

Spring 5-2012

Sigmund Freud, Arthur Schnitzler, and the Birth of Psychological Man

Jeffrey Erik Berry

Bates College, jeffberry3@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scarab.bates.edu/honorsthesis>

Recommended Citation

Berry, Jeffrey Erik, "Sigmund Freud, Arthur Schnitzler, and the Birth of Psychological Man" (2012). *Honors Theses*. 10.
<http://scarab.bates.edu/honorsthesis/10>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Capstone Projects at SCARAB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of SCARAB. For more information, please contact cbell@bates.edu.

Sigmund Freud, Arthur Schnitzler, and the Birth of Psychological Man

An Honors Thesis

Presented to
The Faculty of the Departments of History and of German & Russian Studies

Bates College

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts

By

Jeffrey Berry

Lewiston, Maine
23 March 2012

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis advisors, Professor Craig Decker from the Department of German and Russian Studies and Professor Jason Thompson of the History Department, for their patience, guidance and expertise during this extensive and rewarding process.

I also would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to the people who will be participating in my defense, Professor John Cole of the Bates College History Department, Profesor Raluca Cernahoschi of the Bates College German Department, and Dr. Richard Blanke from the University of Maine at Orno History Department, for their involvement during the culminating moment of my thesis experience.

Finally, I would like to thank all the other people who were indirectly involved during my research process for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	4
2. The Jews of Vienna.....	11
3. Doctor Freud, Doctor Schnitzler	26
4. Viennese Antisemitism.....	40
5. The French Connection.....	66
6. The Birth of Psychological Man	79
7. Conclusion	100
8. Bibliography	104

1. Introduction

The *Wiener Moderne*—Vienna 1900—is a time and place unique in its contributions to modern thought. The capital of the Austro-Hungarian Empire oversaw major developments in philosophy, economics, music, art, architecture, literature, and psychology. It simultaneously witnessed political collapse, culminating in the dissolution of the empire at the conclusion of the First World War, perhaps lending credence to Nietzsche’s claim, “All great periods of culture are periods of political decline: what is great from the standpoint of culture was always unpolitical – even anti-political.”¹ Yet turn-of-the-century Vienna was not always recognized as a great age of culture; in fact, it was often seen in contrary terms. Hermann Broch first deemed Vienna 1900 as the birthplace of modernity in the late 1940s, referring to it as the site of “the gay apocalypse.”² A few other historians maintained the significance of the Habsburg capital, but it was not until the American historian Carl E. Schorske began publishing articles about fin-de-siècle Vienna in the 1960s that the city gained its status as the center of modern culture.³ Using logic reminiscent of Nietzsche’s, Schorske argues that the failure of bourgeois liberalism in late-nineteenth-century Austria caused the upper and middle classes to seek assimilation into the aristocracy. The main channel for this mobility was the arts, which eventually became an “escape, a refuge from the unpleasant world of increasingly threatening political reality.”⁴ Artists and scholars

¹ Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Twilight of the Idols with The Antichrist and Ecce Homo*, trans. by Anthony M. Ludovici (London: Wordsworth Editions, 2007), 43-44.

² Hermann Broch, *Hugo von Hofmannsthal and His Time: the European Imagination 1800-1920*, trans. by Michael P. Steinberg (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 81.

³ Steven Beller, “Introduction,” *Rethinking Vienna 1900* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001), 2. See Beller, 2-11 for a comprehensive historiography of Vienna 1900.

⁴ Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Knopf, 1980), 8.

turned their focus inward, Schorske maintained, catalyzing the transformation from the “rational man,” born of Enlightenment and liberal ideals, to the modern “psychological man, [. . .] a creature of feeling and instinct.”⁵ This model enabled Schorske to explain the emergence of Sigmund Freud, Arthur Schnitzler, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Gustav Klimt, Arthur Schoenberg, Oskar Kokoschka, and the politicians Georg von Schönerer, Karl Lueger, and Theodor Herzl in the same city and era.

This intellectual history assesses the Schorskean model of fin-de-siècle Vienna by analyzing the lives and works of two of the chieftains of Viennese modernism, Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) and Arthur Schnitzler (1862–1931). The former founded psychoanalysis, which, however controversial, turned contemporary psychiatry on its head and left an indelible mark on Western intellectual thought. The latter explored human sexuality and the psyche in his literary texts, and introduced the internal monologue or “stream of consciousness” narrative technique to German literature.⁶ While Freud’s works have sustained recognition, Schnitzler’s have been kept alive through theater productions and film adaptations (such as Max Ophüls’s 1950 *La Ronde* from *Reigen* and Stanley Kubrick’s 1999 *Eyes Wide Shut* from *Traumnovelle*). Connections between the two pioneers of the psyche are many: the “free association” method employed by Freud in *Studies on Hysteria* (1895) demonstrates a remarkably similar understanding of human consciousness to the “stream of consciousness” narrative mode employed by Schnitzler in *Lieutenant Gustl* (1900) and *Fräulein Else* (1924). Freud’s *Die Traumdeutung* (*The Interpretation of Dreams*, 1900), which he

⁵ Schorske, 4.

⁶ This assertion is contested. See p. 91.

considered to be his most significant work, has proven to be an invaluable tool in interpreting the dreams appearing in Schnitzler's literary corpus, even in those written before Freud's alleged discovery of dream interpretation.⁷ Additionally, they both dealt with sexuality and its conflict with societal norms, as well as their ensuing consequences on the human psyche. In many ways, Freud and Schnitzler, with their intimate knowledge of depth psychology, embody Schorske's "psychological man"; indeed, in his analysis, Schorske offers them as primary examples.

Prior to the 1890s, however, Freud and Schnitzler had not yet fully developed their modern theories and ideas. In spite of their markedly different *métiers*, the pair shared remarkably similar origins. They both trained as neurologists at the University of Vienna School of Medicine, where medieval Christian and Romantic medical philosophy, with its focus on spirits and supernatural forces, had been replaced by a medicine founded in the natural sciences. At the University of Vienna School of Medicine, science and rationality had defeated superstition and religion. Once they had become doctors, Freud and Schnitzler entered the educated bourgeoisie. They politically supported the liberals, who sought to defend bourgeois values. Thus the younger Freud and Schnitzler represented "rational man." The eventual defeat of the liberals in Vienna is the missing peg in their eventual transformation to psychological man, and so the cases of Freud and Schnitzler uphold Schorske's thesis of fin-de-siècle Vienna. Or do they?

⁷ Frederick J. Beharriell demonstrated how Freud's wish-fulfillment theory of dreams is necessary for the interpretation of Schnitzler's works as early as *Frühlingsnacht im Sezierraum* (1880). See: Frederick J. Beharriell, "Schnitzler's Anticipation of Freud's Dream Theory," *Monatshefte* 45:2 (Feb. 1953): 81-89.

Though it has enjoyed considerable success and followers, the Schorskean model of Viennese modernism has become the source of criticism for many historians and scholars. These sentiments culminated in the 2001 publication of *Rethinking Vienna 1900*, a collection of essays edited by Steven Beller, that sought to revise Schorske's thesis on many grounds. For example, Vienna is recast as only one of many sources of modern Western culture, alongside *belle époque* Paris, Weimar Berlin, and even New York. More significantly, research on the Jews of Vienna has appeared since the 1980s that raises important questions about Schorske's model of fin-de-siècle Vienna, which arguably downplays Jewish contributions to the *Wiener Moderne*.⁸ According to Beller, "That Jews and individuals of Jewish descent had played a large role in Viennese modern cultural life was not something that anyone had seriously disputed. What had been at issue was quite how large the role had been, and whether there was anything 'Jewish' about it."⁹

As Jewish members of Vienna's liberal bourgeoisie, Freud and Schnitzler once again provide insight in evaluating models of Vienna 1900. Freud and Schnitzler were in many ways characteristic of Viennese Jewry. Attracted by the promise of greater social and economic opportunity, their families had immigrated to Vienna from elsewhere in the Habsburg Empire. The liberal Revolution of 1848 had paved the way for legal and social emancipation of Austria's Jews. Their newfound freedoms and their strong valorization of education enabled them to enter rapidly into Vienna's educated

⁸ Hilary Hope Herzog, *Vienna is Different: Jewish Writers in Austria from the Fin de Siècle to the Present* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011), 3. Herzog identifies Marsha Rozenblit, Josef Fraenkel, Robert Wistrich, Ivar Oxaal, Gerhard Botz, Michael Pollak, George Berkley, and Steven Beller as important scholars of Viennese Jewry.

⁹ Beller, *Rethinking Vienna 1900*, 7.

bourgeoisie: in the second half of the nineteenth century, the number of Jewish academics, lawyers, and doctors grew enormously. In fact, Jews became a disproportionately large section of the liberal bourgeoisie, the class Schorske highlights as being responsible for the explosion of modern culture in fin-de-siècle Vienna. The Jews were drawn politically to the liberals because they supported their social class, but also because the liberals had brought them emancipation. Ultimately, any threat to liberalism would be a threat to the Viennese Jews.

And so it was. Antisemitism spread through Vienna, transforming in nature, and eventually becoming a political force. With a platform of populist antisemitism, the Christian Social Party delivered a coup de grâce to Vienna's liberals in the election of 1895. Antisemitism came to affect the personal and professional lives of both Freud and Schnitzler. Is it coincidental that these developments coincide with the emergence of Viennese modernism?

Schorske dismisses a Jewish current of Viennese modernism by arguing that Jewish members of the liberal bourgeoisie had assimilated, and thus for his purposes, were indistinguishable from their gentile counterparts.¹⁰ This interpretation, founded in class dynamics, conveniently supports his overarching thesis that culture derives from the apolitical. The more recent research on Viennese Jewry, as will be shown, has debunked the Schorskean interpretation by demonstrating that the Jewishness of bourgeois Jews, in spite of their strong assimilationist trend, was not irrelevant.

Although significant critiques of Schorske's model have been made, they fail to offer a convincing revision or alternative. Beller demonstrates that Viennese Jews

¹⁰ Schorske, 7.

rapidly entered the educated bourgeois during the turn of the century, and only hesitatingly replaces Schorske's liberal bourgeoisie with a Jewish educated liberal bourgeoisie.

Using the cases of Freud and Schnitzler, this thesis will demonstrate how antisemitism, both growing and changing, played a fundamental role in the birth of psychological man in Vienna. Antisemitism, itself a byproduct of ethnic nationalist movements, engendered new consciousness of status and ethnicity in both Jews and non-Jews. From this perspective, the defeat of the liberals in the 1895 election, the central catalyst of Schorske's model, becomes merely a side product of the original development, which was the alienation of Jewish members of the bourgeoisie via politicized antisemitism. This did, as Schorske argues, lead the educated class to turn inward and develop a new psychological way of interpreting the world, but it did not involve a complete escape from politics. Instead, the roadblocks posed by antisemitism—whether politically, professionally, or socially—simply encouraged the marginalized to find new outlets of expression.

Structurally, the thesis will center on the lives of Freud and Schnitzler, supplementing biography with contextual history. Thus the history of the Freud and Schnitzler families is informed by the history of the Viennese Jews. This will be followed by an analysis of Freud and Schnitzler's medical career, focusing on the über-rational environment of the Second Viennese Medical School. Subsequently, the rise of antisemitism in Vienna and its impact on the two young neurologists will be reviewed. A final connection—the French connection—will provide the Viennese with the final

element necessary for the birth of psychological man. Freud ushered in the new era with the development of psychoanalysis, as Schnitzler did contemporaneously with a new, psychological literature. The thesis concludes by comparing and contrasting their understanding of the human psyche and a final reassessment of the Schorskean fin-de-siècle model.

2. The Jews of Vienna

As with many of Vienna's Jewish families, the Freuds and the Schnitzlers had shallow roots in the city. When Sigmund Freud was born on 6 May 1856, it was in the Moravian town of Freiberg (Czech: Příbor), not Vienna. Six years later, on 15 May 1862, Arthur Schnitzler was born in Vienna's Leopoldstadt, where his father Johann Schnitzler had moved in 1860 from Hungary, so that he could complete his medical studies at a German-speaking university.¹¹ Although the Freuds and the Schnitzlers were recent arrivals, the history of the Viennese Jews begins much earlier, in the Middle Ages.

The fate of those medieval Jews had an enormous impact on their descendants in fin-de-siècle Vienna. Throughout Christian Europe, the feudal system prohibited Jews from participating in agricultural work. By contrast, the Church forbade Christians certain economic activities, such as moneylending and trade. As a result, medieval Jews often filled these roles, and the Jewish population became concentrated in urban centers. As trade expanded in the twelfth century, many German Jews migrated east; Jews first settled in Vienna during this time.¹²

Similar to elsewhere in Christian Europe, the status and treatment of Jews in medieval Vienna fluctuated according to the position of the city's current ruler.¹³ Periods of tolerance, often instituted by rulers to promote economic activity, were punctuated by moments of brutal persecution: ghettoization, expulsion, and execution.

¹¹ Arthur Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, trans. by Catherine Hutter (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), 21.

¹² Ivar Oxaal, "The Jews of Young Hitler's Vienna: Historical and Sociological Aspects," *Jews, Antisemitism and Culture* (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), 15.

¹³ Oxaal, 16.

By the eighteenth century, the status of Viennese Jews had not considerably improved. On the contrary, the *Judenordnungen* (Regulations of the Jews) of Empress Maria Theresa (1717–80) demonstrate the severe prejudice and legal restrictions directed at the Jewish population. Beginning in 1757, the ordinances dictated that the Jews, of which there were between four and five hundred in Vienna, were officially “unerwünscht,” or undesired, except for those who could demonstrate their ability to improve the economic status of the city, i.e., those with considerable personal assets. Additionally, the regulations forbade the construction of a synagogue, direct ownership of any real property, and restricted Jews to their households until noon on Sundays and holidays.¹⁴ Reminiscent of the *Kleiderordnungen*¹⁵ of previous centuries, Jewish men were also obliged to grow “distinctive, easily-recognizable beards.”¹⁶

The question lingering over the Jews, specifically the Ashkenazi Jews of Central and Eastern Europe, and their precarious position in society is often referred to as the *die Judenfrage*, the Jewish Question. When Bruno Bauer and his more widely recognized fellow Young Hegelian, Karl Marx, introduced the term into German intellectual discussions, it referred specifically to the political emancipation of the Jews in Prussia, but it quickly assumed a broader connotation. Certain “solutions” to the Jewish Question, even when the concept is applied retroactively, can be derived on behalf of both Gentiles and Jews. The devoutly Catholic Empress Maria Theresa, for example, found the presence of Jews in Vienna undesirable, but did not resort to their

¹⁴ Kurt Schubert, *Christentum und Judentum im Wandel der Zeiten* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2003), 132.

¹⁵ In 1215, Pope Innocent III announced a doctrine that compelled Jews to visually distinguish themselves from Christians by wearing distinctive yellow badges and headgear (the so-called *Judenhut*). The compulsory yellow badges were later revived by the Nazis.

¹⁶ Oxaal, 22.

expulsion from the city for economic reasons. She strove to prevent their assimilation, a potential solution for the Jews, into Viennese society by institutionalizing their differentness, stripping them of rights and compelling them to maintain a distinctive appearance. Most notoriously, the Nazi-regime applied the concept in their plan and execution of the holocaust: it was titled *die Endlösung der Judenfrage*, the Final Solution of the Jewish Question.

Liberalism, born of the ideals of the Enlightenment, became an important potential solution to the Jewish Question, as it promised Jewish emancipation through legal equality. Under the reign of Joseph II (1741–90), measures were implemented *vis-à-vis* the Jews that established a foundation for subsequent liberal reforms. In 1782, Joseph II decreed the *Toleranzpatent*, which, as its name suggests, implemented official toleration of the Jews rather than civic equality. Regarding the Jewish Question, Josephinist doctrine may be considered assimilationist in nature in that it actively sought to remove distinctions between Gentile and Jew. Historian Ivar Oxaal describes this dynamic, arguing that “Josephinist Jewish policy [. . .] was openly predicated on the idea that Jews would generate greater economic benefits if their status as a feudal, closed commercial caste was reduced through enforced state education, the adoption of German surnames, and the diversification of their occupational profile.”¹⁷ Effectively, Jewish assimilation might be achieved as a byproduct of the economic system because it would demolish the damaging distinctions instituted by the feudal system.

Nevertheless, Austria failed to match the revolutionary fervor of France with its *Toleranzpatent*. Historian Wolfgang Häusler has summarized the difference between

¹⁷ Oxaal, 23.

the Josephinist doctrine of tolerance and Napoleon's emancipation of the Jews, arguing it had "its basis in the qualitative difference between bourgeois revolution and enlightened absolutism."¹⁸ Further improvement in the legal status of the Viennese Jews did not occur until the Austrians had their own revolution, in 1848.

Liberal reforms enacted during the revolution legalized Jewish religious service and permitted Jews to own real property and to pursue any profession, even to hold public office. Many of these reforms were rescinded after the revolution, only to be gradually reinstated. With the *Ausgleich*, the Compromise of 1867 that created the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary, Jews essentially gained equal legal status; this included the ennoblement, without conversion, of certain Jewish bankers and the appointment of several Jewish members to the *Bürgerministerium*.¹⁹ Thus, by 1867, emancipation had reached the Jews of Vienna.

The era of Austria-Hungary (1867–1918), roughly corresponding with the period historians denote as fin-de-siècle Vienna, witnessed tremendous quantitative and qualitative change in the Jewish population of Vienna. In 1847, just prior to the March Revolution, the Jews in Vienna numbered only 4,000, roughly 1% of the city's total population. By 1880, the number had ballooned to 70,000, representing 10% of the population, and the Jewish population continued to grow at a faster rate than the rest of the city.²⁰ The massive population growth is accounted for by considerable waves of Jewish immigrants to the city from elsewhere in the empire during this time, as was the

¹⁸ Oxaal, 23.

¹⁹ Oxaal, 24.

²⁰ Marsha L. Rozenblit, *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983), 17.

case for the Freud and Schnitzler families. This process was connected, as historian Marsha Rozenblit suggests, with the “two larger population movements of the nineteenth century, the urbanization of Austrians and Europeans generally, and the movement of Central and Eastern European Jews from small towns into the cities and overseas.”²¹ However, in the case of Jewish immigrants to Vienna, these forces were considerably magnified. Whereas 45% of all Viennese were native-born at the turn of the century, this was true for only 20% of the Jewish population.²²

Austro-Hungarian Jews, largely hailing from Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and Hungary, moved to Vienna for specifically Jewish reasons—the city offered greater social, cultural, and economic opportunities for Jewish immigrants. Socially, the emancipation of Jews, particularly the end of residence restrictions within the city and the liberal atmosphere in the wake of 1848, made Vienna an attractive city for Jewish immigrants. Additionally, the *Großstadt* appealed to the Jews because they were urban dwellers: Jewish immigrants were far more likely than their gentile counterparts to have come from other cities and large towns.²³ Culturally, “Traditional Jews who spoke Yiddish, a language derived from medieval German, were more likely to feel at home in German-speaking Vienna than in Polish, Czech, or Hungarian cities which sometimes demanded the acquisition of new linguistic skills.”²⁴

Economic opportunity was another decisive factor in making Vienna a destination for Jewish immigration during the second half of the nineteenth century. As prior urban

²¹ Rozenblit, 13.

²² Rozenblit, 13.

²³ Rozenblit, 37.

²⁴ Rozenblit, 33.

dwellers, the Jews were often better prepared for life in the Viennese metropolis than gentile peasants and agricultural workers. Business prospects for Jews in the provinces had also grown increasingly difficult: growing nationalist sentiment led to boycotts of Jewish businesses in “an attempt to create a Polish, Slovak, or Czech business class,” which exerted significant economic pressure on many Jews.²⁵ Thus many Jews had an economic incentive to relocate to Vienna, where economic antisemitism was less threatening.

The Freuds moved to Vienna for economic and social reasons. Freud’s father, Jakob Freud, was a wool merchant; his mother, Amalia, was Jakob’s third wife. They were quite poor and lived very modestly. The Freuds were prompted to leave Freiberg in 1859 following some financial catastrophe, perhaps provoked by the Panic of 1857. They initially moved to Leipzig, before settling in Vienna a year later. In spite of the promise of new economic opportunities, their financial situation improved only marginally.²⁶

The Schnitzlers came for similar reasons. The son of a poor carpenter, Johann Schnitzler grew up in Nagy-Kanizsa with few financial resources. He began studying medicine and transferred to the University of Vienna because it was more prestigious and offered instruction in German. Vienna offered him the promise of becoming a wealthy and renowned physician.²⁷ His success in the field of medicine will be discussed further in the following chapter.

²⁵ Rozenblit, 30-31.

²⁶ Peter Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1988), 8.

²⁷ Herzog, *Vienna is Different*, 13.

Liberalism had, in effect, transformed Vienna into an attractive environment for Austro-Hungarian Jews. Whereas conversion to Catholicism or insufficient wealth would have previously been barriers to success for Jews in Vienna, under the liberal reforms of the Dual Monarchy, they enjoyed legal equality and decent prospects for assimilation into Viennese society without conversion. For many Jewish immigrants, however, assimilation was not always the result. Indeed, some Jewish immigrants did not seek assimilation at all.

