

31/6

PAPERS
ON
PSYCHO-ANALYSIS

BY
ERNEST JONES, M.D., F.R.C.P. (LOND.)

PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL PSYCHO-ANALYTICAL ASSOCIATION
HONORARY PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH PSYCHO-ANALYTICAL SOCIETY
FOUNDER OF THE 'INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS'
CONSULTING PHYSICIAN TO THE LONDON CLINIC OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS
HONORARY FELLOW OF THE BRITISH PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIETY

'It is impossible to tell the truth so that it shall be understood and not believed.'
BLAKE

'Ein Nichtverstehen ist oft ein Nichtverstehenwollen.'
FREUD

If ye expect not the unexpected ye shall not find the truth.'
HERACLITUS

FIFTH EDITION



LONDON
BAILLIÈRE, TINDALL AND COX
7 & 8, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.2
1948

stances, especially the prevailing cultural traditions, in determining the early development of children: for example, that an Oedipus complex can develop only in a patriarchal society, and so on. That they extensively affect the external form assumed in later life by the individual's peculiarities is evident enough, but I have yet to be shown how their influence is supposed to penetrate to the entirely unconscious phantasies of the infant on which so much of its future nature will depend. No, I think the future will show that psycho-analysis can contribute more to sociology than sociology to psycho-analysis.

ELSTED,
MIDHURST.
September, 1948.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE - - - - -	V
CHAPTER	
I. FREUD'S PSYCHOLOGY - - - - -	1
II. THE PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF EVERYDAY LIFE - - - - -	24
III. THE THEORY OF SYMBOLISM - - - - -	87
IV. THE GENESIS OF THE SUPER-EGO - - - - -	145
V. PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND THE INSTINCTS - - - - -	153
VI. PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND COMPARATIVE PHYSIOLOGY - - - - -	170
VII. PSYCHOLOGY AND WAR CONDITIONS - - - - -	173
VIII. LOVE AND MORALITY - - - - -	196
IX. THE CONCEPT OF A NORMAL MIND - - - - -	201
X. FREUD'S THEORY OF DREAMS - - - - -	217
XI. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DREAMS AND PSYCHONEUROTIC SYMPTOMS - - - - -	251
XII. THE NATURE OF AUTO-SUGGESTION - - - - -	273
XIII. THE PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF ANXIETY - - - - -	294
XIV. FEAR, GUILT AND HATE - - - - -	304
XV. COLD, DISEASE AND BIRTH - - - - -	320
XVI. JEALOUSY - - - - -	325
XVII. PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND MODERN MEDICINE - - - - -	341
XVIII. THE UNCONSCIOUS MIND AND MEDICAL PRACTICE - - - - -	351
XIX. PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND PSYCHIATRY - - - - -	365
XX. THE CRITERIA OF SUCCESS IN TREATMENT - - - - -	379
XXI. PSYCHOLOGY AND CHILDBIRTH - - - - -	384
XXII. SOME PROBLEMS OF ADOLESCENCE - - - - -	389
XXIII. THE PHANTASY OF THE REVERSAL OF GENERATIONS - - - - -	407
XXIV. ANAL-EROTIC CHARACTER TRAITS - - - - -	413
XXV. THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF FEMALE SEXUALITY - - - - -	438
XXVI. THE PHALLIC PHASE - - - - -	452
XXVII.*EARLY FEMALE SEXUALITY - - - - -	485
GLOSSARY - - - - -	496
INDEX - - - - -	501

CHAPTER XXVI

THE PHALLIC PHASE¹

IF one studies closely the many important contributions made in the past ten years, particularly by women analysts, to the admittedly obscure problems relating to the early development of female sexuality one perceives an unmistakable disharmony among the various writers, and this is beginning to show also in the field of male sexuality. Most of these writers have been laudably concerned to lay stress on the points of agreement with their colleagues, so that the tendency to divergence of opinion has not always come to full expression. It is my purpose here to investigate it unreservedly in the hope of crystallising it. If there is confusion it is desirable to clear it up; if there is a divergence of opinion we should, by defining it, be able to set ourselves interesting questions for further research.

For this purpose I will select the theme of the phallic phase. It is fairly circumscribed, but we shall see that it ramifies into most of the deeper and unsolved problems. In a paper read before the Innsbruck Congress in 1927,² I put forward the suggestion that the phallic phase in the development of female sexuality represented a secondary solution of psychological conflict, of a defensive nature, rather than a simple and direct developmental process; last year Professor Freud³ declared this suggestion to be quite untenable. Already at that time I had in mind similar doubts about the phallic phase in the male also, but did not discuss them since my paper was concerned purely with female sexuality; recently Dr. Horney⁴ has voiced scepticism about the validity of the concept of the male phallic phase, and I will take this opportunity to comment on the arguments she has advanced.

¹ Read in brief before the Twelfth International Psycho-Analytical Congress, Wiesbaden, September 4, 1932, and in full before the British Psycho-Analytical Society, October 19 and November 2, 1932. Published in the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, vol. xiv., 1933.

² Chapter xxv.

³ Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1932, vol. xiii., p. 297.

⁴ Karen Horney, 'The Dread of Women,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1932, vol. xiii., p. 353.

I will first remind you that in Freud's¹ description of the phallic phase the essential feature common to both sexes was the belief that only one kind of genital organ exists in the world—a male one. According to Freud, the reason for this belief is simply that the female organ has at this age not yet been discovered by either sex: human beings are thus divided, not into those possessing a male organ and those possessing a female organ, but into those who possess a penis and those who do not: there is the penis-possessing class and the castrated class. A boy begins by believing that everyone belongs to the former class, and only as his fears get aroused does he begin to suspect the existence of the latter class. A girl takes the same view, save that here one should use the corresponding phrase, 'clitoris-possessing class'; and only after comparing her own with the male genital does she form a conception of a mutilated class, to which she belongs. Both sexes strive against accepting the belief in the second class, and both for the same reason—namely, from a wish to disbelieve in the supposed reality of castration. This picture as sketched by Freud is familiar to you all, and the readily available facts of observation from which it is drawn have been confirmed over and over again. The interpretation of the facts, however, is of course another matter and is not so easy.

I would now call your attention to a consideration which is implied in Freud's account, but which needs further emphasis for the sake of clarity. It is that there would appear to be two distinct stages in the phallic phase. Freud would, I know, apply the same term, 'phallic phase,' to both, and so has not explicitly subdivided them. The first of the two—let us call it the *proto-phallic* phase—would be marked by innocence or ignorance—at least in consciousness—where there is no conflict over the matter in question, it being confidently assumed by the child that the rest of the world is built like itself and has a satisfactory male organ—penis or clitoris, as the case may be. In the second or *deutero-phallic* phase there is a dawning suspicion that the world is divided into two classes: not male and female in the proper sense, but penis-possessing and castrated (though actually the two classifications overlap pretty closely). The deutero-phallic phase would appear to be more neurotic than the proto-phallic—at least in this particular context. For it is associated with anxiety, conflict, striving against accepting what is felt to be

¹ Freud, 'The Infantile Genital Organisation of the Libido,' 'Collected Papers' (*International Psycho-Analytical Library*, 1924), vol. ii., p. 245.

reality—*i.e.*, castration—and over-compensatory emphasis on the narcissistic value of the penis on the boy's side with a mingled hope and despair on the girl's.

It is plain that the difference between the two phases is marked by the idea of castration, which according to Freud is bound up in both sexes with actual observation of the anatomical sex differences. As is well known, he is of opinion¹ that the fear or thought of being castrated has a weakening effect on the masculine impulses with both sexes. He considers that with the boy it drives him away from the mother and strengthens the phallic and homosexual attitude—*i.e.*, that the boy surrenders some of his incestuous heterosexuality to save his penis; whereas with the girl it has the more fortunate opposite effect of impelling her into a feminine, heterosexual attitude. According to this view, therefore, the castration complex weakens the boy's Oedipus relationship and strengthens the girl's; it drives the boy *into* the deuterio-phallic phase, while—after a temporary protest on that level—it drives the girl *out of* the deuterio-phallic phase.

As the development of the boy is supposed to be better understood, and is perhaps the simpler of the two, I will begin with it. We are all familiar with the narcissistic quality of the phallic phase here, which Freud says reaches its maximum about the age of four, though it is certainly manifest long before this;² I am speaking particularly of the deuterio-phallic phase. There are two outstanding differences between it and the earlier stages: (1) It is less sadistic, the main relic of this being a tendency to omnipotence phantasies; and (2) it is more self-centred, the chief allo-erotic attribute still remaining being its exhibitionistic aspect. It is thus less aggressive and less related to other people, notably to women. How has this change been brought about? It would seem to be change in the direction of phantasy and away from the real world of contact with other human beings. If so, this would in itself justify a suspicion that there is a flight element present, and that we have not to do simply with a natural evolution towards greater reality and a more developed adjustment.

