

## INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.
- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.
- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.



8713801

**Spielmann, Diane Ruth**

AMBIVALENCE IN THE WORKS OF ARTHUR SCHNITZLER PORTRAYED  
THROUGH DILETTANTISM AND THROUGH THE JEWISH SITUATION

*City University of New York*

Ph.D. 1987

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1987

by

Spielmann, Diane Ruth

All Rights Reserved



AMBIVALENCE IN THE WORKS OF ARTHUR SCHNITZLER  
PORTRAYED THROUGH DILETTANTISM  
AND THROUGH THE JEWISH SITUATION

by

DIANE R. SPIELMANN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate  
Faculty in Germanic Languages and Literatures  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The  
City University of New York.

1987

© 1987

DIANE R. SPIELMANN

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Germanic Languages and Literatures in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

February 10, 1987  
Date

Seymour L. Flaxman  
Chair of Examining Committee

Feb. 10, 1987  
Date

Colleen J. Woodard  
Executive Officer

William J. ...  
Colleen J. Woodard  
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

## Abstract

AMBIVALENCE IN THE WORKS OF ARTHUR SCHNITZLER  
PORTRAYED THROUGH DILETTANTISM  
AND THROUGH THE JEWISH SITUATION

by

Diane R. Spielmann

Adviser: Professor Seymour L. Flaxman

Turn-of-the-century Vienna was a time of ambivalence. The problems which Arthur Schnitzler explored in his works by presenting the dilettante and the Jewish situation in Viennese society find their source in the theme of ambivalence.

Jugend in Wien, Schnitzler's autobiography, and Der Weg ins Freie, his autobiographical fiction, provide the key to understanding the ambivalence he felt both in himself and in his society. Therefore, a frame for this study was formed by arranging the examination of Schnitzler's works so as to begin and end with these books, respectively.

In the introduction, the focus is on Jugend in Wien, in which Schnitzler emphasizes his personal development, as seen through the dilettante and the Jewish situation. A brief historical sketch of society is also given here.

Part One deals with the psychological aspect, as seen in the dilettante phenomenon, which is also explained by Sigmund Freud. Thus, there is an

examination of the Schnitzler-Freud relationship. Another chapter explores dilettantism as a social phenomenon within the monarchy. It is then demonstrated how this operates within Schnitzler's fiction, as a catharsis for his own development. The Schnitzler works examined here are Reigen, Anatol, Das Maerchen, Das Vermaechtnis, and Zwischenspiel.

Part Two focuses on the Jewish situation, which also reflects the ambivalence of the times in the light of the Austrian Constitution of 1867. There is a chapter tracing Jewish history in Vienna from its beginnings through Schnitzler's time, and the following chapter examines the relationship of Schnitzler and Theodor Herzl against growing anti-Semitism and the rebirth of Zionism. Finally, there is an examination of Schnitzler's Professor Bernhardt.

Part Three, ending this study, provides a merging of the two issues, under the theme of ambivalence, as presented in Der Weg ins Freie. The synthesis is seen through Schnitzler's personal history, as it culminates in this work, as well as in an historical evaluation of this Milieuschilderung. Der Weg ins Freie, written at the same time as Jugend in Wien, further develops the same issues presented in the introduction, thus closing the frame to this study.

Dedicated to the memory of my beloved father,

ELIAS SPIELMANN,

who represented the last generation of Jews born  
under the Hapsburg Empire.

## Preface

The world of Arthur Schnitzler is now dead. The Hapsburg Empire, which found its beginnings amid pomp and grandeur in the thirteenth century, came to a close at the end of the Great War. It culminated in the reign of Emperor Franz Josef, who assumed the throne in 1848, and held it until his death in 1916. From then on, Europe would not be the same, and in its desperate search to redefine the political and social structure lost in the First World War, Europe was headed on a course which would lead to the greatest tragedy ever to befall humankind.

In retrospect, the literary works of Arthur Schnitzler, especially the young writer prior to the fall of the Hapsburg Monarchy, achieved a special significance. Through his Milieuschilderung, the young Schnitzler explored the social values of his day. And, particularly, as a Jewish writer during the time of the rebirth of Zionism, he examined the society that was destined to become one of the last for the Jews of Europe.

The following work is an examination of the themes presented by Arthur Schnitzler as now seen in their historical perspective.

I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to my professor and adviser, Dr. Seymour L. Flaxman, who, through his own expertise, provided me with not

only sound editorial advice, but with encouragement and guidance; to Dr. Pieter Judson, who, while in Vienna, expedited my requests from the Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek; to Margery Maier for her swift and skillful word processing.

I also want to thank my family -- my brother, Lee for his patience, fine editorial advice, and diligent proofreading, my mother, for her patience and comments, and posthumously, my father, who delighted in hearing passages of my text and research of the empire into which he, a representative of the last generation of Jews in that empire, was born.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Introduction	1
PART ONE: Ambivalence as Portrayed through Dilettantism	
1. Schnitzler, Freud, and Psychology	10
2. Schnitzler and Dilettantism	19
3. <u>Reigen</u>	30
4. <u>Anatol</u>	41
5. <u>Das Maerchen</u>	52
6. <u>Das Vermaechtnis</u>	74
7. <u>Zwischenspiel</u>	91
PART TWO: Ambivalence as Portrayed by the Position of the Jews	
8. Schnitzler as a Jewish Writer in Turn-of-the-Century Vienna	113
9. Schnitzler, Herzl, and Judaism	138
10. <u>Professor Bernhardt</u>	159
PART THREE: Synthesis	
11. <u>Der Weg ins Freie</u>	198
12. Conclusion	236
Bibliography	242

## Introduction

Ambivalence, which Webster's New International Dictionary defines as, "simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person, action," is the salient running through all of Arthur Schnitzler's works. Presenting this concept, through the repetition of similar themes, Schnitzler utilized ambivalence to reflect the problems confronting and challenging his society as it entered the twentieth century.

Arthur Schnitzler, a Jewish physician and writer, was born in Vienna in 1862 and lived there until his death in 1931. In an article for Books Abroad, Arthur Burkhard states,

Arthur Schnitzler is, in fact, more than any other person, the representative of Austria during this entire period and the best incarnation of the spirit of his time.<sup>1</sup>

The spirit of Vienna was characterized by social, political and intellectual turmoil, the very components of ambivalence. Illustrating this concept, Schnitzler focused on two very specific problems. They are the young man, who, because of conflicting moral standards in his society, is unable to make any commitment, and thus, flounders as a dilettante in that society, and the precarious situation of the Viennese Jew, who, in his quest for assimilation, guaranteed by the new constitution of 1867, is, nevertheless, confronted with an ever increasing anti-Semitic and

hostile environment.

Alfred Fritsche, in his study, Dekadenz im Werk Arthur Schnitzlers, says, "[Es] wiederholen sich die Motive stets, und auch die typischen Figuren treten immer wieder unter anderen Namen auf."<sup>2</sup> These problems, which remained with Schnitzler and his society throughout his life, and found an outlet in his works, were mentioned in his autobiography, Jugend in Wien, which he began in 1901.<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to note that he devoted almost all of Jugend in Wien and his later autobiographical novel, Der Weg ins Freie, completed in 1908, to these very problems.

Autobiography is a valid starting point. Burr, in her work on autobiography, points out that there is a proliferation of the self study at a time of historical, social and intellectual upheaval, and it is at such times that the individual wants to define himself in an ambivalent world.<sup>4</sup> The turn of the century was precisely such a time of change, in which the traditions of the old world were questioned.

Thus, Arthur Schnitzler was taking note of himself at that time. It is in his autobiography, based on his youth through the age of twenty-seven, in which Schnitzler discussed how he realized these two major problems which accompanied him throughout his entire literary career. As Roy Pascal says in his work on autobiography, it is the becoming that is important, and

hence, many an autobiography does, in fact, deal with youth.<sup>5</sup> With respect to Arthur Schnitzler, Friedrich Torberg states in an afterword to Jugend in Wien, "Man darf getrost behaupten, dass die Entwicklung des Dichters Arthur Schnitzler begann, als die Entwicklung des Menschen Arthur Schnitzler beendet war...."<sup>6</sup>

The purpose here is not to prove the truthfulness of Schnitzler's personal life or of his autobiography, but to show how he presented the above mentioned problems, which in many ways were not unique to Arthur Schnitzler, but symptomatic of his milieu.

The reign of the emperor, Franz Josef (1848-1916) was one characterized by ambivalence. It was an era eager to retain traditions of pomp and grandeur, and yet an era of change for the individual and his outlook on life.<sup>7</sup> It was a society of hypocrisy, Olga Schnitzler writes,<sup>8</sup> which very much disturbed her husband.<sup>9</sup> It was a society which, on the surface, valued chastity, but in actuality, ignored it.<sup>10</sup> For example, the double standard of Schnitzler's suesses Maedel was well represented. She was a

prototyp einer Wienerin, reizende Gestalt geschaffen zum Tanzen, ein Muendchen geschaffen zum kuessen.... Man ist nur einmal jung, meint sie...da gibts nichts zu versaeumen, denkt sie sich. [But on the other hand she is very aware of] die obligaten Geschwister mit den Eltern zu Hause, die tratschenden Nachbarn in den Nebengassen....<sup>11</sup>

There is a hierarchy of representation from Schnitzler's characters, to himself, to society. His

characters tend to emulate him, as he does society. In an essay on Arthur Schnitzler, W. Mann writes, "Schnitzlers Menschen stehen miteinander in engster Verwandtschaft, sie sind in ihrem Kern so orientiert wie ihr Erzeuger."<sup>12</sup>

Schnitzler, who stands between his characters and his milieu, is caught in that milieu. He is a representative of the two problems he consistently presents in his work. Unsure of the question of marriage, he is ambivalent toward it, and thus, flounders as a dilettante.<sup>13</sup> He is also an assimilated Jew, who is unsure of how to deal with that situation.<sup>14</sup>

Hypocrisy within society, on a social as well as a political level, is discussed at length in Johnston's history of that time, The Austrian Mind. Turn-of-the-century Vienna is permeated with Schlamperei, or laxness, within the bureaucracy, which Johnston sees as a godsend, for the government of Franz Josef was at times too formal.<sup>15</sup> A strong influence, conservative Catholicism, also helped foster a hypocritical society, in which the double standard of that suesses Maedel, described above, was able to evolve.<sup>16</sup> Double standards, hypocrisy and love of spectacle create an ambivalent society, and this type of society causes, as Johnston indicates, a love-hate relationship within itself.<sup>17</sup> As a result, from a very basic perspective, life and death stand at opposite ends, yet they

complement each other, in that awareness of death allows one to live life to the fullest. The writings of Schnitzler presented this by combining the concept of love and death within Viennese society.

Impressionistic writing circled around the themes of love and death with regularity. Schnitzler, for example, 'zeroed-in' on a central event, elucidating experience as a ring of concentric circles surrounding a focal phenomenon. In dialogue, free association peeled away layers of memory to unmask an obsession at the core -- Eros and Thanatos.<sup>18</sup>

It is interesting to note that Johnston uses examples from Schnitzler's Jugend in Wien and Der Weg ins Freie more than any other single work mentioned in his entire book. Both autobiographies aptly describe, as mentioned above, not only the situation of being Jewish, but the problem of a society based on the double standard, in which narcissism flourished to the extent that young men no longer felt any need for responsibility. They were too interested in themselves, so that a settled life, represented in a commitment, would be impossible. Not until the eve of the Great War, did young men again seek the security of a home life and the ensuing responsibilities.<sup>19</sup>

In this sketch of history, emphasis is placed on the effect the milieu had on Schnitzler, and how it is represented in his works. However, it can also be viewed from a different perspective. Instead of only looking at history's effect on man, the focus can be shifted to man's effect on man making history. For

example, Johnston mentions Schnitzler together with Freud and Herzl. In another example of contemporary criticism, Carl Schorske, in his work, devotes an essay to each of these men and their respective ideas.<sup>20</sup>

The problems of society, as Schnitzler stated them in Jugend in Wien, can be personified in Freud and Herzl, respectively. Freud, through the field of psychology, tried to explore problems that arose in an ambivalent society (e.g., the dilettante). Herzl, through Zionism, reflected the problems of the Viennese Jew and anti-Semitism. Renate Wagner recognizes how these men are a part of their milieu, with Arthur Schnitzler as a representative. She writes in her biography of Schnitzler,

Damals leben hier zwei der beruehmtesten und vor allem in ihrer Nachwirkung bedeutendsten Juden der Weltgeschichte: Theodor Herzl, ohne den es vielleicht den Staat Israel in der heutigen Form nicht gaebe, und Sigmund Freud, ohne den man vielleicht nicht von der Weltmacht der Psychoanalyse sprechen koennte.... Schnitzler [steht] als Musterbeispiel des objektiven Juden.... Nur deshalb kann er ein so ausbalanciertes Werk wie den 'Weg ins Freie' schreiben....<sup>21</sup>

It is this ambivalent society, as seen through the impressions of Vienna in art, as well as science, that constitutes Schnitzler's world. Arthur Schnitzler, personally embodying the two aspects to be explored within the theme of ambivalence, remains the best commentator of Viennese society at the turn of the century.

## Notes

1. Arthur Burkhard, "Schnitzler, Symbol of Austria's Past," Books Abroad, January 1930, 20.
2. Alfred Fritsche, Dekadenz im Werk Arthur Schnitzler (Bern: H. Lang, 1974) 10.
3. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler, Jugend in Wien (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968) 74.
4. Anna Robeson Burr, The Autobiography. A Critical and Comparative Study (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909) 186-87.
5. Roy Pascal, Die Autobiographie: Gehalt und Gestalt, trans. M. Schaible (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1965) 67.
6. Friedrich Torberg, "Nachwort" Jugend in Wien 335.
7. William Johnston, The Austrian Mind. An Intellectual and Social History 1848-1938 (Berkeley: U of California Press, 1972) 18.
8. Olga Schnitzler, Spiegelbild der Freundschaft (Salzburg: Residenz, 1962) 18.
9. O. Schnitzler 48.
10. Johnston 393.
11. Nickl and H. Schnitzler 114.
12. W. Mann, "Arthur Schnitzler" in Gustav Krojanker, ed., Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays ueber zeitgenoessische Schriftsteller (Berlin: Welt, 1922) 211.
13. Nickl and H. Schnitzler 184, 302.
14. Nickl and H. Schnitzler 74-80.
15. Johnston 18, 21.
16. Johnston 59.

17. Johnston 168.
18. Johnston 243.
19. Johnston 393.
20. Carl E. Schorske, Fin-de-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980) 2-23, 116-80, 181-209.
21. Renate Wagner, Arthur Schnitzler. Eine Biographie (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1981) 159.

PART ONE

Ambivalence as Portrayed through Dilettantism

## Schnitzler, Freud, and Psychology

Psychology and literature are two fields sharing common ground. Psychologists have long recognized the importance literature plays in revealing the human mind. For example, in 1913, a student of Sigmund Freud, Theodor Reik, wrote a study entitled Schnitzler als Psycholog. In it he states, "Bei aller Methoden der Verschiedenheit, die Wissenschaft und Dichtung trennt steht der Dichter dem Psychoanalytiker nahe. Er hat im Wesentlichen dieselbe Aufgabe: er weckt der dunkeln Gefuehle Gewalt, die im Herzen wunderbar schliefen."<sup>1</sup> Twenty-five years later, Gordon Allport, also a psychologist, said essentially the same thing. "Personality is not a problem for science or a problem for art exclusively, but for both together. Each approach has its merits, but both are needed for even an approximately complete study of the infinite richness of personality."<sup>2</sup>

Since the concern here is with Schnitzler in Vienna at the turn-of-the-century, it must be noted, that it is precisely that time and place that psychology achieves a new importance, as Freud develops it into a highly significant field of learning. If milieu does affect man's thinking,<sup>3</sup> Schnitzler's own interests as a physician and writer in this new field can be appreciated.<sup>4</sup> Bernd Urban states in his article, "Schnitzler and Freud as Doubles," "Hardly anyone other

than the literary and medical man Schnitzler could have understood better that process of psychoanalysis at that time in Vienna."<sup>5</sup> Especially as a physician, Schnitzler was aware of the growing field of psychology. With his training as a scientist, Schnitzler was able to combine his interests in psychology and his talents in writing to produce works which observe and explore the individual and his problems. There is a combination of artist and scientist. The observations made by the scientist Schnitzler can be portrayed by the artist Schnitzler in a pleasing fashion for the layperson, for as Gordon Allport says,

Only a pedant could prefer the dry collections of facts that psychology can order regarding an individual mental life to the glorious and unforgettable portraits that the gifted novelist, dramatist or biographer can give. The literary artist creates his account; the psychologist merely compiles his.<sup>6</sup>

Schnitzler is not only an artist, but very much a psychologist in his writings. According to W. Mann, "Schnitzler...fasst [seine Gestalten] in einzaehlige psychologische Partikelchen, und seine besondere Kunst gehoert einer Klasse von Menschen, deren Beruf sozusagen das Psychologische ist: den Literaten."<sup>7</sup> Reik also agreed that Schnitzler worked as a psychologist in his literary creations. "Die Art Schnitzlers Gefuehle zu vergliedern und ihren verborgenen Zusammenhaengen nachzuforschen, ist die psychoanalytische."<sup>8</sup> Indeed, one of Schnitzler's main concerns was the individual and

his psychological situation in fin-de-siecle Viennese society.<sup>9</sup> In his autobiography, Jugend in Wien, Schnitzler himself recognized his interest in exposing the human soul.

Mit dem, was ich hier schreibe, masse ich mir keineswegs an, die Entwicklung eines dichterischen Genies zuschildern, sondern die einer menschlichen Seele, in der kuenstlerische dilettantische und mancherlei andere Elemente ein der bedingten, stoerten und foerderten.<sup>10</sup>

Schnitzler is especially interested in neurotic types, which his characters are, for example the dilettante.<sup>11</sup> Literature does deal with the exceptional character, for he is the one to attract most interest. Ambivalence within Viennese society and, to a large extent, the feelings of "lassitude" and "helplessness"<sup>12</sup> encompassing Vienna helped foster the neurotic individual. It is, therefore, no accident that Freudian psychoanalysis, the discovery of depth and emotion in mental life,<sup>13</sup> took shape at that time, the same time Schnitzler was writing.

William Johnston points out how milieu affected both Freud's and Schnitzler's interest in psychology in essentially the same way.

Nothing illustrates so well Freud's symbioses with Viennese culture as the resemblance between his insights and those reached independently by Arthur Schnitzler.... Freud's patients, like Schnitzler's characters, wallowed in the subjective world of Viennese speech undergoing the love-hate that Vienna evoked in most of her creators.<sup>14</sup>

Examples from Schnitzler's writings illustrate his

similarities to Freud. As Reik states, "Schnitzlers Tiefenpsychologie ist gleich der Freudschen bis zum Unbewussten vorgedrungen."<sup>15</sup> For example, Freud is known for emphasizing the division of id and ego, or the division of levels in the human psyche of basic feelings in the subconscious and the control of such feelings in the conscious.<sup>16</sup> These different levels of basic feelings (id), on the one hand, and understanding (ego), on the other hand, are expressed as Reik points out, in the words of Heinrich Bermann, a character in Schnitzler's Der Weg ins Freie:

Aber mit unseren Gefuehlen hat das Verstehen nicht das allergeringste zu tun -- beinahe so wenig wie mit unsern Handlungen. Es schuetzt uns nicht vor Leid, nicht vor Ekel, nicht vor Vernichtung.<sup>17</sup>

Schnitzler further illuminates the different levels of the human psyche in another passage in Der Weg ins Freie, when Heinrich Bermann tries to explain his feeling of guilt vis-a-vis a girl friend's suicide.

Ja. Ich hab' mich ohne Schuld gefuehlt irgendwo in meiner Seele. Und woanders, tiefer vielleicht, hab' ich mich schuldig gefuehlt...[sic] und noch tiefer, wieder schuldlos. Es kommt immer nur darauf an, wie tief wir in uns hineinschauen. Und wenn die Lichter in allen Stockwerken angezuendet sind, sind wir doch alles auf einmal: schuldig und unschuldig, Feiglinge und Helden, Narren und Weise.<sup>18</sup>

Schnitzler uses a dialectic approach, which is, in part, a result of living in an ambivalent society, the same society that produced Freud's dialectic of id and ego. Other similarities in the psychological theories and

practices of Freud and Schnitzler include the use of hypnosis and the analyses of dreams.<sup>19</sup> There is even speculation that theories reached independently by the two men were, in fact, first discovered by Schnitzler.<sup>20</sup>

Both men were aware of each other's work, as is evident in a letter of May 8, 1906, in which Freud wrote to Schnitzler, "Seit vielen Jahren bin ich mir der weitreichenden Uebereinstimmung bewusst, die zwischen Ihnen und meinen Auffassungen mancher psychologischer und erotischer Probleme besteht....<sup>21</sup> Freud was very much awestruck by the fact that Schnitzler's ideas were so similar to his own. He continued in that same letter,

Ich habe mich oft verwundert gefragt, woher Sie diese oder jene geheime Kenntnis nehmen koennten, die ich mir durch muehselige Erforschung des Objektes erworben und endlich kam ich dazu, den Dichter zu beneiden, den ich sonst bewundert.<sup>22</sup>

In viewing the correspondence, it is noted that many years pass between letters. If these two men were so similar in their ideas, it is surprising that there was not a closer relationship. In Jugend in Wien, for example, there is no mention of Freud. Not until late in life did the two men, although living close to one another, see each other.<sup>23</sup> In his letter of May 14, 1922, Freud, in again revealing the similarities between Schnitzler and himself, offered an explanation when he wrote,

Ich habe Sie gemieden aus einer Art von

Doppelgaengerscheu...Ich habe immer wieder, wenn ich mich in Ihre schoenen Schoepfungen vertiefe, hinter deren poetischem Schein die naemlichen Voraussetzungen, Interessen und Ergebnisse zu finden geglaubt, die mir als die eignen bekannt waren.... Ihr Ergriffensein von den Wahrheiten des Unbewussten, von der Triebnatur des Menschen, Ihre Zersetzung der kulturellkonventionellen Sicherheiten, das Haften Ihrer Gedanken an der Polaritaet von Lieben und Sterben, das alles beruehrte mich mit einer unheimlichen Vertrautheit.<sup>24</sup>

It is, indeed, interesting to speculate on the reasons behind the similarities between Schnitzler and Freud. Johnston offers some thought on the question, by comparing the likes and dislikes of both men, which were dictated by their Viennese surroundings.

Freud and Schnitzler shared numerous traits of Viennese aestheticism. Extreme individualists, both men dismissed politics as debasing. Both loved to escape the city into the countryside, yet neither could dwell anywhere but in Vienna. Both were observant travelers, assimilating new impressions with avidity. Although each was fascinated with neuroses, neither identified with neurotics.<sup>25</sup>

As physicians, Kupper and Rollman-Branch, in their article entitled "Freud and Schnitzler," try to offer a more scientific explanation for the similarities between Freud and Schnitzler. They point to such factors as the loss of younger siblings before either Freud or Schnitzler was two years old, repeated pregnancies of their mothers necessitating nursemaids for each, and first memories, in each case, concerning sexual play and curiosity about a particular little girl.<sup>26</sup>

All of these speculations are, of course, interesting to ponder, but what is of importance, in

relation to Sigmund Freud and psychology, is the illustration of yet another way in which Arthur Schnitzler through his writings and portrayal of characters with specific problems is very much a part of Vienna at the turn of the century.

## Notes

1. Theodor Reik, Arthur Schnitzler als Psycholog (Minden/Westphalia: J.C.C. Bruns, 1913) 303.
2. Gordon Allport, "Personality: A Problem for Science or a Problem for Art," The Nature of Personality: Selected Papers by Gordon W. Allport (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1950) 209.
3. Hans Kohn, "Eros and Sorrow: Notes on the Life and Work of Arthur Schnitzler and Otto Weininger," Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook, VI (1961) 153.
4. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler, Jugend in Wien (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968) 93.
5. Bernd Urban, "Schnitzler and Freud as Doubles: Poetic Intuition and Early Research on Hysteria," The Psychoanalytic Review, 65 (1978) 152.
6. Allport 200.
7. W. Mann, "Arthur Schnitzler," in Gustav Kojanker, ed., Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays ueber zeitgenoessische Schriftsteller (Berlin: Welt, 1922) 209.
8. Reik 280.
9. Martin Swales, Arthur Schnitzler: A Critical Study (Oxford, 1971) 29.
10. Nickl and Schnitzler 46.
11. Reik 46.
12. Kohn 153.
13. Allport 198.
14. William M. Johnston, The Austrian Mind. An Intellectual and Social History 1848-1938 (Berkeley: U of California Press, 1972) 241-42.
15. Reik 103.
16. Herbert I. Kupper and Hilda S. Rollman-Branch, "Freud and Schnitzler (Doppelgaenger)," Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association VII (1959) 119.
17. As cited in Reik 100.

18. Arthur Schnitzler, "Der Weg ins Freie," Die Erzählenden Schriften, vol. 1, (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962) 957.

19. Urban 140, 151.

20. Urban 134.

21. Henry Schnitzler, ed., "Sigmund Freud: Briefe an Arthur Schnitzler," Die Neue Rundschau, 66,i (1955) 1.

22. H. Schnitzler 1.

23. H. Schnitzler 10. See also Murray H. Serman, ed., "Psychoanalysis and Old Vienna: Freud, Reik, Schnitzler, Kraus," The Psychoanalytic Review, 65 (1978) 73.

24. H. Schnitzler 3.

25. Johnston 242.

26. Kupper and Rollman-Branch 120.

## Schnitzler and Dilettantism

The theme of the male dilettante, the man incapable of personal or professional commitment, pervades Schnitzler's works. Non-commitment is one illustration of the ambivalence salient in both Schnitzler's life and society.

A society that does not firmly enforce its tenets on all levels gives rise to ambivalence, which is concomitant with dilettantism. Schnitzler recognized these characteristics within himself. In a letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal on June 29, 1896, Schnitzler remarked, "Abzuschliessen, in jedem Sinn. Fehler meines Lebens und meiner Kunst sind daraus zu erklæaren."<sup>1</sup> Perturbed by this situation, he deplores the hypocrisy of his society, of which he is very much a part. As Timms notes in The Times Literary Supplement of April 30, 1982, "For Schnitzler was not a writer who worked in isolation. He was a convivial man whose ideas were filtered through a complex cultural environment."<sup>2</sup> And in turn, Schnitzler's society saw itself in his characters.<sup>3</sup> Since Schnitzler was so enmeshed within his ambivalent society, he found himself searching for truth, a difficult task in a hypocritical society.

But, nonetheless, Schnitzler wrote, "Die reinigende Kraft der Wahrheit ist so gross, dass schon das Streben nach ihr rings um eine bessere Luft verbreitet; die zerstøerende Macht der Luege so furchtbar, dass schon

die Neigung zu ihr die Atmosphaere verdunkelt."<sup>4</sup>  
 Bergel, in his introduction to the Brandes-Schnitzler  
 correspondence emphasizes this point,

Es ging ihm in der Tat um die letzten  
 Wahrheiten...Er ist ein Ethiker: im Zeichen  
 der ruecksichtslosen. Wahrheit und  
 Gerechtigkeit wird in seinen Dichtungen  
 Psychogenese zum Werkzeug des Ringens um eine  
 neue Ethik und Weltanschauung....<sup>5</sup>

As Bergel continues, "Die Flucht vor der Verantwortung  
 und dem eigenen Ich wird blossgestellt. Diese Analyse  
 des Seelischen dient der Wahrheit...."<sup>6</sup>

One of the social factors that causes the  
 ambivalence between what is accepted and what is  
 practiced involves the relationships between men and  
 women. Here is where the dilettante becomes part of the  
 picture, in that he tries to accept society's mores, but  
 is unable to do so. This engendered the ambivalence  
 within Schnitzler's society, thereby providing him with  
 the proper atmosphere to create as he did.

It was the simultaneous existence of mutually  
 incompatible forces which made the Vienna of  
 1900 such an extraordinary fertile  
 environment. A frock-coated Victorian  
 moralism coexisted with blatant erotic  
 displays by army officers in full fig or women  
 of the demi-monde.... Rarely can  
 institutionalized promiscuity have so  
 blatantly coexisted with the proprieties of  
 bourgeois moralism and religious conformity.<sup>7</sup>

An illustration of this could be found in the Neue Freie  
 Presse, a leading newspaper of Vienna at the time, which  
 carried articles on the "Sanctity of Family Life" on  
 page one, and simultaneously, advertised prostitution on

the back page.<sup>8</sup> A more staid society would not have permitted Schnitzler to create within the context of his chosen themes. For example, Schnitzler, as a young medical student, remained in London for an extended period, and in later years, commented that his universal scepticism about love would have been untenable, if he had remained much longer in an environment so utterly unerotic.<sup>9</sup>

Thus the themes of love, sex and morality are ever present in Schnitzler's works, giving rise to the character of the dilettante. The strict Catholic society within a frivolous Vienna caused ambivalence where contradictory forces were part of the same society. In examining this turn-of-the-century Viennese society, the historian, Peter Gay questioned whether sexual repression was so stifling among the Viennese middle classes that it provoked a radical reaction, or was it that sexual libertinism was so freely displayed that the psychologist enjoyed an unprecedented wealth of material. Gay comments that both of these assertions cannot be true at the same time.<sup>10</sup> However, it was precisely because of this phenomenon that the milieu existed for Schnitzler, who disgusted by hypocrisy, tried to seek truth and amelioration within his works. Given his persona and his status as a man of his day, Schnitzler strove in vain to achieve these goals. As a result, writing, for Schnitzler, became very personal.

Not only did it serve as a catharsis for his own relationships, but for his standing within society. What he could not accomplish by his own actions vis-a-vis dilettantism and its inherent ambivalence, he sought to realize through his writing.

Almost every aspect of dilettantism portrayed in Schnitzler's work was experience by Schnitzler, the man living in his society. Therefore, in examining his works in a chronological progression, the parallel between Schnitzler's life and the progression he personally underwent within his society and his own problem with dilettantism vis-a-vis women becomes apparent. Renate Wagner, in Frauen um Arthur Schnitzler, comments on his female characters, "Schnitzler ist ihnen allen begegnet, er hat sie alle gekannt, er hat mit dem Blick des Dichters ihr Wesentliches erfasst und sie (und damit ihre Epoche) mit jener Authentizitaet in der Literaten 'gerettet' fuer die er beruehmt geworden ist."<sup>11</sup> Thus, Schnitzler's relationships are traced from his youthful liasons to those of maturity in marriage. The hypocrisy of his society was intertwined with his own neurosis; based on the fear of marriage, this condition was due to a pathological jealousy he experienced with women. "Zur Eifersucht auf die Vergangenheit kommt auch noch die Eifersucht auf die Zukunft."<sup>12</sup> This was especially true of his youthful relationships, when Schnitzler

repeatedly stated that he did not want to marry.<sup>13</sup>

With respect to his refusal to marry, Schnitzler was hypocritical. He was forthright only in regard to his first relationship. He never discussed commitment with Jeanette, a suesses Maedel of the Vorstadt with whom he spent his evenings. The two families were kept apart. Jeanette Heger is found, among others in Anatol and Reigen. Following these two works, each built upon a progression of episodes within the individual work, Schnitzler focused on subsequent relationships, one to a work, each becoming more problematic and ambivalent in nature.

After Jeanette, his next major involvement was with Mizi Gluemer, a young actress. Even though Schnitzler declared his love to her, as documented in their extensive correspondence, he could not marry. "Schnitzler quaelen nicht nur die aeusseren Umstaende, sondern auch sein altes Leiden: die Eifersucht auf die Vergangenheit. 'Ich bin ein Mistrauensvirtuos'."<sup>14</sup> Mizi Gluemer was the source for Schnitzler's Das Maerchen von der Gefallenen, the work which gave Schnitzler greater recognition.

Marie Reinhard was next in line to receive Schnitzler's affections. She gave birth to his stillborn child, and after her death a year later, she became the subject of Das Vermaechtnis and then again of Der Weg ins Freie.

Schnitzler devoted much energy to Marie Reinhard. He was completely shattered after her death, when he wrote to Hofmannsthal on March 22, 1899,

Ein Tag ist schrecklicher als der andre; es ist viel grauenvoller und hoffnungsloser als irgend ein Wort darueber. Ich habe das Gefuehl, fertig zu sein; Zeichen genug werden mir gesandt! Vom Morgen aus der Ausblick ins leere, leere -- die Erinnerungen an ihr Leben voll Pein, an ihren Tod von einer grenzenlosen Entsetzlichkeit...die letzten Blicke, die letzten Worte unvergesslich -- die letzte Angst auf immer alles zerstuerend, was noch kommen koennte. Eine ungeheure Gleichgultigkeit [sic] gegen alles, was mir auch Inhalt des Lebens schien -- schauen ins Leere, greifen ins Leere, jammern ins Leere.<sup>15</sup>

And yet, Schnitzler had been unable to marry her. Renate Wagner records how he had repeated to Marie Reinhard, "Du hast es gewusst, dass ich dich nicht heiraten werde, ich habe es dir gesagt."<sup>16</sup> This was the case even as she was pregnant with his child. He was eager to have a child, but not to marry. When questioned on the morality of this, Schnitzler responded, "Was ist unmoralischer...einen ungeliebten Mann zu heiraten, wie Tausende Frauen es tun oder einen geliebten nicht zu heiraten."<sup>17</sup> Whether Schnitzler would have married Reinhard had she lived is speculative. However, five years later, he married Olga Gussmann in order to legitimize his son Heinrich at age one. Olga appears in Schnitzler's Zwischenspiel.

The problem of illegitimate births is not unique to Schnitzler in the Vienna of that period. It was a prevalent phenomenon, in that many men did not want to

marry. In Austrian Catholic society this resulted in a high rate of illegitimacy. As Mitterauer states, "Um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts liegt Oesterreich im Spitzenfeld der europaeischen Laender mit hoher Illegitimitaetsquote."<sup>18</sup> This phenomenon continued throughout the nineteenth century into the twentieth century, when it began to affect Schnitzler's upper-middle-class society, and hence his works. "Expressive Sexualitaet verbindet sich hier mit relativ stabilen sozialen Verhaeltnissen."<sup>19</sup> A contemporary sociologist, Othmar Spann, also discussed this trend within his society.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, until World War I, there had been a number of studies involving illegitimacy.<sup>21</sup>

Schnitzler was concerned with this not only in his literary works, but in his daily life. In a letter to Hugo von Hofmannsthal of July 17, 1898, he mentioned the rate of illegitimacy in their contemporary society. "Auch sind jetzt die Zustaende durch die merkwuerdige Vermengung von illegitimen und anerkanntem Einsicht und Halbheit, ganz unruhig."<sup>22</sup>

It is, however, in his literary works that Schnitzler not only reached the public, but as mentioned above, used writing as a catharsis for himself. It was a means for him to write the truth about himself and society. In his works he gave women the opportunity to rise above the indecisiveness of the dilettante so that they would no longer be dependent upon his whims.

Schnitzler understood women and was, therefore, able to realistically represent them.<sup>23</sup> However, despite basing most of his female characters on women in his own life, Schnitzler could do them justice only in his writings. For example, in reference to Mizi Gluemer vis-a-vis Das Maerchen, Renate Wagner claims, "Schnitzler ist als Dichter weiser dann als Mann. Im Leben kann er ueber Mizis Vergangenheit nicht hinwegkommen. Im Stueck gibt er ihr der Fanny moralische ueberlegenheit."<sup>24</sup> As such, "wieder einmal gibt Schnitzler den Frauen denen er in Wirklichkeit so viel Unrecht tut, in seinen Werken recht. Der junge Schnitzler handelt nach dem Ibsen Ausspruch, Dichter sei Gerichtstag halten ueber sich selbst."<sup>25</sup> At the same time, he admonishes all men and himself. Wagner continues, "er ist unbarmherzig mit den Maennern...er laesst sie fuer ihre (und seine) Suenden zahlen."<sup>26</sup> The same thing continued in subsequent relationships. In reference to Marie Reinhard, Wagner says, "Schnitzler in seinen Werken nichts weniger als ein Moralist, bricht im Privatleben immer wieder aus der Monogamie aus."<sup>27</sup>

All of these private incidents which are represented in Schnitzler's writings will be examined seriatim with emphasis on the dilettante. Schnitzler's repeated representation of this particular figure expressed his desire to seek truth in his hypocritical society of turn-of-the-century Vienna. In so doing,

Schnitzler gained greater insights into the human psyche, and thus his portrayal of the dilettante and the ambivalent human condition transcends the limitations inherent in any society; his themes touch upon a universal chord.

## Notes

1. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Arthur Schnitzler: Briefwechsel (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1964) 68.
2. Edward Timms, "The Nostalgia of a Radical," Times Literary Supplement, April 30, 1982, 475.
3. Kurt Bergel, ed., Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel (Bern: Francke, 1956) 22.
4. Bergel n. p. [Preface]
5. Bergel 29.
6. Bergel 29-30.
7. Timms 475.
8. Timms 475.
9. Timms 475.
10. Timms 475.
11. Renate Wagner, Frauen um Arthur Schnitzler (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1980) 22.
12. Wagner 76.
13. Wagner 32.
14. Wagner 74.
15. Nickl and Schnitzler 119.
16. Wagner 115.
17. Wagner 118.
18. Michael Mitterauer, "Familienformen und Illegitimitaet in laendlichen Gebieten Oesterreichs," Archiv fuer Sozialgeschichte, ed., Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, XIX (Braunschweig/Bonn: Neue Gesellschaft, 1979) 123.
19. Mitterauer 132.

20. Othmar Spann, "Die Unehelichkeit im Oesterreich nach Volksstaemmen und Ihre Entwicklung im letzten Jahrzeit," Statistische Monatshefte NF, Vol. 14 (1909) 122.

21. See footnote in Mitteraurer 130.

22. Nickl and Schnitzler 106.

23. Bergel 29.

24. Wagner 25.

25. Wagner 80-81.

26. Wagner 80-81.

27. Wagner 121.

Reigen

Before examining the development of the dilettante from the early character in Anatol to the later married character in Zwischenspiel, it would be best to focus on Reigen, which Schnitzler wrote during his youth, and within itself encompasses such a progression. This drama, written during 1896-97 and first produced in 1921 in Berlin, consists of a series of ten dialogues in which there is a stark progression of the love relationships of the dilettante in varied forms.

Throughout Schnitzler's literary career, his portrayals of the dilettante, a phenomenon so prevalent during his life had to be defended repeatedly.<sup>1</sup> This was especially true of Reigen. The production of 1921 gave rise to a court case in which the actors and producers of the Berlin play were charged with pornography. It was a test of the extent to which censorship could infringe upon the artist's freedom of creation. The trial yielded six hundred pages of testimony which eventually resulted in the vindication of Schnitzler, the actors, and the producers.

Schnitzler, even during the trial, was not bothered by the controversy engendered by Reigen. In a letter to Brandes of January 30, 1922, Schnitzler wrote, "Mit dem Reigen hab ich freilich allerlei dummes erlebt; -- was mir aber kaum nahgegangen ist."<sup>2</sup> In the previous letter of this correspondence, Brandes commented, "Der jetzt

ueberall gluehende Antisemitismus und die Tugendbolderei geben...solche Resultate."<sup>3</sup>

Anti-Semitism did, in fact, give rise to much of the imbroglia surrounding Reigen. For example, one read the following about Schnitzler and Reigen in contemporary journals,

B o r d e l l p r o l o g e d e s J u d e n  
Schnitzler...typischer juedischer  
Schreibefall.... Es ist Pflicht der Wiener  
Katholiken, die in ihrem Kampf gegen Schmutz  
und Schund wieder einmal allein zu stehen  
scheinen sich zu maechtigen Protestaktionen  
[sic] zusammenzutun, die von den Behoerden  
nicht ueberhoert werden koennen.<sup>4</sup>

There were similar statements in Ostdeutsche Rundschau. "...Der bekannte foetor judaicus zu spueren... ist mit huendischer Geschlechtsgier geschrieben, dasz es einem ekelt."<sup>5</sup> Otto Schinnerer in his history of the play, summarizes the article by attributing the controversy almost entirely to "religious, nationalistic, or Anti-Semitic bias."<sup>6</sup>

When Schnitzler first conceived of Reigen in 1896, he did not want it produced (not because of the Anti-Semitism he did not foresee, but because of the subject matter). As late as 1912, Schnitzler wrote, "Eine Auffuehrung dieser zehn Szenen in ihrer wahren Gestalt, ein absoluter Ding der Unmoeglichkeit waere jede Milderung den Sinn des Ganzen zunichte machen muesste."<sup>7</sup> Much earlier, in a letter of February 15, 1903, Hugo von Hofmannsthal and Richard Beer-Hofmann had teasingly addressed Schnitzler as "Lieber Pornograph" when

referring to Reigen in an amusing and ironic tone.<sup>8</sup>

In an article in the Neues Wiener Journal of January 30, 1921, Schnitzler stated that his agreement to produce the play came as a result of the prodding of Max Reinhardt, who promised him a stylized production.<sup>9</sup>

When Maximilian Sladek gained the concession to the Reinhardt theater, he also inherited Reigen, which he produced according to the Reinhardt formula. He, as well as Reinhardt, underestimated the force of anti-Semitism.

