

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF
PSYCHO-ANALYSIS

VOLUME VIII

OCTOBER 1927

PART 4

ORIGINAL PAPERS

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF FEMALE SEXUALITY¹

BY

ERNEST JONES

LONDON

Freud has more than once commented on the fact that our knowledge of the early stages in female development is much more obscure and imperfect than that of male development, and Karen Horney has forcibly, though justly, pointed out that this must be connected with the greater tendency to bias that exists on the former subject. It is probable that this tendency to bias is common to the two sexes, and it would be well if every writer on the subject kept this consideration in the foreground of his mind throughout. Better still, it is to be hoped that analytic investigation will gradually throw light on the nature of the prejudice in question and ultimately dispel it. There is a healthy suspicion growing that men analysts have been led to adopt an unduly phallo-centric view of the problems in question, the importance of the female organs being correspondingly underestimated. Women have on their side contributed to the general mystification by their secretive attitude towards their own genitals and by displaying a hardly disguised preference for interest in the male organ.

The immediate stimulus to the investigation on which the present paper is mainly based was provided by the unusual experience, a couple of years ago, of having to analyse at the same time five cases of manifest homosexuality in women. The analyses were all deep ones and lasted from three to five years; they have been completed in three of the cases and carried to a far stage in the other two. Among the numerous

¹ Read at the Tenth International Congress of Psycho-Analysis, Innsbruck, September 1st, 1927.

problems thus aroused two particular ones may serve as a starting-point for the considerations I wish to bring forward here. They were: what precisely in women corresponds with the fear of castration in men? and what differentiates the development of homosexual from that of heterosexual women? It will be noticed that these two questions are closely related, the word 'penis' indicating the point of connection between them.

A few clinical facts about these cases may be of interest, though I do not propose to relate any casuistic material. Three of the patients were in the twenties and two in the thirties. Only two of the five had an entirely negative attitude towards men. It was not possible to establish any consistent rule in respect of their conscious attitude towards the parents: all varieties occurred, negative towards the father with either negative or positive towards the mother, and *vice versa*. In all five cases, however, it proved that the unconscious attitude towards both parents was strongly ambivalent. In all cases there was evidence of an unusually strong infantile fixation in regard to the mother, this being definitely connected with the oral stage. This was always succeeded by a strong father fixation, whether it was temporary or permanent in consciousness.

The first of the two questions mentioned above might also be formulated as follows: when the girl feels that she has already suffered castration, what imagined future event can evoke dread proportionate to the dread of castration? In attempting to answer this question, i.e. to account for the fact that women suffer from dread at least as much as men, I came to the conclusion that the concept 'castration' has in some respects hindered our appreciation of the fundamental conflicts. We have here in fact an example of what Horney has indicated as an unconscious bias from approaching such studies too much from the male point of view. In his illuminating discussion of the penis complex in women, Abraham² had remarked that there was no reason for not applying the word 'castration' there as well as with men, for wishes and fears about the penis of a parallel order occur in both. To agree with this statement, however, does not involve overlooking the differences in the two cases, nor should it blind us to the danger of importing into the one considerations with which we are already familiar in the other. Freud has justly remarked in connection with the pregenital precursors of castration (weaning and defaecation,

² Abraham, *Selected Papers*, 1927, p. 339.

pointed out by Stärcke and myself respectively) that the psycho-analytical concept of castration, as distinguished from the corresponding biological one, refers definitely to the penis alone—the testicles at most being included in addition.

Now the fallacy to which I wish to draw attention here is this. The all-important part normally played in male sexuality by the genital organs naturally tends to make us equate castration with the abolition of sexuality altogether. This fallacy often creeps into our arguments even though we know that many men wish to be castrated for, among others, erotic reasons, so that their sexuality certainly does not disappear with the surrender of the penis. With women, where the whole penis idea is always partial and mostly secondary in nature, this should be still more evident. In other words, the prominence of castration fears among men tends sometimes to make us forget that in both sexes castration is only a *partial* threat, however important a one, against sexual capacity and enjoyment as a whole. For the main blow of total extinction we might do well to use a separate term, such as the Greek word 'aphanisis'.

