

The psychopathology of everyday Vienna:

Psychoanalysis and Freud's familiars

JAY GELLER

Vanderbilt Divinity School, 21st Ave S, Nashville, TN 37240, USA — jay.geller@vanderbilt.edu
(Final version accepted 17 May 2004)

This paper examines the parapraxes made by, to or about Jewish-identified individuals discussed by Freud in Psychopathology of everyday life. Each of these errors and slips is occasioned by what he terms a 'mésalliance' between a Jew and a Gentile. Such incidents of distorted language betray unresolved ambivalences and unformulated anxieties endemic to Jewish–Gentile interaction in Freud's Vienna. First, the disturbed relationships between German-speaking Gentiles and their threatening Doppelgänger, the Jews, are analyzed by means of Freud's analysis of the 'uncanny' and an examination of the particular restrictions placed upon the 'officially' emancipated Jews in the Habsburg Empire, especially with regard to intermarriage. Then, the paper turns to Freud's discussions of explicitly Jewish-identified individuals and their limitation to illustrating parapraxes associated with what should be the most pleasurable and intimate relationships between Jew and Gentile, namely sexual and connubial relations. His focus upon this conflicted conjunction diagnosed the intrinsically problematic character of Jew–Gentile interaction in his Vienna.

Keywords: fin-de-siècle Vienna, Jewish–Gentile interaction, Sigmund Freud, *Psychopathology of everyday life*, (the) uncanny, parapraxes, *mésalliances* (intermarriage), antisemitism, *Doppelgänger* (doubles), identity (construction), ethnicity

*Nun ist die Luft von solchem Spuk so voll, But now the air is so full of these ghosts
Dass niemand weiss, wie er ihn meiden soll That no one knows how to escape their hosts*

(epigraph to Freud's *Psychopathology of everyday life*,
from Goethe, *Faust*, Part II, Act V, Scene 5, Walter Kaufmann, translation).

In 1919 Freud devoted an essay to '*das Unheimliche*', the 'uncanny', in order to explore what arouses terror, dread, horror. At the beginning of his examination Freud makes a curious move that has affected studies of the uncanny ever since. He does philology: 'The German word "*unheimlich*" is obviously the opposite of "*heimlich*" ("homely"), "*heimisch*" ("native")—the opposite of what is familiar; and we are tempted to conclude that what is "uncanny" is frightening precisely because it is *not* known and familiar' (1919, p. 252). Then, after providing a long citation from Daniel Sanders's *Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache* (1860), s.v. 'Heimlich', Freud adds, 'What interests us most in this long extract is to find that among its different shades of meaning the word *heimlich* exhibits one which is identical with its opposite *unheimlich*' (p. 224). To still any of his readers' possible doubts about this magical

conversion of something into its opposite, Freud cites from the standard dictionary of the German language, Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (1877), s.v. 'Heimlich'. As one reads the excerpted entry, *heimlich* shifts from what is characteristic of a 'place free from ghostly influences [*gespensterhaft*]' to that of a realm apperceived by one who 'believes in ghosts [*Gespenster*]' and thus finds it to be '*heimlich* and full of terrors'. Grimm's editors themselves add that '*heimlich* comes to have the meaning usually ascribed to *unheimlich*' (p. 226).

From these definitions and Freud's subsequent discussion, I would like to isolate several aspects of the uncanny that bear significance for understanding the situation of Viennese Jews during Freud's professional career. First, the uncanny is terrifying; it is something ghostlike. Ghosts were among the figures by which Jews were represented. Second, and more significant to this analysis, sometimes what motivates the terror is the uncanny object or experience's underlying familiarity. Freud ties this second form of the uncanny to the fear of doubles. The tacit familiarity for Central Europeans of *Judentum*, that condensation of ethnos, ethos and ethic (i.e. of Jewry, Judaism and Jewishness), lay in more than its function as the necessary and proximate other or older would-be superseded sibling by which *Christentum*, a comparable condensation of the communities, beliefs and practices of Christians, continued to define itself. With the advent of Emancipation Jewry lost more and more of its manifest difference without losing its structural otherness necessary for first Christian and then German self-definition.

After exploring how *Judentum*'s uncanny characteristics conditioned the antisemitic atmosphere of Freud's Vienna, this paper turns to Freud's *Psychopathology of everyday life* to analyze how, for Freud, the alleged psychopathology of Jews emerged not from any inherent Jewish disposition, as a number of his contemporaries asserted (Gilman, 1993), but at the interface of Jewish-Gentile relations. Austrian Jewry was caught in a double bind. The Viennese society into which many sought admission demanded complete assimilation, even to the point of obliterating any traces of *Judentum*; yet, often accompanying the demand was the assumption that Jews were constitutionally incapable of eliminating their difference. From the Gentile perspective, Jews in Germanophone Austria-Hungary, regularly characterized as a *Gastvolk*, a guest people, or as a parasite upon the *Gastvolk*, the host people, came to be viewed as an *unheimlicher Gast*, an uncanny guest/host. Consequently, as with any encounter with the uncanny, Gentile encounters with Jews were often mediated by dread, anxiety and fascination, by the projection of all that would be strange and alien on their all-too-familiar fellow citizens.

A specter haunts Europe

In the 1880s a German-language pamphlet by the Russian Jewish physician Leon Pinsker began circulating among the Jews of Austria-Hungary. Its author had been driven to despair over the fate of the Jewish people following the violent pogroms that ripped through the Russian Pale of Settlement in 1880-1. Pinsker concluded that the Jews could not trust in emancipation but must emancipate themselves; he disseminated his reflections and remedies in the pamphlet, *Die Autoemanzipation*

(Auto-Emancipation). His diagnosis of the Jewish situation in Europe would emphasize the perceived ghostlike character of *Judentum*.

