For such a multi-disciplinary inquiry on a political ground, Vienna in the *fin-de-siècle* offered unusual advantages. Almost simultaneously in one area after another, that city's intelligentsia produced innovations that became identified throughout the European cultural sphere as Vienna "schools"—notably in psychology, art history, and music. But even in fields where an international awareness of Austrian achievement dawned more slowly—in literature, architecture, painting, and politics, for example—the Austrians engaged in critical reformulations or subversive transformations of their traditions that their own society perceived as radically new if not indeed revolutionary. The term *Die Jungen* ("The Young Ones") as a common designation for innovative *révoltés* spread from one sphere of life to another. First employed in politics in the 1870's to denote a group of young rebels against classical Austrian liberalism, the term soon appeared in literature (*Jung-Wien*), and then among the artists and architects who first embraced *art nouveau* and gave it a special Austrian character.[2]

The new culture-makers in the city of Freud thus repeatedly defined themselves in terms of a kind of collective oedipal revolt. Yet the young were revolting not so much against their fathers as against the authority of the paternal culture that was their inheritance. What they assaulted on a broad front was the value system of classical liberalism-in-ascendancy within which they had been reared. Given this ubiquitous and simultaneous criticism of their liberal-rational inheritance from within the several fields of cultural activity, the internalistic approach of the special disciplines could not do justice to the phenomenon. A general and rather sudden transformation of thought and values among the culture-makers suggested, rather, a shared social experience that compelled rethinking. In the Viennese case, a highly compacted political and social development provided this context.

The era of political ascendancy of the liberal middle class in Austria, begun later than elsewhere in western Europe, entered earlier than elsewhere into deep crisis. By optimistic calculation, actual constitutional government lasted about four decades (1860–1900). Its victory had scarcely been celebrated when retreat and defeat began. The whole process took place in a temporal compression unknown elsewhere in Europe. In France, the post-liberal

question of "modernity" in culture arose in the wake of the Revolution of 1848 as a kind of avant-garde self-criticism of the bourgeoisie, and slowly spread, with many advances and retreats, from the era of the Second Empire to the eve of World War I. In Austria, however, the modern movements appeared in most fields in the 1890's and were fully matured two decades later. Thus the growth of a new higher culture seemed to take place in Austria as in a hothouse, with political crisis providing the heat. Backward Austria, in sudden travail, became, as one of its poets said, "the little world in which the big one holds its tryouts."[3] Could one find, as one analyzed the work of the cultural innovators, traces of the experience of liberal political eclipse and failure? Had it eroded their faith in the inherited high culture in a sense that was more than merely political?

The socially circumscribed character of the Viennese cultural élite, with its unusual combination of provincialism and cosmopolitanism, of traditionalism and modernism, created a more coherent context for studying early twentieth-century intellectual development than other major cities. In London, Paris, or Berlin—as my students and I learned from seminars exploring each as a cultural entity—the intellectuals in the various branches of high culture, whether academic or aesthetic, journalistic or literary, political or intellectual, scarcely knew each other. They lived in relatively segregated professional communities. In Vienna, by contrast, until about 1900, the cohesiveness of the whole élite was strong. The salon and the café retained their vitality as institutions where intellectuals of different kinds shared ideas and values with each other and still mingled with a business and professional élite proud of its general education and artistic culture. By the same token, the "alienation" of the intellectuals from other sectors of the élite, their development of an arcane or avant-garde subculture, detached from the political, ethical, and aesthetic values of the upper middle class, came later in Vienna than in other Western cultural capitals, though it was perhaps swifter and more sure. Most of the pioneering generation of culture-makers who appear in these studies were alienated along with their class in its extrusion from political power, not from and against it as a ruling class. Only in the last decade before World War I does there appear alienation of the intellectual from the *whole* society.

IV

SINCE THE STUDIES in this volume do not constitute a completed map of the historical landscape, they can each be read independently. Each one issued from a separate foray into the terrain, varying in scale and focus according to the nature of the problem. Only the fundamental motif of interaction between politics and culture runs through them all. The hope is that, as in a song cycle, the central idea will act to establish a coherent field in which the several parts can cast their light upon each other to illuminate the larger whole.

A few words on the focus and arrangement of the essays may help the reader on his way. The first piece, "Politics and the Psyche," provides a background for the whole series. It aims to define broadly the special character of the Austrian cultural inheritance—part aristocratic, Catholic, and aesthetic, part bourgeois, legalist, and rationalist, with which the makers of *fin-de-siècle* culture faced their crisis of function and meaning. Their dilemmas are crystallized in two major literary figures—Arthur Schnitzler and Hugo von Hofmannsthal—shown in the arduous task of adapting the legacy in their different ways to the problems of their social class.

The second essay, "The Ringstrasse . . . ," looks back to explore the liberal cultural system in its political ascendancy through the medium of urban form and architectural style. But it looks forward too; the critical responses to the liberal redevelopment of Vienna on the part of two leading participants in it—Otto Wagner and Camillo Sitte—reveal the emergence of conflicting tendencies, communitarian and functionalist, in modern thought about the built environment.

Essay III, "Politics in a New Key," enters directly into the realm of politics in the crucial area of anti-Semitism. Through the analysis of three leaders—two anti-Semites and a Zionist—it pursues the emergence of a politics of fantasy, in which the persistent power of the aristocratic cultural tradition is adapted by these erstwhile Austro-liberals to the modern pursuit of mass politics.

Essay IV plunges more deeply into the intellectual realm, exploring a single text, Freud's epoch-making work, *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Here psychoanalytic method is used in a modified way, by

appropriating the day-residues in Freud's dreams to reconstitute the personal historical experience that influenced his ideas of the psyche. In exploring the social and political content of those dreams and memories—materials which he recovered from his repressed past in his self-analysis—psychoanalysis as an a-historical system of thought is shown taking form under the trauma inflicted upon Freud by history.

Essay V, on the painter Gustav Klimt, widens the focus again, from a single text to the *oeuvre* of a lifetime. As a participant first in the high culture of liberalism, then in the revolt against it in search of the "modern," and finally in a withdrawal to purely decorative functions, Klimt registered in the style and ideas of his painting the changing nature and function of art amid the tensions of late Habsburg society.

The last two essays, "The Transformation of the Garden" and "Explosion in the Garden," offer a synoptic view of the gradual sea-change of art as it lost its orientation toward social reality during the half-century of liberalism's decline. The garden, traditional symbol of man's ordering power, serves as a vehicle for tracing the emergence of new, post-rationalist conceptions of the human condition over four generations. Essay VI, "The Transformation of the Garden," presents through specific examples from literature the often painful but creative reorganization of thought and feeling that emerged in the face of the dissolution of liberal power and of the historical perspectives that had sustained it. The final essay, "Explosion in the Garden," follows the process to the birth of Expressionist culture—a new, more drastic phase in which the destruction of the traditional cultural order reaches a climax and reconstitution begins. In an eruptive outburst against the aestheticism of the *fin de siècle*, Kokoschka and Schoenberg devised new languages in painting and music to proclaim the universality of suffering in transcendent negation of the professed values of their society. With the definition of modern man as one "condemned to re-create his own universe,"[4] twentieth-century Viennese culture had found its voice.

