heard in the Galician town of Rzeszów in the same year that the operetta itself was premiered in Vienna (1888); ibid., 199.
guest instrumentalist or a member of the band. Polkas, mazurkas, waltzes, and other popular dances rounded out the typical programs.

One concert by the Regimentkapelle of the 22nd Infantry Regiment “Graf von Lacy,” given on 25 March 1899, in Spalato (today, Split in Croatia), had a program fairly typical for its location. It included staples of the Austrian repertoire by older, more established Militärkapellmeister such as Josef Franz Wagner, Johann Nepomuk Král, and Rudolf Novaček, as well as an overture by Offenbach and a waltz by Theo Bonheur. Also included in the program was a specially-named Tongemälde, possibly marking the stated occasion of the concert, which was the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Stockach:

1. Kaiserhymne (Haydn)
2. March (J.F. Wagner)
3. Overture to “Orpheus in the Underworld” (Offenbach)
5. Waltz: “Sanja uspomena” (“Dream Memories,” Theo Bonheur)
8. March (Novaček)

In the major cities like Vienna, the programs tended to be slightly more sophisticated. Vienna is the city for which we have by far the most surviving programs, especially those of the Hoch und Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle, which was for many years led by the famous operetta composer Carl Michel Ziehrer. A sample program

---

38 Reproduced in Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik, 270 (my translation from the Croatian).
39 An extensive study of Ziehrer’s programs with the Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle was performed by Friedrich Anzenberger. See Anzenberger, “Das Repertoire der „Hoch- und Deutschmeister“ unter Carl Michel Ziehrer von 1885 bis 1893,” in IGEB Kongressbericht Banská Bystrica, ed. A. Suppan (Tutzing: H. Schneider, 1998), 31-62. By analyzing Ziehrer’s programs, Anzenberger found the following breakdown of pieces performed in Vienna by genre: waltzes 24.9%, potpourri 19.3%, overtures 9.6%, marches 6.0%,
from one of Ziehrer’s concerts with the Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle, for a concert
dated Sunday, 11 December 1887:

1. Ouvertüre von „Athalia“ (Mendelssohn)
2. „Mein Lebenslauf ist Lieb und Lust“ Walzer (Jos. Strauß)
3. Potpourri aus der Oper „Aida“
4. (New) „Busserl“ Polka Mazur (Ziehrer)
5. Fragment aus der Oper „Faust“
6. „Faschingskinder“ Walzer (Ziehrer)
7. „Mein Lied“ für Flugelhornsolo (Gumpert)
8. „Eine Soiree dansante bei Strauß“ großen Potpourri (Ziehrer)
10. „Die Tauben von St. Marco“ Polka (Joh. Strauß)
11. Production der Guitarrenharmonie
12. „Metternich-Gavotte“ (Ziehrer)
13. „Auf Fereinreisen“ Galop (Jos. Strauß)
14. „Fesch Beinand“ Marsch (Mestrozi)

Sometimes the Viennese programs included elements of the exotic, both from the Austro-
Hungarian provinces and beyond. Following the Chicago World’s Columbian Exposition
of 1893, “Americana” pieces were very much in vogue, and when marches by Sousa and
his contemporaries had run their course, new works were composed in a similar style by
Austrian Militärkapellmeister, including the “Washington-Marsch,” the “Mohikaner-
Marsch,” and the “Cowboys-Marsch” (“nach americanisches Wagonlieder”), all by J.F.
Wagner, the potpourri “Von Wien nach Chicago” by Emil Kaiser, and Julius Fučík’s
“Mississippi River Marsch” (op. 160).

Occasionally these programs drew contemporary criticism for their frivolity,
especially from other musicians in the large cities. One passage in the aforementioned

\[\text{polkas (various types) 10.4\%, solo pieces 4.0\%, opera fragments 4.0\%, and other genres 21.8\%. Not surprisingly, Ziehrer programmed his own music much more frequently than that of any other composer.} \]
\[\text{40 Reprinted in Friedrich Anzenberger, "Das Repertoire..." 34. Compare this program to the one Ziehrer arranged in his potpourri Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten; see Chapter 5.} \]
anonymous pamphlet *Ein Notschrei der Zivilmusiker* makes such an accusation as part of a larger attack against the *Militärkapelle*:

That no artistic meaning is attached to the military bands screams from their programs. The military bands put the public taste ahead of musical nourishment on the deepest level, by specifying program numbers (Potpourris) in the concerts in which the musicians are employed in all kinds of clownish larks [Clownsäßen]. Singing and whistling are common. Even under Ziehrer himself, a potpourri was performed in which the musicians in the orchestra had to play cards and even opened an old torn umbrella, etc.  

Yet on more serious occasions, these concert programs could include large-scale works from the international art music repertoire. The eminent music critic Eduard Hanslick made reference to a military concert in Prague sometime around the middle of the nineteenth century devoted entirely to the works of Hector Berlioz. And an 1877 “monster concert” held in Vienna marking the fiftieth year of service by Archduke Albrecht, Field Marshal and Inspector General of the Army, involved at least 10 *Militärkapelle* and some 640 performers. The program reportedly included:

- “Prinz-Eugen” Marsch [Leonhardt]
- “Fackeltanz” – Meyerbeer
- “Stabat mater” – Rossini
- Soldatenchor aus Faust – Gounod

---


43 Program to a concert on 18 April 1877, according to notes taken by Emil Rameis; Österreichische Staatsarchiv, Kriegsarchiv, Nachlass Emil Rameis, box 2, card 462.
Volkshymne [Haydn]
Radetzkymarsch [Strauss Vater]

It was when the Militärkapelle used their “bully pulpit” like this to popularize the works of the classical canon for a general Sunday afternoon audience that they drew the highest praise from contemporary critics. As one observer noted in 1909,

The regimental bands … became useful institutions through the performance of works by the classical and modern masters, exercising their considerable influence for the education, for the moral perfection of the great masses…. They rapidly disseminate musical creations and promote the appreciation of the masters of the musical art as well as the understanding of their artworks. They carry the art to the people by training musicians as efficient, useful orchestra players. The wages, through which our regimental musicians have been acquired in this way for the entirety of music, are recognized and appreciated as a valuable gift of the officer class, which our musicians receive.  

Contemporary Reception

Despite drawing some criticism, Austrian Militärmusik also had a number of equally strong proponents, including no less a source than Eduard Hanslick himself. Having been tapped to write a brief essay on musical life in Vienna for the first volume of Crown Prince Rudolf’s monumental encyclopedic work Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild in 1886, Hanslick reserves a paragraph among his effusions on the great Viennese masters for the institution of Austrian Militärmusik:

The Austrian military music, probably the most excellent in the world, dates its fame not just from Radetzky’s headquarters or from that Paris World’s Fair of 1867. There is no doubt, however, that with the improvements in wind instruments belonging to our era, the achievements of Austrian military music will also become even more perfect. The peaceful conquests that our army makes with the clarinet instead of with the bayonet are surely not the last. The Austrian military has often been drawn into the hearts of whole populations already on the wings of Harmoniemusik. As the regimental band is preferably directed to play for free, it always has the most numerous and sympathetic listenership. There is no art benefit that can be called democratic in such a high degree as the play of the military bands. There everyone may participate without admission fee and salon toilet – thousands of music-seeking people, who possess neither one nor the other, have already often found themselves feeling happy at their concerts in the open air. Even in the most music-rich capitals the love of the population for the regimental band expresses itself so remarkably that their sounds open up all the windows and draw hundreds of musical peripatetics. In Vienna each day, the plaza in front of the Hofburg is thickly populated long before the noon hour, which brings the desired sounds, and when the regimental band marches back to its barracks with a resounding performance – what a cheerful, amusing sight: the large, grateful crowd, which marches along before and behind the orchestra in step!\textsuperscript{45}

These lines were not written originally for the Kronprinzenwerk, however; instead, they were recycled from a longer article Hanslick wrote on the quality of Austrian


Militärmusik around 1850, which was subsequently re-published towards the end of his life in his collection of music criticism titled Aus dem Concert-Saal. Kritiken und Schilderungen aus 20 Jahren des Wiener Musiklebens 1848-1868. In this essay, simply called “Oesterreichische Militärmusik,” Hanslick went on to praise in particular the important cultural role played by the Militärkapelle throughout the empire:

How much greater this charm is only in the provinces! The staff of a regiment comes frequently into places where never an orchestra has played, where one receives now the first impressions of a greater, full, pure music. It is no wonder these impressions are so powerful that such small towns keep the memory of it for many years. The regimental bands are true musical missionaries, who venture into the mute countryside with song and sound, who preach the cheerful gospel of art.46

Amplifying this, Hanslick adds,

For small cities, a well-trained orchestra is an undreamt-of treasure never hoped for, from which the richer blessings of art can blossom. Through the regimental bands, much of the music-loving population heard Weber, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, etc., played for the first time in full force; yes, the performance of entire operas in many small cities became possible through the cooperation of the military bands.47

Hanslick was more than willing to judge the Militärkapelle performances on musical grounds, and not as mere propaganda.48 Yet in his essays, he showed that he had his own set of vaguely Platonic criteria to assess the repertoire of the military bands, which he


47 „Ein wohlgeübtes Orchester ist für kleine Städte ein ungeahnter, nie gehoffter Schatz, aus dem ein reicher Kunstsegen erblühen kann. Durch Regimentscapellen hat manche musikliebende Bevölkerung zum erstenmal Weber, Beethoven, Mendelssohn u. s. w. vollstimmig spielen hören; ja die Aufführung ganzer Opern in mancher kleinen Stadt ist durch die Mitwirkung der Militärmusik möglich geworden.” Hanslick, Aus dem Concert-Saal, 56. It should be noted that Bruckner and Schoenberg, for example, first heard Wagner’s music by way of an Austrian Militärkapelle.

48 Hanslick argued, “da muß es auch erlaubt sein, sie aus künstlerischen Gesichtspunkten zu betrachten, somit als Musiker aufzunehmen, was der Soldat bietet.” Hanslick, Aus dem Concert-Saal, 49.
considered “Not the great masterpieces of German art, but pieces that are strong, full of character, always masculine in sorrow as in pleasure, such as an orchestra of warriors can intone.” This masculinity, in Hanslick’s judgment, was entirely appropriate for the martial underpinnings of Militärmusik itself.49

Hanslick’s viewpoint, though undoubtedly influenced by his own feelings of Austrian patriotism, was not unique. Joseph Cerin, another contemporary critic, also observed, “Our Militärmusik enjoys an undisputed world-wide reputation in its current condition, in its composition and effectiveness. Its development up to the current perfection constitutes one of the most pleasing chapters in recent music history.”50 The level of musical quality that the Austro-Hungarian military bands attained in the late nineteenth century was not necessitated entirely by internal pressures, but often by external ones. Writing in 1950 on the history of military music, Henry George Farmer highlights an incident in the Crimean War in 1854, where the British military bands on the battlefield were put to shame by the performance of the opposing French bands. This incited the British General Staff to reorganize and regularize their band policy, and the Royal Military School of Music was founded soon after. This was essentially the beginning of the “arms race” of military music that took place in the nineteenth century, with Germany opening its own national military band school in Berlin in 1887.51

Austria-Hungary never had an official Imperial and Royal military music school of its own, the Prague Conservatory could be said to have fulfilled this role, since, as we will see, that institution produced so many military musicians and Kapellmeister.\textsuperscript{52}

By the late nineteenth century, military bands often competed in international contests in which a European champion was crowned. Often these contests overlapped with World’s Fairs and other expositions. In 1867 there was a military music congress at the Parisian Exhibition where, according to Farmer, bands from Prussia, France, Austria, Bavaria, Russia, the Netherlands, Baden, Belgium and Spain competed. “The smallest band was that of Bavaria with fifty-one performers, whilst the largest was that of Austria with seventy-six.” The judges were a virtual who’s who of mid-century musicians, including Eduard Hanslick, Hans von Bülow, Léo Delibes, Georges Kastner, Félicien David, and Ambroise Thomas, and the Austrians’ performance there was considered a rousing success.\textsuperscript{53} Indeed, Hanslick himself viewed the results of this competition as the definitive proof of his own chauvinistic claims of the superiority of Austrian Militärmusik, so much that he continued to reference this competition decades later in a subsequent footnote to his essay in Aus dem Concert-Saal,\textsuperscript{54} and even in his article in the Kronprinzenwerk.

\textsuperscript{52} As Farmer noted, “Almost from its inception, the Conservatory of Music at Prague had prepared students for the profession of military music, the result being that some of the finest bands in the Austrian army were under the control of Czechs, and among them Wenceslas H. Zavertal and Carl Sebor.” Ibid., 58.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 56.

The Musicians

Hanslick reserved his highest admiration for the Austrian military musicians – known in Austrian German as *Regimentsmusiken*, or simply *Musiken*:

Crucially it seemed to me that the play of the Austrian bands sounds more expressive, fresher, more alive. The people play for us with greater joy in the music, with a finer sense of hearing and timing, in short, with more musical feeling. If the Prussian musicians distinguish themselves by their exact training, then the Austrians impress by their at least as exact training and by their remarkably musical disposition.55

Hugo Riemann had his own words of praise for the musicians of the *Militärkapelle* as well, whom he considered to be remarkably versatile.56 An institution can only be as good as its members, and the single most important reason for the success of the Austrian military bands was in fact the high quality of the musicians that led and staffed them.

Like the soldiers of the *k.u.k. Armee* itself, these musicians came from virtually every part of the empire, often from otherwise underrepresented minorities. They played in bands of mixed nationalities, sometimes for audiences who spoke another language altogether, yet they helped spread a truly multiethnic culture across Central Europe, which in turn played a small but meaningful role in the preservation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Following a regulation in 1889, each *Militärkapelle* was limited in size to 43 men, not including the *Kapellmeister*.57 This limitation became necessary because the costs of these ensembles had begun to spiral out of control as competition among the regiments

---


57 See *Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik*, 230.
flared up. The 43-man restriction was imposed irrespective of any requirements of instrumentation, which by that time had stabilized to around 20-25 discrete parts.

According to this regulation, each band was limited to the following members, listed by rank: 58

1 Regimentstambour im Feldwebel-Rang (drum-major, sergeant rank)
1 Musikführer (Stabsführer, chief of staff/personnel)
4 Korporäle (corporals, musicians)
5 Gefreite (privates first class, musicians)
30 Infanteristen (privates without rank, musicians)
2 Eleven (apprentices) 59

This size limitation meant that the musicians of the Regimentkapelle had to be extremely versatile, as they were often asked to play multiple wind and string instruments each so the band could form alternative ensembles and play additional indoor venues – especially balls – for extra income. An 1895 advertisement for musicians in Vienna that appeared in the Neue Musikalischen Presse highlighted this versatility:

Musicians: all instruments sought for the Kaiserjäger band in Vienna. Among others, a solo violinist, a solo cellist, a B-flat bombardonist (secondary instrument: violin, viola, cello, or bass), a solo oboist and a good natural horn player will be engaged. Applications accepted by word or in writing to Kapellmeister Mahr, Vienna III, Rennwegkaserne. 60

Of course, by the same token, this demand for versatility could also imply that some musicians may not have been particularly skilled on their second or third instruments.

58 Brixel, “Musiksoziologische Aspekte,” 63.
59 The Musik-Eleven, or apprentices, were originally 15 years old, which was lowered to 14 after 1873. They were eligible to join the Regimentkapelle once they turned seventeen. Many at the time thought that the Musik-Eleven represented an unfair child labor practice – or another competitive advantage that the Militärkapelle had over the local professional musicians. See Brixel, “Musiksoziologische Aspekte,” 74.
This is one of the issues brought up in the aforementioned *Notschrei der Zivilmusiker*, which, in a facetious echo of Riemann’s effusive praise, complained that in one concert, “There a man blew the trombone, which he received 24 hours before, but had never learned… A prodigy!”^{61}

Unfortunately, very little is known about the rank-and-file musicians of the Austrian *Regimentkapelle*. The men who played in the regimental bands did not lead the glamorous lives of celebrities as some of their *Kapellmeister* did, and aside from those musicians who actually became *Kapellmeister* themselves, very few of their stories are known. Although the exact demographics of these ensembles remain shrouded in mystery, it is safe to assume that national identity played a significant role in the makeup of these *Regimentkapelle*. As we have seen, a regiment in the Joint Army was headquartered in one specific part of the Monarchy – and it is from here that they draw the majority of their recruits and conscripts – but oftentimes it was stationed somewhere else altogether. Because the musicians had a special status vis-à-vis the common soldiers, this practice impacted them directly; it meant that some musicians would have come from the regiment’s home region, while others would have been recruited on the spot in their new town, as replacements or extras, as per the job notice shown above. Moreover, these musicians who were hired away from the regiment’s headquarters may not be locals themselves, but instead itinerant musicians moving from city to city in search of whatever jobs they could find. Given this situation, the typical *Regimentkapelle* would have likely had an even more diverse ethnic composition than the regiment itself.

^{61} “Dort blies ein Mann die Posaune, die er 24 Stunden vorher erhalten, aber niemals erlernt hatte… Ein Wunderkind!” Quoted in Brixel, “Musiksoziologische Aspekte,” 67.
This practice of hiring local musicians to augment the Militärkapelle has led many subsequent investigators to question exactly to what extent these military musicians could be thought of as “soldiers.” The music historian and former Militärkapellmeister Emil Rameis (1904-1973) remarked that while many musicologists and historians believed the military musicians to be merely “civilians put into soldier’s clothes,” he himself disagrees, noting from his own experience the number of military musicians who enlisted as Regimentstambour and stayed in the band. Hermann Eichborn agreed that “the musicians are actually thought of as soldiers whom one uses to make music, not as musicians, and when there is a noticeable shortage of the same, they are supplemented by suitably trained professional musicians out of the companies.”

Not every national or ethnic group contributed musicians equally, however. In economically depressed and hardscrabble rural areas – especially on the empire’s borders, where many regiments frequently found themselves stationed – trained musicians were very hard to find. Conversely, in Vienna, where trained musicians abounded, few chose to stay with the Regimentkapelle for long. This meant that a few nationalities were overrepresented among the military musicians of Austria-Hungary. The most prevalent of these groups were the Bohemian Czechs, who, despite the nascent Czech nationalism of the time, reportedly formed the majority of the rank-and-file wind

---

62 “Der von den mit der österreichischen Militärmusik befaßten Musikschriftstellern, darunter Peter Panoff, vertretenen Meinung, die österreichischen Militärmusiker seien keine Soldaten vielmehr „in Soldatenkleider gesteckte Zivilisten” gewesen, muß in diesem Zusammenhang heftig entgegengetreten werden.” Rameis, Die österreichische Militärmusik, 39-40. Peter Panoff was a German musicologist who wrote on military music during the Nazi era.

63 „Die Musiker sind eigentlich als Soldaten gedacht, die man zum Musizieren verwendet, nicht als Musiker, und werden bei idem fühlbaren Mangel an tauglichen vorgebildeten Berufsmusikern vielfach aus den Kompagnien ergänzt.” Eichborn, Militarismus und Musik, 99-100.
and brass players in these ensembles. Other Slavs, Italians, and naturally German-Austrians were also well-represented.

Despite the functional problems of working with so many musicians from disparate backgrounds – and even speaking different languages – this multi-ethnic pool was seen as a positive boon. Writing on the musical advantages that the Austrian Army held over the other armies of Europe, the Prague-born Eduard Hanslick noted, perhaps chauvinistically, that the empire’s multinational makeup was perhaps the greatest advantage of them all, observing:

The Slavs, in particular the Bohemians, are born musicians and are invaluable for any orchestra. The Slav, even if he comes to the regiments without any musical training, learns music quickly and gladly; in Bohemia, moreover, there is hardly a farmer’s son without any musical talent or previous knowledge to be found. An army that is able to form the basic stock of their music bands from Czechs, Poles, and South Slavs has the same advantage over an exclusively German army as a farmer with an excellently rich field does against one with stonier ground. The same cultivation will already bring a much more sumptuous yield out of it. Beside the Slavs, the Italians are a nation of extraordinary musicians, and those who might be considered Austrian alpine inhabitants are at least as musically inclined as any other German people. So the musical basic power of Austria does not have an equal in the world.  

64 "Die Böhmen, unter denen es schon viele gab, die sich demonstrative Tschechen nannten, stellten weiterhin das Gros der Holtz- und Blechbläser." Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik, 230.


Ethel Matala de Mazza has also observed this sense of national unity shown by the multinational Militärmusik ensembles; see her analysis in Matala de Mazza, “Mit Vereinter Schwäche. Musikalische Militäreinsätze in der Wiener Moderne,” in Zeichen der Kraft. Wissensformationen 1800-1900, ed. T. Brandstetter and C. Windgätter (Berlin: Kulturverlag Kadmos, 2008), manuscript page 9.
This large and diverse pool of musical talent may have been a significant advantage, but the training and discipline that was stressed in the Militärkapelle was what Hanslick felt gave the Austro-Hungarians its greatest musical edge. “In the Prussian army,” Hanslick said, “the short tour of duty makes it impossible to train such efficient musicians…. In the Austrian army the term of service is sufficient in association with the discipline to train skilled musicians.”

This educational component was one of the key benefits of serving in the Militärkapelle, both for future Militärkapellmeister and for the development of local professional musicians in the provinces. As Christian Glanz notes, “Military music had above all an important function as an example and training center for musicians and many former military musicians became Kapellmeister of local ensembles.” If the army was the “school for the nation,” the Militärkapelle was its public conservatory.

The Militärkapellmeister

If the regimental bands were a conservatory for the empire, its professors were the Militärkapellmeister. These were the music directors, the arrangers, and the composers for the ensembles. They planned the regular concerts, contracted many of the extra gigs, and engaged most of the band’s musicians. In short, the Militärkapellmeister were the

---


public face of the Regimentkapelle, and many of them became celebrities in their own
time as a result of this exposure.

By the 1890s, the musical expectations of the Regimentkapelle had ballooned to
the point that the Kapellmeister were no longer considered soldiers in any real sense.
During this time, Militärkapellmeister were generally civilian musicians engaged directly
by the officers of the regiment, each with his own individual contract stipulating what
was expected of him. Usually the Kapellmeister was paid a lump sum, from which he
had to pay the regimental music staff and any extra musicians he engaged. In theory,
the leadership of the Regimentkapelle was divided between the Kapellmeister and the
Regimentstambour, or drum major. The Regimentstambour, who was usually a
professional soldier who happened to be a musician, was more closely involved with the
military functions of the band – the ceremonial duties, parades, and other functional
music – while the Kapellmeister led its public concerts. As Hermann Eichborn noted:

The director of the military music service is a member of the same, whom
one calls the Regimentstambour, although he does not have much to do
with the signalers (drums and horns). For the non-military music services
there is a Kapellmeister, who, although only a civilian contractually
engaged with notice, still has a captain’s rank and is provided with a
cavalry saber.

