

Loughborough University Institutional Repository

The immortal self: surrealist alter egos

This item was submitted to Loughborough University's Institutional Repository by the/an author.

Citation: GREW, R., 2007. The immortal self: surrealist alter egos. *Quest*, 5 (The Individual and Society), pp. 47 - 59.

Additional Information:

- This article was published in the journal *Quest* (<http://www.qub.ac.uk/sites/QUEST/>)

Metadata Record: <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/20384>

Version: Accepted for publication

Publisher: Queen's University Belfast

Rights: This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Please cite the published version.

The Immortal Self: Surrealist Alter-Egos

Abstract

This paper examines the use of alter-egos in the work of the Surrealist artists Marcel Duchamp, Max Ernst and Hans Bellmer. Each of these artists may be said to have re-invented their selves through these alter-egos, changing their age, gender and even their species. However, problems arise when the artist and his alter-ego become interlinked to such an extent that one cannot be wholly sure which his real self is. Is this mix-up unavoidable, or have the artists done it on purpose, and if so, what is their reason for doing this? I will argue that the motive for this inextricable blurring of self and Other through the use of the alter-ego is an expression of the desire for immortality.

This desire is complimented and emphasised through the blurring of gender boundaries as well as those of self and Other, as evidenced not only by the androgynous nature of these alter-egos, but also through the fundamental links between ideologies concerning immortality and androgyny, such as alchemy. This may ultimately suggest that these artists sought to lift themselves out of the hum-drum everyday world and onto a different plane where self and Other, and male and female, were no longer opposites, thus achieving the Surrealist desire of uniting opposing forces; the dream and the real.

The Immortal Self: Surrealist Alter-Egos

The Surrealist artists Marcel Duchamp, Max Ernst and Hans Bellmer are well known for their obsessive re-use of alter-ego characters in their work. Duchamp created numerous alter-egos, some named, others anonymous, the most notorious of which is Rose Sélavy, which features Duchamp in drag. Max Ernst meanwhile focused his attention on a single alter-ego figure, namely Loplop, the bird superior. Loplop appears as a hybrid bird-man creature in Ernst's collage novels, but takes on a more abstract form, often as a mere outline, elsewhere in Ernst's work. Bellmer's *Doll*; a constructed mannequin that could be dismembered and reassembled as a grotesque creature with multiple arms, legs or even torsos, may also be seen as an alter-ego due to the way in which Bellmer used it to express different parts of his self (Schmeid 2006, p. 15).

Could it be that, in blurring the boundaries between self and Other through the use of these alter-egos, these artists were able to create a more unified, stable self? That the conscious, rational self, expressed in our every-day appearance, when combined with the unconscious, irrational and repressed Other, portrayed as a monstrous creature, or a person of the opposing gender, could create a balance between these extremes of conscious and unconscious? The unification of self and Other, conscious and unconscious, was advocated by Freud, Jung and Rank on the basis that a balanced psyche was a healthy psyche (Rank 1941, p. 37). Yet there is more to these alter-egos than simply an expression of good mental health. The Other or alter-ego may be viewed as a representative of the unchanging, intangible, immortal part of our selves,

and it is the concept of immortality that may provide the key to the Surrealist use of the alter-ego.

According to Rank, the concept of the soul as an immortal safeguard against death was begun by primitive man, who saw death as something unnatural, an occurrence brought about by magic (1971, p. 84). As society developed, this immortality belief shifted from an individual soul to a totemic spirit, who could ensure the immortality of a whole group through the way in which it acted as 'mother' of the group's children (Rank 1941, p. 206-7). Rank then argues that from totemic groups, a sexual age develops whereby immortality was assured through procreation (1961, p. 92), and then from this sexual age, individual and collective immortality beliefs merge to create the current ideologies surrounding immortality (1961, p. 78-9).

Yet, despite this, Rank insists that the belief in individual immortality is so strong within the self that, regardless of the collective substitutes offered by religion, society and sexual interaction, "the individual constantly seeks to perpetuate his self and his ego through individual works" (1961, p. 37). This may well be the case with our artists and their depictions of their selves and / or Others, thus suggesting that the alter-ego is a visual expression of the desire for immortality.

