

INTRODUCTION



I am very incompletely dressed, and I go from a dwelling on the ground floor up a flight of stairs to an upper story. In doing this, I jump over three steps at a time, and I am glad to find I can mount the steps so quickly. Suddenly I see that a servant girl is coming down the stairs, that is towards me. I am ashamed and try to hurry away, and now there appears a sensation of being impeded; I am glued to the steps and cannot move from the spot.

—Sigmund Freud, *Interpretation of Dreams*, 1900¹

This is a moment of reckoning for the man in the scene. He, alighting quickly and deftly in a half-dressed state, is suddenly confronted by the prospect of his maidservant's gaze. Now, he stands ashamed and frozen, unable to escape, unable to disappear. The scene demands an explanation for his shame, for his inability to disappear, and of the events that made him the object of his maidservant's gaze. One is promptly provided. His elderly housekeeper has refused him her customary respect after discovering his disregard for cleanliness. To compound the situation, the night before the dream, the maidservant had rebuked him for soiling the carpet, further reinforcing the housekeeper's position. He delves deeper into his childhood, a time when maidservants often saw children in scanty clothing. Add to this the information that his mother was often harsh with him "for insufficient aptitude for education in cleanliness," and the maidservant's position of authority in the dream is easily explained by her "attempting to continue this educational work."² The dreamer in the scene is the neurologist Sigmund Freud, whose name is enshrined in our vocabulary and whose work *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900) detailed many such insights about the human mind. Freud offered several generations of scholars a compass to guide understanding of the impulses of the mind and the moorings of the unconscious. For the cultural historian Carl Schorske, contextualizing Freud's formulation was central to his pathbreaking analysis of the crisis of Viennese liberalism. Schorske

pinpointed the crisis to be one of elite intellectual isolation from other sectors of social and political processes due to intense skepticism.³

But what of the moment of reckoning between the man and the maidservant in Freud's dream? What of the lack of authority that Freud's dream expresses—the employer's shame and inability to disappear when confronted by his maidservant's gaze? Maureen Healy has demonstrated that the collapse of the Habsburg Empire was as much an internal phenomenon as an external one, with civilians waging a devastating war on each other.⁴ But what was this internal threat—what was this reckoning yet to take place? Some quarter decade before the publication of *The Interpretation*, the German historian and National Liberal writer Heinrich von Treitschke had fervently asserted, "There can be no culture without its servants. It is self-evident that if there were no men to perform the menial tasks of life, it would be impossible for higher culture to exist."⁵ The liberal bourgeoisie of fin de siècle Vienna experienced the silent tremor of this sentiment—a sentiment that Viennese liberals never stated outright. However, the political, social, and cultural discourses of the fin de siècle, I posit, were haunted by the question of what it would mean for Viennese culture when the paternalism (predicated on the cameralist principles of the eighteenth century) that sustained the master-servant relationship was sacrificed for the individual autonomy of servants. While freedom as an abstract concept sounded like a desirable goal, the manifestation of that freedom in the form of the autonomy of a ubiquitous class of people—about one hundred thousand in strength in 1900 in Vienna alone—was formidable.

My main concern in this book is not rupture but persistence. The lens of this study is not power relationships alone but how cultural constructs inherited from the past persist and perpetuate through individuals as well as sociopolitical institutions. I am reminded of James Baldwin, who tried to convince us that "the great force of history comes from the fact that we carry it within us, are unconsciously controlled by it in many ways, and history is literally present in all that we do."⁶ But, if the past is literally present, historical actors cannot break from it; they may only attempt to reckon with it or fail to do so. The protagonists of modernist high culture may well hide behind the "new" to escape the past that haunts them, but those who write about this escapism need not be as evasive. The servant girl in Freud's dream might not have uttered anything, but her persistent presence cannot be disputed. Neither can the dreamer's shame when confronted with her presence. The servant girl then is not merely subversive but exerts deep psychological and moral power over the dreamer. Is it not the task of the cultural historian then to place the servant girl at the center of the discussion as Freud does in this instance, even if he is and perhaps can only be interested in the dreamer's psychological torment? Must we not, as Nitin Sinha argues, "shake up our own fields of history writing—urban, labor, gender, and social—to discover servants' traces wherever they are found?"⁷ My exploration of modernism and its faithful attendant modernity in this book accepts Steven Shapin's argument that

science is a social activity that should be understood contextually; however, my thesis does not lead to Bruno Latour's claim that "we have never been modern."⁸

Instead, my work attends to the call of the historical and cultural sociologist Orlando Patterson to treat cultural persistence and its related processes of diffusion and transmission seriously as opposed to treating culture as a "postmodern epistemological jungle." Patterson points out that "the cultural half-turn," a term he uses to describe the effect of culture studies on sociology, has replaced the "language of norms, values, attitudes, and ideologies with those of scripts, toolkits, boundaries, narratives, repertoires, and frames." In Patterson's view, the cultural half-turn ignores the persistence of cultural constructs across time and populations both diachronically and synchronically, neglects the collective, downplays shared aspects of culture, and pays exclusive attention to cultural pragmatics.⁹ In this study, I start with the notion that culture is certainly susceptible to change, and dramatic change at that, and so the pragmatics of culture are important. Yet, the study of culture demands more. I contest that culture is also remarkably persistent and neglecting culture's past in favor of the idea that it can spontaneously rupture from the past without leaving a trace departs from an analysis grounded in reality.

From this perspective, then, this book tells a story about mass movements of people within an empire that posed a challenge to an extremely persistent model of social organization. These migrants, many—but not all—of whom were descendants of serfs and slaves, now became servants to the bourgeoisie in the empire's urban centers. These people were not only the Other in the bourgeois master's household and public spaces but also intimately involved in the service and care of their bourgeois masters and the space in which the latter lived. Indeed, they created the space in which their masters lived. Servants, in other words, as Theresa McBride argues, were deeply involved not only in the modernization of the domestic sphere; but not just the private sphere—also the public sphere of modern life.¹⁰ They were also deeply involved in—and, if Treitschke's words are to be believed, even responsible for—the creation of the culture of modernism and modernity itself. So, they posed a challenge to the bourgeoisie. The inability of liberal intellectuals, social movements, and populist parties to successfully reckon with this reality meant that even though urbanization and scientific advances led to dramatic changes in cultural production on the one hand, old cultural configurations, on the other, persisted in the garb of new jargons. The modernism in the Vienna contained in the following pages is *not* the modernism of the avant-garde, the new, and the decadent. It is the modernism that perpetuated the past—the modernism of old, habituated, and unattainable ideals.

Servants of Culture, thus, argues that the collapse of the Habsburg Empire was characterized by the inability to reckon with the past in the face of changing reality. The central thesis of this book then is that modernism, thought to span from approximately 1870 and well into the interwar years, was not a break away

from the past but an obsession with the past. It was the persistence of questions about freedom and self-determination that servant-class women raised in the age of enlightened absolutism. From this perspective, modernism was not a cultural movement initiated by the liberal bourgeoisie of the late nineteenth century, and it was not characterized by a turn away from history. Instead, it was involved with tackling questions raised by preexisting servant-class women and was characterized by the persistence of history. What was “new” about fin de siècle modernism and its interwar manifestations in the form of movements such as the “New Woman,” for instance, was the permeation and appropriation of the cultural and social concerns of the servant class by the bourgeoisie. In other words, the paradox of cultural life in the fin de siècle was that while old laws perpetuated outdated stereotypes, they also opened up avenues for servant-class people to exert social, cultural, and political power not only through their ubiquitous presence but also by living, working, moving, and sometimes exploiting the mass cultural neuroses of the age.