68 The officers alone, and not the men, shouldered the financial burden of the regiment’s band, often paying
anywhere from one to ten percent of their monthly pay for this expense alone, which was only one of a
myriad of expenses that they were, by their class, expected to provide for. See István Deák, Beyond
University Press, 1990), 117, 120, and 124.
69 „Der musikalische Nebenverdienst der k.u.k. Kapellmeister gelangt zur Verteilung: zwischen dem
Kapellmeister, der Musikmannschaft und der Musikkasse. Jedes Regiment besitzt einen eigenen
Musikfond.” Josef Damanski, Die Militär-Kapellmeister Oesterreich-Ungarns. Illustriertes
Biographisches Lexikon (Vienna, Prague, and Budapest: Paltur & Co., 1904), 142.
70 „Der Leiter des militärischen Musikdienstes der Kapellen ist ein Mitglied derselben, den man
Regimentstambour nennt, obwohl er mit den Signalisten (Trommeln und Hörner) nicht das mindeste zu tun
hat. Für die nichtmilitärischen Musikdienste gibt es einen Kapellmeister, der, obwohl nur eine kontraktlich
mit Kündigung engagierte Zivilperson, doch Hauptmannsrang hat und mit einem Kavalleriesäbel versehen
ist.” Eichborn, Militarismus und Musik, 99-100.
Although Andreas Leonhardt once observed that in the past, the *Regimentstambour* and the *Regimentkapellmeister* often came into conflict,\(^71\) in time, the public role of the *Regimentkapelle* began to eclipse its traditional military function, and the prominence of the *Regimentstambour* faded.

Like the musicians themselves, what was notable about these *Militärkapellmeister* is how many of them came from outside of German-Austria – and how many of these musicians’ careers juxtaposed a strong nationalist upbringing with service to the multinational empire. In stark contrast to the dearth of information on rank-and-file military musicians from the *Monarchiezeit*, we are fortunate to have an published directory of Austrian *Militärkapellmeister* from the year 1903-04: *Die Militär-Kapellmeister Oesterreich-Ungarns. Illustriertes Biographisches Lexikon* by Josef Damanski.\(^72\) Damanski was, according to his own biographical sketch, born in Lemberg (Lviv) in 1858, served as a *Militärkapellmeister* apparently in Germany, and then worked in Leipzig as an editor, composer (often under the pseudonym “Joseph Diamand”) and musicologist.\(^73\) The book, Damanski states, is intended to be “an authentic handbook for *Kapellmeister* as well as for musicians, for music instrument manufacturers as well as for conservatoires of music, for music newspapers, for the officers, regimental administrators, concert bureaus, and also for everyone who is thoroughly interested in the conditions of Austro-Hungarian military music and its leaders, who already has a

---

\(^71\) See Brixel, “Müziksoziologische Aspekte,” 73 n.54.  
\(^73\) Ibid.,iv.
connection with this country or would like to have.”  

In addition to the biographies, Damanski includes a modicum of general information related to Militärmusik as well as some of his own musings on other musical repertories. This book lists the Militärkapellmeister who were then currently active with each of the 102 infantry regiments in the Joint Army, plus the four Kaiserjäger regiments, four Bosnian-Herzegovinian infantry regiments, and seven units from the Hungarian Honvéd national guard, for a total of 120 names, of which 84 are treated to full profiles. The remaining 34 are either listed only by name, or with minimal personal details. Of the 84 Kapellmeister profiled, 26 were born within the borders of modern (German) Austria, 40 were born in Bohemia, six in Moravia (for a total of 46 from Czech-speaking lands), six in Hungary (including one from the historically German enclave of Siebenbürgen), one in Croatia, one in Trieste (Istria), three in Germany and one in Russia (see Figure 7).

---

74 “Es ist ein auth. Handbuch für den Kapellmeister wie für Musiker, für die Musikinstrum.-Fabrikanten wie für Konservatorien der Musik, für Musikzeitungen, für die Herren Offiziere, Regimentsverwaltungen, Konzertbureaux, aber auch für Jedermann, welcher sich eingehend für die Verhältnisse der österr.-ungar. Militärmusik und ihrer Leiter interessiert, mit diesem Lande bereits in Verbindung steht oder zu kommen wünscht.” Ibid., iii.

75 The book even includes a lengthy appreciation of the late Hugo Wolff; ibid., 2-4.

76 Source: Damanski, Die Militär-Kapellmeister Oesterreich-Ungarns, passim. As Deák and Jászi have both observed, however, the place of birth does not always equate to nationality. This was one of the most challenging aspects of the nationalities problem in Austria-Hungary: not everyone who was born in Bohemia would have self-identified as a Czech, and large German enclaves existed in nearly every crownland. Nevertheless, this birthplace data still reveals some useful information about the diversity of the Militärkapellmeister.
Figure 7: Militärkapellmeister of Austria-Hungary, 1904 (from Damanski), by birthplace

This is directly comparable to the demographic breakdown of army officer nationalities given in Chapter 2, since both officers and Kapellmeister typically had some kind of postsecondary schooling prior to their army careers. Thus both officers and Militärkapellmeister tended to be drawn from the most affluent national groups; for this reason, Germans and Czechs were overrepresented in of these roles, while the more rural nationalities were underrepresented. Additionally, the Hungarians are underrepresented here likely for the same reason that they were underrepresented within the officer corps as a whole: Hungarians typically eschewed service in the “joint” imperial institutions following the Ausgleich of 1867, and instead preferred to keep to their own Hungarian national guard, the k.u. Honvéd. But what is most striking about this graph is the extent to which musicians from Czech-speaking lands were extremely overrepresented among the Monarchy’s Militärkapellmeister, comprising more than half of the entire corps, and

77 See especially Figure 6 in Chapter 2.
easily outpacing the representation of the German-Austrians. Although some of these Bohemian-born musicians came from German-speaking cities – such as Brünn, Eger, Iglau, Olmütz, or Armeekapellmeister Andreas Leonhardt’s own hometown of Asch – many others likely considered themselves to be ethnic Czechs. In fact, a large number of Bohemian- and Moravian-born Kapellmeister profiled in Damanski’s lexicon attended the Prague Conservatory, which, unlike the more prestigious conservatories in Vienna or Budapest, was a major stepping stone towards a career as a Militärkapellmeister during the late nineteenth century.

Moving in closer to examine the biographies of these Kapellmeister, when they are available, reveals even more diversity than what the simple demographics can show. In addition to their variegated places of birth, the other aspect that becomes notable about these men on the biographical level is the frequency with which they moved around the empire – either with their regiment to a new post town, or on their own in search of a new appointment. Many Militärkapellmeister lived lives that surpassed Gustav Mahler’s in this respect; despite the fact that Mahler’s career wandering is often considered to be exceptional, or is attributed to his embodiment of the “Wandering Jew” stereotype, his

78 Biographical information for a great many Militärkapellmeister is lost – especially for those who were born or were active far away from the major cities of the empire. In addition to Damanski, numerous secondary sources for Militärkapellmeister biographies have appeared in the past 25 years: Eugen Brixel, Gunther Martin, and Gottfried Pils. *Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik: von der “Türkischen Musik” zu den Philharmonikern in Uniform* (Graz: Edition Kaleidoskop, 1982) has an appendix with profiles for 28 bandmasters from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (6 Czechs, 4 Hungarians, 9 Viennese, 6 other Austrians, and 3 from outside the Monarchy). More recently, Elisabeth Anzenberger-Ramminger, Friedrich Anzenberger, and Walter Schwanzer, *Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit: Märsche der Donaun monarchie von Achleitner bis Ziehrer* (Vienna: Walter Schwanzer Musikverlage, 2004) gives short biographies for 66 nineteenth-century Militärkapellmeister and other famous musicians associated with the genre, 41 of whom were born outside of modern Austria (30 in Bohemia, 1 in Silesia, 1 in Hungary 1 in Siebenbürgen, 3 in Slovakia, 1 in Serbia, 2 in Germany, plus entries for Franz von Suppé and Georges Bizet). Additional Militärkapellmeister profiles also appear in Stephan Vajda, „Mir san vom k.u.k…” *Die kuriose Geschichte der österreichischen Militär musik* (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1977).
career now appears to have been relatively typical for his time, and many working
musicians in Austria took advantage of the flexibility offered by the empire’s vast
geography and moved from city to city wherever they could find a suitable gig.\(^{79}\)

To be sure, the *Militärkapellmeister* who found success in Vienna early on would
rarely leave, and many of them resigned their military posts or took on only nominal
duties when their regiments were transferred away from the Imperial capital. Some of
the most famous names associated with Austrian *Militärmusik* were not *Kapellmeister* at
all, in fact, but merely sat in with a military band from time to time – usually in Vienna,
whenever a large crowd was on hand. Though their father did briefly direct a
*Militärkapelle*, the three Strauss brothers Johann, Joseph, and Eduard never would, aside
from an incidental appearance in front of the local Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle.
They did, however contribute several marches and other pieces to the *Militärmusik* genre
– all firmly rooted in the Viennese style of their day. Similarly, when Joseph
Hellmesberger Junior (1855-1907),\(^{80}\) Mahler’s successor as music director of the Vienna
Philharmonic, served briefly as *Kapellmeister* of the 32\(^{nd}\) and possibly the 4\(^{th}\) (“Hoch-
und Deutschmeister”) Infantry *Regimentkapelle* as a young man in the 1870s, he was
merely taking on a gig with what was then just another local Viennese group.

Possibly the most famous of the Viennese *Militärkapellmeister* was Carl Michel
Ziehrer (1843-1922).\(^{81}\) Born and educated in Vienna, Ziehrer spent much of the 1870s
and early 1880s travelling within the Monarchy and beyond in search of work and fame.

\(^{79}\) In this light, the stories of composers like Beethoven and Brahms who moved to Vienna, found success
there relatively quickly, and stayed there, are the exception.

\(^{80}\) Sources: *Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit* 49-50, *Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik* 313.
\(^{81}\) Sources: Damanski 134-36; also *Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit* 147-49; *Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik* 320-1;
During this time, Ziehrer accepted positions playing and conducting civilian and military ensembles in Bucharest, Breslau (today Wrocław, Poland, but then part of the German Empire), Munich, and Hamburg, as well as Pressburg (today, Bratislava, Slovakia) and Zwettl (Lower Austria). In 1885, he won the coveted position of Kapellmeister of the Hoch- und Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle in Vienna, which he held until 1899. It was during this time that “der fesche Michel,” as he came to be called, became a popular fixture on the Viennese musical scene, as cemented by his celebrated trip to the 1893 Chicago Columbian Exposition, where the Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle represented all of Austria-Hungary as part of a special exhibit, and his subsequent tour of the U.S. east coast. His compositional output included more than thirty operettas, plus over 600 marches, waltzes, and other works for popular occasions. Upon his retirement from the Deutschmeisterkapelle, Ziehrer was appointed music director of the Imperial Court Ball, a post he held from 1908 to 1914. The war and the collapse of the Monarchy took its toll on Ziehrer’s fame and finances, but he continued to give concerts in Vienna until his death.

Men like Ziehrer and Hellmesberger may have been less true Militärkapellmeister than Viennese musical figures who happened to lead army bands. Yet growing up in Vienna had some significant advantages, even for those whose careers in military music followed more typical paths. One of these was Josef Franz Wagner (1856-1908), the composer of the famous “Under the Double Eagle” march, chief among his more than

---

82 “Smooth Michael,” in our modern parlance – just the kind of nickname a pop star might receive. See Vajda, Mir san vom k.u.k., 167.
83 Ibid., 171-2.
84 Sources: Damanski 136-38; also Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 135-37; Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik 319-20.
800 compositions. Wagner was born in Vienna as the son of a doctor and studied music privately there. In 1874, he left Vienna to play for the Regimentkapelle of the 23\textsuperscript{rd} Infantry Regiment in Budapest, and four years later he was offered the job as Kapellmeister with the 47\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Regiment band at Trento, in South Tyrol. He remained with the 47\textsuperscript{th}, moving with the regiment to Vienna and then Graz, until 1891. In 1892, Wagner took the job as Kapellmeister with the 49\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Regiment in St. Pölten and Krems, both in Lower Austria close to Vienna, where Wagner’s operettas were already enjoying some success. In 1899, he retired from military service and returned to Vienna, where he continued to conduct casual engagements until his death.

Sons of Militärkapellmeister often followed in their fathers’ footsteps, giving rise to several dynasties of Austrian Militärmusik. One of the more prominent of those was the Komzák family of Bohemia. Karl Komzák Senior (1823-1893)\textsuperscript{85} was born in Netechovice near Budweis, and studied music at the Prague Organ School. In 1848, he began his career as an occasional military musician in Prague, where he also played numerous civilian engagements, including a major engagement in the orchestra for what would ultimately become the Prague National Theater. From 1865, he was Kapellmeister of the 11\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Regiment band at Linz, which was subsequently moved to Prague in 1873. From 1880, he was Kapellmeister of the 74\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Regiment in Prague; then in 1882, he took up the same post with the newly-organized 88\textsuperscript{th} IR in Budweis until his retirement in 1888. The elder Komzák was by all accounts a strong Czech nationalist, and most of his compositions involved Czech national subjects, texts, and symbolism.

\textsuperscript{85} Sources: Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 63-4; also Paul Christiansen, “Komzák, Karel (i),” in Grove Music Online, ed. L. Macy (Internet: www.grovemusic.com, 2001).
Komzák’s predilection for programming Czech nationalist music on his Austrian military concerts reportedly led to an official – albeit quickly-rescinded – censure from the Austrian Imperial government. His son, Karl Komzák Junior (1850-1905) was born in Prague, and studied at the Prague Conservatory. Following his studies, he played briefly in Linz before joining his father’s 11th IR band. In 1871, he started as Kapellmeister of the 7th Infantry Regiment band at Innsbruck at the age of 21. In 1882, just as his father was organizing the new 88th Regimentkapelle, the younger Komzák became the first Kapellmeister of the newly-created 84th Infantry Regiment in Vienna. He moved with the regiment to Mostar, Bosnia-Herzegovina, in 1892, but continued to conduct spa orchestras in the resort town of Baden bei Wien during the summer. He retired from the Militärkapelle four years later. After that he continued to perform, including a celebrated appearance at the St. Louis World’s Fair in 1904, before his sudden death in a train accident in Baden the next year.

The Lehárs were another famous family of Austro-Hungarian Militärkapellmeister. Franz Lehár Senior (1838-1898) was born in Schönwald, near Mährisch Neustadt (today Uničov) in Bohemia. He began his career in 1857 as a musician in the 5th Infantry Regimentkapelle, and saw action in the Battle of Solferino two years later. Following that, he served as Kapellmeister of the 50th Infantry Regiment from around 1863 to 1880, when it was stationed in Komorn and later Pressburg. Subsequently, Lehár was Militärkapellmeister of the 33rd Infantry Regiment in Budapest from 1880, the 19th in Komorn from 1881, and the newly-formed 102nd in Bratislava

Sources: Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 64-6; also Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik 314-5, and Christiansen, “Komzák, Karel (ii),” in Grove Music Online, ed. L. Macy (Internet: www.grovemusic.com, 2001).

Sources: Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 78-79; Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik 316.
from 1882, before returning as Kapellmeister of the 50th in Vienna from 1888 until his own retirement in 1895. His son Franz Lehár Junior (1870-1948) was born in the Hungarian town of Komorn, moved with his father’s regiment to Budapest as a boy, and later studied with Dvořák at the Prague Conservatory. He started his musical career playing with his father’s 50th Regimentkapelle in Vienna in 1889, and afterwards he was briefly the Kapellmeister of the 3rd Bosnian-Herzegovinian Infantry Regiment in Budapest. In 1902, Lehár accepted a job in Vienna as director of the popular Theater an der Wien and never returned to the Militärkapelle again, though he still occasionally composed marches – notably his “Piave-Marsch” commemorating the 1918 Battle of the Piave River, in which his own brother commanded a regiment.

By and large, the Hungarians seem to have eschewed service in the bands of the Joint Army in favor of those of their own local Honvéd regiments, but there were a few Hungarian Militärkapellmeister to be found in the Imperial regiments. The most famous of these was Alfons Czibulka (1842-1894), who was born in the town of Szepesváralja in Hungary (today Spišské Podhradie in Slovakia). Czibulka studied piano in Bratislava and Vienna, and in 1862, became the director of the French Opera in Odessa, then part of the Russian Empire. Within the next four years, he was leading the Nationaltheater in Innsbruck, then the Carlstheater in Vienna, after Franz von Suppé’s tenure there. His career as a Militärkapellmeister began in 1866 with the 17th Infantry Regiment in Bozen, South Tyrol (today Bolzano in Italy), which was the first in a whirlwind succession of positions with Austro-Hungarian infantry regiments. Czibulka was subsequently

88 Source: Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 78-81.
89 Sources: Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 25-6; Das ist Österreichs Militär musik 308-9.
Regimentkapellmeister of the 23rd in Budapest (1869-70), the 20th in Krakow (1870-71),
the 25th in Prague (1872-80), the 44th in Trieste (1880-82), the 31st in Vienna (1883-87),
and after a short time as a civilian musician spent primarily in Hamburg, finally the 19th
in Komorn (1890-94), shortly before his death in Vienna.

The Bohemian Militärkapellmeister, who formed the majority of the field by the
end of the nineteenth century, tended to have the most variegated careers. Ziehrer’s
successor as Hoch- und Deutschmeister Regimentkapellmeister, Wilhelm Wacek (1864-
1944),90 was born in Sobeslau, Bohemia, and studied at the Prague Conservatory.
Following his studies, Wacek became a musician in the 73rd Infantry Regimentkapelle in
Prague before moving to Brixen, in Tyrol, in 1887 to take the position of
Stadtkapellmeister. In 1894 he took over the Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle in Vienna,
a post he held until the dissolution of the Monarchy in 1918. It was under Wacek’s
tenure that the phrase “Philharmonikern in Uniform” was first used to describe the
quality of playing by the Deutschmeisterkapelle.

Josef Matys (1851-1937)91 was born in Groß-Petrowitz (today Velké Petrovice),
near Königgrätz in Bohemia. He began his career as a military musician in 1871 with the
18th Infantry Regiment in Königgrätz, his hometown regiment, but left after two years to
study at the Prague Organ School – only two years before his near-contemporary Leoš
Janáček. In 1877, Matys returned as a musician with the rank of Feldwebel (sergeant) in
the 55th Infantry Regimentkapelle in Lemberg, Galicia, only to leave Imperial service
again three years later to play in the orchestra of the Polish Theater in Lemberg. A short

90 Sources: Damanski 28; also Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 133-4; Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik 319.
91 Sources: Damanski 113; also Märsche der k.u.k. Zeit 86-7.
time later something unusual happened: Matys accepted a position as the leader of an artillery brigade band in the Russian Imperial Army.\textsuperscript{92} It was not impossible for \textit{Militärkapellmeister} to cross national borders, and most European armies always had a high number of foreign soldiers in their ranks at this time, but by the end of the nineteenth century, conscription had made this less common. Nevertheless, the Austro-Hungarian Army included at least four \textit{Kapellmeister} from foreign countries in 1904, and Austrians were sought after as \textit{Militärkapellmeister} by other nations because of their high reputation. Matys only stayed with the Russian Army for three years, however, before he received his first posting as an Austro-Hungarian \textit{Militärkapellmeister} with the 94\textsuperscript{th} IR in Theresienstadt, which he led from 1882 until his retirement in 1911. Of Matys’s time leading a Russian army band, Damanski notes, disparagingly, “When Joseph Matys began the service, he did not have one individual who could have handled, much less played, an instrument in these conditions. He had to start from these beginnings and make his musicians out of 45 non-musical soldiers.”\textsuperscript{93}

Gabriel Šebek (also spelled Schebek, 1853-1921)\textsuperscript{94} was born in Prague, and studied music at the Josef Proksch music school in Prague as a boy. After the death of his parents, Šebek moved to Venice in 1866, to live with relatives. At the time, Venice was still Habsburg territory, but war with Italy soon broke out, and the young Šebek found himself serving as a music apprentice (\textit{Eleve}) in the \textit{Regimentkapelle} of the 43\textsuperscript{rd}...
Infantry Regiment in Mantua under Kapellmeister Heinrich Strobl. In 1873, he left the Imperial service to play in the German Theater orchestra in Budapest, and from 1875 he played for five years in the private orchestra of a certain Russian Baron von Dervies in France. Following a tour of Europe with that orchestra, Šebek took a job as Kapellmeister for a Bulgarian nobleman in 1881, a post that he held until 1887. During his time in Bulgaria, he toured extensively and, according to Damanski, began to incorporate some of the local Turkish color in his own compositions. In 1887, Šebek returned to Austria-Hungary as Kapellmeister of the 22nd Infantry Regiment in Cattaro, Dalmatia (today Kotor in Montenegro). In 1894, he founded the Regimentkapelle of the 4th Kaiserjäger Regiment in Linz, which was later moved to Salzburg, where Šebek remained for the rest of his life following his retirement.

These are but a few of the thousands of Militärkapellmeister and Militärmusiken who played in the service of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the turn of the twentieth century. The careers of these Militärkapellmeister are united in their diversity, and these musicians created their own multi-ethnic Austrian identity through their backgrounds and experiences. The experiences of these Militärkapellmeister illustrate a practical manifestation of the political Gesamtstaatsidee itself, showing the benefits of hybridity in the face of ethnic and national separatism. It is truly remarkable that so many musicians from so many different backgrounds were open to these sorts of cross-cultural exchanges – and, indeed, staked their careers on them. Moreover, as products of a multinational environment, the musicians of the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle produced a repertoire music that reflected and even encapsulated this hybridity. If the multinational outlook of the Austro-Hungarian army was the practical result of the movement of regiments beyond
their national homelands, as historians like Oscar Jászi have argued, then the unique repertoire of those ensembles would necessarily have to be multinational as well.

