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PREFACE

RICHARD WELLS

At the heart of this volume are sixty-seven antiquities collected by Sigmund Freud. They have been selected from the more than two thousand pieces that crowd Freud’s extraordinary working environment at 20 Maresfield Gardens, now the Freud Museum, London. By means of this book (and the exhibition it accompanies), we aim to indicate the archaeological and aesthetic interest of the collection and to explore its significance in relation to the development of Freud’s psychoanalytic work.

Immediately on arrival in England as a refugee, Freud wrote to Marie Bonaparte, with whom he had stayed in Paris en route from Vienna: “Surrounded by love for twelve hours, we arrived proud and rich under the protection of Athene” (June 8, 1938)—a gracious reference to a small, specially prized statue that Marie Bonaparte had just returned to Freud after smuggling it out of Vienna, when he had feared he might lose his entire collection. (Marie Bonaparte had also paid the ransom, a 25 percent tax, demanded by the Fascists for the release of Freud’s belongings, particularly the antiquities.) Less concretely, Freud’s words evoke his vision of an entire civilization, a civilization under threat once more from internal conflicts, which had erupted into the barbarism of the Nazis. During the previous world war, Freud had movingly reported on the disillusionment that the savagery and slaughter had brought to the citizen of the world, who had exchanged his native land for a foreign one in time of war, and who had relied on “unity among the civilized peoples” which had created a “new and wider fatherland.” Freud reflected:

This new fatherland was a museum for him, too, filled with all the treasures which the artists of civilized humanity had in the successive centuries created and left behind. As he wandered from one gallery to another in this museum, he could recognize with impartial appreciation what varied types of perfection a mixture of blood, the course of history, and the special quality of their mother-earth had produced among his compatriots in this wider sense.

Freud continued:

Nor must we forget that each of these citizens of the civilized world had created for himself a “Parnassus” and a “School of Athens” of his own. From
among the great thinkers, writers and artists of all nations he had chosen those to whom he considered he owed the best of what he had been able to achieve in enjoyment and understanding of life, and he had venerated them along with the immortal ancients as well as with the familiar masters of his own tongue. (SE, 14, pp. 277-78)

Beautiful artifacts, mythological and legendary figures, sages and heroes, all from antiquity, jostle in Freud's rooms beside photographs of his scientific and medical mentors and of his female muses. To enter these rooms is to encounter the "Parnassus" and the "School of Athens" which Freud constructed for himself with such energy, turmoil, ambivalence, and playfulness from a civilization that he interpreted so profoundly—and which Freud, perhaps more than anyone, has come to represent. To engage with these items is also to register a multiplicity of points of entry to the personal and cultural matrix from which psychoanalysis itself emerged, and to which the collection of antiquities belongs.

A few months after his arrival in England, Freud was able to report:

"All the Egyptians, Chinese and Greeks have arrived, have stood up to the journey with very little damage, and look more impressive here than in Berggasse" (letter to Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, October 8, 1938).

Paula Fichel, the Freud family maid, and Freud's son Ernst lovingly arranged all his antiquities in his reconstructed rooms in the newly acquired Maresfield Gardens exactly as they had been placed in Berggasse 19, where Freud had lived and worked for forty-seven years. The ailing eighty-two-year-old Freud was able to move in and get straight down to work for the final year of his life—Athena with pride of place among the ranks of antiquities on his desk. It is tempting to detect the goddess's influence behind the safe arrival, against all the odds, of Freud's belongings—not just the antiquities but his library, papers, and furniture, including the famous couch. Less fancifully, the desperately late rescue of Freud and his immediate family had been secured by diplomatic pressure from the United States and Britain, which offered asylum, urged on by an international group of Freud's friends and colleagues. Freud was granted his wish "to die in freedom" in England, the country whose literature and political culture he most admired. "For a while, England, the heir to Freud's remains—as Athens was to those of Oedipus—found itself the leader of the European analytic movement" (O. Mannoni, Freud: The Theory of the Unconscious, London, 1985, p. 175.) Wrenched from its original central European setting, psychoanalysis was to be adapted and disseminated through the English-speaking culture of Britain and the United States.

The opening in America of the exhibition The Sigmund Freud Antiquities: Fragments from a Buried Past, to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Freud's death, in exile in England, is a reminder of the geographical, cultural, and political vicissitudes of the psychoanalytic movement. It provides a stimulus to reflection on the origins, history, and future of psychoanalytic practice.

The exhibition tour also inaugurates the international exhibition program of the Freud Museum. Established in 1986, the museum is developing as a unique
public resource and a forum, which participates in the work of understanding, interpreting, and publicizing the history and continuing development of psychoanalysis in all its ramifications. The exhibition illustrates the fresh perspectives on Freud’s work and character that are being opened up now that his library and consulting rooms are accessible for study. Freud’s collection is being investigated in detail for the first time, and can now be related to his library and manuscripts at the museum. The catalogue entries contained herein are the initial fruits of research into individual pieces, and pioneer the complex task of placing them within the overall context of Freud’s life and work.

The impulse to record and remember as much as possible of the historic cultural laboratory within which Freud had made his discoveries was felt as soon as it was threatened. Freud’s colleague August Aichhorn asked the photographer Edmund Engelman to make a comprehensive record of Freud’s Vienna apartments in the weeks before Freud left. Some of these photographs, reprinted by Engelman himself from the original negatives, record the antiquities in their original setting.

After Freud’s death on September 23, 1939, his daughter Anna continued with her own pioneering psychoanalytic work from 20 Maresfield Gardens, preserving her father’s study and library intact. It was Anna Freud’s wish that after her death this extraordinary legacy of turn-of-the-century Vienna in a London suburb should become a museum in honor of her father. In 1980, the Sigmund Freud Archives, a registered English charity, purchased the land and building at 20 Maresfield Gardens, with funds from the New-Land Foundation Inc. The support of the late Muriel Gardiner, the founder of the New-Land Foundation and longtime friend of Anna Freud, was crucial in establishing the museum. On Anna Freud’s death in 1982, the contents of the house were bequeathed to the English charity to establish the Freud Museum, which was opened to the public on July 28, 1986. Sigmund Freud Archives Inc. and Freud Museum London Trustee Ltd. are the trustees of the registered English charity. The museum is operated through a Joint Committee of Sigmund Freud Archives and the New-Land Foundation, and managed with the assistance of the London Advisory Committee. Well over two thousand benefactors and Friends of the Museum worldwide have enabled the museum to become a cultural and educational center with an international role.
Freud's study, London.
INTRODUCTION

Peter Gay

On May 14, 1938, Sigmund Freud sat down to write his sister-in-law Minna Bernays an important letter. "In the fateful first days of next week," he told her, "the commission on which the fate of the collection depends is supposed to come here. The shipper is lurking in the background." He could not be confident that he would be allowed to live out whatever time he had left in the presence of his beloved antiquities, and his agitation was showing. No wonder: many of these plaques, statuettes, and fragments had been his silent, loyal, immensely rewarding companions for decades, and the thought of having to part with them was almost too much to bear.

The Nazis had marched into Vienna two months before, and the Freud family was gradually, one by one, seeking shelter abroad, in England. Minna, in ill health and almost blind, had been the first to go; on May 5, a solicitous Dorothy Burlingham had taken her to London. And on the day that Freud went to his stripped-down study to write to her—the family were beginning to pack up their possessions—his son Martin, far less competent in dealing with the authorities than his invaluable daughter Anna, followed suit. But Freud, his wife, Martha, and Anna had not yet been issued the crucial document that would open the way to freedom. The Nazi authorities were still temporizing over the so-called Unbedenklichkeitserklärung, the official declaration that Freud was "innocuous"—that he had satisfied all the regulations, paid all the exactions, that an inventive and extortionate regime had been able to think up for Austrian Jews eager to depart. "We are waiting anxiously for this paper," Freud reported to Minna Bernays. It was a sign of his extreme agitation that he, normally in control of events and himself, should admit it.

During the days that followed, Freud, never one to take kindly to passivity, was forced to endure the suspense. The authorities were unpredictable and mean-spirited in the extreme. One distraction for him was being taken out for a drive, twice, to say farewell to Vienna. Always susceptible to the charm of flowers, he found delight, almost in spite of himself, in seeing the city he loved and hated aglow in its spring beauty.

Then, on May 23, he could report to Minna Bernays that he had some splendid news: "My collection has been released. Not a single confiscation, a minimal levy of RM 400"—some one hundred dollars. Fortunately, Freud went on, Hans
Demel, director of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, who had appraised his holdings, had been very “merciful.” He had estimated the value of Freud’s whole collection at RM 30,000, a substantial sum, but far below the limits that would have invited the authorities to keep Freud’s antiquities in Austria. In short, “The shipper can start with the packing without delay.” When Freud moved to his last house at 20 Maresfield Gardens in Hampstead in September 1938, he could surround himself with his cherished objects, almost as though nothing untoward had happened. They eased the year he still had left to live, for they meant a great deal to him.

But what? To discover that is to discover much about Freud the man and the psychoanalyst. “I have made many sacrifices for my collection of Greek, Roman, and Egyptian antiquities,” he once wrote an admirer, the Austrian novelist Stefan Zweig, in his late years, “and actually have read more archaeology than psychology.” I have called this declaration “genial hyperbole,” but the very exaggeration testifies to the privileged place his antiquities held in Freud’s mental economy. And indeed, virtually all Freud’s visitors to Berggasse 19 attest to their significance for him. When Hanns Sachs, later to become a member of Freud’s intimate circle, first visited him in 1909, he noticed that while the collection “was still in its initial stages, some of the objects at once attracted the visitor’s eye.” They were beginning to crowd every available space in his consulting room and the adjoining study at Berggasse 19. Freud’s more observant analysands, like the Wolf Man, found his collection no less striking and, in fact, highly instructive. It was with the Wolf Man (as he had done before, with more than one patient) that Freud employed his collection as a master metaphor for the psychoanalytic process. “The psychoanalyst, like the archaeologist in his excavations,” the Wolf Man recalled Freud telling him, “must uncover layer after layer of the patient’s psyche, before coming to the deepest, most valuable treasures.”

As the essays in this volume abundantly show, no close student of Freud has been able to escape this convenient and powerful archaeological metaphor. It has imposed itself, rightly, because it brings together one of Freud’s dominant passions—second only to his primary addiction, smoking cigars—with his fundamental commitment to digging beneath surfaces, to bringing the hidden to light, to dusting off and piecing together the encrusted fragments from a distant past, fragments often barely legible. Freud’s much-quoted definition of the analyst’s healing work, “Where id was, there ego shall be,” read with these objects in mind, strongly suggests that the archaeological metaphor has more than metaphorical significance. It follows that anyone seriously interested in interrogating Freud’s antiquities is bound to move a little closer to the solution of that larger and most interesting mystery, Freud himself—the epoch-making founder of psychoanalysis, the good nineteenth-century burgher who subverted the very style of thinking in which he was most thoroughly at home.

There is no need to pursue the implications of the archaeological metaphor here; that will be the business of the essays that follow. I want to concentrate rather on one central issue raised by what Freud called his “partiality for the pre-historic”: the remarkable dialectical tension in his thought between rationality
and irrationality. He saw reason and unreason, like almost everyone else, as sharply distinct, and often in severe mutual conflict. But, Freud argued, the two were not inevitably at odds. It was the task of reason to provide access to unreason, and it did so by perfecting instruments for insight partly borrowed from the enemy itself.

Freud, it is essential to remember, was a modern Philosopher, a belated child of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. His God, if he had a god, was logos. One of the most revealing papers he ever wrote, one that deserves to be required reading for anyone seeking to understand Freud, is “The Question of a Weltanschauung,” the concluding essay in his New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis (SE, 22, pp. 158–82). Does psychoanalysis require a worldview of its own? Freud asks in that paper, and replies that it does not. It is part of science, and hence the worldview of science is its appropriate domain. If Freud waded in the muck of the unconscious, of impulses to murder, rape, and incest, he did not to celebrate but to understand and if possible conquer them. As a solid bourgeois, he believed in the virtue of self-control. While he diagnosed the superego bedeviling his educated contemporaries as being excessively punitive, while he deplored what he thought to be the hypocrisy about fundamental needs and desires in his culture, he did not invite the world to discard the responsible conscience, let alone good manners. Those self-serving and shallow readers of Freud who, especially in the 1920s, grasped at what they thought to be his teaching as proclaiming the end of all inhibitions, as issuing a license for license, fatally misread his therapeutic ideal. The abstinence he wanted to impress on his fellow clinicians was not a posture of cynicism or aloofness. If he deprecated the rage to cure as an obstruction in the work of healing neurotics, this should not be read as indifference to the suffering beings before him. His celebrated recommendation that the psychoanalyst emulate the surgeon, who puts away all human emotions as he does his sanguinary work, has served Freud badly: the metaphor was too vivid to capture his real intentions. He intended to do more than to identify, name, and diagnose the mental ills the human flesh is heir to; he intended to do something about them. Reason, to put it tersely, was at once the method of psychoanalysis and its goal.

The “reason” that Freud praised wants to be understood. It meant close observation, pitiless honesty, speculation disciplined by the frequent and faithful return to experience. This, in Freud’s estimate, was the only acceptable way of being scientific about the mind. Tradition and authority and abstract reasoning, at their best, might be suggestive. They could provide hints at, but never serve as guides to, the truth. In fact, most of the time, tradition and the rest did not reach even this modest aim. Writing in the empiricist tradition launched by Francis Bacon three centuries earlier, Freud thought such ways of reasoning to be signposts pointing nowhere, or in wrong directions.

But—and here I approach the second pole governing Freud’s thinking—this primacy of practical reason did not imply the denigration of the emotional dimension of the mind. How could Freud, whose psychology places the drives into the very heart of his theory, underestimate that dimension? The very point of Freud's
theory of the mind, its travail and maturation, was to acknowledge the power of, and find an honored place for, the passions. In this sense, Freud’s motto—"Where id was, there ego shall be"—does his enterprise somewhat less than full justice. He would have been more accurate about his therapeutic ambitions had he described successful psychoanalysis as making peace (or, more humbly, a lasting truce) among id, ego, and superego.

What is more, the emotions play a central role not merely in the psychoanalytic scheme of development but in its therapeutic technique as well. The generous, almost envious, tributes Freud paid to the psychological insights that imaginative novelists and poets can reach through aesthetic insight attest to his respect for intuition. So does the analyst’s listening stance of evenly hovering attention through which the unconscious of the analyst communicates with the unconscious of the analysand. In short the passions, rightly understood and intelligently employed, are paths to understanding.

Which brings me directly to Freud’s collection of antiquities. It reminds us that his view of the passions was by no means always instrumental. Collecting, as psychoanalysts have taught us, is literally a childish activity. But this does not mean that on Freud’s showing it stands condemned; psychoanalysis sees the child as not merely father to the man: the child is, or at least it inhabits, the man. In Civilization and Its Discontents (SE, 21), once again applying the archaeological metaphor, Freud illustrated the "problem of preservation in the sphere of the mind" by reminding his readers of Rome, a modern city that still exhibits visible traces of its long and varied past: the antique Roma quadrata, Roma Septimontium, the city of the republic and the empire and of more modern buildings. That is how the mind is, and it would be futile to wish it otherwise.

Collecting stamps, or china—or Greek and Egyptian and Chinese statuettes, for that matter—partakes of, and preserves, early erotic pleasures; Freud, we are told, liked to gaze at the antiquities on his desk as he worked and, at times, moving from looking to touching, would stroke his favorites. But there is more passion to it still: collecting, as anyone who has ever collected can testify, gives power. To possess a complete collection of certain stamp issues or of one’s reviews or letters to the editor is, in some intimate fashion, a way of controlling and commanding the world.