[129] Herzl, *Tagebücher*, I, 242.
[130] Herzl, *Judenstaat*, p. 92.
[131] Herzl, *Tagebücher*, I, 482–5.
[132] *Ibid.*, p. 486.
[133] *Ibid.*

IV

POLITICS AND PATRICIDE IN FREUD'S *INTERPRETATION OF DREAMS*

THE UNRIDDLER of riddles who found the key to condition in the story of Oedipus was also a lover of joke the age of forty-five he was finally given an associate pr the still unknown Dr. Freud reported the event to a frie journalese. He described his promotion as a political tri

The public enthusiasm is immense. Congratulations and bo pouring in, as if the role of sexuality had been suddenly re His Majesty, the interpretation of dreams confirmed by the Ministers, and the necessity of the psychoanalytic therapy carried by a two-thirds majority in Parliament.[1]

It is a cheerful fantasy, very Viennese: political authority knee to Eros and to dreams.

"Where he makes a jest, a problem lies concealed." In *pretation of Dreams*, published two years before his nouncement, Freud had laid down his first principle of un

the problems of dreams: "A dream is the fulfillment of a wish." At the time of writing, in 1902, he was collecting material to demonstrate that the same rule held true for jokes. "Sometimes," he added, "the jest brings the *solution* of the problem to light as well."[2]

In his moment of elation at his promotion Freud did not simply lean back in satisfaction with the reward of his achievement. Instead, he freed his fantasy to conjure up a wider paradise. Playfully he projected an ordered parliamentary polity united in support of his unorthodox science of Eros. His imagined Parliament, which rallied a two-thirds majority to proclaim the necessity of the psychotherapy of hysteria was, of course, an exact inversion of the political reality of the time. The Austrian Reichsrat of 1902 had itself fallen so deep into political hysteria that it was unable to find a simple majority (let alone two-thirds) to legislate on anything.

We need not believe that political paralysis as such was a major concern to Freud by 1902. What gnawed at him was something both more and less specific: his relationship to the whole political system, including its academic components and consequences. Here it was that his joke fulfilled his wish—the wish to bring political authority to heel. "The jest brings the solution to the problem as well." In the play of Freud's wit the political powers were neither subverted nor dissolved but, on the contrary, miraculously harmonized, united in common recognition of the validity of his theories. Freud thus celebrated in fantasy a victory over politics, the side of human affairs from which he had expected most in youth and had suffered most in manhood.

In the same letter in which the new professor gaily trumpeted his triumph, he also sounded notes of doubt and guilt. Freud felt he could have had the professorship sooner if only he had pressed his own cause. "For four whole years, I had not put in a word about it," he wrote to his friend, Wilhelm Fliess. Only after he had completed *The Interpretation of Dreams* had he decided "to take appropriate steps" with his superiors. To do so, however, involved him in a moral dilemma, "to break with my strict scruples" against cultivating the powerful. Having taken the common-sense road of speaking up for the academic recognition that he felt to be his due, Freud found his success tainted by guilt. His professorship appeared to him ambiguous: on the one hand, it was a victory of his common sense; on the other, it seemed a surrender to hated authority. "I have learned that

the old world is governed by authority, just as the new is governed by the dollar. I have made my first bow to authority."[3]

Where Freud's playful fancy had escalated his promotion into a political triumph, his conscience thus shrank it into a moral delict. Behind these contradictory responses of fantasy and conscience to his long-awaited moment of professional success lay Freud's life-long struggle with Austrian socio-political reality: as scientist and Jew, as citizen and son. In *The Interpretation of Dreams* Freud gave this struggle, both outer and inner, its fullest, most personal statement—and at the same time overcame it by devising an epoch-making interpretation of human experience in which politics could be reduced to an epiphenomenal manifestation of psychic forces. I shall try to extract from the book a few of the materials which illuminate the counterpolitical ingredient in the origins of psychoanalysis.

I

The Interpretation of Dreams occupied a special place in the mind and heart of its author. He regarded it both as his most significant scientific work, the foundation stone of his whole achievement, and as the work that brought him into the clear personally, the source of the strength to face a troubled life anew. The very structure of the work reflects this dual nature. Its surface organization is governed by its function as scientific treatise, with each chapter and section systematically expounding an aspect of dreams and their interpretation. To this scientific structure Freud explicitly subordinated the personal content of the book, designating the dreams and memories that constitute it only as "material by which I illustrated the rules of dream-interpretation."[4] Yet a closer look reveals a second, deep-structure of the work which, running from one isolated dream of the author to the next, constitutes an incomplete but autonomous subplot of personal history. Imagine St. Augustine weaving his *Confessions* into *The City of God*, or Rousseau integrating his *Confessions* as a subliminal plot into *The Origins of Inequality:* such is the procedure of Freud in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. In the visible structure of the scientific treatise he leads his readers upward, chapter by systematic chapter, to the more sophisticated reaches of psychological analysis. In the invisible personal narrative he takes us

downward, dream by major dream, into the underground recesses of his own buried self.

It is the second quest, a *recherche du temps perdu*, that must particularly interest the historian. By following the dreams simply in their order of presentation one becomes aware of three layers in a psychoarcheological dig: professional, political, and personal. These layers also correspond loosely to phases in Freud's life, which he presents in inverse temporal order in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. The professional one lies roughly in his present; the political, in the period of youth and childhood. Deepest of all, both in time and in psychic space, the personal layer leads back to infancy and into the unconscious where infantile experience lives still.* Thus Freud's dreams serve as a thread of Ariadne which we can follow stepwise downward into the realm of instinct.

The elements that appear in the dream arrangement as three clear layers were also constituents of a wracking crisis Freud experienced in the 1890's. Professionally, the frustrations that had dogged him from the beginning of his career had by 1895 produced a bitterness verging on despair. Wishing to be a research scientist, Freud had early been forced by impecuniousness into the career of a physician. True, he had easily won a prized fellowship to Paris in 1885 and briefly thereafter an appointment to a University hospital where he could have clinical material for teaching and research. But the Vienna children's hospital with which he was associated for a decade after 1886 gave him little research opportunity and less prestige. Efforts to win for it the status of a University teaching clinic failed. The most galling indignity Freud had to suffer, however, was the failure to be given a professorship. His long wait—seventeen years in all, where eight was the norm in the medical faculty—crowned his intellectual isolation, professional frustration, and social malaise with what appeared to be academic defeat.[5]

The wider context of Freud's professional frustrations was a

* The ordering of the dreams does not, of course, follow their actual chronology, nor that of Freud's self-analysis. For these chronologies the fundamental work has been done by Didier Anzieu, *L'Auto-analyse* (Paris, 1959). Nor does Freud analyze any of his dreams comprehensively in *The Interpretation*. Rather he uses them as components in the reconstruction of his own experience into a meaningful personal history that justifies both his life and his new science.

seething atmosphere of almost continuous political crisis. Dur
last five years of the nineteenth century Austria-Hungary see
be serving, as one of its poets observed, as "a little world in
the big one holds its tryouts"—tryouts for Europe's soc
political disintegration.[6] The Habsburg Empire was pulling a
the seams internally as Europe was internationally: vertica
nationality lines; horizontally, on class and ideological lines
the nineties the contending political forces had been the classi
liberal versus conservative. But now lower social strata genera
strength to contest the power of the older élites. Out of the w
class sprang socialism; out of the lower middle class and pe
arose both virulent nationalism and Christian Socialism. The
Vienna to Karl Lueger's anti-Semites in the elections of 189
stunning blow to the bearers of liberal culture, Jew and Genti
forces of racial prejudice and national hatred, which th
thought dispelled by the light of reason and the rule of l
emerged in terrifying force as the "century of progress" b
its last.*[7]

Sigmund Freud, by family background, conviction, and affiliation, belonged to the group most threatened by the new Viennese liberal Jewry. Though not—or, more accurately, no —a political man, Freud watched with anxious interest the power of the New Right both in Austria and abroad, espec the France of the Dreyfus affair. Karl Lueger was his *bêt* Émile Zola, the novelist who championed Dreyfus, his politica

