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Patient and Painter:
The Careers of Sergius Pankejeff

Who was the “Wolf Man”? The person behind this pseudonym may seem familiar to many; after all, “Wolf Man” is the name offered by Sigmund Freud to a patient whose case he discussed in his study of 1918, “From the History of an Infantile Neurosis” (“Aus der Geschichte einer infantilen Neurose”). This text is, in turn, one of Freud’s most famous case studies as it offers a new outline of Freud’s thoughts on human development and psychoanalytic theory. Indeed, not only Freud, but also his patient, was well aware of the significance of this work. The Wolf Man was therefore willing to disclose his “real” identity, to confess to being Sergius Pankejeff, not only a former patient of the famous Viennese doctor, but one who had contributed to the development of the psychoanalytic discipline. In contrast to Bertha Pappenheim (Freud’s and Joseph Breuer’s patient “Anna O.”) or Ida Bauer (Freud’s patient “Dora”), Pankejeff did not seek to hide behind the pseudonym. He did not seek to retreat from public view, but wrote his memoirs instead.¹

Although Pankejeff had worked for many years after the Second World War as an employee in an insurance agency, he saw his profession as that of an academic painter.² He had, though, never attended an art academy. His life was marked by his illness, and until his death, he remained a psychoanalytic patient. Being a patient was perhaps his true occupation—and even his calling.

I would like to thank Harold Blum, the Director of the Freud Archives, for giving me permission to work with the Sergius Pankejeff Papers, and the superb staff at the National Archives in Washington. Thanks are also due to Carol Seigel, the Director of the Freud Museum in London; Inge Scholz-Strasser, Director of the Freud Museum in Vienna; and the members of the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia.

In the year 1910, Freud was still eager to build his practice. He had published his manifesto of psychoanalysis, *The Interpretation of Dreams (Die Traumdeutung)* in 1899, but the book sold badly in the early years.\(^3\) He had already published a number of case studies and saw patients. Freud had a large family and financial difficulties. His theories were much discussed but not yet established, and he was fighting for recognition of his newly invented discipline. For many doctors and scholars, psychoanalysis appeared to be a rather questionable undertaking, and despite Freud’s ardent efforts to establish the field as a “science,” it was an uphill battle. Sciences were based on experiments that could be repeated, and would thus establish replicable evidence. Psychoanalysis did not work via experiments, and could not provide that kind of evidence. There remained doubt, always, and this doubt was even inscribed in the psychoanalytic theory.

This was only part of the story, however. Karl Lueger, who served as Vienna’s mayor until his death in 1910, had made anti-Semitism socially and politically acceptable. Freud was not only Jewish, psychoanalysis itself was thought of as a Jewish discipline—much to Freud’s chagrin.\(^4\) What Freud needed were non-Jewish students and colleagues, perhaps even a non-Jewish successor. Three years earlier, he had met Carl Gustav Jung and thought of him as a potential choice, but this possibility did not work out. Freud needed non-Jewish patients as well, and in particular male patients. Freud’s early studies were dedicated to the analysis of hysteria, and hysteria was viewed as a largely female illness at that time; indeed, many of his early patients were young women from the Jewish bourgeoisie—neighbors and the daughters or relatives of friends and acquaintances. Only by the end of the First World War, when traumatized soldiers flooded Vienna’s hospitals and doctor’s offices, was this gendered view of hysteria reconsidered and shell shock studied as a possibly hysterical disease.\(^5\)

In 1910, however, something happened that must have appeared to Freud as a sort of miracle. A 23-year-old man entered Freud’s practice, and asked for help and treatment. He was a
Russian aristocrat named Sergius Pankejeff and he appeared to be very rich. A servant accompanied him (Fig. 1). At his first meeting with Freud, he greeted him with anti-Semitic as well as obscene remarks. Freud was happy. Eagerly, Freud reported Pankejeff’s words to his colleague and friend Sándor Ferenczi: “Jewish Swindler, he would like to use me from behind and shit on my head.” In many ways, Pankejeff seemed to be an answer to Freud’s prayers.