Nor, as the following essays leave no doubt, is even this all. Freud wanted to have, to control, to handle, to know, like everyone else, although in world-historical ways even more so than his fellow humans. His antiquities stood for many things in his personal life and, as his comments to the Wolf Man attest, in his work as well. In 1922, declaring himself impatient with his need to earn money, tolerate a contemptible world, and confront his growing old, he told his intimate friend Sándor Ferenczi that "strange secret longings" were rising up in him, "perhaps from the heritage of my ancestors from the Orient and the Mediterranean."7 His antiquities, many of them from countries he had never visited and many of them originating in the region from which his remote ancestors had come, spoke to him of his Jewishness. It was, that Jewishness, something of a riddle to him: he had grown up as, and remained, a thoroughgoing unbeliever. Without regrets, he
lived without a shred of Jewish ritual. Neither he, nor his family, ever attended synagogue; rather, they celebrated Christmas and Easter. And yet, as became more obtrusively obvious to him as he grew older and as anti-Semitism grew more virulent in Germany and Austria, in some fundamental way he was Jewish. The quality of that Jewishness was not yet accessible to psychoanalytic inquiry, although he was confident that some day it would be. Coveting, bargaining for, and contemplating his antiquities did not solve the question for him. They may even have made the enigma more enigmatic. After all, the krater in which his and his wife's ashes rest came from ancient Greece, a gift from Princess Marie Bonaparte, who was not Jewish.

We have not yet penetrated the full meaning of Freud's antiquities for him, although this assembly of objects helps us to make significant strides toward such an understanding. We do know that he enjoyed his collection immensely, and was deeply grateful to those friends and admirers who supplied him with new pieces. These small objects meant much to him, as I have said, and they stood for much in his life. Although sometimes, as we dissect Freud, using his antiquities as so many surgical knives to probe his mysteries, we might remember the sheer pleasure he took in those pieces. Sometimes a statue is just a statue.

NOTES
2. Ibid., May 23, 1938. Trans. by Peter Gay.
Freud in his study, c. 1905, with a reproduction of Michelangelo's Dying Slave, probably one of the "plaster copies of Florentine statues" that Freud described in his earliest recorded reference to his art collection (Freud-Files, December 8, 1896).
Sigmund Freud was a passionate and well-informed collector of ancient art for over forty years. Freud's study, which contained his famous couch, desk, and library, also housed more than two thousand Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Near Eastern, and Asian objects. He bought primarily sculpture, although he owned some fragments of paintings on plaster, papyrus, and linen, and he eventually collected more than one hundred ancient glass containers and fragments. He concentrated on Egyptian art in particular—it accounts for almost half of his collection—and secondarily on Greek, Roman, and, in his later years, Chinese art.

Freud the collector, like Freud the dreamer, was overdetermined. His antiquities collection is inexhaustibly layered with meanings and associations, surrounded by endless anecdotes. I focus in this essay on the beginnings of Freud's collecting in the 1890s, and discuss three areas of meaning discernible in its origins: its relation to Freud's family, to his colleagues, and to his work. In a climate of anti-Semitism, and in reaction to the death of his father, Freud acquired an idealized image of his father and sought the remote roots of his people, the Jews, in the Near East, and created a new family lineage for himself with these statues from classical, non-Semitic Mediterranean cultures.

Freud's most extreme professional isolation occurred in the 1890s, the years that he began surrounding himself with antiquities. In 1899 he bought a Roman two-faced stone head of Janus, an image used in gates, its contrasting aspects looking both within and without (as Freud himself, in a sense, was beginning to do at this time), and over the years he built up an attentive audience of objects, which included an Egyptian scribe, a Greek goddess of wisdom, and a Chinese sage. Also during this decade Freud conducted his revolutionary self-analysis into unknown areas of the mind. Writing in 1901, he described himself as following the example of archaeologists in aiming “to bring to the light of day after their long burial the priceless though mutilated relics of antiquity” (SE, 7, p. 12). With this collection of antiquities, Freud populated his study with embodiments of the mental fragments from a buried past that he sought to uncover.

Once these early associations were established in the 1890s, the themes of family, colleagues, and work echo throughout the remaining decades of Freud's collecting, even after his relationship to his father was resolved, after he had
found real colleagues, and after the realm of the unconscious had become familiar territory to him.

Freud’s life spans the development of modern archaeology. When he was born in 1856, Troy was a myth, and looting ancient treasures was a profitable business; at the end of his life, in 1939, archaeology was a science, and national archaeological museums had been established in many ancient cities, including Cairo and Athens. Earlier in the nineteenth century, geologists had begun to employ stratigraphy as a dating method, and Darwin’s publication of Origin of Species, in 1859, permitted the assumption that man has a long history.

Heinrich Schliemann’s first major finds at Troy date to 1873, when Freud was an eighteen-year-old student. The legendary labyrinth of Minos was excavated on the island of Crete in 1900, the year Freud published The Interpretation of Dreams, when he was forty-four, and Tutankhamun’s tomb was discovered in the Valley of the Kings in 1922, when Freud was sixty-six. These discoveries and others were widely reported in European newspapers; reports focused on issues that were rather trivial from an archaeological viewpoint, such as the value of the finds and disputes over their ownership. In Vienna, Freud was a daily reader of Neue Freie Presse, the city’s most famous and liberal paper, which was unillustrated at the time of the excavations at Troy and Crete. By the 1920s, when Tutankhamun’s tomb was discovered, lithographs were widely used in the popular press, especially in more sensationalist papers such as Illustrierte Kronen-Zeitung, which dramatized the find with vivid front-page illustrations. Freud first read a scholarly and well-illustrated account of an archaeological excavation in 1899, when he purchased Ilios, Schliemann’s book on Troy. Freud built an impressive archaeological library, and through his reading he became a well-informed collector (see Appendix, p. 184).

The market for antiquities changed greatly during the forty years of Freud’s collecting. Simply put, in the nineteenth century antiquities traveled easily out of Egypt and Greece to European markets, but by World War I, these countries had placed increasing restrictions on the export of antiquities, in a belated attempt to retain their national treasures. The European market for Chinese antiquities developed quickly in the political turmoil and grave robbing that followed the revolution of 1912, which opened China’s doors to the West.

The great European museum collections of antiquities were formed largely in the nineteenth century, and Freud saw several of them in the formative days of his collecting: the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, which he knew from his youth, has one of the largest and most important Egyptian and classical collections in Europe; the Louvre in Paris, whose vast ancient holdings include the Venus de Milo and the Victory of Samothrace (Freud visited Paris in 1885); the Royal Museum in Berlin, which contains the Altar of Zeus from Pergamum.

When we look at a private collection such as Freud’s, it seems natural to assume that it belonged to someone of great wealth because these objects are so expensive today; one wonders how Freud could have afforded such a collection when he was supporting a wife, six children, and several relatives on a salary earned by treating private patients by means of a highly experimental method.
In fact, prices were low. Freud was buying in a relatively unrestricted market, and he was collecting art objects that were unfashionable, particularly in Vienna, where Baroque and Biedermeier were in vogue. On the difficult topic of comparing values over time, we can be helped by Robert Lustig, the Viennese dealer who sold Freud several hundred objects from the mid-1920s to 1938, and then emigrated to New York, where he ran an antiques dealership on Madison Avenue for about twenty-five years. According to Lustig, Greek vases could be purchased in Vienna in the 1920s for the equivalent of two hundred dollars, not five to ten thousand dollars, as they are now priced.

Freud’s bronze Isis Suckling the Infant Horus (p. 53) provides a good example of how undervalued antiquities were in Freud’s lifetime, and how much their monetary and aesthetic values have appreciated over the years. Lustig found Freud’s Isis Suckling Horus on the floor of a second-hand shop in the countryside near Vienna in the early 1930s. When he asked the price, the shop owner put the statue on a scale to weigh it, and Lustig bought it for the price of the metal. Comparable Egyptian bronzes of Isis and the infant sold at auction at Sotheby’s for £7 in 1899, but brought £1750 in 1987.12

Freud was also careful with money and a good bargainer, and he regularly set aside small amounts of extra income for his collection. In a 1910 exchange with Sándor Ferenczi, his colleague in Budapest and also a collector, we find Freud’s pursuit of several objects is tempered by his prudence. Later in life, after his children had grown and his income was more secure, Freud continued to be conscientious about obtaining objects of quality and not overspending. His careful economy, shrewd bargaining, and knowledge of what he was buying made Freud a formidable collector on a practical level.

The lack of restrictions in the antiquities market kept prices low, but also permitted forgeries to enter it easily. Freud wanted to possess original objects, in much the same spirit that he wanted to uncover the most undistorted childhood memories of his patients. He regularly had objects authenticated by local antiquities experts. For example, Dr. Julius Banko, director of the antiquities collection of the Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum, authenticated Freud’s red-figured hydria depicting Oedipus and the Sphinx (p. 95). If Freud discovered he had a fake, he got rid of it. Unavoidably, some forgeries have survived in his collection, but they are few in number and include several that were authenticated by the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Freud’s lifetime. This is hardly surprising, as standards of authenticity and dating technology have changed over the decades. While Freud avoided forgeries, he was comfortable with acknowledged reproductions. Over the years he bought reproductions of the marble relief Gradiva and of Ingres’s Oedipus and the Sphinx. But it is worth emphasizing that Freud wanted to own authentic antiquities, which were the core of his collection.

Freud acquired his first art objects in December of 1896, two months after his father’s death. To consider that he began his collection in some sense as a reaction to his father’s death seems unavoidable; not only the timing but also the content of Freud’s early collecting suggests its strong connection with the loss of his father. It is clear that Freud showed interest in and had the opportunity to collect in
Freud regularly had his new acquisitions authenticated by local experts. Dr. Julius Banko, director of the antiquities collection of the Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum, in July of 1923 wrote this authentication document for Freud's Athenian red-figured hydria (p. 95), which depicts Oedipus and the Sphinx. (Photo: Freud Museum)

the years before his father's death. In 1885, on his first trip to Paris, the twenty-nine-year-old Freud had been impressed that the home of his mentor, French psychiatrist Jean Martin Charcot, who collected Indian and Chinese antiquities, was "in short, a museum," and that the Louvre's collection of Egyptian and Near Eastern antiquities created "a dreamlike world." 19 Freud had also begun, by the mid-1890s, to use an analogy with archaeology to describe his new therapeutic procedure. 20 Granted, Freud lived in poverty during his student days, and remained poor during the early years of his marriage, but his first purchases—plaster casts and prints after Old Master works—were extremely inexpensive. When he bought his first art object in 1896, he had long since furnished a home and office; he had been married for ten years and had lived at Berggasse 19 for five. It is important, however, to keep in mind one additional element in the timing of Freud's first acquisitions. Inexpensive as these purchases were, Freud could better afford them after his father's death, when he no longer bore the financial burden of paying for his father's upkeep. 21

During the period that his father's health failed, in the summer of 1896, Freud made his first trip to Florence. 22 Two months after Jacob Freud's death in October 1896, Freud described several artworks, which seem to be his first acquisitions, in a letter to Wilhelm Flies: "I have decorated my study with plaster copies of Florentine statues. They were a source of exceptional renewal and comfort for me. I am thinking of getting rich in order to be able to repeat these trips. A congress on Italian soil! (Naples, Pompeii)." 23

In this first known written reference to his art collection, Freud tells us what these objects meant to him: they were a source of exceptional "renewal"—Erneuerung in German, or, alternately translated "refreshment," "invigoration," with a sense of "enlivenment" and "potency." 24 The word also has the overture of
"comfort," suggesting the dual reaction of release (exhilaration) and sadness (in need of comfort) that survivors often feel after death has ended the suffering of a loved one. Thus, Freud's first acquisitions brought him both renewal and comfort during his grieving, and filled his study with a sense of life in the face of death.

A clue to the identification of the "plaster copies of Florentine statues" can be seen in a photograph of Freud, taken around 1905, in his ground-floor study at Berggasse 19, in which a reproduction of Michelangelo's Dying Slave appears in the background (see p. 20). No other known photograph of this study, which Freud used from 1891 to 1907, shows any art objects. The Dying Slave was probably one of the reproductions purchased in 1896 (Freud certainly wouldn't have bought more than a few such large casts to decorate his study), and these casts most likely were not moved when Freud transferred his study to the second floor in 1907: no Florentine statues appear in photos of the second-floor study, and by 1907 Freud was buying only original statues and acquiring works from only the very beginnings of the classical period.

The Dying Slave is a "Florentine statue" in the sense that it is by a Florentine artist, although the original was executed in Rome. Freud would have seen it in the Louvre in 1885, eleven years before he began collecting. Freud's purchase of this reproduction in Vienna relates less to his recent trip to Florence and more to his father's death—the father who was enslaved by anti-Semitism, the coward who didn't fight back when insulted. Freud's disappointment in his father was mixed with his childhood love of this gentle and generous parent. The slave in Michelangelo's construction is highly idealized, a beautiful, perfect, even hedonistic and voluptuous man, who is depicted as dying peacefully, as if going to sleep. Originally made for the tomb of Pope Julius II as a symbol of the arts, this image has an aura of the culture that Freud would have given the ideal father who (unlike Jacob Freud) would have known classical literature and the arts.

Michelangelo increased the psychological tension already present in this complex symbol of death/enslavement/perfection by carving behind the slave the crouching figure of a primitive ape. He holds what appears to be a mirror, usually interpreted to refer to the classical aphorism "Ars simia naturae" (art imitates [apes] nature). Working in the late nineteenth-century scientific climate created by Darwin, and in the decade of his own self-analysis, Freud may have seen in this ape, who lurks behind an ideal of humanity, new meaning for the prehistory of man and his primitive unconscious.

One cannot help but wonder what were the other "copies of Florentine statues" Freud purchased in December of 1896. Could one have been Michelangelo's David, the most famous and reproduced statue in Florence? As a companion to The Dying Slave, David would relate symbolically, and perhaps oedipally, to Freud himself. David was a writer (of the Psalms) and a man of humble birth who became a king; as a young Israelite, he became a hero by fearlessly slaying the Philistine giant Goliath. "Philistine" has the same connotation in German (Philister) and English—a common person indifferent to cultural values. Although it seems that the Florentine statues were not moved upstairs to the
new study in 1907, Freud did acquire another prominent “father symbol” for the second-floor office, one that remained with him the rest of his life. Over the analytic couch, Freud hung a large print of the colossal Egyptian temple of Ramesses II, The Rock-cut Temple at Abu Simbel.  

With his sensitivity to word associations, Freud may have appreciated the closeness of Abu to abi, the Hebrew word meaning “my father,” and Simbel to the German (and English) Symbol.  

If, indeed, Freud found Ramesses II, a heroic military leader and sponsor of the arts in 19th Dynasty Egypt, a suitable “father symbol,” then Abu Simbel, his colossal temple with passages deep into Mother Earth, loomed as an idealized heroic presence of Freud’s Jewish-German father over his son’s revolutionary couch.

At the time of Jacob Freud’s death, Sigmund explicitly stated that the loss had affected him deeply.  

Twelve years later, he wrote that he had come to realize, moreover, that this loss had prompted him to write The Interpretation of Dreams (1900) as part of his self-analysis (SE, 4, p. xxvi). I suggest that in addition to discovering the analytic method and writing this fundamental psychoanalytic text in the late 1890s, Freud also began collecting in response to the death of his father—first by placing an idealized statue of his father in his study, then by adding other statues from a learned and classical ancestry.

