

## MAY I CALL YOU FATHER?

(in: International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 2003; 12: 197-205. Stockholm. ISSN 0803-706X.)

*“I cannot think of any need in childhood as strong as the need for a father's protection ”.*  
Sigmund Freud<sup>i</sup>

### Introduction

Among the many aspects of psychoanalytical theory and clinical presuppositions, "masculinity" has been of particular interest for me because although on one hand Freud's theories on "femininity" have been extensively discussed and criticized, on the other hand, there has been little reference to masculinity. Even if the little boy is expected to pass through developmental phases with their associated drawbacks, the process of "becoming a man" has never been fully elaborated. This gives the uncanny feeling that the possession of a penis is in itself a guarantee, a safe-conduct, that will "naturally" lead a little boy to masculinity. Nevertheless, clinical observation demonstrates that "becoming a man" is a highly complex process.

Furthermore, there is an additional difficulty. When trying to define terms such as "masculine" and "feminine" on a sound theoretical base, we face an uncomfortable dilemma in that few words condense the complex significance and hard-to-define meanings included in these terms.

The Freudian "masculine" and "feminine" models, based on Aristotle, are highly lacunars and over-simplified. When elaborating upon this topic Freud speaks of "concepts", or "notions" or again of "psychic qualities". In some of these texts he refers to "masculine" and "feminine" in terms of "activity" and "passivity" whereas in others he stresses the inadequacy of this terminology when applied to human beings. He adds that that if psychoanalysis proposes such concepts these nevertheless fail to throw any light on the essential core of the subject. Such notions convey no psychological distinction<sup>ii</sup>.

No question Freud's perspective of his analytical listening was hampered by his own unconscious and his personal identificatory organization as well as by the social discourse of his era. At the same time, his position was nevertheless revolutionary in that he did not attribute biological, genetic, nor even inherited bases to the notions of "masculine" and "feminine" instead he proposes that these notions are "psychic constructions"<sup>iii</sup>.

Should "masculine" be considered as a psychic construction, masculinity then becomes a psychic representation; every representation (*Vorstellung*) is the result of an investment<sup>iv</sup> – basically of mnemonic traces – which means that any such representation may be dismantled regarding its original components. From a clinical standpoint this indicates the reconstruction of the constitutional moments of masculinity, in particular those that have been forgotten, repressed, or split off, in addition to the vicissitudes of the identificatory processes, the individual's place in the family's libidinal economy, the parents' psychic investment of the child and the social context in which the individual was born and brought up.

As we know, in its complete form, the boy's Oedipus complex comprises two affective impulses towards the father: a strongly affectionate one and an equally intense hostile one. Later, following the resolution of the complex, both affective representations are presumed to be replaced by identification with the father. Should repression fail, these crucial affects will frequently be experienced as intolerable by the subject's ego.

The aim of this paper is to explore the various possible destinies of the paternal Oedipal drive in its affectionate aspects – since this is a basic element in the construction of masculinity. And should it not be repressed it will, in consequence, compromise an adequate identification with the father.

### **The importance of the real father**

The reference to the father of reality is central in Freud's conceptualization: the individual "relation to God depends on his relation to his father in the flesh";<sup>v</sup> the father "is the individual prototype of both God and Devil"<sup>vi</sup>; it is because Dostoevski<sup>vii</sup> had a particularly violent and cruel father in reality that he developed a sadistic super-ego. The task of replacing the mother as the child-protector during infancy against the dangers of the outer world later on falls to the father, as Freud makes explicit in "*The Future of an Illusion*".

From the almighty "father hero" - the "great man in childhood"<sup>viii</sup> so deeply admired and even idolized, but also feared – leaves in its wake a "father nostalgia", a feeling that coincides with the need for protection linked to human helplessness<sup>ix</sup>. The father, although he embodies the threat of castration is also the one who is invested as the figure of protection. He will, therefore, leave his mark upon his children's psychosexual structure and thus influence the nature of their sexual desires.

At the same time, the central character in Freud's "seduction theory", debated at length between the years of 1895 and 1897, is again the father since the mother as the seducer only appears later in Freudian theory. The seductive father to whom Freud refers is accused of perversion, and basically responsible for his female patients' hysteria. In this series of

“perverse fathers” Freud includes his own: “*Unfortunately, my own father was one of these perverts and is responsible for my brother’s hysteria (whose symptoms, on the whole, are identifications) and for that of several of my younger sisters*”<sup>x</sup>. (Apparently only little Sigmund would appear to have escaped!!!)