Pinsker's essay offers a series of images that reflect how, by their very persistence, Jews have brought upon themselves the hatred of the rest of humanity. Israel had not died after the loss of its state, of its actual existence; rather it had continued its existence—as a spirit. 'Among the living nations of the earth the Jews occupy the position of a nation long since dead' (Pinsker, 1882, p. 184). Here Pinsker draws upon the Christian tradition that *Judentum* had been superseded (*aufgehoben*), as well as on 18th- and 19th-century German philosophy, in which images of *Judentum* as dead proliferated (Newman, 1993). Pinsker then evokes the frightening image of 'the uncanny [*unheimliche*] form of one of the dead who wanders among the living' (p. 184, my amended translation). This 'ghostly apparition [*geisterhafte Erscheinung*] ... makes a strange and peculiar impression upon the imagination of the nations' (p. 184). Pinsker lays the blame for the long-festering prejudice against the Jews, hatred of the Jews, fear of the Jew on Wundt's ethnopsychological notion of an inborn fear of ghosts (*Gespensterfurcht*); Judeophobia (*Judophobie*) is rooted and naturalized as demonopathy.

Pinsker's work appeared 13 years before Herzl's Zionist classic, *The Jewish State*, and greatly influenced the development of Jewish student movements in the interim. The Austro-Hungarian Jewish university student organization Kadima (Forward), for example, formed in 1882 to espouse not just Jewish pride in the face of growing antisemitism, but also Jewish nationalist sentiments in the empire. *Die Autoemanzipation* helped these students articulate a response to their exclusion from various German-nationalist student reading societies and fraternities as well as providing a rejoinder to the assimilationist tendencies of family, friends and fellow students. Jewish nationalism crystallized the desire to pursue what was denied them in the empire. Although the bulk of social, economic and civic restrictions and other special legislation regarding Jewish life had been lifted with the emancipation decrees of 1867, Jews suffered from one crucial legal disadvantage. Following Article 19 of the 1867 Imperial Constitution, the Jews, unlike other nationalities such as the Ruthenians and the Czechs, were recognized as a people (*Volksstamm*) but not as a nation (*Nationalität*); hence, they had neither language nor territory rights. Every recognized nationality had the right to teach its children in the 'language customary to the land'—Croat, Czech, German, Magyar etc. Austria-Hungary recognized 11 national groups and their languages, but the state did not confer such status on either the Jews or their languages, Hebrew and Yiddish. Throughout the empire the vast majority of urban Jews learned and spoke German. Pinsker's diagnosis and suggested remedy emboldened and embodied these uncanny citizens of the empire.

Does familiarity breed contempt?

What is so scary about the familiar—other than the prospect of boredom—has been explored, *inter alia*, in Hoffmann's tales of doubles (*Doppelgänger*), de Maupassant's 'Le Horla', Otto Rank's *The double*, the classic silent film(s) *Der Student von Prag*, and, of course, Freud's 'Uncanny' essay. Freud notes Rank's

conclusion, the ‘invention of doubling as a preservation against extinction’ during the stage of primary narcissism. ‘But when this stage has been surmounted, the “double” reverses its aspect ... It becomes the uncanny harbinger of death’ (Freud, 1919, p. 235). The defense mechanism of projection exteriorizes such threats. To Rank’s pioneering work, Freud adds other sources of the double during the course of ego development such as the lingering phantasies, whose realization ‘adverse external circumstances have crushed’ (p. 236). Freud, more significantly, suggests that the double may originate in a critical agency that emerges within and splits off from the ego—more commonly known as the conscience; in later work he would call it the ‘ego ideal’ and the ‘superego’. This agency views the ego as an object. Regardless of the material content of the double, ‘when all is said and done, the quality of uncanniness can only come from the fact of the “double” being a creation dating back to a very early mental stage, long since surmounted’ (p. 236); hence its (un)familiarity.

Another crucial factor in the development of the threatening double was the contradiction between the ideology of the self-authorizing and self-authored autonomous individual and the biological, social and psychological necessities of an other for the emergence of that self. The dependence of the individual on its relationship to that pre-existent other undermines its claims for autonomy and transforms the original into something derivative, at best a copy. The other and its necessity must be suppressed, foreclosed, jettisoned. Further, since nothing is more familiar than the individual self and since that individual can, by definition, only be singular, then the double is out to get the self, to replace the ‘original’.

As recent research on nationalism and ethnicity has determined, the threatening uncanny double also has a collective component. Like the individual self, neither national nor ethnic identity is intrinsically self-determined; rather the identity of a nation or ethnic group is constructed in relation to what it is not, to what has been marginalized or excluded and designated as other (Erikson, 1985; Volkan, 1985). Yet if the identity of the nation or group is not self-contained and cannot be articulated outside of relation, then neither can the particular difference of its others. Underlying differences are processes of identification; what necessitates the antagonistic and seemingly clear-cut differentiation of one group from another is the narcissistic threat of perceived commonalities. That is, what is exaggeratedly represented as most foreign may be what is most familiar, as Freud described in his discussions of the narcissism of minor differences (1930, pp. 113–4). ‘What appear as ethnic or national “differences” are ... more or less elaborate and effortful attempts by groups to forget, deny, or obscure their resemblances’ (Harrison, 2003, p. 345), in particular, attributes it would censor or disclaim.

Strange bedfellows

And this was the situation in the last third of the 19th century in Vienna, where there were two groups attempting to shape collective identities. One consisted of the German-speaking Gentiles. As part of a century-long struggle throughout the German-speaking world to discover a group identity underlying the hundreds of

principalities, duchies and would-be empires—seeking a union of *Blut und Boden* (blood and soil)—Austro-Germans sought to define themselves as Germans over and against the other nationalities of the empire. The newly emancipated Jews of Austria for their part also sought to adopt the ‘universal’ culture of the German bourgeoisie. *Judentum*’s continuing function as exemplary other, as the always already antitype to the Austrian Catholic norm, however, fomented a crisis (Heer, 1968).

