

FEMALE SEXUALITY

The Early Psychoanalytic Controversies

Edited by

*Russell Grigg, Dominique Hecq,
and Craig Smith*

KARNAC

Contents

	<i>Preface</i>	i
	<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ii
	<i>Notes on the Editors</i>	iii
	<i>Biographical Notes</i>	1
	<i>Introduction</i>	7
1	Contributions to the Masculinity Complex in Women <i>J. H. W. Van Ophuijsen</i>	19
2	The Castration Complex <i>August Stärcke</i>	30
3	Manifestations of the Female Castration Complex <i>Karl Abraham</i>	51
4	Origins and Growth of Object Love <i>Karl Abraham</i>	76
5	The Psychology of Women in Relation to the Functions of Reproduction <i>Helene Deutsch</i>	93
6	The Flight from Womanhood: The Masculinity- Complex in Women, as Viewed by Men and Women <i>Karen Horney</i>	107
7	A Contribution to the Problem of Libidinal Development of the Genital Phase in Girls <i>Josine Müller</i>	122
8	The Genesis of the Feminine Super-Ego <i>Carl Müller-Braunschweig</i>	129
9	The Early Development of Female Sexuality <i>Ernest Jones</i>	133

ie

in

c,

en

10	Early Stages of the Oedipus Conflict <i>Melanie Klein</i>	146
11	The Evolution of the Oedipus Complex in Women <i>Jeanne Lampl de Groot</i>	159
12	Womanliness as a Masquerade <i>Joan Riviere</i>	172
13	The Significance of Masochism in the Mental Life of Women <i>Helene Deutsch</i>	183
14	The Pregonal Antecedents of the Oedipus Complex <i>Otto Fenichel</i>	195
15	On Female Homosexuality <i>Helene Deutsch</i>	220
16	The Dread of Woman: Observations on a Specific Difference in the Dread Felt by Men and Women Respectively for the Opposite Sex <i>Karen Horney</i>	241
17	The Denial of the Vagina: a Contribution to the Problem of the Genital Anxieties Specific to Women <i>Karen Horney</i>	253
18	Passivity, Masochism and Femininity <i>Marie Bonaparte</i>	266
19	Early Female Sexuality <i>Ernest Jones</i>	275
	<i>Bibliography</i>	286
	<i>Index</i>	293

The papers included in this volume were first published in the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*. Abraham's 'Origins and Development of the Oedipus Complex' appeared in his *Selected Papers on Psychology and the History of the Psychoanalytic Movement*. 'Homosexuality' appeared in *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*. Johan van Ophuijsen presented his paper on 'The Psychology of Women' to the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society. Ernest Jones read a paper on 'Early Female Sexuality' to the Analytical Society.

Though these papers are now available in English, their original language, and though some of them have been translated elsewhere, they have never before been available in a single volume. This volume, which has been prepared by those who have read these papers and who have been particularly concerned with the history of female sexuality. But it is not only the history of female sexuality that there are two further considerations. The first is the considerable impact they had on the development of psychoanalytic theories. The papers have a clear and lasting impact on the development of psychoanalysis today will also show their considerable impact on the development of psychoanalysis on female sexuality.

We have corrected some of the spelling errors in the original text and have provided more readily accessible versions of some of the references. This includes the correction of some of the references which have been altered to volume and page numbers. The *Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1963) and the *Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1963).

The articles have been prepared for publication. The one exception is the paper by Ernest Jones which opens the collection. This is a paper which has been widely debated in the literature and which has been widely cited.

Conflict	146
Complex in Women	159
	172
in the Mental Life of	183
the Oedipus Complex	195
	220
on a Specific	
Men and Women	241
Sex	
Contribution to the	
Specific to Women	253
Sexuality	266
	275
	286
	293

Preface

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.

edgments

Journal of Psycho-analysis for permission to

"The castration complex." 3 (1920) pp.1-29.

"The femininity." 16 (1935) pp.325-33.

