

STEPCHILD OF PSYCHOANALYSIS: ‘PAEDOPHILIA’ IN EARLY PSYCHODYNAMIC THOUGHT

Diederik F. Janssen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Introduction: Historical Challenges

Despite decades of attention to Freud’s seduction theory, and the contemporaneous cultural profiling of ‘the paedophile’, the concept of ‘paedophilia’ as a circumscribed morbid departure from normal sexuality has received little historical reflection until very recently. The mid-1896 publication of Freud’s theory coincided – almost to the month – with the coinage of the term *paedophilia erotica* by the then towering Viennese authority on sexual pathology, Richard von Krafft-Ebing, who famously dismissed Freud’s hypothesis as ‘a scientific fairytale’ (Freud, 1954, p. 176, n.1). Some of the earliest article-size case studies and conference presentations to appear in German and English dedicated to paedophilia *per se*, beyond Krafft-Ebing’s, were psychodynamic interpretations though, interestingly enough, this was not until some three decades later.¹ This delay seems understandable at first sight, as the diagnosis did not inform the critical junctures in Freud’s own published research on sexual matters

1. See Happel (1925/1926); Hadley (1926); Cassity (1927a, 1927b). Swiss analyst Arthur Kielholz (1937) refers to an unpublished conference presentation in 1922 of two cases by Karl Gräter from Basel. Happel’s case was presented at the first Deutsche Zusammenkunft für Psychoanalyse in Würzburg held 11–12 October 1924; Hadley’s and Cassity’s were presented to the Washington Psychopathological Society (12 December 1925 and 28 June 1926, respectively). Benjamin Karpman (one of Wilhelm Stekel’s analysands) published prolifically on sex crimes from 1923 onwards (the study of which he pursued within the broader purview of *criminal psychodynamics*) and treated a case of paedophilia (‘legally rape’ but at root a pubic hair phobia, he claimed: the case of ‘Kenneth Elton’) in 1926 but delayed publication until 1944 (pp. 516–636) and invokes the diagnostic term only later (1946, p. 29).

DIEDERIK F. JANSSEN is an independent researcher residing in Nijmegen, The Netherlands. His work has appeared in *Subjectivity*, *Medical History* and *The Journal of the History of Sexuality*, among other outlets. Address for correspondence: [diederikjanssen@gmail.com]

Psychoanalysis and History 20.1 (2018): 59–87

DOI: 10.3366/pah.2018.0246

© Edinburgh University Press

www.eupublishing.com/pah

in either 1895–7 or 1905. The question of offenders' psychopathology was not pertinent in any straightforward sense to the specific aetiological puzzle of 'sexual trauma' occupying Freud and Josef Breuer, nor to Karl Abraham's 1907 discussion of Freud's theory (though picked up early on by sexologists, for instance Näcke, 1908), nor to Sándor Ferenczi's 1933 concept of confusion of tongues,² nor to the earliest empirical studies of sexual trauma (e.g. Goroncy, 1926; Rasmussen, 1934), nor to Jean Laplanche's 1960s reconceptualization of seduction (initially with Jean-Bertrand Pontalis), nor, finally, to re-readings of Freud amidst the later cultural mobilization around, and politicization of, initially incest and (even into the 1970s) 'homosexual seduction'.

This is not to say that these consecutive interventions have not had major implications for constructions of 'paedophilia' in relation to both 'incest' and 'homosexuality', and in a less politically banal and more intellectually productive sense to 'the adult other', as was eventually realized by Laplanche (1924–2012). Laplanche's 1990s and 2000s texts are useful to historians seeking to understand the late twentieth-century decentring of kinship and centralization of age difference in demarcations of 'normal' sexual experience. Anticipating such a history, the present article explores the way the stage was set for the earliest reflections on paedophilia as a purportedly distinct psychological symptom, proclivity or illness, and moreover, as identifying a distinct type of patient. This double question is, as no other, troubled by the acute, multiple and intractable temporalities and historicities of intimacy. One takes note of the historian's lamentation that within a timeframe of increasing suspicion against men and male authorities around sexual trauma, even Freud himself came to be considered '(at least in his dirty mind) a paedophile though probably not a pederast' (Gay, 1986, p. xviii). This mid-1980s remark simultaneously diagnoses, and trades in, anachronism, as does Peter Gay's contention (1988, p. 145) that in his 1905 *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* Freud had discussed 'paedophilia' rather than – which would have been more accurate – a most often occasional or impulsive choice of prepubescents as sexual objects. According to Freud, the latter is not 'pathological' unless, theoretically and generally speaking, it assumes 'the characteristics of exclusiveness and fixation'.

These clinical delineations remain extensively debated even today. They honoured, but also problematized, Krafft-Ebing's *paedophilia erotica* and his medico-legal juxtaposition of perverse ('immature') and normal sexual objects (e.g. teens who were at least 'approaching pubescence').³ Such negotiations have

2. Ferenczi here identifies largely the same typical demography of adult abusers as had Freud in 1905 (discussed below), with the same specific suspicion against nannies. Moreover, where specifying what Ferenczi calls 'pathologically predisposed adults', the emphasis on occasional lapses of impulse-control (1933, p. 10) recalls that seen decades earlier in Freud (1905a).

3. Krafft-Ebing's invocation of the term *pubertati proximi*, in 1896 and later texts, may have been casual but it derives from ancient Roman and Canon law and affirms the legalistic frame for

rarely been the subject of historical commentary. Yet unreflectingly generic, ahistorical or historically arguable invocations of the term ‘paedophilia’ are evidenced in work by many more and less prominent Freud critics and historians besides Gay (Jeffrey Moussaieff Masson, Frederick Crews, Brett Kahr, Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen, Frank Cioffi, Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, Harold P. Blum, Élisabeth Roudinesco, Patrick J. Mahony, Cesare Romano, amongst others), perhaps most blatantly by ‘psychohistorians’ such as Lloyd deMause, not to mention most of the clinicians who cite Freud on this issue.⁴

The problem of terms and definitions is significant in its durability, and its historical appraisal requires some preliminary observations. In the majority of even recent psychoanalytic commentaries, the term *paedophilia* is either misdated, used anachronistically, deployed as an ahistorical and acultural synonym for *child sexual abuse* (but then, often inconsistently), left undefined, or conceptualized in ways that are either woefully at odds with, or in variable degrees oblivious to, contemporary sex research. Apropos today’s problem of ‘historical abuse’ cases (surely a complex and invariably undertheorized example of ‘afterwardness’), the term has named a monstrosity (‘paedophile priests’) whose folklore comfortably antedates and exceeds the diagnosis it seeks to communicate. The term ‘paedophilia’ draws lines and reifies legally defined atrocities. Such work is not straightforwardly a psychological operation, and *as* a nosological or pathographic operation, hardly straightforward. How the term has contributed to the kinds of circumscription and juxtaposition that make up the core grammar of social life (divisions between sexual/nonsexual, child/adult, child/parent, minor/adult, child/adolescent, etc.) is evidently a historical – hardly a psychodiagnostic – question.

Psychoanalysts introduced a range of concepts and subclassifications with the potential to upset these ubiquitous binaries, but these have themselves become antiquated and most were never used in mainstream sex research (‘psychosexual

his novel diagnosis. *Ætas pubertati proxima* was known to be the Roman legal age of the capacity for criminal intent, typically considered the space between age 10-and-a-half and 14 (14 being *Ætas pubertatis*) and clearly before the end of puberty at 18 (*Ætas pubertatis plena*).

4. For instance, Kahr conjectured in 2010 (p. 305) that Freud treated at least one ‘convicted pedophile’ but not until somewhere ‘in the 1930s’. Freud would also have provided supervision for another under the care of Theodor Reik. Neither Freud nor Reik published on either case, and it seems fair to assume that Kahr’s use of the psychiatric term relies on hearsay. Kahr himself does not define *paedophilia* although elsewhere he seems to consider it a ‘violent crime’ on a par with arson and murder (Kahr, 2007a, p. 305). Many of Kahr’s colleagues, including Socarides, are on record for using all too common but puzzling expressions such as ‘pedophilic behavior’, suggesting stronger allegiance to criminological than to nosological classification (cf. Kahr, 2007b, *passim*). Illustratively, at times *paedophilia* has figured on the same ontologically problematic plane as *homosexuality*; at other times on that of *rape* or *incest*. In an all-out diatribe on the Catholic church, for instance, Slavoj Žižek operationalizes it as ‘a brutal crime of raping children’ that would capture the core of the church’s ‘institutional Unconscious’ (2014, pp. 109, 111) – with no hint of more nuance elsewhere in his oeuvre.

age', 'latent paedophilia', 'repressed' or 'unconscious paedophilia', 'pseudoneurotic paedophilia', 'secondary paedophilia', 'paedophile nucleus', 'fixated paedophile', 'regressed paedophile', 'schizopaedophilia'). Many psychodynamically informed original contributions to the topic are written in German, Italian or French and the term's linguistic properties (lexical categories, etymology, translation and medical taxonomy, to begin with) often interfere with its psychiatric ambitions.⁵ Into the 1930s, sexological and psychoanalytic glossaries as well as medical dictionaries defined *paedophilia* as 'love of children', or 'boys', or even 'girls' (the lemma does not show up in the *OED* until its 1982 supplement).⁶ In clinical research of even the 1980s it could simply denote a criminal record or act. But increasingly since the mid-1970s, 'paedophilia' has been used retrospectively to diagnose historical figures (a potential that today enjoys major cultural traction but was hardly à la mode before World War II).⁷ The

5. The epithet *paedophile* is ancient but the noun is neoclassical and, until 1896, confined to dictionaries and philological references to ancient Greek *philopaideia* (boy-love) or *philopaidia* (child-love). Freud's philological penchant complicates this etymology. Anticipating Michel Foucault, Freud inserted a footnote reference to ancient Greek sexual mores into the second edition of his *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, appreciating the conceptual, and seemingly also pedagogical, dimensions of *paidierastia* – the otherness of Greek love, in any case: 'The most pronounced difference between the sexual life [Liebesleben] of antiquity and ours lies in the fact that the ancients placed the emphasis on the impulse itself, while we put it on its object. The ancients extolled the impulse and were ready to ennoble through it even an inferior object, while we disparage the activity of the impulse as such and only countenance it on account of the merits of the object' (1910a, p. 14, n.13).

6. The Latin barbarism *paedophilia* ('love of boys, sodomitic appetite') is attested already in a 1697 Latin–Portuguese dictionary (Pereira, 1697, p. 464). Dorland's *American Illustrated Medical Dictionary* did not include *pedophilia* until its 1915 (8th) edition, and here it was only similarly to denote 'The condition of being fond of children' (p. 709), begging the question what is 'medical' about such fondness; this denotation was only arguably found in texts such as Ellis (1905), Stekel (1912/1914) and Jones (1913a, 1913b), which did not definitively medicalize (or sexualize) such fondness. Dorland's 1941 (19th) edition first redefined it as, cryptically, 'A morbid interest in children', while *pedophilia erotica* was to denote 'sexual perversion toward children' (p. 1071). In rare early sociological discussions, *pedophilia* denoted 'friendliness toward children' (*amitié pour les enfants*), for instance apropos an article by the first president of the American Sociological Association, Lester Frank Ward (1901, p. 213). Ward's Anglophone work classifies 'phylogenetic forces' such as parental love but does not contain the term, incidentally, nor its novel sense of 'psychosexual perversion'. He did notably connect *maternal love* to sexual stimulation during lactation in mammals (Ward, 1883, p. 676; 1903, pp. 412–15).