On the other hand if, for both sexes, the mother is the first object of love, to assimilate her seductive activity in the analysis to the Oedipal situation (mainly in the case of the son) is to reduce such an analysis to its commonest anthropological effects. The dimension of seduction by the father, *in both sexes*, raises the question of potential consequences that have been little explored in psychoanalytic research.

The father that I wish to discuss in this paper is not the seductive father who is revealed in the discourse of hysterical female patients, nor the castrating father who castrates but who also protects. This father-figure establishes a somewhat particular relationship with his son. In fact he creates, in fantasy, a situation in which the son is invested as the object of desire in place of the mother i.e. a father who, instead of experiencing libidinal pleasure with his companion, looks for it in his relationship with his son.

The father who “offers” himself to the son as a possible object of desire inverts his Oedipal paternal role: in place of the one who threatens castration he embodies seduction. If, according to Lacanian theory<sup>xi</sup>, the imago of the father, in both sexes, polarizes the most perfect forms of the ego-ideal, it is evident that “seduction by the father” will jeopardize the repression of the affectionate and the hostile drives, with important consequences both for the resolution of the Oedipal as well as for formation of ideals. When this occurs, the symbolic integration, which is normally rendered possible by means of an imaginary conflict, does not take place, thereby preventing the introjection of the classical Oedipal image<sup>xii</sup>. The state of affairs generated by the “seductive father” will have repercussions in the construction of the “nostalgia for protection by father”<sup>xiii</sup>, an important element in the construction of the subject’s inner world.

To begin with, it is important to underline that the father as a function, the “Name-of-the-Father” is not missing for subjective identity has been constituted. Nor are we considering the father who presents himself as legislator, as a pillar of law, producing what Lacan<sup>xiv</sup> calls “the destructive effects of the paternal figure”. My interest is to emphasize, following in Freud’s footsteps, the importance of the reality father in the constitutive process of subjective and sexual identity. We might indeed detect an oversight in this aspect of psychoanalytic theory. Excessive use of the concept of “paternal function”, indisputably fundamental to psychoanalytical theory and practice, nevertheless runs the risk of reducing, or even ignoring, the importance of the father as he was in reality.

To center our thoughts upon the “seductive father” does not mean that this element is the sole determinant to the solution that will be devised by the son, but simply that, in this text, I shall favor this aspect in view of its vital importance in the construction of psychosexuality. It is for this reason that the mother's participation in the “seductive father” is not elaborated here, even though it is evident that, without her complicity, such “seduction” would not have occurred. Similarly the question of bisexuality will not be dealt with in this paper.

Before proceeding, I should like to make one further remark. Although the word “choice” is still currently employed - one speaks, for example of “homosexual choice” or “heterosexual choice” - the word “solution” appears to me to be more appropriate. The “object choice”, homo or heterosexual, is the “solution” found by the individual in his/her constitutional process in response to the verbal and pre-verbal parental communications regarding the fundamental elements of sexual and subjective identity; This also includes the response that the child produces in coping with such elements in important relation to his or her place in the family libidinal economy. This definition of the term “solution” is close to that advocated by Joyce McDougall (See McDougall, J., “The many faces of Eros”, Norton, 1995)

To my mind the term “solution” should therefore be understood in the mathematical sense of the term; i.e.: as an equation that carries many variants. Facing these variants (as in a vectorial force system) a resultant, a solution, must be found. In this perspective, what we call both sexual and subjective identity is not only a solution - or even a symptom in the psychoanalytical sense of the term – it is also a compromise formation in face of the multiple variants with which the individual has to deal from birth onwards.