¹ Freud, 'Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction between the Sexes,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1927, vol. viii., pp. 133, 141.

² When this paper was read before the British Psycho-Analytical Society three child analysts (Melanie Klein, Melitta Schmideberg and Nina Searl) gave it as their experience that traces of the deuterio-phallic phase can be detected before the end of the first year.

This suspicion is very evidently borne out in one set of circumstances—namely, when the phallic phase persists into adult life. In applying the psycho-analytic microscope to investigate a difficult problem we may make use of the familiar magnification afforded by neurosis and perversion. Elucidation of the operative factors there gives us pointers to direct our attention in examining the so-called normal; as will be remembered, this was the path Freud followed to reach in general the infantile sexuality of the normal. Now with these adult cases it is quite easy to ascertain the presence of secondary factors in the sexual life, factors particularly of fear and guilt. The type I have specially in mind is that of the man, frequently hypochondriacal, who is concerned with the size and quality of his penis (or its symbolic substitutes) and who shows only feeble impulses towards women, with in particular a notably weak, or even non-existent, impulse towards penetration; narcissism, exhibitionism (or undue modesty), masturbation and a varying degree of homosexuality are common accompanying features. In analysis it is easily seen that all these inhibitions are repressions or defences motivated by deep anxiety; the nature of the anxiety I shall discuss presently.

Having our eyes sharpened by such experiences to the secondary nature of narcissistic phallicism, we may now turn to similar attitudes in boyhood—I am again referring to the deuterio-phallic phase and in pronounced examples—and I maintain that we find there ample evidence to come to a similar conclusion. To begin with, the picture is essentially the same. There is the narcissistic concentration on the penis, with doubts or uncertainties about its size and quality. Under the heading of 'Secondary Reinforcement of Penis-Pride,' Melanie Klein¹ has in her recent book discussed at length the value of the penis to the boy in mastering deep anxieties from various sources, and she maintains that the narcissistic exaggeration of phallicism—*i.e.*, the phallic phase, although she does not use that term in this connection—is due to the need of coping with specially large amounts of anxiety.

It is noteworthy how much of the boy's sexual curiosity of this period, to which Freud² called special attention in his original paper on the subject, is taken up, not with interest in females, but with comparisons between himself and other males. This is in accord with

¹ Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children' (International Psycho-Analytical Library, 1932), p. 341.

² Freud, 'The Infantile,' etc., *op. cit.*, p. 246.

the striking absence of the impulse towards penetration, an impulse which would logically lead to curiosity and search for its complement. Karen Horney¹ has rightly called special attention to this feature of inhibited penetration, and as the impulse to penetrate is without doubt the main characteristic of penis functioning it is surely remarkable that just where the idea of the penis dominates the picture its own most salient characteristic should be absent. I do not for a moment believe that this is because the characteristic in question has not yet been developed, a retardation due perhaps to simple ignorance of a vaginal counterpart. On the contrary, in earlier stages—as child analysts in particular have shown—there is ample evidence of sadistic penetrating tendencies in the phantasies, games and other activities of the male infant. And I quite agree with Karen Horney² in her conclusion that ‘the undiscovered vagina is a denied vagina.’ I cannot resist comparing this supposed ignorance of the vagina with the current ethnological myth that savages are ignorant of the connection between coitus and fertilisation. In both cases they know, but do not know that they know. In other words, there is knowledge, but it is *unconscious knowledge*—revealed in countless symbolic ways. The conscious ignorance is like the ‘innocence’ of young women—which still persists even in these enlightened days; it is merely unsanctioned or dreaded knowledge, and it therefore remains unconscious.

Actual analysis in adult life of the memories of the phallic stage yields results that coincide with the state of affairs where the phallic stage has persisted into adult life, as mentioned above, and also with the results obtained from child analysis³ during the phallic stage itself. They are, as Freud first pointed out, that the narcissistic concentration on the penis goes hand in hand with dread of the female genital. It is also generally agreed that the former is secondary to the latter, or at all events to the fear of castration. It is not hard to see, further, that these two fears—of the female genital and of castration—stand in a specially close relationship to each other, and that no solution of the present group of problems can be satisfactory which does not throw light on both.

Freud himself does not use the word ‘anxiety’ in regard to the female genital, but speaks of ‘horror’ (*Abscheu*) of it. The word

¹ Karen Horney, ‘The Dread,’ etc., *op. cit.*, pp. 353, 354.

² *Ibid.*, p. 358.

³ See in particular Melanie Klein, ‘The Psycho-Analysis of Children.’

‘horror’ is descriptive, but it implies an earlier dread of castration, and therefore demands an explanation of this in its turn. Some passages of Freud’s read as if the horror of the female were a simple phobia protecting the boy from the thought of castrated beings, as it would from the sight of a one-legged man, but I feel sure he would admit a more specific relationship than this between the idea of castration and the particular castrated organ of the female; the two ideas must be innately connected. I think he implies that this horror is an associative reminder of what awful things—*i.e.*, castration—happen to people (like women) who have feminine wishes or get treated as women. It is certainly plain, as we have long known, that the boy here equates copulation with castration of one partner; and he evidently fears lest he might be that unfortunate partner. In this connection we may remember that to the neurotic phallic boy the idea of the female being castrated involves not merely a cutting off, but an opening being made into a hole, the well-known ‘wound theory’ of the vulva. Now in our everyday practice we should find it hard to understand such a fear except in terms of a repressed wish to play the feminine part in copulation, evidently with the father. Otherwise castration and copulation would not be equated. A fear of this wish being put into effect would certainly explain the fear of being castrated, for by definition it is identical with this, and also the ‘horror’ of the female genital—*i.e.*, a place where such wishes had been gratified. But that the boy equates copulation with castration seems to imply a previous knowledge of penetration. And it is not easy on this hypothesis to give adequate weight to the well-known connection between the castration fear and rivalry with the father over possession of the mother—*i.e.*, to the Œdipus complex. But we can at least see that the feminine wish must be a nodal point in the whole problem.

There would seem to be two views on the significance of the phallic phase, and I shall now attempt to ascertain in what respect they are opposed to each other and how far they may be brought into harmony. We may call them the simple and the complex view respectively. On the one hand, the boy, in a state of sex ignorance, may be supposed to have always assumed that the mother has a natural penis of her own until actual experience of the female genital, together with ideas of his own concerning castration (particularly his equating of copulation with castration), makes him reluctantly suspect that she has been castrated. This would accord with his

known wish to believe that the mother has a penis. This simple view rather skims over the evidently prior questions of where the boy gets his ideas of copulation and castration from, but it does not follow that these could not be answered on this basis; that is a matter to be held in suspension for the moment. On the other hand, the boy may be supposed to have had from very early times an unconscious knowledge that the mother has an opening—and not only the mouth and anus—into which he could penetrate. The thought of doing so, however, for reasons we shall discuss in a moment, brings the fear of castration, and it is as a defence against this that he obliterates his impulse to penetrate, together with all idea of a vagina, replacing these respectively by phallic narcissism and insistence on his mother's similar possession of a penis. The second of these views implies a less simple—and avowedly a more remote—explanation of the boy's insistence on the mother's having a penis. It is, in effect, that he dreads her having a female organ more than he does her having a male one, the reason being that the former brings the thought and danger of penetrating into it. If there were only male organs in the world there would be no jealous conflict and no fear of castration; the idea of the vulva must precede that of castration. If there were no dangerous cavity to penetrate into there would be no fear of castration. This is, of course, on the assumption that the conflict and danger arise from his having the same wishes as his father, to penetrate into the same cavity; and this I believe—in conjunction with Melanie Klein and other child analysts—to be true of the earliest period, and not simply of that after the conscious discovery of the cavity in question.

We come now to the vexed question of the source of castration fears. Various authors hold different views on this question. Some of them are perhaps differences in accent only; others point to opposing conceptions. Karen Horney,¹ who has recently discussed the matter in relation to the boy's dread of the female genital, has very definite views on the matter. Speaking of the dread of the vulva she says: 'Freud's account fails to explain this anxiety. A boy's castration-anxiety in relation to his father is not an adequate reason for his dread of a being whom this punishment has already overtaken. Besides the dread of the father there must be a further dread, the object of which is the woman or female genital.' She even maintains the exceptional opinion that this dread of the vulva is not only

¹ Karen Horney, 'The Dread of Women,' *op. cit.*, p. 351.

earlier than that of the father's penis—whether external or concealed in the vagina—but deeper and more important than it; in fact much of the dread of the father's penis is artificially put forward to hide the intense dread of the vulva.¹ This is certainly a very debatable conclusion, although we must admit the technical difficulty of quantitatively estimating the amount of anxiety derived from various sources. We listen with curiosity to her explanation of this intense anxiety in regard to the mother. She mentions Melanie Klein's view of the boy's talion dread born in relation to his sadistic impulses toward's the mother's body, but the most important source of his dread of the vulva she would derive from the boy's fear of his self-esteem being wounded by knowing that his penis is not large enough to satisfy the mother, the mother's denial of his wishes being interpreted in this sense; the talion dread of castration by the mother is later and less important than the fear of ridicule.² One often gets, it is true, a vivid clinical picture of how strong this motive can be, but I doubt whether Dr. Horney has carried the analysis of it far enough. In my experience the deep shame in question, which can certainly express itself as impotence, is not simply due to the fear of ridicule as an ultimate fact; both the shame and the fear of ridicule proceed from a deeper complex—the adoption of a feminine attitude towards the father's penis that is incorporated in the mother's body. Karen Horney also calls attention to this feminine attitude, and even ascribes to it the main source of castration fear, but for her it is a secondary consequence of the dread of ridicule. We are here again brought back to the question of femininity and perceive that to answer it satisfactorily is probably to resolve the whole problem.

