

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 (Edipus 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 psychoanalysis 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.

past twenty years and correspondingly the habit of writing has taken on a more narcissistic bent. In the second place, this method enables speakers to be chosen who have prominently identified themselves with one or another point of view or method of investigation.

That I should have selected the present theme to discuss with you is natural. Already at the Innsbruck Congress eight years ago¹ supported a view of female sexual development that did not altogether coincide with the one generally accepted, and at the Wiesbaden Congress three years ago² I amplified my conclusions and also extended them to the problems of male development. Put colloquially, my essential point was that there was more femininity in the young girl than analysts generally admit, and that the masculine phase through which she may pass is more complex in its motivation than is commonly thought; this phase seemed to me a reaction to her dread of femininity as well as something primary. Many women analysts have supported this view. It was Karen Homey who first, in her vigorous fashion, protested that the development of the young girl had been observed too exclusively through male eyes and, although her later views seem to me to be more than questionable, I would pay a tribute to the fresh stimulus she gave to the investigation of these problems. Since then child analysts, particularly Melanie Klein, have been able to get to closer quarters with them and to report direct observations of inestimable value.

Let me now review the themes of chief interest and note separately the points of agreement and of difference. To begin at the beginning. The assumption of inborn bisexuality seems to me a very probable one, in favour of which many biological facts can be quoted. But it is an assumption that is very hard to prove, so I do not think we should take it absolutely for granted and fall back on it whenever we encounter clinical difficulties.

Coming to the beginnings of individual life, we shall agree that at least in the first year, and probably later, the mother plays a much greater part in the girl's life than does the father. Of this phase Freud says, 'Everything connected with this first mother-attachment 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.' What we evidently need, therefore, is a finer analysis of the girl's earliest period of attachment to the mother, and that, in my opinion, is what the 'early analyses'

¹ See Chapter XXV.

² See Chapter XXVI.

of young children are giving us. 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. We begin, therefore, with the most difficult point, the crux of all the problems. Is this first stage a concentration on a single object, the mother? And is it a masculine attitude, as clitoritic masturbation would seem to indicate? Roughly speaking, this would appear to be Freud's view. In that case the girl has in her development to change both her sexual attitude and the sex of her love-object, and the well-known difficulties she experiences in her development would be explained by the complexity of these tasks.

In London, on the contrary, as the result partly of the experience of Melanie Klein's early analyses, but also of our findings in adults, we hold quite a different view of this early stage. We consider that the girl's attitude is already more feminine than masculine, being typically receptive and acquisitive. She is concerned more with the inside of her body than the outside. Her mother she regards not as a man regards a woman, as a creature whose wishes to receive something it is a pleasure to fulfil. She regards her rather as a person who has been successful in filling herself with just the things the child wants so badly, pleasant material of both a solid and liquid kind. Her endeavour is to get this out of the mother, and the various obstacles interposed by the delays and numerous other imperfections of feeding stimulate the aggressive components of her desires. The dissatisfaction with the nipple and the wish for a more adequate penis-like object to suck arises early and is repeated at a later period in the familiar clitoris dissatisfaction and penis-envy. The first wish for a kind of penis is thus induced by oral frustration. At this suckling stage we are still concerned with interest in a part-object, much less with father-love. The part-object is still felt to belong to the mother's body. But the father comes into account as the source whence she obtained it by the oral form of coitus which Freud has shown to be the child's initial conception of this act; indeed, in so far as the girl holds as well the converse of this theory, a *mamma-lingus* as well as a *fellatio* theory of coitus, the father is regarded as a rival for the mother's milk. In the second half of the first year, and regularly by the end of it, the personality of the father plays an increasingly important part. True feminine love for him, together with the desire for access to his sexual organ, begins to conflict with his evident relationship to the mother. In the second year we can definitely speak of an Oedipus complex. It differs from the later more familiar form in being more deeply repressed and unconscious; also the 'combined parent imago' plays a greater part in it.

The girl's sadistic attitude towards the contents of the mother's body is recorded in innumerable phantasies of cutting, robbing and burning that body. The oral sadism soon extends to urethral and anal sadism, and it would seem that the destructive conception of excrement is even more pronounced with girls than with boys. There are two definite reasons why the girl's task of coping with this sadism, and the anxiety it gives rise to, is a good deal harder than the boys. In the first place her anxiety essentially relates to the inside of the body and has no external organ on which to concentrate as the boy's has. There is only the clitoris, which is inferior as a source of reassurance in the respects first emphasised by Karen Horney when she contrasted the boy's freedom in seeing, touching and urinating with his external organ. In later years the girl displaces much of her anxiety to the whole exterior of the body, including her clothes, and obtains reassurance from its integrity and general satisfactoriness, but this plays a much smaller part with the young child. In the second place, the boy has another personal lightning-conductor for his sadism and hate—namely, his sexual rival, the father. The girl, on the contrary, has as her sexual rival and the object of her sadism the same person, the mother, on whom the infant is completely dependent for both libidinal and all other needs of life. To destroy this object would be fatal, so the sadism, with its accompanying anxiety, is pent up and turned inwards far more than with the boy. In a word, the girl has for two reasons less opportunity to exteriorise her sadism. This explains the remarkable attachment to the mother and dependence on her, to which Freud has called special attention in a recent paper. We think that these considerations also yield an explanation of what he termed the obscurity and 'inexorable repression' so characteristic of this stage of development. What I have just been relating of the earliest stage, say the first year of life, seems to be very differently conceived of in Vienna and London, and I am convinced that practically all the differences of opinion in respect of the later stages of development go back to these fundamental ones. Let me next try to show how this is so.