Attitudes toward and the structural positioning of *Judentum* drew upon a long history of Christian hatred of Jews. The Jews were viewed as deicides, as a people cursed, as demon spawn, as betrayers, whose miserable circumstances confirmed the truth of the Church. These differentiating images found support in gospel accounts that were themselves products of Christian self-definition—a differentiating of themselves from *Judentum*. Within the Austrian context, perhaps the most important source of Catholic anti-Jewish rhetoric were the sermons of the (in)famous late 17th-century Habsburger court preacher Abraham a Sancta Clara. He offered some choice words about the Jews—years after they had all been expelled from Vienna (a few wealthy Jews were allowed to return in exchange for a great deal of gold at the end of the 17th century). His depiction of the Jews as ‘the dander among all godless unbelievers’ (*der Abflaum aller gottlosen und ungläubige Leute*) and his accusation that ‘they pray several times a day for God to exterminate us Christians by plague, hunger, and war’ (*sie beten alle Tage mehrmals, Gott wolle uns Christen vertilgen durch Pest, Hunger und Krieg*) and other choice bits from his ‘Ho! And fie on the world’ (*Huy! und Pfuy die Welt*) sermon became staples of Viennese antisemitic discourse (Heer, 1968, pp. 79–80).

From the German Gentile perspective the following situation was taking place during the course of the 19th century: the German individual desperately wanted to become ‘himself’ and the other, the Jew, was perceived as also wanting desperately to become that same German self. While the question of individual and national identity was by no means the only crisis experienced by German Gentiles during this period of general social and economic upheaval and transformation, a primary response to this question—antisemitism—also became the code that signaled the suffering of and solution to the myriad problems afflicting German-Austrian society (Volkov, 1978). The German Gentile experienced a deep-felt anxiety about being controlled and ultimately replaced by that uncanny other. Since identity formation is about drawing distinctions—both between self and other and around the self and ‘like’ selves—when identities are becoming more diffuse, as they were during this period, lines, boundaries, walls, tend to be more sharply, violently drawn and fiercely defended.

Against the threat presented by the (un)familiar several strategies have been developed. One such strategy, which was employed in late Habsburg Austria, is to paint the other so that he or she would be clearly defined. Such ascription passes for description. As Sander Gilman among many has demonstrated, there was no shortage of discourses, both popular and scientific, that endeavored to define the Jew. Another primary strategy is the avoidance of mixture, for any intermixture is understood as contamination. This defense manifested itself in a discourse of purity that feared defilement by miscegenation (the products of intermarriage and other such affairs),

a subversive *Verjudung* (Jewification) of culture, and/or a flood of ‘immigrants’. As Georg Ritter von Schönerer, a leader of Austria’s political antisemitism movement put it, ‘*Durch Reinheit zur Einheit*’—unity through purity. Austrian Jews, awash in such representations as well as structurally excluded from or directed to particular social relationships and positions, found it all but impossible not to internalize such denigrating identifications. Split and split off, Jews became doubles to themselves.

Nowhere perhaps was the issue of boundary transgression, especially in Jew–Gentile relationships, starker than in intermarriage, where Jew and Gentile (whether Christian, German or German Christian) met at their most intimate and where the question of coexistence would be most directly negotiated. It would prove a major crux of later racial discussion, especially with regard to the fate of future generations and the threatened poisoning of the gene pool, degeneration of the race etc. Intermarriage was also the site where the question of continued existence came up: whether or not *Judentum* had a future, as the German Jewish physician Felix Theilhaber (1911) put it. Although the number of conversions (whether to Catholicism, Protestantism or ‘*Confessionslosigkeit*’ [no religious preference]—the latter two being the ‘lesser evils’) was greater in Vienna than in other European cities of the time, two factors need to be considered.

First, Austrian law forbade marriages between Christians and Jews unless either the non-Jewish partner converted to Judaism (or registered as ‘*confessionslos*’) or the Jewish partner converted to some form of Christianity (or again registered as ‘*confessionslos*’). Second, intermarriage was relatively rare, and the number of converts—including those who converted for career advancement—relative to the size of the community was tiny. In 1910, for example, fewer than 10% of marriages involving Jews were with a non-Jewish partner, and only 512 (in a community of over 175,000 Jews) changed their religious registration (Rosenblit, 1983). But the numbers did accumulate over the years, and an indistinct class formed who, although regarding themselves as totally assimilated, whether Christian or unregistered, would still be regarded by others as ‘essentially’ Jewish. Researchers estimate that by the time of the *Anschluss* (the 1938 annexation of Austria by Germany) approximately 50,000 Gentiles (equal to about 20% of the entire Jewish population) were suddenly regarded by the Nuremberg Laws as Jewish (Botz, 1990). Despite empirical evidence somewhat to the contrary, Theilhaber’s concern that intermarriage, understood also as a sign of self and group disavowal, boded ill for the Jews was shared by many.

Speaking of whom ...

Throughout *The psychopathology of everyday life* Freud seeks to find meaning in some of the most seemingly meaningless or nonsensical of phenomena, such as parapraxes (*Fehlleistungen*) and slips of speech (*Versprechen*). His study uncovers some of the underlying or repressed motives as well as the processes by which these phenomena emerge. Several of these discursive disruptions appear to be precipitated by contact between Jew and Gentile—especially contact of the most intimate kind. Indeed, instances that entail ongoing or anticipated sexual relationships between Jew and Gentile are the only occasions when individuals explicitly identified as Jewish

are subjected to Freud's clinical commentary. More than a few of the parapraxes and Freudian slips, curious forgettings and mistakes, entail what in one instance Freud refers to as a '*mésalliance*' (1901, p. 67), that is, either a mixed marriage or an affair between Jew and Gentile. One should be wary when an author resorts to foreign terms, especially an author such as Freud, who broke away from the tradition of employing Latin when referring to indelicate matters, an author such as Freud who devoted a chapter to parapraxes involving foreign words. In the three other instances of its appearance in *The standard edition* Freud had employed this French term as a figure for more clinical matters; it figured the 'false connection' between affect and ideational content symptomatic of neurosis ([1894] 1895, p. 75, 1895, p. 303, 1909, p. 175).

