Sex Socialized

The form of representation cannot be divorced from its purpose and the requirements of the society in which the given language gains currency.

E. H. GOMBRICH
ART AND ILLUSION

In this chapter I will offer a series of narratives drawn from the middle of the eighteenth to the early twentieth centuries in western Europe. The first two—about politics and political theory and about the fairly technical question of when ovulation occurs during the menstrual cycle—are intended to show how, in specific contexts, incommensurably, opposite sexes came into being. The second two—an account of why masturbation and prostitution are not so much sexual as they are social pathologies with sexual consequences and a reading of Freud’s argument about the transition from clitoral to vaginal sexuality as a case of near universal hysteria—are intended to show the contrary tendency: how the one-sex model with its interpenetration of the body and culture flourished at the same time in other, quite specific contexts. Having argued in Chapter 5 that the two-sex model was not manifest in new knowledge about the body and its functions, I will argue here that it was produced through endless micro-confrontations over power in the public and private spheres. These confrontations occurred in the vast new spaces opened up by the intellectual, economic, and political revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They were fought in terms of sex-determinant characteristics of male and female bodies because the truths of biology had replaced divinely ordained hierarchies or inmemorial custom as the basis for the creation and distribution of power in relations between men and women. But not all confrontations of sex and gender were fought on this ground, and one-sex thinking flourished still. The play of difference never came to rest.
quantitative: doing it alone and doing it with lots of people rather than doing it in pairs. Such sex is thus in the same category as other misdeeds of number, the withdrawal of the protagonist of Florence Nightingale's Cassandria, for example, who refuses to pour tea for the household and withdraws to her solitary couch. The social context, not the act, determines acceptability. The paradoxes of commercial society that had already plagued Adam Smith and his colleagues, the nagging doubts that a free economy might not sustain the social body, haunt the sexual body. Or, the other way around, the perverted sexual body haunts society and reminds it of its fragility, as it had done in other ways for millennia.

Freud's problem

Freud's account of how the clitoral sexuality of young girls gives way to the vaginal sexuality of mature women powerfully focuses on the issues of my book. On the one hand, Freud is very much a man of the Enlightenment, inheritor of its model of sexual difference. Anatomy is destiny, as he said in a phrase he did not really mean; the vagina is the opposite of the penis, an anatomical marker of woman's lack of what a man has. Heterosexuality is the natural state of the architecture of two incommensurable opposite sexes. But Freud, more than any other thinker, also collapses the model. Libido knows no sex. The clitoris is a version of the male organ—why not the other way around?—and only by postulating a sort of generalized female hysteria, a disease in which culture takes the causative role of organs, does Freud account for how it supposedly gives up its role in women's sexual lives in favor of the “opposite organ,” the vagina. Here, in other words, is a version of the central modern narrative of one sex at war with two.

The story begins in 1905 when Freud discovered the clitoris, or in any case clitoral orgasm, by inventing its vaginal counterpart. (Recall Renaldus Columbus' prior sixteenth-century claim.) After four hundred, perhaps even two thousand, years there was all of a sudden a second place from which women derived sexual pleasure. In 1905, for the first time, a doctor claimed that there were two kinds of orgasm and that the vaginal sort was the expected norm among adult women. This generated an immense polemical and clinical literature. More words have been shed, I suspect, about the clitoris than about any other organ, or at least about any organ its size.109

I want to make two points in particular. In the first place, before 1905
no one thought that there was any other kind of female orgasm than the clitoral sort. It is well and accurately described in hundreds of learned and popular medical texts, as well as in a burgeoning pornographic literature. It simply is not true, as Robert Scholes has argued, that there has been "a semiotic coding that operates to purge both texts and language of things [the clitoris as the primary organ of woman's sexual pleasure] that are unwelcome to men." The clitoris, like the penis, was for two millennia both "precious jewel" and sexual organ, a connection not "lost or mislaid" through the ages, as Scholes would have it, but only (if then) since Freud.10 To put it differently, the revelation by Masters and Johnson that female orgasm is almost entirely clitoral would have been a commonplace to every seventeenth-century midwife and had been documented in considerable detail by nineteenth-century investigators. A great wave of amnesia descended on scientific circles around 1900, and hoary truths were hailed as earth-shattering in the second half of the twentieth century.

