

Age-Stratifying Homosexualities in the Social Sciences

Diederik F. Janssen¹

Published online: 24 September 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2016

Abstract During the latter half of the twentieth century, Anglo-American sociologists advanced cross-cultural and historical typifications of “age-stratified homosexualities”, differentiated from, in particular, “gender-based” and “egalitarian” varieties of same-sex intimacies. In their arguable aftermath, these typological demarcations and juxtapositions may be appreciated as participating in and proclaiming a distinct moment of arrival and consolidation for a broader scope of Western adult “gay” identities and politics. To this end, an historical appraisal is offered of this demarcation and typing of “homosexualities” in terms of age and gender, especially recalling that the earliest apologetic constructions of homosexuality in Northern Europe already proposed both philologically and ethno-geographically informed distinctions between “man-manly” (and eventually “woman-womanly”) love and boy-love. Notwithstanding, the perennial typological distinction of “age-stratification” in “LGBT”-identified advocacy and social sciences, has been, and remains, more problematic than has been, or can be, expressed in terms of social roles, organizations or systems. Implications for ongoing Western psychiatric circumscriptions of “pedophilia” and “hebephilia”, for instance, remain notably unexplored both historically and anthropologically.

Keywords Homosexuality · Age · Social sciences · Anthropology · History · Review

In 1911 Magnus Hirschfeld, the great champion of the neuro-endocrinological model of sexual orientation, nominated *Sexualethnologie* as one the four main pillars of what had recently (in 1906, by Erwin Bloch) been named *Sexualwissenschaft* (Hirschfeld 1912). A distinction between mundane and “ritual”

✉ Diederik F. Janssen
diederikjanssen@gmail.com

¹ Nijmegen, The Netherlands

modalities of homosexuality was explicitly recognized by this time in German-speaking ethnological circles (e.g., Michelsson-Dorpat 1912, p. 342) and tentative typologies of same-sex intimacies were now being offered with an explicit cross-cultural purview (e.g., Stoll 1908, p. 952 et seq.). Ethnographic contributions to non-West-European homosexuality were piling up, both in Hirschfeld's *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (published from 1899) and Friedrich S. Krauss's *Anthropophyteia* (1904–1920) and its *Beiwerke*, adding to a growing number of monographs on non-Western sexual life. Volumes appeared on homosexuality among *Naturvölker* and *Kulturvölker* (Bleys 1996). This burgeoning ethnographic gaze onto indigenous *Sexualleben* held the promise of extending, indeed of reframing and significantly complicating, emergent psychophysiological and especially etiological concepts of the *vita sexualis* such as pioneered in Berlin (a promise voiced by, e.g., Kind 1908).

The probed difference was commonly that between same-sex intimacies socially approved elsewhere or in some other epoch on the one hand, and those persecuted at home, at the occasion of the latter's nomination for an envisioned new era of legal accommodation and indeed, social approval. Yet although *Sexualethnologie* became a department in Hirschfeld's eventual Institut für Sexualwissenschaft, his core concept of sexual intermediacy had ethnology affirm speculations about a common biology, not cross-cultural diversity. Though otherwise well-travelled, he embarked on his famous world tour only in the early 1930s, and he concluded (in a posthumous book) that “The uniform aspect of homosexuality in all races and under all skies has been for me a convincing proof of its biological causation. In this matter, beyond question, the sexual type conquers the racial type” (1938, p. 162).

Theoretically at least, ethnology could be made to speak to the already various competitive approaches to homosexuality by typologically distinguishing same-sex acts, or “roles”, implicitly or explicitly sanctioned, or even cultivated, or at least formally recognized and rationalized, by exotic cultural decree or fiat, from same-sex attraction as a key corollary of (in Hirschfeld's terms) a person's *Sexualkonstitution*. Well into the 1980s, however, it remained a central question how anthropology and psychoanalysis, or some dialogue between them, might speak to the *nature* of homosexuality. Also, in the late 1970s, cross-cultural perspectives on homosexuality were informed by a still strong legacy of nineteenth-century medico-legal distinctions between “situational” (or “occasional”, or “pseudo”, or “acquired”, or “bisexual”) and “true” or “genuine” (“constitutional”, “congenital”, or exclusive) forms of sexual variance—an at times binary distinction that had been informing clinical typologies of child sex offenders as well and mirrored a wider nineteenth-century dichotomy of *perversity* (moral travesty) and *perversion* (morbidly).¹

¹ In German texts, the former was commonly associated with what was called *Not-Päderastie* (pederasty “out of necessity”) or *Not-Homosexualität*, somewhat comparable to the concept of *faute de mieux* masturbation (*Not-Onanie*). This distinction was even projected onto same-sex copulations among beetles (de Kerville 1896). Comparably, during the 1890s Krafft-Ebing and others highlighted socio-cultural reasons for child molestation beside his eventual identification of “pedophilia erotica”, including the superstition (*Aberglaube*) that having a virgin sex partner could cure STDs, libertinism, and cramped housing. There was also an established armchair anthropological discourse on sexual precocity and laxity in intergenerational boundaries around sexuality among “primitives”.

Yet by the 1980s etiological typologies were traded for typologies of the variety of *social* “forms” of homosexuality, such as would speak to a new era of (soon global) sexual citizenship and sexual diversity politics. The long central specter of *Greek love* had made its profile of age-disparity an obvious crux for fleshing out politically vital distinctions between nature and nurture, all the more given the political problem age posed to Hirschfeld’s “humanitarian-scientific” project, which from its late-1890s inception relied in part on respect for—indeed, a proposed raise of—the age of consent in negotiating still ubiquitous allegations and damning etiologies of “seduction”. In Britain, too, it was now being realized that “inverts” could not be “Greek” anymore (Funke 2013). This realization ensured that contemporary age-disparate homoeroticism became caught up with a number of discursive frames that alternatively rendered it pathology, a developmental peculiarity, or a feature of Oriental sexual culture (e.g., Näcke 1904) or of marginalized subcultures. For instance, the case of British schoolboy romances (“fagging”) made for a home-grown Greek-like “institutionalized” and “situational” age-differentiated system of homoeroticism. In an appendix to his 1896 monograph on sexual inversion, Havelock Ellis included a report of another, man-boy system among American tramps.

Yet while Hirschfeld’s typology of homosexuality (from a 1906 text onward) differentiated between age preferences, this dimension of *Homosexualität* was not identified as in any way cultural, institutional, historical or biological until in 1913 he began theorizing *Pädophilie* in terms of what he called “infantile sexual constitution”. Furthermore, Hirschfeld’s nominal alignment, in 1914, of same-sex *pedophiles*, *ehebophiles*, *androphiles* and *gerontophiles* was purportedly based strictly on questionnaire evidence, and has to date remained trivial in Western psychological and social sciences. Same-sex age preferences were empirically taken up again only in 1950s work both by Hirschfeld’s German successor Hans Giese, and, in a more “diagnostic” frame, by Czech forensic clinician Kurt Freund. Despite their joint echoing of Hirschfeld in recognizing multiple age-preferences, at least the same-sex varieties they recognized were by now increasingly fractured along an emergent medico-legal schism between “homosexualities” and the “mental disorder” of pedophilia. Contra Hirschfeld’s own typology, the “humanitarian-scientific” purview of homosexuality *per se*, as it had been delimited by Hirschfeld *cum suis* and originally by his inspirator Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, was to have nothing to do with *pedophilia*. How Hirschfeld’s *ehebophilia* fitted into homosexuality *per se*, meanwhile, remained dubious as the term was virtually always used in anachronistic references to ancient *paiderastia*, despite its 1980s nomination for a general anthropological pertinence (by Rahman 1988, who, incidentally, seems curiously unaware of Hirschfeld’s terminology, and repeatedly misspells his name).²

² Hirschfeld seems to have borrowed, or only re-coined, at least five of the eight words for male and female age preferences he used in 1914 (Janssen 2015).

Age-Stratification in/as LGBT History

Sidestepping the core nominal disjunction in Western sexual culture between homosexualities and age-based sexualities was the coeval nomination of “age stratification” as a distinct type of “social organization of homosexuality”. Where the social psychological and forensic-psychiatric focus lay on “erotic age preference” as a putative dimension or analogue of “sexual [gender] orientation”, and where LGBT research had largely been preoccupied with negotiating this focus with reference to nonclinical samples of “homophiles”, comparative sociologists, philologists and anthropologists would now focus on “age-defined” “roles” in same-sex sexual relations, that is, on age or the life course as a “status-stratifying” gradient. The latter focus emerged *apropos* LGBT emancipation, though largely, and only briefly, in the new post-Stonewall context of Anglophone gay and lesbian studies. Accordingly, what Stephen O. Murray, in 1984 and onward, called *age-stratified*, *age-defined* or *age-based* homosexuality, was to include variably recognized and culturally accommodated intimacies marked by the combination of age-specificity and a culturally substantive age difference of typical same-sex partners—essentially always men and male youths.

