

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

Revisiting Sigmund Freud's Diagrams of the Mind

Spankie, R.

This is an author's accepted manuscript, without diagrams, of an article published in *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Anthropology*, 63 (4), pp. 20-42 in 2019. The final definitive version, including diagrams, is available online at:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.3167/sa.2019.630402>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

Social Analysis

The International Journal of Anthropology: Volume 63: Issue 4

Revisiting Sigmund Freud's Diagrams of the Mind

Ro Spankie

Abstract: One of the original uses of the word 'interior' was to describe that which belongs to or exists in the mind or soul, that is, the mental or spiritual, as opposed to that which is bodily. The etymology of the term gives a clue as to how interior space functions in a manner that is different from the architecture that contains it. This article explores the analogy of architecture as body and the interior as mind through the act of drawing out Sigmund Freud's study and consulting room, with reference to Freud's diagrams of the mind. Working with diagrams, the article will demonstrate a relation between Freud's conceptual shift from descriptive anatomy to hypothetical structures of psychoanalysis and the diagrammatic ordering of the spatial arrangement of his practice.

Keywords: architecture, body, diagram, Freud, interior space, mind, projection, psyche, representation

Home is represented, not by a house, but by a practice or set of practices. Everyone has his own. (Berger 1984: 64)

Sigmund Freud needs little introduction, being well known for having created a theory, a method of investigation, and a treatment for psychological disorders. What he is perhaps less well credited for is the construction of the interior arrangement that most psychoanalytic consulting rooms take today, which arguably features as an essential ingredient in the therapeutic process. This oversight is perhaps due to a curious historical break in Freud's consulting room and study as found today. Although it is possible to visit the study and consulting room at their original location in Berggasse 19, now the Freud Museum Vienna, the rooms are bare—because in 1938, after the Nazis annexed Austria, Freud (who was Jewish) and his immediate family were forced to leave Vienna and make a new home in London. This exile late in Freud's life, at age 82, is why one finds the 'architecture' (the empty study and consulting room) in Vienna, while the 'interior arrangement' (consisting of the furniture and fittings) is in London.

I am an architect by training, and my research concerns the role of the drawing in the design process, in particular in relation to the creation of interior space. The word 'design' comes from the Italian word *disegno*, which means drawing but also the drawing out of an idea (Hill 2006: 33). Designers use the act of drawing as a means of visual thinking, while the finished drawing can be understood as the picturing of a spatial idea. Conventionally, interior design is seen as part of the discipline of architecture, constructed from physical form and represented using scaled orthographic techniques such as plan and section. If, however, one defines interiors as 'that which belongs to or exists in the mind', one shifts the focus from physical form to what the space represents to the occupant, which becomes more challenging in terms of drawing.

In my search for alternative methods of drawing out interior qualities, I came across a range of drawings by Sigmund Freud (see Gamwell and Solms 2006), which I divided loosely as carefully observed medical drawings of slides seen through a microscope and abstract diagrams in the form of

freehand sketches used to think with and through the structure of the psyche, as well as graphics for publication. What is noticeable is that, at the point that Freud's investigations shifted from descriptive anatomy to brain function and the hypothetical structures of psychoanalysis, his drawings also shifted from the scaled and the observational to the abstract and the diagrammatic. Both the content of these later drawings and the way Freud seems to be using diagramming as a tool to think through an idea, as well as to visually explain that idea, suggested potential overlaps with how designers use drawings. I was intrigued to explore whether the shift from physical anatomy to the hypothetical structures of psychoanalysis could provide an analogous technique that might give insight into the relationship between the body/architecture and the mind/interior.

The article's approach is driven by two propositions. First, I suggest that interiors, regardless of their function, should be understood closer to Mary Douglas's definition of 'home' than the more traditional architectural notion of the inside of a house or building. In her article "The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space," Douglas (1991: 287) defines home not as a physical place, but as "a pattern of regular doings," constructed and acted out by an embryonic community. While such a home is located in space, since it also exists in time, it is "not necessarily a fixed space," and "because it is for people who are living in that time and space, it has aesthetic and moral dimensions" (ibid.: 289). Thus, for Douglas a home is not made of bricks and mortar, but "is the realization of [a community's] ideas" (ibid.: 290) about a structured domesticity. Adapting this anthropological observation to architectural method, I would maintain that while an interior is framed by the architecture that contains it, it has a more fluid structure, being full of movable elements such as furniture and effects that the occupant arranges and rearranges according to his or her needs, tastes, and customs. An interior therefore exists in time and has aesthetic and cultural dimensions.

Second, I assume the motivations of the occupant, in this case Freud, to be different from those of an interior designer, suggesting that the desire to decorate, to furnish, and to arrange a space constitutes an expression of self, both conscious and unconscious, rather than solely a response to spatial or functional requirements. The act of arranging his or her space allows the occupant to establish his or her identity and create a personal interior architecture that challenges the traditional architectural understanding of interior design and the more professional concerns of form, function, and style. As the art critic Mario Praz ([1964] 2008: 21) put it: "This is the house in its deepest essence: a projection of the ego."