In addition to Freud’s struggles against anti-Semitism and his experience of the death of his father, the 1890s were years of professional isolation for him. His Jewish heritage and poverty had prevented him from having a university career in pure research, and his radical theories had alienated other neurologists. (Freud’s strong attachment to Wilhelm Fliess during these years is evidence of how desperate he was for intellectual companionship.) That Freud’s collection also functioned, in part, as surrogate colleagues for him is revealed in Freud’s first mention of his collection in the December 1896 letter to Fliess (above, p. 24). From describing the exceptional renewal he received from the statues, Freud free-associated to wanting to meet Fliess in Italy for a “congress,” in other words, for discussion and companionship.
Freud's selection and placement of his antiquities also point to their role as audience. Almost every object Freud acquired is a figure whose gaze creates a conscious presence, and his collection is predominantly sculpture, which by its nature has a more physical presence than painting. In describing the stone Janus head acquired in 1899, Freud emphasized its human presence: "It looks at me with two faces in a very superior manner." 35

Throughout many years of collecting, Freud frequently rearranged his antiquities, but they were always located only within his study and consultation rooms, never in his living quarters. These hundreds of human and animal figures all faced him like a huge audience—from his desk, from cabinets, from across the room. Freud chose in particular to confront many figures of scholars, wise men, and scribes; some were always on his desk. He wrote thousands of manuscript pages facing Imhotep, the Egyptian architect who, in later antiquity, was revered as a healer. Freud's desk was also the home of the baboon of Thoth, the Egyptian god of the moon, wisdom, and learning (p. 57), and of a Chinese sage. Several accounts reveal that Freud treated these figures as his companions. He was in the habit of stroking the marble baboon, as he did his pet chows, and of greeting the Chinese sage every morning. 36

Freud selected a bronze statue of Athena (p. 110), goddess of war, patron of the arts, and personification of wisdom, to stand in the very center of the antiquities on his desk. 37 Behind Athena, Freud placed a Chinese table screen (p. 129), which would have been found on a Chinese scholar’s desk along with other objects—carved jade mountains and unusual stones—to stimulate philosophical meditation or to inspire poetry and painting. Intended to encourage escape from the mundane world, these meditative objects are almost exclusively unp弄. Freud's central focus on the human psyche, evident throughout his antiquities collection by the predominance of human and animal forms, may have led him to choose this unusual screen depicting a figure.
Even after Freud’s theories had gained adherents, the new psychoanalytic societies suffered from defections. Freud worked throughout his life to establish an international professional society in the face of petty disputes and professional jealousies among his followers. The beleaguered founder of psychoanalysis always returned to his desk and to his dependable, silent audience, which represented for him the wisdom of the ages.

Freud first used the analogy of archaeology and psychoanalysis in the mid-1890s. Describing the case of Elisabeth von R., which he began at the end of 1892, Freud wrote:

In this, the first complete analysis of hysteria which I undertook, I arrived at a procedure which I later elevated to a method and deliberately employed: the procedure of clearing away, layer by layer, the pathogenic psychical material, which we like to compare with the technique of excavating a buried city. (SE, 2, p. 134)

In addition to being surrogate ancestors and colleagues, the antiquities seem to have held a third meaning for Freud, that of embodying the suppressed memories he was just beginning to uncover in the 1890s. As Donald Kuspit suggests (below, pp. 133ff), the retrieved memory is like the unearthed ancient object, a metaphor Freud hints at in this comment and goes on to state explicitly in later case histories such as those of Dora (SE, 7, p. 12) and the Rat Man (SE, 10, pp. 176–77).

Surrounding himself with ancient objects in the late 1890s gave Freud a physical reassurance of the reality of the illusory, distorted, and ephemeral memories that constituted his primary data as a scientist. Returning to Freud’s first recorded mention of his collection in 1896, there is another sense in which these objects from a past culture brought him Ernüchtern, a sense of life and power. Their survival was proof of a theory analogous to his own. Describing his self-analysis in 1899, Freud wrote: “I hardly dare to believe it yet. It is as if Schliemann had again dug up Troy, which had hitherto been deemed a fable.”

28
Most discussions of Freud the collector end with the postscript that Freud's ashes were placed in a Greek vase, implying that this was somehow a finale to Freud's collecting. However, there is no evidence that Freud initiated this memorial; it seems, rather, to have been a commemorative gesture arranged by Freud's family after his death. 40

I will end instead with the moment of Freud's death. After a long illness, Freud chose to die in his study, around him his famous couch, the desk at which he had created a new theory of the mind, his library, and his lifelong collection of fragments from a buried past: his ancestors of choice, his most faithful colleagues, and the embodiments of his excavated truths of psychoanalysis.

NOTES
2. Discussed by Spitz, below, pp. 157–58.
3. Gay, Freud: A Life, p. 17. An article in Neue Freie Presse of July 17, 1874, reports a dispute between the Greek and Turkish governments over ownership of the relics excavated by Schliemann. Reports on the discoveries at Troy also appeared in Vienna's Die Presse, May 7 and July 17, 1874. My thanks to Christa Badet, Österreichisches Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, for her help in finding these and other archaeological references that appeared in the Viennese press during Freud's lifetime.
5. See, for example, Brian Fagan, The Rape of the Nile: Tomb Robbers, Tourists and Archaeologists in Egypt (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), parts II and III.
9. Several hundred dealers in Vienna in the 1920s and 1930s sold primarily artworks of the Renaissance, Baroque, and Biedermeier. They might handle an ancient piece as part of a larger lot or estate, but only about five dealers sold ancient antiquities exclusively (interviews with Robert Lustig, Viennese antiquities dealer, September 5, 1988, and Ruth Blumka, widow of the Viennese Renaissance and Baroque dealer Leopold Blumka, October 21, 1988). Fifty-two private collections are listed in a 1908 inventory of the artistic resources of Vienna. Only three are collections of antiquities; the remaining forty-nine are largely Renaissance, Baroque, and Biedermeier. See Österreichisches Kunstdographie (Vienna: Anton Schnell, 1908), vol. 2, Die Denkmale der Stadt Wien, pp. 525 and 532. (This survey covered eleven of twenty-one districts in Vienna; an inventory of the remaining districts, one of which included Freud's residence, was apparently never completed because it was not published in this twenty-four-volume study of Austrian art.)
11. Ibid.
14. Throughout 1910, Freud and Ferenczi corresponded about a minor excavation at Dura-Pentele in central Hungary, from which Ferenczi regularly got objects through a local dealer, whom he called their "treasure hunter." This impoverished inhabitant had turned entrepreneur after a Roman cemetery was discovered buried beneath local farmlands. The collectors shared the spirit of searching out quality at a good price. Their correspondence alludes to "5 clay lamps (for 1 gulden) and a small bronze vessel... also for 1 FL"; Ferenczi says it is supposed to be a Bronze Age piece (February 16, 1910). On February 25, 1910, he writes to Freud about "some minor objects for 20
...a string of beads is inside the bronze vessel, the ring is in an envelope..." He goes on to ask Freud how he feels about some "warlike objects," recently excavated belts, "Roman with gold ornamentation," at prices of 62, 100, and 150 kroner. On March 3, 1910, Freud expresses his general satisfaction with the lamps and beads, not minding the price "if we please the poor fellow," but states he will not accept the expensive belts without seeing them first (Freud-Ferenczi correspondence, typewritten transcription, Freud Museum; trans. by Lynn Gamwell).

15. In a letter to Max Eitingon on February 16, 1927, after describing being fitted for a new prosthesis after oral surgery, Freud, perhaps self-conscious about exceeding his usual budget, writes: "I got myself an expensive present today, a lovely little dipylon vase—a real gem—to fight my ill humor. (Spending money is indicated not only for states of fear.)" (Freud-Eitingon correspondence, typewritten transcription, Freud Museum; trans. by Lynn Gamwell). The reference is probably to the Mycenaean stirrup jar, p. 80.

16. Freud took most of his antiquities to the Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum for authentication. He carefully kept authentication documents for objects in his desk and bookcase: documents for thirty-six objects are preserved today at the Freud Museum. They were prepared by Dr. Julius Barnea, director of the antiquities collection, in the 1920s and by Dr. Hans Demel, director of the Egyptian and Oriental collections, in the 1930s and 1940s. Both Barnea and Demel authenticated objects for private dealers who sold to Freud (Frederic Glueckselig and Robert Lustig). If Freud ever discovered he owned a forgery, he gave it away, according to Robert Lustig (interview, September 5, 1988).

Lustig tells a story that illustrates some of the problems surrounding the authentication of art objects Freud asked Lustig to get an Egyptian stone head appraised before he bought it. Lustig took it to Demel, who told him "It's a fake; don't sell it." The next day a stranger came to Lustig's shop looking for an inexpensive replica to buy; Lustig sold him the stone head. According to Lustig, several months later the stone head appeared in a Christie's auction catalogue; he added ruefully, "He stole it from me!" (Interview, September 5, 1988).

There is a reference to Demel in Freud's chronicle in November 1936, which seems to record an appointment and thus confirms that the two men met to discuss the antiquities (Korzetza Chronik, ed. Michael Molnar, forthcoming). Demel is also the expert who undervalued Freud's collection in 1938, in order to reduce Freud's total assets, on which the Nazis calculated a 25 percent refugee tax. Freud had to pay this tax before he was permitted to take his household belongings, library, and antiquities collection out of Austria (Freud to Minna Bernays, May 23, 1938, Freud Collection, Library of Congress).

17. For example, Freud owned several Egyptian wooden objects, including a large boat, a group of farmers, and a standing falcon-headed figure, which Lustig bought from an Egyptian "pasha" who had married a Viennese woman and settled in Vienna. Lustig had them authenticated at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, as he did most objects before bringing them to Freud (interview, September 5, 1988). The authenticity of these wooden objects has recently been cast in doubt by experts at the British Museum. See C. Nicholas Reeves's catalogue entry, p. 58.

18. It was mentioned by Suzanne Cassier Bernfeld in her 1951 article on Freud's collecting and his relation to antiquity, "Freud and Archaeology," American Imago 8:2 (1951), 127.


20. The analogy appears in Studies of Hysteria (1893–95), the case history of Elisabeth von R. (SE, 2, p. 139). For a slightly later example, see Freud's preface to the Dora case of 1901 (SE 7, p. 12).


22. Freud's biographers differ as to whether Freud actually made this trip. According to Jones, Freud spent a week in Florence in the summer of 1886 as part of "the longest holiday Freud had yet taken; he was away from Vienna for two months" (Life and Work, vol. 1, p. 333; as in n. 8), whereas Gay makes the reasonable point that Freud did not want to vacation too far from Vienna because his father was gravely ill, and that he took a "brief holiday" (Freud: A Life, p. 88). In Freud's letters, in July, he cancels a two-day trip to Berlin because his father was still ill (Freud-Flies, July 15, 1896, p. 194), but then in December, after his father's death, he suggests that he has made a recent trip to Italy, which he wants to repeat (Freud-Flies, December 6, 1896, p. 214). Peter Gay has conjectured that if indeed Freud did make this trip to Florence, it may have been because he thought his father might live somewhat longer after all (personal communication, September 30, 1988). In any case, Freud relied on telegrams to keep in touch whenever he was away, and he could have returned to Vienna overnight, were his father dying. In the end, Freud's somewhat inconsistent behavior—canceling one trip, then taking an even longer one — may not require more explanation.
than to remember his own descriptions of his conflicted feelings toward his dying parent (Freud-Fliess, November 2, 1886, p. 202; Freud, ‘A Disturbance of Memory on the Acropolis,’ SE, 22, pp. 239–48).


24. Translations respectively by Peter Gay, Freud: A Life, p. 171 (as in n. 1), and by Jeffrey M. Masson, Freud-Fliess, p. 214 (as in n. 4), which gives the sense of bringing life but miss the overtones of “comfort.”

25. “Comfort” is given as a translation of Erquickung in a 1958 edition of Cassell’s German Dictionary. Erquickung also suggests “life” as opposed to death, as does the German adjective quick, meaning “lively.” The German Erquickung and quick share an etymological root with the English noun “quick,” meaning “the living,” as in “the quick and the dead.”

26. The date and location of this photograph are not entirely clear. I date it to about 1905 by comparison with other photographs of Freud, noting the amount of gray in his hair, his hairline, and the cut of his beard; in Sigmund Freud: His Life in Pictures and Words, Ernst Freud, Lucie Freud, and Ilse Grubrich-Simitis, eds. (New York: Norton, 1978); see illus. 186 (about 1905), illus. 181 (about 1906), and illus. 193 (about 1906). The latter was used as the model for a medallion made by K. M. Schwertner for Freud’s fiftieth birthday (1906). Assuming this date, the location would have to be Freud’s ground-floor study. Martin Freud corroborates the location in his book Glory Reflected (London: Angus and Robertson, 1957), where he captions this photo, “My first snapshot of father in his study” (p. 24). My thanks to Inge Scholz-Strasser, secretary general of the Sigmund Freud Haus in Vienna, who after consultation with its director, Hankl Leupold-Löwenthal, confirmed this date and location, again on the basis of Freud’s appearance.

Confusion surrounding the date of this photograph may stem from the original prints of it, which are in the Freud Museum. There are three; two are undated, and on one is written “1905,” which is crossed out, and then “1914” in a hand other than Freud’s.

This photograph is reproduced in Sigmund Freud: His Life in Pictures and Words (ILLUS. 217) as being from “about 1912,” with the caption “On the verandah of his home in the Bergasse, taken by one of his sons.” This doesn’t ring true, because this structure in 1912 was off the living room, and Freud didn’t put his antiquities in the family living quarters. The photo could have been taken on a veranda in about 1905, however, because Freud’s ground-floor study, located directly below the living room with attached veranda, also had one. We know from the credits listed in this publication that the caption of the photograph was written in cooperation with Freud’s late son Ernst. The copyright on the photograph is held by Sigmund Freud Copyrights in London; they have no record of the origin of this dating or caption (personal communication with Tom Roberts, Sigmund Freud Copyrights, November, 1988).

27. In 1907 Freud added the following paraphrasis to The Psychopathology of Everyday Life (1901): “There is one misreading which I find irritating and laughable to which I am prone whenever I walk through the streets of a strange town on my holidays. On these occasions I read every shop sign that resembles the word in any way as ‘Antiquities.’ This betrays the questing spirit of the collector” (SE, 6, p. 110). It also betrays that between first publishing this book in 1901 and adding this observation in 1907, Freud had significantly increased his visits to dealers of original antiquities and would have been more prone to this paraphrasis.

Hanging on the wall of Freud’s study, as seen in the c. 1905 photograph of Freud with the reproduction of Michelangelo’s The Dying Slave, is a second reproduction: Masaccio and Masolino’s The Healing of the Paralytic, and The Raising of Tabitha from the Brancacci Chapel in Florence. This photograph or print after the fresco, whose subject no doubt appealed to Freud the physician, is further evidence that Freud began collecting Renaissance reproductions, and then shifted to acquiring original ancient works after around 1905. The five small tablets hanging on the wall in a vertical row on the left, and the single tablet in the upper right, are as yet unidentified.

28. Freud recounted an episode from his childhood in which his father didn’t stand up against an anti-Semitic insult (see Gay, Freud: A Life, pp. 11–12); Freud’s response to this episode is discussed by Spietz, below, pp. 156–57.


30. Ibid.

31. This print was published in 1907, which adds to the likelihood that Freud purchased it when he moved into his new study in this same year.

Freud owned about fifty prints, many of which depict archaeological sites, including an intaglio map of ancient Rome, an eighteenth-century etching by Piranesi from the Vedute di Roma, and a nineteenth-century engraving of the Acropolis at Athens.
32. This was noticed by Henry G. Fischer in “The Abu Symbol,” *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 35:4 (1966), 591. The origin of the name “Abu Simbel” for this funerary monument is not clear. My thanks to Richard Fazzini, curator of Egyptian, Classical, and Ancient Middle Eastern Art, The Brooklyn Museum, for this reference.


34. An “ancestry of choice”; see Spitz, below, p. 157.


36. According to Freud’s maid Paula, who is cited by Jack Spector in *The Aesthetics of Freud* (New York: Praeger, 1972), p. 15. (The Chinese sage was later found not to be an antique Chinese work.)

37. See Bergmann, below, pp. 178–79, where this figure’s role in Freud’s work is discussed. After the Nazi occupation of Austria in 1938, Freud was informed that he and his family would be allowed to leave the country, but the fate of his antiquities collection and library remained uncertain for some time. During this period his friend Marie Bonaparte visited, and Freud asked her to smuggle the tiny figure of Athena out of Austria because it was his favorite piece and symbolized the whole collection to him (Jones, *Life and Work*, vol. 3 (1957), p. 228; as in n. 8).