If we pursue to its roots the fundamental fear which lies at the basis of all neuroses we are driven, in my opinion, to the conclusion that what it really signifies is this aphanisis, the total, and of course permanent, extinction of the capacity (including opportunity) for sexual enjoyment. After all, this is the consciously avowed intention of most adults towards children. Their attitude is quite uncompromising: children are not to be permitted *any* sexual gratification. And we know that to the child the idea of indefinite postponement is much the same as that of permanent refusal. We cannot, of course, expect that the unconscious, with its highly concrete nature, will express itself for us in these abstract terms, which admittedly represent a generalization. The nearest approach to the idea of aphanisis that we meet with clinically is that of castration and of death thoughts (conscious dread of death and unconscious death wishes). I may cite here an obsessional case in a young man which illustrates the same point. He had substituted as his *summum bonum* the idea of æsthetic enjoyment for that of sexual gratification, and his castration fears took the form of apprehension lest he should lose his capacity for this enjoyment; behind them being of course the concrete idea of the loss of the penis.

From this point of view we see that the question under discussion was wrongly put. The male dread of being castrated may or may not have a precise female counterpart, but what is more important is to

realize that this dread is only a special case and that both sexes ultimately dread exactly the same thing, aphanisis. The mechanism whereby this is supposed to be brought about shews important differences in the two sexes. If we neglect for the moment the sphere of auto-erotism—on the justifiable ground that conflicts here owe their main importance to the subsequent allo-erotic cathexis of it—and thus confine our attention to allo-erotism itself, we may say that the reconstructed train of thought in the male is somewhat as follows: 'I wish to obtain gratification by committing a particular act, but I dare not do so because I fear that it would be followed by the punishment of aphanisis, by castration that would mean for me the permanent extinction of sexual pleasure'. The corresponding thought in the female, with her more passive nature, is characteristically somewhat different: 'I wish to obtain gratification through a particular experience, but I dare not take any steps towards bringing it about, such as asking for it and thus confessing my guilty wish, because I fear that to do so would be followed by aphanisis'. It is, of course, plain that this difference is not only not invariable, but is in any event only one of degree. In both cases there is activity, though it is more overt and vigorous with the male. This is not, however, the main difference in accent; a more important one depends on the fact that, for obvious physiological reasons, the female is much more dependent on her partner for her gratification than is the male on his. Venus had much more trouble with Adonis, for example, than Pluto with Persephone.

The last consideration mentioned provides the biological reason for the most important psychological differences in the behaviour and attitude of the sexes. It leads directly to a greater dependence (as distinct from desire) of the female on the willingness and moral approbation of the partner than we usually find with the male, where the corresponding sensitiveness occurs in respect of another, authoritative male. Hence, among other things, the more characteristic reproaches and need for reassurance on the woman's part. Among the important social consequences the following may be mentioned. It is well known that the morality of the world is essentially a male creation. and—what is much more curious—that the moral ideals of women are mainly copied from those of men. This must certainly be connected with the fact, pointed out by Helene Deutsch,³ that the super-ego of

³ Helene Deutsch, *Zur Psychologie der weiblichen Sexualfunktionen*, 1925, S. 9.

women is, like that of men, predominantly derived from reactions to the father. Another consequence, which brings us back to our main discussion, is that the mechanism of aphanisis tends to differ in the two sexes. Whereas with the male this is typically conceived of in the active form of castration, with the female the primary fear would appear to be that of separation. This can be imagined as coming about through the rival mother intervening between the girl and the father, or even through her sending the girl away for ever, or else through the father simply withholding the desired gratification. The deep fear of being deserted that most women have is a derivative of the latter.