Freud needed no specifically political commitment to ma feel the lash of resurgent anti-Semitism; it affected him wl was already hurting—in his professional life. Academic pror of Jews in the medical faculty became more difficult in th years after 1897. Freud reported in ironically elliptical b ratese the answer another Jewish colleague awaiting promoti elicited from a high-placed official, that "in view of the state of feeling, it was no doubt true that, for the mome Excellency [the minister of culture] was not in a position etc. [to ignore] denominational considerations."[9]

In response to his professional and political frustrations retreated into social and intellectual withdrawal. He actually s

* See above, pp. 5–7, 116–18, 144–5, and Essay III, *passim*.

down the social ladder, from the upper medical and academic intelligentsia to which he had gained access in the eighties to a simpler stratum of ordinary Jewish doctors and businessmen who, if they could not assist or further his scientific pursuits, did not threaten or discourage him. In 1897 Freud joined B'nai B'rith, the Jewish fraternal organization, as a comfortable refuge where he was accepted without question as a person and respected without challenge as a scientist.[10]

The more Freud's outer life was mired, however, the more winged his ideas became. He began to detach psychic phenomena from the anatomical moorings in which the science of his day had imbedded them. The speculative daring of his ideas, such as his theories of the sexual etiology of the neuroses, increased his estrangement from the very men who would have to support his professional advancement. Freud's intellectual originality and professional isolation fed upon each other.

The third dimension of Freud's crisis in the nineties was personal, centering on the death of his father. "The most important event, the most poignant loss, of a man's life," was Freud's evaluation. Whatever the general validity of this statement, it certainly held true for Freud. His father's death in 1896 came at a time when it could only reinforce Freud's other difficulties. His dreams and their analysis make plain that his psychological crisis over his father's death unfolded as a crisis of professional failure and political guilt. To lay his father's ghost Freud had either, like Hamlet, to affirm the primacy of politics by removing what was rotten in the state of Denmark (a civic task) or to neutralize politics by reducing it to psychological categories (an intellectual task).

II

LET US NOW turn to *The Interpretation of Dreams* to see how Freud's threefold crisis and his scientific work were related. In chapter 2, the first substantive chapter of the book, Freud developed his basic analytic principle, that a dream is the fulfillment of a wish. He did so by personal means, constructing an extensive model analysis with a single dream of his own, the Dream of Irma's Injection. Though well aware of its many dimensions, Freud here interpreted

the Irma Dream rather narrowly, in terms of the first circle of his hell: professional frustration and self-doubt.[11] This was the circle least likely to encounter resistances in his readers. In chapter 4 Freud proceeded to refine and hence redefine his first principle to read: "A dream is a *disguised* fulfillment of a *suppressed* wish." Again he selected a dream of his own for demonstrative purposes, the Dream of the Uncle with the Yellow Beard. On its innocent, nonsensical surface the dream said nothing, but its analysis showed Freud the unseemly moral consequences ensuing from the thwarting of his professional ambition by politics. His dream-wish was for the power that might remove his professional frustration. As he described it, the dream contained the political wish to "step into the minister's shoes," where he could eliminate his competitors and promote himself to a professorship.[12] The dream also revealed a disguised wish either not to be Jewish or to have the power to eliminate Jewish rivals. A political ambition functioned here as a means to professional self-realization; or, seen analytically in terms of Freud's psycho-archeological dig, a political wish was found to lie as a deeper reality beneath the professional one.

To explain the principle of distortion which he had found to govern the Uncle Dream, with its latent political wish, Freud appropriately introduced political analogies. The dream-thought, he suggested, confronts the same problem in the psyche of the dreamer as "the political writer who has disagreeable truths to tell those in authority." If the censor is strong, the writer must "conceal his objectionable pronouncement beneath some apparently innocent disguise." Just as there are two social powers, ruler and people, Freud argued, so there are two psychic forces. "One of these forces constructs the wish which is expressed by the dream, while the other exercises a censorship upon this dream-wish and by the use of censorship, forcibly brings about a distortion in the expression of the wish." The social model provided an analogy for Freud to show us "a quite definite view of the 'essential nature' of consciousness."[13]

In his selection of the analogy, as in the elucidation of the Uncle Dream, we can see how the political reality of the nineties, through the issue of the professorship, had penetrated Freud's psychic life. In the Irma Dream analysis Freud gave his readers only his sense of personal professional impotence, easily deducible from the manifest content of the dream. In the Uncle Dream he pushed through the

opaque surface of the manifest content to find politics in the latent content. Recounting the background of the Uncle Dream, Freud stated that the information concerning the "denominational considerations" which blocked his promotion, although "not news to me, was bound to strengthen my feeling of resignation."[14] He did not make explicit what his analysis of the Uncle Dream shows us: that much as he might cultivate political resignation in his waking life, the wish to free himself from anti-Semitism reasserted itself in his dreams. And even there, the power of the "secondary force"—the censor representing the social reality—distorted the dreamer's wish for liberation from the fate of the Jews into denigration of, that is, aggression against, his Jewish friends and colleagues.

In his third extensively analyzed dream (the Dream of the Botanical Monograph) Freud's father entered the picture through two recollected episodes. They did little credit to his character. In one episode the father gave his little boy a book to destroy, "not easy to justify from an educational point of view!" In another, the father upbraided his adolescent son for extravagant book buying.[15] Father Jakob Freud thus first trod the boards in the dream book in the unpromising role of an anti-intellectual, frustrating little Sigmund the future scientist—as, more recently, the political world had done.

With this finding from childhood Freud adumbrated the next problem in his scientific exposition, the importance of infantile experience in dream life. In chapter 5, under the heading "Infantile Material as the Source of Dreams," we find, ironically enough, that Freud has concentrated most of the important political materials—memories and dreams—contained in *The Interpretation of Dreams.* On the hunt for the source of his own "pathological ambition,"[16] Freud opened the gates of memory on childhood and early youth. As he did so, a political flood surged in.

Childhood experience, whatever universals may govern it, must be lived in a specific cultural milieu. The one that Freud recovered in self-analysis was that of newly triumphant liberalism in the Austria of the 1860's. He recalled his father's enthusiasm for the new Liberal ministers of 1867: "We illuminated the house in their honor." As his mind reached back "from the dreary present to the cheerful hopes of the days of the *Bürgerministerium*," Freud remembered how "every industrious Jewish schoolboy carried a minister's portfolio in

his knapsack." A wandering poet in the Prater proph
Sigmund—to the delight of his parents, one would pr
would be a cabinet minister.[17] Indeed, until the v
Gymnasium years, Freud planned—undoubtedly, gi
values, with paternal encouragement—to study law,
to a political career. His ambitions were further stren
school friend he most idolized, Heinrich Braun. T
German democrat, Braun later became one of Central
prominent socialist intellectuals.[18]

In such a context of clear and confident mid-cen
Freud acquired the political values he retained all his li
for Napoleon as conqueror of backward Central Eu
for royalty and the aristocracy (in 1873 as a senior in t
Freud had proudly refused to doff his hat to the emp
admiration for England, particularly for the great
Cromwell, for whom Freud, the sexual liberator, na
son; and above all, hostility to religion, especially to I

Having recovered the liberal enthusiasms of his l
dream analysis and reminiscing on its bright politica
suddenly introduces the reader of *The Interpretatio*
what can only be called his Rome neurosis.

