The Unmanning of the Wandering Jew

“The psychoanalytic investigation of paranoia would be altogether impossible if the patients themselves did not possess the peculiarity of betraying (in a distorted form, it is true) precisely those things which other neurotics keep hidden as a secret.”
—Sigmund Freud, “Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia (Dementia Paranoides)”

In 1903 Daniel Paul Schreber, Senatspräsident (or chief judge) of the Dresden State Superior Court and paranoiac, privately published his Denkwürdigkeiten eines Nervenkranken or Memoirs of My Nervous Illness (Schreber 1973; 1988) which chronicled his nine-year institutionalization for paranoia. Despite his family’s best efforts to destroy all extant copies of the Denkwürdigkeiten, several managed to survive and circulate among the psychiatric and psychoanalytic communities. Eventually a copy fell into the hands of Sigmund Freud, who in 1911 published his “Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia (Dementia Paranoides)” (Freud 1911a; 1911b) thereafter known as the Schreber Case. As a consequence of that analysis virtually all subsequent readings of the Schreber Case were mediated by Freud’s. Indeed, thanks to Freud, Schreber’s Denkwürdigkeiten, became the “most-quoted unread book of the twentieth century” (Kendrick 1990, 33). Now Han Israël’s biography has appeared. Schreber: Father and Son (Israël 1989) employs exhaustive archival evidence to counterbalance the already extant interpretations of Schreber’s case. Israël’s work, in the words of one reviewer, “chronicles that eight-decade carnival of negligence, carelessness, and plain fatuity, reducing the whole mess to silence” (Kendrick 1990, 33).

At the risk of joining this circus parade, this paper situates Schreber’s case at the intersection of a number of individual, social, historical, and intertextual trajectories. In
particular I will focus on one particular delusion which Schreber experienced in 1894 and which oddly has failed to register more than passing mention in the copious literature of the case:¹ the Eternal Jew (der ewige Jude) or, as he is more familiarly known, the Wandering Jew.² The Eternal Jew appears at a crucial moment in the narrative: when Schreber envisions both the end of the world and the concomitant necessity that the lone survivor be unmanned. It is the Eternal Jew who “had to be unmanned (transformed into a woman) to be able to bear children.” Schreber continues, “This appellation has therefore a somewhat different sense from that underlying the legend of the same name of the Jew Ahasver; one is automatically reminded of the legends of Noah, Deucalion and Pyrrha, etc.” (S73 [= Schreber 1988, 73]). Hence Schreber’s deployment of the figure appears to displace the traditional representations of the Wandering Jew (cf. Knecht 1974–77; Hasan-Rokem and Dundes 1986; Rose 1990; Anderson 1991) in terms of both gender and race. By attending to this seminal moment of gender and ethnic displacement in Schreber’s text, this paper will uncover other neglected conditions for the construction of his narrative: his problematic identification with the Jews, his syphilophobia, as well as a possible source text for this figuration. To undertake this genealogy I read Schreber’s work against three other contemporaneous works: Wolfgang Kirchbach’s 1890 fairytale for the stage, Die letzten Menschen (The Last Men); Henri Meige’s 1893 psychiatric monograph, Le Juif-errant à la Salpêtrière, Essai nosographique sur les névropathes voyageurs (The Wandering Jew in the Salpêtrière. Nosographic essay on ambulatory neurotics); and Oskar Panizza’s 1893 short narrative, “Der operirte Jude” (The Operated Jew). Other writings by Schreber and the remarks of his psychiatrists are also enlisted to place Schreber’s curious reference. As a consequence of these analyses, identities which are constructed, on the one hand, by the discourses of historical difference naturalized as race, and, on the other hand, by the discourses of natural difference embodied as sex,³ are seen to crisscross in the figure of the unmanned, non-Jewish Eternal Jew. Otherwise put, the narratives of diseased sexuality, diseased reproduction, and problematic gender and racial identity which tra-
verse Schreber's corpus are seen as conditioned by the discourses of anti-Semitism and syphilophobia.

**Historical Intersections**

Schreber's unmanned, non-Jewish Eternal Jew emerged as an effect of a historical conjuncture of contested classes, cultures, and identities (Weindling 1989; Pulzer 1964; Cocks and Jarausch 1990; and Evans 1976). Germany in the 1890s had not yet recovered from the Great Depression of the 1870s, even as it was undergoing radical restructuring as a consequence of rapid industrialization. With massive, pre-eminently male migration from impoverished rural regions into the cities, urban overpopulation complemented agricultural stagnation. In addition to this population shift, the devastated economic conditions of the countryside from Galicia to the Russian Pale, combined with pogroms, motivated the movement westward of large numbers of East European Jews. As a consequence of this altered demography, the traditional occupations of the *Mittelstand* were displaced as were the employment opportunities for lower-class women. And among the working-class a period of ever increasing unrest and resistance ensued. The chaotic effects of these transformations were known collectively as *die Sozialfrage*, the social question.

Public discourse was preoccupied with it. Competing determinations of the causes and cures of rampant social suffering and strife became the focus of political campaigns. Thus, the Conservative Party, fearing that the advent of universal suffrage would transfer their control of the government to the Social Democrats, proffered an answer to the social question. Responsibility for the crisis lay not with the financial, industrial, and landed interests which the Conservatives represented, but with the Jews. Consequently, the 1893 national elections were marked by an openly anti-Semitic rhetoric (Pulzer 1964, 118–26). As the Conservative Party program read: “We combat the widely obtruding and decomposing Jewish influence on our popular life” (Salomon...
1907, 2:71–72). Their candidates called for restrictions on Jewish access to government and the civil bureaucracy. Together with the radical anti-Semitic parties, they garnered 42% of the vote in Schreber’s Saxony; the radical anti-Semites themselves received 20% of the vote and elected six of their candidates. Although the number of Jews in Saxony was small, the anti-Semitic message found a resonance among the alienated Mittelstand. And Schreber as a former candidate for the Reichstag was in all probability following the election with some interest.

The changes in the political economy had consequences as well in what began to be viewed as the human economy. When the Great Depression revealed the inadequacy of liberalism, the administrative rule of expertise and welfare mechanisms embodied by public health policy came to the fore. Professionals populated the corridors of the regime of expertise. These experts asserted themselves—forming monopolies of scientific discourse—by targeting marginal or threatening social groups for their professional gaze.

Women’s bodies—those of the unemployed, of the prostitute, of the women’s movements—and the bodies of the recently emancipated male Jews attained a supervised public presence. Their entry into the public sphere amplified the crises of gender (Maugue 1987; Brown 1988; Le Rider 1990; Showalter 1990; Fout 1992) and national (Stern 1961; Mosse 1964) identity afflicting the German bourgeoisie. These crises were complemented by the medico-legal (re)inscription of fixed, gendered sexual identities (Foucault 1980) and the bio-anthropological construction of definitive racial identities (Gilman 1985; Weindling 1989).

As the century moved toward its conclusion, the bourgeoisie, preoccupied with heredity, displaced these crises onto the specter of degeneration. The apocalyptic tenor was recorded in the opening to Nordau’s 1892 diagnosis of his times, Entartung (Degeneration): “in our days there have arisen in more highly developed minds vague qualms of the Dusk of the Nations, in which all suns and all stars are gradually waning, and mankind with all its institutions and creations is perishing in the midst of a dying world” (Nordau 1895, 2).