In this article I go a step further in demonstrating that Freud's approach to psychoanalysis shares a diagrammatic order with the interior in which he dwelled and practiced. Working with diagrams, the article exposes the intricate analogy between Freud's conceptual contributions and the spatial context in which they were developed. To this end, I will 'draw out' Freud's study and consulting room—two rooms that he furnished, arranged, and adapted to suit his practice over a period of 43 years—in order to shed light on the 'inner' (as opposed to bodily) qualities of the space.¹ The article's first section, "Reconstructing the Consulting Room and Study," offers a description of Freud's workspace as it can be found today, followed by a reconstruction of it during Freud's lifetime. The second section, "Diagramming Space," focuses on the interior qualities of the workspace, such as function, and suggests possible associations that the arrangement of furniture might have held for both Freud and his patients. The final section, "Diagramming the Mind," borrows the structure of a set of diagrams that Freud used to describe the dream process, so as to demonstrate the diagrammatic analogies in his description of the interior in terms of function, sequence, and effect. Throughout the article, drawing—more specifically, diagramming—is used as both a descriptive and an investigative technique.

Reconstructing the Consulting Room and Study

It is in the action of changing and creating it that the individual confers meaning on his environment. (Pawley 1968: 31)

What drew me to Freud's study and consulting room was the fact that the rituals and routines he created around the 'psychoanalytic setting'² are not specific to one location and, like Douglas's description of home, can be understood to exist both physically and in people's minds—in this case as a memory, a method, and a metaphor. Because of the curious transplanting of the interior from one architectural body to another, my first act was one of reconstruction, to imagine the furniture and effects back in the rooms in Vienna. Obviously conceptual, the task here was also speculative because what occurred in those rooms in Berggasse 19 essentially happened behind closed doors. Freud wrote virtually nothing about the arrangement of the rooms within which he worked and where he kept his famous collection of antiquities. Despite the lack of specific source material, however, there is a vast quantity of what could be described as chance references found in Freud's own writings, numerous biographies (M. Freud 1957; Gay 1989; Jones 1953, 1955, 1957; Sachs 1945), published letters (Boehlich 1990; Brabant et al. 1993; Masson 1985), and recollections from patients.³ The most compelling visual evidence can be found in a set of black and white photographs of Freud's study and consulting room in Vienna, taken by a young photographer, Edmund Engelman (1998),⁴ just before Freud left the city, as well as in the museum context of his final home at Maresfield Gardens, now the Freud Museum London. Freud spent the greater part of his life in Vienna. From 1891 to 1938, he and his family lived on the second floor of Berggasse 19, an apartment block in Vienna's ninth district. In 1908 he moved his psychoanalytic practice into two rooms adjoining the family apartment, which he furnished as a study and consulting room. Although his practice had a separate front door, he effectively moved what was originally understood as a clinical practice out of the surgery and into a domestic setting. For the next 30 years, it was in these two rooms that he saw patients, wrote up his case histories and papers, and arranged his ever-growing collection of antique objects.

The first of the two rooms, the consulting room, contained the therapist's couch and Freud's armchair at its head (fig. 1a). Perhaps the most iconic element of the arrangement, the couch alone could be said to represent the practice of psychoanalysis. Given to him by a grateful patient in 1891, the couch, a piece of domestic furniture, referred back to the days when Freud was still a medical doctor and used techniques such as hypnosis in the treatment of nervous disorders. Even though the treatment shifted from the physical to the psychogenic, Freud continued to use the couch and established his own position at its head, out of the patient's view. This arrangement was intended to create an atmosphere conducive to free association,⁵ the patient lying with feet warmed by the stove, in a perfusion of sensuous Oriental rugs and throw pillows, "draped in that flying carpet for unconscious voyaging" (Warner 1998: viii). Freud himself, a disembodied voice or a listening ear, made his presence apparent by the fumes of an aromatic cigar as the patient's unconscious mind was revealed through memories, dreams, and everyday events. That Freud considered this arrangement vital to his practice can be seen in a photograph⁶ taken after he had had his armchair, the couch, and the rugs moved to his summer residence at Hohe Warte just outside Vienna,⁷ so he could continue to treat patients during the summer months.

The adjoining room, connected by open double doors, was furnished as a study (fig. 1b). Referred to by Freud as his inner sanctum, this space contained a large wooden desk, his curiously shaped chair,⁸ and his library. It was an inward-looking environment, with the desk placed adjacent to a large window, facing the double doors and the couch. One could describe the first room as housing the practice of psychoanalysis and the second as framing its theory, the two activities visually connected.

Freudian analysis requires analysts to give their complete attention during the analytic session; any notes are therefore written up from memory afterward. In Freud's case, on returning to his desk at the end of the day, he was literally reflecting back on his day's work, the visual connection aiding recall. Of course, Freud was not just writing up notes. What he heard at the head of the couch provided the raw material for the development of psychoanalysis as a whole. Over his lifetime he published 320 books, articles, and essays, the majority of which were drafted in longhand on this desk.

Today at 20 Maresfield Gardens, the desk is separated from the museum visitor by a rope. Curiously anonymous in comparison to the famous couch or the distinctively shaped chair, its surface is

obscured by writing implements, smoking paraphernalia, and antique figurines that leave seemingly little space to write—and it is this arrangement that remains in the mind rather than the desk itself. One could argue, however, that if the couch represents the method of treatment, it is the desk that tells us about Freud’s writing and the prodigious body of work that was written on its cluttered baize surface.⁹

Figure 1a: View of consulting room with couch and Freud’s chair at the head. Photograph taken in 1938 by Edmund Engelman at Berggasse 19, Vienna. Courtesy of Freud Museum London.

Figure 1b: View of study from behind Freud’s desk. Photograph taken in 1938 by Edmund Engelman at Berggasse 19, Vienna. Courtesy of Freud Museum London.