The Militärkapellmeister, finding themselves in an alien environment, frequently incorporated local musical favorites into their concert programs and subsequently absorbed regional styles in their compositions. Instead of expanding and enforcing the hegemony of German cosmopolitanism, these musicians deferred to local tastes – often out of sheer necessity. This situation had a profound impact on the compositional styles of the Militärkapellmeister and the local performance practices as well: regional musical styles were influenced by the Militärmusik, but Militärmusik took much away from its contact with these regional styles in turn. According to historian Moritz Csáky,

Thus the Militärkapellmeister with their regimental orchestras contributed indirectly to the spreading and popularization of the various folk-musical elements of the entire monarchy, with the effect that the knowledge of the music of the peoples of the monarchy spread rapidly and the most diverse folk-musical elements gradually became fixed stereotypes for their countries of origin.95

The result of this mixture of cultural influences was a repertoire of military music that exhibited diverse influences, yet was united by a set of stylistic principles. The elements that united Austrian Militärmusik into a single discrete genre were often as simple as a characteristic instrumentation or timbre, but, as we will see, they helped to define a musical identity that was strong enough to encompass several disparate national musical idioms and styles and still remain distinctive. It was in this characteristic Militärkapelle

that the disparate national voices – each singing with a recognizable Czech or Italian or Polish or Hungarian or German accent – were brought together into one harmonious expression of Austro-Hungarian identity.
4. The Marches and Marching Bands of Austria-Hungary

The multinational outlook of the Austro-Hungarian Empire – as reflected in its politics, its military establishment, and even its military bands – was unique in Europe. As we have seen, some commentators, most notably Eduard Hanslick, saw this spirit of national hybridity as a positive trait, regardless of what may have motivated it. Strict nationalists, however, were not so sympathetic, and those who opposed the multinational monarchy on political grounds naturally opposed all of its cultural manifestations in turn. Linking music and politics, the contemporary German military musician Hermann Eichborn observed that “The character of Austrian military music is genuinely Austrian; it is a comparable curiosity to the whole political system that, like the ‘Holy’ Roman Empire of the German Nation, became the monster political issue in the state world of the Monarchy.”1 Just like the empire itself, Eichborn notes disparagingly, the Militärmusik of Austria-Hungary was a mélange of disparate national influences. He was certainly correct in that the repertoire that represented Austria-Hungary on the world stage – at international band competitions and World’s Fairs – was the product of a group of ethnically-diverse musicians. More than any political ideology, the music these Militärkapellmeister created reflected this diversity on the level of everyday interactions.

between musicians. It was in this way that Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik came to embody the multinational empire in its entirety.

Any examination of the repertoire of the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle must begin with the march, which was by far its most numerous and representative genre. Yet the march is a difficult genre to deal with. Marches tend to be simplistic in form, but at the same time, they embody an entire complex of extramusical associations. In Mahler: A Musical Physiognomy, Theodor Adorno came very close to defending the formal simplicity of marches – at least insofar as it influenced Gustav Mahler’s music. In a backhanded compliment, Adorno writes: “although belonging to the lower music denigrated by culture, [marches] had at their disposal a canon of procedures, a relatively highly developed formal language, the suggestive power of which was not as remote from that of the symphony as cultural arrogance assumed.” But Adorno does not hesitate to remind us the inherent danger of the military march, which is that “whoever claims ownership of marches, as once of his lead soldiers, to him the door opens on the irrevocable. The entrée is hardly cheaper than death.”

In his novel Radetzkymarsch, Joseph Roth offered his own half-joking summation of the military march genre: “All marches resembled each other like soldiers. Most of them began with a roll of drums, contained a tattoo accelerated by the march rhythm and a shattering smile of the lovely cymbals, and ended with a rumbling thunder of the
kettledrum, the brief and jolly storm of military music.” Roth is correct, in a sense; any
genre so overpopulated with examples as the military march – especially the late
nineteenth-century military march – quickly becomes indistinguishable. At the very
least, the musical differences between marches become trivial and subjective. This is
another reason why marches are seldom studied by musicologists.

At the same time, in the age of heightened nationalism that was the late nineteenth
century, differences between the military marches of competing states took on an
elevated significance. They stood at the front lines of the cultural propaganda war,
symbolically standing in for their respective countries in the court of public opinion. And
in the waning days of Napoleonic warfare, marches often stood at the literal front lines of
the shooting war, serving as distinct calls for soldiers to rally around. Yet the musical
differences between the march repertoires of two warring states were usually very poorly
articulated, despite the fact that they would have been widely felt and understood at the
time. Take, for example, the stereotypical differences that have often been cited between
marches from the Austrian Empire and its chief competitor, Prussia. One modern author,
Andrea Freundsberger, summed up what must be considered the conventional wisdom on
the subject, that “Prussia’s military marches had a grave dignity, which was expressed
very rarely in Austrian military music. Austria’s military music described one and the
same a completely different kind. It embodied a contrast between lively, playful

---

In original: “Alle Märsche gleichen einander wie Soldaten. Die meisten begannen mit einem
Trommelwirbel, enthielten den marsch-rhythmisch beschleunigten Zapfenstreich, ein schmetterndes
Lächeln der holden Tschinellen und endeten mit einem grollenden Donner der großen Pauke, dem
fröhlichen und kurzen Gewitter der Militärmusik.”
amusement up to the melancholy.”

This is clearly a case of national stereotypes influencing musical perception: Prussians themselves were seen as more serious and disciplined in military matters than their Austrian counterparts, and for this reason, it is easy to project a more festive character onto Austrian Militärmusik. At the same time, this also rehearses the larger “north-south” dichotomy, where “northern” cultures are seen to embody active, masculine stereotypes, while cultures to their relative “south” were ascribed passive, feminine characteristics.

Yet observers from the time of the Monarchy tended to offer similar sentiments. One such observer, the Czech critic Richard Batka, noted that “While the Prussian marches stress patriotic enthusiasm, the punishing feeling of obligation, [and] the force of the regular drill, the light, airy, southern blood rolls in the melodies of the Austrians.”

Eduard Hanslick considered this perceived southern levity to be unbecoming of music intended for military men, warning in the 1850s, “Indeed the danger lies in the hopping dance character, which the two Strausses and their numerous imitators brought into the marches, that this military music will be pushed completely away from the sphere of strong seriousness. With the freshest march one should never forget that it is warriors.


6 For a comprehensive assessment of the power of national stereotypes as they persist to the present day, see Ernst Bruckmüller, *The Austrian Nation: Cultural Consciousness and Socio-Political Processes*, trans. Lowell A. Bangerter (Riverside, Calif.: Ariadne Press, 2003).

who are playing it. If the soldier goes to the dance, he takes his sword off: the march should remain under all circumstances armed music.”

Some observes considered the perception that Austrian marches were less serious and even less martial than their Prussian counterparts to be the secret of their widespread success. Corporal Wilhelm August Jurek, the composer of the famous “Deutschmeister-Regimentsmarsch” of 1893, said as much about the popular difference between Prussian and Austrian Militärmusik, especially with respect to his own composition:

In a long row, one would like to link arms. Catchy, casual and laughing it pulls the listeners along with it. Later in the trio it is customary to underscore the drum beats with a strong punch on the table. The glasses must jump high. Who hasn’t experienced this and was quite so cheerful and jolly thereby? In the end everyone must sing along: We’re from the k. and k. Infantry Regiment Hoch- und Deutschmeister [Nummero 4]! One simply must! … In the official Prussian march music this kind of Austrian march could not gain a foothold… The German connects with his military earnestness, dispassion and dutifulness. Here, however, everything is cheerful, coarse and yodeling, so informal and civil.

Notably, Jurek was not himself a Militärkapellmeister or even a trained composer but rather an ordinary band member (a bass drummer, according to some accounts), and he famously debuted his new “Deutschmeistermarsch” not in a barracks or an official

---


military parade, but at a private performance by his Regimentkapelle at a casino outside of Vienna, where, despite Armeekapellmeister Leonhardt’s decades-old ban on such performances, his premiere was featured alongside the other popular entertainment pieces on the evening’s program. As we have seen, these casual engagements at casinos and other locales Hanslick might have considered inappropriate were very typical throughout the Monarchy, and no doubt influenced the musical style of the Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik repertoire. For this reason, the German musicologist Volker Kalisch maintains that the stylistic differences between German and Austrian marches had more to do with their respective music markets than with any national dispositions or stereotypes:

The intended audience for “march music” varied: in Prussia the march remained a concern within the military, in which a public might participate; in Austria, however, the march increasingly gains its meaning by the degree that it is successfully accepted outside of the military by an intended or potential consumer circle. The march composers were to a large extent professional entertainment music composers and at the same time they were Kapellmeister, well-known to the public, who understood that their musical entertainment products served the dominant public taste in each case.

Yet as widely-held as it might have been, the stereotypical north-south distinction between Austrian and German Militärmusik was only relevant within the context of

---

10 The origin of Jurek’s “Deutschmeistermarsch” was famously fictionalized in the 1955 film Die Deutschmeister (directed by Ernst Marischka, and starring Romy Schneider and Siegfried Breuer, Jr., as Jurek. For a more historical account see Stephan Vajda, “Mir san vom k.u.k....” Die kuriose Geschichte der österreichischen Militärmusik (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1977), 5-12.

Germanic Central Europe. In a larger context, it was more than perceived levity that
distinguished the Austro-Hungarian march repertoire from that of its competing states; it
was something even more fundamentally related to the makeup of the multinational
empire itself. The sense of national inclusivity – both within the Monarchy and, more
specifically, within its military music establishment – imparted a palpable sonic
distinction on the repertoire of Austro-Hungarian military marches. This was a patriotic
repertoire that spoke at least eleven languages – much to Hermann Eichborn’s disdain.

As the Austrian *Militärkapellmeister* Emil Rameis later noted, virtually every city and
province in the empire had a march in its honor, and each ethnic group was represented
equally as well:

> [In] comparison with the military marches of other [states], only a nation
> that is in itself a state best exemplifies the difference; in this way, an
> Italian military march will only be Italian, a French one only French. The
> Austrian military march, however, was German, Bohemian, Hungarian,
> Slovak, etc., at the same time; a conglomerate of the many different
> melodic elements absorbed over the years. And exactly this seems to have
> been its strong suit: Austrian military marches pleased everywhere, and
> just like Viennese music, many found their way across the entire continent
> and overseas.\(^{12}\)

Tens of thousands of marches were composed in honor of the Austrian and, after
1867, the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The marches that appeared throughout the
nineteenth century represented the height of *mode du jour*: they were always composed in
the latest musical style of their day, and like the popular songs they essentially were,

---

\(^{12}\) “Ein Vergleich mit den Militärmarschen anderer, nur eine Nation in sich schließender Staaten zeigt am
besten den Unterschied auf: so wird ein italienischer Militärmarsch immer nur italienisch, ein französischer
nur französischer sein. Der österreichische Militärmarsch hingegen war deutsch, böhmisch, ungarisch,
slowakisch etc. zugleich, ein Konglomerat der vielen im Laufe der Zeit in sich aufgenommen melodischen
Elemente. Und gerade das scheint seine Starke gewesen zu sein: die österreichischen Militärmarsche
gefielen überall und gleich der Wiener Musik fanden viele davon ihren Weg über den ganzen Kontinent
und auch nach Übersee.” Emil Rameis, *Die österreichische Militärmusik, von ihren Anfängen bis zum
Jahre 1918* (Tutzing: H. Schneider, 1976), 129.
these marches were not intended to endure long in the repertoire. But the rise of nationalist discourses that marked the late nineteenth century also led to the formations of canons of national music – and despite its multinational construction, Austria-Hungary would not prove an exception to this. As other countries had before, the Austro-Hungarian Empire assembled its own official canon of military marches during this time, codifying them in a single volume in time for Emperor Franz Joseph’s fiftieth jubilee year of 1898. Though the marches this volume contains came from several different eras and represented contrasting styles, they were united by two threads: the diversity of their musical and programmatic content – which honored composers and musical dedicatees from all over the empire – and the uniformity of their instrumentation. These two elements, when combined, created the best signifier of Austro-Hungarian state identity in music. By bringing together elements of several different musical languages within the framework of a prescribed instrumentation and form, this repertoire was, consciously or not, the best musical representation of the organizing principle of the Austro-Hungarian Joint Army and even the Dual Monarchy itself in its last decades. This volume of military marches prefigured the Emperor Franz Joseph’s Chłopy Army Order by nearly a decade in its attempt to bring together the best of each nation for the benefit of the empire as a whole.

_Historische Märsche und sonstige Compositionen_

In 1894, the Imperial and Royal War Ministry issued an order authorizing the first-ever official publication of a collection of regimental marches from the Austro-Hungarian Army. That order read, in part:
The Imperial War Ministry intends to revive and preserve the tradition of outstanding epochs in the history of our nation and army by compiling and publishing in uniform orchestrations the older historic marches which owe their fame to successes in war, as well as suitable marches that were dedicated to the memory of glorious regiments, famous generals, or regimental colonels-in-chief.\(^\text{13}\)

The resulting collection, titled *Historische Märsche und sonstige Compositionen für das kaiserliche und königliche Heer* (“Historical Marches and Other Compositions for the Imperial and Royal Army”) was the first official collection of Imperial military marches ever published by the *Reichskriegsministerium*, constituting a belated attempt at Imperial canonization, the contents of which tell an interesting story of Austrian self-identification. The collection consists of forty-nine marches and military tunes – plus Joseph Haydn’s *Kaiserhymne* – edited and arranged for a standardized turn-of-the-century military band by the *k.u.k. Militärkapellmeister* Emil Kaiser. Of the works in this collection, thirty-six are official regimental marches, and the first part of the collection actually arranges them numerically by regiment (see Figures 8, 9, and 10).

Figure 8: Historische Märsche cover page (courtesy ÖNB)
### INHALT

Volkshymne von Josef Haydn

Historische Märsche und deren Zuweisung.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bezeichnung des Marsches</th>
<th>Datum aus dem Denkmal</th>
<th>Komponist</th>
<th>Wirt zugewiesen</th>
<th>Anmerkung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pfalz-Neuburg-Teutschmeister-Marsch</td>
<td>Motive aus 1191 und 1490</td>
<td>J. N. Forbes</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Croce-Marsch</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Fr. Grünau</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custos-Marsch</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>L. Stanoj</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„Ja wid Nassau“-Marsch</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Fr. Seidelmeister</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louden-Marsch</td>
<td>1888 aus dem militärischen Nachlasse der Familie</td>
<td>J. N. Forbes</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippovitch-Marsch</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>J. Wiedemann</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovanovi-Marsch</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>K. Komazek</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erzherzog Albrecht-Marsch</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>K. Komazek</td>
<td>Infanterie-Regiment Nr.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Historische Märsche Table of Contents, page 1 (courtesy ÖNB)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bezeichnung des Marsches</th>
<th>Staat aus dem Jahre</th>
<th>Komponist</th>
<th>Wird zugerechnet dem</th>
<th>Anmerkung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ollissi-Sturm-Marsch</td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>Fr. Lehar sen.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Schlacht bei Custon 1848.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenek-Panduren-Marsch</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>J. N. Fuchs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Abwehr des Regimentes von den Tiroler Truppen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt-Starhemberg-Marsch</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>J. N. Fuchs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Schlacht bei Custon 1848.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellalič-Marsch</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>unkennet</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Schlacht bei Custon 1848.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillerie-Marsch</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>unkennet</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Der Artillerie-Kompagnie Ausgezeichnet der von der Haisten- A. Leonhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung-Österreich-Marsch</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>unkennt</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Schlacht bei Custon 1848.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SONSTIGE COMPOSITIONEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bezeichnung des Marsches</th>
<th>Staat aus dem Jahre</th>
<th>Komponist</th>
<th>Anmerkung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pariser Einzugs-Marsch</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Walch</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Schlacht bei Custon 1848.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraite und Zapfenfeste</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Amor, A. Leuchardt</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Schlacht bei Custon 1848.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth-Marsch</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Componiert aus der Werkstatt von Joseph mit Berenheit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erzherzog Carl Monument-Festmarsch</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Joseph I. mit Berenheit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter Zapfenfeste der k. und k. Armee</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>unkennet</td>
<td>Von historischer Originalität.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough-Marsch</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>A. Tischler</td>
<td>Componiert aus den den letztgenannten Kranken in der Kaiserlichen Armee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoch Habsburg!</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>J. N. Král</td>
<td>Entworfen von Frézep und Sonne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O du mein Österreich!</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>L. Schrödel</td>
<td>Zur Erinnerung an die Schlacht bei Custon 1848.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table of Contents, page 2 (courtesy ÖNB)**

---

Figure 10: *Historische Märsche* Table of Contents, page 2 (courtesy ÖNB)
Other pieces represented include the official branch marches of the Artillery, the Navy, and of one of the military academies, plus ten additional marches the editor thought needed to be represented. The newest pieces in the collection date from 1888 – seven years before the volume was compiled – and include Karl Komzák Junior’s “Erzherzog-Albrecht-Marsch” as well as three marches from a stage production of that same year entitled *Im Feldlager* by Johann Nepomuk Fuchs. The oldest marches are two attributed to the rococo composer Michael Haydn; the rest mostly date from the mid-nineteenth century. The volume includes marches by famous *Militärkapellmeister* like Andreas Leonhardt, Johann Strauss Vater, and Franz Lehár Senior, but apart from the one march by the younger Komzák, the then-current generation of Johann Strauss Sohn, Carl Michael Ziehrer, and Josef Franz Wagner is completely unrepresented.

In all, thirty composers’ names are given (nine works are anonymous), and detailed biographical information is currently available for seventeen of them. Of that group, eleven were born in Bohemia (including three in Prague), two in Lower Austria (the brothers Joseph and Michael Haydn), one in Siebenbürgen, one in Styria, one in Vienna, and one in Mainz. The editor, Emil Kaiser, was himself born in the German city of Cobourg. The representation of composers from the crownlands – especially Bohemia – is striking; given the relative age of many of the pieces in this volume, it confirms that the overrepresentation of Czechs within Austrian *Militärmusik* that we have already

---

observed at the outset of the twentieth century was hardly a recent phenomenon, but rather a tradition that extended back decades, if not centuries.

But this book is more than just a collection of music; it is also, as the Austrian musicologist Friedrich Anzenberger noted, “an aural history of the Imperial and Royal Army.” Each march bears a title, usually the name of an historical individual or event to whom the work is dedicated. The titles in this case are at least as important as the music itself, and taken together, they present an idealized version of Austrian history. Some marches commemorate more or less famous military victories at Custozza (in both 1848 and 1866), Wagram (1809), Turovo (1882), and Szlankamen (1691). Other marches honor individual generals or members of the Habsburg royal family, usually in their role as “Regimentsinaber,” or regimental sponsors. Of course Johann Strauss Vater’s “Radetzkymarsch” is present, though the table of contents is careful to point out its function as the official regimental march of the 5th Hussars. Other generals so feted include classical Austrian heroes Prince Eugen von Savoy and the Archduke Carl – both of whom had been memorialized by dynamic equestrian statues on the Vienna Heldenplatz only a few decades earlier – in addition to the well-known Generals Schwartzenberg, Pappenheim, Loudon, and Admiral Tegetthoff, the victor in the 1866 naval battle at Lissa. Also notable is the inclusion of military heroes from the Imperial Crownlands, including the Hungarian generals Gyulai and Splényi (from the Napoleonic era); the Croatian generals Joseph Jelačić (famous for suppressing the Hungarian revolts in 1848) and Stephan Jovanović (in command of the Bosnian Occupation of 1878); and

---

15 Friedrich Anzenberger, “Foreword” to Kaiser, Historische Märsche, xxxvii.
the Bosnian-Croatian General Joseph Philippović (also famous for his role in the Bosnian Campaign).

With such a multinational group of subjects and composers, interesting cultural intersections are bound to occur. The “Jovanović-Marsch,” for example, was composed by the Bohemian-born Karel Šebor while he served as *Militärkapellmeister* in Komorn, Hungary (today situated on the Hungary-Slovakia border). Another Bohemian, Gabriel Šebek, composed his “Lacy-Marsch” – honoring the St. Petersburg-born General Franz Moritz von Lacy – while stationed with his *Regimentkapelle* in the Bosnian-Herzegovinian city of Mostar. The aforementioned “Erzherzog-Albrecht-Marsch,” a work honoring the Habsburg cousin who was the victor at Custozza in 1866, was written by Karel Komzák Junior, whose own father, as we have seen, was such an ardent Czech nationalist composer that his works were at one point banned by the Habsburg authorities in Bohemia. Another contribution comes from a German-born Austro-Hungarian *Militärkapellmeister*: “Hoch Habsburg!” by Johann Nepomuk Král, who was born in Mainz and trained in Amsterdam, but served as a *Militärkapellmeister* in the Austrian and Austro-Hungarian Army from 1862 until 1890.16

One of the most extreme cultural intersections in the collection is also one of its most famous marches, trailing only the “Radetzkymarsch” in popularity. “O du mein Österreich” was composed in 1852 by the Austrian military bandmaster Ferdin mend Preis (1831-1864), who based his trio section, with permission, on the song “Das ist mein Österreich,” from the 1849 three-act “romantic fairy tale” (*romantisches Märchen*) *s’Alraunl* by Franz von Suppé (1819-1895). Suppé, the child of a Habsburg bureaucrat

---

stationed in Spalato in the Imperial Crownland of Dalmatia (today, Split in Croatia), was born with the much less Germanic name of Francesco Ezechiele Ermenegildo Cavaliere Suppé Demelli, yet he self-identified an Austrian throughout his life. His devotion to the Habsburg Empire, which echoed that of his elder contemporary Franz Grillparzer, can be heard in works like his *Sieg der österreichischen Volkshymne*, op. 45, an instrumental *Tongemälde* that depicts the outcome of the 1848-49 Hungarian revolts by having Joseph Haydn’s *Kaiserhymne* gradually overcome the Rákóczi March. This was the same sentiment that gave rise to the song “Das ist mein Österreich,” another significant political statement from a turbulent time (Figure 11).  

![Figure 11: “Das ist mein Österreich” (refrain melody), by Franz von Suppé](image)

Kapellmeister Preis, who was born in the Bohemian town of Uttiwa, near Eger, and had been stationed with his 38th Infantry Regiment in Linz, Brünn (Brno), Prague, and Theresienstadt, recast Suppé’s refrain into a more march-appropriate cut-time with added call and response elements (Figure 12). It was in this march setting that millions of Austrians came to know what has since been called “Austria’s second national song.”

---


Here in this march by a Bohemian-born Militärkapellmeister, based on a song from an Italianate Istrian, was a clear-cut case of two composers from the Imperial periphery coming together to create an exceptionally popular expression of the “Austrian substance,” as Roth would have called it.

This volume’s emphasis on music from the periphery may have had unintentional consequences. One thing that is notable about this collection is how few of its marches have remained in the repertoire since the collapse of the Monarchy. Despite the surge in popularity of Militärmusik from the Monarchiezeit following the Second World War, only a handful of the marches from this volume are currently available on twentieth-century commercial recordings. This is precisely because this collection was designed around an inclusive Greater Austria, a concept not entirely compatible with the modern Austrian nation-state. Indeed, after the breakup of the Monarchy in 1918, many Austro-Hungarian military marches ended up entering the national repertoires of the respective nations of either the composer, the dedicatee, or in some cases, both. Others, like the marches commemorating generals Jellačić and Jovanović – two crownland-born generals famous for crushing Balkan nationalist uprisings – seem to have disappeared altogether.
having been removed from the canon of patriotic works for reasons more political than musical.