Like most cultivated Austrians of his generatic
steeped in classical culture. Once he hit upon the ar
his work as depth psychologist and the work of an a
mild interest flowered into a burning passion for anti
sumed with avidity Jakob Burckhardt's newly publis
Greek Culture, so rich in materials on primitive myt
He read with envy the biography of Heinrich Sc
fulfilled a childhood wish by his discovery of Troy
the famous collection of ancient artifacts which were
his office in the Berggasse. And he cultivated a new fi
Viennese professional élite—especially rare in those
drawal—with Emanuel Löwy, a professor of archeol
me up till three o'clock in the morning," Freud wrote
to Fliess. "He tells me about Rome."[19]

At first a hobby pursued for relief of tension, Fre
that Rome had acquired the character of a neurotic
was seized by an irrepressible longing to visit Rome.

stalled in his work on the dream book in 1898, he could do nothing but study the topography of Rome, "for which the longing grows ever more torturesome."[20]

Five times Freud traveled to Italy between 1895 and 1898, without ever reaching Rome. Some inhibition held him back. At the same time Rome became, literally, the city of his dreams. In *The Interpretation* Freud reports four Rome Dreams, all of which suggest, in one form or another, redemption or fulfillment that is never quite achieved.[21] Even the manifest content of these dreams speaks worlds. Freud conflates dream images of Catholic Rome with Jewish ideas and situations. In one dream Rome appears as "the promised land seen from afar," implying Freud to be in the same relation to Rome as Moses to Israel. The vision, though Freud does not say so, seems to express a forbidden wish: a longing for an assimilation to the gentile world that his strong waking conscience—and even his dream-censor—would deny him. He also identifies Rome with Carlsbad, Bohemia's renowned spa, a city of pleasure, rest, and cure; in short, an earthly city of recreation (re-creation), of resurrection. Freud compares himself in the analysis of this dream to a poor, gentle Jewish character in one of the Yiddish stories he loved so well. Because the little Jew did not have the train fare to Carlsbad, the conductor beat him up at every station; but, undaunted, he continued on his *via dolorosa* (the expression is Freud's). Thus the lofty vision of Moses-Freud seeing Israel-Rome "from afar" had its lowly analogue in the picture of the little-Jew–Christ–Freud reaching Carlsbad-Rome on a *via dolorosa*. A third dream reinforces the Christian theme but telescopes it into that of ancient, pagan Rome. From a train window Freud sees across the Tiber the Castel Sant' Angelo, at once papal castle and Roman imperial tomb. Tantalizingly, the train moves off before he can cross the Bridge of the Holy Angel to reach the castle—a house of both buried paganism and Christian salvation.

Freud does not analyze these dreams fully in *The Interpretation*. While recognizing that the wish to go to Rome "had become in my dream a cloak and symbol for a number of passionate wishes," he discloses fully only one of them. The clue to it he finds in Hannibal: "Like him, I had been fated not to see Rome."[22] This idea leads Freud to the recovery of a childhood scene in which he finds part of the source of his Rome neurosis. In that scene, political obligation and oedipal aggression converged.

When Sigmund was ten or twelve years old (1866–68), his father sought to illustrate to him how much the triumph of liberalism had improved the lot of the Jew. He told his son how, in an earlier time, he had been publicly humiliated by an anti-Semitic ruffian, "a Christian," as Freud pointedly calls him. Freud discovered upon questioning that his father had offered neither protest nor resistance to the indignity. Little Sigmund was disgusted with his father's "unheroic behavior." He contrasted his situation with another "which fitted my feelings better: the scene in which Hannibal's father . . . made his boy swear before the household altar to take vengeance on the Romans."[23]

"To take vengeance on the Romans": it was both pledge and project. And as project it was at once political and filial. In most of the other great creative Viennese who were Freud's contemporaries, the generational revolt against the fathers took the specific historical form of rejection of their fathers' liberal creed. Thus Gustav Mahler and Hugo von Hofmannsthal both turned back to the baroque Catholic tradition. Not so Freud, at least not consciously. He defined his oedipal stance in such a way as to overcome his father by realizing the liberal creed his father professed but had failed to defend. Freud-Hannibal as "Semitic general" would avenge his feeble father against Rome, a Rome that symbolized "the organization of the Catholic Church" and the Habsburg régime that supported it.*[24]

We notice at once, of course, that the Rome of Freud the boy in the sixties—forbidding, hostile, bureaucratic—is quite different from the Rome in the dreams and longings of Freud the man in the nineties. The first is an object of hate, an enemy to be conquered, the

* That the Habsburg Empire in a wider sense was involved in Freud's boyhood militancy against Christianity is suggested in his identification of Hannibal with Napoleon—"both crossed the Alps"—and in his hero worship of Napoleon's Marshal Masséna. Little Sigmund learned of the latter from Louis Adolphe Thiers's *History of the Consulate and the Empire*, "one of the first books I got hold of when I had learnt to read." Masséna, whom Freud erroneously believed to be Jewish and who was born one hundred years to the day before Freud, was his "declared favorite" before he encountered Hannibal. Masséna not only fought the Catholic forces in Italy but occupied Vienna, making his headquarters in the Leopoldstadt (later the Jewish quarter in which Freud grew up).

second an object of desire, to be entered in love. Freud says nothing directly about the difference or the relationship between the two. But he offers a clue when he recalls a German classical author's question: "Which of the two [men] . . . paced his study in greater excitement after forming his plan to go to Rome: Winckelmann or Hannibal?" Freud unhesitatingly identifies himself with Hannibal, following in his footsteps of failure. "Like him, I had been fated not to see Rome."[25] Here Freud conceals an important truth from us, if not from himself, concerning his problem of political guilt as scientist and son. The Rome of his mature dreams and longings is clearly a love-object.[26] It is not Hannibal's Rome but that of Johann Joachim Winckelmann, the great eighteenth-century archeologist and art historian. He ardently loved Rome as the mother of European culture. A Protestant, Winckelmann overcame his scruples and embraced Catholicism in order to enter Rome and pursue his passion for classical antiquity as a papal librarian. He conquered his conscience for the sake of his science, his *amor intellectualis* for Rome.*

Winckelmann or Hannibal? Scientist or politician? Freud had faced

* "It is the love of science and it alone," wrote Winckelmann, "that can move me to give ear to the proposal suggested to me." Quoted in Carl Justi, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen* (5th ed., Cologne, 1956), I, 371. The first edition of this classic biography appeared during Freud's Gymnasium years. The second edition was published in 1898, when Freud's interest in archeology was at its height and when he had resumed work on the interpretation of dreams, inclusive of the Rome dreams. The Justi biography reveals remarkable similarities between Winckelmann's life and intellectual stance and Freud's: poverty, an acute sense of low social status, failure to find a congenial intellectual position or adequate professional recognition, a string of intense friendships with homosexual overtones, hatred of political tyranny, hostility to organized religion, and a generativity crisis at the age of forty that resulted in a "first work" of a new and revolutionary kind. Most of these features emerge clearly in Goethe's perspicacious essay of 1805, "Winckelmann," in *Goethes Werke*, ed. Eduard von der Hellen (Stuttgart, 1922), XV, 65–93. Herder, in a somewhat more romantic essay, "Denkmal Johann Winckelmann," in *Herders Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan (Berlin, 1892), VIII, 437–83, appreciates Winckelmann as a serene and stoical hero of science in an age of prejudice and rulers' stupidity. Freud would have seen himself in this version even more clearly than in Goethe's. Though Freud had a magnificent command of the German classics, I have been unable to determine whether he actually read any of these books; but the fact that the Hannibal-Winckelmann contrast played a key role in his analysis does suggest familiarity with Winckelmann's character and aims.

such a choice before, in 1873, when he changed his career plans in high school. Intoxicated with Goethe's erotic description of Mother Nature, young Freud had decided to enter the University in science instead of law, thus following in the footsteps of Winckelmann the scientist—a "soft" scientist like Freud. In so doing, he had abandoned Hannibal's political mission.

