“Kopfabschneiden = Kastrieren.”
[To decapitate = to castrate.]—Sigmund Freud, “Das Medusenhaupt”

Homi Bhabha has argued for “reading the racial stereotype of colonial discourse in terms of fetishism.”1 Freud’s analysis of how the problematic of sexual difference engenders fetishism provides Bhabha with a heuristic for understanding the production of the multiple and contradictory representations of racial difference. The “functional overdetermination”2 of discourses on sexuality and race that Bhabha describes at work in the colonial apparatus is, however, already at play in Freud’s essay “Fetishism.”3 In its discussion of the threat to a young boy’s narcissistic identity posed by the knowledge of sexual difference and his consequent production of a “substitute for the woman’s (mother’s) penis which [he] once believed in,”4 Freud’s study is also addressing another point of inquiry: the threat to Christian
male bourgeois identity presented by an ethnic difference coded as effeminate, specifically the difference embodied by the Jews’ circumcised penises.5

When Freud asserts that the simultaneous disavowal and acknowledgment of sexual difference is primary in the genesis of fetishism, he makes two key moves which simultaneously deny and affirm Jewish difference. First, he curiously isolates and blindly interprets the essay's most recalled example: the “shine on the nose.” While Freud focuses upon his patient’s Glanz auf der Nase as the transliteration of a “glance at the nose,” he overlooks that other near homonym for which the fetish usually substitutes: the glans. Second, he forecloses his earlier theory of fetishism: the repression of the coprophilic pleasure in smelling. The bared glans (of the circumcised penis), the nose, and the dirty, evil smell are figures by which Jewish difference had been constructed. Freud’s attempted scotomization of this difference indicates that he was implicated in what he sought to explicate. These rhetorical and theoretical ploys are symptomatic of his own ambiguous position as a postcolonial subject.6 Like other middle-class (male) Jews in late nineteenth-century Europe, Freud sought entry into a society in which sexual, racial, gender, ethnic, and class identities were becoming fixed even as (because) such identities were being threatened with dissolution. He sought entry into a society which demanded his assimilation but denied its possibility. And to authorize that entry he appropriated scientific and medical discourses that were about and not by Jews like himself. Freud sought to distance himself, his movement, and his theory from any presumption of particularity—in part by defining what is universal. But where Freud proposed psychoanalysis as an objective science of the human, others perceived a “Jewish national affair.”7 If his theoretical construction of fetishism had generalized difference beyond sex, then Freud, as feminized Jew, would also be the object of fetishistic representation. Hence, Freud’s manifest delimitation of fetishism to the problem of sexual difference displaces the recognition of ethnic (and other) differences as constitutive of the epistemological and affective development of the (male European) subject. Yet he betrays his own contradictory position as his disjointed rhetoric and patterns of allusion reproduce such recognition.

The multiple and contradictory representations of the Jew’s body (mis)recognized by Freud’s “Fetishism” are symptomatic of the ways by which differ-
ence—class, ethnic, gender, racial, and sexual—has been represented by the West. They suggest that the fetishism of the other which characterizes the colonial stereotype entails the Europeans’ discursive fixation upon a part of the other’s body. The circumcised penis is a prime example. Circumcision supplements the male Jewish body: it both adds to it (the physical loss appendes symbolic meaning to the body) and completes it. The circumcised penis defines the male as Jewish to both the Jewish and non-Jewish communities. To many non-Jews in particular, that a people would ritually practice genital mutilation is no historical accident: it suggests something perverse in their essential being. Thus circumcision comes to signify Jewish nature.

As is the case with the circumcised penis, the bound foot, tattooed skin, and the like, the fixated-upon body part is often one that has been subjected to some discipline, practice, or technique. This overvalued mark or member uncannily conjoins the natural and the cultural. This ambiguous conjunction of two (culturally) differentiated orders of being contributes to both the fascination and the horror evoked by such body techniques. Further, through such corporeal metonymies, discourses in which historical difference is naturalized as race and discourses in which natural difference is figured by sex combine to construct the ethnic and gender identity of the other.8 These constructs provide symbolic substitutes for and objectified representations of the otherness—both the indigenous heterogeneous populations of modern European society and the different peoples contacted in colonial expansion—which undermines the narcissistic fantasy of European wholeness. By rendering the other visible, these fetishizing representations were simultaneously to disavow, affirm, and, above all, forestall the perceived threat to the Europeans’ white, Christian, male, heterosexual, bourgeois claims to identity and authority.9

This paper returns to Freud’s essay to examine another fetishizing representation that implicates his concern with the threat posed by the ethnic other. His text’s concluding remarks betray a conjunction of two of the West’s preeminent others: the Jew and the Chinese. Together with the Hindu, Jewish and Chinese cultures occupied a peculiar place in the West’s cultural imaginary. Although they were generally perceived as older than Christian Europe, they had apparently been superseded by their rival for world hegemony. Yet still they persisted.10 While the lack of control over
their political and economic destinies insinuated a lack in their cultural (or racial) makeup, their very persistence under conditions of European domination questioned the grounds of a Christian European culture which privileged (its own) sui generis constitution. These European perceptions of the Jew and the Chinese as other—as persistent and therefore unchanging through history; as particular and thus without internal differentiation—are in themselves fetishized constructions. This paper analyzes, in particular, the construction within western discourses of Jewish and Chinese identity out of their seemingly fetishistic practices. It chronicles a history of interwoven representations, of explicit and implicit comparisons whereby a gendered ethnic difference is marked.