As stylistically and programmatically divergent as these works were, what united them was their instrumentation. They were all arranged for what had become a standardized wind ensemble by the late nineteenth century, and for that reason, each of these marches could be performed and heard in virtually the same way in any part of the empire. It was the makeup of the Militärkapelle that shaped these works into a homogeneous musical canon, and it was the timbre of this unique ensemble that made them recognizably Austrian to their audiences.

The Instrumentation of the Militärkapelle

In Austria, the term Militärmusik was not a style marker or a set of performance practice indications; it was a much more basic distinction than that. When composers from Beethoven to Ziehrer labeled a score “für Militärmusik,” they were specifying a particular kind of instrumental ensemble more than anything else – one distinct from the forces called for in a piece labeled “für Harmoniemusik,” or for that matter, “for string quartet” or “for symphony orchestra.” Just as the string quartet and the symphony orchestra encompassed several musical styles over the course of the nineteenth century, so too did Militärmusik.

Despite the stability implied by such a widely-understood designation, however, the Militärmusik ensemble itself was not nearly as fixed as one might assume. From its origins in the eighteenth century up to 1914, the makeup of the military bands changed constantly, as new instruments were developed and others fell out of fashion. This finally
stabilized into a set instrumentation in the last decades before the First World War – not coincidentally at the same time that the patriotic repertoires themselves stabilized into a set canon. This phenomenon was not unique to Austria; the patriotic repertoire of the United States and many other western countries is to this day not only based predominantly on music that was in vogue at the turn of the twentieth century; it is also performed by a wind ensemble that John Philip Sousa himself would have recognized. But the Austro-Hungarian military bands were a special case: they were not as taken by novel and innovative instruments as were the wind bands of France and Belgium, nor were they as stubbornly traditionalist as some of the other musical organizations of Central Europe were known to be. While hardly on the cutting edge of experimentation, the Austrian military bands still readily incorporated the latest advances in music technology and leveraged them to create an ensemble – and a timbre – that was unique throughout Europe.

Indeed, when looking back at the years prior to the First World War, one could claim that the most advanced technology the Austro-Hungarian Army had at its disposal was its band instruments. Parliamentary budget constraints, inexorable bureaucracy, and stubborn pride kept the Joint Army from acquiring the modern weaponry it badly needed in the aftermath of its defeat at the Battle of Königgrätz in 1866, but the newest and most sophisticated valved brass instruments that that came out of factories all over the empire (including the Červený factory, ironically located in Königgrätz) always managed to find their way into the hands of the musicians of its Regimentkapelle. These woodwind and brass instruments represented some of the most advanced of all nineteenth-century
technology in many respects, often incorporating the latest metalworking techniques and mass-production principles in their construction.

The instruments added to the Militärkapelle over the course of the nineteenth century ran the gamut from failed experiments like the ophicleide, to transitional stop-gaps like the bombardon, to successful new designs that are still widely in use more than a century later such as the E-flat clarinet and valved brass instruments. Older instruments like the serpent, the natural trumpet, and the Waldhorn, hung on valiantly, often for decades alongside their eventual replacements, but they were ultimately dropped in favor of the newer instruments at a rate significantly faster than the more conservative musical institutions of Vienna. Virtually all of the wind instruments of the Militärkapelle circa 1900 were completely redesigned from their counterparts circa 1800.

What drove this development was ultimately the needs of the musicians themselves: the need to create a louder sound with fewer musicians, and the need for an instrument that was easier to play and more secure in intonation and projection – especially in the upper registers. The constantly-rising pitch standards of the nineteenth century brought about a shift to instruments pitched in higher keys, as witnessed by the B-flat valved trumpets that ultimately replaced natural trumpets in D and E-flat, and the B-flat clarinet that overtook its counterpart in A. These higher-pitched instruments slowly entered into the symphony orchestra as mainstream composers became aware of them – often coming by way of the theater orchestras, which is hardly surprising since, as we have seen, many military musicians often performed in theater ensembles to supplement their incomes. The procession of newly-invented and redesigned instruments seen in the nineteenth century Militärkapelle contrasts distinctively with the
instrumentation of a modern symphony orchestra, which has remained more or less fixed for over three-quarters of a century.

The instrumentation of these ensembles did not necessarily reflect public taste or even composer intentions; instead, it was the instrumentation of the ensemble itself that circumscribed both popular taste and artistic aspiration. These ensembles may have been continually changing and evolving, but at any given moment, their makeup was a fixed necessity, and any composer who wrote for the group had to bend his musical will around the realities of the Militärkapelle. The primary consideration behind the unusual makeup of the military ensembles was the dictates of outdoor performances, which often necessitated a specific kind of instrumentation suitable for the open air (sometimes called Freiluftbesetzung) that relied heavily on large masses of the instruments that projected the best – typically treble instruments like the clarinet and the trumpet. Writing in 1910, the English military bandmaster Albert Williams reminded aspiring military bandmasters to take their outdoor venues into account with their instrumentation, urging: “Don’t score too thinly for open-air performances; remember it is not an Academy picture; it is a fresco painting.”20 This emphasis on projection over intimacy is what ultimately distinguished Militärmusik from the more chamber-oriented Harmoniemusik of the early nineteenth century.

Prior to the nineteenth century, the instrumentation of the Militärkapelle consisted of ad hoc groups of drums, fifes, and whatever other wind instruments were available in sufficient quantities to be heard. Budgetary constraints still ruled, however, and the instrumentation of these bands was limited by imperial decree to only eight musicians

from 1767 until Archduke Carl’s reforms of 1806, when the upper limit was increased to 48. With the size restrictions lifted, a specific instrumental template for *Militärmusik* began to emerge, influenced by the contemporary *Harmoniemusik* ensembles of the early nineteenth century, augmented by trumpets and drums. Even Beethoven himself accepted and adhered to this template in his own contributions to the military repertoire, going as far as to say in a letter to his publisher, Peters, that, with regards to instrumentation, “The heads of the military bands are the best judges of that matter.”

Over the course of the nineteenth century, whenever new innovations appeared in instrumental development and design, they often found a home in the *Militärkapelle* before any other musical institution in Central Europe. In the 1820s, with the addition of keyed trumpets – natural trumpets with something resembling bassoon keys added in order to play chromatically – the timbre of the *Militärkapelle* started to change dramatically, with the much louder brass instruments taking over the melodic role traditionally played by the high woodwinds. New instruments appeared and disappeared from the *Militärkapelle* with astonishing speed for most of the nineteenth century, but this period of experimentation gradually gave way to one of standardization, as one of the main reforms of Andreas Leonhardt was to ensure that every *Regimentkapelle* had a uniform instrumentation. By 1900, Austro-Hungarian military ensembles had become so standardized in their instrumentation that several Viennese music publishers sold staff paper with the names of the instruments (if not their actual numbers) pre-printed.

---


22 Including, specifically, his two 1809 Marches *für Militärmusik* in F major (W.o.O. 18, known as the “Yorck’scher Marsch,” and W.o.O. 19), and his 1816, Military March in D Major (W.o.O. 24), composed for an Austrian artillery band.

Numerous manuscript scores survive on this preprinted Militärmusik paper, including several works by Josef Franz Wagner (1856-1908), whose compositions and arrangements show us the dominant trends in Militärmusik instrumentation at the turn of the twentieth century.

By J.F. Wagner’s time, the flutes and piccolos had standardized to the key of D-flat, where they would remain until after the First World War. Natural trumpets had been eliminated altogether, and the valved trumpet section was expanded to compensate. The Hochtrompete, a common mid-century obbligato brass instrument found in numerous scores, was replaced by the “Piston” or cornet in E-flat, tuned a whole octave above the section of E-flat trumpets. This is the only appearance of the cornet in prewar Austrian Militärmusik, and it appears to have been identical to the soprano E-flat cornet used in contemporaneous British military bands. The horns adopted their modern key of F by this time, and the bass tuba joined the ensemble in the form of the over-the-shoulder helicon.

The saxophones and mezzo-soprano cornets, which were the mainstay of American, French and British military ensembles, were relatively unknown in Austrian wind bands prior to the First World War. The other notable absence from these Austro-Hungarian ensembles was the oboe, which was very rarely to be found in Militärmusik scores despite the fact that bassoons were relatively common. On the other hand, the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle made extensive use of the flugelhorn, which was

---

becoming increasingly rare in other European and American ensembles after 1890, as well as the bass flugelhorn, which was virtually unknown outside of Central Europe.

Emil Kaiser’s *Historische Märsche* collection had a modern and fairly uniform instrumentation that could be considered representative for its time, varying only according to the keys of the individual marches (Table 1).\(^{25}\)

**Table 1: Historische Märsche Instrumentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piccolo in D flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Flute in D-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A-flat Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 E-flat Clarinets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 B-flat Clarinets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2 Bassoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Horns in F or E-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*E-flat Cornet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 Trumpets in B-flat or E-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Trumpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Flugelhorns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Flugelhorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Trombones (sometimes 3(^{rd}) on bass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphonium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bass Tubas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side and Bass Drums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As informative as this instrumentation list may be, however, the one crucial piece of data that it fails to convey is how each piece was actually performed. It is difficult to know with any certainty whether or not the instruments listed in the score were doubled, and if so, how and how often. The actual composition of these ensembles typically varied from concert to concert. We do have some photographic evidence to make up for this lack of data, but these photographs themselves are not particularly informative, since for much of

\(^{25}\) Kaiser, *Historische Märsche*. Instruments marked with an * were not included in all scores, but when they were indicated, it was for the number indicated. This it was possible for a piece in this collection to indicate either no bassoons or two bassoons in the score.
the nineteenth century, photography was expensive and difficult, and photographs often showed special occasions where an exceptionally large ensemble might have been used. Everyday military concerts unfortunately tended to escape such notice.\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{The Instrumental Idioms}

Despite how dynamic the instrumentation of these ensembles might have been during the nineteenth century, arranging for Austrian and Austro-Hungarian \textit{Militärmusik} quickly evolved into formula, with instruments doubling each other according to registers.\textsuperscript{27} Of course, this is hardly surprising: given that the primary concern was sound production in an outdoor setting, the fineries of orchestration would necessarily have to come second to the realities of performance. In the typical late nineteenth-century Austrian march, the first clarinet, first trumpet, and obbligato flugelhorn share the melody, which is doubled at the octave by the piccolo and possibly the high B-flat trumpet (\textit{Hochtrompete}) or E-flat cornet, when present. The lower trumpet and clarinet parts had little to do but play afterbeats reinforcing the solo line in a heterophonic texture, with the low brass and woodwinds supplying the harmonic foundation or playing counterpoint.\textsuperscript{28} This simple

\begin{itemize}
\item An extensive collection of historic photographs of Austro-Hungarian military ensembles can be found in the Emil Rameis \textit{Nachlass} in the Kriegsarchiv of the Austrian State Archives. Some surviving photographs show as many as sixty-four or more musicians in the military band, with as many as six or more helicons standing out. This implies that a significant amount of part doubling was taking place depending on the level of grandiosity required for the occasion. Also it should be noted that the bands for the infantry, artillery, and cavalry regiments from the same time would have differed from one another in composition – often considerably – yet these differences were rarely notated in the scores, and seemed to have been subsumed within the overarching rubric of \textit{Militärmusik}.
\item For a more general overview of Central European wind band instrumentation in the late nineteenth century, see Bernhard Habla, \textit{Besetzung und Instrumentation des Blasorchesters seit der Erfindung der Ventile für Blechblasinstrumente bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg in Österreich und Deutschland}, 2 vols. (Tutzing: H. Schneider, 1990).
\item See also the description of \textit{Militärmusik} instrumentation given in Christian Glanz, “Blasmusik zwischen traditioneller Funktion und Konzertanspruch,” \textit{Österreichische Musikzeitschrift} 52, no. 7 (1997): 8.
\end{itemize}
texture helped to keep the listener’s attention trained on the melodic line, yet at the same
time the particular constellation of trumpets, flugelhorns, clarinets and piccolos created
the unique timbre that became closely identified with Austrian Militärmusik.

Another important consideration in wind band instrumentation is the key of the
instruments themselves. The fully-chromatic wind and brass instruments of the turn of
the twentieth century were not completely even-tempered, but were still affected by some
of the pitch tendencies of the natural overtone series. This meant that composers and
arrangers still had to be careful to use only instruments in sympathetic keys; it was not
advisable, for example, to pair trumpets in E-flat with clarinets in A. The addition of
valves to brass instruments did little to solve this problem, however, and it in fact created
a new one: valves divert air into extra sets of tubes, which means that they effectively
augment the overtone series of a natural instrument in one key by “borrowing” notes
from another key to fill the gaps. When all three valves on a flugelhorn are engaged, it
sounds as though the instrument has transformed itself into a “natural” flugelhorn a
tritone removed from the original key. The difference between these two intonation
systems meant that the flugelhorn in question could not even play by itself in a key in
which all three valves were subsequently opened and closed – such as C-sharp major –
with any semblance of even temperament.29 It is for these reasons that the Militärkapelle
gradually evolved into a set of wind instruments pitched in sympathetic keys, such as B-
flat and E-flat, as well as D-flat and A-flat, with treble-clef instruments in C particularly

29 All valved brass instruments suffered from this limitation until various compensation systems were
worked out in the mid-twentieth century.
avoided. Another practical result of this limitation was that certain tonic keys had to be transposed for the benefit of the Militärmusik ensemble.

For the woodwind instruments, the golden age of experimentation and development had been the eighteenth century; the nineteenth saw mainly improvements to mechanisms, experimentation in construction materials such as metal for flutes, and the expansion of the instrumental families into other registers. It was during the nineteenth century that the contrabassoon and sopranino clarinets took their place alongside their cousins in the Militärkapelle. At the same time, however, the only major family of reed instruments to have been invented in the nineteenth century – the saxophones – was completely alien to Austria.

The woodwind instruments used in the Austro-Hungarian Regimentkapelle were chosen specifically for their piercing tone quality. The high soprano E-flat clarinets – which entered the Militärkapelle long before Berlioz used them in his Symphonie Fantastique – and the extremely high sopranino A-flat clarinet were developed according to this trend. The piccolo – typically pitched sympathetically in the key of D-flat instead of C – was featured in more scores than were the flutes for this reason as well. In the surviving scores, the B-flat clarinets tended to emphasize their high or clarino register and avoided the deep chalumeau range. Andreas Nemetz’s aforementioned 1844 Allgemeine Musikschule für MilitärMusik contained numerous exercises for the treble woodwinds in the high register, and his technical drills emphasized the kinds of trills and

---

30 This is what likely accounted for the missing oboe – as well as any instruments related to it, such as the English horn and the heckelphone. See also Glanz, “Blasmusik,” 8.
31 Glanz notes this as well; ibid.: 7-8.
flourishes that appeared in *Militärmusik* scores.\(^{32}\) Also featured were virtuosic solo
counter-melodies in the extreme high piccolo or sopranino clarinet range, reminiscent of
the fife or hornpipe tradition, which seemed to become increasingly elaborate by the end
of the nineteenth century. Perhaps the most unusual aspect of woodwind scoring in the
*Militärmusikkapelle* involved the bassoons. Bassoons were typically employed in groups of
two or three, sometimes with the third as contrabassoon, and mirrored the basses and
trombones providing the harmonic foundation. Bassoon solos were very uncommon,\(^{33}\)
and indeed the instruments seemed to have been included only for the sake of adding
volume and tone color to the bass line, to be omitted entirely if the situation warranted.

The brass instruments underwent the most radical changes during the nineteenth
century, yet their idiomatic role within the *Militärmusikkapelle* was still tied to their respective
families. In the United States, brass instruments are often divided into two groups: the
so-called conical- and cylindrical-bored instruments. This distinction refers to the
interior shape of the metal tubes themselves; specifically whether it is predominantly
conical as it expands gradually from the mouthpiece to the bell, or predominantly
cylindrical, flaring rapidly at the bell itself. The conical instruments include the horn, as
well as the tuba and its family, while the cylindrical instruments include the trumpet and
the trombone. Most modern organologists acknowledge that this bipartite distinction is
something of a misnomer, however, as many apparently cylindrical instruments have
long conical sections in them, and the use of valves dictates that even otherwise conical

\(^{32}\) See Andreas Nemetz, *Allgemeine Musikschule für Militärmusik* [1844], ed. Friedrich Anzenberger, IGEB
Reprints und Manuskripten Materialen zur Blasmusikforschung (Vienna: Musikverlag Johann Kliment,
2004).

\(^{33}\) At least one concert solo for bassoon and *Militärmusik* from this era survives, however: “Die alte
Brummbär,” op. 210, by Julius Fučík, who was himself a trained bassoonist.
instruments have significant lengths of cylindrical tubing as well. But we still recognize a difference in timbre between the horns and the trumpets, which is owed primarily to their respective internal dimensions more than anything else.

Since the nineteenth century, however, the German language has evolved its own set of terms for these distinctions – one that is finer and more accurate, and pertains directly to the instrumentation of wind bands. The primary distinguishing characteristic is not the overall internal dimensions, which can be deceptive, but the bell itself, and specifically the rate at which the bell flares over the last few centimeters of its length. This leads to three classifications instead of two: the engmensuriert instruments, which flare out suddenly to a relatively small bell; the weitmensuriert instruments, which flare out gradually to a relatively wide bell; and the mittelmensuriert instruments, which split the difference by flaring rapidly to a relatively large bell. The engmensuriert category includes most of what we call the cylindrical bored instruments, such as the trumpet and trombone, but also possibly the cornet. Mittelmensuriert usually referred only to the horn, which has a very large bell that flares out in an almost triangular shape (Figure 13).
Figure 13: Three archetypical bell forms for brass instruments. 
From left to right: engmensuriert (trumpet, trombone), mittelmensuriert (horn), and weitmensuriert (flugelhorn, euphonium, tuba).

The weitmensuriert category, however, is considered to be the cornerstone and distinguishing feature of Austrian wind band instrumentation from the nineteenth century to the present day. This category encompasses the instruments that are related to Adolphe Sax’s saxhorn family, including the flugelhorn, bass flugelhorn, euphonium, and bass tuba. These were considered to be the most important instruments in the Militäarkapelle by the end of the nineteenth century, and were frequently encountered as virtuoso solo instruments. Subsequent commentators have argued that the extensive use of these weitmensuriert instruments was what gave late nineteenth-century Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik its distinctive timbre, as they were employed in Austria-Hungary to an even greater extent than in most other countries at the time.\(^\text{34}\)

The most important of these weitmensuriert instruments was the B-flat flugelhorn (Flügelhorn), which nearly always carried the melody in tutti sections. In fact, the

\(^{34}\) See for example Glanz, “Blasmusik,” 7.; also Brixel, “Kulturfaktor Militärmusik,” 16.
flugelhorn was such a prominent instrument in Austrian Militärmusik that the regimental band directors often conducted their performances from a copy of the obligatoflugelhorn part.\textsuperscript{35} Flugelhorns were also considered to be virtuoso solo instruments, and concert themes and variations were often composed for this instrument much as they were for the B-flat cornet in France, Britain, and the United States. Nemetz’s 1844 Musikschule primer included what has been called the first valved flugelhorn tutor from a German-speaking country.\textsuperscript{36} These exercises are much more lyrical than his trumpet exercises, in keeping with the instrument’s soloistic role, and include none of the trumpet’s multiple tonguing. Having evolved from the short cavalry bugles of the late eighteenth century, the flugelhorn was an instrument that only came into its own with the invention of valves. Moreover, the Austrian flugelhorn was quite different in construction and timbre from its counterparts in France and Britain. Austrian flugelhorns resembled wider-bored trumpets, and their tone was more strident and direct than other flugelhorns, while still not as brilliant and penetrating as a trumpet. As a result, they were more timbrally analogous to the cornets that were used in these other national traditions, and the flugelhorns’ role in the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle reflects this.

With the addition of valves, the trumpets were now capable of playing chromatic melodies for the first time, and this capability was utilized in the Austrian Militärkapelle before virtually any other instrumental ensemble in Europe.\textsuperscript{37} During the second half of

\textsuperscript{35} Glanz, “Blasmusik,” 8.
\textsuperscript{36} Anzenberger in Nemetz, Musikschule, xvi.
\textsuperscript{37} In other ensembles in Europe, the cornet played the solo brass role until very late in the nineteenth century, while valved trumpets were scored as natural trumpets. Berlioz, Tchaikovsky, and many other composers made use of this cornet-trumpet dichotomy in their orchestral works, while Germanic composers such as Wagner, Bruckner, and Richard Strauss largely ignored the valved trumpet’s fully-chromatic possibilities altogether. Mahler’s distinctive use of the trumpet as a chromatic melodic
the nineteenth century, the first trumpet usually played the obbligato or solo part and became an important locus for the melody of a Militärmusik composition, taking on part of the role played by the solo cornet in France, Britain, and the United States. Even Prussian and German military ensembles used the cornets instead of trumpets in this melodic role for much of the nineteenth century, making the reliance on trumpets in the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle another distinctive timbral element. Beyond the regimental band, however, the most important and characteristic military function performed by the trumpet was as a signaling instrument. Historically, military signals were originally conceived for natural trumpets, and as a consequence, they tend to leap by thirds and fifths following the overtone series in the trumpet’s easiest range. Despite what could be seen as a relatively limited variety of possible melodies, the traditions of nineteenth-century warfare demanded that each army utilize signals for charges, retreats, and changes of orders that were distinct from those of the enemy. In Austria-Hungary, many of these signals remained consistent from the 1750s right up to the First World War (Figure 14).  

---

38 Instrument breaks from this Germanic tradition, and was likely influenced directly by the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle. Effectively, Austrian military bands took the role other ensembles gave to the cornet and spread it across both the trumpet and the flugelhorn, creating an entirely different instrumental timbre.  

38 Sources for these signals include Nemetz, Musikschule, 63-5 and 102. These signals would not have been as esoteric to contemporary audiences as they might seem to us; the introduction of conscription in the late nineteenth century meant that there would have been a very large pool of veterans and reservists throughout the empire intimately familiar with these calls. Moreover, in the smaller army post towns of the empire, the daily cycles of the regiment would have been well-known to the local inhabitants, punctuated as they were by trumpet signals.
Figure 14: Feldjäger Infantry Trumpet signals from Nemetz’s Musikschule (courtesy ÖNB)

---

Nemetz, Musikschule, 102. Translation: No. 1: Forward march, No. 2: Halt, No. 3: Retreat, No. 4: Right oblique march, No. 5: Left oblique march, No. 6: Fire!, No. 7: Cease fire, No. 8: Form line, No. 9: Form cluster, No. 10: Re-form the line, No. 11: Bayonet charge, No. 12: Reinforce the line, No. 13: Call the skirmishers, No. 14: Reveille, No. 15: Advance in a newly-formed line, No. 16: Fix bayonets.
Because of this consistency, one of the simplest ways for a composer to evoke a specifically “Austrian” identity in music was to incorporate the actual trumpet signals of the k.u.k. Armee itself. This kind of reference was typical in large-scale works of Militärmusik, but also can be found in several marches, such as Julius Fučík’s fanfare-march “Österreichisch-ungarische Soldatenklänge.” The practice was not limited to Militärkapellmeister however; even Gustav Mahler referenced recognizable Austro-Hungarian trumpet signals in his symphonies, including, notably, the Abblasen command in the third movement of his Third Symphony.