Fortunately we all agree about the importance of the oral stage, and that the oral stage is the prototype of the later femininity is also a widely accepted tenet, though perhaps less so. Helene Deutsch in this connection has pointed to the sucking nature of the vaginal function. The question of early vaginal sensibility is admittedly obscure, but several women analysts, the latest being Dr. Payne and Dr. Brierley, have produced, if not absolutely conclusive, at least highly significant evidence of its occurrence together with breast feeding. It is, however, hard to discriminate between it and vulval sensations on the one hand, and on the other hand the general retentive sensations and phantasies relating to the anus, womb and the inside of the body generally. One can at all events hardly sustain any longer the view that the vaginal attitude does not develop before puberty. The impressive facts of adult vaginal anaesthesia or even dyspareunia, with the suggestion of what they are the negative of, seem to me definitely to refute the idea of the vagina being an indifferent or merely undeveloped organ. They prove rather the erotic cathexis of the vagina and the deep fear of this. The obscurity of the organ in childhood I should attribute to three causes: (1) Phantasies relating to it, those concerning the wish for a penis and baby, are the ones most directly in conflict with the rival mother, and for obvious reasons the girl cannot display her hostility against her mother as much as the boy can against his father. (2) The vagina is the seat of the deepest anxieties, so an extensive displacement outwards takes place, both of its erotogenicity and the accompanying anxieties. It is felt, like the mouth, to be an evil and dangerous organ which must therefore be kept hidden. (3) It has no physical function before menstruation and is relatively inaccessible, facts which prevent it being used as a reality and libidinal reassurance in the way that a penis or even a clitoris can be.

We now come to the penis-clitoris question, and here the sharpest differences of opinion obtain. This is shown most clearly by considering the connection between the question and the relation to the parents. If for brevity you will allow me purposely to exaggerate the differences of opinion, one might say that according to one view the girl

hates her mother because she has disappointed her wish that her clitoris were a penis, whereas according to the other view the reason that the girl wishes that her clitoris were a penis is that she feels hatred for her mother which she cannot express. Similarly according to one view the girl comes to love her father because she is disappointed in her clitoris, whereas according to the other view she wishes to change her clitoris for a penis because of the obstacles in the way of loving her father. You will agree that we have here very decided differences of opinion, even allowing for my over-sharp way of presenting them.

I have elsewhere pointed to the confusion arising from the three senses in which the phrase 'penis-wish' is used in this connection, and will try to avoid it by defining the sense I mean. At the moment we are talking of the wish that the clitoris were a penis, and I trust that this is unambiguous. We are all familiar with the dissatisfaction and resentment connected with this wish and the part it plays in the girl's psychology. But the fact that so many girls envy boys need not blind us to the feminine attributes, her coquetry, etc., and the important fact of the existence of dolls. Now the problem here is the motivation of this wish. We agree that a part of it arises from the simple auto-erotic envy most fully described by Karen Horney: the freedom the boy enjoys in seeing and touching and his use of the organ in micturition. According to one view, however, this is the main motive for the wish, whereas for other authors it accounts for only the smaller part. Far more important, in my opinion, are what may be called the secondary motives for the penis-wish. These, in a word, are concerned with the girl child's various endeavours to cope with her sadism directed against the parents, especially the mother. At the risk of repetition I would again mention and lay stress on what we regard as the fundamental expression of this sadism, the wish to tear a way into the mother's body and devour the father's penis she believes to be incorporated there. What Melanie Klein happily terms the 'combined parent concept' here corresponds approximately to what in Vienna is often called the pre-Œdipal stage, but we would extend the term Œdipus complex to include this stage also. The sadism so characteristic of this stage gives rise to the girl's corresponding anxiety lest the inside of her own body be similarly robbed and destroyed.