Rank agrees with Freud in that a child has no concept of death as we understand the term; to a child death simply means to be away, absent, and separate, ultimately to continue to exist elsewhere. Thus, as the pre-natal state is the only condition the

childish unconscious knows of apart from post-natal conscious life, the childish unconscious sees the return to the womb as its defence against destructive death, hence why the mother figured so prominently in early immortality ideologies (Rank 1952, p. 24-5).

The blurring of self and Other enacted in these alter-egos as a way of attaining immortality is emphasised through the way in which they also blur gender boundaries, rendering themselves androgynous. In using the terms ‘androgynous’ and ‘androgyne’, I refer to the merging of stereotypically male and female traits which renders the subject unable to be defined by socially constructed ideas of gender. The androgynous subject or androgyne constitutes a third sex; something indefinable by social conventions of gender.

The link between androgyny and immortality is particularly prevalent in alchemical doctrine, which the Surrealists were acquainted with, as it formed a useful source of iconography for the creation of their new modern myth, with which only members of the Surrealist group could identify. The *Second Manifesto of Surrealism*, written by the group’s leader André Breton in 1929 is an excellent example of the Surrealist identification with alchemy. In it, Breton states that: “[t]he Surrealist’s investigations present a remarkable analogy of goal with those of the alchemist’s” (Warlick, 2001, p. 102). This implies that both the Surrealist and the alchemist sought the unification of opposing principles that resulted in androgyny. Similarly, one of the legendary end products of the alchemical process, symbolised in alchemical images by the

androgyne, was the elixir of life. The elixir was said to grant immortality in as much as it could cure any physical or mental illness (Flamel, 1624, p. 70-1).

Rank also provides an alchemical parallel that illustrates the link between immortality and androgyny. He argues that: “The patient who wishes to discover...the squaring of the circle wants in this way to solve the problem of permanently dwelling in and fitting into the mother’s womb” (1952, p. 100). The ‘squaring of the circle’ is an alchemical term for completing the Great Work and achieving the androgynous Philosopher’s Stone. In allying the puzzle of the Great Work with the psychological puzzle of retuning to the womb, we may immediately note that the androgyne can be linked with inter-uterine existence, and therefore with immortality. Similarly, Jung likens the unification of the conscious and unconscious (self and Other) to the point in the alchemical process allegorically described as the king’s disappearance into his mother’s belly, which is highly suggestive of the return to the womb and therefore of the desire for immortality (1963, p. 371). If any more evidence is required that the androgynous Stone may be linked with immortality, then we need look no further than Michael Maier’s *Symbola aureae mensae* (1617) which says:

“And so the stone, just like a man, is conceived from a mixture of two seeds, masculine and feminine,...is born into the light of day...dies, is buried, remains for some time in the grave, from there it arises and enjoys new incorruptible life and is not able to die any more” (Roberts 1994, p. 82)

It is possible that Ernst may have been aware of Rank's theories as early as 1914, as Herbert Silberer's psychoanalytic translation of an alchemical parable, which M. E. Warlick notes as important for Ernst's developing interest in alchemy, refers to Freud, Jung and Rank (Silberer 1971; Warlick 2001, p. 27). Similarly, both Therese Lichtenstein and Celia Rabinovitch use Rank's theories to help interpret Bellmer's *Doll* (Lichtenstein 2001, p. 64; Rabinovitch 2004, p. 26). Even if Bellmer was unaware of Rank's theories, his use of an Other self, a double, creates a strong parallel between the two, and the same may be said of Duchamp (Lichtenstein 2001, p. 58).

Arturo Schwarz has made much of the connections between alchemy and androgyny in the art of Duchamp. However, his argument is founded on the belief that Duchamp had unconscious incestuous desires for his sister Suzanne, and uses the Jungian discussion of alchemy and incest to back up his ideas (Schwarz 1969, p. 94). Yet, as we have seen, Jung's ideas may equally be applied to the concept of immortality, which may have exerted a conscious, rather than an unconscious influence over Duchamp. After all, his epitaph seems to confirm his search for immortality as it reads "It's always the others who die".