Two new medical specialties in particular, medicalized
psychiatry and syphilology, inscribed the narrative of degeneration upon people’s bodies. Unable to cure, they employed their disciplinary discourses to define themselves and to classify and control the individual. Such discourses inscribed the body of the individual with an identity as other, that is, as diseased, as gendered, and as “true” to their group character, be it woman, Jew, homosexual, black, etc. Psychiatrists sought to ground mental disorders both in degenerative heredity and in the psychophysics of the body. And they sought to define any deviance as a mental disorder. They generated a medical discourse of supervision coextensive with their situation as bureaucratic administrators of usually state-run asylums (Gilman 1987; Weiss 1987; Kittler 1990). On the one hand, neuropathology became a function of hereditary disposition and taint. For example, the case sheet for Schreber’s first institutionalization at the Leipzig University Clinic begins: “Previous History. Hereditary loading.” And the case sheet for his final institutionalization at the asylum at Leipzig-Dösen gives extensive coverage of his “Heredity” (Baumeyer 1956, 61, 62). On the other hand, the patient’s body, offering itself up “as object of scientific observation for the judgment of experts” (S251)—as Schreber did his own corpus—was inscribed with the signs of degeneration sought out by the psychiatrist. Foremost among the signs of health and degeneration was gender identity. The Leipzig neurologist Möbius (1903) wrote that “the healthier the individual is, the more definitively he [or she] is male or female” (5). The warrant of heredity and the claim to objectivity undergird a science not just of the individual, but also of the group, of gender and of race. Just as hysteria became definitive of woman’s constitution, so Jean-Martin Charcot (1892), the nineteenth century’s foremost student of hysteria, could also say: “You know, of course, that Jewish families furnish us with the finest subjects for the study of hereditary disease. . . . how in the [Jewish] race, nervous symptoms of all sorts . . . are incomparably more frequent than elsewhere . . .” (1:10; cit. Goldstein 1985, 536). The psychiatry of degeneration provided a discourse for the inscription—and institutionalization—of all those who threatened the social order.

Syphilological discourse, for its part, tied the threat of
degeneration⁴ to the bourgeoisie's perception of pervasive prostitution and seemingly epidemic venereal disease. According to Alain Corbin (1981):

It was as if doctors were led to translate into a scientific language the phantasms which haunted the bourgeoisie of the time. . . . Better than any other morbid phenomenon, syphilis materialized the anxiety which the bourgeoisie cultivated over their descendants. [It] was capable of eviscerating the familial womb. The proof was in the frightening statistics concerning the miscarriages, stillbirths, and infant mortality of syphilitic origin.

Even more serious in nature than syphilis [was] hereditary syphilis. . . . [T]he race—read “the bourgeois family”—found itself menaced by a rot. . . . (146–47)

Within this new narrative of diseased reproduction, the future health of the descendants of the bourgeoisie became problematic—and hence threatened the very future of the bourgeois order which conceived itself as the culmination of a narrative of evolutionary descent, a narrative which continued by means of the transmission of the patrimony of accumulated capital. Hereditary syphilis, in particular, insinuated disease at the root of the ideology of reproduction which maintained that order (cf. Foucault 1978). Together the discourses of hereditary psychiatry and syphilology were inscribed upon the bodies of these threatened and threatening others—and the corpus of one Judge Schreber.

**Displaced Identifications**

The text of a paranoidic provides a privileged arena for witnessing the way in which discourse articulates identity. As Sam Weber (1988) writes: Paranoiacs

say only what they want to say—and yet in so doing they say (or write) something else: for they betray them-
selves . . . precisely because they say only what they want to say—"in a distorted form." [Hence, citing Freud (1939, 43) on textual distortion] "we may nevertheless count upon finding what has been suppressed and disavowed, hidden away somewhere else, though changed and torn from its context."

That is, Schreber's text works by displacement "from one representation to another, along a chain of associations. . . . The subject of [Schreber's text] is no longer constituted by the identity and transparence of self-consciousness. . . . [rather, the subject] is mediated by irreducible heterogeneity, a foreignness. . . . [The text is] the necessary, if idiosyncratic, materialization and localization of a process of articulation" (xix–xx). In other words, the voices which speak to Schreber, which write down all that he thinks, says, and does, represent the voice of the other, of the disciplinary discourses of diseased sexuality, diseased reproduction, and problematic gender and racial identity which is articulated through the body of the paranoiac, through the body of the unmanned, non-Jewish Eternal Jew.

Schreber describes the situation in which "the tendency, innate in the Order of the World, to unman a human being" (S72) is realized:

Perhaps God was also able to withdraw partially or totally the warmth of the sun from a star doomed to perish . . .; this would throw new light on the problem of the Ice Age [cf. S97]. . . . In such an event, in order to maintain the species, one single human being was spared—perhaps the relatively most moral—called by the voices that talk to me the 'Eternal Jew.' This appellation has therefore a somewhat different sense from that underlying the legend of the same name of the Jew Ahasver; one is automatically reminded of the legends of Noah, Deucalion and Pyrrha, etc. Perhaps the legend of the founding of Rome belongs here also. . . . The Eternal Jew (in the sense described) had to be
unmanned (transformed into a woman) to be able to bear children. . . . The Eternal Jew was maintained and provided with the necessary means of life by the ‘fleeting-improvised-men’. . . (S73–74)

Although in his Denkwürdigkeiten, Schreber never explicitly identifies himself as the unmanned Eternal Jew, his account suggests otherwise. “During the latter part of my stay in Flechsig’s Asylum [i.e., early 1894] I thought the [last 212 years allotted the earth] had already expired, and therefore thought I was the last real human being left, and that the few human shapes whom I saw apart from myself . . . were only ‘fleeting-improvised-men’ created by miracle” (S85). The perception that he was the only one alive persists even after he is transferred to Sonnenstein in July 1894 (cf. S125, S143). Schreber provides other clues of his implicit identification with the Eternal Jew. He notes, for example, that “the expression ‘rascal’ which was applied to the fleeting-improvised-man who had to serve the Eternal Jew was also applied to the attendants of the present Asylum in the first part of my stay” (S107 n.56). And in order to retain “the respect of other people whose opinion I value” Schreber defends his feminine “nerves of voluptuousness” (Wollustnerven) by asserting that “Few people have been brought up according to such strict moral principles as I, and have throughout life practiced such moderation especially in matters of sex, as I venture to claim for myself” (S208).

The most significant sign of identification is of course the accounts of his unmanning. Immediately following the discussion of the Eternal Jew Schreber almost offhandedly mentions that “I have myself twice experienced (for a short time) the miracle of unmanning” (S74). Initially he views this assault on his manliness—namely, his becoming a woman—as punishment or persecution: his body was left “for sexual misuse and simply ‘forsaken’, in other words left to rot” (S75), “hand[ed] over . . . in the manner of a female harlot” (S77; cf. S99). Only later could he “see beyond doubt that the Order of the World imperiously demanded my unmanning, whether I personally like it or not. . . . Nothing of course could be envisaged as a further consequence of unmanning but fertilization by divine rays for the purpose of creating
new human beings.” But he adds: “My change of will was facilitated by my not believing at that time that apart from myself a real mankind existed; on the contrary I thought all the human shapes I saw were only ‘fleeting and improvised’” (S148). In other words, his situation had to be identical to that of the Eternal Jew for the unmannung to be accepted. After this shift in valuation, he increasingly interprets his unmannung in a redemptive light: “For several years after I had changed my ideas . . . I lived in the certain expectation that one day my unmannung (transformation into a woman) would be completed; this solution seemed to me absolutely essential as preparation for the renewal of mankind,” and, after adding that “Unmannning for the purpose of renewing the race has in all probability actually occurred several times in earlier periods in the history of the universe” (S212), he refers the reader back to the chapter on the Eternal Jew.

Epispmas of the Wandering Jew

By ascribing a redemptive role to his unmannung, Schreber grafts upon his body one of the leading figurations of the Wandering Jew during the nineteenth century (cf. Knecht 1974–77; Hasan-Rokem and Dundes 1986; Rose 1990; Anderson 1991). The Wandering Jew either figures the culmination of Christian salvation history—in these narratives he is the Jew who, for having cursed Jesus on the way to Calvary, is condemned to wander the earth until his death at the Last Judgment. Or he represents the perfection of romanticized human development—in which case he becomes the secularized revolutionary who represents all of humanity in its progressive march to individual and social perfection. But redemptive is not the only—nor necessarily the preeminent—figuration of the Wandering Jew. The Wandering Jew more frequently was emblematic of a contemporary Jewry eternally marked by its contemptible national or racial character. He became a figure of stubbornness and deceit, of egoism and incessant desire, of a-morality and destructive negation. This Wandering Jew is encountered in Schopenhauer, in Wagner, in Dühring, in numerous German writings of the second half of the nineteenth century. This
Wandering Jew would through its own (self-)destruction, through its becoming non-Jewish, liberate humanity: “One only thing can redeem you from the burden of your curse: the redemption of Ahasverus—Going under [der Untergang]!” (Wagner 1966, 100).