My second point, more central to the concerns of this book, is that there is nothing in nature about how the clitoris is construed. It is not self-recognizably a female penis, and it is not self-evidently in opposition to the vagina. Nor have men always regarded clitoral orgasm as absent, threatening, or unspeakable because of some primordial male fear of, or fascination with, female sexual pleasure. The history of the clitoris is part of the history of sexual difference generally and of the socialization of the body's pleasures. Like the history of masturbation, it is a story as much about sociability as about sex. And once again, for the last time in this book, it is the story of the aporia of anatomy.

"If we are to understand how a little girl turns into a woman," Freud says in the third of his epochal Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality, "we must follow the further vicissitudes of [the] excitability of the clitoris." During puberty, the story goes, there occurs in boys "an accession of libido," while in girls there is "a fresh wave of repression in which it is precisely clitoroidal sexuality that is affected." The development of women as cultural beings is thus marked by what seems to be a physiological process: "what is overtaken by repression is a piece of masculine machinery."111

Like a Bakhtian tribesman in search of fresh pastures, female sexuality is said to migrate from one place to another, from the malelike clitoris to the unmistakably female vagina. The clitoris does not, however, entirely lose its function as a result of pleasure's short but significant journey.

Instead it becomes the organ through which excitement is transmitted to the "adjacent female sexual parts," to its permanent home, the true locus of a woman's erotic life, the vagina. The clitoris, in Freud's less than illuminating simile, becomes "like pine shavings" used "to set a log of harder wood on fire."

This strangely inappropriate identification of the cavity of the vagina with a burning log is not my concern here. Stranger still is what happens to biology in Freud's famous essay. A little girl's realization that she does not have a penis and that therefore her sexuality resides in its supposed opposite, in the cavity of the vagina, elevates a "biological fact" into a cultural desideratum. Freud writes as if he has discovered the basis in anatomy for the entire nineteenth-century world of gender. In an age obsessed with being able to justify and distinguish the social roles of women and men, science seems to have found in the radical difference of penis and vagina not just a sign of sexual difference but its very foundation. When erotogenic susceptibility to stimulation has been successfully transferred by a woman from the clitoris to the vaginal orifice, she has adopted a new leading zone for the purposes of her later sexual activity.

Freud goes even further by suggesting that the repression of female sexuality in puberty, marked by abandonment of the clitoris, heightens male desire and thus tightens the web of heteroerotic union on which reproduction, the family, and indeed civilization itself appear to rest: "The intensification of the brake upon sexuality brought about by pubertal repression in women serves as a stimulus to the libido of men and causes an increase in its activity."112 When everything has settled down, the "masculine machinery" of the clitoris is abandoned, the vagina is erotically charged, and the body is set for reproductive intercourse. Freud seems to be taking a stab at historical bio-anthropology, claiming that female modesty incites male desire while female acquiescence, in allowing it to be gratified, leads humanity out of the savage's cave.

Perhaps this is pushing one paragraph too hard, but Freud in these passages is very much in the imaginative footsteps of Diderot and Rousseau, who argued that civilization began when woman began to discriminate, to limit her availability. Freud in the Three Essays is not quite so explicit, but he does appear to be arguing that femininity, and thus the place of women in society, is grounded in the developmental neurology of the female genitals.

But could he really have meant this? In the first place, the long written
history of the body would have shown that the vagina fails miserably as a "natural symbol" of interior sexuality, of passivity, of the private against the public, of a critical stage in the ontogeny of woman. In the one-sex model, dominant in anatomical thinking for two thousand years, woman was understood as man inverted: the uterus was the female scrotum, the ovaries were testicles, the vulva was a foreskin, and the vagina was a penis. This account of sexual difference, though as phallocentric as Freud's, offered no real female interior, only the displacement inward to a more sheltered space of the male organs, as if the scrotum and penis in the form of uterus and vagina had taken cover from the cold.