7. Moll accused Dostoevsky (1821–81) of having had 'pedophilic inclinations, at least temporarily' ['päophile Neigungen, wenigstens vorübergehend'] (1908, p. 213). Mostly unelaborated inferences of 'sublimated' or 'repressed' 'paedophilia' animated commentaries on Viennese poet and writer Peter Altenberg (Wittels, 1932), English poet Algernon Charles Swinburne (Bragman, 1934), Victorian celebrity art critic John Ruskin (Bragman, 1935; C. Allen, 1950), and African-American poet Paul Laurence Dunbar (W. Allen, 1938). Of Lewis Carroll (Charles Lutwidge Dodgson) it was said in 1938 that 'the promiscuity in [his] relation to

term is increasingly used to specify particular, ‘sick’ speech acts, opinions, images, gazes, marketing ploys (‘sexualization of childhood’) and patriarchal conspiracies. Such historically elastic semantics complicate the already complex interdisciplinary dissonances between historicizable, changeable and arguable concepts and terms such as *perversion* and *paraphilia*. The term’s use – ominously even by contemporary psychoanalysts – evidences a deep cultural inability to separate the *act*, the *idea* of the act, the *will* to the act, the *proclivity* for the act, and the *corollaries* of the act – an inability that begs for historical review as much as cultural introspection.

But *paedophilia* has received enduringly less attention than might be judged proportionate to the cultural alarm long summoned by the term (e.g. Szvec, 1993, p. 591). Consulting key texts, encyclopaedias and dictionaries in the field (even dozens of them, and even the most recent ones), the reader may learn more about *coprophilia* than about *paedophilia* – indeed: essentially nothing about the latter. A multilingual search of the Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing archive suggests that psychoanalysts rarely if ever topicalize the wider spectrum of *erotic age orientation* in such terms as *infantophilia*, *hebephilia*, *ephebophilia*, *teleiphilia* or *gerontophilia*. Authors coining additional terms (such as *ganyphilia*: ‘homoerotic interest by adult males in adolescents’, Nash, 1992) went on to be rarely if ever cited. Paedophilia’s recent profiling in psychoanalytically identified work on perversion, even a collection of contributions from 2004 (marketed as a ‘textbook’), *The Mind of the Paedophile*, remains equally uncited, and most probably unread, by most publishing forensic psychologists and psychiatrists today.⁸

Charles Socarides, in the editorial introduction to this work, could report only three cases in major Anglophone psychoanalytic journals published since his own 1959 article on the subject – hence his characterization of the topic as the ‘stepchild of psychoanalysis’ (2004).⁹ Intriguingly, paedophilia was apparently given career-spanning attention by only a single, American, psychoanalyst (Socarides himself, 1922–2005) who also happens to have co-founded in 1992

children is interesting. He seemingly tried to get in contact with a very great number of children and to “seduce” them in his way’ (Schilder, 1938, p. 166).

8. Forbidding mandatory reporting laws have seemingly had a detrimental impact on most modalities of psychotherapeutic practice concerning paedophilia outside, and even within, western forensic contexts, as well as on publication. It remains to be established how these laws have affected psychiatric, or psychoanalytic, frames.

9. Even Socarides’ interim publications on paedophilia are very few and appear to be confined to a brief contribution to a 1991 special issue on child sexual abuse of deMause’s *Journal of Psychohistory* which briefly abstracts arguments advanced in Socarides’ 1988 book on the aetiology of ‘the perversions’. His single case study in 1988 was the same one from 1959 (1988, pp. 65–6, 447–70, 586). This case is discussed yet again in Socarides’ contribution to the mentioned 2004 book, now augmented by one other case which he states dates back to ‘the late 1960s’ (p. 7, n.).

the notorious National Association for Research & Therapy of Homosexuality (he was its first president) and who until his death considered homosexuality to be a 'neurotic adaptation'. This raises questions about how paedophilia figures in the ongoing transvaluations of concepts of perversion and paraphilia within and beyond psychodynamic theory. After all, as Robert Stoller signalled already in 1973 (p. 247; 1975, p. 36), whatever remained of questions of diagnosis and aetiology at the time was increasingly answered by phallometrists, neurobiologists and evolutionary psychologists.

If the reluctance to engage with these questions reflects the taboo status of the subject, psychoanalytic texts are a privileged site for the perennial scientific articulation of this taboo – one mode being simple avoidance. Where today's psychoanalysts can frequently be seen unpacking mainstream psychiatric constructions of *paraphilia*, some apologize for not probing the subject of paedophilia 'for space concerns' (Benvenuto, 2016, pp. xiv, xxi–xxiii). In 2007, the same author noted that 'If you write a clinical paper on pedophilia and don't vehemently condemn pedophiles, you'll never get published' (2007, n.p.). Examining psychoanalytic texts may help highlight not only *how* taboo assumed a discursive shape, but more precisely *which* taboo was being put into words, in which historical context. If the problem of the incest taboo was being posed in a preliminary way as a *psychological* question before it emerged in psychoanalysis (for instance, in early-1890s work by Edward Westermarck), this coincided with European sexologists beginning to name, research, distinguish, pathologize and aetiologize specific age-exclusive and age-specific erotic attractions (Janssen, 2015). Moreover, these scientific gestures were offered alongside, even importantly within, the new research frame of *gender* variance (Janssen, 2017).

Not least because of this entanglement of parameters, these theoretical and categorical gestures were conceptually, empirically, methodologically, legally and discursively problematic from the outset, and have remained so. As countless sociologists have signalled for decades, historicizable concepts such as 'paedophilia' and 'paedophile' can be said to have facilitated many of the problems of reification, 'othering', scapegoating, medicalization, projection and normalization known to have informed the conceptualization of homosexuality, and other dimensions of sexual variation, in the most historically decisive and defining ways. Homosexuality and paedophilia were ubiquitously conflated until a few decades ago, moreover, and notions of narcissism were long extended equally generously to both. 'Narcissism, pedophilia [pédophilie], homosexuality, masochism and sadism, more or less conscious, more or less formulated, succeed one another or coexist in the troubled desires of adolescents', according to Bouyer (1927, p. 86). Isidor Sadger (1921) discussed paedophilia only as a subtype of homosexuality (apropos a critique of Hirschfeld); likewise, Otto Fenichel nestled his early survey of theories of paedophilia in a chapter entitled 'Male Homosexuality' (1945, pp. 332–3; cf. 1933, p. 277). As late as the early 1970s, theorizing of paedophilia occurred within a similar frame to that of homosexuality, both terms naming 'types of deviant sexual behavior' (e.g. Roche, 1950, defining

paedophilia, as did Benjamin Karpman among others in this timeframe, as ‘a variant of homosexuality’: pp. 5, 8, 9). Paedophilia and homosexuality entered American psychiatric taxonomies (in the earliest post-World War II military psychiatry documents and the eventual 1952 *DSM*) as separate entities. Yet in American studies of child molesters and ‘sexual psychopaths’ from the early 1940s through 1950s, paedophilia was pervasively approached in generic terms as a problem relating to the ‘overprotective mother/passive father’, ‘persistence of infantile sexual attitudes’ and ‘regression to a homosexual stage in infantile sexuality’ (e.g. Apfelberg *et al.*, 1944; Hammer, 1954, pp. 346–54; Hammer & Glueck, 1957).

This problematic legacy indicates a larger, modern problem of dealing with age – (psycho)sexual maturity – as a purportedly circumscribed parameter or fixture of erotic investment. Adorno’s 1963 diagnosis of *Minderjährigenkomplex* (1963, p. 113) – society’s ‘complex about minors’ – already tried to capture the topic’s uncanniness in quasi-psychodynamic language, a gesture that has only gained pertinence. One also recalls that Vladimir Nabokov’s 1955 *Lolita* – step-parental paedophilia’s arguable debut as a mainstream literary motif – had been famously Freud-mocking (e.g. Appel, 1967, pp. 219–20). In sum, its stepchild guises makes paedophilia an excellent case study in the wider inquiry into the contemporary social standing and intellectual reach of psychoanalysis. Paedophilia’s historically recent foregrounding in the western secular world may have provided an *awkwardly single* answer to the interlocking questions of how to rethink the incest committer (now a ‘child abuser’), Christianity’s sodomite (now a ‘consenting adult in private’) and ‘the perversions’ (now ‘paraphilias’ or, in certain cases, trivial kink interests). Lacanian notions such as the *post-Oedipal* (or *de-oedipalized*) or *post-patriarchal condition* have been invoked to explain paedophilia’s late modern ubiquity or normalcy, but also to explain the historical conditions for this supposed eventuality having become a ubiquitous *Angstbild* (cf. e.g. Jagodzinski, 2004, p. 69; Kerslake, 2007, p. 9, n.4; Verhaeghe, 1999/2000, pp. 140, 150; and contributions to Caine & Wright, 2017). If anything, it is increasingly unclear which ‘symptom’ to focus on.

Psychoanalysts have touched upon the topic of paedophilia from a number of angles. Below I briefly discuss the importantly contemporaneous interfaces of early psychodynamic theory with (1) the forensic psychology of perpetrators of child sexual abuse; (2) Krafft-Ebing’s specific aetiological concept of *age fetishism*; (3) contemporaneous study and typologies of homosexual age preferences; (4) emergent ideas about *psychosexual infantilism*; and (5) significantly delayed attention to the pathology of the perpetrator of intergenerational incest.

1. Aetiologies of Abuse

Krafft-Ebing provisionally named *paedophilia erotica* in an aetiology-focused article on child sex offences, characterizing exclusive attraction to prepubescent

children as ‘a morbid disposition, a psychosexual perversion’ (Krafft-Ebing, 1896, p. 269). If the paedophile turned out to be a ‘stepchild of psychoanalysis’, Krafft-Ebing in the nineteenth century had already christened him ‘stepchild of nature’.¹⁰ Krafft-Ebing was not the first to consider an outlying, exclusive erotic age preference as a perversion (Janssen, 2015) but many nineteenth-century authorities on child sexual abuse had identified it strictly with sociocultural factors associated with class, poverty or modern-urban life: crammed housing and urbanization, industrialization and child labour, libertinism, ennui, ignorance, and reportedly prevalent superstitions such as that of the ‘virgin cure’ for syphilis. As six prior articles by Krafft-Ebing and coverage in the first nine editions of *Psychopathia Sexualis* show, clinical considerations of child sex offences had also been legion at the time, pointing especially to neurological or neurodegenerative disease, temporary clouding of consciousness (e.g. due to intoxication or epilepsy), cognitive deficiency, dementia, paranoia, other perversions, or ‘contrary sexual feeling’.¹¹ These factors had been confirmed in prior articles by (among others) Freiburg psychiatry resident Ludwig Kirm, Erlangen ward physician Heinrich Pürckhauer, German neurologist Carl Anjel, Rostock psychiatrist Ulrich Scheven, French alienist Albert Giraud, and renowned Italian criminologist Cesare Lombroso. The very first psychiatry textbooks to pick up at all on the innovations of *paedophilia erotica* and *gerontophilia* (a complementary term coined by Krafft-Ebing in 1901a) were written by Viennese psychiatrists such as Alexander Pilcz (1904, p. 232; 1908, p. 193). Most offered only passing – and rarely deferential – references; Pilcz, illustratively, impractically equates ‘paedophilia’ with all child sexual abuse. In studies and textbooks on sex offenders written between 1905 and 1912, few mentioned paedophilia and those who did, associated it with sadism (*Flagellantismus*, in most instances), not (as had Krafft-Ebing) fetishism.¹² Anglophone texts in which *paedophilia* and *gerontophilia* were discussed were mostly translations of texts by Viennese

10. Krafft-Ebing nominated *urnings* (homosexuals) as ‘Stiefkinder der Natur’ in 1887. In 1893 he extended the qualification to include the whole gamut of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, and in 1896, then, it implicitly covered ‘paedophiles’.