Economically and socially, the Jewish immigrants to Vienna were a very heterogeneous group; even so, a division emerged between these unassimilated immigrants and the existing Jewish population. To describe these groups, the Viennese Jewish journalist Nathan Birnbaum coined the terms “*West-*” and “*Ostjuden*” (“Western” and “Eastern Jews”).²⁸ The Western Jews had largely assimilated into Viennese society: their dress, mannerisms, and language distinguished them little from their Christian counterparts. Many had even willingly converted to Roman Catholicism. Conversion and intermarriage, for example, were seen as “taking the ultimate steps” by those who sought to “cease being Jewish and disappear into the gentile world.”²⁹ And, at the time, this was possible. Just as a Bohemian could become Austrian by learning German, Gentiles accepted baptized Jews as equals. Although converts represented a numerically insignificant portion of the Viennese Jewish population, it included the

²⁸

²⁹ Rozenblit, 128.

following celebrated members of the fin de siècle: Gustav Mahler, Arnold Schoenberg, Karl Kraus, Otto Weininger, and Victor Adler.³⁰

The Eastern Jews, on the other hand, came from smaller cities, towns, and sometimes even rural communities; they maintained the dress and customs of Orthodox Judaism; and many spoke Yiddish, as previously mentioned, as well as Polish or Russian. The visual and aural differentness of these Jewish immigrants created tension in the assimilated Jewish community and stirred antisemitism among some non-Jews. In order to combat this, the Jewish community sought to assimilate the immigrants; for example, by teaching them German. Many Eastern Jews, however, were not interested in assimilation; on the contrary, they “were full of pride and self-confidence, and even displayed a sense of superiority toward Western Jews: they were conscious of their ‘true Jewishness.’”³¹ The tension between these two groups sometimes led to the seemingly paradoxical phenomenon of Jewish antisemitism. As Joseph Roth, himself a Jewish immigrant from East-Galicia, describes it disparagingly: “It is an oft-ignored fact that Jews can have anti-Semitic inclinations too. One doesn’t want to be reminded of one’s grandfather, who was from Posen or Kattowitz, by some stranger who has just arrived from Lodz.”³² In spite of their differences, a new breed of antisemitism, racial antisemitism, would soon place Western and Eastern Jew, perhaps to the dismay of both parties, in the same lot.

³⁰ Rozenblit, 128.

³¹ Brigitte Hamann, *Hitler’s Vienna: A Dictator’s Apprenticeship* trans. by Thomas Thornton (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 338.

³² Hamann, 338.

More important than the question of where Vienna's Jews came from is who they became once they arrived. This included, to list a few salient figures, in addition to Freud and Schnitzler, the writers Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Karl Kraus, Stefan Zweig, and Joseph Roth; the philosophers Ludwig Wittgenstein and Karl Popper; the musicians Gustav Mahler and Arnold Schoenberg; the father of political Zionism, Theodor Herzl; and the Austro-Marxist politicians Victor Adler and Otto Bauer.³³ Yet the forces of conversion and assimilation have rendered the task of identifying Jewish figures, as such a list attempts to do, rather difficult. Instead of delineating Jews according to proclaimed religious views, scholars of fin-de-siècle Vienna prefer to use descent, as it is the most encompassing criterion for determining Jewish identity. As Beller describes it, assimilation must be viewed as a "*Jewish* phenomenon, even if it produces people who are ostensibly not Jewish."³⁴ Thus both Freud, the devout atheist, and Hofmannsthal, grandson of a Roman Catholic convert, may be considered as Jews. This may appear to be an arbitrary construct, or worse, *racist*, but it is necessary: even if some of those of Jewish descent did not self-identify as Jews, they would have been perceived and treated as such by many in the racialized atmosphere of Vienna 1900.

The Jewish presence in fin-de-siècle Viennese culture was so large that Stefan Zweig wrote in his autobiography, *Die Welt von Gestern* (1943), that "nine-tenths of what the world of the nineteenth century celebrated as Viennese culture was in fact

³³ William M. Johnston, *The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History 1848-1938* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 42.

³⁴ Steven Beller, "Class, Culture and the Jews of Vienna, 1900" *Jews, Antisemitism and Culture in Vienna* ed. by Ivar Oxaal, Michael Pollak, and Gerhard Botz, (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), 43.

culture promoted and nurtured or even created by the Jews of Vienna.”³⁵ Indeed, Beller goes so far as to claim “that any non-Jewish bourgeois contribution is the exception, rather than the rule, that the Jews were so dominant in this class that they merit special attention on their own. [. . .] that, while others played a part, the culture flowering in Vienna was an essentially *Jewish* phenomenon.”³⁶

It was not simply the cultural elite that had a large Jewish contingency. During the second half of the nineteenth century, Jews formed a disproportionately large section of Vienna’s liberal bourgeoisie. Beller defines the liberal bourgeoisie as including “members of the university and of the liberal professions: law, medicine and journalism.”³⁷ Here as well, contemporaries can confirm the significant presence of Jews. The German-Jewish author Jakob Wasserman, upon his visit to Vienna, wrote, “nearly all the people with whom I came into intellectual or cordial contact with were Jews. . . . I soon recognized that all public life was dominated by Jews. The banks, the press, the theatre, literature, social functions, all was in the hands of Jews.”³⁸ Statistical analysis offers an even clearer vision of this phenomenon.

Beller offers compelling data on the number of Jews belonging to the liberal bourgeoisie. Although Jews formed only 10% of the population of the city, in the late 1880s they formed one third of the student body at the University of Vienna, “the most prestigious centre of learning in the Monarchy.”³⁹ A similar pattern can be seen in the

³⁵ Stefan Zweig, *The World of Yesterday* (New York: The Viking Press, 1943).

³⁶ Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews 1867-1938: A Cultural History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 7.

³⁷ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 33.

³⁸ Jakob Wasserman, *Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude* (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1922), 102. Quote and translation from Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time*, 21n.

³⁹ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 33.

university's faculty: by 1910, professors of Jewish descent represented more than a third of the law faculty and more than half of the medical faculty.⁴⁰ Likewise, "All the major daily newspapers of the liberal press [in Vienna] were either owned by or edited by people of Jewish descent."⁴¹ The emphasis on the liberal press is logical, given that liberal policies had led to the political emancipation of the Jews in 1867. Among the liberal newspapers listed, the *Neue Freie Presse* stands out for its significance to the lives of both Freud and Schnitzler: Freud read the paper avidly, and Schnitzler published prose works there.

There were two reasons for the disproportionate representation of Jews in the liberal bourgeoisie: firstly, Jews placed a tremendous value on education, and secondly, they encountered little competition from their Catholic compatriots. The first can be demonstrated by analyzing the composition of Vienna's *Gymnasien*. These secondary schools focused on classical education, and until 1904 were the only schools whose students in Austria could continue their studies at a university.⁴² Sigmund Freud attended the Sperlgynasium, while Arthur Schnitzler attended the Akademisches Gymnasium. These are only two of eleven such institutions that existed in Vienna between 1870 and 1910. Jewish students made up roughly 30% of *Gymnasium* students; however, they were not evenly spread across schools. Beller writes, "In three schools Jews were in the majority and in two others comprised over 40 per cent, while in the two socially prestigious schools [. . .] they were a very small minority indeed."⁴³ By

⁴⁰ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 36.

⁴¹ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 38.

⁴² Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 49.

⁴³ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 52-53.

evaluating the occupations of these pupils' fathers, Beller shows that in spite of their lower representation, Jewish fathers comprise a large majority of those working in the sectors of commerce and finance and are overrepresented in medicine, law, and journalism.⁴⁴ In many ways, then, Schorske's liberal bourgeoisie was Jewish. In this light, the Jewish predominance in many of the intellectual and cultural circles of turn-of-the-century Vienna should be unsurprising.

Viennese Jews had many reasons to be optimistic during the early years of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Liberalism had brought them equal legal status, and assimilation into German society appeared to be a viable solution to the Jewish Question. In fact, in the 1860s and 1870s, there was almost no discussion of the Jewish Question.⁴⁵ The promise of social and economic prosperity that had brought Jewish immigrants to Vienna could be realized through education, as demonstrated by their entry into the liberal bourgeoisie. Freud and Schnitzler were no exceptions, and their relationship to Judaism is typical of Viennese Jews of the time.

Freud, for example, considered himself an atheist throughout his adult life, but did not outright renounce his Jewish identity. In the opening page of his autobiographical essay, he declares, "My parents were Jews, and I have remained a Jew myself."⁴⁶ This brings us back to the problem of how one defines Jewishness—presumably Freud refers to a Jewish cultural tradition, not simply Jewish ancestry. He certainly lacked the religious element propagated by his father, Jakob, but there is no

⁴⁴ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 53.

⁴⁵ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 190.

⁴⁶ Sigmund Freud, "An Autobiographical Study," *The Freud Reader*, ed. by Peter Gay (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989), 3.

reason to believe, as one of Freud's biographers, Ernest Jones, suggests, that Freud "grew up devoid of any belief in God or Immorality and does not appear to have felt the need of it."⁴⁷ There is some evidence to suggest that he may have participated in a bar mitzvah, the coming-of-age ritual for Jewish boys once they reach thirteen years of age.⁴⁸ Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi is confident enough to claim that "it is almost inconceivable that he should not have prepared for and experienced the Bar Mitzvah ceremony at age thirteen. His father's orientation, the norms of the time and of his parents' Jewish milieu [. . .] are sufficient warrant for such an assumption,"⁴⁹ although it may be that Yerushalmi has something to gain by overstating Freud's Jewish faith.

Schnitzler's youth and family similarly reflect a Jewish identity centered more on heritage and tradition than religious piety. In his autobiography, Schnitzler offers a fairly detailed account of the role of religion in his family. The older generations, notably Schnitzler's maternal grandmother, observed important religious holidays; "the generation which followed, in spite of all stubborn emphasis on racial solidarity, tended to display indifference to the spirit of Jewish religion, and opposition [. . .] to its formalities."⁵⁰ Schnitzler recalls the conclusion of the annual Day of Atonement at his grandmother's house, which meant a celebratory end to a day of fasting. A table of pastries was ritualistically prepared, but, as Schnitzler notes, these "could be enjoyed also by those who hadn't fasted for twenty-four hours, that is to say by the children and

⁴⁷ Ernest Jones, *The Life and Works of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Basic Books, 1953), 57. Source cited in Hans Küng, "Freud and the Problem of God" *The Wilson Quarterly* Vol 3., No. 4 (Autumn, 1979), 164.

⁴⁸ Ritchie Robertson, *The 'Jewish Question' in German Literature, 1749-1939: Emancipation and its Discontents* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 130.

⁴⁹ Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable* (Binghamton, NY: Vail-Ballou Press, 1991), 132 (note no. 33).

⁵⁰ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 13.

free-thinking male members of the family.”⁵¹ Schnitzler goes on to describe the impact of this religiously heterogeneous environment within the family upon his own religious orientation: “It was an occasion on which one could really begin to have one’s doubts about divine justice.”⁵²

Freud and Schnitzler’s Jewish identity initially attracted little attention from Vienna’s Gentiles. Antisemitism has existed in Vienna as long as Jews have, but during the liberal, early years of the Dual Monarchy, it existed in a relatively innocuous form. Freud recalls that as a child, his father, Jakob Freud, had shared with him a story in order that he would see how far Jews had come: “When I was a young fellow, one Saturday I went for a walk in the streets in your birthplace, beautifully decked out, with a new fur cap on my head. Along comes a Christian, knocks off my cap into the mud with one blow, and shouts, ‘Jew, off the sidewalk!’”⁵³ In the end, Jakob Freud merely bent down to pick up his cap. The significance of the memory to Freud could mean, as Peter Gay suggests, that Freud disapproved of his father’s weakness; however, the harshness of the scene highlights his father’s Jewish identity and the injustices he suffered as a result.

In any case, Jakob Freud was accurate in describing the change in status of Jews. The young Freud and Schnitzler encountered relatively little antisemitism. In a revealing passage of his autobiography, Schnitzler recalls:

In those days—the late-blossoming period of liberalism—anti-Semitism existed, as it had always done, as an emotion in the numerous hearts so inclined and an idea with great possibilities of development, but it did not play an important role politically or socially. The word hadn’t even been invented; and one was satisfied to call those who were particularly

⁵¹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 13.

⁵² Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 13.

⁵³ Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time*, 11-12.

inimical towards Jews, almost contemptuously, *Judenfresser*, or “Jew devourers.” [. . .] only one member of our class could have been termed a *Judenfresser*, and that was a certain youth called Deperis. He was unpopular and considered a ridiculous fellow not only because of this characteristic, but also because he was a dandy and a snob.⁵⁴

Schnitzler concedes that antisemitism existed, but in a non-threatening, if not ridiculous, form. Writing in hindsight, he also suggests that antisemitism would transform: it was “an idea with great possibilities of development,” one that would one day “play an important role politically [and] socially.” And indeed it would. In spite of these rosy portraits, the liberal era in the wake of the *Ausgleich* was to be gradually eclipsed. The very nature of antisemitism was transforming, and it would become an omnipresent force that loomed ever larger over Vienna’s Jews. The city was, after all, not simply Freud and Schnitzler’s Vienna; it was also Hitler’s Vienna.

⁵⁴ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 63.

3. Doctor Freud, Doctor Schnitzler

Following *Gymnasium*, Freud and Schnitzler entered the University of Vienna School of Medicine where they trained as neurologists. The academic environment they encountered in medical school, as well as in the Viennese hospitals and clinics where they practiced, was rational, positivistic, and liberal. As young doctors, Freud and Schnitzler were to become the next generation of rational man.

Freud's entrance into the medical profession may be surprising given his relatively modest beginnings; however, as the first child (of eight), he was afforded some preferential treatment. In spite of the family's financial status, for example, Freud enjoyed the luxuries of books and an education at the prominent Sperlgynasium, where he was first in his class.⁵⁵ Initially, he envisioned pursuing a career in law or politics. In *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud recalls two prophecies from his youth about his future life. The first, prophesized to Freud's mother at his birth by an "old peasant's wife," held that Freud would one day be a great man. The second, recounted by a poet in the Wiener Prater when Freud was just a boy, prophesized that Freud would one day become a cabinet secretary.⁵⁶ And in the early years of the Dual Monarchy, the possibility of the young Moravian Jew becoming a government official seemed perfectly legitimate given that at the time several members of the *Bürgerministerium* were Jewish.⁵⁷ Continuing his recollection, Freud states that "the fact that until shortly before my enrollment in the University I wanted to study jurisprudence, and changed my plans only at the last moment, must be connected with the

⁵⁵ Freud, "An Autobiographical Study," 3.

⁵⁶ Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, 161.

⁵⁷ Gay, *A Life for Our Time*, 16.

impressions” made by those prophecies. In spite of this potential unconscious wish, however, he was compelled, he claims in his autobiographical essay, “Selbstdarstellung,” to pursue medicine after hearing a recitation of Goethe’s “Die Natur.”⁵⁸ Thus, in 1873, he enrolled at the University of Vienna School of Medicine, closing the door on a ministerial career.

Unlike Freud, Schnitzler belonged to a family established in the medical field. His father, Johann Schnitzler (1835–93), made significant contributions to laryngology, and his maternal grandfather was a physician. Even his brother-in-law, Marcus Hajek, was a laryngologist; in fact, he later treated Freud’s cancer of the mouth in 1923, as he did Franz Kafka a year later, in 1924, just prior to his death.⁵⁹ Arthur’s own interest in and commitment to medicine is a point of contention among some scholars. The traditional view holds that he entered the family profession against his will, and only acquired freedom from this obligation after the death of his father in 1893. The reality reflects a more complex relationship with medicine. In his autobiography, Schnitzler describes a childish dream of becoming a doctor, stating “It had always been my dream, even as a small boy, to be a doctor, like Papa. Not only would this have meant that I could drive around all day long in a carriage, but I could have the coachman stop at every sweet shop, if I felt like it, and buy the most delicious pastries.”⁶⁰ Clearly, the father was the motivating factor in this vision, as his description of the daily life of a doctor reflects no understanding of a doctor’s actual duties. Schnitzler continues, “But in a more serious

⁵⁸ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 4. Peter Gay, the editor, also notes: “It is now generally agreed that the author of this essay was one of Goethe’s Swiss acquaintances, G. C. Tobler.”

⁵⁹ Mark Edmundson, *The Death of Sigmund Freud: The Legacy of His Last Days* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2007), 174.

⁶⁰ Arthur Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, trans. by Catherine Hutter (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970), 74.

vein—the example set by my father, and perhaps even more, the whole atmosphere at home, naturally had their effect on me from earliest childhood. [. . .] it transpired as a matter of course that in the autumn of the year 1879 I was enrolled in the faculty of medicine at the University of Vienna.”⁶¹ Again the medical tradition of his father and the family is the dominant factor, but Schnitzler’s language here reflects neither regret nor any other qualification: it was simply “a matter of course.” And so, after graduating with honors from the Akademisches Gymnasium in 1879, Schnitzler began to study his father’s profession.

Freud and Schnitzler studied at the University of Vienna School of Medicine during an era referred to as “the Second Viennese Medical School.” Although the university included a medical faculty since its inception in 1365, it did not develop into a serious institution until the eighteenth century, when Empress Maria Theresia summoned Gerhard van Swieten (1700–72) to Vienna in 1745. Swieten established the First Viennese Medical School, which emphasized “expectant therapy,” or the “healing power of nature,” over bloodletting and other questionable medical practices rampant at the time.⁶²

The nineteenth century was one of great accomplishments in medicine, but these came slowly. The first couple of decades corresponded with the Napoleonic Wars throughout the continent and the subsequent rise of Romanticism, particularly in Germany. As a reaction against the rationalism of the Enlightenment, Romanticism emphasized emotion and irrationality; rational man receded from the intellectual circles

⁶¹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 74,

⁶² Johnston, *The Austrian Mind*, 223.

of Europe. Consequently, medicine and other empirically based sciences suffered. The medical specialty psychiatry, dominated in the nineteenth century by Germans, partially benefitted from Romanticism.⁶³ With their inward-focused studies of the human psyche, German Romantic psychiatrists explored topics such as the unconscious and dreams long before Freud; however, the reaction in all branches of medicine against the Romanticists in the second half of the century “was so complete that Freud’s contributions appeared to his contemporaries as completely novel.”⁶⁴ The pendulum between rational and psychological man, one might say, has swung before.

Given the generally deplorable medical practices of the Romanticists, the physicians of the second half of the century were well justified in reacting strongly against them. In rejecting the validity of observational study, the Romanticists had relied on visionary speculation as a foundation for theories such as vitalism, which “viewed life as the realization of a Divine plan and the life processes as a manifestation of a mystical goal-directed force.”⁶⁵ In Vienna, the philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm von Schelling’s (1775–1854) *Naturphilosophie*, which “posited the unity and rationality of the ‘All,’ as well as the identity of nature and spirit, both in the realm of the Macrocosm (the *Allnatur*) and in the microcosm of the human being,” served as a foundation for medical theory and led to the decline of the School of Medicine during this time.⁶⁶

⁶³ Edward Shorter, *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1997), 71.

⁶⁴ Franz G. Alexander and Sheldon T. Selesnick, *The History of Psychiatry: An Evaluation of Psychiatric Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present*, 144.

⁶⁵ Alexander, Selesnick, *The History of Psychiatry*, 144.

⁶⁶ Mark Luprecht, “What People Call Pessimism”: *Sigmund Freud, Arthur Schnitzler, and Nineteenth-Century Controversy at the University of Vienna Medical School* (Riverside, CA: Ariadne Press, 1991), 11.

Eventually, the pathologist's scalpel replaced the philosopher's pen. The Second Viennese Medical School and its medical philosophy, rising from the ashes of the Romantic era, abandoned speculation, favoring empirical, scientific methods. Yet the reaction itself became excessive. Growing skepticism of the efficacy of available medical treatments in the mid-1800s eventually led to the extreme with therapeutic nihilism, "the doctrine that to do nothing must be the best treatment."⁶⁷ Diagnosis became the primary task of the physician, and treating patients with care was considered unbecoming.

A foundational theory of the Second Viennese Medical School, resulting from the renewed faith in the natural sciences, was what will be referred to as the materialist theory of illness. According to this theory, all illnesses stemmed from some physical aberration. It gained traction from a series of advances in the science of biology in the mid-nineteenth century: the German physiologist Theodor Schwann (1810–82) developed modern cell theory in the 1830s, and Louis Pasteur's experiments in the 1860s led to the germ theory of disease. In cases where physical aberrations could not be demonstrated, it was assumed that future technology, such as more powerful microscopes, would eventually reveal them. Anatomy became the ultimate tool to the diagnostician. Eventually, the materialist explanation was also applied to psychiatry and the pathology of mental illness: "The hunt for lesions [in the brain] became a fixed idea, virtually an obsession, for nineteenth-century psychiatry as it leaned more and more on the fledgling domain of neurology. Psychiatry was taunted and despised for its lack of

⁶⁷ Johnston, *The Austrian Mind*, 225.

scientific progress, its failure to make discoveries even at autopsies.”⁶⁸ Of course, for many mental illnesses, such a hunt was in vain since the materialist theory denies the potential for non-physical causes, such as traumatic experiences. In fact, Lillian Furst has demonstrated that case studies from this time, including Schnitzler’s, hardly considered personal history of the patient at all, save for potential family history as an indication of heredity.⁶⁹ In such a climate, where patients were viewed as cells and genes, it may be unsurprising that Freud and Schnitzler became neurologists instead of psychiatrists.

A quintessential representative of the Second Viennese Medical School is Schnitzler’s father, Johann Schnitzler. Having graduated from the University of Vienna School of Medicine in 1860, Johann Schnitzler was trained in the same medical philosophy founded in empiricism and the laws of the natural sciences as his son. So great was Johann’s commitment to medicine that literary scholar Elizabeth Loentz argues that Arthur Schnitzler’s father Johann had “traded Jewish religion for the universal humanitarian “religion” of medicine,” citing his “Bekenntnis zum Arztberuf” (“Doctor’s Creed”) from 1884:

The doctor’s religion is humanity, that is to say, the love of mankind, regardless of their wealth or poverty, without distinctions of nationality or confession. He should and must therefore, always and everywhere, appear, wherever there is conflict of class or race, wherever national chauvinism and religious fanaticism prevail, and act as an apostle of humanity for the peace and fraternization of mankind. He who does not think this way, does not feel this way, is not a real, true doctor.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Lillian R. Furst, *Before Freud: Hysteria and Hypnosis in the later Nineteenth-Century Psychiatric Cases* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2008), 22.