At this point it is possible to obtain from the analysis of women a deeper insight than from that of men into the important question of the relation between privation and guilt, in other words into the genesis of the super-ego. In his paper on the passing of the Œdipus complex Freud suggested that this happened in the female as the direct result of continued disappointment (privation), and we know that the super-ego is as much the heir of this complex in the female as in the male where it is the product of the guilt derived from the dread of castration. It follows, and my analytical experience fully confirms the conclusion,⁴ that sheer privation comes, of course in both sexes, to have just the same meaning as deliberate deprivation on the part of the human environment. We thus reach the formula: *Privation is equivalent to frustration*. It is even likely that, as may be inferred from Freud's remarks on the passing of the female Œdipus complex, privation alone may be an adequate cause for the genesis of guilt. To discuss this further would take us too far into the structure of the super-ego and away from the present theme, but I should like just to mention a view I have reached which is sufficiently germane to the latter. It is that guilt, and with it the super-ego, is as it were artificially built up for the purpose of protecting the child from the stress of privation, i.e. of ungratified libido, and so warding off the dread of aphanisis that always goes with this; it does so, of course, by damping down the wishes that are not destined to be gratified. I even think that the external disapproval, to which the whole of this process used to be ascribed, is largely an affair of exploitation on the child's part; that is to say, non-gratification primarily means danger, and the child projects this into the outer

⁴ This was reached partly in conjunction with Mrs. Riviere, whose views are expounded in another context, JOURNAL, Vol. VIII, pp. 374-5.

world, as it does with all internal dangers, and then makes use of any disapproval that comes to meet it there (*moralisches Entgegenkommen*) to signalize the danger and to help it in constructing a barrier against this.

To return once more to the young girl, we are faced with the task of tracing the various stages in development from the initial oral one. The view commonly accepted is that the nipple, or artificial teat, is replaced, after a little dallying with the thumb, by the clitoris as the chief source of pleasure, just as it is with boys by the penis. Freud⁵ holds that it is the comparative unsatisfactoriness of this solution which automatically guides the child to seek for a better external penis, and thus ushers in the Œdipus situation where the wish for a baby⁶ gradually replaces that for a penis. My own analyses, as do Melanie Klein's 'early analyses', indicate that in addition to this there are more direct transitions between the oral and the Œdipus stages. It would seem to me that the tendencies derived from the former stage bifurcate early into clitoris and fellatio directions, i.e. into digital plucking at the clitoris and fellatio phantasies respectively; the proportion between the two would naturally be different in different cases, and this may be expected to have fateful consequences for the later development.

We have now to follow these lines of development in closer detail, and I will first sketch what I conceive to be the more normal mode of development, that leading to heterosexuality. Here the sadistic phase sets in late, and so neither the oral nor the clitoris stage receives any strong sadistic cathexis. In consequence, the clitoris does not become associated with a particularly active masculine attitude (thrusting forward, etc.), nor on the other hand is the oral-sadistic phantasy of biting off the male penis at all highly developed. The oral attitude is mainly a sucking one and passes by the well-known developmental transition into the anal stage. The two alimentary orifices thus constitute the receptive female organ. The anus is evidently identified with the vagina to begin with, and the differentiation of the two is an extremely obscure process, more so perhaps than any other in female development; I surmise, however, that it takes place in part at an earlier age than is generally supposed. A variable amount of sadism

⁵ Freud, *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS*, Vol. VIII, p. 140.

⁶ Little is said throughout this paper about the wish for a baby because I am mainly dealing with early stages. I regard the wish as a later derivative of the anal and phallic trends.

is always developed in connection with the anal stage and is revealed in the familiar phantasies of anal rape which may or may not pass over into beating phantasies. The Oedipus relationship is here in full activity; and the anal phantasies, as we shall shew later, are already a compromise between libidinal and self-punishment tendencies. This mouth-anus-vagina stage, therefore, represents an identification with the mother.