However, the nature of this significance is harder to pin down than the arrangement of the consulting room. Since the desk lacks the usual paraphernalia one might expect, such as family photographs, a calendar, or a telephone, the temptation is to treat the 65 objects on it—in particular, the figurines—as a form of hieroglyph awaiting their Rosetta stone. But hieroglyphs, like any system of writing, require a collectively understood set of symbols, and the associations here are not so direct; for example, there is no figure of Oedipus on the desk, and few of the Egyptian figures that make up the majority of the figurines are mentioned in Freud’s writing.

The word ‘object’ plays an important role in psychoanalysis. It is used to describe representations of significant figures within the psyche, as in ‘mother object’ or ‘love object’, and also when feelings for such figures are transferred onto actual objects, as in a ‘transitional object’¹⁰ or ‘fetish object’.¹¹ Functioning both to provide pleasure and to ward off anxiety, such objects represent a complex emotional content to their owner, as well as any formal representation. Research into the 65 objects on the desk reveals that they too hold multiple characteristics and associations, their stories relating both to the character they assume and to their role in Freud’s life. An Osiris figure represents the complex myth of the Egyptian god of the underworld and was also a gift from a friend to celebrate the completion of Freud’s *Totem and Taboo* in 1913. A centaur, a hybrid figure, both man and beast, recalls the strange composite figures created in dreams, as well as the trip to Innsbruck where it was purchased. We learn that Freud, responding to objects that appealed to all the senses, was in the habit of absentmindedly stroking the smooth marble surface of the Baboon of Thoth in the same way he stroked his pet dogs, and that he was unable to write without his favorite pen. For Freud, a lifelong smoker, the multiple ashtrays on the desk would have been infused with the immensely pleasurable association of the smell and taste of cigars (Spankie 2015: 30, 46, 48, 62, 92, 157).

Contemporary commentators also suggested the importance of the emotional content of the figures. An otolaryngologist and contemporary of Freud, Wilhelm Fliess speculated that the little figures that faced Freud as he wrote provided him with an audience that “offer[ed] rest, refuge, and encouragement” (Masson 1985: xvii), acting as markers or signposts to his thoughts. Or as the American poet and patient of Freud Hilda Doolittle (who published under the pseudonym H.D.) described: “The Professor said that his little statues and images helped stabilize the evanescent idea, or keep it from escaping altogether” (H.D. [1956] 2012: 175). Thus, the desk is not ‘functional’ in the way that a designer might use the term; rather, it created what the English psychoanalyst D. W. Winnicott (1967) referred to as a ‘facilitating environment’. In other words, the arrangement of figures on the desk, plus certain writing implements and cigars, created a secure, creative space that allowed Freud both to think and to write.

It is here that, in order to understand the way in which the spatial arrangement of Freud’s consulting room and study interacted with his conceptual work, I propose that the projections of occupants (in this case Freud) as well as their structured domesticity can be best observed, analyzed, and demonstrated through diagrammatic methods. I will thus proceed by working with diagrams, so as to draw out subjective qualities such as time, function, and association in relation to the human mind and interior space.

Diagramming Space

An architect's professional status is based on his or her knowledge of the discipline of architecture, demonstrated through an ability to create measured orthographic projections. These indicate not only what the building will look like but also how its interiors will be arranged (typically shown in plan view) as well as how it stands up, the structure, traditionally hidden or disguised behind the façade (is typically shown in section). The photographer Edmund Engelman (1907–2000) had trained as an engineer and drew a cutaway axonometric drawing of Berggasse 19 (fig. 2a) to show the location of Freud's study and consulting room in the apartment block.

Freud had originally trained as a medical doctor, and part of this training included producing closely observed drawings of slides seen through a microscope. Working in pen and ink, Freud drew in this way from 1876 to 1886 (see fig. 2b) and was a skilled draftsman. In a manner similar to an architect, a doctor's knowledge of a patient's condition is related to his or her understanding of the body's anatomy beneath the surface of the skin. Although both professions' expertise is based on the knowledge of things that are unseen (except through a microscope, on the operating table, or as the building is being constructed), they are essentially dealing with physical matter that—once revealed—can be seen. Freud's drawings are typical nineteenth-century scientific drawings based on a tradition of observation and analysis. I suggest that they can be compared to the orthographic drawings produced by architects because they are created in sectional cuts to reveal what is under the surface of the body tissue (rather than the building façade). Both methods of drawing are measured, to scale, and follow discipline-specific conventions.

Figure 2a: Axonometric showing the street façade of Berggasse 19 cut back to reveal the two rooms used by Freud as his consulting room and study. Drawn by Edmund Engelman in 1938. Courtesy of Freud Museum London.

Figure 2b: On the spinal ganglia and spinal cord of Petromyzon. Drawn by Freud in 1878. Courtesy of Freud Museum London.

Attempting to understand the interior created by Freud, I began my experiment with a measured drawing of Berggasse 19 during Freud's lifetime. To do this, I surveyed the study and consulting room at Berggasse 19 in Vienna's ninth district and the furniture arrangement at 20 Maresfield Gardens, London. Starting with Berggasse 19, I drew out the room plans and mentally placed the furniture back in position. I sat at an imaginary desk and looked at an imaginary couch. I sat in the corner of the consulting room facing the window and looked out to the courtyard, as Freud must have done, and then to my left through the double doors to where I had just imagined the desk. I then drew out my findings in two plans (figs. 3a, 3b) that compare the furniture arrangement in Vienna and London. I marked the visual connection between the desk chair and the couch with an arrow to suggest that the two activities stimulated each other, the desk representing theory and the armchair at the end of the couch, practice.