Controversy surrounding a Schnitzler play is typical. However, in reference to character development, Reigen is not typical for Schnitzler. As opposed to a full character study, Schnitzler is more concerned with type portrayal in Reigen, with special emphasis on the dilettante. Schnitzler did not conceive of Reigen as a Naturalistic play, but as a more stylized picture of human nature. This was especially true in its eventual production by Sladek. As one of the actresses of the original Berlin production in 1921 declared during the trial, "Sie duerfen nicht vergessen, wir haben hier kein naturalistisches Stueck, sondern eine stilisierte Auffuehrung...Wir haben immer nur das Gefuehl gehabt, ein sehr schoenes, kuenstlerisches Werk vor uns zu sehen..."<sup>10</sup> The play was an experiment.<sup>11</sup>

Even though, on the surface, Reigen was seen as an exercise in eroticism, it was anything but that. In

"The History of Schnitzler's Reigen," Otto Schninnerer states,

It seems almost needless to emphasize that Reigen was not written in a frivolous or lubricious spirit, but rather as an expression of the author's keen disillusionment through his realization of the sham and hypocrisy that enter into the most intimate of human relations.... The Reigen scenes are a ruthless unmasking of the animal instincts in man, which often parade under the guise of friendship and love.<sup>12</sup>

The scenes cannot be taken as eroticism. As Schnitzler commented to Viereck during an interview for the latter's book, Glimpses of the Great, "I am far more interested in social problems...than in eroticism."<sup>13</sup> Thus the series of ten interlinking love scenes in Reigen examine, within one uniform work, the behavior of the dilettante which Schnitzler so aptly portrayed in many of his other works.

In Reigen, we encounter the dilettante in all ten scenes. Not only does the male dilettante undergo a progression within this type, so, too, does his female counterpart. Each type (as opposed to character, which requires greater development) appears in two scenes, so as to carry out the Reigen. The female of the first scene reappears in scene ten completing the Reigen. Otherwise, a type appears twice in sequence. Since our interests concern the dilettante, the present focus will be primarily on the male types encountered.

In scenes one and two, Schnitzler portrayed the soldier, Franz; in scenes three and four, the young

master, Alfred; scenes five and six the married man, Karl; scenes seven and eight the writer, Robert Biebertz (note that the writer has both a given name and surname); scenes nine and ten the Count, Steinamanger. By merely enumerating these types, there is already a sense of progression. However, the dilettante, in his lack of a responsible commitment to a female counterpart, is ever present. Reigen portrays him on all rungs of the social ladder -- from the soldier of the masses through to Count Steinamanger (the only type who, besides the writer, has a surname; he is unique). The middle of the Reigen (scene five), reaches the pinnacle of hypocrisy. The dilettante is represented by the married man, who has committed himself to his wife, as the soldier to the prostitute in scene one, or the Count to the prostitute in scene ten. In between this midpoint and the frame of the Reigen are the young master, and the young boy on the lower end, not yet fully developed within society, and on the higher end, the writer, one step under the Count. What each type has in common is that all are equal in love. Each scene culminates in physical consummation of love, with no promise of any commitment as a result. That Karl is a married man is of no consequence. In the dialogue with his wife, he speaks only of his wife's fidelity; he does not in any way promise her his fidelity.

Each of the men is distinguished on two levels. The mere coining of a type, without much development of character and without emphasis of name, leaves to the reader's or spectator's mind the connotations within society that the type conjures up in the imagination. The other distinctions are made visible via the type's behavior and length of dialogue allotted toward his lover before and after the act of love. The justification for this criticism lies in the fact that Reigen is stripped to the bare essentials of type without much elaboration or depth of portrayal.

In scenes one and two, which involve Franz, the soldier, we note one and three-quarters pages of dialogue before the act with the prostitute. Afterwards, there is only an additional one-half page of dialogue before the scene ends. At this level of society there is little sham or hypocrisy; the dilettante need not justify his actions. With the chambermaid Franz engages in only two pages of dialogue before the act. The scene ends within another page and one-half of dialogue. Here Franz must justify his actions to a greater extent. The progression of the dilettante's hypocrisy continues in the next scene of the young master. In scene three, with the chambermaid, Alfred must devote two and three-quarters pages of dialogue before the culmination in the act of love. His justification requires only three-quarters of a page to

the end of the scene, since he is a level above the chambermaid. In the following scene (four), with the young married woman, Alfred must devote more dialogue to attain his goal. It takes over six pages to seduce the young woman named Emma. It is also in this scene that Schnitzler allots a lengthier introduction. Whereas each of the other nine dialogues require a one or two sentence introduction, Schnitzler devotes almost an entire page of introduction to set the appropriate atmosphere. It is as though Schnitzler creates the air of hypocrisy which involves one married partner, and the young man must work harder because of this very situation. The love act is repeated again in this scene after an additional two and one quarter pages. Thereafter, two full pages of dialogue continue, until the scene comes to a close. Scene five is the midpoint, in which we find the love act between husband and wife. Again there is almost no introduction to the scene, indicating no atmosphere is needed; the act is expected. There are five and one-half pages of dialogue before the culmination. Here lengthier dialogue does indicate a seduction, as was the case in scene four. The lack of spontaneity or desire within the institution of marriage, not to mention the obvious hypocrisy, is present. Only one-half page of additional dialogue ends the scene. This was the same length of dialogue used to end scene one -- that of the soldier with the

prostitute. In that scene, just as in scene five, the act is expected. The comparison leads to the conclusion that there is an obvious lack of emotion in either scene or situation!

After the first half of the Reigen is completed, the progression continues with the "better half" of society. This is again reflected, not only in the types named, but in the length of dialogue before and after the act of love in scenes six through nine. In scene six, the married man, Karl devotes six and one-half pages of dialogue to the seduction of the suesses Maedel. He needs three full pages of dialogue following the act to the end of the scene. In the next scene, the writer Robert Biebitz is introduced. His introduction and portrayal is an interesting one for several reasons. He follows the married man. He is therefore one notch above him on the social scale, and as noted before, he is only one notch below nobility. Moreover, as also noted before, he is the only type to whom Schnitzler gave two names. The writer thereby acquires a greater degree of characterization within the overall portrayal of types. This is further enhanced by the fact that, in scene seven, he has an encounter with the suesses Maedel, who remains nameless, and in scene eight he has an encounter with the actress, the Schnitzler type later entitled the Mondaene, or worldly woman, who also remains nameless in this scene. Biebitz, surrounded by two

nameless types in scenes seven and eight, produces a twofold result. It crystallizes Robert Biebitz's identity even further, by juxtaposing his two names in contrast to the two nameless figures, and it focuses on the role of "type" (vis-à-vis the females) in the entire Reigen portrayal of types. The suesses Maedel, as well as the Mondaene (most often portrayed by the actress), become famous Schnitzler types represented in many of his later works.

Biebitz engages in four and one-half pages of dialogue before achieving his goal with the suesses Maedel. Three additional pages of dialogue end the scene. There is an equivalent length of dialogue with both the suesses Maedel and the Mondaene.

In the next scene (nine), the Count is introduced. Since the Count represents the most refined element of society, he requires over five pages of dialogue before the culmination in the act of love. The scene closes after an additional one and one-half pages of dialogue. This is an interesting scene in that "desire" switches from partner to partner. Before the act, the Count is not interested. However, once he is seduced, he becomes interested, while the actress loses her desire. The worldly woman takes on characteristics of the typical male. Once she has conquered, she is no longer interested. She is interested only in the challenge.

The last scene (ten) is the only one in which there

is no love act. Here the Count, on the highest rung of the social ladder, awakens in the arms of the prostitute, Leocadia, on the lowest rung of the social ladder, whom we first encountered in scene one. The Reigen is thus completed. All are equal in the physical act of love. The higher the level of society, the greater the hypocrisy. Different social levels require proportional length of seduction (hence the page count of dialogue). However, the love act remains the same on all levels. This universal premise is further enhanced when the Count of the last scene compares the sleeping Leocadia to a princess, or when Leocadia compares the Count to the soldier, Franz.

The distinctions here are relevant to the "types" on the social ladder and their respective behavior as a result. Not only does the love act remain the same throughout, but so, too, does the dilettante. He is the man who shuns commitment in his progression on every rung of the social ladder.

Reigen, within one work, espouses the Schnitzler philosophy. It is, therefore, a good introduction to the closer examination of the dilettante, as Arthur Schnitzler portrayed him and developed him from his early works to his later works.

## Notes

1. Alfred Fritsche, Dekadenz im Werk Arthur Schnitzler (Bern: H. Lang, 1974) 55.
2. Kurt Bergel, ed., Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel (Bern: Francke, 1956) 134.
3. Bergel 133.
4. Neues Montagblatt, February 7, 1921 as cited in Otto P. Schinnerer, "The History of Schnitzler's Reigen," PMLA, 46 iii (September 1931) 851.  
851.
5. Ostdeutsche Rundschau, May 17, 1903, as cited in Otto P. Schinnerer 841.
6. Schinnerer 859.
7. Bergel 212.
8. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Arthur Schnitzler: Briefwechsel (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1964) 167.
9. Arthur Schnitzler, "Berrichtigung. Ein paar Worte zum Gutachten Maximilian Hardens ueber den Reigen," Neues Wiener Journal Nr. 9732, January 30, 1921, 6, col., 1.
10. Wolfgang Heine, ed., Der Kampf um den Reigen (Berlin, 1922) 34.
11. George Sylvester Viereck, Glimpses of the Great (New York: Macaulay, 1930) 404.
12. Schinnerer 840, 858.
13. Viereck 399.

Anatol

Anatol, reflecting the values of Schnitzler's society, represents the archetypical dilettante. "Leichtsinniger Melancholiker," a phrase by which Anatol describes himself, has come to embody not only Anatol but the entire generation of Viennese young men.

A comparison of Anatol with Reigen will bring out the character of the dilettante. Even though there are many superficial similarities, the two plays are divergent in development. The latter was originally conceived as one play, while Anatol was a compilation of separate episodes, written between 1888 and 1893. Reigen is concerned with type and Anatol with character, as will be seen shortly.

With regard to the similarities, many comparisons have been made. For example, the following appeared in a 1956 criticism of Anatol. "There lurks beneath the ceaseless flow of keen-edged wit, the disturbing comparisons between happiness and pleasure and truth and illusion which comes up...in the same author's Reigen."<sup>1</sup> It is quite appropriate that these two works are mentioned together in a criticism. Without the knowledge of their respective modes of creation, style alone would logically lead to that conclusion. There is movement within both works via the sequence of scenes.

Anatol, just as is Reigen in its progression of scenes and various encounters with divergent portrayals,

is an excellent study of the Schnitzler philosophy of life as embodied in human relationships. An individual is able to find his own expression in society through his experience with another. Hence, almost all of Schnitzler's works deal with couples. In their respective sequence of scenes, experimenting with couples in different situations, Reigen and Anatol have become emblematic of Schnitzler's philosophy. However, this is where the similarities between the two plays end. For the writer and his philosophy,

Anatol has become the symbol for Schnitzler. The work of the youth has justifiably become the token of the man, for within Anatol are the seeds of many of the concepts and characters which Schnitzler treats in his later dramatic works. Here is the philanderer, the raisonneur, the artist, the "suesses Maedel," and the woman who exists outside the bounds of respectable society.<sup>2</sup>

Where Reigen, tinged with a cynical tone (scenes are stripped down to bare types as pointed out in the previous chapter), is more universal, Anatol is tied to its immediate milieu. As a result, Anatol, more so than Reigen, is seen not only as a source of the Schnitzler philosophy, but also as the representative of its contemporary society. This latter observation, in reference to Anatol, is made today as it was contemporaneously. For example as critic Alfred Kerr stated,

Mit leisem Zauberschlag erscheint eine schmerzlich suesse Welt, voll traurigschalkhafter Grazie voll ironischer Melancholie, voll leiser lachender Innigkeit.

Sie ist von zartem Leichtsinne durchweht, von schwermutigem Zweifel umwittert, von holdem Betrug umspielt....Alles flutet durcheinander: Innigkeit und Eleganz, Weichheit und Ironie, Weltstaedtisches und Abseitiges, Lyrik und Feuilletonismus, Lebens raffinement und volksmaessige Schlichtheit, Oesterreichertum und Halbfranzoesisches. Schmerz und Spiel, Laecheln und Sterben....Das ist die unvergleichliche Welt Arthur Schnitzlers.<sup>3</sup>

It is clear from contemporary as well as present criticism that Anatol depicts its milieu better than does Reigen.

In addition, Anatol is more personal to Schnitzler. He was portraying himself at that time. Like Schnitzler, Anatol is a writer in his milieu.

Dieser sentimentale Dandy ist...ein Dichter: seine traemende Seele ist wie der Brunnen im Maerchen: Alle die du liebst, tauchen darin unter und bringen dir dann einen sonderbaren Duft von Abenteuern und Seltsamkeit mit, an dem du dich berauscht....<sup>4</sup>

Wagner concurs with this statement in her biography on Schnitzler. She says, "Schnitzler ist Anatol, weil er einen Lebemann dieses Namens erfunden hat."<sup>5</sup> In writing to his friend Olga Waissnix, Schnitzler signed his letter "Anatol."<sup>6</sup>

Another consideration in viewing the differences between the two plays, and perhaps the more important for our theme, is that of character development, with emphasis on the man. In Reigen, there is no character development, but merely a presentation of type encounters, whereas Anatol as an individual begins to develop character. Even milieu descriptions are

essentially only through Anatol's character. There are no long scene descriptions per se. There are further stylistic considerations. In Reigen, a character never appears more than twice. However, Anatol, as well as Max, appears in all seven scenes. In Reigen, each man is one type, having an encounter with only one or two women, and each woman appears only in her very specific role. Anatol, as a male figure, encounters more than two women. In comparing the women and their portrayal in both Reigen and Anatol, Wagner states, "im Anatol sind noch zusaetzlich einige Varianten Anzutreffen..."<sup>7</sup> These repeated encounters on the part of Anatol with his entourage of women develops the dilettante into the character embodied in Anatol.

As indicated in the previous discussion of couple portrayal, Anatol acquires further characterization through his juxtaposition with Max in each scene. Max, as a foil in temperament, gives Anatol more dimension as a character. Indeed, Schnitzler worked with at least two individuals in order to cultivate character development within an individual; his figures cannot be seen in isolation.

In Reigen, the structure aids in our understanding of the various types on the social ladder. However, the structure of Anatol is not dependent upon status, but rather, on the interrelationship between the protagonist and the female characters. The focus is thus on

character. Anatol serves as the introduction to the dilettante, the character whom Schnitzler continued to refine in his subsequent works.

A structural examination can begin with the fourth scene, "Denksteine." This scene is the midpoint of seven encounters, around which all others are balanced in a mirror image. In "Denksteine," Emily is introduced, whom Anatol interrogates concerning past relationships, symbolized in the precious stones she keeps. Cognizant of Anatol's jealous nature, she tries to deny that the stones were from previous lovers. However, Anatol's persistence forces her to reveal these relationships. She admits she has never loved another as well as Anatol; past involvements no longer have meaning. Nevertheless, Anatol cannot accept Emily. Shouting "Dirne," he leaves. Emily foreshadows the woman in Das Maerchen von der Gefallenen, the play written as a result of Schnitzler's own relationship with the actress Marie Gluemer.

The third and fifth scenes, "Episode" and "Abschiedssouper," respectively, are counterpoints to each other, with the fourth scene serving as the axis. There is no feeling for Anatol in either "Episode" or "Abschiedssouper;" in contradistinction Emily is beset with feeling for him.

In Scene Three Anatol reacquaints himself with Bianca. Years before, Anatol spent two hours with her,

and now expects her recollections to be filled with fond memories. To his chagrin, she does not recognize him. As a result, Anatol is upset. Trying to comfort Anatol, Max says Bianca is "eine von den tausend Gefallenen denen die Phantasie eines Traumes neue Jungfraulichkeit borgt."<sup>8</sup> Thus as "eine Gefallene," Bianca is the one leading the spectator or reader into Emily's appearance in Scene Four.

In Scene Five, "Abschiedssouper," as in Scene Three, there is a woman of the past. Anatol prepares to tell Annie that he no longer wants her. However, before he has a chance to say anything to her, Annie tells Anatol that she wants to end the relationship. In this scene Annie is not affected by emotions as she continues to enjoy her dinner, whereas Anatol is devastated. She is the Mondaene, the worldly woman in direct relationship to Anatol. He is on the defensive vis-a-vis the actions of a Mondaene just as he was on the defensive in explaining his feelings with Bianca in Scene Three. Anatol's sentiments are similar in both Scenes Three and Five, which are opposite to those in Scene Four, where he is on the offensive.

As the perspective from the midpoint of "Denksteine" continues to widen, Scene Two, "Weihnachtseinkaeufe" is juxtaposed to Scene Six, "Agonie." In Scene Two, Anatol's encounter is with the married woman, Gabrielle, whom he labels "ganz einfach Mondaene" (27).

His present love relationship is however not with her, but with a suesses Maedel from the Vorstadt, whom he describes to Gabrielle. Referring to the suesses Maedel, Anatol says,

Sie ist nicht faszinierend schoen -- sie ist nicht besonders elegant und sie ist durchaus nicht geistreich....Aber sie hat die weiche Anmut eines Fruhlingsabends...und die Grazie einer verzauberten Prinzessin...und den Geist eines Maedchens das zu lieben weiss. (27).

"Agonie" is the mirror image of "Weihnachtseinkaeufe." Again there is a married woman, Else. However, unlike Gabrielle, Else is intimately involved with Anatol. Even though Anatol would like to broaden his involvement with Else, and she would like to do the same, she feels she cannot leave her husband. Max advises Anatol to cease the relationship; it causes him nothing but agony. Unable to commit himself in either direction, Anatol continues to maintain the status quo.

In Scenes Two and Six, Mondaene is juxtaposed to suesses Maedel. In "Weihnachtseinkaeufe," there is Gabrielle versus Anatol's description of his girl friend. In "Agonie," Else embodies both Mondaene and suesses Maedel. In Anatol's lengthy conversation with her, it is learned that prior to marriage, Else had very little experience in love. Hence she has the innocence of the suesses Maedel, within the guise of the Mondaene.

Scene One, "Die Frage an das Schicksal," and Scene Seven, "Anatol's Hochzeitmorgen," serve as the frame to

Anatol. Scene One introduces Anatol, the dilettante. This is achieved through dialog between Max, the rationalist and Anatol, the sentimentalist. For example, when Max asks Anatol how, he can determine a woman's fidelity, the following colloquy ensues.

Max: Und deine beweise?

Anatol: Ich ahne es...ich fuehle es...darum weiss ich es. (11-12).

Since Anatol insists that a woman will always betray her lover, Max suggests he hypnotize his own girlfriend, Cora, and investigate the question of her fidelity. Cora is willing to undergo this procedure once. When she is finally hypnotized and Max is sent out of the room, Anatol realizes he cannot follow through and ask his questions. He prefers ignorance so that he may continue to rely on his feelings only. Thus, the result of Scene One, as the opening of the frame, is that it fully introduces Anatol the dilettante, who thrives on his own ambivalent feelings.

Scene Seven, "Anatols Hochzeitsmorgen," is the close of the frame; the dilettante is to marry. This action represents the ultimate in his progression of experience vis-a-vis women. However, Anatol remains the same in his ambivalence here as in the beginning.

Fearing marriage will infringe upon his freedom, Anatol, on the morning of his wedding day, wakes up in the arms of another woman, Ilona, whom he found the prior evening. He attempts to hide his impending

marriage. However, eventually he is forced to reveal this fact to Ilona so that he may arrive in time for his wedding. Max helps assuage Ilona's feelings, by saying that she cannot be betrayed; Anatol can only return to her. It is his wife, whom he will ultimately betray. Thus, Max predicts Anatol's continued dilettantism even within marriage.

The female counterparts in the first and last scenes function in a similar manner. As Cora of Scene One is of little significance, except as a vehicle through which Anatol expresses his feelings, the bride of Scene Seven, not even introduced, is also a vehicle to illustrate Anatol's ambivalence toward marriage. Thus, with Scene Seven, the frame is closed.

In this series of seven episodes Anatol is constantly upset, and is questioning his situation. These are the ingredients for ambivalence which lead to the dilettante's behavior of the uncommitted man.

Henceforth, the dilettante continues to be portrayed in Schnitzler's writings as representative of ambivalence. However, instead of viewing the dilettante at his different stages within a single play such as Reigen, or in a uniform series of episodes, as Anatol, the focus will be on one particular situation in each specific work. Whether single dandy, semi-committed man, unmarried father, or married man, ambivalence toward total commitment on the part of the male

protagonist is ever present in Arthur Schnitzler's  
creations.

## Notes

1. Luverne Walton, "Anatol on the New York Stage," Modern Austrian Literature, 2, ii (1969) 38.

2. Walton 30.

3. Walton 41.

4. Rudolf Hirsch, "Hugo von Hofmannsthal ueber Schnitzlers 'Anatol,'" Neue Rundschau, 82, iv (1971) 796.

5. Renate Wagner, Arthur Schnitzler: Eine Biographie (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1981), p. 104.

6. Wagner 57.

7. Wagner 22.

8. Arthur Schnitzler, "Anatol," Die dramatischen Werke, 2 vols. (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962) 38. All further references to this work will be indicated in the text by the page number in parenthesis.

### Das Maerchen

The works by Schnitzler examined thus far, Reigen and Anatol, comprise a progression of the dilettante figure within one drama. The analysis of this phenomenon will focus on one particular situation of the dilettante figure per single literary work.

Das Maerchen von den Gefallenen, which Schnitzler began writing in November 1890 and completed in March 1891, depicts the ambivalent situation of the young male dilettante in late nineteenth century Vienna who is faced with making a decision concerning commitment and marriage to a woman who has erred by having chosen a wrong lover in the past. This is an oversimplification of the theme of Das Maerchen. However, the three-act drama evolves around this question, which parallels the life of the almost thirty-year-old Schnitzler who was unable to make any decisions on this problem, and who sought to find his excuse in society's view of the "Gefallene."

Beginning with Das Maerchen, Schnitzler chose particular literary themes, which resembled his own life situation at a given time. The outcome of his works are not those of his life. Nonetheless, the problems are similar and it is in his works that he had the freedom to present the situation and then play on the themes as he may have done in his own mind. It is where he could control a situation totally, without the interference of

his own phobias or neuroses, and where he was able to choose a just ending.

First as a catharsis for Schnitzler's own life situation, the writing of Das Maerchen soon also became one of the best examples of exposing the hypocrisy and ambivalence of male-female relationships and their respective roles in society. As reported in the review of Das Maerchen in the Beilage to No. 4712 of the Wiener Allgemeinen Zeitung, "ein Stueck wienerisches Leben wollte er auf die Buehne bringen; und das ist dem Verfasser geglueckt."<sup>1</sup>

Schnitzler felt the need to write Das Maerchen as a result of his own relationship to actress Marie Gluemer. He first met "Mizi," as he called her, when he was twenty-seven years old. She was the lover of Schnitzler's friend, Theodor Friedmann, who no longer desired her.<sup>2</sup> Mizi was thus introduced to Schnitzler. The relationship which developed was probably one of the most intense Schnitzler ever experienced. As Schnitzler himself wrote, "sie war meine Tugend, die Jugend -- und darum wohl die Liebe selbst, die 'wahre Liebe'."<sup>3</sup> However, because of the double standards and hypocrisy of the times, when one set of rules was accepted publicly and another privately, the ambivalence of the situation was sure to emerge. As a result, this intense love relationship, which grew out of a known past, was marred by intense feelings of mistrust on Schnitzler's

part, given his own feelings of jealousy. Thus, Wagner writes of Mizi and Arthur, "sie sind Virtuosen der Quaelerei, ebenso wie sie Virtuosen der Liebe waren."<sup>4</sup> All of these emotions are borne out in the Gluemer-Schnitzler correspondence, consisting of at least six hundred letters from 1889-1893.<sup>5</sup> As stated above it is during this time that Schnitzler wrote Das Maerchen der Gefallenen, with the first production taking place December 1, 1893, after the relationship had already ended.

The problems of the actual relationship, as documented in the vast correspondence, will be compared with the play itself and its themes. These problems are a result of the ambivalent times. It is interesting to note how Schnitzler dealt with them in his life, and how he gave them different expression in the play, where he controlled all the variables. For example, in reference to his treatment of women, Wagner writes, "Schnitzler ist als Dichter weiser denn als Mann."<sup>6</sup>

An examination of Schnitzler, the man, in his declarations of love to Mizi Gluemer is warranted. His own doubts and misgivings vis-a-vis Mizi, as a result of being a product of his ambivalent milieu will also be noted. Only then can we turn to the play, and see how these same problems are treated.

Schnitzler's declarations of love to Marie Gluemer were more intense than to any other woman, before or

after. In the beginning of the relationship, the summer of 1889, he wrote to her,

Ich kann dir nur sagen, dass ich dich liebe, wie noch nie ein menschliches Wesen geliebt worden, und dass mich diese letzten Tage wieder mit tausend Schmerzen gelehrt, dass ich ohne dich eigentlich keine Sekunde der Ruhe, des Gluecks habe....<sup>7</sup>

In a letter of August 4, 1889 Schnitzler declared further

Ich danke dir also noch nachtraeglich fuer deine suessen, suessen lieben Worte, die ja meine einzige Seligkeit bedeuten, wenn du nicht hoechstselbst zu mir reden kannst! Mein Schatz! wie viel, wie unendlich viel bedeutest du mir! noch mehr als du selbst ahnst. Ich sehe in dir ueberhaupt das absolut enzige, was mich mit Freude an die kuenftige Zeit denken laesst in dir mein einziges Glueck, das einzige was dieses sonst sehr schaebige Leben wirklich lebenswerth macht-- wie ich dir fuer das unsaegliche -- Glueck danken soll, dass du mir durch deine Liebe gewaehrst, dass weiss ich nicht -- wenn ich so darueber traeeume, kommt es mir selbst ganz unbegreiflich vor, dass es wirklich wahr sein soll, dass du, das suesseste auf der ganzen Welt mich liebst! -- <sup>8</sup>

Not only was Schnitzler's language intense in his declarations of love, but so, too, was the frequency with which he corresponded with Mizi. Sometimes only a few hours passed before he wrote to her again.<sup>9</sup> Intensity is the appropriate word to describe this relationship in all respects. As much and as often as he declared his love, he also expressed his doubts, misgivings and distrust. Schnitzler was tormented by his own neurotic jealousies, not only of past relationships a woman may have had, but of future

encounters she might have. Wagner does not doubt the authenticity of Schnitzler's feelings. "Schnitzlers Seelenqualen sind zweifellos echt."<sup>10</sup> This is evident in the correspondence. In almost every letter to Mizi in which he declared his love for her (even at the beginning of the relationship), he also expressed his extreme jealousy. He especially felt this because Mizi was an actress -- a profession he mistrusted on account of her constant encounters. As early as August 28, 1889 Schnitzler wrote to Mizi,

...ach ja! eine wahnsinnige Eifersucht, die mich besonders des Nachts ueberkam -- auf alles -- auf die Vergangenheit, die Gegenwart, die Zukunft -- Ich hasste alle Menschen, deinen Beruf, ich war toll -- ...Und ich bin ein Misstrauensvirtuos!...Es passiert mir auch, dass ich gemuetlich ueber die Strasse gehe oder da und dort bin, und ploetzlich faehrt mir irgend ein eifersuechtiges Gedanke durch den Kopf, dass es mich heiss ueberlaeuft....<sup>11</sup>

Schnitzler was tortured by his jealousies. He wrote to her on October 7, 1889,

Ich muss es wieder von deinem Munde hoeren: dass du keinen je geliebt hast als mich.-- Jetzt hoere ich nur diese verdammten Stimmen aus meinem Innern heraus, die mich hoehnen, wenn ich rueckhaltlos glauben, die mich niederschreien, wenn ich jubeln will. -- Ich thue nichts, gar nichts, versuche zu lesen; ja auch zu schreiben -- vergeblich.... -- Ich fuehle, dass ich heute meinen fixen Ideen nicht entrinnen kann, sie peinigen mich zu Tode.<sup>12</sup>

On the surface, the answer would have seemed to be marriage, for which Mizi asked Schnitzler repeatedly. She could not explain her relationship with him to her

family nor to herself for that matter. Schnitzler, however, did not want to marry. He based his irrational jealousies on societal mores, not only past relationships, but possible future encounters. He found it impossible to marry an actress -- especially one who had had lovers in the past and who would be brought to "higher" levels of society through marriage to him. His own hypocrisy, based on an irrational phobia, had vent in his ambivalent society.

Nonetheless, Mizi expected marriage, in light of their intense relationship. She was not shy about asking Schnitzler.<sup>13</sup> Schnitzler replied in the negative with a letter on November 18, 1890,

[Ich muss] dir wohl die Gruende meines Verhaltens aufklaeren, obwohl ich dich fuer so edel hielt, sie endlich zu begreifen. Du thust es aber nicht. -- Nein, du willst sie von mir hoeren, -- gut, hoere sie! -- "Meinen Leuten etwas beibringen." Bitte was. -- Ich schildere dir die Ereignisse, wie sie sich notwendig abspielen muessten -- schicke voraus, dass du fuer mich immer das einzig geliebte u. brave Maedel bist -- Meine Leute also: Wer ist das Maedel? -- Beim Theater!-- Hm -- sonst anstaendig? -- Ja. -- Immer gewesen? -- (Nun, das folgende wuerden sie nicht von mir, aber von andern hoeren:) - 2 Liebhaber; den ersten hat sie verlassen, der 2. hat sie fuers Theater ausbilden lassen, hat dann eine andre geheiratet, hat sie aber noch eine Zeit lang mit kleinern Betraegen unterstuetzt. -- Ihr Ruf? -- Nun, allgemein sagte man, sie gehe zum Theater, um einen reichen Souteneur oder eine gute Partie zu finden, was aber auch gemeine Verlaeumdung sein kann. Nun, und waehrend sie deine Geliebte war? -- Stets treu und brav gewesen, liebte mich echt; nur einmal war sie nahe daran, einen andern zu heiraten, was ja schliesslich vorkommen kann. -- Und du glaubst, dass dieses Maedchen dir die

Garantien fuer eine glueckliche Zukunft als deine Ehegattin bietet? -- Ja. Trotz alledem, denn sie ist eine andre geworden. -- Das glaubt man immer. -- -- Aber gut, ich breche mit meinen Leuten, denn, wenn sie deine Vergangenheit erfahren -- und sie erfahren sie -- geben sie nie u nimmer ihre Zustimmung. --

Also ich heirate dich und fuehre dich in eine Gesellschaft ein. In eine Gesellschaft, wo es uns mit Sicherheit passieren kann, dass in einem Salon, wo du als meine Frau vorgestellt wirst, sich ein Mann befindet, der dich in seinen Armen gehalten, ein Mann, der dich zu Haus, waehrend deine Mutter in der Kueche, auf den Divan geworfen und besessen, ein Mann, der, wenn wir den Salon verlassen, fuer sich hinlaecheln kann und sich denken -- das hab ich auch genossen - vor ihm, und ich war auch nicht der erste!<sup>14</sup>

After having bluntly stated his reservations and hindrances in his relationship with Mizi, he continued by pointing to the reasons for further pursuing the liason.

Nun, wenn ich dich fuer so unabwaschbar befleckt halte, warum, wirst du fragen, liebst du mich denn? -- Warum verlaesst du mich nicht? -- Wieso bin ich dir zu deiner Geliebten gut genug? -- Ich will es dir sagen. Weil ich dich eben so sehr liebe, dass ich ohne dich nicht leben kann. --Weil ich fuehle, dass in dir wirklich etwas heiliges und gutes steckt, das dich erhalten hat, das mich beseligt. Weil ich glaube, dass ich mit mir einmal fertig werden kann, und mir vorstellen, dass die Erinnerung an deine Vergangenheit nur mehr die Erinnerung an Irrthuemer fuer dich bedeutet -- weil ich mir einbilde, dass dir in meinen Armen wirklich eine neue Liebe, etwas suessres, hoeheres aufgegangen, so wie ich bei dir nie geahtes empfunden habe. -- Aber mich mit dir mitten in eine Welt stellen, wo die Leute sind, die mit ihren Erinnerungen herumgehn -- die dich ansehen und dich an die Schoenheiten deines Leibes, die Wonnen deines Liebesrausches erinnern, den sie erzeugt, getheilt haben? -- Das ists, was ich nicht kann. -- 15

After reading this letter, in particular, one realizes

the magnitude of Schnitzler's phobias, which he, however, justified within the context of social mores. The result is the ambivalent actions of the dilettante. Even though he could not marry her, he ideally wanted to stay with Mizi declaring his love always. In this manner he wanted to challenge the "rules" of society. He ended this lengthy letter with,

ich will...nur deine Liebe. -- verlange als einzigen Beweis deiner unendlichen Liebe nur - dass du einsiehst -- wir koennen allein gluecklich sein; aber im Kampf gegen den Hohn der Welt und gegen das Laecheln zweier Vergessner auf den Tod getroffen werden.<sup>16</sup>

Schnitzler told Mizi constantly that the two of them must be together. On September 4, 1889, he wrote, "Du Miza, ich sag dir, es ist nicht anders moeglich du musst bei mir bleiben!"<sup>17</sup> But on the other hand, Schnitzler continued to mistrust Mizi in regard to the future. In September 1890, he wrote to her,

Von der Tiefe deiner Liebe bin ich ueberzeugt, von ihrer Ewigkeit nicht. Es ist immer dasselbe, was mich anstarrt: sie hat sich schon geirrt -- Sie hat schon geweint -- hat einem andern mit den selben suessen Augen gesagt... "Wir zwei" -- hat schon gemeint, sie liebt fuer die Ewigkeit.<sup>18</sup>

But despite these feelings of mistrust and jealousy, in particular, of past relationships, as well as future, Schnitzler constantly asked Mizi for the "truth," how she had felt toward former lovers, and how she felt toward him in light of these past relationships. Nothing was more important to him than the truth. Time and again he repeated, "Wahrheit will ich, nichts andres

-- ... ich beschwoere dich, sei wahr!"<sup>19</sup> Schnitzler wanted to know her every action, and therefore, gave her very little freedom.<sup>20</sup>

With all of these conflicting demands on Mizi and his refusal of marriage, Schnitzler realized that he was torturing her. As early as the summer of 1889, he wrote, "Ich glaube, dass ich dich quaele -- Verzeih, verzeih, verzeih!"<sup>21</sup> Again in October 1889 he wrote,

Warum muss ich dir mit wuesten Klagen kommen statt mit suessen Liebesliedern? Wie erbaermlich ist das! Ich weiss, diesen Brief kaum dass er weg ist werd ich hundertmal bereuen -- aber ich werde ihn wegschikken [sic] -- Und du -- wirst du mir boese sein? Natuerlich -- und mit Recht.<sup>22</sup>

Schnitzler knew that he blamed Mizi for things beyond her control.<sup>23</sup>

Schnitzler's relationship with Mizi was problematic. His own neurosis nurtured, by his ambivalent milieu of turn-of-the-century Vienna, was culminated in this relationship. He found himself in a ambiguous situation, and did not know how to react. Instead, he turned to his catharsis, writing, where he controlled all the variables, and could act more justly vis-a-vis Mizi Gluemer. As Renata Wagner points out, "Er befreit sich am besten...wenn er darueber schreibt.... Beginn das Maerchen zu schreiben. 'Das Maerchen von den Gefallenen' -- Befreie mich-- Psychologisches aus meinem Verhaeltnis mit Mz. -- auch viel aeussere Umstaende -- hoffe, dass es gelingt!"<sup>24</sup>

The play itself was never a real success.<sup>25</sup> Otto Brahm provided Schnitzler with the reason why, by writing on June 6, 1894, "fuer die Buehne jedoch hat es meines Erachtens zuviel Psychologie und zu wenig Anschauung, zuviel Tendenz u. zu wenig Gestalt."<sup>26</sup> This is exactly what Schnitzler did; it was a personal psychological catharsis for him and he was quite aware of this, for he corresponded with Mizi almost daily concerning the play, while he was actually writing it.<sup>27</sup> Despite its overall failure, the play nonetheless provided Schnitzler with broader popularity. For example, it won him the respect and regard of Theodor Herzl, who first wrote to him in 1893, as a result of the play. Herzl praised Schnitzler for the work, saying that Das Maerchen is exactly how he would have wanted to write it.

Thus, the themes which many critics regarded as too "slandorous for the stage"<sup>28</sup> were, in fact, reflective of the society of the day, so much so that Herzl was able to recognize them and relate to them. Writing the play established another relationship, that between Schnitzler and Georg Brandes. Unlike the relatively short-lived correspondence between Herzl and Schnitzler, the Brandes relationship was lifelong. Brandes was impressed by certain aspects of Das Maerchen as a drama. On May 26, 1894, Brandes wrote to Schnitzler, "Die

Frauengestalten sind alle sehr fein und richtig gezeichnet und die Handlung des Stueckes ist gut und logisch gefuehrt.<sup>29</sup>

In the play itself, the circumstances and characters are modelled from Schnitzler's own situation. Fanny Theren, the young actress in the play, represents Mizi Gluemer. Just like Mizi, Fanny has had relationships in the past, but is now intensely involved with the thirty-year old writer Fedor Denner, who has the same ambivalent feelings, phobias and neuroses as Schnitzler. In describing Fedor, Schnitzler was sure to include, "In seinem Zorn liegt nicht der Wille zu verletzen, sondern tief schmerzliche Erregung."<sup>30</sup> There is a personal sentiment here.

The entire play centers around the interaction of Fanny and Fedor, each in turn surrounded by a circle of friends and acquaintances of their respective sex. Each character prevalent in Viennese society represents a different philosophy in regard to Das Maerchen von den Gefallenen, the women who have erred in the past. The dialogues between Fedor and his male friends, and Fanny and her female friends, structurally surround the dialogue between Fanny and Fedor. In reviewing the Schnitzler-Gluemer problems just discussed, the following can be listed, and are also found in the Fedor-Fanny relationship.

- 1) Jealousy on the part of the man in regard to the past relationships of the woman and her

possible future encounters (Past male relationships are not accountable);

- 2) Jealousy, especially intense due to the acting profession of the woman;
- 3) The man, even though intensely jealous, wants to know the "truth" of all past relationships;
- 4) Despite feelings of jealousy on the part of man, he cannot marry;
- 5) The man sees himself as being of a "higher" level of society; and
- 6) The man realizes he is torturing the woman; however, he cannot be without her.

Each of these problems is found in the dialogue between Fedor and Fanny.

In reference to past relationships and jealousies, Fedor says to Fanny:

Muss ich dann nicht mehr von deinen Lippen jene fremden Kuesse wegkuesen, hoer ich dann nicht mehr die Seufzer, die andere vor mir gehoert?- Gibt es dann keinen mehr der sich erinnern darf, wie suess er in deinen Armen geruht -- u. du selbst, kannst du deinen Traeumen gebieten, dass sie immer nur mein Bild vor dein Auge zaubern? (198).

Fanny sees the hypocrisy of the double standard when she tells Fedor, "...frage ich Sie um Ihre Vergangenheit?-- ...Warum zweifle ich keinen Augenblick an Ihnen --" (162)? ...Sie bleiben ja doch der Mann, dem alles erlaubt ist - und ich die Verlorene - fuer immer (173)! Fedor reminds Fanny of the type of woman she is. As an actress who has had previous encounters, she cannot help being on a lower level of the social scale. "Frauen wie du koennen die Treue nicht halten. Ihr seid ja deswegen

nicht schlecht, ihr seid eben so" (199). Just like Schnitzler, Fedor knows he tortures Fanny with this.

Fedor insists these forces are beyond his control. "Etwas Qualvolles geht in meiner Seele vor -- ich lehne mich vergebens dagegen auf...(172). As a result, just like Schnitzler, he wants to know the truth, hoping that this will free him. Fedor says to Fanny, "Sie muessen mir alles gestehen, alles, alles...Erzaehlen Sie nur endlich...Mir ist, als laege darin meine Befreiung..." (173). However, just as with Schnitzler, the truth in this instance is not the answer for him (173). This has also already been seen in the first scenes with Anatol. Thus, Fedor's problems are Schnitzler's problems, the dilettante caught in his own ambivalence.

As mentioned above, the Fedor-Fanny dialogue forms the core of the play. It is surrounded by dialogues which Fedor and Fanny hold with their respective friends, families, and acquaintances. The male dialogues and female dialogues are Schnitzler dealing with his own problems.

Fedor, steeped in his ambivalence, is caught between two philosophies. At one end, there is the philosophy represented by Dr. Leo Mildner, also a writer. Unlike Fedor, he is more of a rationalist. Though it is interesting to note that he has not had any real relationships with women, primarily, it is implied, because of his slovenly appearance. Therefore, when he

argues in favor of ignoring the Maerchen, he does not speak from personal experience. In this manner, Schnitzler is able to portray the argument for a more liberal view, but only from the vantage point of one who is not directly involved; hence, the hypocrisy. On this same side, there is Robert Well, a thirty-year-old painter who also portrays the liberal point of view. However, from the dialogue the spectator realizes that Robert, too, is a bit of a hypocrite, for he also would, by his actions, not accept a Gefallene.