What in the meantime has been the attitude towards the penis? It is likely enough that the initial one is purely positive,⁷ manifested by the desire to suck it. But penis-envy soon sets in and apparently always. The primary, so to speak auto-erotic, reasons for this have been well set out by Karen Horney⁸ in her discussion of the part played by the organ in urinary, exhibitionistic, scopophilic and masturbatory activities. The wish to possess a penis as the male does passes normally, however, into the wish to share his penis in some coitus-like action by means of the mouth, anus or vagina. Various sublimations and reactions shew that no woman escapes the early penis-envy stage, but I fully agree with Karen Horney,⁸ Helene Deutsch,¹⁰ Melanie Klein,¹¹ and other workers in their view that what we meet with clinically as penis-envy in the neuroses is only in small part derived from this source. We have to distinguish between what may perhaps be termed pre-Oedipus and post-Oedipus penis-envy (more accurately, auto-erotic and allo-erotic penis-envy), and I am convinced that clinically the latter is much the more significant of the two. Just as masturbatory and other auto-erotic activities owe their main importance to re-investment from allo-erotic sources, so we have to recognize that many clinical phenomena depend on the defensive function of regression, recently insisted on by Freud.¹² It is the privation resulting from the continued disappointment at never being

⁷ Helene Deutsch (*op. cit.*, S. 19) records an interesting observation in a girl-child of eighteen months who viewed a penis with apparent indifference at that time, and who only later developed affective reactions.

⁸ Karen Horney, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS, Vol. V, pp. 52-54.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

¹⁰ Helene Deutsch, *op. cit.*, S. 16-18.

¹¹ Melanie Klein, communications to the British Psycho-Analytical Society.

¹² Freud, *Hemmung, Symptom und Angst*, 1926, S. 48, etc.

allowed to share the penis in coitus with the father, or thereby to obtain a baby, that reactivates the girl's early wish to possess a penis of her own. According to the theory put forward above, it is this privation that is primarily the unendurable situation, the reason being that it is tantamount to the fundamental dread of aphanisis. Guilt, and the building-up of the super-ego, is, as was explained above, the first and invariable defence against the unendurable privation. But this is too negative a solution in itself; the libido must come to expression somehow as well.

There are only two possible ways in which the libido can flow in this situation, though both may, of course, be attempted. The girl must choose, broadly speaking, between sacrificing her erotic attachment to her father and sacrificing her femininity, i.e. her anal identification with the mother. Either the object must be exchanged for another one or the wish must be; it is impossible to retain both. Either the father or the vagina (including pregenital vaginas) must be renounced. In the first case feminine wishes are developed on the adult plane—i.e. diffuse erotic charm (narcissism), positive vaginal attitude towards coitus, culminating in pregnancy and child-birth—and are transferred to more accessible objects. In the second case the bond with the father is retained, but the object-relationship in it is converted into identification, i.e. a penis complex is developed.

More will be said in the next section about the precise way in which this identification defence operates, but what I should like to lay stress on at the moment is the interesting parallelism thus established, already hinted at by Horney,¹³ between the solutions of the Oedipus conflict in the two sexes. The boy also is threatened with aphanisis, the familiar castration fear, by the inevitable privation of his incest wishes. He also has to make the choice between changing the wish and changing the object, between renouncing his mother and renouncing his masculinity, i.e. his penis. We have thus obtained a generalization which applies in a unitary manner to boy and girl alike: *faced with aphanisis as the result of inevitable privation, they must renounce either their sex or their incest*; what cannot be retained, except at the price of neurosis, is hetero-erotic and allo-erotic incest, i.e. an incestuous object-relationship. In both cases the situation of prime difficulty is the simple, but fundamental, one of union between penis and vagina. Normally this union is made possible by the overcoming of the Oedipus complex. When, on