One or two long natural trumpets were retained by the Militärkapelle until the last quarter of the nineteenth century for the purpose of playing these fanfares before that role ultimately fell to the valved trumpets. Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik scores incorporated two other “specialty” trumpets for much of the later nineteenth century. The first of these to be adopted was the valved bass trumpet, usually in B-flat an octave below the main corps of trumpets. This instrument is most often associated with Wagner because of its appearance in the Ring cycle, but the concept of the bass trumpet is in fact as old as the trumpet itself, as lower-pitched natural trumpets had been included in fanfare ensembles as early as the Renaissance. According to organologist Anthony Baines, valved bass trumpets were developed in Leipzig in the 1820s and soon began to appear in German and Austrian military bands as another instrument to fill out the bass voices of what was a treble-heavy

---

40 Also known as “Leitmeritzer Schützenmarsch,” op. 261. For more on the use of trumpet signals as a programmatic identifier in military Tongemälde and other long compositions, see Chapter 5.
41 Mahler’s use of the Abblasen call immediately following the plaintive offstage posthorn solo (two measures before No. 17 in the Kalmus edition) is strongly reminiscent of the call’s sudden appearance at the end of the extended Austro-Hungarian Retraite oder Zapfenstreich trumpet signal, which served as a tattoo played at the end of the day (see the last measure of Figure 19 in Chapter 5).
ensemble. Wagner himself likely first came into contact with this instrument in this military setting. In Austrian Militärmusik, the bass trumpet typically doubled the trombones or reinforced the melody an octave lower, and was not considered a solo instrument.

The so-called “high trumpet” (Hochtrompete) referenced in many surviving Militärmusik scores is something of an enigma. It could very well have been an important antecedent to the piccolo trumpet, pitched an octave higher than the standard twentieth-century orchestral trumpet, some sixty years before the piccolo trumpet is traditionally acknowledged to have been invented by Mahillion of Brussels. Without surviving examples, however, it is difficult to say with certainty what instrument actually covered this part; it is entirely possible that these parts – notated one octave above the first trumpet – were played by an especially skilled trumpeter using the high register of his mezzo-soprano trumpet.

While the Hochtrompete may have been mysterious, its replacement is actually well-known to us today. The cornet (Piston) in E-flat appears to have replaced the hoch B-flat trumpet starting in the late 1870s, and was a fixture in the Militärkapelle by the 1890s. This instrument, the only cornet to appear regularly in Austrian Militärmusik, was pitched a perfect fourth higher than the B-flat trumpets that were becoming standard at the time. Its relationship to the tutti trumpets was similar to that between the E-flat and B-flat clarinets: the cornet part often mirrors the first trumpet, adding to the overall tone color of the ensemble, and increasing the overall volume at the outdoor concerts. It was not a solo instrument. Notably, the name Piston, which comes from the French cornet à

---

piston, implies that the instrument used piston valves and not the rotary valves that were typically used by the Austro-Hungarian trumpets of the time; this would have varied by the manufacturer, however. It is also likely that this instrument inspired Mahler’s use of a “kleines piston” or small cornet as an optional alternative to the first trumpet in F in the first movement of his Third Symphony, and then again as an alternative to the first trumpet in B-flat in a particularly strenuous section of the finale of his Seventh Symphony.  

Valved horns continued to evolve alongside the natural horns throughout the nineteenth century, and as with the trumpets, this created a curious dichotomy. Andreas Nemetz’s 1844 *Musikschule* gives horn exercises that provide a window into the performance practices of the mid century, showing that, the fully-chromatic valved horn was considered to be merely an accompaniment instrument, playing afterbeats and the occasional countermelody or echo effect in *Militärmusik* scores all the way up to the First World War. Ironically, it was the valveless natural horn or *Waldhorn* that was considered to be the virtuosic solo instrument, coming from the old horn signal tradition. Horn signals had been replaced by trumpet signals in the Austrian Empire by the nineteenth century, and it was likely for this reason that the valved horn was almost never featured as a solo instrument in *Militärmusik* scores. Nemetz’s exercises, however, focused on developing this virtuosic natural horn style, and consisted of fanfares in 6/8 time not unlike what Wagner later featured in his Ring cycle. 

43 Though the E-flat cornet is close to the same pitch range as the trumpet, it is unclear who would have played or doubled this instrument in Austria-Hungary. In France, the earliest cornet players were also horn players – hence the name “little cor.” Mahler’s indication for a *kleines Piston* in his first trumpet parts may actually be an important performance practice clue, however, and it may have been that the E-flat cornets were played initially by trumpet players in Austria-Hungary, likely as a result of the older *Hochtrompete* tradition.
The characteristic Militärmusik scoring for three trombones likely came from the ecclesiastical tradition, and may have even served as a subtle link between the Austrian military bands and the traditions of the Catholic Church. Despite the possibilities afforded by the chromatic slide – or in some cases, the valves – the trombone was not considered to be a solo instrument, and largely filled out the harmonic texture along with the bassoons and bass trumpet. The euphonium, however, was a different story. One of the weitmensuriert bass brass instruments, this descendant of the baritone saxhorn was in fact another prominent solo instrument in the Militärkapelle, and was featured in several late nineteenth century scores as a soloist, or leading the bass instruments in a countermelody. Its tone would have been significantly mellower than the trombones, which played in the same range.

Another important weitmensuriert bass instrument was the bass flugelhorn in B-flat, pitched an octave below the other two flugelhorns it typically accompanied. This instrument was a bell-front version of the tenor saxhorn, which gave it a much brighter tone quality than similar tenor-voiced instruments in other countries’ military ensembles.44 The solo Tenorhorn that Mahler used in the opening measures of his Seventh Symphony was in all likelihood inspired by – if not actually performed on – a bass flugelhorn, as this would have been the instrument most familiar to Austrian musicians at the time.

The bass brass instruments underwent the most profound transformation of any over the course of the nineteenth century, progressing from the keyed serpent, to the ophicleide, and finally to the valved bass tuba. In actual practice, by 1900, the bass parts

would have been played by the helicon: an over-the-shoulder contrabass tuba with an extremely wide internal bore, yet a relatively small bell angled upwards (Figure 15). 45

![Image of a helicon](image1.png)

**Figure 15: Advertisement for a Červený “Kaiserbass” Helicon, circa 1904 (courtesy Wienbibliothek)**

Surviving pictures show that the number of helicons varied in each band, with as few as one or two and as many as six or eight players doubling the bass line. The helicons, which were pitched in F or low B-flat yet did not transpose, provided the harmonic and

---

45 These instruments were common in many countries in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. John Philip Sousa famously became frustrated with the helicon’s small bell and limited projection, leading him to develop the bell-front sousaphone as a replacement.
rhythmic foundation of the ensembles, which in marches usually came in the form of the characteristic “oom-pah” rhythm.⁴⁶

Percussion instruments were not always notated in Militärmusik scores, but were nearly always involved, implying that drum parts were often improvised on the spot by the performers, following established cadences. When they were notated, only the side drum and bass drum typically appeared in scores, with other percussion parts (such as cymbals) often left to the performer’s judgment. The use of pitched drums such as tympani was not common, though bells were occasionally used to augment the piccolos. The side drum, like the trumpet, was an important signaling instrument in the armies of the nineteenth century, and specific rudiments and rhythms were tied to field commands, and Nemetz includes lists of drum signals in his Musikschule.⁴⁷ Though their use on the battlefield had diminished greatly by the turn of the twentieth century, as military tactics and technology evolved, Imperial conservatism meant that drum signals remained an important part of the training process for army recruits, and they were frequently featured in military parades. Militärkapellmeister often drew upon these drum signals in their military potpourris and Tongemälde – especially the maneuver-march cadence used in virtually every Austro-Hungarian military parade from the late nineteenth century up to the present day, which was purported to have been composed by Andreas Nemetz himself (Figure 16).

---

⁴⁶ Glanz, “Blasmusik,” 8.
⁴⁷ See Nemetz, Musikschule, 100-1 passim.
Beyond the *Militärkapelle*

One of the most important legacies of the Austro-Hungarian *Militärkapelle* came as the result of its role as a test bed for new and experimental wind instruments. Many instruments found their way into the military bands, but not all of these were successful. Some, like the keyed trumpet and the bombardon, disappeared relatively quickly. But those instruments that proved their usefulness in the military bands subsequently found their way into the symphony orchestras and the opera houses of Central Europe. By 1900, valved trumpets, horns, and tubas were commonplace in most European symphony orchestras – even in Vienna. More importantly, the instrumentalists developed alongside the instruments during this time, and by the end of the nineteenth century, trumpet, flugelhorn, and euphonium players were regarded for the first time as concert soloists in

---

their own right. At the dawn of the twentieth century, central European composers had not just new and improved instruments to draw upon, but also a large body of skilled musicians to play them – many of whom received their formative training in the *Militärkapelle*.

These instruments and musicians transformed the symphony orchestra in the early twentieth century, representing a subtle yet noticeable shift away from the orchestrational practices of Wagner, Bruckner, and Richard Strauss. Wagner composed for brass instruments heavily, but not chromatically; in a Wagnerian orchestra, the brass played much of the same musical idioms they had played for Beethoven and Mendelssohn – only more of them. Composers like Gustav Mahler first heard the potential of the fully-chromatic brass instruments in the context of the *Militärkapelle*, where they routinely carried the melody, and his own style of writing for the brass instruments represents a synthesis of Wagnerian orchestration and the *Militärmusik* tradition. For subsequent generations of composers, these instruments and their associated techniques would have been virtually taken for granted due to their ubiquity. Nevertheless, many Austrian composers continued to maintain strong ties to *Militärmusik*. Arnold Schoenberg himself composed marches even spent a brief time playing in a *Militärkapelle* during the First World War. Alban Berg imitated the sounds of Austrian *Militärmusik* in his *Drei Orchesterstücke*, op. 6, and more famously, in his military-themed opera *Wozzeck*.

---

49 Mahler was not the only composer to be influenced by the sounds of the military wind bands – Debussy’s and Ravel’s instrumentation owes something to the influence of the French military bands, for example, which had been experimenting with new brass instruments in a similar manner – yet Mahler was the most prominent Central European composer to adopt these techniques, and his inspiration stems directly from the bands of Austria-Hungary.

50 As a parody of military marches and their instrumental idioms, the “Marsch” from Alban Berg’s *Drei Orchesterstücke* is to Austrian *Militärmusik* what Maurice Ravel’s subsequent work *La Valse* is to the
Those composers who studied and imitated Mahler’s orchestration – Shostakovich, for one – absorbed and transmitted the idioms of the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapelle without even realizing it.

The influence of the Militärkapelle on the Central European symphony orchestra was a transformation in musical style from the bottom up. As we have seen, Militärmusik was much more widely heard than the art music of the time, and had an even greater appeal across class lines. It was also a non-localized phenomenon; the relative uniformity of the military bands across the vast Monarchy, combined with the frequency with which they were transferred from one garrison to the next, meant that the newest and most advanced wind instruments could readily be found in even the most backwater communities at the turn of the century. As a result, this particularly Austrian instrumentation and performing style continued to exert a demonstrably strong influence on the military music of the successor states that emerged after the breakup of the Monarchy in 1918. The military and civilian wind bands of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Hungary – brand-new nation-states with few military traditions already in place – continued to play “in the Austrian style” for much of the early twentieth century, following the example imposed by Andreas Leonhardt in the 1860s, and reiterated by the generations of Austro-Hungarian military musicians among their own native sons.\(^{51}\)

---

\(^{51}\) Vajda, *Mir san von k.u.k.*, 161.
The immediate influence of the instrumentation of the Militärkapelle can also be heard in the few large-scale pieces of Militärmusik that were subsequently or contemporaneously arranged for the symphony orchestra. Taken out of their military contexts, these works nevertheless remained closely associated with the Austro-Hungarian army, in part because certain key aspects of their idiomatic instrumentation remained in place. At the same time, these were pieces of program music, and used many of the same devices available to that genre at the time. While not quite as ambitious as the modernist art music of the same era, as we will see, the larger genres of late nineteenth century Militärmusik, such as the potpourris and Tongemälde, proved to be exceptionally successful vehicles for the expression of Austro-Hungarian multinational identity in music, comparable in many ways to Dvořák’s and Smetana’s nationalist works.
5. Austro-Hungarian Tongemälde

One significant development that marked the course of nineteenth-century European music in general was the rise of musical nationalism. Music and national identity first began to be linked during the Enlightenment, when the discourse on the origins of music shifted from the realm of the natural (the music of the spheres, Pythagorean intervals) to the linguistic (music as representation of language). According to Johann Gottfried Herder, instead of being universal, music should be understood to speak in different dialects.\(^1\) In the early nineteenth century, a kind of musical cosmopolitanism that blended nationalist styles was much in vogue. This is what musicologist Carl Dahlhaus called the *juste milieu*, as exemplified by composers like Frederic Chopin, whose Polish-tinged piano pieces were all the rage in Paris.\(^2\) Soon after 1848, however, this balance was derided by critics and ultimately lost when musical nationalism turned exclusionary in the wake of the failed nationalist uprisings.

After 1848, attempts at cosmopolitanism were severely maligned in the more heavily nationalist parts of Europe.\(^3\) During this time, composers sought to glorify their own nations musically by drawing upon its indigenous popular and folk musics as a

\(^3\) Witness for example Tchaikovsky’s treatment at the hands of the Russian nationalists, who favored the efforts of the so-called *kuchka* composers such as Borodin, Mussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov over Tchaikovsky’s western-looking symphonies. This denigration continued well into the twentieth century, as music history textbooks continued to side with the nationalists over Tchaikovsky’s cosmopolitan works.
source for large-scale programmatic works. Within the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Empire itself, this kind of musical nationalism was especially prevalent among the Czechs, whose major exponents included Bedřich Smetana and Antonín Dvořák – both of whom were very influential among the significant number of Bohemian Militärkapellmeister in the Austro-Hungarian Army. Yet just as Dvořák himself attempted to compose American nationalist pieces during his time abroad, these Militärkapellmeister frequently absorbed the local musics from their many different garrison postings and incorporated them into musical statements celebrating the empire’s diversity. Approaching their source material as they would their own national musics, these Militärkapellmeister composed works that reflected the Imperial Gesamtstaatsidee not for political or philosophical reasons, but because it articulated their own complex national identities, and their lived experiences of cultural hybridity.

In addition to an ever-expanding repertoire of marches, the last years of the Dual Monarchy saw the creation of several large-scale compositions reflecting the imperial Gesamtstaatsidee in music. Freed from the musical and social constraints of the march genre, these larger works were often arranged for ensembles other than the Militärkapelle – including, in some cases, the full symphony orchestra. Yet even though these pieces appeared in other contexts, they retained an inextricable connection to Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik. The composers of these works, who were typically serving Militärkapellmeister themselves, continued to use or imitate the instrumental idioms of the Militärkapelle. Moreover, they often quoted or referenced both the functional music of the Austro-Hungarian Army itself – such as trumpet calls, marches, and other songs – while also incorporating or imitating popular and folk melodies from around the empire.
The end result of this peculiar mixture of musical elements was a repertoire that was both distinctly military in its outlook at the same time that it was a multinational expression of imperial Austro-Hungarian patriotism. Two large-scale programmatic works originally composed für Militärmusik in the 1890s that illustrate this development are Carl Michel Ziehrer’s potpourri Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten, and Julius Fučík’s tone poem cycle Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre.

The Potpourri

After the march, the most popular musical genre regularly performed by the Militärkapelle was the so-called “potpourri” (Potpurri). In its simplest form, a potpourri is little more than a medley of the popular or famous tunes of the day. Typically, very little if any original music was composed for these potpourris, though the preexisting melodies generally appeared in a new setting and key. The sources for turn-of-the-century potpourris were quite diverse, ranging from local popular songs (often Wienerlieder), to contemporary operetta numbers from Viennese stage, to classic operas by Wagner, Donizetti, or Weber, and sometimes even classical orchestral pieces and Lieder by Mendelssohn, Schubert, or Schumann. If he was famous enough, a potpourri arranger might even include quotations from his own works in the mix. These quotations were presented in rapid-fire succession, with each barely lasting a minute. By the late nineteenth century, it was common to have twenty or thirty such quotations in a single potpourri, and fifty or more was not unheard of in works lasting half an hour or longer.

Even for someone living in Vienna, opportunities to hear the latest operas and operettas were limited to only those with financial means. In the smaller, more provincial
towns of the empire, these opportunities were non-existent. This is what propelled the popularity of the potpourri genre.\textsuperscript{4} By the end of the nineteenth century, the potpourri had become the primary means of popularizing both new and classical works alike throughout the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Yet despite the appearance of new music in these potpourris, they still had to play to audience tastes, and many potpourri arrangers went out of their way to represent local composers or other timely favorites as a result. For this reason, these potpourris can serve as a barometer for gauging the mass popularity of certain classical and contemporary composers and genres during the latter years of the Monarchy.

In terms of the number of musical references, the more was definitely the merrier. According to a program dated Sunday, 2 April 1893, a potpourri by the \textit{Militärkapellmeister} Josef Franz Wagner made no less than forty-three musical references, including quotes from Wagner’s \textit{Rienzi} and \textit{Tannhäuser}, Gounod’s \textit{Faust}, Weber’s \textit{Oberon} and \textit{Der Freischütz}, Tchaikovsky’s \textit{Pique-Dame}, Gilbert and Sullivan’s \textit{The Mikado}, Verdi’s \textit{La Traviata}, Meyerbeer’s \textit{Les Huguenots}, Strauss’s “Blue Danube” waltz and \textit{Zigeunerbaron}, and other pieces by Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Ziehrer and Boito.\textsuperscript{5} Entitled “Musikalische Fopperei,” Wagner’s potpourri also reminds us that these pieces were generally not considered serious pieces of music. As we have seen, this cavalier attitude to musical masterworks often made potpourris targets for derision by


\textsuperscript{5} From a program reproduced in Andrea Freundsberger, “Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der österreichischen Militärmusik von 1851-1918” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Universität Wien, 1989), 205.
some of the more highbrow critics, who resented the extramusical antics that often accompanied these works.⁶

Yet while they continued to be lighthearted entertainments, not all potpourris were completely frivolous in nature. As program music began to gain in popularity, many potpourris began to incorporate programs of their own, with the narrative serving as a rationale for the ordered presentation of their musical quotations. These programs, which ranged from something as simple as “highlights from the Vienna stage” to very complex storylines, united the otherwise disparate musical selections that went into a work. Some programmatic potpourris commemorated specific events, such as Emil Kaiser’s Von Wien nach Chicago, which arranged references to over forty Austrian and American pieces into a narrative of Deutschmeister-Regimentkapelle’s trip to the 1893 Chicago Columbian Exposition for the benefit of the audience members back at home. Other potpourris had a more overtly patriotic theme, and the most prominent example of an Austro-Hungarian patriotic potpourri was Carl Michel Ziehrer’s Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten (“The Dream of an Austrian Reservist”).

*Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten*

As Kapellmeister of the Hoch- und Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle, Carl Michel Ziehrer was one of the most popular musical figures in Vienna, perhaps second only to Johann Strauss Sohn himself. At the height of their concert season, Ziehrer’s Deutschmeisterkapelle played two or more gigs a day, every day of the week – at venues

---

ranging from private balls to public ice skating at the Eislauf-Vereinsplatz – in addition to their regular concerts at the Prater. Ziehrer composed prolifically for these performances, as his catalog shows. Yet one of the most famous and successful pieces from his tenure with the Deutschmeisterkapelle was not an original work; it was a potpourri he arranged in December of 1890 based around the universal subject of a reserve soldier in the Austro-Hungarian Army dreaming of being called back to serve with his regiment.

The resulting score, titled Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten, had its premiere under Ziehrer’s direction on New Year’s Eve in 1890, at the Hotel Stalehner, which was (and is) located in suburban Hernals, the working-class 17th District of Vienna. Years later, Ziehrer himself had this to say about the genesis of his score:

With Potpourris, which I arranged from the most famous Viennese songs, I had such a success that I cultivated this genre especially for my popular concerts. Thus the [potpourri] “Wiener Lachkabinett” came into being, and in this way, too, did the idea for the “Dream of the Reservist” come to me. I also wrote and performed the textual basis for the different musical phases of the tone painting at a New Year’s Eve at Stalehner with my Deutschmeistern … As in a church, the masses listened to the performance and broke out at the patriotic spots all the more in frenetic rejoicing. And after I ended – a shower of applause, such as I have heard only rarely in my life … I played the Dream of the Reservist very often then, and it made its way through the whole world. The largest honor was given to me, however, when I was allowed to present it once – it was in the palace of Archduke Wilhelm – to His Majesty, our unforgettable Crown Prince [Franz Ferdinand] and the members of our ruling family. The kind words

---

7 The Emil Rameis Nachlass in the Kriegsarchiv of the Austrian State Archives contains some of the financial records of the Deutschmeister-Regimentkapelle, which attest to their high demand during the years around the turn of the century.

of our beloved emperor, which he addressed to me, will remain in my memory for the rest of my life.9

An instant hit, Ziehrer’s *Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten* was published soon afterwards. The score survives in several versions, including arrangements for symphony and theater orchestras, as well as a piano reduction for popular consumption.10

As was typical for the genre, the program was inscribed in the score itself along with the names of the musical works being quoted. But with each published version – and possibly even with each performance – both the program and the musical quotations were altered slightly, making it difficult to establish a “definitive” score.