What is crucial here, I posit, is that this exercise of power should not be interpreted *solely* as individual subversive acts or individual expressions of agency and autonomy against systems of control. This interpretation assumes that the exercise of power is a set of simple oppositions—master-servant, bourgeoisie-servants, parent-child, perpetrator-victim, liberals-conservatives, and so on—with one group wielding all the power and the other group being oppressed. Indeed, some scholars argue that since its inception during the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, liberalism’s history has been one of opposition by the underdogs against established power, while conservatism’s history has been about opposing that opposition.¹¹ As we shall see in this book, this is a highly disputable claim. But the root of this argument of binary oppositions, James Baldwin would point out, requires the underdog’s tacit compliance with the enlightenment liberal. Yet, it would be fallacious to interpret that the ubiquitous and diverse mass of people constituting the fin de siècle servant class were all universally ignorant of the history that put them in the circumstances of terrible choices. While many sociopolitical players may have appropriated contemporary images of criminality and victimhood about servant-class people and indeed may have fooled themselves into thinking these images represented reality, I posit that the members of the servant class were not so easily fooled by the carnage of neurotic images that was the fin de siècle.

Instead, I argue that the exercise of power by servant-class people at the turn of the century was a collective phenomenon that signaled the state’s failure to understand the plights and demands of an increasingly autonomous population. Of course, this is not to say that servant-class men and women were not subject to conditions that restrained their choices. The choice between menial domestic labor and abusive sex work was indeed equivalent to no choice at all in many cases. I argue that the servant class sought actively to forward their interests, assert their

dignity, and exert power in every way they could. These activities did not manifest in a polarized fashion with masters at one end of the sociopolitical spectrum and servants at the other. Furthermore, the increasing autonomy of the servant class did not necessarily manifest in the form of something akin to labor unions, although oftentimes they did. It also manifested as the mass movement of female job seekers, the proliferation of placement agencies, the retreat of men from the servant occupation, the interaction between the servant class and sex work, and also through the performance of crimes. Stated differently, the servant class could not be rendered into “harmless” pieces of background furniture, although many fin de siècle sociopolitical players including the ones who claimed to represent them tried to do just that. It would not be possible for populist movements to rise without support from many segments of this ubiquitous population. The servant girl could and oftentimes did cause substantial “harm” to the society in which she lived while rendering her employers infatuated with their own neuroses. The servant girl in Freud’s dream could be vengeful. This is not to cast blame on the servant girl or doubt her suffering in the face of sexist discourses, but this is to argue that she was not *only* a victim and that any power she exercised was not *only* subversive.

This book fills a lacuna in Habsburg scholarship on servants, certainly, but my contribution departs from the general trend in the field of domestic service. My interest in this book is to interrogate the nature of the crisis that Vienna as the imperial capital of the far-flung Habsburg Empire faced at the turn of the century. Servants are the prism through which I examine cultural persistence. Vienna then is the epicenter of this book. However, the Vienna I interrogate is not one that is detached from the rest of the Habsburg Empire but one that is integrated spatially, temporally, and discursively with the rest of the empire. The Vienna in my book is the receptor of people and discourses from the peripheries and also the radiator of people and discourses to the peripheries. Modernist life in this Vienna has a social, legal, and experiential past from which it inherits its cultural configurations. The ubiquity of servants makes this group of people a particularly apt lens to study the cultural persistence in multiple aspects of fin de siècle Vienna. Vienna thus being a multiethnic, polyglot crossroads of people serves as a medium to understand not only the city itself but also the Habsburg Empire on the whole.

The Schorskean paradigm—the argument that the Viennese fascination for and retreat into the world of the psyche resulted from the failure of Austrian liberalism—has stimulated much research on the crisis of liberalism. Several scholars have located the crisis in elite politics and culture. Jacques Le Rider argues that Viennese intellectuals faced a crisis of gender and ethnic identities.¹² John Boyer shows the crisis to be one that involved the rise of radical politics in the form of Karl Lueger and the Christian Socialist party.¹³ Forwarding Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin’s¹⁴ foray into questions about Viennese scientific theories, Deb-

orah Coen locates the crisis in the challenge that Austrian liberal scientists faced when defining scientific rationality.¹⁵ Steven Beller has pointed out that Coen's argument is a counterpart to James Schedel's work that resisted the Schorskean notion of withdrawal of the liberal bourgeoisie from politics. Schedel contended that the bourgeoisie was very much involved, perhaps overconfident and content about their connections in the bureaucracy.¹⁶ Many scholars have also expanded our perspective on fin de siècle Vienna, directing our lenses to the experience and contributions of specific communities. Steven Beller, George E. Berkley, Robert S. Wistrich, William O. McCagg Jr., and many others have incorporated different aspects of the Jewish experience into the Viennese fin de siècle. Similarly, Harriet Anderson, Alison Rose, Agatha Schwartz, and many others have written women into the story of the fin de siècle.¹⁷

More recently, scholars have reformulated the Schorskean thesis to open up new avenues of understanding the fin de siècle. David S. Luft, for instance, has highlighted that the infusion of philosophical irrationalism was an important aspect of fin de siècle intellectual life. He posits that Viennese discourses about sexuality and gender involved "understanding of the body as a biological reality . . . and a new understanding of the soul as feelings grounded in the body."¹⁸ Chandak Sengoopta similarly argues that the notion of sex hormones allowed fin de siècle scientists to remap the human body, and consequently they embarked on a project to "correct" deviances through medical intervention.¹⁹ Applying the concept of body as a discursive and social construction—a formulation articulated by Foucauldian feminists Judith Butler, Susan Bordo, among others—Alys X. George has emphasized the centrality of the body in the long era of Viennese modernism. Indeed, both Luft and George incorporate the interwar period into the story of Viennese modernism.²⁰ Such research displaces the psyche and instead places the body at the center of Viennese modernism. Similarly, Heidi Hakkarainen has highlighted the centrality of humor in the construction of modern Viennese space of the fin de siècle.²¹ Scholars have also sought to rethink the Schorskean paradigm by approaching the Habsburg Empire "from below," from the streets, the decay, and the crime, as well as the political and sensational involvement of the populace at large. Sexual and criminal subjects at the border of "normal" society take center stage in Scott Spector's examination of fin de siècle urban Central Europe, while Habsburg subjects of various linguistic, religious, and regional backgrounds and their participation in the political and social process are the focus of Pieter Judson's work.²² Daniel Vyleta explores the conceptualizations of Jews as criminals in fin de siècle Vienna, arguing that popular depictions of Jewish criminality were not yet influenced by biological models in the interwar period.²³ For Nancy M. Wingfield, people involved in the empire's commercial sex trade—prostitutes, pimps, and brothel madams—take the limelight.²⁴

All these studies center on the idea of historical rupture. My task in this book is to interrogate this notion of rupture that underlines so much of the scholarship

on modernism and modernity. To do this, one must first engage with what modernism has meant. The historical study of modernism and modernity can roughly be categorized into three stages. The first stage involved the work of scholars who found the foundational source of modernism in late nineteenth-century France. The movement, these scholars argue, stressed a break with the past, particularly traditional church doctrines. The second stage consisted of the inclusion of literary works from Italy, Spain, and Continental Europe. Continental Europe particularly received attention as the center of the crisis of modernity in the fin de siècle. But Britain and America were the focus when it came to the interwar period. The third stage consisted of exploring the discursiveness of modernism, an interpretation from cultural studies known as the linguistic turn. Discursive analysis immediately evokes Michel Foucault, whose studies on sexuality, mental illness, and forms of control have inspired a flurry of scholarship examining power relationships in social, political, cultural, economic, and linguistic contexts. A more recent avatar of this discursive turn is the emphasis on the body and embodiment. All these phases in the study of modernism focus on the rupture in time—a distinct break away from the past apparently inherent in modernism—to understand the cultural moment of the late nineteenth century extending into the interwar period.²⁵