I will now try to reconstruct and comment on Karen Horney's argument about the connection between the dread of the vulva and the fear of castration. At the start the boy's masculinity and femininity are relatively free. Karen Horney quotes Freud's well-known views on primal bisexuality in support of her belief that the feminine wishes are primary. There perhaps are such primary feminine wishes, but I am convinced that conflict arises only when they are developed or exploited as a means of dealing with a dreaded father's penis. However, Karen Horney thinks that before this happens the boy has reacted to his mother's denial of his wishes and, as described above, feels shame and a deep sense of inadequacy in

² *Ibid.*, pp. 352, 356.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 357.

consequence. As a result of this he can, according to her, no longer express his feminine wishes freely. There is a gap in the argument here. In the first place we are to assume that the boy at once equates his phallic inadequacy with femaleness, but it is not explained how the equation is brought about. At all events, he is now ashamed of his earlier feminine wishes, and dreads these being gratified because it would signify castration at the hands of the father—in fact, this is the essential cause of these castration fears. Surely there is another big gap in the argument here. How does the father suddenly appear on the scene? The essential point in the argument, and one on which I would join issue with Dr. Horney, would appear to be that the boy's sense of failure due to his mother's refusal leads him to fall back from his masculine wishes to feminine ones, which he then applies to the father but dreads to have gratified because of the admission they imply of his masculine inferiority (as well as the equivalence of castration). This is rather reminiscent of Adler's early views on the masculine protest. My experience leads me, on the contrary, to see the crucial turning-point in the Œdipus complex itself, in the dreaded rivalry with the father. It is to cope with this situation that the boy falls back on a feminine attitude with its risk of castration. Whereas Dr. Horney regards the feminine attitude as a primary one which the boy comes to repress because of the fear of ridicule of his masculine inferiority, this fear being the active dynamic agent, I should consider that the sense of inferiority itself, and the accompanying shame, are both secondary to the feminine attitude *and to the motive for this*. This whole group of ideas is strongest in men with a 'small penis' complex, often accompanied by impotence, and it is with them that one gets the clearest insight into the genesis. What such a man is really ashamed of is not that his penis is 'small,' but the reason *why* it is 'small.'

On the other hand I fully agree with Karen Horney and other workers, notably Melanie Klein,¹ in the view that the boy's reaction to the crucial situation of the Œdipus complex is greatly influenced by his earlier relationship with his mother. But this is a much more complicated matter than wounded vanity; far grimmer factors are at work. Melanie Klein lays stress on the fear of the mother's retaliation for the boy's sadistic impulses against her body; and this independently of any thought of the father or his penis, though she

¹ Melanie Klein, 'Early Stages of the Œdipus Conflict,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, vol. ix., 1928, p. 167.

would agree that the latter heightens the boy's sadism and thus complicates the picture. As she has pointed out in detail,¹ however, these sadistic impulses have themselves an elaborate history. We have to begin with the alimentary level to appreciate the nature of the forces at work. Privations on this level—especially perhaps oral privations—are undoubtedly of the greatest importance in rendering harder the task of coping with the parents on the genital level, but we want to know exactly why this should be so. I could relate cases of a number of male patients whose failure to achieve manhood—in relation to either men or women—was strictly to be correlated with their attitude of needing first to acquire something from women, something which of course they never actually could acquire. Why should imperfect access to the nipple give a boy the sense of imperfect possession of his own penis? I am quite convinced that the two things are intimately related, although the logical connection between them is certainly not obvious.

I do not know to what extent a boy in the first year of life feels sure his mother has a genital organ like his own, on grounds of natural identification, but my impression is that any such idea has no serious interest for him until it gets involved in other associations. The first of these would appear to be the symbolic equivalency of nipple and penis. Here the mother's penis is mainly a more satisfying and nourishing nipple, its size alone being an evident advantage in this respect. Now how precisely does a bilateral organ, the breast, get changed into a medial one, the penis? When this happens does it mean that the boy, perhaps from his experiences or phantasies of the primal scene, has already come across the idea of the father's penis, or is it possible that even before this his early masturbatory experiences—so often associated with oral ones—together with the commonly expressed oral attitude towards his own penis, alone suffice for the identification? I am inclined to the latter opinion, but it is hard to get unequivocal data on the matter. Whichever of these alternatives is true, however, the attitude towards the mythical maternal penis must from the very first be ambivalent. On the one side there is the conception of a visible, and therefore accessible, friendly and nourishing organ which can be received and sucked. But on the other side the sadism stimulated by oral frustration—the very factor that first created the conception—must by projection create the idea of a sinister, hostile and dangerous organ

¹ Numerous publications in the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*.

which has to be destroyed by swallowing before the boy can feel safe. This ambivalence, beginning in regard to the mother's nipple (and nipple-penis), is greatly intensified when the father's penis becomes involved in the association. And it does so, I feel convinced, very early in life—certainly by the second year. This may be quite irrespective of actual experiences, even of the father's very existence, and is generated mainly by the boy's own libidinal sensations in his penis with their inevitable accompaniment of penetrative impulses. The ambivalent attitude is intensified on both sides. On the one hand the tendency to imitate the father gets related to the idea of acquiring strength from him, first of all orally, and on the other hand we get the well-known Oedipus rivalry and hostility, which also is first dealt with in terms of oral annihilation.

These considerations relating to the oral level begin to throw light on the riddle I propounded earlier—namely, why so many men feel unable to put something into a woman unless they have first got something out of her; why they cannot penetrate; or—put more broadly—why they need to pass through a satisfactory 'feminine' stage before they can feel at home in a masculine one. I pointed out earlier on that in the feminine wishes of the boy must lie the secret of the whole problem. The first clue is that this feminine stage is an alimentary one, primarily oral. Satisfaction of wishes in this stage has to precede masculine development; failure in this respect results in fixation on the woman at an oral or anal level, a fixation which, although originating in anxiety, may become intensely eroticised in perverse forms.

I shall now try to proceed further in the answering of our riddle, and for the sake of simplicity shall consider separately the boy's difficulties with the mother and father respectively. But I must preface this by laying stress on its artificiality. When we consider the parents as two distinct beings, to be viewed separately one from the other, we are doing something that the infant is not yet capable of and something that does not greatly concern the infant in his (or her) most secret phantasies. We are artificially dissecting the elements of a concept (the 'combined parent concept,' as Melanie Klein well terms it) which to the infant are still closely interwoven. The findings of child analysis lead us to ascribe ever-increasing importance to the phantasies and emotions attaching to this concept, and I am very inclined to think that the expression 'pre-Oedipal phase' used recently by Freud and other writers must correspond

extensively with the phase of life dominated by the 'combined parent' concept.

At all events, let us consider first the relation to the mother alone. Leaving the father's penis quite out of account, we are concerned with the riddle of how the boy's acquiring something from the mother is related to his secure possession of the use of his own penis. I believe this connection between the oral and the phallic lies in the sadism common to both. The oral frustration evokes sadism, and the penetrating penis is used in phantasy as a sadistic weapon to reach the oral aims desired, to open a way to the milk, faeces, nipple, babies and so on, all of which the infant wants to swallow. The patients I alluded to earlier as having a perverse oral fixation on women were all highly sadistic. The equation tooth=penis is familiar enough, and it must begin in this sadistic pregenital stage of development. The sadistic penis has also important anal connections—*e.g.*, the common phantasy of fetching a baby out of the bowel by the penis. The penis itself thus comes to be associated with the acquiring attitude, and thwarting of the latter to be identified with thwarting of the former—*i.e.*, not being able to get milk, etc., is equivalent to not being able to use the penis. The thwarting leads further to retaliation fears of the mother damaging the weapons themselves. This I have even found on occasion equated with the earliest frustration. The mother's withholding of the nipple gave her the character of a nipple or penis hoarder, who would surely keep permanently any penis brought near her, and the boy's sadism can in such cases manifest itself—as a sort of double bluff—by a sadistic policy of withholding from the woman whatever she may desire—*e.g.*, by being impotent.