⁶⁹ Furst, *Before Freud*, 22.

⁷⁰ Elizabeth Loentz, “The Problem and Challenge of Jewishness in the City of Schnitzler and Anna O.” *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler* ed. by Dagmar Lorenz (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003) 82-83. My translation of the “Bekenntnis zum Arztberuf.” Original: “Die Religion des Arztes ist die Humanität, d.h. die Liebe zur Menschheit, ohne Rücksicht auf Reichthum und Armuth, ohne Unterschied der Nationalität u. der Konfession. Er soll u. muss daher immer u. überall, wo Kampf der Klassen u. Rassen, wo nationaler Chauvinismus

In essence, Johann Schnitzler's faith in the tenets of liberalism and rationalism was so great that they functioned as religion for him, serving him far more conveniently than Judaism in Vienna. He was, as Loentz claims, "like the majority of Hungarian, Bohemian, and Moravian Jewish immigrants to Vienna, [. . .] "integrationist" or "Germanized," German-speaking and with a strong affinity to German culture."⁷¹ More importantly, he embodies rational man, as a member of the educated bourgeoisie empowered, because of his Jewish identity, by the liberal atmosphere of the city. It was in this environment, where rationality and liberalism had become quasi-sacrosanct, that Freud and Schnitzler studied and trained.

Given the short temporal gap between their studies, it comes as no surprise that Freud and Schnitzler attended lectures from and trained under many of the same professors. The first of these of considerable importance was the Prussian physiologist Ernst von Brücke (1819 – 92). A member of the so-called Berlin medical materialists,⁷² Brücke hoped to rid physiology of Romantic speculation by using physics and chemistry as a basis for explaining empirically observed phenomena. He was called to Vienna precisely because of these materialist leanings. Of considerable importance to both young medical students would have been Brücke's interest in a diverse range of subjects outside of medicine, especially art, as well as his rejection of the growing antisemitism in Vienna.

u. religiöser Fanatismus herrschen, als Apostel der Humanität für Völkerfrieden und Menschenverbrüderung eintreten und wirken. Wer so nicht denkt, nicht so fühlt, ist kein wahrer, kein echter Arzt.“

⁷¹ Loentz, 83.

⁷² Encyclopedia Britannica, s.v. Ernst von Brücke

Freud worked in Ernst von Brücke's physiological laboratory from 1876 to 1882. Freud held Professor Brücke in high esteem; indeed, he is referred to in Freud's autobiography as "the great Brücke himself."⁷³ The extent of his reverence for the physician is evidenced by the naming of his third child Ernst. Brücke's diverse interests likely left an impact on Freud; "Like Brücke, Freud considered it a matter of course to combine natural science with study of art and literature."⁷⁴ Given Freud's humble financial resources, Brücke eventually advised Freud to leave his laboratory to seek work as a physician.⁷⁵

Schnitzler did not work as closely as Freud with Brücke, and certainly did not share his high opinion of the professor, in spite of their shared interest in literature and art. In a solitary reference to Brücke in his autobiography, Schnitzler comments on his examinations, "In physiology, [. . .] I had only the indulgence of Professor Brücke, who was usually feared, to thank for my passing grade."⁷⁶ An alternate translation of the passage suggests Brücke was "dreaded."⁷⁷ Yet Brücke was not the only source of resentment for Schnitzler at medical school; it seems the young doctor was beginning to dislike the career set out for him by his father.

Schnitzler had long been passionate about literature and theater; he recalls in his autobiography being a lover of the Romantics as a student. It is perhaps no coincidence that he singles out E.T.A. Hoffmann, a writer who demonstrated knowledge of depth

⁷³ Freud, "An Autobiographical Study," 4.

⁷⁴ Johnston, *The Austrian Mind*, 231.

⁷⁵ Freud, "An Autobiographical Study," 5.

⁷⁶ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 113.

⁷⁷ Luprecht, "What people call pessimism," 88.

psychology long before its time,⁷⁸ as being his favorite.⁷⁹ As a teen, Schnitzler had even begun writing. He sent his poems to various publications, sometimes anonymously, in hopes that they might catch someone's eye, but to no avail. In November of 1880, he succeeded in publishing a poem and an essay in the Munich-based magazine *Der freie Landesbote*.⁸⁰ Yet Schnitzler's literary efforts ran contrary to the desires of his father:

My father remained unsympathetic toward my literary efforts (not that he got to see all of them), and in consideration of my medical reputation, which for good reason didn't seem to want to establish itself, he was against my appearing publicly as a writer under my own name. He really cannot be reproached for not being too happy about my activities—literary or medical—nor about my way of life. My relationship to the opposite sex especially, of which he was of course only vaguely informed, filled him with growing anxiety.⁸¹

Schnitzler thus lived a double life of sorts: one as a neurologist, fulfilling the expectations of his father, and the other as a literary playboy. As will be demonstrated, Schnitzler's writing, with its deep emphasis on psychology, eventually reflects a synthesis of these two lives.

In spite of his lack of enthusiasm for his medical studies, Schnitzler did successfully train as a neurologist; scholar Hillary Hope Herzog is correct in criticizing articles that dismiss Schnitzler's medical career. One such article, entitled "Physicians Who Abandoned Medicine for Literature," claims that Schnitzler never even attained any expertise in his medical practice.⁸² This was certainly not the case, as will be demonstrated. Nevertheless, when Schnitzler received his medical degree in May 1885,

⁷⁸ See: Harriett Lindner, "Fiktion, Tiefenpsychologie und psychiatrische Therapie in der deutschen Romantik: Am Beispiel E.T.A. Hoffmanns" *Germanistik im Konflikt der Kulturen* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2008): 311-318.

⁷⁹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 56.

⁸⁰ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 274. It was the poem "Liebeslied der Ballerine" ("Love Song of a Ballerina") and the essay "Über den Patriotismus" ("On Patriotism")

⁸¹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 241-242.

⁸² Hillary Hope Herzog, "'Medizin ist eine Weltanschauung': On Schnitzler's Medical Writings," *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler* (New York: Camden House, 2003), 227.

he doubted his decision to study medicine more than ever. He quotes from his diary at the time:

I forget totally what and who I am and with that realize that I am not moving in the right direction. [. . .] I have the definite feeling that, apart from the possible material advantages, it was an idiocy on my part, ethically speaking, to study medicine. [. . .] I don't know yet, don't know today, as I stand (supposedly) in the flower of my young intellectual powers, whether there is a true gift within me for the art of writing. [. . .] Today I feel even less clear about all these things than I did in the past.⁸³

Although Schnitzler himself is uncertain, it is clear that he does not consider medicine to be the right direction for him, and that while he would rather be a writer than a doctor, his abilities for the former were thus far unproven, and the latter offered certain “material advantages.” In spite of all reservations, Schnitzler began his career as a doctor.

After medical school, both young physicians found work at the psychiatric ward of the Allgemeines Krankenhaus der Stadt Wien (Vienna General Hospital), then under the direction of the German psychiatrist Theodor Meynert (1833–92). A polymath like Brücke, Meynert pursued a vast number of subjects outside of his medical specialization. He also shared Brücke's materialistic conception of biology; he hoped to legitimize psychiatry by identifying the pathology responsible for mental disturbances. For this reason, he focused on brain anatomy, and he eventually made significant contributions to understanding the structures and sections of the brain.

Meynert's relationship with Freud was one of mutual respect that devolved into mutual suspicion and eventually into open hostility. After Freud was promoted from *Aspirant* (Clinical Assistant) to *Sekundararzt* (Junior Physician) at the General Hospital, he began to work directly under Meynert, “by whose work and personality,” Freud noted

⁸³ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 161.

long after their falling-out, “[he] had been greatly struck while [. . .] still a student.”⁸⁴ In Meynert’s psychiatric clinic, Freud claims to have worked so diligently in this field that Meynert suggested he devote himself to it, even offering Freud his lecturing duties. When Freud declined, he “guessed already that this great man was by no means kindly disposed towards me.”⁸⁵ This suspicion was confirmed when Meynert criticized Freud’s experiments with cocaine on neurotics between 1884 and 1887; the failure of these experiments was particularly damaging to Freud’s reputation in the era of therapeutic nihilism.⁸⁶ Freud’s private conflict with Meynert became public during the 1890s over Freud’s controversial views on hysteria and hypnotism, which will be reviewed in depth. As a *Sekundararzt*, though, Freud remained loyal to the materialist theory of the Second Viennese Medical School. In his “An Autobiographical Study,” he anecdotally recalls that, while lecturing to visiting American physicians, when “On one occasion I introduced to my audience a neurotic suffering from a persistent headache as a case of chronic localized meningitis; they all quite rightly rose in revolt and deserted me.”⁸⁷ His diagnosis, meningitis, reflects insistence on infection, trauma, or other physical ailment as the origin of the symptoms; interestingly, Freud suggests that American physicians at this time did not accept the materialist theory and praises them in hindsight. It was some time before Freud would deviate from the dogma of the Second Viennese School.

Starting in 1886, Schnitzler also served as a *Sekundararzt* in Meynert’s psychiatric clinic for six months. At this time, his commitment to medicine had become

⁸⁴ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 5.

⁸⁵ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 5.

⁸⁶ Johnston, *The Austrian Mind*, 232.

⁸⁷ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 7.

uncertain; in his diary at this time, he wrote, “it is only my imagination that may help me eventually to achieve anything at all. Certainly not the practice of medicine, although right now, in some strange way, I am getting used to it.”⁸⁸ He had already identified his imagination, i.e., his writing, as his source of success in the future. This note also demonstrates the particular appeal of psychiatry, in opposition to other specializations, to Schnitzler; in his autobiography, he claims to have not done any more work than required in Meynert’s clinic, but that “every now and then there were patients who interested me.”⁸⁹ He describes Meynert as “a great scholar, an excellent diagnostician, but as a doctor [. . .] his behavior seemed too aloof and unsure, almost apprehensive,” and, ultimately, as someone from whom he “received little inspiration” and did not admire.⁹⁰ Similarly to Freud, Schnitzler eventually strayed from Meynert and the other heads of the Second Viennese Medical School over the nature of hysteria and the viability of hypnosis as a treatment.

A definition of the perhaps indefinable medical condition known as “hysteria” is critical to understanding the psychiatric debates led by Freud and Schnitzler at the end of the nineteenth century. While no longer accepted in modern medicine, hysteria dates back all the way to Ancient Egypt, and it continued to be diagnosed early in the twentieth century. The Egyptians “believed that the symptoms were caused by the malposition of the uterus,⁹¹ a sort of “wandering womb.”⁹² This theory is reflected in the

⁸⁸ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 223.

⁸⁹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 223.

⁹⁰ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 223.

⁹¹ Alexander, Selesnick, *The History of Psychiatry*, 21.

⁹² Furst, *Before Freud*, 21.

etymology of the word; it derives from the Greek *hystera*, or “womb.”⁹³ For this reason, the disorder was almost unanimously associated with women; the physicians of Vienna adamantly rejected the notion of male hysteria. This notion also reinforced the perception in Vienna that hysteria resulted from physical, not psychological causes.

Perhaps the closest disorder to hysteria recognized by modern psychology would be conversion disorder, “a type of mental disorder in which a wide variety of sensory, motor, or psychic disturbances may occur,”⁹⁴ although hysteria was notorious as a catchall disease for a seemingly unending list of unexplained symptoms. A helpful contemporary source is the article on hysteria, identified by scholars as having been written by Freud, which appeared in the 1888 publication of Villaret’s medical encyclopedia.⁹⁵ Acknowledging the fairly loose usage of hysteria as a diagnosis, Freud maintains: “The extremely rich [. . .] symptomology of ‘major hysteria’ is composed of a series of symptoms which include the following:”⁹⁶ “(1) *Convulsive attacks*,” “(2) *Hysterogenic zones*,” “(3) *Disturbances of sensibility*,” “(4) *Disturbances of sensory activity*,” “(5) *Paralyses*,” “(6) *Contractures*,” and certain “(7) *General Characteristics*,” such as anesthesia and spasms.⁹⁷ Doctors had difficulty treating an illness that was so poorly defined; for Vienna’s neurologists and anatomists, it was impossible. As will be seen, the key to proper treatment of hysteria was eventually found, although it came from abroad, in France. Before coming to the role of the French in the development of

⁹³ Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. hysteric

⁹⁴ *Brittanica Online Encyclopedia*, s.v. “conversion disorder (psychology)”

⁹⁵ James Strachey, “Editor’s Note: *Hysterie*,” *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* vol. 1, 39.

⁹⁶ Sigmund Freud, “Hysteria,” *The Standard Edition of The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* vol. 1, 42.

⁹⁷ For complete symptomology, see: Freud, “Hysteria,” 42-51.

Freud and Schnitzler's intellectual thought, however, I will return to the subject of the Viennese Jews, and more specifically, the rise of antisemitism in Vienna.

4. Antisemitism in Vienna 1900

On 9 May 1873, remembered today as Black Friday, the Vienna Stock Exchange crashed. Bankruptcies and bank failures wiped out savings and financially ruined many people. The reverberations of the crisis were so great that they spread from Vienna throughout the industrial nations of Europe and across the Atlantic to the United States, where they sparked the Long Depression that lasted for six years. Schnitzler recalls the event in his autobiography: “I was touched [. . .] by the economic catastrophe [. . .] which is still known today as the Big Crash, in which my father, like so many innocent victims, lost all his savings.”⁹⁸ Despite the fact that Jews, like Johann Schnitzler, and Gentiles suffered financial ruin alike, and despite the fact that many Jewish financiers had warned against the threat of speculation, the Jews became a scapegoat for the crisis.⁹⁹ Historian Peter Gay has described the reaction as follows:

The Austrians permitted themselves an orgy of anti-Semitic outbursts. Journalists held the ‘machinations’ of Jewish bankers responsible for the collapse; popular cartoonists depicted hook-nosed and curly-haired bankers gesticulating wildly in front of the Vienna stock exchange.¹⁰⁰

The Panic of 1873 corresponds with a surge in antisemitism in Vienna, but also with the gradual transformation of the very nature of antisemitism, which scholars describe as a shift from cultural to racial antisemitism.¹⁰¹ Prior to racial antisemitism, Jews who had assimilated and converted to Christianity became equals. In fact, the various Jewish ministers of state and ennobled Jews demonstrate that conversion was not a barrier to even the highest social classes of Vienna; liberalism and education had

⁹⁸ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 39.

⁹⁹ Loentz, 84; Hamann, 329.

¹⁰⁰ Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Times*, 15.

¹⁰¹ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 190.

made integration obtainable without conversion. For the most part, this was because antisemitism was either not present or not respected, as Schnitzler recalled as a boy. What existed to some degree was 'cultural antisemitism,' which, according to Beller, started in the early nineteenth century. There was a "process of making Jewishness 'a psychological quality' [and thus] the actual empirical Jew could be brushed aside as irrelevant. 'Jewish' came to be shorthand for capitalist and rationalist."¹⁰² Jewishness, although viewed disparagingly, referred to the Jewish religion, traditions, and heritage, as opposed to the Jewish people themselves. As Jews became more closely associated with the liberal bourgeoisie, "Jewish" then became synonymous for antisemites with "capitalist" and "rationalist," as Beller suggests in the quote cited above. The shift to racial antisemitism, which viewed Jewishness as a permanent, biological trait in the eyes of antisemites, threatened the Jewish bourgeoisie since their cultural "Jewishness" could no longer be overcome through assimilation, or even conversion.

Racial antisemitism, and its eventually politicization in Vienna, developed as a byproduct of nationalist politics in Austria-Hungary. Nationalist sentiment grew among German-Austrians, Hungarians, and Slavic groups like the Czechs, Poles, and Ruthenians. Zionism similarly offered Jews the promise of national identity tied to a defined territory (Palestine). These nationalist movements were not the "new anti-liberal mass movements"¹⁰³ that Schorske describes because they were applications of liberal ideology, the products of the liberal revolutions of 1848. They did act, however, to corrode Habsburg solidarity and led to the rise of racial antisemitism.

¹⁰² Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 191.

¹⁰³ Schorske, 118.

One such liberal nationalist program was the German-nationalist movement. Although born from the liberation wars against Napoleon, German-nationalism truly entered the stage of Austrian politics in 1848 when liberal revolutionaries sought to unify Germans across German-speaking lands into one nation. The so-called German Question had two potential solutions: one, the *Großdeutsche Lösung* (“Greater German solution”), proposed to unify all Germans, including Austrians. The other, the *Kleindeutsche Lösung* (“Lesser German solution”), alternatively proposed to unify only the northern German states. Given the strong position of the Habsburg Empire at the beginning of the nineteenth century, a theoretical *Großdeutschland* implied considerable power for the Catholic Germans of Austria. To prevent this, the Protestant Prussians preferred a *Kleindeutsche Lösung*. The outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War and the defeat of the Austrians in 1866 effectively excluded the possibility of a “Greater Germany.” By the conclusion of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871, the Prussian chancellor Otto von Bismarck had unified the northern German states into a new German nation. Thus Austria-Hungary remained outside of the German Empire. Yet the Austrian liberals did not anticipate that their German-nationalist program would inspire a wave of political movements that would turn against them.

The flame of nationalism had spread to many linguistic and cultural groups within the *Vielvölkerstaat* (multiethnic state) of the Habsburg Empire, not simply to the German-Austrians. A national history was central to many of these groups’ claims to legitimacy. In the midst of the Revolution of 1848, for example, Friedrich Engels divided the ethnicities of the Habsburg monarchy into two categories: 1) the “historic”

nationalities, such as the Germans, the Magyars, and the Poles, and 2) the “non-historic” nationalities, such as the Slovenians and the Ruthenians (Ukrainians).¹⁰⁴ The Magyars, for example, had a powerful nationalist movement that was supported by the strong Hungarian nobility, a historical kingdom, and a national assembly (the Hungarian Diet). Hungarian nationalist sentiment began even before the Napoleonic Wars: when Emperor Joseph II implemented the Language Decree of 1874, which made German the compulsory language of public offices, as a part of his liberal reforms, the Hungarian nobility organized a powerful resistance, compelling Joseph II to repeal practically all of the Hungarian reforms.¹⁰⁵ In 1848, the Hungarians radicalized further by declaring independence and dethroning the Habsburg monarch; historian Jacob Talmon states, “The European revolutionaries hailed the Hungarians as the Revolutionary nation par excellence.”¹⁰⁶ Although the revolution failed, all was not lost. In 1867, a year after Austria’s defeat by the Prussians, the *Ausgleich* (Austro-Hungarian Compromise) created the dual monarchy, whereby the Emperor of Austria also ruled as the King of Hungary. In this imperial-royal configuration, the Kingdom of Hungary was ceded significant political autonomy.

The Hungarians became the exception and not the rule in the Habsburg Empire. That is not to say that nationalist sentiment did not exist among other groups; in fact, the nationalist movements of the Czechs, Poles, and other Slavic groups gained considerable support. Even Ruthenians, a so-called non-historic nationality that was

¹⁰⁴ T. K. Oommen, *Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1997), 118.

¹⁰⁵ Ivan T. Berend, *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2003), 106.

¹⁰⁶ Jacob Talmon, *Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1960), 484. Quoted in Berend, 111.

split between the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires, developed national aspirations. In addition to Habsburg resistance, the nationalist movements in Austria-Hungary encountered difficulties because “the frontiers of an existing state and of a rising nationality rarely coincided.”¹⁰⁷ For example, the ethnic minorities of the newly empowered Kingdom of Hungary, such as Romanians and Croats, formed almost half of the population.¹⁰⁸ Like the British and French before them, the Austrians and Hungarians sought to assimilate their minority populations in order to form “one single nation.”¹⁰⁹ The possibility of assimilation disappeared, however, with the rise of new attitudes about race, the product of pseudo-Darwinist ideas being applied to nationalist ideology. Historian Brigitte Hamann describes the development as follows:

The thesis of man’s origin, which was greatly popularized, and his natural development from the ape in ancient, barbaric times to a more sublime ‘noble man of the future’ consequently led to comparisons. The argument was that supposedly there were ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ peoples, peoples on the rise and peoples on the decline, developed and undeveloped peoples. Theories of race indicated ways to accelerate the ‘refining’ of one people as compared to others. Everyone wanted to belong to the ‘strong,’ ‘more highly developed’ one. ‘Purity of blood’ and a clean pedigree were looked upon as strengths, a mixed background, as a weakness.¹¹⁰

Thus the spread of nationalist ideas in Austria-Hungary coincided with a rise in xenophobia against ethnic minorities and immigrants, especially the Jews.

Antisemitism became a potent force in Vienna at the hands of two politicians: Georg Ritter von Schönerer (1842–1921) of the Pan-Germans and Karl Lueger (1840–1910) of the Christian Socials. Schönerer succeeded in incorporating racial antisemitism into German-nationalism. Originally a liberal politician, he was elected as a Reichsrat

¹⁰⁷ Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origins and Background* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), 329. Quoted in Berend, 118.

¹⁰⁸ Berend, 117.

¹⁰⁹ Berend, 117.