"The penis in relation to the function of reproduc-

"The penis in the mental life of women." 11

"The penis and the oedipus complex." 12 (1931) pp. 141-

"The penis and the masculinity-complex in women, as

pp.324-39

"The penis: contribution to the problem of the genital

1927: pp. 7-70

"The penis: a specific difference in the dread

"The penis and the opposite sex." 13 (1932) pp. 348-60.

"The penis and male sexuality." 8 (1927) pp.459-472.

1935: pp. 263-73.

"The penis and conflict." 9 (1928) pp. 167-80.

"The penis and the Oedipus complex in women." Int. J.

"The penis and the libidinal development of the genital

"The penis and the feminine super-ego." 7 (1926). pp. 359-

"The penis and the masculinity complex in women." 5 (1924) pp.

9 (1929) pp. 303-13.

1921: pp.179-201

University for permission to publish

"Vol 1 (1932) pp. 484-510.

Research Council and Deakin University for

ations

Biographical Works of Sigmund Freud. 24 Vols.

in collaboration with Anna Freud,

London: The Hogarth Press and the

Norton, 1953-1974.

Notes on the Editors

Russell Grigg is lectures in philosophy and co-ordinator of psychoanalytic studies at Deakin University. He is a psychoanalyst in private practice. Dr. Grigg has a PhD in psychoanalysis and has published extensively on psychoanalysis. He is also known for his translations of the seminars of Jacques Lacan.

Dominique Hecq-Murphy is a research fellow in psychoanalytic studies at Deakin University. Dr. Hecq-Murphy has a PhD in literature and a background in French and German, with qualifications in translating. She has published in the field of literary studies and has had her own stories and poetry published.

Craig Smith is a PhD candidate in psychoanalytic studies at Deakin University. He has degrees in political science from the University of Melbourne and Victoria University of Wellington.

Biographical Notes

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 - 1962)

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

2 Biographical Notes

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 fac-

tors in the determination of p
in two of her late, popular w
Neurosis and Human Growth.

Ernest Jones (1879 - 1958)

Freud's biographer, Ernest Jo
analysis. He was a major figu
of the British Psycho-Analyt
Association and would late
Psychoanalytical Association
Jones was a prolific writer and
He originally trained as a doc
ing into Freud's circle around
suggestion that Freud establ
'Committee', made up of the
lowers; and it was Jones that
my faint-heartedness'. On the
quality represent a major break
the first to term Freud's pha
lished in his *Papers on Psy
Analysis*.

Melanie Klein (1882 - 1960)

Klein has been one of the mo
the history of psychoanalysis
period, presented shortly aft
in Vienna, but moved to H
Sándor Ferenczi. After the c
moved again, this time to Be
with Karl Abraham. Around
technique in order to facilit
also introduced new concept
choanalysts, especially in reg
in infancy. Her numerous p
edition, *The Writings of Melan*

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 with the Psychoanalytical Association

Johan H. W. van Ophuysen (1884 - 1962)

Another member of the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society (formerly the Dutch East India Society) who emigrated from the Netherlands from the age of 17 to study psychology and psychiatry, with his brother, he co-founded the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society and others, as well as organized the first congress of analysts there in 1920, the first to be held in the Netherlands. He emigrated to the United States in 1921, where a number of psychiatric institutions were founded in neuro-biology and psychology. He was behind plans for a research program on the senses and their pathology.

Joan Riviere (1883 - 1962)

Joan Riviere was analyzed first by Freud in 1922. In 1919, at Jones' invitation, she became a member of the British Psychoanalytic Society. She came from a family with scholarly traditions. Her father, James Strachey, to remark that she was a well-read, cultured, late Victorian dressmaker, Riviere immersed herself in psychoanalysis. Aside from her papers on the ego and her outstanding translations (with her husband and Alix Strachey), as well as her contributions to journals which were published in the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* and published as *The Inner World*.

August Stürcke (1880 - 1954)

August Stürcke was one of the founders of the Psychoanalytic Society. He specialized in psychiatry and

Psychoanalytic Society which was readmitted to the International Psychoanalytical Association in 1951.

