

‘Chronophilia’: Entries of Erotic Age Preference into Descriptive Psychopathology

DIEDERIK F. JANSSEN*

Independent researcher, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Abstract: A scientific nomenclature of *erotic age preferences* informed the mid- through late nineteenth century joint appearance of homosexuality and sexual abuse of minors on the medico-legal scene. Yet, even in the twenty-first century, legal, psychiatric and culture-critical dimensions of related terms are rarely cleanly distinguished. Review of primary sources shows the ongoing Western suspension of notions of ‘sick desire’, alongside and beyond the medicalisation of homosexuality, between metaphor, legal interdiction and postulated psychopathology. Virtually all early attention to erotic age preference occurred in the context of emergent attention to erotic gender preference. Age of attraction and age difference centrally animate modern homosexuality’s pre-modern past; its earliest psychiatric nomenclature and typologies (1844–69); its early aetiologies stipulating degrees of sexual differentiation (1890s); its concomitant sub-classification (1896–1914); its earliest psychophysiological tests (1950s); and, finally, its post-psychiatric, social scientific typologies (1980s). Several identifications of ‘paedophilia’ were seen throughout the 1890s but as a trope it gained cultural momentum only during, and as a seemingly intriguing corollary of, the progressive depsychiatricisation of homosexuality across the Anglo-European world (late 1950s through 1980s). Early twentieth century sources varied in having it denote (1) a distinct perversion, thus possible ‘complication’ of sexual inversion (2) a discrete corollary of psychosexual differentiation akin to gender preference (3) a distinct subtype of fetishism, thus a likely imprint of early seduction (4) a more intricate expression of erotic symbolism or psychosexual complex or (5) a taste answering to culture, a lack of it, or a libertine disregard for it.

Keywords: Sexology, Psychiatry, Erotic Age-Orientation, Paedophilia, Homosexuality

* Email address for correspondence: diederikjanssen@gmail.com

I am most grateful to the anonymous readers and the editorial team for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. Findings were summarised in a poster presented at the conference ‘Classifying Sex: Debating DSM-5’ held 4–5 July 2013, at the University of Cambridge.

Psychiatric understandings of paedophilia are an outcome of the medicalisation of everyday crime, suggested Thomas Szasz (1920–2012).¹ Forensic notions of sick desire rely on metaphors applied to crimes, not medical science. Szasz's position is at odds with much of contemporary forensic psychology. Yet, it appears consistent with his critique of sexual nosology at mid-century, where he observes that 'homosexuality is an illness because heterosexuality is the social norm'.² Scattered references to *paedophilia* in nineteenth-century descriptive psychopathology, discussed below, are indeed very much entangled with coeval debates about how to appreciate *widernatürliche Unzucht* [unnatural vice] in the new psycho-medical framework of *Konträrsexualismus* [sexual inversion]. These references foreshadow many comparable twentieth-century debates, for instance, about whether to psychiatricise gay bashing in terms of *acute homosexual panic* (or *Kempf's Disease*, coined by Edward John Kempf in 1920), or rape in terms of *raptophilia* or *biastophilic rapism* (early 1980s terms by John Money) or *sexual assault disorder* (included in the first, 1976, *DSM-III* draft) or *paraphilic coercive disorder* (considered for inclusion in *DSM-III-R* in 1985 but voted down the next year).³ In these cases, invocation of terms like *disease*, *paraphilia* and *disorder* makes cultural, legal and commercial sense when made to speak either to insanity defence strategies or to evaluations of civil commitment criteria.

Distinctions between criminal and madman have always been central to forensic psychiatry and pre-date 'paedophilia' by more than half a century. A generic 'differential diagnosis' between *perversité morale* [moral perversity] and *perversion malade* [morbid perversion] informed French alienism in the early nineteenth century.⁴ It was explicitly discussed by an author who ventured one of the early psychiatric taxonomies of sexual deviation, marking the subdivision of 'perversion de l'instinct génésique' [perversion of the reproductive instinct] into discrete 'perversions' – including *philopédie*.⁵ The dichotomy was still critical to the author who would coin the term *paedophilia erotica* nearly half a century later, Richard von Krafft-Ebing.⁶ Indeed, it prominently informed the 1896 article where this coinage takes place, which adds the term to a then familiar breakdown of 'nonpsychopathological' and 'psychopathological' child abusers.⁷

¹ Thomas Szasz, *The Medicalization of Everyday Life: Selected Essays* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2007), 94–101.

² Thomas Szasz, *The Myth of Mental Illness* (New York: Hoeber-Harper, 1961), 45.

³ Complementary sets of sensibilities and caveats have come into play where rape has been conceptualised in terms of *rape trauma syndrome* (coined by psychiatrist Ann Wolbert Burgess and sociologist Lynda Lytle Holmstrom in 1974), child molestation in terms of *sexual abuse accommodation syndrome* (conceptualised by Roland Summit in 1982) and incest in terms of *incest survivor syndrome* (introduced by Sam and Diana Kirschner in 1993). For brief historical reference see Joseph T. McCann, Kelley L. Shindler and Tammy R. Hammond, 'The Science and Pseudoscience of Expert Testimony', in Scott O. Lilienfeld, Steven Jay Lynn and Jeffrey M. Lohr (eds), *Science and Pseudoscience in Clinical Psychology* (New York: Guilford Press, 2004), 77–108.

⁴ Julie Mazaleigue, *Histoire de la Perversion Sexuelle. Émergence et Transformations du Concept de Perversion Sexuelle dans la Psychiatrie de 1797 à 1912* (unpublished PhD thesis: Université de Picardie Jules Verne, 2010).

⁵ Claude-François Michéa, 'Caractères qui Permettent de Distinguer la Perversion Malade de la Perversité Morale', *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, II-4 (1852), 440–7; 'Des Déviations Malades de l'Appétit Vénérien', *l'Union Médicale*, 3/85 (17 July 1849), 338–9.

⁶ Krafft-Ebing mentions the *Perversität–Perversion*, or *Laster–Krankheit* [vice–disease], distinction in the first edition of his *Psychopathia Sexualis* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1886, 35). It was picked up in contemporary reviews (eg. in *Münchener Medizinische Wochenschrift*, 33, 40 [1886], 708) and extended into the early 1890s by Albert Eulenburg and Albert Moll.

⁷ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, 'Ueber Unzucht mit Kindern und Pädophilie Erotica', *Friedreich's Blätter für Gerichtliche Medizin und Sanitätspolizei*, 47 (1896), 261–83.

Nosographic identifications of paedophilia, however, would be questioned as early as 1903, in the anthropologically oriented work by Iwan Bloch,⁸ and soon after by Havelock Ellis. Illustrative of an enduring controversy, the run-up to the 2013 fifth edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5)* was enlivened by the proposal to complement the entity of paedophilia with that of *hebephilia* – erotic attraction to pubescent rather than younger children. The latter rubric had first been used in a mid-1950s typology of sex offences and offenders, precisely ‘on a descriptive level [referring] to the crime committed’.⁹ *Hebephilia* did not make the *DSM-5*, in part, no doubt, because of strong imputations by *DSM* veterans of medicalisation and forensic misuse.¹⁰ The *DSM-5* did introduce the distinction between *Pedophilia* and *Pedophilic Disorder*. The turn to ‘paraphilic disorders’ was generic for all former ‘paraphilias’. The American Psychiatric Association (APA) thus seems to have nominally demedicalised what it still calls ‘paraphilias’ as potentially ‘benign’, even if never ‘normophilic’, orientations.¹¹ That the use of terms remains delicate, however, was illustrated in the retraction late in 2013 of the insinuated applicability to paedophilia of the notion of *sexual orientation* (allowing a ‘pedophilic sexual orientation’ beside ‘pedophilic disorder’), which the APA indicated had been a ‘text error’.¹²

‘Erotic Age-Preference’: A Problem in Descriptive Psychopathology

In appreciating this corrigendum it deserves to be remembered how *paedophilia* and cognate terms entered clinical parlance. This warrants a slightly broader look at how notions of age-specificity and age-exclusivity in erotic attraction figure in the medical history of sexuality. Paedophilia has been consistently signalled out as a discrete entity under the shifting headings of ‘psychosexual perversion’ (1890s, as referenced below), ‘sexual deviation’ or ‘pathologic behaviour’ (1952–67: *DSM-I* and *II*; 1965: *ICD-8*: code 302.2),¹³ ‘psychosexual disorder’ (1979: *ICD-9-CM*), ‘paraphilia’ (1980: *DSM-III* through *IV-TR*), ‘disorder of sexual preference’ (1992: *ICD-10*: code F65.4), finally ‘paraphilic disorder’ (*DSM-5/ICD-11beta*: 302.2/F65.4). Like other ‘sexual deviations’, *paedophilia* entered the *DSM* and the WHO’s *International Classification*

⁸ Iwan Bloch, *Beiträge zur Aetiologie der Psychopathia Sexualis* (Dresden: H.R. Dohn, 1903), Vol. II, 244–53; restated in Bloch’s 1906 *Das Sexualleben Unserer Zeit in Seinen Beziehungen zur Modernen Kultur* (Berlin: L. Marcus, 1907 repr.), 694ff.

⁹ E.F. Hammer and B.C. Glueck, Jr. ‘Psychodynamic Patterns in the Sex Offender. I. Fear of the Adult Female Sex Object and Feelings of Genital Inadequacy’, in P.H. Hoch and J. Zubin (eds), *Psychiatry and the Law* (New York/London: Grune & Stratton, 1955), 157–68, 159.

¹⁰ Criticism was spearheaded by the triumvirate of Allen Frances (chair of the *DSM-IV* and *IV-TR* Task Forces), Michael B. First (*DSM-IV* and *IV-TR* Editor and *ICD-11* consultant), and Richard Green (founding editor of the *Archives of Sexual Behavior* and member of the *DSM-III* Psychosexual Disorders Advisory Committee). APA’s decision overruled its *DSM-5* Sexual and Gender Identity Disorders Task Force on 1 December 2012. The TF’s main and still proselytising member, Ray Blanchard, later expressed his dissent (‘A Dissenting Opinion on *DSM-5* Pedophilic Disorder’, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42 [2013], 675–8). The 1992 *ICD-10*, incidentally, already included ‘early pubertal age’ in its paedophilic attraction range (219).

¹¹ American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 5th edn (Washington, DC: APA, 2013), 685–6.

¹² *Ibid.*, 698; ‘APA Statement on *DSM-5* Text Error’. <http://www.dsm5.org/Documents/13-67-DSM-Correction-103113.pdf> (accessed 1 November 2013).

¹³ Among other words, including *transvestism*, *pedophilia* does occur in the 1949 *ICD-6*’s (v.II:325) and 1957 *ICD-7*’s (v.II:341) *Alphabetical Indices* with a reference to rubric 320.6 ‘Sexual Deviation’, but is not signalled out in the actual classification until the 1967, 8th revision.

of *Diseases (ICD)* without attribution, reference, definition or diagnostic criteria. Apart from *paedophilia* few words pertinent to ‘erotic age-preference’ ever trickled down into the Oxford English Dictionary (*OED*)¹⁴ and only *paedophilia/pederosis* ever entered the *DSM/ICD* indexes. Where *heterosexuality* was named and conceptualised in the earliest context of the naming of and apology for *homosexuality*,¹⁵ the clumsy, gender-neutral neologisms *adultophilia* and *teleiophilic preference* (‘ordinary attraction to adults’) appeared long after an initial rush on pathological and gender-specific terms, and strictly on forensic occasions.¹⁶ Note that with ‘teleiophilia’ the reader is already in the twenty-first century.

Historically, definitions of morbid age of attraction, age of consent and mean or modal age of ‘puberty’ show an approximate and *a priori* alignment. Definitions of all of these are at a fundamental level conventional, and their alignment around 1896 required an intertwining of as much moral and legal as psychiatric sensibility.¹⁷ Proposed definitions of ‘paedophilia’ have continued to waver between ill-defined physiological terms such as ‘puberty’, related somatoscopic (Tanner) stages,¹⁸ and Ages-of-Man categories such as ‘child’ and ‘adolescent’. Revealingly comparable to age-of-consent legislation worldwide, they have also varied and shifted in stipulated minimal age and minimal age difference requirements for diagnosis. The *DSM-5* concept of *normophilia*, or non-paraphilia, balances a naturalistic with a legal reference to age where it is defined in terms of the ‘sexual maturity’ and the legal ability to consent of the normophile’s preferred partner.¹⁹ Moreover, nosological suggestions have consistently wrestled with the relation of mental disorder to the contingency of offences.²⁰ It was child endangerment that had been the most immediate connotation of the US legal rubric of ‘sexual psychopath’, which was current from the late 1930s to the early 1950s, and certainly of its 1990s successor, the

¹⁴ The list hardly extends beyond *pederasty* (entering the *OED* in 1904), *gerontophilia* (as derivative of *gerontophil*, which entered 1972), *paedophilia* (1982) and *epehebophilia* (2005). Arguable cases include *nympholepsy* (after Nabokov’s 1955 *Lolita*) and *Uranian*.