The lacuna in the reckoning between masters and servants has extended to Habsburg scholarship when compared with other regions in the world. A flurry of historical, sociological, economic, literary, and interdisciplinary research on European as well as non-European servants dot the scholarly landscape.²⁶ Since the 1970s, scholarship has focused on specific members within the diverse category of servants. In this context, the feminization of domestic work has been the subject of inquiry for a preponderance of scholarship. Theresa McBride's seminal work *The Domestic Revolution* (1976) established female household servants to be central to the urbanization and industrialization processes in nineteenth-century England and France. She concludes that domestic service has a marginal place in modern developed societies. Following on the heels of McBride, feminist scholars and labor historians, Leonore Davidoff, Mary Romero, Karin Walser, Sarah Maza, Cissie Fairchilds, Dorothee Wierling, Barbara Kosta, and many others have furnished a continuous stream of scholarship on female domestics in England, France, Germany, and the United States. Furthermore, Anne McClintock, Rhacel Parreñas, Jacqueline Andall, Saskia Sassen, and many others have incorporated race, postcolonialism, migration, and globalism into the discussion. McBride's conclusion that domestic service would dwindle in modern developed societies has been contested since the publication of Niki Gregson and Michelle Lowe's influential book *Servicing the Middle Classes* in 1994 that revealed the "resurgence" of domestic service.²⁷ Although Karen Hansen, Majella Kilkey, Maria Rita Bartolomei, and others have studied male domestic workers, female household servants are still the primary lens of this field.²⁸

Moreover, much of the scholarship, even the historical and literary work, is generated with the implicit aim to promote the rights and improve the state of domestic workers. This is a noble endeavor, but because of this lens, scholarship on domestic service underscores the exploitative nature of the work, often referring to sexual exploitation, low wages, and deplorable living and working conditions.²⁹ Susan Yates, for example, in exploring maidservants in literature, argues that “the maidservant, as a woman of the working classes, is particularly alien to the imagination of the bourgeois male writer. Even when she is the subject of discourse, she is still represented as different, in some way less than fully human, along with other ‘inferior’ groups such as women, children and colonized natives.”³⁰ Recently, some scholars have underscored the importance of presenting a more nuanced view of the female servant. Anne McClintock’s research draws upon the works of Arthur Munby,³¹ Sigmund Freud, and Walter Benjamin to contradict the idea that “fetishistic iconographies” of master-servant, dirt-cleanliness, paid and unpaid domestic labor are male-centric. Instead she suggests that for countless women “fetishism was an attempt—ambiguous, contradictory and not always successful—to negotiate the boundaries of power in ways that do not yield simple lessons about dominance and submission.”³² Along the same lines, Judy Giles argues that it is “inaccurate to see mistress-servant relationships as simply the exploitation of one group of people by another.”³³ Furthermore, Helma Lutz’s research demonstrates that the relationships between masters and servants were “continually renegotiated.”³⁴ In an effort to draw upon both microhistory and global history approaches to domestic service, Amy Stanley has viewed “exercise of individual agency” in a specific space and time as a “variation of a common theme, one in which work in domestic service inspired a wider array of women to tell new kinds of stories about themselves, to imagine the possibility of disappearance and reinvention, even if these stories remained dreams, or threats, or outright lies.”³⁵

In the Habsburg context, the few works that have emerged in the field continue the aim to highlight the exploitative nature of the occupation.³⁶ The earliest work focusing on Vienna was Marina Tichy’s book, *Alltag und Traum* (1984). Tichy uses servant newspapers, low-brow, sensationalist, and commercial literature published for servants to reconstruct their living and working environment in Vienna, as well as the master-servant relationship. Her book argues that reading materials for a maidservant primarily focused on grooming, entertaining, and controlling her so that she did not disturb the bourgeois hierarchy.³⁷ Since then, Karin Pauleweit, Eva Eßlinger, Christine Rinne, and a few others have furnished similar works about maidservants in Viennese literature. Further, a steady stream of dissertations from the University of Vienna authored by Ursula Sander, Michaela Maria Hintermayr, Jessica Richter, and others again focus on the evolution of servant rights.³⁸

In highlighting cultural persistence, this work departs from other scholarly work on modernism and modernity. A project of this nature then must make a

judgment of where one looks when one speaks of culture and its productions. What is to be considered a cultural production and what is not? Accepting Patterson's argument that culture is not a single entity but a matrix of cultural configurations that interact temporally and spatially, this book peers at the realities of servant-class people's lives through a matrix of cultural constructs inherited and perpetuated by several historical actors. The servant girl, not the dreamer, is at the center of the study. This presents a unique problem as the servant girl is often—but not always—the silent background of the dream, while the dreamer is not. So, what can be known of the servant girl is only the dreamer's reaction to her presence, and subsequently Freud's interpretation of that reaction. Yet, we know what reactions the servant girl invoked in the dreamer and what interpretation Freud provides. We know something of the dreamer's neurosis from what or whom he is provoked by and what or whom he is rendering harmless through his interpretation of the dream. The act of the servant girl descending the stairs and invoking shame in the dreamer is not subversive—she is simply being human. It is the dreamer then who is neurotic. If enough of these reactions and interpretations were gathered then, something of the culture in which the servant girl lives, acts, and belongs can be known. The cultural productions that define modernism in this book then are not ones that have traditionally been identified as the canon of modernist high culture. If, as Treitschke argues, no high culture was possible without menial servants, then the canon is but one symptom of that culture and not its "source." The "source" must be the servants.

Stated differently, productions considered to be part of high culture did not create new values, they merely reflected the ones that society held to be true at the time. Freud's *Interpretation* and Musil's *The Man without Qualities*, in other words, are located at the tip of the iceberg. The canon is but one grid in the cultural matrix. Therefore, the sources in this book comprise the cultural productions of various social and political actors spanning a large period. They range from brochure literature, police records, medical data, judicial cases, and populist writings to newspaper articles that form the cultural matrix of a servant girl's life in the fin de siècle. In other words, my approach in this work is not restrained by the grid of high culture. Rather, my approach is to push this grid aside so that the underlying cultural lattices upon which it rests become apparent.

Vienna is a particularly suited locale to examine cultural persistence since it was at the center of the European imperial collapse. Despite intense artistic and scientific attempts, liberalism failed to grapple with the paradox of fin de siècle life. By the time *The Interpretation* appeared in 1900, the double bind in which Viennese liberals found themselves was that of promoting the liberal value of individual autonomy on the one hand and the cultural implications of receding paternalistic authority on the other. This anxiety found expression in the works of several fin de siècle writers who tried variously to make harmless the specter of the autonomous servant. In Freud's interpretation of his dream, of course, the

maidservant gains authority only due to his own psychological neuroses stemming from his mother's chastisement about his lack of cleanliness. "Only in our childhood was there a time," he asserts in his interpretation of the source of embarrassment in "typical" dreams, "when we were seen by our relatives as well as by strange nurses, servant girls, and visitors, in scanty clothing, and at that time we were not ashamed of our nakedness."³⁹ His mother's chastisements in his childhood combined with the shame over nakedness typically built in childhood resulted in a dream wherein "the servant girl develops a claim to be treated by me, in the dream as an incarnation of the prehistoric old woman."⁴⁰

Freud provided new jargons to understand the inner workings of the psyche; however, his interpretation in this instance was certainly not new. His interpretation was the banal inheritance of a persistent cultural construct that sought to render the servant girl harmless. If the so-called servant girl interpreted both the dream as well as Freud's interpretation of it, she might argue that the dreamer was horrified by the possibility that she, the servant girl, had a judgment of her own—a glimmer of which he saw when she chastised him for his lack of cleanliness. *That* would imply that the servant girl was not the "thing" he thought she was. She was just like him—another human being and not simply background furniture. In *that* case, *he* was guilty of treating and thinking of her as a furniture. So, Freud rendered this shocking possibility of his guilt harmless by interpreting the servant girl as an embodiment of his mother.