Let us now turn to an analysis of the various artists' alter-egos so that we may explore how the merging of boundaries between self and Other, as well as between genders, refers to immortality, beginning with Duchamp's most well known alter-ego: Rose Sélavy ([fig 1](#)). When her name is pronounced in French, it sounds like "*Eros, c'est la*

vie”; “Eros, that’s life”. If we interpret Rose’s first name as meaning Eros, then we may perhaps note a link to the androgyne through Platonic thought. Plato saw Eros as the yearning for a lost state or union, and explains the accompanying sexual impulse through the allegory of the primal being cut in two, which Rank translates as the mother split into mother and child (Rank 1952, p. 173). Thus, if Eros (Rose) is life (Sélavy), then this life may be said to revolve around the yearning for a lost union or state, connecting Rose to both the lost inter-uterine state suggestive of immortality, and androgyny, as the androgyne represents the lost unity of the primal being in both Platonic and alchemical doctrine (Read 1936, p. 132-4).

The connection between Rose, immortality and androgyny can be expressed on multiple levels. Rose is not just rendered androgynous through the way in which Duchamp brings male and female together in a single image, but also through the complex blurring of gender boundaries moving Rose beyond gender identification to the androgyne. Jean-François Lyotard states that Duchamp goes “beyond the importance given to the difference of the sexes and thus to their reconciliation, he goes beyond, beyond sex” (Jones 1994, p. 204). This concept may be noted in Rose through the idea of masquerade.

Joan Riviere in her groundbreaking 1929 essay argues that women who play up their femininity do so in order to hide their masculinity (Riviere 1929 [2007], p. 2). Thus, Rose’s graceful hands, coy gaze and fashionable clothes may be identified as a feminine masquerade, disguising her underlying masculinity (Duchamp). However,

the masculinity she is trying to hide is absent as Duchamp also denies his masculinity by dressing up as a woman. Thus, the masculine aspect of Rrose's character seems to be just as fictive as the woman Rrose herself (Jones 1994, p. 154). Rrose exists in a gender vacuum, a gap, conforming to Duchamp's belief that: "It's not what you see that is art, art is the gap" (Jones 1994, p. 155). Therefore, if Rrose represents a kind of third ambiguous sex, then she may be linked to the alchemical androgyne and also to immortality, as she is removed from any obligation to procreate, and thus stray too close to sex and mortality (Schwarz 2000, p. 36-7).

Another artist who uses the idea of this third sex in his work is Hans Bellmer. In his *Anatomy of the Image*, he quotes a saying to illustrate the meaning behind his *Doll*, namely: "Opposites are necessary for things to exist and for a third reality to ensue" (Bellmer 2005, p. 117). The numerous incarnations of the *Doll* capture the point at which the self splits into self and non-self or Other (Green 2005, p. 26). Even though the *Doll* itself, and many of the figures in Bellmer's drawings, can be seen as androgynous, due to the merging of stereotypically male and female traits, such as clothing, [\(fig 2\)](#), the link between the *Doll* and the androgyne is further emphasised through this splitting of the ego. Bellmer saw this split as part of a process leading towards a higher level of consciousness, at which point these opposites would rejoin together again to form a new and improved self, a process mirroring both psychoanalytical concepts and the creation of the alchemical androgyne (Bellmer 2005, p. 116). As Bellmer states: "Masculine and feminine are interchangeable; and both the one and the other tend toward their amalgam, the hermaphrodite" (Bellmer 2005, p. 125). The terms 'hermaphrodite' and 'androgyne' are frequently used

indiscriminately. However, even in Bellmer's drawings of 'hermaphroditic' girls with both sets of sexual organs, both are fully functional, unlike biological hermaphrodites. Thus we may define Bellmer's use of the term 'hermaphrodite' as androgynous, as it defies social definitions of gender.

Interestingly, Amelia Jones notes that there are occasions where Rrose appears as a separate entity to Duchamp, thereby presenting herself as an independent Other, rather than an androgyne. Such occasions include the 1941 *Boîte en Valise*, inscribed "from / by Marcel Duchamp or Rrose Sélavy", and the 1925 text *Rotary Demisphere* which says "Rrose Sélavy and I dodge the bruises of the Eskimos with exquisite language" ("Rrose Sélavy et moi esquivons les ecchymoses des esquimaux au mots exquis") (Jones 1994, p. 159). The use of 'Rrose and I' may refer back to Duchamp's "game between 'I' and 'me'" that he played in the creation of Rrose, and arguably many of his other alter-egos as well. Thus Rrose becomes Duchamp's "me", his double, his Other, his shadowy soul. This returns to Rank's argument that the Other / double / soul acts as the means for immortality (1941, p. 102), as well as providing a link to androgyny through the way in which Freud, Jung and Rank all see a healthy, balanced mind as one which has embraced both sides of the self (Rank 1941, p. 37).