¹⁵ Jonathan Ned Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (New York: Dutton, 1995), 52–5.

¹⁶ Attested first in (and only sporadically beyond) Paul H. Gebhard and colleagues’ *Sex Offenders; An Analysis of Types* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 16, and Ray Blanchard *et al.* ‘Fraternal Birth Order and Sexual Orientation in Pedophiles’, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 29 (2000), 463–78, respectively.

¹⁷ Austrian and German laws forbade *Unzucht* [indecency] with minors (under age 14). Krafft-Ebing estimated the age of pubescence in Northern countries at 13–15 for girls and 15 for boys. In 1894, discussing sexual inversion, Krafft-Ebing specifically proposed an age of consent of 18 – a gesture protested by Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–95) – though claiming that among inverts, as among heterosexuals, seduction of youth is ‘of the greatest rarity’ (*Der Conträrsexuale vor dem Strafrichter*. Leipzig/Vienna: F. Deuticke, 1894, 9, 33).

¹⁸ ‘Tanner stages’, so named from circa 1973, were proposed in James Mourilyan Tanner’s *Growth at Adolescence* (Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas, 1955), 25–30. Of use largely to paediatric endocrinologists, Tanner staging became relevant, circa 1997, to child protection investigators confronted with ‘child’ abuse images (today internationally defined as involving persons below the age of eighteen years) as well as in assessments of juvenile sex offenders. From circa 2002, it was named as an aid in the classification of pictorial stimuli long used in penile plethysmography. In May 2012 Ray Blanchard proposed its use in a differential definition of *Classic, Hebeophilic* and *Pedohebeophilic* types of paedophilia for consideration in the *DSM-5*, puzzlingly ‘in order to avoid confusion with legal ages of consent for sexual intercourse in different jurisdictions’ (Blanchard, *op. cit.* [note 10]). The suggestion was not taken up.

¹⁹ APA, *op. cit.* (note 11), 685–6. The unattributed neologism here introduced is John Money’s.

²⁰ The *ICD-9* defined *Paedophilia* as ‘Sexual deviations [*sic*] in which an adult engages in sexual activity with a child of the same or opposite sex’ (1977, v. I: 196); it specifically excluded ‘Homosexual Paedophilia’ from *Homosexuality*. Mentioned DSM-5 Task Force proposed criteria of offense frequency; these were not adopted. Klaus Beier (*Dissexualität im Lebenslängsschnitt*. Berlin: Springer, 1995) considered incest and child sexual abuse indicative of ‘Disorders of Sexual Behavior’, or ‘Dissexuality’, as distinct from ‘Disorders of Sexual Preference’, or Paraphilias.

‘sexually violent predator’.²¹ It has been a peculiarity of these rubrics that they have an opportune, not a necessary, footing in psychiatric diagnoses, and that the former particularly appealed to residual (‘Not Otherwise Specified’) categories in the *DSM-III-R* and subsequent revisions. Most of the post-*DSM-III* cultural and forensic interest in ‘paraphilia’ has concentrated on paedophilia and psycho-diagnostic notions developed largely around child sex offenders, notably, since 1984, that of ‘cognitive distortion’. Diagnostic criteria guided research only from the *DSM-III* onward. To date, these have importantly conformed to a criterion template applied to all ‘paraphilic disorders’, with consistently minimal and arguable scientific rationale.

These observations will prove of increasing significance to historians of the sexological present, given the rising importance of age to global definitions and representations of sexual justice since the weaning from ‘gender orientation’ both of Western morals legislation and psychiatric taxonomies. An important historical backdrop to understanding nosographic activity around all ‘paraphilias’ is indisputably the gradual Western depsychiatricisation of ‘homosexuality’ between the late 1950s and the late 1980s. Until the 1973, 7th printing of the *DSM-II* and the 1992 *ICD-10*, Anglophone psychiatric taxonomies still listed ‘homosexuality’ and ‘paedophilia’ under the common heading of ‘sexual deviation’. Historians of homosexuality note that between these dates, ‘the paedophile’ came to replace ‘the homosexual’ in the Anglo-American experience as a paragon of sexual danger to youth.²² In post-war psychology, ‘a growing body of research evidence was building up a dividing wall between the non-dangerous homosexual and the pederast who did threaten the young and whom it was still thought necessary to include in the dangerousness framework’.²³ During the 1980s, the century-old trope of ‘homosexual seduction’ was definitively replaced with a new forensic parlance of ‘paedophilic grooming’.²⁴ Allusions to the former now received the quasi-psychiatric qualification of ‘homophobic’ slander.

Nineteenth century French dictionaries defined *pédérastie* [pederasty] only vaguely as a ‘criminal passion’ either between men or between men and *jeunes garçons* [young boys].²⁵ Yet, even in the European nineteenth century, ‘homosexuality’ importantly answered to a popular presumption, indeed a forensic pattern, of age difference.²⁶ This may have

²¹ See Elisabeth Freedman, ‘Uncontrolled Desires: The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920–60’, *The Journal of American History*, 74 (1987), 83–106; Deborah W. Denno, ‘Life Before the Modern Sex Offender Statutes’, *Northwestern University Law Review*, 92 (1998), 1317–1414; John Pratt, ‘The Rise and Fall of Homophobia and Sexual Psychopath Laws in Postwar Society’, *Psychology, Law and Public Policy*, 4 (1998), 25–49; Simon A. Cole, ‘From the Sexual Psychopath Statute to ‘Megan’s Law’: Psychiatric Knowledge in the Diagnosis, Treatment, and Adjudication of Sex Criminals in New Jersey, 1949–99’, *Journal of the History of Medicine*, 55 (2000), 292–314.

²² Eg. Patrice Corriveau, *Judging Homosexuals: A History of Gay Persecution in Quebec and France* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011), 168–71; Kevin Ohi, ‘Of Red Queens and Garden Clubs: The Manchurian Candidate, Cold War Paranoia, and the Historicity of the Homosexual’, *Camera Obscura*, 58 (2005), 176.

²³ Pratt, *op. cit.* (note 21), 42.

²⁴ Although paraphrases are considerably older, the former term, ‘homosexuelle Verführung’, appears in Albert Freiherrn von Schrenck-Notzing’s *Die Suggestionstherapie: Bei krankhaften Erscheinungen des Geschlechtssinnes mit Berücksichtigung der conträren Sexualempfindung* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1892), 209. Although in use as early as 1984, one finds the latter term explicitly proposed in Reuben Lang and Roy Frenzel, ‘How Sex Offenders Lure Children’, *Sexual Abuse*, 1 (1988), 303–17.

²⁵ Jean-Claude Féray, *Grecques, Les Mœurs du Hanneton? Histoire du Mot Pédérastie et de Ses Dérivés en Langue Française* (Paris: Quintes-Feuilles, 2004) 67ff.

²⁶ Don Mader and Gert Hekma, ‘Same Sex, Different Ages: On Pederasty in Gay History’, in Thomas Hubbard and Beert Verstraete (eds), *Censoring Sex Research: The Debate over Male Intergenerational Relations* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2013), 161–92; Stephen O. Murray, *Homosexualities* (Chicago: University of

reflected the likelihood of crimes being reported. In any case, associations with child abuse plagued the earliest apologetic outlines of homosexuality. As discussed below, these associations inform the coinage and etymology of some of the earliest terms for homosexuality. Where most early terms denoting age preferences were subsequently coined to classify homosexuals, a definitive reversal in the order of mobilising parameters is achieved only in the *DSM-III*, which illustratively advises the specification of Pedophilia where the diagnosed person is found to be sexually attracted to males, females or both.

Moreover, the strong philological and philhellenic orientation to ancient *paiderastia* of even early twentieth century advocates of same-sex love necessarily married reflections on gender and age orientation. Jana Funke suggests that the denunciation of ‘seduction of youth’ by proponents of ‘Greek love’ had perhaps been more central to the modern assimilationist politics and acceptance of homosexuality than sympathetic historians may have cared to stress.²⁷ Well into the 1950s, many apologists for homoeroticism wrestled extensively with the spectres of ‘Greek love’ and ‘pedagogical Eros’, in efforts to distance themselves from the nascent sciences of crime and mental health. Writings celebrating the beauty of ageless ‘boys’ and ‘youth’ often deployed philosophical and anthropological arguments against medico-physiological and legal sensibilities around age and age difference.²⁸ In the 1900s, anthropologically oriented sexologists (Bloch and Ellis) and also early ethnologists of homosexuality including Ferdinand Karsch-Haack, either explicitly rejected or ignored emergent nosological frameworks for *paedophilialKnabenliebe*.²⁹

The forensic identification of *paedophilia* only very gradually came to spearhead the new and dual scientific parlance of ‘perverted’ (rather than merely criminal or brutal) and precariously ‘developmental’ (thus vulnerable and aetiologically significant) sexualities.³⁰

Chicago Press, 2000), 212–23; Stephen Robertson, ‘Shifting the Scene of the Crime: Sodomy and the American History of Sexual Violence’, *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 19 (2010), 223–42.

²⁷ Jana Funke, ‘We Cannot Be Greek Now’: Age Difference, Corruption of Youth and the Making of Sexual Inversion’, *English Studies*, 94 (2013), 139–53.

²⁸ The widely exploited German *Männerbund* motif, especially, foregrounded gender segregated age classes as underscored in ethnologist Heinrich Schurtz’s 1902 tome *Alterklassen und Männerbünde: Eine Darstellung der Grundformen der Gesellschaft* (Berlin: Reimer, 1902). See Claudia Bruns, *Politik des Eros: Der Männerbund in Wissenschaft, Politik und Jugendkultur, 1880–1934* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008).

²⁹ The former terms are still extremely rare in anthropological literature. From the mid-1980s anthropological typologies of ‘ritualised’ forms of ‘homosexuality’ included *age-structured homosexuality* (attested from 1986), *age-graded homosexuality* (1987), *transgenerational homosexuality* (1988), and *age-stratified homosexuality* (1992). Key authorities on these issues including Gilbert Herdt subsequently abandoned ‘homosexuality’ around 1990 and spoke henceforward of ‘boy insemination rituals’. Anthropological annotations proposed by Herdt were excluded from *DSM* revisions in the 1990s. D. Davis and G. Herdt, ‘Cultural Sensitivity and the Sexual Disorders’, in T. Widiger *et al.* (eds), *DSM-IV Sourcebook*. Vol. 3 (Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association Press, 1997), 191–208. The current, 2001, Chinese Classification and Diagnostic Criteria of Mental Disorders (CCMD-3), although meticulously styled after the *DSM-IV* and *ICD-10*, does not include paedophilia among its ‘disorders of sexual preference’ (http://www.21jk.com.cn/english/ccmd-3/csp_article_ma_in.asp, accessed 1 November 2014). Neither did the CCMD-2: Y. Shen, ‘On the Second Edition of the Chinese Classification of Mental Disorders (CCMD-II)’, in J.E. Mezzich, Y. Honda and M.C. Kastrup (eds), *Psychiatric Diagnosis: A World Perspective* (New York: Springer, 1994), 67–74 (70).

³⁰ See eg. L.D. Sauerstein, ‘Loss of Innocence: Albert Moll, Sigmund Freud and the Invention of Childhood Sexuality around 1900’, *Medical History*, 56 (2012), 156–83. Much of this, it should be kept in mind, remained speculative and casuistic until well after 1900. There were no reports of normative sexual histories to inform professional notions of childhood sexuality until Havelock Ellis reported eight of them in 1901 (‘The Development of the Sexual Instinct’, *Alienist & Neurologist*, 22 [1901], 500–21, 615–23), all he had been able to gather at the time. In 1896, the self-contradictory opinion was that ‘The psychological development [of sex] is a vast and somewhat unexplored field. In the normal child to the age of puberty it is nil’ (W.M. Thompson, ‘Sexual

These key notions were to assume an obvious architectural relation to today's ubiquitous, triple psychiatricisation, which was, importantly, already converging in the mid-1890s, of 'the paedophile', the child sexual abuse victim and the 'surviving' adult. However, 'erotic age preference' assumed more sustained relevance in the nineteenth century context of naming, categorising, theorising and defending gender deviance. It was in such late contexts as the 1957 *Wolfenden Report* that 'paedophiles' still figured importantly in terms of 'recognizably different categories among adult male homosexuals'.³¹ Robertson suggests that, in the US, 'By 1950, the media had begun to split homosexual offenders away from pedophiles and to present them as a problem in their own right, a 'New Moral Menace to Our Youth', as the title of an article in *Coronet* magazine trumpeted'.³² In the Netherlands too, 'The word paedophilia was rarely used before 1945, but shows up regularly in the medical records after 1950; homosexuality and paedophilia only began to be separated from that time onwards'.³³ The first book-length forensic studies on 'paedophilia', in the Netherlands, Canada, Germany and Denmark, were published only from 1960 onward, at the time of the decriminalisation of homosexuality across Europe.