There was also another resident of Dresden in the early 1890s, Wolfgang Kirchbach, who imagined a non-Jewish Wandering Jew. This figure too was the last man alive after the destruction of virtually all human life by an ice age caused by the withdrawal of the sun’s rays and whose telos is the reproduction of the race. Although virtually unknown today, Kirchbach was a noted author and essayist during the *fin de siècle*. Kirchbach moved to Dresden in 1887 where he was a journalist and theater critic. In 1890 he published his Nietzschean fairy-tale for the stage *Die letzten Menschen* (The Last Men). This work evoked the sense of *Dämmerung* and *Untergang*—also some of the silliness—of the *fin de siècle*.

The play opens with the Seer perched on a glacier describing a dead, frozen earth. Humankind is dead. Spirit has withdrawn from the world (*Weltentrückter Geist*). The old sun desires extinction, but its “last ray” (*Sonne letzter Strahl*) unleashes a transformation (Kirchbach 1890, 10). Struck by the ray, the snow begins to melt and the creatures of classical fable appear, as do two humans—Ahas, clearly short for Ahasverus, and Eva—although in different places and unknown to one another. When Ahas—the sole survivor of the last people on the frozen earth, the Eskimos—awakens, his first question is whether he is the first man, from whom others will follow. He explicitly expresses his desire for children. In response the nonhumans neither inform him that he is the last and not the first man nor do they divulge Eva’s presence. The remainder of the play follows, on the one hand, Ahas’s efforts to enforce his dominion and (re)populate the earth and, on the other hand, the nonhumans’ every move to thwart his efforts.

In the course of his pursuit, Ahas is not literally unmanned, rather he is feminized, rendered *ohnmächtig*, impotent, in his struggle for hegemony with Proteus (literally, the first man; Kirchbach 1890, 68). In the end Ahas’s womb does repopulate the world—with the dead. Proteus com-
mands him to "Look / now into the future, which out of your womb (aus deinem Schoß) / will bloom" (69). At that moment, all the generations and nationalities of the dead are raised. Eva’s dying words echo Ahas’s act: “My womb bears death” (Den Tod gebiert mein Schoß; 97).

Although Ahas’s body is not altered there is one major corporeal transformation: the great god Pan. Pan observes Eva and falls in love with her. But she just laughs at his presumption: how could she love a creature with split-hoofed goat legs, big ears, a tail—with one who therefore lacks human virtue. She wishes to couple, i.e., to reproduce, but only with a human. To be with her, Pan becomes, in a manner of speaking, an operated Jew (ich will mich menschlich bilden). He endeavors to strip off his savage appearance (ich will von mir streifen meinen Pelz, den wilden) and to substitute proper dress for his inhuman pelt. He hopes, as it were, to circumcise his circumcision, his difference, by clipping his claws (Ich . . . / will meine Fingerkralle mir beschneiden; 40). And he changes his language: now he speaks of shame, morality, and sin. He desires to “humanize” the other nonhumans spiritually and corporeally: performing the latter by lopping off (verschneiden, which also means “to castrate”) their tails (66). Needless to say, the other nonhumans view the humanly dressed—albeit without pants—Pan as crazy. And all his efforts come to naught when Eva smiles. Humiliated, Pan threatens to rape her, but before he can force a new race upon her he dies from having attempted to graft upon himself what was alien to his nature, what went against the order of the world (75–78).

The thematic, linguistic, figural, and ideological similarities between Kirchbach’s play and Schreber’s delusions are at times startling. While Die letzten Menschen may not necessarily be a source for the Denkwürdigkeiten,¹⁰ these parallels do shed light on a common culture. For instance, both draw upon the catastrophic prophecies of contemporary natural historians.¹¹ And ray phenomena pervaded the literature of physics, metaphysics, and psychophysics.¹² In addition, both call attention to the primacy of reproduction within the regnant masculinist ideology. Both also are very troubled by woman’s sexuality. In Kirchbach’s play human sexual repro-
duction is the source of mortality—understood ontologically, mythically, existentially, pragmatically, and misogynistically. Schreber, for his part, only feels comfortable with his transformation into woman, with his assumption of woman's nerves of sexual passion (Wollustnerven), when his sexuality is domesticated, channeled into reproduction. And since he endeavors to disassociate his higher purpose from base sexuality, by continuing to define his reproductive femininity in terms of sexual pleasure, Schreber may be embodying the still-believed correlation between woman's orgasm and the increased likelihood of conception (cf. Laqueur 1987). The questions then arise: does the Jew figure historical, i.e., racial difference, in Schreber as it does in Kirchbach? And if so, is racial identity no less problematized than gender identity?

Schreber's relationship to and, I claim, his implicit identification with the Jew require a three-fold approach. First, I examine how Henri Meige's 1893 case study/folktale analysis, *The Wandering Jew in the Salpêtrière*, constructs the Jew, especially in the guise of the Wandering Jew, as an object for psychiatric classification and supervision. Second, I demonstrate how Oskar Panizza's short story, "The Operated Jew," which also first appeared in 1893, provides insight into the manner Jewish identity is narratively constructed. Third, I analyze Schreber's own representations of the Jew over and against his avowed Aryanism.

*The Wandering Jew as Diagnostic*

The proliferation of narratives of the Wandering Jew in the latter part of the nineteenth century was in part motivated by the waves of impoverished westward-migrating East European Jews. For psychiatry, these threatening wanderers were stripped of their metaphysical onus and, when placed under supervision, they betrayed their neuropathology. The Wandering Jew typified the Jewish predisposition toward mental illness. Thus, in February 1889 at one of his famous *Leçons* at Salpêtrière, Charcot (1892) recounted the case of a Hungarian Jew by the name of Klein. This little man quickly acquired another patronym: "I introduce him to you as a true descendant of Ahasverus or Cartophilus"—that is, of the
Wandering Jew. Klein, it seems, was “constantly driven by an irresistible need to move on . . . without being able to settle down anywhere” (348; cf. Meige 1986, 191).

Cases such as Klein’s were taken up by Charcot’s student, Henri Meige. In his 1893 study of the Wandering Jew in the clinic, which first appeared in Charcot’s house organ, Nouvelle Iconographie de la Salpêtrière, Meige focuses less on the ailment than on the race of the sufferer. A combination of racial traits converge on individuals such as Klein. Thus, echoing Charcot, Meige (1986) states: “the great frequency of nervous disorders in the Jewish race” (193) reveals a hereditary predisposition to suffer from such neuropathological conditions as ambulatory neurosis. Moreover, Jews are particularly susceptible to this specific ailment since “it is a characteristic of their race to move with extreme ease. At home nowhere, and at home everywhere” (192).

In his monograph Meige mixes psychiatric case studies with analyses of legends, finding in the folktale a historical kernel which betrays racial psychopathology. Thus he suggests that the Wandering Jew is a “sort of prototype of the psychopathic Israelite peregrinating around the world” (194). And conversely, the “cosmopolitan” (191) Jews who pass through the clinic seem to be avatars of the Ahasverus of legend: “It is always more or less the same story; it is always more or less the same face” (191). The Wandering Jew became emblematic of the Jew under psychiatric supervision, of Jewish physiognomy as constructed by psychiatric discourse.

Just as race and mental health have replaced religion and piety in Meige’s narrative, so the redemptive role has also passed hands from Christ to the psychiatrist. This shift becomes evident as Meige tells of the “first Israelite traveller” whom Charcot ever encountered. It appears that the original Wandering Jew in the clinic also suffered from reproductive dysfunction: “He complained especially of genital impotence.” Yet thanks to his treatment, “not a year passed since that time that Mr. Charcot did not see Israelites from the same country come to him complaining of the same symptoms” (193). Under psychiatric supervision, Jewish diseased reproduction can be cured and the world of Jews can be redeemed.
The Operated Wandering Jew

In his depiction of the grotesque lengths a Jew would go to be assimilated, Oskar Panizza, trained as a psychiatrist, buried as a psychotic, and in the interim a poet, essayist, dramatist, short story writer, and syphilitic, wrote a narrative which drew on virtually the entire repertoire of anti-Semitic stereotype. "The Operated Jew" narrates the attempt of Itzig Faitel Stern, medical student and wandering Jew, to construct himself as a German. In this story Panizza has revealed the pre- and post-emancipation, the popular and scientific constructions of the Jew. Initially, Faitel embodied the excrescences of the stereotype: from his name to his "slightly yellow" skin, "most prominent" nose and crooked body (Körperkrummungen), from his walk, wealth, and smell to his knowledge of Talmud and perverse parody of the German language (Panizza 1980, 63–69). Panizza emphasizes Faitel's language as the telltale sign of race: for example, Faitel was predisposed to append meaningless sounds like "Deradâng" to standard German phrases. He is a "monster" (66), the product of diseased descent.