At the other end is the conservative Wandel, a staid official, aged forty, who is described as korrekt. He argues strictly in favor of "upstanding morals" within society. He is betrothed to Fanny's sister, Klara, a bland and boring piano teacher.

Fedor engages in dialogues with both representatives and yet cannot escape his own indecisiveness. The male characters are all portrayed as weak and hypocritical, with Fedor caught in the middle. The females are the stronger of the two sexes. This is especially revealed through Fanny and her dialogues with Agathe, an older actress who speaks from experience. The bulk of this dialogue leads to the conclusion of the play.

What Schnitzler was unable to do in his life, he was able to do in Das Maerchen. Only within limits, does the play resemble Schnitzler's personal

circumstances. The similarities cease in the later scenes, in which Fanny is justified in challenging Fedor. Fanny, together with the encouragement of her friend Agathe, is able to portray stronger characteristics than Fedor or his circle of friends. Agathe, from experience, is forceful in her language and comments, when she advises Fanny to accept an acting contract which will physically separate her from Fedor, "Ein Mannsbild, -- was ich geradezu frevelhaft finde!-- Ich bitte Sie, wollen Sie Ihre Karriere opfern?" Agathe then turns to Fedor, and says, "Herr Denner, Sie verzeihen mir schon --aber die Maenner sind es nicht wert, dass man sich ihnen opfert -- sie tun es niemals fuer uns. -- " (193). These comments are strong given the milieu and what was expected of a woman. What Schnitzler was afraid to admit, he let the women characters verbalize. It is in this regard that Schnitzler's writing became a catharsis for him. He treated women with respect in his fiction.

As Agathe continues, the more succinct she becomes. She says to Fanny, "Kalkulieren Sie nur so: wenn er mich wirklich liebt so laesst er mich nicht fort, sondern -- heiratet mich! Hat er mich nicht genug lieb dazu -- dann darf er nicht verlaagen, dass ich ihm meine Karriere opfere." (193).

Fedor's final portrayal, especially in light of Agathe's strong statements, is very weak. He is not a

man of conviction. Even though throughout the play, he questioned the concept of the "fallen woman" and society's acceptance of it with Fanny and with his friends, he cannot totally reject it himself. As was stated in a review of the play, "Einen ganzen Akt hindurch schwankt Fedor Denner, der eben auch noch kein neuer Mensch, der auch erst ein Uebergangsmensch, also ein Halber ist, zwischen Neigung, Ueberzeugung und alten Vorstellungen."<sup>31</sup> It is here that one finds the key to Fedor's ambivalence. As a result of the changing times, Fedor is a "halber Mensch" unable to make any decisions.

When Fanny asks Fedor for his advice in regard to the acceptance of the acting contract, hoping this will prompt him into a decision for marriage, Fedor cannot reply at all. "Ja, ich glaube...ich wuerde annehmen." (193). A dialog between Fanny and Fedor ensues. Fedor becomes weaker by not taking any step at all. When Fanny reminds him of his questions concerning "Das Maerchen von den Gefallenen," he replies, "Ja, ja...es mag ein Maerchen sein! -- Es gibt aber noch ein tausendfach luegenhafteres und heimtueckischeres...das Maerchen von den Erhobenen!" (198). In other words, he indicates to Fanny that there is no hope -- no return or salvation from her original error. He has been brought to this point, where he would reveal even this much, by the fact that Fanny has to make a decision in regard to the contract, her career.

It is Fanny who must make a decision. Fedor does not have the strength to do so. The contract serves merely as a catalyst bringing the entire relationship to a crucial point. It accelerated what was inevitable, for Fedor continued to torture Fanny with his indecisiveness. In his indecision, he was pushing her to the brink -- making her stronger thereby. On the other hand, his passivity and inaction make him a weaker character. He seems to be begging Fanny to make the crucial decisions. This tortures Fanny even further. Fanny finally says to Fedor, "Du hast alles gewusst. Warum quaelst du mich so? Sag mir doch, was ich tun soll! Willst du dass ich fort gehe?" (199). Fedor can make no decision at all -- not even in the negative. He merely responds, "Und wenn du fortgehst, was dann?" (199). He sees her as unable to remain loyal. It is here that he implies she is of a lower status.

Wie -- ein Treuschwur? Auf ein ganzes Jahr-- du?...aber ich nehme den Schwur nicht an, weil Frauen wie du die Treue nicht halten koennen. Ihr seid ja deswegen nicht schlecht, ihr seid eben so! (199).

Fanny has now been pushed to the brink. In desperation she asks "Willst du mich toeten, Fedor?...Fedor nimm dich in acht, solange wirst du mich behandeln wie eine Dirne..." (199). Where Fedor can make no move, Fanny takes charge with forceful manner and language dictated by Schnitzler's stage direction. The scene ends with

FANNY. entschlossen So geh! -- Es is genug  
Fedor. Sehr stark Geh! -- Wenn du eitel bist,

um in meiner Liebe gluecklich zu sein, zu feig, um an mich zu glauben -- wenn du mich verachtest, an den ich mich klammern wollte, du mich wieder in die Tiefe stoessst, der dastand und ausrief: Nehmt die Reue von ihnen, dann nimm alle Schuld auf dich, was immer da draussen aus mir werden mag. Ich bin es muede, um deine Gnade zu flehen wie eine Suenderin u. vor einem auf den Knien zu liegen, -- der um nichts besserer ist als ich. Sie geht zum Schreibtisch, steckt den dort liegendem Kontrakt in ein Kuvert, auf das sie rasch die Adresse schreibt.

FEDOR. Fanny!

FANNY. ganz starr Mit uns beiden ist zu Ende, Fedor. Geh und vergiss mich, wie ich dich vergessen werde. (200).

Thus ends the drama. However, at the completion of Das Maerchen, Schnitzler was still very much involved with Mizi Gluemer. What he could not do in life, he did in fiction, where he controlled all the circumstances. It is interesting to note how the decision making is left to the woman. He, just like Fedor, could make no decision, which is characteristic of the ambivalent dilettante.

As an afternote, it should be mentioned that the Schnitzler-Gluemer relationship ended as abruptly and intensely as it began -- four years later, two years after the completion of Das Maerchen. While Mizi was away on an acting engagement, she had a brief affair, of which Schnitzler became aware. As a result, he rejected her totally -- her apologies and repentance --with vehemence.

Schnitzler discovered this affair as early as March

1893. He saw this as a personal insult, and wrote, "Was du aber an mir gethan, ist furchtbar und nie wieder gutzumachen."<sup>32</sup> He was very serious. His disgust for Mizi grew, as he continued to torture her with letters. On March 30, 1893, he wrote, "mein Ekel vor dir wird groesser als je meine Liebe war! -- <sup>33</sup> Schnitzler continued to write these letters through June 1893. They are lengthy and written quite often. His declarations of hate were as intense as those of love. At the end of a long letter of April 22, 1893, Schnitzler concluded,

So unendlich meine Liebe war, so unendlich ist mein Hass, und jede deiner Luegen, mit denen du mich gehoeht und erniedrigt von deinem ersten Kuss u. ersten Wort bis zu den letzten, werde dir zum Fluch und jede Thraene, die ich um dich Canaille vergossen, werde dir zum brennenden Leid, an dem du langsam verblutest! Geliebt wurdest du wie keine -- du wirst aber jetzt gehasst, wie noch nie ein Weib auf dieser Welt. Ueber dich komme was ich unverschuldet um dich erduldet -- daran musst du zu Grunde gehen! -- <sup>34</sup>

This passage not only sheds light on Schnitzler's view of himself, but it is also prophetic. Schnitzler could only see himself as being terribly wronged, without thinking of his treatment of Mizi in the relationship. He felt himself erniedrigt. He was obsessed with his dignity and status. Immediately preceding this passage, he wrote, "denn ich bin auch ein Mensch, und ich will mich nicht groesser machen als ich bin...."<sup>35</sup> In his next letter to Mizi of April 26, 1893, he repeated this almost verbatim, "Oh, ich bin nur ein

Mensch. -- Und ich mach mich nicht groesser als ich bin. -- "36 He ended that letter with "ich war von allem Anfang der Narr einer Komoedianten, die nur zuweilen auch selber die Komoedie vorspielte!"37 In life, he saw only his point of view. However, in Das Maerchen he was able to see the woman's point of view. It must be emphasized here that Das Maerchen was completed two years before the actual parting of Schnitzler and Gluemer.

As for the prophetic part of the letter of April 22, "daran musst du zu Grunde gehen" -- Mizi Gluemer committed suicide in 1925. Schnitzler was very much affected by it. Renata Wagner points to a Schnitzler diary entry, in which he wrote of Marie Gluemer, "Keinem Wesen verdankt mein Dichtertum so viel wie ihr...."38

Thus, Das Maerchen is the first drama which focuses on a specific stage of the dilettante's experience in turn-of-the-century Vienna. Schnitzler's continued problems, paralleling his own experiences at a given point in his life are developed further, each in a specific situation, in Schnitzler's subsequent works.

## Notes

1. "Deutsches Volkstheater, "Arthur Schnitzler: 'Das Maerchen'," Feuilleton, Beilage to No. 4712 of the Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung, v., col. 1.
2. Renate Wagner, Frauen um Arthur Schnitzler (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1980) 70-71.
3. Wagner 96.
4. Wagner 88.
5. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler Briefe 1875-1912 (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981) v.
6. Wagner 80.
7. Nickl and Schnitzler 46.
8. Nickl and Schnitzler 48-49.
9. Nickl and Schnitzler 48, 66.
10. Wagner 80.
11. Nickl and Schnitzler 55-56.
12. Nickl and Schnitzler 71.
13. Wagner 78.
14. Nickl and Schnitzler 99-100.
15. Nickl and Schnitzler 101.
16. Nickl and Schnitzler 102-03.
17. Nickl and Schnitzler 58.
18. Nickl and Schnitzler 82.
19. Nickl and Schnitzler 96.
20. Nickl and Schnitzler 95.
21. Nickl and Schnitzler 46.
22. Nickl and Schnitzler 73.
23. Nickl and Schnitzler 175.

24. Wagner 80.
25. Kurt Bergel, ed., Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel (Bern: Francke, 1956) 170-71.
26. Bergel 170.
27. Nickl and Schnitzler 167-68.
28. Bergel 56.
29. Bergel 55.
30. Arthur Schnitzler, "Das Maerchen," Die dramatischen Werke, vol. 1, (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962) 126. All further references to this work will be indicated in the text by the page number in parenthesis.
31. Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung, No. 4712, v, col. 2.
32. Nickl and Schnitzler 179.
33. Nickl and Schnitzler 181.
34. Nickl and Schnitzler 191.
35. Nickl and Schnitzler 191.
36. Nickl and Schnitzler 192.
37. Nickl and Schnitzler 194.
38. Wagner 96.

Das Vermaechtnis

On October 8, 1898, Das Vermaechtnis, a drama in three acts, opened at the Deutsches Theater in Berlin, following Das Maerchen by five years.<sup>1</sup> Schnitzler indicated there was a direct line of thought from Das Maerchen to Das Kind, the original title of Das Vermaechtnis,<sup>2</sup> which takes the theme of the dilettante a step further, in that it deals with the consequences of his actions (or inactions).

The protagonist, Hugo, a twenty-six-year-old lawyer from a bourgeois family, has a four-year-old son Franz out of wedlock with Toni Weber, a twenty-two-year-old woman from a lower level of society. Mother and child are clandestinely supported by Hugo; his family has no knowledge of Toni or Franz. This situation is a step beyond Das Maerchen, for despite the indecisiveness of the dilettante toward the question of marriage, he has fathered a child. However, there is no indication that marriage was ever discussed between Hugo and Toni. For Schnitzler, this is not of importance in this drama. Hugo therefore, disappears at the end of the first act; he dies as a result of a riding accident. But before this he reveals his secret to his mother, requesting that after his death, his family provide for both Toni and Franz by taking them into their home. However, under the circumstances, this becomes difficult in the face of society, since Hugo's father, Adolf Losatti, is

a respectable member of the bourgeoisie. He is a professor of economics, and has two other children, Fransika, twenty, and Lulu, thirteen. Both are perfect models for the society in which they live. For example, Fransika is about to be engaged to young Dr. Ferdinand Schmidt, a self-righteous figure, who is concerned only with correct images. Losatti's wife, Betty, is also quite respectable, fulfilling her role properly. But romance does not exist in her marriage, nor had it ever. Here Schnitzler juxtaposes the passion between Hugo and Toni with the staid acceptance between Losatti and his wife. As Schnitzler himself once commented, "Was ist unmoralischer, ...einen ungeliebten Mann zu heiraten, wie tausende Frauen es tun, oder einen geliebten nicht zu heiraten?"<sup>3</sup> Therefore, even though it is not a direct theme in this drama, as it was in Das Maerchen, marriage becomes a subtheme. It was an issue which occupied Schnitzler as well as society at large.

The examination of Das Vermaechtnis entails two perspectives. They are Schnitzler, the man, whose two-fold purpose in writing the drama is catharsis and self-vindication for his own actions, and Schnitzler, the playwright, who utilizes the depiction of milieu, which becomes an issue via a series of coincidences. This is done in order to examine various aspects of the human condition via relationships and liaisons.

Just as Das Maerchen, Das Vermaechtnis is based

upon Schnitzler's own experience. And just as Schnitzler indicated that, thematically, Das Vermaechtnis follows Das Maerchen, so, too, do the personal events that influenced the writing of the one drama after the other.

After Schnitzler's breakup with Mizi Gluemer, in 1893, the relationship which was the force behind Das Maerchen, Schnitzler was extremely lonely (a leitmotif for Das Vermaechtnis). For example, he repeatedly wrote of his loneliness to his friend Felix Salten. "Meine Stimmung recht schlecht. Leer, traurig. - Heut hab ich sogar geweint..."<sup>4</sup> or "Sehr, sehr, sehr allein."<sup>5</sup> Soon after, Schnitzler had a brief relationship with the actress Adele Sandrock. However, she was unable to fulfill his need for a deeper relationship. According to Renate Wagner, "Seine Sehnsucht nach einer geistigen Beziehung, einem tieferen Verstaendnis kann sie nicht erfuellen, weil sie bei aller Intelligenz viel zu egozentrisch ist."<sup>6</sup> The relationship was thus short-lived.

Schnitzler was alone, until he met Marie Reinhard on July 12, 1894. She was a music teacher, possessing all of the qualities Schnitzler sought. Not only was she pretty, but she had a fine sensitivity, which was needed to provide Schnitzler, the writer, with patience and understanding.<sup>7</sup> Nonetheless, Schnitzler's phobias of marriage and the thought of his loss of freedom

continued to haunt his relationship with Marie Reinhard.

Trotz ihres sanften gefuegigen Wesens beeengt es Schnitzler, mit Marie Reinhard ehggleich in einer Wohnung zusammenzuleben. Noch immer haben Frauen fuer ihn den Stellenwert, dass er sich eigentlich einen Harem wuenscht--sexuelles Vergnuegen, ohne sich darueber hinaus durch die Existenz des weiblichen Wesens weiter stoeren lassen zu muessen.<sup>8</sup>

Schnitzler, just as in the past, refused to marry even after Marie Reinhard became pregnant in early 1897. "Tatsache ist, dass er den Gedanken nicht ertragen kann, seine Freiheit zu verlieren. Da das fuer die jeweiligen Damen kaum akzeptabel ist, redet er meist davon, dass er einen eignen Haushalt nicht leisten koenne."<sup>9</sup> [Schnitzler continued to live with his mother, even after the death of his father.]

Despite accepting the responsibility for Marie and their unborn child, Schnitzler did not curtail his "freedom" vis-a-vis other women. Schnitzler wrote,

Ich liebe ja gewiss Mz. Rh., nur die -- aber die Liebe v. der Schmerz Mz. I. [Mizi Gluemer] ruehrt mich unbeschreiblich...Der RF [Rosa Freundenthal] schrieb ich vorgestern auch so, als wenn ich sie liebte -- Welche sonderbare Schwaeche. Ich habe nicht die Kraft jemanden aufgeben zu wollen; aber doch deswegen, weil nur jede etwas bedeutet. Auch an RF denk ich mit einer Art gereuhter Zaertlichkeit. Wenn Mz. Rh. etwas ahnte von all den Sachen -- sie wuerde es nicht glauben koennen. Bin ich verlogen? Nein ich bin es nicht, fuehle tief, dass ichs nicht bin--vielleicht weil ich mich dessen schaemte, wenn ichs einsehen muesste -- aber ich bin es nicht.<sup>10</sup>

Marie's pregnancy influenced Das Vermaechtnis, and just as Schnitzler shared Das Maerchen with Mizi

Gluemer, so too he shared Das Vermaechtnis with Marie. As he wrote to her on June 27, 1897 during her pregnancy, "Den Nachmittag hab ich angenehm u. allein auf meinem Zimmer verbracht, mit den Entruesteten beschaeftigt, u. einem neuen Stueck, dessen 3 Akte ich mit einem ploetzlichen Interesse skizziert habe (es ist mir schon in Wien eingefallen) u. das vorlaeufig unter dem Titel 'Das Kind' gehen soll."<sup>11</sup>

In another letter to Marie Reinhard (July 18, 1897), Schnitzler again mentioned "Das Kind," which he saw as dealing with love in relation to the future. In the same letter, he also assured her of his responsibility toward her and the unborn child. "Sorgen, mein Schatz, mach dir ueber alle diese Dinge nicht, alles wird so gut verlaufen wie bisher."<sup>12</sup> Even though Schnitzler accepted his responsibilities, he needed an outlet in his writing. Hence, his catharsis by writing Das Vermaechtnis. Not only was it a catharsis, but a self-vindication of his actions. Hugo in Das Vermaechtnis accepts his responsibilities more than Schnitzler (especially, in light of Schnitzler's clandestine relationship with Rosa Freudenthal; Hugo does not engage in this type of activity). In reference to Schnitzler, the man, compared with Schnitzler, the playwright of Das Vermaechtnis, Renate Wagner writes, "Schnitzler in seinen Werken nichts weniger als ein Moralist bricht im Privatleben immer wieder aus der

Monogamie aus, u. postuliert 'Warum kann man sie nicht alle haben, jede fuer sich allein, jede ohne Luege und ohne Qual fuer sich und die andern'."13

Das Vermaechtnis was completed before the still-birth of Marie Reinhard's and Schnitzler's child. Had this occurred before the completion of the play, the themes might have been handled differently, just as the outcome of Das Maerchen might have been different, had Schnitzler ended his relationship with Marie Gluemer before its completion.

A closer look at the Reinhard-Schnitzler relationship is warranted. Unfortunately, there is very little mention of Marie Reinhard in Schnitzler's autobiographical prose. There is barely a reference to her in Jugend in Wien.<sup>14</sup> The correspondence between Reinhard and Schnitzler is also disappointing. Unlike the fiery Gluemer-Schnitzler correspondence, there are very few emotional outbursts (or otherwise informative passages) in the Reinhard-Schnitzler correspondence. "Mizi ich hab dich gern! so gern! so rasend gern!-- Fuehlst du's auch jetzt, waehrend du allein bist, u. spuerst, wie meine Liebe dich umhuellet?"<sup>15</sup> is as emotional as Schnitzler ever becomes with Marie Reinhard. Generally his tone toward her is paternalistic. For example, "Meine Geliebte Mizi, gestern hab ich keine Nachricht von dir erhalten- u. heute kann auch keine mehr kommen, da Sonntag ist und

Nachmittag keine Briefe ausgetragen werden. Das ist sehr traurig mein Schatz --."16 It was not until her death, on March 18, 1899 as a result of an infection after an appendectomy, several months after the opening of Das Vermaechtnis, that Schnitzler documented, in letters, his love for Mizi Reinhard and his deep loss. On March 22, 1899, Schnitzler wrote to Hugo von Hofmannsthal,

Ein Tag ist schrecklicher als der andre; es ist viel grauenvoller und hoffnungsloser als irgend ein Wort darueber. Ich habe das Gefuehl, fertig zu sein; Zeichen genug werden mir gesandt! Vom Morgen aus der Ausblick ins leere, leere -- die Erinnerungen an ihr Leben Voll Pein, an ihren Tod von einer grenzenlosen Entsetzlichkeit, die letzten Blicke, die letzten Worte unvergesslich - die letzte Angst auf immer alles zerstoerend, was noch kommen koennte. Eine ungeheure Gleichgiltigkeit [sic] gegen alles, was mir auch Inhalt des Lebens schien -- schauen ins leere, greifen ins leere, jammern ins leere.<sup>17</sup>

Several weeks later Schnitzler wrote to Georg Brandes,

Vor sieben Wochen ist das Geschoepf begraben worden, das ich von allen Menschen der Erde am liebsten gehabt habe, meine Geliebte, Freundin und Braut -- die durch mehr als vier Jahre meinem Leben seinen ganzen Sinn u. seine ganze Freude gegeben hat, -- und seither daemmere ich hin, aber existire kaum mehr.<sup>18</sup>

It should be noted that here Schnitzler referred to Marie Reinhard as his Braut. Together with his paternalistic instincts toward Marie Reinhard during her lifetime, this indicates the sense of limited responsibility which Schnitzler felt in his relationship to her.

Even though the impetus for Das Vermaechtnis is

based largely on Schnitzler's own life experience with Marie Reinhard, it alone would not have been enough for the success of the play.<sup>19</sup> As discussed above, the phenomenon of the dilettante in turn-of-the-century Vienna, as represented by the plot of Das Vermaechtnis, was not an uncommon one. The situation was merely part of the milieu. As stated in the review of Das Vermaechtnis, "Man amusiert sich ausserhalb, man vermaehlt sich innerhalb der eigenen Sphaere. Das ist ein Stueck unserer Gesellschaftsordnung."<sup>20</sup> The society was riddled with hypocrisy, and Das Vermaechtnis is built upon Hugo's hypocrisy in perpetuating a clandestine relationship during his lifetime. The theme of hypocrisy is further augmented by Schnitzler's depiction of Adolf Losatti's attitude toward this situation. Another leitmotif is that of loneliness. It is interesting to note that Schnitzler portrayed his stronger characters as women. They are Toni, Betty Losatti and Emma, Betty's widowed sister-in-law, who express emotion, especially the fear of loneliness. A further insight into psychology in Das Vermaechtnis is Schnitzler's understanding of various relationships, such as that between lovers and that between mother and child, especially mother and son. These leitmotifs are interwoven into the central theme -- that of the dilettante in his society.

The entire situation is a result of an original

inaction by a so-called dilettante. Given his general characteristics, the dilettante in his ambivalence meanders, and is unable to make any firm decisions or make any serious societal commitments. Hugo's particular situation is an outgrowth of his inability (for whatever reason) to marry his son's mother. The focus in this drama is on the consequences of the dilettante's action (or inaction), which in this case, is reflected in his responsibilities to Toni, the mother, and Franz, his son. The key word here is responsibility. Despite Hugo's indecision with respect to marriage, he does not forsake his responsibility to mother or child. This is borne out in the entire play, and specifically, in Hugo's estimation of Toni. Just as Schnitzler treated Mizi Reinhard in a paternalistic manner, so, too, does Hugo treat Toni. For example, Hugo mentions to his mother, "...weisst du, Mama, klug ist sie schon, aber selbstaendig ist sie gar nicht-- und manchmal selbst wie ein Kind<sup>21</sup> ...Sie ist wirklich noch wie ein Kind..." (415). Therefore, it is on his deathbed that he finally reveals his secret, so that Toni and Franz will not be forsaken. In proving that Hugo had accepted his responsibilities during his lifetime and into his death, Schnitzler, on the one hand, is vindicating society's poor image of the dilettante, while providing a catharsis for himself. One must keep in mind that the groundwork for Das

Vermaechtnis was conceived while Marie Reinhard was pregnant -- before her stillbirth. Schnitzler is, therefore, thinking through the ultimate consequences of his own circumstance. On the other hand, however, we can continue to interpret the dilettante as a less than noble figure, in that Hugo only admits this situation upon his impending death. During his lifetime, he was unable to openly confront the consequences of his indecisiveness; hence, the clandestine relationship and household of Toni and Franz.

Schnitzler's statements, in Das Vermaechtnis, on the dilettante, per se, within his society, virtually end with the first act, when Hugo dies. Instead, the consequences are given total focus, thereby introducing the subthemes of the play. Hypocrisy continues to be an issue, as seen through Losatti, and the leitmotif of loneliness as seen through the female characters. It should be noted that negative aspects are represented through males; and positive aspects through females. However, Schnitzler would not have been able to develop these themes further had it not been for another element, namely, coincidence, which he injected. Coincidence makes it possible for Schnitzler to explore the situation. Not only must Hugo die, but so, too, must Franz, in order that full focus be on Toni, who faces the issue of loneliness.

Auch spielt der Zufall eine gar grosse Rolle  
im Ganzen. Schnitzler braucht ihn schon um

seine These ueberhaupt stellen zu koennen. Hugo muss verungluecken, damit Toni ins Haus seiner Eltern komme. Das Kind muss sterben--...seine Mutter jeden Halt verliere dort, wo sie der Todte verankert wissen wollte.<sup>22</sup>

As part of his own catharsis Schnitzler, just as in Das Maerchen, places the female protagonist in direct consequence to the dilettante's original inability to commit himself. It is, therefore, the woman, and not the man, who must make definitive life decisions. Schnitzler, in reality, would not have allowed a woman to justify herself in face of a man. However, he allows it in his fiction, where he can admit the weakness of the male. As Barbara Gutt writes, Schnitzler's sympathy for women stems from his own ambivalence towards society and private life.<sup>23</sup> The male characters, on the other hand, reveal negative human traits such as hypocrisy. Losatti is an example. Even though he had taken Toni and Franz into his home as a result of Betty's persuasion, Losatti was never comfortable with this decision. He was too concerned with maintaining a good image for society. This becomes especially evident after Franz's death, when he is in favor of evicting Toni.

Waere unser Hugo am Leben geblieben, er haette dieses Verhaeltnis sicher selbst geloest. Er haette eine Frau genommen aus unserem Kreise- aus der anstaendigen Gesellschaft, zu der wir gehoeren, wie es schliesslich fast alle jungen Maernner tun, die ihre Eltern lieb haben und in der Welt u. mit der Welt leben wollen. (461).

However, Losatti is not totally repulsive. He does

have some genuine human feelings toward Franz, his grandson. "Wie sie alle an dem Kind haengen..."(445), or after Toni leaves, Losatti says "...ich kann es nicht leugnen -- der Abschied hat mich doch ein wenig bewegt (459). Both of these statements are directed toward Dr. Ferdinand Schmidt, Fransika's fiancée. Schnitzler portrays another negative human aspect, jealousy, through Schmidt. Dr. Schmidt is the only character who displays no sympathy whatsoever toward Toni. He cannot recognize her pain at Hugo's death. He says to her, "Achten Sie doch den Schmerz der Angehoerigen. Ihr Rasen hilft ja nichts." Not only does he deny her feelings with this statement, but he also considers her an outsider by referring to Hugo's Angehorigen. And when all, even Adolf Losatti, find it too difficult to tell Toni to leave the Losatti household, Ferdinand agrees to tell her (453).

These actions are motivated by Ferdinand's jealousy of Hugo. As Ferdinand explains to Emma,

Dass wir [he and Hugo] einander fremd gegeneber gestanden sind -- mag ja richtig sein. Ich bin eben ganz wo anders hergekommen -- aus einer armseligen und miserablen Kindheit -- waehrend er die Sorge nie gekannt hat. Er hat von Jugend auf alles gehabt, was das Leben schoen macht -- und ich sehr lange nichts. So etwas macht einander fremd...(436).

Thus jealousy, often found in a relationship between two peers, is another human condition which Schnitzler interweaves into the portrayal of his hypocritical

society. A further example of jealousy between peers occurs between Agnes (Emma's seventeen-year-old daughter), who admired Hugo from afar, and Toni.

A relationship based on jealousy is just another type of human liaison. Thus, in Das Vermaechtnis, Schnitzler not only explored relationships between men and women--passionate (Hugo and Toni) juxtaposed against passionless (Adolf and Betty), but also between those of the same sex.

Another human tie found in Das Vermaechtnis is that between parent and child, in which responsibility is also a key word. Hugo reveals his secret to his mother, transferring the responsibility he had to his child to the responsibility Betty will have to her son in keeping his last request. Toni has a responsibility to her son which is recognized by all, in that no one is willing to separate Toni from Franz. Here Schnitzler probes mother-son relationships in particular. Toni and Franz represent the young mother and young son, whereas Betty and Hugo represent the mature mother and mature son. In reference to the latter situation, Betty says to Emma, "Aber dass er ganz wo anders daheim ist als bei uns ...Dass es etwas gibt was ihm teurer war, als wir alle, -- als ich -- nein das hab' ich nicht gehant (428). The phrase als ich indicates the special Freudian liaison existing between mother and son.

Another parent-child pair is Emma and her daughter,

Agnes. Emma also has a responsibility to her daughter. When Agnes is upset at her mother's willingness to take Toni into her home, even at the cost of breaking relations with the Losattis, Emma reconsiders. Her first responsibility is to her daughter, Agnes.

This action on the part of Emma may have been motivated by yet another factor, that of loneliness, a leitmotif of Das Vermaechtnis. Emma feels she had regained Agnes, for life since after the loss of Hugo, Agnes promises to stay with her mother. Emma was, thus, merely trying to assuage her own fear of loneliness. As a result, Emma need not rely on Toni for companionship. Even though Emma was able to empathize more fully with Toni's situation, due to her own similar situation, in the last analysis, her own feelings in combination with a responsibility to her daughter were more powerful.

Emma and Toni, because of their circumstances, are especially concerned and preoccupied with the fear of loneliness in Das Vermaechtnis, but to a lesser degree, so too, is Betty. She had feared loneliness, and, therefore, had accepted a marriage without passion. Through their expression of the universal fear of loneliness, the women Schnitzler portrayed in Das Vermaechtnis are more likeable than the men. They are forced to be more courageous, since their actions are almost always based on the ambivalence of their weaker male counterparts.

The central theme of the dilettante and his

ambivalent actions vis-a-vis the female highlights various human responses -- hypocrisy, jealousy, and loneliness. By interweaving these leitmotifs through the dilettante, Schnitzler portrayed the human condition in Das Vermaechtnis.

## Notes

1. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler Jugend in Wien: Eine Autobiographie (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968) 340.
2. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler Briefe 1875-1912 (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981) 336.
3. Renate Wagner, Frauen um Arthur Schnitzler (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1980) 118.
4. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 209.
5. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 211.
6. Wagner 100.
7. Wagner p. 115.
8. Wagner 94-95.
9. Wagner 108.
10. Wagner 121.
11. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 332.
12. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 336.
13. Wagner 121.
14. Nickl and Schnitzler, Jugend in Wien 328.
15. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 270.
16. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 282.
17. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Arthur Schnitzler: Briefwechsel (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1964) 119-120.
18. Kurt Bergel, ed., Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel (Bern: Francke, 1956) 75.
19. J. J. David, "Das Vermaechtnis," Feuilleton, Neues Wiener Journal, Nr. 1835, 1 Dezember 1898, 1-2.
20. David 1, col. 1.

21. Arthur Schnitzler, Das Vermaechtnis, Die dramatischen Werke, vol. 1, (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962) 408. All further references to this work will be indicated in the text by the page number in parenthesis.

22. David 1, cols. 2-3.

23. Barbara Gutt, Emancipation bei Arthur Schnitzler (Berlin: Volker Spiess, 1978) 17-30.

### Zwischenspiel

Zwischenspiel, a comedy in three acts, had its premiere in 1906, and it was for this play that Schnitzler won the Grillparzer prize in 1908. It is a good example of the theme of ambivalence. Because Schnitzler presents his audience with a couple married for seven years, he portrays a conventional condition to challenge his concept of freedom for the male in society.

In his review of the play, Maximilian Harden saw freedom, in all of its connotations, as the key issue of the drama.<sup>1</sup> In Zwischenspiel, the protagonist Amadeus, as usual, the male, has not matured much beyond his dilettante predecessor, Anatol, with regard to acceptance of responsibility and his resulting ambivalence. Beginning with Anatol, who is totally unattached in any conventional sense for any length of time, and through to Amadeus, in Zwischenspiel, the reader/spectator sees the same progression as is encapsulated within the one play, Reigen. From Anatol, the development continued to the commitment of one beloved found in Das Maerchen. From Das Maerchen, there was a progression to Das Vermaechtnis, where a child out of wedlock is involved. Finally, the development continued to Zwischenspiel, in which there is the interaction of the conventionally married couple-- Amadeus, musician, and his wife, Caecilie, a singer.

They have a young child, whom they both love. Therefore, outwardly, in terms of societal commitment, there has, indeed, been a progression since Anatol's circumstance.

The situation presented in Zwischenspiel, as in the earlier plays, parallels Schnitzler's own experiences. By 1906, Schnitzler was married to Olga Gussmann, a singer twenty years his junior. At that point, their son, Heinrich, born in 1902, one year prior to their marriage, was three years old. From the evidence in correspondence and diaries, Schnitzler was seemingly happy. Nonetheless, there is some doubt. Zwischenspiel is Schnitzler's catharsis, for he continued, through this drama, to toy with the concept of male freedom versus the commitment of marriage.

Schnitzler's feelings of ambivalence never left him, even at the stage of his life where he was supposedly happy. As Schnitzler wrote to Olga in 1901, "Es steckt ein tiefer Lebensschaden in mir, ich spuer' es immer mehr; ich habe nicht die Gabe, rein den Moment zu geniessen. Es ist, als wenn immer unruhige Wolken schwebten, manchmal nur blasse, weisse, duenne, aber ich kenne den klaren Himmel sozusagen nicht."<sup>2</sup> His soul was, thus, caught in his own ambivalence, and his writing, in which he could experiment with a situation beyond the realm of convention, continued to be a vent for these feelings. As mentioned in a review in Die

Nation, "Sie [the characters] kennen beide keinerlei  
äußere Rücksichtnahme auf das billige Urteil der  
Leute. Die konventionelle Heiligkeit der ehelichen  
Institutionen gilt ihnen nicht."<sup>3</sup>

Within the realm of experimentation and the defiance of convention, the psychology of Amadeus' actions in regard to his freedom leads to exposing further subthemes. One of these subthemes is truth. Amadeus' and Caecilie's marriage was based on a vow to be truthful to one another. At the beginning of the drama, Amadeus says to his friend Albertus, "Du kennst uns doch lang genug, mich und Caecilie, und weisst, dass unsere Ehe vor allem auf vollkommene Aufrichtigkeit gegruendet ist.... Wir haben einander noch nie etwas verschwiegen."<sup>4</sup>

Using this as a guideline in their marriage, Schnitzler experiments in Zwischenspiel, which he is afraid to do in his own marriage. Thus, when Amadeus and Caecilie no longer feel the passion they once did, and therefore, find themselves attracted to different partners, they, as they promised, tell one another about it. Nevertheless, it was Amadeus, with his idea of male freedom, more than Caecilie, who insisted on this "truthfulness" and its consequences. Amadeus regards this as being totally truthful to oneself. What he fails to see, however, is that by discussing his attractions (to others), succumbing to them and having

Caecilie do the same is, in fact, not being truthful to his own feelings at all. For example, it is only for the duration of his involvement with Graefin Friederike that he can accept Caecilie's friendship with Prince Sigismund. It is important to point out here that Caecilie merely sees another; there is no intimate involvement. Schnitzler, in the drama, was sure to emphasize this fact. It is for this reason that emphasis is on male freedom. However, this does bring another subtheme to light, that of the female's situation in turn-of-the-century Vienna, her social, as well as her professional status.

Verbal truthfulness, as opposed to emotional truthfulness, allowed Schnitzler, the experimenter, to employ psychology to the fullest. "Er fuehrt die psychologischen Komplikationen klug und sicher und sein Experiment nimmt einen den Bedingungen der gewaehlten Stoffe logisch entsprechenden Verlauf."<sup>5</sup> Thus, Schnitzler exposed universal truths, in that the conditions under which individuals of opposite sex can live together remain the same as they always have been. "Modern aufgeklaerte Anschauungen, oder nicht: die Bedingungen unter denen Menschen miteinander leben koennen, bleiben die Gleichen.... An die Stelle der Menschen treten psychologische Begriffe. Sie behalten das letzte Wort."<sup>6</sup>

This concept is highlighted through the creation of

distinct characterizations. In this regard, Zwischenspiel can be compared with Anatol for their respective portrayals. Both Zwischenspiel and Anatol utilize the juxtaposition of different character types. Amadeus in Zwischenspiel, just as Anatol did, reacts according to his emotions. When Amadeus no longer feels passion for Caecilie, a situation in which Anatol always finds himself vis-a-vis his partners, he wants to end the marriage in a conventional sense so that he may enter into an affair. The emphasis is on conventional, since ambivalence never allows him to want complete separation.

Albertus, Amadeus' writer friend, is the practical counterpart to Amadeus, just as Max is to Anatol. Albertus tries to analyze Amadeus, as well as the situation. Amadeus is a musician and composer, dealing with the verbally inexpressible. Albertus, on the other hand, is the writer, who deals with words, a tangible medium. Schnitzler utilized these respective professions to further contrast the emotional and the practical condition.

Another character of interest in Zwischenspiel is Caecilie. She combines the emotion of Amadeus with the rationalism of Albertus. As a result, she is the wisest and most noble character in the drama.

Looking at these characters within the context of the drama, one finds ample examples of ambivalence on

the part of the male, who feels himself confined by the conventional bounds of marriage. The situation itself is one in which Amadeus' ambivalence is more than apparent. Even though he wants an affair with Graefin Friederike, and therefore, yearns for the freedom to do so, Amadeus does not want to break totally with Caecilie. In his attempt to be truthful, Amadeus indicates that not only is he attracted to Friederike, but Caecilie is attracted to Prince Sigismund. In this manner, he deemphasizes his breach of faithfulness; it is easier to project this onto Caecilie. He bluntly says to her, "Du fuehlst dich zu ihm hingezogen" (909), or "Ich halte dich nicht, Caecilie, wenn es dich anderswohin zieht; -- du hast gewusst, dass ich dich niemals halten werde" (910).

By doing this, he shirks his responsibility for accepting the blame for the potential breakup of the marriage, while actually initiating it, and thus, revealing his weakness as a character. There are subsequent examples of this same phenomenon, in which Amadeus' ambivalent nature reflects the same dilettantism as Anatol. When Caecilie requests that Amadeus show special effort to restore the marriage, he replies, "Es will nicht...es darf nicht wollen. Was haette es fuer einen Sinn? Heute waere ich vielleicht der Staerkere, -- und vielleicht noch ein anderes Mal-- und endlich kaeme doch der Tag, an dem ich unterliegen

wuerde" (910). It is interesting to note that the use of this specific vocabulary does indeed point to a weak character. As does Anatol, Amadeus succumbs to his emotions.

His ambivalence is further and, perhaps, more clearly expressed in the professional and personal living situation Amadeus proposes to Caecilie. Even though he wants the freedom to enter into an affair, and therefore, reciprocates for Caecilie, he, nonetheless, does not want to break totally his tie to Caecilie. His proposal is, therefore, based upon the convenience of their complementary professions. "Es liegt doch eigentlich kein vernuenftiger Grund vor, dass sich unsere musikalischen Beziehungen umgestalten muessten" (913). This situation may be plausible, but what truly breaks with convention, and more importantly for the theme of ambivalence, is that, on the one hand, Amadeus wants the freedom to enter into an affair, while on the other hand, he wants to maintain the security of his home life. Amadeus suggests they continue living together as in the past! He says to Caecilie, "Je ruhiger ich die Sachlage ueberschaue, um so unsinniger erscheint es mir, dass wir wie die ersten besten geschiedenen Eheleute voneinandergehen, dass wir unser schoenes gemeinschaftliches Heim aufgeben sollen..." (914).

Schnitzler, by choosing music as Amadeus' and

Caecilie's profession, introduced his intentions at the very beginning of the drama, in the title itself. "Zwischenspiel" ("Intermezzo") is a technical musical term which signifies an important musical event before and after, whereas the Zwischenspiel is not clearly any decisive movement unto itself. Hence, Amadeus' stage in life; he is writing a Zwischenspiel, a movement of indecision -- key word for ambivalence. In Act One, Amadeus says to Caecilie, "Zum Vorspielen ist es noch nichts; aber die Hauptthemen kennst du doch...das Zwischenspiel...er ist am Klavier und spielt einige Töne" (907). This conversation between Amadeus and Caecilie is repeated, soon after, with the added forewarning from Schnitzler, that the movement which is to follow will have profoundly unfavorable consequences.

Caecilie            Warum spielst du nicht weiter?

Amadeus            Lacht kurz.

Caecilie            War es nicht das Zwischenspiel?

Amadeus            Nickt.