Anglophone ethnology had long specified the notion of *ritual homosexuality* (e.g., Layard 1930, p. 541) or *ritualized homosexual practice* (e.g., Muensterberger 1956, p. 59), and of *institutionalized* or *institutional homosexuality* (e.g., Devereux 1937). But little distinction was yet made between age-preferential sexualities within the clinic or beyond. Most of anthropological contributions to homosexuality were psychoanalytically oriented, notably featuring work by first-hour ethnopsychanalysts Georges Devereux and Géza Róheim, and, as many psychodynamic contributions of that time, tended to lump presumptive etiologies of all same-sex attractions. Typologies were offered later, *apropos* a waxing awareness of LGB ascent to legality and social scientific legitimacy, anticipating the psychiatric declassification of homosexuality and the legal accommodation of “consenting adults in private” across Europe. Early typological isolations of age disparity for cross-cultural purposes include a reference by British anthropologist Geoffrey Gorer (1961, pp. 74, 75) to “institutionalized pederasty”, and a comparable typological gesture by American historian Randolph Trumbach (1977, p. 2), who, according to Murray (2000, p. 2n5), had been unaware of Gorer.³ Murray first presented this taxonomic specification (on the basis of age, gender and profession) in 1984 (pp. 45–53) and came to favor the expression *age-stratified homosexuality* (Murray 1992a: xvii–xxi, 1992b, 2000: pp. 21–223). Barry D. Adam’s coeval terms *intergenerational homosexuality* (Adam 1985, p. 668) and *age-structured homosexuality* (Adam 1986, p. 19) were reportedly advanced first in a 1979 gay caucus newsletter (Murray 2000: p. 2, 2002: p. 7n3) apparently independently of Trumbach and Gorer. Comparable terms used first within this time frame include *age-graded homosexuality* (Gagnon 1987, p. 239), *transgenerational homosexuality* (Greenberg

³ A less universalizing typological nomination of “kept boys” was offered by Sonenschein (1968, pp. 75, 76).

1988, pp. 25, 26–40), and *age-differentiated homosexuality* (e.g., Donaldson and Dynes 1990).

Although Murray and Greenberg both offered a detailed analysis of its social correlates, the age-based “pattern” has subsequently been recognized as an archaic and ethnohistorically paradigmatic or primordial “organization” of same-sex intimacy, marking the most. Other—simultaneously the most ancient, remote, “ritualized”, and controversial—of “homosexual roles” scrutinized under the modern homosexual’s, and eventually LGBT studies’, gaze. As such, it assumes considerable importance, given that it is simultaneously made to inform two sets of politically vital discourses: (1) anthropological discourses of social evolution, organization, and purpose, as well as of sexual variance/diversity; and (2) historical discourses of reclaimable pasts, genealogy, historical (dis)continuity, progress and “arrival”.

Work by Trumbach (1990) has consistently probed a regionally and historically precise multiplicity of types of homosexuals where he claimed that the adolescent-loving *rake* would be increasingly displaced by the adult-seeking *molly* in Britain of the early eighteenth century. Comparable cases of historical “transformation” have been advanced with reference to Japan and China, but they are never unproblematic. Appraisals and reconstructions of “Greek homosexualities” have importantly been explicit and pivotal in virtually all nineteenth-century work on modern homosexuality. If anything they were integral to the latter’s discursive emergence. Either to distinguish or to assimilate the former and the latter has remained controversial even in today’s scholarship, at times explosively so. In the hands of textbook authors, however, “age-stratified homosexuality” has been generously made to underlie or animate quasi-evolutionist concepts of “LGBT” arrival or indeed global historical “transformation”, featuring at times blatantly orientalist—in any case today prominently geopolitically sensitized—conceptions of phenomena such as Afghan *bacha bāzī* (Baer 2003; Manchanda 2015; compare PBS Frontline documentary *The Dancing Boys of Afghanistan*: dir. Doran 2010).

Any claim that the latter man-boy intrigue (and its many purported cultural-historical analogues, such as “dancing boy” cases identified by Dutch Indonesia-ethnographers in the 1880s and 1890s) would belong to “the anthropology of homosexualities”, has no doubt increasingly become at odds with social scientists’ career options and job security, at least in the US. Similar problems have always existed for historians and classicists. Many social scientists complain about the lack of suitable words in this area, and most news reporters frame any “patterned” age difference in sexual intimacy in sure but problematic terms of “pedophile networks”, “abuse”, “trafficking”, “exploitation”, and at times, “patriarchy”. Even into the 1970s, anthropologists still used ambiguous terms such as *pederasts* (Margaret Mead famously denounced a late-1930s “witch hunt” on the latter in Indonesia: Boellstorff 2005, pp. 52, 53). Interestingly, decades of case studies of particularly same-sex clergy scandals across the Western world have typically referred to the historical window of the 1950s through 1970s but they surfaced and were problematized more or less together with the emergence of social-scientific notions of “age-stratified homosexuality”. The latter, in fact, were readily extendable to historical Asian analogies of clergy man-boy homosexualities (e.g.,

Childs 1980). In the West, the still ongoing public relations fiasco advanced a clinically heretic concept of “homosexual pedophilia” as somehow consequential to imposed celibacy and symptomatic of all-male, hierarchical closed-environments. Here, in other words, was not “homosexuality” but clearly an already more *culturally symptomatic* “pedophilia” than the neurodevelopmental disorder the latter is construed as by today’s leading forensic psychologists.

Ensuing discussions do not leave doubt that today it has become increasingly problematic to discern what is to be included in the “age-stratified homosexuality” scope, and thus, arguably, in LGBT/queer history and anthropology, and what, on the other hand, is to be reported to authorities, investigative journalists or niche lawyers. As noted, early pastoral commentaries on the incipient church “crisis” tended to look to psychiatric texts for answers, and in this timeframe they could still conclude that “the distinction between homosexuality and homosexual pedophilia is not quite absolute” (Harvey 1987, p. 219). This now scandalous sense of indistinction was, if anything, honored by the coeval anthropological category of “age-stratified” homosexualities, not least where one of its main proponents (Greenberg 1990, p. 100n4) admits that, for historical purposes at least, “boundaries between the [his] categories are sometimes fuzzy”. An early commenter wrote that, furthermore, “all three [of Murray’s] organizations of homosexuality [age-graded, gender-defined, and profession-based] exist in contemporary North America” (Gerard 1989, p. 495), something Adam (1985, p. 668) had also admitted and Murray seconded. The latter characterized Western “transformation” in telling terms of “a succession in [consecutive] prominence of age, gender, and gay subcultures” (2000, p. 12) and in less abstract terms of an only “recent emergence of gay people rejecting gender- and age-differentiated roles” (p. 11). In other words, typology was always already an ongoing matter of self-identification and disidentification.

The admitted fuzziness and coexistence of types and frames had, and have, myriad ethical, medico-legal, and linguistic implications. This applies in the first instance to the few anthropologists to have documented “age-stratified homosexualities” first-hand, for instance the cause célèbre of New Guinean, including “Sambian”, fellatio by prepubescent initiates of postpubescent bachelors (Herdt 1981). Should the anthropologist (the distinguished anthropologist Gilbert Herdt, most famously) have reported the latter to local authorities, given that “child sexual abuse” was, and is, both legally circumscribed in Papua New Guinea and, specifically during the 1980s, increasingly made to answer to circumscription and condemnation by global entities of the *child rights* and *human rights* varieties? Ritualistic “secrecy” between genders and generations made for a key anthropological trope in Melanesia, but it was an equally mobilizing motif in contemporaneous Anglo-American clinical discourses of abuse and incest. Significantly, possibly millennia of age-disparate child marriage in India (and elsewhere) have rarely if ever been conceptualized in terms of, say, *age-stratified heterosexuality* or indeed *age-stratified sexuality*. To recall, already in late nineteenth-century imperial India, that custom was subject to sustained and successful legal reform efforts.⁴

⁴ I have seen little evidence of a discourse of “pedophilia” or even “sexual orientation” in this historical context; the politicized issues were rather intergenerational marriage, the female age of consent, and the

The limited purpose of the remainder of the present article is to trace the occasions for these questions of anthropological ethos and taxonomy. Tracing “age-stratified homosexuality’s” history, limitations and arguable, eventual social-scientific bankruptcy, illuminates the changing scope of Western homosexuality and LGBT identity, as they assumed scholarly status and voice *along with* the cultural-historical, “homonationalist”, geopolitical and globalist purviews they now have. The ancient motif of age-preferential pederasty made age preferences integral and central to scientific-typological constructions of homosexuality from the mid-1860s onward. Here, makeshift distinctions between *Urnings* (Ulrichs) or *Homosexualists* (Karl-Maria Kertbeny) on the one hand, and *Knabenliebhabern* (boy-lovers) on the other, projected distinct contrastive positionalities of which the former were to reflect a case and a spectrum of natural variance and the latter either morbidity or *normal-sexuals’* depravity. Ulrichs’ famed term *Urningtum* was initially (1864, p. 2) *coined* specifically to introduce the age-specificity that popular, philological, legal, ecclesiastical and dictionary terms like *Knabenliebe* (boy-love) and *Knabenschändung* (boy-violation) had not offered. Where Ulrichs had ambivalently alluded to the possibility of overlap, 1890s authors went on to consolidate a conceptual divide between what was now called “contrary sexual feeling” and what along the way was named *pedophilia*. Late twentieth-century allusions to “age-stratified homosexuality” notably ignored the clinical distinction here introduced while silently subsuming a host of consistently (and all the more interestingly) unsuccessful neologisms including *éphébophilie* (French, coined 1896), *neofilia* (Italian, 1952), *hebephilia*⁵ (English, 1955), *Adoleczentophilie* (German, 1956), and *ganyphilia* (English, 1992). Thus, although their sociological proponents have consistently warned against such a deployment, the category of “age-structured homosexualities” has an increasingly hard time *not* to name and bridge an otherwise culturally and medico-legally unnamed, and increasingly deepened, Western gap between “gays” and “homosexual pedophiles”—that is, between proud and protected “sexual orientations” and hunted “mental disorders”. Discussions of “age-stratified homosexualities” stayed understandably clear of clinical discourses; however, their academic reach has remained both limited and problematic, perhaps *all the more* given that the term has never been made to speak to the contemporary Western “paraphilias” whose medicalization remains notably defined (by both the APA and the WHO) in legal terms of consent (age and age difference, by acute implication) and the “sexual maturity” of preferred partners.