Although scarcely examined in the historiography, the servant girl's interpretation that I have put forth was also not new. Servant-class people, especially servant women, had started resisting the image foisted upon them by the upper classes at least from the time of Joseph II, if not earlier. As a means of resisting this image, some servants blamed their employers for their poor condition, while others took responsibility for their actions even in extremely difficult circumstances. Whatever the means of their resistance, it was clear that starting from the Josephine era, the servant class did not fit the image of harmless background furniture. Increasingly, they were in the foreground, and they had a judgment of their own. This counterimage, put forth mostly by servant women—rather aggressively in some instances—did not come about due to some legislation on the part of the Habsburg regime but through the fact that a large contingent of protestors who had marched on Versailles during the French Revolution were lower-class women. This meant that masters had to deal with their servants, especially female servants, in a way they never had before.

Like Freud, the incomplete masterpiece of the great Viennese writer Robert Musil *The Man without Qualities* assures the reader that the girl who accosted the sex murderer Moosbrugger was completely harmless, almost invisible, and readily available for the service of men's desires: "She was the kind of girl that hires herself out to men down there by the meadows, an out-of-work, runaway servant-girl, a little thing of whom there was nothing to be seen but two invei-

gling mouse-eyes gazing out from under her kerchief.”⁴¹ Nevertheless, Musil was less evasive than Freud in pointing out the underlying rumblings of discontent in a society too habituated to paternalism to respond to the growing discontent of the masses. The millionaire Arnheim’s paternalistic intentions towards his “negro” servant boy Soliman might have been noble “for seeing that Soliman, the little servant turned out a decent citizen,”⁴² however, for the servant “that hour, when he had been promoted from the uncertain status of a pet kept in luxury to being a servant with free board and lodging and a small wage, had caused a devastation in Soliman’s heart of which Arnheim had not the faintest notion.”⁴³ Musil, however, had the benefit of hindsight on *Kakanien*, the term he uses for Austria-Hungary in the period that the novel addresses, i.e., 1913. He had started work on the novel in 1924 and continued to write until his death in 1942.⁴⁴ By the time he started the novel, the Habsburg Empire had collapsed into smaller republics, and by the end of his life, Central Europe once again was at the center of a world war.

If we glance at the commentary from outside observers of the situation in Austria-Hungary, who did not have the benefit of hindsight, the problem is put to us straightforwardly. A 1913 article published in the influential English magazine *Fortnightly Review* titled “Austria, Disturber of the Peace” proclaimed:

Austria Hungary suffers from very dangerous social fissures. In the Dual Monarchy, the aristocracy and gentry still exercise medieval rights. Whilst the body politic of the country is ruled by race privilege, the body social is dominated by social privilege. . . . In the social, and especially in the economic, relations the characteristics are arrogance and brutality from above and humility and servility from below. The agricultural laborers, small farmers, and factory workers are treated almost like serfs. The servants, especially in the country are treated worse. They kiss the hands of their masters and the hem of their mistresses’ garments, and bodily chastisement is common. In Austria-Hungary beggars may be seen kneeling by the roadside before well-dressed passers-by. The women of the poorer classes are treated as chattels.⁴⁵

In 1913, this was the insight from a member of a society that had already grappled with the indelible question of whether culture without subservient servants could indeed be sustained. One might suggest that this grappling was largely unsuccessful in tearing down paternalistic instincts that kept servants in the shadows, especially in Europe’s imperial colonies.⁴⁶ Yet, as Theresa McBride, Sarah Maza, and others show, there is no denying that at least a partial reckoning had taken place in the Western Europe of the nineteenth century.⁴⁷

Within the Habsburg realm, the specter of this question grew ever starker since the liberal revolutions of 1848. The failure of Viennese liberal elites to address this question was the underlying neurosis of the *fin de siècle*. I am reminded of Suzi Gablik’s words, “for better or worse, modern consciousness is solitary, consequent to the disestablishing of communal reality . . . if the great modern enterprise has been freedom, the modern hubris is, finally, the refusal to accept

any limits.”⁴⁸ The anxiety that freedom had limits expressed itself in the form of deranged obsessions with statistics, mobile populations, diseased bodies, sexuality, aesthetics, crime, and working-class lifestyles in fin de siècle Vienna—an obsession that spread to the peripheries of the empire through a complex network of medico-policing surveillance and sociopolitical movements. If the body, as Alys George argues, was central to the medical landscape of fin de siècle Vienna, numbers offered sustenance for this obsession with the body. One body was not enough—many bodies were needed, especially migrant, especially female, especially servant. The source of the neuroses manifested in the form of the many migrants who relentlessly flocked to urban centers, especially Vienna, from the peripheries and took up menial jobs. The female servant on whom all these obsessions could be projected was the symptom of unaddressed questions—a reckoning that had not taken place. Indeed, the unifying object about which dialogue could be had between sociopolitical groups with little else in common was the female servant. The story of the maidservant in Vienna, therefore, is the story of the Habsburg Empire and its subsequent collapse. The servant question in Vienna thus falls at the crux of the empire’s collapse.

Even though these intense sociopolitical dialogues variously called the Servant Question, the *Dienstbotenfrage*, *crise de la domesticité*, and *crisi delle domestiche* swept through fin de siècle Europe, the nature of the dialogue in fin de siècle Austria-Hungary was remarkably indifferent and evasive. By the late nineteenth century, the intellectual and political traditions in other regions of Europe had a formulated framework to address the Servant Question. In Western Europe and North America liberalism took a distinctive form—one that stressed individualism, rationalism, and freedom. In protestant German-speaking Central Europe, the Kantian formulation of individual freedom regulated by rational laws was the enshrined liberal principle. However, post-1848 Austrian liberalism was about “the liberation of the unbound man from the interference of the state” and the Catholic Church.⁴⁹ The primary focus of Austrian liberal culture was the participation of “men of property and education” in the political process. From the 1860s onward, the strain of philosophical irrationalism stemming from the ideas of Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche also became predominant in liberal Vienna.⁵⁰

Liberal Western Europe and protestant German-speaking Central Europe addressed throughout the nineteenth century, intellectually, socially, and legally, the questions inherent in the Servant Problem—questions of paternalism, self-determination, and autonomy. Nineteenth-century American intellectuals during the Civil War era addressed these questions as well. The result of intellectually, socially, and legally grappling with the Servant Question was the disintegration of eighteenth-century paternalistic relationships in these regions. Particularly in Western Europe, the intellectual engagement with the problems of the oppressed classes had produced specialized professions and careers within these classes that

no longer operated on the paternalistic master-servant model. Raffaella Sarti has argued that “these changes were affected by the crisis of the aristocratic way expressing and representing prestige and power and by the policies introduced to fight luxury, which convinced several masters to reduce the number of servants hired for display.”⁵¹ The aristocratic crisis in Western Europe and the Civil War in the United States enabled these regions to “put off” the reckoning with history for another century. This aristocratic crisis was delayed if not entirely denied in the instance of the nineteenth-century Habsburg Empire. The questions underlining the Servant Question were addressed during Joseph II’s reign. Joseph II took the *laissez-faire* approach to master-servant relationships. While his policies prompted a more enlightened approach to servants, he also created a legal structure (on these issues) that could, with little effort, be used to break the enlightenment tide. Subsequently, Francis I in 1810 broke the Josephine tide of the previous century with the 1810 Codes.