Caecilie            Noch fern Hast du dich schon entschieden, wie du es bezeichnen wirst? Bleibt es bei "Capriccio"?

Amadeus            Vielleicht Capriccio doloroso. Es ist seltsam, wie man manchmal seine eigenen Einfälle anfangs missversteht. Die verborgene Traurigkeit des Themas hast du mir entdeckt (912).

It is within this conversation that the entire course of the play is unfolded. Here Schnitzler has given the

reader or spectator a foreboding of his theme and the resulting consequences. This is done not only in Amadeus' ambivalent vocabulary, but in the specific stage directions as well. It is Caecilie who initiates this conversation with Amadeus who, in turn, reacts first in stage directions only, which is significant for his weak character. Only later, does he finally verbalize those feelings. The prediction of negative consequences is Schnitzler's understanding of the results of his own ambivalent soul, if he had been given the freedom to vent these feelings in reality. He fully realized the consequences, and gave them total expression in his drama. As an indirect result, he lent justice to his women characters who, he realized, were victims of his own ambivalent feelings in reality.

Thus, as in the earlier dramas, writing was Schnitzler's catharsis, in which the women of his imagination are heroines. The men are indecisive and foolish. For example, Amadeus does not believe that Caecilie's career can advance on its own. This situation is specifically based on Schnitzler's life experience. As mentioned above, Olga Gussmann, just like Caecilie, was a singer. She felt she could have advanced her career, if she had not been known as Frau Schnitzler. This eventually led to the Schnitzler divorce in 1921. Schnitzler gave no credence to these arguments. However, in Zwischenspiel, Olga

Schnitzler's position was realized. But before this happened in the drama, Amadeus verbalized Schnitzler's feelings on the same subject. Amadeus, who is in the same profession as his wife, says to Caecilie, "Ohne mich zu ueberheben, halte ich es fuer unwahrscheinlich, dass du einen besseren Korrepetitor findest als mich" (913). In contrast to reality, where one cannot predict the outcome of a situation, in the drama, Schnitzler could and did.

Caecilie, in fact, becomes successful as soon as her conventional marriage is dissolved. However, it is interesting to note that the reader learns of Caecilie's success through another female, her friend Marie, who is married to Albertus. Marie says to Amadeus, "Sie hat ja wieder Kolossale Erfolg gehabt!" (917), and again, "Uebrigens scheint mir wirklich dass Caecilie in der letzten Zeit sehr gewachsen ist. Ihre Stimme scheint mir voller, waermer...beseelter sozusagen" (918). Caecilie herself declares her growth to Amadeus,

Ich bin schon heute nicht mehr, die ich war, Amadeus...Oder vielleicht war ich immer dieselbe und habe es nur nicht gewusst; und es ist jetzt etwas von mir abgefallen, das mich frueher umhuelte hat...Ja, so muss es sein: denn jetzt fuehle ich alle Wuensche die frueher her an mir herabgeglitten sind wie an einem fuehllosen eiserner Panzer...jetzt fuehle ich sie ueber meinen Leib, ueber meine Seele gleiten, und sie machen mich beben und gluehen. Die Erde scheint mir voll Abenteuer, der Himmel wie von Flammen strahlend, und mir ist, als saeh ich mich selbst, wie ich mit ausgebreiteten Armen dastehe und warte (936).

Both Schnitzler and Amadeus do not admit this. In reality, Schnitzler was unable to verbalize this at all. However, in Zwischenspiel he justified Caecilie's, and Olga's position through the actions surrounding Amadeus. This has a negative effect for Amadeus, in that he begins to take on unsympathetic characteristics.

In general, all the male characters become unsympathetic, including Albertus. Where Amadeus bases too much on emotional motivation, Albertus bases too much on pure reason which is similar to the straightforwardness of Max vis-a-vis Anatol).

When Amadeus feels he wants Caecilie back, but only after his own affair with Friederike has ended, Albertus reconfirms his original contention.

Freundschaft zwischen zwei Menschen verschiedenen Geschlechts ist immer eine gefaehrliche Sache -- sogar zwischen Eheleuten. Wenn die Seelen sich allzu gut verstehen, so reißen sie allmaehlich auch das mit, was man gern bewahren moechte; und wenn die Sinne zueinander fließen, so gleitet mehr von der Seele nach, als wir ihnen gerade nachsenden wollten. Ein ewiges Gesetz, mein Lieber, das die tiefe Unsicherheit aller irdischen Beziehungen zwischen Mann and Weib verschuldet, und nur, wer es nicht kennt, vertraut den andern und sich selbst. -- Du erlaubst. Er streicht sich Butter auf ein Kipfel (943).

Albertus is always there to remind Amadeus of the rational counterpart. He is Amadeus' alter ego, used to balance or temper Amadeus' inclinations, which are based on his emotions. Albertus, however, is too perfect; he seems to have the answers to everything without showing

any emotion. This is evident in the above stage directions where his words to Amadeus are to be taken as lightly as buttering his biscuit. Together, Amadeus and Albertus would make a more sympathetic character. Each alone is incomplete, and therefore, has faults as a character.

In one of his first lengthy encounters with Amadeus, Albertus philosophizes about the perfect relationship. For example, he advises Amadeus to see adventure in fantasy, and not necessarily in reality.

Abenteuer...! Muessen sie denn gerade erlebt sein? Einem Maler, der ueber Stuemperei erhaben und ueber Jugendtorheit hinaus ist, genuegt ein Modell fuer all Gestalten, die er traemt und schafft -- und den, der zu leben weiss, erwarten alle Abenteuer, nach denen ihn geluestet, im Frieden seines Heims. Er erlebt sie geradeso wie ein anderer, aber ohne Zeitverschwendung, ohne Unannehmlichkeiten, ohne Gefahr; und wenn er Phantasie hat, bringt ihm seine Gattin, ohne dass sie es ahnt, lauter uehelicke Kinder zur Welt (903).

He continues with "words of wisdom" found in his own aphorism,

Man darf die Menschen nie darueber aufklaeren, was sie einem bedeuten. Ich habe darauf einen Spruch gemacht:

Kennst du mich, so stoerst du mich,  
kenn' ich dich, so hab' ich dich  
(903).

Albertus continues to be the one with all of the answers.

Schnitzler was constantly portraying his own situation; Albertus is Schnitzler, the writer, while Amadeus is Schnitzler, the man. In order to illustrate

this idea, Schnitzler recreates his own situation in both Amadeus and Albertus. He juxtaposed Amadeus' "real" situation with writing the music to his Zwischenspiel, while his conversations with Albertus reflect Amadeus' consciousness of the interrelation of both. Albertus, as a writer, has more control in fiction than in reality. "In einem Stueck kann ich ja den Fall viel klarer darstellen, als er sich tatsaechlich praesentiert, ohne das ueberfluessige episodische Beiwerk, mit dem uns das Leben verwirrt. Vor allem habe ich das voraus, dass die Zuschauer in den Zwischenakten nicht dabei und ich indessen mit euch machen kann, was ich will" (924). How much more clearly can Schnitzler present his own case as a writer?

In subsequent conversations, as Amadeus' own situation becomes more complicated, especially in light of challenging Prince Sigismund to a duel for his wife, even though Sigismund was never intimately involved with Caecilie, Albertus continues to offer advice by continuing his fictitious story, which is the libretto for Amadeus' Zwischenspiel. The concept of reality and fiction (Sein und Schein) is constantly intertwined with Schnitzler, as well as with his characters, Amadeus and Albertus. Amadeus, who is controlled by his emotions, becomes angry with Albertus' pessimistic themes. "Wuetend Das interessiert mich absolut nicht. Ich bitte dich, hoere mir davon auf! Ich erfinde dir keine

Schluesse fuer deine Wurstelkomoedie! Wir befinden uns im Leben, mitten im Leben" (942)! This is another clear indication of Schnitzler playing with reality and invention.

The conversations between Amadeus, who acts and thinks according to his emotions, and Albertus, the rational writer, is nothing less than Schnitzler having conversations with himself. There is also a similarity in the names of the two male protagonists -- both begin with A and both end with s, Schnitzler's initials. This dichotomy gives expression to Schnitzler's own ambivalent feelings on the subjects of love and marriage and the reactions of the male dilettante to both.

As a further indication of reality versus imagination, Schnitzler follows the scene of Albertus and Amadeus with Amadeus' son Peterl and his new theater, a gift from Caecilie, his mother. Peterl declares to his father, "Ich kann auch schon Theater spielen" (945)! This scene reinforces the previous one. Schnitzler is constantly reminding both reader and spectator of the interrelationship of reality and invention.

The next character to be examined in greater detail, within the context of Zwischenspiel, is Caecilie. She combines qualities of both emotion and rationalism in Zwischenspiel, thus becoming the heroine. As such, her character is the catharsis for

Schnitzler, in that she, who is victimized by men, is justified in the play in terms of her career, which is reflected in her success, and more importantly, her individuality. Caecilie does, indeed, combine emotional with rational elements. When Amadeus first presents Caecilie with the idea of divorce, she tries to salvage the marriage. She says, "sehr innig, beinah zaertlich Aber vielleicht gibt es heute etwas, das zurueckhaelt,...das zurueckhalten koennte, wenn es nur wollte" (910). When Amadeus refuses this salvation, Caecilie, equally emotional, and yet rational enough to go beyond Amadeus' ambivalence, declares the relationship ended. She says, with no ambiguity, "Jetzt wissen wir, dass, es vorbei ist" (911).

Wanting a divorce, Amadeus, nonetheless, insists upon continuing their professional relationship, in addition to living together as before. Caecilie realizes the impossibility on both counts. "Trotzdem Amadeus...Dass wir einander sehen und sprechen werden, das bringen ja unsere Stellungen mit sich...aber so wie frueher kann es natuerlich auch in Hinsicht auf unsere Arbeit nicht mehr werden. Dass musst du doch einsehen" (913)? In terms of living together as a divorced couple, she says bluntly, "Amadeus, du trauest wieder einmal" (914)!

Yet, upon Amadeus' insistence, the couple tries to live as such. After experiencing this existence,

however, Amadeus cannot cope with it. On the other hand, Caecilie has adjusted, despite her original misgivings. Amadeus can only marvel at Caecilie's acceptance. "Ja, ich finde es geradezu bewundernswert, wie du dich in alles findest; wie ruhig du zu bleiben vermagst in allen neuen Schicksalen und Erwartungen" (935). This difference is further illustrated when Amadeus feels he has found a new Caecilie, to whom he is now attracted, whereas Caecilie finds no basic difference. She is the same woman who has, perhaps, grown (936-37).

Amadeus realizes what his alter ego, Albertus, has been telling him that a friend cannot be a lover, and how Caecilie has had to suffer. In a burst of emotion, Amadeus declares to Caecilie, "Ich liebe dich und ich hasse dich, aber dein Freund bin ich in diesem Augenblick nicht: Was du mir warst: Gattin, Kamaradin...es kuemmert mich nicht!... Ich will -- dein Geliebter will ich heute sein" (938)"..."Ich koennte es nicht ertragen -- nicht ertragen" (939)!

From the rational standpoint, Caecilie realizes, as she has throughout, the futility of their artificial relationship, in which they missed the actual meaning of being truthful to themselves, as well as to one another. She says to Amadeus,

Wenn alles andere wahr gewesen ist, -- dass wir beide uns so schnell darein gefunden in jener Stunde, da du mir deine Leidenschaft fuer die Graefin und ich dir meine Neigung

fuer Sigismund gestand -- das ist nicht Wahrheit gewesen. Haetten wir einander damals unsern Zorn, unsere Erbitterung, unsere Verzweiflungen ins Gesicht geschrien, statt die Gefassten und Ueberlegenen zu spielen, dann waeren wir wahr gewesen, Amadeus, -- und wir waren es nicht (960).

This admission wins favor for Caecilie's character. After Amadeus has left, the drama ends with the stage direction for Caecilie, "Weint leise und laesst den Kopf aufs Klavier sinken" (960). Only then does the reader/spectator realize how much Caecilie has suffered, and this makes her all the more appealing.

Ambivalence, as seen in the male dilettante, carries a subtheme. Through these dialogues between Amadeus and Caecilie, one is able to see how Schnitzler depicted the difficulty of a woman's existence in her contemporary society. Even though Amadeus originally requested freedom in his marriage for himself, by projecting the situation onto Caecilie in reference to Prince Sigismund, he is unable to tolerate that situation as soon as he stops seeing Friederike. Amadeus says, "Ich werde ihr sagen, dass ich's nicht ertragen kann -- dass der Gedanke an den andern mich toll macht" (940), and interestingly enough he continues "Und sie wird es begreifen. Und wenn sie mich anfleht, ihr zu verzeihen..." (940). Even though Amadeus originally set up this situation against Caecilie's instincts, he expects her to ask for forgiveness!

In these confrontations between Amadeus and

Caecilie, the double standard and woman's resultant plight becomes apparent. The following is an illustration, and it should be noted that Caecilie never was intimately involved with another.

Amadeus ...Du hast es ja schon bewiesen. Du hast alles gewusst, was geschehen ist, und doch bist du wieder die Meine geworden...du hast gewusst, dass ich treulos war und du treu, und doch --

Caecilie Treu?...Nein, das war ich nicht. Und erscheine ich dir auch so, fuer mich selbst bin ich's laengst nicht mehr gewesen. Ich weiss es ja, was fuer Wuensche mich durchglaubt haben, -- ich weiss, wie in mancher Naehel mein Leib gebebt und geschmachtet hat, -- und was ich dir gestern abend sagte, dass ich mit ausgebreiteten Armen dastehe und mich sehne und warte, das ist wahr, Amadeus, so wahr als ich hier vor dir stehe!

Amadeus Wenn das wahr ist, was hat dich zurueckgehalten, deiner Sehnsucht zu folgen?...dich, die ebenso frei war wie ich selbst?

Caecilie Ich bin eine Frau, Amadeus. Und es scheint so: irgend etwas macht uns auch dann noch zoenern, wenn wir schon laengst entschlossen sind (955).

Even though Caecilie sees that she is a victim of the double standard, she, nevertheless, accepts the reality of that situation. She says to Amadeus,

Denkst du, ich spielte eine kindische Komodie, um dich zu strafen, und jetzt, nachdem du zu frueh die ganze Wahrheit erfahren hast, wuerde ich dir in die Arme sinken und erklaren, alles sei wieder gut? Hast du es wirklich fuer moeglich gehalten, dass nun alles vergessen sei und wir unsere Ehe wieder aufnehmen werden, wo sie unterbrochen wurde? Kannst du es denn nur wuenschen, dass es so kommt und dass es eine Ehe wird wie tausend andere, wo man sich betruengt -- und wieder versoehnt -- und wieder

betruengt, je nach der Laune des Augenblicks (955).

Caecilie's steadfast position has a two-fold effect. Amadeus' ambivalence is emphasized, and at this point, we realize that the theme deals merely with male freedom, as a result of his ambivalence, and not a so-called free and equal marriage.

Through the above dialogue, there is a role reversal of man and woman, which Schnitzler, the writer only, can allow in his drama. It is Caecilie who wants no return to her former situation. There is no hesitation or ambivalence in her character. She is able to tell the facts as they are, and react accordingly. "Was uns jetzt zueinander treibt, ist nichts als die Angst vor dem wirklichen Abschiednehmen" (956). Throughout the drama, Caecilie is more cognizant of human nature. All of this is in keeping with Schnitzler's meting out justice to women in his plays. Their suffering is the result of the actions of the ambivalent male dilettante.

With this drama, the first section of this study comes to a close. As Reigen portrayed the different stages of the dilettante in society within one play, this same progression of the dilettante was examined beginning with Anatol, and culminating in Zwischenspiel. This series of dramas highlights the ambivalence of the male in turn-of-the-century Vienna.

The Jewish situation is also one of ambivalence

during this period, and since Part One has ended with Zwischenspiel, and in particular, with Caecilie's character, the two parts of this study can be linked with this ending by pointing to Schnitzler's own comment on Caecilie. In a letter to Leonie Meyerhof-Hildeck, of December 15, 1908, Schnitzler wrote, "Caecilie stammt gewiss von Juden ab."<sup>7</sup> Based on the overall portrayal of Caecilie's character, this seems to be a favorable comment for Jews as members of society at large. However, given the ambivalent Jewish situation during Schnitzler's time, especially in the light of society's acceptance of the Jew, one cannot speculate on any single comment. Therefore, as part of the theme of ambivalence, Schnitzler's assessment of the Viennese Jewish situation constitutes Part Two of this study.

## Notes

1. Maximilian Harden, "Theater," Die Zukunft, 53 (9 Dezember 1905) 367 ff.
2. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler Briefe 1875-1912 (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981) 419.
3. Anon., Lessing Theater, "'Zwischenspiel': Komoedie in drei Akten von Arthur Schnitzler," Die Nation, 9, xxiii (2 Dezember 1905) 140.
4. Arthur Schnitzler, "Zwischenspiel," Die dramatischen Werke, vol. 1, (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962) 902. All further references to this work will be indicated in the text by the page number in parenthesis.
5. Felix Poppenberg, "Zwischenspiel," Der Tuermer (Januar 1906) 556.
6. Die Nation 141.
7. Nickl and Schnitzler 586.

PART TWO

Ambivalence as Portrayed by the Position of the Jews

Schnitzler as a Jewish Writer in Turn-of-the-Century Vienna

For the Jew living in the diaspora, the question of Jewish identity and its expression has always been difficult. This was certainly no less the case in turn-of-the-century Vienna, when the problem was especially acute, because of conflicting forces which existed simultaneously. It was the time of Karl Lueger's ascendancy as mayor of Vienna, based on an anti-Semitic political stand, as well as the time of Theodor Herzl's campaign for the reestablishment of the Jewish homeland in Palestine. But it was also a time in which a Jew could live freely under the law as an equal citizen in the Austrian Empire, largely because of Emperor Franz Josef's tolerance and the new Constitution of 1867. Hence, with such conflicting trends in his history, the Viennese Jew would inevitably find himself in an ambivalent situation. Frederic Grunfeld expressed it succinctly in his book Prophets Without Honour,

Before the Nazis, cooperation and mutual understanding were often the rule rather than the exception and in virtually every sphere: not only in business, banking, publishing and the arts, but also where it counted most, at the personal level. People fell in love, married, had children.<sup>1</sup>

[However] in practical terms this two-fold legacy [German and Jewish] was never an easy one to live with. Most of the intellectuals were uncomfortable with it.<sup>2</sup>

...clearly it was not an easy time to be Jewish in Vienna, though the dance at the edge of the volcano was still moving at a leisurely

waltz tempo.<sup>3</sup>

There were occasional outbursts of blatant anti-Semitic incidents throughout the empire. For example, there was the Rohling affair. This incident centered around the publication of Der Talmudjude, in 1871, by August Rohling, professor at Prague University, who "sought to prove the depravity of the Jews by means of extracts from the Talmud."<sup>4</sup> A Galician rabbi, Joseph Bloch, took Rohling to court, proving the fallacy of Rohling's argument. He demonstrated that Rohling was unable to read even a single line from the Talmud, and thus, Bloch won the case.

It is interesting to note here that crude anti-Semitic cases such as this, or the Tisza Eszlar affair, an accusation of ritual murder in Hungary in 1882<sup>5</sup>, even though occurring within the Hapsburg Empire, generally took place outside of Vienna. Thus, Viennese Jewry of the late nineteenth century was shielded from direct anti-Semitic encounters. Nonetheless, the long history of Viennese Jewry is an unhappy one, filled with anti-Semitism. For example, charges of ritual murder were not uncommon occurrences during the Middle Ages in Vienna, whose Jewish community dated back to the year 905 AD. The culmination of these charges was the murder or expulsion of the entire Viennese Jewish community in 1421. Remaining Jews were either sent to die at sea, or burned at the stake. A plaque recalling this event is

still to be found in present-day Vienna, as it was during Schnitzler's time. The plaque states,

Durch den Jordan werden die Leiber Seuche und Uebeln gereinigt; da weicht alles verborgene Suendhafte. So erhebt sich der Ingrimme wuetend durch die ganze Stadt 1421 und sueht die furchtbaren Verbrechen der Hebraerhunde. Die Welt ist nun gereinigt durch die deukalionischen Ueberschwemmungsfluten u. wird so wiederum durch das wuetende Feuer die Strafe buessen.<sup>6</sup>

By the sixteenth century, Jews were again returned to Vienna to save the city from financial difficulties.<sup>7</sup> However, there was popular contempt, active hatred, and discrimination. For example, in order to keep the birth rate low, a Jewish man could not marry until after the death of his father. Then, there was a marriage tax. There were limited rights of residence (Jews were confined to Leopoldstadt), extra taxes for toleration, and exclusion from professions and many trades.<sup>8</sup> The Jewish situation in Vienna remained essentially the same until the Constitution of 1867, when many barriers fell. Finally, under the law, Jews were able to enter most professions with restrictions. As stated in the personal memoirs of a former Jewish resident of Vienna, "there was no field in which it was possible to gain distinction, where Jews did not distinguish themselves, even including the Army, which had several Jewish generals. Much of Vienna's greatness was created by Jews."<sup>9</sup>

Thus, with a long history filled with hardship, the

Jews of the late nineteenth century found some hope and security under Franz Josef's reign. Nevertheless, all were aware of their precarious situation, for anti-Semitism, even though dormant, existed not only in the anti-Semitic cases mentioned above, but also in the campaigns of Georg von Schoenerer and Karl Lueger. Instead of finding its roots in religion, the newer anti-Semitism, for the most part, was of a political nature, finding its basis in economics.<sup>10</sup>

This brief overview of the history of Viennese Jewry leads again to Schnitzler as a Jewish writer. The conflicting trends vis-a-vis the Jewish community, given its history in Vienna, would by their very nature lead to the ambivalent feelings of Jewish identity. And the problem was compounded for the writer whose very existence was based on the complete acceptance and use of a language which he considered his own -- that of his homeland. This was seen in such writers as Stefan Zweig or Jakob Wassermann, the latter a close friend of Schnitzler, who felt compelled to explain his situation by writing Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude.<sup>11</sup> Just as his friend Wassermann, or Beer-Hofmann, probably his closest friend,<sup>12</sup> Schnitzler never left the Jewish faith.<sup>13</sup> "Schnitzler hatte nie ein Hehl aus seinem Judentum gemacht und war ohne orthodox zu sein, nicht wie Karl Kraus und Otto Weininger zum Christentum uebergetreten."<sup>14</sup> Schnitzler never thought of

abandoning his Judaism.<sup>15</sup>

But what exactly was it to be Jewish for Arthur Schnitzler? Harry Zohn calls him an agnostic who was quite conscious of his Jewishness, as well as of anti-Semitism.<sup>16</sup> In her biography of Schnitzler, Renata Wagner writes,

Jude zu sein ist fuer Schnitzler einzig und alleine Rassenfrage der er sich weder entziehen kann noch will...Er wird die Judenfrage im Weg ins Freie behandeln, das Religionsproblem in Professor Bernhardt. Er geht in den Tempel, um selbst zu heiraten und um anderen Leute Trauzeugen zu sein. Sonst setzt er keinen Fuss hinein.<sup>17</sup>

Norbert Abels based his work Sicherheit ist nirgends entirely on the ambivalence Schnitzler felt as a result of considering himself a "deutsch-oesterreichisch-juedischer Dichter."<sup>18</sup> And as for Schnitzler's contemporaries, the Jewish community was proud to call him one of its own. An article entitled "Arthur Schnitzler und Ludwig Fulda," in the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, Berlin, 12 Juli 1912, praised the two men, and ended with, "Fragen wir nicht, welcher von beiden, Schnitzler oder Fulda, der groessere sei, sondern freuen wir uns, dass wir zwei solche Maenner als echte und rechte Juden besitzen."<sup>19</sup>

How did Arthur Schnitzler himself express his Jewish identity? Instead of merely examining this question from Schnitzler's fiction, as do most critics and biographers, i.e., Professor Bernhardt and Der Weg ins Freie, which warrant separate examination,

Schnitzler's expository writing on the subject itself can be reviewed.

It is especially in his expository prose that there are examples of Arthur Schnitzler's personal statements on being Jewish. Along with rational arguments and statements, he expressed this, at times, in emotional outbursts, despite the fact that throughout his life, he had described himself as "zurueckhaltend."<sup>20</sup> Therefore, the strong statements he made on the subject in his correspondence, diaries and autobiography become all the more significant. In the Foreword to Schnitzler's diaries of 1909-1912, Werner Welzig indicates that Schnitzler's non-fiction writings are equally as important as his fictional works.<sup>21</sup> This is especially true in reference to the Jewish question, which arises repeatedly in the non-fiction prose. Before examining the works of fiction in which the ambivalence of a Jewish author writing in German appears in relation to Judaism, it is important to look at Schnitzler's own expository statements on the subject.

One of the sources of Schnitzler's expository prose, in reference to the Jewish milieu and identity, is his autobiography. Jugend in Wien, as its title indicates, is concerned primarily with Schnitzler's formative years through his thirtieth birthday. The work, however, was first conceived in 1901, but written in 1912, at age 50. Thus, the autobiography is

essentially composed of reminiscences. The topics with which he deals made significant impressions on him during his youth. Therefore, not surprisingly, as noted in the introduction, it is concerned with the ambivalence he felt throughout his lifetime, and which he explored from two distinct perspectives. First, he was dissatisfied as a dilettante unable to accept the responsibility of total commitment in his career or in his personal life. In this regard, he wrote about his fluctuations between two careers, of writer and of physician, as well as his inability to make a commitment to a woman, because of his almost pathological jealousies. Second, and with equal feeling, Schnitzler, as a non-religious Jew in turn-of-the-century Vienna, while rejecting Zionism, was nonetheless cognizant of the depths of anti-Semitism.

In the appendix to his autobiography, Schnitzler included a section entitled "Autobiographische Notizen," in which he justified the topics about which he had chosen to write. In 1912, at the time the appendix was written, Schnitzler was quite aware that he had devoted a proportionately large part of his autobiography to Judaism and anti-Semitism. "In diesen Blaettern wird viel von Judentum und Antisemitismus die Rede sein, mehr als manchem geschmackvoll, notwendig und gerecht erscheinen duerfte."<sup>22</sup> Schnitzler elaborated,

Aber zu der Zeit, in der man diese Blaetter moeglicherweise lesen wird, wird man sich, so

hoffe ich wenigstens, kaum mehr einen rechten Begriff zu bilden vermoegen, was fuer eine Bedeutung, seelisch fast noch mehr als politische und sozial, zur Zeit, da ich diese Zeilen schreibe, der sogenannten Judenfrage zukam. Es war nicht moeglich, insbesondere fuer einen Juden, der in der Oeffentlichkeit stand, davon abzusehen, dass er Jude war, da die andern es nicht taten, die Christen nicht und die Juden noch weniger. Man hatte die Wahl, fuer unempfindlich, zudringlich, frech fuer empfindlich, schuechtern, verfolgungswahnsinnig zu gelten.<sup>23</sup>

Schnitzler finished this statement with a stark analogy.

Und auch wenn man seine innere und aeuessere Haltung so weit bewahrte, dass man weder das eine noch das andere zeigte, ganz unberuehrt zu bleiben war so unmoeglich, als etwa ein Mensch gleichgueltig bleiben koennte, der sich zwar die Haut anaesthesieren liess, aber mit wachen und offenen Augen zusehen muss, wie unreine Messer sie ritzen, ja ja schneiden, bis das Blut kommt.<sup>24</sup>

Schnitzler then continued with personal illustrations of anti-Semitism. It is written in telegraphic sentences, describing incidents in which Schnitzler was involved in the Gymnasium, where it was less apparent than in the university, medical school, and clubs to which he belonged.<sup>25</sup>

This was Schnitzler's justification for devoting a large part of his autobiography to the Jewish question. It is interesting that his writing concerning his awareness of his Judaism, to a large extent, stemmed from viewing it vis-a-vis anti-Semitism -- as a reaction to the latter. It is an indication that his awareness was forced upon him by his milieu.

In the autobiography itself, one of the first

Jewish topics he discussed was Zionism, a controversial theme at the time. As for himself, Schnitzler was basically anti-Zionist. His reasoning was that if he, a second-generation Viennese Jew, could not feel any Sehnsucht or Heimweh for Gross-Kaniza, in Hungary, from where his grandfather came, was it possible to feel such sentiment for a land that had been inhabited by his ancestors two thousand years ago.<sup>26</sup> In his novel Der Weg ins Freie, Schnitzler was to repeat this almost verbatim through one of his protagonists, Heinrich Bermann. However, in general, Schnitzler was not totally anti-Zionist. He even condoned it as a necessity for those Jews who felt they had no other choice.

In an Aufbau article of May 8, 1942, Heinrich Schnitzler published an undated open letter by his father entitled, "Meine Stellung zum Zionismus. Ein Unbekannter Brief aus dem Nachlass." In it Schnitzler stated,

Ich moechte die zionistische Stroemung aus dem heutigen politischen Weltbild oder gar aus der Seelenoekonomie des heutigen Judentums nicht wegdenken. Als seelisches Element zur Hebung des Selbstbewusstseins, als eine Moeglichkeit allerlei dunkle Hassgefuehle abzureagieren, insbesondere aber als Wohlfahrtsaktion von hoechstem Range wird der Zionismus immer noch seine Bedeutung bewahren selbst wenn er einmal historisch geworden sein sollte.<sup>27</sup>

However, this support of Zionism is not meant for himself, but for others. It is interesting to note that Schnitzler spoke of "those Jews" in the third person.

He did not include himself in reference to Zionism. In this letter, he continued,

Mann kann aufs Allerhoechste einschaeetzen was diese Bewegung [Zionism] insbesondere fuer arme, verfolgte, gemarterte Juden geleistet hat und noch leisten wird. Man wird sich vor der Wahrheit nicht verschliessen, dass hundert-tausende Juden die tatsaechlich durch die Verfolgungen ihrer Wirtsvoelker mehr noch durch die Schurkereien der betreffenden Regierungen, heimatlos geworden sind, einer neuen Heimat dringend beduerfen. Man wird auch ohne weiters zugeben, dass unzaeahlige Juden, die in ihrer bisherigen Heimat sich weiter ganz wohl behagen koennten, einfach durch den Ekel ueber die Anfeindungen, denen sie oder auch nur Verwandte, Freunde, Stammesgenossen ausgesetzt waren, in verletztem Stolz diese Heimat verlassen und sich eine andere suchen wollen, und dass ihnen diejenige als die angenehmste erscheint, wo eben vor 2000 Jahren ihre Urvaeter zuhause gewesen sind. All dies ist begreiflich, beweist sogar manchmal -- keineswegs immer-- einer gewisse ethische Hoehe. Und darum waere es vollkommen falsch den Zionismus einfach als seelische oder politische Haltung bekaempfen zu wollen....<sup>28</sup>

In an afterword to these statements, the Aufbau indicated that even though Schnitzler's arguments were, at the time, representative of Central European Jewry, given the date of May 1942, at the height of the "Final Solution," Arthur Schnitzler most likely would have changed his views on certain issues regarding Zionism and himself.<sup>29</sup> Such were Schnitzler's views on Zionism during his lifetime.

To return to the autobiography, Zionism is merely one topic of Judaism upon which Schnitzler chose to comment. Throughout the first chapters, Schnitzler wrote about Jewish rituals in his home, and the role

these played in his upbringing. For example, one section is devoted to the description of Yom Kippur in his home where the adults fasted.<sup>30</sup> However, he felt this was done for his grandmother's sake. He summed up his religious situation, in general, with the following:

Uebrigens glaube ich, dass die Froemmste, ja vielleicht die einzig wirklich Fromme in der Gesellschaft, die gute Grossmama war, die wohl auch den grossten Teil des Tages im Tempel betend verbracht hatte, ihre Kinder und Kindeskinde, wenn und solange sie es ueberhaupt taten, feierten den Busstag hauptsaechlich ihr zuliebe und nach ihrem Tode nur aus Pietaeet weiter. Doch war auch meiner Grossmutter das Fasten am Versoehnungstag neben dem oesterlichen Essen ungesaeuerter Broete (die uebrigens in den Kaffee gebrockt vorzueglich mundeten) die einzige rituelle Uebung, an der sie mit Strenge, aber nur mit Strenge gegen sich selbst festhielt. Schon die Feier des Laubhuettenfestes oder gar eine Heiligung des Sabbats fand im grosselterlichen Hause, nicht statt; und in den folgenden Generationen trat -- bei allem, oft trotzigen Betonen der Stammeszugehoerigkeit -- gegenueber dem Geist juedischer Religion eher Gleichgueltigkeit ihren aeusseren Formen gegenueber Widerstand, wenn nicht gar spoettisches Verhalten zutage.<sup>31</sup>

Thus, religious ritual was deemphasized in the Schnitzler household, even though there was conscious recognition of a holiday. This was especially true of Schnitzler's thirteenth birthday, when the Bar-Mitzvah is traditionally celebrated. As Schnitzler wrote, "Mein dreizehnter Geburtstag wurde zwar ohne jedes rituelle Gepraenge, aber durch besonders zahlreiche und schoene Geschenke gefeiert, die ich von Eltern, Grosseltern und anderen Verwandten erhielt...."<sup>32</sup>

There is only one other passage in reference to

Judaism where Schnitzler does not turn his energies to anti-Semitism per se. He recalls that, as a teen-ager, he completed a drama called "Der Ewige Jude," which he felt was the best piece he had ever written. However, the manuscript was destroyed in an accident, and Schnitzler was never able to reconstruct it; in his memory, it remained his best piece.<sup>33</sup> Thus, Schnitzler was quite aware of his Jewish heritage while growing up. He also received a Jewish education.<sup>34</sup>

As Schnitzler grew older, his interest in his Jewishness never ceased; it merely was viewed from another perspective; namely that of anti-Semitism. The remaining passages that deal with Judaism in the autobiography are concerned with anti-Semitism and Schnitzler's reaction to it. Primarily, he was interested in the psychological aspects of it, with his concern for the ritual diminishing. "Doch war es nicht eigentlich die politische, auch nicht so sehr die soziale, sondern vorwiegend die psychologische Seite der Judenfrage, fuer die das Interesse in mir meiner ganzen Anlage noch zuerst erwachte. Das konfessionelle Moment beruehrte mich so gut wie gar nicht."<sup>35</sup>

Schnitzler continued to devote frequent passages to his encounters with anti-Semitism in the Army,<sup>36</sup> as well as in medical school and fraternities.<sup>37</sup> He was apparently perturbed enough by these incidents to eventually incorporate his feelings in fictional works,

such as Professor Bernhardt and Der Weg ins Freie, which found their roots in his youth. He does refer to these works in his autobiography.<sup>38</sup>

Schnitzler felt compelled to quote the entire Waidhofener Beschluss in Jugend in Wien.<sup>39</sup> This was the student decree that declared that Jews were unworthy of the duel. Schnitzler was constantly aware of the distinctions society created between Jew and non-Jew. For example, he wrote about his service in the Army,

Auch unter den militaeraerztlichen Eleven wie beinahe in allen Freiwilligenabteilungen und wo nicht sonst -- fand eine -- sagen wir auch hier "reinliche Scheidung" zwischen christlichen und juedischen oder, da das nationale Moment immer staerker betont wurde, zwischen Arischen und Semitischen Elementen statt und der ausserdienstliche Verkehr hielt sich im allgemeinen in den engsten Grenzen.<sup>40</sup>

Schnitzler also devoted passages to discussions of Lueger and anti-Semitism.<sup>41</sup> Thus, Schnitzler's concern touched the public realm, as well as the personal.

Despite the frequency with which Schnitzler describes the various aspects of Judaic life in his autobiography, his Jewish identity was never satisfactorily defined by him. One of the only places in which he attempted a succinct definition was in the above-mentioned open letter, published in the Aufbau of May 8, 1942. There he wrote,

Ich betrachte mich naemlich keineswegs als einen juedischen Dichter, sondern als einen deutschen Dichter, der, soweit sich so etwas ueberhaupt nachweisen laesst, der juedischen Rasse angehoert, dessen Blut jedenfalls vorwiegend juedisch ist und der auch in

manchen seiner Eigenschaften vieles findet, dass als charakteristisch juedisches angesprochen werden darf.

Ich schreibe in deutscher Sprache, lebe innerhalb eines deutschen Kulturkreises, verdanke gewiss von allen Kulturen der deutschen weitaus am meisten, wenn ich auch ganz genau weiss was ich der hebraeischen...schuldig geworden bin....<sup>42</sup>

It is evident that he felt himself to be a German, since that was the language in which he wrote. It is, however, interesting to note two points within the statement. First, he used his vocation as a writer, using the German language, to give definition to his identity. Second, even though he saw himself as belonging to the Jewish "race," he could not define what he meant by it ("der, soweit sich so etwas ueberhaupt nachweisen laesst, der juedischen Rasse angehoert"). Thus, the definition is weak, and there are only the various statements in the autobiography. The question of his identity defies a definitive answer. Hence, the ambivalence of the Viennese Jew, of which Arthur Schnitzler as a writer is, probably, one of the finest examples.

The autobiography is merely one source of Schnitzler's expository statements. It contains only the recollections of events in his life which, in retrospect, he deemed important enough to consciously leave to future generations. His diaries, on the other hand, are of a more spontaneous nature. They are not recollections, but daily accounts of events important

enough to record. Here, too, there are numerous references to his Jewishness and the problems he faced as a result. Sometimes, his references take on a sarcastic tone. For example, Grunfeld, in Prophets Without Honour, points to a Schnitzler diary entry of March 24, 1903, in which Schnitzler related how, at the premiere of Lebendige Stunden, the audience applauded wildly. They hoped he would appear, and when he failed to do so, they shouted, "What's keeping the arrogant Jew?"<sup>43</sup>

The diaries are written in a telegraphic fashion which has little depth. Topics are merely mentioned. In an intensive review of Schnitzler's diary entries between January 1, 1909 and December 31, 1912, there are scores of references to the Jewish situation in Vienna. Topics include Zionism and anti-Semitic incidents, as well as reactions to Schnitzler's works on Jewish themes. It is interesting to note, in the diary entries, that Schnitzler is almost always in Jewish company. This seems to support the comment Schnitzler made in his autobiography on distinctions between Jew and non-Jew in his school and military environment. Apparently this observation, made in youth, was carried through into adult life. Schnitzler, when not in Jewish company, was quite aware of it. In recording his experiences of July 28, 1910, Schnitzler wrote, "Mittag bei der 'Linde'. Gesellschaft. Es stinkt vor

Judenreinheit."<sup>44</sup> Schnitzler was constantly aware of who was Jewish, and always made a point of mentioning this when he first met someone.<sup>45</sup>

Anti-Semitism, especially the Austrian brand, and the Jewish reaction to it, was always a topic of discussion for Schnitzler. For example, in an entry of July 8, 1910, Schnitzler noted, "...Viel ueber oesterreichische Zustaende; AntiSemitismus etc., Dinge, die man draussen doch nicht recht weiss."<sup>46</sup>

Schnitzler was particularly disturbed by the cowardice of Jewish reaction in the face of anti-Semitism. In a diary entry of February 18, 1909, Schnitzler wrote, "Zu Hause traf ich Richard und Paula [Beer-Hoffmann] an...Ueber die Zustaende hier, ueber die widerliche Feigheit und Sichselbstdavonlauferei einer gewissen Sorte Juden,"<sup>47</sup> or of December 5, 1911, "Ueber den Christus Snobismus in Deutschland, die Feigheit der Juden ('...Oi weh -- Christus!')..."<sup>48</sup> On another occasion, Schnitzler wrote (November 25, 1910), "...die juedischen praktischen Aerzte kriechen den arischen Professoren, sagen wir, nach. - Es ist jaemmerlich. -"<sup>49</sup> There is much mention of discussions on Zionism and Herzl throughout the diaries. Here Schnitzler's thoughts are in keeping with the other expository sources mentioned; for example (January 30, 1909), "...wieder einmal Herzls Buch der Narrheit."<sup>50</sup> There is use of Yiddish expressions by himself, as well as family

members, in Schnitzler's diary entries. There are also many discussions of Jews in German literature.<sup>51</sup>

This consistent and conscious mention of Jewish themes in as personal and spontaneous a work as a diary attests to Schnitzler's awareness of his identity as a Jew in Viennese society. Another source for his comments on Judaism can be found in his extensive correspondence. It is the correspondence, in particular, in which we find those emotional outbursts on the subject of Jewish identity and anti-Semitism. He only revealed these to individuals to whom he felt particularly close. One such person was the Danish literary critic, Georg Brandes. For Brandes' eightieth birthday, on January 30, 1922, Schnitzler wrote how he had opened his soul to Brandes,

...und so erlauben Sie mir nur ganz einfach hier niederzuschreiben: dass unter den Menschen...kaum Einer ist, dem ich so von Herzen und von Geiste zugethan war und bin als Ihnen, Georg Brandes -- und der mir -- nicht nur durch seine Werke, sondern durch sein Sein, sein Dasein -- mehr gegeben hat als Sie!<sup>52</sup>

It is to such a friend that Schnitzler had written, in reference to anti-Semitism, an undated letter, probably in January 1899,

Es ist staunenswerth unter was fuer Schweinen wir hier leben; -- und ich denke immer, selbst Antisemiten muesste es doch auffallen, dass der AntiSemitismus -- von allem andern abgesehen -- jedenfalls die sonderbare Kraft hat, die verlogenensten Gemeinheiten der menschlichen Natur zu Tage zu foerdern und sie aufs hoechste auszubilden. Wie merkwuerdig, dass sogar die offenbaren Maengel, Fehler,

meinetwegen Verbrechen der Judenpresse, die man also so spezifisch -- juedisch hinstellen wollte, von der Antisemitenpresse ins Ungeheuerliche ausgebildet worden sind.<sup>53</sup>

For Schnitzler, this language is particularly strong. As has been observed in Schnitzler's "Notizen" to his autobiography, it is only in reference to anti-Semitism that we find strong emotional language. As Wagner pointed out in her biography of him, Schnitzler, throughout his life, had difficulty expressing emotions.<sup>54</sup> This makes these emotional outbursts all the more noteworthy. The language is equally strong in reference to anti-Semitism in Schnitzler's letters to Olga Waissnix, a trusted friend. In the foreword to the correspondence between the two, Hans Weigel refers to the platonic love-relationship,<sup>55</sup> and indicates that "die Verehrte wird zur Vertrauten, zur Mitwiserin, und als solche wirkt sie fort."<sup>56</sup>

One of the most emotional statements ever made by Schnitzler can be found in a letter to Olga Waissnix shortly before her untimely death in 1897. It referred to anti-Semitism. In a letter of March 29, 1897, Schnitzler wrote,

Gestoert durch zwei Empfindungen, die sich zu widersprechen scheinen: Ekel vor den Menschen, -- wahnsinnige Empfindlichkeit. Denken Sie, in der letzten Zeit verstimmt mich auch der Antisemitismus sehr stark -- man sieht doch eigentlich mit merkwuerdiger Ruhe zu, wie man einfach aus dem Geburtsgrunde von Millionen Menschen nicht fuer voll genommen wird. Ich habe ein so starkes Rachebeduerfnis gegenueber diesem Gesindel, dass ich sie mit Ruhe persoendlich haengen wuerde. Es wird bald

wieder Zeit, die Tragoedie der Juden zu schreiben. -- 57

Not only were these words strong, perhaps the most emotional found in Schnitzler's writings, but they were also prophetic.

