

Doctors Talking to Doctors in Arthur Schnitzler's *Professor Bernhardt*

Introduction

Arthur Schnitzler (1862-1931) has long been regarded as a key figure in the development of Austrian realism, and especially in drama, where the movement was catalysed by the Viennese 'Ibsen week' of April 1891 (Yates 1992: 21-25). This reputation derives both from his socially and politically progressive depiction of contemporary mores and from the differentiated linguistic idiom of his plays, which characteristically reflects the varieties of conversational language to be found in different domains within Viennese society. Although best known for plays exploring relations between the sexes that cut across class boundaries – in *Anatol* (1893), *Liebelei* (1895) and *Reigen* (1900) – Schnitzler was well placed, as a qualified doctor, to offer realistic insight into the medical milieu. He most notably did so in *Professor Bernhardt* (1912), a play that, unusually, does not present any doctor in a patient-facing role. What the audience sees and hears instead is something that anyone who is not a medical professional never normally witnesses, namely doctors talking to doctors.

The starting-point for *Professor Bernhardt* is that the title figure, an eminent Austrian-Jewish doctor and director of a charitably funded hospital, refuses a Catholic priest access to the bedside of a young woman who is dying (offstage) of sepsis following an illegal abortion. He does so not for religious reasons but because the patient is oblivious of her situation and he regards it as his professional duty to allow her to die happily and without fear. The confrontation between doctor and priest concludes Act I, and the following four acts of this unlikely comedy explore the ethical implications and political fall-out of Bernhardt's actions (which include a two-month prison sentence for Bernhardt and the threat of bankruptcy for the hospital), in a turn-of-the-century Vienna that is riven by political, racial and religious

tensions. The first performance of *Professor Bernhardt* took place in Berlin on 28 November 1912. The Austrian censor refused to licence the play, with documentation subsequently released citing Schnitzler's unflattering depiction of Austrian public life as the main reason (Yates 1990: 111). In other words, *Professor Bernhardt* was banned because of its perceived realism. The ban was only lifted in 1918, after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire.

Schnitzler's depiction of the medical establishment also caused consternation, with his brother Julius, a well-regarded Viennese surgeon, reporting the outrage of colleagues, one of whom commented that, were he not already professor, the play would have ruined his chances of promotion (Schnitzler 1983: 11; diary entry for 10 January 1913).

This chapter will investigate four aspects of Schnitzler's realism: medical hierarchies and structures of authority; doctors talking about their work; factionalization; and the breakdown of professional relations. It will explore some of the strategies that English-language translators have adopted in responding to the historical specificity of *Professor Bernhardt* and to the subtleties of register generated by the professional and yet quasi-private, behind-the-scenes nature of much of its dialogue. It will also consider the distinctive challenges that arise when translating a comedy that lays bare the roots of anti-Semitism for a post-Holocaust audience.

Discussion will draw on seven English-language translations that have appeared since 1913. This translation history begins with a severely abridged 'resumé' of the play by Mrs Emil Pohli (Kate A. Jacoby), which was published in the United States without Schnitzler's authorization in 1913 and reissued as *The Anti-Semites* in 1925. The first complete, authorized translation appeared in London in 1927 and was the work of Austrian-born Hetty Landstone, sister of the writer and later well-known British theatre administrator Charles

Landstone. The Jewish Drama League, of which he was a founder member (Landstone 1976), sponsored readings of *Professor Bernhardt* at the Little Theatre on 13 February 1927 and at the Phoenix Theatre on 22 March 1931 (*The Era* 1927, 1931). Key figures from the later event, including Abraham Sofaer as Bernhardt, reprised their roles in the full-scale production that followed in 1936. Presented at the Embassy Theatre on 15 June and transferred to the larger, more central Phoenix Theatre a month later, the play was directed by Schnitzler's son Heinrich. At this point Landstone's translation was replaced by a new version, authored by theatre practitioners Louis Borell and Ronald Adam. While Borell was a Dutch-born actor and supplied the necessary German-language skills, Adam was the manager of the Embassy Theatre and played the role of Flint in the 1936 production (Adam 1938: 161-62).

Writing to Charles Landstone in 1924, Schnitzler was scathing about Mrs Pohli who, by her own admission, 'recast the work of the author and [...] took the liberty of reducing the original to one-fourth, often letting [her] personal interpretation take the place of many pages of dialogue' (Schnitzler 1913, vi).¹ However, the complete play is much too long to be performed unabridged, and Schnitzler himself made a set of authorized cuts which, thanks to his son, informed the three-act 'English version' created by Borell and Adam.² It took a further thirty years for *Professor Bernhardt* to be retranslated in full, in anthologies of Schnitzler plays produced by G.J. Weinberger for Ariadne Press in 1993 and by J.M.Q. Davies for the Oxford World's Classics series in 2004. Although the 1936 text was adapted for BBC Radio in 1953 and 1971, only in 2005 did *Professor Bernhardt* return to the London stage, in a 'new version' by Samuel Adamson that was part of the 'Last Waltz' season at the Arcola Theatre and was broadcast on BBC Radio 3. A prefatory note (Schnitzler 2005: 5) states that Adamson worked from a literal translation by Nadja Sumichrast. Finally, a

translation of Act I of *Professor Bernhardt* by William L. Cunningham and David Palmer appeared in 2007. Although Cunningham (2007) questions the play's viability on the modern American stage, and the project was evidently abandoned in a relatively unpolished state, some of their translation choices are thought-provoking in the post-Holocaust context.

