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The papers included in this collection were originally published in *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, with two exceptions. Karl Abraham's 'Origins and Growth of Object-Love', central to the debate, appeared in his *Selected Writings* and Helene Deutsch's 'On Female Homosexuality' appeared in the first volume of the new American journal, *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. They cover a period from June 1917, when Johan van Ophuijsen presented his paper on the masculinity complex in women to the Dutch Psycho-Analytical Society, to April 1935, when Ernest Jones read a paper on early female sexuality to the Vienna Psycho-Analytical Society.

Though these papers are often referred to in discussions of female sexuality, and though some individual papers have been reproduced elsewhere, they have never before appeared together as a collection. Anyone who has read these papers will be aware of their importance to the topic of female sexuality. But it is not the theme alone that unifies the collection; there are two further considerations of equal importance: the dialogue and debate that take place between the papers, from first to last; and the considerable impact they had on the development of certain of Freud's key theses. The papers have a clear historical interest, then, but rereading them today will also show their continuing relevance to debates within and outside psychoanalysis on female sexuality.

We have corrected some minor typographical, grammatical and spelling errors in the original articles. Where subsequent and more readily accessible versions of important works are available, we have updated the references. This includes all references to Freud's work, which have been altered to volume and page number of *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 24 vols. (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1953-1974).

The articles have been placed in chronological order according to date of publication. The one exception to this is Van Ophuijsen's paper, which opens the collection. This is because it was presented and subsequently debated in the literature, quite some time before appearing in print.
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Karl Abraham (1877 - 1925)

As a member of Freud's inner circle, the 'Committee', Karl Abraham played a prominent role in the development of psychoanalysis. Trained as a psychiatrist, Abraham first met Freud in 1907 and soon became a close personal friend. Abraham established the first psychoanalytic practice in Berlin and, in 1910, founded the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society. He quickly established a successful practice and was highly sought after as a training analyst. Among the analysts he trained were Melanie Klein, Helene Deutsch, Edward Glover, James Glover and Sándor Rado. His untimely death in 1925 prompted Freud to state that 'Abraham's death is perhaps the greatest loss that could strike us, and it has struck us'. During his relatively short lifetime Abraham produced a number of important writings on psychoanalytic theory and practice. These have been published in The Selected Papers of Karl Abraham.

Marie Bonaparte (1882 - 1952)

Marie Bonaparte went to Vienna for an analysis with Freud in 1925. She subsequently came to play a central role in institutionalising and expanding psychoanalysis in France, using her considerable wealth to support both the Psychoanalytic Society of Paris and the International Psychoanalytical Association. In 1938 after Nazi Germany’s annexation of Austria, Bonaparte played a leading role in securing Freud’s passage out of Austria to Britain. She wrote widely on psychoanalysis and female sexuality, especially in relation to female anatomy. Her Female Sexuality (1951) provides her most complete treatment of this theme.

Ruth Mack Brunswick (1897 - 1946)

An American, Ruth Mack Brunswick went to Vienna in 1922 for an analysis with Freud. At that time she was married to a cardiologist named Hermann Blumgart from whom she separated while in Vienna. Though she is mainly known as one of Freud's patients and pupils, she began practicing as a psychoanalyst in 1925. In 1926 Freud referred to her his patient Sergei Pankejeff, better known as the 'Wolf Man'. In the words of Freud to his son Ernst, 'Ruth almost belongs to the family,' and in March 1927 Freud
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acted as witness when she married the composer Mark Brunswick. On Monday 14 September 1936, she filmed the Freuds' golden wedding celebrations.

Helene Deutsch (1884 - 1982)

Helene Deutsch spent her childhood in what is now Poland. In 1907 Deutsch enrolled at the University of Vienna to train as a doctor and went on to specialize in psychiatry. By 1918 she had joined the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society and shortly afterwards began an analysis with Freud. She rapidly came to prominence in the Society and in 1924 was appointed head of the Society’s newly established Training Institute. In 1935 Deutsch migrated to the United States to take up a position in Boston, where she remained, teaching, writing and analysing until her death in 1982. Her later views on female sexuality are to be found in her two volume work, The Psychology of Women.

Otto Fenichel (1898 - 1946)

Otto Fenichel was one of the younger members of the Berlin group. Analyzed by the Hungarian analyst Sandor Rado, Fenichel went on to establish himself as a highly regarded teacher and practitioner of psychoanalysis. His pedagogic reputation led to a number of positions in the 1930s, culminating in a training position in Los Angeles in 1938. Shortly before his premature death at the age of 48, Fenichel published what has been described as a ‘classic textbook’ of psychoanalysis, The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis.