¹¹⁰ Hamann, 202.

representative for the liberal Fortschrittsklub (German Progressive Party) in 1873. Following disputes within the party over the nationality question, over which “The German liberals as a whole were then dividing,”¹¹¹ he left the party in 1876. He capitalized on the residual German-nationalist sentiment that existed in spite of the Austro-Prussian War and the exclusion of Austria from the German Reich, above all in the German-nationalist fraternities, the *Burschenschaften*. These student fraternities had a long history of being the harbingers of German-nationalism in Vienna: in 1848, they played a pivotal role in the German-nationalist movement during the revolution, and in 1871, following the Franco-Prussian War, “they agitated for an extension of unification into the Habsburg lands.”¹¹² Drawing from this support, Schönerer developed a close circle of young university intellectuals, including Dr. Viktor Adler, Engelbert Pernerstorfer, Dr. Heinrich Friedjung, and Dr. Karl Lueger. The group published a political manifesto, the Linz Program, in 1882 under the motto “not liberal, not clerical, but national.”¹¹³

The Linz Program demanded “a customs union and stronger treaty arrangements with the German Empire,” but stopped well short of calling for an Anschluss with the German Reich.¹¹⁴ It was also not overtly antisemitic, although its proposed removal of Galicia and Bukovina (home to roughly one million Jews) from the

¹¹¹ Schorske, 125.

¹¹² Schorske, 127.

¹¹³ Hamann, 240.

¹¹⁴ Schorske, 126.

empire and the prohibition of house-to-house peddling, for example, reflected an unspoken antisemitic bias.¹¹⁵

Ultimately, the German-nationalist university students became the heralds of racial antisemitism. The trigger was a speech by Theodor Billroth, a professor of surgery at the University of Vienna as well as chief surgeon at Vienna General Hospital (AKH), in 1875, which was well received by the *Burschenschaften*. A year later, Billroth published *Über das Lehren und Lernen der medizinischen Wissenschaften an den Universitäten der deutschen Nation nebst allgemeinen Bemerkungen über Universitäten* (On Teaching and Learning Medicine at German Universities), in which he argued,

[that] the Jews are a sharply defined nation, and that no Jew, just like no Iranian, Frenchman, or New Zealander, or an African can ever become a German; what they call Jewish-Germans are simply nothing but Jews who happen to speak German and happened to receive their education in Germany, even if they write literature and think in the German language more beautifully and better than many a genuine Germanic native.¹¹⁶

Although in this particular quote he uses the term “nation,” his argument is racial because, for Billroth and adherents to this new variation of German-nationalism, nation is defined by race. He even speaks elsewhere of “purely German” and “purely Jewish blood.”¹¹⁷ His comment on the beautiful German literature some Jewish authors produce seems to be a reluctant acknowledgement of the role that Jews have played in the development of culture in the German-speaking lands. Billroth goes on to criticize the large number of foreign Jewish students at the medical school,¹¹⁸ which, although unenlightened, is an observation that at least corresponds with Beller’s statistical

¹¹⁵ Hamann, 240; Schorske, 126.

¹¹⁶ Hamann, 329.

¹¹⁷ Hamann, 330.

¹¹⁸ Hamann, 329.

analysis.¹¹⁹ Thus a professor at the University of Vienna School of Medicine (and not just any professor: Billroth is celebrated to this day as the father of modern abdominal surgery) sparked a breed of German-nationalism infused with racial antisemitism that was quickly appropriated by the German-nationalist student fraternities. Following Billroth's example, these students began protesting against alleged "Überfremdung der Universität" (foreign infiltration of the university) by Jewish students, and, as will be seen, eventually expelling Jewish fraternity members.¹²⁰ Antisemitism was incorporated more and more into German-nationalist ideology. For example, antisemitic clauses were even retroactively added to the Linz Program in 1885.¹²¹

Schorske correctly asserts the importance of the *Burschenschaften* to the rise of Schönerer's Pan-German movement and the corresponding proliferation of racial antisemitism, although he oversimplifies the situation when he claims that "universities, once centers of triumphant Austro-liberalism, became in the late seventies and eighties the scene of brawling nationalist agitation as the influence of the *Schönerianer* spread."¹²² While many of the student fraternities were German-nationalist, this was certainly not the case for the entire university, as many remained liberal and combatted Schönerer's influence. Beller's statistics on the proportion of Jewish students and professors at the university alone casts doubts on such an unqualified statement.¹²³ Nevertheless, the university was an important center of the growing Pan-German

¹¹⁹ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 36.

¹²⁰ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 191.

¹²¹ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 192.

¹²² Schorske, 127.

¹²³ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 34.

movement, which posed a threat to Jewish students, even if they were in good company.

Unsurprisingly, the idyllic life free from prejudice ended for Freud and Schnitzler once they arrived at the university. In his “An Autobiographical Study,” Freud writes,

When in 1873, I first joined the University, I experienced some appreciable disappointments. Above all, I found that I was expected to feel myself inferior and an alien because I was a Jew. I refused absolutely to do the first of these things. I have never been able to see why I should feel ashamed of my descent or, as people were beginning to say, of my ‘race.’¹²⁴

This passage suggests that Freud first encountered a form of antisemitism that threatened to obstruct his pursuits as a university student; unsurprisingly, he began studying the same year as the crash of the Viennese Stock Exchange. More importantly, Freud indicates that people had begun to understand Jewishness as a *race*—a direct observation of the new racial form of antisemitism. Freud then asserts,

These first impressions at the University, however, had one consequence which was afterwards to prove important; for at an early age I was made familiar with the fate of being in the Opposition and of being put under the ban of the ‘compact majority’. The foundations were thus laid for a certain degree of independence of judgment.¹²⁵

Antisemitism cast Freud out of society, or at least he perceived this to be the case, thereby making him an outsider, but he believed to have gained as a result “independence of judgment,” an important quality in a scientist.

As with Freud, Schnitzler also first encountered antisemitism at the university. In fact, it was the source of great anxiety and preoccupation for the young Schnitzler. A passage from his autobiography, in which he tells of a philosophical discussion he once had with a member of a German-nationalist reading group, illustrates how antisemitism affected him:

¹²⁴ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 4.

¹²⁵ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 4.

I don't remember having been particularly interested in the problems up for discussion, except in so far as they included the anti-Semitism which had just begun to develop and which filled me with anxiety and bitterness. My reaction was not rooted solely in the fact that I was Jewish, nor was it the result of any personal experiences. These I was not to suffer in full measure until later. Actually neither the political nor the social aspects of the Jewish question aroused these early reactions in me. In accordance with my whole nature it was predominantly the psychological viewpoint that absorbed me. The religious factor played little or no part. I was repulsed by all dogma, from whichever pulpit it was preached or at whatever school it was taught. [. . .] I had as little relationship to the so-called beliefs of my fathers—to that which was *truly* belief and not merely memory, tradition, and atmosphere—as to any other religion.¹²⁶

This passage is extremely important to understanding the impact of antisemitism on Jewish members of the liberal bourgeoisie. Schnitzler notes how antisemitism had “just begun to develop” around the time of his university studies, providing an important timeframe. As Schnitzler was six years younger than Freud, his university studies did not begin until 1879. Although this was a few years after the Panic of 1873, it was only two years after student fraternities initiated the Aryan Clause, thereby prohibiting Jewish membership.¹²⁷ As in the prior passage from Schnitzler, he asserts that, at this time, the Jewish Question had not assumed a political or social aspect. He also categorically rejects the role of religious belief. He reacted with “anxiety and bitterness”; his reaction was, at its base, *psychological*.

The strong psychological component of antisemitism, on the part of both the victim and the aggressor, in the context of fin-de-siècle Viennese society derives from its relationship to honor. Schnitzler attests to this relationship in his autobiography. Following graduation in 1882, he enlisted in the army for one year of compulsory service. He belonged to the predominantly Jewish corps of medical students, derisively

¹²⁶ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 77

¹²⁷ Hamann, 330.

known at that time as the “Moses dragoons.”¹²⁸ These medical students were not, like the army doctors, considered soldiers in the traditional sense, but nevertheless they trained to become reserve officers.

If ever an antiquated code of honor existed, it was among the officers of the Austro-Hungarian army. The ultimate manifestation of this was the tradition of dueling, a vestige of medieval chivalry. A duel was initiated with the aim of gaining “satisfaction,” or restoring one’s honor by risking one’s life for it. Schnitzler describes the mixed feeling he and his fellow students shared about dueling: “all of us, without exactly feeling that we were supporters of the tradition as a matter of principle, but more out of the general spirit of those student days and especially as inductees and future reserve officers, stressed our willingness to give satisfaction if it were demanded.”¹²⁹ Schnitzler continues to relate that only one student, Theodore, declared that he would not duel, simply because he was a coward. He describes his and other students’ reaction to Theodore:

It was not so much the unestablished fact of his cowardice that astonished us, as the courage it took to confess it, something we weren’t ready to admit at the time, not to him nor to ourselves. None of us were brawlers nor were any of us expert duelers, yet there wasn’t one among us who would have tried to evade a student duel or any other kind of duel, if the prevailing rules of conduct made it unavoidable.¹³⁰

In a sense, then, Schnitzler and the others saw bravery in Theodore’s cowardice; they did not believe in dueling as a matter of honor, yet perpetuated it out of fear of being dishonored.

¹²⁸ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 115.

¹²⁹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 127.

¹³⁰ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 127-128.

For Jewish students and officers, this burden was considerably greater given the spread of antisemitism in the universities, notably the aforementioned example of the German-national associations expelling their Jewish members. According to Schnitzler, “conflicts [. . .] also street fights, were not rare in those days between the anti-Semitic student corps and the radical-liberal *Landmannschaften*, formed by those coming from the same native areas, some of which were predominantly Jewish.”¹³¹ Interestingly, Schnitzler associates the nationalist student groups with antisemitism and the liberal groups with Jewish membership, which reinforces the notion that Schorske’s liberal bourgeoisie was predominantly Jewish.

The conflicts between the German-nationalists and the liberal Jews happened publicly and often; Schnitzler claims, “Provocations between individuals in lecture halls, corridors, and laboratories were daily occurrences.”¹³² For this reason, he explains that Jewish students became master swordsmen and “dangerous fencers.” Duels between German-nationalist students and Jews finally came to an end with the decree of the *Waidhofener Beschluss*. As presented by Schnitzler, it reads:

Every son of a Jewish mother, everyone in whose veins flows Jewish blood, is without honor by birth, devoid of any sublime emotion. He cannot differentiate between what is filthy and what is poor. He is a morally unworthy person. Therefore associating with a Jew is dishonorable; one must avoid the company of Jews. One cannot insult a Jew, therefore a Jew cannot demand satisfaction for insults suffered.¹³³

The significance of this decree derives from its assertion that Jews are without honor, and therefore cannot demand satisfaction; in other words, Jews could not participate in duels. Schnitzler writes of the *Waidhofener Beschluss* with great resentment, but he

¹³¹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 128.

¹³² Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 128.

¹³³ Hamann, 242-243. The passage may also be found in Hutter’s translation (Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 128), but I prefer Hamann’s translation.

ultimately places dishonor upon the German-nationalists. He argues that since Jews had become such dangerous fencers, duels were becoming an “embarrassment” for the nationalist students. This, Schnitzler claims, “was certainly the main reason for the priceless Waidhofen manifesto.”¹³⁴ The Waidhofener Beschluss was not officially decreed until several years after Schnitzler’s time at the university in 1896,¹³⁵ as he concedes, but explains, “the spirit that sponsored it and the sentiments it expressed existed at the time I am describing here, at the beginning of the eighties therefore.”¹³⁶ With Schnitzler’s insights, the Waidhofener Beschluss reads as a slight against the antisemites themselves: they had to prohibit the Jews from dueling in order to preserve their own honor. This inversion of expectations, which places dishonor on the side of the antisemites, demonstrates the psychological component of honor that affected the behavior of both Jews and antisemites.

In explaining the expulsion of the Jews from the *Burschenschaften*, Schnitzler anecdotally relates the story of one such Jewish student, Theodor Herzl (1860–1904). Similarly to Freud and Schnitzler, Herzl’s family had immigrated to Vienna from elsewhere in the empire in the mid eighteenth century, in the case of the Herzls, from Hungary. Schorske describes Herzl’s family as being “well out of the ghetto: economically established, religiously ‘enlightened,’ politically liberal, and culturally German. Their Judaism amounted to little more than what Theodor Gomperz, the assimilated Jewish classicist, liked to call ‘un pieux souvenir de famille.’”¹³⁷ He was an

¹³⁴ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 128.

¹³⁵ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 192.

¹³⁶ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 128-129.

¹³⁷ Schorske, 147.

assimilated Jew, ascending into Vienna's liberal bourgeoisie through his education at the *Gymnasium* and the university. As a university student, the young Herzl joined the German-nationalist dueling fraternity Albia. Schnitzler recalls Herzl as a fraternity member, including his eventual expulsion:

I can remember seeing him with his blue student's cap and black walking-stick with the ivory handle and F.V.C. (*Floriat Vivat Crescat*) engraved on it, parading in step with his fraternity brothers. That they eventually expelled him, or, as the students called it, "bounced" him, was undoubtedly the first motivation that transformed this German-national student [. . .] into the perhaps more enthusiastic than convinced Zionist, as which he lives on in posterity.¹³⁸

In reality, Herzl had voluntarily offered his resignation when one of his fraternity brothers, the future writer and critic Hermann Bahr (1863–1934), led "an anti-Semitic student ceremony on the occasion of Wagner's death in 1883."¹³⁹ Nevertheless, Schnitzler's observation of Herzl as a German-nationalist turned Zionist accurately depicts Zionism as a reaction of Jewish German-nationalists to Schönerer's antisemitic Pan-Germanist movement.

Schönerer's increasingly radical Pan-German movement became, in the words of Brigitte Hamann, "a matter of faith and kind of religion."¹⁴⁰ Members developed their own set of symbols, such as the cornflower and runes, and even began to alter their language: Old Germanic "Heil!" replaced "Servus" and "Grüß Gott" as a greeting in the streets of Vienna, and "Dictionaries of Germanized expressions were put on the

¹³⁸ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 129.

¹³⁹ Schorske, 151.

¹⁴⁰ Hamann, 243.

market.”¹⁴¹ They began to refer to Schönerer, “According to an Old Germanic custom, [. . .] as the sole and absolute ‘Führer.’”¹⁴²

Schönerer’s political career effectively ended in 1888 after he and several others, in a “battle against the ‘Jewish press,’ [. . .] forced their way into the editorial offices of the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* and physically attacked the editors with clubs.”¹⁴³ Schönerer was briefly placed in prison, suspended from political activities for five years, and stripped of his aristocratic title.¹⁴⁴ Although he was reelected to the Reichsrat in 1897, he gradually lost political influence. Schönerer and his Pan-German movement lived on, however, in its inheritors Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist German’s Worker Party. In the meantime, Dr. Karl Lueger and his Christian Social Party succeeded in wooing Pan-German voters.

Lueger was born in Vienna, served as Vienna’s mayor from 1897 to 1910, and died in Vienna; he was “Viennese through and through.”¹⁴⁵ He attended the Theresianum, the most prestigious *Gymnasium* in Vienna, and went on to study law at the university. Like Schönerer, Lueger began his political career as a liberal, although, unlike Schönerer, he was not a German-nationalist.¹⁴⁶ The young law school graduate went into politics at the behest of the Jewish politician Dr. Ignaz Mandl. After the crash of the Stock Exchange in 1873, they exploited anti-liberal and anti-capitalist sentiment and created a democratic party with a strong stance against corruption. This succeeded in gaining the support of the hitherto alienated lower middle class, and both Lueger and

¹⁴¹ Hamann, 243-244.

¹⁴² Hamann, 244.

¹⁴³ Hamann, 246.

¹⁴⁴ Schorske, 131.

¹⁴⁵ Hamann, 280.

¹⁴⁶ Schorske, 136.

Mandl were elected to the city council.¹⁴⁷ In the early 1880s, Lueger initially supported Schönerer and the German-nationalist Linz Program, but eventually turned away from Pan-Germanism. In 1887, he joined the Christian Social Association and set his sights on becoming mayor of Vienna.

Although Lueger had traditionally run, alongside Mandl, on a platform against corruption and liberalism, the Christian Social Association's "re-Catholicization" campaign required Lueger to develop an antisemitic public persona. This effectively put an end to his friendship and partnership with Mandl. Lueger quickly became the leader of the association, which depended more and more on antisemitism to unify its diverse constituents.¹⁴⁸ Beller explains the appeal of antisemitism as a way "to unite the polyglot populace of Vienna, for it offered a way in which the Viennese could themselves assimilate and unify while denying the Jews the right to belong. When immigrants came to Vienna they could hide behind the picture of the Jew as an outsider and thus see themselves as on the inside."¹⁴⁹ Thus the Christian Socials called themselves "The Anti-Semites," a term coined in 1860 by the Austrian Jew Moritz Steinschneider.¹⁵⁰ It was not until 1893 that the association officially changed its name to the Christian Social Party.

Success came once Schönerer departed, albeit unwillingly, from the political arena in 1888. Lueger acted quickly to win over his followers, in no small part by engaging in antisemitic rhetoric. It is important to note, however, that in spite of his proclaimed political beliefs, Lueger was more of a political opportunist than a committed

¹⁴⁷ Hamann, 280.

¹⁴⁸ Hamann, 281.

¹⁴⁹ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 193.

¹⁵⁰ Alex Bein, *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated Universities Press, 1990), 594; Hamann, 281.

antisemite like Schönerer.¹⁵¹ In the election of 1895, he finally won enough votes to be elected mayor; however, Emperor Franz Joseph intervened and refused Lueger the mayoralty. Freud allegedly smoked a cigar in celebration of the emperor's action.¹⁵² It had the unintended consequence of making Lueger even more popular, and the emperor vetoed Lueger's election as mayor two more times before finally relenting in 1897. Thus began the era of Lueger's Vienna, which ended only with his death in 1910, thirteen years later.

Eventually, antisemitism became an impediment in the professional lives of Vienna's Jews, as evidenced by the lives of Freud and Schnitzler. For Freud, this meant a long path to a professorship. It has already been demonstrated that Vienna's medical community was far from immune to antisemitic discourse. When Professors Nothnagel and Krafft-Ebing recommended Freud for promotion in 1897, they cautioned him, "You know the further difficulties," that is, the particular difficulties for an aspiring Jewish physician.¹⁵³ Although Jews formed, as previously mentioned, more than half of the University of Vienna School of Medicine's faculty, they encountered great resistance in rising to the highest positions.¹⁵⁴ Peter Gay offers reason to believe that Freud met resistance because he was a Jew: "From 1885 on, during Freud's time of waiting, the average span between appointment to a *Dozentur* [lectureship] and appointment to a

¹⁵¹ Hamann, 281.

¹⁵² Schorske, 6.

¹⁵³ Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Times*, 138.

¹⁵⁴ Dennis B. Klein, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 11.

professorship was eight years. [. . .] Freud had to wait for seventeen.”¹⁵⁵ Of those Jews that did secure a professorship, in any field, many faced student boycotts.¹⁵⁶

Antisemitism in the Viennese medical community forms the foundation of one of Schnitzler’s plays, *Professor Bernhardi: Komödie in Fünf Akten* (*Professor Bernhardi: A Comedy in Five Acts*). Although it is a literary text, it draws interesting parallels with Schnitzler’s actual life, and as a play set in “*Vienna around 1900*,”¹⁵⁷ offers insights into how Schnitzler understood antisemitism and its presence in the medical establishment.

The “comedy” centers on Professor Bernhardi, a Jewish doctor and professor of internal medicine. He is also the director of the Elisabethinum, a fictional private hospital, which he founded with two gentile doctors, Dr. Tugendvetter and Dr. Cyprian. The faculty of the Elisabethinum is roughly split between Jewish and non-Jewish members of diverse positions on the Jewish Question. For example, Dr. Ebenwald and the medical student Hochroitzpointner are antisemitic, Dr. Pelugfelder is a gentile liberal, and Dr. Adler is a baptized Jew.

The search for a successor to Dr. Tugendvetter, who plans to retire at the conclusion of the semester, forms the backdrop of the plot. The first candidate is his assistant, the Jewish Dr. Wenger, who is seen with reason by Bernhardi as the most qualified candidate. Tugendvetter and Ebenwald, however, prefer a considerably less-qualified Gentile, Dr. Hell, who had only secured his current position in Graz through powerful connections. The selection of the candidate is left to the board, which

¹⁵⁵ Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Times*, 138.

¹⁵⁶ Klein, 11.

¹⁵⁷ Arthur Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi: A Comedy in Five Acts* trans. by J. M. Q. Davies *Arthur Schnitzler Round Dance and Other Plays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 290.

invariably will be split between the Jews and liberals in favor of Dr. Wenger on the one hand, and the antisemites in favor of Dr. Hell on the other. Bernhardt, as director, will ultimately have the deciding vote.

The focus of the play turns to a patient, a young woman suffering from septicaemia (blood poisoning), for whom the doctors hold no hope of survival. No family members or friends come to visit her. Discussing the cause of her illness, the medical student Hochroitzpointner speculates, “it was probably the result of an illegal operation,” euphemistically referring to an abortion, to which Bernhardt responds there is no evidence to suggest that.¹⁵⁸ Eventually, the young woman is stricken by a euphoric delusion, believing “that in the next few hours someone dear to her will call for her and carry her off—into life and happiness.”¹⁵⁹ When a Roman Catholic priest, Father Reder, arrives to give the dying patient her last rites, Bernhardt forbids him from attending her out of fear that his presence would strip her of her last moment of happiness and quicken her death. As they argue, a nurse had already left to inform the girl of the priest’s arrival. In a state of fear, the nurse relates, the girl subsequently passed away.

The incident quickly becomes a scandal as antisemites attempt to portray Bernhardt as anti-Catholic. It is suggested that he might be called in for questioning before the parliament. Dr. Ebenwald, whose brother sits in parliament, essentially bribes Bernhardt, proposing that, by supporting Dr. Hell’s appointment over Dr. Wenger, the parliamentary issue could be quickly avoided. Bernhardt refuses and makes the decisive

¹⁵⁸ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardt*, 293.