Freud devotes his second chapter of *Psychopathology*, on the forgetting of foreign words, to a thick description of one such instance. He frames the ensuing narrative in a purported contrast between one's being less likely to forget something in one's own language (*in unserer eigenen Sprache*) than words in a foreign language (*in einer fremden Sprache*). Yet, in the course of this work, Freud regularly undermines this seemingly self-evident distinction (i.e. the preponderance of his examples suggest that we are at least as prone to make mistakes in our own language). Throughout his study the familiar/*heimlich* and the foreign/*unheimlich* are interwoven so as to subvert, perhaps, any absolute distinctions. Although it is the foreign that is represented as the threat, the anxiety arises from the failure to maintain the difference. The following analyses demonstrate that the uncanny (*unheimliche*) Jews (re)present such a crisis of clear and distinct identities.

In Freud's extended illustration of the forgetting of foreign words, he recalls an encounter with a young man who would cite Virgil:

Last summer ... I renewed my acquaintance with a certain young man of academic background. I soon found out that he was familiar with some of my psychological publications. We had fallen into conversation ... about the social status of the race [*Volksstammes*] to which we both belonged (1901, pp. 8–9).

Freud does not here or anywhere else in this work explicitly state which 'race' among the many dwelling in the multi-ethnic Austro-Hungarian Empire is being referred to. ('Ethnic group' would now be a less tendentious translation of the German *Volksstamm* and would better reflect the Jews' legal status in the empire.) Consequently, Freud's elliptical phrasing does not necessarily entail a self-identification as a Jew. As the anecdote proceeds and as analysis will indicate, Freud's discussion of several details both underplays their strong Jewish associations and fails to connect those associations with his and his companion's shared ethnicity.

He continues: 'And ambitious feelings prompted him to give vent to a regret that his generation [*Generation*] was doomed ... to atrophy, and could not develop its talents or satisfy its needs' (p. 9). Freud's young companion sounds one of the most potent themes of the German- and Austrian-Jewish literature of the period: the 'generations' problem. The sons who were reaching their maturity in the first years of the 20th century evince despair and disappointment over their future. More than the continuation of adolescent angst and melancholia, these men were at a loss as

one-time hopes had turned into lingering delusions of Gentile acceptance and/or into denials of growing Gentile enmity among their fathers' liberal generation. The most notable literary exemplar perhaps is the 1908 novel *The road into the open* (*Der Weg ins Frei*) by the Jewish playwright, novelist and physician Freud described as his *Doppelgänger* (double), Arthur Schnitzler.

Freud goes on:

He ended a speech of impassioned fervour with the well-known line of Virgil's in which the unhappy Dido commits to posterity her vengeance on Aeneas: '*Exoriare ...*' Or rather, he wanted to end it in this way, for he could not get hold of the quotation and tried to conceal an obvious gap in what he remembered by changing the order of the words: '*Exoria(e) ex nostris ossibus ultor*.' At last he said irritably: 'Please ... Why not help me? There's something missing in the line; how does the whole thing really go?' (p. 9).

Freud was most willing to help him with the correct quotation—'*Exoriar(e) ALIQUIS nostris ex ossibus ultor*' (Let someone arise from my bones as an avenger)—and to explain the hidden motivations for this moment of forgetfulness.

This young man was familiar with Professor Freud's works and desired to put their author to the test after Freud's having just borne witness to a shameful forgetting of a verse that should have been so familiar to one with a university education (*einer akademischen Bildung*). Freud's acquaintance challenges him to uncover why he (i.e. the young man) forgot the indefinite pronoun '*aliquis*' (someone). Through a series of free associations by the young man the conversation moves from *a-liquis* to *reliquien* (relics), *Liquidation* (liquefying), *Flüssigkeit* (fluid). The young man continues:

Simon of Trent, whose relics I saw two years ago in a church at Trent. I am thinking of the accusation of ritual blood-sacrifice which being brought against the Jews [*die Juden*] again just now, and of Kleinpaul's book in which he regards all these supposed victims as incarnations, one might say new editions, of the Savior (pp. 9–10).

Freud's language of ethnic belongingness is again elliptical. He has the young man say that the accusation was raised against '*the Jews*' and not raised against '*my people*'. This instance of vague ethnic references obscures the fact that the speakers' shared Jewishness conditions the chain of associations. Moreover, Freud chooses not to dwell on the Jewish blood flowing from the rash of libels that had been directed at central and eastern European Jewish communities during the previous two decades—Tisza-Eslar (1882), Xanten (1891), Polner (1899), Konitz (1900; see Smith, 2002). A related accusation, the desecration of the Host such that it (as the transubstantiated body of Christ) was said to bleed, helped justify the massacres, holocausts (in the literal sense of a complete burning of the victims—alive) and expulsions of 1421 in Vienna. All the property of the Jews passed into the hands of Archduke Albert V. The stones of the destroyed synagogue were used in building the University of Vienna, from which Freud later graduated. Hundreds were murdered and most of the survivors who had not fled were expelled; those children who were not expelled were forcibly baptized. A community which once numbered between 1,400 and 1,600 individuals was extinguished, and the city became notoriously known in Jewish tradition as '*Ir ha-Damim*' (the city of blood) (Wistrich, 1990, pp. 6–7).

The more recent accusations would have been relevant to the young man's earlier *kvetch* (griping) since these events challenged claims to the 'cultural progress' of modern Europeans and the parental generation's deluded optimism. Freud also omits to mention that several of the purported victims of ritual murder were young Gentile women rather than young boys; such references would have infused a (normative) sexual element to the accusations. Despite the recalled visit to the reliquary and the accompanying mention of the famous classicist Rudolf Kleinpaul's 1892 volume *Human sacrifice and ritual murder*, Freud opts against interrupting the flow of associations and allows them to remain only just so much cultural capital (*Bildung*) that one acquires as an educated man.