Karen Horney (1885 - 1952)

Karen Horney trained as a doctor at the University of Berlin and went on to train in psychiatry and psychoanalysis. She was in analysis with Karl Abraham and then Hans Sachs. In response to the rise of Nazism in 1932 Horney migrated to the United States, first to Chicago under the sponsorship of Franz Alexander, then to New York. In 1941 the New York Psychoanalytic Institute withdrew her name as a training analyst and instructor. Horney resigned and was active in founding an alternative group, the American Association for the Advancement of Psychoanalysis. In the United States her work came increasingly to emphasise cultural factors in the determination of personality.

Ernest Jones (1879 - 1958)

Freud’s biographer, Ernest Jones, was a major figure of the British Psycho-Analytical Association and would later become its President. Jones was a prolific writer and editor of the psychoanalytic literature, and he also established the Psychoanalytical Library. His most famous work is his multi-volume survey, The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud, published in his lifetime.

Melanie Klein (1882 - 1960)

Klein has been one of the most important figures in the history of psychoanalysis, both as a practitioner and as a theorist. Her work was first presented shortly after her arrival in Vienna, but moved to Hungary with Sándor Ferenczi. After the death of Freud, Klein moved again, this time to Berlin, where she worked with Karl Abraham. Around this time, she introduced the concept of the “splitting of the psyche” and the notion of the “splitting of the ego,” which is central to her theory of infantile development. Her numerous publications include her famous book, The Psycho-Analysis of Children.
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Ernest Jones (1879 - 1958)
Freud’s biographer, Ernest Jones was a relentless campaigner for psycho-
analysis. He was a major figure in the founding and subsequent running of
the British Psycho-Analytical Society and the American Psychoanalytic
Association and would later become president of the International
Psychoanalytical Association for an unequalled term of seventeen years.
Jones was a prolific writer and noted polemicist in psychoanalytic matters.
He originally trained as a doctor and specialized in psychiatry before com-
ing into Freud’s circle around the same time as Karl Abraham. It was at his
suggestion that Freud established the secret inner group known as the
‘Committee’, made up of the ‘best and most trustworthy’ of Freud’s fol-
lowers; and it was Jones that Freud described as ‘a fanatic who smiles at
my faint-heartedness’. On the other hand, Jones’s writings on female sex-
ality represent a major break with Freud’s position, rejecting what he was
the first to term Freud’s ‘phallocentrism’. Jones’s papers have been pub-
lished in his Papers on Psycho-Analysis and Essays in Applied Psycho-
Analysis.

Melanie Klein (1882 - 1960)
Klein has been one of the most influential, albeit controversial, figures in
the history of psychoanalysis. The paper included here is from her early
period, presented shortly after she had settled in London. Klein was born
in Vienna, but moved to Hungary in 1909 and entered analysis with
Sándor Ferenczi. After the counter-revolution in Budapest in 1919 she
moved again, this time to Berlin, where she undertook a further analysis
with Karl Abraham. Around this time Klein began developing the play
technique in order to facilitate analysis with very young children. Klein
also introduced new concepts and a new emphasis in orientation for psy-
choanalysts, especially in regard to the emergence of psychical processes
in infancy. Her numerous publications have appeared in a four-volume
Jeanne Lampl de Groot (1894 -1987)

Jeanne de Groot was a Dutch doctor who went to Vienna in 1921 to have an analysis with Freud. In 1925 she married Hans Lampl and moved to Berlin where she began working at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Clinic. It was on Freud’s advice that at the end of August 1933 Jeanne Lampl de Groot and family (now including two daughters) moved back to Vienna. Following the annexation of Austria in 1938, they moved again, this time to Jeanne Lampl de Groot’s native Holland, where they continued their psychoanalytic work.

Josine Müller (1884 - 1930)

Josine Müller, née Ebsen, studied medicine in Freiburg and Munich. In 1911 she settled in Berlin where she undertook studies in biochemistry and completed her own research in physiological chemistry. From 1912 to 1915 she was an intern at the Women and Children’s Hospital, specializing in infectious diseases. She then moved to the Dr Fränkel-Olivens Sanatorium to complete her training in the area of neurological psychiatry. Her interest in psychoanalysis developed when she moved to Berlin, where she set up her own medical practice in 1916. Her work as a doctor is said to have become increasingly influenced by her interest in psychoanalysis, and more particularly in the area of early female sexuality and psychosexual development. She is probably best known for her articles on this topic. Josine Müller underwent an analysis with Abraham in 1912-1913 and with Hans Sachs between 1923 and 1926.