Let me now enumerate the ways in which the phantasy of possessing a penis attempts to allay this terrible sadism and its accompanying anxiety. I should start by saying that the value the idea of the penis has for the girl is essentially bound up with its capacity to excrete and direct the flow of urine. Helene Deutsch and Karen Horney have called special attention to this association between penis-envy and urethral sadism, while Melanie Klein and, lately, Marjorie

Brierley have dealt extensively with the intimate connection between oral sadism and urethral sadism. According to the 'isopathic principle' which I expounded before the Oxford Congress, the most successful way of dealing with this repressed urethral sadism would be by finding a way in which it can be expressed in reality and thus provide the reassurance of its not being deadly. This is what the boy can do with his urinary games, thanks to the reassurance afforded by the visibly intact penis.

The girl's idea of the penis is, of course, an ambivalent one. On the one hand, it is good, friendly, nourishing, and the fluid emanating from it is equated to milk. On the other hand, it is evil and destructive, its fluid having a corroding power. The use to which the girl puts her imaginary penis in her phantasies is therefore a double one. In so far as it is evil, sadistic and destructive it is a weapon that can be used to attack the mother in the way she fancies her father does, and thus obtain what she wants from the mother's body. In so far as it is good and beneficent it can be used to restore to the mother the penis the girl thinks she has robbed her of; this is especially so when the girl thinks her father whom she has castrated is impotent to satisfy the mother, an attitude very common in homosexuality. It can also be used to neutralise and thus make good again the bad internalised penis, the one the girl has swallowed and by her sadism turned into a harmful and self-destructive organ inside her own body; a visible and intact penis would be the best reassurance against the inaccessible internal anxieties. Thirdly, it can be used to effect restitution to the castrated father by first identifying herself with him and then developing an intact penis by way of compensation. Behind the girl's wish that her clitoris were a penis, therefore, is the most complex network of phantasies. The aim of them is partly libidinal, but for the most part defensive—consisting of various disparate attempts to get her sadism under control and to allay the desperate anxiety it has engendered. Freud asks in connection with this phallic phase why there should be any flight from femininity unless it were due to primary natural masculine strivings. In answer I should agree with Melanie Klein's conclusion that the girl's repression of femininity springs more from her hatred and fear of her mother than from her own masculine attitude. It goes hand in hand with an excessive fixation on the mother, one which often seriously hampers the girl's development. There is, in our opinion, such a thing as a primary natural wish for a penis on the girl's part, but this we regard not as a masculine striving in clitoris terms, but the normal feminine desire to incorporate a man's penis inside her body—first of all by an oral route, later by a vaginal one.

This wish seems to us to lead on directly to the wish for a baby, the normal wish to take in a penis and convert it into a child. This again is in contradiction to Freud's view that the girl's wish for the child is mainly compensatory for her disappointment in not having a penis of her own. I could agree with Freud's description if it referred not to what we may call the clitoris-penis of the phallic phase, but to the original orally incorporated penis. I think there is no doubt that the disappointment at not being able to receive this penis (not the clitoris one) is largely compensated for by concentration on babies, usually in the form of dolls. We are familiar with the same phenomenon in the excessive

maternalism of some women who, for either internal or external reasons, are deprived of sexual enjoyment. But this is not what Freud means.

I should like to say a word about the girl's attitude towards the father. She transfers to him the guilt and fear she developed towards the mother when sadistically robbing her of the penis. After all it is the father's penis as well as the mother's that she devoured, so he also is injured. There is much more envy and jealousy of the mother than of the father, and much of the latter that we observe clinically is really displaced from the former. But once there is great anxiety about the evil internalised penis, harmful because of the sadistic way by which it was obtained, the homœopathic principle again comes into play. Then the girl, as we so commonly find with homosexuals, is impelled to bite the man's penis off so as to obtain reassurance for the anxiety of the original phantasies. If, on the other hand, the relation to the mother is predominantly a good and affectionate one, that to the father will develop on less sadistic lines and will become satisfactory.

We come now to the passing of the phallic phase and the development of a manifest femininity. Here also we must expect divided opinions, since it is easy to see that the view taken of this stage in development must be profoundly influenced by that of the earlier ones. In the first place, just as I am more sceptical about the existence of the phallic phase as a stage in development, so am I more sceptical than the Viennese seem to be about the idea of its passing. It would seem to be more accurate to use the expression 'phallic position' to describe the phenomena in question. We are concerned with an emotional attitude² rather than a stage in libidinal development. This attitude is maintained by certain forces or needs, diminishes whenever these are weaker, but persists just so long as they persist—often throughout life. The 'phallic position' is not seldom quite as pronounced at the age of six, ten or thirty as at the age of two or three. What Viennese analysts describe as the passing of the phallic phase is rather the period in which they recognise the femininity of the girl which many London analysts think they can recognise earlier in its more repressed state. There remains, it is true, the question why the femininity is often less repressed, and therefore more visible, as the girl grows, and this question I propose to deal with next.