The young man then moves from Saint Simon to a list of various other saints and Church fathers—Augustinus, Benedictus, Origen, Paul (which they hear echoed in the reference to Kleinpaul)—and then to Saint Januarius and the vial of his blood that miraculously liquefies on a certain holiday. Finally he comes to the crux of his associational chain: 'Well, something *has* come to my mind ... but it's too intimate to pass on ... Besides I don't see any connection, or any necessity for saying it' (p. 11).

This of course is the key: for when the young man mentions that he is waiting to hear news from a woman friend which may cause difficulties for both, Freud guesses that he is afraid to learn that she has missed her period. He then briefly recalls the series of associations and adds that 'St. Simon was *sacrificed as a child*' (p. 11). The young man later adds that not only is the woman Italian but she also comes from Naples where the statue of Saint Januarius stands.

When Freud leaves the young man and returns to the text he provides this explanation for the origin of this forgetting:

The speaker had been deploring the fact that the present generation of his people [*seines Volkes*] was deprived of its full rights; a new generation, he prophesied like Dido, would inflict vengeance on the oppressors. He had in this way expressed his wish for descendants. At this moment a contrary thought intruded. 'Have you really so keen a wish for descendants? That is not so. How embarrassed you would be if you were to get news that you were to expect descendants from the quarter you know of. No: no descendants—however much we need them for vengeance' (p. 14).

Freud's summation generates curious echoes of an earlier scene in *The interpretation of dreams* where he also addresses the need for the filial generation to revenge the oppressors of the paternal generation. Framing Freud's recollection of his father's recounting to his 'ten or twelve-year-old' son his passive acquiescence to an assault by a Christian lout, that primary locus in analyses of Freud's ambivalence toward his father and *Judentum*, Freud identifies himself with a different Carthaginian than Dido, namely the young Hannibal. In this lead-in to the anecdote is an account of how, when confronted by the 'antisemitic feelings' of his fellow gymnasium students, the young Freud realized that he was a member of an 'alien race'. He saw in Hannibal and his war on Rome a model for Semitic tenacity in the face of oppression (1900, pp. 196–8). Gruman also follows the young man's Dido reference to Freud's discussion of his identification with Hannibal in *The interpretation of*

dreams. Though the ambivalence characteristic of the tension between Freud the scientist and Freud the Jew in fin-de-siècle Vienna catalyzes his discussion, Gruman focuses upon three ‘parodic narrative inversions’ at play in Freud’s example— inversions ‘of historical epic, the duel narrative and the joke’ (1994, p. 131). His analysis culminates in an understanding of Freud’s encounter with the assimilation-desiring Jewish young man as a therapeutic intervention where ‘applied paranoia neutralizes the pathological resentment of clinical paranoia’ (p. 145).

However, by also attending to the resumed discussion of Freud’s Hannibal identification that follows his father’s anecdote, one might question whether Freud’s—and, by extension, the young man’s and other contemporary Germanophone Jews’—ambivalence is so therapeutically resolved. In seeking a counter to the scene of his father narrating weakness and capitulation the young Sigmund finds the account of Hannibal’s father making his son swear vengeance against the Romans. Adding significance to both story and frame, Freud, as noted in a subsequent chapter of *Psychopathology*, makes one of his most telling slips: he mistakenly writes Hasdrubal, the name of both Hannibal’s brother and of his brother-in-law and predecessor, rather than Hamilcar Barca, Hannibal’s father (Freud, 1901, pp. 217–20). At the end of the encounter in *Psychopathology*, although Freud elides that they are his people too when he refers to the oppressors of ‘his people’ (i.e. the people of his companion), he is replaying his own earlier scene. Hence, neither wreaking vengeance nor cohabiting with Gentiles is any more a viable response to the oppressors than is passive acceptance. Ambivalence and not assimilation is the best one can expect from Jewish–Gentile relations, and such conflicted interactions are the way to neurosis and stillbirths; that is, reading the young man’s desire for the termination of any possible pregnancy symbolically (also cf. Schnitzler’s *Road into the open*), there appears to be no future for the Jews in Austria.

Resorting to silence

Freud also finds meaningful mis-statements by or about Jews that take place in summer resorts (*Sommerfrische*). These vacation spots were major sources of status for the Jewish educated bourgeoisie (*Bildungsbürgertum*)—especially since so many did not allow Jews as guests (Lichtblau, 2000; Bajohr, 2003). The two particular examples that Freud cites also arise in the context of mixed marriages. One deals with an anticipated marriage that was to take place ‘in spite of the differences in their social position and race’ (*Standes- und Rassenunterschiede*). A poor but handsome Gentile school-teacher writes a letter to his brother but, instead of being sent to the brother, it arrives in the hands of his fiancée, the daughter of a wealthy villa owner from Vienna. It reads: ‘The girl is certainly no beauty ... But whether I shall be able to make up my mind to marry a Jewess I cannot yet tell you’ (1901, p. 223). Needless to say, the wedding did not go on. Freud here provides a brief picture of Viennese class structure: confirming the statistical studies that have examined the Jew/Gentile breakdown of various forms of employment normally associated with the liberal bourgeoisie—that Jews were numerically under-represented among school-teachers. The scene also possibly echoes some of the stereotypes of the ugly

Jewess (*hässliche Jüdin*), who together with the beautiful Jewess (*schöne Jüdin*) formed a complementary fin-de-siècle imaginary field of female Jewish types, and of the Jews attempting to buy themselves (through wedding dowry) into social acceptability.