Setting apart Pohli's text and that of Cunningham and Palmer, which both offer only a taster of the larger work, English-language versions of *Professor Bernhardt* fall into two categories: complete literary translations, which are primarily intended to be read, and shorter stage adaptations, which invariably sacrifice some of the play's large cast and considerable textual richness. As written records of collaborative theatre projects, each of which necessarily carves out a distinctive performance text, the latter tend to be more revealing of how a different culture and time responds to Schnitzler's realism.

Medical hierarchies and structures of authority

The first act of *Professor Bernhardt* takes place in the ante-room of a ward in the professor's department for internal medicine. Just off stage, a young woman is close to death but, as a side-effect of medication, she is in high spirits, experiencing a heightened but illusory sense of wellbeing. The ante-room is a busy transitional and transactional space: several colleagues come looking for Bernhardt and engage in short conversations with him and each other; routine tasks of various kinds are carried out; and the professor and his staff go in and out of the ward, delivering the patient's end-of-life care. In the course of Act I, the spectator encounters five of the hospital's nine department heads, as well as Bernhardt's two assistants, and the action is framed by exchanges between the nurse Sister Ludmilla and the medical student Hochroitzpointner, the two characters who will later bear false witness against Bernhardt. Exposition takes place within a naturalistic depiction of everyday activity; it is

indeed made clear that the act of summoning the priest is routine, even if subsequent events are not.

The hospital as Schnitzler presents it in *Professor Bernhardt* is a hierarchical institution, governed by a complex web of personal and professional relationships, social identities that are established and maintained by means of performative repetition, by rituals of greeting and farewell, and through the choice of honorifics and address forms (see Norrby and Warren 2012). Such restatement is not only of practical value in a play with a large male cast, many of whom are likely to be similarly attired, but also a significant challenge for the English translator. Every named character in *Professor Bernhardt* has either an academic or a professional title. ‘Doktor’ and ‘Professor’ are repeatedly used, either with the last name or in the impersonal form ‘Herr Doktor’ or ‘Herr Professor’. For the younger doctors, a distinction is made between ‘Herr Dozent’ (as for the pathologist Adler who is a lecturer and department head but not a professor) and ‘Herr Assistent’ for the two junior doctors working under Bernhardt, his son Oskar and Kurt Pflugfelder, the son of the hospital’s eye specialist. Confusingly, Schnitzler also uses ‘Herr Doktor’ for the medical student Hochroitzpointner, even though he is still working towards his final *viva voce* examination.³ Alongside this plethora of academic titles, Bernhardt is addressed as ‘Herr Direktor’, and the less hierarchical ‘Herr Kollege / Kollega’ is also heard. As Hickey observes (2003: 407), German is unusual in having specific professional address forms, and ‘Herr Kollege / Frau Kollegin’ continue to be widely used, especially in medicine, where the question ‘Sind Sie Kollege?’ is predicated on a distinction between doctors and paramedical occupations.

Although the medical profession was no less hierarchical in the English-speaking world around 1900 than it was in Austria, and retains elaborate career structures in both language

areas, the English translations, particularly the more modern ones, tend to make more sparing use of honorifics, reducing the panoply of academic titles to ‘Professor’ and ‘Doctor’.

Consequently, English speakers have to rely on the dialogue and on other clues, such as the relative ages of the speakers, to work out finer hierarchical distinctions. This is especially so in Landstone’s translation, where ‘Doctor’ and ‘Professor’ are inconsistently used. No translation has so far adopted the British convention of using ‘Mr’ for the surgeon, Professor Ebenwald, but Adamson clarifies the subordinate status of Hochroitzpointner by referring to him as ‘Mr’ throughout. The less hierarchical ‘Herr Kollege’ presents a particular challenge: it is how Bernhardi addresses his deputy and main adversary Ebenwald in Acts I and II, and ‘lieber Kollega / Kollege’ (literally ‘dear colleague’) is notably used by Ebenwald to flatter Hochroitzpointner in Act I (Schnitzler 1962: 343, 344) and by the gynaecologist Filitz to patronize Oskar in Act II (Schnitzler 1962: 365). While Pohli, Borell and Adam, and Adamson all ignore these address forms, Landstone and Weinberger both domesticate ‘lieber Kollege’ as ‘my dear fellow’. Davies, by contrast, produces a slightly quaint effect by rendering both ‘Herr Kollege / Kollega’ and ‘lieber Kollege’ as ‘my dear colleague’. Despite their avowed intention ‘to maintain fidelity to the original as far as possible’ while aiming at ‘a natural, readily comprehensible style of speech’ (Schnitzler 2007: xv), Cunningham and Palmer effect a consistent foreignization by deploying a range of interlingual address forms, extending from ‘Herr Professor’ and ‘Herr Doctor’ to ‘Herr Colleague’, ‘Herr Director’, ‘Herr Intern’ and ‘Herr Lecturer’. Insistently repeated, these highlight the role of professional discipline in limiting the impact of political and religious tensions on the efficient working of the hospital and may be viewed as an example of translation choices reflecting ‘fundamentally *ethical* attitudes towards a foreign text and culture’ (Venuti 2008: 19; emphasis in original).