Similarly, the Other / double / soul may also be connected to Rank's theory concerning the myth of the twin. The birth of twins was viewed as a magical occurrence as the twin provided the physical manifestation of the immortal aspect of the person; the soul. Thus, one twin must be killed to ensure the immortality of the

other by making the physical manifestation intangible, and thus untouched by time (Rank 1941, p. 92). The myth of the twin is also connected to the myth of the hero, whose immortality would be created through the fame of his deeds (Rank 1941, p. 96). By possibly equating himself and Rose to the heroic twins, Duchamp again seems to be expressing the desire for immortality, which may be specifically linked to the androgynous Stone of alchemy, as we have seen. The question is that, if Duchamp regarded his own identity as being equal to that of his twin, Rose, then which of the twins has been killed? This is also a question that may be asked of Ernst's alter-ego Loplop; however, before we investigate this, it may be interesting to briefly note the physical, three-dimensional manifestations of these twins.

Jones has argued that the only physical manifestation of Rose is Duchamp's mannequin for the 1938 *Exposition Internationale du Surréalisme*, which is dressed in the artist's clothes, with the signature Rose Sélavy scrawled across the androgynous genitalia (fig. 3). The clothes identify her as Duchamp's 'twin', but her feminine appearance perhaps marks her out as 'Other'. Unlike Duchamp, it may be argued that Bellmer's *Doll* has no physical equivalent as she only exists in photographs; yet in the few photos in which Bellmer appears alongside his Other, he is a shadowy, almost absent figure, hiding behind a tree in one of the photographs of the second *Doll*, and using a camera trick to make his form ghostly and transparent in another with the first *Doll* (fig. 4) (Semff; Spira 2006, p. 9). This suggests a link to Duchamp in that Bellmer's identity is just as ephemeral and subject to change as the *Doll*, thus inextricably binding tangible self and intangible Other together to create a unified, androgynous whole.

However, to return to the question of immortality, androgyny and the twin within alter-egos, we may note such themes in Ernst's work as well. I mentioned earlier the concept of collective immortality whereby procreation occurs through the involvement of the totemic spirit, who reanimates the spirits of the dead and causes them to be born as children from women. This totemic method of procreation allows man to deny his mortal origin, lifting him to the supernatural, immortal hero archetype (Rank 1941, p. 206-7). In using the bird, a totemic animal, as his alter-ego, his Other, Ernst is not only emphasising his immortality, but also perhaps implying androgyny. This androgyny may be seen through the way in which Loplop, though very much a male entity, can be connected to the feminine through his position of totem-as-mother (Warlick 2001, p. 60). Similarly, in one particular example of Loplop which appears in *Chimaera* (fig. 5) and *Loplop presents the Chimaera*, both of 1932, we may note the androgyny inherent in Loplop through his identification with or as the chimaera.

Copyright permission for fig. 5 has expired and the image has been removed.

David Hopkins sees this image as a single androgynous creature (Hopkins 1992, p. 719). This may be noted through the combined existence of the phallic head of Loplop placed atop a leafy body suggestive of female genitalia, perhaps referencing the androgynous golden or blue flower of alchemy (another name for the Stone), so called because of the way in which flowers combine male and female sexual organs in a single entity (MacLeod 1998, p. 81). I am inclined to agree with David Hopkins'

assessment of this example of Loplop as a single being, as 'chimaera' by definition means a hybrid creature.

Also, it is interesting to note that, according to Greek myth, the chimaera was the personification of the storm cloud, and defined as a 'she' (Guirand 1959, p. 166). This not only suggests androgyny through the combination of the male Loplop and the female chimaera, but also through association with Ernst's 'brides of the wind'. Ernst produced images of herds of wild horses, dubbing them 'brides of the wind', a name he also gave to his lover Leonora Carrington, whose personal totemic image was a horse. In fact, Ernst wrote a preface for Carrington's 1938 edition of *The House of Fear*, which he entitled '*Loplop presents the Bride of the Wind*' (Ernst 1991, p. 316). Thus in combining Loplop and the chimaera, daughter of the wind, Ernst may be seen to unite male and female in an androgynous entity.