40. The origin of the idea that Freud’s ashes were placed in this vase at his request is probably his letter to Marie Bonaparte thanking her for the gift of the vase in 1931: “I was very happy with it … and I can even muster some regrets that none of the beautiful urns will accompany me to my grave.” Quoted in Max Schur, *Freud: Living and Dying* (London: Hogarth Press, n.d.), p. 429. This is only a whimsical expression; there is no evidence of such a request being made by Freud, for example, in his will, which makes no reference to funeral arrangements. Also, in the approximately one hundred obituary notices and descriptions of the funeral published within several months after Freud’s death (preserved in the Library of Congress and the Freud Museum), the cremation of Freud’s body is mentioned repeatedly but not the disposition of the ashes. Specifically, Marie Bonaparte does not mention this in her obituary published in *Marianne*, October 4, 1939. All this indicates that the ashes were placed in this vase considerably after Freud’s death, an arrangement made by his family.

Freud’s son Ernst, an architect, designed the plinth on which the vase rests.

The vase that holds Freud’s ashes is a red-figure bell krater with a Dionysiac scene, including a kantharos (high-handled drinking cup) and a bunch of grapes, the attribute of the wine god. Although this vase type and subject are not commonly associated with burial in Greek culture, there is some evidence to suggest that for the Greeks of southern Italy in the fourth century B.C., Dionysos was worshiped primarily as a god of the underworld and the afterlife; this made Dionysiac scenes exceedingly appropriate decoration for vases designed to be placed in the grave (personal communication with Lucilla Burn, November 7, 1988).
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Cylinder seals were developed in southern Mesopotamia (now Iraq) and southwestern Iran in the second half of the fourth millennium B.C. They replaced stamp seals as a means of marking ownership and authenticating documents because they were better able to cover large areas of clay used for sealing jars, bales of textiles, and other goods being stored or transported in large quantities. Also during this time extensive trade networks were developed, and a system of recording transactions was finally perfected — namely, the earliest known writing in a pictographic script on clay tablets.

The design on this Early Dynastic seal is arranged in two registers without a divider. Above, two long-horned quadrupeds, advancing toward the left, are followed by a lion whose tail is being grasped by a figure. This is probably a scene of animal husbandry in which a shepherd in a tufted skirt protects his flock from a predator. Lions roamed northern and eastern Iraq, and the protection of flocks, a duty assumed by the leader of each community, was frequently depicted. The most famous examples show the Assyrian kings, as shepherds of their people, engaged in lion hunts whose meaning had become purely symbolic.

The scene on the lower register is probably an agricultural ceremony. The two long-haired figures appear to be female. The seated one is either a vegetation goddess or a priestess representing her. A male attendant stands behind her and seems to be dressing her hair. The object she holds may be a plough, but it could equally be a sledge used for threshing. The scene before the seated figure may be interpreted as two figures emptying a sack onto a pile of (perhaps) grain, while a third approaches with a sack on his head. The priestess on the left seems to supervise. All the figures wear tufted skirts.

Similar scenes occur at this period on numerous seals from central Iraq and the Diyala region farther east. Often the seated figure wears a horned headress, which was then beginning to be used to identify deities. In some cases the figures seem to be building a tiered structure reminiscent of later ziggurats, but the earliest known ziggurat is some four hundred years later. The more likely explanation is that this is one of the many agrarian festivals that took place in ancient Mesopotamia.

—DC

See P. Amiet, Glyptique mésopotamique archaïque (Paris, 1980), nos. 1441–69, 1482–85, especially nos. 1441 and 1463, from Tell Asmar and Ischali in the Diyala region northeast of Baghdad; for a discussion see pp. 181–86.
The nineteenth and eighteenth centuries B.C., a period that culminated in the reign of Hammurabi (1793–1750 B.C.), saw a tremendous increase in legal, administrative, and scribal activity. More people than ever before required seals so that they could witness contracts or seal their goods and storerooms. The most commonly used seal material was hematite, a hard, fine-grained iron oxide stone. The designs on the best of these seals are remarkably consistent and depict a limited range of figures which could be combined according to certain rigid conventions.

The bearded sun god, as god of justice and omens, was frequently depicted. With his saw-toothed blade he cuts his way through the mountains of the east at dawn; generally he rests one foot on a mountain, but occasionally, as here, his attribute animal, the human-headed bull (probably a bison), is depicted instead. Before him stands a stereotyped representation of the king in ceremonial robes, holding an animal offering (probably for divination) and raising one hand. Above them are the combined symbols of the main astral bodies—sun disk, star, and crescent moon. Behind the god stands a kilted priest who has shaved his head except for a forelock. He holds a cup and a small footed bucket, and he stands on a dais, probably indicating that the scene is taking place in a temple. The suppliant goddess stands with both hands raised and intercedes before the god on behalf of the owner of the seal. The horned headdresses indicate that their wearers are deities. The king wears a round cap with a broad brim or turban, and he and the god wear open robes to allow freedom of movement. The king’s robe has a decorated border and is draped over one shoulder, whereas the god’s is a pleated skirt. The goddess wears a tiered, pleated garment.

There was once an inscription in cuneiform running from the top to the bottom of the seal. The inscription was erased, perhaps by a new owner, but traces of the frame survive. Since this inscription had only two lines instead of the more common three, it is probable that it contained the names of two deities rather than the name and patronymic of the owner. The fine quality of this seal indicates that it probably came from the neighborhood of the capital city, Babylon.

Because seals were meant to be rolled out on clay, their designs and inscriptions were generally cut in reverse. The correct way of viewing the design is on the impression; it is the seal impression that is generally described in catalogues of cylinder seals. In the case of this seal, an impression was made of the impression, so that the scene is in fact back to front. Freud’s collection contains about twenty cylinder seals from the ancient Near East, and he enjoyed making clay impressions of them himself.

—DC

FEMALE FIGURE

Syrian, Middle Bronze Age, c. 2000–1750 B.C.
Clay, h. 4 ½ in. (11.7 cm)
3725

This terracotta is typical of a large group of figurines current in the Orontes Valley of central Syria during the early part of the Middle Bronze Age (c. 2000–1750 B.C.). Numerous examples have been found in well-dated, excavated contexts at sites such as Hama, Qatna, Qadesh, and also at Tell Mardikh (Ebla). The group as a whole includes both male and female figures, differentiated on the basis of overall proportions and style of headdress. Anatomical sexual features such as penises are rare, but many of the females have clearly depicted pubic triangles and/or small applied breasts. Although neither genitals nor breasts are represented on this example, the general shape of the body, especially the treatment of the hips, strongly suggests that it is female.

Further support for this attribution comes from the headdress. Male figures of this Orontes Valley group usually have low pointed caps, whereas the females, as in this case, tend to have elaborate high headdresses with a number of piercings. Several examples have been found in which these holes were used for the suspension of small copper or gold rings.

The function of these figurines is difficult to establish. It certainly cannot be assumed that they formed part of some cult or fertility ritual because fertility figures customarily have exaggerated sexual attributes, and many, if not most, of the Orontes figurines show no representation of the genitalia at all. The contexts in which the majority of these figures have been found seem to be purely domestic rather than religious or funerary. Thus it is more reasonable to interpret these terracottas as ornaments or perhaps even playthings; figurines of this type have frequently been found associated with model beds, chariots, and carts.

—JT

For similar examples, see Leila Badre, Les Figurines anthropomorphes en terre cuite à l'âge du bronze en Syrie (Paris, 1980).
AMENOPHIS I AND AHMOSE-NOFRETIRI

Egyptian, New Kingdom (18th Dynasty), probably reign of Amenophis III, 1390–1353 B.C.
Statute, 3 1/2 x 3 1/4 in. (9 x 8.3 cm)
3072

The main figure of this fragmentary dyad is the deified Amenophis I, who is shown wearing a short Nubian wig, kilt, and armlets and clutching a flail in his right hand. He is seated beside his mother, the deified queen Ahmose-Noferetiri, who wears an elaborate vulture headdress, close-fitting garment, and broad collar. Mortise holes in the top of the head of each figure were probably intended for the attachment of headdress embellishments. The back of the dyad is incised with two opposed pairs of columns of hieroglyphs, one double column relating to each figure. The text behind the king reads: “The good god, son of Amon, ... / King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Djoserkare...” That behind the queen may be translated: “The god’s wife, born of the god, the king’s wife ... / his mother, the mother of the king, Ahmose-Noferetiri...”

After their deaths, both Amenophis I, second king of the 18th Dynasty (r. 1514–1493 B.C.), and his mother Ahmose-Noferetiri, wife of King Ahmose I (r. 1539–1514 B.C.), were worshiped as the divine patrons of the vast Theban necropolis. They enjoyed particular popularity among the official necropolis work force, which was based at the village of Deir el-Medina. The reason for the attention paid to the couple is not at all clear, although it was previously speculated that Deir el-Medina had been founded during the reign of Amenophis I. Both Amenophis I and his mother appear to have shared a common place of burial at Dra Abu’l Naga, in a tomb first prepared for Ahmose-Noferetiri and later extended to receive a second burial. In 1913–14 this tomb was cleared for the fifth Earl of Carnarvon by Howard Carter, the archaeologist best known for discovering the tomb of Tutankhamun in 1922.

The Freud statue, which perhaps comes from a small domestic shrine, is related to a group of statuettes in glazed steatite representing Ahmose-Noferetiri herself or Queen Tjye, consort of Amenophis III, the pharaoh in whose reign this piece was probably carved.
—CNR

This queen-mother affectionately and intimately grouped with her king-son may have appealed to Freud, a firstborn and favored child. “If a man has been his mother’s undisputed darling he retains throughout life the triumphant feeling, the confidence in success, which not seldom brings actual success along with it” (SE, 17, p. 156).

Freud avidly followed reports of excavations throughout his life and surely would have known about Howard Carter’s excavation of the tomb of Amenophis I and Ahmose-Noferetiri. The author of the Oedipus complex may have been intrigued by their burial arrangement—mother and son lying together for eternity in a common tomb.
—PM

Osiris was a complex deity, woven into the Heliopolitan cosmogony as the firstborn son of Geb and Nut, and possessing an essentially dual role in the religion of ancient Egypt. Perhaps originally worshiped as a god of fertility, Osiris only gradually accrued to himself—by assimilation with various local gods such as Andjety, Khentimentiu (Foremost of the Westerners, i.e., the dead) and Sokar—the trappings of a mummified god-king, ruler of the underworld and lord of resurrection. By the end of the 5th Dynasty (2520–2360 B.C.) the king, in life the embodiment of Horus, was equated in death with Osiris. This latter identification was in due course extended to all Egyptians, bestowing on them for the first time an opportunity for an independent existence in the next world and ensuring for Osiris a timeless and unbounded popularity.

According to legend (a number of versions of which exist, the fullest by Plutarch), Osiris was a terrestrial king whose popularity and success aroused the jealousy of his brother, Seth. Seth determined to seize the throne for himself, and with a number of accomplices, he prepared a magnificent chest, the dimensions of which tallied closely with the measurements of his brother. During the course of a banquet held in the king’s honor, Seth had this coffer dragged in, and he offered to present it as a gift to the one whom it fit most closely. When Osiris came to lie down within the box, Seth and his followers immediately nailed shut the lid, sealed it with molten lead, and cast the chest into the Nile. Carried out to sea, the box eventually washed up at Byblos on the Lebanese coast, where it was found by Isis, the dead king’s widow. Brought back to Egypt, the body fell into Seth’s hands and was cut into fourteen pieces and scattered the length and breadth of the country. According to one version of the tale, Isis sought out the pieces and buried each where she found it; other texts tell how the dismembered portions of the body were reassembled as the first mummy. The corpse was reanimated by Isis, “the great magician,” by the beating of her wings (she had taken the form of a kite), and upon the mummy of Osiris the goddess was able to conceive the child Horus.

This well-modeled head of Osiris, broken from a large hollow-cast figure in bronze, wears an atef crown now lacking its separately modeled plumes and perhaps a solar disk. The head was further embellished with a uraeus, the sacred cobra of Egypt (of which only the tail now remains) and an attached beard (again lost). The eyes and the straps of the beard (and, doubtless, the missing beard and the plumes and disk of the atef) were formerly inlaid, presumably with semiprecious stones, such as carnelian and lapis lazuli, faience, or brightly colored glass.

In its complete state, the figure to which this head was once attached must have been an imposing object. If not a cult figure as such, it had clearly been presented to the god by a particularly rich and pious worshiper. The vast majority of ex-voto offerings of this sort appear to have been produced during the Late Period (716–332 B.C.) and after, although the overall style of the present piece, its size, and the lavish use of inlays may reflect a somewhat earlier date.

CNR

On Osiris, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), IV, cols. 623–33, s.v. “Osiris” (J. G. Griffiths), with the references there cited. The standard works on Egyptian bronzes are G. Roeder, Ägyptische Bronzewerke (Glückstadt, 1937), and Klem, Ägyptische Bronzefiguren (Berlin, 1956).
HEAD OF A KING PROTECTED BY
THE HORUS FALCON

Egyptian, New Kingdom (18th Dynasty), probably reign of
Amenophis III, 1390–1353 B.C.
Steatite, originally glazed, h. 3 3/8 in. (8.6 cm)
3362

This head from the figure of a king wears the nemes headcloth surmounted by the double crown of Upper
and Lower Egypt; behind perches a falcon with a solar
disk on its head, its wings (now broken) bent in a ges-
ture of protection. The king’s face (the mouth and nose
of which have suffered damage) is relatively well carved,
with eyebrows and cosmetic lines in relief and separated
by an incised line. The ears are large and well modeled.
Short straps running part way up each side of the face
indicate the presence of a beard, now broken away.

Despite certain stylistic peculiarities, such as the
shortened form and odd positioning of the straps of the
beard, the authenticity of this patinated steatite head is
not open to serious doubt. The material, as much as the
style, suggests that it is a product of the reign of
Amenophis III, one of the richest and most powerful
kings of the 18th Dynasty, father of the heretic
Amenophis IV-Akhenaten (r. 1353–1336 B.C.) and in
all likelihood the grandfather of the boy-king Tut-
ankhamun (r. 1332–1323 B.C.).

The statuette of which this head originally formed a
part is of a distinctive type that occurs sporadically
from the Old Kingdom on, one of a relatively small number of
royal figures in which the symbolic protection of the god
Horus, who was immanent in the king, is given con-
crete expression. The most famous instance of this type
is the “diorite” statue of Chephren of the 4th Dynasty
(2640–2520 B.C.), found in his valley temple at Giza in
1858 and one of the masterpieces of Egyptian art. What
was perhaps a close parallel to the Freud figure is shown
in two dimensions in the chapel of Ipy at Thebes (pri-
ivate tomb no. 217), which dates from the time of
Ramesses II (1279–1213 B.C.). A fragmentary scene
in this tomb shows the deified king Amenophis I—per-
haps the intended subject of the Freud head—carried
by priests in a palanquin. The form of the falcon, with its
bent wings and solar disk, is almost identical, but the
head of the figure is lost.

—CNR

For the steatite figures of the reign of Amenophis III, see J.
Vandier, “Une Statuette de la reine Try,” Monuments et mémoires,
Foundation Eugène Piot 54 (1966), pp. 7–23; C. Aldred,
“Ahmose-Nefretari Again,” Artibus Aegypti. Studia in honorem
Bernardi V. Bodmer a colloquio amici discipulis conscripta (Brussels,
1983), pp. 7–14; On the Chephren statue, see E. L. B. Terrace
and H. G. Fischer, Treasures of Egyptian Art from the Cairo
no. 6, pp. 41–44. For the scene from the tomb of Ipy, see N. de
G. Davies, Two Ramesside Tombs at Thebes (New York, 1927), pl.
XLI: 23.
IMHOTEP

Egyptian. Late Period, 716–332 B.C.
Bronze. h. 4 3/4 in. (12 cm)
3027

Imhotep, the deified vizier of King Djoser of the 3rd Dynasty (2705–2640 B.C.), is best known today as the architect of the Step Pyramid at Saqqara, the world's first large-scale stone building. He was held in high esteem less as an architect, however, than as a sage, and scribes habitually poured a libation to his memory before they began to write. In more recent antiquity, Imhotep was revered as a healer and magician, and from the Late Period on (after 716 B.C.) shrines were dedicated to his worship in temples at Philae, Thebes, Saqqara, and elsewhere. In later times he was recognized as the son of Ptah (god of craftsmen) and a woman named Kheredduankh. The deification of Imhotep was completed when, with the arrival of the Greeks in Egypt, he came to be identified with Asklepios, the classical god of medicine.

