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The purpose of this book is to present an overview of the interdisciplinary potential of art and psychoanalysis, and to demonstrate that each field can enrich and enlarge the other. This is not intended to be a definitive study, but rather a series of related essays exploring some of the ways in which psychoanalytic insights elucidate creativity and its products. I survey a few of the “quarrels” between art historians and psychoanalysts over methodology and also apply psychoanalytic readings to works of art and artists from iconographic, textual, biographical, and aesthetic points of view. Clinical and other asides that are explanatory or that illustrate theoretical material are set apart from the main text and printed in italics. Unless otherwise indicated, clinical examples are taken from my own psychoanalytic practice.

My focus is historical as well as methodological and therefore emphasizes the contributions of Freud as the foundation of most psychoanalytic thinking. Readers will also note numerous references to classical antiquity and observations on the relationship between child development and creativity. This is because psychoanalysis at its best—whether as a clinical procedure or a method of cultural interpretation—highlights the relevance of past to present. Classical psychoanalysis subscribes to the principle that knowing history helps to prevent repeating the worst of it and offers the hope of a better-informed future.

Wisdom, according to Socrates, is knowing that you don’t know what you don’t know. Imagine how different history might have been if Oedipus had known that he did not know the identity of his real parents.

* * *
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Art and Psychoanalysis
Art history and psychoanalysis have been married and divorced several times in the past hundred years. On the face of it, these are two fields that ought to get along. Both are concerned with creativity—art history rather more with the products of creativity, psychoanalysis with its process. Both are concerned with imagery—psychoanalysis with the imagery of dreams and fantasies, art history with imagery as a material product of the artist. Finally, both fields require a historical approach—art history to chronologies of culture, documentation, and style, and psychoanalysis to the developmental history of the individual.

The first marriage of these two fields took place in the late nineteenth century, when Sigmund Freud began the work that culminated in the formulation of psychoanalysis. Even before Freud, however, nineteenth-century artists—Goya, Fuseli, and the Symbolists, for example—had depicted states of mind and dreams as internal rather than external phenomena, and Walter Pater’s descriptions of Renaissance art reflected a new awareness of the psychology of the artist and the personal link between artists and their work.

Also antedating psychoanalysis was archaeology. The ruins of Herculaneum had been discovered in 1738 and those of Pompeii ten years later. In 1821, Jean-François Champollion revealed the meaning of Egyptian hieroglyphs by deciphering the text of the Rosetta Stone. Heinrich Schliemann’s study of Homer led to the excavation of Troy and Mycenae in the 1870s. And in the early twentieth century, Sir Arthur Evans discovered the ruins of Minoan Crete. Historical research and discovery were thus very much in the air as Freud began his exploration of the human mind.
toward the end of the nineteenth century. He had been eminently well prepared for this endeavor by a classical education, which included a knowledge of Greek and Latin. Like Socrates, Freud devoted his life to the pursuit of self-knowledge. The command “Gnothi seauton” (“Know thyself”), inscribed in stone at the site of the Delphic oracle, became Freud’s guiding principle, just as it had been that of Socrates.

In the course of the 1890s, Freud embarked on the landmark adventure of his own self-analysis, which was a personal archaeological excavation. The very term “archaeology” literally means the “study of the beginning,” from archaios (meaning “from the beginning” or “ancient”), and logos (meaning “word,” in the sense of “knowledge” or “lore”). In returning to his childhood, Freud searched for his own beginnings and their significance. He derived the same excitement from exploring his childhood as Keats had experienced on first reading Chapman’s Homer. In a letter of December 21, 1892, Freud wrote the following about his discoveries: “I hardly dare to believe it yet. It is as if Schliemann had again dug up Troy, which before him was a myth.” Later he was quoted as saying that “Only a good-for-nothing is not interested in his past.”

