

Punished or Chosen?
Freud's Castration Anxiety and Circumcision

BY

JENNA E. VEREN
B.S., University of Illinois at Chicago, 2013

THESIS

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Germanic
Studies in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Chicago, 2015

Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee

Heidi Schlipphacke, Advisor and Chair
Elizabeth Loentz
Dagmar Lorenz

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. FREUD, THE FOOTNOTE AND JEWISH IDENTITY.....	6
III. CASTRATION ANXIETY IN FREUD.....	12
IV. THE JEW AS THE FEMALE?	18
V. HISTORICIZING CIRCUMCISION IN MOSES AND MONOTHEISM	21
VI. CIRCUMCISION AS A METONYM FOR CASTRATION ANXIETY: ESSENTIALIZING THE JEWS?.....	30
CITED LITERATURE	36

I. INTRODUCTION

In several of his early works on the sexual development of children, such as *Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben* (1909) and *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (1905) Sigmund Freud places castration anxiety at the core of psychoanalysis. Freud understands castration anxiety not only as signifying sexual differences, but also as a motor for the development of culture. Castration anxiety is, for Freud, at the crux of how society functions, and it is what drives the discontent in society. According to Freud, castration anxiety serves as the root for all sources of neurosis and fear. The castration complex serves as both the point of departure from and arrival into the Oedipus complex for boys and girls, and it is essential in order for a boy to overcome his Oedipus complex. When posed with the threat of castration, the young boy begins to fear the father and give up the mother as a love object. The inability to do this, according to Freud, will result in instances of perversion and sexual deviance. The threat of castration forces the boy to avert all aggressive impulses that are central in the Oedipus complex, and to adopt the moral instructions of his surrounding culture and society, and this constitutes the birth of the super-ego. The establishment of the super-ego results in the suppression the male child's sexual instincts, aggressive drives, and the outward seeking of love and approval. Castration anxiety functions, hence, as the motor of the developmental process.

In his 1909 case study consisting of letters and commentaries, *Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben*, Freud looks closely at the birth of castration anxiety of little Hans. Freud provides commentary to numerous letters regarding music critic Max Graf's observation of his

son. In his case study of “Little Hans,” Freud writes his first detailed case study of infantile sexuality and the psychology of castration anxiety. It is within this case study that Freud suggests that the onset of castration anxiety originates with the mother, who threatens to cut the “Wiwimacher” off if he continues to play with it. “Wenn du das machst, lass’ ich den Dr. A kommen, der schneidet dir den Wiwimacher ab” (5). The mother herself does not represent the threat of castration, but instead she implants the threat into the child’s mind, which he eventually transfers over to the father. The young boy represses this fear, but it inevitably returns via the unconscious when the boy is first introduced to the sexual differences between males and females, namely when he first notices the visible absence of the male sexual organs in the girl.

[...] wenn der kleine Knabe die Genitalgegend des Mädchens zuerst erblickt, benimmt er sich unschlüssig, zunächst wenig interessiert; er sieht nichts oder er verleugnet seine Wahrnehmung, schwächt sie ab, sucht nach Auskünften, um sie mit seiner Erwartung in Einklang zu bringen. Erst später, wenn eine Kastrationsdrohung auf ihn Einfluß gewonnen hat, wird diese Beobachtung für ihn bedeutungsvoll werden; ihre Erinnerung oder Erneuerung regt einen fürchterlichen Affektsturm in ihm an und unterwirft ihn dem Glauben an die Wirklichkeit der bisher verlachten Androhung (260).

This quote appears in Freud’s 1925 article “Einige psychische Folgen des anatomischen Geschlechtsunterschieds.” The visible absence of the penis reignites the dreaded castration complex, which the young boy actively disavows. He tries to understand the lack of genitalia as having yet to grow. For the boy, the female has a penis, but it has not fully developed, or is different from the male genitalia. It is only when the child experiences some other threat of

castration or the threat of punishment by the father that he comes to accept that the female does not have a penis, and he begins to fear the threat of castration as a reality.

Despite this seemingly clear attribution of castration anxiety to the individual psyche, Freud interrupts his commentary with a footnote in *Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben*, problematizing his previous theories and contradicting his earlier claims:

Ich kann den Zusammenhang nicht so weit unterbrechen, um darzutun, wieviel Typisches an diesen unbewußten Gedankengängen ist, die ich hier dem kleinen Hans zumute. Der Kastrationskomplex ist die tiefste unbewußte Wurzel des Antisemitismus, denn schon in der Kinderstube hört der Knabe, daß dem Juden etwas am Penis – er meint, ein Stück des Penis – abgeschnitten werde, und dies gibt ihm das Recht, den Juden zu verachten. Auch die Überhebung über das Weib hat keine stärkere unbewußte Wurzel. Weiniger, jener hochbegabte und sexuell gestörte junge Philosoph, der nach seinem merkwürdigen Buche *Geschlecht und Charakter* sein Leben durch Selbstmord beendigte, hat in einem vielbemerkten Kapitel den Juden und das Weib mit der gleichen Feindschaft bedacht und mit den nämlichen Schmähungen überhäuft. Weiniger stand als Neurotiker völlig unter der Herrschaft infantiler Komplexe; die Beziehung zum Kastrationskomplex ist das dem Juden und der Weibe dort Gemeinsame (21).

Freud evokes both anti-Semitism and circumcision in a manner that is unprecedented in his works up until this point. The ‘ultimate’ threat of castration derives from others, namely the Christians, seeing a Jewish penis that has been circumcised. Freud metonymically links circumcision to castration. The boy substitutes the process of circumcision with that of castration, and fears the Jew because of it. The young boy, in the nursery, hears that a Jewish boy

has something cut off from his penis, and immediately associates this with castration. The ‘true’ threat no longer comes from the female, but instead metonymically linked to the Jewish practice of circumcision. Freud’s citing of Weininger, however, does not discredit his earlier sexual theories of castration anxiety, but instead draws a parallel between the Jew and the female.

The addition of the footnote raises several fundamental questions: Why did Freud present this important insight as a footnote? Why did he interrupt a psychoanalytically focused work that had no previous mention of religion with a footnote related to circumcision and anti-Semitism? Freud never returns to this topic or furthers his argument regarding anti-Semitism and circumcision in *Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben*. How is Freud’s metonymical link of Jewish circumcision with castration anxiety related to castration anxiety deriving from the female lack of a penis; or: does the Jew represent the female? In what follows, I will analyze how circumcision functions here and elsewhere in Freud’s writings as a metonym for castration anxiety. I offer a close reading of select passages from Freud’s works, in order to reflect on broader historical concerns. Specifically, I am interested in working out the complex connections between castration anxiety, circumcision, and the phenomenon of anti-Semitism that concerned Freud deeply. Previous theorists have looked at this footnote as a conflation of Jewishness and femininity, while I maintain that Freud understands the Jew differently. I will argue that Freud does not share the same viewpoint as Weininger that the Jew and the female are structurally similar. Rather, he seems to place the circumcised (male) Jew at a higher structural place than the woman. I will also argue that, for Freud, circumcision serves a dual purpose, both as a mark of punishment and as an outward expression of chosenness. I take a Jewish studies approach to confront Freud’s treatment of circumcision. In doing so, I will show that Freud sees anti-

Semitism as originating from the Christian, or non-Jewish, response to the outward mark of chosenness of the Jews.