¹³ Karen Horney, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

the other hand, the solution of inversion is attempted every effort is made to avoid the union, because it is bound up with the dread of aphanisis. The individual, whether male or female, then identifies his sexual integrity with possessing the organ of the opposite sex and becomes pathologically dependent on it. With boys this can be done either by using their mouth or anus as the necessary female organ (towards either a man or a masculine woman) or else by vicariously adopting the genitalia of a woman with whom they identify themselves; in the latter case they are dependent on the woman who carries the precious object and develop anxiety if she is absent or if anything in her attitude makes the organ difficult of access. With girls the same alternative presents itself, and they become pathologically dependent on either possessing a penis themselves in their imagination or on having unobstructed access to that of the man with whom they have identified themselves. If the 'condition of dependence' (cp. Freud's phrase "Liebesbedingung") is not fulfilled the individuals, man or woman, approach an aphanistic state, or, in looser terminology, 'feel castrated'. They alternate, therefore, between potency on the basis of inverted gratification and aphanisis. To put it more simply, they either have an organ of the opposite sex or none at all; to have one of their own sex is out of the question.

We have next to turn to the second of our two questions, the difference in the development of heterosexual and homosexual women. This difference was indicated in our discussion of the two alternative solutions of the Oedipus conflict, but it has now to be pursued in further detail. The divergence there mentioned—which, it need hardly be said, is always a matter of degree—between those who surrender the position of their object-libido (father) and those who surrender the position of their subject-libido (sex), can be followed into the field of homosexuality itself. One can distinguish two broad groups here. (1) Those who retain their interest in men, but who set their hearts on being accepted by men as one of themselves. To this group belongs the familiar type of women who ceaselessly complain of the unfairness of women's lot and their unjust ill-treatment by men. (2) Those who have little or no interest in men, but whose libido centres on women. Analysis shews that this interest in women is a vicarious way of enjoying femininity; they merely employ other women to exhibit it for them.¹⁴

¹⁴ For the sake of simplicity an interesting third form is omitted in the text, but should be mentioned. Some women obtain gratification of

It is not hard to see that the former group corresponds with the class in our previous division where the sex of the subject is surrendered, while the latter group corresponds with those who surrender the object (the father), replacing him by themselves through identification. I will amplify this condensed statement for the sake of greater clarity. The members of the first group exchange their own sex, but retain their first love-object; the object-relationship, however, becomes replaced by identification, and the aim of the libido is to procure recognition of this identification by the former object. The members of the second group also identify themselves with the love-object, but then lose further interest in him; their external object-relationship to the other woman is very imperfect, for she merely represents their own femininity through identification, and their aim is vicariously to enjoy the gratification of this at the hand of an unseen man (the father incorporated in themselves).

Identification with the father is thus common to all forms of homosexuality, though it proceeds to a more complete degree in the first group than in the second, where, in a vicarious way, some femininity is after all retained. There is little doubt that this identification serves the function of keeping feminine wishes in repression. It constitutes the most complete denial imaginable of the accusation of harbouring guilty feminine wishes, for it asserts, 'I cannot possibly desire a man's penis for my gratification, since I already possess one of my own, or at all events I want nothing else than one of my own'. Expressed in terms of the theory developed earlier in this paper, it assures the most complete defence against the aphanistic danger of privation from the non-gratification of the incest wishes. The defence is in fact so well designed that it is little wonder that indications of it can be detected in all girls passing through the Oedipus stage of development, though the extent to which it is retained later is extremely variable. I would even venture the opinion that when Freud postulated a 'phallic' stage in female development corresponding with that in the male, i.e. a stage in which all the interest appears to relate to the male organ only with obliteration of the vaginal or pre-vaginal organs, he was

feminine desires provided two conditions are present: (1) that the penis is replaced by a surrogate such as the tongue or finger, and (2) that the partner using this organ is a woman instead of a man. Though clinically they may appear in the guise of complete inversion, such cases are evidently nearer to the normal than either of the two mentioned in the text.

giving a clinical description of what may be observed rather than a final analysis of the actual libidinal position at that stage; for it seems to me likely that the phallic stage in normal girls is but a mild form of the father-penis identification of female homosexuals, and, like it, of an essentially secondary and defensive nature.