Faitel accepts the ridicule of everyone—their construction of his identity—until he encounters Dr. Klotz, a famous anatomist. Klotz asserts that according to his measurements Faitel is human: that is, he is capable of being emancipated from his Jewishness. After this declaration, Faitel endeavors to realize this scientific conclusion: to "resemble . . . a respectable human being . . . [to] pretend to be a normal human being" (68). To achieve this goal, Faitel submits to a series of excruciatingly painful operations and is fitted with a number of no less uncomfortable medical appliances—all under Klotz's "concerned eye" (73).

But that is insufficient:

Faitel had heard about the chaste, undefined Germanic soul which shrouded the possessor like an aroma. [i.e., the foetor judaicus, Jewish stench, is aryанизed and deodorized] This soul was the source of the possessor's rich treasures and formed the Shibboleth of the Germanic nations, a soul which was immediately recognized by all who possessed one (72).
To secure such a soul—the (un)speakable sign—he undergoes blood transfusions and a name change. He learns to “recite[] pathetic and sentimental passages by poets” (71). The process seemed to have worked: “. . . During the day [—when] he was in the European corsette, harnessed, supervised, under great surveillance. But in the evening [he] gurgled and bawled: ‘Deradâng! Deradâng!’” (73).

The narrator adds:

Only one thing was still missing. It was important to reproduce this human race which had cost so much to achieve. The new breed was to be grafted with the finest occidental spirit. A blond Germanic lass had to help preserve the results which had been garnered through fabulous efforts. (73)

Faitel, like all bourgeois members of his generation, German and Jewish, was guided by the mandates of reproduction, the obsession with descent and the transmission of patrimony. His own personal conversion needed to be inserted within a narrative of racial renewal. Unfortunately, to fulfill his redemptive desire his surgical transformation had to combat the common belief in the dominance of Jewish heredity. Botanical metaphors and implied Lamarckianism were insufficient. Instead, Panizza drew upon the German literary tradition to open the reader and Faitel to the redemptive possibilities: specifically Goethe’s Wahlverwandtschaften (Elec-tive Affinities). The name of Faitel’s betrothed is Othilia: an allusion to the same-named character in Goethe’s novel. There the modest Öttile enters into the family circle of Eduard and her aunt Charlotte, where she becomes the object of Eduard’s unsatisfied desire. Otto, the child whom Eduard and Charlotte conceive amid this alchemical ménage, bears an uncanny resemblance to Othilia. In other words, her image is imprinted upon the child without the mediation of biology or sexuality. And such is no doubt the chimerical hope of Faitel.

The climax of Panizza’s tale occurs at the wedding feast. While still under the supervision of Dr. Klotz, Faitel comes undone. First, a few “Deradâng! Deradângs!” show them-
selves, signaling an uncontrollable process whereby his entire Jewish physiognomy is restored, replete with “terrible smell.” The story concludes as “Klotz’s work of art lay before him crumpled and quivering, a convoluted Asiatic image in wedding dress, a counterfeit of human flesh” (Panizza 1980, 78–79).

What should be apparent even from this brief summary is what Panizza elided from his account of the multiple constructions of Jewish identity: the foremost marker of Jewish identity, that which inscribes difference on the body, specifically, on the organ of reproduction, namely circumcision. Instead of an epispasm, an operation which reconstructs the foreskin, there is a narrative. “The Operated Jew.” Still his constructions of the Jew are structured by this overlooked marker. On the one hand, in the collection of natural attributes which makes up the Jew as stereotype, circumcision is the artificial supplement which proves the rule of Jewish difference. The representation of the pre-emancipated Jew presupposes circumcision. And on the other hand, while the discourses of modernity interpellate the Jew into an assimilated identity, circumcision becomes the natural language which betrays the Jew who tries to pass and to pass semen. Circumcision is Jewry’s Shibboleth.

In the face of the unsaid, the hidden language of the body is displaced onto the meaningless additions of Jewish language. Yiddish comes to signify Faitel’s identity: when he looks in the mirror he abandons his German soul of empty sayings and reverts to the language of the yeshiva bucher. And his unmarked circumcision is also displaced onto the feminine, the unmanned, throughout the story: Faitel is introduced as beardless, his speech as “cowardly.” Later, during his transformation, he is transfused with the blood of women, apparently menstrual blood, in a scene evoking female suicide: laying supine in a warm bath he opens his vein and falls unconscious: “He wanted to shed his ‘Jewishness’” (71). And, of course, the moment of consummation, of male domination, the moment of revealing his circumcision—his wedding night—becomes the moment of Faitel’s dissolution, his un-manning.
Wandering Chasms

Panizza’s medically supervised unmanning of the Wandering Jew suggests comparisons with Schreber’s figuration, but in contrast to “The Operated Jew”’s hidden circumcision, unmanning as an embodied practice—i.e., the distortion of the male genital—is explicit in the Denkwürdigkeiten. Yet, unmanning too structures Schreber’s text. Just as Faitel’s circumcision reveals the vanity of the redemption sought in assimilation, so, conversely, Schreber’s unmanning is ultimately accepted as leading to the renewal of the race.

While the chiasm of visibility connects the construction of gender identity in Panizza and Schreber, can a similar inversion be discerned with regard to racial identification? Just as Faitel Stern is a Jew desiring to be a German, is Schreber a German desiring to be a Jew? Throughout his narrative Schreber, like Panizza, is gripped by the opposition, the conflict for domination, between German and Jew. Such a position is not surprising from a former Burschenschafter; members of his fraternity, the Wartburg, idolized the Prussian nationalist historian Heinrich von Treitschke (1965), who made famous the cry, “The Jews are our misfortune” (13).19 Schreber’s Aryan sympathies are apparent when he writes that “the Germans were in modern times . . . God’s chosen people. . . . God’s chosen peoples in history—as the most moral at a given time—were in order the old Jews, the old Persians . . . , the ‘Greco-Romans’ . . . and lastly the Germans” (S50). Schreber goes on to define the souls’ use of the ascription “Aryan” in a note: “The expression ‘Aryan’ (‘Aryan’ is another name for the Indo-Germanic peoples) was in general much used at that time; there was also an ‘Aryan’ state of Blessedness, etc. By and large the expression was used to denote the leaning of a great part of the souls towards German nationalism; they wanted to retain for the German people the place of God’s chosen people, in contrast to the Catholicizing and Slavicizing efforts of other souls” (S99 n. 49). There is also a scene in the text which reproduces a frequent trope in anti-Semitic literature: the dissembling Jew who attains control of the state apparatus.20 The voices speak
of a baptized Jew who like Flechsig was "a nerve specialist [and] a kind of administrator of God's interest, and who wanted to institute the rule of Judaism in Germany" (S71). Annuciations of the future hegemony of Germany continually recur throughout the remainder of the narrative, while allusions to the Jew appear limited to moments of hypochondriacal symptom formation: leprosy, bad odors, "the very inferior 'Jew's stomach'" (S133). The Jew is identified with the oppressor, the superseded, or the diseased. And of course, the ultimate redemptive figure, the Eternal Jew, is denied his Jewishness. Schreber even articulates the opposition between the lower and higher gods Ariman and Ormuzd in terms of German and Jew: "the lower God (Ariman) seems to have felt attracted to nations of originally brunette race (the Semites) and the upper God to nations of originally blonde race (the Aryan peoples)" (S52). Yet since Ariman is the god who unmanned Schreber, this last opposition secretes an apparent identification with the Jew. To be the harlot, to be debased, and, as Meige demonstrates, to be the object of the psychiatrist's gaze, is also to be the Jew.