II. FREUD, THE FOOTNOTE AND JEWISH IDENTITY

Why would Freud choose to present such a controversial claim as a footnote? At first glance, the footnote appears as Freud's passive attempt to confront anti-Semitism, so that it would not seem central in his work. Freud displaces this argument into a footnote and never returns to circumcision linking to castration anxiety in his central argument. It seems as though Freud actively hides this Jewish discourse in order to passively confront anti-Semitism. I would argue that Freud engages in a mode of analysis, in which what he writes as an aside, or his offhand remarks, are perhaps of central importance. This is exhibited in several different works by Freud. Several examples of this mode of analysis are in Freud's *Die Traumdeutung* (1900), and *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewußten* (1905), where Freud teaches us that the seemingly accidental is actually what is central and perhaps most important. In *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewußten*, the comical effect of the jokes lies within the uncertainty and confusion that coincide with this comedy:

Lipps (1898, S. 95) ergänzt hierzu, daß diesem ersten Stadium der Erleuchtung, das verblüffende Wort bedeute dies und jenes, ein zweites Stadium folgt, in dem man einsehe, dies sinnlose Wort habe uns verblüfft und dann den guten Sinn ergeben. Erst diese zweite Erleuchtung, die Einsicht, daß ein nach gemeinem Sprachgebrauch sinnloses Wort das ganze verschuldet habe, diese Auflösung in Nichts, erzeuge erst die Komik (Freud, 1905,

4)

It is the reader's or the receiver of the joke's job to uncover the true meaning in order to understand the joke and the comical elements to this joke. The deeper investigation into the joke

will reveal or uncover an essential truth.¹ Wit, according to Freud, must disclose something that is buried or concealed.

Similarly, dreams will not willingly or easily reveal a truth or something of utmost importance, but instead those interested in the dreams must engage in some detective work. The dream appears seemingly accidental; however, Freud believes that one must uncover this accidental material and understand it as symbolism for a real-life incident or problem.

Es kommt zunächst vor, daß im Trauminhalt ein Material auftritt, welches man dann im Wachen nicht als zu seinem Wissen und Erleben gehörig anerkennt. Man erinnert wohl, daß man das Betreffende geträumt, aber erinnert nicht, daß und wann man es erlebt hat. Man bleibt dann im Unklaren darüber, aus welcher Quelle der Traum geschöpft hat, und ist wohl versucht, an eine selbständig produzierende Tätigkeit des Traumes zu glauben, bis oft nach langer Zeit ein neues Erlebnis die verloren gegebene Erinnerung an das frühere Erlebnis wiederbringt und damit die Traumquelle aufdeckt (Freud, 1899, 24).

The material that is uncovered in dreams represents something stored in the unconscious. One must actively seek the origins of these “symptoms” to find the aspect of the dream that is seemingly marginal, yet important. Freud’s use of footnotes in *Analyse* invites the readers to read his work in a similar way that he does in *Witz* and in *Traumdeutung*. My attempt here is to mirror Freud in this mode of analysis and borrow from his own teachings in order to highlight the centrality of the footnote to his theories of psychoanalysis and anti-Semitism.

¹ It is interesting that Freud states “diese Auflösung in Nichts.” It seems as though one must search for a deeper meaning to understand, however there is no true resolution to this.

Freud's use of footnotes and subliminal comments are particularly relevant with regard to his Jewish identity. As Jay Geller points out in his article "*Atheist Jew or Atheist Jew: Freud's Jewish Question and Ours*," Freud did not hesitate to identify himself as a Jew. "Indeed, Freud never did have a problem with affixing the label "Jew" to his person. In his letters, prefaces, and addresses he repeatedly laid claim to that identification" (Geller, 2). He then quotes Freud from his 1926 address to the Vienna B'nai B'rith. "For I was myself a Jew, and it had always seemed to me not unworthy, but positively senseless to deny the fact" (Geller, 2). Despite Freud's willingness and perhaps even eagerness to identify with his Jewish colleagues and identify himself as a Jew, Freud did not initially want psychoanalysis to be labeled as a Jewish science. The membership of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, entailing a Wednesday night meeting at Freud's home, consisted entirely of Jewish psychoanalysts. Freud feared that the domination of psychoanalysis by his Jewish cohorts would result in a stigmatization of the science, and that others would view psychoanalysis as a "Jewish national affair".

Several years later, in *Totem und Tabu* (1913), Freud again interrupts his work with a footnote relating circumcision to anti-Semitism. The footnote appears in Freud's chapter "Die infantile Wiederkehr des Totemismus", where he looks at the relation of the Oedipal complex to the ordinances of totemism. In this chapter, Freud explicates that the child associates with his animalistic totem. When the totem is killed, it represents the killing of the father, which the child understands as a sacrifice. They both fear and respect the father, and feel immense guilt over this. Freud follows up this discussion with the following footnote:

Die Kastrationsangst spielt eine außerordentlich große Rolle in der Störung des Verhältnisses zum Vater bei unseren jugendlichen Neurotikern. Aus der schönen

Beobachtung von Ferenczi (1913 a) haben wir gesehen, wie der Knabe seinen Totem in dem Tier erkennt, welches nach seinem kleinen Gliede schnappt. Wenn unsere Kinder von der rituellen Beschneidung erfahren, stellen sie dieselbe der Kastration gleich. Die völkerpsychologische Parallele zu diesem Verhalten der Kinder ist meines Wissens noch nicht ausgeführt worden. Die in der Urzeit und bei primitiven Völkern so häufige Beschneidung gehört dem Zeitpunkt der Männerweihe an, wo sie ihre Bedeutung finden muß, und ist erst sekundär in frühere Lebenszeiten zurückgeschoben worden. Es ist überaus interessant, daß die Beschneidung bei den Primitiven mit Haarabschneiden und Zahnausschlagen kombiniert oder durch sie ersetzt ist und daß unsere Kinder, die von diesem Sachverhalt nichts wissen können, in ihren Angstreaktionen diese beiden Operationen wirklich wie Äquivalente der Kastration behandeln (Freud, 436).

It is interesting that Freud never directly relates circumcision as a Jewish practice, but instead calls it a practice of the “primitive races.” Castration anxiety that comes from the practice of circumcision, Freud notes, is parallel to that of the totem.

In both footnotes, the child experiences or learns of circumcision; however it is unclear how the child learns of this. It seems as though circumcision is a culturally learned moment that is passed through the generations. The boy never actually sees this, but he only hears of this, and this gives him the right to hate the Jew. This raises an interesting question as to whether anti-Semitism actually begins in the nursery. In both cases; however, the child assumes it is the same as castration, and unconsciously fears the Jew. Like *Analyse*, where Freud is looking at castration anxiety from the standpoint of the male child seeing the female, circumcision and Jewish hatred were not the central focus of this work. *Totem und Tabu* does, however, look at the Oedipus

complex as the grounds for creating religion. In arguing this, he proposes that religion originates from a collective guilt from killing the father. *Totem und Tabu* returns to the Oedipus complex, complicating this relationship between the father and the son. The threat, once again, turns into the fear of the father, and yet Freud relates this to circumcision.