While Pankejeff entered Freud’s practice cursing, he was a helpless man. Severely depressed, he was unable to care for himself—unable even to remove his coat without his servant’s help. Pankejeff had already visited various doctors in Russia and Germany, and as a last resort he had traveled to Vienna to seek help from Freud. Freud referred him to the Bellevue
Hospital, and visited him there regularly. After a limited stay at the clinic, Pankejeff moved to Freud’s neighborhood and entered psychoanalytic treatment. Pankejeff was to live close to Berggasse 19, the location of Freud’s apartment and practice, until the end of his life.

His treatment progressed slowly at first. Freud learned about Pankejeff’s childhood and youth in Russia, and his life both in Odessa and on the country estate, where he lived with his parents and his only—older—sister Anna. Aleksandr Golovin, a painter, joined the family at times as a guest at the estate and gave lessons to the young Pankejeff (Fig. 2). An older maid, Nanya, was in charge of the children’s care. In 1905, Anna committed suicide, an event that devastated her younger brother. In the same year, Pankejeff moved to Odessa to begin his studies of law.

It took some time for Pankejeff’s illness to manifest itself. At first, his symptoms were minor, such as an intense religiosity that seemed to manifest itself in repeated ritualized gestures. But already in 1908, Pankejeff was no longer able to continue with his studies. He felt depressed, and was paralyzed at times. Pankejeff consulted with doctors in Odessa, Munich, Frankfurt, and Berlin, and attended various clinics or sanatoria, before he sought out the founder of psychoanalysis.

Freud was particularly interested in Pankejeff’s family ties, his relationship to his older nanny, Nanya, and his sister Anna, who seemed to have seduced him into sexual games. But the real breakthrough in treatment occurred when Pankejeff told about a dream that he had apparently dreamt repeatedly. Freud noted it down, and published it first in an essay of 1913 on “The Occurrence in Dreams of Material from Fairy Tales”:

*I dreamt that it was night and that I was laying in my bed . . . Suddenly the window opened of its own accord, and I was terrified to see that some white wolves were sitting on the big walnut tree in front of the window. There were six or seven of them. The wolves were quite white, and looked more like foxes or sheep-dogs, for they had big tails like foxes and they had their ears pricked like dogs when they pay attention to something. In great terror, evidently of being eaten up by the wolves, I screamed and woke up. (pp. 283–284, italics in the original)*
Pankejeff tried to document this dream as an image as well, and in his case study, Freud reproduced his drawing. Later, Pankejeff painted two versions of this dream, both of which became part of the collection at the Freud Museum in London (Fig. 3).

This dream inspired Freud to name Pankejeff “Wolf Man” (Wolfsmann). And it inspired him also to an interpretation of it as a rebus, just as he had earlier discussed dreams in his Traumdeutung. According to Freud, Pankejeff must have observed his parents’ lovemaking as a young child, and in all likelihood their sexual encounter a tergo, which would have reminded him of animals whose lovemaking he had witnessed before. Thus, he dreamed of white wolves, recalling his parents’ bodies and white nightgowns. Freud’s interpretation of this dream had consequences not only for his treatment in this particular case, but also for his analytic theory in general. From then on, he would postulate a “primal scene” that psychoanalysis had to explore and that would prove to be crucial for the patient’s psychic development.
According to Freud, Pankejeff’s health seemed to improve. In 1914, he married Therese, a woman of modest background whom he had encountered in a clinic in Munich. In the same year, Pankejeff ended his treatment with Freud, at least provisionally. He wanted to return to Russia and visit his family, now as a newly married man. But the date for this trip was badly chosen. First the world war and then the October Revolution swept through Russia. Freud published his case study of the Wolf Man at the war’s end in 1918, while Pankejeff was still in Russia.