As can be seen from various diary entries and excerpts from his autobiography, as well as his correspondence, it was anti-Semitism (and not religion per se) that occupied most of Schnitzler's thoughts on Judaism. Zionism, a burning issue in the Jewish community of that time, did not elicit such emotional outbursts as did anti-Semitism. As has been seen from his open letter on Zionism, Schnitzler spoke of it primarily as a result of anti-Semitism, which was the source of his emotional outbursts. This can be connected with the question of identity, if one considers Schnitzler's disgust for Jews who ignore anti-Semitism. This is especially evident in diary entries and correspondence. Wolfgang Schindlegger also pointed out this fact in his work, "Das Problem des AntiSemitismus bei Arthur Schnitzler. Betrachtungen ueber Judentum und Gesellschaft um 1900."<sup>58</sup> In light of this, it becomes difficult to accept Hans Kohn's theory of Schnitzler as "accepter." In his article "Eros and Sorrow: Notes on the Life and Work of Arthur Schnitzler and Otto Weininger," Kohn states,

He [Schnitzler] was a member of Viennese middle class society and Viennese Jewry. He accepted both of these conditions of his life.

He was neither proud of them nor did he reject them. He came to terms with them and represented them as objectively and as understandingly as possible.<sup>59</sup>

Evidence found in Schnitzler's expository writing, as presented here, shows the contrary. Schnitzler did not accept anti-Semitism. He was disgusted by Jews who did ignore, it and felt he had to do something. In this respect, his writing was a statement of non-acceptance of the situation. It was also a catharsis, as it was for the dilettante. In the essay "Arthur Schnitzler," Mann implies that Jews, of whom Schnitzler was one of the best representatives, were more sensitive to their milieu. Even though they were aware of their situation, they were forced to accept it.<sup>60</sup> It was not a matter of choice, as Kohn seems to indicate. As such, the Jewish situation, including Schnitzler's, was characterized by ambivalence. Mann interprets this through the question of Zionism, when he writes,

Sie [Jews] tragen die Entwurzelung, die Heimatlosigkeit ihres Volkes als Kainszeichen an der mueden Stirn, geschmeidig geworden durch eine fast gewaltsam schnelle Emanzipation, sind sie ueberall zu Hause, waehrend sie in Wahrheit nirgends zu Hause sind, unfaeelig, das Leben zusammenfassend zu spiegeln, aber begabt mit dem unheimlichen Blick des Analytikers und ohne die wohltaetige Schranke, die das nationale Gebundensein in den andern errichtet. Es ist ihr Glueck und ihr Unglueck, dass sie gerade in ein solches unsicher gewordenes Jahrhundert hineingeboren sind.<sup>61</sup>

Mann sees Schnitzler as the best example of the ambivalent Jewish situation. It is this situation

which has given Schnitzler keener insights. As stated above, with citations from Jugend in Wien, Schnitzler's interest was in the psychological aspects of being Jewish, especially in relation to anti-Semitism. As Klaus Geissler states in his essay, "Arthur Schnitzler und seine Darstellung des Judentums," "Schnitzler interessierte an der 'Judenfrage' vor allem das Psychologische, weniger soziale, politische oder gar religiöse Momente."<sup>62</sup>

Despite an examination of Schnitzler's expository prose, as well as secondary opinions, with regard to his Jewish identity and his reaction to it, it is still not possible to arrive at a definitive judgment. Nor is there one found among all these statements. Hence, the ambivalence Schnitzler faced in being a Jew living in Vienna during the turn of the century. From his expository writings, it is only possible to draw the conclusion that, indeed, as stated in the Zeitung des Judentums of 1912, Schnitzler was an "ehrlicher Jude,"<sup>63</sup> not finding his identity in religion nor in Zionism, but in the particular situation of being a Jew in Vienna, a phenomenon that escaped exact definition. Just as Hans Tietze writes of Schnitzler, in 1933, in Die Juden Wiens, he was the finest "Gestalter wienerisch-juedischen Literatentums."<sup>64</sup>

## Notes

1. Frederic V. Grunfeld, Prophets Without Honour: A Background to Freud, Kafka, Einstein and their World (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1979) 15.
2. Grunfeld 8.
3. Grunfeld 54.
4. Peter G. J. Pulzer, The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964) 163.
5. Pulzer 103-05.
6. Max Grunwald, Geschichte der Wiener Juden bis 1914 (Vienna: Israelitische Kultusgemeinde, 1926) 13. See also Hans Tietze, Die Juden Wiens: Geschichte-Wirtschaft - Kultur (Leipzig: E. P. Tal, 1933) 37-38.
7. Grunwald 14-15.
8. Dirk van Arkel, "Antisemitism in Austria," diss., U of Leiden, 1966, 3.
9. Joseph Fraenkel, ed., The Jews of Austria (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1967) 315.
10. Pulzer 145-50.
11. Jakob Wassermann, Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1921).
12. Renate Wagner, Arthur Schnitzler: Eine Biographie (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1981) 61.
13. Wolfgang Schindlegger, "Das Problem des Antisemitismus bei Arthur Schnitzler: Betrachtungen ueber Judentum und Gesellschaft um 1900," diss., U of Klagenfurt, 1980, 56.
14. Klaus Geissler, "Arthur Schnitzler und seine Darstellung des Judentums," Tribüne: Zeitschrift zum Verstaendnis des Judentums, 40 (1971) 4407.
15. Willehad Paul Eckert, "Arthur Schnitzler und das Wiener Judentum," Emuna: Horizonte zur Diskussion ueber Israel und das Judentum, 2 (Maerz/April 1973) 119.

16. Harry Zohn, "Three Austrian Jews in German Literature: Schnitzler, Zweig, Herzl," in Josef Fraenkel, ed., The Jews of Austria: Essays on Their Life, History, and Destruction (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1967) 70.
17. Wagner 20.
18. Norbert Abels, Sicherheit ist nirgends: Judentum und Aufklaerung bei Arthur Schnitzler (Koenigstein/Ts.: Athenaem, 1982) 7.
19. Rahel Edelstein, "Arthur Schnitzler und Ludwig Fulda," Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, Berlin, 12 Juli 1912: 329, col. 2.
20. Kurt Bergel, ed., Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel (Bern: Francke, 1956) 42-43.
21. Werner Welzig, ed., Arthur Schnitzler: Tagebuch 1909-1912 (Vienna: Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1981) 31.
22. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler, Jugend in Wien (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968) 328.
23. Nickl and Schnitzler 329.
24. Nickl and Schnitzler 329.
25. Nickl and Schnitzler 329.
26. Nickl and Schnitzler 329.
27. Arthur Schnitzler, "Meine Stellung zum Zionismus," Aufbau, 8, ix, 8 Mai 1942: 17, col. 1.
28. Schnitzler, Aufbau, 8 Mai 1942: 17, col. 2.
29. Schnitzler, Aufbau, 8 Mai 1942: 17, col. 3.
30. Nickl and Schnitzler 18-19.
31. Nickl and Schnitzler 18-19.
32. Nickl and Schnitzler 59.
33. Nickl and Schnitzler 74.
34. Nickl and Schnitzler 80.
35. Nickl and Schnitzler 96.

36. Nickl and Schnitzler 141.
37. Nickl and Schnitzler 155.
38. Nickl and Schnitzler 157-58, 208.
39. Nickl and Schnitzler 156.
40. Nickl and Schnitzler 158.
41. Nickl and Schnitzler 146-47.
42. Schnitzler, Aufbau, 8 Mai 1942: 17, col. 1.
43. Grunfeld 58.
44. Welzig 166.
45. See diary entries of January 4, 1911 or April 17, 1912 in Welzig 209; 319-20.
46. Welzig 160.
47. Welzig 50.
48. Welzig 287.
49. Welzig 197.
50. Welzig 46.
51. Welzig 317-18.
52. Bergel 133-34.
53. Bergel 71.
54. Wagner 19.
55. Hans Weigel, "Vorwort," in Arthur Schnitzler Olga Waissnix (Liebe die Starb vor der Zeit): Ein Briefwechsel, Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds. (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1970) 13.
56. Weigel 20.
57. Nickl and Schnitzler, Arthur Schnitzler Olga Waissnix 319.
58. Schindlegger 57.

59. Hans Kohn, "Eros and Sorrow: Notes on the Life and Work of Arthur Schnitzler and Otto Weininger," Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook VI (1961): 154-55.

60. W. Mann, "Arthur Schnitzler," in Gustav Krojanker, ed., Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays ueber zeitgenoessische Schriftsteller (Berlin: Welt, 1922) 213-14.

61. Mann 213-14.

62. Geissler 4407.

63. Edelstein, Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, 12 Juli 1912: 328, col. 1.

64. Tietze 271.

## Schnitzler, Herzl, and Judaism

Theodor Herzl, journalist and playwright, 1860-1904, Vienna, is another figure (as Freud had been previously) to examine vis-a-vis Arthur Schnitzler. Herzl belonged to the assimilated Jewish population of Vienna. Frederic Morton, in A Nervous Splendor, points out that Herzl also found difficulty in expressing his Jewishness.<sup>1</sup> Morton even implies that Christmas was celebrated in the Herzl household by the parents and their son, Theodor.<sup>2</sup>

The same elements of ambivalence toward Judaism found in Schnitzler were also evident in his contemporary, Theodor Herzl, who later became the driving force of Zionism. Therefore, in light of the ambivalence of Viennese Jewry, it is appropriate to examine the interactions of Schnitzler and Herzl.

The relationship between the two men, stemming from their student years, was a fluctuating one, always overshadowed by a mutual envy and antipathy. Schnitzler's son Heinrich quoted a diary entry by his father on September 11: 1894: "Mit Herzl...in Pschorrbraeu soupiert. Ich vertrage Herzl eigentlich nicht gut; sein gewichtiges Sprechen mit den grossen Augen zum Schluss jedes Satzes irritiert mich."<sup>3</sup> Olga Gussmann, Schnitzler's wife of eighteen years, mentioned essentially the same thing in reference to Herzl in her book, Spiegelbild der Freundschaft.<sup>4</sup> She even recalled

a chance meeting of the two men while she was with Schnitzler. "Ich hoere den beiden Maennern verwundert zu. Sonderbar: es will sich kein richtiger Kontakt einstellen. Herzl hat einen liebenswuerdigen, aber leicht feierlich pathetischen Ton, der die Menschen in Distanz halten muss."<sup>5</sup> Schnitzler, in his autobiography in which he dealt with the Jewish question, did not spend much time discussing Herzl. When he did mention him, one detects a tone of envy and perhaps contempt. Schnitzler recalled the student hall in which he first saw Herzl, "wo wir einander, ohne uns noch persoendlich zu kennen, an einem Versammlungsabend spoettisch fixiert hatten."<sup>6</sup>

An additional source for exploring Schnitzler's relationship with Herzl is found in the Schnitzler Nachlass in which there is a section called "Charakteristiken." There Schnitzler expressed his feelings, on various individuals, including Theodor Herzl. These "Charakteristiken" are excerpts from Schnitzler's diaries, which he updated during the 1920s.<sup>7</sup> The "Charakteristiken" are thus repetitious, and read as diary entries. The beginning is not dated; there are dates only toward the end. The section on Herzl began, it would appear, in the mid 1890s, and extended through to 1927, twenty-three years after Herzl's death. This was one of the only places in which Schnitzler aired his impressions of Herzl. It is

difficult to determine what motivated Schnitzler to simultaneously envy Herzl, as well as to have an antipathy toward him. Schnitzler, who in his correspondence with Herzl shed almost no light on his ill feelings toward him, lashed out against him in the "Charakteristiken."

The following are direct quotations of the "Charakteristiken" on Herzl. Schnitzler recalled his first awareness of Herzl: "Wir fixieren einander...wiedersehen im Kammer, Sommerfrische....Ich auf der Durchreise in Uniform. Gegenseitige Antipathie."<sup>8</sup> Schnitzler quoted Herzl's reaction to him: "Begegnung auf einem Ball. Ich trage eine gerippte weisse Kravatte. Er: 'Und ich hielt Sie fuer einen Brummel'" (451-52). Schnitzler continued, "Keinerlei Sympathie" (452).

Within the context of a discussion of Israel with Herzl, Schnitzler recalled, "Ich aeussere meine Zweifel, dass er selbst nach Palestina gehen werde" (453). Schnitzler recalled that the discussion continued when Herzl offered him a post as regisseur in Palestine. "Er im Laufe der Diskussion: 'Man wird Ihre Stuecke in Palestina besser spielen als am Burgtheater.' Ich...aber in welcher Sprache wird man meine Stuecke dort spielen? Er: 'In allen Kultursprachen.' Er dachte damals keineswegs noch ernstlich an einen Staat mit hebraeischer Sprache, sondern als eine Art Foederalismus

nach Oesterreichischem Muster" (453).

These comments represent Schnitzler's version of this particular encounter, in which Herzl offered to Schnitzler the position of stage director in Palestine. It is interesting to note how differently Herzl recalled this same incident, the only time the playwright is mentioned in Herzl's diaries. "Mit Arthur Schnitzler gesprochen, ihm die Sache kurz erklaert. Als ich sagte: es ist die Renaissance als Schlusspunkt dieses klassischen Jahrhunderts der Erfindungen im Verkehrswesen -- da war er begeistert. Ich versprach ihm, er werde Intendant des Theaters werden."<sup>9</sup> No reaction by Schnitzler was recorded in this Herzl diary entry of 1895.

After recording the above-mentioned discussion, Schnitzler wrote, "es will sich kein Verhaeltnis zwischen uns herstellen" (454). Even in retrospect, given the written evidence, it is difficult to speculate as to why this antipathy existed. Harry Zohn, in his article, "Wiener Juden in der deutschen Literatur," implies there was jealousy between the two men since Herzl was a frustrated playwright.<sup>10</sup> His personal goal was to have a play performed in Vienna's Burgtheater, as evidenced by his statement to Schnitzler during the construction of the Burgtheater in the 1890s, "da komm ich einmal hinein."<sup>11</sup> This thought never left Herzl. Zohn points out that years later, even though recognized

as a leading Zionist, as well as a journalist, Herzl still longed for a literary career.<sup>12</sup> "Der Zionismus kostet mich Geld, und darf mir nichts einbringen. Andererseits habe ich mir als 'deutscher Schriftsteller' ungemein geschadet, und man traut sich nicht recht mich aufzufuehren."<sup>13</sup> Zohn points to further lamentations by Herzl. "Als Schriftsteller, namentlich als Dramatiker, gelte ich nichts, weniger als nichts. Man nennt mich nur einen guten Journalisten obwohl ich fuehle, weiss, dass ich ein Schriftsteller von grosser Rasse bin oder war, der nur sein volles Mass nicht gegeben hat, weil er angeekelt und entmutigt wurde."<sup>14</sup> Olga Schnitzler recalled the same sentiments, "zuweilen, in unvermeidlichen Momenten der Muedigkeit, bedauert er [Herzl] versagt, sich auf ein so grosses Unternehmen eingelassen zu haben. 'Am Schreibtisch ist mein Platz'.<sup>15</sup> Schnitzler also recorded, "H. hat es in gewissen Momenten bereut sich mit dem Zionismus eingelassen zu haben. Am wohlsten hat er sich am Schreibtisch gefuehlt. 'Je suis un plumier'" (467). Schnitzler continued, "Hermann Bahr erzaehlt mir, er H.[erzl] scheine doch am meisten darunter zu leiden, dass man ihm als Dichter nicht hoch genug stelle" (456).

In the "Charakteristiken," Schnitzler recorded his criticism of Herzl's literary works. Herzl referring to Schnitzler's friends, Beer-Hofmann and Hofmannsthal,

asked Schnitzler, "Haben die Herren vielleicht mein neues Stueck am Burgtheater gesehen?" Schnitzler noted, "Da ich diese Fragen bejahen muss, faehrt er fort: 'Nun was haben Sie mir darueber zu sagen.' Ich sagte dass ich es nicht fuer gut halte" (455). In this passage Herzl asked Schnitzler for Beer-Hofmann's and Hofmannsthal's reactions, but Schnitzler volunteered his own negative opinions. Another such incident was recorded by Schnitzler in "Charakteristiken." This section is dated 1900, while previous sections were not dated at all. "H. im Klub, interpelliert mich ueber 'I love you' und hoert ungern die Wahrheit" (464). Herzl, obviously sensitive about his literary talent, did not welcome strong criticism, and as a result, the Schnitzler-Herzl relationship was strained.

Schnitzler, in "Charakteristiken," continued with indications of dislike for Herzl. Nonetheless, Herzl's untimely death affected Schnitzler, as Renate Wagner writes in her biography, "Schnitzler.ist ueber die Nachricht von Herzl's Tod sehr erschuettert und so sehr er sich vor der Teilnahme an Begraebnissen sonst zu druecken pflegt, zu diesem geht er."<sup>16</sup> Wagner points out that in a later diary entry, Schnitzler felt that Herzl had never liked him, but that he, Schnitzler, always had admired Herzl.<sup>17</sup>

Olga Schnitzler recalled the death of Herzl and her husband's reaction. "Am 4. Juli 1904 kommt die Kunde

von Herzls Tod, die Schnitzler tief erschuettert."18 In his "Charakteristiken," Schnitzler wrote, "kunde von H.s Tod, der mich sehr erschuetterte" (466), and again in 1906, "viel ueber H., der mich wie ich weiss, nie leiden mochte und keine Ahnung von mir hatte, waehrend ich ihn wirklich bewunderte" (468-69).

However, Schnitzler's last comments on Herzl in 1927, in his "Charakteristiken" are negative. Not only did he express his feeling that Herzl was too grandiose in his thoughts, but his dislike for him was also evident. There is exceptionally strong language on Schnitzler's part, something not often found in Schnitzler's writing.

Lese Herzl Tagebuecher. Band I. Seine ersten Aufzeichnungen ueber seine zionistischen Plaene wirken manchmal wie manische Ausbrueche eines grossenwahnsinnigen Feuillettonisten. Bei aller Bewunderung fuer die Energie, die Leidenschaft und den Stil seiner Versuche auf dieses Mass von Pose und Eitelkeit war ich nicht gefasst (469).

This completed the "Charakteristiken" on Herzl, the only source in which Schnitzler verbalized his antipathetic feelings toward him. We are thus left with an impression of mutual dislike between the two men.

Another original source documenting the relationship between Herzl and Schnitzler can be found in their correspondence, which lasted from 1892 until 1900, with most of the letters written in 1894-95.<sup>19</sup>

As an introduction to this correspondence, first published in Midstream, in 1960, Joel Carmichael,

indicated that the correspondence was almost entirely of a literary nature, and dealt very little with Jewish affairs. "In the vigorous correspondence between [Schnitzler and Herzl] which was to last for almost a decade we see Herzl in the full tide of his life as journalist, dramatist, and poet, almost wholly untouched, as yet, by that interest in Jewish affairs that was to dominate the last ten years of his life."<sup>20</sup> The correspondence did, in fact, taper off, as Herzl became more involved with Zionism, but the correspondence itself did deal with Jewish questions, as Herzl and Schnitzler represented them in literature. The communications would have continued, once the name Herzl became synonymous with Zionism, but Schnitzler's personal feelings toward a homeland in the land of Israel curtailed the relationship. As Olga Schnitzler stated, "Aber die beiden Freunde sehen einander kaum mehr, zu verschieden sind ihre Wege, ihre Ziele."<sup>21</sup>

Herzl was first to contact Schnitzler, and it was in reference to literature. In July of 1892, after Herzl became acquainted with Schnitzler's Maerchen, he wrote to Schnitzler, praising him for the work. In this letter, Herzl compared himself, as a dramatist, to Schnitzler,

Wenn ich aber so ein Talent wie Ihres aufbluehen sehe, freue ich mich wie wenn ich nie ein Literat, das heisst, ein engherziger, unduldsamer, neidischer, boshafter Tropf gewesen waere....Ihre Art zu schreiben, mutet mich ganz verwandtschaftlich an. So

ungefaehr, mein Lieber, haette ich wohl auch schreiben moegen.<sup>22</sup>

Even though it was essentially a letter of praise, one can sense the underlying tone of envy in Herzl's language. In this letter, Herzl offered no reason why he and Schnitzler never had any contact. Schnitzler's answer of July 25, 1892, was a short note of thanks. However, his next letter to Herzl, on August 5, 1892, was lengthier, and offered explanations as to why the two never met earlier. Schnitzler was more forthright and honest; however, he employed irony in the style he used in writing to Herzl. For example, he began his letter with, "Verehrtester Freund, eine Ahnung muss ich doch immer gehabt haben, dass wir einander einmal naeher kommen, dass Sie mich sogar 'loben' werden."<sup>23</sup> The tone was overly confident. Schnitzler then proceeded to recall,

Als ich zum ersten Mal dich sah...Sie hielten eine Rede und waren 'scharf' - in einer Weise scharf! Ich befand mich in Ihrer Naehue und hatte die Empfindung als wenn Sie mich mit einem gewissen milden Sarkasmus betrachteten; Sie laechelten ironisch - und ich begann Sie zu beneiden....Und wieder beneidete ich Sie-- 'wer solche Stuecke schreiben koennte.' (damals schrieb ich nemlich [sic] ganz bestimmt schlechtere Stuecke als Sie!) Aber die ganze Studentenzeit verstrich, ohne dass wir ein Verhaeltnis zu einander finden konnten -- offenbar wie mir Ihre letzten Zeilen beweisen -- weil ich -- fuer Sie zu arrogant war!<sup>24</sup>

Early in their writing careers, Schnitzler had been envious of Herzl. "Und auch damals laechelten Sie

ironisch! -- Und wieder verlief ich Sie mit jener gedruckten Stimmung, die man Leuten gegenueber hat, die einem auf derselben Strasse zwanzig Schritte weit vorauslaufen."<sup>25</sup> The next excerpt from the Schnitzler letter is, perhaps, the most famous.

Ich erkannere mich auch eines letzten Zusammenreffens mit Ihnen - auch irgend einem Ball, in einer Nacht, wie Sie schon sehr lange, ein beruehmter Mann waren, waehrend ich, an mir, an meinem Berufe - an beiden! - verzweifelnd, von niemand eigentlich ernst genommen, meinen Ehrgeiz als 'guter Gesellschafter' und demimondainer (im Bourget'schen Sinn) zu befriedigen suchte. Ich war an jenem Abend besonders gut gelaunt und, wie ich glaubte, namenlos elegant. Da erschienen Sie. Mit ruhigen ueberlegenen Augen prueften Sie meine Cravate - und vernichteten mich Wissen Sie was Sie sagten? 'Und ich hielt Sie fuer einen Brummel!!!'<sup>26</sup>

Schnitzler felt that because of this tie he fell into disfavor with Herzl. However, he knew that one day he would learn to choose a better tie.<sup>27</sup> There is an expression of confidence on the part of Schnitzler.

This relationship continued to be overshadowed by mistrust. In a New Year's letter of December 30, 1892, Schnitzler wrote to Herzl, "Ich stehe in meiner eigenen Anerkennung noch nicht fest genug, um eine Liebenswuerdigkeit wie die Ihre nicht besonders stark zu empfinden. Es wundert mich unsoemehr, dass Sie mir noch bis zu einem gewissen Grade zu mistrauen scheinen."<sup>28</sup>

The next series of intensive letters occurred from late 1894 through early 1895. Again it was Herzl's initiative, but this time it involved his play, Das Neue

Ghetto, in which Herzl explored the contemporary Jewish situation in Vienna. Before discussing the play itself Herzl, in a letter of November 8, 1894, requested that Schnitzler be his confidant in the production of the play and his pseudonym. Herzl assumed the name of Albert Schnabel. He was trying to emulate Schnitzler, even using the initials A. Sch.! Apparently, some trust was established between the two men. Herzl wrote that he needed "einen 'gentleman' und Kuenstler...die Mithilfe eines feuerfesten, wasserdichten Freundes, der mir sein foermliches Ehrenwort gibt, zu schweigen."<sup>29</sup> Schnitzler had agreed to this in his answer to Herzl on November 10, 1894, "Es ist selbstverstaendlich, dass ich Ihnen in jeder Weise und mit dem groessten Vergnuegen zur Verfuegung stehe."<sup>30</sup>

Several months later, Herzl, despite Schnitzler's help, was still not successful in finding a producer for his play. Nonetheless, Herzl had not permitted anyone to know that he was Albert Schnabel. On September 1, 1895, Herzl wrote, "ich freue mich dass ich Sie zu meinem Vertrauten gemacht. Sie sind der Einzige...Ein wirkliches Geheimnis darf hoechstens auf vier Augen stehen."<sup>31</sup> The correspondence continued on this literary basis. However, through the theme of Herzl's play, Das Neue Ghetto, there was peripheral discussion of the Jewish question in Vienna. In these discussions, Herzl voiced his opinions beyond the realm of his play.

Schnitzler, on the other hand, offered literary advice (which Herzl took only to a limited extent) and perceptive insights, but only within the context of the play itself and the characters Herzl portrayed. This is evident in the lengthy answer Schnitzler wrote to Herzl on November 17, 1894. Schnitzler commented on his milieu in his criticism of Herzl's main character, Jakob Samuel. In the original version of Das Neue Ghetto, Jakob, insulted for his Jewish identity, dies in a resulting duel. Before he dies, Jakob remarks on the contemporary state of the Jews in Vienna. In reference to this, Schnitzler wrote,

Am meisten hab ich in diesem Sinne gegen den Schlusssatz des Stueckes einzuwenden, den der sterbende Jakob Samuel zu sprechen hat. Lassen Sie ihn lieber wortlos sterben-- dieser Tod sagt mehr, besseres, ich glaube selbst was ganz andres als der Sterbende selbst. Der Sterbende sagt: 'Juden, Brueder, man wird euch erst wieder leben lassen, wenn ihr zu sterben wisst'-- Sein Tod aber spricht: Dieser arme Teufel und edle Mensch muss sich von einem erbaermlichen Haderlumpen einfach deshalb niederschliessen lassen -- weil er als Jude geboren ist! -- Es gab eine Zeit, wo die Juden zu tausenden auf den Scheiterhaufen verbrannt wurden. Sie haben zu sterben gewusst. Und man hat sie nicht leben lassen-- deswegen -- So faehrt Ihr Drama nachdem es sicher und schoen seinen Weg hingebraust ist-- auf einem falschen Geleise ein --.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, Schnitzler commented only in a factual and historical manner -- without adding contemporary social observations. Before this could have happened, he veered back to the play and its characters. These were safe borders for him, so that he did not have to offer

his critique of the contemporary social conditions to Herzl. Schnitzler continued the letter by commenting on the different Jewish types Herzl included in the play. In retrospect, it is interesting to note that it is Schnitzler who advised Herzl in this regard. He enumerated the Jewish types that should have been included in Herzl's play. This was fourteen years before Schnitzler's novel, Der Weg ins Freie, in which Schnitzler included what he saw as possible Jewish types living in contemporary Vienna. After this discussion of characters, Schnitzler offered Herzl a critique of Jews living in their society. "Es ist gar nicht wahr, dass in dem Ghetto, das Sie meinen, alle Juden gedruickt oder innerlich schaebig herumlaufen. Es gibt andere -- und gerade die werden von den AntiSemiten am tiefsten gehasst."<sup>33</sup> However, Schnitzler, as before, automatically reverted to the context of the play, for he immediately continued,

Etwas in der Art muesste auch in dem Stueck gesagt werden. Ihr Stueck ist kuehn, -- ich moechte es auch trotzig haben. Und vor allem lassen Sie Ihren Helden nicht so ergeben sterben. Ich habe es schon anfangs gesagt-- jetzt faellt es mir wieder ein -- Sie sehn, wie ernst es mir damit ist! --<sup>34</sup>

The correspondence evolving around Das Neue Ghetto was intense. It continued for at least another half year.

If Schnitzler was not particularly fond of Herzl, as evident in the above discussion, his relationship with him was primarily in expressing some of his

thoughts on their contemporary Jewish situation within the realm of fiction. For example, within the half year to follow, Schnitzler expressed these opinions to Herzl, always in the context of Das Neue Ghetto.

On December 15, 1894 he wrote "Ein vornehmes Theater hat doch eigentlich absolut keinen Grund dieses Stueck nicht aufzufuehren!"<sup>35</sup> This is an indirect comment on contemporary Jewish life in Vienna. On January 7, 1895, Schnitzler expressed,

Diesmal hat mir das Schauspiel noch viel besser gefallen....Es ist wahrhaftig ein Stueck, an dem man sich freuen kann, ein Stueck des Lebens, das rings um ist, das Stueck eines ganz lebendigen, mit Geberden, die heftig und doch zielbewusst absichtsvoll und doch mannigfaltig sind.<sup>36</sup>

This was, again, a social comment on the part of Schnitzler, but always within the realm of the play.

On January 14, 1895, Schnitzler Promised, "das Manuscript will ich in Ehren halten."<sup>37</sup>

This exchange of correspondence was the most intense between the two men. After that point, there followed one more series of letters, and again it began with Herzl. On June 23, 1895, Herzl wrote an enthusiastic letter to Schnitzler telling him of a work greater than anything he had written before.

In den Wochen, seit ich Ihnen nicht geschrieben habe, ist etwas anderes, Neues, viel Groesseres in mir aufgeschlossen, was mir jetzt wie ein Balsaltberg vorkommt, vielleicht weil ich noch so erschuettert bin und das Entstandene noch so feuerlich glueht. Wochen der ungeheuerlichsten Produktionsaufregung, in der ich manchmal

fuerchtete, verrueckt zu werden.  
 Es sind vorlaeufig nur die Planskizzen -- sie  
 sind schon ein ganzes Buch. Wir werden, wenn  
 wir im Sommer in Salzkammergut  
 zusammentreffen, darueber reden.  
 Dieses Werk ist jedenfalls fuer mich und mein  
 ferneres Leben von der groessten Bedeutung--  
 vielleicht auch fuer andere Menschen. Denn  
 was mich annehmen laesst, dass ich etwas  
 Wertvolles entworfen habe, ist die Tatsache,  
 dass ich dabei keine Sekunde lang  
 literatenhaft an mich gedacht habe, sondern  
 immer an andere Menschen, welche schwer  
 leiden.<sup>38</sup>

Again Herzl wished to gain Schnitzler as a confidant and trustee of his new project. Herzl was referring to his Judenstaat, the draft of the modern state of Israel, even though he did not specifically mention this in the letter. In the same letter, Herzl continued by writing that he was enroute to Paris, and if anything should happen to him, Schnitzler should know where this new manuscript was. Herzl gave Schnitzler exact directions for the location of the manuscript. "Jemand muss das wissen, falls ich 'hinfahre ueber Nacht' Das sind jetzt Sie."<sup>39</sup> This did indicate renewed trust in Schnitzler. Herzl ended the letter with the following words:

Ich war nie in einer so gluecklichen, hohen Stimmung. Ich denke nicht ans Sterben, sondern an ein Leben voll maennlicher Taten, das alles Niedere, Wueste, Verworrene, das je in mir gewesen sein mag, ausloescht, aufhebt und alle mit mir versoehnt, so wie ich mich durch diese Arbeit mit allen versoehnt habe.  
 Ihr Freund Herzl.<sup>40</sup>

In Schnitzler's response of June 30, 1895, his enthusiasm for Herzl's project emerges. Thinking that this was another piece of fiction, Schnitzler wrote,

"Lieber Freund, die wunderschöne Stimmung, von der Ihr Gedanken jetzt erfüllt und welche in Ihrem Brief an mich ueberstromt ist, freut mich um Ihrer und Ihres Werkes willen. Was ist es? Wieder ein Stueck?"<sup>41</sup> It can be assumed that Schnitzler did have the summer meeting with Herzl mentioned in that letter. It is, thus, interesting to note that from that point on there was almost no correspondence between the two men.

The relationship, with which Schnitzler was always uncomfortable, diminished considerably as a result of differing views on Zionism. As Olga Schnitzler wrote in Spiegelbild der Freundschaft:,

Das Land der Vaeter! -- fuer Schnitzler ein geographischer Begriff, zu dem er nie in lebendige Beziehung geraten konnte. Fremd und erschreckend schienen ihm die Bilder aus Palaestina, eine gnadenlose Steinwueste, oed und grauenhaft anzusehen. Nein! Sein Leben hatte sich in einem Jetzt und Hier zu erfuehlen....das zu sein wozu er sich immer wieder bekannte: ein euopaeischer Jude deutscher Kultur.<sup>42</sup>...  
Nein ihm konnte es damals keine Loesung der Judenfrage bedeuten, dorthin zurueckzukehren, von wo man vor zweitausend Jahren ausgegangen war....<sup>43</sup>

As much as Schnitzler travelled, he never visited Palestine -- even though he had considered it.<sup>44</sup>

The only further correspondence between Schnitzler and Herzl occurred in December 1900, five years later, when it involved a proposed printing of a Schnitzler piece in the feuilleton pages of the Christmas issue of the Neue Freie Presse. The tone of mistrust and dislike continued over a misunderstanding and disagreement, and

thus ended the correspondence between Schnitzler and Herzl, and we can assume the relationship.

Looking at this peculiar liason from the perspective of the Schnitzler "Charakteristiken" on Herzl and the Schnitzler-Herzl correspondence, one can make interesting comparisons and, from there, draw conclusions. Both of these sources highlight a mutual distrust and envy. Within the correspondence, there are three series of letters. The first one started with the discussion of Schnitzler's Maerchen, the next one was on Herzl's Das Neue Ghetto, and the last one arose when Herzl indicated to Schnitzler that he had written his magnum opus (without revealing Judenstaat by name). In this there are two interesting points to note. It was always Herzl who initiated each series of letters. He also wanted to secure Schnitzler's support for his own endeavors. This aim was realized with his piece Das Neue Ghetto, for which he did have Schnitzler's help, securing the latter as confidant of his pseudonym, Albert Schnabel, and in the eventual revision and production of the play. It did not work, however, with his non-fiction, Judenstaat. The correspondence was, thus, broken off, for the men did not share the same proposed solutions to the problem of the Jewish situation in Vienna, which they both recognized.

The second point is the difference in personality of the two men. As already noted with the last line of

Schnitzler's "Charakteristiken" on Herzl, Schnitzler considered Herzl too emotional in his enthusiasm, almost to the point of hysteria. [Schnitzler referred to Herzl's "manische Ausbrueche" (469).] Schnitzler had little patience or respect for this. An objective reader of the correspondence between the two men, must note the difference in style and tone of language. Schnitzler was more honest, in that he had an even tone. As Wagner points out in her biography of Schnitzler, he was an extremely tolerant and even-minded man.<sup>45</sup> He was not given to outbursts; he was rational. Thus, as a public person, Schnitzler bore the burden of his antiSemitic world,<sup>46</sup> but found his outlet in fiction.

In her studies, Renate Wagner indicates that Schnitzler tended to become silent when he was angry-- he had difficulty showing his emotions publicly.<sup>47</sup> In particular reference to the Jewish question, Schnitzler, in his autobiography, commented on his reactions and personality. Schnitzler admitted that once, while beset by a question of religion, he attempted to write an essay to vent his anger. However, "der Zorn erstickt meine Worte. So erkannte ich frueh genug, dass ich auch zum Essayisten nicht geboren war."<sup>48</sup> Thus, Schnitzler, who became silent when angry, could only comment on society through literature. This became very clear through the Schnitzler-Herzl relationship. His comments to Herzl were always in the context of literature.

## Notes

1. Frederic Morton, A Nervous Splendor: Vienna 1888/1889 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1979) 137.
2. Morton 182.
3. Heinrich Schnitzler, et al., Arthur Schnitzler: Sein Leben, Sein Werk, Seine Zeit (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981) 44.
4. Olga Schnitzler, Spiegelbild der Freundschaft (Salzburg: Residenz, 1962) 46.
5. O. Schnitzler 80.
6. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler, Jugend in Wien (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968) 156.
7. Werner Welzig, ed., Arthur Schnitzler: Tagebuch 1909-1912 (Vienna: Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1981) 14.
8. Arthur Schnitzler, "Charakteristiken," Nachlass, vol. 188, Cambridge University 451. All further references to this work will be indicated in the text by the page number in parenthesis.
9. Theodor Herzl, Theodor Herzls Tagebuecher 1895-1904, 3 vols. (Berlin: Juedischer Verlag, 1922) 9.
10. Harry Zohn, Wiener Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays (Tel Aviv: Olamenu, 1964) 44.
11. Zohn 44.
12. Zohn 47.
13. Zohn 47.
14. Zohn 47.
15. O. Schnitzler 100.
16. Renate Wagner, Arthur Schnitzler: Eine Biographie (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1981) 156.
17. Wagner 156.
18. O. Schnitzler 100.

19. Until recently, with the publication of Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler, Briefe 1895-1912 (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981), the published correspondence between Schnitzler and Herzl was limited. There existed only the translated version by Joel Carmichael, which appeared in the Winter 1960 issue of Midstream.

20. Joel Carmichael, ed. and trans., "Excerpts from the correspondence between Theodor Herzl and Arthur Schnitzler (1892-1895)," Midstream 6, i (Winter 1960) 46.

21. O. Schnitzler 100.

22. Manfred Georg, ed., Herzl Briefe (Berlin: Brandusche, 192[ ]) 29.

23. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler, Briefe 1875-1912 (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981) 124.

24. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 124.

25. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 124-25.

26. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 125.

27. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 125-26.

28. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 161.

29. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 793.

30. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 234.

31. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 799-800.

32. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 237. Herzl followed Schnitzler's advice to a limited extent by omitting the latter half of the comment, "...wenn ihr zu sterben wisst," as cited in Theodor Herzl, Das Neue Ghetto (Vienna: Loewit, 1920) 117.

33. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 239.

34. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 239.

35. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 243.

36. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 248.

37. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 249.

38. Georg 52-53.
39. Georg 54.
40. Georg 40.
41. Nickl and Schnitzler, Briefe 41.
42. O. Schnitzler 96.
43. O. Schnitzler 99.
44. Wagner 261.
45. Wagner 261.
46. O. Schnitzler 96.
47. Renate Wagner, Frauen um Schnitzler (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1980) 102.
48. Nickl and Schnitzler, Jugend in Wien 98.

Professor Bernhardt

The situation of the Jew in turn-of-the-century Vienna is one of ambivalence -- especially for the Jewish writer, and for Arthur Schnitzler in particular. This was certainly made clear by Schnitzler's expository prose as well as in his relationship with Theodor Herzl.