A lecture by Michel Foucault given on 19 March 1975, gestured toward a genealogy of paedophilia, arguably the first of such gestures.³⁴ Since then, substantial contributions to paedophilia's medico-forensic prehistory have been few, fragmentary and recent.³⁵ Like 'homosexual', the label invites a historicisation of the labeller at least as much as of the

Hygiene', *Medical Century*, 4 [1 June 1896], 265–7). Although there was definite nosological attention to 'Venus praematura' and 'sexualitas precoc', Krafft-Ebing's provisional categorisation of 'untimely' (both precocious and old age) emergence of the sexual drive as one of the four main taxa of sexual psychopathy may have been the first systematic gesture to have the parameter of age speak centrally to the medical embrace of the *vita sexualis*. One finds it first in an 1877 article ('Ueber Gewisse Anomalien des Geschlechtstriebes. . .', *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, 7 [1877], 291–312), eventually under the name of *Paradoxie* ('*paradoxia sexualis*') in the first edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, *op. cit.*, 24, 25–8; cf. *Lehrbuch der Psychiatrie* (Stuttgart: Enke, 2nd edn [1883], Vol.1, 82; 3rd edn [1888], 91–2). Italian psychiatrist Enrico Morselli would call this 'eterocronia paradossa sessuale' (*Manuale di Semeiotica delle Malattie Mentali*, Milan: Vallardi, 1894, Vol. II, 668–9).

³¹ Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution, *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1957), 23.

³² Stephen Robertson, *Crimes against Children: Sexual Violence and Legal Culture in New York City, 1880–1960* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 213.

³³ Theo van der Meer, 'Eugenic and Sexual Folklores and the Castration of Sex Offenders in the Netherlands (1938–68)', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part C*, 39 (2008), 195–204. Florian Mildenerger concludes that 'The difference between homosexuality and paedophilia was established scientifically in the 1920's, with sexual science and clinical psychiatry working hand-in-hand' ('. . . als Conträrsexual und als Päderast verleumdet. . .' – Der Prozess um den Naturforscher Theodor Beer (1866–1919) im Jahre 1905', *Zeitschrift für Sexualforschung*, 18 [2005], 332–51 [332]). Chris Brickell claims that in New Zealand of the first half of the twentieth century, conversely, 'The catch-all 'corrupter of children' gave way to 'the homosexual', a man with an underlying attraction to males of any age who posed a psychological danger to boys' ('Waiting for Uncle Ben': Age-Structured Homosexuality in New Zealand, 1920–50', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 21 [2012], 467–95).

³⁴ Michel Foucault, *Les Anormaux: Cours au Collège de France (1974–75)* (Paris: Seuil/Gallimard, 1999), ch. 11, and *Histoire de la Sexualité I* (Paris, Gallimard, 1976), 43–5. Foucault's case study was Henry Bonnet and Jules Bulard's 14-page *Rapport Médico-Légal sur l'État Mental de Charles-Joseph Jouy, Inculpé d'Attentats aux Moeurs* (Nancy, Impr. de la Vve Raybois, 1868). Here, a patient is described in terms of arrested development, as a 'semi-imbécile' (13) lacking the 'virilité morale' [moral manhood] (12) to resist alleged seductions by precocious eleven-year-old neighbourhood girls. He was acquitted on this basis.

³⁵ On early forensic ramifications of child sexual abuse see especially Anne-Claude Ambroise-Rendu, *Histoire de la Pédophilie: XIXe-XXIe Siècles* (Paris: Fayard, 2014). Scattered notes on forensic psychiatry and psychoanalysis are available in Florian Mildenerger, *Beispiel Peter Schult: Pädophilie im Öffentlichen Diskurs* (Hamburg: Männerschwarm, 2006); Jacques Arveiller, 'Pédophilie et Psychiatrie. Repères Historiques', *l'Évolution Psychiatrique*, 63 (1998), 11–34; Paolo F. Peloso and Cosimo Schinaia, *On Paedophilia* (London: Carnac, 2010), 115–38.

labelled.³⁶ Little attention has been given to its globalisation. The broad outline offered below focuses primarily on the few, but diverse, references to age-specificity in nineteenth century West-European sexological nosology.

Παιδεραστία into Homosexuality/Paedophilia

Historians of homosexuality have observed an intricate cross-fading of the ramifications of pagan custom, sin and crime with those of mental disorder and social identity. Notwithstanding, medical as well as lyrical conceptions of homosexuality remained critically embroiled with those of ancient Greek *paiderastia* well into the twentieth century.³⁷ Twentieth century academic apologies for man–boy liaisons also invariably invoked Greek references.³⁸

In his 1875 textbook on forensic psychopathology, Krafft-Ebing referred to ‘Knabenliebe der Griechen und entarteten Römer’ [boy love of the Greeks and degenerate Romans] as among the ‘sexuellen Verirrungen des Alterthums’ [sexual aberrations of antiquity].³⁹ Discussion of this ancient custom was to remain a central point of reference in the *sexual psychopathology* here anticipated. There had been no ancient equivalent to such a psychopathology. The closest to an ancient medical pronouncement on boy-love had arguably been Plutarch’s ethico-moral distinction, in his *Moralia*, between approved *παιδεραστία* and untoward *παιδομανία*.⁴⁰ Christian disparagement of *παιδεραστία* featured a different, but still only moral, neologism. Verb and noun inflections of *paedophthoros* (*παιδοφθορος*, ‘child/boy seducer or corrupter’) appeared in numerous early Christian, as well as anonymous Greek ascetic texts. The latter term appeared in ‘stereotyped lists’ of sins apologetically or polemically levelled against the surrounding Greco-Roman world. The epithet, turning *erastia* ‘love’ into *phthoros* ‘abuse’, was possibly ‘part of a stock arsenal of accusations to be used in debates with pagans’.⁴¹ It occurs in various enumerations of sins, and it is a matter of dispute whether the word can be taken to denote all homosexuality, all seduction of youth or both.⁴² The *Constitution of the Apostles* (late fourth century AD) expanded the sixth commandment on adultery with: ‘Do not abuse

³⁶ The historical case of Lewis Carroll (Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, 1832–98) is just one of many contemporary examples of the myriad of nuanced ways in which a public figure, generations after his death, can be both acquitted and suspected of at least ‘latent’ paedophilia, or else of having been a ‘voyeur’, a ‘fetishiser’ of innocence, an ‘obsessive’ photographer of children, or at the last resort, of having had ‘possibly sinister’ interests. See eg. Will Brooker, *Alice’s Adventures: Lewis Carroll in Popular Culture* (New York: Continuum, 2004), *passim*.

³⁷ Julie Mazaleigue-Labaste, ‘De l’Amour Socratique à l’Homosexualité Grecque’, *Romantisme* 1/2013 (no. 159), 35–46.

³⁸ See the two-issue *International Journal of Greek Love* (1965–6, edited by Walter H. Breen alias J.Z. Eglinton), its one-issue revival *Kalos* (1976), and the Amsterdam-based periodical *Paidika* (1987–95).

³⁹ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Lehrbuch der gerichtlichen Psychopathologie* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1875), 160.

⁴⁰ Plutarch, *Amatorius* 769b (*Moralia* IX). Sixteenth and seventeenth century dictionaries list *pederastes* and *pedophilos/pedophilusas* ‘amator puerorum’, *pedomania* (cf. *pedomanes*) as ‘insanus puerorum amor’, *paedophthoros* as ‘puerorum corruptor/stuprator/pædicator’, and *paedophthoria* as ‘puerorum stupratio’. Eg. Valentinus Curio’s *Lexicon Graecvm* [etc.] (1525, n.p.). One source (Elio Antonio de Nebrija, *Dictionarium Latinohispanicum, Et Vice Versa Hispanicolatinum*, Antwerp: Steelsius, Vol. 1, 1560, n.p.) glosses *paederastia* as ‘amor obscenus in pueris’.

⁴¹ Cornelia B. Horn and John W. Martens, *Let the Little Children Come to Me’: Childhood and Children in Early Christianity* (Washington, DC: CUA Press, 2009), 225–31.

⁴² The root word *pais* ‘boy, child’, as in early modern and in later venereological references to *Päderastie* and *paedication*, carried connotations of age but could simply mean *eromenos* ‘beloved’ or the one taking a ‘passive role’ in intercrural intercourse. Where it meant *boy*, the designated age bracket is often broad, relative, unclear, and/or disputed among classicists.

boys (*oude paidophthoréseis*): for this vice is against nature and had its beginning in Sodom [...]. Among these earliest sources to specify sex offenders against ‘youth’ are pre-ecumenical ancient church councils and synods. The Synod of Elvira (305-306 CE) says of *stupratores puerorum* that they ‘shall not be admitted to communion, not even on their deathbeds’.

The term *Knabenschändung* (*Knabenschände*, *Knabenschänderei*, *Knabenschänderey*) [violation of boys] cross-faded from the sixteenth to early-nineteenth century from an ecclesiastical to a medico-legal relevance, often subsumed with bestiality under the legal header of *Sodomie* (*Sodomiterey*). The term long retained its scriptural ring: the *Luther Bibel* and the *Zürcher Bibel* (both sixteenth-century) translate the *arsenokoitai* of 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timotheus 1:10 as *Knabenschänder*. Although the gender-neutral term *Kinderschänder* ‘child violator’ is of early-eighteenth-century origin⁴³ and encountered in early-nineteenth-century legal medical textbooks, Krafft-Ebing is notably one of the first, in 1896, to use it in an indisputably psychiatric context.

Where the early Christian neologisms were intended to reframe Greek boy-love, the earliest mid-nineteenth-century psychiatric terms proposed by Heinrich Kaan (*puerorum amor* [boy love] or *paederastia*) and Claude-François Michéa (*amour grec* [Greek love], including male *philopédie*) were undistorted echoes of and direct references to ancient Greece, retaining a philological connotation of pederastic age preference.⁴⁴ *Philopédie* and *Pädophilie* were among the very few modern sexological terms with cognate terms actually attested in ancient Greek. Lexicographically, *philopédie* appears to have been the first of modernity’s *philiās* to figure alongside the earlier *monomanies érotiques* [erotic monomanias].⁴⁵ At that time the *phil-/philus* prefix/suffix was scientifically familiar in entomology (1838: *Sitophilus*), medicine (1828: *Haemophilie*) and phrenology (1815: *philoprogenitiveness*). Denoting a psychiatric condition, however, it carried intrusive semantic baggage. Philologically, lifelong *φιλία* [friendship] between men was the ideal corollary of an initial *paiderastic* tutorship.⁴⁶ The superordinate term *Paraphilie*, incidentally, would not be coined until 1903, and here only as a counterpoint to medicalising alternatives.⁴⁷

⁴³ The *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste* (Leipzig: J.H. Zedler, 1742, Vol. 34, 760) lists *Knabenschänder* (‘stuprator adolescentis vel pueri’), *Kinderschänder* (‘stuprator impuberum’), *Jungfrauschänder* (‘stuprator virginis’) and *Brautschänder* (‘stuprator sponsæ’).

⁴⁴ In Kaan’s early sexual psychopathology *puerorum amor* was a pendant of *amor lesbicus*. The former term was a conventional Latin translation of Greek *παιδεραστία*. The latter term was initially retained by Krafft-Ebing. Henrico [Heinrich] Kaan, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (Leipzig: L. Voss, 1844), 44; pertinent section was quoted untranslated in an anonymous review in the *British Monthly Journal of Medical Science*, 1845, 494–96; Michéa, ‘Des Déviations Maladies’. Michéa’s term (*philopædie*) appears in a review in the *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, 2 (1850), 116, 117, but remained mostly restricted to a handful of medical textbooks of the following decade.

⁴⁵ The next to be coined with a modern, specifically forensic intention, and still the only to be adopted by Krafft-Ebing in his 1877 seminal article on perversions, were *nécropbiles*, the word used in print first in Joseph Guislain’s *Leçons Orales sur les Phrénopathies, ou, Traité Théorique et Pratique des Maladies Mentales* (Ghent: L. Hebbelynck, 1852), Vol. 1, 257.

⁴⁶ K.J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 49–54. ‘Paedophile’, too, was child-loving Demeter Kouroutrophos (Ceres).