Johan H. W. van Ophuijsen (1882 - 1950)

Another member of the Dutch group, van Ophuijsen was born in Sumatra (formerly the Dutch East Indies) and continued his schooling in the Netherlands from the age of thirteen. He went on to study medicine, neurology and psychiatry, with a particular interest in psychoses. In 1917 he co-founded the Dutch Psychoanalytic Society along with August Stärcke and others, as well as organising 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.

Throughout his work . . . female sexuality. At first unc . . . social factors, he increasingl . . . ogy of women and the natu . . . ascribed the 'impenetrable o . . . to the 'stunting effect of civi . . . tional secretiveness and unse . . . 1908 he made a similar, thou . . . rity is said to be due to unu . . . and internal nature'.⁵

However, much later, w . . . life of women is "'a dark co . . . femininity' is itself a riddle . . . applicability of the Oedipal . . . Freud says appears contradi . . . phallus for both sexes, he w . . . only as it affects the male ch . . . girl are not known to us'.⁶ Th . . . since, as James Strachey not . . . complete parallel in the psych . . . it appears that the basis for t . . . from the case of the little bo . . . accordingly. The remark is ev . . . none of Freud's initial discov . . . with women patients—reca . . . history of Dora. Indeed, do . . . conscious and the technique of p . . . to which the question of fem . . . is the key? Moreover, James . . . attention to feminine psych . . . misleading.⁶ While it is true . . . of males, such a claim has t . . . texts in which Freud deals w . . . ality. It means neglecting the . . . on compulsive actions and u

ly as a psychiatrist rather than as a
numerous papers on issues ranging from
psychiatry, with his last paper, an
'Be Peace in Nomenclature', intended
journal.

Introduction

Throughout history people have
knocked their heads against the
riddle of the nature of femininity¹

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.² 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'.³

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.⁴ 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'.⁵ 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.⁶ 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 reper-

cussions for clinical issues. Two both revolving around the case of the thirties, 'Female Sexuality' in *Introductory Lectures*, whose motto is 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable', and the posthumous *Outline of Psychoanalysis*.

While some of the papers in the 1920s, 'The Infantile Genital Organization' and 'The Oedipus Complex' (1924), are these two important contributions, the debate takes on a life of its own.

It is a dispute that soon moves to The Hague and Paris. The controversy is 'the debate'. However, at least one disagreement rejects this.⁹ As reflected here it becomes obvious that unacknowledged throughout. Abraham's clinical papers bear witness here is the concept that would be the genital development and eventually the Oedipus complex and the castration becomes clear over the course of the debate: those who, like Helene Deutsch, Mack Brunswick and Marie Bonaparte, oppose him. Amongst the latter are students: Karen Horney and Melanie Klein.

What also becomes clear is the role of allegedly marginal figures in the debate and not only in relation to the course and development of female sexuality—the contribution by Karen Horney after the publication of his *Female Sexuality*—also be mentioned that some of the analysis such as Johan van Ophuijsen's crucial contributions.

In a letter of September 1919, writing on a version of femininity, Freud moves from the pseudo-science of Helene Deutsch that Freud introduces his formulation of more than a decade because Freud quotes from a

ing the discussion of issues relevant to hysterical fantasies (1908) and hysterical defence on the transformation of drives and activity of the following year. In all these papers, Freud repeatedly touching on related issues, makes claims that will subsequently make sense of what are at the heart of the controver-

1920s Freud's thinking on this issue takes shape fundamentally, as is indicated both by his re-orientation of the Oedipus complex and by his re-assertion of the centrality of the phallic phase for both sexes. It is this that marks everything that Freud has to say about female sexuality. One of many consequences of this is that occurs in 1931 when, gradually, Freud discovers something that he had been unable to see: that the entire sexual development lies the little girl's attachment to her mother. He henceforth appropriately re-orientates and explains his ignorance as a problem. To say, while it is true that Freud never fully understood the importance of penis envy for female sexualization, that in 1931 he describes the 'suspicion that the little girl has of her penis',⁷ in his late work he nevertheless re-orientates female sexuality of an intense and exclusive attachment to the oedipal mother—an attachment that includes, most importantly, the attach-