My focus will be on the queue, the pigtail. The German word for queue, Zopf, is seen to function as a “nodal point”—perhaps analogous to Lacan’s point de capiton11—where Jew and Chinese, signifying chain and discursive practice, the representation of bodies and the body of representations meet. Meanings constellate about this signifier in which the identity of the other is pinned to the telltale truth of the body. Chinesenzopf, or Chinese pigtail, until the early twentieth century, was a necessary if not always named constituent of the queue of markers by which Chinese identity was constituted in European discourses. It was also a condensation of all such markers: “The most outward sign of [Chinese] nationality, the pigtail . . . is the symbol of the Chinese spirit as it now exists, a mass of contradictions, opposed in almost every particular to the ideals of our civilization.”12 The Judenzopf, or the plaitted hair of a diseased Jew, figured as a displacement of the foremost marker of Jewish difference, the circumcised penis. It made visible the hidden sign of the Jew. Such Zöpfe were the products of a fetishizing cultural logic, which sought to tie these others in a braid of ever threatening, yet ever contained, effeminate malevolence. Before exploring the mediation of the Zopf, however, we must tease out some of the more familiar associations of Jew and Chinese.

A Queue of Practices

Footbinding joins suttee and circumcision in a series of mutilations which the civilized Christian masculine West invokes both to assert its own superiority
and to justify its intrusive domination into the lives of the Chinese, Hindu, and Jewish peoples. A curious aspect of this series is that the first two of these practices are applied to women whereas the third is performed on males, albeit very young ones. And yet we need not adopt the Freudian register in which circumcision figures as a "symbolic substitute" for castration to associate this Jewish mark of identity with the feminine. Historical research by Sander Gilman and myself have drawn the connection such that the circumcised penis sticks out a little less. Perhaps one telling example: in the street slang of fin-de-siècle Vienna the clitoris was called the "Jud," the Jew.

Circumcision and footbinding held a particular interest not just for historians and theologians, missionaries and imperial officials, and racists of various stripes, but also for the biologists of the late nineteenth century. As millennia-long-practiced techniques of body alteration, both circumcision and footbinding provided crucial tests for the competing paradigms in evolutionary heredity. Thus if acquired traits could be inherited, then the number of Jewish males born without foreskins and Chinese females born with smaller feet would be significantly greater than the norm. However, the failure of statistical data on Jewish and Chinese newborns to corroborate this assumption provided conclusive proof against the "supposed transmission of mutilations."

Discussion of footbinding also appears in Freud's "Fetishism" essay:

Affection and hostility in the treatment of the fetish—which run parallel with the disavowal and the acknowledgment of castration—are mixed in unequal proportions in different cases, so that one or the other is more clearly recognizable. We seem here to approach an understanding even if a distant one, of the behavior of the "coupeur de nattes" [Zopf-abschneider]. In him the need to carry out the castration which he disavows has come to the front. His action contains in itself the two mutually incompatible assertions: "the woman has still got a penis" and "my father has castrated the woman." Another variant, which is also a parallel to fetishism in social psychology, might be seen in the Chinese custom of mutilating the female foot and then revering it like a fetish after it has been mutilated. It seems as though the Chinese male wants to thank the woman for having submitted to being castrated.
In this passage Freud claims that his new theory of the epistemological and affective ambivalences which cause and characterize fetishism can explain the two problematic examples: Chinese footbinding, which exemplifies non-European sexual pathology, and the Zopfabschneider, the braid- or pigtail-cutter, who, following the sexologist Krafft-Ebing, is emblematic of the pathological end of the broad spectrum of (European) fetishistic behavior.19 Thus in Freud’s essay, which as suggested above was circumscribed by the specter of circumcision, we encounter another series in which two instances of female mutilation are complemented by the (hidden) circumcised penis.

More than just another example of the commonplace conjunction of vio-
lence upon women with the effeminizing violence of circumcision, the key
topoi in the history of the fetishization of the Chinese and Jewish other con-
verge, albeit in condensed form, upon this passage. For instance, here
Freud's theory not only explains two particular problematic cases, it also
incorporates the two prime exemplars of his earlier olfactory theory: feet
and hair. As noted earlier, smell is coded Jewish. Moreover, both fetishistic
acts are associated with cutting. While this is self-evident in the case of the
Zopfschneider, it may be no less so for pre-Disney German encounters
with Freud's Chinese example. Perhaps the foremost instance of foot short-
ening with which his early readers would have been familiar is from Grimm's
Fairy Tales: the amputation of Cinderella's elder stepsister's big toe and her
younger stepsister's heel. Besides, Freud does not refer to footbinding per
se, but to the "custom of mutilating the female foot." And the word trans-
lated as mutilating, verstümmeln, conveys the sense of truncating or curtailing,
as in the phrase verstümmelter Schwanz, referring to a (dog's) docked
tail (see figure 1). Further, just as the mention of castration explicitly evokes
for Freud sexual difference, his two problematic examples of mutilation
 evoke the signs of ethnic difference. The principal mark of difference of the
Christian West—at least through the eighteenth century—is the cutting
action of circumcision, whether the opposing groups be Christian/Jew or
Christian/Muslim, while for the Chinese, hair (and dress) had long been
the index of difference. Hence this discussion of fetishized body parts as
metonyms of ethnic difference now shifts from toe to head, or rather from
foot to hair. That is, the correlation of Jewish and Chinese difference has
been mediated by the Zopf, the pigtail, the queue. Just as the Judenzopf
entailed a representation—displaced from circumcised penis to plaited
hair—of the effeminacy that marked male Jewish identity, so the queue,
"the distinctive outward and visible sign of Chinese manhood," condensed
the panoply of effeminate Chinese characteristics: "Their cracked whining
voices, the peculiar twanging, guttural sound of their language, their effem-
inate dress, their exaggerated politeness, and their long queues [which]
amused foreigners." But in my tale of these rather phallic forms I will not
be suggesting that Western men crossed their legs—if not themselves—
when they observed a male Jew or a Chinaman. Rather these effeminate
because bezöpft males threatened a cultural order founded upon the natural
opposition of masculine and feminine. Against this threat, the cut needed to be cut down.