If Freud was not aware of this history, he surely must have known that there was absolutely no anatomical or physiological evidence for the claim that "erogogenous susceptibility to stimulation" is successfully transferred during the maturation of women "from the clitoris to the vaginal orifice." The abundance of specialized nerve endings in the clitoris and the relative impoverishment of the vagina had been demonstrated half a century before Freud wrote and had been known in outline for hundreds of years. Common medical knowledge available in any nineteenth-century handbook thus makes Freud's story a puzzle, if it is construed as a narrative of biology. Finally, if the advent of the vaginal orgasm were the consequence of neurological processes, then Freud's question of "how a woman develops out of a child with bisexual dispositions" could be resolved by psychology without any help from psychoanalysis.

Freud's answer, then, must be regarded as a narrative of culture in anatomical disguise. The tale of the clitoris is a parable of culture, of how the body is forged into a shape valuable to civilization despite, not because of, itself. The language of biology gives this tale its rhetorical authority but does not describe a deeper reality in nerves and flesh.

Freud, in short, must have known that he was inventing vaginal orgasm and that he was at the same time giving a radical new meaning to the clitoris. Richard von Krafft-Ebing may have anticipated him a bit when in the 1890s he wrote that "the erogenous zones in women are, while she is a virgin, the clitoris, and, after defloration, the vagina and cervix uteri." But this is in the context of a discussion of a variety of erogenous zones; immediately following is the observation that "the nipple particularly seems to possess this [erogenous] quality." Krafft-Ebing, like many of his contemporaries, believed that the "normally developed mentally and well bred" woman's sexual desires were small. He also regarded woman's supposed sexual passivity (a symbol for her passivity in public life) as imbedded in "her sexual organization." But neither he nor anyone else drew social consequences from the distinction between vaginal and clitoral eroticism. There was, in fact, no evidence at all in the contemporary literature for the sort of vaginal sexuality Freud postulates. Nor was there any special interest in denying it. The stark contrasts we shall see below are the result of a historical juxtaposition of texts. Authorities in French, German, and English during Freud's time, and stretching back to the early seventeenth century, were unanimous in holding that female sexual pleasure originated in the structures of the vulva generally and in the clitoris specifically. No alternative sites were proposed.

The major English-language medical encyclopedia of Freud's day begins the "clitoris" subheading of a lengthy and up-to-date entry on "Sexual Organs, Female" by citing the Viennese anatomist and philologist Joseph Hyrtl, who derived the word "clitoris" from a Greek verb meaning "to titillate" and observed that these etymological roots are reflected in the German colloquial term Kitzler (tickler). Its anatomy is presented as the homologue of the penis, although the clitoris' nervous supply is "far greater, in proportion to its size." Indeed, its cutaneous investment is supplied with special nerve endings, which give it remarkable and special sensitivity... At the base of the papillae are the endings which Krause believes to be related to the peculiar sensibility of the organ and has named corpuscles of sexual pleasure (Wohlfühlkörperchen). They are usually called genial corpuscles.

On the other hand, the upper and middle portions of the vagina are innervated by "the same sources as the uterus." It is "not very sensitive," and indeed the anterior wall is so insensitive that it "can be operated on without much pain to the patient." This may be hyperbole, but it suggests that to nineteenth-century authorities the vagina was an unlikely candidate for the primary locus of sexual pleasure in women.