⁴⁷ The term *Paraphilie* was coined by Vienna based folklorist of erotica Friedrich Salomo Krauss in a book review published 2 August 1903, as a purportedly neutral and anthropologically suitable alternative to the damning medical phrases ‘sexual perversion’ and ‘sexual psychopathy’ (‘Psychopathia sexualis: Ein Bericht’. *Wiener Klinische Rundschau*, 17 [1903], 564–6). Whether a mere re-wording could deliver on such a promise was doubted early on. ‘Krauss bereichert uns um das neue Wort ‘Paraphilie’ anstelle der ‘Psychopathie’, ein fortschrittlich-oppositionelles Wort zwar, aber auch nur ein Wort und als Aufklärung etwa so bedeutsam wie

From an etymological point of view, the late-nineteenth through to twentieth century juggling of terms (*philia*, *sex*, *eros*, *perversion*, *disorder*, *orientation*) amounted to considerable *Wortsalat*. To mid-nineteenth-century forensic authorities, the matching of ancient terms and medico-legal cases had already proved problematic.⁴⁸ The ancient distinction between edifying love and problematic behaviour, specifically between *Pädophilie* and *Päderastie*, had been revived deliberately in the late 1830s by the pioneering researchers into ancient Greek sexual mores Julius Rosenbaum, Moritz Hermann Eduard Meier and Heinrich Hößli. However, like Johann Ludwig Casper, all three notably used the terms *Männerschändung* (Fr.: *andrèrastie*) and *Männerliebe* alongside the juxtaposed terms of *Knabenschändung* and *Knabenliebe/Paedophilie*.⁴⁹ Right up to Krafft-Ebing's forensic appropriation of the latter term in 1896, as evidenced in work by Albert von Schrenck-Notzing, this contrast between *Pädophilie* (*pedophily* in the 1895 English translation) and *Päderastie* for many was still of purely philological significance and remained without definite nosological intentions.⁵⁰

Krafft-Ebing's *Paedophilia erotica*, in this light, was a careful, but still awkward, reworking of known, indeed ancient, terms. Following French nosological terms including *monomanie érotique* and *folie érotique* [erotic madness], Krafft-Ebing coined the phrases

'Seitensprünge' [Krauss enriches us with the new word 'paraphilia' as a replacement for 'psychopathy', a progressive and critical word, but also a mere word, and as an explanatory term about as significant as 'having a bit on the side'] (Alfred Kind, 'Anthropophyteia', in K. Vanselow [ed], *Geschlecht und Gesellschaft* (Berlin: Verlag der Schönheit, 1907), Vol. II, 179). The early travails of the term beyond Krauss can be provisionally sketched. It entered the English language in a 1913 article in the *American Journal of Urology* by its editor and popular sexology author, William J. Robinson. Robinson discussed a German article on onanism published that year by Wilhelm Stekel, an early member of the Freudian inner circle who, notably, had been a student in Von Krafft-Ebing's clinic. Krauss was a regular guest at the scientific meetings of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Association (he must have met Stekel, if not earlier, at the 8 June 1910 meeting). Stekel went on to use Krauss's term but seemingly only after he (Stekel) was made to leave the Vienna society in late 1912. The term nowhere appears in the 4-volume *Minutes* of the Association and Freud never used it in print or correspondence; *perversion* remained the term preferred by psychoanalysts. An early populariser of the term in English was American psychoanalyst Benjamin Karpman, an analysand of Stekel and reviewer of the early 1920s translation of Stekel's ten-volume *Störungen des Trieb- und Affektlebens*. The term hardly spread beyond Karpman in the ensuing decades; its *DSM-III* reintroduction to replace *DSM-II* 'sexual deviation' came without attribution but with continued hints of scientific eligibility: 'The term Paraphilia is preferable [to 'sexual deviation'] because it correctly emphasises that the deviation (para) is in that to which the individual is attracted (philia)' (Task Force on Nomenclature and Statistics of the American Psychiatric Association, *DSM-III Draft*, 1978, L-8; APA, *DSM-III*, Washington, DC: APA, 1980, 266–7). Member of the *DSM-III* Psychosexual Disorders Advisory Committee John Money later claimed responsibility for the terminological switch. Homosexuality never officially was a 'paraphilia' to the APA: it became a 'Sexual Orientation Disturbance' in 1973 and 'Ego-Dystonic Homosexuality' was a *DSM-III* 'psychosexual disorder' (as early as *DSM-III Draft*, 1978, L-30).

⁴⁸ 'Schon der Name (Knaben- oder Jünglingsliebe) passt nicht für diese Wollustbefriedigung zwischen männlichen Individuen, denn wir werden in der Casuistik Fälle von gegenseitigen Päderasten viel höherer Lebensjahre anführen' ['Even the term (*Knaben-* or *Jünglingsliebe*) does not apply to this sexual satisfaction between male individuals, because in case studies of mutual pederasts we will cite much more advanced ages'] (Johann Ludwig Casper, *Practisches Handbuch der gerichtlichen Medicin* (Berlin: Hirschwald, 1858), Vol. I, 173). The sentence survives into the book's 8th edition of 1889, surviving its author (1796–1864) for a quarter of a century.

⁴⁹ M.H.E. Meier, 'Päderastie', in J.S. Ersch and J.G. Gruber (eds), *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste* (Vol. 9) (Leipzig: J.F. Gleditsch, 1837), 149–189; Julius Rosenbaum, *Geschichte der Lustseuche im Altertume* (Halle: Lippert & Schmidt, 1839), 1845 pr., 123–4, 205–6 (pertinent passages appear in translation in 'Histoire de la Syphilis dans l'Antiquité', *Archives de la Médecine Belge*, 17, 3 [1846], 267–85; 17, 7, 151–61); Heinrich Hößli, *Eros. Die Männerliebe der Griechen* (St. Gallen: P. Scheitlin, 1838), Vol. 2, 264–9. The same distinction informs incidental usages of the word *pédophilie* such as in Thésée Pouillet's *De l'Onanisme chez l'Homme*, 3rd edn (Paris: Vigot, 1897), 5.

⁵⁰ Schrenck-Notzing, *op. cit.* (note 24), 134–9; *Therapeutic Suggestion in Psychopathia Sexualis with Especial Reference to Contrary Sexual Instinct* (Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Co., 1895), 131.

Fetischismus eroticus in 1891 (adapting from Alfred Binet's 1887 expression 'fétichisme dans l'amour', itself a diversion from *fetishism's* previous anthropological uses) and *Zoophilia erotica* (next to *Bestialität* and *Zooerastie*) in 1894. It is in this terminological journey that Krafft-Ebing coined *Pädophilia erotica* in 1896 and, for purely taxonomical purposes, *Gerontophilie* in 1901.⁵¹

Diagnosing Paedophilia

In texts on *attentats aux mœurs* [sexual offences] of the second half of the nineteenth century – by Casper⁵² and subsequently by authorities such as Devergie, Tardieu, Pénard, Brouardel, Bernard, Toulmouche and Thoinot – virtually all attention was given to the physical and venereological (ie. evidentiary) status of child victims. While the fourth, 1887, edition of Paul Moreau's *Des Aberrations du Sens Génésique* [Aberrations of the Sexual Instinct] is full of pre-adolescent nymphomaniacs and incestuous fathers and brothers, one finds moral denunciations of *odieux attentats* [odious crimes] but not yet a specification of offender types.⁵³ Of the *Mädchenschneider* [girl-cutter], *Mädchenstecher* [girl-stabber], and *Knabengeissler* [boy-flogger] cases subsequently discussed by Krafft-Ebing, some had long appealed to typological sensibilities; but they were to be subsumed under the rubric of *sadism* not *paedophilia*.⁵⁴

Nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century evidence of slang applied to frequenters of child prostitutes, and to connoisseurship of young male beauty or girlhood innocence may be too scant to empirically consolidate a link with the kind of identity positions associated with 'paedophile activism', which may be traced back to the theme becoming a matter of discussion and schism in the late-1950s West-European homophile movement.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, 'Ueber sexuelle Perversionen', in E. von Leyden and F. Klemperer (eds), *Die deutsche Klinik am Eingang des 20. Jahrhunderts in akademischen Vorlesungen*, Vol. 6 (Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg, 1901), 113–54: 136.

⁵² Johann Ludwig Casper, 'Ueber Nothzucht und Päderastie und deren Ermittlung Seitens des Gerichtesarztes', *Viertel-jahrschrift für gerichtliche öffentliche Medizin*, 1 (1852), 21–78; *Klinische Novellen zur gerichtlichen Medizin: Nach eigenen Erfahrungen* (Berlin: Hirschwald, 1863), 33–52.

⁵³ Paul Moreau de Tours, *Des Aberrations du Sens Génésique*, 4th edn (Paris: Asselin & Houzeau, 1887). A review of the 1881, second edition, however, does list 'l'amour des enfants impubères quel que soit leur sexe' [the love of prepubescent children regardless of their sex] in a typology of aberrations suggestive of a perverted instinct, beside habitual onanism, sodomy, pederasty, tribadism, bestiality, and necrophilia (*Journal de Thérapeutique*, 8 [1881], 382–3).

⁵⁴ The first two terms appear in print from circa 1827 and 1841, respectively, following incidental cases. Another quasi-type of sadist, *Mädchenschlächter* [girl butcher], was alerted to in Paul Johann Anselm von Feuerbach's *Merkwürdige Criminal-Rechtsfälle* (Tasché und Müller, 1811), Vol. 2, 1–30. *Knabengeissler* (*Psychopathia sexualis*, 1892, 82) is Krafft-Ebing's neologism.

⁵⁵ A largely underground, mostly British 'Uranian' community of poets is said to have opposed Karl Heinrich Ulrichs's claims for 'androphilic, homoerotic liberation at the expense of the paederastic' (Michael Matthew Kaylor, *Secreted Desires: The Major Uranians: Hopkins, Pater and Wilde* [Brno: Masaryk University Press, 2006], xiiin). An appendix to Ellis and Symonds's 1896 *Das konträre Geschlechtsgefühl* (Leipzig: Wigand, 1896, 269–76) discussed customary boy-man pairing among US hoboes. Covered in book-length studies, there was also something of a Victorian/Edwardian 'cult of the (girl-)child'. The latter, probably largely chaste phenomenon hardly attracted psychoanalytic attention until the mid-1970s. Cultural historians have predictably resisted present-day psychiatric interpretations. Catherine Robson sets out 'to ask questions about the cultural origins [of the Victorian gentleman's obsession with the child], to consider what else that adult interest might be signifying in the period before its pronouncements of medicalized discourse effectively closed down all explanations other than the diagnosis of individual pathology' (*Men in Wonderland: The Lost Girlhood of the Victorian Gentleman*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001, 10). See also James R. Kincaid's *Child-loving: The Erotic Child and Victorian Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1992), and Ashley Faulkner, *The Adoration of the Child: Liturgy and Eugenics in British Literature, 1870–1914* (unpublished PhD thesis: University of Virginia, 2012).

Considered symptomatologically, reports of paedophilia remain exceedingly rare and casuistic until the 1890s. In 1840, American phrenologist W. Byrd Powell mentioned a man, George Kennedy, hanged for rape of a ten-year-old girl who, according to a memorandum, while ‘standing on the drop, with the rope about his neck, [. . .] informed the spectators that such [sexual] commerce with female children had been the governing passion of his life’.⁵⁶ Clinical research and organic theories of paedophilia seem to have been consolidated in, but also largely limited to, an 1864 article by Powell, discussing craniological similarities of at least five men (three executed, ‘several’ incarcerated) said to have had ‘an intemperate desire for commerce with female children’. This empirical basis confirmed Powell’s earlier impression that as ‘inveterate masturbators’, and in contrast to nymphomaniacs, such men turned out to have underdeveloped ‘organs of animal sensibility’ and overdeveloped ‘amatory organs’.

However, various independent nosological identifications of paedophilia can be seen at the close of the nineteenth century. This entails the passage from the incidental symptom of indecent behaviour to a *sui generis* mental affliction, that is, to an inborn, ‘primary’ orientation that is not strictly either an occasional symptom of senility, dementia, imbecility, epilepsy or an occasional corollary of alcoholism, impotence or libertine brutality. An 1881 conference paper by Freiburg psychiatry resident Ludwig Kirn, published in 1883, already offered most of this differential diagnosis, interestingly without elaborating its eponymous suggestion that heterosexual *Unzucht mit Kindern unter vierzehn Jahren* [indecenty with a child under fourteen years], as *widernatürliche Unzucht* and *Sodomie* [sodomy], could be an expression of ‘perverse sex drive’.⁵⁷ In 1890, Italian sexologist Guglielmo Cantarano included ‘tendenza verso persone impuberi’ [propensity for prepubescent] in a classification of sexual aberrations, as an example of ‘perversion due to a failing sense of pleasurable reciprocity’.⁵⁸ In 1891, French criminal anthropologist Émile Laurent, in a short chapter on ‘les amoureux des enfants’ [child-lovers], discussed those, unlike elderly offenders and libertines, who are ‘so to say born with the passion’ and, furthermore, those whose *amour* slides into exclusive sexual obsession.⁵⁹ In that same year, in the first major monograph on homosexuality, Albert Moll would discuss ‘Neigung zu unreifen Mädchen und Knaben’ [inclination to immature girls and boys], ‘Liebe zu Kindern’ [love for children] and ‘Liebe zu Jünglinge’ [love of youths], beside ‘Neigung

⁵⁶ W. Byrd Powell, ‘Organ of Muscular Motion’, *The American Phrenological Journal and Miscellany*, 2 (1840), 163–6; Powell, ‘The Organs of Sensation and Motion Discovered’, *The Chicago Medical Examiner*, 5.1 (1864), 1–14 (4–6).