**Persistent Signs**

The history of discursively braided types actually left a trace at the one other site in Freud’s collected works in which *Zopfabschneider* appears: his 1910 “Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood.” In that essay Freud already connects foot and *Zopf*:

But the fixation on the object that was once strongly desired, the woman’s penis, leaves indelible traces on the mental life of the child, who has pursued that portion of his infantile sexual researches with particular thoroughness. Fetishistic reverence for a woman’s foot and shoe appears to take the foot merely as a substitutive symbol for the woman’s penis which was once revered and later missed; without knowing it, *"coupeurs de nattes" [Zopfabschneider]* play the part of people who carry out an act of castration on the female genital organ.²⁸

This passage immediately follows Freud’s reiteration of the famous footnote from the case history of Little Hans. There he suggests the connection among castration, circumcision, and the conjunction of antisemitism and misogyny. The Leonardo essay is also one of Freud’s only two texts in which Spinoza is explicitly mentioned. And it is with Spinoza and his 1670 *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* that this knotty tale of *Judenzopf* and *Chinesenzopf* begins. In the notorious third chapter on the election of the Jews he writes:

The sign of circumcision is . . . so important that I could persuade myself that it alone would preserve the nation forever. Nay, I would go so far as to believe that if the foundations of their religion have not emasculated their minds they may even, if occasion offers, so changeable are human affairs, raise up their empire afresh, and that God may a second time elect them.

Of such a possibility we have a very famous example in the Chinese. They, too, have some distinctive mark on their heads which they most scrupulously observe, and by which they keep themselves apart from
everyone else, and have thus kept themselves during so many thousand years that they far surpass all other nations in antiquity. They have not always retained empire, but they have recovered it when lost, and doubtless will do so again after the spirit of the Tartars becomes relaxed through the luxury of riches and pride.  

This first significant conjunction of the Jews and the Chinese in the European philosophic tradition isolates their apparently singular fetishizing and fetishized practices of circumcision and wearing the queue. In Spinoza's analogy the bodies of these two ancient people bear a marker which both signifies their persistent and distinctive identities and has persistently effected those distinctions.  

While the explicit analogy of the circumcised penis with the *Chinesenzopf* is rarely met outside the *Tractatus*, direct or indirect comparison of the Jews and the Chinese becomes a topos in western philosophic, literary, and psychological discourses. The millennia-long preservation of both peoples, remarked upon by Spinoza, is frequently the pretext for such comparisons and facilitates their function as types. For Voltaire the moneygrubbing Jewish middleman and the Chinese mandarin function as antipodes of civilization. The Jews are a venal people incapable of any creative production and represent a ritual-ridden primitivism in which no moral transgression is impossible. On the other hand, China is a venerable land in which art, science, and techne flourish; it exemplifies his ideal of enlightened deism and rational morality.  

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Jews and the Chinese are compared in discussions of the inheritance of national character. For example, Alphonse de Candolle, in his 1873 study of evolutionary processes in human societies, compares the two ancient peoples and, unlike Voltaire, finds them both civilized. Even Wilhelm Schallmayer, one of the founders of the German eugenics movement, concedes that the veneration of parents and positive valuation of fertility which contributed to the high biological value of the “oldest living civilization,” the Chinese, was just as characteristic of the Jews—until their attempted assimilation to European ways. Jung’s proposed theory of race-specific psychologies is a bit more problematic. In 1927 he wrote that “it is a quite unpardonable
mistake to accept the conclusions of a Jewish psychology as generally valid. Nobody would dream of taking Chinese or Indian psychology as binding upon ourselves. The cheap accusation of antisemitism that has been leveled at me on the ground of this criticism is about as intelligent as accusing me of an anti-Chinese prejudice.”33 Later, when discussing the theories of the unconscious propounded by the Jewish psychoanalysts Freud and Adler in his 1934 essay “The State of Psychotherapy Today,” Jung writes: “As a member of a race with a three-thousand-year-old civilization, the Jew, like the cultured Chinese, has a wider area of psychological consciousness than we.” But unlike the Chinese, the Jew “is something of a nomad, and has never yet created a cultural form of his own and as far as we can see never will, since all his instincts and talents require a more or less civilized nation to act as host for their development.” In addition to drawing upon the antisemitic commonplaces of the Jews’ nomadic character and their unoriginality, Jung also contributed to the tradition of feminizing representations. Exemplifying the connection of ethnos and gender, he added, “the Jews have this peculiarity in common with women; being physically weaker, they have to aim at the chinks in the armour of their adversary.”34