### **The seduction by the father**

Traditionally, when analyzing the ambivalence inherent in the Oedipal situation, we resort to the classic version of the myth, which suggests the existence of a natural and normative heterosexual attraction. However, the myth has other variants that suggest that there is nothing natural, and even less innate, in our instinctual impulses. According to one of the versions, Oedipus would have killed his father Laius during a fight for the love of the handsome Chrisypos, son of Pelops<sup>xv</sup>. It is at least curious that this version of the myth has not received from psychoanalytic writers (beginning with Freud himself) the attention it merits<sup>xvi</sup>. Indeed, to analyze the Oedipus complex from this point of view opens up a number of new and interesting identificatory perspectives. We can suppose that Chrisypos became the depositary not only of the son's affectionate drives, but also those of the father in regard to the son – unconsciously, the father reproduces with his son, the conflicts resulting from his own oedipal situation - an oedipal configuration marked by intense homosexual investments, thereby characterizing what I call “seduction by the father” as a consequence of which, the repression of the affectionate/hostile drives regarding the father becomes problematic.

The vicissitudes of these impulses may be exemplified in various psychic configurations. Perhaps it is through examining certain forms of homosexuality that we may study them more closely. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that “seduction by the father” is not sufficient to explain the homosexual “solution”. As Freud<sup>xvii</sup> had remarked:

*“It is not for psychoanalysis to solve the problem of homosexuality. It must rest content with disclosing the psychical mechanisms that result in determining of object choice and with tracing back from them to instinctual dispositions”.*

My purpose, in this paper, is limited to the attempt to link the consequences of “seduction by the father” to certain expressions of adult sexuality. According to my hypothesis, the homosexual solution may, in some cases, allow the subject to invest the affectionate drive directed to the father when the latter does not exercise his function as the oedipal father, that is, in which the castration threat is inexistent. A small clinical fragment may serve to illustrate this hypothesis.

### **Clinical vignette**

Andrew, aged 21, came to see me after following a long conversation with a friend. This discussion, according to Andrew, helped him to understand that his sexual- emotional life was confused and, most of all, that it was bringing him very little gratification. Apparently his homosexual solution did not cause him any great conflict and throughout our analytical work it did not appear to be symptomatic.

Although the analytical work presents certain aspects that deserve deeper consideration, I shall center my reflections on a particular dimension of my patient’s identificatory process to illustrate the “father seduction” factor.

Andrew did not experience any profound attachment to his mother, nor was his father particularly absent, (factors that are proposed in many psychoanalytic writing concerning the supposed origins of homosexuality<sup>xviii</sup>.) On the contrary, Andrew’s father had always been very much present in his life; and the “quality” of his presence, from my observation of this case, was an important contributory factor to Andrew’s homosexual solution.

Andrew has a masculine appearance, with no affectation, and nothing in his behavior or appearance would suggest a “gay” stereotype. In his sexual activities he prefers to play the so-called “active role”.

A turning-point in his analysis occurred when certain aspects of his choice of partners were analyzed in a deeper way. So far, in our work, he had already mentioned that for men to “turn him on”, they had to be older than him and must also convey a feeling of security. It is

probable that Andrew was already aware of the paternal aspects of his choice of partners. However, in one particular session he said:

*“Well, you know, there’s something else about my way of choosing my partners that I have never mentioned to you.” (After a long silence.)*

*“This aspect makes all the difference... I’ve found many men who fit my fantasies, but very few have responded to one fundamental question. It’s very important to me to ask them: “May I call you father?” It is only with those who can accept this request that I am able to have a gratifying relationship”.*

This episode gave plenty of material to be analyzed: the reason it had taken Andrew so long to tell me about it was his fear— in the transference – that I would be the bad father. In addition, the fact that I was considerably older than he had contributed to a markedly erotic transference. But perhaps the most important aspect of his “secret” was that in this way he was unconsciously preserving his father from the hatred he felt towards him. It became clear in our work that a crucial aspect of the protective Oedipal father had been totally absent in Andrew’s inner world. It was this protection that he constantly sought in the choice of his “May-I-call-you-father” partners. This brought us to another crucial point in his analysis. At a given moment I asked him:

P. R.: *“Would you say that, as a little boy, you had a father?”*

Andrew: *“No- Not at all!!”*

This particularity – the feeling of not having had a father – revealed another aspect of his life that I subsequently discovered in other individuals with similar life histories. In everyday life situations – facing other men, fighting for their rights... – in which Andrew should have been be “father to himself”, he was invaded by the strongest feelings of anxiety, to the point of avoiding any such situations as far as possible.

Being able to understand and analyze a major episode of “seduction by the father” acquired fundamental importance for Andrew.