In order to further explore this theme it is important to examine the medium in which Schnitzler felt most comfortable, the medium in which he controlled all variables, namely, fiction. Professor Bernhardt, subtitled Comedy in Five Acts, had its premiere in November 1912, in Berlin, since the controversial material was censored in Catholic Austria until December 1919. It is an example of Schnitzler exposing the baseness of anti-Semitism. As Adolf Gaisbauer mentions in his article exploring the historical background of Professor Bernhardt, "Arthur Schnitzlers Komoedie 'Professor Bernhardt' handelt von der Ausnuetzbarkeit des Antisemitismus zur Abreaktion persoenlicher Abneigungen, zur Durchsetzung egoistischer Plaene und zur Befriedigung 'selbstloser Gemeinheit'."1

From this opening statement by Gaisbauer, we immediately see various concepts which Schnitzler introduced into Professor Bernhardt. They are, interestingly enough, comedy in connection with, as Gaisbauer states, anti-Semitism, personal antipathy, and selfish vulgarity. In the analysis of Professor

Bernhardi, an attempt will be made to examine each of these concepts and how it relates to the ambivalence of the Jewish situation in Vienna during the turn-of-the-century. This will be explored from a two-fold perspective: how the Jew is viewed by others in his society, and how the Jew views himself in that society, as well as the historical circumstances that made it possible to present Professor Bernhardi in the manner Schnitzler did.

A brief summary of the plot is appropriate. Professor Bernhardi is the director of a private medical facility that he helped found. However, since Bernhardi is a Jew, his position is vulnerable, because of the anti-Semitic factions within the institution. Only one incident is needed to bring the dormant anti-Semitism to the fore.

One of Bernhardi's patients is a young woman who, despite the fact of her impending death, feels she is fully recovered. In this last moment of euphoria, she expects her lover to come for her. Bernhardi, as a physician, does not want to destroy these last moments of happiness for his dying patient. To allow the priest, who has been summoned to the clinic by Ludmilla, the Catholic nurse, to enter the patient's room would do so. Therefore, in his capacity as physician, Bernhardi requests that the priest not enter the room. In the interim, however, Ludmilla does inform the woman of the

priest's presence. This shock to the patient causes her immediate death, before the priest is able to enter and administer the last sacrament. Within eight days, the incident is blown out of proportion. Bernhardt is accused of forcibly blocking the priest's entrance into the patient's room, and thus offends basic religious feelings of his Catholic society. As a result, the future of the institution is threatened. With the hope of preventing the dissolution of the facility by the board of trustees and the Austrian Ministry of Education, Bernhardt voluntarily resigns his post to the Vice Director, Dr. Ebenwald, a blatant anti-Semite. Bernhardt, who does not want to become embroiled in politics, is willing to make a statement assuring that his actions were not motivated by the desire to injure religious feelings, but by professional ethics only. However, anti-Semitic colleagues, as well as his society in general, initiate an investigation of the incident. As the result of a trial, Bernhardt is found guilty of forcibly hindering the priest from fulfilling the last sacrament. He is sentenced to a two-month prison term. After his release, his attorney wants to have a retrial, since Ludmilla, on whose statement Bernhardt was convicted, admitted to exaggerating the incident. Bernhardt, however, wants no part of this. He merely wants to return to private practice.

Alongside this main plot, there are subplots, which

also point to the vulnerable situation of Jewish physicians because of anti-Semitism. While Bernhardt is facing his own career uncertainties, he is visited by Dr. Feuermann, a Jewish gynecologist from the provinces, who is threatened with the loss of his position because of the death of a patient that was beyond his control. Another subplot dealing with the Jewish question is the election of a physician to the post of head of dermatology in the institute. Bernhardt, while still director, must break a tie-vote. He chooses the more qualified candidate, Dr. Wenger, who is Jewish. Before he chooses Wenger, it is implied by Ebenwald, among others, such as Flint (Minister of Education and one-time physician himself) that if Bernhardt chooses the other candidate, who is a non-Jew, it may help Bernhardt's case. Bernhardt, however, stands on principle and chooses Wenger.

On the surface, the plot and subplots of Professor Bernhardt are not in line with the usual Schnitzler presentations. Aside from the nurse, Ludmilla, there are no female characters. The interactions of the characters in Professor Bernhardt are not the usual ones. There are more characters, without the particular one-to-one relationship for which Schnitzler is known. As Robert O. Weiss points out, the critic Josef Koerner wrote of the drama, "Professor Bernhardt faellt als ein Unternehmen sui generis aus dem Rahmen des

Schnitzlerschen Gesamtwerks."<sup>2</sup> Weiss uses this statement to bring attention to the fact that critics generally ignore the subtitle Komoedie, and in his article, Weiss proves that the play is, indeed, meant as a "comedy" -- but primarily in relation to the concept of "hero."

This idea warrants analysis, and will be incorporated into the examination of the theme of ambivalence, the ambivalence of the Jewish situation as perceived by, and seen through, the characters -- Jewish as well as non-Jewish -- within the society. By looking at the main plot and the subplots of the drama, one realizes that anti-Semitism provides the background in which Schnitzler can proceed with his character study. For a long time, Schnitzler was pondering a situation into which he could incorporate the baseness of anti-Semitism. As he wrote to Brandes in 1900 (30 April), "Es wird naemlich kaum moeglich sein in der naechsten Zeit etwas Wienerisches zu schreiben in das nicht die antisemitische Frage hineinspielt."<sup>3</sup> His impetus for writing Professor Bernhardt is strictly personal, and not political in any way.<sup>4</sup> It took him twelve years to give expression to the personal feelings that took the form of Professor Bernhardt.

Schnitzler saw Professor Bernhardt primarily as a character study. As evidenced in his correspondence with Georg Brandes, "soll Bernhardt ueberhaupt

kategorisiert werden, so moechte ich ihn am liebsten als Charakterkomoedie angesehen wissen."<sup>5</sup> This point is emphatically reiterated in a letter Schnitzler wrote to the Austrian historian, Richard Charatz, on January 4, 1913, after the Berlin premiere of Professor Bernhardi. The letter was first made public in 1964 by Heinrich Schnitzler, at a revival of the play in Germany. As Siegfried Melchinger states in his article, "Das Juedische in Professor Bernhardi," "Dem Programmheft der Wuerttembergischen Staatstheater hat Heinrich Schnitzler, der Regisseur der Stuttgarter Neuinszenierung des 'Professor Bernhardi' einen Brief seines Vaters zur Verfuegung gestellt, von dem wie ich glaube, alle kuenftigen Interpretationen des ebensoschwierigen wie meisterhaften Stueckes auszugehen haben."<sup>6</sup>

This letter must be taken into account for an interpretation of the drama. The letter emphasizes three main points, one of which is that Bernhardi is the depiction of the milieu of the Jewish situation in light of anti-Semitism. It is through this that Schnitzler saw the play as a character study, and thus, one can call it a "comedy" (of character interaction), and finally, the letter allows us, once again, to see Schnitzler's personal feelings on being a Jew in Vienna.

In his discussion, Schnitzler starts out on an overall positive note, saying that there have been many

contributions by Jews to society in general.

Nicht weniger stark als Sie, glaube ich zu empfinden, was ich dem deutschen Volke danke. Aber selbst wenn ich unter voelliger Vernachlaessigung meiner Rassenzugehoerigkeit (was mir anfechtbar erschiene) Alles, was ich besitze dem Deuschtum zu danken glaubte, so draengte sich mir doch manchmal die Ueberlegung auf, wie Vieles das Deuschtum selbst den Kulturellen und ethischen Leistung des Judentums, so weit seine Geschichte zurueckreicht zu verdanken hat.<sup>7</sup>

Schnitzler wavers, in that he prefaces the statement by praising German society. One also notes his parenthetical statement "meine Rassenzugehoerigkeit (was mir anfechtbar erschiene)." There is always an element of doubt -- hence ambivalence. This is especially true at the end of that statement. He closes it with, "und wuerde mich immerhin auch einigermaßen in der Schuld meiner Ahnen fuehlen."<sup>8</sup>

He always cast doubt on any positive statement. These feelings stem from his belief that no one segment of society is better than another. "Der juedischen Kulturarbeit hoeheren Wert zuzugestehen, oder Sie im Ganzen als eine mir sympathischere einzuschuetzen, als die irgendeinerandern Kulturvolkes, Germanen, Romanen, oder sonst welche versuch ich keineswegs..."<sup>9</sup> As a result, Schnitzler compared himself to his character, Dr. Kurt Pflugfelder in Professor Bernhardt, "So bekenne, ich mich zu der Meinung des Dr. Kurt Pflugfelder, der Antisemit und Antiarier zugleich, die Menschen im Allgemeinen als eine recht mangelhafte

Gesellschaft erklart und sich an die wenigen Ausnahmen da und dort zu halten behauptet."<sup>10</sup> However, some of his co-religionists are the most distasteful to him. Schnitzler, the realist and cynic, continued by criticizing his fellow Jews. He criticizes Jews who are out-of-touch with reality. They either isolate themselves in their religious rituals, deny the existence of anti-Semitism, or play "uncle Tom" in society.

Ich weiss nicht einmal ob gerade die Antisemiten, die Christlichsozialen und die deutsch-nationaler Couleur, mir trotz persoenerlicher Eindruecke und Erfahrungen die widerwaertigsten Menschenexemplare darstellen. Beinahe geradeso aergerlich ist mir eine gewisse Sorte Juden die aus kindischem Trotz sich als Reaktionaere gebaerden und ihren religioesnationalen Standpunkt durch das Festhalten an sinnlos gewordenen Gebraeuehen zu wahren suchen, die Ihnen innerlich laengst fremd geworden sind. Als die peinlichsten Zeitgenossen freilich empfinde ich diejenigen Juden, die vom Antisemitismus nichts spueren oder nichts zu spueren vorgeben, sei es nun aus Mangel an Feingefuehl, aus Bequemlichkeit, aus Satieriertheit, aus Snobismus oder aus Kriecherei. In Hinsicht auf diese Sorte Juden bin ich sogar AntiSemit.<sup>11</sup>

In summing up Schnitzler's feelings on Judaism found in the letter to Charmatz, one can make an interesting observation. In almost all of his discussions he defines Judaism in what it is not; the definition is derived from the negative. "In grappling with the Jewish problem, Schnitzler does not minimize its difficulty. He does not mask its ugliness. He makes no predictions as to its future trend. He merely

lays bare a moral and social condition that brings suffering and bewilderment to millions of people."<sup>12</sup> This emphasizes another point of the letter to Charmatz. Professor Bernhardt is an Austrian play, and in such a play, Schnitzler had to depict a situation with Jews and anti-Semitism. Therefore, Professor Bernhardt had to be a Jewish character. Schnitzler wrote to Charmatz,

Aber wie immer man zu der sogenannten Judenfrage stehen mag (die in hoehere Sinn ja wieder keine Frage ist) [It should be noted that whenever Schnitzler begins to approach the "Jewish Situation," he shows his own ambivalence by wavering, in the fact that he has to add a parenthetical note.] mir erscheint es direkt unmoeglich, heute ein in politischen Kreisen spielendes oesterreichisches Stueck zu schreiben, ohne-- ich will ja nicht sagen, die nun einmal bestehende Gegensaetzlichkeit zwischen juedischen und christlichen resp. juedischer und germanischer Elementen um jeden Preis zu betonen -- aber gewiss unmoeglich ohne dem Vorhaendeinsein juedischer Elemente und der Eigentuemlichkeit juedischen Geistes in einer den tatsaechlichen Verhaeltnissen entsprechenden Weise Rechnung zu tragen.<sup>13</sup>

The drama was so typically Austrian that Brahm, who in the past had produced many a Schnitzler play in Berlin, wrote to the playwright on September 19, 1912, "er erkenne die vortreffliche Menschenschilderung, den guten Bau und den famosen Dialog an. Doch sei das Milieu zu fremdartig, fuer norddeutsche Hoerer zu schwer eingaengig, und befremdend. Die Berliner juedischen Aerzte seien nicht verfolgt, im Gegenteil, sie dominieren. Auch sei die Umwelt nicht katholisch, sondern protestantisch."<sup>14</sup> As mentioned above, the

premiere was, nonetheless, in Berlin, held on November 28, 1912, in the Kleines Theater, under the direction of Viktor Barnowsky. It was the evening of Brahm's death.

In his article, Gaisbauer depicts, incident by incident, the actions in the play, comparing them with similar occurrences in contemporary society. It is for this reason Gaisbauer writes, "Er [Professor Bernhardi] enthaelt historisches Material aus dem Zeitraum eines Vierteljahrhunderts (1883 bis 1908) und stellt eine insbesondere auf den Antisemitismus thematisch begrenzte Rueckschau und Umschau seines Autors dar."<sup>15</sup> Gaisbauer concludes with a Schnitzler letter to Brahm, while he was at work on Professor Bernhardi: "Ich habe Freude, dran und es ist mir wohl, dass ich mir allerlei von der Seele sprechen kann auf dem anstaendigen Wege selbsterschaffener und, wie mich duenkt, nicht unlebendiger Figuren."<sup>16</sup>

In order to portray his milieu, Schnitzler used a medical clinic as a microcosm of his society, since this was a familiar setting for him.<sup>17</sup> Schnitzler's father, Johann, founded the Poliklinik, just as Bernhardi founded the Elisabethinum. In Jugend in Wien, there is a reference to Schnitzler's father: "Die Poliklinik wurde im Jahre 1872 von zwouelf jungen Dozenten der Medizin, darunter meinem Vater, gegruendet die sich fuer ihre Lehrtaetigkeit, um dem misslichen Gastverhaeltnis an den staatlichen Kliniken zu entgehen, eine eigene

Staette des Lehren, Lernens und Heilens zu schaffen wuenschten."<sup>18</sup> And just as did the Elisabethinum, the Poliklinik had the support of a royal patron, despite opposition by private physicians.

...An Goennern fehlte es nicht; und da sich ueberdies ein Prinz des Kaiserlichen Hauses, der treffliche Erzherzog Rainer, entschlossen hatte, das Protektorat des Institutes zu uebernehmen, so schienen die guenstigsten Bedingungen fuer dessen ungestoerte und gedeihliche Fortentwicklung gegeben. Da begannen ploetzlich, vor allem aus den Kreisen der praktischen Aerzte, die damals oekonomisch unter den Nachwirkungen der Boersenkatastrophe von 1873 zu leiden hatten, Klagen, Anklagen, Verdaechtigungen, Verleumdungen laut zu werden, die allmaelig durch publizistische Beihilfe faktioeser Art den Charakter einer regelrechten in ihren Mitten recht unbedenklichen Hetze annahmen. Die Poliklinik, so hiess es, bedeute den Ruin der praktischen Aerzte.<sup>19</sup>

In this discussion, Schnitzler added that it had been his father, just as Bernhardi did, who defended the medical clinic, allowing it to continue its work and to become firmly established in the community. "Waehrend jener Kaempfe war es vor allem mein Vater gewesen der die Sache des Institutes dessen Mitbegruender und Vorstandsmitglied er war, als Redakteur der 'Medizinischen Presse' der oeffentlichkeit gegenueber vornehm gewandt und temperamentvoll vertreten hatte...."<sup>20</sup> However, within a few years, Johann Schnitzler realized the undercurrents of anti-Semitism in the Poliklinik.

Mein Vater in einer vorzueglichen Entgegnung die Anfang 1886 in der "Medizinischen Presse" erschien -- deutet jene mehr oder minder

verborgenen oder verleugneten Motive, insbesondere jenes, das sich bei jedem Konkurrenzkampf heute noch wie damals mit einer oft elementaren Schamlosigkeit geltend zu machen pflegt, am Schluss seiner Ausfuehrungen leise an, wenn es von "gewissen Stroemungen, die mitunter auch die intelligentesten Kreise mitreissen!"<sup>21</sup>

This last statement refers to the delicate balance between Jewish and Christian physicans at the Poliklinik. It seems that for every Jewish physician elected to a new post at the clinic, there had to be a position counterbalanced by a non-Jewish physician.

For example, in July 1900, the Fackel, in an article, entitled "Universitaetsbummel," reported an incident in the Poliklinik which reflected this situation.<sup>22</sup>

The article focused on anti-Semitism within the clinic,<sup>23</sup> and Schnitzler gave vent to this in

Professor Bernhardt. Schnitzler "hat in diesem Werk ueberzeugend die Illusion zerstoert, dass der (juedische) Intellektuelle sich vollig unabhaengig von den gesellschaftlichen Triebkraefte[n] seiner Zeit entwickeln kann."<sup>24</sup>

Thus, Professor Bernhardt, in its main plot as well as subplots, is typically Austrian. As Schnitzler wrote to Charmatz, "Und eine oesterreichische Komoedie habe ich geschrieben."<sup>25</sup>

Schnitzler insisted he had written a character study presented as a "comedy." As stated above, he noted this point to Brandes, as well as to Charmatz. "Ich habe eine Charakterkomoedie geschrieben, die in

aerztlichen und zum Teil in politischen Kreisen spielt, kein Tendenzstueck, das den Konflikt zwischen Wissenschaft und Kirche oder gar, wie Sie meinen, den Streit zwischen zwei Religionen darzustellen oder am Ende in irgendeiner Richtung zu entscheiden sucht."<sup>26</sup>

Before an examination of the "character study" in detail, it is important to understand the concept of "comedy." Professor Bernhardt is subtitled "Comedy in Five Acts," and, as Robert O. Weiss indicates in his article, "The Hero in Schnitzler's Comedy Professor Bernhardt," one cannot deny that Schnitzler intended it as such.<sup>27</sup> This concept can be viewed from different perspectives. Weiss indicates, as can be seen by the title of his article, comedy refers to the "hero," Bernhardt, and is, therefore, seen within the context of a strict definition. Weiss contends that the typical tragic hero acts. Bernhardt does not act, he reacts.<sup>28</sup> His prime actions as Director of the Clinic, except for the tie-breaking vote for Wenger, are not seen. Weiss also points out that Bernhardt finds himself in a situation which makes him appear "ridiculous" to himself, and this, certainly, is not characteristic of the tragic hero.<sup>29</sup> Thus, Weiss concludes,

Professor Bernhardt is in truth an appropriate hero for a character comedy: he is a rebel without a cause; a martyr without martyrdom; an avenger incapable of revenge; and he becomes a popular hero without having intended or done anything heroic. No wonder, then, that he cuts a comical figure in his own view and thus justifies, for his part, the play's

categorization as a comedy.<sup>30</sup>

Weiss presents a relevant argument if one considers the subtitle as applied to the hero only in the strict definition of comedy. However, as Melchinger points out, Schnitzler would not be so foolish as to take anti-Semitism as the subject for a comedy.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, the strict Weiss interpretation, as it applies to the hero only, is acceptable. But, in a much broader sense, comedy is used to make a comment on character study and interaction, as Schnitzler indicated to Charmatz. It is the result of a ridiculous, and simultaneously, appalling situation.

Anti-Semitism is the background, the vehicle, or the catalyst which brings out the ugliness and the "Gemeinheit" of the human species. "Schnitzler war so wenig wie Bernhardi frei von Menschenverachtung."<sup>32</sup> People, including those considered more intelligent, like physicians in the Poliklinik or Elisabethinum, are driven by "Eitelkeit, Neid, Karrieresucht."<sup>33</sup> And from this perspective, the interactions of the characters presented in Professor Bernhardi depict a comic situation. Just like all people, physicians, too, are not above pettiness.<sup>34</sup> Also, it is interesting to note that the "real" situation, as it occurred in the Poliklinik, was reported in a comic manner in the Fackel. This is immediately apparent from the opening line: "Ein huebsches Intriguenlustspiel."<sup>35</sup> In Jugend

in Wien, Schnitzler referred to anti-Semitism as being so base that it appeared comic. For example, anti-Semitism played a key role in a medical student debate involving continued aid to needy students, most of whom were Jews from the Hungarian section of the empire. In his description of these events, Schnitzler used the word comedy.

Es war nun in meinem Freiwilligenjahr, vielleicht auch ein Jahr vorher oder spaeter, dass in einer solchen Generalversammlung von deutschnationaler Seite die Forderung erhoben wurde, es duerfte von nun an nur mehr deutsche, keine ungarischen und slawischen, das hiess also keine juedischen Studenten der Unterstuetzung teilhaftig werden. Eine stuermische Diskussion erhob sich; es gab Interpellationen, Invektiven, Ordnungsrufe, kurz die ganze Komoedie der Parlamentsskandale im Kleinen....<sup>36</sup>

Schnitzler explored characters in Professor Bernhardt. As he wrote to Charnatz,

Denn ich empfinde es als meinen Berufe, Menschen zu gestalten und habe nichts zu beweisen, als die Vielfaeltigkeit der Welt. Eine Handlung so zu fuehren, dass jede an ihr beteiligte oder nur an sie Anstreichende Figur ihr innerstes Wesen preiszugeben genoetigt wird, darin liegt am Ende das Geheimnis aller dramatischen Energie. Die Leitung der Begebenheiten ist bis zu einem gewissen Grad dem kuenstlerischen Willen und wohl auch der theatralischen Wilkuer des Dichters ueberlassen...die Hauptgestalten...keineswegs nach Laune oder Bedarf zusammengestueckelt werden koennen, sondern von Anbeginn dastehen so wie sie der Dichter in seiner Seele empfangen hat....<sup>37</sup>

Characters created by the author is the author's concept of society. In the instance of Professor Bernhardt, anti-Semitism, while providing background to

explore characters, also is the result of individual characters and their interaction. The two perspectives are interlinked and reversible, and thus, the author made a comment on milieu through his characters. As Schindlegger writes, "Wien um 1900 legt eine Regiebemerkung zum Professor Bernhardi Ort und Zeit des Komoediengeschehens fest und dokumentiert damit den Zeitgeschichtlichen Bezug dieser Oesterreichischen Komoedie."<sup>38</sup>

Ambivalence is interwoven in Arthur Schnitzler's writings, which represented him, as well as his milieu.

Zwei Seelen wohnen zwar nicht in seiner Brust, aber seine Seele weist Spruenge auf. Er lehnte sowohl den politischen Zionismus als auch dessen Gegenteil, eine gaenzliche Assimilation ab.... Schnitzler hat die bestehende Spannung nie ganz in sich ueberwinden koennen und seine Judennot ist er wohl auch nie ganz los geworden.... Schnitzler habe sich innerlich immer wieder mit seinem Judentum auseinandersetzen muessen.<sup>39</sup>

For the Jew living in Vienna in 1900, ambivalence is seen from two perspectives: the Gentile viewing the Jew in the former's society, and the Jew viewing himself in that society.

An analysis of the characters, non-Jewish and Jewish, in Professor Bernhardi will illustrate these points. Notwithstanding an analysis of the specific non-Jewish characters in their interrelations with Jews in Catholic society, the situation presented through the plot in Professor Bernhardi is one which gives rise to ambivalence felt by its characters. Professor Bernhardi

and his Jewish colleagues are allowed to function within society. Permitted to do so by the tolerance fostered by the Austrian constitution of 1867, and with the support of the Prince, they establish an institute. However, there is always latent and dormant anti-Semitism which makes the acceptance of Jews by others ambivalent. Even though Bernhardi is an excellent physician, most of his non-Jewish colleagues, as well as society at large, welcome the opportunity to oust him. Had Bernhardi not been Jewish, the entire incident would not have occurred. As Schnitzler wrote to Charmatz, he had no choice but to portray Bernhardi as a Jew.<sup>40</sup>

The subplots also highlight Christian society's ambivalence in accepting the Jew. Dr. Feuermann is employed by the community. However, as soon as something goes awry, despite his blamelessness in the situation, Feuermann is faced with dismissal. In the more focal situation of the Elisabethinum, the Wenger-Hell affair points to the shaky acceptance of the Jewish physician.

All of the individual characters portrayed in Professor Bernhardi represent the different types found in society. Of the non-Jewish characters in Professor Bernhardi, there are Dr. Ebenwald, Hochroitzpointer, Ludmilla (the nurse), Franz Reder (the priest), Dr. Filitz, Dr. Tugendvetter, Prof. Dr. Flint (the Unterrichtsminister), Hofrat Dr. Winkler (the

Unterrichtsministerium), Dr. Cyrian, the Drs. Pflugfelder (father and son), and two Jews converted to Christianity, Dr. Schriemann and Bernhardi's defense attorney, Dr. Goldenthal.

Each of these individuals represents a different type in his reaction to Catholic society and the Jewish situation. The spectrum extends from the rabid anti-Semite to defenders of Bernhardi. There are also those who are indifferent, and those who display latent anti-Semitism. In addition, one finds the interesting category of the converted Jews, and the conflicts those individuals feel in the situation presented.

The most blatant anti-Semites cut across all segments of the minisociety Schnitzler has created within the Elisabethinum. At the top is the Vice Director, Dr. Ebenwald, whom Bernhardi chose for that position years earlier. On the other end of the social ladder, one finds Hochroitzpointer, a medical student from the Tirol and the Slavic nurse, Ludmilla. The false testimony of Hochroitzpointer and Ludmilla, both of whom witnessed the Bernhardi and priest encounter, was the primary cause for Bernhardi's conviction and two-month prison sentence.

In their individual cases, on the surface, the motivation seemed to be nothing but anti-Semitism. However, anti-Semitism served as a catalyst to illustrate other characteristics, such as greed and

avarice in individuals. In the case of Ludmilla, outright stupidity and fear are the reasons for her anti-Semitism. Her character is weak, as demonstrated in her encounters with Hochroitzpointer. She originally calls the priest, and then allows him to enter for fear she must do her duty as a good Catholic. It is also because of fear that she finally confesses to her priest that she lied on the witness stand, in order to help convict Bernhardi. Only at the suggestion of her father confessor does she decide to come forth in order to vindicate Bernhardi. The fear Ludmilla has is a result of her blind obedience to a "higher order." In this case, it is religion that plays a large role in her society. Ludmilla is Schnitzler's comment on the interrelationship of fear and stupidity; religion, according to Schnitzler, serves this purpose. Schnitzler expresses this concept through Flint, who says to Winkler, "Glauben Sie denn wirklich, lieber Hofrat, dass das Volk heute reif ist, oder jemals reif sein wird ohne Religion zu existieren." 41

It was also the testimony of Hochroitzpointer that helped convict Bernhardi. Schnitzler portrayed him as a highly unsympathetic character. His descriptions of Hochroitzpointer point to a precocious individual, who believes he knows more than he actually does. Even his appearance gives this impression, "25 jaehriger junger Mensch, mittelgross, dick, kleiner Schnurbart, Schmiss,

zwickter, blass, das Haar sehr geschneigelt" (339).

Hochroitzpointer does not regard his profession seriously, even though he is dealing with human life. For example he is more concerned with the ball given by the Fuerstin (339-40). He admits, "Ich habe mich gar nicht niedergelegt Herr Dozent. Es war nimmer der Mueh wert.... Bis sieben habe ich getanzt, um acht war ich schon auf der internen Abteilung, um zehn auf der chirurgischen, um zweielf..." (392). Dr. Schreimann retorts, "Ihn unterbrechend hoeren S'schon auf, ich weiss ja dass Sie ueberall sind" (392), and when he asks Hochroitzpointer about the report he was to prepare, the answer is, "Bin leider nicht frueher dazu gekommen, Herr Dozent" (392). Hochroitzpointer is not particularly intelligent, constantly postponing his exams; he is self-important. When Bernhardi asks why Ludmilla originally allowed the priest into the room despite his reservations, she indicates that Hochroitzpointer permitted it, and she, who listens to instructions, acted on his directions. Hochroitzpointer remarks to Bernhardi, "Ja, ich hab's ihr natuerlich nicht verboten, Herr Direktor" (359).

Bernhardi answers in his ironic manner, "Selbstkverstaendlich, Herr Doktor Hochroitzpointer. Sie hospitieren wahrscheinlich auch in der Kirche, was" (359)? To which Hochroitzpointer replies, "Herr Direktor, wir leben in einem christlichen Staat" (359).

After Bernhardt leaves, and Ludmilla becomes upset at her possible disobedience, Hochroitzpointer says with confidence, "Und wenn er schon boes' war, -- der Herr Direktor. Na lang bleibt ers ja nimmer. Das bricht ihm den Kragen" (359)!

Hochroitzpointer's anti-Semitism is a product of the society, in which he lives. Schnitzler had a particular disgust for this type of person, the anti-Semite who bases his feelings on the inability to reflect upon society's blind hatred. In Jugend in Wien, Schnitzler revealed the origins of his character Hochroitzpointer as a combination of two distasteful personalities he encountered in medical school. Schnitzler recalled how he lost his seat in the student Generalversammlung, a body that had become totally anti-Semitic. As a result, Schnitzler wrote,

Mein persoenlicher Nachfolger wurde ein fleissiger Mediziner meines Jahrgangs namens Maeuletschlaeger, ein aufgedunsener, blasser Tiroler. [Hochroitzpointer is also from the Tirol, and the description "blass" should be noted.] Bauernstaemmling, dem es bestimmt war, noch vor Vollendung seiner Studien an Miliartuberkulose zugrunde zu gehen. Sein aeuusseres Bild fliesst mir zusammen mit dem eines andern Mediziners, den ich einige Jahre spaeter an der Standthartner'schen Abteilung zu behandeln hatte, wo er mit Scharlach darniederlag. Als ich ihm wenige Tage nach seiner Genesung im Spitalsgarten begegnete, hielt er sich als mutiger Bekenner des Waidhofener Beschlusses fuer verpflichtet, ohne Gruss an mir vorbeizugehen. Aus der Vereinigung dieser beiden Gestalten erstand die Figur des Studenten Hochroitzpointer, dem in meiner Komoedie Professor Bernhardt eine ziemlich charakteristische Rolle zugeteilt ist.<sup>42</sup>

The other anti-Semite, Dr. Ebenwald, is unlike Hochroitzpointer or Ludmilla; he is part of the upper echelon of the minisociety Schnitzler created within the Elisabethinum. Ebenwald, a surgeon and the Vice Director of the institute, would gain most by Bernhardt's ouster. As a result, he is political,<sup>43</sup> using anti-Semitism as a crutch. For example, he openly backs Dr. Hell over Dr. Wenger, because the former is Christian (379). Furthermore, Ebenwald admits he was always an anti-Semite. He says to Dr. Schreimann, a converted Christian, originally Jewish, "Du darfst ja nicht vergessen...auf der Universitaet und noch spaeter als alter Herr war ich ein Fuehrer der Deutschnationalen strengster Observanz. Und du weisst, was das heisst: Wacht am Rhein - Bismarckeiche - Waidhofner Beschluss- Juden wird kein Satisfaktion gegeben, auch Judenstaemmlingen" (395).

Thus far only blatant anti-Semites, whose hatred is based on blind stupidity, have been considered, as was the case with Ludmilla and even Hochroitzpointer, or the jealousy found in career opportunism, as was the case with Dr. Ebenwald. In this regard, the Christian characters are the least ambivalent. They are outright anti-Semites, and, as a result, would totally reject all Jewish influence. In retrospect, this ideology culminated in the "Final Solution" of the Nazis forty years later, but, as documented in historical sources,

the idea was already alive in the Austrian Parliament of the 1880's.<sup>44</sup> Ludmilla, Hochroitzpointer, and Dr. Ebenwald are Schnitzler's representatives for that segment of society. However, the remaining non-Jewish characters in Professor Bernhardt better reflect the majority of the turn-of-the-century Austrian populace in their ambivalent acceptance of the Jew in that society. In this group are Dr. Filitz and Dr. Tugendvetter, in the Elisabethinum; Dr. Flint and Dr. Winkler, in the Government; and the priest, Franz Reder, representative of the Church.

Both Dr. Filitz, the gynecologist, and Dr. Tugendvetter, the dermatologist, play relatively minor roles. Each is primarily important in the subplots. Dr. Filitz is the gynecologist who must judge in the case of Dr. Feuermann, a Jew. Even though Feuermann is finally vindicated, he loses his practice as a physician; he has been ostracized. In the original discussion he had with Filitz, the latter made sure to indicate that religion plays a role in the medical profession. There is, thus, a subtle indication that Feuermann, as a Jew, cannot expect to practice in a Christian society. Filitz interrupted Feuermann's arguments by saying, "Aber ich versichere Sie, Glaube und Wissenschaft vertragen sich sehr gut" (363). And in reference to Bernhardt's situation, Filitz is quick to acknowledge that Bernhardt deserves the bad publicity he

is getting as a result of the encounter with the priest. He insists the reactions are not exaggerated. "Hier ist nichts aufgebauscht worden, hier brauchte auch nichts aufgebauscht zu werden..." (365). When Dr. Lowenstein replies that this would not have occurred, had Bernhardi not been Jewish, Filitz replies, "Also, da seid ihr ja gluecklich wieder bei eurer fixen Idee. Bin ich etwa auch ein Antisemit? Ich, der ich immer mindestens einen juedischen Assistenten habe? Gegenueber anstaendigen Juden gibt es keinen Antisemitismus" (366). This entire statement reveals the ambivalent "acceptance" of the Jew in Christian society.

Dr. Tugendvetter is also such a character. His importance is in the subplot involving the election of either Hell or Wenger as his successor. Tugendvetter is a peripheral character. Nonetheless, his wavering attitude toward Jews in society is subtly expressed by his inactions. He does not actively, or even passively, support his able assistant Wenger as his successor. In the case of Bernhardi, he only appears in the Fifth Act, after Bernhardi's jail sentence is completed. At that point only, does he assure Bernhardi that he had supported him. His comments are shallow. For example, he mentions to Bernhardi how good Bernhardi looks after his jail sentence -- as though he had been on vacation. "Weisst du, lieber Bernhardi, ich hatte total vergessen, dass deine Kerkerstrasse heute ablaeuft. Mein, wie

rasch eigentlich zwei Monate vergehen.... Aber du siehst wirklich geradezu glaenzend aus.... Wenn er an der Riviera gewesen waere, koennte er auch nicht besser aussehen" (452). These comments are insulting to Bernhardi, who realizes the subtle anti-Semitism, and as a result, chooses to ignore the comments by interrupting Tugendvetter (453). This is Schnitzler's comment on society's apathetic reactions, because of its ambivalent acceptance of the Jew.

Dr. Flint and Dr. Winkler, officials in the Unterrichtsministerium, reflect, in government, that which is reflected by the physicians in the Elisabethinum. Both Flint and Winkler show their ambivalent attitudes toward the Jew.

Flint is an interesting character, in that he appears as the opportunist. He is strictly Machiavellian, a fact of which Bernhardi is aware. Bernhardi does not trust him, even though Flint says he will support Bernhardi in Parliament.

Bernhardi recalls that when he and Flint were medical students together, Flint refused to contradict their professor in a diagnosis, even though the patient lost his life as a result. Flint feared it would hinder his political standing with the professor for future opportunities (383).

Bernhardi realizes that since it is opportunistic to be anti-Semitic, he cannot depend on Flint. Even

though assuring Bernhardi of his support, Flint says, "Und so hast du in deinem Auftreten gegenueber Seiner Hochwuerdigen eine Kleinigkeit vergessen, naemlich, dass wir in einem christlichen Staate leben..." (385). Flint's subsequent actions reveal these sentiments.

While defending Bernhardi in Parliament, Flint notes that the sentiment is definitely anti-Semitic. As a result, he changes his speech in the middle, and then is instrumental in stripping Bernhardi of his medical license. Flint's actions are predicated on the same motivating factors as those of the Viennese Mayor, Karl Lueger, who first supported Jewish causes, but, later in his career, became anti-Semitic for political advantage. Just as Flint changed his parliamentary speech in midcourse, so, too, did Karl Lueger, which helped him, finally, to obtain his political stronghold.<sup>45</sup> It is society's ambivalent acceptance of the Jew which made the political opportunism of Flint and Lueger possible.

Hofrat Winkler typifies the latent and subtle anti-Semite who harbors this ambivalent attitude toward the Jew. Winkler is not introduced until Act Five. Here, in the juxtaposition of his dialog with Bernhardi and that of the previous dialog of Bernhardi and Flint, Winkler appears as the rational character who seemingly supports Bernhardi. However, his subtle anti-Semitism is made clear toward the end of the play, when he, too,

implies that Bernhardi was anything but right in his encounter with the priest. To Bernhardi's surprise, Winkler says, "Und nebenbei, Herr Professor ist das ja nur eine Einbildung, dass Sie recht gehabt haben" (462). The strongest statement ends the drama with irony. In reply to Bernhardi's attempt at securing support, Winkler says, "Moeglich -- Da waer ich halt, -entschuldigen schon, Herr Professor - , grad so ein Viech gewesen wie Sie" (463).

The ambivalent acceptance of the Jew by Christian society is, as Peter Horwath declares in his final analysis of Professor Bernhardi, "Diese Welt ist ohne Hoffnung."<sup>46</sup> Schnitzler had foreshadowed this ending in his dialog between Bernhardi and the priest, Franz Reder, in the previous act.

Reder, who appeared in Act Four, told Bernhardi he knew that the latter was merely acting as his profession dictated. When Bernhardi asked why he was not more emphatic about this in court, Reder was caught in his own ambivalent acceptance of Bernhardi, as a Jew. The dialog which follows illuminates the concept of God in relation to the individual and society. The end of the discussion, from the priest's point of view, clearly shows the inherent inability of Christian and Jew to communicate (433-36).

Was ich bestreite, ist nur, dass Sie aus diesem Gefuehl der Verantwortung heraus mir den Eintritt in das Sterbezimmer verweigert haben. Der wahre Grund Ihrer Haltung gegen

mich lag nicht in Ihrem Verantwortungsgefuehl, auch nicht in der edlen Aufwallung eines Momentes, wie Sie sich vielleicht einbilden, wie sogar ich selbst zu glauben nahe war, sondern er lag viel tiefer, in den Wurzeln Ihres Wesens selbst. Jawohl, Herr Professor, der wirkliche Grund war, -- wie soll ich sagen --, eine Antipathie gegen mich -- eine unbeherrschbare Antipathie -- vielmehr eine Feindseligkeit -- ...gegen das, was dieses Gewand hier fuer Sie und Ihresgleichen bedeutet... (433-34).

Two other non-Jewish characters are Dr. Cyprian, the neurologist, and Dr. Pflugfelder, the ophthalmologist. Both are Bernhardt's staunchest supporters: Dr. Cyprian for practical reasons, knowing that the institute cannot exist without Bernhardt's skill in administration, and Dr. Pflugfelder, as a result of his sincerity as a political liberal.<sup>47</sup>

Two more Christian characters, Dr. Shreimann, the laryngologist, and Dr. Goldenthal, Bernhardt's defense attorney, warrant examination, in that they are converts. As such, both characters reflect their ambivalence toward themselves as one-time Jews in a non-Jewish environment. Because they are not totally accepted, they display their Christianity and Austrian patriotism. For example, Dr. Schreimann, in lending Ebenwald his support, must prove himself to Ebenwald, since the latter has lingering doubts.

Ebenwald: Es koennte aber vielleicht doch Fragen geben, in denen du ein Zusammengehen mit mir gewisse Bedenken versuchen wuerde (394).

Schreimann: ...also, auch wenn ich Nationaljude waere, ich wuerde in diesem Falle

gegen Bernhardi Stellung nehmen. Aber abgesehen davon, erlaube ich mir dich wieder einmal darauf aufmerksam zu machen, dass ich Deutscher bin, geradeso wie du. Und ich versichere dich, wenn sich einer von meiner Abstammung heutzutage als Deutscher und Christ bekennt, so gehoert dazu ein groessere Mut, als wenn er das bleibt, als was er auf die Welt gekommen ist. Als Zionist haett ich's leichter gehabt (395).

Goldenthal is also of dubious credibility. Dr. Pflugfelder feels he is not fully defending Bernhardi, for fear of being himself accused of holding on to Judaism. Dr. Lowenstein concurs, "Goldenthal hat sich benommen wie ein Schubjack, wie uebrigens nicht anders zu erwarten war.... Ein Getaufte! Seine Frau traegt so ein Kreuz. Seinen Sohn laesst er in Kalksburg erziehen! Das sind schon die Richtigen" (419).

The discussion of the non-Jewish characters in their ambivalence in accepting the Jew in "their" society would not be complete without looking at the remaining non-Jewish person in the play, Dr. Kurt Pflugfelder, son of Dr. Pflugfelder Sr. As mentioned above, Schnitzler identified with Kurt, through whom he exposed the cynicism of a hopeless situation.

Kurt recognizes himself as anti-Semitic, as well as anti-Aryan. "Und Antisemit. Jawohl.... Bins sogar noch immer im Allgemeinen. Nur bin ich siether auch Antiarier geworden. Ich finde, die Menschen sind im allgemeinen eine recht mangelhafte Gesellschaft, und ich halte mich an die wenigen Ausnahmen da und dort" (352). It is interesting to note that Schnitzler says this

early in the drama, as a foreshadowing technique. After Act One, Kurt Pflugfelder no longer appears in the entire drama. His function is to lay the groundwork for the human situation, or comedy, as it proceeds in Professor Bernhardt. It is also a comment on the general situation of the Jew, one without hope or security. As a result, "Sicherheit ist Nirgends" (from Schnitzler's Paracelsus) is the title of a study by Norbert Abels, which describes the Jewish situation in turn-of-the-century Vienna as Schnitzler portrayed it.<sup>48</sup>

Ambivalence from the Jewish perspective is also manifest in Professor Bernhardt. There are, for example, the half-Jew Dr. Adler, and the Jews, Dr. Lowenstein, Dr. Wenger, Dr. Feuermann, Dr. Oskar Bernhardt and finally Dr. Bernhardt Sr. How do they, as Jews, feel in turn-of-the-century Vienna, as reflected by the crisis in the Elisabethinum? In most of the Jewish characters, there is a sense of insecurity. "...Die Selbstbehauptung des Gewissens gegenueber einer feindlichen Mehrheit, die oeffentliche Meinung bestimmt, bleibt bestehen."<sup>49</sup> From this arises their ambivalence.