11. In the 1894 edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, diagnoses of child molesters included sadism (including a boy-specific interest in flagellation); variably age- and gender-specific hair fetishism leading to the non-consensual cutting of hair; ‘imbecility’; ‘idiocy’ after apoplexy and after head trauma or with a congenital basis; epilepsy or other transitory or ‘pre-epileptic’ mental disturbances; and cases of religious paranoia and persecutory delusion. In some cases, more than one of these precipitations were encountered. Other cases involving children would fall under the rather more legal rubrics of exhibitionism, sexual murder (*Lustmord*), and paternal or sibling incest. Two cases within the domain of ‘contrary sexual feeling’ also include sexual offences involving minors.

12. Notable here is independent work on sex offenders and other populations by Berlin prison psychiatrist Friedrich Leppmann, Berlin doctor Alfred Kind, Berlin venereo-dermatologist and member of Magnus Hirschfeld’s Scientific Humanitarian Committee Georg Merzbach (alias

psychoanalysts including Wilhelm Stekel (e.g. 1912/1914). The earliest appearances in English and Italian textbooks on abnormal psychology are from circa 1919 and 1921 onwards, respectively. But even by 1921, influential French criminologists with an interest in sexual deviation, including Lyons criminologist Alexandre Lacassagne and professor of forensic medicine at the Sorbonne Victor Balthazard, did not list *pédophilie* in their taxonomies of sexual psychopathology.

Krafft-Ebing's paedophile was born from degeneration theory, recalling earlier claims by Turin 'father of criminology' Lombroso. The latter had named young age (infancy) and old age of rape victims, as well as significant (decades of) age disparity between perpetrators and victims of rape, as instances of sexual interests in rapists that set them apart from 'normal people' (1882, p. 11). Lombroso goes on to cite this, together with perpetrators' variably young (adolescent) or advanced age, as specific indications of organic disease, indeed of a 'morbid or degenerative basis'. To Krafft-Ebing, however, all sexual perversion amounted to a 'Signum degeneracionis'. Moreover, in Krafft-Ebing's unfailing aetiological framework, if 'Perversio sexualis' had a fetishistic origin (such as he would claim paedophilia did; see below), vulnerability to such a mechanism was itself evidence of a 'tainted', 'degenerative basis'.¹³

If in the mid-1890s aetiological concepts of perversion had been scattered along a problematic spectrum from heredity to acquisition (Sulloway, 1983[1979], p. 288, n.7), the lynchpin concept of degeneration was increasingly being qualified and attacked in the 1900s and beyond, notably by Freud (1905a) and Iwan Bloch (1903, favourably cited by Freud in 1905c, p. 416, when discussing sexual perversions). Bloch directly contested Krafft-Ebing's paedophilia diagnosis (1903, pp. 244–53), calling child–adult sexual contacts ethnographically 'ubiquitous' and (as would Freud) identifying situational factors as well as opportunistic perpetrators, including servants and teachers.¹⁴ As had countless eighteenth- and nineteenth-century authors on the epidemiology of onanism (following Samuel-Auguste Tissot's 1760 *L'Onanisme*), Freud, in his 1896

Georg Back), Cologne psychiatrist Gustav Aschaffenburg, Dresden criminologist Erich Wulffen, and German psychiatrists Matthias Heinrich Göring and Max Kaufmann.

13. Emil Kraepelin (1905, pp. 298–304) agreed, notably apropos the case of a molester of boys in the preferred age range of 10 to 14-and-a-half.

14. Following Bloch, the validity of *paedophilia erotica* as a construct was importantly qualified by Havelock Ellis (who went on to be a long-time correspondent of Freud), and even Moll, who in 1908 also de-emphasized 'primary' forms of perversion. Before World War II, few clinicians beyond Hirschfeld's Berlin circle reported having diagnosed let alone tried to treat paedophiles, or paedophilia, and reports of therapeutic success were less than a handful. Moll, Krafft-Ebing and pioneering forensic psychologist Albert von Schrenck-Notzing discuss cases but do not report treating paedophiles themselves. Swiss psychiatrist Auguste Forel would discuss two cases (in later editions of his *Die Sexuelle Frage*) but in 1907 lists only one case unsuccessfully treated by hypnotism. In 1913, Freud was of the opinion that 'the therapy of perverts [...] is not the true field of psychoanalytic work' unless they are unhappy (Nunberg & Federn, 1975, p. 185).

articles, identified nurses, governesses and teachers as well as older siblings (brothers) and age mates as two groups of seducers, with ‘adult strangers’ forming a rare third. He mentions an uncle in 1895 (later revealed to be a father) and parents and grandparents in subsequent letters. If anything, Vienna’s fin-de-siècle child molester was the lower-class house servant or maid, ubiquitously suspected, by Krafft-Ebing and most other sexologists at the time, of ‘excessive affection’ (*übergrosse Zärtlichkeit*; Breuer & Freud, 1895, p. 240) and actual impertinencies with children. In a letter to Fliess on the family romance from 1898, Freud writes that ‘In all analyses one comes upon the same story twice over; the first time as a phantasy relating to the mother, and the second time as a real memory of the servant’ (1954, p. 256). The pervasiveness of the trope of the sexually transgressive nanny in Vienna and Berlin (e.g. Fliess, 1897, p. 199; Réti, 1904, p. 84; Seidel, 1912, pp. 248–249; Kossak, 1913; Stekel, 1922a, p. 317; Tausk, 1912, p. 55) may point to a reality of fluid boundaries of domestic intimacy, the servants’ own vulnerability to illicit advances, or to more general class-based anxieties around non-kin domestics. Swiss lay analyst Oskar Pfister (1922, pp. 98–101) mentions seduction by a maid in an early case study of male heterosexual paedophilia. Yet few were diagnosing misbehaving nannies, whose key motive Freud, in 1905, considered to be opportunity. In a June 1902 conference presentation, Krafft-Ebing’s pupil Alfred Fuchs briefly (parenthetically) considered the diagnosis in describing a female child nurse who reportedly masturbated small children under her care: ‘perhaps the monster was paedophilic’ (Fuchs, 1903, p. 211). Moll (1908, p. 201) briefly alludes to the same possibility. But in his 1896–7 Fliess letters, Freud only ever loosely refers to ‘perversion on the part of the seducer’ and ‘perverse acts’ (Freud, 1954, pp. 180, 182, 185, 215–16). Freud’s much-discussed letter of 21 September 1897 generally refers to ‘perverse acts against children’ (1954, pp. 215–16), or ‘perversions against children’ as translated by Masson (Freud, 1985, p. 264). The original German speaks of ‘Perversion gegen Kinder’ (Freud, 1950, pp. 229–30) and of fathers who ‘would have to be accused of being perverse (pervers)’. The presumptive prevalence of ‘perversion’ is weighed against that of hysteria: rather than necessarily dealing with *perversion*, Freud here doubts the ubiquity of *perversity* (*Perversität*) as its behavioural correlate and as causal factor in victims’ later, surprisingly ubiquitous, hysteria – a terminological nuance advocated in Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia sexualis* (from its first edition onwards) but not honoured by Freud (judging from Freud’s sporadic use of ‘Perversität’). In a letter of 3 January 1897 Freud writes that ‘New valuable evidence of the soundness of my material is provided by its agreement with the perversions described by Krafft’, but he here refers to the *effects* of perverted acts and does not specify ‘the perversions’. Freud notably omits the epithet ‘perverse’ altogether in all later references to adult, sibling or nanny seductions. Delineations of ‘over-tenderness’ would continue to animate Freud’s aetiological thinking (‘an excess of parental affection’ in ‘neuropathic’ parents [1905a, p. 65]; ‘heightened affection for the mother’ in children [1909, p. 15] leading to anxiety and thus

repression; ‘maternal over-affection’ [1910b, p. 35] in the aetiology of homosexuality) without specific reference to paedophilia.

Neither the term *paedophilia* nor its figuration of a distinct sexual perversion appears in the Psychoanalytic Society’s 1906–18 *Minutes*. Freud undoubtedly read Krafft-Ebing’s 1896 article and owned the 1901 (11th) as well as three earlier editions of Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis*, but possibly concentrated most on the ninth edition of 1894 (Sulloyay, 1983[1979], pp. 296–7; Freud apparently did not own the 10th, nor the 12th, 1903, edition). Krafft-Ebing’s diagnostic term first entered the 10th German edition of 1898, while *Gerontophilie* first entered the 1907 edition. Nevertheless, the former diagnosis had been discussed, albeit briefly, in several mainstream reviews of Krafft-Ebing’s texts. Freud also owned Auguste Forel’s 1905 *Die Sexuelle Frage* and Havelock Ellis’s 1906 *Erotic Symbolism*, both of which proposed competing evaluations of outlying erotic age preferences (both offered neologisms for the occasion: *Päderose* and *paidophilia/presbyophilia*, respectively). But unlike leading sexologists Magnus Hirschfeld, Albert Moll and later Wilhelm Stekel, Freud himself never used any of these words in print or in published correspondence.¹⁵ Nor did such towering authorities as (amongst others) Abraham, Ferenczi, Carl Jung, Viktor Tausk, Otto Rank, Hermann Rorschach, Wilhelm Reich, Anna Freud, Jacques Lacan, Helene Deutsch, Donald Winnicott, Theodor Reik, Melanie Klein and Heinz Kohut.¹⁶ Of those who would develop an at least tenuous affinity with psychoanalysis, Hirschfeld, Stekel, Fenichel, Bloch, Ernest Jones, Otto Juliusburger, Isidor Sadger and Alfred Adler were among the very few to ever mention the erotic age preferences by name as specific entities, and apart from outsiders Bloch and Hirschfeld, none of these would do so before 1912. These early references are decidedly divergent, invariably without definition, and uninformed by case studies.¹⁷ The subject of aberrant erotic age attraction, in any case, was being

15. The *Gesamtregister/Hauptregister* (1977/2008) of Freud’s *Gesammelte Werke* has an undefined entry for *Pädophilie*, but the references provided are anachronistic if they are to refer to Krafft-Ebing’s or Ellis’s concepts.

16. For Freud and others, this is also true for the term *Gerontophilie*, Hirschfeld’s 1906 neologism *Epeheophilie* (seemingly borrowed from Georges Saint-Paul, who used it once in an 1896 French text), and the superordinate term *Paraphilie* (coined in 1903, in a gesture toward demedicalizing ‘perversions’, by Friedrich Salomon Krauss, a later frequent guest of the Vienna Society meetings).

17. Stekel (1912, p. 368/1914, pp. 532–3) briefly speculates that ‘A homosexual impulse is frequently concealed behind a love for old women (*gerontophilie*) or a love for children (*pedophilie*)’ (the latter term is included only in the 1914 translation). Adler (1912, p. 161; 1919, p. 161; 1922, pp. 39, 171; 1928, pp. 40, 179) offhandedly associated *Paedophilie* with inferiority issues and (as *Gerontophilie* and perversion in general) fear of women in male neurotics (these undefined terms occur only as of 1922). Jones (1913b, p. 112) briefly associates ‘excessive tenderness and pronounced pedophile inclinations’ [‘exzessiver Zärtlichkeit und [...] ausgesprochenen pädophilen Neigungen’] with the formation of certain psychogenic neurotic

picked up primarily by those who happened to end up falling out of grace with Freud (with the late exception of Fenichel): Moll, Stekel, Adler and Ferenczi.