The footnotes in *Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben* and in *Totem und Tabu*, appear displaced and partially hidden in this psychoanalytical work. In Freud's psychoanalytic theory, the root of castration anxiety occurs at the unconscious level and is attributed to sexual differences. Freud clearly focuses on gender and sexuality, but he does not take great heed of race or ethnicity. Freud's main focus, within this work, centers on how the female represents the prospect of castration. He, however, does not analyze any religious or cultural practices, with the exception of this footnote. Freud suggests that circumcision is actually the root of anti-Semitism, by seeing it through the lens of castration anxiety. It is not until *Der Mann Moses und die Monotheistische Religion* (1939) that Freud returns to this claim and actually elaborates on its relation to the hatred of the Jews. I would argue that Freud's attempts to displace and repress these claims in these earlier works is linked to his desire not to have psychoanalysis be viewed as a "Jewish science" or a "Jewish national affair". As Jay Geller mentions, there was an attempt by Freud, to avoid psychoanalysis from becoming a Jewish science: "Freud, who identified himself with the values of the cultured bourgeoisie and the corollary objective universals of scientific positivism and Enlightenment rationality, fortiori, psychoanalysis, developed by Freud and pre-eminently practiced by Jews, was continuously attempting to deflect its identification as a 'Jewish national affair'" (Geller 2007, 113). At the time that Freud presented the footnote, he did

not desire to be viewed as a Jewish psychoanalyst; rather, he wanted psychoanalysis to be respected as a scientific practice.

Freud's desire to be respected as a scientist and desire for others to recognize psychoanalysis as a legitimate discourse in medicine explains the integration of non-Jewish psychoanalysts, such as Carl Jung and Ernest Jones, into his fold. Jewish psychoanalysts working alongside Freud became increasingly wary of integrating non-Jewish psychologists. In a 1910 address to psychoanalysts, Freud defends his decision to appoint Jung as the president of the International Psychoanalytic Association. "Most of you are Jews and therefore incompetent to win friends for the new teaching. I am getting on in years and am weary of being perpetually attacked. We are in danger. They won't leave me a coat on my back. This Swiss will save us—will save me and will save you as well" (Diller, 36). Carl Jung, the Swiss psychiatrist, quickly adapted the theories of Sigmund Freud, but the relationship rapidly fractured when Jung allied with the Nazi party and integrated anti-Semitism into his philosophy.

Considering that Freud presented this footnote in *Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben*, which was published in 1909, it is possible that Freud could have feared that the inclusion of the footnote into his main text could confirm others' belief that psychoanalysis was a Jewish science. The inclusion of this information as a footnote, however, does not diminish the importance. Freud invites us through his own theories of analytical method to read this as perhaps the most vital point of his text.

III. CASTRATION ANXIETY IN FREUD

To trace Freud's trajectory from psychoanalytical model of castration to his latter theories of castration via circumcision, one needs to look at Freud's earliest theories of castration anxiety. The true core of castration anxiety, for Freud, derives from the sexual differences between the male and female genitalia. When the child notices the differences, he initially assumes that the penis is there, but that it has yet to develop. This is initially exhibited between Hans' and his younger sister: "Ein wenig später sieht Hans zu, wie man seine einwöchentliche Schwester badet. Er bemerkt 'Aber ihr Wiwimacher ist noch klein', und setzt wie tröstend hinzu: 'Wenn sie wächst, wird er schon größer werden'" (7). In Freud's footnote to this, he regards this initial reaction as a "fehlerhaften Wahrnehmung," where every animate object must possess male genitalia. Freud notes that this perception is not an isolated instance, but is the general reaction amongst children. "Das nämliche Urteil, in den identischen Worten ausgedrückt und von der gleichen Erwartung gefolgt, wurde mir von zwei anderen Knaben berichtet, als sie den Leib eines kleinen Schwesterchens zuerst neugierig beschauen konnten. Man könnte über diese frühzeitige Verderbnis des kindlichen Intellekts erschrecken" (Freud, 5). The misperception is as follows: Every living being, *belebtes Wesen*, must possess male genitalia.

Wir wissen, er hat sich durch sorgfältige Induktion den allgemeinen Satz erworben, daß jedes belebte Wesen im Gegensatze zum Unbelebten einen Wiwimacher besitzt; die Mutter hat ihn in dieser Überzeugung bestärkt, indem sie ihm bejahende Auskünfte über solche Personen gab, die sich seiner eigenen Beobachtung entzogen. Er ist nun ganz und gar unfähig, seine Errungenschaft wegen der einen Beobachtung an der kleinen Schwester wieder aufzugeben (5).

The young child represses his perception of this not being a real penis, and the fear of castration reemerges via castration anxiety. The “belebtes Wesen” is important not only for understanding the female’s fate, but also for understanding the Jew and his fate. The Jew, unlike the female, does possess a penis, yet he is circumcised. Because the female has nothing, she is nothing. The Jew does have a penis, therefore, he is something, or living. Freud does not indicate that the young boy believes that the Jewish boys’ penis has yet to grow. There are two phases to this process. First, Little Hans denies the lack of male genitalia in the girl and assumes they have yet to appear. Later, the young boy comes to accept the lack of a penis as the truth, and eventually fears this as a potential punishment for himself. It is precisely this threat that causes the boy to overcome the Oedipus complex. The sexual difference arouses the boy’s fear, and he represses his desire for his mother, and he enters a period of latency. It is during this time that the superego continues to develop and the child learns to sublimate the primal instincts.

For the girl, however, the castration anxiety is the point of departure into the Oedipus complex. The girl attributes her lack of the penis to the mother. “Das kleine Mädchen verfällt nicht in ähnliche Abweisungen, wenn es das anders gestaltete Genitale des Knaben erblickt. Es ist sofort bereit, es anzuerkennen, und es unterliegt dem Penisneide, der in dem für Folge wichtigen Wunsch, auch ein Bub zu sein, gipfelt” (Freud, 1908). The castration complex not only perpetuates a disdain for the mother, but also propagates the onset of penis envy. For Freud, castration is inevitably inseparable from castration anxiety. The prospect of the boy being castrated and the experience of seeing the female must always result in immediate anxiety.

Freud revisits the differences between the male and female experiences of castration anxiety and penis envy in his 1931 work *Über Weiblichkeit*.

Bei diesem entsteht der Kastrationskomplex, nachdem er durch den Anblick eines weiblichen Genitales erfahren hat, daß das von ihm so hoch geschätzte Glied nicht notwendig mit dem Körper beisammen sein muß. Er entsinnt sich dann der Drohungen, die er sich durch seine Beschäftigung mit dem Glied zugezogen, fängt an, ihnen Glauben zu schenken, und gerät von da an unter den Einfluß der *Kastrationsangst*, die der mächtigste Motor seiner weiteren Entwicklung wirkt. Auch der Kastrationskomplex des Mädchens wird durch den Anblick des anderen Genitales eröffnet. Es merkt sofort den Unterschied und – man muß es zugestehen – auch seine Bedeutung. Es fühlt sich schwer beeinträchtigt, äußert oft, es möchte “auch so etwas haben” und verfällt nun dem *Penisneid*, der unvertilgbare Spuren in seiner Entwicklung und Charakterbildung hinterlassen, auch im günstigen Fall nicht ohne schweren psychischen Aufwand überwunden werden wird (1834).