While Bernhardi repeatedly addresses Ebenwald as ‘Herr Kollege’, as if pleading for collegial behaviour, Ebenwald responds with ‘Herr Direktor’, his cold formality hinting at the thinly disguised anti-Semitism that will be catalysed by Bernhardi’s confrontation with the priest. Their first exchange runs as follows:

EBENWALD: Guten Morgen. Ist vielleicht – Ah, da sind Sie ja, Herr Direktor.

BERNHARDI: Guten Tag, Herr Kollege.

EBENWALD: Haben Herr Direktor eine Minute Zeit für mich? (Schnitzler 1962: 342)

The translations, such as that of Adamson, below, tend to even out the tone:

EBENWALD: Good morning, is – ah, there’s our Director.

BERNHARDI: Morning, Ebenwald.

EBENWALD: Could you spare a few seconds? (Schnitzler 2005: 30)

While Bernhardi’s clipping of ‘Good morning’ to ‘Morning’ strikes a friendly note that compensates for the loss of ‘Herr Kollege’, Ebenwald’s use of the first-person plural in ‘our Director’ is suggestive of a relaxed collegiality. His second speech is much more neutral than the source text, where the question is phrased in the nominal third-person form. Regarded as archaic in modern German and barely used outside the service industries, this ‘bound form of address’ (Braun 1988: 11-12 and 51) is not uncommon in *Professor Bernhardi* but its hyper-formality always bears some affective colouring. Here it implies that Ebenwald respects the office of director but not its Jewish holder, and the request precludes a thoroughly unprofessional attempt to ensure that the next Professor of Dermatology will not be Jewish. Of the English translations, only Cunningham and Palmer retain a hint of Ebenwald’s coldness by repeating ‘Herr Direktor’ (Schnitzler 2007: 400). While fluent English cannot easily accommodate Schnitzler’s very precise use of professional address forms, such defamiliarizing strategies disrupt the fluency, thereby highlighting the fragility of the shared vocational endeavour.

Doctors talking about their work

That *Professor Bernhardt* offers a glimpse of doctors' professional lives – showing how they engage with each other and how medicine is entangled with other concerns – is a substantial part of the play's realism. Act I in particular contains a good deal of shop-talk: there are references to the use of camphor as a heart stimulant, to diabetes, to *tabes dorsalis* (a symptom of advanced syphilis), to tumours in the kidney and cerebellum, to X-rays, to the level of albumin in a patient's blood, to bed shortages, case-notes, post mortem reports and death certificates. Schnitzler's confident marshalling of clinical detail is a challenge for the non-specialist translator, and once the play's scientific context has become historical – once, for example, diabetes and syphilis have become treatable and X-rays are commonplace – that dimension of the play may acquire an air of museality. Indeed, stage adaptations, especially that of Borell and Adam, have tended to pare down the medical minutiae, thereby bringing the political dimension of *Professor Bernhardt* into sharper relief.

When Schnitzler's doctors talk about their work, they very frequently talk about dissection (see Neumann 2016). The play opens with discussion of a post mortem and later in the first act, in what is summarized by Pohli as a 'conversation about the slow progress the science of medicine has made' (Schnitzler 1913: 9), the pathologist Adler defends his choice of specialism: internal medicine is too reliant for his liking on guesswork and experimentation, whereas pathology is properly scientific. Although Schnitzler is respectful of this therapeutic scepticism (a widely held view, even *c.* 1900) and presents Adler as a decent man who behaves in a principled manner, he simultaneously derives comedy from popular unease with regard to pathological anatomy. Adler's laboratory, where he habitually works until midnight, is in the hospital's basement and Bernhardt greets him with the words, 'Was führt Sie in das

Bereich der Lebendigen, Doktor Adler?’ (Schnitzler 1962: 350). Only Borell and Adam undertranslate this opener as ‘What brings you here, Adler?’ (Schnitzler 1937: 25). More typically it is rendered as ‘What brings you to the land of the living, Doctor Adler?’ (Schnitzler 2004: 301), as the English translations embrace the play’s ghoulish potential.