The second example, added to the fifth edition of *Psychopathology* (1919), is more developed; it is a story that Freud's colleague Viktor Tausk rather ironically entitled 'The faith of our fathers' (*Der Glaube der Väter*). The protagonist is a Jewish man who converted to Christianity to get married, since his Christian wife would not cross over to *Judentum*. Again, marriages between Jews and Christians were not *per se* allowed. Their two sons were baptized, but, as they got older, their father informed them of their Jewish descent so that the antisemitic influences in their primary school (*Volksschule*) would not turn them against him. The recounted incident takes place at a summer resort where he and his family are staying. Unaware of their Jewish descent, the hotel hostess unleashes a series of antisemitic utterances. Here is the guest's dilemma: should or shouldn't he stand up to his hostess and demonstrate his boldness and the courage of his convictions to his children? Then he weighs the pros and cons—mainly the cons: creating a scene, turning the hostess against him and his family, and as a consequence receiving horrible service at the resort. In any case, he does not want to subject his sons to what is going on. So he sends them off: 'Geht in den Garten *Juden*' (Go into the garden, *Jews*), instead of 'Geht in den Garten *Jungen*' (Go into the garden, youngsters) (Freud, 1901, pp. 92–3). Rather than sparing his children from the indirect and possibly direct opprobrium of the woman, he has made them—and himself—into potential targets. Even baptism and intermarriage did not provide him with a shield against antisemitism.

There is another instance of a *mésalliance*, one drawn from his psychoanalytic practice, that Freud mentions (1901, pp. 65–7); indeed the word '*mésalliance*' is the unconscious representation that catalyzes a chain of associations, like 'the genealogical tree of a family whose members have also intermarried' (Freud, 1896, p. 198). It culminates in a slip of the tongue (*Versprechen*). While derivatives of the root 'Jew-' (*Jud-*) do not appear in this example, an unmistakable synonym does: 'non-Aryan' (*nicht-Arierin*). Freud's patient has a dream of *a child who would commit suicide by means of a snakebite*; she associates the manifest content with a lecture on first aid for snakebite that she had attended. When asked what kind of poisonous snakes were discussed, the patient responds *Klapperschlange* (rattlesnake). Freud finds that unlikely since rattlers are not native to Europe, let alone Vienna. As their exchange continues Freud makes an interesting aside that may be considered a recognition of the stereotypical ascriptions to which Jews had been subjected: 'it is usual for us to lump together everything which is non-European and exotic' (1901, p. 66). Not surprising in light of Freud's elliptical references to his own Jewishness, by means of 'us' Freud makes himself the subject and not the object of such practices. Eventually the chain of associations leads to reminiscences of the play *Arria und Messalina* by the Viennese playwright Adolf Wilbrandt. From this the essential content of the dream could be deduced: 'Certain recent events had made her apprehensive that her only brother might make a socially unsuitable marriage, a *mésalliance* with a non-Aryan' (p. 67).

Such visibility and identification of the Jew *qua* Jew in these interactions Freud would also signal in another from his collection of Freudian slips; it wasn't manifestly addressing a sexual *mésalliance* but who knows? An individual describing the relationship of two friends, one of whom is Jewish (*Jude*), says, 'They live together like Castor and Pollak' (p. 69). Obviously the individual had substituted this derogatory epithet for Poles, Polack or Pollak, for the other Gemini: Pollux. Pollak suggests that the Jew was of Eastern provenance, although he may not have been. At this time the *Ostjude* or Eastern European Jew had come to be considered the normative or true Jew. Despite the seemingly natural affinity, even identity, of Germans and Jews, Jewish difference is always made manifest.

Although engaged in the analysis of the parapraxes of individuals, albeit one that presumed the common psychological disposition of all, Freud's choice of examples suggests that he was also aware of a possible collective psychopathology betrayed by those same parapraxes. That Jewish (and Gentile) individuals would have lapsed into errant communications may well have indicated that the pursuit of intermarriage or interethnic love affairs either signaled or generated unresolved ambivalences and unformulated anxieties. Such affects would themselves be effects of the encounter between the dominant Gentiles and their uncanny double, the Jew in Central Europe. There is nothing in itself 'wrong in mixed marriages' as Freud told Joseph Wortis (1954, p. 144) in 1935; however, the conversion, whether whole- or half-hearted, necessary for intermarriage would have indicated the Jewish individual's ambivalence or self-hatred. For Freud, although non-observant, never repudiated his Jewish descent. Indeed, he felt that conversion represented a different form of conversion hysteria as Freud's 1928 analysis of his correspondence with an American doctor who returned to Christianity and subsequently attempted to proselytize Freud attested (Gilman, 1998, pp. 59–61). Yet Freud's focus should suggest neither that such *mésalliances* were an exceptional form of Jewish–Gentile interaction nor that Jews alone were adversely affected by these everyday interactions.

Conversion cannot the cut erase

It was not possible, especially not for a Jew in public life, to ignore the fact that he was a Jew; nobody else was doing so, not the gentiles and even less the Jews. You had the choice of being counted as insensitive, obtrusive and fresh; or of being oversensitive, shy and suffering from feelings of persecution. And even if you managed somehow to conduct yourself so that nothing showed, it was impossible to remain completely untouched; as for instance a person may not remain unconcerned whose skin had been anaesthetized but who has to watch, with his eyes open, how it is scratched by an unclean knife, even cut into until the blood flows (Schnitzler, 1913, pp. 6–7).

In an addendum to a memoir of his youth Arthur Schnitzler presents a most uncanny analogy to the inescapable ascription of the deprecating label 'Jew' to his fellow Viennese Jews, no matter how assimilated they may be. There was no way out of the efforts to render the all-too-familiar as different. Despite possible protestations, his contemporaries could not be blind to the antisemitic assaults to which they had become anaesthetized. More significant, even as they might dismiss the attacks because of the manifest absence of pain, and perhaps resign themselves

to living with a scar that might distort their countenance but that they can attempt to cover up, a more insidious injury has been inflicted. Because the knife is dirty, a poison has entered their system that, unbeknownst to them, may at a later date do them serious harm. To extend Schnitzler's figure a bit further: the first symptoms of such a tetanus infection would be spasms and tightness of the jaw muscles affecting speech. Consequently, it is not so much Jewishness as it is the hostile interaction between Jew and Gentile that betrays itself in conversation (Gilman, 1986)—in language acts such as those analyzed by Freud in *The psychopathology of everyday life*.