What can be seen is that the arrangement is similar: the relationships remain the same but not the exact position, as if all the elements were related to one another by elastic threads. Referring to contemporary discussions on 'topological thinking',¹² we see that Freud's interior architecture is capable of being compatible with a number of extensive qualities, such as distance, area, or volume, while retaining the same function. This is why it can be packed up and recreated. Like Engelman's axonometric drawing, my two plans locate important pieces of furniture and establish the visual connection between Freud's two main positions in the space. The drawings, however, fix the interior at a moment in time—1938—and say little about the rituals and routines that occurred within it or what the space represented to Freud or his patients.

Figure 3a: Diagrammatic room plan of Berggasse 19, Vienna, showing the consulting room with the patient lying on the couch, the analyst sitting at the head out of sight and the study with the desk facing the couch that is viewed through a screen of objects. Drawn by author.

Figure 3b: The same arrangement at 20 Maresfield Gardens London. Drawn by author.

The word ‘diagram’ comes from the Greek διαγραμμα, defined by the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) as “that which is marked out by lines.” In contrast to orthographic drawings, diagrams should be understood graphically as representations rather than projections. Diagrams rely on lines, symbols, images, and text to communicate; their purpose is to draw out or connect ideas rather than depict what something looks like. The crucial point is that, as a technique, diagramming—working with diagrams—shifts the emphasis from physical form or appearance to latent structure, offering a tool to ‘draw out’ or reveal unseen qualities, such as the relationship between elements and their psychological function.

The distinction made between projection and representation is important. The dictionary tells us that the word ‘projection’ comes from the Latin *prōiectiōn-*, *prōiectiō*, with *prōiectiō* meaning the “action of projecting or throwing forward” (OED). In drawing, this translates as “a representation of a figure on a surface according to a particular system of correspondence between its points and the points of the surface” (OED). The projection, therefore, regardless if drawn out in lines of sight, light, or pencil lead, implies a correspondence between the original object and its projection. For architects, this correspondence is made through scale and measure. A representation, on the other hand, is “something which stands for or denotes another symbolically; an image, a symbol, a sign” (OED), the correspondence to the ‘other’ being through association or analogy rather than points in space. It is this ability of diagrams to depict associative, analogous qualities that makes them so potent in drawing out the interior.

The ability of diagrams to edit out superfluous information and clarify complexity means that architects use them as both an analytical and a generative tool. However, for the most part, such techniques apply discipline-specific conventions. As my interest shifted from the architectural to the interior qualities described above, I saw the potential of studying Freud’s diagrams to draw out his workspace with particular reference to his diagrams of the mind.

I began with the sketches. Throughout his life, Freud corresponded widely with letters to family, friends, and colleagues, which he would illustrate with sketch diagrams—most intriguingly for me, including some spatial layouts. As part of his medical studies, Freud (aged 20 at the time) spent four weeks at the University of Vienna’s biological station in Trieste. His task was to study the anatomy of eels, using the scientific model of observation, analysis, and reflection to search for evidence of the male eel’s testicle as a way to identify its sex. Despite dissecting 400 specimens, he had no success. However, in writing to his friend Eduard Silberstein in 1876, he included sketches not only of an eel, but also of his workroom, his worktable surface (carefully recording the position of his microscope and other equipment), and one of his chairs, with his body’s position indicated by arrows (see sketches in Boehlich 1990: 143–147).

What is interesting about these sketches is the consideration Freud gave to the arrangement of his workspace, which suggests a close relationship in his mind between the spatial layout and his working method and the importance of details, such as the position of the window and his own body’s position in the chair. Freud, explaining to Silberstein two years earlier, wrote: “I am one of those human beings who can be found most of the day between two pieces of furniture, one formed vertically, the armchair, and one extending horizontally, the table, and from these, as social historians are agreed, sprang all civilization” (Boehlich 1990: 48–49).

Another example is a sketch plan included in an 1883 letter to his then fiancée Martha Bernays describing his accommodations at the Vienna General Hospital—the first of three letters sent to Martha that day (see sketch in Grubrich-Simitis et al. 2013: 308). The plan is just an outline, but what is intriguing are Freud’s annotations explaining how he has divided the space into two sides: one for studying (writing, reading, thinking), which he terms his *animalische* side, and one for living, which he calls *vegetativer* (sleeping, washing, dressing) (ibid.: 308). Rather than just locating the functional

requirements of student life against the spatial layout, Freud associated them with psychic concepts. By describing the animal functions as “higher,” he also suggested an ordering of the two, with the discomfort of the vegetative part disturbing the concentration of the animal part. Again, the plan locates important pieces of furniture and describes pictures on the wall, while the window is annotated with the words “air and light,” and the door, the “outer world.”¹³

Figure 4: Diagram of study and consulting room showing activities and associations. Drawn by author.

I was unable to find any such descriptions of the study and consulting room, so in reference to these sketches and the layout of the study and consulting room in both Vienna and London I redrew Freud’s workspace as a diagram focusing on the arrangement of activities and their associations rather than the architecture (fig. 4). His most important activities were the acts of consulting — ‘practice’ (observation and analysis) — and of studying — ‘theory’ (reflection). I suggest that in Freud’s mind the study and consulting room represented his animalische side and the family apartment, the vegetativer. Meanwhile, I also noticed the window — Freud was right-handed and always positioned the desk with the window to the left — and the entrance from the waiting room and exit via a side door.