Freud’s “archaeological” self-analysis laid the foundations for his subsequent work, and his knowledge of Greek and Roman mythology fortified him in these labyrinthine byways. “Mythology,” he wrote in 1926, “may give you the courage to believe psychoanalysis.” By the process of association, Freud followed his thoughts back in time to his childhood. There he located three cornerstones of psychoanalysis: infantile sexuality, the power of the unconscious, and the Oedipus complex. Like the great humanists of the Renaissance, Freud had recourse to classical examples to illustrate and validate his ideas. He recognized the expression of the Oedipus complex in the work of Sophocles, narcissism in the myth of Narcissus, and Eros, or the life force of the libido (a Latin term), in the Greek god of love.

Freud used the process of “free association” to search through his childhood, as he instructed patients to do in his clinical work. By the same process, both Freud and his patients explored the meaning of dreams. When he unearthed the mechanisms of dreaming, he recognized the revolutionary significance of his discovery. “Insight such as this,” he wrote, “falls to one’s lot but once in a lifetime” (preface to the third English edition of The Interpretation of Dreams). In a letter to his friend Wilhelm Fliess, he suggested that a memorial plaque be installed outside his home, stating that on July 24, 1895, “The Secret of the Dream was revealed to Sigmund Freud.”
FREUD’S ARCHAEOLOGICAL METAPHOR

In the following year, 1896, Freud gave a lecture entitled “The Aetiology of Hysteria,” in which he introduced archaeology as a metaphor for the process of psychoanalysis. Like the archaeologist, the psychoanalyst begins with visible remains (such as symptoms), clears away the rubbish collected over time, and searches for buried material. “Saxa loquentur!” ("The rocks speak!") Freud declared, meaning that physical ruins are the archaeologist’s primary sources. Just as the archaeologist tries to reconstruct (or read) ancient civilizations from architectural ruins, sculptural remains, traces of mural paintings, pottery shards, and other artifacts, so the psychoanalyst reconstructs the patient’s buried childhood history from phenomena such as dreams, jokes, memories, symptoms, fantasies, mistakes, slips of the tongue (parapraxes), and so forth.

In 1900, Freud took daydreams as artifacts of the mind and compared their wish-fulfilling function to architectural revision. Just as Renaissance and Baroque architecture assimilate elements of ancient Greek and Roman buildings, he wrote, so the daydream assimilates elements of childhood and creates a wish-fulfilling narrative. Extending the architectural metaphor even further, Freud called the daydream the “facade of the dream.”

Freud conceived of personal history not only in terms of archaeological layers, but also in terms of individual artifacts. Nevertheless, he drew two important distinctions between archaeology and psychoanalysis. First, for the archaeologist, reconstruction is the end result of the search, whereas for the psychoanalyst it is preliminary. And second, the analysand, in contrast to the buried civilization, is alive and working with memories, free association, dreams, and other means of access to the unconscious.

Freud’s archaeological metaphor recurs in his writings from 1896 on. Its relevance to psychoanalysis and the influence it exerted on Freud was continuous.

RECONSTRUCTION AND THE HISTORY OF ART

The art historian, like the archaeologist, faces a task of reconstruction. He may not always have to deal with a buried civilization, but any examination of the past, even the most recent past, requires historical reconstruction. Whether creating a catalogue raisonné of an artist’s work, making an attribution, or sequencing style, the art historian is engaged in a process of
reconstruction. In contrast to other historians, art historians deal primarily with images. The archaeologist’s task is facilitated by knowing how to read the language of a buried culture, and the art historian benefits from being able to “read” images.

In addition to the traditional formal and iconographic readings of the visual arts, psychoanalysis offers the potential for dynamic readings. The term “dynamic” in psychoanalysis refers to the determination of human psychology by conflicting forces—instinctual unconscious drives and wishes in conflict with reality; ego, id, and superego in conflict with one another; sadism in conflict with masochism; and so forth. In contrast to the dynamic view, the traditional reading of history tends to interpret human behavior in a literal, static manner. By taking into account the dynamics of internal conflict, psychoanalysis can make connections between an artist’s life and work, revealing meanings in both that might not otherwise be apparent.

There are different approaches to imagery among art historians, and there is no single, definitive psychoanalytic approach. Each analyst writing about art brings to bear on the subject a particular training, experience, intellectual bias, and aesthetic response. Because good works of art synthesize numerous sources, they are sturdier than any one bias and outlast the critical quarrels of history.