In contrast to the male experience of fear of punishment, the female experience of castration anxiety results in a feeling of inferiority, which leads to her penis envy. She immediately recognizes the difference (*sofort*) and, unlike the male, does not repress her fear or envy.

Feminist theorists have often criticized Freud for his notions of the female experience, especially that of penis envy; however, they nevertheless often return to Freud and use Freud in their analyses of the construction of the female identity. In a collection of essays on female and psychoanalysis, Shelly Saguaro prefaces the book with a note on Freud’s importance to bringing the female into the forefront of psychology.

Despite the fact that female sexuality is seen by Freud as a foreign and obscure ‘dark continent’, it was at least – and at last – seen to be acknowledged. Women theorists’

responses to the claims of psychoanalysis, therefore, are largely an attempt not to refute but to reply to, and thus modify; to establish 'a woman's point of view': and to counteract the predominance of the male (8).

Freud's theories of female sexuality provide an important basis to which theorists return repeatedly. In her essay "Castration or Decapitation," Helene Cixous notes that where Freud assigns a feeling of loss and mourning to the female, she would argue that the female never actually mourns, but instead "takes up the challenge of loss" to continue living in a productive way (242). In contrast, she argues that the male must always mourn in order to withstand the fear of castration. She alters Freud's theory to create a more positive experience for the female.

It is interesting to consider the male Jewish experience as parallel to the female experience. Freud writes about the crisis of the female, and he also writes about the non-Jewish boy understanding circumcision as castration, but he never describes the crisis of the Jewish male. We do; however, see Little Hans experiencing much the same crisis that a non-Jewish boy would, as Freud describes. It is unclear whether the Jew immediately recognizes that he is different, as the female does. Little Hans acts according to Freud's common observation, where he notices that the female lacks a penis, and believes it has yet to grow. Freud also does not clearly state that the Jew immediately recognizes his partial lack of a penis as being inferior. Instead later we see the Jew transforming this difference into a superiority complex, which one can see explicitly in *Moses*. The differences between the male and female fates are nonetheless clear. The male threat of castration is the driving force for male development, and is essential for the male to avoid a stage of neurosis. The female feels as though her mother has denied her the

superior organs, and this feeling of denial pushes the female into the Oedipus complex. The feeling of being inferior persists in the female unconscious.

As I previously mentioned, when the boy sees the female genitalia, he does not immediately become anxious, but instead there is a delay. The male requires another form of threat, specifically the threat of mother, for the castration anxiety to be brought to consciousness. The female experience, however, differs in that she immediately comprehends her own inferiority.

Sie ist im Nu fertig mit ihrem Urteil und ihrem Entschluß. Sie hat es gesehen, weiß, daß sie es nicht hat, und will es haben. An dieser Stelle zweigt der sogenannte Männlichkeitskomplex des Weibes ab, welcher der vorgezeichneten Entwicklung zur Weiblichkeit eventuell große Schwierigkeiten bereiten wird, wenn es nicht gelingt, ihn bald zu überwinden. Die Hoffnung, doch noch einmal einen Penis zu bekommen und dadurch dem Manne gleich zu werden, kann sich bis in unwahrscheinlich späte Zeiten erhalten und zum Motiv für sonderbare, sonst unverständliche Handlungen werden (Freud, 1925, 4).

The female perceives the lack of a penis as a punishment, and, according to Freud, she perceives this as a universal punishment bestowed upon women as the inferior gender. The female, in turn, becomes jealous of the male and desires to feel equal to the male and be chosen.

According to Luce Irigaray, the female within Freud's model is already castrated, because there is nothing visible to be seen. "Woman's castration is defined as her having nothing you can see, or her *having* nothing" (Irigaray, 48). Irigaray only attributes Freud's description of "kein belebtes Wesen" as having nothing, where Freud suggests that this is being nothing, because all

animate objects must possess genitalia, unless they are punished or castrated. If the female has nothing, she must have been punished. The female, unlike the male and unlike the Jew, never experiences the threat of castration, because she feels that she has already been castrated. She, in turn, blames her mother for this wrongdoing. For Irigaray, she blames the mother for having already castrated her, but Freud argues that she blames the mother for not bestowing her with male genitalia. For Freud, the female is not actually castrated, but merely represents the prospect of castration. This is in contrast to Irigaray, where the girl has already been castrated. Both Freud and Irigaray, however, see the female embodying the passive position. This distinction is especially important in relation to the Jew. The Jew is not always already castrated, and he is never fully castrated. He merely metonymically represents castration because he is circumcised. He also never feels as though he has been castrated. The fear of castration still resonates with him, as we see with Little Hans. He understands circumcision as a gift or a rite bestowed upon him. Unlike the male, the girl does not overcome the Oedipus complex via castration anxiety, but instead enters into the Oedipus complex stage at the point of penis envy. The Oedipus complex in females is either abandoned slowly, or it is repressed over time. Freud does not present us with a real 'healthy' model of the female, as he does for the male. According to Freud, the difficult path through the Oedipus complex for girls can explain the numerous instances of female neurosis, later in life. (i.e. narcissism, masochism, homosexuality, etc.)

IV. THE JEW AS THE FEMALE?

As I previously mentioned, Freud suggests a dual process in castration anxiety: The boy sees the girl and believes that the penis has yet to grow, and then he comes to accept her lack of penis as truth and fears punishment in the same form. In his footnote, however, castration anxiety is the root of anti-Semitism, via circumcision, which raises the fundamental question: What separates the Jew and the female, for Freud? The girl elicits fear of punishment, and, by extension, perhaps the Jew does, too. Freud, however, does not understand this as the same fear. In *Geschlecht und Charakter* (1903), Otto Weininger claims that the Jew is feminine and thereby suggests that the Jew represents cowardliness.

Daß aber diese Untersuchung gerade in einer Psychologie der Geschlechter geführt werden muß ist unerläßlich aus Gründen einer Abgrenzung. Es bereitet jedem, der über beide, über das Weib und über den Juden nachgedacht hat, eine eigentümliche Überraschung, wenn er wahrnimmt, in welchem Maße gerade das Judentum durchtränkt scheint, von jener Weiblichkeit, deren Wesen einstweilen nur im Gegensätze zu allem Männlichen ohne Unterschied zu erforschen betrachtet wurde. Er könnte hier überaus leicht geneigt sein, dem Juden einen größeren Anteil an der Weiblichkeit zuzuschreiben, als dem Arier, ja am Ende eine platonische auch des männlichsten Juden am Weibe anzunehmen sich bewogen fühlen (Weiniger, 415).