Curiously, my diagram reveals that Freud’s spatial arrangement at the end of his life is not dissimilar to his workspace at age 20 in Trieste. This suggests that he repeated certain rituals and routines or ‘patterns of doing’ through- out his life, adapting them to different circumstances. There is, however, one significant difference: Freud’s method of observation changed from looking to listening. By 1896, Freud had swapped the microscope for the couch, moving himself out of the patient’s view (and them out of his). This arrangement remains accepted psychoanalytic practice today and is considered an essential component of the therapeutic process. This was a hugely significant development, as noted by psychoanalyst Ilse Grubrich-Simitis (1997: 24): “There can be no doubt that the radical revolutionization of clinical perception was fully accomplished only when ‘hearing’ too came to be incorporated into the perceptual process.” This is because listening requires that, unlike the eels of Trieste, the subject being studied is alive.

I was mindful that this interior space was one with two users — Freud and the patient (also referred to as ‘analysand’ or sometimes ‘student’) — and I directed my attention to the experience of the patient or ‘living subject’. Freud discouraged his patients from taking notes, “fearing such conscious activities would interfere with the deeper, spontaneous processes of the mind” (Warner 2012: 412). Despite this, one patient, H.D., did keep notes from the period of analysis she underwent with Freud between 1933 and 1934, which she published later in a 1956 volume titled *Tribute to Freud*. A skilled poet and founding member of the Imagist movement, H.D. structured her text like an analytic session, allowing it to wander from Freud’s study and consulting room to her childhood, to the myths and characters embodied in the ancient figurines, to wartime London, and back to her childhood, offering a beautiful and visual description of the consulting room and the experience of free association. Describing her own analysis, H.D. ([1956] 1971: 20–21) wrote:

My imagination wandered at will; my dreams were revealing, and many of them drew on classical or Biblical symbolism. Thoughts were things, to be collected, collated, analyzed, shelved, or resolved. Fragmentary ideas, apparently unrelated, were often found to be part of a special layer or stratum of thought and memory, therefore to belong together; these were sometimes skillfully pieced together like the exquisite Greek tear-jars and iridescent glass bowls and vases that gleamed in the dusk from the shelves of the cabinet that faced me where I stretched, propped up on the couch in the room in Berggasse 19, Wien IX.

What is interesting in this passage is that H.D., like Freud, connects the space and the mind, describing psychoanalysis as a process of ordering one’s thoughts in the same way as one might order one’s things in a cluttered or disorderly interior. H.D. unwittingly alludes to something that architectural historian Antoine Picon (2013: 37) describes as the paradoxical status of ornament and ordering: “The Latin word for ornament, ornamentum, shares, for instance, a common etymological

origin with the verb *ordino*, meaning to organise, to order, as if an ornament, any well-conceived ornament, expressed the underlying order of things.” Thus, while the study and consulting room look on the surface like a typical fin-de-siècle Viennese interior, underneath, as the description of the desk implied, the furniture and effects acted as markers or signposts, to both Freud and his patient’s thoughts.

The psychoanalytic process asks patients not to focus on the present, but to allow their mind to wander back to childhood as well as to consider the future. In a remarkable passage, H.D. ([1956] 1971: 29–30) maps this idea of time onto the consulting room:

Length, breadth, thickness, the shape, the scent, the feel of things. The actuality of the present, its bearing on the past, their bearing on the future. Past, present, future, these three—but there is another time-element, popularly called the fourth-dimensional. The room has four sides. There are four seasons to a year. This fourth dimension, though it appears variously disguised and under different subtitles, described and elaborately tabulated in the Professor’s volumes ... is yet very simple. It is as simple and inevitable in the building of time-sequence as the fourth wall to a room. If we alter our course around this very room where I have been talking with the Professor, and start with the wall to my left, against which the couch is placed, and go counter-clockwise, we may number the Professor’s wall with the exit door 2, the wall with the entrance door ... 3, and the wall opposite the couch 4. This wall actually is largely unwallled, as the space there is left vacant by the wide-open double doors.

H.D.’s description adds another layer—that of time—to my original diagram (see fig. 4). In spatializing the past, present, and future, the couch is the analytic instrument dealing with the past, while the Freud family apartment and the exit door to everyday life are the present. The double doors to the waiting room represent the outside world and the future, and, finally, the space left vacant, containing the study and desk, are the fourth dimensional (fig. 5). I understand H.D.’s term ‘fourth dimensional’ as the imagination or the creative and unconscious power of such psychic spaces. Adding these annotations next to the graphic symbols of the important furniture elements, the diagram is no longer a spatial layout but a representation of H.D.’s ‘psychoanalytic setting’.

Figure 5: Diagram of study and consulting room with H.D.’s description of time added. Drawn by author.

Diagramming the Mind

When I myself had begun to publish papers, I had been obliged to make my own drawings to illustrate them. (Freud 1900; SE vol. 4: 172)

In his own spatial diagrams as described above, Freud mapped psychic concepts onto actual space. As his clinical work shifted from neuropathology to neuropsychology and then to metapsychology, he increasingly found himself attempting to apply psychic concepts to the anatomy of the brain. In a set of sketch diagrams intended to illustrate an unpublished essay, “Introduction to Neuropathology,” from about 1886, Freud drew looping lines to connect various nodes intended to show how the body (arms, face, hands) are represented in areas of the brain. At the time these drawings appeared, many neurologists presumed the body was somehow mirrored in the brain, perhaps altered in form but recognizable, intact. Yet in these sketches and others like it, Freud speculated that the brain worked differently. As he put it in his 1891 monograph entitled *On Aphasia*, the brain’s fibers and cells “contain the body periphery in the same way as a poem contains the alphabet, in a complete rearrangement” (quoted in Gamwell and Solms 2006: 91). Later research supported Freud’s novel idea that “the body periphery is not projected onto the cortex in a simple and direct fashion ... but rather it is represented there” (ibid.).