**ART AND PSYCHOANALYSIS**

Of the categories of psychoanalytic thinking that have been applied to the visual arts since the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, four can be readily identified. They are symbolism, sublimation, creativity, and biography and autobiography.

*Symbolism*

From the beginning, symbolism has played a prominent role in psychoanalysis. Whether in symptom formation, dreams, myths, folklore, or religion, Freud recognized the importance of symbolization as a mental operation. Reading symbols is also an essential aspect of interpretation in the arts. The term “symbol” derives from the Greek word *symbolon*, which, in antiquity, designated a coin, medal, or other object that could be broken in half and fitted back together for purposes of identification. In other words, the two
parts “added up” to a whole that identified someone or something, and came to mean a “token” or “symbol” in their present sense.

Freud proposed that symbols are related to what is symbolized by analogical criteria such as shape, size, or usage; small animals can symbolize children, long thin objects a phallus, and windows and doors the orifices of the body. Both Freud and his English follower Ernest Jones\(^9\) insisted that, although there is an enormous number of symbols, the objects or ideas symbolized are limited in number. Psychoanalytic symbols are restricted to the body and its functions (particularly the sexual ones), family members, birth, and death. Because of these limitations, symbolic interpretations of artistic imagery are often criticized for “reducing” the many and varied to the few, or for “reducing” the creative artist to the status of an ordinary mortal.

An important subsequent contribution to the theory of symbolization came from D. W. Winnicott,\(^{10}\) a leading member of the English Object Relations school of psychoanalysis (see Chapter 7). Winnicott identified the so-called transitional object as the infant’s first symbol. Whether a teddy bear or a piece of cloth, the transitional object is selected by the child before he reaches one year of age; it permits the child to separate from the mother, especially before going to sleep, and creates a transitional, symbolic space. The transitional object constitutes the child’s first created symbol, which, according to Winnicott, forms the basis for adult creativity.

The French analyst Jacques Lacan\(^{11}\) addressed symbolism in the context of linguistics. Lacan worked in the tradition of Ferdinand de Saussure, the French linguist who objected to the notion of a “linguistic symbol.” For Saussure,\(^{12}\) the word (or “linguistic signifier”) was not naturally related to the object or idea it “signified”; a psychoanalytic symbol, on the other hand, is related in some articulable way to what it symbolizes. The linguistic model is clearly in contrast to the original Greek derivation of “symbol” as one half of the split “token.” Instead, according to Saussure, signifier and signified are related by virtue of structural, linguistic requirements rather than by analogy.

Lacan tried to integrate the structural-linguistic approach to symbolism with psychoanalysis, claiming that the unconscious is structured like a language. He envisioned the structure of language as contained within a symbolic order, whose laws are those of a “symbolic father.” He called this symbolic lawgiver “the Name of the Father,” which may be considered a linguistic equivalent of the superego. In French, “le Nom du Père” sounds like “le Non du Père” (the “No of the Father”), the latter being the verbal
expression of the father's function as a disciplinarian and psychic structuralist. Such punning has its own artistic quality and is well within the tradition of Duchamp, Dada, and the French taste for wordplay.

Lacan's work on the symbolic power of the gaze has also entered the literature on art and psychoanalysis. He related the gaze to desire and to the complex, often contradictory, functions of the eye. Power, evil, benevolence, envy, and love are among the motivating forces of the gaze (that is, the psychological impact of the eye). The visual operation of these forces has been related to painting in several ways. They can operate within the iconographic or narrative content of a picture, between picture and artist, and between picture and observer.

**Sublimation**

Sublimation, a term first proposed by Freud, is the process that facilitates creative and intellectual activity. Although creativity and intellect appear to be distinct from sexuality, they are nonetheless thought to be fueled by libidinal energy. According to classical psychoanalytic drive theory, a sublimated instinct is one that is redirected away from its sexual aim and object on to a "higher" cultural level, such as art, science, sports, and other socially valued pursuits. The sublimatory activity is thus a transformation of an instinctual activity. For example, the baby's instinct to play with feces might be sublimated into making mud pies, molding clay, kneading dough, finger-painting, and eventually creating art.