There is the half-Jew, Dr. Adler, a physician, who witnessed the Bernhardt-Reder encounter, and then proceeded cautiously with some hesitation at each step. He is introduced in Act One, in a conversation with young Dr. Kurt Pflugfelder. Both praise Professor Bernhardt, and within the course of the conversation,

noting that Bernhardt overcame all odds in his career, Dr. Adler speaks of his own Jewish background and the sufferings he had to endure as a result.

Ich bin der letzte, der seine [Bernhardt's] Verdienste verkleinern moechte. Und dass er so hoch gekommen ist gerade bei den heutigen Stroemungen, -- ich habe ein gewisses Recht, davon zu reden, da ich selbst aus meiner juedischen Abstammung niemals ein Hehl gemacht habe, wenn ich auch muetterlicherseits aus einer alten Wiener Buergerfamilie stamme. Habe sogar Gelegenheit gehabt, in meiner Studentenzeiit fuer die andere Haelfte zu bluten (352).

Adler does not hide his Jewishness. Even if he wanted to do so, his environment would not allow him to forget it. However, as a result of his witnessing the encounter, Adler is not as outspoken as this introductory statement would lead one to believe. From then on, he appears only briefly, generally listening to other opinions before deciding what to do. He vacillates, and, as a result, he takes no initiatives. Interestingly, he is eager to listen to the opinions of his Jewish colleagues. For example, in a crowd of several physicians, he asks Wenger what he thinks of the affair (398). However, in the meeting of the physicians, Adler votes for Bernhardt's dismissal, with the expectation that Bernhardt will be declared innocent, nonetheless, during the course of the investigation (411). In other words, he, as a witness to the entire incident, is afraid to take any initiative. In court, however, Adler is an honest

witness. Dr. Lowenstein, one of Bernhardt's staunchest supporters, says, "Adler muss ich direkt Abbitte leisten. Er hat sich famos benommen" (419).

Two other Jewish physicians are involved in the subplots, Dr. Feuermann and Dr. Wenger. Dr. Feuermann is described as "junger, kleiner, schwarzbaertiger, aufgeregter Mensch mit Brille..." (360). His nervous condition was aggravated because of the precariousness of his situation as a Jewish physician in a non-Jewish district, Oberhollabrunn. The physical description of Feuermann is "klein" and "schwarzbaertig" -- the same description used for Dr. Adler (349). Dr. Wenger, too, is described as "klein." In addition, Wenger is described as, "...gedrueckt, unsicher und dabei manchmal ueberlaut..." (398). An element of insecurity coupled with nervousness is present at times; he is "loud."

Perhaps, the most outspoken Jewish character is Dr. Lowenstein. He too shares similar physical, as well as emotional, characteristics with the other Jewish physicians. He is not tall in stature, wears glasses, and also has mannerisms which indicate nervous characteristics. Schnitzler's description reads as follows, "...gegen vierzig, mittelgross, etwas hastig, kleine Augen, die er manchmal weit aufreisst. Brille. Er bleibt gern mit abfallender linker Schulter und leicht gebogenen Knien seinem Gesprachspartner gegenueber stehen und faehrt sich manchmal durch die

Haare" (365). Of all the characters, Lowenstein, as a Jew, is most aware of the ambivalent society in which he lives. As soon as he is introduced, Dr. Lowenstein's reaction to the Bernhardi affair is, "das ist ein Fressen fuer gewisse Leute, das wird aufgebauscht werden...und um ganz deutlich zu sein, dass kein Mensch den Versuch machen wuerde, wenn Bernhardi nicht zufaellig ein Jude waere" (365-66).

The two remaining Jewish characters are Professor Bernhardi and his son, Dr. Oskar Bernhardi. The role of twenty-five-year-old Oskar is a relatively minor one. He appears only in Acts One and Two. It is difficult to speculate why this character is present at all, unless it merely reflects the situation of young Dr. Arthur Schnitzler in his father's clinic. There are, however, obvious differences between Arthur Schnitzler and Oskar Bernhardi.

In Jugend in Wien, Schnitzler is not totally enthusiastic about the medical profession, which his father has chosen for him,<sup>50</sup> whereas Oskar seems to be very intense in pursuing his medical career (see 340-41, discussion with Hochroitzpointer, and again 345-46, discussion with his father). Also, in the physical description, Oskar, being "recht elegant," does not resemble Schnitzler, who said of his own appearance in Jugend in Wien, "die Haare ziemlich lang, breitkremziger, sogenannter Rembrandthut, flatternde

Krawatte; und wenn auch als Sohn aus buergerlichem Hause anstaendig gekleidet, war ich doch keineswegs das, was man einen netten und soignierten jungen Herren nennenkonnte."<sup>51</sup> Oskar may have been Schnitzler's (or his father's) Wunschbild of himself.

Oskar is described as "25 Jahre, recht elegant, von zuvorkommendem aber unsicherem Benehmen" (340). Just as with all other Jewish characters depicted thus far, Oskar's persona has elements of insecurity and neurosis.

The only Jewish character who is not described with this "nervous" characteristic is Professor Bernhardt himself, who is "ueber fuenfzig, graumeliertes Vollbart, schlichtes, nicht zu langes Haar, im Gehaben mehr von Weltmann als vom Gelehrten" (341). The description of Bernhardt is the least concrete; it is left to the reader's or spectator's imagination by the suggestion of connotations for Weltmann versus Gelehrten. Bernhardt has distinct qualities, in that he is given no physically "Jewish" characteristics. The presentation of Bernhardt with no concrete characteristics adds to the "passive," almost ephemeral, qualities Bernhardt possesses in his "reactions," rather than "actions." "Professor Bernhardt bleibt undeutbar."<sup>52</sup> In this regard, Bernhardt is not unlike many of the Schnitzler characters. They are passive -- actions and circumstances work on them, as was the case with the dilettante character.

Bernhardi's passivity reveals the ambivalence in his character as a result. Bernhardi himself admits this, by saying that he was not born to be a Kaempfer, or take definitive actions for a cause. Hofrat Winkler reiterates this as well,

Hofrat: ...zum Reformator sind Sie ja wahrscheinlich nicht geboren... So wenig wie ich. -- Das duerfte wohl daran liegen, dass wir uns doch innerlich nicht bereit fuehlen, bis in die letzten Konsequenzen zu gehen-- und eventuell selbst unser Leben einzusetzen fuer unsere Ueberzeugung....

Bernardi: Sie vergessen nur das eine, lieber Herr Hofrat, wie die meisten uebrigen Leute, dass ich ja nicht im entferntesten daran gedacht habe, irgend eine Frage loesen zu wollen... (463).

The comedy Professor Bernhardi reveals ambivalence in the human soul from different angles. Ambivalent attitudes of Jew and non-Jew in their respective situations are caused by external factors, such as anti-Semitism, while internal factors, such as those inherent in Bernhardi's personality, as was the case with the dilettante, also reflect ambivalence, which is the key in understanding the man, as well as the writer, Arthur Schnitzler.

Ambivalence in Arthur Schnitzler's works has been examined separately as a theme in the Jewish milieu, as well as a characteristic of the dilettante. There is a synthesis of these two perspectives into one in Der Weg ins Freie, the concluding chapter of this study.

## Notes

1. Adolf Gaisbauer, "Der Historische Hintergrund von Arthur Schnitzlers 'Professor Bernhardt'," Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts, 50 (1974), Neue Folge, 113.
2. Robert O. Weiss, "The 'Hero' in Schnitzler's Comedy Professor Bernhardt," Modern Austrian Literature, 2, iv (Winter 1969) 30.
3. Kurt Bergel, ed., Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel (Bern: Francke, 1956) 83.
4. Wolfgang Schindlegger, "Das Problem des Antisemitismus bei Arthur Schnitzler: Betrachtungen ueber Judentum und Gesellschaft um 1900," Diss. University of Klagenfurt, 1980, 56.
5. Bergel 117.
6. Siegfried Melchinger, "Das Juedische in 'Professor Bernhardt'," Theater Heute, 12, v (1964) 32.
7. Arthur Schnitzler, "Eine oesterreichische Komodie," Letter to Richard Charmatz, January 4, 1913, in Melchinger 33.
8. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger 33.
9. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger 33.
10. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger 33.
11. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger 33.
12. Sol Liptzin, Arthur Schnitzler (New York: Prentice Hall, 1932) 196.
13. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger 32.
14. Otto Brahm, Letter to Arthur Schnitzler, September 19, 1912, as cited in Adolf Gaisbauer 137.
15. Gaisbauer 163.
16. Gaisbauer 163.
17. Melchinger 33, and Schnindlegger 58.

18. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler Jugend in Wien: Eine Autobiographie (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968) 198.
19. Nickl and Schnitzler 199.
20. Nickl and Schnitzler 199.
21. Nickl and Schnitzler 200-201.
22. Karl Kraus, ed., "Universitaetsbummel," Die Fackel, No. 47 (Mid July 1900) 27-28.
23. Schindlegger 61.
24. Schindlegger 69.
33. 25. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger
32. 26. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger
27. Weiss 30.
28. Weiss 32.
29. Weiss 32.
30. Weiss 33.
31. Melchinger 32.
32. Melchinger 32.
33. Melchinger 32.
34. Liptzin 176.
35. Kraus 27.
36. Nickl and Schnitzler 157.
37. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger 32.
38. Schindlegger 66.
39. Peter Horwath, "Arthur Schitzlers 'Professor Bernhardt': Eine Studie ueber Person und Tendenz (I. Teil)." Literatur und Kritik (12 Maerz 1967) 90.
32. 40. Schnitzler, Letter to Charmatz, in Melchinger

41. Arthur Schnitzler, Professor Bernhardt, in Die dramatischen Werke 1 (Frankfurt: S. Fischer Verlag, 1962) 446. All further references to this work will be indicated in the text by the page number in parenthesis.

42. Nickl and Schnitzler 158.

43. Horwath 97.

44. Gaisbauer 121, footnote 19.

45. For a complete discussion of Karl Lueger and Antisemitism, see Richard S. Geehr, ed., "I decide who is a Jew!": The Papers of Dr. Karl Lueger (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982) and Menachem Z. Rosensaft, "Jews and Antisemites in Austria at the End of the Nineteenth Century," Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook XXI (1976) 57-86.

46. Peter Horwath, "Arthur Schnitzlers 'Professor Bernhardt': Eine Studie ueber Person und Tendenz," Literature und Kritik, (13 April 1967) 192.

47. Horwath 94.

48. Norbert Abels, Sicherheit ist nirgends: Judentums und Aufklaerung bei Arthur Schnitzler (Koenigstein/Ts.: Athenaem, 1982).

49. Willehad Paul Eckert, "Arthur Schnitzler und das Wiener Judentum," Emuna, 2 (Maerz/April 1973) 129.

50. Nickl and Schnitzler 75, 93.

51. Nickl and Schnitzler 142.

52. Horwath 84.

**PART THREE**

**Synthesis**

Der Weg ins Freie

Jugend in Wien concentrates on two particular ideas that Schnitzler presented in his work. They are the dilettante in his uncertainty regarding the acceptance of responsibility and commitment, and the Jewish situation in light of assimilation versus Zionism in turn-of-the-century Vienna. In The Austrian Mind, William Johnston finds the issues of the day as Schnitzler saw them in the key word ambivalence. Hence, Schnitzler has been considered as representing the dilettante and as representing the Jew.

It is, therefore, fitting that the examination of the dilettante in the various works analyzed in Part One, and of the Jewish situation in Professor Bernhardt in Part Two, should be followed by an examination of Der Weg ins Freie, which synthesizes these two themes into the greater context of ambivalence.

Schnitzler completed Der Weg ins Freie in 1908, and two years later, in a letter to Hofmannsthal, called it his most personal work.<sup>1</sup> A Schnitzler contemporary, Joseph Koerner, stated, "Kein Zweifel ferner, dass es seines Autors liebstes Kind ist...."<sup>2</sup> As a result, "An keines seiner Werke hat der Dichter solchen Fleiss gewendet wie an dieses, das ihn drei Jahre lang beschaefigte (1905/7)."<sup>3</sup>

Since Schnitzler spent the most time on this work, it was an attempt to present the most pressing problems

he himself encountered. Within the framework of fiction, he attempted an objective distance, in order to examine the problems he found most important. Hence, Der Weg ins Freie became self-analysis, a total catharsis for the author - much more so than autobiography or any personal memoir. It is precisely in the analysis, for which Schnitzler became known as Freud's "Doppelpaenger," that there is a synthesis of the two themes. They come together in the ambivalence the author felt within himself in his society. Schnitzler's method lies in a definite dependence on presenting personal experience through his character portrayals. As Schnitzler stated in Der Weg ins Freie, "und fuer den, der es nicht selbst erlebt hatte, konnte Vergangenes nie Wahrheit werden."<sup>4</sup> Hence, the above-mentioned letter to Hofmannsthal, in which Schnitzler called Der Weg ins Freie, "das persoendlichste meiner Schoepfungen."<sup>5</sup> Thus, experience is the key to understanding why Schnitzler chose his particular themes. If Schnitzler's personal experience, i.e., the dilettante and the Jewish situation, is seen as the springboard for a more complex understanding of a particular Weltanschauung of the times, as well as in general, the themes of Der Weg ins Freie can be unified.

Schnitzler's contemporaries, however, were not totally satisfied with this approach. Even though they, too, saw a synthesis of themes in the fact that

Schnitzler presented his own experiences, they were lacking the obvious historical buffer of time necessary for clear analysis into a broader single theme. For example, Joseph Koerner explored the problem and concluded that "...die Erklarung koennte nur aus einlaesslicher Lebens- und Bildungsgeschichte Arthur Schnitzlers geschoefft werden."<sup>6</sup> Another contemporary critic and close friend of Schnitzler, Georg Brandes, could also not completely understand the synthesis. In a lengthy letter of June 1908, Brandes wrote to Schnitzler,

Aber haben Sie nicht zwei Buecher geschrieben? Das Verhaeltnis des jungen Barons zu seiner Geliebten ist eine Sache, und die neue Lage der Juedischen Bevoelkerung in Wien durch den AntiSemitismus eine andere, die mit der ersteren, scheint mir, in nicht notwendiger Verbindung steht.... Ich freue mich ueber den inneren Reichtum des Werkes und sehe ja sehr gut die vielen Zusammenhaenge...aber nicht den strengen notwendigen Zusammenhang.<sup>7</sup>

An answer to this can be found in Schnitzler's own response to Brandes. Schnitzler's answer of July 4, 1908 provides the approach to the synthesis of the two themes. Schnitzler wrote, "...ich habe eben ein Lebensjahr des Freiherrn von Wergenthin geschildert, in dem er ueber allerlei Menschen und Probleme und ueber sich selbst ins Klare kommt."<sup>8</sup> In light of this statement, and with the buffer of time for proper analysis, the method by which the themes are unified can now be revealed through the examination, within their

historical milieu, of Schnitzler's major characters, who so closely represented their creator. His characters crystallized the author's own philosophy. "Die Gedanken seiner Menschen waren fast immer seine eigenen.... Jeden Dichter treibt gewiss nur der eine Drang, sein Bild vom Leben und damit sein Inneres zu moeglichst klaren Ausdruck zu bringen...Schnitzlers Menschen stehen mit einander in engster Verwandtschaft, sie sind in ihrem Kern so orientiert wie ihr Erzeuger."<sup>9</sup>

Through an analysis of Schnitzler's major characters, the leitmotifs will emerge which also help to unify the novel through the theme of ambivalence. For example, in Schnitzler's answer to Brandes, he continued by pointing to one particular subtheme that affects almost all of the major characters of the novel.

Manche von diesen Problemen sind mir selbst allerdings erst im Laufe der Arbeit zu ihrer eigentlichen Bedeutung erstanden - obwohl sie ja von Anbeginn in den Geschehnissen enthalten waren: insbesondere das Problem der Schuld und der Verantwortung.... Fiel es Ihnen nicht auch auf, wie sowohl Georg als Heinrich Bermann als Leo Golowski jeder ein Menschenleben auf dem Gewissen haben? Georg metaphysisch oder in der Einbildung der Moerder seines ungeborenen Kindes, Heinrich laesst seine Geliebte aus Eitelkeit - oder "Traegheit des Herzens"...zu Grunde gehen- Leo bringt seinen Gegner im Duell um. (Und keinem von ihnen ist innerlich freier zu Muth, als dem, der just im ueblichen Wortsinn getoedtet haet!)"<sup>10</sup>

This is merely one subtheme that runs through the individual character's experiences which, therefore, can be seen as one particular technique used in unifying the

novel as a whole. Furthermore, such links are explored by Richard Allen, in his 1967 article, "Schnitzler's Der Weg ins Freie: Structure or Structures." In Schnitzler's letter to Brandes, the importance Schnitzler gave to his own experience, real or imagined, is evident. "Ich wollte, ohne Tendenz, Menschen und Beziehungen darstellen - die ich gesehn habe (ob in der Welt draussen, oder in der Phantasie bliebe gleich)."<sup>11</sup>

These experiences, portrayed by his characters vis-a-vis the self in society, provide the basis for the Schnitzler Weltanschauung, which is permeated with ambivalence, and thus, translates into the unifying theme of Der Weg ins Freie. As a result, this novel can be viewed, as it was seen by Schnitzler, as one of his most important works. In the conclusion to this lengthy letter, Schnitzler wrote to Brandes, "...da er [Der Roman] fertig ist, schaetz ich ihn hoeher als alles was ich bisher gemacht."<sup>12</sup> As indicated above, no other work more closely represented Schnitzler, the man, the writer, the philosopher who, within historical perspective, became a source for understanding turn-of-the-century Vienna.

Through an examination of the major characters of the novel, as well as the subthemes they each represent, it becomes evident that there are no simple answers to their problems, to Schnitzler's problems, or to society's problems. Hence, "ambivalence" becomes the

theme which unifies Der Weg ins Freie, as it encapsulated Schnitzler's world and the human psyche in general. Mann, in his article "Arthur Schnitzler" summarizes this concept:

Er [Schnitzler] wird wohl unendlich bewegt, aber zugleich verwirrt und entwaffnet, weil er fuer die tausend Erscheinungen gleichsam tausend Augen besitzt, die ihm zu vielen Seiten entblossen. Daher gestaltet er auch keine ergentliche Handlung, an der sich das Leben auswirken koennte, daher kommt er nicht dazu, bestimmte Menschen mit bestimmten Tun fuer sich reden zu lassen, sondern stellt immer wieder wie seine Gestalten die Frage nach dem Sinn und kann nur immer aufs neue ihre Unloesbarkeit dartun.<sup>13</sup>

A focus upon the characters of Der Weg ins Freie illustrates precisely that it is the Unloesbarkeit of their problems within their milieu which gives impetus to the novel and its theme of ambivalence, experienced by each character in his dilemma. Mann's statement will be repeated almost verbatim, as each character tries to solve his own problems.

Schnitzler's life experiences cut through and overlapped in all of his major male characters in Der Weg ins Freie. As for female roles, compared to the numerous men depicted, there is only one major character -- that of Anna Rosner. However, in an examination, one notes that she, too, is an embodiment of many of the women who had been close to Schnitzler. In addition, there are other female characters who are encountered indirectly through the male characters. These females also reflect the women of Schnitzler's experiences.

If one begins by looking at Georg von Wergenthin and then Heinrich Bermann, even superficially, the two main problems become evident. Georg, the non-Jew, in his relationship with both Anna and his musical career, represents the dilettante already encountered in Schnitzler, as well as in all the main characters previously analyzed. Heinrich Bermann, the Jewish writer, represents the Jewish writer in Schnitzler, as well as the characters in Professor Bernhardi. Through a close scrutiny of Georg and Heinrich, a synthesis of the two is revealed, as they view the problems which confront each separately and yet in tandem. Hence, through this overlapping of characters, Schnitzler underwent a self-analysis, and as a result, there is a basis for a union of the two separate themes of the novel into the one linking theme of ambivalence of the individual in his milieu.

Georg, the dilettante, is introduced in Chapter One, at age twenty-seven, grieving over his father's recent death. The loss of the father represents one's loss of security. Georg is left on his own, and therefore, it becomes ever more incumbent upon Georg to take control of his own life and establish his own identity - something which was always difficult for him, given his indecisiveness. For example, the reader learns that Georg had difficulty in choosing a career even before his father's death. He and his older brother Felician

had chosen law as a career. Felician completed his studies, whereas Georg did not. "Felician und Georg liessen sich als Hoerer an der juristischen Fakultaet einschreiben" (637), but just as did the young Schnitzler, Georg prefers the arts. "Aber der Vater selbst war es, der es dem Juengern nach einiger Zeit freistellte, die Universitaetsstudien aufzugeben und sich seinen musikalischen Weigungen entsprechend weiter zu bilden, was dieser dankbar und erloest annahm" (637). However, since the makings of the dilettante are within Georg, he cannot wholly devote himself to music either. "Doch auch auf diesem selbstgewaehlten Gebiete war seine Ausdauer nicht bedeutend, und oft wochenlang hintereinander konnte er sich mit allerlei Dingen beschaeftigen, die von seinem Wege weit ablagen" (637).

The introduction to Georg as the dilettante is well established. This impression is further crystallized and substantiated through the development of Georg as a major character. It becomes especially apparent in Georg's relationship to Anna Rosner, whom he meets almost from the outset of the novel, just as he re-enters society following the mourning period for his father's death. The relationship lasts throughout the duration of the novel, and his experiences and problems of the relationship further reveal Georg as the dilettante.

Even before his "commitment" to Anna Rosner, Georg

felt the desire for adventure. For example, after listening to the suggestion that he conduct a tour of the United States, Georg recalls, "waehtend er sich dieses Gespraechs erinnerte, behagte er sich sehr in der Idee, ein bisschen in der Welt herumzuabenteueren, wuenschte sich, fremde Staedte und Menschen kennen zu lernen, irgendwo im Weiten allerlei Liebe und Ruhm zu gewinnen, und fand am Ende, dass seine Existenz im ganzen viel zu ruhig und einfoermig dahinfloesse" (681). Like Schnitzler, Georg feared the mundane existence of the bourgeois, and as a result, Georg could not see himself sustaining a relationship.

Und was wuenschte, was ahnte er selbst? Das Leben war ja so unberechenbar. War es nicht sehr gut moeglich, dass er wirklich einmal mit ihr [Anna] draussen in der Welt herumreisen, eine Zeit des Gluecks mit ihr durchleben...und endlich von ihr scheiden wuerde, wie er von mancher andern geschieden war? - Doch wenn er an das Ende dachte, das jedenfalls kommen musste, ob es nun der Tod bringen moechte oder das Leben selbst, so fuehlte er es wie ein gelindes Weh im Herzen... (706).

As his relationship with Anna takes hold, Georg realizes he cannot totally accept commitment.

Selbst als er Anna an ihrem Haustor verlassen hatte, vor drei Tagen nach dem ersten Abend vollkommenen Gluecks, was er sich frueher als jeder anderen Regung, der Freude bewusst geworden, wieder allein zu sein. Und gleich darauf, ehe noch das Gefuehl des Danks und die Ahnung einer wirklichen Zusammengehoeerigkeit mit diesem sanften, sein ganzes Wesen mit so viel Innigkeit umschliessenden Geschoepf in seiner Seele emporzudringen vermochte, flog durch sie ein sehnsuchtsvoller Traum von Fahrten ueber ein schimmerndes Meer, von Kuesten, die sich verfuehrerisch naehern, von Spaziergaengen an Ufern, die am naechsten Tage

wieder verschwinden, von blauen Feinen, Ungebundenheit und Alleinsein (712).

Georg's relationship progresses to the point where he is forced to think of commitment, especially in light of Anna's pregnancy, but he fears the prospect of an orderly life.

Er sah sich ploetzlich in einem sehr buergerlichen Heim, unter dem bescheidenen Licht einer Haengelampe, beim Abendessen sitzen, zwischen Frau und Kind. Und aus dieser getraeumten Familienszene wehte es ihm entgegen wie ein Hauch von sorgenvoller Langeweile. Ah, es war noch zu frueh dazu, er war noch zu jung. Wie sollte es denn werden? War es denn moeglich, dass sie die letzte Frau blieb, die er umarmt haette? Vielleicht konnte sie es werden, in Jahren, in Monaten schon...aber heute noch nicht. Trug und Luege in ein wohlgeordnetes Heim zu tragen, davor scheute er wohl zurueck. Doch der Gedanke, von ihr fortzueilen zu andern, die er begehrte, mit dem Bewusstsein, Anna so wieder zu finden, wie er sie verlassen, war lockend und beruhigend zugleich (839-40).

Georg's dilettantism, reflected in his inability to accept commitment, stems from his deep-seated ambivalence. As did Schnitzler, Georg, too, weighs each consideration, without taking definitive action. As a result, Georg lives an ambivalent existence. Georg, in Der Weg ins Freie, is a repetition and a culmination of the dilettante characters portrayed previously. For Schnitzler, Georg is the ultimate character, who is much refined since Anatol, and more philosophical than Amadeus, the married man. The length of Der Weg ins Freie also allowed Schnitzler to give Georg more depth than his characters in previous works.

A criticism, which had been raised by Brandes, in regard to the portrayal of Georg's character, in light of the unifying themes of the novel, was that Georg, as a non-Jew, does not have a Jewish girlfriend.

Schnitzler's answer to this criticism was not wholly satisfactory. He merely stated that, from the start, it was clear that Georg, as well as Anna, be Catholic.<sup>14</sup> Given the importance to Schnitzler of the two themes at hand, one can speculate as to why this was the case in the portrayal of both Georg and Anna. It is precisely because these themes were close to Schnitzler that Georg and Anna are non-Jewish. Schnitzler wanted to portray the dilettante in totality. By creating either Georg or Anna as a Jew, the dilettante aspect would have been clouded. Apparently Schnitzler wanted nothing to interfere with his presentation of the dilettante and his problems. As already cited, "...ich wollte, ohne Tendenz, Menschen und Beziehungen darstellen."<sup>15</sup>

Another probable reason for a non-Jewish Georg and Anna becomes apparent in light of the second theme. Georg as the non-Jew, not involved with a Jew, can act as the neutral party. He can be objective in listening to the problems and their potential solutions, as represented by the differing opinions of the Jewish characters. Georg thereby becomes Schnitzler himself, attempting to be objective, as he mentally debates the different sides of the Jewish question in Vienna.

As W. P. Eckert writes, in "Arthur Schnitzler und das Wiener Judentum," "...zum Zionismus nimmt Arthur Schnitzler in dem Roman Der Weg ins Freie noch mehrfach Stellung. Dem Antizionisten, Heinrich Bermann stellt er einen Zionisten gegenueber in der Person des jungen Leo Golowski. Zwischen beiden findet ein Streitgespraeche ueber die Berechtigung des Zionismus statt, dessen Zeuge Georg von Wergenthin wird."<sup>16</sup> This is precisely Georg's function in relation to the Jewish community. Not only is he the objective individual in the varying arguments within the Jewish community, he is the witness to their feelings.

For example, while in the company of a social gathering consisting primarily of upper-middle class Jews, the group with whom Schnitzler, because of his own identity, is concerned, Dr. Stauber feels compelled to let Georg know he is a Jew. In response,

Georg laechelte liebenswuerdig. In Wirklichkeit aber war er eher enerviert. Seiner Empfindung nach bestand durchaus keine Notwendigkeit, dass auch der alte Doktor Stauber ihm offizielle Mitteilung von seiner Zugehoerigkeit zum Judentum machte. Er wusste es ja, und er nahm es ihm nicht uebel. Er nahm es ueberhaupt keinem uebel; aber warum fingen sie denn immer selbst davon zu reden an? Wo er auch hinkam, er begegnete nur Juden, die sich schaemten, dass sie Juden waren, oder solchen die darauf stolz waren, und Angst hatten man koennte glauben, sie schaemten sich (661).

Only through Georg's portrayal as a non-Jew could such an observation be made with a semblance of objectivity. The statement by Dr. Stauber indicates

there was inherent ambivalence within the Jewish community. Hence, Georg is the catalyst through which the reader is made aware of the problem, with some objectivity, as opposed to the various Jewish characters themselves pondering their own statements and points of view. Not only is Georg's function made apparent in this regard, but it also enhances Georg's own ambivalent feelings on the personal level of commitment. Ambivalence in any aspect of turn-of-the-century Vienna provides the link in unifying the themes of the novel. This link is further strengthened by the introduction of the second male protagonist, Heinrich Bermann, who not only has similar dilettante characteristics to Georg's, and even more so to Schnitzler's, but who also is Jewish, and represents the assimilated upper-middle-class Viennese Jew.

Through examples of Heinrich's experiences, thoughts, and debates with Georg, the former reveals himself to be a deeper thinker than Georg. He becomes Georg's alter ego. Sol Liptzin, in his discussion of "The Road to Freedom," said essentially this, when he compared Georg to Anatol and Heinrich to Max. "In accordance with his usual dramatic technique, he [Schnitzler] assigns the hero Georg von Wergenthin, who resembles such aesthetic epicureans as Anatol...a contrasting friend, Heinrich Bermann, the sceptical realist."<sup>17</sup> Even though one cannot wholly agree with

Liptzin's comparison, it does indicate, as was suggested in the discussion of Anatol and Max, that the latter serves as the alter ego of the former. In other words, as Anatol and Max can be seen as two sides to one person, so, too, can Georg and Heinrich.

This argument establishes yet another approach in the attempt to unify the two problems of the novel. Heinrich, who is also represented as a dilettante on the personal level of career and relationships, further substantiates this theory. He resembles Schnitzler, if not in physical qualities, then certainly in spiritual and intellectual qualities. "Dieser Bermann war ein hagerer, bartloser Mensch mit duestern Augen und etwas zu langem schichten Haar, der sich in der letzten Zeit als Schriftsteller bekannt gemacht hatte..." (647). As a writer, he represents Schnitzler more so than Georg does. He is primarily concerned with the psychological makeup of individuals. Heinrich himself states to Georg,

Das einzige was mir eine gewisse Sicherheit gibt, ist eigentlich nur das Bewusstsein in menschlichen Seelen hineinschauen zu koennen...[sic] tief hinein, in alle, in die von Schurken und ehrlichen Leute, in die von Frauen und Maennern und Kindern, in die von Heiden, Juden, Protestanten, ja selbst in die von Katholiken, Adeligen und Deutschen obwohl ich gehoert habe, das gerade das fuer unsereinen so unendlich schwer oder sogar unmoeglich sein soll (670).

An analysis of this statement makes it apparent that Heinrich Bermann, just like Schnitzler, is

interested not only in the psychology of the individual in general, but also in the question of the Jewish writer. This was apparent when he, as a Jewish writer, expressed his doubts in correctly describing or even understanding certain types. In reference to this latter concern, Heinrich noted Georg's curiosity. As a result, Heinrich explains the precarious situation of the Jew in society in general, and how a non-Jew cannot possibly understand that situation.

Ja, ja, aber es liegt doch ein anderer Ton darin, [Heinrich here makes reference to Georg's title and surname, Freiherr Wergenthin-Recco] das werden Sie mir zugeben und auch ein anderer Sinn wenn man einem den Freiherrn, als wenn man einem den Juden ins Gesicht schleudert obzwar das letztere bisweilen...Sie verzeihen schon...der bessere adel sein mag. Nun, Sie brauchen mich nicht so mitleidig anzuschauen, setzte er ploetzlich grob hinzu. Ich bin nicht immer so empfindlich. Es gibt auch andere Stimmungen, in denen mir ueberhaupt nichts und niemand etwas anhaben kann. Da hab ich nur dieses eine Gefuehl, was wisst Ihr denn alle, was wisst Ihr denn von mir... (671).

When coupled together, these two statements by Georg demonstrate the ambivalence of the Jewish situation. Ambivalence is represented by first expressing an inability as a Jew, especially a Jewish writer, to understand certain types, but, on the other hand, being Jewish is probably a "greater nobility" than the rest, who can likewise never really understand the Jew. This inherent dichotomy, indeed, leads to an ambivalent position. Thus, just as Schnitzler, throughout his literary career, represented the

dilettante and the Jewish question, so, too, does the character of Heinrich Bermann.

The next description of Heinrich reveals him to be a dilettante, just like Georg. In reference to himself, Heinrich states,

Ich bin in einer ziemlich unruhigen Zeit. Ich entwerfe viel, aber ich mache nichts fertig. Das Vollenden interessiert mich ueberhaupt selten. Offenbar bin ich innerlich zu rasch fertig mit den Dingen (692).

Just as did Georg (or Schnitzler), Heinrich admits he has difficulty in completing something or following through with something; hence the dilettante! This lends credence to the theory that Heinrich and Georg are one. As previously stated by Sol Liptzin, Heinrich, reflecting on Georg's statements and actions, serves as the latter's alter ego. It is, therefore, through bonding these two characters that the synthesis of the two problems Schnitzler presents in the novel, as well as in all of his works, can be understood.

In his article "Arthur Schnitzler's Der Weg ins Freie," Aspetsberger sees this as essentially the method by which Schnitzler expressed a uniformity throughout the novel. He sees the synthesis of the themes in the case of the individual versus society. "Weil es nicht um individuelle Schicksale gehe, wie die Kritik bisher vielfach annahm, sondern um die Gesellschaft und Politik, sei der Roman in seiner scheinbaren Vielstraengigkeit auch als Kunstform entgegen den

kritischen Stimmen (vor allem Brandes und Koerner's) als einheitliches und gelungenes Gebilde zu sehen."<sup>18</sup> Thus, as he further explains, Georg and Heinrich are faced by the same problems; hence, their characters serve to unify an overall theme. "Die multiindividuelle Perspektive des Gesellschaftsromans ist auch aus der Zeit dem spaetbuergerlichen Individualismus erklarlich...denn zudem bilden die Figuren, wie Georg und Bermann etwa, monumentale Spaetformen des Individualismus, keinen Gegenpol zur Gesellschaft, sondern vollziehen, wie beobachtet, zeittypische Haltungen in variiertes Form nach."<sup>19</sup> They are the same character in a varied form, as reflected by their society. Aspetsberger sees society as the key in making them such.

In his recent dissertation on Arthur Schnitzler, Wolfgang Schindlegger sees the importance of Aspetsberger's argument, which unifies the themes of Der Weg ins Freie. As does Aspetsberger, he takes both Koerner's and Brandes' arguments into consideration. Schindlegger attributes Brandes' misinterpretation to lack of familiarity with the Austrian milieu. When Brandes wrote to Schnitzler that he saw two books, Schindlegger indicates that Brandes prefaced this statement with, "Leider kenne ich nicht Oesterreich oder Wien gut genug um im Stande zu sein, eine Ansicht darueber zu haben, wie aehnlich das Bild ist, das Sie

geben...."20

As indicated by the Aspetsberger argument, it is historical milieu that helps to provide a justification for unifying the two themes. In addition, Schindlegger points to an additional argument, the psychological one from the perspective of the individual. Schindlegger mentions both history and psychology, "Diese notwendige Verbindung zur Einheitlichkeit die Brandes vermisst, ist im Roman sehr wohl dadurch hergestellt, dass die Figuren der gleichen historischen Situation ausgesetzt sind; sie wird weniger in einzelnen Ereignissen vermittelt als an ihren Auswirkungen erkennbar, die in den sozialen Beziehungen und der psychologischen Struktur der Personen zutage treten."21

By unifying the themes into one, the analysis has gone beyond the original attempt of a synthesis through Schnitzler's personal experiences only. What is interesting to note is that most contemporaries of Schnitzler, i.e., Koerner and Brandes, who recognized this Schnitzler experience, saw two themes nonetheless, whereas today the interpretation is leaning toward one theme for Der Weg ins Freie. It is the buffer of time which allows for a proper interpretation. And it is in historical retrospect that one can see how the ambivalence of the milieu created the ambivalence of the individual within his society. This is reflected by the two problems so dominant in Der Weg ins Freie, as they

are in so many of Schnitzler's other works. The problems are not to be seen as two separate themes, but merely as two reflections or perspectives of the one theme of ambivalence in turn-of-the-century Vienna. Thus, ambivalence within the historical context is the key to understanding the novel. It is the unifying factor that is seen in its own time perspective. And this is why the background of Jewish society, with its inherent ambivalence, especially in regard to Palestine, sets the stage for society in general, as reflected in the different conversations between Georg and Heinrich. These conversations, indeed, first center around the Jewish question, but then go beyond, by providing a springboard for including all aspects of life.

The society is an ambivalent one, with Jewish society as its microcosm. In reference to Der Weg ins Freie, a contemporary journal on Judaism stated,

Da nun unter den Juden im allgemeinen oder in dem Einzelnen, angenommen oder wirklich ein Zwiespalt [hence, the ambivalence] besteht, da ferner das Buch, obwohl der Held und die Heldin Christen sind, hauptsaechlich sich mit Juden beschaefftigt, so muesste man schon nach dem Eingang, der einen grossen Raum einnimmt, denken, es behandle diese vielerorterte Frage von einem hohen Standpunkte aus, zeige, wo "der Weg ins Freie" zu finden sei.<sup>22</sup>

The Jewish situation as part of the general scene provides the proper stage-setting for describing the larger historical theme of ambivalence. The Jewish question, specifically, will be expanded further into the general. However, before being introduced to

Heinrich's own reflections on this specific topic, the reader learns of the Jewish milieu from background characters. Later in the novel, Heinrich expounds upon each of the concepts presented. Within the Jewish circle, it is the merchant, Ehrenberg, who is most vocal. His home is the meeting place for contemporary ideas. He is invariably involved in most discussions of the Jewish question, including Jewish identity in general. For example, in one of the first gatherings, Ehrenberg vehemently declares the dilemma of the Jewish situation. Even though Jews are the staunchest supporters of varying movements in lay society, they are always reminded that they are Jews, and therefore, not wholly accepted. In a discussion with Theresa Golowski, a Jewish Socialist, Ehrenberg says,

...ich bin vielleicht ein Laie in politischen Dingen, aber ich versichere Sie, Therese, es wird euch juedischen Sozialdemokraten geradeso ergehen, wie es den juedischen Liberalen und Deutschnationalen ergangen ist.... Wer hat die liberale Bewegung in Oesterreich geschaffen?...Die Juden!...Von wem sind die Juden verraten und verlassen worden? Von den Liberalen. Wer hat die deutschnationale Bewegung in Oesterreich geschaffen? Die Juden. Von wem sind die Juden im Stich gelassen...was sag ich im Stich gelassen...bespuckt worden wie die Hund'?...von den Deutschen! Und geradeso wirts ihnen jetzt ergehen mit dem Sozialismus und den Kommunismus. Wenn die Suppe erst aufgetragen ist, so jagen sie euch vom Tisch. Das war immer so und wird immer so sein (696-97).

Ehrenberg, as a minor character, sets the stage for Heinrich's reflections to Georg. Later in the novel,

Heinrich, in thinking about his own father, repeats Ehrenberg's words almost verbatim to Georg, but with much greater intensity.

Wie hat dieser Mann sein Vaterland geliebt! Sie haben Keine Ahnung in welcher raffinierten Weise man ihn aus seiner Partei hinausgedraengt hat. Ein verwirrendes Ineinanderspiel von Tuecke, Beschraenktheit, Brutalitaet...echt deutsch mit einem Wort (830).

In the Ehrenberg salon, additional problems faced by the Jewish community are encountered. When Nuernberger, a non-practicing Jew, declares he has abandoned Judaism, Ehrenberg says to him,

Wenn man Ihnen einmal den Zylinder einschlaegt auf der Ringstrasse, weil Sie, mit Verlaub, eine etwas juedische Nase haben, werden Sie sich schon als Jude getroffen fuehlen, verlassen Sie sich darauf (689).

On this same topic, Heinrich muses to Georg,

Manchmal ist man ja wirklich daheim, trotz allem, fuehlt man sich hier so zu Hause, - ja geradezu heimatlicher, als irgendeiner von den sogenannten Eingeborenen sich fuehlen kann. Es ist offenbar so, dass durch das Bewusstsein des Verstehens das Gefuehl der Fremdheit in gewissem Sinn wieder aufgehoben wird. Ja, es wird gleichsam durchtraenkt von Stolz, Erablassurg, Zaertlichkeit... (757-58).

Again, the problem was introduced simplistically by Ehrenberg, but pondered and reflected upon by Heinrich, in his discussions with Georg. In addition, the reader ascertains from Heinrich that there are no easy solutions. He says to Georg,

Dafuer gesteh ich Ihnen ja auch zu, dass ich mich trotz meiner vollkommenen Gleichgueltigkeit gegen jegliche Religionsform nie und nimmer werde taufen lassen, selbst

wenn es moeglich waere - was ja heute weniger der Fall ist als je -- durch solch einen Trug antisemitischer Beschraenktheit und Schurkerei fuer alle Zeit zu entrinnen (724).