Schreber's gender identifications are always also ethnic identifications. Similarly, sexuality and race simultaneously overcode his body. On Schreber's body difference is above all sexual; however, racial cross-identifications are written across the sexual with the most graphic displacement occurring with the retraction of "the (external) male genitals (scrotum and penis) [of the Eternal Jew] into the body" (S73) so that he can become a woman and repopulate the world. Although for Schreber the end of the human race necessitates the unmanning of the Eternal Jew (and himself) and is the rationale for the correlation of the Eternal Jew with non-Jewish prototypes like Noah, Deucalion and Pyrrha, etc., the act of unmanning also evokes Jewishness. This is not—or not just—to suggest that unmanning is castration and therefore alludes to circumcision, although just prior to writing his Schreber study, Freud (1909, 36n) had conversely concluded that circumcision conjures up the specter of castration. Rather—or moreover—by this specific form of unmanning, Schreber's body endeavors simultaneously to displace and acknowledge its identification with the Jew. While Faitel's
Aryan transformation would conceal his feminization, Schreber's feminizing invagination, by concealing the glans in flesh, figures an episperm which would elide the Jewish mark of difference: namely, circumcision.

Yet like Faitel Stern's meaninglessly appended "Dera-dáng," the site of the distortion and displacement of Schreber's racial difference is, however, more linguistic than corporeal. In language the figuration of identity and difference through the displacement of gender is replaced by displacement along a phonological chain of associations. For example, the difference between poison-laden rays which inflict pain on the body and those which heal the damage, the difference between searing and blessed rays, is the difference between the Sehrende and the Segnende (S98). Schreber's sensitivity to the slightest phonological displacements is most apparent in his discussion of the "the miraculously created birds." They "do not understand the meaning of the words they speak; but apparently they have a natural sensitivity for similarity of sounds" (S168). Schreber provides a series of near homophonic pairings: for example, "Chinesenthum"/"Jesum Christum," "Abendroth"/"Athemnoth," or "Ariman"/"Ackermann" (S168). Such sounds both excite the birds into states of voluptuousness and confuse them; such sounds render them susceptible to malicious manipulation.

Schreber names these birds after young girls. But the linguistic incompetence ascribed to the birds and, implicitly, to women had also been ascribed to the Jews. The rote singing of empty phrases was the standard critique of Jewish liturgy circulating in, among others, the anti-Semitic chirpings of Richard Wagner (1966, 90–91) and Otto Weininger (1906, 323). The birds' parody of a language—it sounds like a recognizable language but is essentially meaningless—coincides with frequent representations of the language of the Jews, Yiddish. But the language which most resembles Yiddish may well be the Grundsprache, the basic language of the rays. Schreber describes the basic language as "a somewhat antiquated but nevertheless powerful German, characterized particularly by a wealth of euphemisms (for instance, unholy [in the reverse sense] for holy)" (S50). Yiddish, Jüdisch-deutsch, is itself a derivative of late medieval German, which recodifies eu-
phenemism back into profanity; take for instance Schmuck: the jewel becomes the prick—before its retraction.22

Could the voices which beset Schreber have been speaking Yiddish? Is Yiddish the “nerve-language” which “no human being as such can force another to use” (S69), but which Schreber because of his condition was in fact forced to use? Could the overheard screams, the bellowing (Brüllen), and nonsensical utterances of Schreber be his Yiddish response? Schreber was likely familiar with Yiddish. Israëls (1989, 187) has unearthed documents which attest that Schreber and his family owned property on one of the major commercial streets of Leipzig, Brühlstrasse, a street of Jewish fur dealers.23 Moreover, these premises housed a Hebrew book shop. As is quite apparent from a poem Schreber wrote for his mother’s ninetieth birthday in 1905 (Allison et al. 1988, 204–67, 282–83), the disposition of this building generated a number of unpleasant associations with Jews:

Although your heart is hardly set on fur and skins,
And you have perhaps only moderate liking
For those who eat kosher and for Poland’s Jews
Let me, however, put a photograph of
A building in Brühl together with the others,
On which not seldom did your cares rest. . . .
Yet sixty years it belonged to you and yours,
And let one thing be said in its praise:
When it was no longer ours, it was a loss
That we cry over less than others.

Did this loss, this dislocation of difference, repeat itself in the displacement of Brühl onto Brühl? Did the Sprache, the language, of Brühlstrasse become the Brüllwunder or the bellowing miracle of the asylum (see, e.g., S165)? Taking that possibility one step farther, I need borrow from Sam Weber’s analysis of the Schnittwunde, the cut on Schreber’s face, which Schreber chose to exemplify the nature of miracles, the Wunder, directed against him. For Weber (1988, xlv–il) this displaced phonological identification of inscribed difference—from wound/Wunde to miracles/Wunder—renders difference,
and the absolute importance of difference, visible. Cannot the obverse be afoot with the displaced phonological identification of Brüllwunder with the Brühlwunde? That is, could the bellowing miracle be alluding to, even as it occludes, the mark of Jewish difference, the wound of the inhabitants of Brühlstrasse, namely circumcision? Did Schreber identify with the circumcised, the Beschnittenen, who are also the circumcisers, the Bescheider? Did he then like Faitel adopt a new name? Did he become Herr Schneider, the man whose name led Schreber to question the origin of all names, of all patronyms, of all identities (S179–80)?

In contrast to his non-Jewish counterpart, Schreber’s Jewish Eternal Jew is not unmanned for any redemptive purpose. Either this figure is complicit with oppression—the circumcised is always also the circumciser (cf. Wilson 1982, 588)—or he marks a dead end. The finality of this incarnation can signify superseded Judaism, Jewry’s exclusion from the higher echelons of the state, the diseased dead, or transformations that lead either to humiliation (like Pan stripping off his fur) or commodification (the Jewish fur dealers of the poem) and do not lead to natural reproduction, to the production of a new race. Yet just as Schreber’s initial experience of unmanning as emasculation, as feminized victimization, is transformed and revalorized through its insertion in a narrative of redemptive reproduction, so too is the negative valuation attached to Schreber’s implicit identification with the circumcised, with the unmanned Eternal Jew. That is, the means by which Schreber performs his identification with redemptive reproduction is by “cultivating voluptuousness” (Pflege der Wollust; cf. S149, S207–10). This phrasing resonates with biblical reference: specifically, in Genesis 18:12 Sarah, overhearing the prophecy that she will bear children, remarks: “After I have grown old . . . shall I have pleasure.” In Luther’s translation this passage reads: “Nun ich alt bin soll ich noch Wollust pflegen.” Is Schreber identifying with the patriarch Sarah who accompanied her husband Abraham on his wanderings and through whom God fulfilled his covenant with Abraham? Is the non-Jewish Wandering Jew a Jewess? In Schreber’s delusions the identities of difference merge and separate. He is at once Jew and German, male and female.
Schreber as Syphilophobe or
The Miscarriages of a Justice

But the problematic of reproduction opens upon another scene. Among the motives suggested for his delusions of redemptive unmanning is that his marriage with Ottalie Sabine Behr had been childless. Since he was the last surviving male Schreber and since he was advanced in age there was no one left to provide the patronymic (cf. Freud 1911, 57–58). Consequently, he sought to substitute for his wife. Since she was unable to reproduce his name, he sought to reproduce hers. That is, each of her names evokes reproduction. The relationship between Ottalie and nonsexual reproduction has already been discussed with regard to Panizza’s story. Goethe’s elective affinities might find their analogue in Schreber’s “certain conviction that spontaneous generation (parentless generation, generatio aequovoca) does in fact exist” (S185; cf. S191). Her second name, Sabine, recalls the Sabine women, who were raped by Latin tribesmen under Romulus in order to ensure the production and hegemony of their descendants. And her maiden name, Behr, is a virtual homonym of the German verb stem for giving birth, gebären.