⁵⁷ Ludwig Kirn, ‘Ueber die klinisch-forensische Bedeutung des perversen Sexualtriebes’, *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und ihre Grenzgebiete*, 39 (1883), 216–39; *Archives de Neurologie* (Paris), 4 (1882), 131–2 and 5 (1883), 374–5. Krafft-Ebing agreed early on where he stated that ‘Alle perversen geschlechtlichen Akte, von der Päderastie und Unzuchtshandlungen mit Personen des eigenen Geschlechts überhaupt bis zur Sodomie, Leichenschändung, Unzucht mit Kindern, Lustmord u.s.w. haben gerichtlich-medizinisch die Vermutung krankhaft bedingter Akte für sich und fordern bei dem jezigen Stand unseres Wissens die Prüfung des Geisteszustands’ [‘All sexually perverse acts, from pederasty and any sexual offence with people of one’s own sex to sodomy, violation of corpses, sex offences involving children, and lust murder call upon themselves the medical forensic presumption of morbidly conditioned acts and according to the current state of our knowledge call for the examination of the state of mind’] (‘Die gerichtliche Psychopathologie im Jahre 1882’, *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft*, 4 (1884), 104–5, cf. 106–7).

⁵⁸ Guglielmo Cantarano, ‘Inversione e Pervertimenti dell’Istinto Sessuale’, *La Psichiatria: Gazzetta Trimestrale* [Napoli], 8 (1890), 275–93 (283, 289). The pertinent classification was reproduced in German in a review by D. Feist in *Centralblatt für Nervenheilkunde und Psychiatrie*, 15, N.F. 3 (1892), 90–1.

⁵⁹ Émile Laurent, *L’Amour Morbide* (Paris: Société d’Éditions Scientifiques, 1891), 193–201. The book was translated as *Die krankhafte Liebe* (Leipzig: Spohr, 1895). Laurent co-translated Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia sexualis* into French in 1895.

zu alten Männern', as distinct perversions and 'complications' of that condition.⁶⁰ In 1893, Chicago urologist George Frank Lydston briefly mentions as warranting the term 'sexual perversion', 'a class of cases where the criminal has no desire for female adults, but for female children only'.⁶¹ By 1894, Spanish author José de Letamendi identified *pederastia* ('amor á niños' [love of children]) as an 'erotic aberration' ('parafrodisimo' as opposed to 'afrodisimo') distinct from *homoerastia*.⁶² In 1896, French poet Marc-André Raffalovich, also explicitly located 'l'amour des hommes pour les impubères' [men's love for prepubescents] outside both normal uranism and normal heterosexuality.⁶³ Von Krafft-Ebing described *Pädophilie erotica* provisionally as 'eine krankhafte Disposition, eine psychosexuale Perversion' [a morbid disposition, a psychosexual perversion] in an 1896 aetiological paper on *Unzucht*, excluding those 'pubertati proximi' from the paedophilic age range.⁶⁴ The term entered his textbook on psychiatry first in its sixth, 1897 edition, his *Psychopathia Sexualis* in the tenth German edition of 1898, the English language in that edition's 1899 translation, the French language (as *pédophilie érotique*) in 1900 and the Italian language (*pedofilia erotica*) about 1902.⁶⁵

Influential medico-legal textbooks, notably dating before the first edition of *Psychopathia sexualis*, provided case studies Krafft-Ebing went on to consider indicative of *paedophilia*.⁶⁶ Another forensic case study, singled out by Krafft-Ebing for this purpose, dealt with an exclusive age preference for boys aged between six and twelve, with accompanying *horror feminae* and *horror puellarum*. Its authors stressed that their case evidenced an element of sensual and sentimental adoration, not just carnal interest. The patient had been generically diagnosed as '*dégénéré atteint de perversion du sens génital*' [degenerate affected by perversion of the sexual instinct] and referred to an *asile d'aliénés* [insane asylum].⁶⁷ With his new diagnosis, Krafft-Ebing described the case a

⁶⁰ Albert Moll, *Die konträre Sexualempfindung; Mit Benutzung amtlichen Materials* (Berlin: Fischer, 1891), 102, 146–7, 262; cf. 2nd edn (1893), 13, 134–5, 196–7, 351n; 3rd edn (1899), 216–20, 323–6; 'Probleme in der Homosexualität', *Zeitschrift für Criminal-Anthropologie, Gefängniswissenschaft und Prostitutionswesen*, 1 (1897), 157–89 (at 158–60).

⁶¹ Hunter McGuire and G. Frank Lydston, *Sexual Crimes among the Southern Negroes* (Louisville, KY: Renz & Henry, 1893), 5–6.

⁶² José de Letamendi, *Curso de Clínica General, ó Canon Perpetuo de la Práctica Médica* (Madrid: Imp. de los Sucesores de Cuesta, 1894), Vol. II, 120, 128–9.

⁶³ Marc-André Raffalovich, *Uranisme et Unisexualité* (Lyons: Storck, 1896), 42.

⁶⁴ Krafft-Ebing, *op. cit.* (note 7), 281. The term 'pubertati proximi' derives from ancient Roman and Canon law; Krafft-Ebing equates it with pubescence.

⁶⁵ Krafft-Ebing, *op. cit.* (note 7); reviewed in the *Zeitschrift für medizinale-Beamte* (9 [1896], 571–3) and reprinted and expanded in Krafft-Ebing's *Arbeiten aus dem Gesamtgebiet der Psychiatrie und Neuropathologie* (Leipzig: Barth, 1899), IV, 91–127; *Psychopathia sexualis*, 10th German edn (Stuttgart: Enke, 1898), 236, 337; *Lehrbuch der Psychiatrie auf klinischer Grundlage für praktische Ärzte und Studierende*, 6th edn (Stuttgart: Enke, 1897), 434; *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 10th, English edn (New York: Rebman, 1899), 525; 'Résumé du Rapport sur les Perversions Sexuelles', *Journal de Neurologie*, 10 (1900), 430–2 (431) and abstracted in *Semaine Gynécologique* (1900), 254; *Archivio di Psichiatria, Scienze Penali ed Antropologia Criminale*, 23 (1902), 282; *Rivista Sperimentale di Freniatria e Medicina Legale delle Alienazioni Mentali*, 28 (1902), 421.

⁶⁶ Joseph Maschka, *Handbuch der gerichtlichen Medicin* (Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1882), Vol. 3, 170–7; Valentin Magnan, 'Étude Clinique sur les Impulsions et les Actes des Aliénés. Leçon faite à l'asile Sainte-Anne le 23 janvier 1881 (Paris: impr. de V. Goupy et Jourdan, 1881); 'Ueber Geschlechtliche Abweichungen und Verkehungen [1885]'. In: *Psychiatrische Vorlesungen II/III* (Leipzig, 1892), 40–2; *Des Anomalies, des Aberrations et des Perversions Sexuelles* (Progrès Médical, 1885), 11–13; *Recherches sur les Centres Nerveux* (Paris: Masson, 1893), 340; Charcot and Magnan, 'Inversion du Sens Génital et Autres Perversions Sexuelles', *Archives de Neurologie* (1882), 320–1n1.

⁶⁷ Pacotte and Raynaud, 'Rapport Médico-Légal sur un Cas de Perversion', *Archives d'Anthropologie Criminelle, De Criminologie et de Psychologie Normale et Pathologique*, 16 (1895), 435–44.

year later as ‘eine spezielle Anomalie’ ‘innerhalb des Rahmens der Homosexualität’ [a special anomaly. . . within the frame of homosexuality].⁶⁸

Early-twentieth-century comments on ‘paedophilia’ were few, and hardly deferential to Krafft-Ebing. Most psychiatrists including Kraepelin and Bleuler dedicated only a few lines to child molestation in their textbooks; both, like Freud, mentioned not sexual perversion but the older differential diagnoses of epilepsy, dementia senilis (*Altersblödsinn*) and mental retardation.⁶⁹ Havelock Ellis’s brief use of *paidophilia* in 1905/6, denoting a prevalent inflection of ‘erotic symbolism’, was credited neither to Krafft-Ebing nor to Saint-Paul (discussed below); Ellis would explicitly doubt the existence of a paedophilic perversion.⁷⁰ Auguste Forel coined a competing term – *Pæderosis* – in 1905, again without reference to Krafft-Ebing, to mean a ‘spezielle angeborene pathologische Anlage’ [particular congenital pathological predisposition].⁷¹ Argentine physician, José Ingegnieros, also leaves Krafft-Ebing uncited where discussing a bizarre case of contemplative, ‘morbidly paedophilic’ fugue.⁷²

Krafft-Ebing briefly alluded to an associationist aetiology of the ‘eigenthümliche Art von Fetischismus. . . des Alters’ or ‘Altersfetischismus’ [peculiar kind of age fetishism] which he had named. He does so in an 1898 elaboration of his 1896 article.⁷³ He coined the word *Gerontophilie* when returning to this hypothesis in 1901, but did not discuss actual cases. In 1905, both Laurent⁷⁴ and Ellis described paedophilia in poorly elaborated terms of fetishism (Laurent: ‘fétichisme des jувénilités’ [juvenilities-fetishism]), neither with reference to Krafft-Ebing. More intricate theoretical approaches to age-specific attraction, as a purported dimension of either ‘psychical hermaphroditism’ or ‘psychosexual infantilism’, were being offered by Albert Moll (see below), later by

⁶⁸ Krafft-Ebing, *op. cit.* (note 7), 282; Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia sexualis, op. cit.* (note 6), 10th German edn, 1898, 339.

⁶⁹ Emil Kraepelin, *Psychiatrie: Ein Lehrbuch für Studierende und Ärzte*, 7th edn (Leipzig: Barth, 1903), Vol. 1, 298; 8th edn (1920), Vol. 1, 408; Eugen Bleuler, *Lehrbuch der Psychiatrie* (Berlin: Julius Springer, 1916), 421. Kraepelin did discuss a case of exclusive sexual interest in boys aged 10–14 $\frac{1}{2}$, but considered it rooted in degeneracy and a concomitant early sensitivity to unpropitious associations (*Einführung in die psychiatrische Klinik* [Leipzig: Barth], 2nd edn [1905], 299–304, 3rd edn [1916], 237–43). He notably believed ‘homosexuality had to be fought prophylactically and the age of consent raised to protect young people from homosexuals’ (Florian Mildenerger, ‘Kraepelin and the ‘Urnings’: Male Homosexuality in Psychiatric Discourse’, *History of Psychiatry*, 18 [2007], 321–35).

⁷⁰ Havelock Ellis, ‘Erotic Symbolism’, *Medicine* [Detroit], 11 (1905), 747–55 (753); *Erotic Symbolism, The Mechanism of Detumescence, The Psychic State in Pregnancy* (Philadelphia, F.A. Davis Co., 1906), 11, 13–14; cf. *Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students* (London: W. Heinemann, 1933), 129n, 181–2. Ellis remained ‘inclined to agree with [Fritz] Leppmann, who has carefully studied sexual outrages on children, that, psychologically, there is no definite deviation on a congenital basis involving an exclusive sexual attraction to unripe girls. It may easily be associated with impotent senility. Otherwise it occurs either as an occasional luxurious speciality of a few over-refined persons, or, more commonly, as part of a general indiscriminating sexual tendency in the weak-minded. So far as it has any psychological definition it may best be regarded as resembling the symbolisms. . . . [W]e 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’. Elsewhere, he conceded that ‘an exaggerated attention to virginity can only be regarded as a sexual perversion, allied to *paidophilia*, the sexual attraction to children’ (*Studies in the Psychology of Sex, Volume VI: Sex in Relation to Society*, Philadelphia: F.A. Davis, 1910, 381).

⁷¹ Auguste Forel, *Die sexuelle Frage* (Munich: E. Reinhardt, 1905), 259–60. In editions from 1907 onward Forel mischaracterises Krafft-Ebing’s *Pädophilie* as denoting ‘Laster’ only.

⁷² José Ingegnieros, ‘Síndromas Episódicos en los Degenerados Mentales. Estados Patológicos la Afectividad. Un Caso de «Pedofilia» Mórbida con Éxtasis Contemplativo’, *La Semana Médica* [Buenos Aires], XI, 3 (1904), 51–5.