ments and claims, nothing characteristically better than his question: 'What does a woman want? For classical psychoanalysis, this was the great riddle. And Freud seeks to solve it, as always been the same 'throughout

of viewing what Freud is doing, individual psychoanalysis does not try to describe what a woman is like, how she comes into being'.⁸ For, however, in the course of the discussions of femininity, what is fundamentally at stake in the debate, when Freud re-orientates the Oedipus complex. It is the key to the little girl's attachment and thus to many further aspects of the Oedipus complex and, in turn, it has important reper-

cussions for clinical issues. Two crucial texts on the question of femininity, both revolving around the castration complex in girls, appear in the early thirties, 'Female Sexuality' and the lecture on 'Femininity' in *New Introductory Lectures*, whose material is briefly re-visited five years later in '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 of the 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.⁹ And indeed, when one reads the articles collected 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.¹⁰ Object-love: here is the concept that would enable a re-thinking of female psychosexual 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 sexuality—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 psychoanalysis such as Johan van Ophuijsen and Jeanne Lampl de Groot here make crucial contributions.

In a letter of September 1930 to Viereck, Freud writes that he is working on a version of femininity that will be 'as distant from the poetical as from the pseudo-science of Hirschfeld'.¹¹ Ironically, it is with a poetic riddle that Freud introduces his 1932 lecture 'Femininity', which is a recapitulation 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?'¹² 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'.¹⁵ By then, it has become the cornerstone of psycho-

analysis and will remain so. I thought on the whole issue debate, which centres on the this, for what should be stressed. Oedipus complex only appears this plays in the distinction between the Oedipus Complex and sex, coupled with the hatred by itself to account for the difficult case of Dora demonstrates on an impediment to the advancement.

As Freud subsequently in originally been 'on a portrayal of sexual life of children and of a pregenital organizations of the because it throws into relief here onwards is to articulate the Oedipus complex—an art mid-nineteen twenties. This in sexes, or rather, the fact that the from the question of castration.

In 'Some Psychological Contributions Between the Sexes' Freud concludes and suggests that penis envy substitute penis for little girls, and as a love-object. Her mother has turned into a little womanly becomes central to the theory becomes central to the whole is increasingly suggested as the Boys experience a castration complex, and their sublimated desire ego. Girls are spared this stage that their super-ego is weaker nature of femininity, however. Dissolution of the Oedipus respond in three ways to castration has three possible outcomes: normality, or a normality—which by

In little girls the Oedipus in boys. In both cases the

like an extended metaphor, it conjures
 as a riddle about a riddle which covers
 the potential pun about maidenheads

ettas,
 ther
 humans.

ne's poem *Nordsee*, from a section enti-
 the sea: 'Tell me, what signifies man?
 d where doth he go?'¹² The sea, like
 ree have often been related in the poet-
 ver. A murmur, though, can be heard—
 rmed reader, then, Freud's lecture on
 unity opens with some kind of ironic
 he answer' is the last line in Heine's

part by the female Oedipus complex,
 t the outcome, but the outset, of the
 us shifting the emphasis onto the 'pre-
 derations that this entails:

pus complex concealed her pre-
 ther from our view, though it is
 aves such lasting fixations behind
 n is the outcome of a long and dif-
 of preliminary solution, a position
 oned, especially as the beginning
 lstant. And we are now struck by
 ces, which is probably momentous, in
 lipus to the castration complex.¹³

ous complex, though not under this
 nd Wilhelm Fliess with a reference to
 uai reference that re-emerges in *The*
 h the Oedipus complex also underlies
Theory of Sexuality and 'The Sexual
 ory of penis envy is first hinted at,¹⁴ it
) entitled 'A Special Type of Choice of
 as become the cornerstone of psycho-

analysis and will remain so. It will also determine the development of his
 thought on the whole issue of sexual difference. Of course, the 1920s
 debate, which centres on the issue of castration, will greatly contribute to
 this, for what should be stressed here is that the full significance of the
 Oedipus complex only appears with the castration complex and the role
 this plays in the distinction between the sexes. Thus the original formula-
 tion of the Oedipus Complex as the desire for the parent of the opposite
 sex, coupled with the hatred for the parent of the same sex, is insufficient
 by itself to account for the difference between the sexes; moreover, as the
 case of Dora demonstrates only too well, this original formulation is also
 an impediment to the advance of Freud's clinical work.