Though this conflict with the mother no doubt lays the basis for later difficulties, my experience seems to teach me that greater importance is to be attached in the genesis of castration fear to the conflict with the father. But I have at once to add a very important proviso. In the boy's imagination the mother's genital is for so long inseparable from the idea of the father's penis dwelling there that one would get a very false perspective if one confined one's attention to his relationship to his actual 'external' father; this is perhaps the real difference between Freud's pre-Oedipal stage and the Oedipus complex proper. It is the hidden indwelling penis that accounts for a very great part of the trouble, the penis that has entered the mother's body or been swallowed by her—the dragon or dragons

that haunt cloacal regions. Some boys attempt to deal with it on directly phallic lines, to use their penis in their phantasy for penetrating the vagina and crushing the father's penis there, or even—as I have many times found—by pursuing this phantasy to the length of penetrating into the father's body itself—*i.e.*, sodomy. One sees again, by the way, how this illustrates the close interchangeability of the father and mother *imagines*; the boy can suck either or penetrate into either. What we are more concerned with here, however, is the important tendency to deal with the father's penis on feminine lines. It would be better to say 'on apparently feminine lines,' for true feminine lines would be far more positive. Essentially I mean 'on oral- and anal-sadistic lines,' and I believe it is the annihilation attitude derived from this level that affords the clue to the various apparently feminine attitudes: the annihilation is performed by the mouth and anus, by teeth, faeces and—on the phallic level—urine. Over and again I have found this hostile and destructive tendency to lie behind not merely the obviously ambivalent attitude on all femininity in men, but behind the affectionate desire to please. After all, apparently complacent yielding is the best imaginable mask for hostile intentions. The ultimate aim of most of this femininity is to get possession of, and destroy, the dreaded object. Until this is done the boy is not safe; he cannot really attend to women, let alone penetrate into them. He also projects his oral and anal destructive attitude, which relates to his father's penis, on to the cavity that is supposed to contain it. This projection is facilitated by association with the earlier sadistic impulses, oral and phallic, against the mother's body, with their talion consequences. Destruction of the father's penis further means robbing the penis-loving mother of her possession. To penetrate into this cavity would therefore be as destructive to his own penis as he knows penetration of his father's penis into his mouth would be to it. We thus obtain a simple formula for the Oedipus complex: my (so-called feminine—*i.e.*, oral destructive) wishes against my father's penis are so strong that if I penetrate into the mother's vagina with them still in my heart the same fate will happen to me—*i.e.*, if I have intercourse with my mother my father will castrate me. Penetration is equated with destruction, or—to recur to the more familiar phrase used earlier—copulation is equated with castration. But—and this is the vital point—what is at stake is not castration of the mother, but of the boy or else his father.

After having considered the various sources of castration anxiety, and the problem of femininity in the male, I now return to the original question of why the boy in the phallic phase needs to imagine that his mother really has a penis, and I will couple with it the further question—not often raised—of whose penis it really is. The answer is given in the preceding considerations, and to avoid repetition I will simply express it as a statement. *The presence of a visible penis in the mother would signify at once a reassurance in respect of the early oral needs, with a denial of any need for dangerous sadism to deal with privation, and above all a reassurance that no castration has taken place, that neither his father nor himself is in danger of it.* This conclusion also answers the question of whose penis it is the mother must have.¹ It is her own only in very small part, the part derived from the boy's earliest oral needs. To a much greater extent it is the father's penis; though it may also in a sense be said to be the boy's own, inasmuch as his fate is bound up with it through the mutual castration danger to both his father and himself.

The reason why actual sight of the female genital organ signals the passage from the proto- to the deuterio-phallic phase has also to be given. Like the experiences of puberty, it makes manifest what had previously belonged solely to the life of phantasy. It gives an actuality to the fear of castration. It does this, however, not by conveying the idea that the father has castrated the mother—this is only a mask of rationalisation in consciousness—but by arousing the possibility that a dangerous repressed wish may be gratified in reality—namely, the wish to have intercourse with the mother and to destroy the father's penis. In spite of various suggestions to the contrary, the Oedipus complex provides the key to the problem of the phallic phase, as it has done to so many others.

We have travelled far from the conception that the boy, previously ignorant of the sex difference, is horrified to find that a man has violently created one by castrating his mate and turning her into a woman, a castrated creature. Even apart from actual analysis of the early childhood years, the proposition that the boy has no intuition of the sex difference is on logical grounds alone hard to hold. We have seen that the (deuterio-) phallic phase depends on the fear of castration, and that this in its turn implies the danger of

¹ Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children' (*op. cit.*, p. 333), answers this question categorically: "The woman with a penis" always means, I should say, the woman with the father's penis.'

penetration; it would appear to follow from this alone that intuition of a penetrable cavity is an early underlying assumption in the whole complex reaction. When Freud says that the boy renounces his incest wishes towards his mother in order to save his penis, this implies that the penis was the offending carrier of those wishes (in the proto-phallic phase). Now what could these penis wishes that endanger its existence have been if not to perform the natural function of the penis—penetration? And this inference is amply substantiated by actual research.

I may now summarise the conclusions reached. The main one is that *the typical phallic stage in the boy is a neurotic compromise rather than a natural evolution in sexual development*. It varies, of course, in intensity, probably with the intensity of the castration fears, but it can be called inevitable only in so far as castration fears—*i.e.*, infantile neuroses—are inevitable; and how far these are inevitable we shall know only when we have further experience of child analysis. At all events the mere need to renounce incest wishes does not make it inevitable; it is not the external situation that engenders the phallic phase, but—perhaps avoidable—complications in the boy's inner development.

To avoid the imagined and self-created dangers of the Œdipus situation the boy in the phallic phase abandons the masculine attitude of penetration, with all interest in the inside of the mother's body, and comes to insist on the assured existence of his own and his 'mother's' external penis. This is tantamount to Freud's 'passing of the Œdipus complex,' the renunciation of the mother to save the penis, but it is not a direct stage in evolution; on the contrary, the boy has later to retrace his steps in order to evolve, he has to claim again what he had renounced—his masculine impulses to reach the vagina; he has to revert from the temporary neurotic deuterophallic phase to the original and normal protophallic phase. Thus the typical phallic phase—*i.e.*, the deuterophallic phase—in my opinion, represents a neurotic obstacle to development rather than a natural stage in the course of it.¹

¹ It may be of interest to note the respects in which the conclusions here put forward agree with or differ from those of the two authors, Freud and Karen Horney, with whose views there has been most occasion to debate. In agreement with Freud is the fundamental view that the passage from the proto- to the deuterophallic phase is due to fear of castration at the hands of the father, and that this essentially arises in the Œdipus situation. Freud would, I think, also hold that the feminine wishes behind so much of the castration fear are generated as a means of dealing with the loved and dreaded father: he would possibly lay more stress on the idea of libidinally placating him, whereas I have directed more attention to the hostile and destructive impulses

Turning now to the corresponding problem in girls, we may begin by noting that the distinction mentioned earlier between the proto- and the deuterophallic phase is if anything more prominent with girls than with boys. So much so that when I made the suggestion that the phallic phase in girls represents a secondary solution of conflict I was under the impression that by the phallic phase was meant what I now see to be only the second half of it, a misapprehension Professor Freud corrected in recent correspondence; incidentally, his condemnation of my suggestion¹ was partly based on the same misunderstanding, since on his part he naturally thought I was referring to the whole phase. In extenuation I may remark that in his original paper Freud gave no account of the phallic phase in girls, on the score of its extreme obscurity, and that his definition—a phase in which it is believed that the sex difference is between penis-possessing and castrated beings—strictly applies only to the deuterophallic phase, the penis being supposed to be unknown in the first one.

The difference between the two halves of the phase in Freud's conception is similar to that pointed out earlier with boys. According to him, a clitoris supremacy sets in at a certain age when the girl is ignorant of the difference between the clitoris and the penis and so is in a state of contented bliss in the matter; this I am calling for the moment the proto-phallic phase of girls, which corresponds with that of boys when they are similarly supposed to be ignorant of the sex difference. In the deuterophallic phase, the one I had suggested was a secondary defensive reaction, the girl is aware of the difference and, like the boy, either admits it reluctantly—and in this case resent-

behind the feminine attitude. On the other hand I cannot subscribe to the view of sex ignorance on which Freud repeatedly insists—though in one passage on primal scenes and primal phantasies (*Gen. Sch.*, Bd. xi., S. 11) he appears to keep the question open—and I regard the idea of the castrated mother as essentially a mother whose man has been castrated. Nor do I consider the deuterophallic phase as a natural stage in development.

With Karen Horney there is agreement in her scepticism about sex ignorance, in her doubts about the normality of the (deutero-) phallic phase, and in her opinion that the boy's reaction to the Œdipus situation is greatly influenced by his previous relation to his mother. But I think she is mistaken in her account of the connection between these two last matters, and consider that the boy's fear of his feminine wishes—which we all appear to hold lie behind the castration fear—arise not in shame at his literal masculine inferiority in his relation to his mother, but in the dangers of his alimentary sadism when this operates in the Œdipus situation.