The problem may well have been less individual and more social. These uncanny *mésalliances* could have arisen out of individual psychopathology; nevertheless they could just as well have conditioned and been conditioned by a collective psychosis. By blurring the lines of distinction—especially as the dominant group sought so hard to maintain them—the acculturating Jews presented a narcissistic threat to Gentile collective identity. The bargain that the Jews had made to attain Emancipation—acceding to the demand 'Be like us'—had proved Faustian. Though it may have appeared as if an era of rationality had dawned with the advent of Emancipation, night as ever framed the day (Kaufmann, 1961); for, as the epigraph to *Psychopathology* announced, ghosts were about and no one knew a way out. Before the violence would escape social and cultural restraints later in the century, the first distorted signs of the return of repressed and unresolved ambivalences, as well as of unformulated anxieties, slipped into the discourse of everyday fin-de-siècle Vienna. Freud's *Psychopathology of everyday life* let slip the distorted desires, demands and dreads that shadowed the masks of his fellow Viennese. This analysis of Freud's discussions of explicitly Jewish-identified individuals and their limitation to illustrating paraproxes associated with what should be the most pleasurable and intimate relationships between Jew and Gentile suggests that, by focusing upon this conflicted conjunction, Freud diagnosed the intrinsically problematic character of Jew–Gentile interaction in his Vienna.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank the J. William Fulbright Program and the Sigmund-Freud-Gesellschaft who sponsored my stay as a visiting scholar at the Sigmund Freud Museum in Vienna, March–June 2001, where this essay first germinated. I would also like to thank Professors Volney Gay and Amy-Jill Levine for their comments on earlier drafts of this work as well as the anonymous referees for their comments on the original submission.

Translations of summary

Die Psychopathologie im Alltags-Wien: Die Psychoanalyse und Freuds Vertraute. Der Beitrag untersucht die von Freud in der *Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens* erörterten Fehlleistungen, die Individuen, welche als jüdisch identifiziert werden, unterliefen, ihnen widerfuhren oder sie betrafen. Anlass zu all diesen Irrtümern und Fehlleistungen war eine „Mésalliance“, wie Freud es nannte, zwischen einem Juden und einem Nicht-Juden. Solche Beispiele für eine zerstörte Sprache verraten unbewältigte Ambivalenzen und unartikulierte Ängste, die für den Umgang von Juden und Nicht-Juden in Freuds Wien charakteristisch waren. Erstens werden die gestörten Beziehungen zwischen deutschsprechenden Nicht-Juden und ihren bedrohlichen *Doppelgängern*, den Juden, mit Hilfe von Freuds Analyse des „Unheimlichen“ und einer Untersuchung der spezifischen Restriktionen analysiert, die den „offiziell“ emanzipierten Juden im Habsburger Reich auferlegt waren, und zwar insbesondere in Bezug auf die Mischehe. Im Anschluss daran

wendet sich der Autor Freuds Diskussionen von ausdrücklich als jüdisch identifizierten Individuen und ihren Grenzen zu, um Fehlleistungen zu illustrieren, die mit Beziehungen zwischen Juden und Nicht-Juden zusammenhängen, die eigentlich zu den lustvollsten und intimsten zählen sollten, nämlich sexuellen und ehelichen Beziehungen. Seine Konzentration auf diese konflikthafte Verbindung diagnostizierte den von Grund auf problematischen Charakter der jüdisch/nicht-jüdischen Interaktionen im Wien seiner Zeit.

Psicopatología de la vida cotidiana vienesa: el psicoanálisis y los conocidos de Freud. Este artículo examina las parapraxias producidas por, ante, o sobre individuos identificados como judíos por Freud en su *Psicopatología de la vida cotidiana*. Cada uno de estos errores y lapsus es producido por lo que él denomina una “*mésalliance*” entre un judío y un gentil. Tales incidentes en la distorsión del lenguaje delatan ambivalencias no resueltas y ansiedades no formuladas endémicas en la interacción entre judíos y gentiles en la Viena de Freud. En primer lugar, las perturbadas relaciones entre gentiles germanohablantes y amenazados *Doppelgänger*, los judíos, son analizadas recurriendo al estudio de Freud sobre lo “sinistro” y a un examen de las restricciones particulares impuestas a los judíos emancipados “oficialmente” en el Imperio de los Habsburgo, en especial en los matrimonios mixtos. Luego el artículo dirige su atención a las discusiones de Freud sobre los individuos identificados explícitamente como judíos y sus limitaciones para ilustrar parapraxias asociadas con lo que deberían ser las relaciones más placenteras e íntimas entre judíos y gentiles, sobre todo las relaciones sexuales y conyugales. La atención sobre esta conjunción conflictiva diagnostica el carácter intrínsecamente problemático de las interacciones entre judíos y gentiles en la Viena de su época.

Psychopathologie de la Vienne quotidienne. La psychanalyse et l’entourage de Freud. Cet article se penche sur les actes manqués faits par, à, ou à propos de personnes identifiées comme juives rapportés par Freud dans la *psychopathologie de la vie quotidienne*. Chacun de ces lapsus et erreurs est occasionné par ce qu’il appelle une « *mésalliance* » entre un Juif et un Gentil. De tels incidents de distorsion de langage trahissent les ambivalences non résolues et les anxiétés non formulées qui étaient endémiques dans les interactions entre Juifs et Gentils dans la Vienne de Freud. Tout d’abord, les troubles dans les relations entre Gentils germanophones et Juifs, leurs *Doppelgänger* [sosies] menaçants, sont analysés à la lumière de l’analyse que fait Freud de l’« inquiétante étrangeté », ainsi que d’une étude des restrictions particulières dont faisaient l’objet les Juifs « officiellement » émancipés dans l’empire des Habsburg, en particulier en ce qui concerne les mariages mixtes. Puis l’article se tourne vers les commentaires de Freud concernant des personnes clairement identifiées comme juives et leurs limites dans leur capacité à illustrer des actes manqués, ces limites étant en rapport avec ce qui pourrait être considéré comme l’aspect le plus agréable et intime des relations entre Juifs et Gentils, à savoir les relations sexuelles et conjugales. Cette conjonction conflictuelle ainsi mise en évidence traduit le caractère intrinsèquement problématique des interactions entre Juifs et Gentils dans sa ville de Vienne.