Further scope for abandoning sober realism is offered by the nauseating anecdote of an orderly who resorts to drinking medical alcohol from the pathologist’s specimen pots. It is perhaps symptomatic of the modern unfamiliarity (or unease) with pathology museums that Davies at once clarifies and sanitizes the image: ‘the fellow gradually drank all the alcohol intended for our preparations’ (Schnitzler 2004: 304), while Adamson evokes an implausibly hedonistic experience: ‘there was a winebibbing assistant in anatomy who crept about unstopping all the test-tubes and quaffing their contents’ (Schnitzler 2005: 42). Elsewhere Adamson uses pathological anatomy to heighten the insensitivity of Hochroitzpointner, who describes himself as being ‘on top of the world at an autopsy’. Instead of introducing Adler matter-of-factly, as in the source text, Hochroitzpointner announces that the pathologist ‘carves up dead bodies all day’ (Schnitzler 2005: 28). Adamson then ramps up the callousness, having Hochroitzpointner tell him that the dying sepsis patient will be ‘One for the slab tomorrow’ (Schnitzler 2005: 44). Such overtranslation loses sight of pathological anatomy as the necessary bedrock of medical training and research well into the twentieth century, instead using it to give medicine, and especially the proto-fascist Hochroitzpointner, a more sinister hue.

Factionalization

As Oskar Bernhardt observes at the start of Act II (Schnitzler 1962: 362), even without the catalysing effect of his father’s actions, the hospital’s institutional politics is determined by a

complex set of shifting, unstable rivalries and affinities that are professional, political and religious in origin. Schnitzler gives some indication of where solidarities lie in his choice of pronouns of address, a topic in which comparative sociolinguistics has been interested since the groundbreaking work of Brown and Gilman (1960). The binary pronomial system used in German cannot be reproduced in English, where only the historically formal ‘you’ is in common usage, but an awareness of subtleties in the source text should ideally inform other lexical choices and indeed directorial decisions. Although one might expect the formal pronoun ‘Sie’ to be the default in a professional domain such as a hospital, *Professor Bernhardt* displays significant variation. Bernhardt reciprocally uses the informal pronoun ‘du’ with his son Oskar, as does Pflugfelder with his son Kurt; Bernhardt also notably uses ‘du’ with Cyprian and Tugendvetter, the two senior colleagues with whom he founded the hospital fifteen years previously. He is on similarly familiar terms with two of the younger department heads, Löwenstein and Filitz, and with Flint, a close friend from student days who is now Minister for Education. Ebenwald, by contrast, uses the informal ‘du’ only in a somewhat conspiratorial scene with his protégé, Schreimann, a converted Jew and former army doctor.

This usage follows standard sociolinguistic conventions: the informal pronoun of address is used with close family; with close friends (often following an agreed shift from ‘Sie’, traditionally celebrated with alcohol); amongst students; and when a strong relationship of mentorship has been established. As a reversion to formality is extremely rare, what the informal pronoun of address highlights in *Professor Bernhardt* is not necessarily present but rather past relations, that at some previous time these pairs of characters were on very good terms. Particularly in the case of Filitz, a conservative Catholic who readily sides with Ebenwald in Act III, the choice of address pronoun suggests that, prior to the confrontation

with the priest, Bernhardt drew figures from very different backgrounds into his orbit. As the dialogue does not elaborate on this particular backstory, English translations may well create a sharper antagonism between Filitz and Bernhardt than is present in the source text.

Furthermore Bernhardt's continuing use of 'du' in Act V, with Tugendvetter, when the latter is clearly trying to disassociate himself from his old friend following the latter's release from prison, and with Flint after the Minister has sacrificed him to save his own career, serves as a powerful reminder of change and adds a poignancy to these dialogues that is almost inevitably lost in translation.

In all the cases above, the informal pronoun 'du' is reciprocally used. However, in a further instance, Schnitzler displays the delicate negotiation that potentially underpins the choice of address pronoun. At the start of Act II, Oskar encounters Dr Feuermann, a friend from medical school who is facing a charge of malpractice and seeking Professor Bernhardt's support. Although they would previously have used the informal pronoun 'du' to each other, Feuermann is not confident of finding solidarity eight years later and acknowledges Oskar's power as his father's gatekeeper by addressing him as 'Sie':

FEUERMAN: Ich weiß nicht, ob Sie sich meiner noch erinnern werden –

OSKAR: Aber Feuermann, ob ich mich deiner noch erinnere! *Reicht ihm die Hand.*

(Schnitzler 1962: 360)

In a play where memory is thematized as a marker of stable selfhood and consistent ethical behaviour (Fliedl 1997: 230-52), it reflects well on Oskar that he not only remembers Feuermann but replies using the informal pronoun of address ('deiner'). That this shift was a deliberate authorial strategy is clear from the surviving draft of Act II, where it is explicitly signalled: 'Aber Feuermann! "Sie!" Ob ich mich Deiner noch erinnere!'.⁴ While Davies renders Oskar's speech as 'My dear Feuermann, still remember you!' (Schnitzler 2004: 310),

with the adjective conveying affection, and Landstone intensifies adverbially to similar effect ('Why, Feuermann! Of course I remember you quite well', Schnitzler 1927: 36), Borell and Adam insert several question marks:

FEUERMANN: I don't know whether you will remember me?

