

EDITOR'S NOTE

FETTSCHISMUS

(a) GERMAN EDITIONS:

- 1927 *Almanach* 1928, 17-24.
1927 *Int. Z. Psychoanal.*, 13 (4), 373-8.
1928 *G.S.*, 11, 395-401.
1931 *Sexualtheorie und Traumlehre*, 220-7.
1948 *G.W.*, 14, 311-17.

(b) ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

- 'Fetishism'
1928 *Int. J. Psycho-Anal.*, 9 (2), 161-6. (Tr. Joan Riviere.)
1950 *C.P.*, 5, 198-204. (Revised reprint of above.)

The present translation is a modified version of the one published in 1950.

This paper was finished at the end of the first week of August, 1927 (Jones, 1957, 146), and was published almost simultaneously the same autumn in the *Almanach 1928* and in the last issue of the *Zeitschrift* for 1927.

In his earliest discussion of fetishism, in the *Three Essays* (1905*d*), *Standard Ed.*, 7, 153-5, Freud wrote that 'no other variation of the sexual instinct that borders on the pathological can lay so much claim to our interest as this one', and he in fact returned many times to a consideration of it. In this first account he did not go much further than maintaining that 'the choice of a fetish is an after-effect of some sexual impression, received as a rule in early childhood', and he left it at that in some passing comments on foot-fetishism in his study on *Gratia* (1907*a*) a year or two later (*ibid.*, 9, 46-7). His next approach to the subject seems to have been in an unpublished paper 'On the Genesis of Fetishism', read to the Vienna Psycho-Analytical Society on February 24, 1909 (Jones, 1955, 332); but we have unluckily not been given access to the Society's Minutes. At that time he was on the point of preparing the 'Rat Man'

analysis (1909*d*) for publication, and in it he mentioned a fresh point—the connection of fetishism with pleasure in smell (*ibid.*, 10, 247)—which he enlarged upon in a footnote added to the *Three Essays* in its second edition of 1910 (*ibid.*, 7, 155). But soon afterwards a new and more important connection must have occurred to him, for this same added footnote contained the first assertion that the fetish stands for the missing penis of the woman, which had figured prominently among the infantile sexual theories to which he had recently devoted a paper (1908*c*), *ibid.*, 9, 215–18. This new explanation of the fetish was also mentioned (as Freud remarks on p. 153*n*. below) in his study on Leonardo (1910*c*), *ibid.*, 11, 96, published very soon after the *Three Essays* footnote.

The special question of the origin of foot-fetishism (referred to in the present paper, p. 155 below) attracted Freud's attention a few years later. On March 11, 1914, he read another paper to the Vienna Psycho-Analytical Society, on 'A Case of Foot-Fetishism'. This too remains unpublished, but this time we fortunately have a summary of it from Ernest Jones (1955, 342–3). The explanation of the choice of the foot as a fetish—approach to the woman's genitals from below—, which was arrived at there, was published in a further addition to the same footnote of the *Three Essays* in its third edition of 1915. Another similar case history was reported very briefly by Freud in Lecture XXII of his *Introductory Lectures* (1916–17). But though the present paper is of importance as bringing together and enlarging on Freud's earlier views on fetishism, its major interest lies in a very different direction—namely, in a fresh metapsychological development which it introduces. For several years past Freud had been using the concept of 'disavowal' ('*Verleugnung*') especially in relation to children's reactions to the observation of the anatomical distinction between the sexes.¹ And in the present paper, basing himself on fresh clinical observations, he puts forward reasons for supposing that this 'disavowal' necessarily implies a split in the subject's ego. At the end of his life Freud took up this question again and widened its scope: in an unfinished and posthumously

¹ See, for instance, the paper dealing explicitly with that subject (1925*f*) as well as the earlier ones on 'The Infantile Genital Organization' (1923*e*), 'The Economic Problem of Masochism' (1924*b*) and 'The Loss of Reality in Neurosis and Psychosis' (1924*e*).

published paper on 'Splitting of the Ego in the Process of Defence' (1940*e* [1938*l*]) and in the last paragraphs of Chapter VIII of *An Outline of Psycho-Analysis* (1940*a* [1938*l*]). But though fetishism is specially considered in both these works, Freud there points out that this 'splitting of the ego' is not peculiar to fetishism but is in fact to be found in many other situations in which the ego is faced with the necessity of constructing a defence, and that it occurs not only in disavowal but also in repression.¹

¹ It is perhaps not entirely fanciful to see a beginning of these ideas in a paper sent by Freud to Fliess on January 1, 1896 (Freud, 1950*a*, Draft K). In that paper Freud speaks of the final stage of the 'neuroses of defence' as involving a 'malformation' or 'alteration' of the ego. Something similar is even to be found still earlier, in the third section of the first paper on the neuro-psychoses of defence (1894*d*).