Footnote 4 continued

larger scope of gender relations within a contested imperial setting. In Europe, proto-LGBT advocates and researchers such as Hirschfeld, Moll and Krafft-Ebing proposed a raise of the age of consent. But their respective studies, typologies, and descriptive statistics of same-sex age preferences were never elaborated to a general social-scientific interest in erotic age preferences.

⁵ A mid-1950s forensic-diagnostic term, *hebephilia* would inclusively refer to any “sexual activity of adults with adolescents of both sexes [i.e., either sex]” (Hammer and Glueck 1955, p. 159n). Coinage of the latter was notably credited to New York ethnolinguist, ethnopsychiatrist and chief prison psychiatrist Paul K. Benedict (1912–1997) although he is not known to ever have used the term in print. Neither Hirschfeld’s acultural *ephebophilia* nor Benedict’s clinically appropriated *hebephilia*, have ever been much in vogue whether in later LGBT politics or studies or elsewhere, except for a small circle of forensic psychologists around Kurt Freund.

In this light, the emergence of an anthropological-historical delimitation of “age-stratified”, juxtaposed to “egalitarian” (i.e., non-stratified), “homosexualities” one century after Ulrichs’surning theory reflects a celebratory nomination of same-sex desire between consenting adults in private (or eventually, also, between age-equal LGBT youths) as now securely, *categorically*, emancipated from the damaging allegations of seduction and corruption. Compared to the campaigned adult model, especially ritualized forms of boy-man sex were consequently figured as increasingly, precisely *typologically*, other, in the sense of now being securely remote—historically, ethnographically and politically.⁶

“Age-Stratified Homosexuality”: Emergence of an Ethno-Type

The sociological concept of “age-stratified homosexuality” articulated a newly comparative, social-geographic gaze on “homosexual behavior” that centralized and surveyed how it was “socially organized” at a time and place (the circum-Atlantic 1960s through 1980s) where “society” began to legally accommodate what had long been called sodomy on the explicit conditions that it excluded minors as well as public indecencies. Neither the gaze nor the stipulated conditions were new; yet although pre-WW2 and early homophile politics in West-Europe revolved in part on respect for (and often a proposed scope expansion of) age-of-consent laws, strict distinctions such as on the basis of age were not made in early ethnological surveys of same-sex sexualities. There was a general nineteenth-century notion (in work by Ulrichs, Kertbeny and Albert Moll, for instance) of age-equal adult homosexuality being the norm only in Northern Europe, and perhaps only recently. “Age-stratification” between lovers and beloveds was widely reported, even variably presumed normative, in seemingly all early ethnological surveys of homosexuality, such as by Richard Burton, Havelock Ellis, Bernhard Stern, Iwan Bloch, Ferdinand Karsch-Haack, Edward Westermarck and Edward Carpenter, although it was significantly not elaborated into a distinct social-scientific type. Karsch-Haack’s *Jahrbuch* articles and his encyclopedic 1906 and 1911 surveys of the cross-cultural “vita homosexualis” (*gleichgeschlechtliche Leben*) notably did not advance a strict typology (he was an outspoken defender of Hirschfeld’s

⁶ Although space does not allow an in-depth analysis, this is perhaps best illustrated in the work of Herdt, who ventured explicit analogies between “boy-insemination rites” in the 1970s New Guinean Highlands and “coming out rituals” of 1990s US. LGBT teens (Herdt 1997, ch. 4), and wrote about “sexual panics” in the Western world. Herdt on various occasions echoed, and subsequently *only inconsistently* denounced, the language of social scientific typologies of “homosexuality”. By 1997, Herdt’s term was “age-structured homoerotic relationships” yet he curiously retains undefined terms such as “age-asymmetric homosexuality” and “age-structured homosexuality” to designate non-ritual man-boy liaisons (1997, pp. 64–88). Moreover, he found himself—inevitably—maneuvered into increasingly disjunctive discursive positions within the late twentieth-century frame shifts around same-sex intimacies and “child” abuse in a global context. Noteworthy here are his postdoctoral work on psychopathology (and notable collaboration with psychiatrist Robert J. Stoller), his eventual, frustrated involvement in efforts to address cultural dimensions of the APA’s *DSM-IV*, especially its “paraphilic” rubric “pedophilia” (Davis and Herdt 1997), and his speculation about the role of adrenarche (a prepubertal surge in adrenal cortical activity) as an explanatory factor in the prepubescent age, and “psychosexual development”, of fellating initiands (Herdt and McClintock 2000).

universal third-sex theory, and served on Hirschfeld's *Jahrbuch's* editorial board) although they covered many non-Western attestations of age disparity. Early ethnological consensus here served to consolidate then-current assumptions informing the "etiology" of homosexual orientation. Surveying the latter intrigue, Bleys (1996, pp. 190, 236–237, 249, 268) has noted that Karsch-Haack and the wider ethnological impression of the day, construed man-boy sexual liaisons as not clearly separate from what Hirschfeld (in 1906) came to call *Androphilie*. They were at times considered separate from emergent concepts of inborn homosexuality for being occasional (e.g., ritual), transitory, and, hence, in a more morally questionable league. Westermarck (1908, pp. 258–259), furthermore, followed early work by Ellis (as well as Moll) to connect Middle-Eastern *Knabenliebe* to ancient Greek love, highlighting its educational purviews as well as invoking the (Ulrichsian) commonplace that it was the girl-like youth of boys, or indeed their youth per se, that attracted especially the non-effeminate type of man.

Programmatic denials that "urnings" or "homosexualists" or "inverts" were boy-seducers notwithstanding, psychiatric-nosological references to erotic age preferences *per se* did not consolidate until the early 1890s (Janssen 2015). Although the earliest criticisms of eventual clinical diagnoses entailed ethnographically informed objections (notably by Bloch, in 1903), few early twentieth-century ethnologists may have been aware of either Krafft-Ebing's clinical terms *Pädophilie erotica* (coined in 1896) and *Gerontophilie* (1901), or Hirschfeld's later appropriation of these terms, in 1906 and 1914, for his nonclinical typology of male homosexuals. Incidentally, quasi-scientific Greek terms denoting same-sex interests in younger, older, age-equal or age-indifferent partners were actually being coined (by Dutch lawyer Von Römer, in a 1904 *Jahrbuch* article) but they were given no application in any discipline.

Ancient *paidēraistia* had long been considered in broader anthropological frames of initiation rituals, which necessarily stressed participants' generationality and life stages. Interpretations of Dorian *Knabenliebe* in terms of education or initiation, or at least its reading in explicit terms of an "ancient national custom [*Nationalsitte*]" had been offered already in classical philologist Karl Otfried Müller's *Die Dorer* (1824, pp. 289–298), with (rather loose) associations with Papuan initiation rituals drawn already in a 1907 article by his colleague Erich Bethe (for an historical appreciation of this association see Dover 1988). By now, Van Gennep (1909[1960, pp. 171, 172]) also loosely distinguished homosexual acts in terms of rites of initiation (*rites de passage*) and of friendship (*rites de fraternisation*). But only toward the late 1970s, when the history of Greek homosexuality, the cross-cultural comparative model of "homosexualities" and "gay studies" were to rise to a coordinated prominence, were age difference between, and age stratum membership of, lover and beloved made to inform a distinct cross-cultural type of "sexuality", or rather, "sexual system".