All versions of the program follow the same basic plot, however, focusing on a blacksmith in a provincial Alpine town who also happens to be a reserve soldier in the Austro-Hungarian Army. As the piece begins, the Reservist, as he is identified in the scores, is finishing up his day working at the forge when encounters an interestingly

---


10 One version of the full orchestral score published in Vienna by Josef Weinberger, a copy of which, currently held in the Ziehrer Nachlass in the Music Collection of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB), has performance indications marked in Ziehrer’s own hand (catalogued as F2.Ziehrer.721. Mus; another copy of the same score is catalogued as F2.Ziehrer.720. Mus). The ÖNB also has several copies of a contemporaneous and slightly truncated piano reduction by Josef Krenn, also published by Weinberger (MS1293-4°.9 Mus) and by Gustav Lewy (F2.Ziehrer.722.Mus, MS4346-4°.55,4 Mus, and MS71146-4°.38 Mus), plus an arrangement for salon or theater orchestra by Isy Geiger, also published by Weinberger (MS18400-4°.312 Mus), and an arrangement for zither by Th. F. Schild, also published by Lewy (F2.Ziehrer.1462.Mus).
diverse cast of characters for such a rustic setting, including a band of musical Gypsies playing the Rákóczi March, an Alpine hunting party, the post coach (announced by a posthorn solo), cows in the pasture (symbolized by a Ranz des vaches-style horn call-and-response), and a peasant wedding party at a tavern complete with waltz and Ländler. Following the obligatory musical thunderstorm, the reservist returns home and falls asleep. He then dreams that he is called up by his local regiment, and finds himself boarding a train for Vienna. Upon his arrival, the Reservist hears the regimental trumpeter’s early-morning Tagwache call. Following a brief prayer service, the Reservist marches off to Imperial maneuvers, which culminate with a live-fire mock battle – accompanied by actual k.u.k. trumpet signals as well as indications for rifle shots and other sound effects. The celebrations following the battle incorporate Johann Strauss Vater’s Radetzkymarsch in what might be that piece’s first programmatic appearance symbolizing the triumph of the Austro-Hungarian Army as a whole.\textsuperscript{11}

Ziehrer’s Tongemälde is far from over at this point, however, and the battle is immediately followed by a military funeral and the playing of Haydn’s Kaiserhymne. This segues into a parade featuring Polish, Styrian, Hungarian, and Bohemian regiments, as well as the cavalry and the artillery. After the parade, the reservist goes to a Militärkapelle concert – identified specifically in some scores as a Deutschmeisterkapelle concert – and hears a program that resembles many of Ziehrer’s own, including works by Mendelssohn and Wagner, a Wienerlied by Ziehrer’s elder contemporary Johann Sioly

\textsuperscript{11} Though it embodies Altösterreich to us today, the “Radetzkymarsch” only appeared in Emil Kaiser’s contemporaneous Historische Märsche collection in its role as Regimentsmarsch of the 5th Hussars, which took Field Marshal Radetzky as its Inhaber; see Figure 10 in Chapter 4.
(1843-1911), and several compositions by Ziehrer himself.\textsuperscript{12} The frivolity of the concert is dispelled immediately when a trumpet sounds the retreat, compelling the soldiers to return to their barracks. At this moment, the Reservist is awakened back in his own home by the cries of his youngest child. It is morning already, and he returns to work at his forge, happy that everything was only a dream, yet retaining a renewed sense of patriotism.

True to the potpourri genre, the specific musical quotations Ziehrer incorporates in \textit{Der Traum} are associated with the narrative elements of the program on a one-to-one basis. Table 2 shows the forty program numbers and their associated quotations as indicated in the full orchestral score published by Josef Weinberger.\textsuperscript{13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Musical Quotation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is evening</td>
<td>Otto Nikolai, Overture from \textit{Die lustigen Weiber von Windsor}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Reservist can be heard working at the forge</td>
<td>Theodor Michaelis, “Die Schmiede im Walde”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A wandering gypsy band plays in its own style</td>
<td>Rákóczi March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{12} Compare the concert program depicted in this work to one of Ziehrer’s actual programs as reprinted in Chapter 3; notably, Mendelssohn’s “Athalia” Overture appears on both, and the large number of German pieces represented in the concert and in this potpourri generally betrays Ziehrer’s own predisposition towards pan-German cultural nationalism.

\textsuperscript{13} Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, F2.Ziehrer.721.Mus. Though undated, this score was clearly published during Ziehrer’s lifetime, and it appears to have been used by the composer himself in performances. As a result, this score contains several crossed-out sections and substituted handwritten pages – hardly surprising given both the political nature of the program and the general flexibility of Ziehrer’s popular concert milieu. Nevertheless, F2.Ziehrer.721.Mus seems to be as close to a definitive score as we have; a modern recording of \textit{Der Traum} by a military band of the Austrian Bundesheer (Militärmusik Oberösterreich/Franz Bauer, on Militärmusik Records MRCD 3622, n.d.) uses this score as its basis, adding only Mühlenberger’s popular “Mir san die Kaiserjäger” march and a Deutschmeister march by Sioly to the parade scene.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The gypsies are interrupted by a returning hunting party</td>
<td>C.M. von Weber, Entr’acte/Jägerchor from <em>Der Freischütz</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The mill wheel can be heard</td>
<td>Richard Eilenberg, “Die Mühle im Schwarzwalde”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The mail arrives</td>
<td>posthorn signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The cows return from the pastures</td>
<td>pastoral horn call and response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The evening bells can be heard from the monastery church</td>
<td>Louis Lefébure-Wély, “The Monastery Bells,” op. 54, no. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Reservist finishes his working day and briefly joins a wedding procession to the tavern</td>
<td>C. M. von Weber, peasant march from <em>Der Freischütz</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Waltz (dance in the tavern)</td>
<td>Joseph Lanner, “Die Romantiker”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. An approaching thunderstorm interrupts the celebration; it rains with thunder and lightning; everyone hurries home</td>
<td>C.M. von Weber, storm music from <em>Oberon</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. At home, the Reservist prays; everything becomes peaceful (a cuckoo clock can be heard); the Reservist begins to dream</td>
<td>Carl Reinecke, “Abendgebet”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The Reservist dreams he is called up and goes by train to Vienna</td>
<td>Ziehrer, “Vergnügungszügler-Polka”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reveille (the Reservist arrives at the barracks)</td>
<td>“Tagwache” trumpet signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Prayer</td>
<td>F.H. Himmel, hymn “Gebet während der Schlacht”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Moving out to the maneuvers</td>
<td>J.N. Kral, “Hoch Habsburg Marsch”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Maneuver scene; Battle</td>
<td>k.u.k. trumpet signals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Celebration; Remembrance of duties</td>
<td>Johann Strauss Vater, “Radetzky-Marsch”; trumpet signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Military funeral</td>
<td>G. Donizetti, funeral march from <em>Dom Sébastien</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Volkshymne</td>
<td>J. Haydn, <em>Kaiserhymne</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. March</td>
<td>Ziehrer, “Couragirt-Marsch”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Field mass and parade</td>
<td>“Messlied” hymn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Much like a modern film score, Ziehrer’s program incorporates pieces of music in both diastic and non-diastic ways. It would be somewhat absurd to assume that the Reservist was actually hammering away at his forge to the tune of a Lied by Theodor Michaelis, yet the Militärkapelle concert he attends later on is undeniably intended to be an accurate representation of the Reservist’s own aural experiences. To reinforce the diastic authenticity of this musical narrative, several pieces of functional music from the k.u.k. Arme can be found in the score – all of which would have been well-known not only to the many veterans and reservists created by the adoption of universal conscription, but anyone who had lived in an Austro-Hungarian barracks town. The
hymn for the morning prayer service that takes place before the maneuvers, entitled “Gebet wärend der Schlacht,” is one of the most famous of these functional pieces. This piece was originally a Lied setting of a text by Theodor Körner (1791-1813) composed in 1813 by the Berlin-born composer Friedrich Heinrich Himmel (1765-1814), but it had been subsequently adapted as a hymn tune that, by the end of the nineteenth century, was traditionally sung by the soldiers of the Austro-Hungarian Army prior to a battle (Figure 17).

Ziehrer’s arrangement of this hymn tune reflects the actual performance practice of his time; even in the version for symphony orchestra, the strings drop out at this point, and the hymn tune is presented by the winds and brass only, as a Militärkapelle within the

---

14 Körner’s “Gebet wärend der Schlacht” text was also set by Carl Maria von Weber (op. 41, no. 1, 1814) and Franz Schubert (D.171, 1815), among others.

15 This hymn was also known as the “Gebet vor der Schlacht” by the end of the nineteenth century, despite the fact that there is another Körner poem by the same name. Translation of the first verse: “Father, I call on you! / Roaring, the smoke of the cannons beclouds me / Sparking, the raging lightning has found me / Ruler of battles, I call on you / Father, guide me!”
orchestra. Also notable about Ziehrer’s arrangement are the bass drum hits that mark each phrase; these represent the cannon shots that punctuated this hymn when it was sung by the massed army prior to the Imperial maneuvers (Figure 18).

![Figure 18: Ziehrer, Der Traum... No. 16: “Gebet” (piano arrangement by Hans Krenn)](image)

A wide variety of official Imperial and Royal trumpet and drum signals appear in this composition, as well. The first is the *Tagwache*, or reveille, which Ziehrer presents as program no. 15, much in the same way that it was notated in Andreas Nemetz’s *Musikschule für MilitärMusik* and numerous other sources. The battle section (no. 19) incorporates the *k.u.k.* trumpet calls for *Hab’t Acht* (“attention”), *Marsch vorwärts* (“forward march”), *Feuer* (“fire”), and *Angriff mit dem Bajonett* (“attack with

---

16 This is not unusual, since by the 1890s the modern symphony orchestra wind section would have closely resembled the Austro-Hungarian *Militärkapelle* in all but number. Similarly, Gustav Mahler also frequently featured sections in his symphonies and *Orchesterlieder* where the strings drop out to leave only the winds and percussion.

17 Andreas Nemetz, *Allgemeine Musikschule für MilitärMusik* [1844], ed. Friedrich Anzenberger (Vienna: Musikverlag Johann Kliment, 2004), 65 and 102; see Figure 14, no. 14, in Chapter 4.
bayonets”), and the cavalry signal *Vergatterung* ("remembrance of duty"). The long retreat that sounds at the end of the day is the *Retraite oder Zapfenstreich* ("retreat or tattoo"), a shortened version of which also served as the retreat command in the field. It is this same trumpet call that begins Franz von Suppé’s overture to *Leichte Kavallerie*, though Ziehrer presents it in its full form, played by a plaintive solo trumpet (Figure 19).

![Figure 19: Ziehrer, Der Traum… No. 39: “Retraite” or “Zapfenstreich” (solo B-flat trumpet)](image)

18 Nemetz, *Musikschule*, 102; see also Figure 14, nos. 1, 6, and 11 respectively, in Chapter 4.
19 Nemetz, *Musikschule*, 63. This call segues directly into Ziehrer’s “Schönfeld-Marsch,” as the army marches off the maneuver field for the day.
20 Ibid., 102 and 106; see also Figure 14, no. 3, in Chapter 4. What Ziehrer presents is slightly modified from how the full-length *Zapfenstreich oder Retraite* call was given in Nemetz, but surviving recordings indicate that Ziehrer’s version matched contemporary military practice, which included the *Abblasen* call in the final measure.
21 The asterisks indicate where a cut can be made in performance, if desired.
The Polish, Styrian, Bohemian, and Hungarian marches that appear in the parade march-past are not identified by name in the score. They could be actual – if obscure – marches, but it seems more likely that they are Ziehrer’s own attempts at aping these national styles. The Hungarian regiment’s march, for example, bears more than a passing similarity to a contemporaneous “Ungarischer Marsch” by Karl Šebor, which also opens with a minor-key first strain and has a characteristically Hungarian “snap” or “tempo guisto” dotted rhythm in the second. Some versions of Ziehrer’s score – notably the 1890s piano reduction by Hans Krenn – add or substitute the actual marches of other famous regiments, such as Johann Sioly’s “Der Deutschmeister-Franzl” representing the Viennese Hoch- und Deutschmeister regiment, but this does not appear in any of the larger-ensemble scores from Ziehrer’s time. The Artillery march, however, is authentic: it is the “Prinz-Eugen-Marsch,” which can be found in Emil Kaiser’s Historische Märsche collection.\textsuperscript{22} Notably, each march is introduced by the “Manövrier-Marsch” cadence from Andreas Nemetz’s 1844 Musikschule für MilitärMusik; this is the official cadence that would have accompanied such a parade on the streets of Vienna.\textsuperscript{23}

Thanks to Ziehrer’s many surviving programs and concert announcements, we actually have a very detailed reception history for this piece. In fact, in the first three years after its premiere, Ziehrer performed Der Traum more often than any of his works, and it appeared on at least seventy programs Ziehrer conducted with the Hoch- und

\textsuperscript{22} See Figure 10 in Chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{23} See Figure 15 in Chapter 4.
Deutschmeister Regimentkapelle. Twenty-five years later, during the First World War, Ziehrer allowed a revised version of this potpourri to serve as the score to one of the first European wartime propaganda films ever produced. The silent film, also called Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten was produced by the Wiener Kunstfilm-Industrie company in 1915, and directed by the future husband-and-wife team of Jakob Fleck and Luise Kolm (later Fleck). Following the demise of the Monarchy in 1918, however, this once-popular piece left the public consciousness. Like the former Hofballkapellmeister Carl Michel Ziehrer himself, Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten was too heavily tied up with the Habsburg Dynasty and the discredited Gesamtstaat that it represented to be of any use to the new Republic of Austria. Half a century would pass before public opinion swung the other way.

* * *

25 The film is also known by the names Der Traum des österreichischen Reservisten and Der Traum des Reservisten. Sadly, however, it now appears to be lost.
27 With the wave of Habsburg nostalgia that swept Austria after the Second World War, Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten has experienced something of a renaissance, and it remains a frequently-performed work today among the Republic of Austria’s military bands and other civilian groups. At times, performances of this work are accompanied by a tableau vivant presentation of the program in lieu of the film; one such dramatized performance took place under the auspices of the Austrian Bundesheer itself, on their program “50 Jahre Militärmusik,” which took place in the Wiener Stadthalle on 3 September 2007.
The Austro-Hungarian patriotic repertoire took many forms, and it even included original works that aspired to the more highbrow expressions of late nineteenth-century European nationalism. These were the *Tongemälde*, or tone-paintings, a genre related to but distinct from the *Symphonische Dichtung* (symphonic poem) or the *Tondichtung* (tone poem), made famous by Franz Liszt and Richard Strauss, respectively. In the 1870s, Bedřich Smetana famously adopted this form for overt folk-nationalist purposes in his six-movement cycle *Má Vlast* (“My Fatherland”). Comparable large-scale original compositions honoring the Austro-Hungarian Empire itself were very rare, but one significant exemplar is known to us today: an 1898 cycle of four symphonic poems by Julius Fučík titled *Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre* (“Austria’s Glory and Honor”).

Originally composed für Militärmusik, this cycle commemorates the Gesamtstaatsidee through musical narratives and tableaux of the Habsburg Monarchy’s historic achievements. In the process, Fučík, a serving Militärkapellmeister better known for marches like “Entry of the Gladiators” and “Children of the Regiment,” blends the national musics of the empire’s constituent peoples, sometimes in surprising ways.

**Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre**

Julius Arnošt Vilém Fučík (1872-1915) was born in Prague and learned the violin from an early age. He spoke Czech fluently, and went on to study bassoon and composition at...
the Prague Conservatory – the latter under Antonín Dvořák, alongside fellow students Josef Suk and Oskar Nedbal. Fučík began his professional musical career in 1894 playing bassoon in the 49th Infantry Regimentkapelle at Krems under Josef Franz Wagner. Following a brief series of civilian engagements in theater orchestras in Prague, Zagreb, and Sisak, Fučík applied for and won the position of Militärkapellmeister with the 86th Infantry Regiment in Sarajevo in September 1897. This regiment and its band were subsequently transferred to Budapest in 1900, where Fučík spent most of the next ten years of his career, before leaving the military permanently.

Fučík’s musical catalog indicates that he frequently appropriated several national styles in his own music. Many of his works were ostensibly Czech nationalist, starting with his opus 3, a Lied entitled “When in the Dark Times of the Czech Nation” (piano and baritone, 1896). His catalog also includes a potpourri titled “Ungarn in Lied und Tanz,” op. 119 (1902) and a number of Hungarian songs that date from his time stationed in Budapest. Several Italianate compositions can be found as well, notably his marches “Il Soldato,” op. 92, and “Florentiner,” op. 214. He even composed a Kol Nidrei, op. 87 (1898). Though he was frequently tormented by poor health, Fučík’s thirteen years with the 86th Infantry Regiment proved to be his most prolific compositional period, with his

---

32 Ibid., 30.
33 See Lugitsch’s thematic catalog; ibid., 55ff.
most famous work, the march “Einzug der Gladiatoren,” op. 68, among the principal works dating from this time. It was also during his tenure with the 86th IR that Fučik undertook one of his most ambitious instrumental compositions, Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre, in honor of Kaiser Franz Joseph’s fiftieth jubilee year of 1898.

Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre is a set of four tone poems, with each one representing a specific musical image or narrative. The titles of the individual movements are, as one might expect, centered primarily on the rulers of the Habsburg dynasty, but the programs, where available, encompass the people and events of their times as well. The cycle progresses from a depiction of the coronation of Rudolf von Habsburg as German King in 1276, through a character piece representing the Empress Maria Theresia, to a dramatic retelling of the 1866 Battle of Custozza, and finally to a tableau honoring the fifty-year reign of Kaiser Franz Joseph. Fučik began his sketches for the cycle while visiting Prague during the summer of 1898, completing the first movement on 2 October, the third and fourth movements on 30 October, and the second movement on 20 December of that year.34 Such a late completion date meant that Fučik’s composition would have missed the actual Jubilee festivities, which were scheduled to culminate on 2 December, but the assassination of the Empress Elisabeth earlier that year muted those commemorations severely, and it is likely that performance opportunities for such a celebratory work would have been limited as a result.

34 A piano reduction of the score had been completed on 15 November. See Lugitsch, “Julius Fučik,” 101. See also Werner Probst, notes to Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre, performed by Militärmusik Kärnten/Sigismund Seidl (Bad Aussee: ATP Records ATP/CD-200, 1996). This CD is the first and thus far only recording of the complete modern arrangement of this work.
By missing the 2 December deadline, however, Fučík was also unable to receive official permission to dedicate the work to the Emperor, and we have no verifiable records of its performance for more than five years afterwards. The individual movements were published in 1903 by Mojmir Urbanek of Prague in separate arrangements for orchestra, wind band, and piano as Fučík’s opus 59. This publication date was, fortunately, just in time to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the 1866 Battle of Custozza, and indeed, at least the third movement was performed publically in Prague in honor of that event. Its resounding success was such that a special gold-leafed copy of that movement was presented to the Emperor’s private Fideikommissbibliothek in January 1907, and three years later, Fučík himself received an honorary membership in the Prague Society of Veterans of Custozza and Lissa. This movement would continue to be a staple of Fučík’s concerts for the remainder of his career, and even appeared on his final concert, with the Regimentkapelle of the 92nd Infantry Regiment on 26 July 1913, only two years before his death in Berlin.

35 Probst, CD notes to Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre.
36 Lugitsch, “Julius Fučík,” 101. Sources for the score include two copies of the published version of “Die Schlacht bei Custozza” are available in the ÖNB, as MS5337-4°.Mus and MS67063.Mus (the latter leather-bound with gold leaf). They include a piano score (with indications for program and instruments) as well as parts. Fučík is identified as “Kapellmeister im k. und k. Infanterieregiment No. 86” on the cover, which also advertises versions for string orchestra and for Harmoniemusik as well as for Militärmusik. The complete cycle has been edited and arranged for modern symphonic band by Armin Suppan (Vienna: Adler, 2002). The original manuscript materials to Fučík’s Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre are part of the Fučík Collection of the Czech National Museum in Prague, and were inaccessible due to cataloging at the time of writing. The Suppan edition changes the original instrumentation significantly, deleting unusual instruments like the bass flugelhorn and adding the typical instruments of a contemporary wind ensemble, such as the saxophones. Suppan also transposes the entire score up by a whole step, either to compensate for “high pitch” and/or to simplify the key for the changed transposition of the brass parts, from primarily E-flat to B-flat instruments. As this is the only complete edition currently in publication, all measure numbers in this chapter refer to the 2002 Suppan edition.
37 This information comes from Probst, CD notes to Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre. The gold-leafed Fideikommissbibliothek copy is currently held by the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek as MS67063.Mus.
Fučík’s tone poem cycle mixes influences from mainstream nineteenth-century European art music – including Dvořák, Smetana, Wagner, Brahms, and Liszt – along with idioms from various national musics and popular Italianate styles from the operetta stage. Even though it was common for Militärkapellmeister to quote well-known melodies from other composers in their own works, Fučík seems to have restrained himself in this regard; the only recognizable melodies that can be found in this cycle are Haydn’s Kaiserhymne, Strauss’s “Radetzkymarsch,” and F.H. Himmel’s hymn “Gebet vor der Schlacht,” as well as several Austro-Hungarian trumpet signals. The folk-like melodies that Fučík employs appear to have merely been inspired by actual folk music and, in the style of Brahms or Dvořák, they are Hungarian or Italian in only the most general sense. Indeed, Fučík’s task in Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre mirrored Dvořák’s American-styled works, such as his symphony “From the New World,” which mimicked the folk melodies of an alien land. Fučík, as a Czech, was something of an alien himself in the more remote corners of Hungary and the Balkans where he found himself stationed, but he was willing and able to incorporate the local musical styles into this composition all the same.  

The form of each individual movement is sectional, not unlike one of Dvořák’s or Smetana’s tone poems, and Fučík supplied occasional notes in the score to indicate what exactly was being referenced. The four movements are linked

---

musically by a pair of recurring melodies, at least one which can be found in each movement.

I. Gründung Österreichs. Rudolf von Habsburg und seine Krönung zu Aachen (1218-1291)

The first symphonic poem in the cycle describes the monumental events surrounding the coronation of Rudolf von Habsburg, the first Habsburg Duke of Austria, in 1276. It does so by giving an idealized late nineteenth-century musical impression of medieval peasant life, interspersed with the momentous events of the coronation itself. Fučík allows us to follow the program of this movement more closely through a dozen or so text labels interspersed throughout the score, giving us a better sense of what is meant to be evoked from one section to the next.

The introduction of this movement (mm. 1-32) begins in a style reminiscent of Dvořák’s or Smetana’s Czech nationalist symphonic poems, with a bombastic gesture in the brass evoking the pomp of medieval court, while the harmonized melody that follows in the woodwinds helps to situate this piece in the realm of the mythic, almost fairy-tale past (Figure 20).
This leads to the first folk-like melody, marked “Morgendämmerung, Schalmeien von Weitem” (“Break of dawn, shawms in the distance,” mm. 33-51) with the high woodwinds playing an up-tempo round dance with an accent pattern reminiscent of a mazurka (Figure 21).

Though this triple-meter dance theme may be somewhat evocative of medieval music, Fučík was no musicologist; he was less interested in presenting an authentic musical past than he was in creating a simple sense of musical “otherness” that would be enough to
transport his audience. Here, Fučík is only using folk topics, not folk music, drawing primarily on the instrumental idioms of the pastoral woodwind tradition, which would have been very familiar to Fučík’s audience by way of the opera repertoire – if not from the actual opera stage, then at the very least from the numerous opera potpourris that dominated the Militärmusik concerts at this time.