However, it is not just this single example of Loplop that lends itself to a reading of androgyny and the desire for immortality. We may widen our scope when we consider that Loplop is sometimes known as the bird superior, and can be seen as a type of king of the birds. This is perhaps expressed in *The Prince Consort* 1931 whereby Loplop assumes a royal title, which Warlick attributes to Ernst's relationship with Marie-Berthe Aurenche, whose family had a distant claim to the French throne (2001, p. 153). This is a prime example of the blurring of the lines between self and Other as, though it is Ernst who is having a relationship with a distantly descended royal, it is Loplop who bears the resulting title.

In this work, Loplop appears as a circular leafy ring. The shape and position of the leaves are perhaps suggestive of an inverted fleur-de-lis, symbol of the French monarchy, enhancing this connection between Loplop and his royal position. Similarly, Loplop's round shape perhaps references the alchemical oroboros, which functions as an allegory of the cyclic nature of the Great Work. This may in turn be connected with the alchemical androgyne, as the androgyne can be used to signify either the end or the beginning of the alchemical process.

Rank notes that there is a history among both primitive and ancient societies of regicide, whereby the divine king is killed by his successor(s) (1989, p. 127). The divine king can often be portrayed as androgynous, as we may note in the way in which Egyptian pharaohs had themselves represented as androgynes (Zolla 1981, p. 62). Rank connects this regicide with the cult of the twins, whereby the death of one ensures the immortality of the other, as we have noted previously. The surviving twin, the king, is believed to have power of the works of nature, something we may note in Ernst through the way in which he uses the prefix "Loplop presents..." in a number of his works, as though it is Loplop who is master of them rather than Ernst (Rank 1941, p. 104-5). Thus Loplop ensures his immortality through his status as 'king' as well as Other, and, if Loplop rather than Ernst is the master of a work, then it may also be argued that immortality is gained through his status as artist as well.

However, the dialogue between androgyny and immortality through Ernst's use of the totemic bird is not just limited to his depictions of Loplop. The totemic alter-ego bird figure also appears in works such as *Oedipus Rex* 1921 ([fig. 6](#)), which Legge has previously interpreted in Freudian terms with the possibly androgynous bird / bull hybrid creature as a totemic representation of the father (1989, p. 74). Rank opposes Freud in his psychological translation of the Oedipus myth. Instead of seeing it as an analogy of infantile sexuality, Rank interprets the story of Oedipus as a struggle between individualisation and socialisation; the self-sufficient hero who feels he has lost his freedom through family commitments. Oedipus is the clash between the immortal perpetuation of the self, represented by the hero, and the biological role of the father in perpetuating generations (Rank 1941, p. 122-3). Thus, if this androgynous composite creature does indeed represent the father, then perhaps it could be interpreted as the fear of the social responsibilities fatherhood would entail, something applicable to Ernst as it was around this time that he became a father himself.

It should also be remembered that this totemic creature might signify Ernst's alter-ego. Perhaps the bird represents Ernst and the bull his father. This would seem to coincide with Warlick's view that Ernst's earlier androgynes relate to his parents and himself; he was the "young red king" born to take the old king's place, just as the allegorical alchemical androgyne is born from the death of the king, its father (2001, p. 182). Perhaps then we should read this image as the bird superimposing itself onto the bull / father, the son has taken the father's immortality and now sits as the new, androgynous king.

Bellmer's *Doll* may also be considered in this context. If the *Doll* can be seen as a personification of parts of Bellmer's psyche; a reflection of parts of his self as Wieland Schmied argues, then it can perhaps be interpreted as an alter-ego or a twin, referring us back to Rank's immortality wish of denying the death of the physical self through the survival of an immortal Other (Schmied 2006, p. 15). Yet again we are faced with the question of which twin has survived. Lichtenstein has emphatically argued that Bellmer harboured a desire to merge with a woman, that he wanted to possess and be possessed by her in order to erase the gender divide (Lichtenstein 2001, p. 49). As both the *Doll* and Bellmer occasionally cross-dressed, while Bellmer also referred to himself as a woman on occasion, it would seem that either one has the potential to be the conquering androgynous king (Lichtenstein 2001, p. 48).