As Freud subsequently indicated, the accent in the *Three Essays* had
 originally been 'on a portrayal of the fundamental difference between the
 sexual life of children and of adults', while his later work emphasized 'the
pregenital organizations of the libido'.¹⁶ This shift in emphasis is crucial
 because it throws into relief the castration complex. The problem from
 here onwards is to articulate the link between this castration complex and
 the Oedipus complex—an articulation which Freud only achieves in the
 mid-nineteen twenties. This in turn highlights the difference between the
 sexes, or rather, the fact that the difference between the sexes is insepara-
 ble from the question of castration.

In 'Some Psychical Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction
 Between the Sexes' Freud compares male and female infantile sexuality
 and suggests that penis envy develops into a desire for a child as a substi-
 tute penis for little girls, 'and with that purpose in view she takes her father
 as a love-object. Her mother becomes the object of her jealousy. The girl
 has turned into a little woman.'¹⁷ This is when the castration complex real-
 ly becomes central to the theory of sexuality, and also when identification
 becomes central to the whole notion of sexual difference, for identification
 is increasingly suggested as the process by which the crisis is resolved.¹⁸
 Boys experience a castration complex which shatters the Oedipus com-
 plex, and their sublimated desires subsequently form the core of the super-
 ego. Girls are spared this stage, it would seem, from which Freud infers
 that their super-ego is weaker. More relevant to an understanding of the
 nature of femininity, however, is what Freud makes clear in 'The
 Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex,' namely, that the little girl can
 respond in three ways to castration, and thus that the Oedipus complex
 has three possible outcomes for women: the masculinity complex, hyste-
 ria, or a normality—which, by the way, still needs defining in 1932.¹⁹

In little girls the Oedipus complex raises one problem more than
 in boys. In both cases the mother is the original object; and there

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?²⁰

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?'²¹ 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?'²² 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 the primary evidence for Questions of a general nature upon anatomical destiny? Can the girl a castrated little boy? to the male drive which is opposed to active? Are the ment of the Oedipus complex Is it ever dissolved? All the the debate raises further: m what castration means here? what the object symbolizes? tration or the fear of losing? an answer is—what specific Freud keeps quiet while his thing missing in his theory an understanding of castration of the penis: castration is as Ophuijsen's paper on the m x concept.²³ But if this is so complex no longer explains s but one in a series of separate right in reducing it to *aphan*: A new direction needs to be asked.

What really focuses the all: how does the little girl and turn to her father? Thus cely one of the key questions above.²⁴ The most relevant p ous stages of sexual organization sexual development:

Stages of Libidinal Organization

- Final Genital Stage
- Earlier Genital Stage
- Phallic
- Later Anal-sadistic Stage
- Earlier Anal-sadistic Stage
- Later Oral Stage
- Prephallic
- Earlier Oral Stage (sucking)

boys retain that object in the Oedipus
 then that girls abandon it and instead

Sexuality', and the 1932 lecture on
 of this topic, but rather than focusing
 complex as did Freud's writings from 1923
 (station, which was written in 1925), they
 s complex and thus emphasize the pre-
 to her mother: 'With the small girl it is
 her mother. How does she find her way
 did she detach herself from her moth-
 What does the little girl require of her
 sexual aims during the time of exclusive
 ough the question remains to establish
 love objects, Freud now traces the dif-
 ge, focusing on the reasons for the first
 an working out why she should secure
 er. He now suggests that the little girl
 ment to her mother to one onto the
 complex is a later development and one
 s means that the consequences for the
 ase castration and the way they are
 e sexes—Freud's comments about the
 g very much to the point. But as he
 n emphasis is one of the main conse-
 n than the larger field of psychoanalysis.
 complex is the secret of the distinction
 stulates an innate bisexuality, he does
 or femininity. Moreover, there is only
 ers we have included in this collection
 are bound to arise with a theory of cas-
 t dispositions, innate propensities, as
 of a possible psychology of sexual dif-
 ference of hereditary and environmental
 round three axes: the nature of female
 emunity is defined by a libido which
 he mother-child relationship.
 nents, all participants in the controver-
 v This means that the theory of femi-
 nity, 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 cas-
 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 symbol-
 ic concept.²³ 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 *aphanisis*, 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.²⁴ 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:

Stages of Libidinal Organization.		Stages of Object-love.
VI. Final Genital Stage	Object-love	(Post-ambivalent)
V. Earlier Genital Stage (phallic)	Object-love with exclusion of genitals	} (Ambivalent)
IV. Later Anal-sadistic Stage	Partial love	
III. Earlier Anal-sadistic Stage	Partial love with incorporation	
II. Later Oral Stage (cannibalistic)	Narcissism (total incorporation of object)	(Pre-ambivalent)
I. Earlier Oral Stage (sucking)	Auto-erotism (without object)	

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'.²⁵ 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 the Oedipus Complex; it is because of her position that she now outshines the mother: the mother's position is established. In the contribution to the debate a momentous turn. It moves away from the sexes to a discussion of what is to be considered in isolation from the biological, an essentialism rooted in biology. The characterization of femininity is now seen as a complex as the over-determined system.

Some argue that the controversy was invited to Vienna to shed some light on the relationship between British and Viennese psychoanalysis. But perhaps it is more accurately described as a dialogue, isolated, in Freud's 1931 and 1932 papers between London and Vienna. It is a dialogue in the political climate in Europe of the time, a dialogue of research or reconciliation. Jones, for example, he says, on the disagreements between the two schools as the first in a series of exchanges between the two schools of psychoanalysis. Owing to the fact that he was the only one, and so it is not surprising that the debate to be made during Freud's lifetime.

In addition to the allure of the controversy, the most important debate to take place during his lifetime, indeed up to the time of his death, his passionate responses contributed to the time. The papers collected in this volume do they throw light on the early years of his life; they also compel the reader to see the light that brings back into the world those whose names are missing from the history of 'Femininity'. It is indeed puzzling that Freud acknowledges his debt: in both directions, he and others altogether, gets papers from other contributors without mentioning them. Perhaps, that he appears as the true author of psychoanalysis. In 1931 he acknowledged his debt to the other contributors.

in the controversy discuss this passage—
 on of Freud. In this clinical paper where
 on complex in two women ('X' and 'Y')
 not only traces the genesis of penis envy
 also suggests, by drawing parallels with
 y teasing out some general conclusions,
 ence making a literal understanding of
 . In fact, Abraham's understanding of
 n Stürcke's premise that weaning is the
 silent while others (Fenichel, Horney,
 adopt some of Abraham's terms or ideas
 r as cannibalistic incorporation of the
 s the cause of penis envy) and grapple
 —perhaps most striking in this respect
 ecedents of the Oedipus Complex'.²⁵
 Abraham's discussions of partial love as
 one hand and of identification on the
 Freud's differentiation between primary

phasis of the debate shifts to the much
 eationship with her mother, and hence
 nd away from the construction of sexu-
 eason why arguments become more
 the phallic phase in his work on 'The
 ex'. But it is as though the controversy
 It is as though Freud is now alone. For
 eenders look for answers in biology or
 ection-relations as the focus of their dis-

y accusing his opponents of looking for
 : field of inquiry, disapproving of what
 gy:

raunschweig, Horney, Jones, Rado,
 not distinguish more clearly and
 ic and what is biological, that you
 sm between the two and that you,
 thinkingly construe psychic facts
 t you, in the process of so doing,
 ressive much that without doing so
 ould only like to emphasize that we
 rate from biology just as we have
 und physiology.²⁶

And yet, here there is also a turning point in Freud's work: emphasis is 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 now 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 complex 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 encapsulated, 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 centres 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 sexuality, 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, perhaps, 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?²⁹

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 phallogocentric and patrocetric nature of psychoanalysis as he conceived it,³⁰ by his self-diagnosed hysteria,³¹ by his hysterical phobia as diagnosed by Didier Anzieu?³² Perhaps some or even all of these features played a role;

but in our view more fundamental research has an affinity with 'through', resistance, and return. The strengths of this collection to the community of psychoanalysis: the specificity of this analytic process itself. One can find what is specific.