More comparisons, both direct and indirect, flourished when the exemplary status of China suffered in the wake of both romanticism’s enlightenment critique and the European quest for self-authorizing origins.35 The picture of China began to overlap with that of the Jews as their status, too, diminished in the repudiation of earlier emancipatory ideals and the rerouting of western cultural history from the biblical Hebrews to Indo-Aryan forebears.36 In the third part of his Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit (1787), Herder set the tone for the ensuing century. He describes Chinese culture as “incompatible with western culture and like a peculiar embalmed mummy, painted with hieroglyphs and wrapped with silk; its circulation is like that of a hibernating animal.” Mechanistic moral teachings, political despotism, and the “vain pride” which kept them from mixing with other peoples thwarted intellectual progress and left Chinese cultural development stuck as it were in boyhood. Herder explicitly compares the Chinese to the Jews on the matter of a prideful refusal to intermix and interbreed with other nations. He draws
the analogy after discussing how certain Chinese professions like commerce and medicine epitomize their entire character because they employ the Chinese's "cunning industriousness and their talent for imitating anything their greed finds useful" to further its desires. Their deceitful commercial and medical practices—these are also the two premier occupations by which medieval Jewry interacted with other peoples and for which it was often castigated—illustrate the consequences of Jewlike separation. Such cultural isolation led to the decay (verartet) and corruption (verdub)t of both the Chinese and the Jews. This explicit comparison is accompanied by a number of implicit connections between Chinese and Jew including the singular roles of Confucius and Moses, limited scientific creativity, characteristic craftiness, slavish dependence on moral law, mediating role in commerce, etc. Herder also remarks on the Chinese "lack of masculine strength and honor." The denigration of the Chinese by ascribing characteristics also attributed to the Jews continued with the Brothers Schlegel. They considered Chinese culture "rigid [sarr] and formalistic," "a merely external system of good conduct without that inner soulfulness and without that feeling for divine revelation." Hegel also finds China to be "rigid, mechanistic [sarrer Mechanismus]" and incapable of progressing to absolute freedom. Michelet echoes these sentiments and Schopenhauer's successor Hartmann claims that the Chinese lack "depth and profundity, without any real feeling for right and wrong." Reflecting the popular image of the Chinese is a passage from Karl May's oft-published 1892 novel, Blauroter Methusalem:

Right next to cowardice, among the bad qualities of the uncultured Chinese, is cruelty [Grausamkeit]. This... absence of feeling characterizes his relations with everyone except kin... [T]his culture is well advanced in years, hoary old: the arteries are hardened and the nerves deadened; the body is withered and the soul dried up. [In sports and games] emerge the selfishness and unscrupulous slyness which marks the Chinese... They do not know from gymnastics; hence the lack of mettle and physical dexterity.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, the phantasm of the "Yellow Peril" also emerged amid accounts of secret societies, the growth of the
Figure 2 The Yellow Peril (German version). From Arthur Diosy, The New Far East, 4th ed. (London: Cassell and Company, 1904), frontispiece.

coolie trade, the millionfold emigration from the overpopulated Chinese mainland—and German imperial and imperialist politics. To mobilize domestic public opinion and the opinion of the rulers of Russia and France for Germany’s new belligerent Far East policy, Kaiser Wilhelm II designed in the summer of 1895 a pictorial allegory bearing the subheading in German, French, and English, “Nations of Europe! Join in the defence of your faith and your home!” Drawn by H. Knackfuss, this cartoon was reproduced throughout Europe and eventually bore the caption, “The Yellow Peril” (see figure 2). These profiles of a mummified, formalistic, amorally cunning, cowardly, conspiratorial, and unmasculine people threatening to overflood Europe are the stock of the nineteenth century depictions of the Jews.

One dissenting voice within the European tradition is Karl Rosenkranz, who might be characterized as the executor of Hegel’s philosophic estate. He argued that conservatism and mummification are not inherent to the
Chinese character. To exemplify this position he notes that “The Zopf was only lately introduced.”44 The Zopf, the queue, the pigtail, thus appears to have been—if often unexpressed—the determinant mark of Chinese identity and to have embodied their religious, rigid, and reactionary character until rendered historically contingent by Rosenkranz.

There was another analogical tradition between Jew and Chinese which even antedated Spinoza. As the Dutch and the English began their mercantile expansion to Southeast Asia and the East Indies, they encountered communities of resident aliens, the overseas Chinese, who handled much of the commercial activity for the indigenous population of the region. The Chinese distinguished themselves in other ways: Sir Henry Yule, the rediscoverer of Marco Polo, commented: “Thinking of the Eastern people in the mass one was apt to class the Burmese and other kindred races with the Chinese, but when one saw the latter in the streets of Amarapura [Burma] his individuality was just as recognizable as it would have been in Hyde Park. [In the Chinese ward] every shop and house exhibited the unmistakable countenance and [pig] tail.”45 These Europeans were less concerned, however, with the threat presented by the persistence of Jewish and Chinese populations than with the competition generated by their comparable position in local economies. As early as 1597 Dutch travelers to Bantam in West Java comment that the Chinese “are almost exactly like the Jews in our country: for they never go anywhere without taking a balance with them, and all things to their liking they pay close attention to any profit.”46 Soon another visitor to Bantam drew a more invidious analogy. Edmund Scot wrote that “the Chinese ‘who like Jewes live crooching under them,’ rob them of their wealth and send it for China.”47 Two decades later, Sir Thomas Herbert, travelling the Indies during the 1620s, also compared the Chinese of Bantam with the Jew: “The Chyneses . . . after they have lost their whole estate . . . in littel time, Jew-like, by gleaning heere and there, are able to redeem their loss.”48 Thereafter the analogy becomes a commonplace in the narratives of travelers and traders—and academics. The political economist Wilhelm Roscher compares the Jews’ historical situation in Europe with that of the Chinese in Southeast Asia; in both cases once the indigenous populations became more developed, they sought to reappropriate the control of commerce that was originally left in the hands of those
“foreign, higher cultured peoples,” the Jews and the Chinese. Although Roscher does not himself draw the analogy, he then goes on to describe the Chinese character in a manner analogous to antisemitic descriptions of the Jew: for example, “Many of the most important characteristics of the Chinese are caricatures of the common manifestations of [European] high culture; [they provide] for us Europeans and Christians a warning example of where the one-sided development and overvaluation of the understanding, of immediate practical utility, . . . have to lead.”