Thus, although the iconography Duchamp Ernst and Bellmer use to portray their alter-egos is not usually found within typical depictions of the alchemical androgyne, the meaning and relevance of the symbol seems to have remained intact. For Duchamp, Ernst and Bellmer, as well as the alchemist, the androgyne is a sign of achievement, one that will ensure the immortality of its creator, and yet this achievement is just as intangible as immortality. The androgynes of alchemy, as well as Duchamp Ernst and Bellmer, exist on a non-physical plane, as does the immortal Other / soul, signified by the alter-ego. Yet the identities of the artists' alter-egos overlap with their own to such a degree that we can never be entirely sure which 'twin' has been sacrificed – is it the artist, his Other, or both that has become

immortal? This non-physical existence of the artist conveyed through his androgynous, immortal Other perhaps allows him access to that place so desired by the Surrealists; the place where opposites cease to be opposites, where the dream and the real unite. By blurring binary opposites of self and Other, male and female, a new, unified being is created that can occupy this Surrealist space.

References

Image References

Fig. 1. Man Ray: *Marcel Duchamp as Rose Sélavy* 1921, black and white photograph, Milan, Collection of Arturo Schwarz. National Gallery of Art, Washington D.C. [Internet]. Available at:

http://images.google.co.uk/imgres?imgurl=http://www.nga.gov/exhibitions/2006/dada/images/artwork/202-016-m.jpg&imgrefurl=http://www.nga.gov/exhibitions/2006/dada/artwork/paris.shtm&h=260&w=207&sz=13&hl=en&start=17&um=1&tbnid=P9I_eqkko8ILTm:&tbnh=112&tbnw=89&prev=/images%3Fq%3Drrose%2Bselavy%26svnum%3D10%26um%3D1%26hl%3Den%26sa%3DX [Accessed 6/12/07].

Fig. 2. Hans Bellmer: *The Games of the Doll* 1938 - 49, gelatine silver print coloured with aniline on board, 12.4 x 9.4cm, Centre Pompidou, Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris. The Art Institute of Chicago – Ryerson and Burnham Libraries: *Hans Bellmer in the Art Institute of Chicago: The Wandering Libido and the Hysterical Body*. [Internet]. Available at:

<http://www.artic.edu/reynolds/essays/taylor2.php#E31678> [Accessed 5/12/07].

Fig. 3. Marcel Duchamp: *Rose Sélavy*; Mannequin for the 1938 *Exposition Internationale du Surréalisme*. *Tout-Fait: The Marcel Duchamp Studies Online Journal*, Issue 4, 2002. [Internet]. Available at:

http://images.google.co.uk/imgres?imgurl=http://www.toutfait.com/issues/volume2/issue_4/articles/graham/images/27_big.jpg&imgrefurl=http://www.toutfait.com/issues/volume2/issue_4/articles/graham/popup_27.html&h=525&w=181&sz=45&hl=en&start=3&tbnid=81hfJzMcjTkTWM:&tbnh=132&tbnw=46&prev=

[Accessed 31/7/07 and 5/12/07].

Fig. 4. Hans Bellmer: *The Doll* 1934, gelatine silver contact print, 9 x 6cm, Private Collection. National Gallery of Art Press Images for *Foto: Modernity in Central Europe, 1918-1945*, June 10th – September 3rd 2007. [Internet]. Available at:

<http://images.google.co.uk/imgres?imgurl=http://www.nga.gov/press/exh/231/assets/thumbnails/231-218.jpg&imgrefurl=http://www.nga.gov/press/exh/231/images.shtm&h=140&w=93&sz=5&hl=en&start=84&tbnid=sE8vsMORn8jCpM:&tbnh=93&tbnw=62&prev=> [Accessed 5/12/07].

Fig. 5. Max Ernst: *Chimaera* 1932, pen and Indian ink on paper, 12.2 x 9.2cm, illustration for *This Quarter*, Surrealist number, Paris, Sept., 1932. David Hopkins: Hermetic and Philosophical Themes in Max Ernst's *Vox Angelica* and Related Works; *The Burlington Magazine* **134**, 1992, p. 718.

Fig. 6. Max Ernst: *Oedipus Rex* 1921, oil on canvas, 93 x 102 cm, Private Collection. Metropolitan Museum of Art: Special Exhibitions; Max Ernst: A Retrospective.