When Pankejeff returned to Vienna in 1919, he had completed his studies of law—indeed, Pankejeff would insist on carrying the title “Doctor” in later years—but he had lost his family fortune. He commenced a second analysis with Freud. This time, however, he was no longer a rich patient, but one who had to be taken care of by Freud and the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society—medically and financially. After a second analysis, Freud referred Pankejeff to his American student Ruth Mack Brunswick who continued treating him in 1926–1927. In 1938, Pankejeff’s wife Therese committed suicide.
The American psychoanalyst Muriel Gardiner, who had been in analysis and trained in Vienna with Mack Brunswick, was in Vienna in the late 1930s still. A wealthy heiress from Chicago, she used her money and connections to secure false passports for Jews and help them emigrate. Gardiner offered Pankejeff funds—and the opportunity to continue his analysis with Mack Brunswick, who had meanwhile moved to Paris. Pankejeff followed Mack Brunswick to London as well, but after a brief stay in England, returned to Vienna. Thus Pankejeff’s fourth analysis ended. He decided to remain in Austria, whereas Freud and most of his other patients, students, and colleagues were forced to leave the country and struggled to emigrate.

Freud died in London in 1939. Back in Vienna, Pankejeff became an Austrian citizen in 1947 and was able to gain employment in an insurance company (Fig. 4). Gardiner, who had meanwhile moved to New Jersey and worked there as a psychoanalyst, contacted him after the war. Once again, she began to offer Pankejeff financial support. Beginning in 1956, she visited him several times a year in Vienna.

Before the war, Gardiner herself had been analyzed by Mack Brunswick in Vienna. At that time, Freud had refused to take her as a patient—perhaps because of her brief relationship with one of his students, Ernest Jones. Instead, he referred her to Mack Brunswick. Gardiner probably met Pankejeff during her treatment as a fellow analysand. Not accepted for treatment by Freud, she established a relationship to one of his famous patients and thus an indirect bond to the master. It was Gardiner who encouraged Pankejeff to pen his memoirs of his analysis with Freud.

Pankejeff, however, recorded in his memoirs not only his encounter with Freud, but also his own contributions to psychoanalysis. Were the members of the psychoanalytic organization not obliged therefore to care for him and contribute to his well-being? Gardiner visited Pankejeff regularly, took control over his relationship with other analysts, and tried to guard his privacy. Yet, she asked acquaintances who visited Vienna to photograph the former Freud patient and report to her about him (Fig. 5). Ultimately, Gardiner published her own recollections of Pankejeff, together with Freud’s case history, Pankejeff’s memories of Freud, and Mack Brunswick’s case
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Figure 4. Pankejeff, at his desk in the Austrian insurance company, n.d. Freud Archives/Pankejeff Papers.

Figure 5. Pankejeff, photograph sent to Muriel Gardiner, Vienna, ca. 1965. Freud Archives/Pankejeff Papers.
studies of the patient (Pankejeff, 1971). She sent the royalties from this book to Pankejeff.

Gardiner, however, did not remain the only one caring for Pankejeff. After her first visits to Vienna, she contacted Kurt Eissler, then head of the Sigmund Freud Archives. Eissler was a Viennese emigrant, who returned to Vienna during the summers and now treated Pankejeff during his stays there. In the meantime, Pankejeff had acquired a long-term girlfriend and learned how to play out analysts against each other. He asked for money for himself, for his girlfriend, and even for funds to keep her from moving in with him.10 In addition to Eissler, Pankejeff saw a Viennese psychiatrist, Wilhelm Solms-Rödelheim, throughout the year. Both Gardiner and Eissler kept in touch with him, and Solms-Rödelheim sent reports on the patient’s well-being. In 1977, Pankejeff began to suffer from dementia, and Solms-Rödelheim referred him to a psychiatric clinic, today’s Otto Wagner-Spital (Fig. 6). Pankejeff died there in 1979; he was 92 years of age.