¹⁵⁹ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardt*, 306-307.

vote in favor of Dr. Wenger. Consequentially, Bernhardt's affair is discussed in parliament; a section of the statement against him reads:

Professor Bernhardt, who subscribes to the Moasic confession, was then given to understand by Father Reder that he had come to fulfil a sacred duty, which in this case was all the most urgent because the sick woman had succumbed to the effects of an illegal operation, for which she had only herself to blame; whereupon Professor Bernhardt contemptuously asserted his proprietorial rights in hospital premises built and maintained of course with money donated by noble patrons. When Father Reder declined further discussion and tried to enter the ward, Professor Bernhardt blocked his way, and just as Father Reder grasped the door-handle, determined to enter the ward and carry out his sacred duty, Professor Bernhardt gave him a shove—¹⁶⁰

The subtleties of this statement against Bernhardt, as well as the clear misrepresentation of events, offer insights into how Schnitzler believed antisemitism functioned. For one, although it does not openly criticize Bernhardt for his faith, his "Mosaic confession" is his sole descriptor, and it is communicated in such a way as to put him in opposition with the priest on religious grounds. The young woman, the source of whose illness could not be determined by the rational and liberal Bernhardt, is now openly criticized, in spite of her death, for an abortion "for which she had only herself to blame." The abortion question serves to further outrage the Catholic audience, and the unsubstantiated claim serves to make Bernhardt's supposed wrongdoing appear all the more disturbing. Finally, it is suggested that Bernhardt violently acted to prevent the priest from "carry[ing] out his sacred duty," which never happened. The entire statement hopes to vilify Bernhardt as an anti-Catholic Jew, and elicit an emotional, psychological response from its intended Catholic reader. Schnitzler believes, as will be further demonstrated by his thoughts on Dr. Karl Lueger, that the Christian Social Party does

¹⁶⁰ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardt*, 344.

not have a legitimate case for their antisemitic politics, and merely uses it as a political tool to harness the outrage of the masses.

At the beginning of the next scene, it is revealed that Bernhardt has been sentenced in court to two months of imprisonment. Although the priest testified that he did not believe Bernhardt acted out of contempt for the Roman Catholic Church, the false testimony of the nurse and others led to his conviction. The testimonies of the doctors who defended Bernhardt were discounted as evidence of Jewish solidarity.

Following Bernhardt's release, he became, in the words of Dr. Flint, a doctor turned Christian Social politician, "a martyr, a political victim of clerical intrigue, a sort of medical Dreyfus."¹⁶¹ The play ends in a dialogue between Bernhardt and Flint, in which Bernhardt reasserts his rejection of the possibility of becoming a politician and his desire to remain a doctor.

The negative reception of *Professor Bernhardt* and several of Schnitzler's other works demonstrate how antisemitism negatively affected Schnitzler's literary career. *Professor Bernhardt* premiered in November 1912 in Berlin's Kleines Theater: it was banned in Austria-Hungary, and only made its debut after the dissolution of the empire, in 1918, at Vienna's Deutsches Volkstheater. The official reason for the ban "was that the play presented a distorted picture of Austrian public life."¹⁶² When the liberals protested, they focused on censorship, instead of the play, with the unintended

¹⁶¹ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardt*, 387.

¹⁶² Holly Sayer, "Arthur Schnitzler's Critical Reception in Vienna: The Liberal Press and the Question of Jewish Identity" *German Life and Letters* 60:4 (October 2007), 489.

consequence of failing to defend the play itself. Thus it was left an undefended victim to the antisemitic press.¹⁶³

Although it is by no means an autobiographical text, certain connections between *Professor Bernhardi* and Schnitzler's actual life are impossible to ignore. Just as Professor Bernhardi co-founded the Elisabethinum, Johann Schnitzler had co-founded the private hospital Allgemeine Poliklinik Wien. A character reminiscent of Arthur Schnitzler even appears in the text: Bernhardi's son, Oscar, works in his father's clinic just as Schnitzler did. The connection becomes unmistakable when Oscar's secret penchant for composing is revealed:

OSCAR (*entering from the ward, to Tugendvetter*) Good morning, Professor.
TUGENDVETTER Hello, Oscar. I've heard already: a musician on the side. A dedication waltz called 'Rapid Pulses'.
OSCAR Please, Professor—
BERNHARDI What, you've been composing again without even mentioning it to me? (*Pulls his ear in jest*) Well, are you coming?
OSCAR Yes, I have to go the laboratory.
TUGENDVETTER Fathers and sons—what?¹⁶⁴

Oscar is, as Schnitzler had been prior to his father's death, an artist acting as a doctor in order to meet his father's expectations. That Oscar hid his musical activities from Bernhardi demonstrates the latter's disapproval. Tugendvetter's offhand remark, "Fathers and sons—what?" cements the dynamic, in Schnitzler's eyes, as a common source of contention between father and son.

The final, most significant connection between *Professor Bernhardi* and Schnitzler's real life is the character Dr. Flint, who bears uncanny resemblance to the Christian Social mayor of Vienna, Dr. Karl Lueger. Written just after Lueger's death,

¹⁶³ Sayer, 490.

¹⁶⁴ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi*, 301.

Professor Bernhardt has been interpreted by many as a commentary on the Lueger era.¹⁶⁵ By popularizing political antisemitism, Lueger had an impact on the lives of all of Vienna's Jews, but for Schnitzler there was an additional personal significance. Lueger's political mentor, while he was still a liberal politician, was the Jewish Dr. Ignaz Mandl, Schnitzler's second cousin. One of Mandl's brothers, Louis, was a close childhood friend of Schnitzler and even served with him in the military.¹⁶⁶ Thus Schnitzler was very familiar with Mandl and his (temporary) political ally Lueger, and he describes their political careers in his autobiography:

As Vienna councilman, [Mandl's] functioning was vociferous rather than productive. He was active, without any justification whatsoever, as an anti-corruptionist, and to begin with formed, together with Dr. Lueger, what might be termed a party of their own. Soon they were joined by other rather questionable ethicists, and the anti-corruption democratic party soon developed into the anti-Semitic wing of the city administration, not because more corrupt elements were to be found among the Jewish population than among those of other faiths, but because it seemed more easily explicable to the masses and therefore promised a quicker political success, to denounce as corrupt a strictly defined group of human beings, especially the Jews, who seemed destined for the role even without the 'yellow mark' they once had to wear.¹⁶⁷

It is clear that Schnitzler is highly critical of these two politicians, but his criticism focuses entirely upon the legitimacy of their platform, rather than disagreeing with them ideologically. He criticizes them, for example, as being "vociferous rather than productive" and "active, without any justification whatsoever, as an anti-corruptionist." He then discounts political antisemitism, as he did in *Professor Bernhardt*, as a political tool: Lueger became antisemitic "not because more corrupt elements were to be found among the Jewish population [. . .], but because it was more easily explicable to the masses and therefore promised a quicker political success." He explains that

¹⁶⁵ Matthias Konzett. "The Difficult Rebirth of Cosmopolitanism: Schnitzler and Contemporary Austrian Literature" ed. by Dagmar Lorenz *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003), 362.

¹⁶⁶ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 118.

¹⁶⁷ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 119.

antisemitism was not rational or legitimate, but merely an effective political tool. Of course, with the adoption of antisemitic rhetoric, Lueger advanced, “without a glance at his fallen friend [the Jewish Dr. Mandl], moved on to the prescribed path of his promising future at the end of which beckoned the longed-for-goal of his aspirations—the dignity of the mayoralty.”¹⁶⁸ Schnitzler goes further to criticize Lueger’s own personal commitment to antisemitism:

Although he understood so well how to exploit the lower instincts of the masses and the general political atmosphere to further his own ends, at heart, even at the height of his popularity, he was no more anti-Semitic than he had been in the days when he had played tarot at the home of Dr. Ferdinand Mandl, with his brother Ignatz and other Jews. There were and still are people who thought it was to his credit that even during the period of his most pronounced anti-Semitism he preserved a certain preference for a great many Jews and didn’t try to conceal it, but as far as I am concerned, this has always seemed to me the strongest evidence of his moral questionability. Or are the so-called differentiations between the demands of political partisanship, on the one hand, and one’s own private, human convictions, experiences and sympathies on the other really so clean-cut as the designation implies? I would say no, just the opposite; that for the pure in heart it is impossible to make such differentiations, much less to be pleased with them.”¹⁶⁹

In addition to further discounting antisemitism, this passage demonstrates Schnitzler’s strong commitment to ethics, represented by “the pure in heart.” For Schnitzler, Lueger is despicable not only because of his antisemitic politics, but also because he does not genuinely believe in them, rendering him morally or ethically questionable.

Professor Bernhardi embodies Schnitzler’s conception of the ethical “pure in heart.” Bernhardi prevented the priest from attending to the dying woman because he believed it to be his duty “to ensure that as far as possible [his] patients are allowed to die happily,” not because of anti-Catholic sentiment.¹⁷⁰ Of all the characters, Bernhardi was the only one concerned with the truth of the matter: Father Reder used the incident

¹⁶⁸ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 120.

¹⁶⁹ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 119-120.

¹⁷⁰ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi*, 307.

to protect and further the Church, Dr. Ebenwald used it to advance an unqualified Gentile professionally, and Dr. Flint used it to further his political career. Even the liberals, upon making him a hero, attempt to use him for political gain, but Bernhardi declines, insisting, “my affair is a purely personal one.”¹⁷¹ That is to say, he preferred not to take sides in the political conflict. In his words, “I never had the faintest intention of trying to solve questions. I simply did what I held to be right in the specific case.”¹⁷² Ultimately, Bernhardi raises questions about the moral life of Vienna: “The issue was no longer Austrian politics, or for that matter politics at all, rather I suddenly seemed to be dealing with wider ethical matters, with responsibility and revelation and ultimately the question of free will.”¹⁷³

Just as Bernhardi was isolated by his colleagues at the hospital, so was Freud in real life. As Freud felt more and more isolated from Viennese society and the academy, he focused on building relationships with other Jews. At a conference in Vienna in 1887, Freud met the German Jewish otolaryngologist Wilhelm Fliess (1858–1928), an acquaintance which developed into a strong friendship that would last for fifteen years. Their well-documented correspondence (they wrote often by letter since Fliess lived in Berlin) demonstrates that Freud used Fliess as a sounding board for many of his new (and controversial) theories, and ultimately Fliess played an important role in both Freud’s life and the development of psychoanalysis.¹⁷⁴ Freud also later joined the Viennese chapter of B’nai B’rith International, a Jewish fraternal lodge, in 1897. He

¹⁷¹ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi*, 379.

¹⁷² Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi*, 400.

¹⁷³ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi*, 398.

¹⁷⁴ See: Sigmund Freud, *The Origins of Psychoanalysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess, Drafts and Notes, 1887-1902* trans. by Eric Mosbacher and James Strachey (New York: Basic Books, 1954).

joined to surround himself with accepting (Jewish) friends, seeking “refuge specifically from anti-Semitic ostracism.”¹⁷⁵ As he did with Fliess, he presented his theories and works to the B’nai B’rith for constructive criticism before he published them. In a sense, antisemitism caused him to abandon the established academic circles and seek support from the Jewish community.¹⁷⁶ Upon developing psychoanalysis, Freud again sought out Jewish followers. In fact, until Carl Jung (1875–1961) and another Swiss psychiatrist joined in 1907, all members (around 20) of the psychoanalytic circle were Jewish. Freud began to fear that psychoanalysis would be regarded as a “Jewish science” and would consequentially never receive mainstream acceptance. He thus reluctantly encouraged Christians like Jung to join the psychoanalytic movement.¹⁷⁷ Yet before Freud discovered psychoanalysis, and before Schnitzler developed into a renowned writer of modern literature, they first turned away from Vienna and the rest of the German-speaking world, and toward the shining city of light, Paris.

¹⁷⁵ Klein, 72.

¹⁷⁶ Klein, 72.

¹⁷⁷ Klein, 94.

5. The French Connection

A number of scholars have revised and rejected Schorske's fin-de-siècle model. Among other criticisms, they contend that Vienna was not the lone birthplace of modernism. The city of Paris stands out as the most important antecedent to Vienna 1900. Though the ethnic Germans of Austria shared linguistic, cultural, and historical connections with their northern neighbors in Berlin, the Viennese avant-garde looked to French, not German, modernism as a model. It was as a correspondent for the liberal newspaper *Neue Freie Presse* in Paris—the Paris of the Dreyfus Affair—that Herzl completed his transformation from liberal German-nationalist into “Zionist crusader.”¹⁷⁸ French ideas and theories also deeply influenced Freud and Schnitzler, in their respective *métiers*. Freud traveled to France to train under and translate the great French hypnotists, Jean-Martin Charcot and Hippolyte Bernheim, representing the Paris and Nancy Schools of hypnotism, respectively. His embrace of hypnotherapy distanced him further from the medical establishment in Vienna and brought him closer to discovering psychoanalysis. Schnitzler became one of hypnotherapy's few, as well as one of its more vigilant, supporters in Vienna, and developed perspectives similar to Freud's on the human psyche. When Schnitzler dedicated himself to writing literature, he became a founding member of Vienna's foremost literary circle, Jung-Wien (Young Vienna), which drew inspiration from Parisian *decadence* rather than Berlin naturalism. Thus the French connection brought Freud one step closer to psychoanalysis, and Schnitzler one step closer to his modern literature of the psyche.

¹⁷⁸ Schorske, 152.

The legitimization of hypnotherapy began in France, although hypnotism itself actually began in Vienna during the eighteenth century, at the hands of the German physician Franz Anton Mesmer (1734–1815). Trained during the heyday of the First Viennese Medical School, Mesmer developed a clinical technique that he called “animal magnetism,” today often referred to simply as “mesmerism.” He “believed that the universe was filled with a magnetic fluid and that man’s health depended upon its amount and distribution. Cures were achieved by a laying on of hands by the magnetist or through physical contact with objects [. . .] charged by him with magnetic power.”¹⁷⁹ Accusations of charlatanism and fraud prevented Mesmer and his theories from gaining acceptance in the scientific community. In 1778, he was forced to leave Vienna when questions were raised about sexual involvement in his efforts to cure the attractive pianist Maria Theresia von Paradis of her blindness.¹⁸⁰ At the request of Louis XVI, he moved to Paris, where his treatments became popular among the aristocracy.

Mesmerism provided the basis for the development of hypnosis. The Scottish surgeon James Braid (1795–1860) evaluated demonstrations of animal magnetism and was intrigued by the so-called mesmerized state of patients. He concluded that their sleep-like state was legitimate and renamed it hypnosis (*hypnos* is Greek for sleep).¹⁸¹ Although hypnotism sought to distance itself from the poorly respected mesmerism, it received the same criticism from the medical community. Hypnotism’s début onto the medical stage came only after its popularization by the esteemed French neurologist Jean-Martin Charcot (1825–93).

¹⁷⁹ Ackerknecht, *Short History of Psychiatry*, 84.

¹⁸⁰ Alexander, Selesnick, *The History of Psychiatry*, 127.

¹⁸¹ Alexander, Selesnick, *The History of Psychiatry*, 132.

Perhaps the foremost neurologist in nineteenth-century France, Charcot made many important medical discoveries long before his work in hypnosis as head of the Salpêtrière hospital in Paris. These include the first identifications of multiple sclerosis, ALS (“Lou Gehrig’s disease”), and Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease, among many others. He was so renowned as a neurologist that, although the heads of different wards in the hospital traditionally rotated, a special chair in nervous diseases was created specifically for him in 1882.¹⁸² As Alexander and Selesnick point out in their *History of Psychiatry*, it was precisely because “Charcot’s reputation as a neurologist was so firmly established that he could afford to turn his interest to the phenomenon of hypnosis, which was still in disrepute among most medical men.”¹⁸³

That Charcot happened upon the hysteric patients of La Salpêtrière was actually coincidental. As a result of a building renovation, epileptics and hysterics were temporarily assigned to his ward. He began to study these new patients with great enthusiasm. Although he was not the first to make the discovery, Charcot struck down most definitively the belief that hysteria was an exclusively female disorder, but he could document only six cases of male hysteria, conceding that it primarily afflicted women.¹⁸⁴

The personage of Charcot was almost as famous as the physician. He was renowned for the large, international audiences he commanded in his Parisian home. Every Tuesday, he gave lectures to members of the medical community, the so-called *lécons du mardi*, and on Thursday he gave lectures to lay members of the public, often

¹⁸² Shorter, *History of Psychiatry*, 85.

¹⁸³ Alexander, Selesnick, *The History of Psychiatry*, 171.

¹⁸⁴ Furst, *Before Freud*, 113. “Pierre Briquet [. . .] in his *Traité Clinique et thérapeutique de l’hystérie* (1859) briefly mentions the possibility of male hysteria.”

people of high social status.¹⁸⁵ Perhaps it was his penchant for entertaining the haute monde that led him to hypnosis, a procedure that was quite theatrical, even magical. As Freud later admitted, “there was something positively seductive in working with hypnotism [. . .] and it was highly flattering to enjoy the reputation of being a miracle-worker.”¹⁸⁶ Thus Charcot became the great physician-entertainer, immortalized in André Brouillet’s 1887 painting *Une leçon à la Salpêtrière* in which he demonstrates hypnosis on a hysterical woman before a large audience of colleagues. Literary scholar Lilian Furst notes that even Charcot’s medical writings emphasized this point, arguing that “Reading Charcot’s case histories underscores the extent to which he was essentially both a storyteller and a showman.”¹⁸⁷ As will be shown, this trait was as influential on the young Freud, the interpreter of dreams, and Schnitzler, the dramatist, as was his work with hypnotism.

As Charcot’s prestige continued to spread, he succeeded in capturing Freud’s attention. Freud’s work on brain anatomy under Meynert proved to be no more financially prosperous than physiology under Brücke had been, and thus he fixed his sights on psychiatry. At the time, this medical specialty hardly existed in Vienna. This was a consequence of the dominant materialist theory of illness: “physicians trained in anatomy ignored neurotic patients, on whom postmortem analysis could reveal nothing.”¹⁸⁸ In order to train in psychiatry, Freud had to leave Vienna, and, as his

¹⁸⁵ Furst, *Before Freud*, 112.

¹⁸⁶ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 9-10.

¹⁸⁷ Furst, *Before Freud*, 121.

¹⁸⁸ Johnston, *The Austrian Mind*, 229.

autobiography states, “In the distance shone the great name of Charcot.”¹⁸⁹ Freud stayed in Vienna until he had obtained the *Dozent* (Lecturer) position, before leveraging his close relationship with Brücke to secure a travel grant to study in Paris under Charcot in 1885.

Freud arrived in Paris speaking broken French and with few contacts. It was not until he offered to translate Charcot’s transcribed lectures, *Leçons sur les maladies du système nerveux* (Lectures on the Diseases of the Nervous System), into German that he was “admitted to the circle of [Charcot’s] personal acquaintances.”¹⁹⁰ In Freud’s preface to this translation, he identifies the paradigm shift resulting from Charcot’s work: “When in the winter of 1885 I arrived at the Salpêtrière [. . .], I found that Professor Charcot [. . .] had turned away from the study of the nervous diseases that are based on organic changes and was devoting himself exclusively to research into the neuroses—and particularly hysteria.”¹⁹¹ This observation seemingly suggests that Charcot denied organic changes as the basis of neuroses, effectively rejecting the materialist theory of illness; however, at the time both Charcot and Freud were materialists. In Charcot’s medical writings, for example, Furst observes, “Charcot concentrates on the physical manifestations of hysteria such as ovarian or abdominal pain, headaches, beating at the temples,” and concludes it is “because he is a neurologist accustomed to tracking the signs of somatic disease.”¹⁹² This commitment to materialist theory had important implications for Charcot’s understanding of hypnosis and hysteria. Charcot was able to

¹⁸⁹ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 6.

¹⁹⁰ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 6.

¹⁹¹ Sigmund Freud, “Preface to the Translation of Charcot’s *Lectures on the Diseases of the Nervous System*,” *The Standard Edition of The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* vol. 1, 21.

¹⁹² Furst, *Before Freud*, 114.

induce symptoms of hysteria in patients, such as paralysis, using hypnotism. He concluded that the ability to enter into a hypnotic state must be a pathological trait specific to hysterics and other neurotics since hysterical symptoms could only conceivably have materialist etiology—a stance that Charcot’s Paris School maintained until after Charcot’s death.

In response to his studies under Charcot, Freud recalls needing to “overcome [his] initial bewilderment at the findings of Charcot’s new investigations,”¹⁹³ emphasizing how radical propositions such as hypnotherapy and male hysteria were perceived by the Viennese medical community. Although Freud lowered his guard to Charcot’s ideas, convincing the rest of Vienna proved more difficult. Upon his return in 1886, he delivered a report of his studies under Charcot to Vienna’s Gesellschaft der Ärzte (Doctors’ Society). As Freud describes it:

I met with a bad reception. Persons of authority, such as the chairman (Bamberger, the physician), declared that what I said was incredible. Meynert challenged me to find some cases in Vienna similar to those which I had described and to present them before the Society. [. . .] One of them, an old surgeon, actually broke out with the exclamation: ‘But, my dear sir, how can you talk such nonsense? *Hysterion* (sic) means the uterus. So how can a man be hysterical?’¹⁹⁴

Freud now had two reasons to be dissatisfied with the medical establishment in Vienna: antisemitism and irrationality. He laments, “The impression that the high authorities had rejected my innovations remained unshaken; and, with my hysteria in men and my production of hysterical paralyses by suggestion, I found myself forced into the Opposition.”¹⁹⁵ The capitalization of ‘opposition’ is invariably the stylistic choice of the translator, Peter Gay, since all nouns in German are capitalized; however, his emphasis

¹⁹³ Freud, “Preface to the Translation of Charcot,” 21.

¹⁹⁴ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 8.