No one took it to be such. Freud's contemporary, the gynecologist E. H. Kisch, for example, cites Victor Hensen's article on the physiology of reproduction in the authoritative Handbuch der Physiologie (1881) to the effect that direct stimulation of sexual feeling is through the dorsal nerve of the penis and the clitoris. Kisch then notes that sexual pleasure in women is due chiefly to friction on the clitoris through the intromitted
come into contact with the glans of the clitoris, then the blood which is causing the bullos to swell, by way of the reflex spasm of the muscular constrictor ani, is propelled through the exposed pari intermedia into the glans, now ready for the stimulus; and thereby the purpose of the entire passive apparatus (the sensation of sexual pleasure) is achieved. The sexually pleasurable titillation increases with continuing stimulation up to its final transformation into indifference [orgasm] and return to the usual quiescent state of the affected parts. The process is further supported by the same sort of auxiliary means as in the male.

The vagina, Kobelt thinks, is so well known that it warrants no extended description. But he nevertheless pauses to point out that it plays a minimal role in genital orgasm: “The small number of nerves which, singly, make their way down into the voluminous vaginal tube puts the vagina so far behind the glans—small but very rich in nerves—that we can grant the vagina no part in the creation of the specific pleasurable sex feelings in the female body.”

Kobelt’s book was by far the most detailed account of the clitoris ever published, but it did not radically revise established views. An earlier French medical encyclopedia came to roughly the same conclusions. “Clitoris,” it says, derives from the Greek verb kleroriaein, meaning to touch or titillate lasciviously, to be inclined to pleasure. A synonym is “oestrum veneris,” a frenzy of sexual passion. The clitoris is like the penis in form and structure and “enjoys an exquisite sensibility,” which makes it highly susceptible to “abuse.” The author of this entry disapproves strongly of titillating the clitoris, as some colleagues recommend, to cure certain nervous disorders like catalepsy. (Although unacknowledged, this was a therapy derived from a famous case of Galen’s in which a widow, laboring under a purported backup of “semen,” suffered from backaches and other pains until the pressure was relieved by a midwife who rubbed her genitals.) A subsequent entry on “clitoris,” the female equivalent of masturbation, discusses further abuses invited by this site of pleasure.

In the “vagina” entry, on the other hand, the subject is defined as the “cylindrical and elastic passage from the uterus to the external parts.” There follows a short discussion of nomenclature which warns against confusing the vagina with the cervix, the part that used to be called “the neck of the womb,” but there is no discussion of its innervation or erotic functions.

These articles from the nineteenth century refer back in turn to a seventeenth-century text by François Mauriceau, one of the luminaries of French obstetrics. He notes that the clitoris is “where the Author of Nature has placed the seat of voluptuousness—as He has in the glans penis—where the most exquisite sensibility is located, and where he placed the origins of lasciviousness in women.” Indeed, the pudendum more generally has the capacity to engender delight because the nerves that supply the clitoris supply it too. Mauriceau, after describing for almost six pages the clitoris’ muscles, nerves, and vasculature, concludes that it functions just like the penis.

The vagina is a far duller organ. It is the tube leading from uterus to the outside, “a slack canal (mol et lache) which during coitus embraces the penis.” Only the glands near its outer end are relevant to sexual plea-
sure because they pour out great quantities of a saline liquor during coition, which increases the heat and enjoyment of women. These are the substances, Mauriceau suggests, to which Galen was referring when he spoke of needing to use other means to cause their release when the caresses of a man were not available. And this takes the history of the clitoris back to where I left it earlier. In 1612 Jacques Duval wrote: "In French it is called temptation, the spur to sensual pleasure, the female rod and the sorcer of men: and women who will admit their lewdness call it their gaude mihi [great joy]."  

The French physician echoes the certainties and tensions of later as well as earlier accounts. On the one hand, the clitoris is the organ of sexual pleasure in women. On the other, its easy responsiveness to touch makes it difficult to domesticate for reproductive, heterosexual intercourse. This was Freud's problem, and I will now return to it.