Horney¹⁶ has pointed out that for a girl to maintain a feminine position and to accept the absence of a penis in herself often signifies not only the daring to have incestuous object-wishes, but also the phantasy that her physical state is the result of a castrating rape once actually performed by the father. The penis identification, therefore, implies a denial of both forms of guilt, the wish that the incestuous deed may happen in the future and the wish-fulfilment phantasy that it has already happened in the past. She further points out the greater advantage that this heterosexual identification presents to girls than to boys, because the defensive advantage common to both is strengthened with the former by the reinforcement of narcissism derived from the old pre-Ædipus sources of envy (urinary, exhibitionistic and masturbatory) and weakened with the latter by the blow to narcissism involved in the acceptance of castration.

As this identification is to be regarded as a universal phenomenon among young girls, we have to seek further for the motives that heighten it so extraordinarily and in such a characteristic way among those who later become homosexual. Here I must present my conclusions on this point even more briefly than those on the former ones. The fundamental—and, so far as one can see, inborn—factors that are decisive in this connection appear to be two—namely, an unusual intensity of oral erotism and of sadism respectively. These converge in an *intensification of the oral-sadistic stage*, which I would regard, in a word, as *the central characteristic of homosexual development in women*.

The sadism shews itself not only in the familiar muscular manifestations, with the corresponding derivatives of these in character, but also in imparting a specially active (thrusting) quality to the clitoris impulses, which naturally heightens the value of any penis that may be acquired in phantasy. Its most characteristic manifestation, however, is to be found in the oral-sadistic impulse forcibly to wrench the penis from the man by the act of biting. When, as is often found, the sadistic temperament is accompanied by a ready reversal of love to hate, with the familiar ideas of injustice, resentment and revenge,

¹⁶ *Idem, loc. cit.*

then the biting phantasies gratify both the desire to obtain a penis by force and also the impulse to revenge themselves on the man by castrating him.

The high development of the oral erotism is manifested in the numerous ways well known through the researches of Abraham¹⁶ and Edward Glover¹⁷; they may be positive or negative in consciousness. A special feature, however, to which attention should be called is the importance of the tongue in such cases. The identification of tongue with penis, with which Flügel¹⁸ and I¹⁹ have dealt at length, reaches with some female homosexuals a quite extraordinary degree of completeness. I have seen cases where the tongue was an almost entirely satisfactory substitute for the penis in homosexual activities. It is evident that the nipple fixation here implied favours the development of homosexuality in two ways. It makes it harder for the girl to pass from the fellatio position to that of vaginal coitus, and it also makes it easier to have recourse once more to a woman as the object of libido.

A further interesting correlation may be effected at this point. The two factors mentioned above of oral erotism and sadism appear to correspond very well with the two classes of homosexuals. Where the oral erotism is the more prominent of the two the individual will probably belong to the second group (interest in women) and where the sadism is the more prominent to the first group (interest in men).

A word should be said about the important factors that influence the *later* development of female homosexuality. We have said that, to protect herself against aphanisis, the girl erects various barriers, notably penis identification, against her femininity. Prominent among these is a strong sense of guilt and condemnation concerning feminine wishes; most often this is for the greater part unconscious. As an aid to this barrier of guilt the idea is developed of 'men' (i.e. the father) being strongly opposed to feminine wishes. To help her own condemnation of it she is forced to believe that all men in their hearts disapprove of femininity. To meet this comes the unfortunate circumstance that many men do really evince disparagement of women's

¹⁶ Abraham, *op. cit.*, ch. xii.

¹⁷ Edward Glover, 'Notes on Oral Character Formation', *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS*, Vol. VI, p. 131.

¹⁸ J. C. Flügel, 'A Note on the Phallic Significance of the Tongue', *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PSYCHO-ANALYSIS*, Vol. VI., p. 209.