⁷³ Krafft-Ebing, *Arbeiten*, IV, 118; *op. cit.* (note 51), 136; ‘Neue Studien auf dem Gebiete der Homosexualität’, *Jb f Sex Zw*, 3 (1901), 1–36 (6).

⁷⁴ Émile Laurent, *Fétichistes et Érotomanes* (Paris: Vigot, 1905), 63–7.

early students of psychoanalysis (Hirschfeld, Otto Juliusberger, Max Marcuse) and finally in monographic studies by Wilhelm Stekel and Arthur Kronfeld. In psychoanalysis, intergenerational infatuations came to be represented as fixations of a generalised, indeed ‘civilisational’, economy of familial libidinal investments. Yet, of the five ‘complexes’ involving incestuous tendencies toward children proposed in subsequent psychoanalytic texts *apropos* the Oedipus and Electra complex (so named in 1910 and 1913, respectively), not one gained a psychoanalytic foothold.⁷⁵

The reported case load of *paedophilia erotica* at that time, it needs to be stressed, was small, combining those of Krafft-Ebing (about ten by 1899), Schrenck-Notzing (two), Ellis (one), Forel (one) and, *avant la lettre*, Laurent (two). As it appears from a late edition of his *Der Hypnotismus* [*Hypnotism*], Forel claimed acquaintance with ‘many cases’ but reported treating only one case by hypnosis (outcome ‘uncured’).⁷⁶

Age and ‘Sexual Inversion’

Typological attention to age is evident in the work of two early apologists for homosexuality, neither of whom was medically trained. In an 1869 pamphlet Karl-Maria Kertbeny made a distinction between boy-loving homosexuality native to Southern countries and man-loving homosexuality native to Northern countries.⁷⁷ The piece contained the coinage of the word *Homosexualität*. At the same time, epithets including *Päderast/Knabenliebhaber* [pederast/boy lover] and allegations of *Knabenverführung* [seduction of boys] were countered in a plea for social acceptance of adult male homosexuality.

Comparably, in his first of twelve famed pamphlets Karl Heinrich Ulrichs coined the term *urnische Liebe* specifically to establish a contradistinction to the popular connotation of *Knabenliebe*.⁷⁸ Ulrichs’ initial terminology had modern homosexuality emerge right out of Pausanias’ speech in Plato’s *Symposium* that provided the (dissenting) distinction between an inferior love belonging to Common Aphrodite (borne from Zeus and Dione) oriented toward ‘women as much as boys [*paidēs*]’ on the one hand, and on the other, a love informed by an older, ‘Heavenly’ Aphrodite (borne from Uranus) of younger men but not ‘boys before the stage when their intelligence begins to develop, which is near the time when they begin to grow a beard’.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ The first of these was the *Jocasta complex* (R. de Saussure, ‘Le Complexe de Jocaste’, *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*, 6 [1920], 118–22), denoting not an idiopathic paraphilia but a gradient from normal to perverted maternal love for sons. Subsequent terms included *Griselda complex* (coined 1922), *Learkomplex* [Lear complex] (1933), *Phaedra complex* (1933), and *Laius complex* (1953).

⁷⁶ Auguste Forel, *Der Hypnotismus* 5th edn (Stuttgart: Enke, 1907), 183. Hirschfeld, however, claimed acquaintance with ‘about 30–40’ cases (*Die Kenntnis der homosexuellen Natur eine sittliche Forderung*. Berlin: F. Stolt, 1907, 58).

⁷⁷ ‘§ 143 des preußischen Strafgesetzbuches vom 14. April 1851 und seine Wiederbestätigung als § 152 [. . .]’, *Jb f Sex Zw*, 7 (1905), I–IV, 1–66 (53–4).

⁷⁸ ‘Zur Schaffung neuer Ausdrücke [Urningtum] glaubte ich schreiten zu müssen, weil das bisher wohl gebrauchte Wort «Knabenliebe» zu der Mißdeutung Anlaß giebt, als liebe der Urning wirklich Knaben, während er doch junge Männer (puberes) liebt. Auch im alten Griechenland liebte der Urning nicht Knaben. ‘Παῖς’ heißt so gut ‘junger Mann’, als ‘Knabe’ [I found myself obliged to create new expressions [Urningtum] given that the hitherto used word *Knabenliebe* [boy love] gives rise to the misinterpretation that the Uranian really loves boys while he rather loves young men. In ancient Greece, the Uranian did not love boys. ‘Παῖς’ translates into *young man* as well as it does into *boy*]. Numa Numantius [Karl Heinrich Ulrichs], *Vindex, Social-juristische Studien über mannmannliche Geschlechtsliebe* (Leipzig: Matthes, 1864), 2.

⁷⁹ Plato, *Plato: The Symposium*, M.C. Howatson and Frisbee C.C. Sheffield (eds) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 12–3. Pausanias, in this passage, calls for a law on the seduction of younger boys. In the

Ulrichs' later Urning typology, in his *Memnon* essays, blended a gender habitus and an age orientation schema: the *Weibling* loved *drauci* [strong young men], the *Zwischen-Urning* men aged between eighteen and twenty-three and the *Mannling pueri* [youths].⁸⁰ This early theoretical imbrication of gender and age preference, on the basis of a shared physical habitus between women and male youths from the perspective of the male Urning, was followed by theorists of sexual inversion of the 1890s. However, the terms themselves fell into disuse despite being used by John Addington Symonds and Havelock Ellis in the early- and mid-1890s, in the posthumous reprint of *Memnon* in 1898, and in allusion by Magnus Hirschfeld in the 1899, maiden issue of his *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* [Yearbook for Sexual Intermediates].⁸¹

In his subsequent, 1869 pamphlets *Incubus* and *Argonauticus*, Ulrichs would further reflect on the relative incidence and pathological nature of 'Geschlechtsneigung [Geschlechtsliebe; Geschlechtslust] zu unreifen Knaben' [sexual inclination/love/lust directed at immature boys] in Urnings and Dionings (heterosexuals), in connection with a widely publicised forensic case ('Fall Zastrow') of alleged sadistic rape of a five-year-old boy in that year.⁸² The accused apparently possessed and endorsed Ulrichs' *Memnon*, and has been identified as the second person in this period, after Ulrichs, to publicly announce an attraction to men.⁸³ The case led to a sensational criminal trial and was timed so as to impact on important discussions later that year of possible reform of the Prussian anti-sodomy law. Significantly, in his discussions Ulrichs makes boy-love and man-love mutually exclusive ('Wer Knaben liebt, liebt nicht Männer; und umgekehrt' [Who loves boys, does not love men and *vice versa*]) and qualifies the former consistently as 'krankhaft' [morbid].⁸⁴

same work, the character Aristophanes suggested that men-loving boys (*philerasts*) would grow into boy-loving *paederasts* (25) in his fable about the origin of sexual preference. This reference was lost on nineteenth-century sexology.

⁸⁰ Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, *Memnon. Die Geschlechtsnatur des mannliebenden Urnings. Eine naturwissenschaftliche Darstellung. Abtheilung I* (Schleiz: Heyn, 1868), 10–5. An essentially identical typology is found in Ludwig Frey's *Die Männer des Rätsels und der Paragraph 175 des deutschen Reichsstrafgesetzbuches. Beitrag zur Lösung einer brennenden Frage* (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1898), 92–6. The corresponding types are here named *Weiburning*, *Normalurning*, and *Mannurning*, respectively.

⁸¹ Magnus Hirschfeld-Charlottenburg, 'Die objektive Diagnose der Homosexualität', *Jb f Sex Zw*, I (1899), 4–35. This article in fact makes the very first gesture toward an empirical, epidemiological approach to erotic age preference, as it presents a questionnaire of which question no. 74 probes Ulrichs' typology, and question no. 79 specifically inquires after sexual attraction toward 'unreifen Individuen' [immature persons] (33–4). As discussed below, however, terms Hirschfeld and other typologists would use retained no explicit link between gender habitus and age.

⁸² Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, *Incubus. Urningsliebe und Blutgier* (Leipzig: Serbe, 1869), 10–11; *Argonauticus: Zastrow und die Urninge* (Leipzig: Serbe, 1869), 35, 42, 119, 126. On the significance of the case in the history of homosexuality, see Manfred Herzer, 'Zastrow–Ulrichs–Kertbeny: Erfundene Identitäten im 19. Jahrhundert', in Rüdiger Lautmann and Angela Taeger (eds), *Männerliebe im alten Deutschland: Sozialgeschichtliche Abhandlungen* (Berlin: Rosa Winkel, 1992), 61–80; and Hubert Kennedy, *Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Pioneer of the Modern Gay Movement* (San Francisco: Peremptory, 2002), 167–76.

⁸³ Herzer, cited by Kennedy, *ibid.*, 168. Forensic discussion at the time rather spoke of a 'perverse', 'perhaps inborn' sexual orientation, specifically of *Männerliebe* [love for men], *Tendenz zu Männern* [propensity for men], and *Neigung zu Männern* [inclination to men]; the defendant Von Zastrow denied a 'Hang zu Kindern' [penchant for children] (Johann Ludwig Casper, *op. cit.* (note 48), 5th edn, adapted and expanded by Carl Liman. Berlin: Hirschwald, 1871, Vol. 1, 490–500).

⁸⁴ 'Unmannbaren gegenüber freilich möchte ich jede Geschlechtsneigung trotz alle dem für krankhaft halten ...' [With respect to prepubescent I would of course regard any sexual inclination as morbid. . .] (Ulrichs, *Memnon II*. Schleiz: Heyn, 1868, 19; cf. *Argonauticus*, 127). In his 1870 pamphlet *Araxes: Ruf nach Befreiung der Urningsnatur vom Strafgesetz* (Schleiz: Heyn, 1870, 6) Ulrichs prophetically spelled out the legal principle of consenting adults in private.

Ulrichs' 1868/9 verdict was perhaps the earliest instance of an age-centric, rather than gender-centric, nosological conception of *Knabenliebe* – at least an early instance where the metaphor of disease was applied strictly on the basis of age.⁸⁵ An absolute schism between pathological boy-love and non-pathological, inborn man-love can thus be traced back to the earliest apologetic representations of homosexuality, and arose in the context of a criminal case, in an attempt to pre-empt popular connotations of homosexuality with violent child abuse.⁸⁶ The 'Northern homosexualist'⁸⁷ would notably have to argue the same case for at least a century to come.⁸⁸

For Ellis/Symonds and later Moll, following Ulrichs, age-preference came to speak to the nascent theorem of sexual inversion, albeit briefly. Male youths shared the feminine features of women, such that only attraction to robustly adult males would indicate a complete inversion, and thus full pathology, of gendered sensibilities in males.⁸⁹ This symptomological significance of age is not found in Krafft-Ebing's early *Stufen-theory*.⁹⁰ On the basis of many case studies, Moll alluded to the possibilities that age-attraction is a graded symptom of either developmental stagnation ('Hemmung') or even a standstill in the differentiation of sexual drive, or an admixture ('Mischung') of otherwise properly gendered, inborn forms of sexual receptivity ('Komplexe von Reaktionsfähigkeiten').⁹¹ Both erotic age- and gender-preference would thus be the outcome of sexual differentiation and had the tendency to appear as 'Mittelstufen' [intermediate stages] or 'psychosexuelle Übergangszustände' [psychosexual transitional states]. Such transitional states would be

⁸⁵ It is on the basis of gender that earlier German medico-legal sources classified *Knabenliebe* as 'Laster' [vice], 'verbrecherische Liebe' [criminal love] and as 'Krankheit der Seele' [morbidty of the soul]. Eg. Johann Valentin Müller, in *Frankfurter medizinische Annalen für Aerzte, Wundärzte, Apotheker und denkende Leser aus allen Ständen* (1789), 57–8, and his later *Entwurf der gerichtlichen Arneywissenschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Andreäische Buchhandlung, 1796), vol. 1, 133–4.

⁸⁶ Illustrative of the relevance of this for the differential naming of homosexuality and pederasty, for years after the Zastrow trial, the common parlance of the day preferred the term 'Zastrow' to that of 'Urning' (along with the verb *zastriren*; *Incubus*, 87–8). A notably comparable case of child abuse in 1903 led to the coinage of the terms *Dippoldismus* and *Dippolderei*, after the defendant, Andreas Dippold. The words appear in 1903 and subsequently in widely read and translated work by Iwan Bloch (*Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit in seinen Beziehungen zur modernen Kultur*. Berlin: Marcus, 1907, 613, 630), but as 'Zastrow' soon faded from public memory. The neologism *Paedoadismus*, used casually by Benedict Friedländer, in 1904 (*Renaissance des Eros uranios*. Berlin: Renaissance, 1904, 61n), was hardly ever used again either. On the Dippold case, see Peter Dudek, 'Liebevoller Züchtigung': Ein Mißbrauch der Autorität im Namen der Reformpädagogik (Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinkhardt, 2012), 49–61.

⁸⁷ Kertbeny, *op. cit.* (note 77), 54.