His usurpation of her name, however, may have been in reaction to an ailment that went nameless, the plague nominated by euphemism: namely syphilis. That is, their childlessness had not been due to infertility, rather Sabine had experienced a series of miscarriages. According to the medical history from the University Psychiatric Clinic, she had had two prior to his first institutionalization (Baumeyer 1956, 61). Further, Schreber writes: “After recovering from my first illness, I spent eight years with my wife, . . . marred only from time to time by the repeated disappointment of our hope of being blessed with children” (S63). This passage suggests that she may have had several more miscarriages or stillbirths. White (1961, 60) and Israëls (1989, 277) conclude that she may have had as many as six. By the 1880s doctors asserted that there was a very strong correlation between miscarriages and syphilis, especially when at least one of the parents suffered from hereditary syphilis. Alfred Fournier, the leading syphilologist of his era, suggested that “women
who had miscarried several times be subjected to mercury treatment as a precautionary measure during pregnancy” (Harsin 1989, 67). Could Schreber have had syphilis or have been the child of a syphilitic, or did he fear that either was the case?25

The case history from his first institutionalization at the Leipzig University Clinic reads “Was given Pot[assium] lod[ide] since syphilis was suspected.” Since this comment is immediately followed by “His wife had had two miscarriages” (Baumeyer 1956, 61), the person who drew up this case history appears to have drawn the connection among Schreber’s behavior, his wife’s problems with reproduction, and his possible syphilitic infection. Schreber too seems to have come to the same conclusion. In a poem to his wife on the occasion of their tenth anniversary (6 February 1888), he wrote (Busse 1991):

Four times your fervid desire remained unfulfilled!
No sacrifice was for you too great, nor was too steep,
Such as experts continually prescribed for you:
    Sweet maternity was not to be your share—
Then Fate threatened you with still harder knocks.
I myself became ill; from germs [aus Keimen], hardly noticed
The suffering grew and hard times ensued. (334–35)

Schreber conjoins, if he does not explicitly make a causal connection between, his wife’s miscarriages and his own illness. Further, while the poem’s illness is not named, in the Denkwürdigkeiten the “germs” reappear in Schreber’s belief that he had “some germs [Keime] of leprosy” (S97), an illness, which as discussed below, is closely associated with syphilis. Hence the poem suggests some concern of Schreber with syphilitic infection (cf. Busse 1991, 256–58).

Was Schreber also aware of the treatment with potassium iodide26 and its implications? Did he suspect that his physicians were dissembling the true nature of his illness? When he discusses his original stay at Flechsig’s Clinic in the Denkwürdigkeiten, Schreber questions the doctor’s “white lie”: “Professor Flechsig wanted to put down my illness solely to poi-
sioning with potassium bromide . . .” (Bromkalivergiftung; S62). Does Schreber betray his awareness of the possible diagnosis of syphilis through the substitution of bromine for iodine, and of cause for cure? Is sodium bromide one of the basic languages’s famous euphemisms?

Analysis of a Paralysis

Another connection lay with his brother Gustav who had committed suicide in 1877. In the report on Paul Schreber’s hereditary background, his brother is described as paralytic. The source for this remark was probably the letter written by his sister Klara to Paul’s psychiatrist in 1900. In this note she reported “that the progressive paralysis of our dear eldest brother had already been recognized at that time” (Baumeyer 1956, 68; cf. Israëls 1989, 151). Although the Denkwürdigkeiten make no mention of Gustav’s suicide let alone his paralysis, it can be assumed that Paul knew of his brother’s condition as well. The diagnosis of progressive paralysis usually signified that one suffered from syphilis, although this connection did not go uncontested until the Wassermann test cast aside all scepticism (Cf. Fleck 1979, 14). One source which affirmed the tie was Emil Kraepelin’s textbook on psychiatry—a work which Schreber readily consulted while preparing his text (cf., e.g., S89–90). Kraepelin (1899, 1:19) writes: “If the clinical picture leaves us very uncertain about the great group of paralytic mental disturbances, it is from now on doubtless that at least the majority of these stand in some causational relationship with syphilis.” He later amplifies this conclusion: “Among the causes of paralysis we must first of all consider syphilis. We find this [disease] remarkably often in the past of paralytics, even if at present syphilitic symptoms relatively seldom make an appearance” (2:286). After examining the statistical evidence, he concludes “In any case the connection between syphilis and paralysis stands up to any doubt” (2:287).

While Schreber does not complain that he is suffering from some paralytic disorder when he reenters Flechsig’s clinic in 1893, he does make other complaints. Dr. Weber, Schreber’s psychiatrist during his second stay at Sonnenstein,
writes in his report to the court: "At the beginning of [Schreber']s stay [at the university Psychiatric Clinic] he . . . complained that he was suffering from softening of the brain" (Hirnerweichung, S267). According to Black's Medical Dictionary's entry on "softening of the brain":

when people who have been the subjects of gout, alcoholism, or syphilis, especially elderly persons, become gradually dull in intellect, drowsy, absent-minded, emotional, and finally demented, these symptoms are also attributed to 'softening of the brain.' (1972, 139)

More pertinent is the reference in the index to the second volume of Kraepelin's textbook (1899, 2:604). Under Gehirnerweichung it reads: "see progressive paralysis." Kraepelin also describes how such paralytic ailments are not localized to the head but generate "very profound and general disturbances to the entire body" (1:39). Many of the ailments which Schreber describes—the "very multifarious . . . miracles enacted against the organs of the thoracic and abdominal cavities [and] directed against my head and the nerves of my head" (S132, S135)—could be ascribed to syphilis. Indeed, Schreber's "body without organs" made famous by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1972) as well as the problematization of gender identity can be ascribed to syphilis; as Charles Bernheimer (1989) writes: "Insofar as it erodes the body, obscures differences between organs, rupturing membranes, causing abscesses and chancre, syphilis is the appropriate pathological analog of the collapse of gender differences" (272).

Naming Names

That Schreber fails to name syphilis as the cause of or in anyway connected with his dementia is not too surprising. Syphilis was the disease that went unnamed (cf. Harsin 1989; Corbin 1990; Geller 1991). With the first productions in 1889–91 of Ibsen's play Die Gegangenen (Ghosts), the horror of what everyone knew was hereditary syphilis was brought to theater audiences and to the readers of theater reviews.
In this play the unnamed consequence of his father's sexual excesses reduces Alving, a talented young artist, to a headache-shriven neurasthenia-weakened invalid who, as the play ends, cries out "The sun, the sun!" and collapses into dementia and death.

But syphilis is mentioned once in the Denkwürdigkeiten: "Another time I traversed the earth from Lake Ladoga to Brazil and, together with an attendant, I built there in a castle-like building a wall in protection of God's realms (Gottesreiche) against an advancing yellow flood tide: I related this to the peril (Gefahr) of a syphilitic epidemic" (S87). Clearly Schreber was familiar with the rhetoric of the "venereal peril" which populated both popular press and medical discourse (cf. Corbin 1977, 1990). Moreover his repeated references to and identifications with the harlot, the whore, and the prostitute invoke the discourse on syphilis. The prostitute was represented—whether medically or morally, literarily or visually (cf. Gilman 1988; Bernheimer 1989; Corbin 1990)—as the source of syphilitic contagion.29 According to Havelock Ellis (1936), "in the eyes of many people, the question of prostitution is simply the question of syphilis" (319). If Schreber had indeed contracted syphilis from a prostitute—or even if his father or brother had done so—then he may have pinned the blame for his failure to reproduce and other miseries on the prostitute. Thus when he called out "The sun is a whore" and "God is a whore"30 he was identifying the sources of his current victimization with the ultimate source of his predicament. Moreover, when he bemoaned his own reduction to harlot status, this shameful insult to his hypermasculine honor, he was not only figuring his victimization, but also assuming blame for his syphilis-induced inability to pass on the patronym.

And to return to Schreber's paradoxical identification with the Jews, the disease-disseminating prostitute was frequently represented as Jewish. Every bordello had its "handsome Jewess" (cf. Huysmans 1956, 75). And in fact during the last decades of the nineteenth century there had been a large increase in Jewish prostitution as a consequence of the vast migrations of East European Jewry. Moreover, the Jews were figured as the leaders of the white slave trade. The
widely publicized Lemberg trial of 1892 in which twenty-seven Jewish procurers from Galicia were convicted of trafficking in women fueled these charges (Aschheim 1982; Briston 1983).