Otto Weininger attributes anti-Semitism to the lack of manliness among Jews, and their likeness to the female. Circumcision, along with other stereotypes of the Jewish body, feminizes the Jewish male and elicits a similar threat of castration that is brought on by the sight of the female.

Freud analyzes the fear of castration coming from circumcision from the gentile, male perspective. It is interesting to think that his observation of little Hans comes from a Jewish perspective, and his anxiety comes from the girl.² Freud does not consider the difference between Jewish castration anxiety and gentile castration anxiety, yet they have different experiences. But even for Weininger, the Jew is not quite equal to the girl; instead male homosexuality is allied with femininity. While Freud mentions Weininger in his footnote, Freud does not assume the same viewpoint regarding Jewish sexuality. Both Geller and Gilman suggest Freud's reference to Weininger is limited to the single instance of little Hans, and Freud's assessment of Hans as a homosexual (Geller, 126). Both Weininger and Freud work with a model of bisexuality that indicates both sex identity and object choice. Within this model, the more feminine a man is, the more likely it is he will be attracted to another man. However Freud, unlike Weininger, is not attesting to a link between the Jew and homosexuality, but perhaps instead is only interested in the single case of Hans' homosexuality.

Freud's theory of circumcision in *Analyse* problematizes his previous theory of castration anxiety. Freud first proposes that the "ultimate threat of castration anxiety" arises at the sight of the female, and then later proposes in *Analyse* that the ultimate threat is from the Jew. Freud's chronology is called into question here. In *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*, Freud first presents the female as the core of castration anxiety. Freud does not, however, present castration anxiety as a means of anti-feminism. The boy does not come to hate the female, but instead it sparks the boy's fear. The female then sees the young boy, and she develops penis envy. In

² Although Freud addresses the discourse that conflates the male Jew and the female, Freud does not explore the women as the anti-Semite.

Analyse der Phobie eines fünfjährigen Knaben, Freud proposes that when the young boy sees the Jewish penis, this immediately gives him the right to hate the Jew. *Analyse* appears as a thought experiment here, where Freud contradicts his earlier claims and the chronology is not completely worked out. It seems that the misogyny appears first, sparking this initial fear, which leads the Christians to associate the Jew with the female, as having been castrated. However, Freud notes that the Jew is the ultimate representation of castration anxiety, despite the female being necessary in order for this model to function. In *Moses and Monotheism*, Freud focuses merely on anti-Semitism, and does not return to misogyny.

Although the female feels she has been punished for not having male genitalia, she does not experience the same chosenness that the Jew does in circumcision. She does not feel as though she has been chosen for several reasons. First, the female has not been given a penis. She blames her mother for this, and feels that she is lacking because of this.

V. HISTORICIZING CIRCUMCISION IN MOSES AND MONOTHEISM

Historical documentation of circumcision history and practices show an association of circumcision to castration. Although the origin of circumcision remains widely unclear to historicists, they suggest that circumcision in Judaic culture began as an outward sign of a covenant between God and the Jewish man (Dunsmuir, 2). The earliest acts of Jewish circumcision were acts of commitment and devotion. According to the Hebrew bible, circumcision was the first commandment that God gave to Abraham

This is My covenant which you shall keep, between Me and you and thy descendants after thee, every male among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall be circumcised on the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a sign of the covenant between Me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations” (Genesis 17:10-12).

In numerous other cultures, however, circumcision was implemented with the purpose of instilling pain, and as a form of punishment or humiliation. Historians suggest that in ancient Egypt, circumcision was performed on slaves, as a mark of humiliation or as a way to mark property (Ozturk, 18). Despite the vast amount of cultures who engaged in the practice of circumcision, Freud focuses on circumcision as a Jewish practice, arguing that this creates a separation between the Jews and Christians. Freud sees Jewish circumcision as a combination of punishment and a mark of chosenness. Circumcision is not exclusive to the Jews, yet it is central to Freud’s understanding of anti-Semitism. Freud’s exclusive concern with Jewish circumcision relates to the historical apex in which he was writing and his concerns with anti-Semitism during

a time of crisis. There is no evidence to suggest that Freud was unaware of other cultures that practiced circumcision.

It was not until 1939 that Freud gave his own explicit historical narrative of circumcision and anti-Semitism. In 1934, Freud explicates the purpose of his new book in a letter to friend and colleague Arnold Zweig: “Angesichts der neuen Verfolgungen fragt man wieder, wie der Jude geworden ist und warum er sich diesen unterblicken Haß zugezogen hat. Ich hatte bald die Formel heraus. Moses hat den Juden geschaffen und meine Arbeit bekommt den Titel: Der Mann Moses, ein historischer Roman”.³ Freud proposes the concept of his new book as a ‘novel’: *Der Mann Moses: Ein Historische Roman*. Freud’s decision to change the title of his work to *Moses and Monotheism* represents a shift in perspective from a fictional work to a disjointed representation of modern society. Often read, by scholars, as historical fiction, the history that Freud describes in *Moses and Monotheism* endeavors to understand the origin of the ‘othering’ of the Jews, and how the Jews have become the subject of the undying hatred. The result of Freud’s work appears as a hybrid of history, fiction, and psychoanalysis, creating an ambiguity paralleling Freud’s situation in Germany.

In this “historical novel,” Freud suggests that Moses was not a Jew, but rather an Egyptian, who introduced the Jews to monotheism. According to Freud’s narrative, the Jews found this religion to be too demanding, so they killed Moses and repressed the religion. It was not until later that the Jews began to regret killing the father and readapted the monotheistic religion. Freud proposes that since Moses was an Egyptian, circumcision originated from the Egyptians, not the Jews. “Moses hat den Juden nicht nur eine neue Religion gegeben; man kann

³ September 30, 1934

auch mit gleicher Bestimmtheit behaupten, dass er die Sitte der Beschneidung bei ihnen eingeführt hat“ (46). Circumcision is both borrowed and chosen by the Jews themselves. The cultural borrowing and active nature of circumcision give the Jews a certain agency in this process. Circumcision appears here as a rite and a curse that was given to the Jews, but something that they willingly take on. In the footnote, circumcision was only the marked otherness of the Jew, and resulted in the “die tiefste unbewußte Wurzel des Antisemitismus.”

Circumcision serves a dual purpose here. Freud’s understanding of circumcision emerges as both a punishment for abandoning the religion, as well as an outward expression of chosenness, by God.

Der biblische Bericht widerspricht ihr zwar mehrfach, er führt einerseits die Beschneidung in die Urväterzeit zurück als Zeichen des Bundes zwischen Gott und Abraham, andererseits erzählt er an einer ganz besonders dunkeln Stelle, dass Gott Moses zürnte, weil er den geheiligten Gebrauch vernachlässigt hatte, dass er ihn darum töten wollte, und dass Moses’ Ehefrau, eine Midianiterin, den bedrohten Mann durch rasche Ausführung der Operation vor Gottes Zorn rettete (Moses, 34)

The tradition of circumcision, as presented here, was founded and practiced by the Egyptians, not the Jews. Freud suggests that the creation of the Jewish religion, and the practice of circumcision are completely dependent on Egyptian monotheism. In creating a new religion, Moses chose his people, thus making them the “chosen ones,” who also choose to be chosen. Circumcision stands as both the identifying factor of the Jews, and the factor that sets them apart from all others. By using circumcision as the identifier or the uniting factor of the Jewish people, Freud establishes a division between the Jews and the Christians. Circumcision acts as both their

form of punishment, but also as self-sacrifice, giving the Jews some agency in the act of circumcision. “Moses hatte sich zu den Juden herabgelassen, sie zu seinem Volk gemacht; sie waren sein auserwähltes Volk” (Freud, 57). Moses represents the father, and he chose the Jews essentially as his children. On the one hand, he punishes his children with circumcision, but if they do so, they will be chosen.