OSKAR: But – Feuermann? Do I *not* remember you? (*Shakes hands.*) (Schnitzler 1937: 35)

The questions and the loss of Oskar's interruption make the exchange considerably more tentative than the source text, thereby potentially reducing his moral stature.

The chosen pronoun of address gives no indication of the source of the affinities and rivalries between particular characters, but the rituals of greeting and farewell that are a recurring feature of *Professor Bernhardi* sometimes do. An example can be found in the first words of Professor Tugendvetter when he enters the ante-room of Bernhardi's ward in Act I:

TUGENDVETTER: Guten Morgen. Servus, Bernhardi. Grüß Sie Gott, Ebenwald. Ich hab dich schon oben gesucht, Bernhardi. (Schnitzler 1962: 346)

In his habitually jovial manner, Tugendvetter first greets all present with a neutral 'Guten Morgen', then uses the more familiar 'Servus' to Bernhardi. As is conventional, the latter is complemented by the informal pronoun of address ('dich'), whereas he greets Ebenwald more formally, using 'Sie'. Although 'Grüß Gott' (literally 'God's greeting' or 'May God greet you') is nowadays regarded as relatively neutral and is widely used in place of 'Guten Morgen / Guten Tag / etc' in Austria and Bavaria, it is hardly coincidental that on the two occasions in *Professor Bernhardi* when it appears – the other being Bernhardi greeting Cyprian with 'Grüß dich Gott' (Schnitzler 1962: 353) – the addressee is not Jewish. The chosen formula can be read as a polite acknowledgement of Austria's dominant Catholic culture on the part of a Jewish character.⁵

Several translations capture something of Tugendvetter's breezy manner:

TUGENDVETTER: Good morning. How do, Bernhardi! How do, Ebenwald! I have been looking for you upstairs, Bernhardi. (Schnitzler [Landstone] 1927: 18)

TUGENDVETTER: Good morning. Hi, Bernhardi. Hello, Ebenwald. I was looking for you upstairs, Bernhardi. (Schnitzler [Weinberger] 1993: 12)

TUGENDVETTER: Morning all. Hello, Bernhardi, been looking for you. Hello, Ebenwald. (Schnitzler [Adamson] 2005: 36)

While Landstone localizes Tugendvetter to the north of England and Weinberger Americanizes him, Adamson creates a relaxed tone by having him clip his sentences. Of the three, only Weinberger produces different greetings for Bernhardi and Ebenwald, albeit without a marked distinction in formality. Perhaps more successful in this respect is Davies with 'Good morning. Hello, Bernhardi. How are you, Ebenwald?' (Schnitzler 2004: 298). However, the possibility of a distance informed by religious difference is very definitely lost in all of the translations.

In its untranslatability 'Grüß Gott' is comparable to the now somewhat dated Austrian greeting 'Habe die Ehre' (literally 'I have the honour'), which in *Professor Bernhardi* is evocative of a masculinist culture underpinned by pan-German nationalism and potentially also anti-Semitism. Particularly favoured by Adler and Hochroitzpointner (two of the three characters who bear duelling scars), 'Habe die Ehre' is also used by Ebenwald as a valediction. The reference to honour creates a passive-aggressive demand to be recognized by the addressee(s) as belonging to an 'in-group', albeit one that – as when Oskar Bernhardi uses the greeting – around 1900 can still be flexibly defined. Such undertones are certainly lost if, as frequently happens, 'Habe die Ehre' and 'Grüß Gott' are translated as 'Hello'. Only

Cunningham and Palmer attempt otherwise, systematically using ‘My pleasure’ for ‘Habe die Ehre’ and ‘Greetings’ for ‘Grüß Gott’. Cunningham (2007) registers dissatisfaction with this solution but, in light of the fact that both expressions gesture towards aspects of Austrian culture that were already acquiring baleful undertones at the time of the play, an ethical argument for not domesticating them can certainly be made.

While it remains fairly clear despite the intervening century that Bernhardt and his allies share the humane values of a secular liberalism, with only Löwenstein foregrounding his Jewish identity, the politics of the opposing camp – a pernicious cocktail of pan-German nationalism, clericalism and anti-Semitism – has become increasingly difficult to convey with any precision because it is so complicated and so deeply rooted in the specificity of turn-of-the-century Austria. This situation has generated some awkward mistranslations: for example, Landstone has Kurt Pflugfelder assert that he is not merely an Anti-Semite but also an ‘Anti-Agrarian’ (rather than ‘Anti-Aryan’, Schnitzler 1927: 26); and Ebenwald’s continued links to a German-nationalist fraternity make him, in Adamson’s version, ‘an old student of Germanity’ (Schnitzler 2005: 79). Borell and Adam, working in 1936, when the Austrian First Republic was struggling to maintain its independence from Nazi Germany and refugees were already arriving in Britain, notably update the political context. In their version, the Jewish convert Schreimann no longer asserts that he is a German and a Christian but professes instead to be ‘an Austrian and a Christian’ (Schnitzler 1937: 68). Adamson, who comments that he has made ‘minor tucks and clarifications’ (Schnitzler 2005: 5), tends to explain political references. Thus he underlines the extent of anti-Semitic prejudice by having Schreimann quote rather than merely mention the notorious Waidhofen Resolution, whereby in 1896 a Viennese student assembly declared Jews to be without honour and therefore unfit to duel with Aryans (Schnitzler 2005: 78). What needed only a brief allusion for German

speakers in 1912, and prompts Schreimann to joke that he has a duelling scar nonetheless, is spelled out for the post-Holocaust audience.