¹⁹⁵ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 8.

is not without warrant. It reminds the reader that Freud spoke often of belonging to the “opposition.” For example, when Freud describes his first encounter of antisemitism at the University of Vienna (cited in a previous chapter), he states the result was that he “was made familiar with the fate of being in the Opposition [. . .]. The foundations were thus laid for a certain degree of independence of judgment.”¹⁹⁶ Antisemitism cast Freud out of society and made him an outsider, yet Freud was consoled by the “independence of judgment” and the willingness to break from the establishment he developed as a result. Charcot and the Paris School merely gave him reason to make the break.

Charcot also played a significant role in Schnitzler’s medical career. In 1888, Schnitzler also transferred out of Meynert’s ward at the Allgemeines Krankenhaus, so that he could work under his father in his private *Poliklinik*, where he worked until the death of his father in 1893. Ever the writer, Schnitzler made his biggest contributions to the field of medicine through his journal articles, published in his father’s journal, *Wiener medizinische Presse*, later the *Internationale klinische Rundschau*.¹⁹⁷ Although Schnitzler never went to Paris to study under Charcot, he became familiar with his theories and writings through Freud’s translations. Thus Charcot represents the first direct point of contact between Freud and Schnitzler. In fact, Schnitzler even published reviews of Freud’s translations. Schnitzler described Freud’s first translation of Charcot as “einer ausgezeichneten Übersetzung von Dr. *Freud*.”¹⁹⁸ He goes so far as to

¹⁹⁶ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 4.

¹⁹⁷ Horst Thomé selected and published the most significant of Schnitzler’s medical texts in 1988. See: Arthur Schnitzler, *Medizinische Schriften* ed. by Horst Thomé (Vienna: Paul Zsolnay Verlag, 1988).

¹⁹⁸ “an excellent translation from Dr. *Freud*.” Translation my own.

recommend Charcot's study as reading for all physicians.¹⁹⁹ Schnitzler's wholehearted endorsement of Charcot's ideas (and Freud's translation thereof) can be interpreted as a significant alignment with Freud's perspective on both hysteria and hypnotism, which certainly was not the case for the rest of the Viennese medical community.

The debate became more complex with the rise of a rival French school of hypnotism in Nancy. Under the helm of the physician Ambroise-Auguste Liébeault and his protégé, Hippolyte Bernheim, the Nancy School challenged Charcot's assertion that hypnotism could only be performed on hysterics. In 1886, Bernheim published *De la Suggestion et de ses applications à la thérapeutique* (On Suggestion and Its Applications to Therapy), in which he argued that the effectiveness of hypnotism was actually the product of suggestion, i.e., when the hypnotist guided the thoughts and behavior of the hypnotized using verbal and non-verbal forms of suggestion. The hypnotic state merely helped facilitate suggestion, which could also be applied without hypnotism. Bernheim effectively stripped "the manifestations of hypnotism of their strangeness by linking them up with their familiar phenomena of normal psychological life and of sleep."²⁰⁰ More importantly, he also demonstrated that non-hysterics were susceptible to both suggestion and hypnotism as well. This had enormous consequences for psychiatry: since hypnotism could be used to induce the symptoms of hysteria, such as localized paralysis, in otherwise mentally sane subjects, it followed that hysteria and other nervous disorders could have purely psychological origins.

¹⁹⁹ Arthur Schnitzler, "Neue Vorlesungen Vorlesungen über die Krankheiten des Nervensystems, insbesondere über Hysterie," *Medizinische Schriften*, 82.

²⁰⁰ Sigmund Freud, "Preface to the Translation of Bernheim's *Suggestion*," *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* vol. 1, 75.

Freud quickly caught wind of these developments. He translated Bernheim's *De la Suggestion* into German in 1888, only two years after his translation of Charcot's lectures.²⁰¹ Up until his visit to Bernheim in Nancy in 1889, however, Freud remained committed to Charcot and the Paris School.²⁰² Bernheim's ideas, like those of Charcot, were met with skepticism and disbelief by most of the medical community in Vienna. Once again, Schnitzler was a notable exception. Through Freud's translation, he had access to the developments in Nancy. This time, Schnitzler wrote a significantly more detailed review. He begins by describing the two camps that had formed in Vienna: "while one comes to the conclusion that we have found in hypnotic suggestion one of the *most valuable therapeutic achievements* of our century, the other finds in the same treatment something *degrading*; while one strives to inform the medical world of their enthusiasm for the new cause, the other scornfully shuts it out."²⁰³ There appears to be more at stake than a mere academic debate, as hypnotherapy promises to be either an achievement of the century or degradation of the medical science. Using equally strong language, Schnitzler reveals his position, based on his reading of Bernheim:

If you have once read this work, in which every page makes known the logical sharpness, the profound observations and the fine didacticism of its author, perhaps then even the skeptics will ask themselves if they can simply proceed to casually disregard the truths which appear to represent such a significant asset to our science. Someday they will finally have to emancipate themselves from the adverse impression that the amateur application and inept popularization of a purely scientific theory engendered. It now lies in

²⁰¹ James Strachey, "Editor's Note: Preface to the Translation of Bernheim's *De la Suggestion*," *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* 1, 73.

²⁰² Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time*, 51.

²⁰³ Arthur Schnitzler, "*Die Suggestion und ihre Heilwirkung* von Dr. H. Bernheim, Professor an der Fakultät de Médecine in Nancy. Autorisierte deutsche Ausgabe von Dr. Sigm. Freud, Dozen für Nervenkrankheiten in Wien," *Medizinische Schriften* ed. by Horst Thomé (Vienna: Paul Zsolnay Verlag, 1988), 210. My translation. Original: "während der eine zum Resultat kommen, daß wir aus der hypnotischen Suggestion einer der *wertvollsten therapeutischen Errungenschaften* unseres Jahrhunderts gewonnen haben, findet der andere in der selben Heilmethode etwas *für Entwürdigendes*; während der eine seine Begeisterung für die neue Sache der ärztlichen Welt mitzuteilen strebt, schließt sich der andere verachtend von ihr ab."

the hands of scholars of the highest circles, and a diamond does not become worthless because children and fools once played with it.²⁰⁴

By “children and fools,” Schnitzler refers to the animal mystics like Mesmer and other crooks who had misappropriated hypnotism. He appeals to the work of famous physicians in France, “scholars of the highest circles,” in hopes of demonstrating hypnotherapy’s legitimacy to the Viennese. Schnitzler’s review demonstrates that he viewed hypnotherapy as a sort of “litmus test” for the Viennese medical establishment, fearing that “local debates were driven by secondary, political concerns rather than rational judgment.”²⁰⁵ This dilemma served, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, as the central conflict of Schnitzler’s later play *Professor Bernhardi*: the protagonist’s actions became a political, rather than a rational or ethical issue. Unfortunately for Freud and Schnitzler, the Viennese—led by Meynert—would disappoint them with their lack of enthusiasm for the French science. Hypnotherapy, by planting seeds of doubt about the philosophical underpinning of the Second Viennese Medical School, the materialist theory of illnesses, and by developing into a source of contention within Vienna’s medical community, had the effect on Freud and Schnitzler of discrediting Vienna’s supposedly liberal and rational institutions, and ultimately alienating them from the ideas and values propagated by those institutions.

²⁰⁴ Schnitzler, “*Die Suggestion und ihre Heilwirkung*,” 211. My translation. Original: “Wenn sie einmal dieses Werk gelesen haben, in welchem jede Seite die logische Schärfe, die tiefe Beobachtung und den schönen Lehrwillen ihres Verfassers kundgibt, so werden sich wohl auch die Skeptiker fragen, ob es den angeht, an den Wahrheiten auch weiterhin flüchtig vorbeizugehen, die einen so bedeutenden Gewinn für unsere Wissenschaft vorzustellen scheinen. Man wird sich endlich einmal von dem ungünstigen Eindruck emanzipieren müssen, welcher die laienhafte Verwertung und die ungeschickte Popularisierung einer rein naturwissenschaftlichen Lehre hervorbrachten. Gelehrte der strengsten Gilde haben die Sache heute in der Hand, und ein Diamant wird nicht darum wertlos, weil einmal Kinder und Narren damit gespielt haben.”

²⁰⁵ Hilary Hope Herzog, “‘Medizin ist eine Weltanschauung’: On Schnitzler’s Medical Writings,” *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler* ed. Dagmar Lorenz (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003), 233.

At the same time as the debates over hypnosis raged in Vienna, Schnitzler dedicated himself to writing with new conviction. In 1887, he co-founded what was to become “the most important literary association in turn-of-the-century Vienna,” Jung-Wien (Young Vienna).²⁰⁶ It counted Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Richard Beer-Hofmann, and Peter Altenberg, as well as briefly Karl Kraus and Theodor Herzl, among its members. The group, known for its meetings at the Café Griendsteidl, adopted literary critic Hermann Bahr as its leader and spokesman. In serving in such a role, and with his extensive writing on literary theory, Bahr offers an unrivaled source for understanding the theoretical foundation of Jung-Wien and Schnitzler’s literary works.

As seen in the previous chapter, Bahr was originally a Pan-Germanist; however, Bahr constantly reinvented himself. In 1884, he left Vienna for Berlin, where he stayed until 1887. Here he became a Marxist and political supporter of the Social Democrats. Bahr also developed his passion for literature in Berlin, specifically for the emerging Naturalist movement. German Naturalists “looked unashamedly towards France,” especially towards Émile Zola (1840–1902), “as a source for its literary models.”²⁰⁷ In many ways, Naturalism represented the same ideals and theories as the Second Viennese Medical School. Much as the materialist theory of illness understood the human body as the sum of its chemical and physical components, Naturalism perceived human society and individuals using concepts from the natural sciences. It sought to recreate the empirical world as it appeared through careful observation. Inspired in part

²⁰⁶ Abigail Gillman, *Viennese Jewish Modernism: Freud, Hofmannsthal, Beer-Hofmann, and Schnitzler* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2009), 2.

²⁰⁷ Andrew W. Barker, “‘Der grosse Überwinder’: Hermann Bahr and the Rejection of Naturalism,” *The Modern Language Review* vol. 78, no. 3 (June, 1983), 620.

by Darwinist ideas, it focused on notions of heredity and social *milieu*, viewing human behavior and society as products of deterministic elements.

Some of Schnitzler's earlier texts, such as the drama *Liebelei* (*Light-O'-Love*, 1895), demonstrate Naturalist characteristics.²⁰⁸ Central to Schnitzler's Naturalist social critique in many of his early works, including *Liebelei*, is the so-called *süßes Mädel* (cute girl) character. As defined by Reinhard Urbach, "The *süßes Mädel* type may be described as a young and frivolous thing from the outskirts who, during the flower of her youth, seeks pleasurable experience with the young men of better social class and then, in maturity, marries a workman—a good man."²⁰⁹ Above all else, Schnitzler's celebrated use of the *süßes Mädel* type belongs to his wider critique of social norms on sex and love outside of marriage. This will be demonstrated in the analysis of another play, *Reigen* (*La Ronde*, 1897), in the next chapter.²¹⁰

For Bahr, who stood at the avant-garde of literary movements just as he had done earlier with politics, Naturalism soon became passé. After returning to Austria in 1887 to complete his military service, Bahr left for Paris in 1888, where he discovered the aesthetic—not materialist—movements of *Décadence*, Symbolism, and Impressionism.²¹¹ Ever the "literary catalyst,"²¹² the former champion of Naturalism returned to Vienna and published the essay "Die Überwindung des Naturalismus" (The Overcoming of Naturalism) in 1891, in which he declared, "The reign of Naturalism is

²⁰⁸ Barker, 623.

²⁰⁹ Reinhard Urbach, *Arthur Schnitzler* trans. by Donald Daviau (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1973), 61-62.

²¹⁰ *Reigen* refers to a round dance, is known in the English-speaking world by its French translation, *La Ronde*.

²¹¹ Harold Segel, *The Vienna Coffeehouse Wits: 1890-1938* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1993), 42.

²¹² Andrew W. Barker, " 'Der grosse Überwinder': Hermann Bahr and the Rejection of Naturalism" *The Modern Language Review* vol. 78, no. 3 (June, 1983), 617.

past, its role is finished, its magic is broken.”²¹³ To demonstrate just how avant-garde Bahr’s claim was, it is important to note, as Wolfgang Nehring points out that the “most important works of naturalism, for example Hauptmann’s *The Weavers*, had not even been written yet when this happened.”²¹⁴ Bahr’s familiarity with the modern literary movements in France, however, enabled him to make a profound prediction: “I believe, therefore, that Naturalism will be overcome by a nervous Romanticism; or rather, I would like to say: by a mysticism of the nerves.”²¹⁵ In effect, Bahr believes that literature will transgress Naturalism, with its focus on the empirical and depicting the world as it materially is, to a modern literature of the nerves, which turns inward and uses psychology to understand how the world is perceived and felt. Who better to champion this modern, psychological literature than the neurologist Dr. Arthur Schnitzler?

²¹³ Hermann Bahr, “Die Überwindung des Naturalismus” ed. by Claus Pias *Kritische Schriften II* (Weimar: VDG, 2004), 128. My translation. Original: “Die Herrschaft des Naturalismus ist vorüber, seine Rolle ist ausgespielt, sein Zauber ist gebrochen.”

²¹⁴ Wolfgang Nehring, “Berlin – Vienna: Competition and Reciprocal Inspiration” *Pacific Coast Philology* Vol. 38 (2003), 7.

²¹⁵ Bahr, 130. My translation. Original: “Ich glaube also, daß der Naturalismus überwunden worden wird durch eine nervöse Romantik; noch lieber möchte ich sagen: durch eine Mystik der Nerven.”

6. The Birth of Psychological Man

In spite of their education and talent, Freud and Schnitzler were pushed to the margins of Viennese society like so many other Jews in the city. Consequently, they became disillusioned with the city's (increasingly German-imported) ideals and theories, such as the materialist theory of illness in medicine and Naturalism in literature, and instead looked towards the city of Paris as a model. Their identity as Viennese Jews brought them further than their French predecessors: on one hand, antisemitism fostered heightened identity consciousness (and thereby played an important role in the "discovery" of the unconscious), and on the other, their "objectivity" as Jews allowed them to explore the role of sexuality in neuroses and human behavior to an extent unprecedented in the Catholic Habsburg capital.

The final catalyst in Freud's development of psychoanalysis—the conception of psychological man—came through collaboration with the Jewish physician Josef Breuer (1842–1925), whose acquaintance Freud had made through their mutual friendship with Ernst von Brücke. It is interesting to note that in 1868, Breuer had discovered, together with Professor of Physiology Ewald Hering, the psychological reflex involved in respiration, known to this day as the Hering-Breuer reflex, which had hitherto only been understood as a physiological function. Thus from early on, Breuer was acutely aware of the role of psychology in even the most basic of human functions.

Freud and Breuer's collaboration and comparison of case histories culminated in the 1895 publication of *Studien über Hysterie* (*Studies on Hysteria*). The centerpiece of this publication was the case history of Anna O., the pseudonym of a young Viennese

Jew named Bertha Pappenheim (1859–1936). Since December 1880, Anna O. had been a patient of Breuer. Her father had contracted a fatal illness, and she became his caretaker. Soon, however, the twenty-one year old started to demonstrate multiple symptoms of hysteria, including:

weakness induced by loss of appetite, a severe nervous cough [. . .] a convergent squint [. . .] headaches, intervals of excitement, curious disturbances of vision, partial paralyses and loss of sensation. [. . .] She experienced mental lapses, long somnolent episodes, rapid shifts of mood, hallucinations about black snakes, skulls, and skeletons, mounting difficulties with her speech. [. . .] at times, she could speak only English, or French and Italian. She developed two distinct, highly contrasting personalities, one of them extremely unruly.²¹⁶

More remarkable than Anna O.'s long list of strange symptoms was the method that was developed to treat them. The major breakthrough in Anna O.'s case occurred when she began demonstrating symptoms of hydrophobia and became unable to drink water. As usual, Breuer would place her under hypnosis during his visits, and she would often begin talking incessantly and telling stories. The breakthrough occurred when "she told Breuer she had seen her English lady-companion—whom she disliked—letting her little dog drink out of a glass. Once her suppressed disgust came out into the open, the hydrophobia disappeared."²¹⁷ Thus Anna O. could relieve her symptoms merely by talking about their origins. She referred to this procedure as her "talking cure" or as "chimney sweeping"; Breuer called the phenomenon catharsis.

Breuer ended his treatment of Anna O. in June 1882. In the final paragraph of his written case on Anna O., he states, "The final cure of the hysteria deserves a few more words. It was accompanied [. . .] by considerable disturbances, a deterioration in the patient's mental condition. [. . .] It remains to be seen whether it may not be that the

²¹⁶ Gay, *Freud: A Life For Our Times*, 65.

²¹⁷ Gay, *Freud: A Life For Our Times*, 65.

same origin is to be traced in other cases in which a chronic hysteria terminates in a psychosis.”²¹⁸ As he subtly hints, his “final cure” falls considerably short of being an actual cure. When treatment ended, Bertha Pappenheim was addicted to chloral and morphine and subsequently spent several years in various sanatoria.²¹⁹

Breuer first shared Anna O.’s case with Freud in 1883, more than ten years before the publication of *Studien über Hysterie*. Breuer’s cathartic treatment became another important piece of evidence in the case against the materialist theory of illness; however, Breuer and Freud did not reject the role of biology outright. In the Anna O. case, for example, they offer a potential heredity link: “She may be regarded as having had a moderately severe neuropathic heredity, since some psychoses had occurred among her more distant relatives.”²²⁰ Unfortunately, Freud and Breuer’s collaboration was not meant to last. Even as they wrote *Studien*, they begin to have considerable disagreements. For example, Freud and Breuer disagreed over whether neurotic illnesses were somehow linked with sexuality. Freud’s correspondence with Fliess demonstrates that, at the time, Freud had already begun to suspect a link. He wrote in one letter, “It may be taken as well known that neurasthenia is a frequent consequence of an abnormal sexual life. The assertion, however, which I should like to make and test with observations is that neurasthenia can in fact *only* be a sexual neurosis.”²²¹ This is a tremendous leap from the materialist theory of illness that still prevailed in Vienna, and it is a claim that remains disputed to this day—a leap that Breuer was reluctant to make.

²¹⁸ Josef Breuer and Sigmund Freud, “Case I: Fräulein Anna. O.,” *The Freud Reader* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989), 78.

²¹⁹ Loentz, “Jewishness in the City of Schnitzler and Anna O.,” 79.

²²⁰ Breuer and Freud, “Case 1,” 61.

²²¹ Gay, *Freud: A Life For Our Times*, 62.

Much later, Freud gave a fuller account of the story, claiming that Breuer abandoned the case prematurely when, upon being summoned to Pappenheim's bedside, he found her "in the throes of false labor, announcing, "Dr. B's baby is coming!"²²² In spite of Breuer's reluctance, and his ultimate abandonment of the patient, the Anna O. case and the discovery of catharsis remains central to the foundation of psychoanalysis.

After Freud broke from Breuer, he transformed the cathartic treatment in two important ways. For one, he argued for a sexual etiology of neurotic illnesses. Secondly, he abandoned the use of hypnotism. Freud's analysis of sexuality and its effect on the psyche was undoubtedly influenced by Richard Krafft-Ebing (1840–1902), the man who finally recommended Freud for a professorship. He was, next to Meynert, "the most renowned psychiatrist in Vienna."²²³ In 1886, Krafft-Ebing published *Psychopathia sexualis*,²²⁴ which documented case histories of abnormal sexual behavior. It helped, for example, to popularize the terms "sadism" and "masochism," named after the Marquis de Sade and Leopold von Sacher-Masoch, respectively. Krafft-Ebing, a devout Catholic, openly disapproved of the sexual deviances he described and was against any form of recreational sex.²²⁵ *Psychopathia sexualis* realized immediate success, as it was translated into seven languages and published in twelve new editions by the year of Krafft-Ebing's death.²²⁶ Freud's theories about sex received no such welcoming.

In 1896, a year after the publication of *Studien über Hysterie*, Freud published the paper "L'Hérédité et l'étiologie des névroses" ("Heredity and the Aetiology of the

²²² Loentz, "Jewishness in the City of Schnitzler and Anna O.," 79.

²²³ Johnston, 232.

²²⁴ A Latin title was common for books from this time period that contained sexual or erotic subject matter, as it was an attempt to dissuade lay readers.

²²⁵ Johnston, 233.

²²⁶ Johnston, 233.

Neuroses”), which he addressed to “the disciples of J.-M. Charcot [who died in 1893], in order to put forward some objections to the aetiological theory of the neuroses which was handed on to us by our teacher.”²²⁷ He begins by minimizing the role of heredity, a vestige of the materialist theory of illness. Then, in an act of showmanship that would have impressed the French neurologist he denounces, he declares:

“What, then, are the specific causes of neuroses? Is there a single one or are there several? [. . .] On the basis of a laborious examination of the facts, I shall maintain [. . .] that each of the major neuroses [. . .] has at its immediate cause one particular disturbance of the economics of the nervous system, and that these functional pathological modifications *have as their common source the subject’s sexual life, whether they lie in a disorder of his contemporary sexual life or in important events in his past life.*”²²⁸

He goes on to recognize the specific etiology of hysteria as a “*passive sexual experience before puberty.*”²²⁹ Freud was able to advance this theory more clearly once he had abandoned the use of hypnotism.