Carl Müller-Braunschweig (1881 - 1958)

Carl Müller-Braunschweig first studied philosophy and, after completing a doctoral dissertation, published several papers on Kantian ethics. He gave up a career as a philosophy lecturer to pursue his work in psychoanalysis, although his interest in Kant never abated. For example in 1953-1954 he lectured on ‘Freud and Kant: Psychoanalysis and a Philosophy of Morals’. Müller-Braunschweig underwent analyses with both Karl Abraham and Hans Sachs and from the 1920s onward became a key figure in the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society. Controversy surrounds the role Müller-Braunschweig played in accommodating the Nazi authorities’ demand for the ‘aryanization’ of psychoanalytic societies during the 1930s. After the war Müller-Braunschweig helped re-establish the Berlin Psychoanalytic Society and Psychoanalytical Association.
who went to Vienna in 1921 to have his wife married Hans Lampf and moved to the Berlin Psychoanalytic Clinic. It was a year later, in 1933, Jeanne Lampf de Groot and her two daughters moved back to Vienna. In 1938, they moved again, this time to Holland, where they continued their medical studies in Freiburg and Munich. In 1936, she moved to Berlin, where she set up her private practice in neurology and psychiatry, with a particular interest in psychoses. In 1917 she co-founded the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society along with August Stärcke and others, as well as organizing the international congress of psychoanalysts there in 1920, the first to be held after the First World War. In 1935 he emigrated to the United States where he worked on the psychiatric staff of a number of psychiatric institutions. Van Ophuijsen never lost his interest in neuro-biology and psychoanalysis, and when he died in 1950 he left behind plans for a research program to study the somatic causes of the drives and their pathology.

Joan Riviere (1883 - 1962)

Joan Riviere was analyzed first by Ernest Jones in 1915, and then by Freud in 1922. In 1919, at Jones' invitation, she became one of the founding members of the British Psychoanalytical Society. Born Joan Verrall, Riviere came from a family with scholarly connections to Cambridge—a fact which led James Strachey to remark that they had both come out of the same middle-class, cultured, late Victorian box. After a brief career as a professional dressmaker, Riviere immersed herself in the study and practice of psychoanalysis. Aside from her papers, perhaps her greatest contribution lies in her outstanding translations of Freud's works (in conjunction with James and Alix Strachey), as well as translations from the Zeitschrift and Imago journals which were published under her editorial guidance in the International Journal of Psycho-Analysis. Her collected papers have been published as The Inner World and Joan Riviere.

August Stärcke (1880 - 1954)

August Stärcke was one of the founding members of the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society. He completed his early training as a doctor specializing in psychiatry and unlike the other contributors listed here,
Stärcke always saw himself primarily as a psychiatrist rather than as a psychoanalyst. Stärcke produced numerous papers on issues ranging from psychoanalysis to neurology and psychiatry, with his last paper, an intriguingly titled 'There Will Never Be Peace in Nomenclature', intended for publication in an entomological journal.
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**Introduction**

Throughout history people have knocked their heads against the riddle of the nature of femininity. 

Throughout his work Freud repeatedly declared his ignorance of female sexuality. At first inclined to regard this ignorance as being due to social factors, he increasingly came to view it as arising from the psychology of women and the nature of femininity itself. Early on, in 1905, he ascribed the ‘impenetrable obscurity’ surrounding female sexuality partly to the ‘stunting effect of civilised conditions’ and partly to the ‘conventional secretiveness and insincerity’ of women. Some three years later in 1908 he made a similar, though less specific, comment, where this obscurity is said to be due to ‘unfavourable circumstances both of an external and internal nature’.

However, much later, when the explanation given for why the sexual life of women is “‘a dark continent” for psychology’ is that the ‘nature of femininity’ is itself a riddle, Freud adopts a new caution regarding the applicability of the Oedipal model to the little girl. In point of fact, what Freud says appears contradictory: even as he refers to the primacy of the phallus for both sexes, he warns that ‘we can describe this state of things only as it affects the male child; the corresponding processes in the little girl are not known to us’. This last remark is a very surprising one indeed, since, as James Strachey notes, Freud had over many years spoken of a complete parallel in the psychosexual development of the sexes—and now it appears that the basis for this view was that he had simply extrapolated from the case of the little boy to that of the girl, changing the positions accordingly. The remark is even more surprising on another count. Almost none of Freud’s initial discoveries can be dissociated from his early work with women patients—recall the women of *Studies on Hysteria*, the case history of Dora. Indeed, doesn’t Freud owe his discovery of the unconscious and the technique of psychoanalysis to his encounter with hysteria, to which the question of female sexuality and desire, even female identity, is the key? Moreover, James Strachey’s claim that Freud did not direct his attention to feminine psychology for fifteen years after Dora is somewhat misleading. While it is true that all Freud’s case studies of this period are of males, such a claim has to consider as inconsequential the numerous texts in which Freud deals with women or issues relevant to female sexuality. It means neglecting the women patients discussed in the 1907 article on compulsive actions and in the *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*.
of 1916-1917, just as it means ignoring the discussion of issues relevant to female sexuality in his article on hysterical fantasies (1908) and hysterical attacks (1909), as well as the 1917 piece on the transformation of drives and the article on the taboo of virginity of the following year. In all these places, and others as well, Freud is repeatedly touching on related issues, and, moreover, beginning to articulate claims that will subsequently make their way into his later writings and that are at the heart of the controversy on female sexuality.