After 1850, the unevenness of industrialization and urbanization within the empire spurred large-scale internal migrations.⁵² As a result, Vienna drew many men and women of the Catholic faith from Bohemia and Moravia to avail opportunities in the many economic initiatives in the city.⁵³ In the 1860s, the Habsburg Empire experienced intense political changes. The early 1860s was a period of constitutional experiments. The February Patent of 1861, for instance, created a Lower Austrian Assembly. Vienna remained under the jurisdiction of the Lower Austrian government until 1918. Furthermore, in 1862, Franz Josef issued a *Gemeindegeseztz* (Municipality Law) that granted increased autonomy to local municipal governments in Cisleithanian Austria, including independent administration of the local police. Franz Josef’s constitutional experiments in the period between 1860 and 1867 culminated in the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867. The compromise created a Dual Monarchy, following which the Kingdom of Hungary and the Austrian half (Cisleithanian) of the empire functioned as two autonomous units. The 1860s was also time of intense economic expansion (*Gründerzeit*) and industrialization within the empire. Although the economic growth between the panic of 1873 and 1896 remained slow, the tide of internal migration did not recede.⁵⁴

The urban liberal bourgeoisie, who had emerged as the principal employers of servants both in households as well as in businesses by 1848, attempted to address the problems with the 1810 Codes during the *Vormärz*. After 1848, they were intellectually paralyzed by the rising strength of an increasingly feminized servant class. While the disenfranchisement of peasants in the distant peripheries of Bohemia, Moravia, and Galicia could not have stirred their response, the increasing number of migrants from the far stretches of the empire manifesting in their houses, cafés, and public spaces impinged upon the vision and vocabulary of the liberal bourgeoisie. One of the things that the bourgeoisie did not seem to know was that the servants whom they wished to treat as some kind of mechani-

cal objects working in the background were just like themselves. They could also lie, cheat, murder, and use the law in perverse ways. This posed a challenge to the bourgeoisie. In this context, the liberal intellectuals failed to free themselves from a vocabulary that could not, in Baldwin's words, "bear the weight of reality" and chose instead to perpetuate age-old stereotypes.⁵⁵ Thus, instead of creating a dialogue with their servants, the liberal bourgeoisie became deeply implicated in the "Other"-ing of vast swaths of the empire's population. But the liberal ideals of science and reason that many intellectuals espoused were not themselves implicated in this process of "Other"-ing. They were just one of the many faculties deployed by an increasingly neurotic liberal intelligentsia to prove stereotypes about the servant girl true: that she was indeed one to be rendered subservient and one to be subjected to paternalistic supervision. After 1879, liberals lost their political lead in Vienna and began to gradually retreat. By the mid-1880s, the serious engagement with underlying servant-class questions were left to emerging populist parties at both ends of the political spectrum, particularly the Christian Socials and the Social Democrats.

Debates on the Servant Question started in the Lower Austrian Assembly in 1883 and continued till 1911, when a new Service Order finally came into effect. The Social Democrats who aligned with the emerging feminist and workers' movements attempted to continue the emancipatory precepts of liberalism by seeking to professionalize the servant occupation while calling for universal suffrage. However, they were confronted with a servant class that was extraordinarily diverse, from the serf-like state of many laborers to pedagogically advanced governesses and financially (and culturally) sound butlers and caretakers. Population census data were difficult to interpret and compare since the category of "servant" often reflected the image of a servant held by the people who collected the data and further changed depending upon the changing social position of the groups.⁵⁶ The arcane 1810 Codes were the overarching governing framework for this extraordinarily diverse population that essentially saw no specialization under the law throughout the nineteenth century. In other words, the common feature of the Habsburg working classes was that, except for the people engaged in some specialized work that came under guild laws, most were "servants" under the law. The members of the diverse servant class, thus, had no unifying occupational, racial, gender-based, or many times even class-based identity. Furthermore, the groups that were on the better end of the spectrum had built their entire lives often successfully around the paternalistic precepts of the 1810 Codes and indeed the prestige, privileges, and protections it granted them.

The left-wing Social Democrats, rather, imposed an identity on this diverse group—one that epitomized poor, unskilled, and feminized work. The identity was manufactured from a preexisting cultural construct, some strains of French anti-Romanticism, and some trends in other regions of Europe. In nineteenth-century Florence, for example, the feminization of servants occurred due to the

aristocracy's increased demand for female servants, and therefore more women entered the occupation. In Germany, the servant was clearly distinguished from day-wage laborers, the latter of which was predominated by males.⁵⁷ In any case, this concocted identity aligned with the sociopolitical agendas of women's and workers' rights that the left-wing Social Democratic Worker's Party espoused and provided them a base to call for unionization of servants against the paternalism of the 1810 Codes. However, what was on offer in place of the paternalism was more aggressive paternalism. The imposition of a homogenous identity upon them stirred deep discontent among certain members of the servant class, indifference to these movements among some others, and social and economic marginalization for still others.

On the other hand, the right-wing Christian Socials who represented the interests of the Catholic lower middle class were in many ways as apathetic toward the plight of the working classes as higher middle-class liberals.⁵⁸ But, unlike liberals, Christian Socials did not retreat from grappling with the Servant Question. Like the Social Democrats, they conceptualized servants as victims. But they offered up antisemitism as a solution. Indeed, antiliberal antisemitism appealed to some groups within the servant class who resented the identity imposed upon them by the Social Democrats. Other groups embraced nationalistic identities, such as that of the Czech identity that was also on offer due to the rise of regional nationalisms elsewhere within the empire.⁵⁹ As Gary B. Cohen argues, in the Bohemian capital of Prague, "a long series of political contests over both the tokens and the reality of group existence in the city . . . actually forced many individuals to define and articulate loyalties to one side or the other."⁶⁰ To forward their peculiar projects, political parties as well as intellectuals appropriated the police, who through extensive networks furnished the requisite information. The gathering of this information was grounded in inherited cultural constructs often passed off as "experience" or "reasonable assumptions."

Servants are ubiquitous in nineteenth-century written records.⁶¹ My book does not focus on reconstructing the life and work of actual individual servants but the rhetoric attached to servanthood and instances of choice. The written materials that I use reveal not only the voices of the maidservants themselves but also the voices of police officials, medical professionals, hospitality industry employees, anti-*Mädchenhandel* campaigners, populists, and feminists who participated in imprinting maidservants with labels of immorality, sexual aggressiveness, vagrancy, disease, and victimhood.

The women's voices appear in the sources for specific reasons. These were women who came in contact with the police and the judiciary on account of their choices: the choice to enter sex work, the choice to murder their employer, or the choice to be a murderer's accomplice and/or lover. While these instances do not reveal the complete life stories of the women in question, they focus on the context of the specific choice. One could argue that these voices do not repre-

sent the life of a “typical” maidservant in fin de siècle Vienna. But these instances, in Amy Stanley’s words, “show us that the global economy was made up . . . of individuals and their choices.”⁶² These instances also reveal which stories specific sociopolitical players chose to incorporate in the narratives they deployed, which ones they excluded, and for what reasons.

The interpretation of some archival records used in this study requires additional caution as they contain only fragmented segments. This is especially true for archival records on prostitution. Many scholars refer to this problem in their work.⁶³ For archives in Cisleithanian Austria, specifically, Nancy M. Wingfield points out, “we do not know why some records were saved and some were not.”⁶⁴ Furthermore, the records on “prostitution” and *Mädchenhandel* are combined in the police archives of Vienna. My interest in these records is limited to cases that involved servants who chose “prostitution” or were “victims” of alleged *Mädchenhandel* operations or were “rescued” from *Mädchenhändler* and procurers. I also examine cases pertaining to another group of women who appear in these records, that is, waitresses and female cashiers, since they were considered servants until 1885.

The interpretations I provide for the case studies in this book do not make any assumptions on what information was available to the “victims” in question or what they were thinking when they made the decisions they did. Indeed, it is unlikely that these “victims” knew clearly and accurately about the offers made to them. Even if these offers were suspicious, these “victims” may have been in extreme financial circumstances, and the weight of hope and expectations with few clear options may have been powerful. Indeed, these “victims” may simply have ended up in their circumstances through duplicity, misapprehension, and/or inflated expectations. The “experience” and paternalism upon which the system of medico-policing in fin de siècle Vienna was based make it extraordinarily difficult to approach the “truth” about these cases. While the “victims” in question may certainly have been misinformed or duped, it would be fallacious to assume that it is the *only* possible interpretation for every case in the genre. Such an interpretation assumes that the “victims” were devoid of reason and agency and could not possibly negotiate the system of paternalism to which they were subject. The interpretations I provide then argue for a multidimensional view of the cases in question. All cases were *not* the same, and the “victims” involved were also *not* the same. It is conceivable, I argue, that the “victims” preferred the sex industry over the “respectable” life of menial work and servitude to bourgeois employers, and police brutality. Perhaps, they were aware of, resented, and did not wish to cater to or abide by the assumptions upon which the categories of “respectability” and “disrepute” were based given that these categories only constrained their options in already strained financial circumstances.