[Internet]. Available at:

http://images.google.co.uk/imgres?imgurl=http://www.metmuseum.org/special/Max_Ernst/images/3-Oedipus-md.L.jpg&imgrefurl=http://www.metmuseum.org/special/Max_Ernst/view_1.asp%3Fitem%3D2%26view%3DI&h=463&w=500&sz=68&hl=en&start=2&tbnid=Onc0rgOrFNUYpM:&tbnh=120&tbnw=130&prev=

[Accessed 31/7/07 and 5/12/07].

Works cited

Bellmer, H., 2005. The Anatomy of the Image. In Hans Bellmer *The Doll*. London, Atlas Press, 2005 pp 105-158.

Ernst, M., 1937. Biographical Notes. In W. Spies ed. *Max Ernst: A Retrospective*. Munich, Prestel, 1991, pp. 280-339.

Flamel, N., 1624. *His Exposition of the Hieroglyphicall Figures which he Caused to bee Painted upon an Arch in St. Innocent's Church-Yard In Paris...* London, T. S. for Thomas Walkley.

Green, M., 2005. Introduction. In Hans Bellmer *The Doll*. London, Atlas Press, 2005, pp 7-30.

Guirand, F. ed., 1959. *Larousse Encyclopaedia of Mythology*. London, Batchworth Press.

Hopkins, D., 1992. Hermetic and Philosophical Themes in Max Ernst's *Vox Angelica* and Related Works. *The Burlington Magazine* **134** pp. 716-723.

Jones, A., 1994. *Postmodernism and the Engendering of Marcel Duchamp*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Jung, C. G., 1963. *Mysterium Coniunctionis: An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy*. In Read et al eds. *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Legge, E., 1989. *Max Ernst: The Psychoanalytic Sources*. London, UMI Research Press.

Lichtenstein, T., 2001. *Behind Closed Doors: The Art of Hans Bellmer*. Los Angeles / London, University of California Press.

MacLeod, C., 1998. *Embodying Ambiguity: Androgyny and Aesthetics from Winckelmann to Keller*. Detroit, Wayne State University Press.

Rabinovitch, C., 2004. *Surrealism and the Sacred: Power, Eros and the Occult in Modern Art*. Oxford, Westview Press.

Rank, O., 1926. *The Development of the Ego*. In R. Kramer ed. *A Psychology of Difference: The American Lectures*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press 1996.

- 1941. *Beyond Psychology*. New York, Dover Publications.
- 1952. *The Trauma of Birth*. New York, Robert Brunner.
- 1961 (1932). *Psychology and the Soul*. New York, A. S. Barnes & Co. Inc.

- 1971. *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.
- 1989 (1932). *Art and Artist: Creative Urge and Personality Development*. New York / London, W. W. Norton & Co.

Read, J., 1936. *Prelude to Chemistry: An Outline of Alchemy, its Literature and Relationships*. London, G. Bell & Sons Ltd.

Riviere, J., 1929. *Womanliness as Masquerade*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.ncf.edu/hassold/WomenArtists/riviere_womanliness_as_masquearde.htm [Accessed 03/05/07].

Roberts, G., 1994. *The Mirror of Alchemy: Alchemical Ideas and Images in Manuscripts and Books from Antiquity to the 17th Century*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Schmeid, W., 2006. The Engineer of Eros. In M. Semff and A. Spira eds. *Hans Bellmer*. Ostfildern, Hatje Cantz 2006.

Schwarz, A., 1969. *The Complete Works of Marcel Duchamp*. London, Thames and Hudson.

- 2000. *Kabbalah and Alchemy: An Essay on Common Archetypes*. New Jersey / Jerusalem, Jason Anderson Inc.

Semff, M. and Spira, A. eds, 2006. *Hans Bellmer*. Ostfildern, Hatje Cantz.

Silberer, H., 1971. *Hidden Symbolism of Alchemy and the Occult Arts*. London, Dover Publications Inc.

Warlick, M. E., 2001. *Max Ernst: A Magician in Search of a Myth*. Texas, University of Texas Press.

Zolla, E., 1989. *The Androgyne: Fusion of the Sexes*. London, Thames and Hudson.

I would like to thank the AHRC for providing the financial support that made this research possible.