In the nineties, as Freud said, "the increasing importance of the effects of the anti-Semitic movement upon our emotional life helped to fix the thoughts and feelings of those early days."[27] The ghosts of Hannibal and his father rose to call again for "vengeance on the Romans." They barred Freud's road to Winckelmann's Rome—the Rome of pleasure, maternity, assimilation, fulfillment. Science would have to defeat politics and lay the father's ghost.

III

THESE OBJECTIVES Freud accomplished with the help of what he called "A Revolutionary Dream." The description and analysis of this dream occupies the central position in Freud's demonstration of the principle that a childhood wish is the fundamental determinant of the meaning of dreams.[28]

It was in August of 1898 that Freud dreamed the Revolutionary Dream—a time when politics hung especially heavy in the air. After a winter of violence between Czechs and Germans, especially in the universities, the thorny problem of language rights remained unresolved. Parliament was still paralyzed, for the German parties refused to abandon obstructionist tactics until the government should revoke the language ordinances favoring the Czechs. In June there had been violent anti-Semitic outbreaks in Galicia. In addition to these difficulties there was the nagging, acute problem of renewing the 1867 accords to regulate the economic and fiscal relations between the Austrian and Hungarian halves of the Dual Monarchy.

Count Franz Thun, Austrian minister president since March 7, 1898, was devoting most of his summer to negotiations of a preliminary accord between the Austrian and Hungarian cabinets—negotiations that had to reckon with the prospect of resistance from both German and Hungarian nationalists in their respective parliaments. Thun himself was an arch-aristocrat, a great landholder and head of

the party of the Bohemian high nobility; in short, a feudal political bureaucrat of the old school.* Though he aimed at compromise with the Germans, Count Thun was goaded by their aggressiveness into tough measures against them and quickly became the object of their cordial hatred.[29] This was the figure who became Freud's central antagonist in the Revolutionary Dream.

Ironically enough, 1898, year of paralysis and chaos, was also being celebrated as the fiftieth anniversary of Emperor Francis Joseph's accession. Since the emperor had been brought to power in the Revolution of 1848, that upheaval, too, was recalled to public mind, and to Freud's consciousness.[30]

On the day of his Revolutionary Dream, Freud was setting out for a holiday with his family at Aussee.[31] While he was waiting for his train at Vienna's Westbahnhof, he recognized Count Thun stalking onto the platform. The count was, as Freud correctly surmised, bound for the emperor's summer retreat in Ischl, where the preliminary Austro-Hungarian economic accords—the so-called Ischl clauses—were being worked out. In his bearing, as in his politics, Count Thun was a "*Feudalherr* from top to toe." "Tall, thin, dressed with exquisite elegance, [he looked] more like an Englishman than a Bohemian," one of his subordinates recalled. "His monocle never left his eye."[32] Now, as he passed through the train gate, the count displayed his aristocratic aplomb. Although he had no ticket, he waved the ticket-taker aside and entered a luxurious compartment. All Freud's resentment of aristocracy welled up at the minister's imperious behavior. He found himself whistling a subversive air from Mozart's *Marriage of Figaro:* "If the Count wants to dance, I'll call the tune."

The dream on the train bore the stamp of this chance encounter and the emotions it aroused. It telescoped Freud's present political feelings with his past political experiences and scenes and images from history. In the opening scene of the dream Freud found himself at a university student gathering, where Count Thun (or a conservative predecessor, Count Taaffe) was belittling German nationalism. In his disdainful way the aristocrat deprecated the symbolic

* Franz Thun (b. 1847) was the nephew of Count Leo Thun (b. 1811), the Minister of Culture who introduced the educational and university reforms mentioned on pp. 38–9 and 282–3.

flower of the German nationalists as a limp plant, colt's foot [German, *Huflattich*], that Freud connected by verbal association with flatulence; in short, the speaker implied that German student militancy was so much wind. Freud, to his own surprise, rose in angry response to the minister's contemptuous remarks. In analyzing the scene he identified himself with Adolf Fischhof, a medical-student leader who helped to trigger the Revolution of 1848 at the University and to carry it onto the larger political stage.* Freud discovered another Jewish medical politico in the dream: his former fellow student, Victor Adler. By 1898 Adler had become the leader of Austrian Social Democracy. In analyzing the Revolutionary Dream Freud recalled having defied Adler, toward whom he had had strong feelings of envy and rivalry, in a German nationalist student organization to which they both belonged in the 1870's.[33] Fischhof and Adler had shown that one could be both a Jewish doctor and a political leader—a fact that Freud virtually denied to be possible in explaining his choice of careers.†[34] Even as Freud dreamed out his own long-repressed political wish and exhumed by analysis the figures who proved that his youthful dream of a political role might have been true, he refrained from putting the pieces together either for his reader or in all likelihood for himself.

In the scenario of the dream, after his outburst of anger at the minister, Freud suddenly fled the political scene. He retreated through the halls of the University, that is, through academia. Escaping into the street, he then tried to get out of town, to some destination where "the Court would not be in residence." The final scene, accordingly, was at the railroad station where, in his waking life, it had all begun. There Freud found himself on the platform in the company of a blind man, whom he recognized in his analysis as his dying father. Freud held a urinal for the helpless old man, conscious that the ticket-taker would look the other way. So ends the dream.

* Like Freud, Fischhof was a poor, Moravian-born Jew. He became a doctor because before 1848 no other academic course was open to his race. When the revolution broke, Fischhof occupied a medical position later held by Freud: that of *Sekundararzt* (intern) at the Royal Imperial General Hospital in Vienna. Cf. Richard Charmatz, *Adolf Fischhof* (Stuttgart, 1910), 14, 17–31.

† "A ministerial career is definitely barred to a medical man," wrote Freud of his decision to abandon the law in 1873.

With this scene, the dream had done its work in dissolving political impulses and political guilt. Before the dream, Freud had confronted the powerful Count Thun on the platform as a pre-revolutionary Figaro with the subversive wish to call the tune for the count. His present situation of political impotence and resentment dominated this waking fantasy. In the dream he had discharged, by his defiance of the count, the commitment of his youth to anti-authoritarian political activism, which was also his unpaid debt to his father.

It is easy for the modern reader to forget the boldness—half nerviness, half courage—involved in Freud's presentation of the Revolutionary Dream and its daytime prelude to his contemporaries. Count Thun, after all, still headed the government when Freud sent the last pages of his manuscript to the printer in early September 1899. In the Revolutionary Dream, his last explosive hail-and-farewell to politics, Freud took the field as liberal-scientific David against a very real political Goliath, the incumbent minister president. He laid bare his political and social feelings in no uncertain terms. Yet both on the station platform and in the dream, the encounter between the little Jewish doctor and the gaunt aristocrat suggests a quixotic duel, at once heroic and ridiculous. In it Freud found by analysis not so much his civic courage as an "absurd megalomania, which had long been suppressed in my waking life."[35] The strange encounter, Freud versus Thun, had brought it to the surface.

Neither the dream nor Freud's reading of it came to rest in affirmation or rejection of a particular political position, not even that of Count Thun. Freud implied his own ideological truth when he saw himself in his dream as rejecting both aristocratic authority (Thun-Taaffe) and the authority of socialism (Adler, the older and bolder brother). The "political" problem was dissolved in the final scene on the platform, where the dream-thought substituted the dying father for the living count. Here the flight from politics, through the University, and on to scientific medical service, found vindication. Freud had become a "minister" after all, as the prophet in the Prater had foretold—a minister not in the political sense, but in a medical sense, ministering to his dying father. Not Hannibal the general, but Winckelmann the scientist.