Freud first gave specific attention to ‘the sexually immature ... as sexual objects’ in a two-page passage – effectively a single paragraph – of his 1905 *Three Essays*, but this was uninformed by personal experience with actual ‘perverse’ patients. The passage, which offers no references, was notably to remain unchanged throughout all six editions (1905a, pp. 10–11; 1910a, pp. 13–14; 1915, pp. 14–15; 1920, pp. 14–16; 1922, pp. 14–16; 1926, pp. 21–2) except for the oblique, if interesting, added footnote mentioned above (n.5). Freud lumps together animals and children as erotic foci, a taxonomical-theoretical gesture that Moll (who remains uncited) had offered a year before (1904, pp. 701–2) and would later reiterate (1908, p. 200; Freud was in turn echoed at this point by Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 1913, p. 296/1916, p. 247, and Marie Bonaparte, 1934, pp. 225–6).¹⁸ Highlighting the unavailability of preferred partners as a precipitating situation, along with opportunity for the ‘cowardly and impotent’ or the impulsive, Freud’s differential diagnostic appraisal of sex crimes against children was more concise than that of contemporaneous French and American experts, most of whom were at least trying on generic concepts of insanity or perversion, and many of whom operationalized impotence and impulsiveness in terms of advanced age and alcoholism, respectively.¹⁹ Already in 1886 Krafft-Ebing had characterized sex crimes involving children as typical of ‘the unmanly, knavish, and often almost childish’, of those who have either no faith in their virility or have ‘to some extent’ lost theirs (1886, pp. 100–1). That such crimes might be perpetrated by ‘an adult of full virility, and mentally sound’, was thus ‘psychologically unthinkable’. Then again, the worst offences would be committed by healthy persons from ‘oversaturation of sexual pleasure, lust and brutality’ and under the influence of alcohol. Freud, not incomparably, signals out

phenomena related to childhood fantasies. Sadger (1915, p. 102, n.2) used the term *paedophilia* first in reference to a patient’s father, but does not elaborate. An early explorer of the unconscious roots of criminality, Franz Alexander, repeatedly characterized *pedophiliacs* as ‘often extremely inhibited, crushed and weakly individuals’ in texts published between 1935 and 1958 (Alexander, 1949, p. 260; 1961, pp. 128, 159, 193; Alexander & Shapiro, 1952, pp. 136, 137) but offers no elaboration, no references and no case studies for substantiation.

18. Krafft-Ebing used the terms *Fetischismus eroticus*, *Zoophilia erotica* and *Pädophilia erotica* in successive (1891, 1894 and 1896) articles, clearly specifications of extant terms that hitherto lacked a necessary connotation or dimension of lust. Ellis (1905) also groups zoophilia and paedophilia together in one class of ‘erotic symbolisms’, but also includes ‘presbyophilia’ (gerontophilia) and necrophilia, and never elaborated on the nosological gesture.

19. These include Krafft-Ebing but also medical examiners to the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, J. Clifton Edgar and W. Travis Gibb, American professor of nervous and mental diseases Charles Gilbert Chaddock, and in France, forensic specialist Léon-Henri Thoinot and pathologist and hygienist Paul Brouardel (Auguste Ambroise Tardieu’s successor as doyen of French forensic medicine after his death in 1879).

children as erotic objects to suggest that the pathology of the object choice is not given as *sui generis* or 'primary' (as it was in Krafft-Ebing's *paedophilia erotica*), nor 'constitutional' (as it would be for Hirschfeld), but rather a matter of degree – of intensity and exclusiveness. Thus, the 'nature and value of the sexual object steps [sic] into the background' (Freud, 1910a, pp. 13–14).

Considering that 'There are many reasons for the predilection of old men for little girls', Freud briefly opined that 'the libido of every one of us has probably been stimulated by little girls' at the 23 January 1907 Wednesday Evening Meeting (Nunberg & Federn, 1962, p. 88).²⁰ In 1905 and 1907, then, Freud stressed the continuity of mundane and 'insane' (*geisteskrank*) conditions for child seduction, and in emphasizing the former, does not problematize the latter. Such arguable, ambiguous 'normalization' is also seen, without reference to Freud, in work by (beyond Bloch) Ellis and Stekel. Ellis advised that sexologists 'are not called upon to regard as morbid, even if it is sexually tinged, the pleasure which the aged take in the freshness of the young' as long as such pleasure remains easily restrained (1913, p. 126). Stekel would later characterize *Pädophilie* as a 'peculiarly ubiquitous', 'almost normal' dimension of sexuality ('as any analyst knows' it to be, he suggests) and claimed to have found 'traces of pedophilic tendencies in nearly every neurotic' (1922a, p. 311).

2. Age Fetishism

A closer look at Krafft-Ebing's diagnosis is in order. In 1896, having postulated the existence of a distinct sexual perversion, Krafft-Ebing discussed paedophilia tentatively, but problematically, as a potentially fetishistic phenomenon, and eventually, with gerontophilia, as a definite subtype of fetishism. Ellis's subsumption of both under his rubric of 'sexual symbolism' and criminal anthropologist Émile Laurent's concept of *fétichisme des jувénilités*, both in 1905, were similar theoretical gestures. Krafft-Ebing's theory took shape only gradually between 1896 and 1901. In Krafft-Ebing's 1896 article, one 'paedophile' is suspected to be a hair fetishist; one other borrowed case – an Algerian boy-lover who, according to his statement, had turned paedophilic at age 25 after a 12-year-old boy had tried to seduce him – would also suggest a fetishistic aetiology (but implausibly for more than one reason²¹). In an 1899 extension of the article (dated 1898), Krafft-Ebing suggested that three further same-sex cases were 'probably due to a fetishistic, i.e. associative, manifestation'. None of his case descriptions give evidence for this hunch, however, although one man claims to have been seduced to masturbation by a 13-year-old peer. While the 10th edition of *Psychopathia* (1898) had not stressed the connection, in the 11th edition of

20. Freud was aged 50 at the time.

21. One has to believe, for instance, in a window of susceptibility for 'fixation' extending into adulthood.

1901 Krafft-Ebing claimed that paedophilia ‘seems to be connected with fetishism, at least I could prove a fetishistic provenance in several of my cases’, indeed, ‘the perversion in question probably always requires fetishistic influences’ (1901b, p. 379). In another 1901 text, finally, he boldly characterizes paedophilia erotica as ‘a special kind of fetishism’ and as a ‘peculiar kind of age fetishism’ (1901a, p. 6). Unlike *Gerontophilie* in 1907, however, *paedophilia erotica* never ended up in the *fetishism* section of *Psychopathia*. Moreover, whereas ideas about fetishism and sadomasochism may have ‘served Krafft-Ebing’s efforts to understand sexual attraction in general’ (Oosterhuis, 2000, p. 284) and to increasingly psychologize sexuality, he never theorized or researched *normal* age preference.

Only a few clinicians honoured Krafft-Ebing’s associationist hypothesis. London hypnotist Charles Lloyd Tuckey (1855–1925) traced the fact of one American man’s life having been ‘poisoned by his passion for committing [sexual] attacks on little girls’ to the subject’s recollection ‘that being a child of six years he was corrupted by a little girl of the same age’ (1906; cf. 1907, pp. 338–9; the 1906 article was favourably discussed by Alfred Meisl, 1907). Treatment with hypnotism was pronounced a success after he reported having become ‘very fond of little girls in a proper way’. Kiel forensic psychiatrist Julius Raecke (1912) considered sexual acts on children to only rarely evidence (in terminology borrowed from Theodor Ziehen, 1910) a *fetishistic perversion* (*assoziative Parhedonie*) although Raecke admitted that the difference with *situational perversity* (*Situationsparhedonie*) may be one of transition rather than kind. One man would have attained a compulsive drive to kiss underage girls on sight ‘following a chance touching by his servant girl’ (Raecke, 1912, p. 31). A 1920 article details another case of a man obsessed with little girls, in particular their panties (*lingerie enfantine*), which the authors trace back to sex play at the approximate age of seven (Briand & Borel, 1920). But despite these peripheral articles, Krafft-Ebing’s notion of *Alters-Fetischismus* (age fetishism) failed to impress major contributors to the topic of fetishism such as Paul Garnier, Hirschfeld, Freud and Stekel. In a scientific meeting of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society on 23 January 1907, Freud pointed out (apropos a discussion with Meisl, apparently over Lloyd-Tuckey’s 1906 case) that just as:

the man who used to attack little girls ... many people have received their first sexual excitement ... as children while playing with their contemporaries of the opposite sex. Why is it that the others permit the girl to grow up with them, whereas this man does not? For him she remains small. We must assume an additional fixating factor. (Nunberg & Federn, 1962, p. 88)

In sum, Krafft-Ebing’s case-based aetiological inferences were questionable on their own terms, were stated with some confidence only near his death in 1902, and were explicitly contested within five years by Freud himself. Where in the ensuing years forensic experts began to categorize child molesters along increasingly psychological lines, some tentatively confirmed (F. Leppmann, 1912, pp. 203, 204)

but most others failed to mention (e.g. Senf, 1912, pp. 36–9) a fetishistic aetiology (Freud never cited either author).

3. *Homosexual Age Preferences*

Until well into the twentieth century, erotic age preference derived most of its scientific contours from the literature on homosexuality – namely as a dimension of the latter, or (in the disputed case of paedophilia) a limit to, or rare complication of, it (Janssen, 2015, 2017). Freud (1905a) in fact listed most of the sexologists who had dealt, or were dealing, with this particular problem of homosexual age preferences. In a newspaper letter of that year, Freud (1905b) is cited as drawing a sharp distinction between homosexuality among adults and crimes involving children under the age of 14, the general age of consent at the time. The letter was predictably applauded in Hirschfeld's *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* by legal expert Eugène Wilhelm ('Praetorius', 1906, p. 869). But while absolving *consenting adults in private* from both legal and psychiatric circumscription on this occasion, neither Freud nor Wilhelm took the opportunity to comment on any psychiatric dimensions of such crimes. Unlike Hirschfeld, who would refer child sex offenders to the 'forensic sexologist', and unlike Krafft-Ebing, who had likewise referred them to the 'sexual pathologist', Freud, in delivering them to law enforcers and legislators, was in the same camp as legalistic Hirschfeldians such as Wilhelm (and Viennese contemporaries, e.g. Réti, 1904, p. 74).

Despite interest from Moll in the early 1890s, few commentators would explicitly distinguish gender-based and age-based erotic attraction in the decade to come.²² Hirschfeld notably considered paedophilia one of the 'subgroups' (*Nebengruppen*) of male homosexuality in a 1914 typology of homosexuals (in a book owned by Freud), and seems to have had the most research acquaintance with the phenomenon at the time (some 30–40 cases already by 1907). Significantly, the Vienna circle was aware of his interest in homosexual age preference. In response to a call for collaboration, on 22 April 1908 the Psychoanalytic

22. Moll had been one of the first to draw attention to the problem in the European literature (1891, pp. 102, 146–7, 262), and was also the first to provide a developmental theory of same-sex erotic age orientation, rendering it a symptom of incomplete sexual differentiation (1898, pp. 160–94, 478–81; Freud owned, and in 1923 cited, this book). Moll never elaborated on his conceptual apparatus, however. Although he alludes to it in a 1904 book chapter, Moll's 1908 *Das Sexualleben des Kindes* [*The Sexual Life of the Child*], addressing a lay audience, provided no occasion for it. Notes on the book's famously negative reception in the Vienna Society (Nunberg & Federn, 1967, pp. 43–58) do not suggest the topic was singled out. Even his rival Hirschfeld, who went on to be the foremost authority on the matter, chose to overlook Moll. Max Dessoir's important 1894 article about stages of sexual differentiation details two cases of adult men with histories of young adult, episodic and/or non-exclusive erotic receptivity to young boys. These case histories were such that a definitive diagnosis of 'homosexuality' was problematic, Dessoir argued, but he had no specific interest in typologizing homosexuality on the basis of age preference.