Eventually, among the agents of empire and their caricaturists at home, these analogies began to become identifications. In his 1865 memoir, *Quedah, or Stray Leaves from a Journal in Malayan Waters*, Captain Sherard Osborn wrote:

> A few Chinese, the Jews of the Eastern Archipelago, were there also. They were so obsequious, so anxious to attract the attention of a British midshipman. . . . The insolent contumely they endured at the hands of the Malays struck me very much. The . . . Chinese . . . bore it with cringing and shrinking; one could see, by the twinkle of their little glittering eyes that they only abided their time to bite the heel that bruised them.

For the readers of the popular magazine *Punch*, the figure of the Chinese middleman had already assumed the features of the stereotypical Jewish old-clothesman: bent back, hooked nose, and stacks of hats (see figure 3). A number of European colonials proposed a solution to the problem of Chinese national character, a solution which had often been suggested to the Jews. Only through intermarriage would a “nation [like the Chinese] which adheres to its national customs so obstinately” be changed. And the sign of that change was the abandonment of the queue: “The offspring of unions between Chinese men and Burmese women were thought to have a great future. The sons were brought up Chinese. . . . But [they] were not suffered to wear the plaited queue.”

The commercial, characterological, and bodily identification of the Chinese with the Jew that emerged in a situation of mercantile and later colonial contact in Southeast Asia converged with the European tradition of cultural antisemitism and anti-Sinicism in the person of the western-edu-
Figure 3 Chinese (Jewish) old-clothesman. From “A Lass of Wax,” *Punch* 15 (1848): 19.

cated King Vajiravudh of Siam. In a series of essays that appeared in both English and Thai, he articulated the implicit mediation of representations of the Jew in European depictions of Chinese by naming the Chinese the “Jews of the Orient.” This explicit and pejorative identification of the Chinese as the Jew began to be widely disseminated through Europe following the 1914 appearance of his anonymously published pamphlet of the same name. After several chapters discussing the Jews, he described how, like the Jews,
The Chinese also preserved their allegiance to their race, taking advantage of all the benefits of foreign citizenship but giving no loyalty in return. The Chinese [like the Jews were an ancient, unchanging race who] also possessed the concept of racial superiority, regarding only Chinese as civilized and classifying all other peoples as barbarians. And, lastly, the Chinese shared the Jewish moneymaking instinct. . . . In their devotion to money the Chinese were without morals or conscience or pity. They would cheat, rob, or murder for money. . . . In effect the Chinese were “like so many vampires who steadily suck dry an unfortunate victim’s life-blood.”

While King Vajiravudh draws upon the rhetoric of persistence, particularity, and parasitism of anti-Jewish discourse to depict the Chinese, corporeal comparisons are not manifest. But to the European the body of the other bears signs of difference. European rhetoric would eventually include a fourth P, perversion (and a fifth, predisposition), by which the identity inscribed upon the other’s body became codified as a medico-legal entity. It is necessary then to rejoin the queue to this theater of identification in order to examine the fetishized mediation of anti-Jewish and anti-Chinese representation. After discussing the historic, structural, and functional implications of Spinoza’s comparison of circumcised penis and Chinese queue, I will explore the transfiguration of this analogy in that displacement of circumcision, the Judenzopf. The Zopf figures a difference which renders visible a violence which threatens as well as maintains gendered ethnic identities and state authority.

A Historical Tail

Rosenkranz was quite right about the historicity of the queue. The western identification of the Chinese with their allegedly ages-old coiffure is all but coeval with the institution of the custom. At the time of the publication of Spinoza’s Tractatus, the practice of wearing the queue had only been enforced for some 25 years. Only in 1645 had the conquering Tartars or Manchus—whose recent climb to power Spinoza mentions—decreed, under pain of decapitation, that all conquered Chinese males shave their forehead and braid their remaining hair in the manner of a Tartar warrior.
The queue would be an effective sign both of their subjugation and of the Manchu-desired cultural homogenization of the population. Prior to the takeover long, elaborately coiffed black hair had been a hallmark of cultural self-identity. The Chinese historically referred to themselves as the "black-haired race." Consequently images of pre-Manchu conquest Chinese in the works of the Jesuits like Matteo Ricci were sans pigtail.

The European image of the Chinese changed in the 1650s and 1660s, when a number of illustrated texts were published in Spinoza's homeland, the Netherlands. These included Martinus Martini's 1654 account of the Manchu conquest of China De Bello Tartarico Historia and J. Nieuhof's renowned 1665 An Embassy from the East-India Company of the United Provinces, to the Grand Tartar Cham Emperor of China. These texts recounted how the Tartars had imposed their coiffure upon the conquered Chinese. Perhaps viewing the frontispiece of Nieuhof's volume (see figure 4), which depicted the emperor surrounded by bezöpfte Manchu warriors and conquered Chinese, Spinoza, like first-time European visitors to early-twentieth-century China, seems to have been "especially struck by three points to which he is not accustomed at home. The people will consist entirely of men; they will all wear their hair plaited in queues; and they will all be exactly alike." The queue-wearing Chinese male then became a fixture in the imagination of the West: whether on the page, on the stage, or in the gutter. Exemplifying the last is this catchy racist ditty:

Chink, Chink, Chinaman, sitting on a rail,
Along comes a white man and cuts off his tail.