From 1914, Freud\(^\text{13}\)^ modified his view of sublimation to take into account the role of the ego. In the ego, the libido is desexualized, integrated, and only then redirected into cultural endeavors. This attachment of sublimated energy to the ego is consistent with the ego's narcissism. In the context of the structural theory, formulated in 1923,\(^\text{14}\) Freud's description of the ego includes its synthetic, or integrative, function. The ego's job is to mediate between the instinctual wishes of the id (for example, playing with feces) and the demands of reality (for example, society's admiration for works of art). In this function, the ego is the unifying life force of libido and the ego's narcissism can be seen as "reflected" in the creative product. The particular shape that such a "reflection" takes is the work of art and depends on a confluence of factors, most notably on the expressive talents of the artist.

The concept of sublimation is one of the most elusive in classical psychoanalysis. Although Freud discussed sublimation throughout his
writings, he did not arrive at a satisfactory theoretical formulation of it. Most of his focus on sublimation involved the role of the libido (Eros); but he also considered that the aggressive, or death, instinct could undergo sublimation.

Creativity

Sublimation may be thought of as a necessary route to creativity, to which it is closely related but not identical. In this book, the focus is mainly on creativity in the visual arts, whereas Freud’s earliest studies of the subject dealt with writers. In 1908, Freud related the child at play to the creative writer. Both, according to Freud, create a fantasy world that they take seriously and invest with a great deal of emotion. Freud compares the daydream to a “castle in the air,” or fantasy narrative whose purpose is to gratify a wish; the wish is gratified by the story line of the fantasy which “corrects” a piece of reality. Daydreams are set in motion when a memory trace from childhood attaches itself to an unsatisfactory present-day situation. The wish-fulfilling aspect of the daydream belongs to the future and is usually erotic and/or ambitious in nature.

This temporal condensation of the daydream is made explicit by the comparison with pictorial juxtaposition. Freud wrote that “Just as, in many altar-pieces, the portrait of the donor is to be seen in a corner of the picture, so, in the majority of ambitious phantasies, we can discover in some corner or other the lady for whom the creator of the phantasy performs all his heroic deeds and at whose feet all his triumphs are laid.” This passage highlights the pictorial character of both the fantasy and the painted image; the latter juxtaposes past (the Christian event depicted), present (the donor), and future (the donor’s wish for salvation), just as the daydream does.

Creative writing, in Freud’s view, is “like a day-dream.” It is “a continuation of, and a substitute for, what was once the play of childhood.” The author turns the fantasy into a written narrative that satisfies both his own narcissism and the reader’s pleasure. He creates a central hero who, like the hero of the daydream, “reflects” the author’s narcissism.

In the briefest way, Freud related the mechanisms of creative writing and daydreaming to the development of myth. All three phenomena derive from an early period, whether childhood or an early historical era, and fulfill wishes. All therefore combine different periods of time and are motivated by an unsatisfactory reality. Whereas a single daydream or creative work
is the product of an individual, myths are projections of entire cultures and therefore operate on a grander scale. Myths, according to Freud, are "the secular dreams of a youthful humanity." 18

So far Freud had addressed the dynamics and content of the creative product that derive mainly from unconscious and conscious wishes. The ego transforms such wishes into the product by taking account of the reality demands of technique, material, and audience response. This aspect of creativity is less completely formulated by Freud than its dynamic and narrative content, although he notes that the writer alters the daydream through the medium of a formal, or aesthetic, framework. The creative writer, in effect, "sublimates" his wish by transforming libido into aesthetic form.

In his studies of Leonardo da Vinci (Chapter 2) and Michelangelo's Moses (Chapter 6), Freud turned to the visual arts. Nevertheless, despite his attention to the formal necessities of creativity, he did not consider them analyzable. In 1928, he declared that "Before the problem of the creative artist analysis must, alas, lay down its arms." 19 It was left to later psychoanalytic writers to refine further the description of the creative process, particularly the transition from id impulse to aesthetic form.