This figure of Imhotep was cast in bronze by the lost-wax method; the eyes are inlaid, probably with electrum (an alloy of silver and gold). The god is shown seated, wearing a close-fitting cap and a short, pleated kilt, and holding a partially unrolled though uninscribed papyrus on his knees. Imhotep's feet rest upon an uninscribed square base. The figure may have been presented at a shrine of the god by a pilgrim seeking relief from illness or offering thanks. The original throne, from which the bronze has now been separated, may have been inscribed with the pilgrim's name and a dedication to the god.

—CNR

Freud may have especially favored this figure because of Imhotep's identification during classical times with the Greek god of healing, Asklepios. In The Interpretation of Dreams, Freud refers to this deity as being associated with the healing power of dreams:

In Greece there were dream oracles, which were regularly visited by patients in search of recovery. A sick man would enter the temple of Apollo or Aesculapius, would perform various ceremonies there, would be purified by lustration, massage and incense, and then, in a state of exaltation, would be stretched on the skin of a ram which had been sacrificed. He would then fall asleep and would dream of the remedies for his illness. These would be revealed to him either in their natural form or in symbols and pictures which would afterwards be interpreted by the priests. (SE, 4, p. 34n)

—FM

On Imhotep, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), III, cols. 145–48, s.v. "Imhotep" (D. Wildung).
Because of the vast numbers of figures offered to the gods as gifts by devout pilgrims, particularly during the Late Period and Greco-Roman times, temple repositories had periodically to be cleared out and the old offerings buried in the vicinity of the god's shrine. Such caches, frequently stumbled upon by diggers, are the source of most divine figures encountered today in private and public collections.

Corrosion deposits built up over the years of burial have only recently been removed from this particular bronze, revealing the incised detail of its surface. Now attached to a modern wooden base, the figure of the god Amon-Re is shown in human form, wearing a short wrap-over kilt, his left foot to the fore. His right arm is held down by his side, and his left arm is bent at the elbow, originally to grasp a staff, now lost. On his head the god wears his characteristic flat-topped crown with tall double plumes and large solar disk; on his chin he carries the divine beard.

The name Amun, "the hidden one," conveys some impression of the god's universal and all-pervading nature. A creator god, his elevation to the status of king of the gods and lord of the thrones of the Two Lands (Egypt) is first attested in the reign of Sesostris I (1918–1875 B.C.); during the course of the Middle Kingdom (1987–1640 B.C.) "Amun" appears as a component of several royal names. The god's prestige was further increased during the New Kingdom (1540–1075 B.C.) by association with the sun god Re. As a result of this syncretism the king became son of Amun, and the monarch owed his very existence to the god's impregnation of the royal mother. By the time of the Greeks, the god Amon-Re was identified with Zeus.

The city of Amun (Egyptian niuity Amun, the "No-Amon" of the Bible) was Thebes, the east bank of which boasts two magnificent and well-preserved temples dedicated to the god's worship, at Luxor and Karnak. Numerous other monuments offer evidence of his preeminence, not only within Egypt but also beyond the frontiers—notably in Nubia, where the god's popularity continued for several centuries after the decline of Egyptian political influence in the area.

—CNR

For a discussion of some of the possible meanings of this statue in the context of Freud's life and work, see below, Spitz, pp. 154ff.

—FM

On Amun, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden. 1972–), 1, cols. 237–48, s.v. "Amun" (E. Otto), and the references there cited.
PTAH

Egyptian, Late Period, 716–332 B.C., or later
Bronze, h. 6 3/4 in. (17.1 cm)
3236

This well-modeled figure of the god Ptah, cast solid by the lost-wax method, has a variegated green patina. The god is shown in characteristic form, with a close-fitting cap, broad collar, menit counterpoise (collar counterweight), and a square-cut false beard. His hands, protruding from the ridge-backed shroud he wears, clutch a was scepter, the hieroglyph for “dominion.” The figure is mounted on a modern ebony base, which obscures the tang and replaces the ancient bevel-fronted maat base upon which the god is traditionally depicted.

Ptah stands apart from the other important gods of ancient Egypt in that he was first and foremost a local god—that of Memphis, a royal residence and the administrative capital of Egypt. He was variously represented as having created the world by thought and speech alone; as the divine patron of craftsmen and artists, Ptah was equated by the Greeks with Hephaistos. He was later worshiped as the principal figure of the Memphite triad, his partners being the lion-headed goddess Sekhmet and the junior member Nefertum, god of the sacred lotus.

As with the greater number of such figures, this bronze was presumably presented at a shrine of the god by a supplicant.

—CNR

On Ptah, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), IV, cols. 1177–180, s.v. “Ptah” (H. te Velde).
The traditional Egyptian sphinx, with its lion’s body and human head (more bizarre forms had little more than a human face, or the head of a ram or falcon), was a curious mix of brute strength and contemplative intelligence. Despite its ominous presence, it was throughout Egyptian history a power for good, a guardian creature closely associated with the king. Usually male (although not infrequently female), the creature could be represented in a number of poses: couchant with its paws stretched out in front, seated, standing, or walking. It has been suggested that the term “sphinx” originated from an Egyptian expression, *sheep ankhu*, which means “living image.”

This green faience amulet in the form of a seated sphinx has hair arranged in cruciform fashion. The type is evidently female, although here it is shown without breasts. Broken across the legs and repaired, the creature is seated on a rectangular base, rounded at the rear, a suspension loop behind the head.

The most famous Egyptian sphinx is the colossal sculpture carved from a limestone outcrop in the necropolis at Giza. Carved initially in the image of King Chephren of the 4th Dynasty (2640–2520 B.C.) (whose pyramid complex it guards), during the New Kingdom the Giza sphinx was worshiped as a representation of the sun god Harmachis—Horus in the horizon—and associated with the Semitic deity Hauron.

—CNR

On Egyptian sphinxes, see W. Helck et al., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden, 1972–), V, cols. 1139–147, s.v. “Sphinx” (C. M. Zwie).
This small vulture, cast in bronze by the lost-wax method, makes contact with a rectangular base at the feet and tail. It has a suspension ring, now worn through, on the back.

The Egyptians identified the vulture with a number of deities, including Nekhbet of Elkab, the principal tutelary goddess of Upper Egypt, whom this small bronze piece was probably intended to represent. In hieroglyphic script, the vulture stands as the sign for mut (mother), which is the name given to another vulture goddess, Mut, one of the maternal guardians of pharaoh. A member of the Theban triad of gods, Mut was the consort of Amun and mother of Khons. Her cult center was located at Karnak in that area of the temple known as Ishru. Unlike Nekhbet, Mut is more usually represented in human form as a woman wearing a vulture headdress surmounted by the double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt.

Although amulets of a size appropriate for wear were a common feature of ancient Egyptian life, Freud’s vulture is more probably to be recognized as a small votive bronze offered at a shrine by a visiting pilgrim.

—CNR

“It would be interesting to enquire how it could be that the ancient Egyptians came to choose the vulture as a symbol of motherhood.” So began Freud’s discussion of the Egyptian vulture deity and the ancient concept of an androgynous mother-goddess. Basing his discussion on ancient Greek authors such as Plutarch, Freud wrote that the Egyptians regarded the vulture as a symbol of motherhood, believing that only female vultures existed and that they could be impregnated by the wind. Thus the vulture goddess Mut, both in her sexual self-sufficiency and her occasional representation with male as well as female attributes, was a goddess who possessed both maternal and masculine characteristics (SE, 11, pp. 88–89, 94).

The context of Freud’s inquiry into the Egyptian vulture is his essay “Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood.” His interpretation is based, in part, on a well-known mistranslation of a passage from Leonardo’s notebooks in which the artist wrote of a nibbio coming to his cradle when he was an infant. In the German text that Freud used, the Italian word nibbio is incorrectly translated as “vulture” instead of “kite” (SE, 11, p. 61, editor’s note). There is a debate as to the significance of this mistranslation to the validity of Freud’s interpretation of Leonardo.

—FM

On Nekhbet and Mut, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), IV, cols. 366–67, s.v. “Nechbet” (M. Heerma van Voss), and cols. 246–48, s.v. “Mut” (H. re Veldde).
The goddess Isis, offspring of Geb and Nut and sister-wife of Osiris, represented above all else the wisely and motherly virtues that the Egyptians held dear. Following the death of Osiris and his eventual resurrection as lord of the underworld, Isis took refuge in the marshes of Chemmis in the Delta. Here she gave birth to their son, rearing him in secret, protecting him by her magical powers that he might in due course avenge the murder of his father.

In this bronze figure, Isis wears a tripartite vulture headdress surmounted by the horned disk of her close associate, the cow goddess Hathor, and a simple, close-fitting, ankle-length garment. Harpocrates (Horus the child), to whom the goddess offers her breast, is naked (in keeping with his youth) except for a broad collar and close-fitting cap and sidelock; physically, however, he is represented not as a child but, in typical Egyptian fashion, as a miniature adult.

As the mother of Horus, Isis was also the mother of pharaoh and the guarantor of royal succession. Always a goddess of importance in Egypt, during the later periods of pharaonic rule the worship of Isis was especially popular. Under the Romans, her cult spread throughout the empire, and she came to be regarded as the goddess par excellence. Isis lactans is seen by some as a natural prototype for the Christian image of the Madonna and Child.

The Freud bronze, which is of particularly fine quality, was cast by the lost-wax technique. Although it may have been employed as a domestic cult figure, it is more likely to have been intended for dedication at a shrine of the goddess. Figures of metal, stone, wood, or faience were commonly offered to the gods by devout pilgrims who hoped by their gifts to secure divine favor—here, perhaps, in view of the goddess's maternal associations, in anticipation of or thanks for a painless birth. Such figures were commonly inscribed with the name of the deity and the name and filiation of the votary, either upon the base or (as perhaps here) upon an original plinth, now lost.

— CNR

For the goddess Isis, see W. Helek et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), III, cols. 186–203, s.v. "Isis" (J. Bermman), with references.
DONATION STELE

Egyptian, Ptolemaic Period, dated 301 B.C.
Limestone, h. 20 3/8 in. (53 cm)
4581

This extremely interesting limestone stele has a commemorative inscription and the characteristic round top and division into registers.

In the upper register is the winged disk of the sun, the emblem of the solar god Horus, which extends its protection over the scenes below. The sun is flanked by two uraei, the sacred cobras of Egyptian kingship, which wear the crowns of southern or Upper Egypt (right) and Lower Egypt (left). This emblem is common on Egyptian stelae of all periods.

The middle register, largest of the three, is intended to symbolize the religious meaning of the entire stele. On the right stands the figure of a pharaoh wearing one of his many ritual crowns; in his hands he presents the hieroglyph denoting a field, or agricultural land. This motif was originally designed to commemorate endowments of land but was rapidly applied to religious donations in general. The cartouche containing the name of the king is damaged and seems to be uninscribed, but we know from the accompanying text in the lower register that he is in fact Ptolemy, the general of Alexander the Great, who seized control of Egypt when Alexander died in 323 B.C. and later declared himself pharaoh.

The style of the figures and the hieroglyphs are typical of this period, as is the method of carving in relief. The high value originally attached to the stele is shown by traces of gold leaf, which once decorated the upper registers.

Four gods face the person of the king and are clearly intended as the recipients of the donation. From right to left these are: the sky god Amun, wearing two vertical plumes on his head; his consort Mut, wearing the double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt; their son the moon god Khonsu, who is here identified with the god Horus in an unusual form, shown with the crescent and disk of the new moon upon his head; and Horus of Mesen, a solar deity, described here as "the noble winged scarab who presides over the Lower Egyptian Thebes."

The gods pictured in the middle register make it very likely that the object originated in the city of Semebchert, otherwise known as the Lower Egyptian Thebes, the modern Tell Balamun in the northern Delta. Inscriptions from this site are extremely rare and add to the interest of this stele.

The lowest register, somewhat damaged, contains an inscription in demotic, the shorthand script regularly used in Egypt for everyday purposes during the Late Period. The six lines of text record a date, the month of Pachons in the fourth year of Pharaoh Ptolemy (July, 301 B.C.). The text then mentions a chapel, which is to be assigned in perpetuity, together with its endowment income and its divine images, to one Amenhotep, son of Khaibor. Nothing else is known of this man, but another major inscription of Ptolemy, issued while he was still nominal governor of Egypt, records that large tracts of land in the northern Delta, which had been confiscated when Egypt was a province of the Persian Empire, were returned at this time to the native priesthood, doubtless to secure their loyalty to their new overlords. The Freed stele, which probably once stood in the chapel to which it refers, records a small episode in this process, the attempt by the first Greek-speaking ruler of Egypt to secure a power base among the literate classes of his newly acquired province.

—JDR

BABOON OF THOTH

Egyptian, Roman Period, 30 B.C.—A.D. 395
Marble, h. 8 3/4 in. (22.5 cm)
3133

The cult center of Thoth, the ibis-headed lunar god and patron of all things intellectual, particularly writing, was Hermopolis Magna (modern el-Ashmunein) in Middle Egypt. As scribe of the gods, Thoth had charge of the scales at the Weighing of the Heart ceremony, conducted after death to establish the merit and virtue of the deceased (see p. 63). The baboon (hedj wer, the Great White One), one of the old gods of Hermopolis Magna whose worship the ibis god supplanted, was recognized as the spirit of Thoth. Thoth frequently appears in baboon form seated atop the balance, from which vantage point he could announce to Osiris that the dead man was indeed “true of voice.”

The baboon of Thoth is here shown in a characteristic squatting pose with its front paws resting upon its knees and with the lunar crescent and disk upon its head. This figure’s function is not immediately apparent. During the New Kingdom (1540–1075 B.C.) smaller examples of the type evidently formed part of composite group representations of a scribe in the presence of his god. Here, however, the baboon more probably represents an independent offering, perhaps originally set in a contrasting base dedicated at a shrine of Thoth by a pilgrim of the Classical Period, when the god was enjoying renewed popularity owing to his identification with the Greek god Hermes.

As god of intellectual pursuits, the baboon of Thoth may have held a special appeal for Freud because of its conflation of instinct and intellect. One of Freud’s missions, after all, was to reveal the profound influence of instinct—sexuality and aggression—on man’s intellectual achievements.

This deity, the inventor of hieroglyphs, also reminds us of Freud’s interest in the Egyptian language. In “The Antithetical Meaning of Primal Words” (1910), Freud discussed the work of nineteenth-century philologist Karl Abel and compared the antithetical meaning of certain Egyptian words with a similar phenomenon in dreams—that of the symbolic representation of an idea by its opposite. Freud noted that “we psychiatrists cannot escape the suspicion that we should be better at understanding and translating the language of dreams if we knew more about the development of language” (SE, 11, p. 161).

—FM

This striding, falcon-headed deity, whose skin is painted red-brown, wears a low, wrap-over kilt in white, with red and black pendant uraeus serpents at the front; his plain tripartite wig (longer at the front than at the back) is painted a dark blue-green. The arms appear to have been carved separately and pegged on; on the undersurface of each foot is a tenon for insertion into a separate base.

This bizarre figure is probably intended as a representation of the falcon-headed Horus, son of Isis, who avenged the murder of Osiris, king of the underworld (see p. 40). Like a number of pieces in Freud's collection, the falcon-headed god is of relatively modern manufacture, of a type still produced in Egypt today using traditional methods and frequently employing ancient materials. It was perhaps one of a group of wooden pieces purchased by Freud from the dealer Robert Lustig in 1931 or 1932. Lustig acquired the figures from the nineteenth-century descendants of an Egyptian “pasha” who had settled in Vienna.