This age-defined type was the product of armchair ethnology, connecting philological and historically disparate and often dated ethnohistorical references in the relative absence of contemporary observations, except for late 1970s Melanesian data, offered particularly by Herdt, and their early 1980s assimilation into regional ethnohistorical surveys, also notably by Herdt. How *pederasty* as a "social

obligation” or “social custom” would have to figure in relation to (now increasingly post-psychiatric) *homosexuality* would continue to be hotly contested throughout the 1980s, at first most prominently by classicists. Where Kenneth Dover (1920–2000) had published his *Greek Homosexuality* in 1978, key works followed suit on “institutional pederasty” (Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg 1980, following the author’s important 1978 historical monograph on homosexuality) and on “ritualized homosexual behavior” (Herdt 1981) in Melanesian male initiations. A 1980 article by Dutch classicist Jan N. Bremmer returned to Bethe’s ritual thesis by arguing for “Indo-European parallels” to the ritualization of “pederasty”, and extending this return, classical philologist Harald Patzer’s (1910–2005) 1982 book *Die griechische Knabenliebe* set out to correct the “ethnocentrism” he deemed inherent in the conventional (especially Dover’s) term *homosexuality*. The gesture was in turn rebutted by Dover (1984) and criticized by Halperin (1986, 1989; the latter, in turn, to be criticized by other classicists, including Thomas Hubbard). Works by French ancient historian Sergent (1984, 1986) similarly probed the cross-cultural reach of the ancient model of, in his terms, *homosexualité initiatique*.

But none of these classicists pushed toward a comprehensive cross-cultural differentiation of “homosexuality” by age. Patzner notably provided a six-tiered cross-cultural typology of different purported “motivations” for same-sex sexual acts (pp. 62–66)—not one differentiating social roles, social status hierarchies or demographic variables such as age. It was male North-American sociologists, alongside and in the wake of these early disputations, and as a part of the controversy over essentialist and constructivist theories of sexual identity, who went on to circumscribe “age-stratified homosexuality”. Doing so they notably avoided reference to coeval, and increasingly globalist, discussions concerning child sexual abuse and “pedophilia”. The latter had been given both amateur historical and cross-cultural frames in both feminist and “psychohistorical” work of the 1970s and early 1980s, in respective work by, most notably, Rush (1980) and Lloyd deMause (e.g., 1991). This work’s focus was to survey attestations of purportedly ubiquitous “child” abuse throughout history and across cultures, and while addressing “Greek love” and probing the ethnographic record, it had little if anything to offer to the then emergent epistemological or ontological debates about (homo)sexual identity, let alone queerable or reclaimable pasts.

In short, then, 1980s North American sociological distinctions between gender-differentiated, age-differentiated, and egalitarian, *homosexualities* (among less successful classifications by profession and class) expressed major shifts in conceptualizing *sexualities* against a multiple background of social, legal and not always conversant scholarly debates. The latter included importantly recalibrated ideas about what the 1968 *DSM-II* had called *sexual deviations* (including “homosexuality”), and what the 1980 *DSM-III* would go on to call *paraphilias* (excluding homosexuality *per se*, but retaining “pedophilia”). Based on the Recommendations of the Ninth, 1975, Revision Conference, the WHO’s 1977 *ICD-9* listed both homosexuality “whether or not it is considered as a mental disorder” and pedophilia, but explicitly excluded “homosexual pedophilia” from “homosexuality” (vol. I, p. 196). In an eventual, final revolution of mobilizing parameters, the 1987 *DSM-III-R*, which discarded “ego-dystonic homosexuality” from its list of

mental disorders, invited diagnosticians to make a clinical specification of *pedophilia* in terms of “same sex, opposite sex, or same and opposite sex” direction (APA 1987, p. 285). Between the mid-1970s and mid-1980s, in other words, the “pedophilic homosexual” was becoming a “homosexual pedophile”.

One might say that “age-structured homosexuality” could only begin to have distinct scientific, political and indeed sociological, contours in a place and at the time of “consenting adults” gaining a minimally secure emancipation from culture-wide allegations, in the US. and in West-Europe, of seduction, corruption, “recruitment”, and violation of boys—allegations still aggressively leveled against the gay “lifestyle” in the late 1970s US. (most notoriously by Anita Bryant). They were offered, more specifically, at the historical juncture at which these “homophobic” insinuations of seduction were definitively cross-faded with the novel tropes of “pedophilic grooming” (a term and concept entering the clinical literature circa 1988) and “abused abusers” (an epidemiological concept of “sexual abuse” growing to prominence in the early through mid-1980s).

Age and the Coming of Age of LGBT Studies

Age-disparate courtship and eventual role reversal, however, were also part and parcel of any so-called age-stratified homosexuality. In fact, there was notably still a broad discussion of a presumptive gay “youth orientation” or “youth fetish” on both sides of the Atlantic, inviting critical reflection on age precisely as it informed “the social organization of gay males” (Harry and DeVall 1978, pp. 120–133). Indeed, it is only since the mid-1970s that same-sex age preferences were subject to empirical research in the US. at all (they had been since the 1890s in continental Europe and since the late 1950s in Britain).

The Anglophone anthropology of homosexuality at the time was still coming into its own. In a 1997 article, Murray, who is more than anyone associated with the 1980s–1990s comparative “social organization” model of homosexuality, situated himself in a US. context of still little coverage in mainstream anthropological outlets, still limited organization of LGBT anthropologists, and with little ethnographic work being done. Murray specifically pointed out that among Anglophone anthropologists research attention to “age-stratified” variants was, with the one exception of a few scattered New Guinean tribes, nonexistent. Although historical texts at times still invoke them as taxonomically valid and useful (e.g., Brickell 2012), it seems that, in the Anglophone literature at least, related terms and modes of classification of “social organization” have long become too sensitized to be actively defended by most social scientists other than, indeed, for historical purposes. Recent anthropological writings on homosexuality rarely endorse the mentioned types, or rather operationalize them to fit evolutionary frames (e.g., Kirkpatrick 2000), and thus one is called to look upon the mentioned late-1980s terms with a sense of culture-historical circumspection.

The context of the later coinages was already substantially different from earlier ones, for instance, and there were nontrivial nuances as to the exact respective definitions of terms. These nuances, on hindsight, have significantly gained in

ethico-analytic import throughout the Western world. This pertains in the first instance to the reading of age difference in terms of putative forms of gender hierarchy. Trumbach was originally signaling out cases where “adolescent boys” take on a “passive or feminine” role but abandon it on achieving “adult status” (1977, p. 2), from those where adult males adopt such a role permanently. Focusing less on social status and more on socialization, Adam toyed with a juxtaposition of “intra-gender sexuality, a predominantly male form of same-sex bonding”, including a “Melanesian” and an “ancient” model of boy-man sex, and “trans-gender homosexuality” (1986, p. 31). By now he notably warned that the “structure of the lesbian and gay worlds shows radical breaks with both the intra- and transgenderist forms” (p. 31). Murray comparably differentiated *age-stratified homosexuality*, “in which the younger partner is being socialized to masculine roles (generally the role of a warrior)” from cases in which boys are “used for his elder’s sexual pleasure without concern about the junior partner’s masculine development, and from the few instances in which the younger penetrates the elder” or where women and girls are involved (2000, pp. 5, 23–24). Elsewhere, he footnoted that, “If the age-stratified type is subdivided, it seems to me that inter-generational relationships should be distinguished from those in which contiguous age-classes are paired, or between relations that are believed to masculinize boys and those that are not” (2002, pp. 3, 7n7). In any case, for key typologists of the 1980s, age differentials initially mattered decisively, yet only ever tentatively, in terms of their mapping on the construction, malleability, reinforcement or *cultic* properties of gender. Strictly speaking, then, age-stratification mostly played out in terms of affirming, or reproducing, established binary gender regimes. As noted, Murray doubted the monism of his age-based type but he also wavered in identifying its ontology, conceptualizing types in terms of intimate behavior but just as easily as the projections of “dominant discourses”. Adam (1986) already stressed that various types may answer to dominant as well as less dominant social codes, that if anything sexual configurations are historically unstable, and that their underlying social codes will perennially be subject to diverging interpretations.

These caveats render it all the more dubious, or at least variable, in many cases of “age-stratified homosexuality” whether the “organizing” or “stratifying” emphasis is actually on age or age difference, on gender or its creation, or rather (as seemingly in all cases) on *some acute (if culturally specific) entanglement of ascriptions of maturity, gender, social prestige and sexuality*. This consideration of acute entanglement in fact refers one to the mid-nineteenth emergence of homosexuality in West-European texts (as argued below) and confirms Bleys’ thesis (1996) that one must hold up its anthropology to the historical background of the embryotic legal accommodation, psychiatric declassification and scholarly *Salonfähigkeit* of “consenting adults” today thought of as freed from all insinuations of “stratification”—except for the “role-play” varieties.

Murray’s and colleagues’ eventual rubrications of “age-stratified homosexuality” were coeval with the coming of age of what then was called *gay* or *lesbigay studies* as an interdisciplinary, circum-Atlantic academic research area. Establishing, distinguishing and explaining sexual types and social organizations was a critical agenda of a fledging, self-conscious social scientific community defining, mapping

out, and taking ownership of a new research subject. Most mentioned typologizers knew and reviewed each other's work and met in person.⁷ Canadian sociologist Adam had been a member of the Vancouver Gay Liberation Front already in 1970 and was a founding member of the Gay Caucus of the American Sociological Association as well as a co-founder of the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Studies Association. American sociologist David F. Greenberg also has memberships in LGBT study groups. Murray, also an American sociologist, started off from critical observation of US LGBT culture and post-Foucault historicism, on which he published a small book in 1984, and in which he offers, in the words of a contemporary review, "the beginnings of a Weberian typology of the ideal types of male homosexual social organization across both cultural and historical contexts" (Brotsky 1985, p. 115). The book, as said, pioneered a three-tiered typology of age-, gender- and profession-based same-sex sexual relations but also briefly outlined a purported Western transformation from age- to gender-defined and from gender-defined to gay (not status-defined) homosexualities. It found its way into reviews in mainstream outlets over the course of the late 1980s.