While the dialectic of the absence and presence of hair on the one hand, and the relationship between cutting and power on the other reinforce Western interpretations, the Western fixation on the queue—with the usually tacit desire to cut it off—somewhat distorts the concerns of the Chinese themselves. What was most abject to the conquered Chinese was the tonsure, the shaved head which framed the queue. According to the Dutch surgeon, Wouter Schouten, who travelled the East Indies in the mid-seventeenth century: "The worst disgrace that could happen to any Chinese . . . was, when he had lost everything else, to lose the hair of his head, which was very long. When at length it was cut off their whole countenance
was changed and they were covered with infamy to such a point the other Chinese refused to speak to them or even to help them in their direst need, so that at last in an attempt to recover some money they even came to staking their own persons and freedom” rather than their hair.\textsuperscript{63} Shaving that black hair had long been associated with the humiliation and punishment of slaves and convicts. Further motivating their revulsion was the widely held belief that the Confucian injunction to preserve a parent’s progeny intact applied to the hair—this general horror of bodily mutilation also justified the Chinese repudiation of circumcision.\textsuperscript{64} According to the Chinese historian Frederic Wakeman, the common folk “viewed the loss of their hair as tantamount to the loss of their manhood.”\textsuperscript{65} His colleague Philip Kuhn echoes this assessment: “what for the Manchu warriors symbolized manliness, to the Chinese symbolized effeminacy.”\textsuperscript{66} As a consequence of the correlation of hair with individual and corporate identity, “During the conquest of the South, headdress became the rallying point of a desperate Chinese resistance and certainly made the Manchu takeover many times bloodier than it would otherwise have been.”\textsuperscript{67}

Yet once in force, the tonsure decree led to the overvaluation of the queue. On the one hand, the length and beauty of the braid became for men a form of individual distinction.\textsuperscript{68} And on the other hand, since frontal hair growth is a slow process, the presence or absence of the queue became the symbol of support or defiance of the current regime. The history of the queue in China always followed a double-edged trajectory: off with your hair or off with your head. As one defiant Ming teacher put it: “To cut off my head is a small matter. To shave my head is a great matter.”\textsuperscript{69}

The Manchu decapitation decree was inversely mirrored by its opponents. Following the examination of potential members to one of the various rebellious secret societies—groups like the Triad Brotherhood, the Hung League, and the Tai-Ping insurgents—“those who refuse to join [it] are taken to the West Gate and have their heads cut off. The next thing, for those who are proceeding with the ceremony, is the cutting off of the queue, the queue being a sign of subjection to the Manchu rule,”\textsuperscript{70} and allowing all of the hair to grow. Hence, to the imperial government the insurgents of the so-called Tai-Ping Rebellion were known as the “long-haired rebels.”\textsuperscript{71} However, prior to open hostilities, since “it would be a sign
Figure 4 The Emperor of China surrounded by queue-coiffed Manchu warriors and conquered Chinese. From J. Nieuhof, Het Gezandtschap Der Neerlandsche Oost-Indische Compagnie, aan den Grooten Tartarischen Cham, Den tegenwoordigen Keizer van China (Amsterdam: Jacob Mörs, 1669), frontispiece. Reprinted by permission of the Dept. of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton Univ. Libraries.
of rebellion to be seen without [one,] a false queue [would often be] braided on again." Cutting off the queue, rather than a sign of Western domination, was a sign of rebellion, if not liberation. Forty years later, following the initial failure of his reform movement, Sun Yat-Sen left China to save his life and to gain western support for his movement: "At Kōbō, whither I fled from Hong Kong, I took a step of great importance. I cut off my cue, which had been growing all my life." Sun also hoped by this act to be mistaken for Hawaiian or Japanese rather than mainland Chinese—and, indeed, Americans and Europeans, even friends, at first glance were so deceived. Imperial Chinese detectives, however, were not; in the process the fetish character of the queue for the western gaze was underscored. The detectives followed Sun throughout his journey to the U.S., and they eventually kidnapped him in London in 1896. For the ethnic Chinese and their Manchu overlords, the queue always retained its historically overdetermined character: representing both homogeneity and ethnicity, masculinity and effeminacy, subordination and sedition. Moreover, because of the queue, Chinese cultural and political identity was determined by a cutting. In both its polyvalent character and the relationship between identity and an act of cutting, the queue bears certain structural similarities to circumcision. Indeed, the constellation of characteristics may well have infected the function of that displacement of the circumcised penis: the Judenzopf.

The German Queue

Zopf has a long history of signifying difference in German. In its entry on the word Zopf, Grimm's Wörterbuch tells an interesting story of gender and historical difference. Zöpfe had by the eighteenth century been displaced from women's heads to men's—only later to return again to women's. Following a trajectory which parallels the Chinese history from military to mandarin to modernity, the Zopf was first imposed by Friedrich Wilhelm I of Prussia to simplify hair care and facilitate the fighting capacity of the army. Eventually, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, it became customary. The Zopf became so identified with the absolute despotism and sophistic philosophes of the time that its removal was viewed as a (rite of) "passage into the future." Calling someone an alten Zopf became a form of
ridicule; it marked the victim as antiquated and evoked “obdurate inflexible pedantry.” Although such scorn was directed at the contemporary representatives of an earlier epoch, the Zopfzeit, noted for its Sinophilia, it could just as easily be applied to those other Zopfräger, the Chinese, as they were represented in post-Enlightenment discourses.