Doctors shouting at doctors

Act III of *Professor Bernhardt* presents an extraordinary meeting of the hospital management committee, convened to discuss the repercussions of Bernhardt's confrontation with the priest, which include the resignation of the hospital's trustees and a parliamentary question. It is a formal occasion, with a prescribed structure and procedures. In Schreimann's words, a meeting should not resemble a coffee house without the billiards – a comment localized in 1936 as 'a pot-house gathering' (Schnitzler 1937: 80). Rather it is a miniature legislature, whose conventions are derived from that sphere. However, in view of what is simultaneously taking place in the Austrian parliament – Bernhardt's actions are used as an excuse to propose the exclusion of Jews from certain public roles and Flint saves his own career by agreeing to Bernhardt being charged with 'Religionsstörung' (obstructing religious observance, an offence that was on the Austrian statute books in 1912) – that analogy becomes increasingly ominous. Act III degenerates into doctors shouting at doctors and ends with Bernhardt resigning as director and walking out together with three of his colleagues.

The meeting is the structural core and dramatic highpoint of *Professor Bernhardt* and tends to be only lightly abridged, even when radical cuts are made elsewhere. Two significant challenges for the translator are to ensure that each character, three of whom are seen for the first time in Act III, has a distinctive voice and that the gradual collapse of restraint and professionalism can be clearly discerned. The most important new figure is Professor Pflugfelder, a veteran of the 1848 revolutions who is vocal and belligerent from the outset. He plays a major role in the breakdown of the meeting and ends the act with a lengthy,

pathos-laden appeal to his colleagues to call Bernhardi back. Schnitzler's stage directions make very clear that tempers are gradually lost on all sides, as sarcasm, sniping and quasi-parliamentary catcalls escalate into an unrestrained shouting match and even Bernhardi is roused to fury. However, the German lexis is relatively inoffensive, no doubt because Schnitzler was mindful of what was permissible on the early-twentieth-century stage. Moments of escalation are therefore subtly indicated, as in the following exchange, which concludes Löwenstein's account of events in parliament:

LÖWENSTEIN: [...] Eine Schmach! Ihr habt es erreicht.

FILITZ: Keine Invektiven, lieber Löwenstein. (Schnitzler 1962: 408)

What gives offence here is that Löwenstein addresses his colleagues (or implicitly a subset of the group) not using the formal pronoun 'Sie', as would be expected, but the informal 'Ihr' (the plural equivalent of 'du'). Unless the translation takes account of this unconventional pronoun choice, Filitz's response may seem excessive.

LOEWENSTEIN: [...] It's a disgrace! (*Looking at Ebenwald.*) You have succeeded.
(Schnitzler [Pohli] 1913: 37; Filitz's speech is omitted)

LOEWENSTEIN: [...] It's a disgrace! And you've brought it about between you!

FILITZ: No abuse, my dear Loewenstein. (Schnitzler [Landstone] 1927: 94)

LOWENSTEIN: [...] A humiliation! You have got what you wanted.

FILITZ: No abuse, my dear Lowenstein. (Schnitzler [Borell and Adam] 1937: 78)

LÖWENSTEIN: [...] A disgrace! You've gotten what you wanted.

FILITZ: No invectives, dear Löwenstein. (Schnitzler [Weinberger] 1993: 83)

LÖWENSTEIN: [...] It's despicable. You have achieved your purpose.

FILITZ: No invective, my dear Löwenstein. (Schnitzler [Davies] 2004: 351)

LÖWENSTEIN: [...] It's enough to turn your stomach. You got what you wanted.

FILITZ: Let's not get personal. (Schnitzler [Adamson] 2005: 90)

Although Davies's version is very flat and Pohli lays the blame squarely at Ebenwald's door, several translations compensate using the aggressive colloquialism of the verb 'to get', with Adamson also offering fluent phrasal renderings of 'Schmach' and 'Keine Invektiven' and sidestepping the awkwardness of 'my dear Löwenstein'.