⁸⁸ In 1891, following up his earlier study of Greek love, John Addington Symonds complained that enduringly, 'individuals belonging to radically different species are confounded in one vague sentiment of reprobation. . . . The depraved debauchee who abuses boys receives the same treatment as the young man who loves a comrade. . . . The vulgar have confounded two different classes; and everybody who studies the psychology of Urnings is aware that this involves a grave injustice to the latter' (emphases added). John Addington Symonds, *A Problem in Modern Ethics* (privately printed, 1891). Reprinted in Jean Brady (ed.), *John Addington Symonds (1840–93) and Homosexuality: A Critical Edition of Sources* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 135, 192.

⁸⁹ Comparable considerations in Havelock Ellis and John Addington Symonds, *op. cit.* (note 55), 224; trans: *Sexual Inversion* (London: Wilson & Macmillan, 1897), 118–9; and Max Dessoir, 'Zur Psychologie der Vita sexualis', *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie*, 50 (1894), 941–75 (955).

⁹⁰ Unlike Moll, before 1896 Krafft-Ebing maintained that mature Urnings' desire 'seems never to be directed to immature males' except out of lack of older and in situations of 'violent passion'. At the subsequent stage he called *Effeminatio*, 'Inclination zu unreifen Personen' [inclination to immature persons] would again 'never' be present (*Psychopathia sexualis*, 7th edn, 1892, 258–9, 281; cf. Schrenk-Notzing, *op. cit.* [note 24] 124). These two claims are retained verbatim even in the 14th, 1912, Alfred Fuchs (ed.) (277, 289), but with the notable additional mentioning of 'Paedophilia erotica' from the 10th (1898) onward.

⁹¹ Albert Moll, *Untersuchungen über die Libido sexualis* (Berlin: Kornfeld, 1898), 160–94, 478–81.

the rule, not the exception. In 1899, Moll pointed out that in even in Germany ‘full sexual inversion’ – which would mean men’s attraction to men above the age of thirty – was rarer than attraction to those below twenty, and that until recent times a full degree of inversion may have been unknown – as it appeared to be in the Americas and the Orient. Here, only *Knabenliebe*, that is, ‘Homosexualität mit Neigung zu ganz oder halb unreifen Knaben’⁹² [homosexuality with an inclination to completely or semi-immature boys], would have been widely acknowledged at the time.

A comparable taxonomical suggestion in mid-1890s sexology maintained that unlike innate, effeminate and ‘passivist’ (masochistic) Uranists, ‘acquired’ and ‘active pederasts, the only true pederasts, are attracted by immature youths (gytons) of feminine aspect’.⁹³ Of a half dozen loose schemas of age-specificity in erotic attraction found in the 1896–1914 period, all were occasioned by similar, mostly theoretical, attempts to differentiate between homosexuals, and mostly by authors seeking to qualify sexual inversion’s pathological status. Most prominently, they occur in writings by Georges Saint-Paul in 1896,⁹⁴ by Ludwig Frey (pseud?) in 1898,⁹⁵ in a 1904 theoretical typology by Dutch physician von Römer published under editorial care of Hirschfeld,⁹⁶ in a 1906 essay and 1914 book by Hirschfeld⁹⁷ and finally in a book on urban vice and gay subculture by Catalan pedagogue Max Bembo, published around 1912.⁹⁸ Only Hirschfeld’s male schema, which borrowed all terms without attribution from Krafft-Ebing and Saint-Paul, proved of some utility to twentieth-century sexologists, although it never found broad cultural resonance. Of further note, the earliest identifications of *gerontophilia*, which Krafft-Ebing only

⁹² Moll, *Die konträre Sexualempfindung*, *op.cit.* (note 60), 1899, 3rd edn, 219.

⁹³ Dimitry Stefanowsky, ‘Uranism and Pæderasty’, *Alienist and Neurologist*, 15 (1894), 455–8. In a footnote Stefanowsky notably refers readers puzzled by the word ‘gyton’ to Petronius’ *Satyricon*, which mentions ‘a youth about sixteen years of age; curly-headed; a minion by calling; handsome featured; Giton by name’.

⁹⁴ Georges Saint-Paul pitted *féminiphile* with *paidophile* against *masculiphile invertis*, and coined the terms *éphébophilie*, *androphilie*, and *gunophiles/gynäkophilie* for further age specificity. As Krafft-Ebing, Saint-Paul recognises ‘cerebral, inborn’ and ‘temporary’, situational ‘paedophilia’ (‘Dr Laupt’s’, *Tares et Poisons: Perversion et Perversité Sexuelles*. Paris: G. Carré, 1896, 187, 296–7 *et passim*; ‘Betrachtungen über die Umkehrung des Geschlechtstriebes’, *Zeitschrift für Criminal-Anthropologie, Gefängnis-Wissenschaft und Prostitutionswesen*, 1 [1897], 321–57). Saint-Paul’s intricate typology was largely maintained in the work’s second edition, *L’Homosexualité et les Types Homosexuels* (Paris: Vigot, 1910), 296 *et passim*. The adjective *gynäkophil*, incidentally, was used first by Gustav Jäger in reference to fleas (*Die Entdeckung der Seele*. Leipzig: Günther, 1880, 269, a book that also holds the earliest attestations of Kertbeny’s terms *Homosexualität* and *Heterosexualität* in print) and later by Freud, *apropos* his Dora case, in reference to unconscious homoeroticism in hysterical girls (‘Bruchstück einer Hysterie-Analyse’, *Monatsschrift für Psychiatrie und Neurologie*, 18 [1905], 425, 465n1).

⁹⁵ Frey, *op. cit.* (note 80), 92–6.

⁹⁶ Proposed terms included *Neoterophile* (loving those junior), *Presbyterophile* (those senior), *Helikophile* (peers), *Brotophile* (no age preference); *Manthanophil*, *Didaskalophil* (teacher’s interest in students and *vice versa*). Lucien Sophie Albert Marie von Römer, ‘Vorläufige Mitteilungen über die Darstellung eines Schemas der Geschlechtsdifferenzierungen’, *Jb f Sex Zw*, 6 (1904), 347–8, 349.

⁹⁷ Hirschfeld’s eventual schema, in 1914, included the gender-specific terms *Pädophilie* – *Epebophilie* – *Androphilie* – *Gerontophilie* (males), and *Korophilie* (Eng.: *korophilie/corophilia*) – *Parthenophilie* – *Gynäkophilie* – *Graophilie* (females). Magnus Hirschfeld, ‘Vom Wesen der Liebe’, *Jb f Sex Zw*, 8 (1906), 64, 198; *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (Berlin: Louis Marcus, 1914), 279–82; *Sexualpathologie II* (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1918), 212–3. The schema entered American medical literature in a review by L.P. Clark, ‘A Critical Digest of Some of the Newer Work upon Homosexuality in Man and Woman’, *State of New York State Hospital Bulletin*, 7 (1914), 328–86.

⁹⁸ Bembo’s typology included *gemelos/-as* (loving peers); *infantilistas* (infants), *pederastas* (<13–14 y), *pedicones/-as* (‘adolescents’), *filadelfos/-as* (20–30 y), *virastas* (30–45 y), and *senectas* (>50 y). Max Bembo, *La Mala Vida en Barcelona: Anormalidad Miseria y Vicio* (Barcelona, nd. [1912]), 41–2, 68.

encountered among ‘sexual inverts’, all figured either in reference to homosexuals or as a ‘complication’ of homosexuality.⁹⁹

In his earlier aetiology-based typology of inverts, Saint-Paul had used the same term, *paidophilie*, in the same year as Krafft-Ebing, but used it in reference of a homosexual love for young *éphèbes*, not prepubescent *enfants*,¹⁰⁰ that is, as *éphébophilie*, a word also coined here for contrastive purposes and later to be reintroduced by Hirschfeld without attribution. Saint-Paul classified Oscar Wilde, in the year after his trials, as *un inverti paidophile* [a ‘paedophilic’ invert].

Moll, Krafft-Ebing and Hirschfeld all repeatedly stressed that the incidence of ‘paedophilia’ in or seduction by inverts was less, or at least not more, prevalent than among heterosexuals. Already in 1891, Moll spoke of a ‘complete analogy’. Both Hirschfeld, in 1914, and Moll, in 1921, ventured estimations of the respective incidence of age-preference categories.¹⁰¹ These estimations honoured a by now firmly established division between the first-order category of ‘homosexuality’ and second-order questions of ‘perversion’ or age-preference. Yet, the title of one of Krafft-Ebing’s last articles – ‘Flagellatio Puerorum als Ausdruck des Larvirten Sadismus eines Paedophilen Conträrsexuellen’¹⁰² – illustrates the concomitant problem of describing complex cases in terms of co-morbidity, especially in relation to the increasingly arguable ‘aberration’ of sexual inversion. Was the defendant at root an invert, a paedophile, a sadist or a flagellantist? The question clearly mattered to a world in which many, including Krafft-Ebing, had begun to de-pathologise ‘sexual intermediates’. One empirical contribution to Hirschfeld’s *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* claimed that 100 out of a nonclinical sample of 550 cases of *Konträrsexualismus* proved to be ‘complicated’ by other ‘anomalies’ in sexual preference, about fifteen cases by ‘Pädophilie’, the latter in turn considered ‘always closely entangled with masochism-sadism’.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Benjamin Tarnowsky is the first to have mentioned ‘eine ausschliessliche Neigung zu alten Männern’ [an exclusive propensity for old men], considered to occur in ‘many born inverts’, in a psychiatric context (*Die krankhaften Erscheinungen des Geschlechtssinnes*. Berlin: Hirschwald, 1886, 20). Moll (*Die conträre Sexualempfindung*, 1891, 147; 2nd edn, 1893, 197) likewise dedicates a short paragraph to ‘Neigung zu alten Männern mit grauen Bärten’ [propensity to old men with gray beards] (‘passion pour les vieillards à barbe blanche’, in an 1893 French translation) among men and considers it a sexual perversion complicating a sexual inversion. Gustav Jäger, purportedly already in an unpublished, 1879 manuscript, spoke of *Seniophilie* in sexual inverts (‘Ein bisher ungedrucktes Kapitel über Homosexualität aus der ‘Entdeckung der Seele’’, *Jb f Sex Zw*, 2 [1900], 110–11). Unlike Ellis’s later term *presbyophilia*, synonyms later adopted by Hirschfeld, von Römer, and Bembo, also appeared in typologies of sexual inversion. Forensic usage begins only with a 1907 report by Julius Wagner Ritter von Jauregg, who felt he need to coin an additional term, *Alt-Weiberliebe* [love for elderly women], in reference to a heterosexual casus (‘Alt-Weiberliebe, Sadismus, fraglicher Lustmord’, *Wiener Klinischen Wochenschrift*, 20 (1907), Occasional offprint: 1–18).

¹⁰⁰ Saint-Paul, *Tares et Poisons*, *op. cit.* (note 94), 296–7.

¹⁰¹ Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, *op.cit.* (note 97); Albert Moll, *Behandlung der Homosexualität: Biochemisch oder psychisch?* (Bonn: Marcus & Webers, 1921), 23–4.

¹⁰² *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie*, 58 (1901), 545–57. Compare the expression of ‘Paedophilia erotica homosexualis’ in Krafft-Ebing’s article ‘Drei Conträrsexuale vor Gericht’ (*Jahrbuch für Psychiatrie und Neurologie*, 19 [1900], 262–82), and Hermann Rohleder’s subsequent subtype of female homosexuality, ‘Paedophilia erotica homosexualis feminarum’ (*Das perverse Geschlechtsleben des Menschen, auch vom Standpunkte der Lex Lata und der Lex Ferenda*. Berlin: Fischer, 1907, 502).

¹⁰³ Alfred Kind, ‘Ueber die Komplikationen der Homosexualität mit andern sexuellen Anomalien’, *Jb f Sex Zw*, 9 (1908), 35–69. Case 100, furthermore, entailed ‘Heftige Neigung, die Hände schöner Jünglinge zu berühren’ [a violent inclination to touch the hands of beautiful youths].