Grimms’ dictionary also includes another derivative of Zopf: Judenzopf. Judenzopf is “a disgusting sickness of the scalp” otherwise known as plica polonica. Already in the 1780s Johann Pezzl, describing Polish Jews in Vienna, remarked that “their hair [was] turned and knotted as if they all suffered from the plica polonica.” A number of texts by the middle of the next century began to describe the spread of plica among Jews. The Judenzopf is a sign of the foul practices and primitiveness of the Jews.

But a Jüdin’s Zopf was also the sign of the Jewish attempt to assimilate. In a dinner scene from Heinrich Heine’s Die Hartzreise, one of the characters gives an account of Kriegsratin von Steinzopf née Lilienthal. The name indicates that a Jewess—Lilienthal is typical of the names Jews assumed when they were required in 1812 to conform to western naming practice—had married into the petrified Prussian aristocracy. With Stein (stone) and Zopf Heine doubly indicates the cultural rigidity of the members of that class. Yet the scene Heine sets unfolds layer after layer of ethnic and phallic fetishization. Heine describes a Berlin population concerned about appearances. Berliners desire an illusory reality that reflects their expectations. Just prior to invoking Frau Steinzopf, dinner conversation had turned to discussing the two Chinese who had been “exhibited” in Berlin prior to becoming Privatdozenten (lecturers) in aesthetics at Halle—their Zöpfe, incidentally, are not mentioned. This exhibition is then inverted with the imagined exhibition of two echt (real) Teutons in China. Returning to Berliner spectacles, the conversation focuses upon Berlin theatergoers’ disdain for anachronism or any divergence from proper time, place, or personhood: “Such meticulousness in the preservation of illusion on the part of the general management extends not merely to skirts and trousers, but also to the persons enveloped in them. Hence in the future, Othello is to be played by a real Moor. . . .” Berliners desire an identity between the other and the objects with which they figure that other. Frau von Steinzopf exemplifies this desire in name—a Prussian Christian name which nonetheless carries
Figure 5 The *krumme* or crooked Jew and the straight-braided, pious Helene. From Wilhelm Busch, *Die fromme Helene*, 4th Aufl. (Heidelberg: Fr. Bassermann, 1874), 2–3.
in the Zopf its own anachronism, its own difference—in marital status—to marry a non-Jewish aristocrat is to become one—and in viewing practice: “and if it should happen that Lord Burleigh slipped, by mistake, into the hose of King Henry IV, then [this] wife of an exalted official in the war ministry, would not take her eyes off this anachronism for the whole evening.” More than sexual innuendo is at play in this image. Just as the anachronistic Zopf betrayed the former Fräulein Lilienthal’s attempt to assimilate, so despite appearances the telltale penis—by implication a circumcised one—will show through.

During the course of the nineteenth century the Zopf, the braid, returned to the coiffure of German maidens. Hence the Judenzopf added lack of virility to its associations with rigidity, anachronism, and dirt. Moreover, as the work of the writer and cartoonist Wilhelm Busch shows, braids come to signify German-Jewish difference. In the opening chapter of Die fromme Helene Busch created one of the most widespread derogatory images of the Jew: “And the Jew with crooked (Krummer) heel / crooked (krumme) nose and crooked (krummer) legs / snakes his way to the stock market / profoundly corrupted and soulless.” Busch illustrated this section with a drawing of Helene, whose straight Zöpfe frame her face (see figure 5).

Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, the famed German physicist and satirist much admired by the young Freud, drew attention to another Judenzopf. One of his best-known prose pieces is the parody of the physiognomists published in 1873, “Fragment von Schwänzen” [On tails]. This brief work swiftly moves from animal tails to queues with ready allusions to their phallic character—the German for tail is also slang for penis (see figure 6). But it begins with an analysis of a pigtail, more specifically a sow’s tail of explicitly Jewish nature (see figure 7). The Jewish character of this Zopf is so obvious that he admonishes his readers: if they do not recognize in this Schwanz—Lichtenberg says if they do not “smell, as if [they] had a nose in [their] eyes”—that which is “repugnant to nature and an abomination to all peoples and all times they should stop reading right there.”

With a virulence which exceeds that of a Voltaire—or a Goebbels—Lichtenberg goes on to describe the history of this sow to whom this tail was once attached. This pig poisons the streets with her unspeakable stench of manure, desecrates a synagogue, and cannibalistically consumes her
Figure 6 Phallic-shaped Schwänze or tails. From Lichtenberg, “Fragment von Schwänzen,” 597.
three piglets. Then, when attacking a poor young child, she is slaughtered and consumed by a gang of young beggars. Beyond dredging up the monstrous centuries-old figure of the Judensau, this parody both of physiognomic claims and of the physiognomist Lavater's anti-Jewish polemic implies that Jewish physiognomy—here figured by a sow’s Schwanz, in other words a maternal phallus—and what it reveals about Jewish character are self-evident. This dismembered member embodies Jewish identity.
To follow the trajectory of this metonymy of Jewish identity, the story moves ten years from Lichtenberg to Fichte, from ostensive parody to political polemic, from an abgeschnittene Zopf to an abgeschnittene Kopf, from a cut-off pigtail to a cut-off head. In his 1793 *Contribution to the Correction of the Public’s Judgment Regarding the French Revolution*, Fichte writes that the bestowal of civil rights was only possible for that “state within a state,” the Jews, after a drastic operation in which the Jewish identity of the Jews would be thoroughly extinguished: “to give [the Jews] civil rights I see no other means than one night to cut off all of their heads [die Köpfe abzuschneiden] and replace them with ones in which there is not a single Jewish idea.” The first part of this procedure apotropaically recalls that other one which confers identity onto the male Jew: namely, circumcision. Fichte’s surgical strike would substitute for the original. Only then, since no form of self-chosen displacement or disguise can extinguish the fetish character of their identity, can the (male) Jews undergo the epispasm of assimilation, bearing foreheads, if not foreskins, like their Gentile companions.