What was Freud's interpretation of the Revolutionary Dream? Strikingly, he ignored the flight from politics which is so prominent

in its scenario and manifest content. Instead, he brought his analysis to focus in the final scene on the station platform from which, in his view, the whole Revolutionary Dream received its basic meaning. Freud recalled two episodes of his childhood in which his father had reprimanded him for urinating. In one of them he finally found the personal, childhood source of his "pathological ambition," before it had been translated in his youth into the political sphere and in his maturity to the professional sphere. In that episode little Sigmund had "disregarded the rules which modesty lays down" and urinated in his parents' presence. His insensitive father had reprimanded him with a prophecy that rang like a curse: "This boy will come to nothing." In the final scene of the Revolutionary Dream, the grown-up Dr. Freud reversed this situation. Instead of the strong father reprimanding the weak son for urinating, the strong son helped the weak father in urinating. "As though I wanted to say," Freud comments, "'You see I *have* come to something.'" Vengeance, of an intellectual kind, is being taken here not on Rome and not on Count Thun, but on the father. As the father replaces the prime minister on the station platform, patricide replaces politics.

Is not this something more as well: revenge on politics itself? Freud suggested this explicitly in a footnote where he connected his victory over his father with his victory over politics:

> the whole rebellious content of the dream, with its *lèse majesté* and its derision of the higher authorities, went back to rebellion against my father. A Prince is known as father of his country; the father is the oldest, first, and for children the only authority, and from his autocratic power the other social authorities have developed in the history of human civilization.[36]

In this passage Freud adumbrated his mature political theory, the central principle of which is that all politics is reducible to the primal conflict between father and son.[37] The Revolutionary Dream, miraculously, contained this conclusion in its very scenario: from political encounter, through flight into academia, to the conquest of the father who has replaced Count Thun. Patricide replaces regicide; psychoanalysis overcomes history. Politics is neutralized by a counterpolitical psychology.

"*Wissen macht frei*"—so ran the great slogan of Austrian liberalism.

Freud had not paid his debt to his father as a revolutionary doctor like Adolf Fischhof in 1848 or Victor Adler in 1898. Instead, Freud would pay it as a scientific liberator. He dissolved the oath of Hannibal by his counterpolitical discovery: the primacy of infantile experience in the determination of human behavior. With that discovery, a new road to Rome lay open.

IV

BEFORE FREUD could go to Rome he had to fulfill two more tasks left over from the victory over politics and father in the Revolutionary Dream. He had to send his father's ghost to an appropriate kind of Valhalla, and he had to universalize his personal experience as a scientific finding. He solved the first task with a dream of Hungary, the second with a myth of Thebes.

The Dream of Hungary must have been dreamed some time after October 1898, when Count Thun was still wrestling with the problem of pulling the two halves of the Empire, the Austrian and the Hungarian, together. After both governments had agreed on the Ischl formula, the fruit of Count Thun's negotiations, the Hungarian nationalists rebelled. Resorting to obstructionism in their parliament, in emulation of the Germans in the Reichsrat, in February the Hungarian nationalists brought down the government that had initialed the agreement.[38] It was in this situation that Freud in his dreams assigned his father the important role of peacemaker. Freud reported his dream as follows:

> After his death my father played a political part among the Magyars and brought them together politically. Here I saw a small and indistinct picture: a crowd of men as though they were in the Reichstag; someone standing on one or two chairs, with other people around him. I remembered how like Garibaldi he looked on his deathbed, and felt glad that that promise had come true.[39]

A promise come true indeed! Here was Freud's father synthesizing in his person the two traditional allies of Austro-German liberals against the Habsburgs: Italian and Hungarian nationalists. As Garibaldi, father Freud was a modern Hannibal, a populist political-military hero who also failed to take Rome (from the pope in 1867). As Hungarian leader, Jakob Freud was in his turn stepping into the minister's shoes and solving the Hungarian problem, which would soon bring down Count Thun.

As parliamentary ruler, reconciler of the irreconcilable Hungarians, father Jakob Freud thus made good his failures of Sigmund's youth. Freud found in the dream, along with elements denigrating his father, the wish that the father might stand "great and unsullied" before his children after his death. Freud makes no comment on the fact that the paternal apotheosis should be political. Yet the substance of the dream speaks clearly enough: a successful Father Garibaldi-Freud in Hungary made his son's pursuit of politics unnecessary and canceled the debt of 1868.

Freud's second task in opening his road to Rome was professional: to draw theoretical consequences from the experience of the patricidal impulse he had found in the Revolutionary Dream. This he did by identifying a mythic archetype, the myth of Oedipus, to give form to his finding that "the death-wish against parents dates back to earliest childhood."[40] He appropriated the Oedipus myth in such a fashion as to bring out the *sexual* dimensions it contains. In so doing he pushed the interpretation of dreams as a whole one step farther down from personal infantile experience, to which he had traced, in order to expose, his political encounters, to the childhood of the human race. The mythic layer is the deepest in *The Interpretation of Dreams,* where the individual experience of the unconscious is found embedded in the universal archetypal experience of primitive man. Here personal history joins the a-historical collective.

We cannot here treat the significance of the Oedipus legend for Freud's thought or for the structure of *The Interpretation of Dreams.* Let us only suggest a peculiarity of Freud's treatment of Oedipus related to the problem of neutralizing politics. Freud pays no attention to the fact that Oedipus was a king. As for Nietzsche and other modern philosophers, so for Freud, the Oedipus quest was a moral and intellectual one: to escape a fate and acquire self-knowledge. Not so for the Greeks. Sophocles' drama *Oedipus Rex* is unthinkable except as *res publica,* with its regal hero motivated by political obligation: to remove the plague from Thebes. Although Oedipus' guilt is personal, his quest to discover it and his self-punishment are a public matter and are required to restore public

order. Freud's Oedipus is not *Rex*, but a thinker searching for his identity and its meaning. By resolving politics into personal psychological categories, he restores personal order, but not public order. Dr. Freud left Thebes languishing still under the plague of politics, while he elevated his slain father's ghost to kingship in the Dream of Hungary.

Was there then nothing left of Hannibal-Freud, nothing of Figaro-Freud, nothing of Freud the challenger of the count in the Revolutionary Dream? The Latin legend on the title page suggests an answer: *Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo* (If I cannot bend the higher powers, I shall stir up hell [the river Acheron]). These words from Virgil's *Aeneid* are spoken by Juno, divine defender of Semitic Dido against Aeneas, founder of Rome. Having failed to persuade Jupiter to let Aeneas marry Dido ("to bend the higher powers"), Juno summons from hell a Fury, Allecto, who unleashes seething passions of sex and military aggression in the camp of Aeneas' allies. Virgil paints a fearsome portrait of Allecto—a Gorgon-like phallic female "alive with black and writhing snakes," a bisexual monster.[41] Freud cites Juno's words again in his text in an important place, where he wishes to point up the overall significance of his research into dreams. After repeating the quotation, he says, "The interpretation of dreams is the royal road to a knowledge of the unconscious activities of the mind." And in a footnote he adds: "This line [the legend] is intended to picture the efforts of the repressed instinctual impulses."[42]