In 1950, Daniel E. Schneider 20 discussed creativity in terms of psychic economy. In his view, ego mastery is necessary as the "transformer" of the endless source material in the unconscious. The artist must thus be in continual contact with his unconscious. Dreams are a special source of unconscious material; a work of art, according to Schneider, may be considered as a kind of "dream turned inside out." By that he means that the analysis of a dream is the reverse of creating art; when a dream is analyzed, its hidden structure is opened up and deconstructed, whereas a work of art assembles or constructs the creative material.

Ernst Kris, 21 an art historian as well as a psychoanalyst, described the creative process as "regression in the service of the ego" in 1952. In other words, the artist must be able to "regress" to early instinctual impulses in such a way that they are controlled and formed by the ego. This controlled regression is somewhat akin to the technique of method actors, who call on experiences from their own past as source material for emotions required by a particular role. In 1957, Phyllis Greenacre 22 referred to this process as "access to childhood." All such descriptions of creativity assume the artist's internal psychic flexibility, which permits identification with, and portrayal of, a wide range of characters and themes. The emphasis on "regression" and childhood "access" derives from the relatively flexible
psychic structures and identifications of children as compared with adults.

Even more elusive than the creative, or sublimatory, process is aesthetic form. In clinical practice, aesthetics is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to analyze. And yet one's aesthetic response is definitely influenced by psychological factors. Among the analysts who have addressed the issue of aesthetics and creativity, readers are referred to Anton Ehrenzweig, Pinchas Noy, William G. Niederland, and Gilbert Rose.

With some variation, most analytic writers on creativity view aesthetic form as the solution to, or reconciliation of, internal impulses or states of being in opposition to requirements of the outside world. By virtue of its aesthetic quality, the work of art permits conscious pleasure in forbidden wishes and impulses that reside in the unconscious. For example, a young child may express anger at a mother by drawing a witch with long fingernails or at a father by drawing an ogre. Puns and jokes permit the release of hostility by translating it into a humorous form (for example, the frequency of mother-in-law jokes). Similarly, the oedipal crimes of incest and parricide become art in the plays of Sophocles and Shakespeare.

**Psychobiography of the Artist**

Freud's 1910 study of Leonardo (Chapter 2) was the first psychobiographical study of an artist. As a genre, psychobiography borrows from the clinical case study, differing from traditional biography in its emphasis on certain kinds of data. As in clinical psychoanalysis, the psychobiographer pays close attention to dreams, memories, symptoms, and behavior patterns. Such material is analyzed, in addition to being presented and described. In order to effect such an analysis, the writer needs some psychodynamic insight, and ideally some training in psychoanalysis. The psychobiographer relates the subject's biography to aspects of his work and reasons from the work to an analysis of the subject.

Since the publication of Freud's *Leonardo*, many psychobiographies of artists have appeared, with those of van Gogh being by far the most numerous. Artists' letters, journals, autobiographies, and casual statements given in interviews have been psychoanalyzed. The ideal psychobiography of an artist combines the available literary documentation with visual evidence. Biographers of artists, following Freud's lead, have begun to call on childhood events, memories, and dreams, to understand not only the course of the subject's life, but also the form and content of his or her work. As interest in the contemporary artist as a psychobiographical subject
increases, a new technique for gathering information has developed—namely, the "interview." If the artist is recently deceased and his contemporaries are still alive, the researcher can interview those who knew him; such has been the case with Picasso. When the artist is still living, however, interviewers have access to the proverbial horse's mouth, which raises new issues.

If the interview is recorded and the interpretation left up to the reader, then the potential for controversy is kept to a minimum. But if a psychological reading, beyond the literal value of the artist's statements, is attempted, potential problems arise. First, it becomes necessary to consider the status of a statement knowingly made for publication. What image, for example, does the artist wish to project? Is he or she trying to cover up something? Does a financial, philosophical, or psychological motive in making a particular statement render that statement self-serving? Is the artist's hidden agenda conscious or unconscious? Is there a hidden agenda at all? Second, the analytic interpreter may be constrained by the laws of libel from printing what he or she really believes.