Following the “Morgendämmerung” melody’s second repetition, the first of the cycle’s two important recurring melodies is introduced (mm. 52-104). These two melodies together serve the same function as the idée fixe in Berlioz’s Symphonie Fantastique, in that at least one of them appears in each subsequent movement, albeit slightly transformed in a way appropriate to the program. The first of Fučík’s two idée fixe melodies appears initially in a section titled “Sommeranfang” (“Arrival of summer”) first in the low brass as a counterpoint to the “Morgendämmerung” melody before it is taken up by the tutti ensemble (Figure 22).

![Figure 22: Fučík, mvt. I, mm. 52-63, idée fixe 1 (horn I)](image)

This theme is recalled later in the first movement at an even more significant moment: just before the end, after the coronation and the tumult of the day. This recurrence is labeled “Vision Rudolf von Habsburgs,” and indeed this melody could be said to
represent the contemplative side of not only the founder of the Habsburg dynasty, but his descendants as well. Its subsequent appearances in the third and fourth movements also take on a similarly tranquil and reflective character, in contrast to the more bombastic music heard before or afterwards.

Following a truncated recapitulation of both the “Sommeranfang” and “Morgendämmerung” themes (mm. 91-104), a series of fanfares in the tutti trumpets announce “Der helle Tag,” or Rudolf’s impending coronation (mm. 105-132). The second *idée fixe* is introduced soon afterwards (mm. 133-185); Fučík gives us fragments of this theme first in the low woodwinds before it receives a full presentation in the low brass. The instrumentation and harmonization of this theme, with strident low brass over *staccato* woodwinds, is noticeably Wagnerian, perhaps drawing a direct parallel between Rudolf von Habsburg and Lohengrin (Figure 23).

![Figure 23: Fučík, mvt. I, mm. 164-179, idée fixe 2 (low brass)](image)

This melody returns in the codas of the second and fourth movements of the cycle, signifying the triumphs of the Habsburg dynasty, always played forcefully by the low brass. Its first full statement in this movement builds to a short, climactic fanfare (mm.

---

40The rhythm and setting Fučík uses in this theme would be recalled by a secondary theme in his later *Miramare* overture, op. 247.
186-188), which is followed immediately by a short and delicate return of the first *idée fixe* melody (see Figure 22), this time in the flutes and clarinets, drawing the coronation scene to a close (mm. 189-200).

Fučík continues his alternation of majestic and intimate melodies for the remainder of the movement, effectively creating musical bridge between Rudolf’s historic triumph and the idyllic life of his rustic subjects. Following another similar series of low fanfares (labeled “Fanfare der Herolde,” mm. 200-214) announcing the news of the coronation to the assembly of the peasants are repeated against a section of chromatic sixteenth notes representing an almost operatic tumult (“Das Volk versammelt sich,” or “The folk assembles,” mm. 215-279). The next section, marked “Pfeifer (1276)” (mm. 280-294), features an idiomatic fife melody in the piccolos and flutes (Figure 24).

![Figure 24: Fučík, mvt. I, mm. 280-294 (piccolos)](image)

This fife melody is perhaps deliberately evocative of an actual Austrian military marching tune dating from 1682 – one of the earliest surviving pieces of Habsburger Militärmusik (Figure 25).\(^\text{41}\)

\(^{41}\) Also reprinted in *Das ist Österreichs Militärmusik*, 18.
Following the piper melody, the fanfares return (mm. 295-304) to introduce a brief hymn-like section marked “Orgelspiel in der Kirche” (mm. 305-315). This light and stately triple-meter woodwind melody leads into the section labeled “Vision Rudolfs von Habsburg” (mm. 316-327), which gradually builds up into a grandioso restatement of the first idée fixe melody (Figure 22, mm. 328-342), marking a moment of satisfied reflection on the day’s events – or perhaps, given the theme’s later recurrences, a moment of prophecy for the future greatness of the Habsburg line. One last restatement of the herald’s fanfare introduces the coda (mm. 343), a triumphant march unrelated to any of the themes heard before, but incorporating two repetitions of the main rhythmic motive from the second, Wagnerian idée fixe (Figure 23, mm. 368-375) to bring the movement to its conclusion.

II. Maria Theresia (1717-1780)

The second movement is named for the Habsburg Empress who ruled Austria (and through her husband, the Holy Roman Empire) during the second half of the eighteenth century. On the surface, it is a standard Adagio movement made up of several contrasting sections, most of which are either actual dances or melodies of a dance-like
character. Unlike the other movements, however, the second movement has no captions identifying its themes or sections, but the form seems to imply a multifaceted tableau evoking the Empress herself, if not a narrative. What is most notable about the second movement is the odd mixture of influences that can be heard in its themes, which seem to be drawn from folk and popular music from around the empire – most of which having more to do with Fučik’s own time than Maria Theresia’s.

The movement begins with a delicate and perhaps – to Fučík – feminine introduction (mm. 1-36) prominently featuring the high woodwinds and triangle. The initial melody in the clarinets is taken up by the flugelhorns, before a lilting solo melody is introduced by the euphonium (mm. 18-26). Strains of this melody are taken up by the tutti ensemble, but this does not last long, as the introduction cadences abruptly and modulates from its initial D major to E minor. The principal recurring theme of the second movement is then introduced by the clarinets (mm. 36-53) and the low brass (mm. 55-70). This melody is clearly in the character of a nineteenth-century Hungarian popular song, complete with what Béla Bartók would later classify as a typically Hungarian “tempo guisto” rhythm (Figure 26).42

42 My initial assessment regarding the similarities between this melody and the Hungarian folk style, as presented in a lecture at the Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschaften on 25 May 2006, was confirmed by Wolfgang Suppan in an article published shortly afterwards; see Suppan, “Julius Fučík, Komponist.” 249.
In fact, the rhythm and melodic contour of this theme are similar to several surviving Hungarian folk songs that Fučík may have known. One such contemporary song that shows a similar rhythm and melodic contour was “Megy a kislány” (“He goes to the girl”), which was recorded by soldiers from the front lines in 1916, and has been preserved by the Phonogrammarchiv of the Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Figure 27).\footnote{This song, which translates as “He goes to the girl,” sung by a soldier in the 76\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Regiment was recorded at the Phonogrammarchiv of the Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften (today the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften) on 25 January 1916, and is catalogued in their collection as Ph 2558. It can also be found in the Phonogrammarchiv CD compilation “Soldatenlieder der k.u.k. Armee” (OEAW PHA CD 11, 2000).}
Of course, Fučík’s melody diverges from this example, but the rhythmic and contour similarities are striking. This theme recurs several times in the “Maria Theresia” movement, becoming its primary musical idea. The first repetition of this “Hungarian” melody occurs in the relative major key (mm. 71-94), in a transformation that owes something to the early nineteenth-century Imperial Army recruiting songs (the Verbunkos – the word comes from the German Werbung, or “advertising”) that were performed by gypsy bands throughout Hungary (Figure 28).
This is the style of music that composers like Liszt and Brahms came to associate with Hungary – much to Béla Bartók’s later-expressed chagrin. It should be noted that unlike subsequent nationalist composers like Bartók, the accurate representation of “authentic” folk music would not have been important to Fučík’s aesthetic. Much as with the “medieval” atmosphere of the previous movement, his goal would have been simply to evoke a Hungarian flavor recognizable to his audience. To this end, it would have been sufficient to use the genres of music most closely associated with Hungary in the public imagination – despite their relative inauthenticity. We do know that Fučík considered this snap or tempo guisto rhythmic figure to be specifically Hungarian, however, as he used a similar rhythm as the basis for the main themes of his later Hungarian march “Attila,” op. 211.

The remainder of the second movement plays out in a sectional Adagio form, with the recurring Hungarian theme interspersed with music of a gently contrasting character. Following the verbunkos transformation, a new melody of an almost Brahmsian character is introduced, which forms the basis for one of the longest episodes of the movement (mm. 95-213). This melody segues at the movement’s midpoint into a dramatic restatement of the original minor-key Hungarian theme (mm. 213-226), which is now interpolated with motives from one of the idée fixe melodies from the first movement (mm. 227-265). It is the second or “Wagnerian” theme (see Figure 23), and here it is presented in the low brass over a drum roll as a call and response against the Hungarian melody in the higher woodwinds. This immediately segues into a delicate waltz – more than a little anachronistic for the movement’s ostensible eighteenth-century program (Figure 29).
This waltz section (mm. 266-297) is followed by a transitory section that features a solo horn intoning the Wagnerian *idée fixe* once more (mm. 298-331), before segueing into the final presentation of the Hungarian theme (mm. 332-348), now in the sunny key of F major, signaling the impending coda of the movement.

On the whole, there is very little about this movement that recalls the eighteenth-century musical soundscape of the Empress Maria Theresia. On the contrary, the strong Hungarian influence along with the presence of the waltz and other contemporary turn-of-the-century characteristics seem to paint a musical picture of a very different Austrian Empress: the Empress Elizabeth, wife of the sitting Emperor Franz Joseph. “Sissi,” as she was popularly called, was well-known to be a friend to the Hungarian nobility, especially following the *Ausgleich* of 1867, and she remained extremely popular there for the rest of her life. It is certainly possible that this movement was originally conceived in honor of the Empress Elisabeth, who was tragically assassinated while Fučík’s work on this cycle was well underway. Whether the dedication was changed out of respect for the late empress, for political reasons, or simply to create a more historically-comprehensive program is impossible to determine. It should be remembered, however, that this
movement was the last to be completed, nearly two months after the other three, and was the primary reason Fučík missed the deadline for imperial recognition, suggesting some kind of last-minute reworking might have been involved.\(^{44}\)

It would be very telling indeed if Fučík simply changed the dedicatee of this movement without changing any other musical or programmatic aspects. It would imply that Fučík felt it was more important to preserve an aspect of Hungarian music in the cycle than to present an accurate evocation of the eighteenth century – or perhaps that his own conception of the Habsburg Empire was more geographical than historical. The coda of the second movement contains yet another cryptic clue to its possible origins: it features a version of the second Wagnerian *idée fixe* melody, stretched out in rhythmic augmentation (mm. 378-384). The fact that a similarly valedictory reference to Rudolf’s coronation theme will be made in the coda to the final movement, dedicated to Franz Joseph, suggests the possibility of a musical parallel between these movements that could be more of a spousal relationship than a dynastic one.

**III. Die Schlacht bei Custozza (24. Juni 1866)**

The third movement was, on its own, the most popular movement of the suite, and it is the only one for which we have a substantial reception history. This movement is a kind of *Schlachtsymphonie* depicting the Battle of Custozza, which took place in June of 1866, just nine days before the Monarchy’s crushing defeat at Königgrätz. At Custozza, an

---

\(^{44}\) Independently from my own findings, which were first presented in Vienna in May 2006, the Austrian musicologist Wolfgang Suppan echoes this assessment, noting Fučík’s use of pseudo-Hungarian melodies in place of evocations of eighteenth-century music. He concludes that, many ways, this movement is much more evocative of Fučík’s own milieu than Maria Theresia’s. See Wolfgang Suppan, “Julius Fucik, Komponist.” 241-50.
Austrian army under Archduke Albrecht, cousin to the Emperor Franz Joseph, defeated a larger Italian nationalist force fighting for King Victor Immanuel. The victory was, of course, rendered meaningless before the battle was even joined because a secret treaty had already ceded the Veneto region to the Italian Monarchy; nevertheless, it was still of great importance for Austrian Army morale in the years that followed. Custozza was, effectively, the empire’s last major victory.

When compared to other, more famous battle symphonies – such as Beethoven’s Wellingtons Sieg or Tchaikovsky’s 1812 Overture – Fučík’s Schlacht bei Custozza shows several key formal differences. The most notable of these is that, unlike Beethoven or Tchaikovsky, who used patriotic music from both sides almost equally, Fučík gives us no musical “enemy.” Short references to Italian songs are only presented twice, both early in the movement during the time leading up to the battle. Indeed, the most likely formal model for this movement seems to have been Carl Michel Ziehrer’s potpourri Der Traum eines österreichischen Reservisten. Both of these pieces incorporate authentic, functional k.u.k. Armee music – such as trumpet signals and even Himmel’s “Gebet während der Schlacht” – to represent the Austrian soldiers. And since Ziehrer’s piece described a scene from Imperial training maneuvers, there was naturally no enemy to depict.

Like the first movement, the third movement also includes notes in the score indicating specific references to a program. Moreover, this movement also features a highly detailed program note written by one of Fučík’s military contemporaries. The following text was published with the first Urbanek edition of the score to the third movement (as opus 59c), and is attributed to a Hauptmann Karl von Beauregard:
Deep, still night. The blanched moon hems the slowly-drawn clouds, which spread their shade over the heads of the sleepers in the camp: the foreboding dreams of the resting troops, whose ominous shudder floats over the dark hills in silent quakes.

The crimson goddess arises. Praise God! The morning pushes away the terrors of the oppressive night, only anticipation remains: what will today bring? Whom will the laurel grace? And whom the crimson rose?

Loud and blaring, the battle music announces the bloody day’s work. But the enemy also prepares for the brazen struggle. The “Ave Maria” sounds from Mincio; an Italian battle song follows it and then the first iron greeting booms.

Now ready! Halt! Stand quiet! Before the battle, a prayer to the Almighty; then according to the Austrian custom, a brother’s kiss for comrades-in-arms and a farewell to the distant beloved. Now forward! Do you see Custozza’s heights? The general from the Kaiser’s house points there. The thunder roars! The bullet whistles! The saber swishes! Forward! Hurrah! Victory! Triumph!45

As the program note suggests, the thirteen-minute movement is a narrative of the entire day, from the birds chirping before dawn, to the quiet activities of the Italian towns, to the Austrian soldiers’ reveille and Abmarsch. The battle itself takes up a relatively small portion of the movement, and is immediately followed by a raucous victory celebration.

After an introduction evoking the predawn stillness of nature in the low brass and woodwinds (mm. 1-55), a trumpet sounds the Tagwache or reveille signal four times in

---

echo (mm. 56-63)\footnote{See Figure 14, no. 14, in Chapter 4.} – the first of many official Imperial and Royal trumpet signals that will be featured in Fučík’s score. The music gradually picks up the pace in an onomatopoetic imitation of the soldiers’ stirring at the first call and the rays of dawn (mm. 64-94), and the score informs us that another “helle Tag” is breaking for the Monarchy, though of a very different kind (mm. 95-106). This is immediately followed by the first reference to the Italians, labeled in the score as “morning prayers” emanating from a nearby Italian town identified in the program note as Mincio. It is a simple melody that unfolds following the musical and programmatic daybreak (mm. 107-122).

This is tranquil scene is interrupted by the mobilization of the Habsburg troops. The initial advance of the Austrian army is signaled by the trumpet’s call of Hab’t acht and Vorwärts,\footnote{See Figure 14, no. 1, in Chapter 4} accompanied by a march of Fučík’s own composition (mm. 124-149, Figure 30).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fucek_mvt_iii}
\caption{Fučík, mvt. III, mm. 129-136 (horns, bass flugelhorn, euphonium)}
\end{figure}
Though this march does not seem to be a direct quotation, it might owe something to the trio from Karl Komzák Junior’s famous 1888 “Erzherzog-Albrecht-Marsch,” one of the most recent works to be included in Emil Kaiser’s 1895 Historische Märsche collection – a particularly appropriate connection, considering Komzák’s march is dedicated to the Habsburg field marshal who won the day at Custozza (Figure 31).

![Figure 31: Komzák jun., “Erzherzog-Albrecht-Marsch,” Trio (flugelhorns, low brass)](image)

The next musical cue is the second and final depiction of the Italians in the score; in this case, an “italienisches Lied” that can be heard from afar (mm. 150-164). This cue juxtaposes a simple flute melody against yet another Austrian army strum pet signal, one that Fučík later re-used in one of his Austrian marches, titled “österreichisch-ungarische Soldatenklänge.” This musical ambivalence towards the Italians may seem strange to us, but it reflects the contemporary political situation: Custozza was, after all, still Habsburg territory. Just as in Fučík’s time, there were Italians fighting on both sides, and they formed an important contingent in Archduke Albrecht’s army. So the battle was not
necessarily “against” the Italians as much as it was “for” the Italians – for their hearts and minds, as we would say – and against Italian nationalism.

Following a series of short trumpet and drum signals (mm. 165-176), the final build-up to the battle begins with a section labeled “Gebet vor der Schlacht” (mm. 177-191). This section features a full-verse quotation of Friedrich Heinrich Himmel’s hymn tune (see Figure 17) in a setting not unlike Ziehrer’s quotation of the same hymn – right down to the simulated cannon shots (see Figure 18). This hymn is followed by a short, lyrical euphonium solo titled “Letzte Grüße an die Heimat” (mm. 191-207), expressing the soldiers’ nostalgic thoughts for home in the face of peril.

The musical battle scene resembles imperial training maneuvers – something Fučik would have known well – more than the actual Battle of Custozza itself. The start of battle is marked by another trumpet call – specifically, an urgent Generalmarsch (mm. 208-225). The cacophony of battle begins as a four-part fugal exposition, with a simple subject counterpointed each time against the Schnellschritt (“quick-time march”) call in the trumpets (Figure 32).

Figure 32: Fučik, mvt. III, mm. 226-229 (clarinet I, trumpet I)

48 Also called the “advance the line” command; see Figure 14, no. 15, in Chapter 4.
As this section unfolds (mm. 226-275), addition episodic material and trumpet calls can be heard, including the Laufschritt (“double-time”) and Schiessen (“fire”) commands.\textsuperscript{49} The fugal opening is not continued past its initial statement, however, and this section reaches the level of high melodrama very quickly. True to the imperial doctrine of the prewar era, Fučík’s battle culminates with a dashing cavalry charge, and the call of Reiterei Feueralarm (“riders commence firing”)\textsuperscript{50} heralds the arrival of a climactic musical section labeled “Calvarie rückt an” (mm. 276-306). Soon the tension of battle begins to mount through the repetition of a pounding three eighth-note motive, which eventually takes over the tutti ensemble (mm. 299-306).

Fučík finally breaks this tension and makes the victor of the Battle of Custozza apparent to all by resolving the eighth-note motive into the ebullient and rhythmically-similar first strain of the familiar “Radetzkymarsch,”\textsuperscript{51} here in a section marked “Victoria!” (mm. 307-350). Just as in Ziehrer’s potpourri, we are not treated to the full march, only a complete first strain, after which the music begins to transition through the second strain from E-flat major to C major (mm. 331-350) for an Andante religioso statement of the first, reflective idée fixe melody (see Figure 22 above; mm. 350-378) before a much more pompous and celebratory coda. The first idée fixe is set here in a manner similar to its appearance following the climactic events of the first movement,

\textsuperscript{49} See Figure 14, nos. 11 and 6, respectively, in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{50} Compare to Figure 14, no. 9, in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{51} If the “Radetzkymarsch” itself is not triumphant enough for the occasion, the score gives a few more cues for alternative performance indications, including one suggesting that for “monster performances,” it might be possible to add rifle and canon shots to the battle and Radetzkymarsch sections. According to a footnote in the score published by Urbanek, “Bei Monstre-Aufführungen wo sowohl Gewehr- als auch Kanonenfeuer gegeben wird, kann der Radetzky-Marsch ganz bis zur Wiederholung des Trio (transpon. in Des) gespielt werden; und zwar vom * bis * dann die Komposition weiter.” There is no specific evidence that this cycle or this movement was ever performed at such a “monster” concert, however.
where it sounded a note of reflection at the end of the day. Here what is to be reflected upon is grave, by comparison: the Austrians lost some 960 killed and 4,600 wounded or captured out of a contingent of 60,000 men, while the Italian nationalists suffered more than 8,100 casualties from their army of about 120,000. Yet this battle would be regarded as an important vindication of the Austrian and Austro-Hungarian Army for decades to come. While the Battle of Custozza proved to be a positive boon for the soldiers’ morale, the army itself became, in a way, a prisoner of its own success, as memories of the victorious battle hindered the necessary development of new military tactics and technologies. Certainly Fučík’s contribution to the legend of Custozza helped to keep its memory alive in the public imagination right up until the disasters of the Eastern Front campaigns of 1914-15, when the Austrians’ fairy tales of pluck and dash were shattered by the harsh reality of twentieth century warfare.

IV. Jubiläum Seiner Majestät Kaiser Franz Joseph I. (1848-1898)
The fourth and final movement commemorates the fifty-year reign of the Emperor Franz Joseph, who as we have seen was considered by many of his subjects to be the primary source of stability in the Monarchy. Like the second movement, this movement is intended to be a musical tableau of the Kaiser and his attributes, and it is cast in a similarly sectional form with a few significant returning melodies. Also like the second movement, the fourth movement has very few specific programmatic indications beyond the title, with only two labels in the score to guide the listener.

The movement begins with a turbulent Allegro vivace labeled “1848: Bewegte Zeiten.” “Agitated times” may seem to us to be a rather flippant way to dismiss the
revolutions that nearly destroyed the Austrian Empire and brought the eighteen-year-old Franz Joseph to the throne to replace his uncle, the weak Emperor Ferdinand. But when one considers that the source of these revolutions was tied into the nascent nationalist movements that continued to threaten the Monarchy even fifty years later, Fučík’s politically-correct discretion here is understandable. Starting off with a cymbal crash, the minor-key music for this section (mm. 1-48) conveys the sense of *in medias res* that the young emperor might have felt upon finding himself thrust into the spotlight in the middle of such a national calamity.

The turbulence subsides briefly (mm. 48-64) for a contrasting dotted-rhythm Allegretto melody that prefigures a “hunting” motive that we will hear later, only to return to the Tempo I, now in the key of C major (mm. 65-91). This will be the last time we hear the “bewegte” music in this piece, and it transitions to a much calmer section in a moderate sextuple time (92-120). This section, too, is only a transition to what will be the primary theme of this movement: an E-major melody in sextuple meter with a vaguely Alpine or perhaps Italianate character, initially played by the solo trumpet, before being taken up by the *tutti* ensemble (mm. 121-180, Figure 33).

![Figure 33: Fučík, mvt. IV, mm. 121-131 (*tutti* winds and brass)](image-url)
This versatile melody recurs several times in this movement in both a simple, lyrical setting as well as a grandioso, celebratory one. Its first statement is halted by a complete change of texture, this time to a gentle cut-time melody that emerges in the solo high E-flat clarinet (mm. 180-204). A stormy triplet section transitions back from duple to triple meter (mm. 205-239), leading directly into another statement of the “Alpine” theme in six, once again in the key of E major.