The voices of panderers or procurers, both male and female, frequently appear in vice police records. Section §512 of the Austrian Penal Code of 1889 included

Mädchenhandel (trading in girls) and *Kuppelei* (procuring or pandering) under the same legal category and often meted out similar punishments. Although there were differences in the functions of various types of procurers and panders involved in the empire's sex trade, I do not elaborate on these gradations in this book, and I use the terms "procurer" and "panderer" interchangeably to refer to persons who arranged the transport, supply, and distribution of women in the commercial sex industry. The term *Mädchenhandel* literally translates as "trading in girls" or "commerce in girls." The more politically charged translations are "trafficking in girls," "female trafficking," and "sex trafficking."⁶⁵ Sex worker activists around the world have long battled these terms, arguing that they forward negative stereotypes about sex work. While many of these stereotypes were prevalent in the nineteenth century, some connotations are much more recent.⁶⁶ With a view to resist introducing present-day stereotypes that the word "trafficking" bears in the context of the nineteenth century, I avoid using translations and retain the word *Mädchenhandel* throughout this work. Furthermore, I also resist translating the term *Mädchenhändler* as "trafficker" and retain the German word. When the context demands, I use the phrase "trading" or "transporting" rather than "trafficking," and anti-*Mädchenhandel* campaigners rather than anti-trafficking campaigners. I use the term "white slave trade" when referring to the Europe-wide rhetorical phenomenon, which, in German-speaking parts of the continent, is again captured by the term *Mädchenhandel*.

While I am sensitive to the negative connotations associated with the term "prostitute," for the sake of authenticity I translate *prostituerte* as "prostitute" and use this term throughout the book as opposed to "sex worker," since the time period under consideration was the era of regulation. The term *Dirne*, which is more prevalent in records prior to 1850, appears occasionally in my sources. The term originally referred to servants, but the secondary meaning of a young, single woman became more popular in the eighteenth century.⁶⁷ In the nineteenth century, the term was applied to young, attractive, and unattached working-class women. The term also had moral overtones, indicating a young woman who was promiscuous and entertained extramarital relations. In some contexts, it could be translated as "whore" or "prostitute." I leave the term *Dirne* untranslated throughout this book as it does not bear the same connotations as the corresponding words in English. Other terms such as *Lohnhuren*, *Freudenmädchen*, and *öffentlichen Frauenpersonen* I translate as "wage whores," "girls of pleasure," and "public women," respectively. Moreover, I use the morally charged terms "prostitution," "debauchery," "promiscuity," "immorality," and "whoring" only when context requires. Otherwise, I use phrases such as "commercial sex" and "sex trading" to denote actions that involved engaging in sex in exchange for money and gifts as well as actions that enabled these exchanges such as procurement and pandering.

Terms used to refer to servants are various.⁶⁸ In records prior to 1850, the term *Gesinde* is common and, in fact, represents a larger group of people of both gen-

ders such as agricultural workers and servants working in shops, pubs, inns, and so on. After 1850, the terms *Dienstmädchen* and *Dienstboten* are more prevalent. The former translates as “maidservant” and the latter is just “servant.” However, both terms usually indicate a female servant, unless mentioned otherwise. *Dienstmagd*, *Dienstmäd'l*, *Dienstmädel*, all translating as maidservant, are less frequently used in the Austrian context, and such usages usually indicate the source is from Germany. *Hausmagd* and *Hausmädchen* translated as “housemaid” is also uncommon, and, when used, they refer specifically to servants who work in a bourgeois household or in lower positions in an aristocratic household as opposed to more general terms like *Dienstboten* that also include servants working in pubs, inns, and hotels. The term *Stubenmädchen*, which translates as “chambermaid,” is a term used for parlor maids or a lady’s handmaid in aristocratic households. But, in the last decades of the nineteenth century, the term also referred to maidservants who cleaned hotel rooms and *Gasthaus* rooms. The terms *Hausgehilfen* and *Hauspersonal* translated as “domestic help” and “domestic personnel” were terms employed by servant rights movements who sought to professionalize domestic service.

Throughout this book, I resist the use of the term “domestic worker,” a relatively recent phrase, to maintain temporal authenticity. When I use the term “maidservant” it includes female cooks, nannies, maidservants, chambermaids, maids-of-all-work, governesses, and occasionally wet nurses. Furthermore, the term is not limited to women working in bourgeois households. Although bourgeois households were the principal employers, the aristocracy, the hospitality industry, and small businesses also employed and provided lodging to servants. To be as authentic as possible, when the sources specify the type of servant, I translate with specific terms such as “chambermaid” or “maid of all work.” *Knecht* and *Diener* refer to a male servant and are translated as “male servant” or “manservant” and, according to context, more specifically, as “footman” or “hotel manservant.” Throughout this book, I do not translate place names. Instead, I use the name specified in the records under consideration. For example, Mährisch, Ostrava, and Ostrawa refer to the same place in German, Czech, and Polish languages, respectively. However, if “Mährisch” is the term used in one written record and “Ostrava” in the other, I use the terms exactly as is when referring to each source.

Chapter 1 examines the cultural construct of the “itinerant maidservant.” I argue that the itinerant maidservant was the most persistent cultural construct in the Habsburg realm. It emerged from a legacy of suspicion that the Habsburg state, from the time of its inception, bore toward “free” people—that is, those people who were mobile, neither owning property nor owned as property themselves. The chapter traces the transmission of this cultural construct to the nineteenth century via judicial and social discourses. Chapter 2 illuminates how the 1810 Franciscan Codes served as the crucible for sustaining the cultural construct of the itinerant maidservant well into the nineteenth century. I argue that the

vagueness of the 1810 Codes permitted the tightening of the cultural definition of the term “servant” as the century progressed. “Servant,” by the end of the nineteenth century, meant a poor, lower-class, migrant woman with questionable morals performing menial tasks in a bourgeois household. Chapter 3 argues that the increased encroachment of physicians caused male servants to distance themselves from the servant occupation. By the *fin de siècle*, servanthood was transformed from an occupation comprising a diverse set of people to an identity that encompassed a very specific subsection of the population. In chapter 4, I argue that the exaltation of statistics as an impartial instrument of measurement legitimized policing biases and enabled the police to increase surveillance and targeting of servant-class women. This obsession with numbers masked several underlying changes triggered by urbanization in the late nineteenth century.

Chapter 5 highlights the role played by *fin de siècle* feminist and populist movements in perpetuating the age-old cultural construct of the itinerant maid-servant. The victim narrative masked varying levels of maternalism, ignorance, and downright hypocrisy exhibited by these movements. Through the examination of police records from the perspective that women were adults capable of intelligence and self-determination even in the context of shrinking economic opportunities, I argue that paternalistic discourses exaggerated the idea that servants were passive victims and negated any possibility of women’s willing participation. Furthermore, I highlight that the identity politics promoted by these movements caused the diverse servant occupation to fragment into smaller groups of people who sought to distance themselves from the occupation. Chapter 6 analyzes the discourse of the maidservant victim from the perspective of criminal acts. This chapter argues that an incessant blind spot existed in Habsburg society when it came to viewing women as capable of perpetrating or colluding with crimes. When confronted with a female perpetrator, the most frequent excuse was that she was a victim of improper upbringing, abuse, debilitating poverty, and/or abandonment following seduction. The conclusion illuminates the persistence of the cultural construct in the debates about domestic service in interwar Red Vienna.