You may remember the distinction I drew in my Wiesbaden paper between the proto-phallic and the deutero-phallic phases, the separation between them being marked by the conscious discovery of the sex difference. This discovery often results in envy and imitation, which are the main characteristics of the deutero-phallic phase. One very important observation about which there is general agreement is that the passing of this phase—or rather the plainer evidence of femininity—is apt to be accompanied by unmistakable hostility and resentment against the mother. Freud in his explanation has coupled these two events together not only chronologically but intrinsically. The reasons he gives for the girl's emerging from the phallic phase can be summarised in one word—disappointment. The girl comes to realise that her wish to have a penis of her own is doomed to disappointment, and so she wisely resigns herself to seeking other sources of pleasure that will console her. In doing so she exchanges both her own sex, from male to female, and that of her love-object, from mother to father. The passing of the deutero-phallic phase, therefore, ushers in the CE₂dipus complex with its rivalry with the mother. This accords with the undoubted observation that the normal CE₂dipus situation is more visible after the phallic phase has weakened. As Jeanne Lampl-de Groot concisely puts it, the girl has to traverse an inverted CE₂dipus situation before arriving at the normal one.

¹ Cp. 'libido position/ and the psychotic 'positions' in Melanie Klein's Lucerne paper.

² Not so much one of definite ideas.

In London, on the other hand, we regard the deutero-phallic phase as essentially a defence against the *already existing* CE₂dipus complex. To us, therefore, the problem of why the defensive phallic phase comes to an end puts itself quite differently, being not altogether unlike the problem of why an infantile phobia ever disappears.

The answer I should give resembles Freud's in so far as both could be given in terms of 'adaptation to reality.' But the way in which the impressions of reality work does not seem to me at all the same as they do to Freud.

Fundamentally they strengthen ego development at the expense of phantasy. The phantasy of the penis as a defence is given up because (1) it is recognised as a phantasy and therefore not an adequate protection, (2) there is less anxiety and therefore less need for defence, and (3) other defences are available.

Let me now consider these reasons in order. We know that there are definite limits to the power of hallucinatory wish-fulfilments, at least in the normal person, a fact which Freud has often illustrated by the case of hunger. This is true whether the wish is for the satisfaction of a body need—*e.g.*, a libidinal one—or for a protection against anxiety. In this case the phantasied protection is found not to work well just because it does not give the reassurance of external reality, which is what the girl needs and is what she is beginning to find elsewhere.

In the second place, her anxiety has diminished as her ego has got stronger. She is better able to see her mother as a real and usually affectionate person rather than as the imaginary ogre of her phantasy. She is also no longer so dependent on her mother as she was in the first two or three years of life. She can therefore afford to display more sadism against her and other persons of the environment instead of locking it up and developing internal anxiety. This is the well-recognised stage when the environment finds the growing girl 'difficult' and hard to manage.

Thirdly, the girl is now learning to exteriorize both her libido and her anxiety. She has passed the stage of part-object love and is more interested in her father or brother as a whole.

This replaces the early part-object incorporated in the mother. Her anxiety is much less internal and is taking the form of the characteristic dread of desertion, one that often lasts through life.

The young girl is now much bolder in her claims, and dares for the first time to be the open rival of her mother. The resentment she displays against her has not only the meaning Freud attaches to it, of reproach that her clitoris is not a penis, but is also the bursting through of the older animosity long pent up. It is not merely the reproach that her mother gave her only a clitoris, it is the reproach that her mother had always kept the breast and the father's penis in her possession and not allowed the girl to incorporate them into her body to her heart's desire. The sight of a boy's penis is not the sole traumatic event that changes her life; it is only the last link in a long chain. Nor do I think that if a girl never experienced this trauma she would be masculine, which would seem to follow from the view that this is what drives her into femininity.

I may now sum up my contentions in a few sentences. The main facts to be explained are the young girl's desire for a penis and her resentment against her mother. The central difference between the two points of view, which for present purposes I have exaggeratedly called the London and Vienna ones, seems to me to turn on the question of the early CEdipus complex, ushered in by oral dissatisfaction. Being unable to cope with the anxiety this engenders, she more or less temporarily takes flight in the 'phallic phase' and then later resumes her normal development. This view seems to me more in accord with the ascertainable facts, and also intrinsically more probable, than one which would regard her femininity to be the result of an external experience (viewing a penis). To my mind, on the contrary, her femininity develops progressively from the promptings of an instinctual constitution. In short, I do not see a woman—in the way feminists do—as *un homme manqué*, as a permanently disappointed creature struggling to console herself with secondary substitutes alien to her true nature. The ultimate question is whether a woman is born or made.

Put more generally, I think the Viennese would reproach us with estimating the early phantasy life too highly at the expense of external reality. And we should answer that there is no serious danger of any analysts neglecting external reality, whereas it is always possible for them to underestimate Freud's doctrine of the importance of psychical reality.