By asserting that they are chosen, the Jews further separate themselves from the Christians. Their assertion of chosenness creates Christian hostility and an overarching sense of superiority, which the Jews desire to possess. Freud’s insistence that the Jewish people are chosen, despite killing Moses, evokes a rivalry between the Jews and the Christians. The Christians recognized the Jews as the “chosen” people and could not, according to Freud, bear this chosenness afforded to the Jews. It is precisely the Jews’ assertion of their chosenness that generates hatred on the part of the Christians, Freud suggests: “Ich wage die Behauptung, dass die Eifersucht auf das Volk, welches sich für das erstgeborene, bevorzugte Kind Gottvaters ausgab, bei den anderen heute noch nicht überwunden ist, so als ob sie dem Anspruch Glauben geschenkt hätten” (*Moses*, 164). The Jews saw the strength of their religion and assertion of chosenness as a potential power, and the Christians viewed this power as a threat. The “*Anspruch*” suggests that the religion was not a gift but rather an entitlement that the Jews demanded. Because they chose to sacrifice, via circumcision, the Jews take agency of their chosenness, and feel as though they deserve this. This, in part, is how Christian jealousy emerges. Not only because they are chosen, but also because they demand this and feel entitled to this chosenness. Their agency in being chosen creates a rivalry and evokes jealousy.

Yerushalmi attests that Freud offers this not as a justification of anti-Semitism, but instead as a psychological understanding of the origins of anti-Semitism in his time of persecution:

I trust I need not belabor the point that if the man who penned these lines wrote also of the “truth in anti-Semitism, he was not offering a justification for anti-Semites but a partial psychoanalytic explanation of the price he felt the Jews have paid for remaining “chosen” rather than “saved.” For a mind like Freud’s there had to be an unconscious psychoanalytical truth within anti-Semitism in order to explain its extraordinary virulence, duration, and ubiquitousness. The specific truth he felt he had uncovered—the unconscious Christian charge “You won’t admit that you murdered God...It was true, we did the same thing, but we admitted it”—may be questioned. But in any case, it implies that anti-Semitism is not incidental but endemic to Christianity, doubly so because of its unconscious component (Yerushalmi, 52)

The fact that the Jews are chosen rather than saved proposes that the Jews possessed more agency in this separation, especially when one considers circumcision as a sacrifice. Yerushalmi proposes that anti-Semitism is an unconscious process, not as an excuse for actions, but as a psychoanalytical standpoint for anti-Semitism as the unconscious practice of the time. Freud understands anti-Semitism as an unconscious process to understand how the Jews have become outsiders, not only in Germany and Vienna, but also throughout the world. By the Jews own altering of their physical attributes, vis-à-vis circumcision, the Jews are further “othered” and separated from the rest of European society.

Circumcision, for Freud, has a dual effect on the Jews. The Jews desire the separation from their Christian others, and desire to be chosen, however, this chosenness is inevitably tied to self-sacrifice. “Die Beschneidung ist der symbolische Ersatz der Kastration, die der Urvater einst aus der Fülle seiner Machtvollkommenheit über die Söhne verhängt hatte, und wer dies Symbol annahm, zeigte damit, das er bereit war, sich dem Willen des Vaters zu unterwerfen, auch wenn er ihm das schmerzlichste Opfer auferlegte” (Freud, 1939 149). Circumcision creates hatred towards the Jews, because it reminds others of the threat of castration. The Jews must experience a painful sacrifice, but they are then recognized as chosen. Unlike the female, the Jews no longer fear castration, because it is already done. The Jew is only partially castrated, and he was given the opportunity to sacrifice this piece himself. The girl, however, forms a less-developed superego, because she has no fear of punishment. She is not given the opportunity to sacrifice. She is already fully castrated and this is her fate. She does not experience the same sense of chosenness by the father.

In both the psychoanalytical theory of castration anxiety, as well as the historical narrative that Freud posits in *Moses and Monotheism*, the threat of castration derives from the father. In the case of little Hans, the mother threatens to tell the father that the young boy masturbates, and if he continues to do so, he will be castrated. As previously mentioned, Little Hans’ fear arises from the threat of the mother, and, despite the fact that Freud shows little interaction with the father, this fear transforms into the fear of the father. In her book *Nostalgia after Nazism*, Heidi Schlipphacke shows, via Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s reading of Freud, that this tautological nature of Freud’s argument reveals that the father is always, for Freud, the desired punisher. She references *Ein Kind wird Geschlagen* (1919) to show that

despite the father's absence throughout the essay, Freud sees the boy's fear of punishment as directed to the father despite the fact that it is the female caretaker who actually beats the child (Schlipphacke, 105). The child has to be fixated on the father, because he stands in for the law. The model of the father as the abuser, or the threat, can be seen in the case of "Little Hans. Hans first associates the horses Wiwimacher with the power of the mother. "Nein, ich hab gedacht, weil du so groß bist, hast du einen Wiwimacher wie ein Pferd" (*Analyse*, 6). This is later exemplified as little Hans' fear of being bitten by a horse.

Am 8. Jänner will die Frau selbst mit ihm spazieren gehen, um zu sehen, was mit ihm los ist, und zwar nach Schönbrunn, wohin er sehr gerne geht. Er fängt wieder an zu weinen, will nicht weggehen, fürchtet sich. Schließlich geht er doch, hat aber auf der Straße sichtlich Angst. Auf der Rückfahrt von Schönbrunn sagt er nach vielem Sträuben zur Mutter: *Ich hab' mich gefürchtet, daß mich ein Pferd beißen wird.* (Tatsächlich wurde er in Schönbrunn unruhig, als er ein Pferd sah.) Abends soll er wieder einen ähnlichen Anfall bekommen haben wie tags vorher, mit Verlangen zu schmeicheln. Man beruhigt ihn. Er sagt weinend: »Ich weiß, ich werde morgen wieder spazieren gehen müssen«, und später: »Das Pferd wird ins Zimmer kommen. (Freud, 1909, 15)

Later, however, little Hans dreams that his father comes into his bedroom and takes him away from his mother: "Ich bin im Bette bei der Mama . Da kommt der Papa und treibt mich weg. Mit seinem großen Penis verdrängt er mich von der Mama" (Freud, 46). The horse acts as an imperfect substitute and an unconscious representation of the father and the fear of the father castrating, despite the fact that the father never actually threatens the son.