Given Freud’s familiarity with Bernheim’s theories, this was a fairly predictable progression. As he states in his autobiographical essay,

While I was in this perplexity [concerning the necessity of hypnotism in cathartic treatment] there came to my help the recollection of an experiment which I had often witnessed while I was with Bernheim. When the subject awoke from the state of somnambulism, he seemed to have lost all memory of what had happened while he was in that state. But Bernheim maintained that the memory was present all the same; and if he insisted on the subject remembering [. . .] then the forgotten memories used in fact to return, hesitatingly at first, but eventually in a flood with complete clarity. [. . .] So I abandoned hypnotism, only retaining my practice of requiring the patient to lie upon a sofa while I sat behind him, seeing him, but not seen myself.²³⁰

In liberating catharsis from hypnotism using Bernheim’s theories, Freud created a new form of treatment, which he named “psychoanalysis.” He began referring to the patient’s

²²⁷ Sigmund Freud, “Heredity and the Aetiology of the Neuroses,” *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* vol. 3, trans. by James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953), 143.

²²⁸ Freud, “Heredity and the Aetiology of the Neuroses,” 149.

²²⁹ Freud, “Heredity and the Aetiology of the Neuroses,” 152.

²³⁰ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 17.

seemingly lost memories as “repressed”; he encouraged his patients to speak freely in a technique he referred to as “free association”; and, of course, he put a sofa into his office.

The free association technique did not develop directly after the refusal of hypnotism. At first, Freud adopted a method of “insistence and encouragement,” that is to say, of guiding the patient’s train of thought.²³¹ This method proved problematic, not only because of “strain on both sides,” but also because the analyst’s insistence may act as a form of suggestion, convincing the patient of some past even that in fact never happened.²³² Consequently, Freud decided to pursue a new method, one “which was in one sense its opposite. Instead of urging the patient to say something upon some particular subject, I now asked him to abandon himself to a process of *free association*—that is, to say whatever came to his head, while ceasing to give any conscious direction to his thoughts.”²³³ Not only did the analyst cease to lead the patient with his suggestions, but he also encouraged the patient to speak as freely as possible from the restraints of his own conscious, effectively “bringing into consciousness of the repressed material which was held back by resistances.”²³⁴ The task of the analyst requires him to identify such repressed material and to analyze its significance, what Freud calls the “*art of interpretation*.”²³⁵

His theory about the sexual etiology of neuroses, particularly hysteria, was quickly adapted to these new psychoanalytical concepts. In a later paper from 1896,

²³¹ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 24.

²³² Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 24.

²³³ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 24.

²³⁴ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 25.

²³⁵ Freud, “An Autobiographical Study,” 25.

“Zur Ätiologie der Hysterie” (“The Aetiology of Hysteria”), Freud explains that hysteria is caused by a psychological conflict that arises when the “ego” calls for the repression of an “incompatible idea” associated with memories of infantile sexual experiences.²³⁶

Freud’s study of his patients’ repressed memories led him to “depth psychology,” the study of the “unconscious.” This describes the part of the mind where unacceptable memories, desires, or fears are repressed, and thus hidden from the conscious mind. It is perhaps better described as all unconscious mental processes, and not an anatomical location within the brain.²³⁷ Additionally, Freudian psychoanalytical theory makes a distinction between two sections of the unconscious, the “preconscious” and the “unconscious proper.” The preconscious is the place of thoughts that, although not conscious at the moment, are not repressed and are therefore available for recall.

For Freud, the greatest source of repressed material was the dream. It led to the creation of his most famous work, *Die Traumdeutung* (*The Interpretation of Dreams*, 1899), which he himself considered “the most valuable of all the discoveries it has been my good fortune to make.”²³⁸ The “unriddler of riddles,” as Schorske calls him,²³⁹ completed a feat that would even impress Charcot: he discovered a method for interpreting the meaning of dreams. It was the theory of wish fulfillment: “When the work of interpretation [of a dream] has been completed, we perceive that a dream is the fulfillment [sic] of a wish.”²⁴⁰ Freud further argues that this wish is an unconscious wish,

²³⁶ Freud, “The Aetiology of Hysteria,” *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* vol. 3, trans. by James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953), 210-211.

²³⁷ Reuben Fine, *A History of Psychoanalysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 37.

²³⁸ Sigmund Freud, “The Interpretation of Dreams,” *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 4, trans. by James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1953), xxxiii.

²³⁹ Schorske, 181.

²⁴⁰ Freud, “The Interpretation of Dreams,” 121.

and therefore one that must be distorted in the dream in such a way so that it does not disturb the dreamer in his sleep, hence the seemingly irrational content of dreams.²⁴¹ He believes that psychoanalysis facilitates the interpretation of these unconscious dream-wishes. Just as in free association, the unconscious surfaces through its association to harmless ideas and images. Freud's interpretation of dreams brought him to the conclusion that certain "dream-elements" maintain a constant relation to a specific unconscious desire; he names these fixed elements "dream symbols."²⁴² It is through these dream symbols that Freud claims to be able to interpret the dream-wish. Freud believes the ability to interpret dreams is important because the dream is a neurotic symptom, leading him to the conclusion that all neuroses are the fulfillments of unconscious wishes.²⁴³ Thus Freud had discovered not only the unconscious, but also how it functions and how to interpret it.

Yet Freud was not the only midwife present at the birth of psychological man: Schnitzler came to strikingly similar conclusions in his literary works. This connection was not lost on Freud and Schnitzler, as evidenced by their (limited) correspondence. The oldest (known) letter, was written from Schnitzler to Freud in celebration of the latter's fiftieth birthday, on 6 May 1906:

Most Esteemed Professor,
Even if you personally may only barely remember me, allow me to associate myself with those who congratulate you today. I thank your writings for such manifold strong and deep suggestions [Anregungen], and your fiftieth birthday presents me the opportunity to tell you this and to offer you the warmest assurances of my sincere admiration.
Your devoted [ergebener]

²⁴¹ Sigmund Freud, *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis* trans. by James Strachey (New York: Washington Square Press, 1962), 154.

²⁴² Freud, *A General Introduction*, 157-158.

²⁴³ Freud, *A General Introduction*, 87; Fine, 42.

Arthur Schnitzler²⁴⁴

A humble Schnitzler, who at the time was certainly the more recognized of the two, congratulates Freud on his birthday and thanks him for his writing as a source of inspiration. Two days later (8 May 1906), Freud sent his response:

Dear Dr. Schnitzler,

For many years I have been conscious of the far-reaching conformity existing between your opinions and mine on many psychological and erotic problems [. . .]. I have often asked myself in astonishment how you came by this or that piece of secret knowledge which I had acquired by a painstaking investigation of the subject, and I finally came to the point of envying the author whom hitherto I had admired. Now you may imagine how pleased and elated I felt on reading that you too have derived inspiration from my writings. I am almost sorry to think that I had to reach the age of fifty before hearing something so flattering.

Yours in admiration

Dr. Freud²⁴⁵

Freud makes the connection between the two that Schnitzler had hesitated to make explicitly. Above all, he cites the “far-reaching conformity” of their opinions on “psychological and erotic problems.” Given the amount of work of both men dedicated to these subjects, this is a significant claim. Freud continues by sharing his initial astonishment when reading Schnitzler for his demonstration of knowledge of ideas that Freud “had acquired by a painstaking investigation of the subject.” It might be possible to read this letter as a slight against Schnitzler, as if Freud’s astonishment had been solved when Schnitzler cited his work as a source of inspiration; however, Freud also notes that he has derived his own inspiration from Schnitzler’s work, creating a more reciprocal relationship.

²⁴⁴ Arthur Schnitzler, “Besser sublimiert als verdrängt: in Cambridge entdeckt: ein unbekannter Brief von Arthur Schnitzler an Sigmund Freud,” *Die Presse*, ed. by Luigi Reitani (3 October 1992), Spectrum x. My translation. Original: “verehrtester Herr Professor, wenn Sie sich auch persönlich meiner kaum mehr erinnern dürften, erlauben Sie mir doch mich den Glückwünschenden beizugesellen, die heute vor Ihnen erscheinen. Ich danke Ihren Schriften so mannigfache starke und tiefe Anregungen, und ihr fünfzigster Geburtstag darf mir wohl Gelegenheit bieten, es Ihnen zu sagen und Ihnen die Versicherung meiner aufrichtigsten wärmsten Verehrung darzubringen, Ihr ergebener Arthur Schnitzler.“

²⁴⁵ Sigmund Freud, *Letters of Sigmund Freud* (New York: Basic Books, 1960), 251.

The third and last letter (that scholars know about) between the pair is dated fourteen years later, on 14 May 1922. This time, Freud wrote to congratulate Schnitzler on his sixtieth birthday. The most important passage from that letter, which is too long to reproduce in its entirety, reads:

Dear Dr. Schnitzler,

[. . .]

I will make a confession which for my sake I must ask you to keep to yourself and share with neither friends nor strangers. I have tormented myself with the question why in all these years I have never attempted to make your acquaintance and to have a talk with you (ignoring the possibility, of course, that you might not have welcomed my overture).

The answer contains the confession which strikes me as too intimate. I think I have avoided you from a kind of reluctance to meet my double [*Doppelgängerscheu*]. Not that I am easily inclined to identify myself with another, or that I mean to overlook the difference in talent that separates me from you, but whenever I get deeply absorbed in your beautiful creations I invariably seem to find beneath their poetic surface the very presuppositions, interests, and conclusions which I know to be my own. Your determinism as well as your skepticism—what people call pessimism—your preoccupation with the truths of the unconscious and of the instinctual drives [*von der Triebnatur*] in man, your dissection of the cultural conventions of our society, the dwellings of your thoughts on the polarity of love and death; all this moves me with an uncanny feeling of familiarity. [. . .] So I have formed the impression that you know through intuition—or rather from detailed self-observation—everything that I have discovered by laborious work on other people. Indeed, I believe that fundamentally your nature is that of an explorer of psychological depths, as honestly impartial and undaunted as anyone has ever been, and that if you had not been so constituted your artistic abilities, your gift for language, and your creative power would have had free rein and made you into a writer of greater appeal to the taste of the masses. I am inclined to give preferences to the explorer. But forgive me for drifting into psychoanalysis; I just can't help it. And I know that psychoanalysis is not the means of gaining popularity.

With warmest greetings

Your Freud²⁴⁶

Evidently, Freud's wish for confidentiality was not fulfilled. In the letter, Freud famously makes the famous *Doppelgänger* connection between the two. The letter also demonstrates that, at least up until 1922, Freud and Schnitzler had never met. Freud once again acknowledges the conformity between their ideas ("the truths of the unconscious and the instinctual drives in man, your dissection of the cultural

²⁴⁶ Freud, *Letters of Sigmund Freud*, 339-340.

conventions of society”), although these ideas had evolved considerably since 1906. Instead of assuming inspiration of one writer upon the other, he concludes that Schnitzler “know[s] through intuition—or rather from detailed self-observation—everything that [he has] discovered by laborious work on other people.” To a certain degree, this conclusion furthers Freud’s cause even more than claiming Schnitzler is a follower, because the discovery of the same ideas independently would legitimize Freud’s works, which for the second time he insists are the fruits of clinical observation. Unlike questions over the actual nature of their intellectual relationship or over the true sources of their inspiration, the validity of Freud’s claim to a strong conformity between their ideas may plausibly be assessed.

Several of Schnitzler’s literary works clearly demonstrate accordance with Freudian theories, including those about sex, the unconscious, and dreams. Schnitzler’s play *Reigen* (*La Ronde*, 1897), for example, challenged social constraints placed upon sex in fin-de-siècle Viennese society; his novella *Lieutenant Gustl* (1900) used stream of consciousness narration to demonstrate the psychological impact of antisemitism in the honor-culture of the Austro-Hungarian military; and, finally, the delusions of the sick young woman from *Professor Bernhardt* (1912) correspond with the elements of a (Freudian) dream.

Reigen, known in English-speaking circles as *La Ronde* after Max Ophüls’s film adaptation (1950), was perhaps Schnitzler’s most famous, and certainly his most infamous, literary work. Written in the winter of 1896-97, the manuscript was originally entitled *Liebesreigen* (Round-Dance of Love). Schnitzler eventually passed this

manuscript on to one of his publishers, S. Fischer, from whom he received the following reply in 1898: “I have already read *Liebesreigen*, and I hope it is possible to publish this fine work; however, I have serious misgivings. The manuscript is currently being appraised by my lawyer.”²⁴⁷ As euphemistically as possible, he expressed his fear that the erotic nature of the play would bring legal difficulties. Unsurprisingly, the lawyer strongly recommended against its publication.²⁴⁸

At the request of Alfred Kerr, Schnitzler then shortened the title of the play from *Liebesreigen* (Round Dance of Love) to *Reigen* (Round Dance), because “it is not love, but rather sexual intercourse that forms the central theme of the play.”²⁴⁹ Out of fear of publishing the play publicly, he decided to publish it privately at his own expense. He ordered the printing of 200 copies, which he distributed among his (male) friends; it did not include his name, but did have a foreword declaring it as an “unmarketable manuscript.”²⁵⁰ In 1903, Schnitzler finally managed to have it published publicly, only for it to be banned a year later. It did not premier until 1920 in Berlin and 1921 in Vienna.

The play, set in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, has ten characters, five of each gender, who belong to entirely different social classes: a soldier, a prostitute, a maid, a young gentleman, a young wife, a husband, a *süßes Mädel*, a poet, and an actress. There are ten scenes involving ten different pairs: it is a “round dance” in which each scene, two

²⁴⁷ Gerd K. Schneider, *Die Rezeption von Arthur Schnitzlers Reigen* (Riverside, CA: Ariadne, 1995), 10. Schneider cites: Peter de Mendelssohn, “Zur Geschichte des *Reigen*: Aus dem Briefwechsel zwischen Arthur Schnitzler und S. Fischer” *Almanach: Das sechsundsiebzigste Jahr* (Frankfurt a.M.: S. Fischer, 1962), 19. Translation my own. Original: “Ich habe den *Liebesreigen* schon gelesen, ich wünschte, es wäre möglich, dieses feine Werk zu veröffentlichen, ich habe aber große Bedenken. Das Manuscript befindet sich gegenwärtig bei meinem Rechtsanwalt zur Begutachtung.”

²⁴⁸ Schneider, 11.

²⁴⁹ Schneider, 11. My translation. Original: “nicht die Liebe, sondern lediglich der Geschlechtsakt das zentrale Thema des Stücks bilde.”

²⁵⁰ Schnitzler, *My Youth in Vienna*, 276; Schneider, 12.

characters have sex, and one of them then finds a new (sexual) partner in the proceeding scene, until in the tenth scene it has gone full circle. For the audience of the turn of the century, there were many controversial elements of such a play: the open depiction of (primarily) extramarital sexual relations—although each scene only includes the discussion between partners before and after the act—were even more outrageous because they belonged to different social classes. *Reigen* demonstrates how human sexual impulses transgress any constraints placed upon them by society, be it the institution of marriage, religious doctrine, or class distinctions. Sex offers characters liberation from these social constraints.²⁵¹ At the same time, however, characters quickly return to maintaining social order, to save face, post-coitus. Ultimately, love has been cheapened, replaced by sex, which happens quickly and quietly, and then goes unacknowledged.

In Schnitzler's *Reigen*, rules inhibiting sexual impulses have a deleterious effect on society, just as Freud's theory of psychoanalysis posits that repressed sexual impulses lead to neuroses in the individual. Although these phenomena take place at different levels, i.e., the societal vs. the individual, they reflect the same conceptual foundation.

As with Freud's theories about sexuality, Schnitzler's *Reigen* was met with great controversy, although *Reigen*'s reception at the turn of the century was not uniformly negative. Many who did protest did so from an antisemitic, Christian Social perspective.

²⁵¹ Felix W. Tweraser, *Political Dimensions of Arthur Schnitzler's Late Fiction* (Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1998), 63.

These critics often derided Schnitzler's work as being *Jewish* filth or pornographic in nature. One such example from critic Friedrich Törnsee (1903) reads:

Reigen is namely nothing but a disgrace (*eine Schweinerei*), or is that too German, an obscenity (*eine Cochonnerie*)²⁵² [. . .] to judge the lewdness of the content fairly, it may have been possible for it to escape from the realm of pornography into the domain of art. To write extensively about the book, even to touch on its content, would merely act to oversell it.²⁵³

Törnsee acknowledges the fine line between art and pornography, and concludes that Schnitzler is clearly on the wrong side of it. His utilization of a French word to deride Schnitzler's work reflects the antisemitic attack on modernist art and literature as international (here, specifically French) and Jewish, which were perceived by antisemites as the polar opposite of German.²⁵⁴

In the same year that Schnitzler privately published *Reigen*, he also produced the novella *Lieutenant Gustl*. First published in a supplement of the liberal *Neue Freie Presse*, it recounts the story of a young lieutenant in the Austro-Hungarian Army in internal monologue. It is often cited as the first example of the stream of consciousness narration technique in German literature; however, it has recently been demonstrated that *Lieutenant Gustl* is only the first of such texts from a male author. Another Viennese

²⁵² *Die Schweinerei* and *die Cochonnerie* are synonymous, but the first derives from the German word for pig (*das Schwein*), whereas the second derives from the French (*le cochon*). This underlines the strong association between Schnitzler and contemporaneous French literary movements, although here the author implies that Schnitzler is unworthy of the German word.

²⁵³ Friedrich Törnsee, "Bücherschau: Arthur Schnitzlers *Reigen*," *Neues Bahnen* III.ix (1 May 1903), 245. Cited in Schneider, 50. My translation. Original: "*Reigen* ist nämlich nichts als eine Schweinerei oder, ist das zu deutsch, eine Cochonnerie, die [. . .], um das Lüsterne des Tema's [sic] sachlich verurteilend zu behandeln, aus der Reihe des Pornographischen in das Gebiet der Kunst hätte emporheben können. Über das Buch eingehend zu schreiben, ja es nur inhaltlich zu streifen—hieße im Reklame machen."

²⁵⁴ Hamann, 79.

author, Else Kotányi, published the novella *Venus am Kreuz* (1899) one year prior to Schnitzler.²⁵⁵

The namesake of the novella, Lieutenant Gustl, is also the narrator. It begins with Gustl, who resides in Vienna, attending an oratorio at a concert house. Although his date, Steffi, had stood him up, he decided to attend the concert anyway. He quickly tires of it, and his thoughts begin to roam, ranging from his opinions on young girls in the audience to memories about his family and past romances. He also reveals a source of considerable anxiety for him, although he denies being concerned about it: he challenged a doctor to a duel, which will take place the next day, in order to restore his honor. He recalls, at first with difficulty, how the affair transpired:

How did the thing start? [. . .] As I recall it, [. . . another officer] was talking about the manoeuvres; and it was only then that the Doctor joined us and said something or other I didn't like—about playing at war—something like that—but I couldn't say anything just then Yes, that's it And then they were talking about the Military School Yes, that's the way it was And I was telling them about a patriotic rally And then the Doctor said—not immediately, but it grew out of my talk about the rally—'Lieutenant, you'll admit, won't you, that all of your friends haven't gone into military service for the sole purpose of defending our Fatherland!' What a nerve of anyone to dare say a thing like that to an officer! [. . .] Yes, that was it And there was a fellow there who wanted to smooth over matters—an elderly man with a cold in the head—but I was wild! The Doctor had said it in a tone that meant he was talking about me, and me only. The only thing he could have added was that they had expelled me from college and for that reason I had to go to military service.²⁵⁶

The stream of consciousness presented in this passage demonstrates Schnitzler's understanding of memory and the distinction between conscious and unconscious thoughts. The delay between Gustl's conscious thoughts and the reconstruction of events shows how these memories exist at the preconscious level, as they are not instantly available to the conscious mind. The source of Gustl's anxiety, and the origin of

²⁵⁵ Schwartz, 6.

²⁵⁶ Arthur Schnitzler, *Lieutenant Gustl* trans. by Richard L. Simon (Los Angeles: Green Integer, 2003), 11-13.

the whole affair, derives from the doctor's comment, "all of your friend's haven't gone into military service for the sole purpose of defending our Fatherland!" Gustl self-consciously interprets this as an attack on his own commitment to his duty as an officer. The final sentence in the quote, "the only thing he could have added was that they had expelled me from college and for that reason I had to go to military to military service" is of particular interest: from the context of the rest of the plot, it is unclear whether or not this statement is true. Since Gustl responds so violently to the doctor, and the thought occurs to him in the first place, one has reason to believe that it is true. If so, Gustl may have repressed this memory and deluded himself into thinking that his military service was a product of his strong patriotic beliefs and desire to defend his country. The doctor's comment painfully brought the repressed memory back into his consciousness. An elderly man, likely familiar with the folly of duels and the unnecessary deaths it brings, tries to resolve the situation, but to no avail. The anxiety could only be mediated by an act of violence, the proposed duel, against the *agent provacteur*, the doctor.

Gustl's thoughts drift away from the duel, and eventually the concert comes to an end. The young lieutenant impatiently rushes to the front of the cloakroom, only to find himself in a quarrel with a baker (of considerably lower social status). The baker then discretely grabs the hilt of Gustl's saber, and, speaking quietly so that no other guest will hear, threatens to draw the saber, break it, and send it to Gustl's commander if he continues to make a scene. Although the baker promises to tell no one of the aborted duel, and no bystanders seemed to notice, Gustl is overcome by shame for having been disgraced before the military's code of honor. Thus he decides that he will commit

suicide the next morning. On his return home through the Wiener Prater, the smells and sights of the park revive his desire to live. He falls asleep on a park bench and awakens the next morning. Before going home to commit a final act to redeem his honor, he stops at a coffee house, where he learns from the server that the baker had died in the night from a stroke. Without any witnesses of his dishonor (except himself), Gustl decides against committing suicide. He relishes his decision to live, but the story ends with his concluding thoughts about his duel with the doctor: “And this afternoon at four . . . Just wait, my body, I’m in wonderful trim I’ll knock you to smithereens!”²⁵⁷ Any hope that Gustl’s refusal to commit suicide equated a refusal of the antiquated military code of honor is dashed, and he is ultimately no wiser than before.