For it is obvious that in the 1920s Freud’s thinking on this issue takes a new turn. Something changes fundamentally, as is indicated both by his abandonment of the earlier symmetry of the Oedipus complex and by his accompanying insistence upon the centrality of the phallic phase for both sexes—a fundamental reorientation that marks everything that Freud henceforth writes on the subject of female sexuality. One of many consequences of this is a development that occurs in 1931 when, gradually, Freud comes to the realisation of something that he had been unable to see before: that behind the woman’s entire sexual development lies the little girl’s attachment to the ‘pre-oedipal’ mother. He henceforth appropriately praises the work of women analysts and explains his ignorance as a problem of counter-transference. That is to say, while it is true that Freud never relinquishes his belief in the importance of penis envy for female sexuality; in Analysis Terminable and Interminable he describes the ‘suspicion that one has been “preaching to the winds” . . . when one is trying to persuade a woman to abandon her wish for a penis’,7 in his late work he nevertheless also stresses the significance for female sexuality of an intense and enduring attachment to the pre-oedipal mother—an attachment that marks all subsequent love objects, including, most importantly, the attachment to the Oedipal father.

Yet despite all the positive statements and claims, nothing characterises Freud’s position with respect to female sexuality better than his question: Was will das Weib?, What does a woman want? For classical psychoanalysis female sexuality has remained the great riddle. And Freud seeks comfort in the observation that it has always been the same ‘throughout history’.

There is however another way of viewing what Freud is doing, indicated by the remark that ‘psychoanalysis does not try to describe what a woman is, but sets about inquiring how she comes into being’.8 For, however many issues there are that arise in the course of the discussions of female sexuality, what remains fundamentally at stake in the debate, when all is said and done, is the issue of castration. It is the key to the little girl’s negotiating the Oedipus complex and thus to many further aspects of the nature and development of femininity and, in turn, it has important repercussions for clinical issues. Two topics both revolving around the castrating elements, ‘Female Sexuality’ in Introductory Lectures, whose main theme is ‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ and posthumous Outline of Psychoanalysis.

While some of the papers, ‘The Infantile Genital Oedipus Complex’ (1924) and ‘The Transformation of Drives’ (1924) are two important contributions, the debate takes on a life of its own. It is a dispute that soon involves psychoanalytic circles in Hague and Paris. The controversy — What does a woman want? — becomes clear over the course of the camps: those who, like Heidegger, resist doing so. Mack Brunswick and Marie Bonaparte add further layers to the debate. Amongst the latter students: Karen Horney and Marie Bonaparte.

What also becomes clear is that allegedly marginal figures in the debate. sollen here be acknowledged through and not only in relation to the course and development of female sexuality—the contribution by Karen Horney after the publication of her work was also mentioned. And it is also be acknowledged that some figures such as Johan van Ophem, have also contributed significantly to the development of the concept of femininity.
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‘Analysis Terminable and Interminable’ and also in Chapter 7 of the
posthumous Outline of Psychoanalysis.

While some of the papers included in this collection predate Freud's
papers, 'The Infantile Genital Organisation' (1923) and 'The Dissolution
Oedipus Complex' (1924), the controversy was really triggered by
these two important contributions. As a consequence of their publication
the debate takes on a life of its own in the late 1920s.

It is a dispute that soon takes on the proportions of a controversy
involving psychoanalytic circles from Vienna to London, via Berlin, The
Hague and Paris. The controversy is usually referred to as the 'Freud-Jones
debate'. However, at least one recent re-examination of the terms of the
disagreement rejects this. And indeed, when one reads the articles col-
clected here it becomes obvious that the real dispute, though it remains
unacknowledged throughout, is between Freud and Abraham, with one of
Abraham's clinical papers being central to the controversy. Object-love:
here is the concept that would enable a re-thinking of female psychosexu-
al development and eventually a theorizing of the articulation between the
Oedipus complex and the castration complex in the little girl. It gradually
becomes clear over the course of the debate that there are really two
camps: those who, like Helene Deutsch, Jeanne Lampl De Groot, Ruth
Mack Brunswick and Marie Bonaparte, support Freud, and those who
oppose him. Amongst the latter are Ernest Jones and two of Abraham's
students: Karen Horney and Melanie Klein.