Thus, in tracing the persistence of these cultural constructs, this book offers a fresh look at what went wrong with the Habsburg Empire. Instead of older narratives of inept bureaucrats and military leadership, the pages that follow show an entire society crumbling atop an outdated and untenable paternalistic system of control. Could these constructs have been discarded in favor of a reckoning? This question saturates the pages that follow.

Notes

1. Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, trans. A. A. Brill (New York, 1913), 201–2.
2. *Ibid.*, 202–3, 206–9.
3. Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York, 2012).
4. Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I* (Cambridge, 2004).
5. Henry William Carless Davis, *The Political Thought of Heinrich von Treitschke* (London, 1914), 137.
6. James Baldwin, “Unnameable Objects, Unspeakable Crimes,” in *The White Problem in America* (Chicago, 1966).
7. Nitin Sinha, “Who Is (Not) a Servant Anyway? Domestic Servants and Service in Early Colonial India,” *Modern Asian Studies* 55, no. 1 (2021): 152–206.
8. Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, 1991); Steven Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution* (Chicago, 1996).
9. Orlando Patterson and Ethan Fosse, eds., *The Cultural Matrix: Understanding Black Youth* (Cambridge MA, 2015), 7–8. See also, Orlando Patterson, *Freedom in the Making of Western Culture*, vol. 1 (New York, 1991).
10. Theresa M. McBride, *The Domestic Revolution: The Modernisation of Household Service in England and France 1820–1920* (New York, 1976).
11. See, for instance, Randall Collins, “The Rise and Fall of Modernism in Politics and Religion,” *Acta Sociologica* 35, no. 3 (1992): 171–86.
12. Jacques Le Rider, *Modernity and Crises of Identity: Culture and Society in Fin-de-siècle Vienna* (New York, 1993).
13. John W. Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna: Christian Socialism in Power, 1897–1918* (Chicago, 1995).
14. Allan Janik and Stephen Toulmin, *Wittgenstein’s Vienna* (New York, 1973).
15. Deborah R. Coen, *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty: Science, Liberalism, and Private Life* (Chicago, 2008), 12.
16. Steven Beller, review of *Vienna in the Age of Uncertainty: Science, Liberalism, and Private Life*, by Deborah R. Coen, *Habsburg H-Net Reviews* (January 2010). See also, Andrew Barker, “Rethinking Vienna 1900,” *Austrian History, Culture and Society* 3 (2003): 226–28.
17. Steven Beller, *Vienna and the Jews, 1867–1938* (Cambridge, 1989); George E. Berkley, *Vienna and Its Jews: The Tragedy of Success, 1880s–1980s* (Cambridge, MA, 1988); Robert S. Wistrich, *The Jews of Vienna in the Age of Franz Joseph* (Liverpool, 2006); William O. McCagg Jr., *A History of Habsburg Jews, 1670–1918* (Bloomington, 1989); Harriet Anderson, *Utopian Feminism: Women’s Movements in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna* (New Haven, 1992); Alison Rose, *Jewish Women in Fin de Siècle Vienna* (Austin, 2008); Agatha Schwartz, *Shifting Voices: Feminist Thought and Women’s Writing in Fin-de-Siècle Austria and Hungary* (Montreal and Kingston, 2008).
18. David S. Luft, *Eros and Inwardness in Vienna* (Chicago, 2003), 2.
19. Chandak Sengoopta, *The Most Secret Quintessence of Life: Sex, Glands, and Hormones, 1850–1950* (Chicago, 2006).
20. Alys X. George, *The Naked Truth: Viennese Modernism and the Body* (Chicago, 2020), 9–10.

21. Heidi Hakkarainen, *Comical Modernity: Popular Humour and the Transformation of Urban Space in Late Nineteenth Century Vienna*, vol. 23 (New York, 2019), 8.
22. Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire: A New History* (Cambridge, MA, 2016); Scott Spector, *Violent Sensations: Sex, Crime, and Utopia in Vienna and Berlin, 1860–1914* (Chicago, 2016).
23. Daniel M. Vyleta, *Crime, Jews, and News: Vienna, 1895–1914* (New York, 2007).
24. Nancy M. Wingfield, *The World of Prostitution in Late Imperial Austria* (Chicago, 2017).
25. See Vincent Sherry, ed., *The Cambridge History of Modernism* (Cambridge, 2017).
26. For a historiography of domestic service, see Raffaella Sarti, “Historians, Social Scientists, Servants and Domestic Workers: Fifty Years of Research on Domestic and Care Work,” in *International Review of Social History* 59, no. 2 (2014): 279–314.
27. Sarti, “Historians,” 298.
28. *Ibid.*, 296, 308.
29. Karin Wälsler, “Prostitutionsverdacht und Geschlechterforschung: Das Beispiel der Dienstmädchen um 1900,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 11, no. 1 (1985): 99–111.
30. Susan Yates, *Maid and Mistress: Feminine Solidarity and Class Difference in Five Nineteenth-Century French Texts* (New York, 1992), 21.
31. On the relationship between Arthur Munby and the maidservant Hannah Cullwick, see Liz Stanley, ed., *The Diaries of Hannah Cullwick, Victorian Maidservant* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1984).
32. Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York, 1995), 138.
33. Judy Giles, “Authority, Dependence and Power in Accounts of Twentieth-Century Domestic Service,” in *The Politics of Domestic Authority in Britain since 1800*, ed. L. Delap, Ben Griffin and Abigail Wills (London, 2009), 218.
34. Helma Lutz, *The New Maids: Transnational Women and the Care Economy*, trans. Deborah Shannon (New York, 2011), 2, 47.
35. Amy Stanley, “Maidservants’ Tales: Narrating Domestic and Global History of Eurasia, 1600–1900,” *American Historical Review* 121, no. 2 (2016): 460.
36. I have elaborated on a few theses, but there are many more on maidservants from Vienna University in the past three decades, such as Marcus Casutt, “Häusliches Dienstpersonal (insbesondere Dienstmädchen) im Wien des 19. Jahrhunderts” (PhD diss., Universität Wien, 1995); Gabriele Czachay, “Die soziale Situation der Hausgehilfinnen Wiens in der Zwischenkriegszeit” (master’s thesis, Universität Wien, 1985); Rafaela Eichinger, “Frau und Mutter Kirche: Probleme der beruflichen Sozialisation katholischer Pfarrhaushälterinnen; Eine empirische Studie (ab 1950)” (master’s thesis, Universität Wien, 2011); Barbara Grandl, “Dienstbotenlektüre: Vom Leben und Lesen weiblicher Hausbediensteter in Wien um 1900” (master’s thesis, Universität Wien, 2013); Maria Holzer, “Dienstmädchen um 1900 im I. Wiener Bezirk” (master’s thesis, Universität Wien, 1985); Luise Kobau, “Zur sozialen und wirtschaftlichen Lage der weiblichen Dienstboten in Wien, 1914–1938” (PhD diss., Universität Wien, 1985); Maria Samhaber, “Häusliches Personal in Wien von 1890 bis 1920: Arbeits- und Lebensbedingungen von Dienstmädchen; ‘Dienstbotenno’ oder die Not der Dienstboten” (master’s thesis, Universität Wien, 1980); Hedwig Fohringer, “Männliche und weibliche Dienstboten vor Gericht in der landesfürstlichen Stadt Eggenburg im Zeitraum von 1700 bis 1750” (PhD diss., Universität Wien, 2014); Wolfgang Gasser, “Jüdische DienstbotInnen in Wien—von den na-