¹ Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 297.

fully—or tries to deny it. In the denial, however, unlike the state of affairs alleged to exist with boys, there is implied some real knowledge of the difference, for the girl does not maintain the previous belief—that both sexes have a satisfactory clitoris—but wishes that she now had a different organ from before—viz., a real penis. With homosexual women, who reveal implicitly in their behaviour and explicitly in their dreams the belief that they really have a penis, this wish goes on to imaginary fulfilment, but even with the more normal girl during her deuterio-phallic phase the same belief that she has a penis alternates with the wish to have one.

As with boys, the two halves of the phase are divided by the castration idea, by the idea that women are nothing but castrated beings—there being no such thing as a true female organ. The boy's wish in the deuterio-phallic stage is to restore the security of the proto-phallic one which has been disturbed by the supposed discovery of castration: to revert to the original identity of the sexes. The girl's wish in the deuterio-phallic stage is similarly to restore the undisturbed proto-phallic one, and even to intensify its phallic character; thus to revert to the original identity of the sexes. This I take to be a more explicit statement of Freud's conception.

Two distinct views appear to be held in respect of female sexual development, and to bring out the contrast between them I will exaggerate them in the following over-simple statement. According to one, the girl's sexuality is essentially male to start with (at least as soon as she is weaned), and she is driven into femaleness by failure of the male attitude (disappointment in the clitoris). According to the other, it is essentially female to start with, and she is—more or less temporarily—driven into a phallic maleness by failure of the female attitude.

This is avowedly an imperfect statement, which does not do justice to either view, but it may serve to point a discussion. I will call the two A and B respectively and add a few obvious modifications which will make them more exact and also diminish the grossness of the difference between them. The supporters of A would, of course, admit an early bisexuality, though they maintain that the male (clitoris) attitude predominates; they would also agree to the so-called regressive (anxiety) factors in the deuterio-phallic phase, though they hold these to be less important than the libidinal impulse to maintain the original maleness. On the other side the supporters of B would also admit an early bisexuality, an early clitoris

maleness in addition to the more pronounced femaleness: or—to put it more cautiously without begging any question—the co-existence of active and passive aims which tend to get associated with particular genital areas. They would also admit that there is often little apparent love for the father, who is regarded mainly as a rival, in the early stage of mother fixation; and in the deuterio-phallic phase they would agree that direct auto-erotic, and therefore libidinal, penis envy plays an important part together with the anxiety factors in driving the girl from femaleness into the phallic maleness. Again, there is general agreement that the experience of seeing a penis powerfully influences the transition from the proto- to the deuterio-phallic phase, though not about the reasons why it does so. Further, both views agree that in the deuterio-phallic phase the girl desires a penis,¹ and blames the mother for her lack of it, though whose penis she desires and why she desires it are questions not so readily answered.

Nevertheless, in spite of these modifications, there remain differences of opinion in regard to both halves of the phase, and by no means in respect of accent only. In investigating the corresponding obscurity of male sexual development it proved useful to lay stress on the correlation between the problems of castration fear and dread of the vulva. Here I would similarly bring into prominence a correlation between the problem of the girl's desire to own a penis and her hate of her mother, since I feel sure that to explain either of these is to explain the other. And I will anticipate my conclusions to the extent of remarking that it may prove possible to combine in a single formula the male equation of problems with the female one.

In attempting to elucidate the contrasting views described above I will avail myself of two clues, both provided by Freud. The first of them is contained in his remark² that the girl's earliest attachment to her mother 'has in analysis seemed to me so elusive, lost in a past so dim and shadowy, so hard to resuscitate that it seemed as if it had undergone some specially inexorable repression.' We must all agree

¹ Incidentally, I may comment here on the unfortunate ambiguity of such phrases as 'to desire a penis,' 'the wish for a penis.' In fact three meanings of such phrases are to be discerned in connection with infantile female sexuality: (1) The wish to acquire a penis, usually by swallowing, and to retain it within the body, often converting it there into a baby; (2) the wish to possess a penis in the clitoritic region: for this purpose it may be acquired in more than one way; (3) the adult wish to enjoy a penis in coitus. I shall try to make it clear in each case which meaning is intended.

² Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 282.

when he points out that the ultimate solution of all these problems lies in a finer analysis of the girl's very earliest period of attachment to the mother, and it is highly probable that the differences of opinion in respect of the later stage of development are mainly, and perhaps altogether, due to different assumptions concerning the earlier stage.

To give an example of this: Freud,¹ in criticising Karen Horney, describes her view as being that the girl, from fear of advancing to femininity, *regresses* in the deuterio-phallic stage. So sure is he that the earlier (clitoris) stage can only be a phallic one. But this is just one of the questions at issue; to anyone taking the opposite view the process just mentioned would not be a regression, but a neurotic new-formation. And it is a question to be discussed. We should not take it too much for granted that the use of the clitoris is altogether the same thing psychologically as the use of the penis simply because they are physio-genetically homologous. Sheer accessibility may also play its part. The clitoris is after all a part of the female genitals. Clinically the correspondence between clitoris masturbation and a male attitude is very far indeed from being invariable. I have known, on the one hand, a case where the clitoris could not function because of a congenital malformation, but where the vulval masturbation was distinctly male in type (prone posture, etc.). On the other hand, cases where clitoris masturbation in the adult accompanies the most pronouncedly feminine heterosexual phantasies are an everyday experience, and Melanie Klein² states that this combination is characteristic of the earliest infancy. In my Innsbruck paper I expressed the opinion that vaginal excitation played a more important part in the earliest childhood than was recognised—in contra-distinction from Freud's³ opinion that it begins only at puberty—a view that had been previously expressed by several women analysts, Melanie Klein⁴ (1924), Josine Müller⁵ (1925), and Karen Horney⁶ (1926). This opinion I had reached first from the

¹ Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 296.

² Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children,' *op. cit.*, p. 288.

³ Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 283.

⁴ Melanie Klein, 'From the Analysis of an Obsessional Neurosis in a Six-year-old Child,' First German Psycho-Analytical Assembly, Würzburg, October 11, 1924.

⁵ Josine Müller, 'A Contribution to the Problem of Libidinal Development of the Genital Phase in Girls,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1932, vol. xiii., p. 361.

⁶ Karen Horney, 'The Flight from Womanhood,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1926, vol. vii., p. 334. She has comprehensively sustained this opinion in a paper published in the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, vol. xiv., p. 57.

same class of material as Josine Müller quotes—namely, women who show strong masculine propensities in conjunction with vaginal anaesthesia. What is important about this early vaginal functioning, so deeply repressed, is the extraordinary amount of anxiety that goes with it (far more than with clitoritic functioning), a matter to which we shall have to recur. Actual vaginal masturbation is often considered by physicians to be commoner than clitoris masturbation in the first four or five years of life, whereas it certainly is not so during the latency period—a fact in itself suggesting a change from feminine to more masculine attitudes. Apart, however, from actual vaginal functioning there is extensive evidence of feminine phantasies and wishes in early childhood to be obtained from both adult and early analyses: phantasies relating to the mouth, vulva, womb, anus and the receptive attitude of the body in general. For all these reasons I feel that the question of the alleged clitoritic and therefore masculine primacy of the female infant may well be kept in suspense until we know more about the sexuality of this very early stage.

A cognate example of misunderstanding due to differing primary assumptions arises in connection with the problem of the intensity and of the direction (aim) characteristic of the deuterio-phallic phase. Freud, who holds that both intensity and direction are to be explained in terms of the proto-phallic masculine phase, and that the trauma of seeing the penis only reinforces this, criticises Karen Horney for believing that the direction alone is given by the proto-phallic phase, the intensity being derived from later (anxiety) factors.¹ In so far, however, as Karen Horney is a supporter of view B—and I cannot of course say just how far this is so—she would maintain the exact converse of the view Freud ascribes to her; she would agree with him that the intensity of the deuterio-phallic phase is derived from the earlier one (though with displacement) and differ from him only in holding that its direction is not so derived, being in the main determined by secondary factors. All this again depends on whether the earlier phase is regarded as predominantly masculine and auto-crotic or predominantly feminine and allo-erotic.

Freud² would appear to hold that the question is settled by the very fact that many young girls have a long and exclusive mother attachment. He calls this a pre-Oedipal stage of development, one where the father plays very little part and that a negative one

¹ Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 296.

² *Ibid.*

(rivalry). These facts of observation are not to be doubted—I can myself quote an extreme case where the exclusive mother attachment was prolonged till near puberty, at which age an equally exclusive transference to the father took place. But they do not in themselves exclude a positive Oedipus complex in the girl's unconscious imagination: they prove only that, if this does exist, it has not yet learned to express itself in relation to the actual father. In my experience of typical cases of this kind, however, and in that of child analysts, particularly of Melanie Klein, Melitta Schmideberg and Nina Searl, analysis shows that the girls had from very early times definite impulses towards an imaginary penis, one incorporated into the mother but derived from the father, together with elaborate phantasies on the subject of parental coitus. I would again remind you at this point of the stress laid in the earlier part of the paper on the 'combined parent concept,' the picture of parents fused in coitus.