Freud was not the first to use Juno's threat to stir up hell as a motto for a work with subversive implications. Again the trail leads us back to politics, this time to the socialist Ferdinand Lassalle.[43] One of Lassalle's most brilliant pamphlets, *The Italian War and the Task of Prussia* (1859), also carried the words *Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo* on its title page. On July 17, 1899, Freud wrote to Fliess that he had chosen this as the motto for *The Interpretation of Dreams;* in the same letter, but making no connection, he mentioned that he was taking "the Lassalle" on vacation for summer reading.[44] Conversant as he was with the *Aeneid*, Freud needed no Lassalle to discover the lines that graced his title page.[45] Yet the strong correspondence between Lassalle's pamphlet and Freud's cathexis of youthful political predilections and current political anxieties in the nineties makes it highly likely that Freud read it. *The Italian War*

contained many themes and attitudes that we have found in *The Interpretation of Dreams:* the hatred of Catholic Rome and the Habsburgs as the bastions of reaction; the linkage of Garibaldi and the Hungarians as liberal protagonists; and, like Freud in his dream-confrontation with Count Thun, the espousal of German national feeling against the aristocratic Austrian.[46] In intellectual strategy lay a further affinity. Lassalle, too, played with repressed forces, in his case the revolutionary forces of the people. That is why he chose the Virgil motto for his pamphlet. In it, Lassalle tried, *à la* Juno, to persuade the "higher powers" of Prussia to lead the German people, in alliance with the Italians, in a war of national unification against the Habsburg state. But behind his persuasion lay a threat: Should Prussia fail to act, her rulers would learn to their sorrow "in what strata of opinion power [actually] resides." Lassalle thus threatened "those above" with the latent forces of national revolution, with stirring up a political Acheron.[47] Freud would have found it easy to appropriate Lassalle's legend, transferring the hint of subversion through the return of the repressed from the realm of politics to that of the psyche.

The contents of Freud's dreams often confirm relationships that other evidence only suggests. In a dream of Lassalle,[48] Freud virtually celebrated the primacy of psychoanalysis over politics that his use of Lassalle's motto implies. Along with another Jewish German political leader, Eduard Lasker, Lassalle serves the dreaming Freud as a symbol of the fatal power of sex. Characteristically, Freud ignores in his interpretation of this dream the fact that the material carriers of the message were both politicians. He assigns them significance only as "men of talent." Both "came to grief over a woman," and thus illustrated the damage—in Lasker's case organic, in Lassalle's neurotic—"caused by sexuality." Freud found in the dream a monitory confirmation of his own fears, as another "man of talent," of coming to grief over a woman. In the dream Freud also conquers the power of his own sexual temptation by his clinical understanding of neurosis, while the two Jewish politicians are undone. Sex is stronger than politics, the dream seems to us to say, but science can control sex.*

* The dream is called "Autodidasker," after the single word that was its manifest content.

Freud's Acheron of "repressed instinctual impulses," like Lassalle's Acheron of the angry *Volk*, certainly had subversive implications for those in political authority. In the final pages of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud took pains to assuage the fears such findings might arouse. Again he chose Roman lore for his example:

> I think that the Roman Emperor was in the wrong when he had one of his subjects executed because he had dreamt of murdering the emperor . . . would it not be right to bear in mind Plato's dictum that the virtuous man is content to *dream* what a wicked man really does? I think it best, therefore, to acquit dreams.[49]

Freud had earned the right to these lines, with their comforting message to "those above," whom Juno's threat might alarm. Having exhumed his own political past through dream analysis, he had overcome it by identifying his political obligations and impulses with his father, explaining them away as attributes of his father's ghost.

And so the spell of Hannibal's oath was broken. His theoretical work and his self-analysis accomplished in *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud actually entered the Eternal City in 1901, nearly five years after his father's death, not "to take vengeance on the Romans," but as intellectual pilgrim and psycho-archeologist, in the footsteps of Winckelmann. He wrote, "It was an overwhelming experience for me, and, as you know, the fulfillment of a long-cherished wish. It was [also] slightly disappointing." Freud described his varied reactions to three Romes: the third, modern, was "hopeful and likeable"; the second, Catholic Rome, with its "lie of salvation," was "disturbing," making him "incapable of putting out of my mind my own misery and all the other misery which I know to exist." Only the Rome of antiquity moved him to deep enthusiasm: "I could have worshipped the humble and mutilated remnant of the Temple of Minerva."[50]

Did Freud think of the significance of his spontaneous urge to worship Minerva in her ruins? Like Juno's hellish Fury, Allecto, whom Freud had invoked on his title page, Minerva, too, was a bisexual goddess. But where Juno's phallic female unleashed terror against the founders of the city, the virgin goddess was protectrix of the civic order, using her spear, her snaky aegis, and her Gorgon-

the enemies of the polis. In 1902, not long her temple in Rome, Minerva's long-awaited fore the Parliament building in Vienna, the symbol faith in a rational polity. Minerva's wisdom was of a special kind that reconciled one to Jupiter, to the structure of necessity and the reality of power.

In the letter with which this essay began, Freud had wryly celebrated his promotion to a professorship in the caricature of a political triumph. We can now see his humor as somewhat more bitter than its surface would suggest. Promotion came as a personal and professional triumph, but at a high moral cost. For, against his conscience, Freud had recourse to what was known in Austria as "protection"—the help of socially influential individuals to secure personal preferment.*

> It was my own doing in fact. When I got back from Rome, my zest for life had somewhat grown, my zest for martyrdom diminished. . . . So I made up my mind to break with my strict scruples and take appropriate steps. . . . One must look somewhere for one's salvation, and the salvation I chose was the title of professor.[51]

The brilliant, lonely, painful discovery of psychoanalysis, which made it possible for Freud to overcome his Rome neurosis, to kneel at Minerva's ruined temple, and to regularize his academic status was a counterpolitical triumph of the first magnitude. By reducing his own political past and present to an epiphenomenal status in relation to the primal conflict between father and son, Freud gave his fellow liberals an a-historical theory of man and society that could make bearable a political world spun out of orbit and beyond control.

* For the way in which this effort involved Freud's destiny with the politics of modern Austrian art, see pp. 244–5.

NOTES

[1] Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, March 11, 1902, in Sigmund Freud, *The Origins of Psycho-analysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess, Drafts and Notes, 1887–1902*, ed. Marie Bonaparte, Anna Freud, Ernst Kris; tr. Eric Mosbacher and James Strachey (New York, 1954), p. 344.

[2] The opening observation was made by Goethe of J. G. Lichtenberg, Freud's favorite satirist. Freud quoted it approvingly in *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis* (1915–16), in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (hereafter *SE*), tr. and ed. James Strachey *et al.* (London, 1953–64), XV, 38; *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), *SE*, IV, 121. For the whole problem, see *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious* (1905), *SE*, VIII, *passim*.

[3] Freud, *Origins*, pp. 342, 344.

[4] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, xxvi.

[5] Both the facts and the interpretation of Freud's slow-paced medical and academic career have been the subject of heated controversy. The most comprehensive, and often productively documented, attempt to defend the Austrian academic and bureaucratic authorities against the charge of hostility, injustice, or prejudice against Freud is that of Joseph and René Gicklhorn, *Sigmund Freuds akademische Laufbahn* (Vienna, 1960). Kurt R. Eissler redresses the balance in Freud's favor with further substantial research in his counter-polemic, *Sigmund Freud und die Wiener Universität* (Bern, 1966). On the length of Freud's wait for a professorship, see especially the latter work, pp. 24–5, 181–3.

[6] "Dies Oesterreich ist eine kleine Welt,/ In der die grosse ihre Probe hält." Friedrich Hebbel, quoted in Heinrich Benedikt, ed., *Geschichte der Republik Oesterreich* (Munich, 1954), p. 14.