"Homosexual recruitment" now being de-gendered into "pedophilic grooming" by forensic psychologists, and "pedophiles" being increasingly associated with "rationalizations", conspiratorial "rings", theories of "abused abusers", and coerced sexual initiations, there could have been some felt urgency to reflect on the status of "pedophilia's" same-sex variants in terms such as "clinical ethnography" (a term and concept advanced by Herdt, with Stoller, in 1985). Yet only very few articles and books of the 1980s can be seen to begin weighing historical, anthropological and psychiatric discourses of "pedophilia" as they were diverging from those of "homosexuality". One is Barry R. Burg's 1983 study *Sodomy and the Perception of Evil*, which allows comparison to its revised and newly introduced 1995 edition, *Sodomy and the Pirate Tradition*. In the latter, the author situates himself in a changing context of attention to clergy child molestation (1995, p. xxii), adding spice to his earlier attempts to profile buccaneers with a purported age-preference for boys in elaborate analogy to the "pedophiles" described in 1960s North American clinical-forensic studies (pp. 121–128, 187n38–39).

Murray's review of Burg's first book (in a 1989 *Journal of Homosexuality* issue) appropriately lamented this way of analogizing. But to fully appreciate Burg's discursive juggling of seventeenth-century sodomy and 1960's "pedophilia", it is good to recall that at this early date there were few explicit scholarly objections to making "age stratification" part of "gay and lesbian history". At the conclusion of the 1980s, even the U.S. *Journal of Homosexuality* featured a double special issue on what it called *Male Intergenerational Intimacy* (Volume 20, Numbers 1–2, 1990) with historical, philological, ethnological, sociological and clinical contributions. An Amsterdam-based internationally-oriented journal, *Paidika*, articulated this interdisciplinary frame for "boy-love" from its inception in 1987 through to its

⁷ Herdt (1996) cites a 1982 draft of Adam's eventual 1986 article; Greenberg names Murray in an early article briefly discussing "age-asymmetric sexual relationships among males" as being not uncommon in "highly patriarchal societies" (Greenberg and Bystryn 1982, p. 517).

discontinuation in 1995, by that time listing a half-dozen historians of sexuality on its editorial board and having featured interviews with prominent scholars including ethnologist Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg (1992) and anthropologist Herdt (1994). Many commentators were Dutch; negotiations over pedophilia within the Dutch gay community had been subject to critical historical review and reflection already at the outset of the 1980s (Sandfort 1980). Most of that period's short-lived contestation of the age of consent on both sides of the Atlantic centralized, or exclusively focused, on same-sex configurations—virtually always “men” and (teenage) “boys”. In other words, at the time that North American sociologists were surveying and taxonomizing “age-stratified homosexualities”, in Anglophone scholarship of the 1980s and early 1990s, there were still both mainstream homosexuality-identified and fringe “boy-love”-identified platforms seeking to render the interdisciplinary umbrella term *homosexuality* hospitable to contemporary, and worldwide, “man-boy” liaisons.

Adam (1987, pp. 151–156) was among the early few to critically observe the imminent failure of that latter project. Of note here is that this project had been a key article of controversy throughout the slow crystallization of “egalitarian homosexuality” since the mid-nineteenth century. *Paidika*'s eponymous invocation of Greek lovers and loves echoes the earliest modern projections of homosexuality, and of boy-love, onto ancient Greece (for the latter, see an alienist text of 1843, cited in Janssen 2015). And ancient *paiderastia* remained a central object of fascination and commentary for Northern-Western homosexuality well into the 1960s. There were scattered initiatives to boost the imago of the still nameless male love of same-sex adolescents in the wake of the burgeoning “scientific-humanitarian” approach to homosexuality already in the late 1900s (by John Henry Mackay). But most of such pre-WW2 gestures appropriated Greek pederasty's pedagogical and *Männerbund* motifs (which, incidentally, took their inspiration from Heinrich Schurtz's 1902 ethnological work on age classes) and evidenced little interest in either congratulating or contesting the few extant typologies and diagnoses informing same-sex erotic age preferences, let alone elaborate them to a cross-cultural (i.e., other than a universal-ethical-poetic) pertinence.

In the late 1950s one does begin to find proposals to situate scientific research addressing the possible nexus of “homophilia” and “pedophilia” in regions of the world not controlled by religious and ethical qualms present in the Judeo-Christian world (“Ohira” 1958, p. 100). Greek love was tentatively exalted to a cross-cultural, “international” pertinence by American numismatist Walter H. Breen (1928–1993), who, writing under the pseudonym J. Z. Eglinton, published an amateur philological study of the topic in 1964. Juxtaposed to “androphile homosexuality”, by *Greek love* Breen meant “the peculiar ethical/educational love relationship between men and adolescent boys, institutionalized in ancient Greece and various other societies, and found more or less quietly in our own culture even to the present day” (Eglinton 1965, p. 3). Breen's subsequent short-lived journal, published in two issues in 1965–1966, would notably be a place for “cross-cultural studies of patterns analogous to Greek love” (p. 3); his editorial explicitly called for ethnographic observations (p. 4). It had a one-issue revival (*Kalos, On Greek Love*) in 1976, but the project was subsequently watered down to scattered amateur contributions to

various West-European and US periodicals of various “man-boy love” and “pedophile emancipation” varieties. One of the earliest and most ambitious contributors to this scene was Dutch jurist and one-time senator Edward Brongersma (1911–1998) whose late-1950s work, published in an early Dutch homophile magazine, already deconstructed Western sexual typology (with recourse to the Kinsey scale) to make cross-cultural room for *knappenliefde* (boy love) involving post-pubescent boys. As Breen, Brongersma consistently gave the latter the grandeur of being “of all times and peoples” (citing Goethe: 1959, p. 87; 1986, p. 90).

As cited above, anthropologists notably took until the mid-1980s to ratify a typological split between “homosexualities” on the basis of age, with only a few telling exceptions. Not cited by Breen or Brongersma, in 1961 Gorer (1905–1985) ventured a typology of “homosexualities” where he defined *institutionalized pederasty* as involving “an age differential (typically a generation, but in some age-grade societies an age-group) between the partners, the older being the lover and the younger the beloved; and in many societies only the lover is meant to achieve genital gratification” (1961, p. 75). *Androphilia*, by contrast, was the new term for and fashionable among consenting same-sex-loving adults; Gorer’s more archaic term and concept of *pathicism*, finally, referred to passive homosexuals.⁸ Gorer notably also recognized a “minor” homosexuality called *pedophilia*. He does not comment on it, suggesting that it was considered “grossly pathological” in all known societies. The occasion for Gorer’s ad hoc typology, which is devoid of references, was notably his favorable review of an important study of homosexuality in Britain (Schofield 1960) that was still one of the few to paint a new respectable, research-based image of “the male homosexual”. In the wake of and echoing the 1957 *Wolfenden Report*, here the “adult-seeking” androphilic homosexual was juxtaposed to the figure of “the pedophile” now considered to represent a distinct, and distinctly marginal, subtype of homosexual. Much the same studies and gestures were appearing by that time (late 1950s) in Germany, The Netherlands, Denmark, and elsewhere. Of note, in some countries, a discriminatively high homosexual age of consent was still being faced (for instance until 1971 in The Netherlands, until 1973 in Germany, until 1976 in Denmark, and even until 2000 in the UK).

The 1960s anthropological demarcations of age-specific same-sex sexualities proposed independently in Gorer’s book review, Breen’s self-taught classical studies, and Brongersma’s early “pedophile” advocacy, co-occur in the timeframe of early homophile emancipation and the prospect of legal accommodation of at least “egalitarian”, and possibly also less egalitarian, varieties of same-sex intimacy. However, in the social sciences next to nothing was done with these gestures until homosexuality had become the legitimate scholarly focus it can be said to have become, at least in some disciplines and to some extent, by the late 1970s. Earlier cross-cultural surveys of homosexuality by Clellan Ford (with Frank Beach), Hermann Baumann, Wainwright Churchill, and Marvin K. Opler, for

⁸ Gorer claimed limited first-hand observations on “pathics” and “pederasty” among the Senegalese Wolof, about which he briefly commented in a 1935 book (reprinted as late as 1983; 1949, pp. 26, 176). In the preceding year he had published a book on the Marquis de Sade, in which he also briefly touched upon homosexuality.

instance, did not clearly isolate a typological role for age, although all did generalize across cultures in brief allusions to initiatory and pedagogical “roles”, “functions” or “forms”. Gregersen’s popular and brief cross-cultural appraisal (1982[1983, pp. 295–297]) still invoked Gorer’s typology. Notwithstanding, cross-cultural correlational studies of “homosexuality” did not differentiate between types until the mid-1990s (Crapo 1995). The latter narrowly focused on “mentorships”, meaning male same-sex sexual “relationships between persons of different age groups (e.g., generations or age-graded categories) and social standing” (p. 185).