Freud's fixation on the father as the punisher is parallel to Freud's Jewish model. In the

story of *Moses*, the Jews conformed to the father by accepting circumcision as a symbol of devotion to Moses, but also out of fear of the father as the punisher, specifically as the castrator. I would argue that the link between the two theories is the threat from the father. The threat, in turns creates castration anxiety among the Jews, as well as the Christian others; however, the Jews respond to this threat and anxiety more proactively than the Christians. Similarly, the story of *Moses* seems to parallel Freud's understanding of the formation of the superego. After the Jews killed Moses, they readapted a new religion, which was based on the volcanic god, Jaweh. The Jews repress the killing of the father, but this returned to consciousness and the Jews continuously felt guilt over the killing and, out of fear of the father, expressed their devotion via circumcision. The Jews then controlled their aggressive instincts and conformed to the monotheistic religion, much as children do during the formation of the superego.

Freud does not explicitly begin to write of the hatred of the Jews until the second and third section of *Moses*, when he was already in exile. Being pushed out of the country reinforced his need to historicize anti-Semitism. In the first prefatory notes to the third section, Freud states that he must abandon his work due to the worsening conditions in Austria. "Ich glaube es nicht nur, ich weiss es, dass ich mich durch dies andere Hindernis, durch die äussere Gefahr, abhalten lassen werde den letzten Teil meiner Studie über Moses zu veröffentlichen (Freud, 100). Several months later, in June of 1938, Freud writes a second prefatory note, which contradicts his earlier one, and explicates the need to continue on with his work in a time of crisis.

Denn in dem kurzen Zeitraum zwischen beiden haben sie die äusseren Verhältnisse des Schreibers gründlich geändert. Ich lebte damals unter dem Schutz der katholischen Kirche und stand unter der Angst, dass ich durch meine Publikation diesen Schutz

verlieren und ein Arbeitsverbot für die Anhänger und Schüler der Psychoanalyse in Österreich heraufbeschwören würde. Und dann kam plötzlich die deutsche Invasion; der Katholizismus erwies sich, mit biblischen Worten zu reden, als ein ‘Schwankes Rohr.’ In der Gewissheit, jetzt nicht nur meiner Denkweise, sondern auch meiner ‘Rasse’ wegen verfolgt zu werden, verließ ich mit vielen Freuden die Stadt, die mir von früher Kindheit an, durch 78 Jahre, Heimat gewesen war (*Moses*, 102)

The growing anti-Semitism in Austria and Germany, and the final push that forced Freud out of his homeland reinforced Freud’s need to understand anti-Semitism as an inherent “racial” difference, and forced him to rethink his previous psychoanalytical theories, or to bring that which had been pushed to the footnotes into the open.

VI. CIRCUMCISION AS A METONYM FOR CASTRATION ANXIETY: ESSENTIALIZING THE JEWS?

Freud presents circumcision as the tie to culture and race. Freud uses the word race as an indication of Jewish lineage, and as the return to the religion over the generations. He does not use the term race in its literal form based purely on heredity. Freud's use of "*Rasse*" in quotes indicates that Freud does not believe, or understand Jewish circumcision as a racial trait, but instead as a cultural practice. He essentially deconstructs race by assigning the Jews agency in their practice. For Freud, the repetition of Jewish circumcision through the generations creates a distinct cultural group; however, it is important to consider that circumcision is a constructed difference and that Jews are not born with this trait. Freud, nonetheless, constructs a "racial theory" of anti-Semitism, despite the fact that circumcision is a practice, not an inherent difference. By suggesting that circumcision is a constructed difference, rather than an inherited difference, Freud suggests that the Jews continuously choose to be chosen and different. By assigning such agency, Freud potentially essentializes the Jews, and he deconstructs race. It seems as though Freud seeks to create an organic difference between the Jews and the Christian others. The question arises; however, as to whether the Christians construct this difference, as Freud suggests, or if Freud intends to create a desired chosenness amongst the Jews? It appears as though Freud further distances the Jews from the Christians, especially in a time of crisis, by suggesting that the Jews desire to be chosen.

This raises an essential question: In highlighting the differences between the Jews and gentiles, does Freud essentialize them, or is he relying on culturally produced traits? Freud writes of the cultural and intellectual superiority of the Jews in *Moses and Monotheism*, where he

compares two religions of antiquity, stating that the Christian religion and people are ‘primitive’ in their practices.

Der Vorrang, der durch etwa 2000 Jahre im Leben des jüdischen Volkes geistigen Bestrebungen eingeräumt war, hat natürlich seine Wirkung getan; er half, die Rohheit und die Neigung zur Gewalttat einzudämmen, die sich einzustellen pflegen, wo die Entwicklung der Muskelkraft Volksideal ist. Die Harmonie in der Ausbildung geistiger und körperlicher Tätigkeit, wie das griechische Volk sie erreichte, blieb den Juden versagt. Im Zwiespalt trafen sie wenigstens die Entscheidung für das Höherwertige (Freud, 142)

The Jews, according to Freud, are further away from barbarism, because they do not fixate on sports and reject brutality and violence. It is interesting to think that Freud uses the rejection of sport to show a cultural superiority, when this has often been used as a stereotype amongst anti-Semites. In his book *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man* (1997), Daniel Boyarin perceives this stereotype as the Jewish male ideal lacking manliness.

More than just an anti-Semitic stereotype, the Jewish ideal male as counter type to “manliness” is an assertive historical product of Jewish culture. Pre-modern Jewish culture frequently represented the ideal Jewish man as feminized, a sort of “woman.” I am thus not claiming a set of characteristics, traits, behaviors that are essentially female but a set of performances that are read as non-male within a given historical culture (Boyarin, 3).

The lack of manliness can be understood as a desired trait in pre-modern Jewish culture, and passivity was something that was desired. As Boyarin explains that society equated manliness with physical strength. Christian society understood the Jewish ideal as feminized, and as often weak and subservient. Freud understands this stereotype as a positive attribute of the Jews, and especially as what makes them superior to the Christians, specifically as intellectually and spiritually superior.

Freud also refers to the Jews as genius, even going as far as to compare them to William Shakespeare:

Die Frage nach der Entstehung des Monotheismus bei den Juden bleibe so unbeantwortet, oder man begnüge sich mit der geläufigen Antwort, das sei eben der Ausdruck des besonderen religiösen Genies dieses Volkes. Das Genie ist bekanntlich unbegreiflich und unverantwortlich, und darum soll man es nicht eher zur Erklärung anrufen, als bis jede andere Lösung versagt hat. Dieselbe Erwägung gilt auch für den merkwürdigen Fall des William Shakespeare aus *Stratford* (Freud, 83).

Freud insinuates that the Jews' intellectual and ethical abilities surpass other religions because they value intellectual and ethical achievements more than others. This not only refers to intellect, but also refers to their spirituality. The Jews have, above all, succeeded in dematerializing God and thinking abstractly. All of this led to the increase in the Jews' self-confidence, which can also be understood as a product of their chosenness and self-sacrifice.