We are here led to consider the second of the clues to which I referred just now. It concerns the young girl's theories of coitus, which play a highly important part in her sexual development. They should be helpful in the present connection, since—as Freud has long ago shown—the sexual theories of a child are a mirror of its particular sexual constitution. A few years ago Professor Freud wrote to me that of the two points of which he felt most sure in the obscurity of female sexual development one was that the young girl's first idea of coitus was an oral one—*i.e.*, of fellatio.¹ Here, as usual, he put his finger on a central point. But it is probable that the matter is more complex: at all events, this central consideration has several corollaries that are worth pursuing. In the first place, it is hardly likely that a purely oral conception would develop if the first thought of coitus occurred years after the infant's own oral experiences; and detailed analysis of this early period, especially by child analysts, confirms what one might expect—namely, that the experiences and the conception are closely related not only genetically, but also chronologically. Melanie Klein² attributes great importance to the stimulus given to the child's desires by the inevitable imperfections and dissatisfactions of the suckling period, and would connect the

¹ I may also quote the other point, since any pronouncement from such a source must command interest. It was that the girl gives up masturbation because of her dissatisfaction with the clitoris (in comparison with the penis).

² Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children,' *op. cit.*, p. 326.

weaning time both with the deepest sources of hostility to the mother and with a dawning idea of a penis-like object as a more satisfying kind of nipple. That nipple wishes are transferred to the idea of the penis, and that the two objects are extensively identified in the imagination, is fairly familiar ground, but it is hard to say when this transference begins to be applied to the father in person. It is, I think, certain that for a relatively long time they apply more to the mother than to the father—*i.e.*, that the girl seeks for a penis in her mother. By the second year of life this vague aspiration is getting more definite and is getting connected with the idea of the mother's penis having been derived from the father in the supposed act of fellatio between the parents.

In the next place, the fellatic idea can hardly be confined to the notion of purposeless sucking. The child well knows that one sucks for a purpose—to get something. Milk (or semen) and (nipple-) penis are thus things to swallow, and by the familiar symbolic equations, as well partly from the child's own alimentary experiences, we reach also the ideas of excrement and baby—equally obtained from this primordial sucking act. According to Freud,¹ the child's love and sexuality are essentially devoid of aim (*sziellos*), and for this very reason are doomed to disappointment. The contrary view is that in the unconscious there are very definite aims, and the disappointment is due to their not being reached.

I wish to make clear at this point that the wishes here referred to are in my opinion essentially allo-erotic. The girl infant has not yet had the occasion to develop auto-erotic envy at the sight of a boy's penis; the desire to possess one herself, for the reasons so clearly stated by Karen Horney,² comes later. At the early stage the wish to take the penis into the body, through the mouth, and make a (fæcal) baby out of it is, though still on an alimentary level, nevertheless akin to the allo-erotism of the adult woman. Freud³ holds that when the girl's wish to own a penis is disappointed it is replaced by a substitute—the wish to have a child. I would, however, agree rather with Melanie Klein's⁴ view that the penis-child equation is more innate, and that the girl's wish to have a child—like the normal woman's wish—is a direct continuance of

Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 286.

² Karen Horney, 'On the Genesis of the Castration Complex in Women,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1924, vol. v., pp. 52-54.

³ Freud, 'Some Psychological Consequences,' etc., *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁴ Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children,' *op. cit.*, p. 309.

her allo-erotic desire for a penis; she wants to enjoy taking the penis into the body and to make a child from it, rather than to have a child because she cannot have a penis of her own.

The purely libidinal nature of the wishes manifests itself in many ways, of which I will mention only one. The insertion of the nipple into the mouth is followed by the anal-erotic pleasure at the passage of faeces, and the cleansing process associated with this is often felt by the girl to be a sexual experience with the mother (or nurse). The point of this observation is that the mother's hand or finger is equated to a penis and is often the seduction that leads to masturbation.

* * * * *

Now if the mother gets all this—just what the girl longs for—from the father, then a situation of normal Œdipus rivalry must surely exist, and in exact proportion to the girl's own dissatisfaction. The accompanying hostility is in direct line with that felt previously towards the mother in the suckling period, being of the same order; and it reinforces it. The mother has got something the girl wants and will not give it to her. In this something the idea of the father's penis soon comes to crystallise more and more definitely, and the mother has obtained it from the father in successful competition with the girl, as well as the baby she can make from it. This is in disagreement with Freud's¹ formidable statement that the concept of the Œdipus complex is strictly applicable only to male children and 'it is only in male children that there occurs the fateful conjunction of love for the one parent and hatred of the other as rival.' We seem compelled here to be *plus royaliste que le roi*.

Freud's fellatio account of coitus, however, from which we started, yields no explanation for the important observation on which he insists,² that the girl infant feels rivalry for her father. The fellatio conception of coitus, in fact, would seem to be only one half of the story. One finds also the complementary idea that the father not only gives to the mother, but receives from her; that in short she suckles him. And it is here that the direct rivalry with the father is so strong, for the mother is giving him just what the girl wants (nipple and milk); other sources of rivalry, hate and resentment in respect of the father, I shall mention presently. When this 'mammalingus' conception, as it may be called, gets sadistically

¹ Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 284.

² *Ibid.*, p. 282.

cathected, then we have the familiar feminist idea of the man who 'uses' the woman, exhausts her, drains her, exploits her, and so on.

The girl infant doubtless identifies herself with both sides in these conceptions, but in the nature of the case her wanting, receiving desires must be more prominent than the giving ones; there is at that age so much that she wants and so little that she has to give.

What then of the phallic activity against the mother recorded by Helene Deutsch, Jeanne Lampl-de Groot, Melanie Klein, and other women analysts? We must not forget how early the child apprehends the penis not simply as an instrument of love, but also as a weapon of destruction. In the girl's sadistic furor against the mother's body, due largely to her inability to suffer thwarting, she clutches at all weapons, mouth, hands, feet; and in this connection the sadistic value of the penis, and the power it gives of directing destructive urine, is perhaps not the least of its uses which she envies the boy. We know that thwarting stimulates sadism, and, to judge from their phantasies as well as actual conduct, it would seem very difficult to overestimate the quantity of sadism present in infants. On talion grounds this leads to corresponding fear, and again it seems difficult to overestimate the depth and intensity of fear in infants. We must regard the sexual development of both boys and girls as influenced at all points by the need to cope with fear, and I must agree with Melanie Klein's¹ scepticism about the success of Freud's² avowed endeavour to depict sexual development without reference to the super-ego—*i.e.*, to the factors of guilt and fear.

At this point I am constrained to express the doubt whether Freud does not attach too much significance to the girl's concern about her external organs (clitoris-penis) at the expense of her terrible fears about the inside of her body. I feel sure that to her the inside is a much stronger source of anxiety and that she often parades concern about the outside as a defensive attitude, a conclusion the truth of which Melanie Klein³ has demonstrated in great detail in her penetrating investigations of the earliest years of female development. Josine Müller⁴ has happily remarked that the anatomical fact of the girl's having two genital organs—the internal vagina (and womb) and the external clitoris—enables her to displace eroto-

¹ Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children,' *op. cit.*, p. 323.

² Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 294.

³ Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children,' *op. cit.*, pp. 269 *et seq.*

⁴ Josine Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

genicity from the internal to the external one when the former is threatened. After all, the central dread of the guilty girl—even in consciousness—is that she will never be able to bear children—*i.e.*, that her internal organs have been damaged. We are reminded of Helene Deutsch's¹ triad of equivalent female fears: castration, defloration and parturition—though the first of these needs careful definition—and of the characteristic adult fears of 'internal diseases,' particularly of cancer of the womb.

The early dread of the mother, just as the hate of her, is transferred to the father, and both dread and hate are often curiously concentrated on the idea of the penis itself. Just as the boy projects his sadism on to the female organs, and then exploits these dangerous organs as a means of destroying his father homosexually, so does the girl project her sadism on to the male organ, and very largely with a similar outcome. It is one of the oddest experiences to find a woman who has devoted herself to a penis-acquiring career (homosexually) having at the same time fear, disgust and hatred of any real penis. In such cases one gets a vista of the dread and horror that gets developed in regard to the penis, the most destructive of all lethal weapons, and how terrifying can be the idea of its penetrating into the inside of the body.² This particular projection is so important that one must ask how much of the girl's fear is the result of her sadistic wishes to bite away (and swallow) the penis, tearing it from the mother, or later the father, with the consequent dread lest the dangerous—because sadistically conceived—penis penetrates her; it is hard to say, but this may possibly be the very centre of the matter.