What also becomes clear when reading these essays is that some
allegedly marginal figures in the controversy actually play a major role,
and not only in relation to the controversy itself, but also in relation to the
course and development of Freud's subsequent research into female sexu-
ality—the contribution by Karl Abraham (who died too early: one year
after the publication of his important paper) is a case in point. It should
also be mentioned that some lesser figures in the history of psychoanaly-
sis such as Johan van Ophuijsen and Jeanne Lampl de Groot here make

In a letter of September 1930 to Viereck, Freud writes that he is work-
ling on a version of femininity that will be 'as distant from the poetical as
from the pseudo-science of Hirschfeld'. Ironically, it is with a poetic riddle
that Freud introduces his 1932 lecture 'Femininity', which is a recapit-
ulation of more than a decade of work on the topic. A poetic riddle,
because Freud quotes from a poem which looks incongruous in the con-
text of his lecture, but also because, like an extended metaphor, it conjures up a series of further questions. It is a riddle about a riddle which covers woman—and not only by virtue of the potential pun about maidenheads in English:

Heads in hieroglyphic bonnets,
Heads in turbans and black birettas,
Heads in wigs and thousand other
Wretched, sweating heads of humans.

The quotation is from Heinrich Heine’s poem Nordsee, from a section entitled ‘Fragen’ where a youth asks the sea: ‘Tell me, what signifies man? From whence doth he come? And where doth he go?’ The sea, like woman and the unconscious—all three have often been related in the poetic imagination—holds back the answer. A murmur, though, can be heard—another riddle, as it were. For the informed reader, then, Freud’s lecture on the problem of the nature of femininity opens with some kind of ironic reversal: ‘And a fool is awaiting the answer’ is the last line in Heine’s poem.

The problem is compounded in part by the female Oedipus complex, and Freud is led to reconsider not the outcome, but the outset, of the Oedipus complex in the little girl, thus shifting the emphasis onto the ‘pre-Oedipus period’ and all the reconsiderations that this entails:

For a long time the girl’s Oedipus complex concealed her pre-Oedipus attachment to her mother from our view, though it is nevertheless so important and leaves such lasting fixations behind it. For girls the Oedipus situation is the outcome of a long and difficult development; it is a kind of preliminary solution, a position of rest which is not soon abandoned, especially as the beginning of the latency period is not far distant. And we are now struck by a difference between the two sexes, which is probably momentous, in regard to the relation of the Oedipus to the castration complex.13

Freud first mentions the Oedipus complex, though not under this name, in a private letter to his friend Wilhelm Fliess with a reference to both Oedipus Rex and Hamlet, a dual reference that re-emerges in The Interpretation of Dreams. And although the Oedipus complex also underlies the drift of The Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality and ‘The Sexual Theories of Children’, where the theory of penis envy is first hinted at,14 it is only first named in a piece of 1910 entitled ‘A Special Type of Choice of Object Made by Men’. By then, it has become the cornerstone of psycho-analysis and will remain so. I thought on the whole issue of the Oedipus complex only appears in The Interpretation of Dreams. And although the Oedipus complex also underlies the drift of The Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality and ‘The Sexual Theories of Children’, where the theory of penis envy is first hinted at,14 it is only first named in a piece of 1910 entitled ‘A Special Type of Choice of Object Made by Men’. By then, it has become the cornerstone of psycho-psychological thought on the whole issue of the Oedipus complex only appears in The Interpretation of Dreams. And although the Oedipus complex also underlies the drift of The Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality and ‘The Sexual Theories of Children’, where the theory of penis envy is first hinted at,14 it is only first named in a piece of 1910 entitled ‘A Special Type of Choice of Object Made by Men’. By then, it has become the cornerstone of psycho-
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is no cause for surprise that boys retain that object in the Oedipus complex. But how does it happen that girls abandon it and instead take their father as an object?25