[7] For the vertical (nationality) disintegration, Robert A. Kann, *The Multinational Empire* (New York, 1950), is the sturdiest general survey. Berthold Sutter focuses sharply on the nationality crisis of the late nineties in *Die Badenischen Sprachverordnungen von 1897* (Graz-Cologne, 1965). For the rise of the New Right in its anti-Semitic aspect, see P. G. J. Pulzer, *The Rise of Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria* (New York, 1964).

[8] Freud to Fliess, Sept. 23, 1895; Nov. 8, 1895; Feb. 9, 1898, in Freud, *Origins*, pp. 124, 133, 245; Ernest Jones, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud* (New York, 1953–57), I, 392–3.

[9] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 137.

[10] Freud to Fliess, Dec. 12, 1902, in Freud, *Origins*, p. 237. Freud, "Address to the Society of B'nai B'rith" (1926), *SE*, XX, 273–4. The date of Freud's entry into B'nai B'rith is implied by him, and stated by the editors of the Standard Edition, to have been 1895. But Dennis Klein of the University of Rochester has established 1897 as the correct date on the basis of B'nai B'rith records. The sociology of Freud's friendships and associations has yet to be worked out in detail.

[11] Erik Erikson has enlarged and deepened Freud's analysis of this aspect of the dream with the concept of the generativity crisis of middle age, in "The Dream Specimen of Psychoanalysis," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytical Association*, II (1954), 5–56. The most comprehensive and structured analysis is by Didier Anzieu, *L'Auto-analyse de Freud et la découverte de la psychanalyse* (Paris, 1959), pp. 24–45. For a broad and rich but less rigorous treatment and for further bibliography on this and other dreams, see Alexander Grinstein's useful work, *On Sigmund Freud's Dreams* (Detroit, 1968), pp. 21–46 *passim*.

[12] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 134–41, 191–3.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 142–4.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 169–73, especially 172–3. Freud does not analyze at this point the meaning of these episodes, although his language clearly reflects resentment at his father's behavior.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 192–3.

[18] Freud to Julie Braun-Vogelstein, Oct. 30, 1927, in Sigmund Freud, *Letters of Sigmund Freud*, ed., Ernst L. Freud (New York, 1964), pp. 378–80; Julie Braun-Vogelstein, *Heinrich Braun* (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 20–4.

[19] Freud to Fliess, Jan. 30, 1899; Feb. 6, 1899; May 28, 1899; Nov. 5, 1897, in Freud, *Origins*, pp. 275–6, 282, 229. Suzanne Bernfeld has explored, with great sensitivity to cultural factors, the function of archeology both in Freud's scientific thought and, psychoanalytically, in his personal attempt to overcome guilt over death wishes. See her "Freud and Archeology," *American Imago*, VIII (1951), 107–28.

[20] Freud to Fliess, Dec. 3, 1897; Oct. 23, 1899, in Freud, *Origins*, pp. 236, 269. The latter date, on which he reported his "ever more tortured longing [*die Sehnsucht immer quälender*]" (translation mine), was the anniversary of his father's death.

[21] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 193–8. One later Rome Dream, in which the city is the setting of grief, is not included here. This dream's bearing on Freud's problem of ambivalence as a Jew has been interestingly demonstrated by Peter Loewenberg in "A Hidden Zionist Theme in Freud's 'My Son, the Myops . . .' Dream," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XXXI (1970), 129–32.

[22] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 196–7.

[23] *Ibid.*, 197.

[24] *Ibid.*, 196–8.

[25] *Ibid.*, 196.

[26] This Rome Freud connected (though not in *The Interpretation*) with his oedipal tie to his Czech Catholic nanny, who had introduced him to Catholicism and had given him "a sense of my own powers," in contrast with the discouragements of his Jewish father. Cf. Freud to Fliess, Oct. 3–4, 1897; Oct. 15, 1897, in Freud, *Origins*, pp. 219–22. Psychoanalytic literature, following Freud, has tended to accept his primary identification of the Rome longing

with the nanny as mother-substitute and oedipal love-object, reducing the Catholic and Czech attributes of Rome in Freud's dream-pictures to symbols of this primal tie, and interpreting the inhibition preventing travel to Rome as an expression of the incest taboo. See, for example, Grinstein, *Freud's Dreams*, pp. 75–6, 90–1; Jones, *Life*, I, 5–6; Bernfeld, "Freud and Archeology," *American Imago*, VIII, 114–20; and Kenneth A. Grigg, "All Roads Lead to Rome: The Role of the Nursemaid in Freud's Dreams," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, XXI (1973), 108–26. By emphasizing here the historical significance of the Jewish-Catholic tension in the dreams' manifest contents, I am trying to restore Freud's political-cultural experience to its dynamic, formative role in the development of his psychoanalytic system of thought in which, in effect, he resolves the pain of general history by translating it into personal history.

[27] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 196.

[28] *Ibid.*, IV, 208–19; V, 431–5. My analysis of the Revolutionary Dream is far from complete. For other dimensions, see Grinstein, *Freud's Dreams*, 92–160; and William J. McGrath, "Freud as Hannibal: The Politics of the Brother Band," *Central European History*, VII (1974), 47–57.

[29] Richard Charmatz, *Oesterreichs innere Geschichte von 1848 bis 1907* (2d ed., Leipzig, 1912), II, 128–32.

[30] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 211.

[31] McGrath has established the date as Aug 11, 1898. See *Cen. Eur. Hist.*, VII, 47, note 29.

[32] Rudolf Sieghart, *Die Letzten Jahrzehnte einer Grossmacht* (Berlin, 1932), p. 35.

[33] Martin Grotjahn, "A Letter by Sigmund Freud with Recollections of His Adolescence," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, IV (1956), 649–52.

[34] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 193.

[35] *Ibid.*, IV, 215.

[36] *Ibid.*, IV, 217 n. 1.

[37] This theory was set forth in Freud, *Totem and Taboo* (1913), *SE*, XIII.

[38] Ervin Pamlenyi, ed., *Die Geschichte Ungarns* (Budapest, 1971), pp. 450–4. The Ischl clauses were agreed upon on August 30, 1898. The Hungarian opposition inaugurated in October 1898 the obstruction crisis which provided the context of Freud's dream. Grinstein, *Freud's Dreams*, p. 376, suggests a later date than the crisis itself would in my view require.

[39] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, V, 427–8.

[40] *Ibid.*, IV, 257.

[41] Virgil, *The Aeneid*, bk. 7, lines 286–571, especially 312, 323–9, 445–55.

[42] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, V, 608.

[43] This discovery was made by Ernst Simon, "Sigmund Freud the Jew," Leo Baeck Institute, *Year Book*, II (1957), 301.

[44] Freud to Fliess, July 17, 1899, in Freud, *Origins*, p. 286. Freud does not mention any specific title in his letter, only "den 'Lasalle' " [*sic*]. While Lassalle's separate works were not readily available at the time, several collected editions which would include "The Italian War . . ." were issued in the

nineties. One of these, Erich Blum's *Ferdina*
Schriften, appeared in Leipzig in 1899,
manuscript of *The Interpretation of Dream*

[45] He first cited them in a letter to Fliess on
172.

[46] Ferdinand Lassalle, *Gesammelte Reden und*
(Berlin, 1919), I, especially 16–17.

[47] *Ibid.*, I, 112. See his frank discussion of hi
Marx, n.d. [mid-May], 1859, in Franz Me
Nachlass von Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels u
1902), IV, 150.

[48] Freud, *The Interpretation*, *SE*, IV, 298–302.

[49] *Ibid.*, V, 620.

[50] Freud to Fliess, Sept. 19, 1901, in Freud, *O*

[51] Freud to Fliess, March 11, 1902, in Freud,