¹⁹ Ernest Jones, *Essays in Applied Psycho-Analysis*, 1923, ch. viii.

sexuality together with dread of the female organ. There are several reasons for this, into which we need not enter here; they all centre around the male castration complex. The homosexual woman, however, seizes with avidity on any manifestations of this attitude and can by means of them sometimes convert her deep belief into a complete delusional system. Even in milder forms it is quite common to find both men and women ascribing the whole of the supposed inferiority of women²⁰ to the social influences which the deeper tendencies have exploited in the way just indicated.

I will conclude with a few remarks on the subjects of dread and punishment among women in general. The ideas relating to these may be connected mainly with the mother or mainly with the father. In my experience the former is more characteristic of the heterosexual and the latter more of the homosexual. The former appears to be a simple retaliation for the death wishes against the mother, who will punish the girl by coming between her and the father, by sending the girl away for ever, or by in any other way seeing to it that her incestuous wishes remain ungratified. The girl's answer is partly to retain her femininity at the cost of renouncing the father and partly to obtain vicarious gratification of her incest wishes in her imagination through identification with the mother.

When the dread mainly relates to the father the punishment takes the obvious form of his withholding gratification of her wishes, and this rapidly passes over into the idea of his disapproval of them. Rebuff and desertion are the common conscious expressions of this punishment. If this privation takes place on the oral plane the answer is resentment and castrating (biting) phantasies. If it takes place on the later anal plane the outcome is rather more favourable. Here the girl manages to combine her erotic wishes with the idea of being punished in a single act—namely, of anal-vaginal rape; the familiar phantasies of being beaten are, of course, a derivative of this. As was remarked above, this is one of the ways in which incest gets equated with castration, so that the penis phantasy is a protection against both.

We may now *recapitulate the main conclusions* reached here. For different reasons both boys and girls tend to view sexuality in terms of the penis alone, and it is necessary for analysts to be sceptical in this direction. The concept 'castration' should be reserved, as Freud

²⁰ Really, their inferiority as women.

pointed out, for the penis alone and should not be confounded with that of 'extinction of sexuality', for which the term 'aphanisis' is proposed. Privation in respect of sexual wishes evokes with the child the fear of aphanisis, i.e. is equivalent to the dread of frustration. Guilt arises rather from within as a defence against this situation than as an imposition from without, though the child exploits any *moralisches Entgegenkommen* in the outer world.

The oral-erotic stage in the young girl passes directly into the fellatio and clitoris stages, and the former of these then into the anal-erotic stage; the mouth, anus and vagina thus form an equivalent series for the female organ. The repression of the incest wishes results in regression to the pre-Œdipus, or auto-erotic, penis-envy as a defence against them. The penis-envy met with clinically is principally derived from this reaction on the allo-erotic plane, the identification with the father essentially representing denial of femininity. Freud's 'phallic phase' in girls is probably a secondary, defensive construction rather than a true developmental stage.

To avoid neurosis both the boy and the girl have to overcome the Œdipus conflict in the same way: they can surrender either the love-object or their own sex. In the latter, homosexual solution they become dependent on imagined possession of the organ of the opposite sex, either directly or through identification with another person of that sex. This yields the two main forms of homosexuality.

The essential factors that decide whether a girl will develop the father-identification in such a high degree as to constitute a clinical inversion are specially intense oral erotism and sadism, which typically combine in an intense oral-sadistic stage. If the former of these two factors is the more prominent one the inversion takes the form of dependence on another woman, with lack of interest in men; the subject is male, but enjoys femininity also through identification with a feminine woman whom she gratifies by a penis substitute, most typically the tongue. Prominence of the second factor leads to occupation with men, the wish being to obtain from them recognition of the subject's male attributes; it is this type that shews so often resentment against men, with castrating (biting) phantasies in respect of them.

The heterosexual woman dreads the mother more than the homosexual woman does, whose dread centres around the father. The punishment feared in the latter case is withdrawal (desertion) on the oral level, beating on the anal one (rectal assault).