Both the 1931 paper on 'Female Sexuality', and the 1932 lecture on 'Femininity' are further explorations of this topic, but rather than focusing on the outcome of the Oedipus complex as did Freud's writings from 1923 to 1925 (witness the preceding quotation, which was written in 1925), they focus on the entry into the Oedipus complex and thus emphasize the pre-oedipal relationship of the little girl to her mother: 'With the small girl it is different. Her first object, too, was her mother. How does she find her way to her father? How, when and why did she detach herself from her mother?'26 This question leads to others: 'What does the little girl require of her mother? What is the nature of her sexual aims during the time of exclusive attachment to her mother?'27 Although the question remains to establish how it is that the little girl changes love objects, Freud now traces the different stages involved in this change, focusing on the reasons for the first attachment to the mother rather than working out why she should secure a secondary attachment to the father. He now suggests that the little girl progresses directly from an attachment to her mother to one onto the father: consequently her Oedipus complex is a later development and one that is often not surmounted. This means that the consequences for the Oedipus complex, the phallic phase, castration and the way they are linked are different for each of the sexes—Freud's comments about the super-ego, mentioned above, being very much to the point. But as he implies in 1932, this further shift in emphasis is one of the main consequences of the 1920s controversy within the larger field of psychoanalysis.

Thus, for Freud, the castration complex is the secret of the distinction between the sexes. Although he postulates an innate bisexuality, he does not assume an innate masculinity or femininity. Moreover, there is only one libido: the male one. The papers we have included in this collection are testimony to the objections that are bound to arise with a theory of castration which eschews anatomical dispositions, innate propensities, as well as issues of identification and of a possible psychology of sexual difference, not to mention the significance of hereditary and environmental factors. These objections revolve around three axes: the nature of female sexuality; the presupposition that femininity is defined by a libido which is male and primarily phallic; and the mother-child relationship.

Notwithstanding the disagreements, all participants in the controversy concur on one point: penis envy. This means that the theory of femininity, and indeed the whole development of female sexuality, has to take into account, that is either explain or explain away, the fact of the little girl's disappointment at not having the primary evidence for Questions of a general nature upon the female sex, a castrated little boy turned to the male drive which is opposed to active? Are the effects of the Oedipus complex ever dissolved? All the other questions the debate raises further: what castration means here is what the object symbolizes? castration or the fear of losing the answer is—what specific thing missing in his theory an understanding of castration of the penis: castration is as Ophuijsen's paper on the main concept.28 But if this is so complex no longer explains is but one in a series of separate the notion in reducing it to a principle A new direction needs to be asked.

What really focuses the mind of how does the little girl turn to her father? Thus, as one of the key questions above is: The most relevant stages of sexual organization of the sexual development:
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ments, all participants in the contro-
This means that the theory of femi-
dom of female sexuality, has to take
or explain away, the fact of the little
girl's disappointment at not having a penis, or at having lost it—this being
the primary evidence for the postulation of an early phallic phase.
Questions of a general nature arise. For instance, is sexuality predicated
upon anatomical destiny? Or is it rather determined by culture? Is the lit-
tle girl a castrated little boy? Is the feminine drive masochistic, as opposed
to the male drive which is sadistic, or should it be seen as passive, as
opposed to active? Are these categories relevant at all? Does the develop-
ment of the Oedipus complex in the little girl mirror that of the little boy?
Is it ever dissolved? All these questions are addressed in the debate. But
the debate raises further, more fundamental issues as well. Is it so clear
what castration means here? Does it mean losing the object itself or losing
what the object symbolizes? That is, is the fundamental fear the fear of ca-
tration or the fear of losing the object's love? The question now in need of
an answer is—what specifies the privileged character of the phallus?
Freud keeps quiet while his students argue with each other. There is some-
thing missing in his theory. It is, however, already quite clear to some that
an understanding of castration should not be narrowed down to the loss
of the penis: castration is, as August Stärcke suggests in a response to van
Ophuijsen's paper on the masculinity complex as early as 1920, a symbolic
concept. But if this is so, it seems that Freud's theory of the castration
complex no longer explains the question of sexual difference: if castration
is but one in a series of separations common to both sexes, and if Jones is
right in reducing it to aphalasis, it cannot be the arbiter of sexual difference.
A new direction needs to be taken, a new focus found, a new question
asked.