The connection of Jewish emancipation and decapitation would reappear in the ensuing decades. For example, an 1805 anonymous pamphlet was entitled: “The Jewish Reformation, or how the Jews could be exterminated without cutting off a single head.” A variant of this figuration appeared in an 1803 pamphlet which concedes that it would be unchristian to break the neck of a Jew at birth, but recommends instead that after the firstborn son all future male children be castrated: “We’re only talking here about a couple more snips. But this couple more, what consequences would they have for the welfare of the state.” These images combined a concern about a secular substitute for baptism, a desire for the limitation of the Jewish population—if not fantasies about its outright extermination—and a clear allusion to circumcision. For the Jews to be emancipated and enter modernity meant they had to cut off their ties to their dirty, rigid, pedantic, bezöpfte, beschnittene (circumcised) past. They had to cut off that cutting which cut them off from male European bourgeois Christendom. The *Judenzopf*, like the Jewish nose, was a displacement from lower to upper whereby a gendered, Jewish identity was rendered visible, vaunting, and vulnerable.

This Zopf-mediated chronicle of formal, functional, and substantial
analogies between Jew and Chinese drained—like most of the misogynistic, homophobic, racist, and antisemitic effluvia, the series of gender, sexual, racial, and religious differentiations by which identity and hegemony were constructed and legitimated in modern European discourses—into that fin-de-siècle cesspool masquerading as philosophical anthropology, Otto Weininger’s best-selling Geschlecht und Charakter. Weininger invokes the Chinesenzopf as a signifier of Chinese effeminacy to introduce his discussion of a Judentum (Judaism, Jewishness, Jewish people) “saturated with femininity.”85 He muses: “One might be tempted to believe in the complete effeminacy of the [Chinese]. It can at least be no mere whim of the entire nation that the Chinaman habitually wears a pigtail [Zopf].”86 With this anthropological “truism” about the gendered character of a “whole race,” Weininger sets up his characterization of the feminine nature of another race, albeit one defined as much ontologically as anthropologically, namely, the Jews. And as was the case with the other Zopf-associated depictions of the Jews, the Jewishness of Weininger’s Judentum is radically differentiated from the rest of mankind and must be overcome. He ominously concludes his chapter, “Mankind has the choice to make. There are only two poles [i.e., Judaism and an Aryan-associated Christianity], and there is no middle way.”87

From Sinai to Sinology?

As this article has shown, from circumcision to the queue the Zopf bridged the West’s representations of Jew and Chinese, often of a feminized male Jew and Chinese, and reinforced those constructions. This article has also examined how the Zopf betrayed the conflicts and contradictions of contesting cultures in China and in the West. Although the relations of power and forms of knowledge that mediate Chinese and Manchu on the one hand, and Christian and Jew on the other, significantly differ, a number of structural similarities have been indicated. Hence ever embedded in a historical logic of Zopf- oder Kopfabschneiden, the Chinesenzopf, like circumcision or Beschneiden, served as a violent signifier, a signifier of violence. Further, the queue signified differential relations between Chinese and Manchu just as circumcision—and its complement, the Judenzopf—did between Christian and Jew.
Yet the genealogical question remains undecided: are European representations of Jew and Chinese parallel effects of the West’s fetishizing logic discussed in this paper or is the Zopf a displacement from Sinai to Sinology? That is, is the differentiation between Jew and Christian — Europe’s construction of the proximate Jewish other — the ground for that between Europe and its more distant others like the Chinese? Jonathan Boyarin, for example, has recently argued that medieval Christian discourse on the Jews was appropriated in Spanish representations of New World populations. This article, too, has drawn attention to a number of explicit and implicit analogies. Clearly, some network of relationship exists among Chinese, queue, Christian, Jew, violence, and threat, as the following, final example testifies. One orientalist employs a rather curious analogy to illustrate the overvaluation of the queue: “In Mediaeval Europe, if there was a failure of the crops, or an outbreak of the plague, the mob generally burnt a Jew; in Modern China, in case of any calamity, or any untoward event such as the loss of a pigtail, they stone a missionary.” Still, genealogy remains unclear since the representational strategies of othering by which the West has asserted hegemony over its colonial and postcolonial subjects have usually elided the West’s own gender, sexual, racial, religious, and class differences. While it remains difficult to parse the overdeterminations of the fetishized images of the other — and of the West — this article has mapped a historical pattern of overlapping representations. Through the figure of the Zopf, a hegemonic European culture generated fetishized representations of the Chinese and Jew. This body part simultaneously acknowledged, disavowed, and substituted for those other peoples which threatened that hegemony.

Notes
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