At this point, about two-thirds of the way through this movement, the mood changes once again to a “Jagdfantasie” – the second programmatic cue in the score – drawing heavily on the rhythmic and instrumental topics of the hunt in honor of the Kaiser’s favorite pastime (mm. 298-356). This music does not sustain any kind of momentum, however, as it quickly returns to the stately “Alpine” theme (mm. 356-363) and ultimately transitions to a nine-beat meter to make another reference to the first triple-time *idée fixe* melody (see Figure 22, here mm. 364-384) in the same texture.

A fermata brings the character tableau to a close and marks the beginning of the explicitly patriotic section of this movement. The climax of this movement – and the finale of the entire cycle – naturally incorporates Josef Haydn’s *Kaiserhymne*, which is introduced gradually, one motive at a time (mm. 385-389). Fučík then takes that initial five-note motive and repeats and transforms it, crescendoing and accelerating throughout (mm. 390-414) until he allows the last full phrase of the “Gott Erhalte” to break through in a setting that is unlikely to be confused with “Deutschland über Alles.” The final repetition of that last four-bar phrase of the hymn leads immediately into a coda (mm. 422 ff) that contains the final restatement of the second, Wagnerian *idée fixe* from the first movement (see Figure 23), bringing the movement to its completion and the listener
through a 600 year odyssey of Austrian history right up to Fučík’s own time. The effect of this is striking: instrumental music may not be able to convey specific ideas on its own, but one thing it can do quite well is link ideas together, juxtaposing them in a subconscious way that spoken language often cannot. In this case, Fučík is making it abundantly clear that Rudolf von Habsburg’s prescient vision of a multinational Austrian Empire has come to fruition in the person of Franz Joseph.

In this remarkable four-movement cycle, Fučík combines Czech, Hungarian, and Italian folk-nationalist references along with influences from Germanic art music and quotations from the functional Austro-Hungarian Army repertoire into a programmatic presentation on the history and vitality of the Habsburg regime itself. **Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre** was a multinational and multiethnic musical-stylistic collage that was only made possible by the confluence of proto-modernist aesthetics and the unique historical situation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This was the result not of its composer’s political ideology, however, but of his everyday musical experience as a subject of the multinational empire. As the historian Malachi Hacohen observed, “Central European multiculturalism was less a product of cosmopolitan pursuit of international dialogue and more result of cross-cultural exchanges, generating both cosmopolitan and nationalist discourses.”

Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre was itself the product of these kinds of exchanges.

Fučík could not have written Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre without first being a Czech nationalist, and the nationally-tolerant k.u.k. Armee allowed him to retain and even

---

develop his Czech identity in a way that even composers working in major cities like Vienna often could not. This is likely one important reason why so many Bohemians became Militärkapellmeister: they could be Czech nationalists and still compose for a living as long as they acknowledged the Czech peoples’ role within the multinational monarchy. And this is something that Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre does well: it merges accepted – if not stereotypical – national musical topics into a single expression of Austrianness.

In a way, the success of Fučík’s multinational inclusiveness can be confirmed by the cycle’s scant reception history – and the fact that Fučík created a work that had no home for many years after the breakup of the old Habsburg Empire. Just as with the collections of Austro-Hungarian marches, this was a piece of patriotic music without a fatherland, an unwelcome reminder of a long gone fairy-tale kingdom in the years following the First World War. Though it was written by a Czech, it was not a “Czech” work; though its title referenced Austria, it did not restrain itself to the modern German-Austrian republic. The piece represented a concept much greater than all of those nations – though a concept that had subsequently ceased to exist. To paraphrase Nietzsche, by way of Adorno, Fučík’s nationally-inclusive cycle Österreichs Ruhm und Ehre had become “music for all and none.” Its value could never be properly measured as long as the limiting ideologies of ethnonationalism held sway.

Far from a stylistic dead end, however, the kind of musical multinationalism practiced by Militärkapellmeister like Ziehrer and Fučík had influence well beyond the

---

realm of patriotic music. Their eclectic admixture of Austro-Hungarian musics was not limited to Militärmusik alone; it also extended into their operettas and other popular compositions, and even had a significant impact on the course of musical modernism itself. As the ethnomusicologist Philip Bohlman noted, “By the turn of the century, ethnic musics had found their way into many parts of the Austrian and Hungarian music traditions, so much so that any concept of Austrian music in the twentieth century must account for the presence of ethnic difference. From operetta to the avant garde, Austrian composers sought space for the sounds of national others, which in turn unleashed the virtually unchecked stylistic variation that we now call musical modernism.”

Although the empire had been lost, the ideal of national coexistence that guided it in its latter years has not been completely extinguished. Shades of the multinationalist Austrian idea can be seen in the internationalizing movements in the arts that emerged in response to the world wars, particularly in the new international music symposia at Darmstadt and elsewhere. It is the spiritual predecessor of the multicultural ideology of our own time, which strives to respect and maintain the integrity of each culture for the good of all. Finally, this idea has its ultimate manifestation in the modern European Union, whose motto “united in diversity” bears more than a passing resemblance to Franz Joseph’s Viribus Unitis. As a musical genre that fostered unity without homogenizing difference, the Militärmusik from the Austro-Hungarian Empire still bears considerable relevance today.

Conclusion: Unser Österreich

Suddenly [Diotima] came out with the pronouncement that the True Austria was the whole world. The world, she explained, would find no peace until its nations learned to live together on a higher plane, like the Austrian peoples in their Fatherland. A Greater Austria, a Global Austria – that was the idea [Count Leinsdorf] had inspired in her at this happy moment – the crowning idea that the Parallel Campaign had been missing all along!

Robert Musil, The Man without Qualities

When Ferdinand Preis composed his march version of “O du mein Österreich” in 1852, the Habsburg Empire was only beginning to pick up the pieces from the 1848 revolutions and reassert itself under the firm guidance of the young Kaiser Franz Joseph. Internal troubles resurfaced soon enough, however, and within two decades, “Austria” had ceased to exist on any map – replaced by the amorphous concept of the “Imperial and Royal Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary.” Yet even then, Preis’s and von Suppé’s little tune refused to go away. In fact, it became more popular than ever in the decades leading up to the First World War, as evidenced by its inclusion in the War Ministry’s official collection of marches some forty years after its composition. Though it seems extraordinary to us now, the climate of political and national confusion that marked the era of the Dual Monarchy actually managed to foster a golden age of military music

within the *k.u.k. Armee*. During the turbulent years around the turn of the twentieth century, when Habsburg rule was threatened by nationalist movements in every quarter of the empire, its common subjects were, by and large, marching in step with the Imperial and Royal military bands.

“O du mein Österreich” was the product of two men born at opposite ends of a vast and multi-ethnic empire, in areas that were beginning to attain national consciousness and would ultimately become parts of other nation-states after the First World War. But rather than a lament for an empire that came to be called a “prison of nations,” “O du mein Österreich” was an expression of self-identification with an institution that was much larger than any one nation, created spontaneously and without any official imperial direction. The story of *Militärkapellmeister* Julius Fučík is equally improbable: a Czech nationalist composer – literally from the Dvořák school – writing music that incorporated German, Italian, and Hungarian styles in support of a program glorifying the House of Habsburg and its multinational empire. According to the traditional paradigm of the decline and fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the face of rampant ethnonationalism, none of this should have happened. Yet this evidence shows us that the multinational Habsburg Empire was the only place within all of Central and Eastern Europe that such cross-cultural exchanges could have taken place on a regular basis. The same environment that produced a bitter strain of divisive ethnonationalism also nurtured its opposite; Julius Fučík was as much a product of the Dual Monarchy as Georg von Schönerer and Karl Lueger.

While Austria-Hungary may not have had a single official state culture or a cosmopolitan outlook emanating from the top down, it did create the conditions for a
multinational culture – or cultures – to emerge through the normal daily interactions of its subjects. Rather than an active project that broke down national distinctions and melded its subjects into a single culture according to specific philosophical guidelines – something so many historians have struggled in vain to find – the old Austro-Hungarian Empire was actually a viable framework for the peoples of many nations to coexist side by side without necessarily abandoning or degrading their nationalist distinctions. The Austro-Hungarian Joint Army was not only the most visible pillar supporting the House of Habsburg; it was also the source – and the testing laboratory – for many of the ideas of national tolerance that kept the Monarchy relatively harmonious. As the “school for the nation,” its veterans took these ideas with them when they returned to their own villages and towns after their service.

The Army’s nationally-diverse regimental bands and their repertoire of marches and patriotic compositions were the direct result of this mixture of cultures. The military bands of the Austro-Hungarian Army put multinationalism on display throughout the empire, from the frontiers to the imperial capital, through their many public concerts. This process benefitted from the Monarchy’s arcane and paranoid practice of stationing regiments far from their national homelands – which, as we have observed, unintentionally created opportunities for cross-cultural exchanges that were unparalleled in Europe. Thus the residents of a Galician barracks town regularly turned out on a Sunday afternoon to hear a band comprised of Czechs, Germans, Poles, and Italians playing music that paid tribute to both the empire itself as well as their own local Galician culture. Habsburg subjects in Trieste, Budapest, Iglau, or Vienna heard the same. This kind of transnational interaction distinguished Austria-Hungary from the
colonialist powers; it would have been tantamount to the British Empire regularly stationing Indian sepoy regiments – and their musicians – in London. Instead of a sharp distinction between metropole and periphery, the Austro-Hungarian Empire had in its Militärkapelle an institution that smoothed these cultural differences – at least within the realm of music – by blending supranational and local styles along with highbrow and lowbrow genres. Given the regularity and relative uniformity of Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik throughout the empire, this concert experience was the closest thing Austria-Hungary had to a single state culture at the turn of the twentieth century. It was a ritual shared by virtually all the people of the Monarchy, regardless of nation or class.

As a shared ritual, the nearest analogy to these military concerts that we in the United States would understand today might be television. The uniformity of television programs across what is otherwise a large and diverse country creates a normalizing influence that cuts across political, cultural, religious, and class lines. Divided as the United States is by political ideology into red and blue states, into various different ethnic and religious groups, and speaking multiple languages (with English serving as a language of convenience), television has become the most prominent locus of a united American culture. It is the only form of culture that is accessible to all Americans, regardless of class or cultural outlook – and as a result, it is the only single cultural experience that all Americans are able to share.

At the dawn of the modern age of mass politics, the closest Austro-Hungarian equivalent to television was not to be found in the concert hall, opera house, or dramatic theater. None of the bourgeois or aristocratic entertainments of the day could reach a similar mass audience. Instead, only the free public concerts of the Imperial and Royal
Army bands had the same kind of mass appeal, ease of access, and programmatic uniformity. These concerts were, as Eduard Hanslick observed, a truly democratic art form, free and available to all who had the time to stop and listen. Each band performed a similar repertoire wearing uniforms and using mass-produced instruments that varied little from one group to the next. The Empire’s policy of moving their regiments from garrison to garrison only served to highlight this uniformity, as a barracks town in the Balkans might have seen a band whose musicians were drawn predominately from Graz one year and from Prague the next. This unique combination of musical and cultural continuity meant that these concerts were a powerful tool for homogenizing Austro-Hungarian culture, and despite the fact that they took place with very little direct Imperial guidance, they nonetheless achieved notable results. One wonders what Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik might have accomplished as part of a broader cultural program coordinated at the highest levels.

The effectiveness and uniformity of the multinational framework reflected within the Militärmusik of Austria-Hungary can be observed in the surprising patriotic outpouring following the assassination of Franz Ferdinand in 1914. In the immediate aftermath, Austrians from all walks of life rushed to enlist at the declaration of war, and retention rates among the reservists recalled to active duty were exceptionally high – especially in the far-flung crownlands. People of all ethnicities and political affiliations put their differences aside, if only for a moment, and supported the Monarchy and its House unequivocally when confronted with a major crisis. In the words of one historian, “The war brought with it a surge of pride in being a subject of the multi-national empire, and all its nations, as well as all classes, professions and creeds initially shared in the
feelings.”

These men of many different nations flocked to their Imperial regiments and set out for the Eastern Front in the fall of 1914 as one unified body, marching off to their ultimate fate to the music of their regimental band, playing the “Radetzkymarsch,” or “Hoch Habsburg!,” or perhaps “O du mein Österreich.”

To these soldiers in 1914, it was their Austria, regardless of whether they were Germans, Hungarians, or Slavs. Franz Joseph was their emperor – or, simultaneously, their king and their archduke – and people from all over the empire were prepared to sacrifice and if necessary even die for him. Initial support for the war was so widespread in 1914 that “serious anti-military propaganda had no real effects in the Habsburg Monarchy until the Russian Revolution,” according to Norman Stone, who also noted that “the nationality agitation that had distinguished Austro-Hungarian politics before 1914 vanished almost completely in 1914, and most of the nationalities gave no cause for complaint.”

The simple fact that the Monarchy remained intact through many years of military setbacks and economic hardships attests to the strength of these bonds. Though the Habsburg Serbs – and later the Italians – were naturally more prone to show divided loyalties than the other national groups, the difficulties of the war were by and large felt by all the nationalities the same, and the levels of disaffection were equal across the board. Despite the Monarchy’s checkered history of nationalist squabbles and unrest,

---

4 As the military historian John Keegan notes, “Of the nine language groups of the army, of which 44 per cent were Slav (Czech, Slovak, Croatian, Serb, Slovene, Ruthenian, Polish, and Bosnian Muslim), 28 per cent German, 18 per cent Hungarian, 8 per cent Romanian and 2 per cent Italian, the Germans were always dependable, if some were never wholly enthusiastic; the Hungarians, non-Slavs and privileged co-equals, remained reliable until defeat stared them in the face at the end; the Catholic Croats had a long record of loyalty to the empire, which many of them maintained; the Poles, hating the Russians, distrusting the
the constituent nations of the Habsburg Empire held together in the face of adversity longer than anyone would have imagined. And the k.u.k. Armee itself held together even longer still: more than a week after the abdication of the Emperor Karl in the early morning hours of 12 November 1918, an army group in the Dalmatian town of Cattaro (today Kotor, in Montenegro) still flew the Imperial standard, waiting in vain for demobilization orders that never came. Though the destructive war had been mismanaged badly by the Austrian High Command, and the Army had lost over one million men – nearly one-eighth of Austria-Hungary’s total mobilization – the career soldiers had not lost faith in their multinational institution. Besides, where could men without nations go in a newly-nationalized world?

This ultimate dissolution of the Monarchy into independent nations following World War I led directly to many of the revisions that continue to plague the historiography of Austria-Hungary, as the new successor states created their own narratives of triumph over Habsburg oppression to justify their existence. Even in the Republic of Austria, memories of the old Monarchy were the first casualty of the peace: the nobility was forced to abandon all titles (including the honorific “von” from their names – a step Germany never took), and the Habsburg family was permanently exiled.

Germans, and enjoying the large electoral and social privileges under the Habsburgs, were Kaisertreu; the Bosnian Muslims, sequestered in special, semi-sepoy regiments, were dependable; the Italians and the rest of the Slavs, particularly the Czechs and Serbs, lost the enthusiasm of mobilisation quickly. Once war ceased to be a brief adventure, the army became for them “a prison of the nations,” with the ubiquitous German superiors acting as gaolers.” John Keegan, *The First World War* (New York: A. Knopf, 1999), 155-6.

5 This story is related in Gunther Rothenberg, *The Army of Francis Joseph* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1976), 219.

6 This theme of Austro-Hungarian soldiers now stateless after the dissolution of the monarchy was the subject of the Viennese playwright Franz Theodor Csokor’s 1936 drama *3. November 1918*. Characteristically, the regimental colonel in the play, who had only known the Army culture his entire life, elects to shoot himself rather than attempt to assimilate into the new post-imperial reality.
Austria became a nearly homogenous German state, both in the present and retroactively. So Germanized were the newly-minted Austrians that support for unification with Germany – prohibited outright by the Treaties of Versailles and Saint-Germain – soared over 90% in the first years after the war.\(^7\)

Thus the desire to see the history of Austria through entirely Germanic lenses is a strong one. But especially after the Second World War, there emerged an even stronger desire to define Austria apart from Germany. The ancient stereotypical distinctions between southern and northern Germans took on an entirely new meaning in the aftermath of the world’s greatest catastrophe, as the Austrians attempted to distance themselves from the horrors of both a war of aggression and a horrific genocide that was carried out with cold German efficiency. The wave of Habsburg nostalgia films that were produced in Austria in the years following the war revisited the Monarchiezeit with a fondness that would have been unthinkable in the interwar period. But these films hardly represented the unflinching gaze of history; instead, they typically strove to present the Austrian people as good-natured and harmless – something for which the character actor Hans Moser was especially renowned during this time. Postwar films like the historical comedy Die Deutschmeister (dir. Ernst Marischka, 1955), which gave a fictionalized account of the genesis of Corporal Willy Jurek’s famous “Deutschmeister Regimentsmarsch,” portrayed the old Austro-Hungarian Army as something lighthearted, musical, and fun – in other words, everything the Nazi Wehrmacht was not. The occupation satire 1. April 2000 (dir. Wolfgang Liebeneiner, 1955) glossed over the

entirety of Austrian history – Crusades and all – to depict the postwar Austrians as a pleasant, fun-loving, and above all musical people who were hardly a threat to any other country. The climax of that film featured a specially-composed march that the entire population of Austria sang in unison to prove to the tribunal of the futuristic Global Union just how un-warlike they were. The lyrics to the march that was supposed to bring about the end of what was portrayed as fifty-five years of allied occupation began with Hans Moser asking, innocuously, “The sun shines the same on everyone / why not also on Austria?”

By this time, the public image of indigenous Austrian music as “lively” and “playfully cheerful” versus the more serious German music was taken as axiomatic, and despite the inherent subjectivity of such a statement, it became emblematic of the level of discourse on popular and military music from the Monarchiezeit. As several Austrian marches are in fact based on polka rhythms – and certainly the famous “Radetzkymarsch” could be considered as much a polka as a march – this stereotypical assessment of Austrian marches as light and frothy carries some ring of truth. When combined with the many surviving memoirs and personal accounts describing the old k.u.k. Armee in lovingly nostalgic terms, the image of the harmless Empire and its well-dressed army became virtually indelible. This in turn feeds into the attitude of modern Austrians towards nationalism itself, which, even before the Second World War, has been regarded with a high degree of scorn and suspicion.

8 “Die Sonne scheint auf alle gleich / warum nicht auch auf Österreich?” The music to this march was by score composer Alois Melichar (1896-1976).
9 See Andrea Freundsberger’s comparison of German and Austrian marches in Freundsberger, “Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der österreichischen Militärmusik von 1851-1918” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Universität Wien, 1989), 177ff., quoted in Chapter 4, above.
Yet this essentialization of both cultural and music history only succeeds in isolating the past even further from us. It is not its cheerfulness that made Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik unique; in reality, a large number of nineteenth-century marches from all countries could well be considered bright and lively by our standards – including many Prussian marches. What made Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik special was its diversity: rather than glorifying one nation, it honored several at the same time, often blending them together in ways that were both novel and banal. Like the Army it represented, this music spoke eleven languages or more; it was the unplanned and even unintended product of the mixture of those languages and cultures. This was music that was as diverse and at the same time as pragmatically harmonious the Monarchy itself.

For this reason, I feel that the Militärmusik of the Austro-Hungarian Empire should not be so readily associated with the contemporary Austrian nation-state, nor with any of its breakaway nations. Modern Austria inherited the Monarchy’s name but not its multinational disposition. Ferdinand Preis’s “O du mein Österreich” may feature prominently in parades marking the modern Republic of Austria’s national holiday, but this state is far removed from the “Austria” that Franz von Suppé had in mind when he composed the original tune. Suppé’s Austria was a larger concept, which still has much to teach the modern world about the nature of nationalism and its antitheses.

This idea of a multinational empire encapsulated within a single musical repertoire goes a long way towards explaining why someone as cosmopolitan as Gustav Mahler felt so drawn to the Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik. The Militärkapellmeister of the old Monarchy were a diverse group, with biographies that equaled Mahler’s own, and the music they created transcended the traditional limitations of musical
ethnonationalism. Because of this, the apparent paradox of imperial militarism and national harmony would have seemed perfectly normal to an Austrian from Mahler’s time, especially given the fact that it was in the old k.u.k. Armee, more than anywhere else, that the nations of the empire were able to put aside their differences and get along with one another. The national inclusivity of Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik opens up new hermeneutic paradigms for Mahler’s military-inspired works, especially his challenging Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Symphonies. The sudden appearance of a drum cadence, a trumpet fanfare, or a bass flugelhorn solo in these universalist symphonies seems less of an ironic contradiction given Mahler’s own political and historical context. If “the world was Mahler’s symphony,” as the musicologist Donald Mitchell asserted, then this world would have been a Global Austria, in Musil’s sense.

The multinational hybridity of Austrian Militärmusik – which was only rarely officially acknowledged or defined – was ultimately only the practical outcome of a kind of political détente in which each of the nations of the empire were considered equal only to the extent that no one could amass power tantamount to the emperor himself. Yet this multinationalist ideal also reflected the makeup of the empire in a realistic way – something that many of the ethnic nationalist movements were often incapable of recognizing. To be Austrian during the last decades of the monarchy was to be of mixed ancestry, a situation brought about by the historical and geographical situation of the Habsburg Empire at an ethnically diverse crossroads in Central and Eastern Europe. Because of their various political marriages, the ancient aristocracy had never been

---

“racially pure,” thus making them the special object of scorn for the ethnonationalists. And with the increased internal migration brought about by industrialization, very few among the non-noble classes could claim any kind of ethnic or cultural purity themselves. The nationalists may have wanted to isolate Czechs from Germans and Slovenes from Hungarians, but the real Austrian was a mélange of all these, and more.

As Robert Musil said through his naively optimistic interlocutor the Countess Diotima, “the True Austria was the whole world.” If the nations of the Habsburg Monarchy could coexist in relative peace, then perhaps there is hope for all of us. In our own turbulent yet increasingly interconnected world, the multinational project of the Austro-Hungarian Militärkapellmeister remains an example worth studying, and given the European Union’s project of culturally integrating a political bloc that speaks twenty-three different languages and counting, it would do well to take note of Austria-Hungary’s successes and failures. The empire’s primary failure was a military one: the destructive course it embarked upon after the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sofia was the direct result of the medieval attitudes professed by the Monarchy’s ancient aristocracy, who only saw an affront to honor that called out for vengeance. But in contrast to this destruction, one of the Monarchy’s great successes was also military in origin: of all the arts, it was only within the sphere of Militärmusik that Austria-Hungary was able to see its disparate nationalist identities integrated consistently and successfully. The music of the Regimentkapelle was the music of all the Monarchy’s subjects; it spoke all of their languages at once, yet in its own unique voice. It took elements of the musical past of many nations to create a future uniting them all. During the Monarchy’s last years, Austro-Hungarian Militärmusik served as a balm, soothing
differences between peoples and cultures and allowing the medieval Habsburg Empire to persist through the rise of nationalism, right up to the First World War – a crucible that no multinational empire could have survived.
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