Theorists such as Adorno and Horkheimer have adapted Freud's theory of Jewish intellectual superiority, especially in their work *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (1944). Freud notes the Jews ability to sublimate, where the Jews use their fetishes to sublimate their aggression. "Wenn

er (die Jude) Unglück gehabt hat, gibt er nicht sich die Schuld, sondern dem Fetisch...und verprügelt ihn, anstatt sich selbst zu bestrafen“ (Freud, 1930, 253). Adorno and Horkheimer adapt this theory of sublimation, but look specifically at the personality of anti-Semites as unable to sublimate. Where anti-Semites falsely project their aggression onto the Jew, the Jews fixate their aggression onto something productive, or they sublimate it: “Der Antisemitismus beruht auf fascher Projektion... Um die in Kontrolle genommene Projektion und Ihre Enartung zur falschen zu verstehen, die zum Wesen des Antisemitismus gehört, bedarf es der genaueren Überlegung” (Adorno, 197). Adorno and Horkheimer mimic what Freud says about Jewish superiority, based on their rejection of magic and sorcery. The non-Jewish instinct of false projection often results in the conforming of the masses. Anti-Semitism, according to Adorno and Horkheimer, lacks any intention and is inherited.

Der Antisemitismus ist ein eingeschliffenes Schema, ja ein Ritual der Zivilisation, und die Pogrome sind die wahren Ritualmorde. In ihnen wird die Ohnmacht dessen demonstriert, was ihnen Einhalt gebieten könnte, der Besinnung, des Bedeutens, schließlich der Wahrheit. Im läppischen Zeitvertreib des Totschlags wird das sture Leben bestätigt, in das man sich schickt (180).

Anti-Semitism is founded on inheritance, which relates back to what Freud says about the boy in the nursery. He hears of circumcision, and this gives him the right to hate the Jew.

The continuous oppression that the Jews experienced contributes, Freud seems to argue, to their superiority. Freud writes of the tenacity of the Jews, in *Der Mann Moses und die Monotheistische Religion*, and their ability, or willingness, to productively contribute to any society that would accept them.

“Noch stärker wirkt der zweite Punkt, nämlich dass sie allen Bedrückungen trotzen, dass es den grausamsten Verfolgungen nicht gelungen ist, sie auszurotten, ja, dass sie vielmehr die Fähigkeit zeigen, sich im Erwerbsleben zu behaupten und, wo man sie zulässt, wertvolle Beiträge zu allen kulturellen Leistungen zu machen“ (Freud, 114).

Freud's concern with Jewish superiority via their ability to withstand oppression is especially relevant when considering that Freud was pushed out of Austria and in exile while writing this final section of *Moses*.

What further sets the Jews apart from the Christians for Freud is their persistence to continue the practice of circumcision, showing their devotion to the religion and to Moses himself. Eliza Slavet suggests that this attests to the Jews 'supreme intellectual spirituality'.

In *Moses* he explains that circumcision is a “key-fossil” attesting to the survival of the Jewish chain of tradition. Indeed it is *the* symbol of the Jews' sacred consecration, and the sign of their supreme intellectual spirituality (117).

What both Slavet and Freud suggest here is a mechanism of sublimation. Circumcision is explained as a sense of maturity and supreme intellectualism among the Jews. Even though Freud sees the Jews as a superior cultural group that possesses superior intellectual ability, Freud distances the Jews from the rest of society. There nonetheless appears to be a contradiction in Freud's model. The Jews, through sacrifice in circumcision and sublimation, seem to define themselves as the other, yet Freud's footnote seems to suggest that others define them as the threat. The Christians ultimately substitute Jewish circumcision as castration.

For Freud, the Jew and the woman are parallel in the eyes of the Christians; however, within Freud's model of development, they are ultimately not the same. The Jew is only partially

castrated, and his autonomy in his sacrifice distinguishes him as chosen. In contrast, the female is already fully castrated and has no agency in this castration. Her fate has already been determined, and she never feels chosen. Freud understands hatred of the Jews as the (gentile) anxiety arising from the fear of castration that emerges at the sight of the (already castrated) woman; however, he indicates that the correlation of the Jewish male with the female is actually a false projection on the part of the Christians. As he argues in his final and most personal work, *Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion*, the Christians come to envy the Jews for their outward mark of chosenness.

CITED LITERATURE

Boyarin, Daniel. *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise Of Heterosexuality And The Invention Of The Jewish Man*. Berkeley : University Of California Press, 1997. Print.

Diller, Jerry V. *Freud's Jewish Identity: A Case Study In The Impact Of Ethnicity*. Rutherford, NJ : Fairleigh Dickinson University Press ; 1991. Print.

Dunsmuir, W. D., and E. M. Gordon. "The History of Circumcision." *BJU International* 83.S1 (1999): 1-12. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *Analyse Der Phobie Eines Fünfjährigen Knaben*. 1909. Lexington, KY:, 2014. Print.

---. *Der Mann Moses Und Die Monotheistische Religion: Drei Abhandlungen*. Amsterdam: Albert de Lange, 1939. Print.

---. *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewußten*. 1905. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1970. Web.

---. *Drei Abhandlungen Zur Sexualtheorie*. 40 Vol. Leipzig: Deuticke, 1910. Web.

---. *Die Traumdeutung*. 1899. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei, 1961. Web.

---. *Das Unbehagen in Der Kultur*. Wien: Internationaler psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1930. Web.

- . "Einige psychische Folgen des anatomischen Geschlechtsunterschied". *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*. 11;4, Berlin. 1925. Web.
- "Über Weiblichkeit" *Gesammelte Werke: Psychoanalytische Studien + Theoretische Schriften*. e-artnow, 2015, 1931, ebook.
- *Totem Und Tabu: Einige Übereinstimmungen Im Seelenleben Der Wilden Und Der Neurotiker*. Leipzig : Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1920. Print.
- Geller, Jay. "Atheist Jew Or Atheist Jew: Freud's Jewish Question and Ours." *Modern Judaism* 26.1 (2006): 1-14. Print.
- Geller, Jay. *On Freud's Jewish Body: Mitigating Circumcisions*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2007. Web.
- Gilman, Sander L. *Freud, Race, and Gender*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1993. Web.
- Horkheimer, Max, Adorno, Theodor W., *Dialektik Der Aufklärung: Philosophische Fragmente*. 1944. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer: 1969. Print.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum Of The Other Woman*. Ithaca, N.Y. : Cornell University Press, 1985. Print.
- Ozturk, O. M. "Ritual Circumcision and Castration Anxiety." *Psychiatry* 36.1 (1973): 49. Print.
- Saguaro, Shelley., eds. *Psychoanalysis And Woman: A Reader*. New York : New York University Press, 2000. Print.

Schlipphacke, Heidi M. *Nostalgia After Nazism: History, Home, And Affect In German And Austrian Literature And Film*. Lewisburg [Pa.] : Bucknell University Press, 2010. Print.

Slavet, Eliza. *Racial Fever: Freud And The Jewish Question*. New York : Fordham University Press, 2009. Print.

Weininger, Otto. *Geschlecht Und Charakter: Eine Prinzipielle Untersuchung*. 1903. Wien: Braumüller 1947. Print.

Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim, and Sigmund Freud. *Freud's Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991. Web.