- poleonischen Kriegen, dem Biedermeier bis zur 1848-Revolution” (master’s thesis, Wien Universität, 2001). There is also Claudia Harrasser’s bibliographical work, *Von Dienstubten und Landarbeitern: Eine Bibliographie zu (fast) vergessenen Berufen* (Innsbruck/Wien, 1996); Roman Sandgruber, “Dienstmädchen um 1900 im I. Wiener Bezirk” (master’s thesis, Wien Universität, 1985); Beate Wirthensohn, “Hausgehilfinnen und Hausfrauen: Aspekte einer konfliktreichen Beziehung; Wien 1893–1934; Im Spiegel bürgerlicher und sozialdemokratischer Frauenpresse” (master’s thesis, Wien Universität, 1987). Further, there is Sabine Smolik’s thesis on maidservants in Salzburg, “Zur Situation der Dienstmädchen in der Stadt Salzburg von 1880 bis 1914” (master’s thesis, Universität Salzburg, 1989). Karin Pauleweit’s work draws upon literary sources and autobiographical writings of maidservants from fin de siècle Berlin and Vienna to provide a comprehensive account of how maidservants perceived themselves. See Karin Pauleweit, *Dienstmädchen um die Jahrhundertwende: Im Selbstbildnis um im Spiegel der zeitgenössischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1993).
37. Marina Tichy, *Alltag und Traum: Leben und Lektüre der Dienstmädchen im Wien der Jahrhundertwende* (Vienna, Köln, Graz, 1984).
 38. Eva Eßlinger, *Das Dienstmädchen, die Familie und der Sex: Zur Geschichte einer irregulären Beziehung in der europäischen Literatur* (München, 2013); Michaela Maria Hintermayr, “Diskurs über Suizide und Suizidversuche von Hausgehilfinnen in Wien zwischen 1925 und 1933/34,” (PhD diss., Universität Wien, 2010); Jessica Richter, “Die Produktion besonderer Arbeitskräfte: Auseinandersetzungen um den häuslichen Dienst in Österreich (Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1938),” (PhD diss., Wien Universität, 2017); Christine Rinne, “Mastering the Maidservant: *Dienstmädchen* Fantasies in Germany and Austria, 1794-1918,” (PhD diss., Indiana University, 2005); Ursula Maria Sander, “Häusliches Dienstpersonal im späten 19. Jahrhundert,” (master’s thesis, Universität Wien, 2008). Domestic service in non-European contexts and female labor migrations from developing countries to more developed countries has received much scholarly attention. For instance, see Michele Ruth Gamburd, *The Kitchen Spoon’s Handle: Transnationalism and Sri Lanka’s Migrant Housemaids* (Ithaca, NY, 2000); Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work* (Berkeley, 2003). Since the resurgence of the domestic service occupation in Western countries, recent scholarly research in the area is devoted to incorporating women’s work in the household into mainstream labor history. An important scholarly work in this context is the edited volume by Raffaella Sarti, Anna Bellavitis, and Manuela Martini. This volume approaches the question of what is work from the perspective of the historical and sociological importance of home-based productive labors that includes unpaid, paid, hybrid, and intermediate work. Domestic servants are an important category of people who perform these forms of labor. See, Raffaella Sarti, Anna Bellavitis, and Manuela Martini, eds., *What Is Work? Gender at the Crossroads of Home, Family, and Business from the Early Modern Era to the Present* (New York, 2018).
 39. Freud, *The Interpretation*, 203–4.
 40. *Ibid.*, 209.
 41. Robert Musil, *The Man without Qualities*, vol. 1, trans. Eithne Wilkins and Ernst Kaiser (New York, 1965), 81.
 42. *Ibid.*, 262.
 43. *Ibid.*
 44. Luft, *Eros and Inwardness*, 92.

45. Arthur Preuss, *The Fortnightly Review 1913*, vol. 20 (London, 2018), 251–52.
46. See, for example, McClintock, *Imperial Leather*.
47. McBride, *The Domestic Revolution*; Sara Maza, *Servants and Masters in 18th-Century France: The Uses of Loyalty* (New Jersey, 1983).
48. Suzi Gablik, *Has Modernism Failed?* (London, 2004), 9.
49. Luft, *Eros and Inwardness*, 7.
50. *Ibid.*, 7–9.
51. Raffaella Sarti, “Who Are Servants? Defining Domestic Service in Western Europe (16th–21st Centuries),” in S. Pasleau and I. Schopp (eds.), with R. Sarti, *Proceedings of the “Servant Project,”* 5 vols., vol. 2, *Liege, Éditions de l’Université de Liège*, 2005 (but 2006): pp. 3–59. [Cited in the format requested by the author.]
52. Annemarie Steidl, “Migration Patterns in the late Habsburg Empire,” in *Migration in Austria*, ed. Günter Bischof and Dirk Rupnow (New Orleans, 2017), 69–86.
53. Monika Gletler, *Böhmisches Wien* (Vienna, 1985), 65. In addition to late industrialization and urbanization, the large-scale influx of migrants to Vienna is also related to some changes that took place in the Bohemian and Moravian agriculture. See Petra Grešlová, Simone Gingrich, Fridolin Krausmann, Pavel Chromý, and Vít Jančák, “Social Metabolism of Czech Agriculture in the Period 1830–2010,” *AUC Geographica* 50, no. 1 (2015): 23–35.
54. Luft, *Eros and Inwardness*, 18.
55. See, Eddie S. Glaude Jr., *Begin Again: James Baldwin’s America and Its Urgent Lessons for Our Own* (New York, 2020).
56. Sarti, “Who Are Servants?” 23–25.
57. *Ibid.*, 19–20.
58. Luft, *Eros and Inwardness*, 20.
59. Jakub S. Beneš, *Workers and Nationalism: Czech and German Social Democracy in Habsburg Austria, 1890–1918* (New York, 2017); Monika Gletler, *Sokol und Arbeiterverein (D. T.J.) der Wiener Tschechen bis 1914: Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der nationalen Bewegung in beiden Organisationen* (München und Vienna, 1970).
60. Gary B. Cohen, *The Politics of Ethnic Survival: Germans in Prague, 1861–1914* (West Lafayette, 2006), 17.
61. The life stories and autobiographies of some nineteenth-century servants are contained in special collections, and some accounts such as that of Helene Gasser are published. See DOKU, Helene Gasser, *Memoiren einer Köchin*, 1834. Her life story is transcribed, written, and published by Althaus and is key source material for Althaus’s book on the daily lives of maidservants in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. See, Andrea Althaus, ed., *Mit Kochlöffel und Staubwedel: Erzählungen aus dem Dienstmädchenalltag* (Vienna, 2010).
62. Amy Stanley, “Maidservants’ Tales,” *American Historical Review* 121, no. 2 (2016): 460.
63. Wingfield, *World of Prostitution*, 15; Nicole von Germeten, *Profit and Passion: Transactional Sex in Colonial Mexico* (Oakland, 2018), 3; Timothy Gilfoyle, “Prostitutes in the Archives: Problems and Possibilities in Documenting the History of Sexuality,” *American Archivist* 57, no. 3 (1994): 514–27; Carolyn Steedman, *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History* (New Brunswick, 2002); Ann Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ, 2009).
64. Wingfield, *World of Prostitution*, 15.
65. There is lot of literature on the political implications of the word “trafficking.” For instance, see Adanna Chi Mgbako, *To Live Freely in This World: Sex Worker Activism in*

- Africa* (New York, 2016); Lisa Duggan and Nan D. Hunter, *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture* (New York, 1995); Melinda Chateauvert, *Sex Workers Unite: A History of the Movement from Stonewall to Slutwalk* (Boston, 2014). For a broader survey on prostitution scholarship, see, Elizabeth Clement, "Prostitution," in *Palgrave Advances in Modern History of Sexuality*, ed. H. G. Cocks and Matt Houlbrook (New York, 2006), 206–30.
66. See, for instance, Kamala Kempadoo, Jyoti Sanghera, and Bandana Pattanaik, eds., *Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New Perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Rights* (New York, 2016).
67. Michael Mitterauer, "Servants and Youth," *Community and Change* 5, no. 1 (1990): 11–12.
68. For details on terms used for servants in the German-speaking world, see, Mitterauer, "Servants and Youth," 11–38.