As he recounted it, his father had been living for many years in Martinique. In his early twenties Andrew, who had never been there, decided to pay his father a visit and also get to know the Caribbean islands. To his astonishment, he discovered that his father had never told any of his local friends that he had a son, not to mention that his son was already an adult.

A few days after Andrew’s arrival in Martinique, his father told him that something amusing was being said among his friends: the friends thought that Andrew and his father were lovers! The father found this very funny and did nothing to dispel this illusion. Moreover, he asked his son to play the role of being the father’s young lover “in order to fool everybody”.

Andrew felt extremely uncomfortable with his father's proposition and begged him to explain the real situation immediately. His father eventually did so, but went on imagining and talking about his friends' fantasies about their "homosexual" relationship.

This event produced many associations and dreams in Andrew's on-going analysis and also brought back memories of similar facts in his past life. The strong emotions associated with these recollections – which conveyed profound anxiety that had hitherto been held in repression – were colored by feelings of castration and guilt. The analyses of these episodes from his past gave Andrew a better understanding of his psychosexuality and his sexual predilections and at the same time revealed further aspects of his parents' attitudes towards him as a child.

As our work proceeded Andrew gained deeper understanding of his conflicting feelings attached to the father figure in his internal world with the result that he was able to enjoy a much better sexual and love life, and with considerably less anxiety and guilt. This enabled him, as he put it, " to get closer to the man inside myself ".

### **Other destinies**

Other clinical configurations arising from seductive father-son relationships doubtless deserve more exhaustive examination, but they will be mentioned here only in a summarized form.

As already noted, the presence of a seductive father is not limited to those who adopt a homosexual solution. I have had the opportunity to listen to similar accounts by heterosexual analysands some of whom experienced even more concrete situations of seduction: for example patients who recalled having been masturbated on several occasions by their fathers. These men frequently sought analysis because of profound difficulties not only in their sexual lives but also in establishing affective relationships.

The return of affectionate impulses regarding the father may present itself in a way that, at first sight, runs the risk of being taken for repressed homosexuality. This is in part due to the fact that such patients often express a variety of sexual wishes and fantasies with relative ease. It sometimes happens that these sexual desires are only brought into the sessions after many months of analytical work. I am referring here to patients who fit the social pattern of so-called normality: they are heterosexual, some of them are married, they sometimes have lovers, they satisfy their partners sexually. To sum up, they are what might be referred to as "real men". Yet these men are often aware of the urge not to penetrate, but to be penetrated. One particular aspect of this situation is the fact that there is a separation,

sometimes complete, between sexuality and sensuality. Such individuals frequently do not tolerate any manifestations of affection: kisses, touches, hugs, caresses – without there being any repressive mechanisms involved. Some of them become the clients of transvestites. Pornography also may constitute for others a means of giving expression to their sexual fantasies. Others again arrange meetings “by chance” in anonymous situations such as beaches, clubs, bathhouses, and vacation trips. These patients frequently do not have, nor do not want to have, steady partners, nor do they imagine any particular physical type of partner in that what a matter most is the need to be penetrated. In analysis, one such patient reported having once searched for an African transvestite because he knew that Africans enjoy the reputation, as he expressed it, of being “well-endowed”. Having encountered an African transvestite he evaluated the size of his penis then asked this person to penetrate him. He explained that what he wanted was to feel “*all of that inside me*”, notwithstanding the pain.

The analysis of such cases eventually reveals that the fantasy of anal/genital incorporation of the paternal penis is an attempt to achieve an identification with the father, according to the Freudian model<sup>xix</sup> which consider incorporation as the earliest means of identifying; an attempt to fully take possession of the “ideal father - the one who protects.”. In other situations, the search for identification is expressed through fellatio, following the model presented in “*Totem and Taboo*”. Such practices provide us with the understanding of other destinies by which the affectionate drive regarding the father may take place.

In some cases, being penetrated appears to represent a way of investing, *in negative*, the affectionate impulses: the passive attitude adopted by certain subjects is the means they have discovered in order to face the anguish generated by the total absence of the paternal castration threat.

In other cases, it seems that anal penetration expresses an attempt to get rid of the weight of the elements that constitute the representation of masculinity, elements which not only translate the social image, but also the parental investment, especially that of the father regarding his male child: being penetrated comes to be equated with getting rid of the burden of masculinity.