As the girl grows she often transfers her resentment from the mother to the father when she more clearly understands that he it is who really owns (and withholds) the penis. Freud³ quotes this curious transference of hostility, resentment and dissatisfaction from the mother to the father as a proof that it cannot arise from rivalry with the mother, but we have just seen that another explanation is at least possible. It is fully intelligible that there should be resentment at the thwarting of the allo-erotic penis desire, which the father's presence stimulates, and that this applies first to the mother and then to the father. An additional tributary flows into the

¹ Helene Deutsch, 'The Significance of Masochism in the Mental Life of Women,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1930, vol. xi., p. 48.

² Hence, amongst other things, the frequency of beating phantasies where penetration is obviated.

³ Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, pp. 281, 286.

resentment against the father for his thwarting the libidinal desire—namely, that this thwarting has also the effect of exposing the girl to her dread of the mother. For where there is a dread of punishment for a wish, then gratification of this wish may be the strongest safeguard against the anxiety, or at least is commonly believed by the unconscious to be so; and anyone, therefore, who denies this gratification commits a double crime—he refuses at the same time both libidinal pleasure and security.

We have to bear in mind all this background, which is doubtless only an extract of the true complexity, when we attempt to reconstruct the development of the deutero-phallic phase. At this point the girl becomes *consciously* aware of a real penis attached to male beings, and she characteristically reacts to it by wishing to possess one herself. Why exactly does she have this wish? What does she want the penis for? That is a crucial question, and the answer to it must also provide the answer to the equally crucial question of the source of the girl's hostility to her mother. Here we get a fairly clear-cut issue between views A and B, one which should prove stimulating to further research.

The answer to both questions given by view A undoubtedly has the merit of being simpler than that given by view B. According to it the girl wishes to possess the penis she sees because that is the sort of thing she has always prized, because she sees it in her wildest dreams of an efficient clitoris being realised in the *n*th degree. There is no serious internal conflict in the matter, only resentment, particularly against her mother, whom she holds responsible for the disappointment that inevitably ensues. Envy of the penis is the principal reason for turning from the mother. The actual value of the clitoris-penis would appear to be essentially auto-erotic, the best exposition of which was given years ago by Karen Horney.¹ The wish is almost entirely libidinal, and is in the same direction as the girl's earlier tendencies. When this wish is disappointed, the girl falls back on a feminine incestuous allo-erotic attitude, but as a second best. Any so-called defence there may be against femininity, or rather objection to it, is dictated not so much by any deep fear of it in itself, but by the desire to retain the masculine clitoris-penis position, which it imperils; in other words, by the same objection boys would have were they offered the alternative—namely, because it is tantamount to castration. This view, which in a word explains

¹ Karen Horney, 'On the Genesis,' etc., *loc. cit.*

both the hate of the mother and the strength of the deuterophallic phase by one main factor—the auto-erotic desire to possess a clitoris-penis—is both simple and consistent. The question is, however, whether it is also comprehensive—*i.e.*, whether its underlying assumptions in the proto-phallic phase take into due account all the ascertainable factors.

The answer given by view B is that the girl originally desired the penis allo-erotically, but is driven into an auto-erotic position (in the deuterophallic phase) in the same way that boys are—from fear of the supposed dangers attaching to the allo-erotic desires. I may here cite a few authors who illustrate sharply the contrasting views. On the one hand Helene Deutsch,¹ in accord with Freud, writes: ‘My view is that the Œdipus complex in girls is inaugurated by the castration-complex.’ On the other hand Karen Horney² speaks of ‘these typical motives for flight into the male rôle—motives whose origin is the Œdipus complex,’ and Melanie Klein³ asserts ‘in my view the girl’s defence against her feminine attitude springs less from her masculine tendencies than from her fear of her mother.’

The masculine form of auto-erotism is thus here the second best; it is adopted because femininity—the real thing desired—brings danger and intolerable anxiety. The deepest source of resentment against the mother is the imperfect oral satisfaction, which leads the girl to seek a more potent nipple—a penis—in an allo-erotic and later in a hetero-erotic direction; the libidinal attitude towards the nipple here expresses itself as feminine phantasies associated with vulval—either vaginal or clitoral—masturbation, alone or with the nurse in cleansing operations. She is homosexually attached to the mother at this stage, but it is only from her that she can hope to obtain the desired penis satisfaction, by guile or force. This is all the easier because after all the mother is still at this early age the main source of (allo-erotic) libidinal gratification. And she is dependent on her mother not only for affection and gratification, but also for the satisfying of all her vital needs. Life would be impossible without the mother and the mother’s love. There are therefore the strongest possible motives for the girl’s intense attachment to her mother.

Nevertheless in the unconscious there is another side to the

¹ Helene Deutsch, ‘The Significance,’ etc., *op. cit.*, p. 53.

² Karen Horney, ‘The Flight,’ etc., *op. cit.*, p. 337.

³ Melanie Klein, ‘The Psycho-Analysis of Children,’ *op. cit.*, p. 324.

picture, and a much grimmer one. The sadistic impulse to assault and rob the mother leads to intense dread of retaliation, which often develops—as was explained earlier—into dread of the penetrating penis; and this is revived when she comes across a real penis attached, not to the mother, but to the father or brother. Here she is actually no worse off than before—she still has a clitoris, and the mother has taken nothing away from her. She blames her, however, for not having given her more—a penis—but behind this reproach that the mother has insufficiently attended to her auto-erotic desires lies the deeper and stronger one that she has thwarted the true, feminine needs of her receptive and acquisitive nature and has threatened to destroy her body if she persists in them. View B would therefore appear to give more adequate reasons for hostility to the mother than does view A. Both agree about the pregenital thwarting at the mother’s hands, but they differ in their estimate of the thwarting on the genital level. There, according to the one view, A, the mother deprives the girl of nothing, but there is resentment at not being given more; according to the other view, B, the mother both thwarts the feminine aims (towards the penis) and also threatens to mutilate the body—*i.e.*, to destroy the real feminine penis-receiving and child-bearing organs—unless the girl renounces those aims. Small wonder that she does renounce them, always to some extent, and often altogether.

The deuterophallic phase is her reaction to this situation, her defence against the dangers of the Œdipus complex.¹ Her desire in it to possess a penis of her own saves her threatened libido by deflecting it into the safer auto-erotic direction, just as it is saved when deflected into perversion. This shifting on to the auto-erotic (and therefore more ego-syntonic) plane, with its consequent neurotic intensification, meets in its turn with disappointment. There are very few girls who do not deceive themselves—to some extent throughout life—about the source of their inferiority feelings. The real source, as always with inferiority feelings, is internal forbiddenness because of guilt and fear, and this applies to the allo-erotic wishes far more than to the auto-erotic ones.

But there are additional advantages in this phallic position, hence

¹ This view, maintained in my Innsbruck Congress paper, was, I think, first put forward by Karen Horney (‘On the Genesis,’ etc., *op. cit.*, p. 50), and has been elaborately developed by Melanie Klein, ‘The Psycho-Analysis of Children,’ *op. cit.*, pp. 271, etc.

its great strength. It is a complete refutation of the feared mother's attack on her femininity, because it denies its very existence and therefore all reason for any such attack. And there are also still more irrational unconscious phantasies. The ambivalence towards the mother can be dealt with. On the one hand the girl is now armed with the most powerful weapon of attack, and therefore of protection; Joan Riviere¹ has called special attention to this motive. On the other hand, by the important mechanism of restitution, one to which Melanie Klein has devoted important studies in this connection, she can compensate for her dangerous wishes to rob the mother of a penis: she now has a penis to restore to the deprived mother, a process which plays an extensive part in female homosexuality. Further, she no longer runs any risk of being sadistically assaulted by the man's dangerous penis. Freud² asks whence, if there were any flight from femininity, could it derive its source except from masculine strivings. We have seen that there may be much deeper sources of emotional energy in the girl than masculine strivings, though these can often prove a well-disguised outlet for them.

There will, I think, be general agreement on one point at least—namely, that the girl's desire for a penis is bound up with her hate of the mother. The two problems are inherently related, but it is over the nature of this relationship that there is the sharpest division of opinion. Whereas Freud holds that the hate is a resentment at the girl's not being granted a penis of her own, the view presented here, one which has been well sustained by Melanie Klein,³ is that the hate is essentially a rivalry over the father's penis. In the one view the deuterio-phallic phase is a natural reaction to an unfortunate anatomical fact, and when it leads to disappointment the girl falls back on hetero-erotic incest. In the other view the girl develops at a very early age hetero-erotic incest, with Œdipus hate of the mother, and the deuterio-phallic phase is an escape from the intolerable dangers of that situation; it thus has exactly the same significance as the corresponding phenomenon with the boy.

* * * * *

I should like now in summing up to institute a general comparison between these problems in boys and girls respectively. With

¹ Joan Riviere, 'Womanliness as a Masquerade,' *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1929, vol. x., p. 303.