Although antisemitism plays a relatively small role in the plot of the novella, its depiction illustrates much about the nature of antisemitism in turn-of-the-century Viennese society. The protagonist, Gustl, who is almost certainly not Jewish, reveals himself as an antisemite several times while he attends the concert. These instances are significant because the story’s use of stream of consciousness narration offers the reader an unfiltered window into the mind of an antisemite as Schnitzler imagines it.

The first encounter occurs during the concert, when a very unentertained Gustl debates pulling a letter, which informs him that his date Steffi would instead be dining with another man, from his wallet. Gustl recalls how he and his friend Kopetzky had seen the pair together at a garden party eight days prior, during which Steffi supposedly had given him “the sign” with her eyes the whole time. Gustl continues, “He didn’t notice anything—unbelievable! Probably a Jew! Surely, he works in a bank, and the black

²⁵⁷ Schnitzler, *Lieutenant Gustl*, 59.

moustache ... he must be a reserve lieutenant as well! Well, he better not come to weapons exercise in my regiment! They just keep on commissioning so many Jews—I don't give a damn about all that antisemitism."²⁵⁸ Although Gustl does not know, he declares the man must be Jewish. It is likely Gustl makes this assumption because, threatened by this rival, he wishes to diminish him. He diminishes the anxiety induced by his rejection by making his rival the focus of an antisemitic tirade. From this perspective, Gustl is little different than those who used the Jews as a scapegoat following financial ruin in the Panic of 1873. Thus Schnitzler offers antisemitism as a defense mechanism, a *psychological* reaction to anxiety and stress. Hypocritically, Gustl then attempts to absolve himself by dismissing antisemitism altogether.

Gustl's thoughts then drift to a party he attended with the Mannheimers, of whom he says, ". . . they say the Mannheimers themselves are Jews, baptized, of course . . . they don't look it — especially Mrs. Mannheimer . . . blond, beautiful figure It was a good party, all in all. Wonderful dinner, excellent cigars They must have piles of money."²⁵⁹ The Mannheimers had taken the ultimate step of assimilation, baptism, and yet continued to be recognized as Jews. Antisemitism is once again put in question, as the baptized Jews do not even "look" Jewish. In fact, Gustl even finds himself attracted to Mrs. Mannheimer. He reminisces about the great party, but ultimately concludes by delving into another stereotype: "They must have piles of money." The larger scene, including the discussion about Gustl's rival and the Mannheimers, reveals the

²⁵⁸ Arthur Schnitzler, *Lieutenant Gustl* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2009), 9. My translation. Original: "Er hat nichts gemerkt—unglaublich! Muß übrigens ein Jud' sein! Freilich, in einer Bank ist er, und der schwarze Schnurrbart . . . Reserveleutnant soll er auch sein! Na, in mein Regiment sollt' er nicht zur Waffenübung kommen! Überhaupt, daß sie noch immer so viel Juden zu Offizieren machen – da pfeif ich auf'n ganzen Antisemitismus!"

²⁵⁹ Schnitzler, *Lieutenant Gustl*, 8.

complexity of questions about Jewish identity and antisemitism in fin-de-siècle Vienna, and how they became psychologically nuanced. This developed, in part, out of the inability to clearly distinguish between Jew and non-Jew: Gustl's rival may or may not be Jewish, whereas the Mannheimers are converted Jews, which, at least from a religious perspective, means that they are no longer Jews at all. Gustl, who has clearly demonstrated antisemitic sentiments, is himself confused, focusing on antisemitism to disparage a rival of dubious Jewish identity, and finding himself physically attracted to a woman who, from the perspective of racial antisemitism, is in fact Jewish. Thus antisemitism was a psychological affair, heightening consciousness about one's identity on behalf of both the aggressor and the victim.

A third connection between Freud's psychoanalytical theory and Schnitzler's literary works is the dream, which will be demonstrated in the case of *Professor Bernhardi*.²⁶⁰ This comedy specifically shows Schnitzler's acceptance of the Freudian interpretation of dreams and neuroses, i.e., as fulfillments of unconscious wishes, through the neurotic delusions of the dying young woman. In fact, her delusions are consistently described as a dream. For example, when Professor Bernhardi hopes to persuade the priest to not see the patient, he says:

As I've already explained, Father, the patient is completely unaware of the situation. And your visit is the last thing she's expecting. Indeed she is under the illusion that in the next few hours someone dear to her will call for her and carry her off—into life and happiness. Father, I don't believe you would be doing a good deed, or even I might add one pleasing to God, if you were to waken her from this last dream.²⁶¹

²⁶⁰ Return to the chapter "Viennese Antisemitism" for a more thorough introduction and analysis of *Professor Bernhardi*.

²⁶¹ Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi*, 307.

Pelugfelder also refers to it as a dream when he appeals to the board of the Elisabethinum to keep Bernhardi as the director:

Cast your minds back, think how this whole regrettable business started,—and you must come to your senses. A poor wretch lies dying in hospital, a mere child who has paid dearly for her morsel of youth and happiness and, if you will, sin—paid with mortal anxiety, pain and indeed her life. In her final hour she becomes euphoric. She feels elated, she is happy once again, she is unaware of the approach of death. She believes she is recovering! She dreams of her lover returning to fetch her away, lead her out of those halls of misery and suffering, back into life and happiness. It was perhaps the most beautiful moment of her life, her final dream. And Bernhardi didn't want to have her wakened from this dream to face the terrible reality. This is the crime he has committed! This and nothing more.²⁶²

Both citations describe, somewhat differently, the source of the ethical dilemma: the dying young woman is delusional and euphoric, and therefore the admittance of the priest will thrust the truth of her impending death upon her, so that she will die suffering instead of happiness. A more Freudian interpretation of this scene sees the young woman as having repressed the painful reality that she will soon die alone, as no “lover,” as Pelugfelder insists, family members, or friends have arrived to care for her. As a defense against this uncomfortable reality, she becomes delusional. Her wish, which is to survive and for someone, perhaps a lover, to “fetch her away,” becomes fulfilled by the delusion, and therefore she becomes euphoric and happy. The priest, who represents the real world and its social expectations, threatens to wake her from the comfort of her dream. It may be interpreted that Bernhardi would prefer a life of neurotic happiness over reality or a life governed by religion, but it is important to note the special consideration of the patient's immediately impending death. Dreams and delusions are not, however, the true solution to the problem. Instead, it is preferable, as argued by Freud, to reformulate societal values so as to lessen the anxiety and pain

²⁶² Schnitzler, *Professor Bernhardi*, 358.

induced upon the psyche. Bernhardt does this by rejecting the assumption of abortion and acknowledging only the fact that the young woman will soon die, rather than condemning her for having brought misfortune upon herself.

In spite of the strong conformities between Freud's theories and the ideas presented in Schnitzler's literary texts (of which there are countless more examples), there were also matters over which the two were not in accordance. In 1976, literary scholar Reinhard Urbach found a document in Schnitzler's estate detailing his opinions on psychoanalysis and published it under the title "Über Psychoanalyse."²⁶³ In it, Schnitzler criticizes important elements of psychoanalytic theory, particularly the notion of dream symbols and the suggestion that the Oedipus complex is present in every person. In spite of small distinctions, however, the doppelgängers Freud and Schnitzler demonstrate strong theoretical conformities regarding questions of sexuality and the human mind.

²⁶³ Arthur Schnitzler, "Über Psychoanalyse," *Protokolle 2*, ed. by Reinhard Urbach (Vienna: Jung & Vol, 1976): 277-284.

7. Conclusion

A final critique in the Schorskean fin-de-siècle model is the political escapist theory. The important role of politics in the development of the *Wiener Moderne* is undisputed, but the nature of this role is a source of contention. The fin-de-siècle Vienna model, initiated by Schorske and embraced by others during the 1980s, such as William McGrath and Dennis Klein,²⁶⁴ maintains the defeat of liberalism in Vienna during the 1890s compelled the descendants of the liberal bourgeoisie to devote themselves entirely to culture or science as “an escape, a refuge from the unpleasant world of increasingly threatening political reality.”²⁶⁵ In this escape, “the bourgeois turned [. . .] inward to the cultivation of the self,” where “the political sources of anxiety found reinforcement in the individual psyche.”²⁶⁶ They derived these models, in part, from the examples of Freud and Schnitzler. Freud, they argued, reluctantly gave up on his political aspirations, became “counterpolitical,” and discovered psychoanalysis as a result of using his work as an outlet for political passions. Similarly, Schnitzler produced literary works “[whose] themes [. . .] were entirely apolitical and self-indulgent.”²⁶⁷

As has been demonstrated, the fin-de-siècle Vienna model is problematic in several significant ways. Firstly, Schorske only offers a “vague definition of the liberal bourgeoisie,”²⁶⁸ tersely describing it as being “confined to the middle-class Germans

²⁶⁴ William J. McGrath, *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis: The Politics of Hysteria* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986). Dennis B. Klein, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

²⁶⁵ Schorske, 8.

²⁶⁶ Schorske, 10.

²⁶⁷ Klein, 14.

²⁶⁸ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 44.

and German Jews of the urban centers.”²⁶⁹ The first of these proves to be quite problematic for Schorske’s thesis. John Boyer’s analysis of fin-de-siècle Viennese politics demonstrates that “much of what might be assumed to be a ‘liberal bourgeoisie’ was in fact the reverse, in that it voted against the Liberals in the traumatic elections of 1895.”²⁷⁰ Thus it was not only the extension of the vote to “the peasants, the urban artisans and workers, and the Slavic peoples,” but also the bourgeoisie who led to the rise of the Christian Socials.²⁷¹

As discussed in the chapter “The Jews of Vienna,” the Jewish component of Schorske’s liberal bourgeoisie was not, as Schorske argues, indistinguishable from its gentile counterpart because of assimilation.²⁷² In reality, they were predominant in what Beller refers to as the “liberal educated class [. . .], a subset of the liberal bourgeoisie.”²⁷³ Education, rather than political estrangement, explains why many Jews entered the so-called liberal professions of medicine, law, and journalism, but also the cultural elite.

The birth of psychological man came as a result of nationalist sentiment. The application of Darwinism led to new discussions of race in nationalistic circles, eventually spawning racial antisemitism. This became a greater issue in Habsburg Vienna than elsewhere because of the multiethnic nature of the empire and the arrival of Jewish immigrants to the city on a large scale in the second half of the nineteenth century. The acute consciousness of (national) identity, and, in the case of the Jews, the

²⁶⁹ Schorske, 5.

²⁷⁰ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 45. Beller cites John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

²⁷¹ Schorske, 5.

²⁷² Schorske, ?.

²⁷³ Beller, *Vienna and the Jews*, 33.

anxiety derived from antisemitism, led to discussions of the psyche. Its origins were political, which Schorske describes as “political frustration.”²⁷⁴ Furthermore, when considering the predominance of the Jews in the cultural elite, the role of the psyche in Viennese Jewish modernism should be unsurprising.

The Schorskean escapist theory, according to which the leaders of Viennese modernism abandoned politics and in fact became apolitical, similarly must be revised, if not completely discredited. This notion is not new: within a year of Schorske first publishing his counterpolitical theory in 1973,²⁷⁵ scholars began to raise questions about its validity.²⁷⁶ I hope to expand upon these critiques by specifically evaluating the cases of Freud and Schnitzler. I argue that while the (predominantly Jewish) liberal educated class may have faced a threatening political reality, they hardly participated in the apolitical, narcissistic escape that Schorske and others suggest. On the contrary, they used their work, be it scientific or cultural, as a platform for political and social critique; a fact particularly evident in the works of Freud and Schnitzler.

To demonstrate Freud’s relationship to politics, Schorske depends almost exclusively upon *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Using Freud’s dreams and their corresponding analyses, Schorske sought to demonstrate “Freud’s life-long struggle with Austrian socio-political reality: as scientist and Jew, as citizen and son.”²⁷⁷ He argues that in order for Freud to confront the resulting frustrations, he had the choice

²⁷⁴ Schorske, 5.

²⁷⁵ Carl E. Schorske, “Politics and Patricide in Freud’s Interpretation of Dreams” *American Historical Review*, vol. 78 (Apr. 1973), 328-47. This essay became Chapter 4 of *Fin-de-Siècle: Politics and Culture* (1980).

²⁷⁶ Stanley Rothman and Philip Isenberg, “Sigmund Freud and the Politics of Marginality” *Central European History*, vol. 7, no. 1 (Mar. 1974), 58-78. For a modern, more comprehensive critique, see: Scott Spector, “Marginalizations: Politics and Culture Beyond *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*” *Rethinking Vienna 1900* ed. by Steven Beller (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001), 132-153.

²⁷⁷ Schorske, 183.

either “to affirm the primacy of politics by removing what was rotten in the state of Denmark (a civic task) or to neutralize politics by reducing it to psychological categories (an intellectual task).”²⁷⁸ Although his dichotomy is clever (and conveniently supports his thesis), it remains to be seen if Freud *neutralizes* politics by reducing it with psychoanalysis, a claim Schorske assumes to be self-evident. It would also be inaccurate to suggest that Schnitzler was apolitical. His criticism of dueling and the military in *Lieutenant Gustl*, was so controversial that he lost his military pension.

By focusing the research of literary scholars and historians, it has been possible not just to raise questions about Schorske’s fin-de-siècle model, but to replace it. Certainly Sigmund Freud and Arthur Schnitzler only tell one part of a much larger story, but their role as “explorers” made them enormously important in their own fields.

²⁷⁸ Schorske, 186.

Bibliography

- Alexander, Franz G, and Sheldon T. Selesnick. *The History of Psychiatry: An Evaluation of Psychiatric Thought and Practice from Prehistoric Times to the Present*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Ackerknecht, Erwin H. *A Short History of Psychiatry*. Translated by Sula Wolff. New York: Hafner, 1968.
- Bahr, Hermann. "Die Überwindung des Naturalismus." In *Kritische Schriften II*, edited by Claus Pias. Weimar: VDG, 2004.
- Barker, Andrew W. "'Der grosse Überwinder': Hermann Bahr and the Rejection of Naturalism." *The Modern Language Review* 78:3 (June 1983): [617-630].
- Bein, Alex. *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated Universities Press, 1990.
- Behariell, Frederick J. "Schnitzler's Anticipation of Freud's Dream Theory." *Monatshefte* 45:2 (Feb. 1953): 81-89.
- Beller, Steven. "Class, Culture and the Jews of Vienna, 1900." In *Jews, Antisemitism and Culture*, edited by Ivar Oxaal, Michael Pollak, and Gerhard Botz. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Beller, Steven, ed. *Rethinking Vienna 1900*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2001.
- Beller, Steven. *Vienna and the Jews 1867-1938: A Cultural History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Berend, Ivan T. *History Derailed: Central and Eastern Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Boyer, John W. *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Breuer, Josef and Sigmund Freud. "Case 1: Fräulein Anna. O." In *The Freud Reader*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989.
- Broch, Hermann. *Hugo von Hofmannsthal and His Time: the European Imagination 1800-1920*. Translated by Michael P. Steinberg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

- Edmundson, Mark. *The Death of Sigmund Freud: The Legacy of His Last Days*. New York: Bloomsbury, 1952.
- Fine, Reuben. *A History of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.
- Freud, Sigmund. "An Autobiographical Study." In *The Freud Reader*. Edited and trans. by Peter Gay. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Freud Reader*. Edited and trans. by Peter Gay. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1989.
- Freud, Sigmund. *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: Washington Square Press, 1962.
- Freud, Sigmund. "The Interpretation of Dreams." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 4, trans. by James Strachey. London: Hogarth, 1953.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Letters of Sigmund Freud*. Edited and trans. by Tania and James Stern. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Origins of Psychoanalysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess, Drafts and Notes, 1887-1902*. Translated by Eric Moschacher and James Strachey. New York: Basic Books, 1954.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. by James Strachey. London: Hogarth, 1953.
- Furst, Lilian R. *Before Freud: Hysteria and Hypnosis in Later Nineteenth-Century Psychiatric Cases*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2008.
- Gay, Peter. *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- Gillman, Abigail. *Viennese Jewish Modernism: Freud, Hofmannsthal, Beer-Hofmann, and Schnitzler*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2009.
- Hamann, Brigitte. *Hitler's Vienna: A Dictator's Apprenticeship*. Translated by Thomas Thornton. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Herzog, Hilary Hope. *Vienna is Different: Jewish Writers in Austria from the Fin de Siècle to the Present*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011.

Herzog, Hilary Hope. "Medizin ist eine Weltanschauung': On Schnitzler's Medical Writings." In *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*, edited by Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003.

Johnston, William M. *The Austrian Mind: An Intellectual and Social History 1848-1938*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Jones, Ernest. *The Life and Works of Sigmund Freud*. New York: Basic Books, 1953.

Klein, Dennis B. *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Kohn, Hans. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origin and Background*. New York: Macmillan, 1944.

Konzett, Matthias. "The Difficult Rebirth of Cosmopolitanism: Schnitzler and Contemporary Austrian Literature." In *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*, ed. by Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003.

Küng, Hans. "Freud and the Problem of God." *The Wilson Quarterly* 3:4 (Autumn, 1979): [1-161]

Lindner, Harriett. "Fiktion, Tiefenpsychologie und psychiatrische Therapie in der deutschen Romantik: Am Beispiel E.T.A. Hoffmanns." *Germanistik im Konflikt der Kulturen*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008: [311-318].

Loentz, Elizabeth. "The Problem and Challenge of Jewishness in the City of Schnitzler and Anna O." In *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*, edited by Dagmar C. G. Lorenz. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003.

Lorenz, Dagmar C. G. *A Companion to the Works of Arthur Schnitzler*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2003.

Luprecht, Mark. *"What People Call Pessimism": Sigmund Freud, Arthur Schnitzler, and Nineteenth-Century Controversy at the University of Vienna Medical School*. Riverside, CA: Ariadne Press, 1991.

McGrath, William J. *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis: The Politics of Hysteria*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Nehring, Wolfgang. "Berlin – Vienna: Competition and Reciprocal Inspiration." *Pacific Coast Philology* 38 (2003): [1-12].

- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Twilight of the Idols with The Antichrist and Ecce Homo*. Translated by Anthony M. Ludovici. London: Wordsworth Editions, 2007.
- Oommen, T. K. *Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1997.
- Oxaal, Ivar, Michael Pollak, and Gerhard Botz, ed. *Jews, Antisemitism and Culture in Vienna*. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Oxaal, Ivar. "The Jews of Young Hitler's Vienna: Historical and Sociological Aspects." In *Jews, Antisemitism and Culture*, edited by Ivar Oxaal, Michael Pollak, and Gerhard Botz. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Reitani, Luigi. "Besser sublimiert als verdrängt': in Cambridge entdeckt: ein unbekannter Brief von Arthur Schnitzler an Sigmund Freud." *Die Presse*, October 3, 1992, Spectrum, x.
- Robertson, Ritchie. *The 'Jewish Question' in German Literature, 1749-1939: Emancipation and its Discontents*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Rothman, Stanley and Philip Isenberg. "Sigmund Freud and the Politics of Marginality." *Central European History*, vol. 7, no. 1 (Mar. 1974): 58-78.
- Rozenblit, Marsha L. *The Jews of Vienna, 1867-1914: Assimilation and Identity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- Sayer, Holly. "Arthur Schnitzler's Critical Reception in Vienna: The Liberal Press and the Question of Jewish Identity." *German Life and Letters* 60:4 (October 2007): [p481-492]
- Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York: Knopf, 1980.
- Schneider, Gerd K. *Die Rezeption von Arthur Schnitzlers Reigen*. Riverside, CA: Ariadne, 1995.
- Schnitzler, Arthur. *Lieutenant Gustl*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2009.
- Schnitzler, Arthur. *Lieutenant Gustl*. Translated by Richard L. Simon. Los Angeles: Green Integer, 2003.
- Schnitzler, Arthur. *Medizinische Schriften*. Edited by Horst Thomé. Vienna: Paul Zsolnay, 1988.

- Schnitzler, Arthur. *My Youth in Vienna*. Translated by Catherine Hutter. New York: Holt, Rineheart and Winston, 1970.
- Schnitzler, Arthur. *Professor Bernhardt: A Comedy in Five Acts*. In *Arthur Schnitzler Round Dance and Other Plays*, trans. by J. M. Q. Davies. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Schnitzler, Arthur. "Über Psychoanalyse." Edited by Reinhard Urbach. *Protkolle 2* (Vienna: Jung & Vol, 1976): 277-284.
- Schwartz, Agatha. "The Crisis of the Female Self in *Fin-de-Siècle* Austrian Women Writers' Narratives." *Modern Austrian Literature* 40:3 (2007): [1-19]
- Schubert, Kurt. *Christentum und Judentum im Wandel der Zeiten*. Vienna: Böhlau, 2003.
- Segel, Harold. *The Vienna Coffeehouse Wits: 1890-1938*. West Lafayette, IN.: Purdue University Press, 1993.
- Shorter, Edward. *A History of Psychiatry: From the Era of the Asylum to the Age of Prozac*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1997.
- Spector, Scott. "Marginalizations: Politics and Culture Beyond *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*." In *Rethinking Vienna 1900*. Edited by Steven Beller. New York: Berghahn Books, 2001.
- Talmon, Jacob. *Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1960.
- Törnsee, Friedrich. "Bücherschau: Arthur Schnitzlers Reigen." *Neues Bahnen* III.ix (1 May 1903).
- Tweraser, Felix W. *Political Dimensions of Arthur Schnitzler's Late Fiction*. Columbia, SC.: Camden House, 1998.
- Urbach, Reinhard. *Arthur Schnitzler*. Translated by Donald Daviau. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1973.
- Wasserman, Jakob. *Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude*. Berlin: S. Fischer, 1922.
- Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *Fred's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*. Binghamton, NY: Ballou Press, 1991.
- Zweig, Stefan. *The World of Yesterday*. New York: The Viking Press, 1943.