Society discussed a sex questionnaire by Hirschfeld in which the questions of erotic age attraction, including to prepubescents, were explicitly posed (Nunberg & Federn, 1962, pp. 385–6, 387; the revised version appeared later that year in Hirschfeld, 1908, pp. 684–95). They had already been included in the survey's earliest version appended to an 1899 article by Hirschfeld, an article cited by Freud in 1905. But engagement with Hirschfeld on this point seems to end here.

There was a general nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century impression that virile homosexuals preferred adolescent, hence 'feminine', boys while effeminate ones preferred older, more seasoned men (Janssen, 2017). Although Freud only generally refers to the typology's main proponent (Karl Heinrich Ulrichs) in 1905, three brief allusions to erotic age preferences in 1905 and 1910 can be cited as late engagements with the issue. In 1905 Freud echoed the then still common understanding that the Greek lover's interest in boys (*Knaben*) provided an example of homosexuals on the masculine end of the spectrum loving their younger object for their feminine qualities: their 'shyness, demureness, and the need of instruction and help' (1905a, p. 9). This may be compared to Max Dessoir's argument that to 'active pederasts', boys presented 'the same luster, the same softness of skin and forms, the same breath of innocence as did maiden' (cited by Schrenck-Notzing, 1892, p. 130). Abraham Arden Brill (a translator of *Three Essays*) favourably cited Freud's observation in a 1913 Anglophone article (pp. 84–5). In a footnote to the second German and first English editions of *Three Essays* (both 1910) Freud elaborated that modern sexual inverts, due to an early fixation on usually their mother, narcissistically look for 'young men resembling themselves in person [jugendliche und der eigenen Person ähnliche Männer] who shall love them as their mother has loved them' (1910a, p. 11, n.). In *Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of his Childhood* (1910), with a reference to Da Vinci's interest in young male students as well as to 'boy Narcissus', Freud generally refers to this dynamic as applying to the 'childlike person' (*kindlichen Person*) of the male boy-lover (*Knabenliebhaber*) (1910b, pp. 9, 36, 38, 65).²³ This 'love for boys' invoked the Greco-Renaissance norm of male same-sex interests in what were, and are, commonly understood to be teenage youths. However, unlike early special pleaders, such as Ulrichs and his successor Hirschfeld, Freud made no clear distinction between *Knaben* (boys) and *Jünglingen* (male youths) here, and offered no further explanation of variations in erotic age preferences, nor of their gender (e.g. heterosexual) varieties. Freud, in other words, came in at the tail end of a long modern history of references to ancient Greece associating same-sex gender preference with an erotic age preference for adolescents. Freud tried to explain the association, but barely problematized it, and unlike Hirschfeld circa 1908, still confounded the two

23. Hirschfeld (1914, p. 667) cited the work but not Freud's theoretical point.

variables.²⁴ Sadger spelled out implications for nosology as follows: ‘Thus, the beloved’s age is the mark of the year indicating when a homosexual withdrew his love from the mother to his own ego. In this way an invert can also become paedophilic’ – but this was not until 1921 (pp. 131–2).

There were notable early elaborations of these interpretations, and they laid the groundwork for narcissism-centred interpretations of perversion, including all ‘paedophilia’ and all homosexuality. Prominent sexologist Max Marcuse was perhaps the first in favourably citing Freud’s theory, in a footnote to his 1912 case study of a ‘homosexual of the particular paedophilic type’ (p. 296, n.1). He was among the very few to make this (Hirschfeldian) specification.²⁵ In an article appearing under Marcuse’s editorial care the next year, Max Rudolf Senf briefly considered a male penchant for same-sex youths to be ‘fuelled by the reliving and witnessing of long-completed developmental processes’ (1913, p. 158). Ferenczi’s concepts of *subject-homoeroticism* and *object-eroticism*, introduced at the October 1911 Third Congress of the International Psycho-Analytical Association (published 1914; cf. 1909), rather endorsed the juxtaposition of man-loving passive/effeminate inverts (to be considered a Hirschfeldian case of ‘sexual intermediacy’) and Freud’s type of boy-loving active/masculine inverts (to be considered to suffer from obsessional neurosis). Ferenczi provided the 1915 Hungarian edition of *Three Essays*; Freud took on board his taxonomical suggestion in a footnote added to its fourth German edition (1920, pp. 12–13, n.).

It also seems significant that ‘paedophilia’ was number 17 of Otto Fenichel’s mid-1930s ‘175 Topics of Discussion about Freud’s “Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex”’ (Muehlleitner *et al.*, 2009). In 1931 he offered an extension of Freud’s account of narcissistic object choice to heterosexual male paedophilia, which (without discussing a case) he connects to a feminine habitus and childhood gender uncertainty in men (Fenichel, 1931, p. 21; 1936, p. 305) or a libidinization of one’s own feared, but ‘reactively’ cherished, childhood (1934, p. 487). In other words, where Freud had separated aetiologies of child sex offences and those that Hirschfeld had come to call *ehebophilia*, Marcuse, Fenichel and Sadger applied the latter aetiology to *paedophilia*. And where by 1914 Hirschfeld had come to disconfirm the Ulrichsian typology of masculine boy-lovers and feminine man-lovers, Freud reaffirmed it even in the last edition of *Three Essays*, with others, notably Ferenczi, endorsing its psychodynamic salience.

24. ‘Age-stratified homosexuality’ also had ethnographic analogies, as documented in a 1907 article reviewed by Stekel (1911) and cited by Jones (1914, p. 174, n.2). Substantive psychodynamic approaches were not offered until much later, however (e.g. Muensterberger, 1956; Layard, 1959).

25. Freud had contributed two articles to Marcuse’s journal *Sexual-Probleme* in 1908, and would contribute two invited articles to Marcuse’s 1923 *Handwörterbuch der Sexualwissenschaft* (which Freud, naturally, owned and which contained entries on *Pädophilie* and *Gerontophilie* by Arthur Kronfeld, a close colleague of Hirschfeld’s).

4. *Psychosexual Infantilism*

Hirschfeld advanced concepts of *psychosexuelle Infantilismus* and *infantile Sexualkonstitution* in a 1913 booklet, which he was the first to apply to paedophilia. The former concept elaborated Berlin neurologist Albert Eulenburg's 1895 consideration of hyposexuality as a symptom of 'a kind of psychosexual developmental inhibition – a lingering at the childhood stage of sexual feeling; [...] "sexual infantilism" ["eine Art von psychosexueller Entwickelungshemmung [sic] – ein Zurückbleiben auf der Kindlichkeitstufe des Sexualgefühls; [...] "sexuellen Infantilismus"]' (Eulenburg, 1895, p. 96). Associations of hyposexuality with concepts of *psychic infantilism* (*geistiger Infantilismus*; *Psychoinfantilismus*) had more recently been advanced by Austrian psychiatrist and neurologist Gabriel Anton as well as his Graz colleague Heinrich di Gaspero. Proponents of Hirschfeld's psycho-endocrinological theory of paedophilia were few but included his colleagues Otto Juliusburger, Arthur Kronfeld, Max Marcuse and Berndt Götz, as well as others with ties to Berlin, including Friedrich Leppmann. Berlin psychiatrist Juliusburger (1914, 1915) was one of the first to elaborate Hirschfeld's idea, conceptualizing both paedophilia and gerontophilia in terms of a pathological 'fixation of infantile activity' (*Fixierung infantiler Betätigung*) on peers or parents, respectively (1914, pp. 201–2). This can be considered a theoretical advance beyond an earlier forensic conjecture regarding elderly sex offenders against boys as evidencing a revisiting of possibly unconscious childhood attractions to same-sex peers (by Berlin leading forensic psychiatrist Arthur Leppmann, 1909, p. 217) – an inference incidentally considered compatible with Freud's developmental theory of perversion by Graz neurologist Hermann Zingerle (1911, p. 38). Of further note, Kraepelin comparably speaks of a 'stalling of the drive at an earlier stage' ('Stehenbleiben des Triebes auf früher Stufe') as a possible dynamic behind attraction to children but does so only in 1916 (pp. 241–2, apropos his 1905 boy-molester case) and offers no elaboration or further cases.

A more influential, psychodynamic response would be offered by Stekel. In the early 1920s Stekel nominated *psychosexual infantilism* as a paraphilic paradigm, rooted either in fixation or compulsive regression 'in Freud's sense' to childhood phases of development. As he explains, Stekel (1922a, pp. 7, 77–8) rejected most of Hirschfeld's larger psycho-endocrinological frame (a frame that would ultimately lead to Hirschfeld's marginalization even within his own circles). Stekel's anecdotal interpretations (1917, pp. 54, 201; 1921a, p. 25; 1921b, p. 171; 1921c, pp. 333–41; 1922a, pp. 311–44; 1922b, p. 135; 1923, p. 250; 1928, pp. 90–1) loosely extended the Krafft-Ebingian/Hirschfeldian concepts of paedophilia and gerontophilia to the established literary motif of May–December (or January–May) marriages, and conjectured their ubiquitous, neurotic character. This is peculiar in that he also characterized himself as venturing into untrodden analytic territory. Beyond brief and non-pertinent references to Magan, Bloch, Ellis and prominent criminologist Erich Wulffen,

and in contrast to *gerontophilia*, Stekel conspicuously cites no previous authority on paedophilia. He does cite Freud's Da Vinci case (1923, pp. 13–14) but not in relation to the latter's boy-love. Stekel also cites Ferenczi's 1914 typology of homosexuality, but only in a dissenting footnote that does not pick up on the dimension of erotic age preference (1917, p. 382, n.1).

5. 'Counter-Oedipus'

Many of Stekel's anecdotal vignettes (only a couple of them are forensic) dealt with women, with incest or anxieties over its possibility, and almost all of these with other than same-sex desires. Dynamic elements, according to Stekel, were multiple, but he repeatedly cites fixation on siblings or (grand)parents precipitated by early experiences. Stekel, in other words, stayed close to the nuclear family for his conceptualization of what he called paedophilia and gerontophilia.

More readily than gerontophilia, paedophilia would go on to be alluded to a number of times in the more general terms of a parent's family complex, but (not unlike prior analytic gestures) these attempts were distinctly isolated, abortive and arguable. In a Marxist paper published in 1939, the parent-child vector of the family romance was named (without much attention to gender) 'counter-oedipal' (Freedman, 1939, p. 116, n.25). Yet in few discussions was such a vector explicitly related to a paedophilic age orientation, or indeed to incest in any legal sense. Jung's (1946) anthropologically frivolous concept of *kinship libido* (*Verwandtschaftslibido*; pp. 101, 117–18) was never specified, or tied, to erotic age preference. Incest was granted psychological dimensions only tenuously in the late nineteenth century, and hardly given any psychiatric dimension at all. Westermarck suggested that 'The home is kept pure from incestuous defilement neither by laws, nor by customs, nor by education, but by an instinct which under normal circumstances makes sexual love between the nearest kin a psychical impossibility' (1891, p. 319). The implied question was which (psychically) abnormal circumstances would be able to compromise such an impossibility – thus defiling the home. There was thus an early link between anthropology's incest and psychiatry's incest, but it went long unexplored; Weiner, for instance, could report no prior studies 'in which detailed psychiatric and psychological data were collected from involved fathers' (1962, p. 607).²⁶ Focusing on psychodynamic contributions, Dutch forensic psychiatrist Salomon van der Kwast (1963, pp. 81–2) and internationally renowned Dutch psychiatrist Henricus Cornelius Rümke (1967, pp. 425–31) both came to the same conclusion. Van der Kwast discounted the role of *paedophilia erotica* on the basis of 30 cases, given that most involved daughters were spoken of as attractive in terms of their incipient physical maturity, not their 'puerility' (1963, pp. 129–30). Rümke estimated that incest was only sporadically accompanied by perversion; he was not acquainted with a single

26. Weinberg (1955, pp. 94, 229) did nominate paedophilia as a factor in incestuous men's 'personality types'.

case of paedophilia (or gerontophilia) but advocated a phenomenological approach. Likewise, all 27 incestuous men studied in Canada in this timeframe showed ‘no history of adult sexual perversion, including pedophilia’ (Cormier *et al.*, 1962, p. 203). The earliest psychodynamic studies of incest committers in the 1960s, then, did not lead to a circumscription of such perversion.