What really focuses the controversy is the most perplexing question of
all: how does the little girl manage to relinquish her love for her mother
and turn to her father? This question of the substitution of objects is pre-
cisely one of the key questions Abraham tackles in the article mentioned
above. The most relevant passage is in fact the table surveying the vari-
ous stages of sexual organization and object-love traversed in the course of
sexual development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Libidinal Organization</th>
<th>Stages of Object-love</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI. Final Genital Stage</td>
<td>Object-love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Early Genital Stage (phallic)</td>
<td>Object-love with exclusion of genitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Later Anal-sadistic Stage</td>
<td>Partial love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Earlier Anal-sadistic Stage</td>
<td>Partial love with incorporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Later Oral Stage (cannibalistic)</td>
<td>Narcissism (total incorporation of object)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Earlier Oral Stage (sucking)</td>
<td>Auto-eroticism (without object)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Post-ambivalent) (Ambivalent) (Pre-ambivalent)
Note that all the participants in the controversy discuss this passage—all, that is, with the single exception of Freud. In this clinical paper where Abraham investigates the castration complex in two women ('X' and 'Y') with symptoms of melancholia he not only traces the genesis of penis envy to a fixation at the oral stage, but also suggests, by drawing parallels with symptoms observed in men, and by teasing out some general conclusions, that both sexes fear castration—hence making a literal understanding of penis envy somewhat redundant. In fact, Abraham's understanding of penis envy links up perfectly with Stärcke's premise that weaning is the primary loss. So Freud remains silent while others (Fenichel, Horney, Klein, Jones, and even Deutsch) adopt some of Abraham's terms or ideas (the identification with the father as cannibalistic incorporation of the phallus; object love; oral sadism as the cause of penis envy) and grapple with them, reject, or develop them—perhaps most striking in this respect is Fenichel in 'The Pre-genital Antecedents of the Oedipus Complex'.

Worth considering here too are Abraham's discussions of partial love as preliminary to object-love on the one hand and of identification on the other which seem to anticipate Freud's differentiation between primary and secondary identifications.

It is now obvious why the emphasis of the debate shifts to the much neglected issue of the little girl's relationship with her mother, and hence to the nature of female sexuality, and away from the construction of sexual difference. Obvious too is the reason why arguments become more intense with Freud's insistence on the phallic phase in his work on 'The Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex'. But it is as though the controversy is now taking place on two levels. It is as though Freud is now alone. For both Freud's opponents and his defenders look for answers in biology or anatomy even though they take object-relations as the focus of their discussions. In point of fact Freud reacted by accusing his opponents of looking for answers outside the psychoanalytic field of inquiry, disapproving of what might be called this return of biology.

I object to all of you [Müller-Braunschweig, Horney, Jones, Rado, etc.] to the extent that you do not distinguish more clearly and cleanly between what is psychic and what is biological, that you try to establish a neat parallelism between the two and that you, motivated by such intent, unthinkingly construe psychic facts which are unprovable and that you, in the process of so doing, must declare as reactive or regressive much that without doing so is primary... In addition, I would only like to emphasize that we must keep psychoanalysis separate from biology just as we have kept it separate from anatomy and physiology.26

And yet, here there is also placed increasingly upon the point that Freud reformulates oedipal terms: 'how' rather than 'what'.

By 1925, it is with great relief that we turn to the end of the Oedipus Complex; it is because of her paper. Freud now outshines the mother: the mother is established. In the contributions of others (Fenichel, Horney, Klein, Jones, and even Deutsch) there is a momentous turn. It moves away from the sexes to a discussion of why considered in isolation from the male: an essentialism rooted in biological characterization of femininity is replaced as the over-determined system.

Some argue that the controversy in the 1920s are prompted by a return to the political climate in Europe after the First World War. It was perhaps more accurately formulated, in Freud's 1931 and 1935 letters, to say that he, like many others, was troubled by the disagreements as the first in a series of exchanges between British and Viennese psychoanalysis. Owing to the disagreements as the only one, and so it was debate to be made during Freud's lifetime. Indeed up to the time of his death, indeed up to the time of his death, passionate responses contributed to the political climate in Europe. The papers collected here those who have invited us to Vienne to shed light on the disagreements as the first in a series of exchanges between British and Viennese psychoanalysis. Owing to the disagreements as the only one, and so it was debate to be made during Freud's lifetime. Indeed up to the time of his death, indeed up to the time of his death, passionate responses contributed to the political climate in Europe.
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And yet, here there is also a turning point in Freud’s work: emphasis
placed increasingly upon the mother-child dyad. It is, moreover, at this
point that Freud reformulates the question of the substitution of objects in
oedipal terms: ‘how’ rather than ‘why’ the little girl changes love objects.27
By 1925, it is with great reluctance that the little girl enters the Oedipus
Complex; it is because of her penis envy that she turns to her father who
ow outshines the mother; the lack of symmetry between the sexes is now
established. In the contributions that follow the issue takes a subtle but
momentous turn. It moves away from the issue of the distinction between
the sexes to a discussion of what defines masculinity and femininity, each
considered in isolation from the other; a diacritical approach gives way to
an essentialism rooted in biology. It would seem that penis envy, far from
characterizing femininity, is now nothing other than the castration com-
plex as the over-determined symptom in girls.