 Forgery in Egypt has a long history. One of the earliest known imitations is a green stone shabti figure (now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford) brought back from Egypt during the seventeenth century. Locally produced fakes of this early date are rare, however, and it is only with the advent of the nineteenth century that such copies became common. Napoleon's expedition to Egypt in 1798 prompted a renewed interest in the land of the Nile, an interest further stimulated by J.-F. Champollion's deciphering of hieroglyphic script in 1822 and the establishment of the first Egyptian museum at Ezbekia in 1835. From this time on, with the burgeoning tourist trade, forgeries of Egyptian antiquities proliferated, although their general naiveté would today deceive only the most inexperienced of collectors.

-FM

This finely modeled blue Egyptian faience figure represents Pataikos, the bony-legged, brachycephalic dwarf divinity. Shown naked except for a close-fitting cap, he stands on a square base, and there is a suspension loop behind his neck.

Pataikos, whose name is a Greek form of the Egyptian Ptah-Sokar, was a manifestation of Ptah, creator god of Memphis. He was a common household deity, showing affinities with both Bes and Harpocrates, particularly during the Late Period. Pataikos was a popular subject for amulets, more complex and slightly earlier versions of which are shown with a scarab beetle on the head, clutching a serpent in either hand, and with the feet resting on two crocodiles.

Dwarfs—both the pathologically deformed as well as pygmies of the sort brought as a gift for King Pepi II by the explorer Harkhuf during the 5th Dynasty (2520–2360 B.C.)—were a common feature not only of Egyptian religion but of court life. Some achieved wealth and relatively high office, such as the dwarf Seneb, well known from his tomb statue and false door (now in the Cairo Museum), who during the Dynasty (2640–2520 B.C.) was appointed as chief of all the dwarfs in the palace and as priest in the funerary cults of kings Cheops and Dedefra.

The material of Freud’s Pataikos figure, Egyptian faience, bears no more than a superficial resemblance to faience proper, the tin-glazed earthenware of Faenza in Italy. Egyptian faience consists of a ground quartz core with an alkaline glaze; it was produced throughout the ancient Near East from the fourth millennium B.C. on.

—CNR

This finely carved fragment of sunken relief depicts a kneeling courtier with his arms raised in adoration, a subject commonly found decorating the door jambs of the tomb chapel. The figure displays strong Amarna influence, both in physiognomy and costume, and is reminiscent of the sort of work produced during and in the wake of the Amarna period, between the reigns of Akhenaten and Horemheb.

Its quality notwithstanding, the authenticity of the piece is open to serious question. The overall proportions of the figure (in particular the length of the upper torso and the narrowness of the hips) are unconvincing, with some confusion in the drapery of the arms and in the fall of the kilt below the navel. Other details are, in sum, equally disconcerting: the strands of the wig lack a common source at the crown; the curls on the inner edge of the wig fail to continue into the fringe of hair covering the brow, causing the wig to appear to sit too high; the eye is over-large, positioned too close to the nose, and the contour line between eye and eyebrow badly positioned and rather short; the lips are poorly modeled, and the stubby beard perhaps not entirely appropriate to the figure; the two folds of flesh in the neck beneath the chin, which ought at this period to be present on a principal figure, are absent; the peculiar "flap" at the neck of the man's shirt is clearly a mis-
construed tie-opening. The shape of the block accommodates the figure with suspicious neatness, without any evidence of a text. Both the back and left-hand edge of the block have been cut in modern times. The cutting is exceptionally neat and markedly different from the hesitant, uneven sawing usually encountered in blocks that have been reduced in size (for ease of transportation) for sale on the art market.

The Freud relief is nevertheless an exceptionally subtle work, well above the quality of fakes normally encountered. It brings to mind the work of the Berlin Forger, Oxan Aslanian, one of the best (known) producers of spurious Egyptian pieces. Aslanian was an Armenian based in Egypt, Berlin, and finally Hamburg, and was working at about the time Freud was putting his collection together. Some of his most successful creations were executed in the Amarna style, as several photographs of his work preserved in the Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst in Munich reveal.

—CNR

The writer is grateful to Cyril Aldred, J. R. Harris, and other colleagues for their comments on this piece. On the Berlin Forger, see S. Schoske and D. Wildung, Falsche Pharao (Munich, 1983); R. Krauss, "Zwei Beispiele für Echtheitsuntersuchungen an Ägyptiaca," Jahrbuch Preußischer Kulturbesitz 23 (1986), pp. 153–73.
This small, fragmentary representation of a woman originally formed the left-hand figure of a group statue, probably a funerary dyad depicting the lady standing beside her husband. She wears a long, striated, tripartite wig and a simple, close-fitting dress (which in the complete figure would have extended down to the ankles), its broad shoulder straps concealing the breasts. The face is competently modeled, with narrow, far-set eyes and a broad nose (now chipped). As is characteristic of sculpture of this date, the ears are large, their size further emphasized by the style of the wig.

The vast majority of minor sculptures of this type seem to have been purchased "off the shelf" and associated with the owner by means of an appropriate identifying text, which could be either incised or added in paint. The features of such sculptures offer less the portrait of an individual than a portrayal of the Egyptian ideal, which in the case of women was demure, passive, and physically appealing.

Although the ancient Egyptians regarded the sexes as equal before the law, the roles of men and women differed fundamentally. The Egyptian woman had her place, which was first and foremost as wife and mother. Despite occasional instances of female literacy and the minor part played by women in temples, the basis of a woman's world was the family home. Much of her time was expected to be spent indoors, hence the yellow skin color commonly found in sculpture and relief, in contrast to the red skin of the field-working male.

—CNR

On women in ancient Egypt, see S. Schoske and D. Wildung, Nofret—Die Schöne, 2 vols. (Munich, 1984), with the bibliography there cited.
For the Egyptians the scarab beetle (Scarabaeus sacer) was closely associated with the concept of resurrection and rebirth: it lays its eggs in a ball of dead matter, dung, from which new life was subsequently seen to emerge. The scarab is today one of the most frequently encountered amulets from ancient Egypt.

The majority of Egyptian scarabs are small (less than 1.5 cm in length), usually made of glazed steatite, and commonly set as bezels in finger rings. This particular specimen, carved in gray-green serpentine, is somewhat larger and of the type commonly referred to as a heart scarab. It has a realistically modeled back with “pecked” prothorax and striated elytra (wing cases), and the flat base carries seven horizontal lines of incised hieroglyphic text, reading from right to left.

This text, taken from Chapter 30B of the Book of the Dead (see p. 76), may be translated: “Recitation by the Osiris Kenro: O my heart of my mother! O my heart of my mother! O my heart of my coming into being! Do not stand up against me as a witness before the guardian of the balance! / The Osiris, the standard-bearer / Kenro.” Kenro, whose title is a military one, appears to be otherwise unattested. To judge from the style of his heart scarab, however, he lived during the 18th or, more probably, the 19th Dynasty.

The heart scarab was a common article of funerary equipment, intended to prevent the heart (for the Egyptians the seat of all emotions and the source of all physical action, including speech) from testifying against its owner at the final judgment, the Weighing of the Heart. In this ceremony, the heart was placed in one pan of the scales to be balanced against the feather of Maat, goddess of truth and justice, which rested in the opposing pan. With the heart in place on the balance, the deceased recited a declaration of innocence before the divine tribunal of forty-two assessors. If there was no imbalance, the deceased was proclaimed “true of voice” and received into the underworld by Osiris. If the scales did not balance, his chances of entry into the hereafter would be lost: he would be thrown to “the Eater”—a composite monster, part crocodile, part lion, and part hippopotamus—to die a second death.

The rubric to Chapter 30 of the Book of the Dead, reads: “To be inscribed on a scarab made from nephrite, set in fine gold with a chain of silver and placed at the throat of the deceased.” In practice, however, any green stone might be used—such as the gray-green serpentine employed here—and the scarab wrapped unmounted in the mummy bandages, close to the heart it was intended magically to bolster.

—CNR

SHABTI FIGURE OF SENNA

Egyptian, New Kingdom (18th Dynasty), Thutmose III—Amenophis II, 1479–1400 B.C.
Limestone, h. 9 in. (23 cm)
3271

Mummified figures recognizably of the type referred to as shabty, ushabti, or shawabti first appeared singly in tombs toward the end of the Middle Kingdom (1938–1640 B.C.), when they were clearly intended as substitutes for the dead person. Later their role broadened, and they came to be regarded as deputies of the deceased, whose job was to carry out on his behalf in the next world any menial agricultural tasks that he might be called upon to perform. This change in function was reflected, during the middle years of the 18th Dynasty, by the introduction of figures clutching agricultural implements—a pick, a hoe, and usually a rope suspending a basket slung over the left shoulder—with which these tasks were to be accomplished. By the Third Intermediate Period (1075–716 B.C.), shabtis are encountered often several hundred to a burial, equipped with their own rei (overseer) figures to supervise each group of ten workers. Carved from stone during the earlier periods, the range of materials employed in the production of shabti figures later widened to include wood, pottery, glass, bronze, and Egyptian faience, the most commonly used material of all.

This limestone shabti of a man has a tripartite wig decorated with thickly applied dark blue-green paint with vertical yellow stripes. The sensitively modeled face has large ears and a squared beard. The hands are crossed on the chest above seven horizontal bands of cursive hieroglyphic text in black. The hieroglyphs are now faded; that the owner's name was Senna, however, is confirmed by the text of an identical shabti in Bologna.

Shabti figures are commonly inscribed, as here, with a version of Chapter 6 of the Book of the Dead (see p. 76), which translates: "O shabti allotted to me! If I be summoned or if I be detailed to do any work which has to be done in the realm of the dead, if indeed obstacles are implanted for you therewith as a man at his duties, you shall detail yourself for me on every occasion of making arable the fields, of flooding the banks, or of conveying sand from east to west: ‘Here am I,’ you shall say,"
—CNR

Freud was fascinated by the way in which the dead continue to influence the living, that is, to live on intrapsychically—in mummified form, one could almost say—and to work for and on the living mind. Freud discovered a different kind of life after death: the coercion of the commands, prohibitions, fears, and wishes of the deceased on the minds and actions of those who live on.
—FM

This high-quality shabti—of a man, despite its rather foppish appearance—is unusual in that it was a composite figure, with a finely worked body of hard white stone and a carved and gessoed wooden head painted in black, red, and yellow. The original position of the figure's crossed arms (which were presumably modeled separately in wood, like the head) is shown by traces of red on the chest. Whether the figure originally carried tools is uncertain. The feet (now missing) were no doubt also produced in wood and attached in a manner similar to that of the arms. The figure wears an elaborately pleated costume with flared sleeves and square-fronted apron. The front of the apron carries three columns of hieroglyphs, which still preserve traces of their original dark fill. This text, obscured in places by encrustation, identifies the owner as “overseer of cattle in the temple of Re, Djehutyemheb” (apparently over an earlier name which had been erased), followed by the usual extracts from Chapter 6 of the Book of the Dead (see p. 76).

The so-called costume of daily life worn by this figure was a common feature of shabtis of late 18th and 19th Dynasty date, and was later adopted for the reis or overseer shabtis supplied to supervise the worker figures.

—CNR

On the apron of this shabti, remnants of earlier, imperfectly erased hieroglyphs are still visible—a condition consonant with Freud’s view of mental life as a stratification of meanings. He discussed the idea of layers of inscription and attempts at effacement in his short paper “A Note Upon the ‘Mystic Writing-Pad’ ” (SE, 19, pp. 227–34).

—FM

SHABTI OF IMHOTEP BORN OF BASTETIRDIS

Egyptian, Late Period (30th Dynasty), 380–342 B.C.
Egyptian faience, h. 8 in. (20.3 cm)
3351

This well-modeled shabti figure of pale green Egyptian faience has a body of characteristic mummy form and wears a striated tripartite wig and divine beard. The shabti’s hands, which protrude from the close-fitting shroud, clutch in the left a pick, and in the right a hoe and basket rope; the basket itself is suspended behind the left shoulder. Nine horizontal bands of hieroglyphic text cover the front and sides of the lower torso and legs. The continuity of the text is interrupted by a dorsal pillar; the feet rest on a square base.

The text is taken from Chapter 6 of the Book of the Dead (see p. 76), and in it the owner is named as a priest: “the god’s father Imhotep, born of Bastetirdis.” Other shabtis of the same man, a contemporary of the 30th Dynasty, are in Leiden and Frankfurt. Like Freud’s example, these would have been interred in the tomb of Imhotep, which was probably situated in the vast Saqqara necropolis. Freud possessed a closely similar shabti of Imhotep’s brother, Wahibreemakhet, born of Bastetirdis (FM 3464), conceivably acquired at the same time. It is possible that the two men shared a common place of burial.

—CNR

For the Leiden shabti of Imhotep, see H. Schneider, Shabtis: An Introduction to the History of Ancient Egyptian Funerary Statuettes (Leiden, 1977), vol. II, no. 5.3.1.9, pp. 156–57, with vol. III, pl. 57. For the Frankfurt shabti, see Ägyptische Kunst im Liebigsäus (Frankfurt am Main, 1981), no. 30. For Wahibreemakhet as a probable brother of Imhotep, see Schneider, loc. cit. For three Leiden shabtis of Wahibreemakhet, see ibid., vol. II, nos. 5.3.1.55–57, pp. 164–65, with vol. III, pls. 58 and 67.
This painted figure, which takes the form of a mummiﬁed falcon, has a red body and a cream head and chest. Details of the eyes are picked out in black and red; a schematized collar in blue is at the front, with its menit counterpoise (to balance the weight of the heavy bead collar) on the back. A mortise hole on top of the head was probably intended for the attachment of a double-plume ornament with solar disk, a regular feature of such ﬁgures; here, however, it is lost.

Freud’s falcon represents the funerary deity Sokar, lord of Rostau (the entrance to the underworld), the preeminent deity of the Memphite necropolis, who is closely associated with the creator god Ptah (see p. 48).

The ﬁgure is of a type usually found mounted on the vaulted lids of wooden pedestal or corner-post coffins of the 25th Dynasty (750–656 B.C.) and on the somewhat later shrine-shaped canopic boxes (intended to contain the viscera of the deceased, which the Egyptians removed from the body and embalmed separately) of Ptolemaic times (332–30 B.C.).

—CNR

On Sokar, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), V, cols. 1055–74 (E. Browski), with the references there cited.
This bronze coffin for a sacred animal takes the form of a rectangular box with cavetto cornice, sealed at one end and still preserving its ancient contents. The box is surmounted by a well-modeled falcon with detailed feathering, feet, broad collar, and eyes, standing on a rectangular base that was cast as part of the box. The falcon represents Horus in his original manifestation as lord of the sky; he wears the double crown of Upper and Lower Egypt, an allusion to Horus’s victory over Seth and his succession to the throne of the living (see p. 40).

During the later dynasties, animal cults were especially popular in Egypt, and pilgrims who wished to make an offering to the gods were able to purchase in the temple precincts ritually killed and mummified creatures—from falcons, ibises, crocodiles, dogs, and cats, to shrews, fish, and scarab beetles. These animals, frequently bred in captivity on the temple estates, were often packed into an appropriately shaped container, as here, which could then be offered as an ex-voto in the pilgrim’s name. The mummies were interred by the thousands in rambling underground galleries such as those discovered at Tuna el-Gebel in Middle Egypt and the Sacred Animal Necropolis at Saqqara, just outside Cairo. This particular coffin may have come from any one of the sites where falcon worship was common, including Buto, Giza, Saqqara, Abydos, and Kom Ombo.

These manifestations of divinity were often dealt with in a rapid, and apparently careless, production-line manner. Modern examination of several well-bandaged and ostensibly intact animal mummies has shown them to be drastically incomplete, composed of little more than a handful of old bones, or else miraculously overendowed.