Unsurprisingly, the literary translations of Weinberger and Davies introduce no greater degree of profanity into Act III of *Professor Bernhardt* than is present in the source text, and neither do Borell and Adam – for the practical reason that their text would have required the approval of the Lord Chamberlain. Although one reviewer urged Heinrich Schnitzler to 'reconsider the scenes in which the hospital staff lose their tempers and shout at each other in a manner which seems very unlike that of educated gentlemen' (*The Stage* 1936), Adamson condemns the 1936 translation as 'a curiously emasculated affair' (Schnitzler 2005: 5), himself offering a 'spiky new version' (Schnitzler 2005: back cover) of *Professor Bernhardt* that has doctors not just shouting but swearing at each other. In particular, Pflugfelder's belligerence quickly manifests itself in expletives, as when he interrupts Cyprian:

PFLUGFELDER *unterbricht* Was geht uns die Interpellation und ihre Beantwortung überhaupt an? Es ist eine externe Angelegenheit.

EBENWALD *brüllend* Bedenken Sie doch, daß wir in Gefahr stehen, uns vor der ganzen Welt lächerlich zu machen, wenn wir hier weiterberaten und beschließen – im Angesichte der Möglichkeit, daß alle unsere Beschlüsse von einer höheren Instanz bei nächster Gelegenheit annulliert werden.

CYPRIAN: Entschuldigen Sie, Ebenwald, das ist ein Unsinn. (Schnitzler 1962: 410)

In the source text Pflugfelder's rather formal interruption seems insufficiently provocative to trigger Ebenwald's furious retort, whereas Adamson's dialogue is direct and explicitly confrontational, with vulgarisms drawing attention to the key nouns:

PFLUGFELDER: (*Interrupting.*) The bloody question in the house, its fucking answer – to hell with it, it’s nothing to do with us!

EBENWALD: (*Roaring.*) Do we want to look like a herd of asses? Why settle anything tonight, when it’ll probably be overturned by the law tomorrow!

CYPRIAN: Sorry, Ebenwald, but to quote Filitz: horseshit. (Schnitzler 2005: 92)

Previous to this exchange, Adamson has twice rendered Filitz’s habitual interjection ‘Unsinn’ (literally ‘nonsense’) as ‘horseshit’, which allows him to add an additional layer of humour to Schnitzler’s dialogue here by having Cyprian quote this comically tame profanity in order simultaneously to contradict Ebenwald and mock Filitz. As Windle (2011: 164) observes, in deploying vulgarisms ‘translators are most often guided by their sense of which [target language] expressions convey a corresponding effect, or of which are acceptable in the target culture, and elicit equivalent response [...] at a given period’. By spicing up Act III in this way, Adamson brings *Professor Bernhardt* into line with a more liberal theatre culture and with a century arguably less restrained by decorum.

Conclusion

For its early audiences, especially in Vienna, Schnitzler’s *Professor Bernhardt* offered realistic insight into an unfamiliar medical milieu within which, regrettably, the more familiar and divisive politics of the larger public sphere were reflected. Although some of the medical detail is now of historical interest only and references to pathology have tended to be repurposed, the incident at the core of the play remains accessible and current. The dangers of unregulated abortion have by no means been forgotten, and without prompt diagnosis and treatment sepsis is still life-threatening. Furthermore, the question of what constitutes ‘a happy death’ continues to be fiercely debated.⁶

By the time *Professor Bernhardt* made it onto the London stage in 1936, its theatrical idiom seemed dated: according to Ivor Brown, it was ‘rational, realistic, and argumentative, [...] exactly the kind of play which the left wing used to handle in the early years of the century’ (*The Observer* 1936). However, as another reviewer observed, ‘one thing [...] brings this old-fashioned play up-to-date – the terrible appositeness of its theme – Anti-Semitism’ (*The Star* 1936). While Borell and Adam go some way towards adapting the realism of *Professor Bernhardt* to the political climate of the 1930s, Cunningham and Palmer experiment with foreignizing strategies that underline the prophetic nature of Schnitzler’s work. The 2005 version is likewise informed by an awareness that, although the play concerns ‘gentlemen of great intelligence and culture for whom the Holocaust would have been a lunatic’s sick joke, [...] the seeds are well and truly sown for a bleak and terrifying future’ (Schnitzler 2005: 6). Adamson’s radicalization of the pivotal third act therefore acknowledges not just differences in theatre culture but also the post-Holocaust context of the production; and as Bernhardt’s reputation and livelihood are all but destroyed, the last vestiges of civilized collegiality break down in grandiose fashion.

Bibliography

A., K. 1936. *The Star*, 15 July

Adam, Ronald 1938. *Overture and Beginners*. London: Gollancz

Anon. 1927. ‘Professor Bernhardt’, *The Era*, 16 February, 8

Anon. 1931. “‘Professor Bernhardt’. Jewish Drama League Production’, *The Era*, 25 March,