Figure 6. Pankejeff with his nurse, at the Otto Wagner Spital (July 1978). Freud Archives/Pankejeff Papers.
“On this day which is of such importance for the psychoanalytic world as well as for you, I am sending you congratulations,” Eissler wrote in the 1960s in a birthday telegram to Pankejeff (Fig. 7). One has to consider the sequence mentioned in this gratulatory note: the “psychoanalytic world” came first. In the 1960s, Pankejeff had already become a historic figure, and a part of the legacy of Sigmund Freud. After Pankejeff’s death, Eissler ordered a death mask of the deceased, which he sent to Gardiner in the United States (Fig. 8). Gardiner gave the mask to the Philadelphia psychoanalytic organization, of which she was a member; it was later sent to the newly founded Freud Museum in London. Eissler collected Pankejeff’s papers also after his death, and added them to the Freud Archives in Washington, where Pankejeff’s property is thus united with that of his former doctor.

The Archive

What do Pankejeff’s papers tell us about him? If Freud was interested in dreams, Pankejeff eagerly shared his interest. He not only painted versions of his famous dream, but as evidence in the Washington archive shows, he also searched for images that would put his dream into an art historical context. Thus, Pankejeff kept a card picturing an excerpt from an early modern Dutch print, published by the New York Pierpont Morgan Library; it features a tree populated by animals (Fig. 9). Pankejeff kept a diary, in which he noted down his nightly dreams; these sketches include his dreams of Freud. Always eager to remain Freud’s student, not just his patient, Pankejeff added psychoanalytic interpretations to these dreams.

In his case study of the Wolf Man, Freud describes Pankejeff’s early religious obsessions and indicates that he had been cured of them. Pankejeff’s archive, however, does not confirm this. On the contrary, it includes a large number of religious writings and devotional objects. Pankejeff collected pictures and pamphlets issued by the Catholic Church, particularly those that pertained to St. Teresa of Avila, also known as Teresa de Jesus.
Figure 7. Kurt Eissler, birthday telegram sent to Pankejeff, 1967. Freud Archives/ Pankejeff Papers.

Figure 8. Pankejeff’s death mask (1979), commissioned by Kurt Eissler. Freud Museum, London.
Perhaps not accidentally, Pankejeff’s wife was named Theresa as well. He kept a postcard of Raphael’s Sistine Madonna that is exhibited in the Dresden Gemäldegalerie. This painting is at the center of “Dora’s” second dream; Pankejeff had probably read Freud’s 1905 case study. Following the Russian-Orthodox tradition, Pankejeff cherished Easter, and sent out many Easter cards. Some of these greeting cards he sent to Gardiner, who forwarded them to the Freud Archives. Pankejeff and Gardiner communicated with each other as “Doctor” to “Doctor.”

Pankejeff’s interest in astrology led him to read books such as Robert Henseling’s 1939 study, *Umstrittenes Weltbild: Astrologie, Welteislehre, Um Erdgestalt und Weltmitte*, and he was particularly interested in the first section, entitled “Die Astrologie und ihr Ursprung,” dealing with the origin of astrology. Pankejeff copied passages with care and designed astrological charts that would tell about a person’s fate in the future, just as dreams would tell about his past. In his quest for persons with whom
to compare his own astrological chart, he produced charts for others, such as Albert Einstein.

A large number of Austrian schoolbooks in his possession document Pankejeff’s intensive autodidactic studies of history, mathematics, and philosophy. He wrote down passages from various books, reread them, and underlined and annotated his copies with red pencil. Many of his notebooks are devoted to passages from European literature, ranging from the nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries. The patient who served as an important witness of the development of psychoanalytic theory in the early twentieth century was interested in the work of Hans Magnus Enzensberger and his political poetry of the 1960s.