The yellow tint of the flood also suggests some connection with Jews. Yellow skin like Faitel's was often represented as characteristic of Jews. Moreover, the requirement for Jews to wear a yellow badge was instituted in the thirteenth century to prevent Christian prostitutes from having intercourse with Jews (Bullough and Bullough 1987, 127; Encyclopaedia Judaica 1972, 4:64ff). There may not have been Jewish brothels on the shores of Lake Ladoga, but they could be found from Lemberg or Lahore to Rio. This worldwide, prostitute-borne disease, too, acted like a Wandering Jew. Huysmans (1956), in his 1884 A Rebours (Against the Grain), wrote:

Never wearying, [syphilis] had traveled down the ages; to this day it was raging everywhere, disguised under ordinary symptoms of headache or bronchitis, hysteria or gout; from time to time, it would climb to the surface, attacking for choice badly cared for, badly fed people breaking out in gold pieces, setting, in horrid irony, a nautch-girl's parure of sequins on its wretched victim's brows, inscribing their skin, for a crown to their misery, with the very symbol of wealth and well-being. (98–99)

The connection among syphilis, the Jews, and Schreber's body is again implicated by the next epidemic which according to the Denkwürdigkeiten confronted Europe: leprosy, "the signs of which were visible on my own body" (S97). Delineating the relationship between syphilis and leprosy, whether one of virtual identity or definitive difference, played a constitutive role in the scientific, historical, and philosophic/anthropological construction of the disease-entity syphilis. For example, in the absence of an adequate patient history and in the presence of many similar dermatological symptoms, the primary diagnostic function of nineteenth-century venerealists was to distinguish syphilis from leprosy (Crissey and Parish 1981). Moreover, among the major controversies which engaged the medical historians of syphilis was whether
or not it was a mutation of leprosy or was what in pre-
Columbian Europe went by the name of “leprosy” (Bloch
1901–11). Voltaire (1879, 572–75) also distinguished between
leprosy and syphilis. In his Dictionnaire philosophique leprosy
was as emblematic of the Jews as fanaticism and usury and
was opposed to syphilis. Leprosy signified dirtiness, the
arbitrary rule of priests and women, culture reduced to the
animal level. Syphilis by contrast was a gift of Nature; it was
tied to the “source of life.” Indeed it was emblematic of na-
ture: outside of human control . . . punishing even while
fulfilling what is necessary—or pleasurable. The victim of
syphilis is hence by implication innocent. Thus for Voltaire
leprosy was opposed to syphilis as the Jew is to the order of
the world.

And after leprosy the next disease to afflict Europe and
Schreber was the plague, die Pest, which in all of its varieties
would emit a variety of disgusting smells (S98) that were
suggestive of the foetor judaicus, the Jewish stench. The name
of this affliction, die Pest, would in the anti-Semitic narratives
of the decades to come hook up with the prefix Juden and as
Judenpest become another term for syphilis.31

Did Schreber suffer from either syphilis or hereditary
syphilis?392 The sincerity of Schreber’s claim to moral prin-
ciples and sexual moderation need not be doubted. But with
a paralytic elder brother and a father who became mentally
ill when he, the son, was eight years old, and who remained
ill for the last eleven years of his life, Schreber’s fear that he
may be a hereditary syphilitic cannot be dismissed. Syphi-
lophobia too was considered “one of the most depressive of
afflictions, particularly when it occurs in neurasthenic sub-
jects; it is accompanied by melancholia, loss of appetite and
even a strong tendency towards suicide”35—symptoms to
which Schreber fell victim. Schreber’s hallucinated body may
well have been constructed by the discourses of syphilology
and syphilophobia.

In conclusion, by focussing on Schreber’s too-long ne-
glected figuration of the unmanned, non-Jewish Eternal Jew,
this paper has located his Denkwürdigkeiten at this historical
conjuncture of contested classes, cultures, and identities. The
corpus of Schreber is traversed by narratives of diseased sex-
uality, diseased reproduction, and problematic gender and racial identities, while his body is inscribed by historical, i.e., racial, and natural, i.e., sexual, difference through the discourses of anti-Semitism and syphilophobia. Schreber’s case is a case study of how discourse—as practice and as institution—constructs identity.
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* The research for this paper was performed under the auspices of the Center for the Critical Analysis of Contemporary Culture (CCACC), Rutgers University—New Brunswick. An earlier version of this paper was presented at Syracuse University on 11 April 1991.

1. The only extensive treatment is Prado de Oliveira (1979, 261–69), who suggests a number of parallels between the Denkwürdigkeiten and Eugène Sue’s 1845–47 novel Le juif errant. Prado’s match-game argument is on the whole unconvincing: e.g., the number 212 figures in both works, a character in both is institutionalized in a psychiatric asylum, the Jesuits are heavies in the two narratives. Besides, he makes no case for Schreber’s familiarity with the novel; cf. Israels (1989, 44–45). Lukacher (1981) also evokes the Eternal Jew when portraying Schreber’s world-destroying delusions as a prolepsis of the Shoah.

2. In the Denkwürdigkeiten the German phrase which we usually translate as Wandering Jew is eunger Jude. Eunger Jude literally means and in Macalpine and Hunter’s very literal translation of Schreber reads “Eternal Jew”; however, since “Wandering Jew” is the more familiar, I use that phrase unless specifically referring to Schreber’s text.

3. As Foucault (1973; 1978), Laqueur (1987; 1990), and others have shown, the determination of difference underwent a marked transformation with the advent of the modern episteme and/or the bourgeois epoch. That is, difference shifted from a hierarchical relationship to a binary one. This is graphically displayed in Laqueur’s analysis of the shift in the representation of genitalia. By the late eighteenth century female sexual organs are no longer deficient models of the male; they now embody difference. This change correlated with the development of sexual stereotypes as identity determinants; cf. Hausen (1981). Following Poovey (1988), sexual difference, theorized as grounded in nature, became the zero degree of all difference. Yet if men were different from—and superior to—women, how did men differentiate themselves from one another? How were the relations of power represented? Men as the makers of history (cf. G. W. F. Hegel, passim), bourgeois men as the creators of historical consciousness (cf. White 1973; Lyotard 1988; de Certeau 1988), instituted historical differentiation. The racial other had no history (cf., e.g., Hegel on Africa in his Philosophy of History); the history of the religious other had been superseded (cf., e.g., F. C. Baur on the history of Christianity); and the class other was either overthrown in history (the aristocracy) or, again, outside of or at an earlier stage in history (the peasantry, the proletariat, the Volk). With the development of the teleological narrative of evolution these histories became naturalized.


5. Only in 1896 could he “no longer doubt that a real race of human beings in the same number and distribution as before did in fact exist” ($163; cf. S212).
6. Cf. the excerpted case history of Schreber’s second admission to University Clinic: “1 March [1894]. Maintains that he is a young girl frightened of indecent assaults” (Baumeyer 1956, 62). A question that needs to be asked, but apparently has been neglected, is whether Schreber was sexually assaulted by the attendants.

7. Prior to this move, Kirchbach was a member of the circle around Michael Georg Conrad and his literary organ Die Gesellschaft. Other members of this circle included the Jewish writer Conrad Alberi (born Conrad Sittenfeld), who wrote a notorious vilification of Jewishness, “Judentum und Antisemitismus” (Alberi Dec. 1889), and soon thereafter Karl Bleibtreu, whose review of Otto Weininger’s Geschlecht und Charakter (Sex and Character) enthusiastically echoed Weininger’s depiction of Jewry (Bleibtreu 19 March 1904), as well as Oskar Panizza (see below). Biographical information from Kirchbach (1910); Kelly (1990, 6:330). On his reputation, see Striedieck (1947, 42–43).

8. Kirchbach’s introduction of the Seer (Seher) to describe the destruction of the world recalls the “seer of spirits” (Geistesseher) who was, according to Schreber, connected with the 1755 great Lisbon earthquake in the same manner as Schreber himself is with his “vision” of the end of the world (S97).

9. Kirchbach’s play is marked by an extended rhetoric of rays and radiating. For instance, the sirens sing that “the earth shines in the ice” (Es strahlt die Erde im Eise; 19), how “the lovely human woman’s untouched body shines forth” (schönert noch am unberührten Leibebraucht das liebliche, das Menschenweib; 27) is more beautiful than how “the light of intellect radiates in man” (im strahlt des Geistes Licht; 27), Proteus’s incarnation is compared to a “lightening bolt” (Blitzstrahl; 70), etc.