While in the 1980s similar demarcations were being advanced, as cited, they went on to be criticized throughout the 1990s. Herdt did fieldwork on “Sambian” male initiation in 1974–6, 1979 and 1981, completing his dissertation in 1977. His use of terms in reference to ritual cycles across Oceania was substantially criticized already by the early 1990s, with Herdt himself (1991, 1993) and Deborah Elliston (1995) proposing corrective terms including “boy-inseminating rites [or *relationships* or *practices*]” and “semen practices”, respectively. Early commentators including Knauff (1993, ch.3) retained both earlier and new terms, while duly warning that the latter risked the same homogenizing and reifying applications. Reiterating and complicating this terminological caveat a decade onward, Knauff observed that the practices in question (among Gebusi, in the early 1980s, at least) had themselves become “behaviorally vestigial or moribund” (2003, p. 137). Incidentally, while the term *pedophilia* is still exceptionally rarely used by anthropologists and was explicitly warned against by anthropologists writing in the mid-1990s who were also rethinking their use of “homosexuality” (notably Herdt), it was on occasion used in the mid-1980s by European Melanesianists Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg (1985) and, referring to early 1960s fieldwork, Serpenti (1984). Soon after, the term was effectively displaced by what itself, as argued, soon proved to have been an only briefly palatable concept, that of “age-structured homosexualities.”

The latter are today expectedly framed in terms of organized juvenile prostitution, “abuse”, “grooming”, and “trafficking”. While very few anthropologists are on record in endorsing such frames, remarkably few have dared to embrace the competing, “homosexualities” frame: as noted, those who might have, in the early 1990s, were instead already weaning themselves from the latter term and its conceptual baggage. Interestingly, especially during the 1990s “pedophilia” went on to be considered a “morbidity” of distinctly cultural, trans-jurisdictional and intercontinental proportions, with especially Western and White, if also Orientalist (especially Japanese),⁹ connotations of “fetishized” innocence. Yet to date, very little has been published on the evident globalization of the concept and term. The term *pedophilia* is ubiquitously used in reference to any “child” sexual abuse, including any “child” sex tourism, but rarely with the explicit intention to construe *abusers* as, in post-1980 APA and WHO terms, “paraphiles”.¹⁰ In fact,

⁹ A 1976 book on *Japanese Patterns of Behavior* already briefly alluded to a specifically Japanese “Lolita syndrome” (Lebra 1976, p. 63).

¹⁰ The UN and WHO have had a tendency to define *child*, in this context, as anyone under age 18. The WHO’s acultural concept of “pedophilia” as a “paraphilia” has ranged from involvement of “early pubertal” and younger (*ICD-10*) to “prepubertal” (*ICD-11 beta draft*) ages, which, to date, has effectively medicalized many if not most forms of age-stratified homosexuality.

culture critics have classically stressed precisely that such abuse is integral to (“symptomatic” of) what are variably characterized as patriarchal and misogynic power structures, especially those associated with church hierarchies. Similarly focused critical readings of “homosexual” initiations were notably being offered already by the mid-1980s (e.g., Creed 1984).

Age and the Invention of “Egalitarian Homosexuality”

The sketched terminological musical chairs recalls the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century invention of modern “homosexuality”, and indeed requires some further historical footnoting with a light on “age-structuring” which curiously has not been offered by the “comparative sociologists” of “homosexualities” themselves. The social-scientific “othering” of what in the 1980s came to be called “age-stratified homosexuality” has been an integral and ongoing problem in figurations of sexual diversity in the Anglo-European history of ideas. Erotic age preference centrally informed the earliest theories of homosexuality and subsequent, early “sexual pathology” typologies. It is here that erotic age preferences were first typologically acknowledged or, in the case of “pedophilia” (*avant la lettre*), pathologized. This is such that the emergence of the late twentieth-century ethnohistorical frames for age-stratified homosexuality discussed above would appear more integral to West-European constructions of homosexuality—indeed *sexual orientation*—per se, than has been reflected in the literature proposing these frames. In any case, Anglo-American authorities on “age-stratified homosexualities” writing in the 1980s and beyond did not refer to the primary historical sources, and neither did their early (Elliston 1995), and subsequent (e.g., Blackwood 2002), critics.

Gender and maturity have often proven interrelated in vernacular and scientific conceptualizations of both sexual subjects and objects. Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century reflections on *Knabenliebe* evidence a widespread tendency to normalize male boy-love and to advance naturalistic explanations, rather, for more egalitarian same-sex attractions, honoring the governing hetero-naturalistic idea that opposites attract. To early homosexuality theorists, men who fancied young boys were consequently considered closer to womanizers, and hence less marked by pathology, than were “true inverters”. For instance, as late as 1904 Moll qualified only men attracted to *adult* males as such.

This pervasive scientific hunch went on to animate early psychoanalytic notions and typologies of sexual diversity; however, it is attested already in the earliest European typologies of homosexuality, and thus, of sexual orientation in general. Where *päderastia* was honored by substantive (monograph-length) German-language studies and reappraisals in the 1820s and 1830s, in the 1860s “homosexuality” emerged as a distinct male age-preference for young men, and where first typologized, by Ulrichs in 1865, the dimensions of gender habitus, gender-of-attraction and age-of-attraction were still considered closely co-inflected. Ulrichs as well as his correspondent Kertbeny (who coined the term *homosexuality* in German) specified their new concepts of “man-manly love” in newly theorized

terms of gender habitus, and this had explanatory purchase on observed variations of preference for either youthfulness or maturity in same-sex beloveds. If homosexuality, *avant la lettre*, had been largely age-stratified (“pederastic”) in the European experience, as Trumbach claims for the British case, age and age differences now became explicit typological and *defining* parameters of sexual variance, at the occasion of a new project that served to acknowledge and accommodate consenting “adults” (*Erwachsenen*) in necessarily precise, legal terms. In the case of Ulrichs, however, homosexuality (*Urningtum*) was a postpubescent but not yet “egalitarian” affair. Rather, it was named and typologized to reflect the variable ages of involved beloveds (postpubescent youths and young adults) as well as the ages of beloveds *not* to be involved (prepubescent *Knaben*, i.e., boys below age 14). The invention of modern homosexuality, in sum, was coterminous with the specification of included and excluded age strata.

Moreover, both Northern European authors already explicitly wrestled with the problems posed by reports of Southern and non-Western age-differentiated “homosexualities”, such as coming from Albania and Turkey (Ulrichs 1865, p. viii; Kertbeny 1869, pp. 70–72). In fact, Kertbeny and Ulrichs came near to providing the first *anthropological* typologies of homosexuality. Kertbeny distinguished Northern men-loving inborn homosexualists and Southern youth-loving homosexualists (including Greek lovers). The latter, boy-loving kind would be seen as well among the ranks of elderly Northern former-“normalsexuals” whose interest in feminine youths would strike one only as presenting a less acute “riddle of nature” than presented by the typical Northern pattern of male erotic interest in the adult male, which Ulrichs famously decrypted in terms of “a female soul enclosed in a male body” (see a recent appraisal by Leck 2016). Ulrichs included boy-loving Turks and Albanians in his delineation of *Urningtum*, however, as they fitted his urning type of the *Mannling* (“manling”) loving girlish youths from puberty onward, as opposed to *Weiblings* (“womanlings”) loving sturdy adult men. The reported involvement of young teens would qualify intimacies for the former type, given the earlier male pubescence age in Southern spheres Ulrichs cites.

It may have been that Ulrichs, often named the first typologist and theorist of homosexuality, was also the very first to explicitly pathologize (male same-sex) pedophilia as such (Janssen 2015). Ulrichs and Kertbeny already dissociated homosexuality from *Pädophilie erotica*, which was definitively named and pronounced a “psychosexual perversion” in 1896. Even at this late stage, “contrary sexual feeling” was generally thought to give rise to age-differentiated romances between a man and a youth or young man (“an elder and a younger man”, in Oscar Wilde’s famous 1895 self-defense), although by this time, it was broadly agreed with Ulrichs and Kertbeny that the *invert*, or *urning*, would not fancy prepubescent boys.

The dichotomy was importantly legal, with the Austro-German age of consent *and* the putative average male pubescence age converging at 14 years. However, with twentieth-century rises in the Western age of consent and lowering pubescence ages, a growing gap can be seen to have emerged in what to call pathological (prepubescent) and what to call normal (legal) preferential ages, despite the youth-centered “sexual revolution” of the 1960s and 1970s. Proponents of “age-stratified

homosexuality” largely avoided critical discussion of the emergence of this Western gap as it was still growing, which may help explain its short-lived and only ever debatable standing in anthropology and history alike.