² Freud, 'Female Sexuality,' *op. cit.*, p. 297.

³ Melanie Klein, 'The Psycho-Analysis of Children,' *op. cit.*, p. 270.

both the idea of functioning in the hetero-erotic direction appropriate to their nature (penetrating with boys, being penetrated with girls) is absent—? renounced—in the deuterio-phallic phase. And with both there is an equally strong denial—? repudiation—of the vagina: every effort is made towards the fiction that both sexes have a penis. There must surely be a common explanation for this central feature of the deuterio-phallic phase in both sexes, and both the views here discussed provide one. According to the first, it is the discovery of the sex difference—with its unwelcome implication; according to the second it is a deep dread of the vagina, derived from anxiety about the ideas of parental coitus associated with it, a dread which is often re-activated by seeing the genital organ of the opposite sex.

Probably the central difference between the two views, the one from which other differences emanate and where therefore our research must be specially directed, is over the varying importance attached by different analysts to the early unconscious phantasy of the father's penis incorporated in the mother. That the phantasy in question occurs has been well known to analysts for more than twenty years, but—as a result especially of Melanie Klein's notable researches—we may have to recognise it as a never-failing feature of infantile life and to learn that the sadism and anxiety surrounding it play a dominating part in the sexual development of both boys and girls. This generalisation could profitably be extended to all the phantasies described by Melanie Klein and other child analysts in connection with what she has called the 'combined parent' concept, one which I suggested earlier is closely associated with Freud's pre-Œdipal stage of development.

Not only is the main characteristic of the deuterio-phallic phase—the suppression of hetero-erotic functioning—essentially the same with boys and girls, but so also is the motive for it. The renunciation is effected in both cases for the sake of bodily integrity, to save the sexual organs (external with the boy, internal with the girl). The girl will not risk having her vagina or womb damaged any more than the boy will his penis. Both sexes have the strongest motives for denying all ideas of coitus—*i.e.*, of penetration—and they therefore keep their minds set on the outside of the body.¹

¹ I am not suggesting that this is the only motive force at work. As Joan Riviere pointed out in the discussion when this paper was read before the British Society, it falls into line with the general tendency towards exteriorisation in the growing child's search to establish contact with the outer world.

In the two sections of this paper I used as a starting-point a pair of related problems: with boys the fear of castration and the dread of the vulva, with girls the desire to own a penis and the hate of the mother. It is now possible to show that the essential nature of these two apparently unlike pairs is common to both sexes. The common features are the avoidance of penetration and fear of injury from the parent of the same sex. The boy fears castration at the hands of his father if he penetrates into the vagina; the girl fears mutilation at the hands of the mother if she allows herself to have a penetrable vagina. That the danger is often associated, by projection, with the parent of the opposite sex, in the manner I have described above, is a secondary manifestation; its real source is hostility towards the rival parent of the same sex. We have in fact the typical Œdipus formula: incestuous coitus brings with it fear of mutilation by the rival parent. And this is as true of the girl as of the boy, in spite of the more extensive homosexual disguise she is compelled to adopt.

To return to the concept of the phallic phase. If the view here advanced is valid, then the term proto-phallic I suggested earlier applies to the boy only. It is unnecessary, since it really means simply genital; it can even be misleading, since it predisposes one to think of the boy's early genital functions in a purely phallic—*i.e.*, auto-erotic—sense to the exclusion of the allo-erotism that exists from the earliest times—in the first year of life itself. For the girls the term will be still more misleading in the eyes of those who hold that the earliest stage of their development is essentially feminine. As to the sex ignorance said to characterise the proto-phallic phase, this is no doubt true of consciousness, but there is extensive evidence to show that it is not true of the unconscious; and the unconscious is an important part of the personality.

I now come to what I call the deutero-phallic phase, the one generally meant when one uses simply the term 'phallic phase.' View A we have discussed above tends to regard the deutero-phallic phase as a natural development, in both sexes, out of a proto-phallic phase, its direction being much the same in the two. View B lays more stress on the extent to which the deutero-phallic phase is a deflection from the earlier one, comprising in important respects even a reversal of the direction of the latter. This may perhaps be most sharply expressed by saying that *the previous heterosexual allo-erotism of the early phase is in the deutero-phallic one—in both sexes—largely transmuted into a substitutive homosexual auto-erotism. This latter*

phase would thus—in both sexes—be not so much a pure libidinal development as a neurotic compromise between libido and anxiety, between the natural libidinal impulses and the wish to avoid mutilation. Strictly speaking, it is not a neurosis proper, inasmuch as the libidinal gratification still open is a conscious one, not unconscious as it is in neurosis. It is rather a sexual aberration and might well be given the name of the *phallic perversion*. It is closely akin to sexual inversion, manifestly so with girls. This connection is so close that—although it is not strictly germane to the purpose of my paper—I will venture to apply to the problem of inversion some considerations that arise from the present theme. It would seem as if inversion is in essence hostility to the rival parent that has been libidinised by the special technique of appropriating the dangerous organs of the opposite sex, organs that have been made dangerous by sadistic projection. We saw earlier to what an extent the genital sadism was derived from the earlier oral sadism, so it may well be that the oral sadism I suggested on an earlier occasion¹ was the specific root of female homosexuality is that of male homosexuality also.²

To avoid any possible misunderstanding I would remind you that the phallic phase, or phallic perversion, is not to be regarded as a definitely fixed entity. We should think of it, as of all similar processes, in dynamic and economic terms. It shows, in other words, every possible variation. It varies in different individuals from slight indications to the most pronounced perversion. And in the same individual it varies in intensity from one period to another according to the current changes in stimulation of the underlying agencies.

Nor do I commit myself to the view that the phallic phase is necessarily pathological, though it obviously may become so through exaggeration or fixation. It is a deviation from the direct path of development, and it is a response to anxiety, but nevertheless, for all we know, research may show that the earliest infantile anxiety is inevitable and that the phallic defence is the only one possible at that age. Nothing but further experience in analysis at early ages can answer such questions. Further, the conclusions here come to do not deny the biological, psychological and social value of the homosexual constituent in human nature; there we come back to our one and only gauge—the degree of free and harmonious functioning in the mental economy.

¹ *Op. cit.*

² Melanie Klein (*op. cit.*, p. 326) traces this to an 'oral-sucking fixation.'

I will allow myself now to single out the *conclusions* which seem to me to be the most significant.

The first is that the typical (deutero-) phallic phase is a perversion subserving, as do all perversions, the function of salvaging some possibility of libidinal gratification until the time comes—if it ever comes—when fear of mutilation can be dealt with and the temporarily renounced hetero-erotic development be once more resumed. The inversion that acts as a defence against the fear depends on the sadism that gave rise to the fear.

Then we would seem to have warrant for recognising more than ever the value of what perhaps has been Freud's greatest discovery—the Œdipus complex. I can find no reason to doubt that for girls, no less than for boys, the Œdipus situation, in its reality and phantasy, is the most fateful psychical event in life.

Lastly I think we should do well to remind ourselves of a piece of wisdom whose source is more ancient than Plato: 'In the beginning . . . male and female created He them.'

EARLY FEMALE SEXUALITY¹

THIS lecture is intended to be the first of a series of exchange lectures between Vienna and London which your Vice-President, Dr. Federn, has proposed for a special purpose. For some years now it has been apparent that many analysts in London do not see eye to eye with their colleagues in Vienna on a number of important topics: among these I might instance the early development of sexuality, especially in the female, the genesis of the super-ego and its relation to the Œdipus complex, the technique of child analysis and the conception of a death instinct. I use the phrase 'many analysts' without attempting to enumerate these, but it is evident that there is some danger of local views becoming unified to such an extent as to enable people to speak of a Vienna school or London school as if they represented different tendencies of a possibly divergent order. This, I am convinced, is in no wise true. The differences are of just that kind that go with imperfect contact, which in the present case are strongly contributed to by geographical and linguistic factors. The political and economic disturbances of the past few years have not brought London and Vienna nearer to each other. Many English analysts do not read the *Zeitschrift*, and still fewer Vienna analysts read the *Journal*. And I have not as yet succeeded in making the interchange of translations between the two as free as I could wish. It is true that German work has much freer access to the *Journal* than English work has to the *Zeitschrift*, but this one-way avenue, far from perfect as it is, is not at all a satisfactory solution. The fact is that new work and ideas in London have not yet, in our opinion, been adequately considered in Vienna.

Dr. Federn has had the happy thought of remedying the present difficulty by arranging a direct personal contact and discussion. In my opinion also this is the most promising way to proceed. In the first place, I have the impression that nowadays far more psycho-analysis is learnt through the spoken than through the written word. The habit of reading has certainly declined among analysts in the

¹ Read before the Vienna Psycho-Analytical Society, April 24, 1935. Published in the *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, Bd. xxi., and in the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, vol. xvi.