The concept that the mind represents the body not concretely but functionally, abstractly, and symbolically was a breakthrough for Freud. Some observers have suggested that it was the moment

when the ‘mind’ entered his scientific work (Gamwell and Solms 2006: 91; Strachey 1970: 14). Of course, mental functions, unlike body tissue and structure, are dynamic and exist over time, and they involve processes that cannot be seen and cannot easily be drawn. Unsurprisingly, this was the point at which Freud gave up observational drawings and began to use diagrams.

Figure 6: Diagrams from the fair copy of the “Neue Folge der Vorlesungen zue Einführung in die Psychoanalyse [New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis].” Where W-Bw=Pcpt.-Cs.; Uberich = Superego, Es=Id, Ich=Ego vorbewusst = Preconscious, unbeusst=Unconscious, Vdg or Verdrangt = Repressed. (Grubrich-Simitis 1997: 156, Plate 9.1). By permission of The Marsh Agency Ltd. on behalf of Sigmund Freud Copyrights.

As Freud developed the theory of psychoanalysis, he used diagramming to think through psychological structures that are not only invisible but also hypothetical. In these sketches of the ego and the id (fig. 6), one can see him trying to work out the best way to describe the structure of the psyche for the “New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis” (Freud 1933; SE vol. 22). If the earlier drawings were about observation and analysis, one could suggest that these later diagrams are ‘design drawings’ because Freud is ‘drawing out’ an idea and speculating on what it might be.¹⁴ Similar to a *mappa mundi*, the concern is not spatial accuracy, but rather the desire to explain one idea in relation to another. As Lynn Gamwell points out: “Einstein once said that when he thought about science, he thought visually, he thought in pictures, and this appears to be the case with Freud” (cited in Carey 2006).

The Dream Diagrams

Perhaps Freud’s most intriguing diagrams were published in what he considered his most important work. “The Interpretation of Dreams” was written between 1895 and 1897, although it was not published until 1900. Chapter 7, “The Psychology of the Dream Processes,” contains three abstract ‘figures’ that at first glance could be mistaken for Egyptian hieroglyphs. Freud tells his reader that they are diagrams (or figures) to help explain the dream process—a function of the mind that cannot be seen and has no physical locality, due to being dynamic and existing over time.

Freud offers his reader an analogy to aid interpretation: “I shall carefully avoid the temptation to determine psychical locality in any anatomical fashion. I shall remain upon psychological ground, and I propose simply to follow the suggestion that we should picture the instrument which carries out our mental functions as resembling a compound microscope or a photographic apparatus, or something of the kind” (1900; SE vol. 5: 536). The microscope returns, this time as an analogy, to make the invisible visible. Freud explains that just as the lenses in an instrument “are located one behind the other,” so in certain psychical processes functions “go through a definite temporal sequence in their arousal” (ibid.).

So how does the diagram work? Reading from left to right, using line, symbol, and text, figure 7a illustrates how one’s perception (Pcpt) is activated by experiences or stimuli (either internal or external) indicated by the upward arrow. These are stored in the mind as a memory or memory trace (Mnem). The memory trace is not just the content of the perception itself but the associations and sensations that come with it, as well as links to other memories. Over a lifetime, these build up, represented by the dots, and for the most part are forgotten, ending up in the unconscious (Ucs). The unconscious also stores our ‘wishes’ and ‘fears’, the oldest and most powerful of which derive from memory traces laid down in childhood when we are most impressionable. Responses to new stimuli or experiences may be motivated by these unconscious wishes and fears, now brought into the conscious mind by the Preconscious (Pcs) that controls motor activity (M) indicated by the downward arrow on the right.

Figure 7a: Diagram from “The Interpretation of Dreams” where Pcpt = perception, Mnem = memory, Ucs = unconscious, Pcs = Preconscious, M = motor activity. By permission of The Marsh Agency Ltd. on behalf of Sigmund Freud Copyrights.

Freud tells his reader that it is the time sequence of this psychic process, as indicated by the arrows, that is important rather than the spatial order, and that in dreams the process described is reversed. Dreams, beginning as wishes (or fears) in the unconscious, work their way back through the memory traces before they surface as dream-images in the sleeping perceptual system. This ‘regressive’ process effectively returns an idea back into the sensory image from which it was originally derived. As Freud emphasizes: “In regression the fabric of dream-thoughts is resolved into its raw material” (1900; SE vol. 5: 543). He continues:

Analogies of this kind are only intended to assist us in our attempt to make the complications of mental functioning intelligible by dissecting function and assigning its different constituents to different component parts of the apparatus ... We are justified, in my view, in giving free reign to our speculations so long as we retain the coolness of our judgement and do not mistake the scaffolding for the building ... strictly speaking, there is no need for the hypothesis that the psychical systems are actually arranged in a spatial order. It would be sufficient if a fixed order was established by the fact that in a given psychic process the excitation passes through the systems in a particular temporal sequence. (ibid.: 536–537)

One could substitute the word ‘diagrams’ for ‘analogies’, and the quote would still make perfect sense.

Figure 7b: Third dream diagram reworked to describe the effect of Freud’s study and consulting room on his working method. Drawn by author.