Many of Pankejeff’s notebooks are filled with copies relating to art historical works, but at the same time, they show his interest in the different properties of colors and in instruction in anatomy for artists. He did not choose a German textbook that would have been easily available in Vienna. Instead, he sought a connection to Freud again. In 1885, Freud had studied neurology with Jean-Martin Charcot in Paris. Pankejeff got hold of a copy of the French textbook, *Nouvelle anatomie artistique du corps humain: cours pratique et élémentaire*, authored by Paul Richer and published in 1906. Charcot had employed Richer at his Salpêtrière hospital, where Richer worked as an artist and translated photographs of hysterics into drawings fit for Charcot’s publications. Pankejeff copied Richer’s illustrations with great precision, in turn.

**The Artist**

In the mid-1970s, when the Austrian journalist Karin Obholzer learned that Pankejeff was still alive and she discovered his address, she decided to visit him. The publication of her conversations with him begins with a description of his top floor apartment, introducing its most private room—his bedroom—and remarking on the omnipresent artwork:

There was the conventionally furnished bedroom, the largest room in the apartment that he had probably
shared with his deceased wife Therese before her death, a smaller room next to the kitchen, and his study . . . On the walls were his landscape paintings, influenced by impressionism, as well as still lifes with flowers. (Obholzer, 1980, pp. 10–11)\textsuperscript{12}

Pankejeff showed Obholzer around his apartment and commented on his paintings; he also expressed a particular preference for Velasquez, Impressionist artists, and van Gogh.

Pankejeff drew and painted hundreds of pictures and these must have filled this space. Among his artwork, there are drawings that document his immediate vicinity: his desk, his chair, a view from a window. Many of these pictures focus on his telephone, which offered him a connection to the outside world (Fig. 10). Pankejeff drew portraits as well. Many of these were pictures of friends, but he also drew a large number of self-portraits (Fig. 11). Often, he concentrated primarily on the eyes of a person, which he sometimes highlighted especially. In another series of portraits, Pankejeff introduced color. Here, he combined different planes of color that intersected with drawn lines. A few times, he drew on both sides of the paper. The reverse of the self-portrait pictured here offers a forest and what seems to be his mother’s head under a bisecting line (Fig. 12).
Figure 11. Pankejef, self-portrait, n.d. Freud Archives/Pankejef Papers.

Figure 12. Pankejef, verso of self-portrait (Ill. 11), n.d. Freud Archives/Pankejef Papers.
If the landscape is here part of the drawing only, it moves into the center in most of Pankejeff’s work. Much of his paintings are landscape studies, and he understood himself to be a landscape painter. In Russia, Pankejeff learned *en plein air* painting from Golovin, and he executed his landscape paintings out of doors. Nearly all of these paintings were done on small cartons that are normal in size, and that would have been available in any art shop offering school supplies. The landscape paintings show forests but also Austrian mountain scenes, and occasional huts and houses—but no human figures (Fig. 13). Pankejeff would take his boards and explore the countryside. A couple of these landscape paintings show dense forests that might have resonated with his memories of Russian forests.

Pankejeff seems to have drawn clear distinctions between his group of interiors, his portrait drawings and paintings, and his landscape studies. While the interiors and portraits are studiously copied in attempts to render true proportions, the landscapes demonstrate problems with perspective and proportion. Devoid of human figures, they show trees and mountains and houses, and at times these are in odd relation-

![Pankejeff, landscape painting, oil on board, n.d. Freud Archives/Pankejeff Papers.](image)
ships to one another. Human dwellings appear usually at a distance. Pankejeff painted paths and roads, yet they would never lead to any houses, but instead pass them by. Houses are pictured, but they cannot be reached. Pankejeff’s technique in turn followed that of Impressionist painters, and some of his motifs—for example haystacks—emulated the paintings by Claude Monet (Fig. 14). His preferred colors are brown and red tones. Once again, colors bleed into each other, for he would paint landscapes without drawing strong contours.