La psicopatologia della vita quotidiana a Vienna: la psicoanalisi e i conoscenti di Freud. Questo lavoro prende in esame le paraprassie fatte da, a, e a proposito di individui identificati come ebrei o coniate dagli ebrei, discusse da Freud nella *Psicopatologia della vita quotidiana*. Ognuno di questi errori o lapsus nasce in occasione di quella che Freud definisce la *mésalliance* tra ebreo e gentile. Tali incidenti di distorsione della lingua denunciano le ambivalenze irrisolte e le ansie non formulate endemiche nel rapporto tra ebreo e gentile nella Vienna di Freud. In primo luogo i rapporti disturbati tra gentili germanofoni e i loro minacciosi *Doppelgänger*, gli ebrei, sono analizzati attraverso l’analisi del «perturbante» e l’esame delle particolari restrizioni, soprattutto per quel che concerneva i matrimoni misti, cui erano sottoposti nell’Impero asburgico gli ebrei «ufficialmente» emancipati. L’articolo riprende poi le discussioni di Freud sugli individui chiaramente individuati come ebrei e sui loro limiti nell’illustrare le paraprassie associate con quelli che dovrebbero essere i rapporti più piacevoli e intimi tra ebreo e gentile, cioè i rapporti sessuali e di connubio. L’attenzione da lui dedicata a questa congiunzione conflittuale traduce il carattere intrinsecamente problematico dell’interazione tra ebreo e gentile nella sua Vienna.

References

- Bajohr F (2003). ‘*Unser Hotel ist judenfrei.*’ *Bäder-Antisemitismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* [‘No Jews allowed’: Antisemitism at 19th- and 20th-century spas]. Frankfurt/M: Fischer.
- Botz G (1990). *Die Ausgliederung der Juden aus der Gesellschaft. Das Ende des Wiener Judentums unter der NS-Herrschaft (1938–43)* [Segregating the Jews out: The end of Viennese Jewry

- under Nazi domination (1938–43)]. In: Botz G, Oxaal I, Pollak M, editors. *Eine zerstörte Kultur. Jüdisches Leben und Antisemitismus seit den 19. Jahrhundert* [A destroyed culture. Jewish life and antisemitism since the 19th century], p. 285–312. Buchloe: Obermayer.
- Erikson EH (1985). Pseudospeciation in the nuclear age. *Political Psychol* **6**:213–17.
- Freud S (1895 [1894]). Obsessions and phobias: their psychical mechanism and their aetiology. SE **3**.
- Freud S (1895). *Studies on hysteria*. SE **2**.
- Freud S (1896). The aetiology of hysteria. SE **3**.
- Freud S (1900). *The interpretation of dreams*. SE **4**.
- Freud S (1901). *The psychopathology of everyday life*. SE **6**.
- Freud S (1909). Notes upon a case of obsessional neurosis. SE **10**.
- Freud S (1919). The 'uncanny'. SE **17**.
- Freud S (1928). A religious experience. SE **21**.
- Freud S (1930). *Civilization and its discontents*. SE **21**.
- Gilman S (1986). *Jewish self-hatred, anti-semitism and the hidden language of the Jews*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Gilman S (1993). *Freud, race, and gender*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Gilman S (1998). Max Nordau, Sigmund Freud, and the question of conversion. In: *Love + marriage = death and other essays on representing difference*, p. 40–64. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Gruman HL (1994). Freud's 'forgetting of foreign words': The history of the Jews between parody and paranoia. *History Memory* **6**:125–51.
- Harrison S (2003). Cultural difference as denied resemblance: Reconsidering nationalism and ethnicity. *Comp Stud Soc Hist* **45**:343–61.
- Heer F (1968). *Der Glaube des Adolf Hitlers. Anatomie einer politischen Religiosität* [The faith of Adolf Hitler: Anatomy of a political religion]. Munich: Bechtle Verlag.
- Kaufmann W (1961). *Goethe's Faust*. New York: Doubleday.
- Kleinpaul R (1892). *Menschenopfer und Ritualmorde* [Human sacrifice and ritual murder]. Leipzig: Schmidt & Günther.
- Lichtblau A (2000). Die Chiffre Sommerfrische als Erinnerungstopos ['Summer resort' as motif in memoirs]. In: Hödl S, Lappin E, editors. *Erinnerung als Gegenwart. Jüdische Gedenkkulturen* [Memory as present: Jewish memorial cultures]. Berlin: Philo Verlag.
- Newman A (1993). The death of Judaism in German Protestant thought from Luther to Hegel. *J Am Acad Relig* **61**:455–84.
- Pinsker L (1882). Auto-emancipation: An appeal to his people by a Russian Jew. In: Hertzberg A, editor. *The Zionist idea: A historical analysis and reader*. New York: Atheneum, 1973.
- Rosenblit ML (1983). *The Jews of Vienna, 1867–1914: Assimilation and identity*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Schnitzler A (1913). *My youth in Vienna*. Hutter C, translator. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Smith H (2002). *The butcher's tale: Murder and anti-semitism in a German town*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Theilhaber FA (1911). *Der Untergang der deutschen Juden: Eine volkswirtschaftliche Studie* [The demise of German Jewry: An economic study]. Munich: E Reinhardt.
- Volkan VD (1985). The need to have enemies and allies: A developmental approach. *Political Psychol* **6**:219–47.
- Volkov S (1978). Antisemitism as a cultural code. Reflections on the history and historiography of antisemitism in imperial Germany. *Leo Baeck Yearbook* **23**:25–56.
- Wistrich RS (1990). *The Jews of Vienna in the age of Franz Joseph*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Wortis J (1954). *Fragments of an analysis with Freud*. New York: Simon & Schuster.