Russell Grigg
Dominique Hecq
Craig Smith

Notes

- ¹ Sigmund Freud, 'Femininity', in *SE* 22:113.
- ² *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*.
- ³ 'On the Sexual Theories of Children', 'Femininity', *SE* 22:113.
- ⁴ 'The Infantile Genital Organization: Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex', 'Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes', *SE* 22:252.
- ⁵ *New Introductory Lectures*, *SE* 22:104.
- ⁶ See for instance Juliet Mitchell and École Freudienne (Macmillan, London). Mitchell briefly explains why Karl Abraham's dynamics of the debate—see *Maternal Sexuality?* (Seuil: Paris, 1992).
- ⁷ See Karl Abraham, 'Origins and Development of the Oedipus Complex', *SE* 22:252.
- ⁸ Freud-Viereck 21.9.1930, *The Letters to Jung*, London: The Hogarth Press, 1962.
- ⁹ *The Complete Poems of Heine*, trans. J. Hayward, *SE* 19:129 (emphasis added).
- ¹⁰ 'On the Sexual Theories of Children', 'Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes', *SE* 22:252.
- ¹¹ 'A point somewhat refined in 1925', *SE* 22:165-75.
- ¹² 'The Infantile Genital Organization: Psychological Consequences', *SE* 22:252.
- ¹³ 'Why does the little girl change her sexual object?', though a key conceptual difficulty in dealing with the presence of a fact—motherhood is not the conceptual difficulty in dealing with the fact—see Freud's essay on 'The Oedipus Complex', *SE* 22:165-75.
- ¹⁴ A point somewhat refined in 1925, though not everything, *SE* 22:165-75.

... now see as his opponents: Abraham, Horney and Jones. But he omits to mention (and hence to show how legitimate the concern is to foreground the terms of the Freud's conceptual framework from within) the papers presented here in this collection—the answer to such questions.

... more than three-quarters of a century ago, ... stance from the cross-firing of arguments ... t femininity. But it is important to main- ... is to suggest why the argument around ... and hence to show how legitimate the ... concern is to foreground the terms of the ... Freud's conceptual framework from with- ... s that made it possible, as well as to sug- ... v starting points, in the current re-exam- ... s why we have adopted a chronological ... the significant material produced by the ... ersy—all except for Freud, but it goes ... ellectual interaction that occurred from ... s. his own contributions should be read

... distinction between psychoanalysis and ... reciprocal influence of psychical and bio- ... adaptation to sexual stages. Thus even ... rs to keep psychoanalysis separate from ... n about sexual difference that children ... late on the couch, dealing with the very ... indeed psychical consequences to the ... 'sexes?'

... femininity, there remains one riddle ... Freud's blindness in the area of feminin- ... lay in recognizing the crucial mother- ... acy dictated by Freud's own masculin- ... ly, he and others suggest, or by the phal- ... of psychoanalysis as he conceived it,³⁰ by ... his hysterical phobia as diagnosed by ... even all of these features played a role;

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.