Although Freud may not have been aware of all the detailed history of genital anatomy I have just recounted, it is impossible that he would not have been familiar with what was in the standard reference books of his day. He was, after all, especially interested in zoology during his medical-student days and was an expert neurologist. Furthermore, one did not have to be a scientist to know about clitoral sexuality. Walter, protagonist of the notorious My Secret Life, notes in his review of the copulative organs that the clitoris is an erectile organ which is "the chief seat of pleasure in a woman." Probably thousands of tracts about masturbation proclaimed its sensitivity. And of course Freud himself points out that biology has been "oblige to recognize the female clitoris as a true substitute for the penis," though it does not follow from this that children recognize that "all human beings have the same (male) form of genital" or that little girls therefore suffer penis envy because their genital is so small.  

Freud, in short, must have known that what he wrote in the language of biology regarding the shift of erotogenic sensibility from the clitoris to the vagina had no basis in the facts of anatomy or physiology. Both the migration of female sexuality and the opposition between the vagina and penis must therefore be understood as re-presentations of a social ideal in yet another form. On a formal level, the opposition of the vagina and penis represents an ideal of parity. The social thuggery that takes a polymorphously perverse infant and bullies it into a heterosexual man or woman finds an organic correlate in the body, in the opposition of the sexes and their organs. Perhaps because Freud is the great theorist of sexual ambiguity, he is also the inventor of a dramatically sexual antithesis: between the embarrassing clitoris that girls desert and the vagina whose erotogenic powers they embrace as mature women.

More generally, what might loosely be called patriarchy may have appeared to Freud as the only possible way to organize the relations between the sexes, leading him to write as if its signs in the body, external active penis versus internal passive vagina, were "natural." But in Freud's question of how it is that "a woman develops out of a child with a bisexual disposition," the word "woman" clearly refers not to natural sex but to theatrical gender, to socially defined roles. The supposed opposition of men and women, "exclusive gender identity," in Gayle Rubin's terms, "far from being an expression of natural differences . . . is the suppression of natural similarities." In Civilization and Its Discontents Freud seems poignantly aware of the painful processes through which body parts are sorted out and come to represent the most telling of differences. Civilization, like a conquering people, subjects others to its "exploitation," proscribe "manifestations of sexual life in children," makes "heterosexual genital love" the only permitted sort, and in so doing takes the infant, "an animal organism with (like others) an unmistakably bisexual disposition" and molds it into either a man or a woman.  

The power of culture thus represents itself in bodies, forges them, as on an anvil, into the required shape. What Rosalind Coward has called in another context "ideologies of appropriate desires and orientations" must struggle—one hopes unsuccessfully—to find their signs in the flesh. Freud's argument, flying as it does in the face of centuries of anatomical knowledge, is a testament to the freedom with which the authority of nature can be rhetorically appropriated to legitimize the creations of culture.

It is, however, an argument that works on its own terms and thereby illustrates just how powerfully culture operates on the body. In the first place, Freud remained a Lamarckian all his life. He believed in the inheritance of acquired characteristics, which he generalized to include traits of the psyche—aggressions and need, for example. Need, he wrote to his colleague Karl Abraham, is nothing other than the "power of unconscious ideas over one's own body, of which we see remnants in hysteria, in short, 'the omnipotence of thought.'"  

Hysteria is the model for mind over matter. The hysterical, like the patient who feels pain or itches in a missing limb, has physical symptoms that defy neurology. The hysterical's seizures, twitches, coughs, and squints are not the result of lesions but of neurotic cathexes, of the pathological
attachment of libidinal energies to body parts. In other words, parts of the body in hysterics become occupied, taken possession of, filled with energies that manifest themselves organically. (Freud's term Besetzung is translated by the English neologism "cathexis." The verb besetzen also has the sense of "charge," as with a furnace, or "tamp," as with a blasting charge, or "set in place," as with a paving stone or a jewel."