Another rather meaningful situation was recounted by a patient who came to see me on a medical recommendation because of to stress. In discussing his sexual practice, he said that the fact of a woman being unattractive to him never prevented him from making love to her. Furthermore in situations in which the woman did not arouse him in the least, he “evoked the male inside myself” in order to prove that he was “a real man”. We can readily imagine the psychic cost of such an “evocation”.

With regard to addictive sexualities, or certain “neo-sexualities”, one can also observe the marks of the “seduction by the father”. Joyce McDougall<sup>xx</sup> reports that a collapse of the internal parental function is a frequent occurrence in the addictive dimension of either heterosexual or homosexual activity. I would add that one cause of this collapse is the seduction that certain fathers display toward their sons.

The collapse of such parental functions, with the consequence that it is impossible to evoking “nostalgia for the protection of the father”, can also be observed in drug addictions: faced with the original helplessness of infancy (*Hilfflosigkeit*) and the impossibility of appealing to the “father of protection”, the drug may produce a “security support”, an illusion<sup>xxi</sup> of a retrieval of a lost paradise, in an attempt to restore the broken “oceanic” state. The appeal to the father is a request for protection against castration, therefore against death in a context where symbolic castration has already taken place, that is, where the paternal function has been normally exercised.

(It is important to recall that the original helplessness of infancy must not be understood from a purely biological viewpoint. To the baby, when the “Other” is missing this does not result in biological death, but in a certain form of ontological death such as we find in certain forms of psychosis. The essential function of the primordial Other, initially embodied by the mother, is to introduce the child to the world of metaphor where secondary objects replace the primordial ones: in order assure the maintenance of secondary narcissism, of the “I”, one must sacrifice one’s primordial narcissism. The human baby who refuses this demand, thereby excluding himself from the socio-cultural pattern does not fully achieve his status as a human being.

Lacan<sup>xxii</sup>, in his analysis of “Little Hans”, refers to the importance of the real father in the acquisition of the masculine sexual functioning. In order for the Oedipus complex to be resolved, the father must assume the function that embodies the threat of castration – “the father-function in a concrete version”. Lacan observes Hans’s difficulty in possessing his real penis, to the extent that it is not threatened. The lack of the “castrating father” in this sense renders the child’s situation unbearable. Thus little Hans is forced into seeking a “matriarchal line”, finding in the figure of his grandmother a paternal replacement. From this point on, according to Lacan, Hans develops a “narcissistic structure” in his relationships with women, a circumstance that leads to his phobic solution. However, an attentive reading of the Hans case also reveals the extent to which his father, with Freud’s support, was rather a “friend-father”: this position may then be perceived as a variant of the seductive father.

The number of children, especially boys, who are directed to therapy because they present sexual identity “problems” is on the increase. From the first meeting with these children it frequently becomes evident that the “quality” of the relation these children have with the

paternal imago has failed to be useful as an identificatory support. These children behave at times in a so-called “feminine” way. They are not, in general, children who have a marked homosexual orientation, although this situation can sometimes exist. More often they are boys who, due to the peculiarities of their family constellations, have identified themselves with the symbolical references, which, in our society, are ascribed to girls. This may generate anguish in the parents, especially in mothers who “demand” from their husbands what they are unable to give.

It is a noteworthy fact that in many of these cases, the fathers of such boys find themselves in a critical situation regarding social standard of “masculinity” as an ideal, which they feel they do not succeed in attaining. An exploration of the elements, especially unconscious ones, in the identificatory processes of these fathers reveals, in many cases, a problematic situation similar to that presented by the child - setting aside the generational difference and changes in the social context.

In this perspective, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the “crisis of masculinity”, so much studied and debated in recent years, is a consequence of the difficulty, more and more accentuated, for both the affectionate and the hostile drives to find identificatory support. The symbolic references to masculinity, which are social constructions without any anchorage in anatomical-biological “reality”, are in constant motion and, as we know, any change generates anguish since it implies the renouncing former libidinal positions for new ones.