Krafft-Ebing very generally cited Westermarck’s book in his *Psychopathia Sexualis* but not his incest theory, and while highlighting the genetic implications of incestuous marriages in his psychiatry textbook, he hardly reflected on the psychiatry of incest offenders, or victims, other than in moral and situational terms. By 1905, pioneering sexologists such as Bloch and Ellis had engaged with Westermarck’s incest theory, Freud’s seduction theory as well as Krafft-Ebing’s *paedophilia erotica* but neither was connecting these dots. Freud did not engage with Westermarck’s incest theory until 1912 (Freud, 1912, 1913). Westermarck, in turn, objected that ‘the study of neurotic persons can hardly be regarded as a safe guide to the proper understanding of the normal manifestations of the sexual instinct’ (1921, p. 204, n.2), which left open the question of purportedly *abnormal* manifestations. In any case, an explicit claim to a link between incest (the crime) and paedophilia (the perversion) was first made outside of psychoanalysis, by Hermann Rohleder in 1912 (pp. 160–1, 164; 1917, p. 409; Marcuse, 1915, p. 37).²⁷

Ernest Jones independently, yet ambiguously, alluded to a common dynamic in the subsequent year (Jones, 1913a). Where in 1910 Jones named a ‘father–daughter complex’, in 1913 he specifically speaks of ‘daughter complex’ and ‘son complex’ (*Tochterkomplex, Sohnkomplex*).²⁸ Jones here briefly alludes to a childhood fantasy of generational reversal, which he, in an arguably contrived way, ties to a mix-up of the generations, implicating daughters as lovers in the case of men, and sons in the case of mothers. This would provide a generic dynamic for ‘incestuous inclinations of parents for their children, also for normal parental love and for child-loving in general [Paedophilie im allgemeinen]’ (Jones, 1913a, p. 222). Accordingly, a man’s mother complex would co-inflect with his daughter complex.

Jones’s expression ‘Paedophilie im allgemeinen’ is undefined and unreferenced, and cannot be construed as an unambiguous reference to Krafft-Ebing’s *Pädophilia erotica*.²⁹ He did not revisit this interpretative gesture, but a number

27. In 1896 (pp. 279–80) Krafft-Ebing cited an early 1880s case study by Valentin Magnan of a woman in love with her prepubescent nephews as an example of *paedophilia erotica* which, strictly speaking, established the first casuistic link.

28. Ernest Jones was accused, and acquitted, of indecencies with girls in March 1906, and other improprieties in 1908 (Kuhn, 2002, 2015). He later acknowledged not having treated ‘any case of sexual perversion’ himself (Jones, 1920, p. 225).

29. Jones occasionally cited Krafft-Ebing but seemingly never on the subject of sexual perversion. In a 1913 elaboration of a 1910 article, Jones (1913c, p. 148) briefly refers to an interesting self-analysis of a boy-loving, *paedovestic* man alluding to masochistic, fetishistic,

of ‘counter-oedipal complexes’ were subsequently proposed to pinpoint the parent–child vector of kin-based complexes – many of these in fact before Freud’s death in 1939. They include the *Griselda complex* (attributed by Jones in 1922, p. 80, to James Jackson Putnam’s 1913 reference to ‘Griselda phantasies’), *Jocasta complex* (de Saussure, 1920; cf. Devereux, 1953), *Lear complex* (Pauncz, 1933), *Phaedra complex* (Wittels, 1944; Messer, 1969), *Laius complex* (Devereux, 1953), and arguably the concept of *maternal fetishism* (Apter, 2006). To comment very briefly on these historically scattered analytic gestures: they were made in considerable isolation from each other as well as (in various degrees) of the forensic-sexological notion of paedophilia. *Age difference* was inherent in all of them, as it had been in the Oedipus and Electra complexes, but *age* was not critical to any of them.³⁰ Few have proven of published clinical, or even conceptual, utility beyond the author who coined them (or in the case of Georges Devereux’s *Laius complex*, the very few authors who ever referenced them).³¹ Besides, mythological reference points had obvious problems.³² In the 1980s and 1990s, much was being made of the intrigue of Laius (Oedipus’s progenitor) having been the very ‘inventor of pederasty’, as Devereux had pointed out in 1952. But the archaism (*pederasty*) already highlights how confused *ancient paiderastia*, *homosexuality* and *paedophilia* still were in the American 1950s, and indeed, Devereux did little to disentangle them.

narcissistic and regressive aspects (Pettow, 1911). Jones considers the man’s *mental puerilism* as being ‘due to a pronounced paedophilia’, but again leaves the term undefined. Neither Pettow nor a commenting medical student (Marcus, 1913) invokes the term or concept. Ambiguity informs most of the few contemporaneous invocations of the term. For instance, Régis and Hesnard briefly and cryptically postulate that the (undefined) entity of *pédophilie* ‘is equally explained by development, brought about by the difficulty, individual or social, of obtaining another sexual object (Sexuelle Not), one of the components of the bisexual tendency’ (1913, p. 375).

30. Only Pauncz briefly referred to Krafft-Ebing’s *paedophilia erotica* and Forel’s *paederosis*. Yet important early monographs dealing with the forensic psychology of paedophilia, such as by Karpman and Mohr *et al.*, and authors of mid-century case reports (including Socarides), never discussed the complexes just listed. Like Jones, Putnam alludes to a ‘psychological parallelism’ between mother-love and daughter-love, in Putnam’s case involving a father’s (Putnam’s own) 18-year-old daughter (for discussion, see Prochnik, 2006, ch. 27).

31. De Saussure and Wittels offered no references; Messer did not refer to Wittels; Devereux did not mention any of the above and names only one anthropologist as inspiration; of the above, Nash cited only Devereux.

32. For more, though hardly recent, commentaries see especially *Laïos pédophile: Fantasma originaire*, a special issue of *Revue française de psychanalyse* 57(2) (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1993). Modern concepts of paedophilia are hardly informed or illuminated by the myth, as Devereux (1953, p. 136) points out (with reference to Paul Brandt alias Hans Licht). Laius’s crime was not ‘paedophilia’, nor ‘paiderastia’, but abduction/rape, and not of a prepubescent child; Jocasta’s crime of incest was unwitting, did not involve minors, and we learn nothing of her ‘sexual orientation’ (a concept that hardly existed until the mid-nineteenth century).

As said, the problem hardly attracted any interest from historians, despite the early 1980s focus on Freud's seduction hypothesis and the wider problematization of child sexual abuse in the Anglo-American experience. At that time, divergent theories of paedophilia were acknowledged (Travin & Protter, 1993, p. 112). However, psychoanalysts by this time increasingly drew from non-analytic, forensic sources to frame shifting concerns, arguments and even classifications. Going forward, in many psychodynamically attuned accounts of incest, the incest committer and the paedophile went on to figure collaterally in forensic typologies that are not of psychodynamic origin and have little psychodynamic pertinence (e.g. Ambrosio, 2005). Yet the problem of incest was central to concomitant shifts of perspective and authority. Where incest still inevitably related to a structural problem of the (however increasingly less nuclear and 'deconstructed') social environs of human development, 'paedophilia' had the rather more programmatic ambition of referring to what would constitute the limits and conditions of female sexual choice ('consent') and the (increasingly globalized) child's right to an innocent childhood. 'Paedophilia' only gradually, and only problematically, surpassed 'incest' as the keyword in these increasingly extrafamilial negotiations.

Looking back on the various vignettes concerning *paedophilia* identified above, one could observe that psychoanalysis advanced certain frames, questions and answers, which were largely incompatible with the forensic psychological frames closing in on 'pathological' sexualities identified by Stoller in 1973 (incidentally, the year of the APA's declassification of 'homosexuality'). If Krafft-Ebing's concept of 'pathologically' erotic child-love was not critical to the ensuing 'Freud wars', nor to the overlapping 'memory wars', it does seem to have had a critical structural import all along. Far beyond Freud's lifetime there were significant disagreements about the definition, the nature (perversion or neurotic symptom), the aetiology, the pathology and the pathogenicity of structural 'over-tenderness' (*Überzärtlichkeit*) towards children. In this light, it may be ventured that psychoanalysis has been a curiously silent, and at times complicit, witness to ongoing politicizations and reifications of modern concepts such as 'innocence' and 'sexual orientation'. In any case, the largely nineteenth- and twentieth-century processes through which incest (kinship), homosexuality (sex/gender) and paedophilia (age/maturity) were disentangled beg for historical – and possibly psychodynamic – perspectives on their once-promiscuous entanglements.

References

- Adler, A. (1912, 1919, 1922, 1928) *Über den nervösen Charakter. Grundzüge einer vergleichenden Individual-Psychologie und Psychotherapie*. 2nd edn, 1919; 3rd edn, 1922; 4th edn, 1928. Wiesbaden/Munich: J.F. Bergmann.
- Adorno, T.W. (1963) *Eingriffe. Neun kritische Modelle*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Alexander, F. (1949) *Fundamentals of Psychoanalysis*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Alexander, F. (1961) *The Scope of Psychoanalysis, 1921–1961: Selected Papers*. New York: Basic Books.