Some argue that the controversy reaches its peak in 1935, when Jones,
invited to Vienna to shed some light on the growing disagreements
between British and Viennese analysts, offers a talk on female sexuality.28
But perhaps it is more accurate to see the controversy sealed, if not encap-
sulated, in Freud’s 1931 and 1932 essays on the topic. In any case, a split
between London and Vienna is more than obvious in 1935. And by then,
the political climate in Europe cannot be said to be conducive to either
research or reconciliation. Jones’s visit to Vienna in 1935 to read a paper, as
he says, on the disagreements between London and Vienna was intended
as the first in a series of exchanges between the two most important cen-
tres of psychoanalysis. Owing to the deteriorating situation in Europe it
was the only one, and so it became the last major contribution to the
debate to be made during Freud’s lifetime.

In addition to the allure of the freshness and topicality of the single
most important debate to take place inside psychoanalysis during Freud’s
lifetime, indeed up to the time when Jacques Lacan revives it, there are the
passionate responses contributed by analysts from all parts of Europe at
the time. The papers collected here are significant for two reasons: not only
do they throw light on the early controversy surrounding female sexuali-
ty, they also compel the reader to re-read Freud’s work in a different light,
the light that brings back into full view the ideas or concepts belonging to
those whose names are missing from Freud’s ‘Female Sexuality’ and
‘Femininity’. It is indeed puzzling to see the partial way in which Freud
acknowledges his debt: in both papers he mentions certain names, ignores
others altogether, gets papers by the same person confused, alludes to
other contributors without mentioning them by name, making sure, per-
haps, that he appears as the true and only father of this new science called
psychoanalysis. In 1931 he acknowledges the work of those whom, except
for Deutsch, of course, we might now see as his opponents: Abraham, Lampl de Groot, Fenichel, Klein, Horney and Jones. But he omits to mention those who made the most valuable contributions in conceptual terms (except for Abraham, but he is no longer alive): van Ophuijsen, Stärcke, Mack Brunswick and Riviere. In 1932, only three contributors are named; all are women, which is perhaps explicable by the fact that the lecture partly aims at dissipating suggestions of misogyny. But how should we understand the omissions and confusions? Is Freud, in the name of psychoanalysis, taking as his own the product of research prompted by his own findings? It is only in the light of the papers presented here in this collection that it is possible to uncover the answer to such questions.

Given that it all happened more than three-quarters of a century ago, our position is necessarily at a distance from the cross-firing of arguments within the early controversy about femininity. But it is important to maintain this distance, for our concern is to suggest why the argument around the issue of castration was needed, and hence to show how legitimate the controversy was. Ultimately, our concern is to foreground the terms of the controversy in order to present Freud's conceptual framework from within the perspective of the exchanges that made it possible, as well as to suggest new points of view, if not new starting points, in the current re-examination of female sexuality. This is why we have adopted a chronological ordering of what we consider as the significant material produced by the main contributors to the controversy—all except for Freud, but it goes without saying that, given the intellectual interaction that occurred from around 1920 up to the mid-thirties, his own contributions should be read alongside this collection.

While Freud insisted on the distinction between psychoanalysis and biology, he also insisted on the reciprocal influence of psychical and biological events in the course of adaptation to sexual stages. Thus even though Freud exhorted his followers to keep psychoanalysis separate from biology, the fundamental question about sexual difference that children ask, is also the one adults reformulate on the couch, dealing with the very nature of sexuality: are there indeed psychical consequences to the anatomical difference between the sexes?  

Apart from the question of femininity, there remains one riddle though. What was it that caused Freud’s blindness in the area of femininity, and more particularly his delay in recognizing the crucial mother-daughter dyad? Was this inadequacy dictated by Freud’s own masculinity and status as father, as, ultimately, he and others suggest, or by the phallocentric and patrocentric nature of psychoanalysis as he conceived it, by his self-diagnosed hysteria, by his hysterical phobia as diagnosed by Didier Anzieu? Perhaps some or even all of these features played a role; but in our view more fundamentally, research has an affinity with through', resistance, and the strengths of this community of psychoanalysis and community of psychoanalysis and research. This is why we can find what is specific
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but in our view more fundamental is the fact that Freud's approach to research has an affinity with the analytical process itself, with its 'working-through', resistance, and return of the repressed. And it is one of the great strengths of this collection that it shows how this approach permeates the community of psychoanalysts of his day. It is perhaps in the inseparability of this analytic process itself from the discoveries made in its name that one can find what is specific to the method of psychoanalysis.
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