Before concluding I would like draw attention to difficulties with the affectionate/hostile drives regarding the father in order to throw some lights on certain forms of psychosis, particularly paranoia. The situation in this context is quite different from the previous ones we have been discussing, for in psychotic structures the paternal metaphor is frequently lacking. The analysis of the Schreber case, for instance, reveals Schreber’s inability to contain and deal with his affectionate feelings toward his father. However, this raises an important issue: besides the question of projection, might we not suppose that Schreber’s homosexuality was a continuing quest for a male figure who could serve as an identificatory support to the construction of his sense of masculinity? This would lead us to propose that the place that Schreber ascribes to Dr. Flechsig, and later to God, may be understood as an attempt to find a depositary for the affectionate drive that could not be lived out with his own father. From this perspective, the projection, the aim of which is the search for an identificatory figure, will be experienced in a persecutory fashion. In the same way, in “*The Wolf Man*”, “*The Rat Man*”, and in “*Little Hans*”, a considerable part of the psychic conflicts presented by those subjects was due to the return of repressed elements perceived by the ego of the subject as “feminine”. Perhaps for the same reason, paranoia, as in some forms of perversion, displays a “preference” for the male sex: the projection of non-integrated homosexual longings allows the subject to treat an internal instinctual danger as if it were external.

In general, I believe that the reason for which homosexual impulses are so feared by certain analysts [for example, when the contact with such feelings leads to psychic disorganization] is frequently due to the fact that they are attached to representations of a profoundly loved father. When reinvested, such representations awaken anguish related to the threat of castration. In psychoanalytic practice, it is of fundamental importance to distinguish those homosexual impulses, which reveal themselves as a projection of unconscious desires that are felt to be ego-dystonic - representing a homosexual wish that is not (or not yet) assumed by the subject, from those wishes which conceal a search for identification. To reduce such projective movements to repressed homosexual desires is to overlook the “homosexual radical”<sup>xxiii</sup> element that forms part of masculinity.

### **Conclusion**

The castration complex is a reaction to the limitations imposed by the father to the precocious sexual activity of the son<sup>xxiv</sup>. However, if the father does not integrate his own erotic/aggressive drives, and become aware them, even if only in fantasy, with regard to his son, he is no doubt repeating conflicts that were not worked through with his own father: in the father/son encounter, the significant oedipal aspects of the meeting of this father with his own father will be repeated with the son.

It may happen that the father, unable to recognize and tolerate the erotic investment of his son, is hostile to such feelings. Frequently, in this case, a circuit of disinvestments is established: due to the anxiety caused by such an investment, since this runs the risk of being experienced by the father as a threat to his own masculinity; consequently he will tend to disinvest the son, and holds him at a distance. Inevitably, the latter lives this distance as rejection – as indeed is – and he in turn disinvests the father. Such rejection may generate a feeling of depreciation and low self-esteem in other aspects of life. But the opposite may also happen: the son may hold his father at a distance in order to avoid the father’s acknowledgement of the son’s erotic feelings. I believe that the accounts of having had “a distant father” and of “being closer to the mother” that some subjects bring into their analytic sessions have their origins here.

It is important to remember that for Freud, the paternal complex culminates in “the murder of the father” – “the principal and primal crime of humanity as well as of the individual”<sup>xxv</sup>; this constitutes the point where ontogenesis and phylogeny, the life-time individual history and the great history of mankind unite: the death of the father that each child has to carry out is recapitulating the death of the tyrant by the “children” of the primitive horde.

When the father does not assume the position of being the depositary of both the affectionate drive and the intense hostility of this son – or when the exteriorisation of the fear

of the outer world is not transformed into "anguish of the father"<sup>xxvi</sup> – the child himself is prevented from experimenting with his ambivalent feelings. This may harm the elaboration of the wish for the father's death and hinder identification with the Oedipal father. Without this identification, the father's symbolic function is compromised. And it is precisely this symbolical dimension, proper to humankind that transforms the tyrant into a father and the members into brothers.

When the symbolic father is absent, the subject cannot evoke a protecting paternal imago in order to become in turn a father to himself. It may happen that the subject looks for relationships in the style of "May I call you father" in an attempt to deal with this lacking introjection. Many times, he will even play the role of father to his own father (which is what happened when Andrew told his father to tell everyone that they were not lovers), thus setting the limits where the father has failed to do so. Therefore, in different life-circumstances, the son will have recourse to an imaginary father with all the fantasies attached to him. If the only father figure remains the tyrant that may castrate or seduce, the relationship of the subject with the world, and above all with other men, runs the risk of presenting itself in a persecutory or severely hysterical way.