Other psychobiographical approaches to art history focus on iconography and cultural context. Iconographic choices can be determined by convention or the wishes of a patron, while the cultural context of a work of art influences its style and content. We would assume, for example, that a picture created in 1650 in Holland would be in the Baroque style. We would expect a work commissioned by a medieval church to depict a Christian subject. We would not be surprised if a ruler commissioned his own portrait, nor if the artist idealized the subject and emphasized the ruler's political power. But no matter how rigorous the convention or how demanding the patron, the artist also makes choices. When it is possible to isolate the various iconographic sources of a work of art, one necessarily learns something of the artist's character and talent by distinguishing between what in the work was dictated by convention and patronage and what was chosen by the artist.

Even within the boundaries of convention and style, the artist can make significant choices. But the range of these choices is affected by their time and place. An Early Christian, Byzantine, Romanesque, or Gothic artist would have had a more limited range than a Renaissance or Baroque artist. The cultural factors accounting for this differentiation are many and varied. In the Renaissance, the increased range of patronage, as well as an educational system that encouraged classical studies and a renewed sense of history, contributed to the artistic expansion of that period. Likewise,
industrial development in the nineteenth century inspired an entirely new iconography of factories, machinery, and urban tension, as well as peaceful landscapes providing an escape from urban pressures into leisure and relaxation. In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries the development of psychoanalysis is reflected in artistic styles such as Surrealism and Abstract Expressionism. But, while the insights of psychoanalysis have consciously informed the arts of the past hundred years, the validity of the psychoanalytic method of art criticism extends to ancient as well as to recent history.

The application of psychoanalysis to works of art and culture that historically precede the development of psychoanalysis itself has been a controversial issue. One aspect of the controversy revolves around the nature and readability of evidence. Art historians have traditionally preferred dealing with written documents such as contracts, archival records, and other contemporary texts that can reasonably be related to the artist or work being studied. While a reliable psychoanalytic researcher would have to take such documentary evidence into account, he would also give serious attention to other types of data—for example, dreams and memories. He would still, however, be relying on the report of a dream or memory, most likely to have been recorded in written form. The main documentary source is the work of art itself, which, in the case of the visual arts, is an image or a building, rather than a written text.

Biographical significance adds another dimension to the iconography of a work. Whether one reasons from the work to the artist or vice versa, both imagery and documentation are read by the psychoanalytic critic in a way that takes into account the psychology of the artist. The difficulty of this task is increased by the very transformation that the artist makes from the original impulse and the unconscious source material to the final aesthetic product. One must "see through" all the conscious layers of reworking, including convention, style, context, and often the requirements of a patron. In order to do so, one must "read" psychologically, which, like the interpretation of an interview, depends on the reader's ability and insight.

In the final analysis, one important principle emerges from the introduction of the psychoanalytic method into art history: the traditional notion of documentation has been enlarged.

In this book, I begin with the foundations of art and psychoanalysis as established by Freud. Chapters 2 and 6 consider Freud's two major studies
of art, Leonardo (Chapter 2) and Michelangelo’s Moses (Chapter 6), and some of the most significant responses to them. Chapters 3 through 5 attempt to relate works of art to the general nature of imagery (Chapter 3), the Oedipus complex (Chapter 4), and the dynamics of dreaming (Chapter 5).

The second half of the book deals with different methods of reading art from a psychoanalytic perspective. In Chapter 7, Winnicott’s transitional object is discussed in relation to creativity and symbolization. Chapter 8 considers the mother-child relationship in Western art in the light of Freud and later psychoanalysts; it concludes with a discussion of the gaze as formulated by Lacan. In Chapter 9, the work of art is read as a text independently of the artist’s biography; the example taken is the primal scene, which contains implications for the gaze as well as for classical psychoanalysis. Chapters 10 and 11 review different approaches to psychobiography. Chapter 12 analyzes the libel trial between Whistler and Ruskin as an example of the psychological meaning of aesthetic response.

To date, most psychoanalytic studies of art have focused on the twentieth century. One rationale for this has been the notion that the Oedipus complex cannot be documented earlier, as Freud had not yet formulated it. That, of course, reflects the static view of history, for if the psychoanalytic method is valid, it must apply to all periods of human history. Partly for that reason, and partly because of my own areas of specialization, I have, in addition to some twentieth-century material, concentrated on earlier periods of Western history.
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