- Alexander, F. & Shapiro, L.B. (1952) Neuroses, behavior disorders and perversions. In F. Alexander & H. Ross (eds), *Dynamic Psychiatry*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, pp. 117–39.
- Allen, C. (1950) The problem of John Ruskin. *The International Journal of Sexology* 4(1): 7–14.
- Allen, W. (1938) Paul Laurence Dunbar. A study in genius. *The Psychoanalytic Review* 25(1): 52–82.
- Ambrosio, G. (ed.) (2005) *On Incest: Psychoanalytic Perspectives*. London: Karnac.
- Apfelberg, B., Sugar, C. & Pfeffer, A.Z. (1944) A psychiatric study of 250 sex offenders. *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 100(7): 762–70.
- Appel, A. Jr. (1967) ‘Lolita’: The springboard of parody. *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature* 8(2): 204–41. Co-appearing in L.S. Dembo (ed.), *Nabokov: The Man and His Work*. Madison & London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967, pp. 106–43.
- Apter, E. (2006) Maternal fetishism. In D. Nobus and L. Downing (eds), *Perversion: Psychoanalytic Perspectives/Perspectives on Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac, pp. 241–60.
- Benvenuto, S. (2007) Psychoanalysis and philosophy: A conversation with Mario Perniola by Sergio Benvenuto and Cristiana Cimino. *European Journal of Psychoanalysis* 24. Available at: <http://www.psychomedia.it/jep/number24/perniola.htm> [Accessed 20 December 2017].
- Benvenuto, S. (2016) *What Are Perversions? Sexuality, Ethics, Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac.
- Bloch, I. (1903) *Beiträge zur Aetiologie der Psychopathia sexualis*. Vol. 2. Dresden: H.R. Dohrn.
- Bonaparte, M. (1934) Introduction à la théorie des instincts [Pt. 1]. *Revue française de psychanalyse* 7(2): 217–71.
- Bouyer, H. (1927) L’Hygiène psychique de la puberté. *Archives de Philosophie* 5(2): 82–102.
- Bragman, L.J. (1934) The case of Algernon Charles Swinburne: A study in sadism. *The Psychoanalytic Review* 21(1): 59–74.
- Bragman, L.J. (1935) The case of John Ruskin: A study in cyclothymia. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 91(5): 1137–59.
- Breuer, J. & Freud, S. (1895) *Studien über Hysterie*. Leipzig: F. Deuticke.
- Briand, M. & Borel, A. (1920) Pédophilie et fétichisme. *Bulletin de la Société clinique de médecine mentale* 13(December): 250–5.
- Brill, A.A. (1913) The conception of homosexuality. In *Transactions of the Section on Nervous and Mental Diseases of the American Medical Association at the Sixty-Fourth Annual Session, held at Minneapolis, Minn., June 17 to 20, 1913*. Chicago: American Medical Association Press, pp. 79–95.
- Caine, D. & Wright, C. (eds) (2017) *Perversion Now!* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cassity, J. (1927a) Psychological considerations of pedophilia. *Psychoanalytic Review* 14(2): 189–99.
- Cassity, J. (1927b) The functional psychoses as an evolution of psychic impotency. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 66(2): 105–30.
- Cormier, B., Kennedy, M. & Sangowicz, J. (1962) Psychodynamics of father–daughter incest. *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal* 7(5): 203–15.
- de Saussure, R. (1920) Le complexe de Jocaste. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 6(2): 118–22.
- Dessoir, M. (1894) Zur Psychologie der Vita sexualis. *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und psychisch-gerichtliche Medizin* 50(5): 941–75.
- Devereux, G. (1953) Why Oedipus killed Laius; A note on the complementary Oedipus complex in Greek drama. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 34(2): 132–41.
- Ellis, H. (1905) Erotic symbolism. *Medicine* [Detroit] 11(10): 747–55.

- Ellis, H. (1913) Sexual problems, their nervous and mental relations. In W.A. White & S.E. Jelliffe (eds), *The Modern Treatment of Nervous and Mental Diseases*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger, pp. 100–42.
- Eulenburg, A. (1895) *Sexuale Neuropathie. Genitale Neurosen und Neuropsychosen der Männer und Frauen*. Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel.
- Fenichel, O. (1931) *Perversionen, Psychosen, Charakterstörungen*. Vienna: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.
- Fenichel, O. (1933) Outline of clinical psychoanalysis: Chapter VI: The sexual perversions. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 2: 260–308. Also published as chapter 7 in Fenichel, O. (1934) *Outline of Clinical Psychoanalysis*. Albany, NY: Psychoanalytic Quarterly Press & W.W. Norton.
- Fenichel, O. (1934) Über Angstabwehr, insbesondere durch Libidinisierung. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 20(4): 476–89.
- Fenichel, O. (1936) Die symbolische Gleichung: Mädchen = Phallus. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 22(3): 299–314.
- Fenichel, O. (1945) *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Ferenczi, S. (1914) Zur Nosologie der männlichen Homosexualität (Homöerotik). *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 2(2): 131–42.
- Ferenczi, S. (1933) Sprachverwirrung zwischen den Erwachsenen und dem Kind. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 19(1/2): 5–15.
- Ferenczi, S. (1909) Weiteres zur Homosexualität. In S. Ferenczi, *Bausteine IV*. Bern: Hans Huber, 1939, pp. 177–84.
- Fliess, W. (1897) *Die Beziehungen zwischen Nase und weiblichen Geschlechtsorganen, in ihrer biologischen Bedeutung dargestellt*. Leipzig & Vienna: Deuticke.
- Freedman, B. (1939) Psycho-social repression and social-rationalization: A preliminary formulation of Marxist psychoanalysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 9(1): 109–22.
- Freud, S. (1905a) *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie*. Leipzig & Vienna: Franz Deuticke (and subsequent editions in 1910a, 1915, 1920, 1922, 1926).
- Freud, S. (1905b) Stellungnahme zum Fall Prof. Dr. Beer. *Die Zeit* [Vienna], 27 October 1905, p. 5.
- Freud, S. (1905c) Bruchstück einer Hysterie-Analyse. *Monatschrift für Psychiatrie und Neurologie* 18(4): 285–467.
- Freud, S. (1909) Analyse der Phobie eines 5jährigen Knaben. *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschungen* 1(1): 1–109.
- Freud, S. (1910b) *Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci*. Leipzig & Vienna: F. Deuticke.
- Freud, S. (1912) Über einige Übereinstimmungen im Seelenleben der Wilden und der Neurotiker, I: Die Inzestscheu. *Imago* 1(1): 17–33.
- Freud, S. (1913) *Totem und Tabu*. Leipzig & Vienna: Hugo Heller.
- Freud, S. (1950) *Aus den Anfängen der Psychoanalyse: Briefe an Wilhelm Fliess, Abhandlungen und Notizen aus den Jahren 1887–1902*. Ed. M. Bonaparte, A. Freud & E. Kris. London: Imago.
- Freud, S. (1954) *The Origins of Psycho-Analysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess, Drafts and Notes: 1887–1902*. New York: Basic Books.
- Freud, S. (1985) *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess, 1887–1904*. Ed. and trans. J. Masson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fuchs, A. (1903) Zwei Fälle von sexueller Paradoxie. *Jahrbücher für Psychiatrie und Neurologie* 23: 207–13.
- Gay, P. (1986) *Freud for Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gay, P. (1988) *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Goroncy, C. (1926) Untersuchungen an in der Kindheit genozüchtigten weiblichen Personen. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für die gesamte gerichtliche Medizin* 7(1): 1–23.
- Hadley, E.E. (1926) Comments on pedophilia. *Medical Journal and Record* [New York] 124(3): 157–62.

- Hammer, E.F. (1954) A comparison of H-T-P's of rapists and pedophiles. *Journal of Projective Techniques* 18(3): 346–54.
- Hammer, E.F. & Glueck, B.C. Jr. (1957) Psychodynamic patterns in sex offenders: A four-factor theory. *The Psychiatric Quarterly* 31(1): 325–45.
- Happel, C. (1925) Aus der Analyse eines Falles von Päderastie. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 11(2): 206–11. Trans. as: Notes on an analysis of a case of pæderasty. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 7 (1926): 229–36.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1908) Zur Methodik der Sexualwissenschaft. *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* 1(12): 681–705.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1914) *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*. Berlin: Louis Marcus.
- Hirschfeld, M. & Burchard, E. (1913) *Der sexuelle Infantilismus*. Halle a.S.: Marhold.
- Jagodzinski, J. (2004) *Youth Fantasies: The Perverse Landscape of the Media*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Janssen, D.F. (2015) 'Chronophilia': Entries of erotic age preference into descriptive psychopathology. *Medical History* 59(4): 575–98.
- Janssen, D.F. (2017) Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: First theorist of erotic age orientation. *Journal of Homosexuality* 64(13): 1850–71.
- Jones, E. (1913a) Die Bedeutung des Großvaters für das Schicksal des Einzelnen. *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse* 1(3): 219–23.
- Jones, E. (1913b) Einige Fälle von Zwangsneurose (Schluß). *Jahrbuch für psychoanalytische und psychopathologische Forschung* 5(1): 55–116.
- Jones, E. (1913c) Simulated foolishness in hysteria. In: *Papers on Psycho-Analysis*. London: Baillière, Tindall and Cox, pp. 141–53.
- Jones, E. (1914) Die Empfängnis der Jungfrau Maria durch das Ohr. *Jahrbuch der Psychoanalyse* 6: 135–204.
- Jones, E. (1920) *Treatment of the Neuroses*. New York: W. Wood.
- Jones, E. (1922) *A Psycho-Analytic Study of Hamlet*. London: The International Psycho-Analytical Press.
- Juliusburger, O. (1914) Zur Lehre von psychosexuellen Infantilismus (Parathymie, regressive Psychopathie. *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* 1(5): 198–206.
- Juliusburger, O. (1915) Zur Lehre von den psychischen Entwicklungsstörungen (Infantilismus). *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und psychisch-gerichtliche Medizin* 72(3): 200–46.
- Jung, C.G. (1946) *Die Psychologie der Übertragung*. Zurich: Rascher.
- Kahr, B. (2007a) The infanticidal attachment in schizophrenia and dissociative identity disorder. *Attachment: New Directions in Psychotherapy and Relational Psychoanalysis* 1(3): 305–9.
- Kahr, B. (2007b) *Who's Been Sleeping in Your Head? The Secret World of Sexual Fantasies*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kahr, B. (2010) Four unknown Freud anecdotes. *American Imago* 67(2): 301–12.
- Karpman, B. (1944) *Case studies in the psychopathology of crime*. Vol. 2. Washington, DC: Medical Science Press.
- Karpman, B. (1946) A yardstick for measuring psychopathy. *Federal Probation* 10: 26–31.
- Kerslake, C. (2007) Introduction. In C. Kerslake & R. Brassier (eds), *Origins and Ends of the Mind: Philosophical Essays on Psychoanalysis*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, pp. 1–20.
- Kielholz, A. (1937) Zur Begutachtung eines Falles von Päderosis. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 23(3): 415–29.
- Kossak, M. (1913) Sexuelle Verführung der Kinder durch Diensthofen und ihre Bekämpfung. *Sexual-Probleme* 9(January): 18–25.
- Kraepelin, E. (1905) *Einführung in die psychiatrische Klinik*. 2nd edn. Leipzig: Barth.
- Kraepelin, E. (1916) *Einführung in die psychiatrische Klinik*. 3rd edn. Leipzig: Barth.