Paulo Roberto Ceccarelli\*

e-mail: pr@ceccarelli.psc.br

\*Ph. D in Psychopathology and Psychoanalysis by Paris VII University – Paris – France; Psychologist, psychoanalyst, Full member of the "Círculo Psicanalítico de Minas Gerais" (affiliated to the International Federation of Psychoanalysis Societies), Full member of the "Société de Psychanalyse Freudienne", Paris, France; Member of the Latin American Association of Fundamental Psychopathology; Appointed professor of the Psychology Dep. of the Pontifical Catholic University of Minas Gerais – Belo Horizonte, BRAZIL.

## Acknowledgement

To Joyce McDougall, brilliant psychoanalytic writer and researcher into the many faces of Eros, with gratitude for her stimulating ideas and friendship over many years.

---

<sup>i</sup> S. Freud, "Civilization and its Discontents. London: Hogarth Press; 1953. pp. SE 21. p. 72.

<sup>ii</sup> S. Freud, "Femininity", S.E., v. XXII, p. 114; S. Freud, "The psychogenesis of a case of homosexuality in a woman". Hogarth Press 1953. pp SE 18. p. 171

<sup>iii</sup> - One of the most successful attempts to understanding the complex process of "becoming a man" was proposed by Robert Stoller.

<sup>iv</sup> - Freud, S., "The unconscious ". London: Hogarth Press; 1953. pp. SE 14.

<sup>v</sup> - Freud, S., "Totem and Taboo ", London: Hogarth Press; 1953. pp. SE 8. p. 147.

<sup>vi</sup> - Freud, S., "A Neurosis of Demoniacal Possession in the Seventeenth Century" . London: Hogarth Press; 1953. pp. SE 19.

<sup>vii</sup> - Freud, S., "Dostoevski and parricide ". . London: Hogarth Press; 1953. pp. SE 21.

<sup>viii</sup> - Freud, S., " Moses and Monotheism ". London: Hogarth Press; 1953. pp. SE 23.

<sup>ix</sup> - Freud, S., " Civilization and its Discontents ", Op., p. 72.

- x - Masson, J. - "A correspondência completa de Freud/Fliess, 1887-1904", (The Freud/Fliess correspondence) Rio de Janeiro, Imago, 1986, p. 232.
- xi - Lacan, J., "Les complexes familiaux", (Familial Complexes), Paris, Navarain, 1984, p.65.
- xii - Lacan, J., "Le séminaire, Livre III. Les psychoses", (Book III Seminar: Psychoses), Paris, Seuil, 1981, p.240.
- xiii - Freud, S., "Civilization and its Discontents", Ibid.
- xiv - Lacan, J., "Ecrits", (Writings), Paris, Seuil, 1966, 579.
- xv - Grimal, P., "Dictionnaire de la Mythologie Grecque et Romaine", (Greek and Roman mythology dictionary) Paris, PUF, 11ème édition, 1991, p. 248.
- xvi - Maybe Freud has not followed this vein of research due to the way he dealt with homosexuality throughout with work. Such aspect is particularly clear in the Freud/Jung correspondence.
- xvii - Freud, S., "The psychogenesis of a case of homosexuality in a woman", Op. Cit., 171.
- xviii - In a long footnote, added in 1915 to the Three essays, Freud presented the most comprehensive synthesis of his scientific thought - but also a humanistic one - about homosexuality.
- xix - Freud, S. - "Group psychology and Ego analysis", S.E., v. XVIII.
- xx - McDougall, J., "The many faces of Eros", Norton, 1995, 189.
- xxi - The word "illusion" is employed here in the same sense used by Freud. Cf. Freud, S., "The future of an Illusion", S.E., v. XXI. In this very text, Freud refers to the use of drug as a support to human helplessness.
- xxii - Lacan, J., "Séminaire IV, La relation d'objet," Paris, Seuil, 1994, 220.
- xxiii - Vanggaard, T., "Phallós: A symbol and Its History in the Male World", New York, International University Press, 1972.
- xxiv - Freud, S., "Introductory lectures to psychoanalysis", S.E., Conf. XXI, v. XVI.
- xxv - Freud, S., "Dostoevski and parricide", S.E., v. XXI, p. 183.
- xxvi - Freud, S., "Transference Neuroses: a synthesis", Rio de Janeiro, Imago, 1985, p. 77.