11

Anon. 1936. ‘The Phoenix. “Professor Bernhardt”’, *The Stage*, 16 July

- Beier, Nikolaj 2008. 'Vor allem bin ich ich ...'. *Judentum, Akkulturation und Antisemitismus in Arthur Schnitzlers Leben und Werk*. Göttingen: Wallstein
- Braun, Friederike 1988. *Terms of Address. Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Brown, Ivor 1936, *The Observer*, 21 June
- Brown R. and Gilman, A. 1960. 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity', in Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 253-74
- Cunningham, William L. 2007. 'Caveat Translator – Let the Translator Beware', *Translation Journal*, 11/3 (July)
- Fliedl, Konstanze 1997. *Arthur Schnitzler. Poetik der Erinnerung*. Vienna, Cologne and Weimar: Böhlau
- Hickey, Raymond 2003. 'The German address system. Binary and scalar at once', in Taavitsainen, Irma and Jucker, Andreas H. (eds) *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins, 401-25
- Landstone, Charles 1976. *I Gate-Crashed*. London: Stainer & Bell
- Neumann, Annja 2016. 'Schnitzler's Anatomy Lesson: Medical Topographies in *Professor Bernhardi*', *Jahrbuch Literatur und Medizin*, 8, 31-60
- Norrby, Catrin and Warren, Jane 2012. 'Address Practices and Social Relationships in European Languages', *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 6, 225-35
- Schnitzler, Arthur 1913. *Professor Bernhardi, A Comedy by Arthur Schnitzler*. An Adaptation in English by Mrs. Emil Pohli. San Francisco, CA: Paul Elder
- 1925. *The Anti-Semites (Professor Bernhardi: A Play)*, Little Blue Book 226. Girard, KS: Haldeman-Julius
- 1927. *Professor Bernhardi. A Comedy in Five Acts*, trans. Landstone, Hetty. London: Faber & Gwyer

- 1936. *Professor Bernhardt, A Play in Three Acts*, English version by Borell, Louis and Adam, Ronald. London: Gollancz
- 1937. *Professor Bernhardt*, in *Famous Plays of 1936*. London: Gollancz, 11-118
- 1962. *Professor Bernhardt*, in *Gesammelte Werke*, 6 vols. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer, 1961-1977: *Die Dramatischen Werke. Zweiter Band*, 337-463
- 1983. *Tagebuch 1913-1916*, ed. Welzig Werner, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- 1993. *Professor Bernhardt*, in *Professor Bernhardt and Other Plays*, trans. Weinberger, G.J. Riverside, CA: Ariadne Press, 1-145
- 2004. *Professor Bernhardt*, in *Round Dance and Other Plays*, trans. Davies, J.M.Q., Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 289-400
- 2005. *Professor Bernhardt. A Comedy*, in a new version by Adamson, Samuel. London: Oberon Books
- 2007. 'Professor Bernhardt, Act I', in *Eight Plays. Performance Texts*, trans. Cunningham, William L. and Palmer, David. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 395-421
- Windle, Kevin 2011. 'The Translation of Drama', in Malmkjær, Kirsten and Windle, Kevin, *The Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 153-68
- Venuti, Lawrence 2008. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, 2nd edn. London: Routledge
- Yates, W.E. 1990. 'The Tendentious Reception of *Professor Bernhardt*. Documentation in Schnitzler's Collection of Press-Cuttings', *Austrian Studies*, 1: *Vienna 1900. From Altenberg to Wittgenstein*, 108-25

——— 1992. *Schnitzler, Hofmannsthal, and the Austrian Theatre*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press

¹ See unpublished letter from Arthur Schnitzler to Charles Landstone, 9 January 1924, Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Marbach a.N., catalogue number: HS.NZ85.0001.01261.

² A 1919 copy of *Professor Bernhardi* with Schnitzler's cuts is held in the Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Marbach a.N., catalogue number: HS.NZ85.0001.00045.

³ A handwritten annotation on the surviving typescript for Act I identifies Hochroitzpointner as 'Dr. d.' (*doctor designatus*). The more conventional abbreviation, 'Dr. des.', is still used, especially in North America and in the German-speaking world, for students who have not fulfilled all the formal requirements for the award of a doctorate, such as publishing the dissertation. The largest part of Schnitzler's archive, including genetic material for *Professor Bernhardi*, is held in Cambridge University Library. Here folder A118, 1, sheet 2 (recto), p. 2. A Digital Critical Edition of Arthur Schnitzler's Works (1905-1931) is in development. The first texts, to include *Professor Bernhardi*, are due to be available online from Cambridge University Library in 2017. Judith Beniston is lead editor for *Professor Bernhardi*.

⁴ Arthur Schnitzler papers, Cambridge University Library, folder A118, 2, sheet 4 (recto), p. 64.

⁵ It is indicative of the deliberate complexity of identity politics in *Professor Bernhardi* that it is not absolutely clear whether or not Tugendvetter and Cyprian are intended to be of Jewish descent. Beier (2008, 317) argues plausibly on the basis of contextual and genetic evidence that Tugendvetter is Jewish whereas Cyprian is not.

⁶ The production of *Professor Bernhardi* staged by [Foreign Affairs] at Barts Hospital Pathology Museum, London, 23-25 September 2015, in a new version by Judith Beniston and Nicole Robertson, was accompanied by a cross-disciplinary symposium entitled "'Dying Well": Enacting Medical Ethics'. The podcast is available at: <http://backdoorbroadcasting.net/2015/09/dying-well-enacting-medical-ethics/>