My own earlier diagrams had mapped psychic structures onto the space of the study and consulting room, but now Freud’s dream diagrams suggested the possibility of mapping the interior space onto the dream structure. So I borrowed Freud’s dream diagrams as a ‘scaffold’ to explain how his interior arrangement functioned, adding images of the furniture and figurines described earlier over the black dots to symbolize the associations and sensations embodied in the objects around him. In figure 7b, the dotted arrow pointing to the right indicates that the case histories Freud heard at the end of the couch informed his writing, while the curved dotted arrow going in the opposite direction indicates that theories developed in his writing would direct his interest in particular aspects of case histories, suggesting a process of simultaneity. A representation rather than a projection, my diagram refers to temporal sequence rather than spatial arrangement, separating out function instead of form. The ideas embodied in and associated with the couch, the desk, and the antique figurines functioned as visual references. The building blocks of Freud’s imagination, they were endlessly rearranged in his subconscious “in the same way as a poem contains the alphabet,” as Freud had put it in *On Aphasia*. Repeating this pattern of regular doings—day in, day out—gave Freud a scaffold against which to build his theories.

Conclusion

In “The Interpretation of Dreams,” Freud writes that “the most striking psychological characteristic of the process of dreaming: a thought, and as a rule a thought of something that is wished, is objectified in the dream, represented as a scene, or, as it seems to us, is experienced” (1900; SE vol. 5: 534). However, citing G. T. Fechner, Freud speculates “that the theatre where our dreams are enacted is a different one from the scene of action where our ideas are generated in waking life” (ibid.: 536). Interior space can be described as a series of scenes or backdrops against which we live out our lives. Like the architecture that contains them, it is possible to describe the physical layout of an interior in orthographic projections. But there is another space, created by the occupant over time—a personal interior architecture that resists such techniques by being highly subjective and emotive. Using Sigmund Freud’s study and consulting room as an example, this article has argued that diagramming offers a more rewarding technique to describe such interiors. In stripping back the architecture of a given space to reveal its invisible structures, rituals, and routines, diagramming allows for visual analogy and speculation. But most importantly, it provides tools to work with as well as think with.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges Philip Steadman for advice given during the development of this article, the opportunity to present a draft version at the conference “Diagrammatic: Beyond Inscription?” and the feedback given at that point, as well as the peer reviewers, in response to whose comments this article has been greatly improved. The author also wishes to acknowledge financial support received from the University of Westminster for image funding.

Ro Spankie is a designer, teacher, and researcher. She is a Principal Lecturer at the University of Westminster, London, and an Associate Editor of the journal *Interiors: Design/Architecture/Culture*. Her PhD in Architectural Design, awarded by University College London, focused on the role of drawing as an investigative tool in relation to three case study interiors, one of which was the study and consulting room of Sigmund Freud. Her publications include “Within the Cimeras: Spaces of Imagination” in *The Production Sites of Architecture* (2019), edited by Sophia Psarra, and *An Anecdotal Guide to Sigmund Freud’s Desk* (2015). E-mail: r.spankie@westminster.ac.uk

Notes

1. Freud had lived in apartment number 5 on the second floor of Berggasse 19 from 1891 to 1938, a period of 47 years. From 1896 to 1908, he practiced from a three-room apartment (consisting of a waiting room, consulting room, and study) on the floor below. In 1908, he was able to move his practice up into the adjoining apartment (number 6) on the same landing as the family home. This arrangement continued until the Freuds left Vienna in 1938.
2. The ‘psychoanalytic setting’ is the ‘pattern of regular doings’ (to borrow Douglas’s term) set between the analyst and the patient, such as rules about time and money, the use of the couch, and so forth (see Freud 1912; SE vol. 12: 111–112). Please note that references to *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (SE), edited by James Strachey (1953– 1974), are abbreviated throughout as presented here.
3. One of Freud’s more famous patients was Sergei Pankejeff, to whom Freud (1918; SE vol. 17) gave the pseudonym ‘Wolf-Man’. Pankejeff later wrote about the experience, describing the space as follows: “I can remember, as though I saw them today, his two adjoining studies, with the door open between them and with their windows opening on a little courtyard. There was always a feeling of sacred peace and quiet here. The rooms themselves must have been a surprise to any patient, for they in no way reminded one of a doctor’s office but rather an archeologist’s study ... A few potted plants added life to the rooms, and the warm carpet and curtains gave them a homelike note. Everything here contributed to one’s feeling of leaving the haste of modern life behind, of being sheltered from one’s daily cares” (cited in Gardiner 1972: 139).
4. The apartment was photographed by Engelman in May 1938 just before it was packed up for shipping. These photographs were not published until 1998.
5. Free association, a psychoanalytic technique, encourages patients to put into words whatever thoughts or fantasies spontaneously occur in their minds, “without selection or censorship,” and in this way to stop giving any conscious direction to their thoughts (Freud 1912; SE vol. 12: 112).
6. This arrangement can be seen in a photograph of Freud sitting at the end of the couch at Hohe Warte. The image, IN26 “Sigmund Freud, 1933,” can be viewed at <https://www.freud.org.uk/photo-library/freud> portraits/.
7. In the summer, the Freud family would rent a house on the outskirts of Vienna to escape the heat of the city. During these periods, Freud would continue to write and, in order not to disrupt their analysis, would continue to see some of his patients. Remarkably, in order to facilitate this, every year the couch and other pieces of furniture, as well as a substantial part of the collection of antiquities, would travel with the family to the summer residence.
8. The desk chair was made in 1930 by the architect Felix Augenfeld as a gift from his daughter Mathilde. Augenfeld wrote: “She explained SF had the habit of reading in a very uncomfortable body position. He was leaning in this chair, in some sort of diagonal position, one of his legs slung over the arm of the chair, the book held high and his head unsupported. The rather bizarre form of chair I designed is to be explained as an attempt to maintain this habitual posture and make it more comfortable” (Warner 1998: 57).
9. Again, the ability to be relocated offers a clue. It is recorded that each summer the desk and many of the objects on it were transported to the various family summer residences. When the Freud’s possessions arrived in London in 1938, it was a matter of pride that the objects on the desk were arranged in the same order in which they had appeared in Vienna. This act of recreation indicates that the arrangement was in some way significant to Freud.
10. An example of a transitional object might be a teddy bear (see Winnicott 1967).
11. An example of a fetish object might be a woman’s stocking (Freud 1927; SE vol. 18: 152–157).
12. Here the term ‘topological thinking’ refers its use in Manuel De Landa’s (2002) article “Deleuze and the Use of the Genetic Algorithm in Architecture.”
13. Translations from this collection are my own. Later in life, Freud struggled with the reception of his work by the outer world, and it is possible even in these early days that he saw his room as a sanctuary from external criticism.