—CNR

On Horus, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), III, particularly cols. 14–25, s.vv. “Horus” (W. Schenkel), “Horus and Seth” (H. te Velde), and “Horus-myth” (J. G. Griffiths). On Egyptian animal worship, see H. S. Smith, A Visit to Ancient Egypt: Life at Memphis and Saqqara (c. 500–30 B.C.) (Warminster, 1974).
The surface of this human-headed bird is covered with a thin layer of gesso and painted. The tripartite wig and beard are black; the breast is yellow with feathering in blue; the feet are red; the wings are green with details in blue and red; facial details are in blue on a yellow background.

This type of figure, commonly encountered perched at the rounded summits of Ptolemaic wooden funerary stelae, represents the ba (individuality) of the deceased, one of the aspects into which a person divided at death. The accompanying aspects were the body itself and the ka, or life force. Unlike the body, the ba was not a prisoner of the tomb. Very much independent, it took the form of a bird in order to revisit the land of the living and partake of the pleasures left behind.

—CNR

For the ba, see W. Helck et al., Lexikon der Ägyptologie (Wiesbaden, 1972–), I, cols. 588–90, s.v. “Ba” (L. V. Žabkar); S. D’Auria, P. Lacovara, and C. H. Roehrig, eds., Mummies and Magic: The Funerary Arts of Ancient Egypt (Boston, 1988), esp. pp. 43–45 (J. P. Allen).
For the ancient Egyptian, the coffin, whether carved in stone (when it is more properly referred to as a sarcophagus), beaten from sheet metal, pegged together from planks of wood, or molded in cartonnage (see p. 75), was the deceased's eternal home and his ultimate protection from hostile elements. Small rectangular boxes, produced during the Early Dynastic Period (2965–2705 B.C.) for contracted burials, developed during the succeeding Old Kingdom (2705–2225 B.C.) into massive sarcophagi designed to receive a full-length mummy. Anthropoid coffins, human-form containers that could double as substitutes for the mummy, appear to have developed from the cartonnage head coverings of the First Intermediate Period (2180–1987 B.C.). From the 12th Dynasty on (after 1938 B.C.), they became the most usual type, often contained within a larger coffin or sarcophagus of rectangular form or nested (as with Tutankhamun) one or more within another in the manner of Russian dolls.

This wooden face mask, one of three in Freud's collection, was originally pegged (perhaps with an intervening layer of linen) to the lid of an anthropoid coffin. The surface of the mask is gessoed and painted. The colors have darkened considerably, but the face appears to originally have been a creamy yellow with the eyes detailed in red, white, and black; the lips and nostrils are outlined in red. A dowel in the chin provides evidence for the original presence of a beard, which conveniently identifies the otherwise anonymous owner as a man. The floral fillet, with its large, central lotus flower (the stem of which would have continued over the head), appears to have been originally executed in red and dark blue-green. Remains of the right ear may be discerned, separately applied in plaster.

—CNR

For a comprehensive and up-to-date discussion of the subject, see J. H. Taylor, Egyptian Coffins (Aylesbury, in press).
Wood of any size and quality has always been scarce in Egypt, and a popular alternative for the preparation of certain items of funerary furniture was cartonnage—a form of board made up of alternating layers of linen (or papyrus) and glue, molded around a form and gessoed to receive the painted design. Masks or headpieces of cartonnage occurred as early as the First Intermediate Period (2180–1987 B.C.). During the Third Intermediate Period (from the 22nd Dynasty on, after 944 B.C.), one-piece cartonnage cases made an appearance, split at the back to allow the insertion of the mummy. Perhaps during the 26th Dynasty (664–525 B.C.) and certainly by Ptolemaic times (332–30 B.C.) these cases were replaced by a series of separate cartonnage elements, including mask, broad collar, frontal panels, and foot case and sandals.

This particular piece of cartonnage, prepared for the mummy of a woman, would have been placed over the legs. Its surface decoration is divided by a column of hieroglyphs, which may be rendered: “Recitation by the Osiris Taqhatu, true of voice, daughter of Djehuty, true of voice, engendered by the lady of the house Taqhatu, true of voice: May Anubis, who is in his bandages, lord of the Sacred Land, come to you; may he give to you a goodly burial upon the west in the district of the Coptite nome.” The dog-headed Anubis, who had assisted Isis, “the great magician,” in the embalming of her husband Osiris, is here called upon to perform a similar service for the lady Taqhatu.

The colored vignettes at the upper left and upper right of the cartonnage contain named representations of the four sons of Horus (shown with red bodies and loops of linen, yellow collars, green faces—green being the color of fertility—and blue-black hair). These minor deities, whose role was the elimination of hunger and thirst, are: Duamutef, the dog-headed genius responsible for the embalmed stomach of the deceased; Imsety, the human-headed protector of the liver; Hapy, the baboon-headed guardian of the lungs; and Qebsenuef, the falcon-headed guardian of the embalmed intestines. The lower left and right vignettes depict Osiris, lord of the underworld, protected respectively by Isis and her sister Nephthys, the two principal mourners at the god’s funeral. Each figure is shown with blue or green flesh and red costume.

A single line of hieratic (a cursive form of the hieroglyphic script) is written in black on the back of the panel. Presumably a delivery docket, it records that the cartonnage was “destined for the district of Coptos.”

—CNR

Freud saw dreams as being analogous to hieroglyphs in that both communicate through imagery. “If we reflect that the means of representation in dreams are principally visual images and not words, we shall see that it is even more appropriate to compare dreams with a system of writing than with a language. In fact the interpretation of dreams is completely analogous to the decipherment of an ancient pictographic script such as Egyptian hieroglyphs” (SE, 13, p. 177).

—FM

MUMMY BANDAGES WITH VIGNETTES FROM THE
BOOK OF THE DEAD

Egyptian, Ptolemaic-Roman Period, c. 100 B.C.—A.D. 200
Linen; 3441 (top): 4 1/4 x 15 in. (11.5 x 38 cm),
3327 (bottom): 4 3/4 x 21 3/4 in. (12 x 55 cm)

The Book of the Dead was a collection of magical spells, with accompanying vignettes, intended to enable the deceased to pass through the underworld in safety and to achieve a carefree existence in the hereafter. Excerpts from it (never the full repertoire) are commonly found buried with the dead, written on rolls of papyrus, vellum, or leather, on the wrappings of the mummy, and on the walls of the tomb chamber or on individual items of funerary furniture.

These two fragments of inscribed, medium-quality linen come from the wrappings of a mummy. The first (top), probably from the beginning of the document, is painted in black with an outline representation of the god Osiris, lord of the underworld. The mummiform god wears the atef crown and is shown seated upon his throne within a shrine, his body enclosed within a close-fitting shroud from which his hands protrude to clutch a crook and flail, the twin symbols of kingship; offerings of food, drink, and flowers are placed before him. Two columns of cursive hieroglyphs between the god and the offerings read (right to left): “Recitation by Osiris, Foremost of the Westerners [i.e., the dead], the great god, lord of Abydos, lord of eternity, ruler of forever.” The speech that this text anticipates is not present.

The second fragment of inscribed linen (bottom) is of similar quality and perhaps from the same mummy. It contains a vignette showing the procession to the tomb and the deceased adoring the god Re-Horakhty. The text, written from right to left in hieratic, is taken from Chapters 1, 2, and the beginning of Chapter 3 of the Book of the Dead—the “spells of going out into the day.” According to Dr. R. A. Caminos, who has studied these linen fragments, the owner’s name is given as Pakhasu, and that of his mother as Taremjetnetbastet. Neither Pakhasu nor his mother appear to be attested from other sources. Palaeography and overall style, however, suggest that they flourished between c. 100 B.C. and A.D. 200, if not a little later.

—CNR

This portrait, in classical style, represents a balding, middle-aged man seated face-front and wearing a white tunic decorated with two embroidered bands. The painting is of a type produced in Egypt between the first and fourth centuries A.D. employing one of two basic media: encaustic (pigmented beeswax) and tempera (watercolor). These portraits are usually found bound in place over the face of the owner’s mummy, in an interesting combination of foreign artistic tradition and native religious practice. At least one such portrait has been found in its ancient frame, indicating that, in the earlier period at least, such paintings were commissioned for display while the owner was still alive.

Freud acquired his mummy portrait from the collection formed by an Austrian dealer, Theodor Graf. Graf was associated with several important archaeological discoveries made in Egypt during the latter years of the nineteenth century. In November 1887, Graf took delivery of a large consignment of portrait panels executed in encaustic and tempera, stripped from mummies that had been uncovered only a short time before in the cemetery of ancient Philadelphia, er-Rubaiyāt, in the Faiyum. Of the more than three hundred mummy portraits that were to pass through Graf’s hands, some ninety-six were put on display in Berlin in 1889. The exhibition was a great success and subsequently traveled to many of Europe’s major museums. In 1893 the collection was shown at the World’s Fair in Chicago.

In the several catalogues of the Graf collection produced during these years, the present mummy portrait is listed as no. 53. It is described in the 1922 (Buberl) edition with Freud’s ownership and its purchase price (600 florins) noted.

—CNR

The Freud portrait is published as no. 482 in K. Parlasca, Repertorium d’arte dell’Egitto greco-romano. Serie B—Vol. II. Ritratti di mummie (Rome, 1977), p. 88, with pl. 117, fig. 2, where full references will be found. The definitive edition of the Graf portraits is that of P. Buberl, Die griechisch-ägyptischen Mumienbildnisse der Sammlung Th. Graf (Vienna, 1922), which Freud owned. The standard discussion of mummy portraits is that of K. Parlasca, Mumienportraits und verwandte Denkmäler (Wiesbaden, 1966); see also A. F. Shore, Portrait Painting from Roman Egypt (rev. ed., London, 1972), and D. L. Thompson, Mummy Portraits in the J. Paul Getty Museum (Malibu, 1982).
This beautifully shaped vase reaches its widest diameter some distance below the shoulder. It rises as a narrow cylinder from its small, flat, and spreading foot. It then gradually swells out before drawing in again to the flattish shoulder, from which rise the double stirrup handle, with its false spout, and the actual spout. The rounded form is accentuated by the decoration of concentric bands of orange glaze, closely spaced near the foot, more sparsely above it, and most concentrated near the shoulder, just below which the rings are varied with a band of broken zigzags. The upper surface of the stirrup handle is decorated with concentric rings, matching the set under the foot, and the shoulder bears five stylized papyrus heads, each formed from three semicircular strokes, one hook, and two rows of dots. This simple decoration articulates and emphasizes the stirrup jar's taut, elegant form, with which it is in perfect harmony.

This vase belongs to the period of the great Mycenaean palaces. Vases of this type were very probably found at Mycenae by Freud's hero Heinrich Schliemann when he excavated there in the mid-1870s.

—LB

This vase is published and discussed by C. and H. Weiss, "Ein Blick in die Antikensammlung Sigmund Freud," Antike Welt 16 (1985), pp. 44-45. For the type of vase and its decoration, see A. D. Lacey, Greek Pottery in the Bronze Age (London, 1967), pp. 199, 215; for the stylized papyrus heads, see A. Furumark, Mycenaean Pottery: Analysis and Classification (Stockholm, 1941), p. 293, fig. 45, no. 130 (slightly more angular than this one); for a vase very similar in shape and decoration, but again with more angular flowers, see Stefan Hiller, Mykenische Keramik (Mainz, 1973), pl. 25, no. 242.
HORSE AND RIDER

Greek, Archaic Period, c. 550 B.C.
Terracotta, h. 4 1/8 in. (10.3 cm)
3723

This highly stylized figure of a horse and rider merges man and animal into one entity. The apparently legless rider, who clings with both hands to the horse's mane, seems to grow from the horse's back. The horse is boldly decorated with stripes and slashes; his eye is strongly marked and on his chest three rows of dots above a wavy line are perhaps a schematic indication of a harness.

Horses of this kind, with or without riders, were a popular product of the coroplasts' workshops of Boeotia in the sixth century B.C. Like most terracotta figurines, they are generally found in graves, where they were laid as gifts and perhaps to provide comfort to the dead. Although their significance is not altogether clear, models and carvings of horses and horsemen were always popular in ancient Greece in graves or on tombstones. They may well have been intended to underline the heroic character of the dead person as a warrior or hunter.

—LB

Freud used the metaphor of riding to speak of the ego riding the forces of the id:

The functional importance of the ego is manifested in the fact that normally control over the approaches to motility devolves upon it. Thus in its relation to the id it is like a man on horseback, who has to hold in check the superior strength of the horse; with this difference, that the rider tries to do so with his own strength while the ego uses borrowed forces. The analogy may be carried a little further. Often a rider, if he is not to be parted from his horse, is obliged to guide it where it wants to go; so in the same way the ego is in the habit of transforming the id's will into action as if it were its own.

(SE, 19, p. 25)

This figure is an especially apt image for this metaphor because Freud conceived the ego as differentiating out of the id, and hence, horse and rider are joined into one composite body.

—FM

CORINTHIAN BLACK-FIGURED

ALABASTRON

Greek, Archaic Period, c. 600 B.C.
Terracotta, h. 11 1/4 in. (28.2 cm)
3699

The overall impression given by this large alabastron (oil or perfume flask) is of a rich, abstract tapestry, but in fact, there is a central subject, a winged “mistress of animals,” standing frontally but with her head turned to the left. She wears a beautiful, finely patterned tunic, with its details incised and touches of added red and white. She has a large head, broad shoulders, and long arms. She wears a long-sleeved tunic over another garment; the tunic is richly bordered and has a central decorative panel of incised zigzags and white spots; the undergarment is striped vertically in red, black, and white. On her head she wears a polos, the tall headdress often worn by goddesses in the Archaic Period (c. 600–480 B.C.), and in each hand she holds the neck of a swan. The wings of the swans extend around the vessel and almost touch at the back, and the field is filled with a dense thicket of ornaments: large rosettes, palmette bunches, and lotus buds.

The vase painting of Corinth in the sixth century B.C. was characterized by scenes of animals, some real, some fantastic, prowling through dense thickets of ornaments. Many of the monsters, animals, and semi-human figures originated in the Near East. The winged mistress of animals shown here is thought to derive from various Near Eastern mother-goddesses, whom the Greeks associated with the huntress goddess Artemis.

This vase presents a typical alabastron profile, the contours swelling out strongly below the slender neck, then tapering to the rounded base. The decoration of black and red, with touches of faded grayish white, shows to perfection on the characteristic Corinthian pale yellow-brown clay. The vertical edge of the rim is decorated with a simple broken meander, and the neck has vertical rays above a band of checker pattern formed by setting short vertical black rays between horizontal bands of golden glaze. Under the base is a large rosette framed by rays and lines.

This vase is carefully painted, and in general the shape, size, and style suggest it belongs to the early Corinthian period.

—LB

For Corinthian vases of similar shape and size, see London GR 1861.10.24.15 and 1869.4.4.11, both decorated with a winged male figure. For the mistress of animals on Corinthian vases, see H. Payne, Neokorinthia (Oxford, 1931), pp. 78–79; for a more general discussion of the mistress of animals in Archaic Greek art, see Chr. A. Christou, Parnia Theron. Eine Untersuchung über Ursprung, Erscheinungsformen und Wandlungen der Gestalt einer Gottheit (Thessaloniki, 1968), and R. Laffineur, L’Orfèvrerie Rhodienne orientalisante (Paris, 1978), pp. 32–45, with good bibliography.
This large cylinder lekythos (oil or perfume flask) bears a figure scene of two warriors on horseback. Doric columns frame the scene on the left and right. The warriors move to the right, armed with shields, spears, and helmets, and wearing short tunics and mantles. Beside their horses walk a dog and a bitch. The crests of the warriors’ helmets break through into the meander border above the scene, and in the field are letters of the Greek alphabet, principally nubs, scattered at random. Added red is used for the mane of the second horse and the tail of the first, for the crest of the leading warrior’s helmet, for the rims of both their shields, and for the spots on their mantles; these last are also decorated with incised crosses.