Thus, especially for the non-religious Jews like Heinrich or Ehrenberg, who nonetheless see themselves as Jews, as opposed to Nuernberger, the answer to the question of identity becomes increasingly difficult. This naturally exacerbates feelings of uncertainties.

At first, the answer to the dilemma of the Viennese Jewish community was resettlement in the land of Israel, where one could finally find an identity. It was in Vienna that the rebirth of Zionism had been advocated by Theodor Herzl a decade earlier.

Schnitzler first introduced the formal question of Zionism by again using the character of Ehrenberg, who in search of an answer to the Jewish dilemma says,

Ich habe naemlich die Absicht weiter zu fahren, nach Aegypten, nach Syrien, wahrscheinlich auch nach Palaestina. Ja, vielleicht ist es nur, weil man aelter wird, vielleicht weil man soviel vom Zionismus liest und dergleichen, aber ich kann mir nicht helfen, ich moecht Jerusalem gesehen haben, eh ich sterbe...aber wenn man so liest, was in der Welt vorgeht, man moechte selber manchmal glauben, es gibt fuer uns keinen andern Ausweg (688).

However, after his trip to Palestine, Ehrenberg is disappointed; he has found no solution to the problem. When he is asked about his trip, he barely answers.

Endlich ergab sich, dass ihn die Landschaft enttaeuscht, die Strapazen der Reisen verstimmt, und dass er von den juedischen

Ansiedlungen die sichern Vernehmen noch im Entstehen waren, so gut wie nichts gesehen hatte. Also wir haben begruendete Hoffnung, bemerkte Nuernberger, Sie hier zu behalten, selbst fuer den Fall, dass der Judenstaat im Laufe der naechsten Zeit gegruendet werden sollte?

Unwirsch erwiderte Ehrenberg, "Hab ich Ihnen je gesagt, dass ich die Absicht habe auszuwandern? Ich bin zu alt dazu" (741).

Seemingly embarrassed by his original enthusiasm in believing to have found a solution, Ehrenberg finds a convenient excuse. This deepseated ambivalence toward Palestine was introduced by Ehrenberg. However, it is best reflected upon in the three-way discussions of Leo Golowski, the Zionist, Heinrich, the anti-Zionist, and Georg, who, as the non-Jew, is the objective witness. Leo speaks of the land of Israel as the future and hope of the Jewish people. Heinrich, on the other hand, comments as an anti-Zionist, with exactly the same arguments Schnitzler used in his autobiography, Jugend in Wien, written at approximately the same time as Der Weg ins Freie. In the novel, Heinrich says to Leo,

Mein Instinkt sagt mir untrueglich dass hier, gerade hier meine Heimat ist und nicht in irgend einem Land, das ich nicht kenne, das mir nach den Schilderungen nicht im geringsten zusagt und das nur gewisse Leute jetzt als Vaterland einreden wollen, mit der Begrueundung, dass meine Urahnen vor einigen tausend Jahren gerade von dort aus in die Welt verstreut worden sind (719).

However, just as did Schnitzler, Heinrich has no solution.

Und zusammengehoerig fuehlte er sich mit niemandem, nein mit niemandem auf der welt.

Mit den weinenden Juden in Basel gerade so wenig, als mit den groehelnden Alldutschen im oesterreichischen Parlament; mit juedischen Wucherern so wenig, als mit hochadeligen Raubrittern, mit einem zionistischen Branntweinschaenker so wenig, als mit einem christlich-sozialen Greisler (721).

The ambivalence is expressed through a hopelessness as demonstrated in this juxtaposition of types. This feeling is further enhanced when Georg's thoughts as the neutral party are presented. In this regard, Georg becomes an important observer. Through Georg as referee, the desperate situation of Heinrich's reflections becomes apparent. There is a web of confusion, so much so that a non-Jew, Georg, can begin to feel it.

Verwundert, ja ein wenig ergriffen hatte Georg zugehoert... (721). Bald neigte sein Sinn sich Leo zu, in dessen Worten ihm ein gluehendes Mitleid fuer seine ungluecklichen Stammesgenossen zu beben schien, und der sich stolz von Menschen abkehrte, die ihn als ihresgleichen nicht wollten gelten lassen. Bald wieder war er innerlich Heinrich naeher, der sich zornig von einem Beginnen abwandte, das phantastisch und kurzsichtig zugleich, die Angehoerigen einer Rasse, deren Besten ueberall in der Kultur ihres Wohnlandes aufgegangen waren, oder mindestens an ihr mitarbeiteten, von allen Enden der Welt versammeln und in eine gemeinsame Fremde senden wollte, nach der sie kein Heimweh rief. Und eine Ahnung stieg in Georg auf, wie schwer gerade diesen Besten, von denen Heinrich sprach, denen, in deren Seelen sich die Zukunft der Menschheit vorbereitete, eine Entscheidung fallen musste; wie gerade ihnen, hin und hergeworfen zwischen der Scheu, zu dringlich zu erscheinen und der Erbitterung ueber die Zumutung, einer frechen Ueberzahl weichen zu sollen, -- zwischen dem eingeborenen Bewusstsein, daheim zu sein, wo sie lebten und wirkten, und der Empoerung, sich eben da verfolgt und beschimpft zu sehen;

wie gerade ihnen zwischen Trotz und Ermattung das Gefuehl ihres Daseins, ihres Wertes und ihrer Rechte sich verwirren musste. Zum erstenmal begann ihm die Bezeichnung Jude, die er selbst so oft leichtfertig, spoettisch und veraechtlich im Mund gefuehrt hatte, in einer ganz neuen gleichsam duestern Beleuchtung aufzugehen. Eine Ahnung von dieses Volkes geheimnisvollem Los daemmerte in ihm auf, das sich irgendwie in jedem aussprach, der ihm entsprossen war; nicht minder in jenen, die diesem Ursprung zu entfliehen trachteten wie einer Schmach; einem Leid oder einem Maerchen, das sie nichts kuemerte, -- als in jenen, die mit Hartnaeckigkeit auf ihn zurueckwiesen, wie auf ein Schicksal, eine Ehre oder eine Tatsache der Geschichte, die unverrueckbar feststand (722).

Immediately following this passage, Schnitzler by means of physical comparison of Heinrich and Leo, through Georg's eyes, cleverly intermingles or switches the physical appearance of each with what each is expounding. By crossing over the appearance and philosophy of the two opposing characters and points of view, he adds to the feeling of ambivalence and desperate confusion.

Und als er [Georg] sich in den Anblick der beiden Sprechenden verlor und ihre Gestalten betrachtete, die sich mit scharf gezogenen, heftig bewegten Linien von dem roetlich-violetten Himmel abzeichnete, fiel es ihm nicht zum ersten Male auf, dass Heinrich, der darauf bestand, hier daheim zu sein, in Figur und Geste einem fanatischen, juedischen Prediger glich, waehrend Leo, der mit seinem Volk nach Palaestina ziehen wollte, in Gesichtsschnitt und Haltung ihn an die Bildsaule eines griechischen Juenglings erinnerte, die er einmal im Vatikan oder im Museum von Neapel gesehen hatte (723).

As noted above in relation to Heinrich and Georg, there is again an intermingling of characters; in this

case, that of Heinrich and Leo, through Georg, as the all-important objective party, sometimes siding with one and then with the other. This has the effect of again unifying the structure and theme of the novel. Various characteristics, whether physical, as mentioned, or metaphysical, are common to all those portrayed in the novel. For example, this latter aspect is present in the underlying subtheme of guilt discussed earlier, which Schnitzler mentioned in his letter to Brandes. This argument was one of the main points of the Allen article in 1967, "Schnitzler's Der Weg ins Freie: Structure or Structures." It made the breakthrough in modern criticism by viewing, for the first time, the novel as one structure. By citing the Schnitzler-Brandes correspondence, Allen stresses that in examining Heinrich, Georg, and Leo, one notes that the subtheme of guilt for the taking of a life was common to all three. Heinrich is guilty of the suicide of his actress girlfriend, Georg of the stillbirth of his child, and Leo of the duel with his anti-Semitic officer.<sup>23</sup>

To further prove his theory of one structure through characterizations, Allen points to the counterbalancing of character types. His argument is similar to that of Liptzin. However, Allen is more successful. He does this by tying together the original two perspectives through the characters.

Even though Georg and Anna are portrayed as non-Jewish, each character has, so to speak, his Jewish counterparts. Taken together these counterparts form a symmetrical scheme, and, if allowed, this scheme does provide a necessary connection...for the novel as a whole. On the one hand the protagonist, Georg von Wergenthin, is counterbalanced by his "Marxian" realist -- sceptics, Heinrich von [sic] Bermann and Edmund Nuernberger. Both of these as writers wield "das Wort"; both reveal Georg to himself through verbal analysis. Georg is moreover counterbalanced by the activist Leo Golowski (a Zionist), a well as by such male exponents of "die Tat" as S. Ehrenberg and Willy Eisler.... On the other hand Anna Rosner, Georg's Hauptgeliebte is counterbalanced by her Heinrich Bermann counterpart, the realist Else Ehrenberg; by her Leo Golowski equivalent, Therese Golowski....<sup>24</sup>

Here the two themes are brought together by the characters, as Liptzin suggested. This then acts as a counterargument to the Brandes theory of two themes, and therefore, fosters one main theme. The themes in the novel are linked by two distinct techniques used in the character portrayals. They are the intermingling of the characters as seen in their similarity of problems: the dilettante common to Georg and Heinrich, the Zionist versus the anti-Zionist tendencies of Leo and Heinrich, respectively, as juxtaposed through Georg; and the counterbalancing of different characters as pointed out by Liptzin and, more elaborately, by Allen.

Ultimately, both of these techniques represent Schnitzler in his own ambivalence. These characters each portray his persona. To continue with character analysis as a unifying technique reflecting Schnitzler's

personal experience, it is necessary to view the major female characters. Just as the males portrayed essentially represent Schnitzler, the main female protagonist represents the women in Schnitzler's life.

Schnitzler portrays only one major female character in each of his works. For example, only Mizi Gluemer was presented in Das Maerchen, and Olga Schnitzler in Zwischenspiel. Der Weg ins Freie, as originally introduced, embodies an evolution of the Schnitzler themes; concomitantly, its characters are a culmination of previous characters portrayed. This was also the case with the male protagonists. As Mann writes, "Es [Der Weg ins Freie] ist der aufrichtigste Gerichtstag, den hier ein Dichter ueber sein ganzes bisheriges Schaffen haelt."<sup>25</sup> Similarly, the female characters found in Der Weg ins Freie represent a fusion of previous characters intermingled from Schnitzler's personal life.

Beginning with Anna Rosner, Georg's beloved, the reader notes the most obvious common factor with Marie Reinhard. Just as did the latter, Anna gives birth to a stillborn child. She shares additional traits with Marie Reinhard. Both stem from a bourgeois family and are softspoken, and both are music teachers. However, Anna, as an amalgam of characters, does not only represent Marie, but also Olga Schnitzler. Anna, just as did Olga, aspired to a singing career, yet neither

was good enough to attain a professional level. Anna is the embodiment of the two most influential women in Schnitzler's personal life.

Another woman who affected Schnitzler's life was Mizi Gluemer, the actress upon whom Schnitzler modeled Das Maerchen. She too appears in Der Weg ins Freie. As a lesser influence than either Marie or Olga, the character of Mizi remains nameless in the novel, and is never directly introduced. However, she is, nonetheless, unmistakably present in Heinrich Bermann's beloved, who eventually commits suicide because of her unrequited love for Heinrich. This is based on the fact that Mizi Gluemer committed suicide because Schnitzler's love turned into hatred. In the novel, the relationship between Heinrich and his nameless actress is only conducted through letters. Schnitzler and Gluemer carried on a correspondence that consisted of over six hundred letters in a period of only four years.

By intermingling these female types from Schnitzler's personal life, as well as associating them with not just one character, Heinrich or Georg, but with both of them, Schnitzler again combined the two characters of Heinrich and Georg, and thus linked the themes they each represent. There is an interlinking not only of characters, but also of themes and subthemes. This was evident with the theme of the dilettante in both Georg and Heinrich, the theme of the

Viennese Jew in the conversations between Leo and Heinrich, as linked by the neutral observer Georg, and a further linking, by the subtheme, of guilt for a human life in Georg, Heinrich and Leo.

There is an additional combination of themes in terms of possible solutions to the respective problems. Heinrich's feelings toward Palestine as a proper response to the dilemma of the Jewish situation can be compared with Georg's "solution" to his dilemma of dilettantism.

In reality, as a Jew, Heinrich harbors doubts concerning a Jewish future in Palestine. Even though, for the most part, he is anti-Zionist, he nevertheless does not totally dismiss Palestine as a solution, not even for himself. In one of the conversations with Leo, Heinrich, when asked if there will be a return to the Scheiterhaufen, responds, "Fuer diesen Fall...dazu verpflichte ich mich hiermit feierlich, werde ich mich vollkommen nach Ihnen richten" (724). Palestine would be an eventual solution, but only as a last resort, as an escape. In this manner, the characters of Georg and Heinrich can be linked thematically. Georg's decision to go to Detmold, Germany, becomes a solution or an escape. It is merely an attempted road to freedom for his own dilemma of escaping the bourgeois life style symbolized by eventual marriage to Anna. For Georg, the stillbirth is the tragedy that prompted his escape. For

Heinrich, and his people, the tragedy was the threat that was later realized in the course of events in the annihilation of European Jewry. It was this tragedy of cataclysmic proportions that gave the impetus for the eventual partition of Palestine, and that led to the establishment of the state of Israel.

Just as Palestine would have been a possible escape from Austria for Heinrich, Detmold was also an escape from Austria, albeit as a last resort, for Georg. Allen remarks in his article, "Georg, in choosing Detmold, is rejecting 'assimilation,' his move to Detmold is likewise Zionist."26 Both Schindlegger27 and Aspetsberger28 give essentially the same interpretation. This represents, therefore, another link in themes. In a slightly different interpretation, also linking themes, the stillbirth, instead of tragedy, can indicate stagnation, as can Austria at the turn of the century, which included the Jewish situation.29

Through these links, there is a unity within the novel of finding the solution, or the road to freedom. In this search, the character's experiences and frustrations demonstrate that the solution is not an easy one - a true solution may not exist at all. There are merely outward solutions to deeper inner problems that reflect many different levels -- hence, ambivalence as a basic tenet of the human psyche.

It is especially through the discussions between

Heinrich and Georg, first focusing on the Jewish situation, but later expanding to all areas of life, that the reader discovers the one major theme of the novel - that of ambivalence. Heinrich, who reflects more deeply than Georg on the problems they both face, can thus be seen as Georg's alter ego. Here his answer to Georg on the Jewish situation is similar to his answer to the other questions presented in the novel. The answer reflects a philosophy of the times and the human condition in general.

Using Palestine as an example and springboard to a broader philosophy, Heinrich says,

Fuer unsere Zeit gibt es keine Loesung, das steht einmal fest. Eher gibt es hunderttausend verschiedene Loesungen. Weil es eben eine Angelegenheit ist, die bis auf weiteres jeder mit sich selbst abmachen muss, wie er kann. Jeder muss selber dazusehen, wie er herausfindet aus seinem Aerger, oder aus seiner Verzweiflung oder aus seinem Ekel irgendwohin, wo er wieder frei aufatmen kann. Vielleicht gibt es wirklich Leute, die dazu bis nach Jerusalem spazieren muessen.... Ich fuerchte nur, dass manche, an diesem vermeintlichen Ziel angelangt, sich erst recht verirrt vorkommen wuerden. Ich glaube ueberhaupt nicht dass solche Wanderungen ins Freie sich gemeinsam unternehmen lassen...denn die Strassen dorthin laufen ja nicht im Lande draussen, sondern in uns selbst. Es kommt nur fuer jeden darauf an, seinen inneren Weg zu finden. Dazu ist es natuerlich notwendig, moeglichst klar in sich zu sehen, in seine verborgensten Winkel hineinzuleuchten, den Mut seiner eigenen Natur zu haben. Sich nicht beirren lassen. Ja das muesste das taegliche Gebet jedes anstaendigen Menschen sein: Unbeirrtheit (832-33)!

Heinrich here reaches far beyond just providing an answer to the question of Palestine, or, for that

matter, Georg's solution to his problem, found in taking an outward road to Detmold. Both solutions are superficial.

Solutions, or the road to freedom, are not found outside, but inside of oneself, and, thus, are more complex and inherently ambivalent. Nevertheless, the individual must try to follow his own inclinations. Liptzin stated this repeatedly in reference to Der Weg ins Freie: "A person enters on the road to freedom only when he follows the dictates of his own personality irrespective of moral taboos or social ostracism..."<sup>30</sup> Further, he noted, "The only criminals for whom there is no atonement are, according to Schnitzler, those who act against their own nature..."<sup>31</sup> As these "inner roads" are more complex, causing greater ambivalence, there are no real answers -- not for any of Schnitzler's main characters, nor for Schnitzler himself. Writing for Schnitzler was the catharsis, not the solution. By writing, he could control the variables as he pondered the solution. As demonstrated by all of his characters, including those of Der Weg ins Freie, no real solutions are found.

It is no accident that most of Schnitzler's main characters are artists -- especially writers. Through their artistic medium, they, too, search for answers. This is especially evident in Der Weg ins Freie, with special emphasis on the opera, in which both Heinrich

and Georg collaborate, another link in combining the two characters. It becomes the story within the story. Heinrich, as the writer, as well as Georg's alter ego, writes the libretto to which Georg has composed the music. Unification of the major characters of Der Weg ins Freie is achieved through the character of Aegidius in this opera. The theme of ambivalence is manifest in that "no" solution is possible for Aegidius. As mentioned by Allen, who sees Der Weg ins Freie as one entity, "in some ways the shadowy figure of Aegidius, beset by his own impending death, is the Hauptperson of the novel, combining in him Georg, Heinrich, and Leo...."<sup>32</sup>

However, there is a difference in examining these three separate characters. The essential difference between Georg and Heinrich is that Georg can apparently accept that superficial answer. He derives satisfaction in escaping to Detmold, thus leaving his problems, Anna and the need to make a commitment, behind (958). He confuses escape with solution. The same observation can be made in regard to Leo, the Zionist who can escape to Palestine. But for Heinrich, there is no simple answer. Escape on the outer roads is not the solution. He still has to contend with his inner roads. Heinrich, as Georg's alter ego and, to a degree, Leo's alter ego, is a deeper thinker, which causes additional problems. The greater the levels of thought and the deeper one probes

these levels, the more confusion exists.

Ambivalence, which is the key, the unifying theme to this novel, as well as to all of Schnitzler's works, is manifested through the two different perspectives examined here. Der Weg ins Freie, especially represented in Heinrich Bermann, is the pinnacle of this theme. As Liptzin stated, "The profoundest thinker among Schnitzler's young men, he [Heinrich Bermann] is, also the unhappiest, perhaps because he probes too deeply..."<sup>33</sup> Continuing, Liptzin added, the deeper the thinker, the greater the ambivalence. "Depth of insight does not lead to clarity, but rather it leads to a realization of the abysmal confusion within us. It does not make for happiness, but rather for a knowledge of our helplessness."<sup>34</sup>

This is evident in the last encounter with Heinrich. Here he reflects with Georg for the final time, before the latter travels to Detmold, on the problems they both faced in the past. He starts out by specifically referring to the guilt/non-guilt he felt at the news of his actress girlfriend's suicide, but, as was the case previously, in using Palestine as a springboard to broader issues, he reflects further, encompassing most areas of his own life experience, as well as that of Georg. As Heinrich probes his different inner thought levels, we understand his ambivalence within the historical milieu, which reflects the human

condition.

Ja. Ich hab mich ohne Schuld gefuehlt. Irgendwo in meiner Seele. Und woanders, tiefer, wieder schuldlos. Es kommt immer nur darauf an, wie tief wir in uns hineinschauen. Und wenn die Lichter in allen Stockwerken angezuendet sind, sind wir doch alles auf einmal; schuldig, und unschuldig, Feiglinge und Helden, Narren und Weise.... In mir sieht's naemlich greulich aus. Sollten Sie das noch nicht bemerkt haben? Was hilft's mir am Ende, dass in allen meinen Stockwerken die Lichter brennen? Was hilft mir mein Wissen von den Menschen und mein herrliches Verstehen? Nichts... (957).

The deeper one probes, and the more one thinks, the greater the confusion and resulting ambivalence.

Schnitzler, the man, was confronted with this throughout his own life, in terms of two perspectives: personal commitment and Jewish identity. These ideas were given fullest expression in Der Weg ins Freie. This was Schnitzler's world, and this he represented through the theme of ambivalence, in all of its universal ramifications.

## Notes

1. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Arthur Schnitzler, Briefwechsel (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1964) 257.
2. Josef Koerner, Arthur Schnitzlers Gestalten und Probleme (Zuerich: Amalthea, 1921) 199.
3. Koerner 199.
4. Arthur Schnitzler, "Der Weg ins Freie," Die Erzaehlenden Schriften (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962) 797. All further references to this work appear in the text.
5. Nickl and Schnitzler 257.
6. Koerner 203.
7. Kurt Bergel, ed., Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel (Bern: Francke, 1956) 95.
8. Bergel 96-97.
9. W. Mann, "Arthur Schnitzler" in Gustav Krojanker, ed., Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays ueber zeitgenoessische Schriftsteller (Berlin: Welt, 1922) 211.
10. Bergel 97.
11. Bergel 97.
12. Bergel 97.
13. Mann 212.
14. Bergel 97.
15. Bergel 97.
16. Willehad Paul Eckert, "Arthur Schnitzler und das Wiener Judentum," Emuna: Horizonte zur Diskussion ueber Israel und das Judentum, 2 (Maerz/April 1973) 122.
17. Sol Liptzin, Arthur Schnitzler (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1932) 216-17.

18. Friedbert Aspetsberger, "Arthur Schnitzler's 'Der Weg ins Freie'," Sprachkunst: Beitræge zur Literaturwissenschaft, IV, i/ii (1973) 66.

19. Aspetsberger 79.

20. Wolfgang Schindlegger, "Das Problem des Antisemitismus bei Arthur Schnitzler: Betrachtungen ueber Judentum und Gesellschaft um 1900," diss., U of Klagenfurt, 1980, 71, citing Bergel 95.

21. Schindlegger 71.

22. M. Brann, ed., "Die Darstellung der Juden im deutschen Roman des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. (Fortsetzung), Die Juden bei Arthur Schnitzler," Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums (Breslau: Barasch und Riesenfeld, 1915) 13.

23. Richard H. Allen, "Schnitzler's Der Weg ins Freie: Structure or Structures?," Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association, 6, iii (Fall 1967) 13.

24. Allen 14.

25. Mann 217.

26. Allen 15.

27. Schindlegger 89.

28. Aspetsberger 72.

29. Aspetsberger 74.

30. Liptzin 211.

31. Liptzin 225.

32. Allen 13.

33. Liptzin 222.

34. Liptzin 223.

### Conclusion

For the writer and for his society, the world of Arthur Schnitzler was one of ambivalence. Conflicting forces coexisted in turn-of-the-century Vienna. The pomp and splendor of the Hapsburg monarchy gave rise to a moral laxness that permeated all levels of society, despite the omnipresence of Catholic morality. Hence, dilettantism, cloaked in hypocrisy, was not an uncommon phenomenon. In another arena, greater political freedoms were guaranteed under the Constitution of 1867. However, this was counterbalanced by growing factionalism, which fostered a reawakening of anti-Semitism. The roots of this anti-Semitism generated a hatred that, just after Schnitzler's own lifetime, unleashed a cataclysm of unprecedented proportions.

As a writer, Schnitzler was able to focus on these two pressing issues that also very much affected him personally. It is only recently, with the sufficient passage of time necessary for the proper historical perspective, that Schnitzler's works can be appropriately evaluated as to their broader significance.

Two works in particular, Jugend in Wien and Der Weg ins Freie, provide the key to understanding the ambivalence Schnitzler felt both personally and in his society in general. Ambivalence, as a concept, defined as simultaneous counterforces coexisting, creates an

inherent tension. In Jugend in Wien, focusing on his youth, Schnitzler outlined these ideas within the context of the dilettante and of the Jewish situation in Vienna. This autobiography, even though describing his youth, was actually begun in 1901,<sup>1</sup> between the ages of forty and fifty, a time for general, as well as personal, reflection of that which was discovered during youth.

In Der Weg ins Freie, Schnitzler elaborated on these same two concepts. Since Schnitzler referred to it as "das persoendlichste meiner Werke,"<sup>2</sup> Der Weg ins Freie can be called a autobiographical fiction. It took Schnitzler the three years from 1905 to 1908 to complete this novel. Thus, it was written at approximately the same time as Jugend in Wien, the time for not only the author's reflections, but also his catharsis. Therefore, a frame for this study was formed by arranging the examination of Schnitzler's work so as to begin and end with these two books, respectively.

By pointing to Schnitzler's personal history and experience, there is a possibility of a synthesis of the two issues. However, as Schnitzler's contemporaries agreed, this was a weak foundation by itself for the theory of combining the two problems under one theme. Now, with the requisite buffer of time, an ongoing reinterpretation of the personal Schnitzler experience against a broader background is under way. Through the

use of historiography, it is possible to see ambivalence fall into the two categories Schnitzler so aptly used in his writing to describe, not only himself, but his society, as well as the human condition in general. Within Schnitzler's works, the two issues go beyond their strict bounds. The theme of ambivalence allows for a broader perspective, in which the human condition is probed. Tensions and anxieties, universal tenets of the individual, come to the fore as a result of the historical situation.

The psychological aspect, as seen in the dilettante phenomenon, is embodied and explained by Sigmund Freud, with the different levels of consciousness. Thus, the relationship between Schnitzler and Freud provides a better understanding of their contemporary society, in which the dilettante was ever present. Schnitzler traced this phenomenon in his many works including, Reigen, Anatol, Das Maerchen, Das Vermaechtnis, and Zwischenspiel.

The other aspect entailing ambivalence was the Jewish situation. As stated above, the Jewish milieu, especially in turn-of-the-century Vienna, embodied an inherent ambivalence in the light of the Austrian Constitution of 1867, which provided for the acceptance of the Jew in society. Anti-Semitism, however, existed simultaneously within that same society, and, as a result, provided the force for the rebirth of Zionism in

Vienna as advocated by Theodor Herzl. Professor Bernhardt becomes Schnitzler's vehicle, as a microcosm of society, to expose the interaction of the Jewish and non-Jewish environment.

Der Weg ins Freie provides a synthesis of the two issues. In this autobiographical fiction, the two problems are combined by pulling the dilettante aspect and the Jewish aspect together on two bases, both historical. These themes are synthesized within the personal history of Schnitzler himself, who wrote as a catharsis, and within general history, as the historian William Johnston outlined it in The Austrian Mind. Der Weg ins Freie allows these two perspectives to merge within its structure.

Since the emphasis was on Milieuschilderung within an historical context, it is only now, with the accurate historical retrospect, that the analysis of the concept of ambivalence, throughout Schnitzler's works, is valid. Over the years, Arthur Schnitzler has become known as one of the best representatives and one of the most perspicacious commentators on his times and milieu, thus eclipsing his personal history. Through the theme of ambivalence, as represented by the dilettante and the Jewish situation, Arthur Schnitzler has explored the universal human condition of ambivalence, with its accompanying doubts, uncertainties, and insecurities. The very tensions he perceived, combined with his

trenchant powers of observation coalesced to catalyze  
the creative mind of Arthur Schnitzler.

## Notes

1. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Arthur Schnitzler, Jugend in Wien (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1960) 323.

2. Therese Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler, eds., Hugo von Hofmannsthal - Arthur Schnitzler Briefwechsel (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1964) 257.

## Bibliography

## Primary Sources

- Schnitzler, Arthur. "Autographen, AR 531." Arthur Schnitzler Collection. New York: Leo Baeck Institute Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Berichtigung. Ein Paar Worte zum Gutachten Maximilian Hardens ueber den 'Reigen'." Neues Wiener Journal. Nr. 9732, 30 January 1921: 6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Briefe 1875-1912. Eds. Theresa Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Briefe 1913-1931. Eds. Peter Michael Braunwarth, et al. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Georg Brandes und Arthur Schnitzler: Ein Briefwechsel. Ed. Kurt Bergel. Bern: Francke, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Hugo von Hofmannsthal - Arthur Schnitzler: Briefwechsel. Eds. Theresa Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Arthur Schnitzler - Olga Waissnix. Liebe die starb vor der Zeit. Ein Briefwechsel. Eds. Theresa Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler. Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Charakteristiken," Nachlass, vol. 188. Cambridge: Cambridge U: 450-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Gesammelte Werke: Die Dramatischen Werke. 2 vols. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Gesammelte Werke: Die Erzaehlenden Schriften. 2 vols. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "321 Herzl, Theodor, H; HN 10." Letters from Arthur Schnitzler to Theodor Herzl. Jerusalem: Central Zionist Archives.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jugend in Wien: Eine Autobiographie. Eds. Theresa Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler. Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Meine Stellung zum Zionismus." Aufbau, 8 8 May 1942: 17.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Eine oesterreichische Komoedie," Letter to Richard Charnatz, January 4, 1913. "Das Juedische in 'Professor Bernhardi'." Ed. Siegfried Melchinger. Theater Heute, 12, v (1964): 32-33.

\_\_\_\_\_. Tagebuch 1909-1912. Ed. Werner Welzig. Vienna: Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981.

## Secondary Sources

- Abels, Norbert. Sicherheit ist nirgends: Judentum und Aufklärung bei Arthur Schnitzler. Koenigstein/Ts: Athenaeum, 1982.
- Allen, Richard H. An Annotated Arthur Schnitzler Bibliography 1879-1965. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, n.d.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Schnitzler's 'Der Weg ins Freie'" Structure or Structures?" Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association, 6, iii (Fall 1967): 4-17.
- Allport, Gordon. "Personality: A Problem for Science or a Problem for Art." In his The Nature of Personality: Selected Papers. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1950: 198-209.
- Arendt, Hannah. The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.
- Aspetsberger, Friedbert. "Arthur Schnitzlers 'Der Weg ins Freie'." Sprachkunst: Beitræge zur Literaturwissenschaft, 4, i/ii (1973): 65-80.
- Berlin, Jeffrey B. An Annotated Arthur Schnitzler Bibliography 1965-1977. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Arthur Schnitzler Bibliography for 1977-1981." Modern Austrian Literature, 15, i (1982): 61-83.
- Boyer, John W. "Freud, Marriage, and Late Viennese Liberalism: A Commentary from 1905." The Journal of Modern History, 50, i (March 1978): 72-102.
- Brandes Georg. "Arthur Schnitzler." In his Gestalten und Gedanken: Essays. Munich: Albert Langen, 1903. 35-40.
- Brann, M., ed. "Die Darstellung der Juden im deutschen Roman des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. (Fortsetzung). Die Juden bei Arthur Schnitzler." In his Monatsschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums. Breslau: Barasch und Riesenfeld, 1915: 13-21.
- Burkhard, Arthur. "Schnitzler: Symbol of Austria's Past," Books Abroad. January 1932: 21-22.

- Burr, Anna Robeson. The Autobiography: A Critical and Comparative Study. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.
- Carmichael, Joel, ed. and trans. "Excerpts from the Correspondence Between Theodor Herzl and Arthur Schnitzler (1892-1895)." Midstream, 6, i (Winter 1960): 46-64.
- David, J. J. "'Vermaechtnis'." Feuilleton, Neues Wiener Journal, Nr. 1835, 1 December 1898: 1-2.
- Deutsches Volkstheater. "Arthur Schnitzler: 'Das Maerchen'." Feuilleton, Beilage zu Nr. 4712 der Wiener Allgemeinen Zeitung. n.d.: v.
- Eckert, Willehad Paul. "Arthur Schnitzler und das Wiener Judentum." Emuna: Horizonte zur Diskussion ueber Israel und das Judentum, 2 (March/April 1973): 118-124.
- Edelstein, Rahel. "Arthur Schnitzler und Ludwig Fulda." Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums. Berlin: 12 July 1912: 328-29.
- Fraenkel, Josef, ed. The Jews of Austria. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1967.
- Fritsche, Alfred. Dekadenz im Werk Arthur Schnitzler. Bern: H. Lang, 1974.
- Gaisbauer, Adolf. "Der Historische Hintergrund von Arthur Schnitzlers 'Professor Bernhardi'." Bulletin des Leo Baeck Institutes, Neue Folge. 13 (1974): 113-63.
- Geehr, Richard S., ed. "I Decide who is a Jew!" The Papers of Dr. Karl Lueger. Washington D. C.: UP of America, 1982.
- Geissler, Klaus. "Arthur Schnitzler und seine Darstellung des Judentums." Tribune. Zeitschrift zum Verstaendnis des Judentums, 10 (1971): 4407-4415.
- Georg, Manfred, ed. Herzls Briefe. Berlin: Brandusche, n.d.
- Grunfeld, Frederic V. Prophets without Honour. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- Grunwald, Max. Geschichte der Wiener Juden bis 1914. Vienna: Israelitischen Kultusgemeinde, 1926.

- Gutt, Barbara. Emancipation bei Arthur Schnitzler. Berlin: Volker Spiess, 1978.
- Harden, Maximilian. "Theater." Die Zukunft, 53 9  
December 1905: 366-76.
- Hirsch, Rudolf. "Hugo von Hofmannsthal ueber  
Schnitzlers 'Anatol'." Neue Rundschau, 82 iv  
(1971): 795-97.
- Heine, Wolfgang, ed. Der Kampf um den 'Reigen.'  
Berlin: Ernst Rowohlt, 1922.
- Herzl, Theodor. Das Neue Ghetto: Drama in vier Akten.  
Vienna: R. Loewit, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Tagebuecher 1895-1904. 3 vols. Berlin:  
Juedischer Verlag, 1922.
- Horwath, Peter. "Arthur Schnitzlers 'Professor  
Bernhardi': Eine Studie ueber Person und Tendenz  
(I. Teil)." Literatur und Kritik, 12 (12 March  
1967): 88-104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Arthur Schnitzlers 'Professor Bernhardi':  
Eine Studie ueber Person und Tendenz (II. Teil und  
Schluss)." Literatur und Kritik, 13 (13 April  
1967): 183-93.
- Janz, Rolf-Peter, and Laermann, Klaus. Arthur  
Schnitzler: Zur Diagnose des Wiener Buergertums im  
Fin de siecle. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche  
Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1977.
- Johnston, William M. The Austrian Mind: An  
Intellectual and Social History 1848-1938.  
Berkeley: U of California, 1972.
- Kilian, Klaus. Die Komodien Arthur Schnitzlers.  
Duesseldorf: Bertelsmann Universitaetsverlag,  
1972.
- Kohn, Hans. "Eros and Sorrow: Notes on the Life and  
Work of Arthur Schnitzler and Otto Weininger."  
Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook VI. London: Secker  
and Warburg, 1961. 152-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Karl Kraus, Arthur Schnitzler, Otto  
Weininger. Aus dem juedischen Wien der  
Jahrhundertwende." Schriftenreihe  
Wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck  
Institute of Jews from Germany. Tuebingen: J. C.  
E. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1962.

- Koerner, Josef. Arthur Schnitzlers Gestalten und Probleme. Zurich: Amalthea, 1921.
- Kraus, Karl, "Universitaetsbummel." In his Fackel, 47, ii (Mid July 1900): 27-28.
- Kupper, Herbert I, and Rollman-Branch, Hilda S. "Freud and Schnitzler - (Doppelgaenger)." Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, 7 (1959): 109-126.
- Lessing Theater. "'Zwischenspiel' Komodie in drei Akten von Arthur Schnitzler." Die Nation, 9, xxiii (2 December 1905): 140-41.
- Liptzin, Sol. Arthur Schnitzler. New York: Prentice Hall, 1932.
- Mann, W. "Arthur Schnitzler." Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays ueber zeitgenoessische Schriftsteller. Ed. Gustav Krojanker. Berlin: Welt, 1922. 207-18.
- Melchinger, Siegfried. "Das Judentum in 'Professor Bernhardi'." Theater Heute, 12, v (1964): 32-35.
- Minor, J. "Burgtheater." Oesterreichische Rundschau, 4, i (12 October 1905): 542-46.
- Mitterauer, Michael. "Familienformen und Illegitimitaet in laendlichen Gebieten Oesterreichs." Archiv fuer Sozialgeschichte. Ed. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Verbindung mit dem Institut fuer Sozialgeschichte xix. Braunschweig - Bonn: Neue Gesellschaft, 1979: 123-88.
- Morton, Frederic. A Nervous Splendor: Vienna 1888-1889. New York: Penguin Books, 1979.
- Neumann, Gerhard, and Mueller, Jutta. Der Nachlass Arthur Schnitzlers. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1969.
- Pascal, Roy. Die Autobiographie, Gehalt und Gestalt. Trans. M. Schaible. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1965.
- Poppenberg, Felix. "'Zwischenspiel'." Der Tuermer, 8, iv (January 1906): 552-57.
- Pulzer, Peter G. J. The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

- Reik, Theodor. Arthur Schnitzler als Psycholog. Minden: JCC Bruns, 1913.
- Rosensaft, Menachem Z. "Jews and Antisemites in Austria at the End of the Nineteenth Century." Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook XXI. London: Secker and Warburg, 1976. 57-86.
- Scheible, Hartmut. Schnitzler. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch, 1976.
- Schindlegger, Wolfgang. "Das Problem des Antisemitismus bei Arthur Schnitzler: Betrachtungen ueber Judentum und Gesellschaft um 1900." Diss. Klagenfurt: Universitaet fuer Bildungswissenschaft, 1980.
- Schinnerer, Otto P. "The History of Schnitzler's 'Reigen'." PMLA, 46, iii (September 1931): 839-59.
- Schnitzler, Heinrich, et al. Arthur Schnitzler: Sein Leben, Sein Werk, Seine Zeit. Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Nachlass meines Vaters." Aufbau, 9 November 1951: 9-10.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. "Sigmund Freud Briefe an Arthur Schnitzler." Die Neue Rundschau, 66, i (1955): 1-12.
- Schnitzler, Olga. Spiegelbild der Freundschaft. Salzburg: Residenz, 1962.
- Schorske, Carl E. Fin-de-Siecle Vienna: Politics and Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980.
- Sherman, Murray H. "Psychoanalysis and Old Vienna: Freud, Reik, Schnitzler, Kraus." The Psychoanalytic Review, 65 (1978): 68-94.
- Spann, Othmar. "Die Unehelichkeit im Oesterreich nach Volksstaemen und Ihre Entwicklung im letzten Jahrzehnt." Statistische Monatshefte, Neue Folge 14 (1907): 120-22.
- Stiegnitz, Peter. "Schnitzlers Tagebuch wird entziffert." Allgemeine juedische Wochenzeitung, 33, vi (10 February 1978): 6.
- Swales, Martin. Arthur Schnitzler: A critical Study. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

- Tietze, Hans. Die Juden Wiens: Geschichte - Wirtschaft - Kultur. Leipzig: E. P. Tal, 1933.
- Timms, Edward. "The Nostalgia of a radical." Times Literary Supplement. 30 April 1982: 475.
- Torborg, Friedrich. "Nachwort." Jugend in Wien by Arthur Schnitzler. Eds. Theresa Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler. Vienna: Fritz Molden. 1968. 330-38.
- Urbach, Reinhard. Arthur Schnitzler, Second Edition. Velber bei Hannover: Friedrich, 1972.
- Urban, Bernd. "Schnitzler and Freud as Doubles: Poetic Intuition and Early Research on Hysteria." The Psychoanalytic Review, 65 (1978): 131-65.
- van Arkel, Dirk. "Antisemitism in Austria." Diss. Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit, 1956.
- Viereck, George Sylvester. "The World of Arthur Schnitzler." In his Glimpses of the Great. New York: Macaulay, 1930. 395-409.
- Wagner, Renate. Arthur Schnitzler: Eine Biographie. Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Frauen um Arthur Schnitzler. Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1980.
- Walton, Luverne. "'Anatol' on the New York Stage." Modern Austrian Literature. 2, ii (1969): 30-41.
- Wassermann, Jacob. Mein Weg als Deutscher und Jude. Berlin: S. Fischer, 1921.
- Weigel, Hans. "Vorwort." In Arthur Schnitzler - Olga Waissnix. Liebe die Starb vor der Zeit. Ein Briefwechsel. Eds. Theresa Nickl and Heinrich Schnitzler. Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1970. 9-27.
- Weiss, Robert O. "The 'Hero' in Schnitzler's Comedy 'Professor Bernhardt'." Modern Austrian Literature, 2, iv (Winter 1969): 30-33.
- Welzig, Werner. "Zur Herausgabe von Schnitzlers Tagebuch." In Arthur Schnitzler - Tagebuch. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981. 7-33.
- Zohn, Harry. "Arthur Schnitzler und das Judentum." In his Wiener Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays. Tel Aviv: Olamenu, 1964. 9-18.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Three Austrian Jews in German Literature: Schnitzler, Zweig, Herzl." In The Jews of Austria: Essays on their life, history, and destruction. Ed. Josef Fraenkel. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1967. 67-82.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Theodor Herzl." In his Wiener Juden in der deutschen Literatur: Essays. Tel Aviv: Olamenu, 1964. 43-48.