In sum, then, not only is the topic of “age-stratification” negotiated in the earliest modern delineations of homosexuality (and with this, *sexual orientation per se*), modern homosexuality was explicitly and importantly *defined* and campaigned as a distinct and exclusive erotic age-preference: for youths or mature men (and, sporadically, elderly men), at the exclusion of younger boys. Of note, before pedophilia was pronounced a perversion, in 1896 by forensic psychiatrist Krafft-Ebing, in the late 1880s he already pronounced it something homosexuals (*Conträrsexuale*) were not. If *regardless of gender* pedophilia indeed seemed a distinct “perversion” to mid-1890s proponents of sexual psychopathology and sodomy law reformers alike, such a clinical verdict could neither immediately nor straightforwardly lay claim to an anthropological accreditation. In fact, little was made of “pedophilia” until it was increasingly juxtaposed to and differentiated from domestic “homophilia” toward the end of the 1950s. And as reviewed, this is where one sees both pro-pederastic (Breen, Brongersma) and pro-homophilic (Gorer) authors projecting across cultures age-disparate homosexuality *as a distinct cultural-psychological entity*.

Conclusion

Anthropologizing the Coming of Age of Homosexuality

Mentioned historical findings have been rarely stressed but they suggest that the late twentieth-century social scientific appraisal of “age-stratified homosexualities” may be considered integral to, even today, ongoing negotiations over what homosexuality is to exclude to be accepted as a scholarly topic. The contemporary legalistic, “egalitarian”, concept of consenting “adults” was explicitly voiced by Ulrichs in 1870, in the same series of pamphlets that pronounced pedophilia, *avant la lettre*, as “morbid” *per se*. The same political project still informed Gorer’s early 1960s typology although by now it was framed in behavioristic (though nevertheless pathologizing) terms. But as Ulrichs’, Gorer’s and later typologies reflect, there is no straightforward anthropological, nor a straightforward psychological, distinction between an erotic interest and its codification. Hence, any focus on or belaboring of the former, *or* the latter, is a socio-political event in its own right: a new instance of codification in any case. As shown, ethnographic observations have thus from the very beginning been, and will continue to be, caught up in changing codifications.

Whether Ulrichs’ project can be considered to have voiced and promoted a modern Western passage from increasingly untenable age-stratified to increasingly less untenable gender-stratified paradigms of non-heterosexual intimacies, is debatable. In any case, the repudiation of age stratification in the new discursive form of paraphilic “pedophilia”, a pathological discourse liberally projected onto “all societies” already by Gorer, was still critical to the establishment of international LGBT corporate identities in the early 1990s. Moreover, its known

outcome still triggered criticism during the late 1990s (Gamson 1997, pp. 183–187; Graupner 1999). In other words, it may be inevitable to consider 1980s and 1990s anthropological, and quasi-evolutionist, typologies of homosexuality as integral to the then still very much ongoing circumscription of homosexuality as a type of “variant” sexuality. This is all the more intriguing given the fact that the late-1980s authors were already explicitly questioning and deconstructing unitary and normative concepts and constructions of “the homosexual”, and that they worked on the eve of the formulation of queer theoretical, and eventually queer anthropological, vantage points.

“Queer anthropological” approaches to the distinctly Western, particularly American, trope of “pedophilia”, however, have been very few, apart from the few notes offered apropos today’s flagship case of Central Asian *bacha bāzī* (a case, incidentally, already discussed by Burton in 1886). In the Anglophone experience, the 1970s Anthropology Research Group on Homosexuality took off only in the late 1980s, when it changed its name to Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists. Its *Newsletter* (1979–2003) has expectedly never extended its incidental discussion of the sociological typology of “homosexualities” to the coeval psychiatric-neurological containment of “pedophilia” (or, more recently and controversially, “hebephilia”). If *pedophilia* was still a type of homosexuality to Gorer in the 1960s context of British LGBT emancipation, the term has long become unfit for use anywhere near LGBT objectives, all the more if one’s writings have to be sold widely to a Western general audience sensitized to the geopolitical status quo.

Where this leaves “age-stratified homosexualities” remains concomitantly problematic—indeed: as problematic as ever. As suggested, its advocated merit as a social-scientific type has a distinct and notably recent, Western, historical-political profile. The rubric importantly *typifies* the history-anthropology of sexuality that it purportedly only helps mapping. It interestingly informed a cartography, as well as a social history, of sexual diversity aimed at identifying variance within variance. In this dual capacity it can be said to have had risqué aspects as it sidestepped then clearly hardening domestic psychiatric frames for the “chronophilias”, as Johns Hopkins gender researcher John Money (1921–2006) called erotic age orientations in 1986.¹¹ It also had historically intriguing “homonormative” dimensions, insofar as typological distinctions were projected on a problematically heterogeneous archive of desires and intimacies without much reflective interest in such distinctions and projections as *themselves* historically and culturally pivotal steps toward gay “egalitarianism”, that is, the absence *and* programmatic rejection of stratification. If the latter named a “type”, however, it certainly named a type of assimilationist concession, and “pride” at this point is clearly tied up with how one chooses to own up to this gesture’s history. Recalling “age-stratified homosexualities”, as argued, seems an inevitable part of this choice.

¹¹ Money coined the term *transcultural sexuality* in the same year (recalling Hirschfeld’s *Sexualtheologie*). Much like Herdt’s, Money’s oeuvre evidences a problematic suspension between psychopathology, psychology, anthropology and culture critique that stood a poor chance of solving questions hovering over the contemporary “homosexualities” literature. Recent overviews (Seto 2016) testify to the fact that 30 years onward, the topic of “chronophilias” remains colonized by forensic psychologists evidencing little interest in dialogue with the original comparative sociologists or anthropologists.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of interest Author declares that he has no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

- Adam, B. D. (1985). Structural foundations of the gay world. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 27, 658–671.
- Adam, B. D. (1986). Age, structure, and sexuality: Reflections on the anthropological evidence on homosexual relations. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11(3–4), 19–33.
- Adam, B. D. (1987). *The rise of a gay and lesbian movement*. Boston, MA: Twayne.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author. **(revised)**.
- Baer, J. (2003). Kandahar: Closely watched Pashtuns—A critique of western journalists' reporting bias about 'gay Kandahar'. *Gay and Lesbian Review*, March–April.
- Blackwood, E. (2002). Reading sexualities across cultures: Anthropology and theories of sexuality. In E. Lewin & W. L. Leap (Eds.), *Out in theory* (pp. 69–92). Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg, G. (1980). *Mannbarkeitsriten*. Frankfurt: Ullstein Verlag.
- Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg, G. (1985). Der pädophile Impuls. Wie lernt ein junger Mensch Sexualität? *Der Monat neue Folge*, 294, 175–192.
- Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg, G. (1992). Interview. *Paidika*, 2(4), 21–26.
- Bleys, R. C. (1996). *The geography of perversion: Male-to-male sexual behavior outside the West and the ethnographic imagination 1750–1918*. London: Cassell.
- Boellstorff, T. (2005). *The gay archipelago: Sexuality and nation in Indonesia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brickell, C. (2012). 'Waiting for Uncle Ben': Age-structured homosexuality in New Zealand, 1920–1950. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 21(3), 467–495.
- Brodsky, J. (1985). Review: Social theory, homosexual realities, Gai Saber Monograph No. 3 by Stephen O. Murray. *Mid-American Review of Sociology*, 10(2), 115–118.
- Brongersma, E. [O. Bruno] (1959). Pedofilie: Een plaatsbepaling. *Vriendschap (Netherlands)*, 14(June), 87–88.
- Brongersma, E. (1986). *Loving boys* (Vol. 1). Elmhurst, NY: Global Academic Publishers.
- Burg, B. R. (1995). *Sodomy and the pirate tradition: English sea rovers in the seventeenth-century Caribbean*. New York: New York University Press.
- Burton, R. F. (1886). *The book of the thousand nights and a night*. Vol. X. The Burton Club.
- Childs, M. H. (1980). Chigo Monogatari. Love stories or Buddhist sermons? *Monumenta Nipponica*, 35(2), 127–151.
- Crapo, R. H. (1995). Factors in the cross-cultural patterning of male homosexuality: A reappraisal of the literature. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29(2), 178–202.
- Creed, G. W. (1984). Sexual subordination: Institutionalized homosexuality and social control in Melanesia. *Ethnology*, 23, 157–176.
- Davis, D. L., & Herdt, G. (1997). Cultural sensitivity and the sexual disorders. In T. Widiger, A. Frances, H. Pincus, R. Ross, M. First, & W. Davis (Eds.), *DSM-IV sourcebook* (Vol. 3, pp. 191–208). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association Press.
- de Kerville, H. G. (1896). *Perversion sexuelle chez des coléoptères mâles: Description d'un coléoptère anormal (Harpalus Serripes)*. Rouen: Imprimerie Julien Lecercf.
- deMause, L. (1991). The universality of incest. *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 19, 157–164.
- Devereux, G. (1937). Institutional homosexuality of the Mohave Indians. *Human Biology*, 9, 498–627.
- Donaldson, S., & Dynes, W. R. (1990). Typology of homosexuality. In W. R. Dynes (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of homosexuality* (Vol. 2, pp. 1332–1337). New York, NY: Garland.
- Doran, J. (2010). *The dancing boys of Afghanistan*. England: Clover Films.
- Dover, K. J. (1978). *Greek homosexuality*. London: Duckworth.