14. Examples of diagrams used to think through an idea include Darwin's 'tree of life' diagram, Lévi-Strauss's diagram of the 'raw' and the 'cooked', Lacan's L-scheme, Waddington's epigenetic landscape, and Crick's pencil sketch of the DNA double helix.

References

- Berger, John. 1984. *And Our Faces, My Heart, Brief as Photos*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Boehlich, Walter, ed. 1990. *The Letters of Sigmund Freud to Eduard Silberstein, 1871–1881*. Trans. Arnold J. Pomerans. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Brabant, Eva, Ernst Falzeder, and Patrizia Giampieri-Deutsch, eds. 1993. *The Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Sándor Ferenczi. Vol. 1: 1908–1914*. Trans. Peter T. Hoffer. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Carey, Benedict. 2006. "Analyze These." *New York Times*, 25 April. <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/25/health/psychology/analyze-these.html>.
- DeLanda, Manuel. 2002. "Deleuze and the Use of the Genetic Algorithm in Architecture." In *Designing for a Digital World*, ed. Neil Leach, 117–120. Chichester: Wiley-Academy.
- Douglas, Mary. 1991. "The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space." *Social Research* 58 (1): 287–307.
- Engelman, Edmund. 1998. *Sigmund Freud, Vienna IX, Berggasse 19*. Photographs and epilogue, Edmund Engelman; introduction and legends, Inge Scholz-Strasser. Vienna: Verlag Christian Brandstätter.
- Freud, Martin. 1957. *Glory Reflected: Sigmund Freud—Man and Father by His Eldest Son*. London: Angus and Robertson.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1900. "The Interpretation of Dreams." Reprinted in Strachey 1953–1974, vols. 4, 5.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1912. "Recommendations to Physicians Practising Psycho-analysis." Reprinted in Strachey 1953–1974, vol. 12: 109–120.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1918. "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis." Reprinted in Strachey 1953–1974, vol. 17: 7–123.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1927. "Fetishism." Reprinted in Strachey 1953–1974, vol. 18: 152–157.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1933. "New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis." Reprinted in Strachey 1953–1974, vol. 22.
- Gamwell, Lynn, and Mark Solms. 2006. *From Neurology to Psychoanalysis: Sigmund Freud's Neurological Drawings and Diagrams of the Mind*. Binghamton: Binghamton University Art Museum, State University of New York.
- Gardiner, Muriel, ed. 1972. *The Wolf-Man and Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis.
- Gay, Peter. 1989. *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Grubrich-Simitis, Ilse. 1997. *Early Freud and Late Freud: Reading Anew "Studies on Hysteria" and "Moses and Monotheism"*. Trans. Philip Slotkin. London: Routledge.
- Grubrich-Simitis, Ilse, Albrecht Hirschmüller, and Gerhard Fichtner, eds. 2013. *Sigmund Freud und Martha Bernays. Die Brautbriefe Band 2: Unser "Roman in Fortsetzungen"* [The Letters during Their Engagement, vol. 2: Our "Novel in Installments"]. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer.
- H.D. (pseud. Hilda Doolittle). (1956) 1971. *Tribute to Freud*. Oxford: Carcanet Press. H.D. (pseud. Hilda Doolittle). (1956) 2012. *Tribute to Freud*. 2nd ed. New York: New Directions.
- Hill, Jonathan. 2006. *Immaterial Architecture*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, Ernest. 1953. *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 1: The Young Freud 1856–1900*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Jones, Ernest. 1955. *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 2: Years of Maturity 1901–1919*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Jones, Ernest. 1957. *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 3: The Last Phase 1919–1939*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Masson, Jeffrey, ed. 1985. *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess 1887–1904*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Pawley, Martin. (1968) 2007. "The Time House or Argument for an Existential Dwelling." In *The Strange Death of Architectural Criticism*, ed. David Jenkins, 24–34. London: Black Dog Publishing.
- Picon, Antoine. 2013. *Ornament: The Politics of Architecture and Subjectivity*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Praz, Mario. (1964) 2008. *An Illustrated History of Interior Decoration: From Pompeii to Art Nouveau*. Trans. William Weaver. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Sachs, Hanns. 1945. *Freud: Master and Friend*. London: Imago.
- Spankie, Ro. 2015. *An Anecdotal Guide to Sigmund Freud's Desk*. London: Freud Museum London.
- Strachey, James, ed. 1953–1974. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.
- Strachey, James. 1970. "Sigmund Freud: A Sketch of His Life and Ideas." In *Two Short Accounts of Psycho-Analysis*, Sigmund Freud, 11–24. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
- Warner, Marina. 1998. *20 Maresfield Gardens: A Guide to the Freud Museum*. London: Serpent's Tail.
- Warner, Marina. 2012. *Stranger Magic: Charmed States and the Arabian Nights*. London: Vintage.
- Winnicott, D. W. 1967. *Playing and Reality*. London: Tavistock Publications.