It is likely that the warriors are female, presumably Amazons; if they were men, one would expect them, in the Archaic period, to be shown bearded. Black-figure vase painters covered women’s skin with white slip, which was fragile and tended to wear off. Usually it is possible to detect, as here, where the exposed areas of flesh are rather greenish, differing in tone from the other black areas. This is noticeable, for example, on the near legs of both riders, now hardly standing out against the black of the horses’ flanks. Had they been male riders, the legs would probably have been incised. The same greenish tinge to the black occurs where one would expect to see a shield device on the shield of the leading rider.

This large lekythos has a short neck, a very plump and heavy cylinder, a thick fillet between foot and body, and an elegantly profiled, stepped foot. The lip, handle, lower part of the body, and upper surface of the foot are decorated in black glaze, which has partly peeled off the lower parts of the body, while the other areas are reserved (unglazed).

The neck rises from a ring of tongues; on the shoulders are three linked multipetaled fan palmettes, with two dots between each, and a large open bud hanging on either side of the handle. The figure scene is bordered by a meander band running to the right between one black line above and two below; the lower border is formed by a single glazed ground line in the reserved area of the figure scene, and in the black glaze below it are two narrow red lines.

The figure scene is on the whole rather carelessly painted, although more care has been taken with the horses and dogs than with the human figures. The distinction between the sexes of the dogs is an interestingly realistic detail.

This vase has been attributed to the Gela Painter, a prolific painter of lekythoi who was named after the Sicilian colony of Gela, where more than forty vases by his hand were found. The size and shape of the vase are those he favored, and the form of the palmette decoration is highly idiosyncratic. The subject of the figure scene occurs elsewhere in his work, and the letters sprinkled in the field are characteristic. Typical, too, is the interest shown in animals and the more careless rendering of human figures. The framing columns are also a frequent feature of his scenes.

—LB

This small chimney lekythos presents the Sphinx, facing right, seated on a column capital or altar between two seated and two standing elders of Thebes, all leaning on sticks. There are dots in the field, intended as sketchy imitations of inscriptions. White was added to highlight certain areas: the details of the altar, the Sphinx’s head and wings, the outlines of the folding stools of the elders, and the fillets around their heads.

This lekythos has an elongated neck and mouth, a flat shoulder, and a stepped foot. On the shoulder are two sketchy rows of buds, and below the shoulder, which is articulated by a single black line, is a sketchy meander running to the right above two black lines. Below the figure scene are three narrow reserved lines.

The shape of the vase and the careless style of the painting, with the elongated, small-headed figures, indicate an attribution to the workshop of the Haimon Painter. Both the style and the iconography find close parallels in the work of the Painter and his associates, although the fake letters in the field would be unusual for the Painter himself.

—LB

See J. M. Morer, Oedipe, la sphinx et les Thébains (Geneva, 1984) for two very similar pieces with virtually identical scenes: Louvre CA 1705 (pl. 29.1-4), which is assigned to the related Photos Group, and Frankfort VF b 305 (pls. 27.1-2), attributed to the Haimon Painter. For the Haimon Painter, see E. Haspels, Attic Black-figured Lekythoi (Paris, 1936), pp. 130–41.
The figure scene on this small hydria shows Herakles on the right, reclining on a rock and attended by a satyr. Herakles is naked except for his lion skin, which he wears pulled up over his head, the paws tied on his chest. He holds out a mug to be filled by the satyr, who carries a jug and a strainer, which he seems to be offering to the hero. Behind Herakles is a large overflowing cornucopia. All the vessels bear traces of encrustation, which suggests that they were once painted either white or gold. In the field above are three festoons of dots, also once white or gold, of which only shadows now remain.

This rather elongated hydria has a long neck and a tall, spreading foot. The overhanging rim is decorated with rays sketchily rendered; the neck bears a rough tongue pattern. On the shoulder is a veined laurel wreath running to the right; probably it was originally embellished with white or gold spots set above and below the central stem where each pair of leaves branches off, now marked only by shadows in the glaze. Below the vertical handle is a palmette complex, which extends with trumpet-shaped flower buds at each side across to the horizontal handles. Under each handle is a female head. Below the figure scene, encircling the vase, is a band of wave pattern moving to the right.

—LB

ATHENIAN RED-FIGURED LEKYTHOS

Achilles and Phiale Painters (Workshop)
Greek, Classical Period, c. 450–440 B.C.
Terracotta, h. 14 ¾ in. (37.4 cm)
3700

This large cylinder lekythos is of elegant design and manufacture. The figure scene shows a winged woman pursuing a youth to the left. Under a black-bordered mantle, the woman wears a finely pleated chiton with full, baggy sleeves. Her hair is arranged under a keryryphalos (headband), and she wears earrings. She stretches out her right hand to the youth, who moves off to the left while looking back at his pursuer. He is dressed in a large mantle, also black-bordered, which hangs to his feet and leaves his right shoulder bare. On his head he wears a wreath of red-painted leaves, and he carries a lyre.

Judging by the context of the pursuit and the predatory gesture of her right hand, the winged woman must be Eos, goddess of dawn. According to legend, Eos was of an amorous disposition, and in art of the fifth century B.C. she is frequently shown pursuing a youth, either Kephalos or Tithonos. Kephalos is usually shown as a hunter; this youth's lyre makes it more likely that he is Tithonos, a prince of Troy. The abduction of Tithonos had a tragic ending, for when Eos persuaded Zeus to grant her lover immortality, she forgot to ask also for the gift of eternal youth. Thus it became the fate of the unfortunate Tithonos to grow ever older and more decrepit, yet powerless to die.

This lekythos has a long neck, separated from the lip by a slight jog and rising from a sloping shoulder. The cylinder is almost vertical for much of its length, tapering sharply to the narrow fillet above the small, neat foot. The neck, handle, and lip are black-glazed, as is the upper surface of the foot and most of the body, on which the figures are reserved in the red-figure technique. The shoulder is decorated in the older black-figure technique, with the pattern in black upon a clay ground; the vertical edge of the foot is also reserved. The black glaze is generally lustrous but is in parts slightly smoky with a greenish tinge. These areas are probably ghosted imprints of other vases fired near this lekythos in the same kiln.

The base of the neck is marked by an ovolo (egg pattern), and on the shoulder are three black palmettes, the central one pointing down, with an elongated central petal, the outer two pointing toward the handle. All three are circumscribed by scrolls, with double curls in place of the more usual lotus buds flanking the central palmette. The figure scene is bordered below by a band of simple meander running to the right, and above by a meander band in which three meander squares alternate with one upright crossed square.

The shape and pattern decoration of this vase enable its assignment to the workshop of the Achilles and Phiale Painters. A more precise attribution is difficult; it is near the work of the Phiale Painter and his associates, but the figures are stiffer and sketchier. The eye in particular is very casually rendered with four brief strokes, that of the brow extended to the edge of the nose.

—1.B

This white-ground lekythos shows a youth (left) and a woman (right) facing each other across a funerary stele. The youth, wrapped in a red mantle that leaves his chest and arms bare, leans on a stick. The woman is dressed in a black peplos with red borders; her face and hair, like those of the youth, are rendered in red outline and wash. In her left hand she carries a shallow basket from which dangle three fillets or sashes; her right hand reaches toward the stele. The stele is tall with a stepped base and crowned with an ovolo molding, surmounted by an acanthus leaf acroterion, which breaks through the meander border above. The stele is hung with sashes like those in the basket, and to emphasize that the scene is set in a graveyard, another tomb monument is drawn (rather awkwardly) behind the first.

This lekythos is of standard late fifth-century B.C. shape and size. The neck, lip, and handle are black-glazed, as are the lower part of the body and upper surface of the foot. The vertical edge of the foot is covered in a red wash; the shoulder and upper body of the vase bear a white slip on which the figures are painted in matte red outlines, then filled in with washes of solid color, principally red and black. The shoulder is decorated with a palmette design in dilute brown glaze with touches of added red, now very worn. The upper edge of the cylinder wall is bordered with a band of meander with occasional saltire crosses, very sketchily executed in dilute glaze, between double and more solid glaze lines above and below.

White-ground lekythoi were made to contain the perfumed oil given as a gift to the dead; some of them have an inner container so that the vase could appear full at less expense. Nearly all were made as grave goods, and this accounts in part for their extreme fragility and the fugitive nature of their coloring, much of which was applied after firing. Their subject matter is often funerary, visitors at a tomb being the most popular theme. Sometimes the scenes show lekythoi standing on the steps of a tomb, or else carried in baskets like the one shown here. Often there are just two people in the scene, and it is generally difficult to tell the deceased from the mourner. This ambiguity is paralleled on the contemporary sculptured tombstones of Attica. In this case, however, it seems likely that the woman is bringing an offering to the tomb of the dead youth.

On the grounds of shape, pattern-work, style, and subject, the vase may be attributed to the Reed Painter, a prolific painter of white-ground lekythoi. The reeds that are the key characteristic of his work are absent here, but typical of his hand is the woman's head, with delicate profile and luxuriantly curling red hair. Typical, too, are the form of the stele, the appearance of the second monument behind it, the abundance of fillets, and the attitude of the youth—all features readily observed on the Reed Painter's many vases.

—LB

This vase is unpublished, unless it is ARV 1379, 62, Paris Market. Segredakis, described by T. D. Beazley, Attic Red-figure Vase-painters (Oxford, 1963) as “youth and woman at tomb (youth leaning on a stick to right, woman in peplos moving left with barker).” Freud owned at least one other object that had originated with the Parisian dealer Segredakis, notably the bronze Venus considered here (see p. 112), purchased by Marie Bonaparte; she may have presented Freud with other antiquities from the same source. For the Reed Painter and his workshop, see D. C. Kurz, Athenian White-ground Lekythoi (Oxford, 1975), pp. 58–68. A very similar scene appears on one of the Reed Painter’s London vases, GR 1873.8-20.303 (vase D 73).
SPHINX

Greek, South Italian, late 5th-early 4th century B.C.
Terracotta. h. 7 1/4 in. (18,5 cm)
4387

In the Greek legend of Thebes, the Sphinx was a monster, half-lion and half-woman, who destroyed those who could not answer her riddle: "What is it that walks on four legs in the morning, on two at noon, and on three in the evening?" Oedipus answered that it was Man, who first crawls on all fours, then walks upright, and in old age needs a stick as a third leg.

This figurine is apparently solid, and was originally covered in white slip, now discolored. The clay, where visible, is orange. The Sphinx sits solidly on her haunches, facing ahead. On her head is the tall polos headdress; her wavy hair is drawn back from her forehead and fastened in a bun at the back. Her breasts are prominent, her legs and paws sturdily modeled. Her body is slim, and her wings are precisely modeled and neatly curled above her back.

The provenance and date of this piece are suggested by its clay and style.
—LB

For similar examples of Greek terracotta sphinxes, see F. Winter, Die Antiken Terrakotten (Berlin, 1903), III, part i, p. 230, no. 5 (two in Ruvo and one in Berlin, not otherwise published).
The scene on this small hydria (water jar) shows Oedipus seated before the Sphinx. Oedipus (right) is seated on his mantle, which covers a rock. Naked except for the pilos (cap) on his head, he leans on the pair of spears held in his right hand. His left hand seems to make a conversational gesture toward the Sphinx, who sits bolt upright facing him. Her seat is a curiously rendered rock, shown as if with a black core. Her face and body are white, the body decorated with spots of brown glaze presumably representing fur. Her wings are reserved in the red ground, with details added in black glaze; her tail is also reserved. Behind her stands a youth, presumably a companion of Oedipus, also armed with two spears and with a mantle over his shoulders.

This hydria has an elongated neck, a wide rim, and a relatively narrow body drawn in to an elaborate stepped foot. The overhanging edge of the rim is decorated with a carelessly executed ovolo, and the same pattern encircles the vase below its widest point to form the ground line for the figures. The vertical handle rises from a complex of palmettes and lotus buds, which extends around to the horizontal handles of the vase.

—LB

For Freud, no myth attained a greater explanatory power in relation to psychoanalysis than that of Oedipus and the Sphinx. The influence of his classical education on the development of his thinking is readily apparent in the crystallization of his ideas on the human condition in the famed "Oedipus complex." Reviewing his dreams and self-analysis, and drawing on his knowledge of Greek tragedy, Freud observed patterns of experience within himself that he believed universal in human behavior:

I have found, in my own case too, being in love with my mother and jealous of my father, and I now consider it a universal event in early childhood. . . . If this is so, we can understand the gripping power of Oedipus Rex, in spite of all the objections that reason raises against the presupposition of fate. . . . The Greek legend seizes upon a compulsion which everyone recognizes because he senses its existence within himself. Everyone in the audience was once a budding Oedipus in fantasy and each recoils in horror from the dream fulfillment here transplanted into reality, with the full quantity of repression which separates his infantile state from the present one. (SE, 1, p. 265)

On Freud's fiftieth birthday and in recognition of the key role that the Oedipus legend had played in the development of psychoanalysis, Freud's colleagues presented him with a medallion bearing a portrait of Freud on one side, and Oedipus and the Sphinx on the other, with the quote from Sophocles, "He who knew the famous riddle and was a most powerful man."

—FM

On this vase, see C. and H. Weiss, "Ein Blick in die Antikensammlung Sigmund Freud," Antike Welt 16 (1985), pp. 50–51. For a similar scene on a vase of comparable date and style, in which Oedipus, in the company of another youth, prepares to answer the Sphinx, seated on similar rocks (present whereabouts of this vase are unknown), see J. M. Moret, Oedipe, la sphinx et les Thébains (Geneva, 1984), pl. 55; For the Apollonia Group, see J. D. Beazley, Attic Red-figure Vase-painters (Oxford, 1963), 1482, and K. Scheffold, Untersuchungen zu den Keramischen Väsen (Berlin and Leipzig, 1934), pp. 102–104.
This is a perfect example of a Tanagra figure. Although such figures were mass-produced in antiquity, today scholars and collectors unite in their praise. This woman demonstrates the Hellenistic interest in the individual and human, rather than the ideal and heroic. Even though virtually nothing is known about the social conditions of third-century Boeotia, figures such as this seem to provide a vivid glimpse of the women of Tanagra going about their daily lives.

This figure is of fine, pale orange clay. It was made in two molds; the base was made separately. There are traces of white slip over most of the figure, and red on the hair.

The woman stands with her weight on her right leg, her head turned to the left. She wears a mantle drawn tightly over a chiton and muffling her right arm; in her left hand she holds a fan. Her hair, under her conical sun hat, is drawn back in the "melon" style and tied in a bun. She also wears earrings.

—LB

For the history and terracottas of Tanagra, see R. A. Higgins, *Tanagra and the Figurines* (London, 1987). For a figure whose body may derive from the same mold as this one, see F. Winter, *Die Antiken Terrakotten* (Berlin, 1903), III, part ii, 54:7 (Athens 1112); compare also London GR 1875.3-9.1 (C 247).
GROTESQUE HEADS

Greek, Hellenistic Period, 100 B.C.—A.D. 100
Terracotta, each: h. 1 1/8 in. (4 cm)
3752, 3747

These two small grotesque heads were broken from figures of a man and a woman. Both have hideously large noses, ears, and mouths set in sagging, wrinkled skin. The female head differs from the male in its head covering; otherwise there is very little to distinguish them.

The exact significance of such grotesque heads is not clear, although thousands survive from ancient Greece. Perhaps they represent dwarfs or persons with other deformities who may have been objects of curiosity in the Hellenistic courts. Elaborate tableau and mime performances were an important element of Hellenistic court entertainment and may have included dwarfs. Judging from contemporary art and literature, the Hellenistic mind certainly displayed an extreme interest in physical deformity in all its various forms; the evidence does not permit us to conclude whether this interest was morbid or sympathetic.

—LB

For examples of similar grotesque heads from Smyrna, see S. Mollard-Besques, Musée du Louvre. Catalogue raisonné des figurines et reliefs en terre-cuite grecs, étrusques et romains (Paris, 1972), III, part 1, pls. 292–329; for examples very close to these, see especially pls. 295e and 321i.