- Dover, K. J. (1984). Book review of Patzer (1982). *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 104, 239–240.
- Dover, K. J. (1988). Greek homosexuality and initiation. In *The Greeks and their legacy: Collected papers, Vol. II: Prose Literature, History, Society, Transmission, Influence* (pp. 115–134). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Eglinton, J. Z. [W. Breen] (1964 [1971]). *Greek love*. London: Neville Spearman Ltd.
- Eglinton, J.Z. [W. Breen] (1965). Introducing a new journal. *International Journal of Greek Love*, 1(1), 3–4.
- Elliston, D. A. (1995). Erotic anthropology: “Ritualized homosexuality” in Melanesia and beyond. *American Ethnologist*, 22(4), 848–867.
- Funke, J. (2013). ‘We cannot be Greek now’: Age difference, corruption of youth and the making of sexual inversion. *English Studies*, 94, 139–153.
- Gagnon, J. H. (1987). Out of sexuality: A sociologist’s journal. *Contemporary Sociology*, 16(2), 238–240.
- Gamson, J. (1997). Messages of exclusion: Gender, movements, and symbolic boundaries. *Gender & Society*, 11, 178–199.
- Gerard, K. (1989). Book review of Murray (1984). *Journal of Homosexuality*, 16(1–2), 492–498.
- Gorer, G. (1949 [1935]). *Africa dances: A book about West African Negroes*. London: John Lehmann.
- Gorer, G. (1961). Man to man. *Encounter*, 88, 73–78.
- Graupner, H. (1999). Love versus abuse: Crossgenerational sexual relations of minors: A gay rights issue? *Journal of Homosexuality*, 37(4), 23–56.
- Greenberg, D. F. (1988). *The construction of homosexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Greenberg, D. F. (1990). The socio-sexual milieu of the Love-Letters. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 19(2), 93–104.
- Greenberg, D. F., & Bystryn, M. H. (1982). Christian intolerance of homosexuality. *American Journal of Sociology*, 88(3), 515–548.
- Gregersen, E. (1983). *Sexual practices: The story of human sexuality*. New York, NY: Franklin Watts.
- Halperin, D. M. (1986). One hundred years of homosexuality. *Diacritics*, 16(2), 34–45.
- Halperin, D. M. (1989). Normalizing Greek desire. In P. Culham & L. Edmunds (Eds.), *Classics: A discipline and profession in crisis?* (pp. 257–273). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hammer, E. F., & Glueck, B. C., Jr. (1955). Psychodynamic patterns in the sex offender. I. Fear of the adult female sex object and feelings of genital inadequacy. In P. H. Hoch & J. Zubin (Eds.), *Psychiatry and the law* (pp. 157–168). New York/London: Grune & Stratton.
- Harry, J., & DeVall, W. B. (1978). *The social organization of gay males*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Harvey, J. (1987). *The homosexual person: New thinking in pastoral care*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Herdt, G. (1994). Interview. *Paidika*, 3(2), 2–17.
- Herdt, G. H. (1981). *Guardians of the flutes*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Herdt, G. (1991). Representations of homosexuality in traditional societies: An essay on cultural ontology and historical comparison, Part II. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 1(4), 603–632.
- Herdt, G. H. (1993). Introduction to the paperback edition. In G. H. Herdt (Ed.), *Ritualized homosexuality in Melanesia* (pp. 7–44). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Herdt, G. H. (1996). Issues in the cross-cultural study of homosexuality. In R. P. Cabaj & T. S. Stein (Eds.), *Textbook of homosexuality and mental health* (pp. 65–82). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Herdt, G. H. (1997). *Same sex, different cultures*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Herdt, G., & McClintock, M. (2000). The magical age of 10. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 29, 587–606.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1912). Sexualwissenschaft als Grundlage der Sexualreform. In M. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Mutterschutz und Sexualreform. Referate und Leitsätze des I. Internationalen Kongresses für Mutterschutz und Sexualreform in Dresden 28./30. September 1911* (pp. 75–84). Breslau: Preuss & Jünger.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1938). *Racism*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Janssen, D. F. (2015). “Chronophilia”: Entries of erotic age preference into descriptive psychopathology. *Medical History*, 59(4), 575–598.
- Karsch-Haack, F. (1906). *Das gleichgeschlechtliche Leben der Ostasiaten*. Munich: Seitz & Schauer.
- Karsch-Haack, F. (1911). *Das gleichgeschlechtliche Leben der Naturvölker*. Munich: E. Reinhardt.
- Kertbeny, K.M. [anon.] (1869). §143 des preussischen Strafgesetzbuches vom 14. April 1851 und seine Aufrechterhaltung als §152 im Entwurfe eines Strafgesetzbuches für den Norddeutschen Bund. Leipzig: Serbe.
- Kind, A. (1908). Homosexualität und Volkskunde. *Anthropophyteia*, 5, 197–203.
- Kirkpatrick, R. C. (2000). The evolution of human homosexual behavior. *Current Anthropology*, 41(3), 384–413.

- Knauft, B. M. (1993). *South Coast New Guinea cultures: History, comparison, dialectic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knauft, B. M. (2003). What ever happened to ritualized homosexuality? Modern sexual subjects in Melanesia and elsewhere. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 14(1), 137–159.
- Layard, J. W. (1930). Shamanism: An analysis based on comparison with the flying tricksters of Malekula. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 60, 525–550.
- Lebra, T. S. (1976). *Japanese patterns of behavior*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.
- Leck, R. M. (2016). *Vita sexualis: Karl Ulrichs and the origins of sexual science*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Manchanda, N. (2015). Queering the Pashtun: Afghan sexuality in the homo-nationalist imaginary. *Third World Quarterly*, 36(1), 130–146.
- Michelsson-Dorpat, G. (1912). Article review. *Zentralblatt für Athropologie*, 17, 341–342.
- Muensterberger, W. (1956). Perversion, cultural norm and normality. In S. Lorand & M. Balint (Eds.), *Perversions: Psychodynamics and therapy* (pp. 55–67). New York, NY: Random House.
- Müller, K. O. (1824). *Die Dorier, Part 2* (Vols. 3, 4). Breslau: Josef Max.
- Murray, S. O. (1984). *Social theory, homosexual realities*. New York, NY: Gay Academic Union.
- Murray, S. O. (1992a). Introduction: Homosexuality in cross-cultural perspective. In S. O. Murray (Ed.), *Oceanic homosexualities* (pp. xiii–xl). New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Murray, S. O. (1992b). Age-stratified homosexuality: Introduction. In S. O. Murray (Ed.), *Oceanic homosexualities* (pp. 3–23). New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Murray, S. O. (1997). Explaining away same-sex sexualities: When they obtrude on anthropologists' notice at all. *Anthropology Today*, 13(3), 2–5.
- Murray, S. O. (2000). *Homosexualities*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Murray, S. O. (2002). *Pacific homosexualities*. Lincoln, NE: Writers Club Press.
- Näcke, P. (1904). Die Homosexualität im Oriente. *Archiv für Kriminal-Anthropologie und Kriminalistik*, 16, 353–355.
- Ohira, (1958). Paedophilie en deskundigheid. *Vriendschap [The Netherlands]*, 13(7/8), 99–100.
- Patzer, H. (1982). *Die griechische Knabenliebe*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Rahman, T. (1988). Ephebophilia: The case for the use of a new word. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 24(2), 126–141.
- Rush, F. (1980). *The best kept secret*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sandfort, T. (1980). Het COC en de pedofilie. *Homologie (The Netherlands)*, 1(Sept.), n.p.
- Schofield, M. ["Gordon Westwood"]. (1960). *A minority: A report on the life of the male homosexual in Great Britain*. London: Longmans.
- Sergent, B. (1984). *L'homosexualité dans la mythologie grecque*. Paris: Payot.
- Sergent, B. (1986). *L'homosexualité initiatique dans l'Europe ancienne*. Paris: Payot.
- Serpenti, L. (1984). The ritual meaning of homosexuality and pedophilia among the Kimam-Papuans of South Irian Jaya. In G. H. Herdt (Ed.), *Ritualized homosexual behavior in Melanesia* (pp. 292–317). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Seto, M. C. (2016). The puzzle of male chronophilias. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. doi:10.1007/s10508-016-0799-y.
- Sonenschein, D. (1968). The ethnography of male homosexual relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 4(2), 69–83.
- Stoll, O. (1908). *Das Geschlechtsleben in der Völkerpsychologie*. Leipzig: Verlag von Veit & Comp.
- Trumbach, R. (1977). London's sodomites: Homosexual behavior and western culture in the 18th Century. *Journal of Social History*, 11(1), 1–33.
- Trumbach, R. (1990). Sodomy transformed: Aristocratic libertinage, public reputation and the gender revolution in the 18th Century. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 19(4), 105–124.
- Ulrichs, K. H. (1864). *Vindex, Social-juristische Studien über mannmannliche Geschlechtsliebe*. Leipzig: Matthes.
- Ulrichs, K. H. (1865). *Ara Spei*. Leipzig: Matthes.
- Van Gennep, A. (1960). *The rites of passage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Original work published 1909).
- Westermarck, E. (1908). Homosexualität. *Sexual-Probleme*, 4, 248–279.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (1977). *Manual of the international statistical classification of diseases, injuries, and causes of death* (Vol. 1). Geneva: WHO.