- Krafft-Ebing, R. von (1886) *Psychopathia sexualis: Eine klinisch-forensische Studie*. Stuttgart: Enke.
- Krafft-Ebing, R. von (1896) Ueber Unzucht mit Kindern und Pädophilie erotica. *Friedreich's Blätter für gerichtliche Medizin und Sanitätspolizei* 47(4): 261–83.
- Krafft-Ebing, R. von (1901a) Neue Studien auf dem Gebiete der Homosexualität. *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 3: 1–36.
- Krafft-Ebing, R. von (1901b) *Psychopathia sexualis, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der conträren Sexualempfindung*. 11th edn. Stuttgart: Enke.
- Kuhn, P. (2002) 'Romancing with a wealth of detail', or Narratives of Dr. Ernest Jones's 1906 trial for indecent assault. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* 3(4): 344–78.
- Kuhn, P. (2015) In 'the dark regions of the mind': A reading for the indecent assault in Ernest Jones's 1908 dismissal from the West End Hospital for Nervous Diseases. *Psychoanalysis and History* 17(1): 7–57.
- Layard, J. (1959) Homo-eroticism in primitive society as a function of the self. *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 4(2): 101–15.
- Leppmann, A. (1909) Greisenalter und Kriminalität. *Zeitschrift für Psychotherapie und medizinische Psychologie* 1(4): 212–21.
- Leppmann, F. (1912) Zur ärztlichen Begutachtung von Sittlichkeitsverbrechern (§176,3 St.G.B.). *Ärztliche Sachverständigen-Zeitung* 18(10): 202–5.
- Lloyd-Tuckey, C. (1906) Perversion sexuelle guérie par l'hypnotisme. *Revue de l'hypnotisme et de la psychologie physiologique* 20(3): 91–3.
- Lloyd-Tuckey, C. (1907) *Treatment by Hypnotism and Suggestion; Or Psycho-Therapeutics*. 5th edn. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Lombroso, C. (1882) Geschlechtstrieb und Verbrechen in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen. *Archiv für Strafrecht und Strafprozess* 30(1): 1–29.
- Marcus, E. (1913) Bemerkungen zu einer 'Selbststudie über Retour à l'enfance'. *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse. Medizinische Monatsschrift für Seelenkunde* 3(3): 148–51.
- Marcuse, M. (1912) Ein Fall von vielfach komplizierter Sexualperversion. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 9(1): 269–300.
- Marcuse, M. (1915) *Vom Inzest*. Halle a.S.: Carl Marhold Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Meisl, A. (1907) Die Entwicklung der Sexualvorstellungen und Sexualneigungen. *Wiener klinische Rundschau* 21(52): 831–3.
- Messer, A.A. (1969) The 'Phaedra Complex'. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 21(2): 213–18.
- Moll, A. (1891) *Die conträre Sexualempfindung: Mit Benutzung amtlichen Materials*. Berlin: Fischer.
- Moll, A. (1898) *Untersuchungen über die Libido sexualis*. Vol. 1, Pt. 2. Berlin: Kornfeld.
- Moll, A. (1904) Perverse Sexualempfindung, psychische Impotenz und Ehe. In H. Senator & S. Kaminer (eds), *Krankheiten und Ehe*. Munich: J.F. Lehmann, pp. 667–717.
- Moll, A. (1908) *Das Sexualleben des Kindes*. Berlin: H. Walther.
- Muehlleitner, E., Giefer, M. & Reichmayr, J. (2009) Fenichel's 175 Topics of Discussion about Freud's 'Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex'. *Psychoanalytic Review* 96(3): 411–30.
- Muensterberger, W. (1956) Perversion, cultural norm and normality. In S. Lorand & M. Balint (eds), *Perversions: Psychodynamics and Therapy*. New York: Random House, pp. 55–67.
- Näcke, P. (1908) Zur Psychologie der Kinder als Opfer von Sittlichkeitsverbrechen. *Archiv für Kriminal-Anthropologie und Kriminalistik* 32(1/2): 149–54.
- Nash, J.L. (1992) Ganyphilia: Etiologic and psychotherapeutic concepts. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice & Research* 1(3): 237–47.
- Nunberg, H. & Federn, E. (eds) (1962) *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Vol. I: 1906–1908*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Nunberg, H. & Federn, E. (eds) (1967) *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Vol. II: 1908–1910*. New York: International Universities Press.

- Nunberg, H. & Federn, E. (eds) (1975) *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society. Vol. IV: 1912–1918*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Oosterhuis, H. (2000) *Stepchildren of Nature: Kraftt-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pauncz, A. (1933) Der Learkomplex, die Kehrseite des Ödipuskomplexes. *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 143(1): 294–332.
- Pereira, P.B. (1697) *Prosodia in vocabularium bilingue, latinum, et lusitanum, digesta*. 7th edn. Évora: Ex Typographia Academiae.
- Pettow, R. (1911) Über eine besondere Form sexueller Anomalie. (Selbststudie über Retour à l'enfance). *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 4(1): 692–6.
- Pfister, O. (1922) *Die Liebe des Kindes und ihre Fehlentwicklungen*. Bern: Ernst Bircher.
- Pilcz, A. (1904) *Lehrbuch der speziellen Psychiatrie für Studierende und Ärzte*. Leipzig & Vienna: Franz Deuticke.
- Pilcz, A. (1908) *Spezielle gerichtliche Psychiatrie für Juristen und Mediziner*. Leipzig & Vienna: Franz Deuticke.
- Praetorius, N. [E. Wilhelm] (1906) Die Bibliographie der Homosexualität für das Jahr 1905. *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 8: 701–886.
- Prochnik, G. (2006) *Putnam Camp: Sigmund Freud, James Jackson Putnam and the Purpose of American Psychology*. New York: Other Press.
- Putnam, J.J. (1913) Bemerkungen über einen Krankheitsfall mit Griselda-Phantasien. *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse* 1(3): 205–18.
- Raecke, J. (1912) Zur psychiatrischen Beurteilung sexueller Delikte. *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten* 49(1): 25–39.
- Rasmussen, A. (1934) Die Bedeutung sexueller Attentate auf Kinder unter 14 Jahren für die Entwicklung von Geisteskrankheiten und Charakteranomalien. *Acta Psychiatria et Neurologica* 9(3–4): 351–434.
- Régis, E. & Hesnard, A. (1913) La doctrine de Freud et de son école [part 1]. *L'Encéphale* 18(April): 356–78.
- Réti, S. (1904) *Sexuelle Gebrechen, deren Verhütung und Heilung; für Ärzte und Laien, vom Standpunkte des praktischen Arztes beleuchtet*. Halle a.S.: Carl Marhold.
- Roche, P.Q. (1950) Sexual deviation. *Federal Probation* 14(3): 3–11.
- Rohleder, H. (1912) *Die Zeugung unter Blutsverwandten*. Leipzig: G. Thieme.
- Rohleder, H. (1917) Incest in modern civilization. *American Journal of Urology and Sexology* 13(September): 406–11.
- Rümke, H.C. (1967) *Psychiatrie III. Tussen psychose en normaliteit*. Amsterdam: Scheltema & Holkema.
- Sadger, I. (1915) Zum Verständnis infantiler Angstzustände. *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 3(2): 101–5.
- Sadger, I. (1921) *Die Lehre von den Geschlechtsverirrungen (Psychopathia sexualis) auf psychoanalytischer Grundlage*. Leipzig & Vienna: Franz Deuticke.
- Schilder, P. (1938) Psychoanalytic remarks on *Alice in Wonderland* and Lewis Carroll. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease* 87(2): 159–68.
- Schrenck-Notzing, A. (1892) *Die Suggestions-Therapie bei krankhaften Erscheinungen des Geschlechtssinnes mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der conträren Sexualempfindung*. Stuttgart: Enke.
- Seidel, A. (1912) *Geschlecht und Sitte im Leben der Völker; Anthropologische, philosophische und kulturhistorische Studien*. Berlin: Hugo Bermühler.
- Senf, M.R. (1912) Geschlechtstrieb und Verbrechen. *Archiv für Kriminologie* 48(1–2): 1–55.
- Senf, M.R. (1913) Narzissmus. *Sexual-Probleme* 9(3): 153–65.
- Socarides, C.W. (1959) Meaning and content of a pedophilic perversion. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 7(1): 84–94.
- Socarides, C.W. (1988) *The Preoedipal Origin and Psychoanalytic Therapy of Sexual Perversions*. Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

- Socarides, C.W. (1991) Adult-child sexual pairs: Psychoanalytic findings. *The Journal of Psychohistory* 19(2): 185–9.
- Socarides, C.W. (2004) Preface. In C.W. Socarides & L.R. Loeb (eds), *The Mind of the Paedophile: Psychoanalytic Perspectives*. London: Karnac, pp. xvii–xix.
- Stekel, W. (1911) [Review: 'Die Dorische Knabenliebe', by E. Bethe]. *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse* 1(1): 47–9.
- Stekel, W. (1912) Masken der Homosexualität. *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse* 2(7): 367–72. Trans. as: Masked masturbation. Trans. S.A. Tannenbaum. *American Medicine* 20 (August 1914): 530–7.
- Stekel, W. (1917) *Onanie und Homosexualität*. Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Stekel, W. (1921a) *Die Geschlechtskälte der Frau*. 2nd edn. Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Stekel, W. (1921b) *Onanie und Homosexualität*. 2nd edn. Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Stekel, W. (1921c) Depressions, their nature and treatment. *Psyche and Eros* 2(6): 333–41.
- Stekel, W. (1922a) *Psychosexueller Infantilismus*. Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Stekel, W. (1922b) *Die Sprache des Traumes*. 2nd edn. Munich: Bergmann.
- Stekel, W. (1923) *Die Impotenz des Mannes*. 2nd edn. Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Stekel, W. (1928) *Briefe an eine Mutter. Teil II: Vor und nach den ersten Schuljahren*. Zurich & Leipzig: Wendepunkt-Verlag.
- Stoller, R.J. (1973) Overview: The impact of new advances in sex research on psychoanalytic theory. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 130(3): 241–51.
- Stoller, R.J. (1975) *Perversion: The Erotic Form of Hatred*. New York: Pantheon.
- Sulloway, F.J. (1983[1979]) *Freud, Biologist of the Mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Szwec, G. (1993) Faudra mieux surveiller les petits!? *Revue Française de Psychanalyse* 57(2): 591–603.
- Tannenbaum, S.A. (1913) Sexual abstinence and nervousness. *American Journal of Urology* 9(6): 290–322. Reprinted in *American Journal of Urology and Sexology* 12(6) (1916): 241–75.
- Tausk, V. (1912) VI. In *Die Onanie, 14 Beiträge zu einer Diskussion der Wiener Psychoanalytischen Vereinigung*. Wiesbaden: J.F. Bergmann, pp. 48–68.
- Travin, S. & Protter, B. (1993) *Sexual Perversion: Integrative Treatment Approaches for the Clinician*. New York: Springer.
- Van der Kwast, S. (1963) *Over de incest: Een oriënterend onderzoek*. Meppel: J.A. Boom & Son.
- Verhaeghe, P. (1999) The collapse of the function of the father and its effects on gender roles. *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture & Society* 4(1): 18–31. Reprinted in R. Salecl (ed.) (2000), *Sexuation. SIC 3*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 131–54.
- Ward, L.F. (1883) *Dynamic Sociology*. Vol. 1. New York: D. Appleton.
- Ward, L.F. (1901) La mécanique sociale [incl. discussion]. *Annales de l'Institut International de Sociologie* 7: 163–237.
- Ward, L.F. (1903) *Pure Sociology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Weinberg, S.K. (1955) *Incest Behavior*. New York: Citadel.
- Weiner, I.B. (1962) Father-daughter incest: A clinical report. *The Psychiatric Quarterly* 36 (1): 607–32.
- Westermarck, E. (1891) *The History of Human Marriage*. London: Macmillan.
- Westermarck, E. (1921) *The History of Human Marriage*. 5th edn. Vol. 2. London: Macmillan.
- Wittels, F. (1932) The Lilith neurosis: Projection of the female component in men. *Psychoanalytic Review* 19(3): 241–56.
- Wittels, F. (1944) Psychoanalysis and literature. In S. Lorand (ed.), *Psychoanalysis Today*. New York: International Universities Press, pp. 338–48.
- Ziehen, T. (1910) Zur Lehre von den psychopathischen Konstitutionen [cont'd]. *Charité-annalen* 34: 273–84.

- Zingerle, H. (1911) Über das Greisenalter in forensischer Beziehung. *Archiv für Kriminal-Anthropologie und Kriminalistik* 40(1–2): 1–54.
- Žižek, S. (2014) The undoing of an event. In H. Feldner, F. Vighi & S. Žižek (eds), *States of Crisis and Post-Capitalist Scenarios*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 107–25.

ABSTRACT

Mainstream theorizing of paedophilia from the mid-1920s through to mid-1960, and even into the 1980s, was importantly psychodynamically oriented. The early history of the concept of paedophilia in early psychodynamic thought is problematic, however. Extant historical references are not without problems of their own, and have suffered from a lack of insight in the wider history of sexuality at this point of ‘erotic age preferences’. Review of primary sources highlights several contemporaneous interfaces of early psychodynamic theory: with the established forensic psychology of perpetrators of child sexual abuse; Krafft-Ebing’s specific aetiological concept of *age fetishism*; early study and typologies of homosexual age preferences; emergent and divergent ideas about *psychosexual infantilism*; and strikingly late empirical attention to the psychiatry of the perpetrator of intergenerational incest.

Key words: paedophilia, incest, homosexuality, Freud, history of psychoanalysis, history of psychiatry, Krafft-Ebing