Freud knew that the natural locus of man's erotic pleasure was the clitoris and that it competed with the culturally necessary locus of her pleasure, the vagina. Marie Bonaparte reports that her mentor gave her Felix Bryk's Neger Eros to read. The author argued that the Nandi tribes engaged in clitoral excision on nubile seventeen- and eighteen-year-old girls so as to encourage the transfer of orgastic sensitivity from its "infantile" zone to the vagina, where it must necessarily come to rest. The Nandi were purportedly not interested in suppressing female pleasure but merely in facilitating its redirection to social ends. Freud drew Bonaparte's attention to the fact that Bryk must have been familiar with his views and that the hypothesis regarding Nandi orgasmic transfer was worth investigating.

Bonaparte's efforts to discover the fortunes of "clitoroidal" versus "vaginal" sexuality in women whose clitoris had been excised proved inconclusive, but she did offer a theoretical formulation of the transfer of erotic sensibility that fits my understanding of Freud's theory of female sexuality. "I believe," writes Bonaparte, "that the ritual sexual mutilations imposed on African women since time immemorial . . . constitute the exact physical counterpart of the psychical intimations imposed in childhood on the sexuality of European little girls."111 "Civilized" people no longer seek to destroy the old home of sensibility—an ironic observation for Bonaparte, since she collected cases of European excision and herself underwent painful and unsuccessful surgery to move her clitoris nearer her vaginal opening so that she might be "normally orgasmic"—but enforce the occupation, or cathexis, of a new organ by less violent means.

If we put all of this together, Freud's argument might work as follows. Whatever polymorphous perverse practices might have obtained in the distant past, or today among children and animals, the continuity of the species and the development of civilization depend on the adoption by women of their correct sexuality. For a woman to make the switch from clitoris to vagina is to accept the feminine social role that only she can fill. Each woman must adapt anew to the redistribution of sensibility that furthers this end, must reinscribe on her body the racial history of bisexuality. But neurology is no help. On the contrary. Thus the move is hysterical, a recathexis that works against the organic structures of the body. Like the missing-limb phenomenon, it involves feeling what is not there. Becoming a sexually mature woman is therefore living an oxymoron, becoming a lifelong "normal hysteric," for whom a conversion neurosis is termed "acceptable."

And this gets us back to Freud's concern, which like Shakespeare's at the end of Twelfth Night is somehow to assure that bodies whose anatomies do not guarantee the dominance of heterosexual procreative sex nevertheless dedicate themselves to their assigned roles. But Freud is at the same time a product of nineteenth-century biology, which postulates two sexes with distinctive organs and physiologies, and of an evolutionaryism that guarantees the adaptation of genital parts to heterosexual intercourse. In the end, the cultural myth of vaginal orgasm is told in the language of science. And thus, not thanks to but in spite of neurology, a girl becomes the Viennese bourgeois ideal of a woman.

I end this book with Freud not because he comes at the end of the making of sexual difference but because he posed its problems so richly. I might have ended with the scientists, including my great-uncle Ernst Laqueur who in the 1930s worried about endocrinological androgeny when male hormones were found in the female and female hormones in the male. But that worry is only a chemical version of the sorts of issues already raised by nineteenth-century embryology. Freud, precisely because he shattered the old categories of man and woman, had to work hard and ingeniously to establish new ones. With all his passion for biology, this preeminent twentieth-century thinker showed how difficult it is for culture to make the body fit into the categories necessary for biological and thus cultural reproduction. Two sexes are not the necessary, natural consequence of corporeal difference. Nor, for that matter, is one sex. The ways in which sexual difference have been imagined in the past are largely unconstrained by what was actually known about this or that bit of anatomy, this or that physiological process, and derive instead from the rhetorical exigencies of the moment. Of course the specific language changes over time—Freud's version of the one-sex model is not articulated in the same vocabulary as Galen's—and so does the cultural setting. But basically the content of talk about sexual difference is unfettered by fact, and is as free as mind's play.
one were to accept this later reading. Frie's argument still supports my claim that the relationship to production and exchange is marked on the body's capacity to procreate. On heat and religious fervor, see William Bouwsma, John Calvin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).
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