10. Kirchbach did not produce the play in Dresden on account of the great expense such a production would entail. In his “Selbstbiographie,” Kirchbach (1910) laments: “The stage production of this work is very expensive: I can only hope, perhaps one evening in my life, to see it on stage—if I should live so long” (7). Józsa Savits, the head director of Munich’s Hoftheater, expresses his regret both that he is unable to afford underwriting a play he compares with Midsummer’s Night Dream and Manfred and that others will not because they are reluctant to support any living playwright (letter of 3 February 1890; in Becker and von Levetzow 1910, 343–44). Kirchbach finally found backing since when he was directing plays in 1899 Berlin, his repertory consisted of Aristophanes’s The Birds and Lysistrata, Shakespeare’s Trojus and Cressida, Kleist’s Amphitryon, and one of his own plays: The Last Men. This production apparently escaped the attention of Adalbert von Hanstein; in his literary history of the Michael Georg Conrad’s Münchener circle, “jüngstes Deutschland” discussion of Den letzten Menschen appears in a chapter entitled “Die Dramatiker ohne Bühnen”, drawn Krist withou–tag (von Hanstein 1901, 142–49). Despite the failure to find a theater, the published version of the play apparently received, as Kirchbach puts it, “great recognition.” In addition to the comparisons provided by Savits, Kirchbach (1910) cites Max Kretzer, the author of the first German naturalistic novel, who commented that Die letzten Menschen was “the most original [das Eigenartigste] play written by a German poet in the last decade” (7); Kirchbach adds that Maximilian Harden, literary critic and editor of the influential political weekly Die Zukunft, and others had made similar comments. Von Hanstein also speaks of the play as the “most audacious concept” (kühnste Einfall) devised by any of the “stageless dramatists” (von Hanstein 1901, 142). Still it is possible that Schreber may have read about, if not read, the play. The Denkwürdigkeiten clearly attests to his being a Kulturmensch familiar both with classic drama and with Wagner. More intriguing still is that Schreber’s wife Sabine was the daughter of the former artistic director of the Leipzig theater.

11. For Kirchbach, see von Hanstein (1901, 142); and Schreber provides a listing of some of his reading in natural science (S80, n. 36).
12. The discovery of electromagnetic radiation by Hertz in 1887; Ned Lukacher in conversation reports of the proliferation of rays (e.g., the so-called N-Strahlen) and emanations (Austrahlungen) in spiritualist, theosophic, and other quasi-Eastern, quasi-occultist circles; cf. Kittler’s discussion of Fleischig’s psychophysics (1990, 290–304).

13. Cf. Amymone responds to Ahas’s question about the “nameless one”: “The human female (Menschenweib) / the dreadful, the unfathomable! / and through you [i.e., Ahas] comes death-impregnated woe! / It is woman, the maternal horror, / out of whose womb monstrous life / emerges. Your other ‘I’ [Dein andres Ich], the abyss, / in which your self will once more be dashed to pieces. / The human female, made in your image / who quickens the world through mortality / and ever creates dying upon the earth” (Kirchhach 1890, 50).

14. In anti-Semitic discourse, the alleged cosmopolitanism of the Jews was frequently opposed to the natural ties to Blut und Boden of the indigenous Volk.

15. Similarly, the doctor has replaced Christ as the source of authority and grace. Thus the skepticism of these Jewish neurotics about the physician’s opinion is analogized to the sin of the Wandering Jew: the “refusal to believe in medical power was tantamount to the fateful refusal to believe in the divinity of Christ”; cited by Goldstein (1985, 542).


17. Itzig Faitel Stern recalls Friedrich Freiherr von Holzshuher’s near-identical pseudonym, Itzig Faitel Stern, which he adopted for his anti-Semitic parody of Jewish emancipationist claims, the 1834 Die Manipulativen der hauwererdehliche kénigliche bayerische Juedenschaft. En Edress an die hauwererdehliche Harren Landstaend. The name of Panizza’s protagonist also alludes to the foremost representation of the perverse, egoistic, money-grubbing Jew in nineteenth-century German literature, Veitel Itzig from Gustav Freytag’s Soll und Haben; cf. Zipes (1980, 53–54).

18. On the relationship between the Jewish body and Jewish language, see Gilman (1986).

19. On Schreber’s student membership in the Wartburg and their adoration of Treitschke, see Israels (1989).

20. Cf. Hermann Gödtsche’s 1868 novel Buaxitz which was a primary source for The Protocols of the Elders of Zion; cf. Bernstein (1935). Also see Dinter (1917).

21. Even Schreber’s adoption of Zend/Zoroastrian deities to populate his heavens may also betray a Judaizing influence: in his Parerga and Paralipomena, Schopenhauer (1974) writes: “Just as Jehovah is a transformation of Ormuzd, so is Satan the corresponding transformation of Ahriman” (2:379).

22. On the psychoanalytic association of Schmuck/jewelry and Schmuckkésthen/jewel-case with genitalia, albeit female genitalia, see Freud (1905, 91–92).

23. Not only did the family own property on this thoroughfare, but when Moritz and Pauline Schreber were first married they lived in an apartment at the corner of Brühl and Theaterplatz (later renamed Richard-Wagner-Strasse), and it was there that Paul’s elder brother and eldest sister were born; cf. Israels (1989, 25–26).

24. White (1961, 60, 64, 70) repeatedly mentions Baumeyer’s reports of possible syphilis, both in Schreber’s family and in Schreber’s case history, but draws no conclusions. But as I discovered after presenting this paper, some thirty years later Busse (1989; 1991) was the first to draw in print possible connections between those reports and Schreber’s symptomology.

25. Or, and I thank Carolyn Williams for recalling to me this question: could Sabine have been the (hereditary) syphilitic? Her original class situation might have motivated such an assumption. Whereas the bourgeois woman was pure, the lower-class woman, the public woman—prostitute, actress—was the source of infection. And Sabine came from such a background. Her father Heinrich Behr was artistic director at the Leipzig city theater. He had earlier been an
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operatic singer. Her mother was the daughter of the comic dramatist Roderich Benedix. Within the Schreber family tradition Sabine was recalled as having come from a circus background, while her father was remembered as a singer and a dancer, cf. Israels (1989, 277). In any case she was never really accepted by Schreber's close-knit family.

26. Panizza's syphilis, too, was treated with potassium iodide; see Quétel (1990, 45).

27. Indeed, such poisoning is what the case history from his first institutionalization at the Leipzig University Clinic suggests, although it lists bromide as part of a series of abused medications: "Subsequently he was in Sonnenstein Asylum for treatment, having taken large quantities of morphine, chloral, and bromide for several weeks"; cit. Baumeyer (1956, 61).

28. Did the elided chapter three contain this information, albeit wrapped in delusions of soul murder? Klara's letter would seem to suggest so, in Baumeyer (1956, 67–68).

29. On male responsibility in women's literature see Showalter (1986); on the abolitionist/feminist attack on the double standard of medico-legal regulation, see Walkowitz (1982); Corbin (1990); and Evans (1976).

30. These phrases do not come from Schreber's pen; rather, Schreber's uttering of "the sun is a whore" and suchlike is mentioned by his psychiatrist Dr. Weber at Sonnenstein in the "Medical Expert's Report to the Court," which Schreber included in his edition of his memoirs (2270). Both phrases are recorded in the Sonnenstein case sheet under the date "September, 1896"; cit. Baumeyer (1956, 64).

31. Hans Zöberlein, in Befehl des Gewissens (Conscience Commands), depicts the Jewish seductress Mirjam suffering from a sterility-causing blood disease, "her Jewish pox (Judenpest) . . . syphilis"; cit. Theweleit (1989, 15).

32. Oskar Panizza certainly did. Panizza who structured his narrative of the operated Jew upon the absent presence of Faitel Itzig's circumcised penis like Schreber structured his narrative of the Eternal Jew upon the present absence of his castrated one also viewed himself as victimized by syphilis. Throughout his life he obsessed on its telltale sign, a gumma on his right leg. In Panizza's finest and most notorious work, the 1893 play, Das Liebeskonzil, Dame Syphilis is the child of Salome and the Devil, whose "features wear an expression that is decadent, worn, embittered. He has a yellowish complexion. His manners recall those of a Jew of high breeding . . ." (Panizza 1973, 79). Syphilis is born after the holy family—a decrepit God, a consumptive Christ, and a lascivious Mary—fearing their powers usurped by the outrages of the Borgia pope Alexander VI, his court, and countrypeople, commissions this very Jewish Devil to "Stick your nose into your witch's kettle" (95) and create a punishment both "libidinous and destructive."

33. La vie médicale (March 1901), citing a Dr. Kieman in the New York Medical Journal; cit. Quétel (1990, 297 n. 30).
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