Russell Grigg
Dominique Hecq
Craig Smith

Notes

- ¹ Sigmund Freud, 'Femininity', in *New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis* (1933a), SE 22:113.
- ² *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905d), SE 7:151.
- ³ 'On the Sexual Theories of Children' (1908c), SE 9:211.
- ⁴ 'Femininity', SE 22:113.
- ⁵ 'The Infantile Genital Organization' (1923e), SE 19:142. In addition to this paper, see 'The Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex' (1924d) and 'Some Psychical Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes' (1925j).
- ⁶ Editor's note to 'Psychical Consequences', SE 19:245.
- ⁷ SE 22:252.
- ⁸ *New Introductory Lectures*, SE 22:149.
- ⁹ See for instance Juliet Mitchell and Jacqueline Rose, *Feminine Sexuality: Jacques Lacan and the Ecole Freudienne* (Macmillan: London, 1982), pp. 8 and 15-16 in particular, where Juliet Mitchell briefly explains why 'Karl Abraham's work is crucial'. For a more radical revision of the dynamics of the debate, see Marie-Christine Hamon, *Pourquoi les femmes aiment-elles les hommes?* (Seuil: Paris, 1992).
- ¹⁰ See Karl Abraham, 'Origins and Growth of Object-Love', Part II of 'Development of the Libido' (1924). Reprinted below.
- ¹¹ Freud-Viereck 21.9.1930, *The Diary of Sigmund Freud 1929-1939: A Record of the Final Decade* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1992), 283.
- ¹² *The Complete Poems of Heine*, trans. Edgar Alfred Bowring (G. Bell and Sons, 1916), 260.
- ¹³ 'Femininity', SE 19:129 (emphasis added).
- ¹⁴ 'On the Sexual Theories of Children' (1908c), SE 9:205-26, links the alleged universal possession of a penis in children (p. 215) with the proposed theory of the little girl's disappointment at not having it (p. 218).
- ¹⁵ SE 11:165-75.
- ¹⁶ 'The Infantile Genital Organization' (1923e), SE 19:141.
- ¹⁷ 'Psychical Consequences', 256. Worth noting is that the question underlying this statement is 'Why does the little girl change love objects?'
- ¹⁸ Identification, though a key concept, is an elusive one. There is, obviously, a conceptual difficulty in dealing with the preoedipal mother. This probably makes sense, since whether a construct or a fact, motherhood is part of the whole phallic economy. Here lies and follows the conceptual difficulty in dealing with the preoedipal, rather than oedipal, mother. (Contrast with Freud's essay on Leonardo da Vinci.)
- ¹⁹ A point somewhat refined in 1933, though Freud admits then: 'We have learned a fair amount, though not everything, about all three.' ('Femininity', 129)

- ²⁰ 'Psychical Consequences', SE 19:251.
²¹ 'Female Sexuality', SE 21:225.
²² 'Female Sexuality', SE 21:235.
²³ August Stärcke, 'The Castration complex', below.
²⁴ Karl Abraham, 'Origins and Growth of Object-Love', below.
²⁵ See below.
²⁶ 'Letter to Carl Müller-Braunschweig' (1935), published as 'Freud and female sexuality: a previously unpublished letter', *Psychiatry*, 34(1971):328-9.
²⁷ See the passage quoted above from 'Psychical Consequences', SE 19:251.
²⁸ Juliet Mitchell, *Female Sexuality*, 20.
²⁹ William I. Grossman, 'Discussion of "Freud and Female Sexuality"', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 57(1976):301.
³⁰ Juliet Mitchell, *Feminine Sexuality*, 23.
³¹ See letters to Fliess of 14.9.1897, 30.9.1897 and 3.10.1897, in *Letters to Fliess*, 261, 270 and 325.
³² Didier Anzieu, *Le Corps de l'oeuvre* (Gallimard: Paris, 1981), 61.

Contributions to

J. H.

International Journal

Undoubtedly Contributions
condemned paper. This may
1924 well after Freud intro
writings. However Van Op
Psycho-Analytical Society
German the same year and in
The term 'masculinity'
Freud acknowledges his debt
in the present paper that he
series only are first clearly ex
the engendered zone is linked to
usually important, and Freud
of the little girl.

The maternal man Oppen
sexual woman. One of the ca
specially discussed by female
Castration Complex in *Women
Sexuality*, of 1931. The analy
features encountered in the
the man Oppenheimer takes her
regarded.

Van Oppenheimer's starting
every woman that it denotes
is necessary through no fault
having brought her into this
some character types encounte
served not that this marking a
marked as a belief in the
history the castration and
attached to the foreign is abse
other have what predominates
serving femininity and repro
presence of a form of masculinity
same character types.