During the times when he did not feel well and had to stay at home, Pankejeff found an alternative to landscape painting. It seems that here Gardiner offered not only medical advice. It was probably she who suggested that he take nature indoors and paint flowers instead. A last grouping of his paintings shows flower arrangements in various vases. Pankejeff’s preference was for red gladiolas (Fig. 15). The archives contain many such paintings.
When Pankejeff returned to Vienna in 1919, he became the ward of Freud and the Viennese psychoanalytic organization. After the Second World War, the American psychoanalysts Gardiner and Eissler continued in the role of self-appointed guardians. But Gardiner’s support extended far beyond medical assistance and direct financial aid. She did not offer money outright, probably out of discretion—although it is not clear whether such discretion was necessary in Pankejeff’s case. Gardiner paid for occasional lessons in Russian from him, and she also bought a good number of his landscape paintings. These pictures she in turn sold in the United States to her fellow
analysts, often for a pittance. They became welcome souvenirs of the last “real” patient of Sigmund Freud.

Therapists from New York or Chicago tried to buy pictures from Pankejeff directly, or sent him theories about his art and artistic development. While Pankejeff viewed himself as a painter, he sold hardly any of his work. Psychoanalysts were by far his best clients. Already early on in his painting career, he may have adjusted to this audience. Many of his paintings are signed not “Pankejeff,” but “S.P.” Freud relates in his case study of Pankejeff that his patient confused the name of an insect, “Wespe” (wasp), with “Espe,” only to recognize later that it was the German pronunciation of his own initials, S.P. Pankejeff also signed paintings simply with “Wolfsmann” (Wolf Man). Who would be the painter of these pictures then? Was it Pankejeff? Was it Espe? Was it the Wolf Man? Gardiner, Eissler, and Pankejeff in particular had entered a symbiotic relationship that contributed to the well-being of each of them. And Pankejeff’s paintings became an important instrument in various negotiations. And despite Gardiner’s attempts to monitor access to him—or perhaps also because of this—Pankejeff became a celebrity patient who was not only used by various psychoanalysts, but who knew as well how to use them.15

Notes

1. Pankejeff also wrote and published other essays. His studies on literature, a pamphlet on insurance law, as well as essays on psychoanalysis are part of his collection in the Freud Archives.
2. In several of his letters, Pankejeff describes himself as an “akademischer Maler.”
4. There is a rich literature on this topic. See, for example, Stephen Frosh’s Hate and the ‘Jewish Science’: Anti-Semitism, Nazism and Psychoanalysis (2005).
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Pentimento (1973), where in the chapter “Julia,” Hellman described Gardiner’s experiences as her own. See also Sheila Isenberg’s Muriel’s War: An American Heiress in the Nazi Resistance (2010).


12. Translation LW. In her book, Obholzer did not disclose Pankejeff’s address, which was Tendlergasse 4, 9. Bezirk.

13. I would like to thank André Dombrowski for this observation.

14. I would like to thank Isabel Suchanik for pointing out the parallels between several of Pankejeff’s paintings and those of well-known Impressionists.

15. Today, one or two dozen of Pankejeff’s paintings are in private property; they are owned by former colleagues and friends of Gardiner or their heirs. A few paintings are at the Freud Museum in Vienna, deposited there with the papers of Solms-Rödelheim. Most of the paintings, several hundred of them, are part of the Pankejeff papers in the Freud Archives, where they are kept as documents of a famous patient, not as artistic work. In the fall 2010, I was able to curate at Philadelphia’s Slought Gallery the first exhibition of Pankejeff’s paintings, “The Wolf Man Paints!” Supported by the University of Pennsylvania and the Psychoanalytic Center of Philadelphia, it offered a first exploration of Sergius Pankejeff as patient and artist. Isabel Suchanek and Melanie Adley assisted me in its preparation. See http://slought.org/content/11461/ (February 2012). This article is based on work done for the exhibition and on a lecture presented at the Robert Bosch Stiftung in Stuttgart, October 2011; a more extensive study is in preparation.
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