'Paedophilia' and Child Sexual Abuse

There has been an elaborate early modern legal discourse on the nature of child sex offenders, but at least in England this did not include the notion of a sexual perversion.¹⁰⁴ Even by the late-1850s, Tardieu signalled out pederasty where habitually committed on boys aged six to twelve years but could at that time only provisionally refer to Kaan and Casper in considering pederasty the corollary of a possible 'perversion morale'.¹⁰⁵ In two 1894 book chapters marking the beginning of American forensic interest in the area of under-age sex crimes, neither of the authors specified perversion in relation to offences against children, although both alluded, as Tardieu, to the emergent European availability of such a specification.¹⁰⁶ Forensic psychology of child sex offenders is of twentieth-century, particularly psychoanalytic, origin, and at first relies minimally on the notion of paedophilia.¹⁰⁷

One could ask why a specifically forensic definition of a paedophilic predilection was not forthcoming until the 1890s, despite decades of alienist and forensic study of child sex offenders. Harry Oosterhuis characterises Krafft-Ebing's medical forensic coinage of *paedophilia* as coterminous with a shift which was only gradual 'from a psychiatric perspective in which deviant sexuality was explained as a derived, episodic and more or less singular symptom of a more fundamental mental disorder, to a consideration of perversion as an integral part of a more general, autonomous and continuous sexual instinct'.¹⁰⁸ Early forensic observations on victim age were largely concerned with hypotheses at the environmental and demographic level. Tardieu correlated offender and victim age, observing a general inverse relation, an empirical 'law' not contradicted in research by Alexandre Lacassagne, Paul Bernard and Paul Brouardel.¹⁰⁹ For Brouardel, it fitted the suggestion that impotence was a central predisposing factor in sex offences. Lombroso connected an apparent nineteenth century rise in offences against children,

¹⁰⁴ Sarah Toulalan, 'Is He a Licentious Lewd Sort of a Person?': Constructing the Child Rapist in Early Modern England', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 23 (2014), 21–52.

¹⁰⁵ 'Il faut donner une place à part dans l'histoire de la pédérastie aux attentats commis sur de jeunes garçons de six à douze ans par des hommes débauchés dont les excitations et l'exemple corrompeur ont plus d'une fois appelé avec la juste sévérité des lois les investigations d'une expertise médicale'. Auguste Ambroise Tardieu, *Étude Médico-Légale sur les Attentats aux Mœurs* (Paris: J.B. Baillière & Fils), 2nd edn (1858), 116–7, 3rd edn (1859), 124–5; 4th edn (1862), 152; 5th edn (1867), 177, 187, 7th edn (1878), 200. Pertinent section also published in *Annales d'Hygiène Publique et de Médecine Légale*, II, 9 (1858), 141.

¹⁰⁶ W. Teavis Gibb, 'Indecent Assault upon Children' (I) and Charles Gilbert Chaddock, 'Sexual crimes', in *A System of Legal Medicine*, 2 vols. (New York: E.B. Treat, 1894). Chaddock, a translator of Von Krafft-Ebing, relates that 'Sexual perversion (erotic fetichism) might lead to an unnatural preference for children' (Vol. II, 544). Gibb considered that sexual assaults upon children 'are usually perpetrated by men who are insane, old men beyond the age of virility, men under the influence of liquor, and those suffering from some form of perversion of the sexual instinct which may be akin to insanity' (Vol. I, 652).

¹⁰⁷ Eg. Eva Muys and Karel Velle, 'Seksuele Delinquentie in het Onderwijsmilieu: Pedofiele Onderwijzers in de 19de Eeuw. Casus: Oost en West-Vlaanderen', *Revue Belge d'Histoire Contemporaine*, 28 (1998), 293–337; Tanja Hommen, *Sittlichkeitsverbrechen: Sexuelle Gewalt im Kaiserreich* (Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus, 1999); Brigitte Kerchner, 'Körperpolitik. Die Konstruktion des 'Kinderschänders' in der Zwischenkriegszeit', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 21 (2005), 241–78. Muys and Velle suggest that psychosocial interest in sex offenders in Belgium did not arise until 1925 (319n87). Their use of the term *pedofilie* (passim) is accordingly arguable.

¹⁰⁸ Harry Oosterhuis, 'Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll', *Medical History*, 56 (2012), 133–55 (135).

¹⁰⁹ Paul Bernard, *Des Attentats à la Pudeur sur les Petites Filles* (Paris: Dion, 1886), 45–6; René Garraud and Paul Bernard, 'Des Attentats à la Pudeur et des Viols sur les Enfants', *Archives d'Anthropologie Criminelle et des Sciences Pénales*, 1 (1886), 396–435 (412); Paul Brouardel, 'Les Causes des Attentats aux Mœurs', *Annales d'Hygiène Publique et de Médecine Légale*, 8 (1907), 331–40.

as opposed to adults, not to an idiopathic perversion but to ‘insatiability with regard to pleasure in the cases of individuals of high culture, together with the abundance of opportunity’.¹¹⁰

Alienist attention to moral offences against children into the twentieth century focused mainly on possible grounds for defendants’ reduced capacity. Defendants, for their part, were likely to cite circumstantial and incidental, not preferential, factors. Exculpatory statements were scrutinised as possible clues to the state of their mental faculties. A case of predominantly homosexual child abuse reported in 1843, for instance, had alienists puzzling over whether the defendant’s *apologia* – a primary school teacher referring to ‘l’exemple de Socrate et d’Alcibiade’ [the example of Socrates and Alcibiades] and contesting medical consensus about onanism – entailed ‘la corruption du cœur ou la perversion de l’intelligence’ [a corruption of the heart or a perversion of the intellect].¹¹¹ Legal students including Ulrichs and Krafft-Ebing spelled out that any distinct morbid sexual orientation in recidivist cases of *Notzucht* [rape], *Unzucht* [indecentcy], *Verführung* [seduction], *Blutschande/Inzucht* [incest] or *Schamverletzung* whether involving men, women or minors, would not in itself indicate mental alienation. Krafft-Ebing’s coinage of *paedophilia erotica* was only to supplement a long-known list of etiological factors (senility, alcoholism, epilepsy, degeneracy and mental retardation) that in themselves might, or might not (libertinism), imply diminished responsibility in sex offenders. In all of his own cases, except a seeming Platonic one, Krafft-Ebing found signs of degeneration. Still, without a third factor (*neurasthenia*, *dementia paralytica*) present, acting upon a paedophilic orientation would not suggest diminished capacity. These conclusions were affirmed by others including Von Schrenck-Notzing.¹¹²

Did ‘paedophilia’ dovetail with a nascent professional inclination to psychiatricise early sexual experience? Qualifications such as ‘damage’, ‘violation’, ‘defilement’, ‘corruption’ and ‘abuse’ had long informed the linked epidemiologies of *Onanie* [onanism], *Knabenschände* and *Verführung*. They assumed more precise aetiological significance to psychiatrists from the mid-nineteenth century onward, in informed assumptions about acquired pederasty (by Casper, from 1852) and in Binet’s 1887 associationalist aetiology of fetishism. The broadening of this significance by Freud in 1895/6 to hysteria, obsessional neurosis and paranoia (seduction’s promotion to the status of ‘caput Nili der Neuropathologie’, in Freud’s terms) was famously dismissed by Krafft-Ebing as ‘a scientific fairy-tale’.¹¹³ In other words, at the time of the naming of

¹¹⁰ Cesare Lombroso, *Le Crime: Causes et Remèdes* (Paris: Alcan, 1899), 311 (*Crime, Its Causes and Remedies*, London: W. Heinemann, 1911, 257).

¹¹¹ G. Ferrus, A. Foville and A. Briere De Boismont, ‘Attentat aux Mœurs, Condamnation, Appel, Expertise Médicale et Prononcé du Jugement’, *Annales Médicopsychologiques*, 1 (1843), 289–99.

¹¹² Albert von Schrenck-Notzing, ‘Die Frage nach der verminderten Zurechnungsfähigkeit’, *Archiv für Criminal-Anthropologie*, 8 (1901), 79–80; *Kriminalpsychologische und Psychopathologische Studien* (Leipzig: Barth, 1902), 97–8.

¹¹³ ‘Sexual abuse’ attained a pathophysiological dimension in nineteenth-century andrological, vitalist and moral hygiene treatises, diffusely connoting ‘excess’, ‘waste’, ‘exhaustion’ and consequent drainage of vitality. Although the rather more ethical terms and notions of *geschlechtliche/sexuelle Mißbrauch* [sexual abuse] (both expressions are attested from the 1850s) and *psychische Trauma* [psychic trauma] were established at the time, the specific psychological sense of *sexuelle Trauma* [sexual trauma] and *sexuelle Schädigung* [sexual damage] entered German idiom only in Josef Breuer and Sigmund Freud’s *Studien über Hysterie* (Leipzig: F. Deuticke, 1895, 115, 116), in reviews of that book, and in the one French and two German 1896 ‘seduction’ articles by Freud. Age- and offence-specific phrases appear first in the twentieth century, all in explicit reference to Freud and invariably coined by early psychoanalysts (Leopold Loewenfeld, Karl Abraham, Albert Moll, Wilhelm Stekel, Otto Rank, among others). Examples include *infantile Sexualtrauma* [infantile sexual trauma] (attested from

a paedophilic orientation, there was only a limited and disputed basis for the psychiatric relevance of sexual victimhood. ‘Paedophilia’ was clearly relevant both to narrowly-defined and expanded sexual aetiologies of mental illness, but certainly not critical.

The label did occur in the very same year as the publication of Freud’s three ‘seduction theory’ papers, a coinage suspended between Edward Tylor’s exogamy and Edward Westermarck’s incest avoidance theories and the germination of Freud’s Oedipus complex.¹¹⁴ Freud’s rethinking of the issue has been considered ‘the central event in the discovery of psychoanalysis, both in Freud’s own account and in that of his biographers’.¹¹⁵ In the early 1980s, historical unearthing of the abandoned ‘seduction hypothesis’ figured prominently in an epochal reassertion of that inference. Freud notably signalled out three groups of ‘seducers’: ‘nursemaids, governesses, domestic servants, and teachers’;¹¹⁶ older children and siblings; and ‘adult strangers’. Not a single accusation of a parent or ‘paedophile’ can be identified in Freud’s published caseload at the time.¹¹⁷ The term *paedophilia* does not appear in the *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society* (1906–18). Freud never used it in print or correspondence, and would only briefly reflect on the child as erotic object of choice in 1905.¹¹⁸ Equally, in perhaps the earliest aetiology-centred quantitative study of child sex offenders, published in that year, the existence of any such mental disposition as paedophilia (‘eines Kinderschändungstriebes’) was considered ‘most questionable’ and no mention was made of either Krafft-Ebing or his term.¹¹⁹ Wulffen’s voluminous textbook *Der Sexualverbrecher [The Sex Offender]* of

1903), *sexuelle Jugendtrauma* [juvenile sexual trauma] (1907), *psychosexuelle Trauma* [psychosexual trauma] (1907), *sexuelle Kindheitstrauma* [childhood sexual trauma] (1908), and *Inzesttrauma* [incest trauma] (1910).

¹¹⁴ Edvard Westermarck, *The History of Human Marriage* (London: Macmillan, 1891), 320; Sigmund Freud, *Die Traumdeutung* (Leipzig: Franz Deuticke, 1900). The late nineteenth century medicalisation of ‘seduction’ seems to align with ethnographically widespread and much earlier popular (folkloric) connections of incest with notions of illness, madness, and disruption of the natural sphere. How to understand these prescientific tropes of disease in the context of proto-scientific, or even today’s scientific, ones is thus as much a medical as an anthropological problem. The early twentieth-century proximity of psychoanalysis to anthropology and folklore studies would suggest this was better realised than it is now.

¹¹⁵ Paul Robinson, *Freud and His Critics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 104. For divergent reconstructions, see Hall Triplett, ‘The Misnomer of Freud’s ‘Seduction Theory’’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 65 (2004), 647–65; Han Israels and Morton Schatzman, ‘The Seduction Theory’, *History of Psychiatry*, 4 (1993), 23–59; D.A. Davis, ‘A Theory for the 90s: Traumatic Seduction in Historical Context’, *Psychoanalytic Review*, 81 (1994), 627–40; George J. Makari, ‘Towards Defining the Freudian Unconscious: Seduction, Sexology and the Negative of Perversion (1896–1905)’, *History of Psychiatry*, 8 (1997), 459–85; Mikkel Borch-Jacobsen, *Making Minds and Madness: From Hysteria to Depression* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), ch. 2.

¹¹⁶ On the nineteenth century commonplace of the seducing maid/servant, see eg. Andrew J. Counter, ‘Bad Examples: Children, Servants, and Masturbation in Nineteenth-Century France’, *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 22 (2013), 403–25.

¹¹⁷ Post-publication letters to Wilhelm Fliess dated 6 December 1896 and 21 September 1897 as well as Freud’s ‘Selbstdarstellung’ (in L.R. Grote (ed.), *Die Medizin der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, Leipzig: Meiner, 1925, Vol. IV, 1–52) contradict this, stating that women’s seducers were (nearly) all fathers. Another letter dated 28 April 1897 also reports a father and grandfather as seducers. Cf. Triplett, *op. cit.* (note 115), 663–4.

¹¹⁸ Sigmund Freud, *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Leipzig/Vienna: Franz Deuticke, 1905), 10–11. Lumping paedophilic with zoerastic object choice, and as Leppmann (*cit. infra*), Freud stresses surrogacy/situational and occasional reasons for object choice, marking the ‘faint-hearted and impotent’ and those with the best opportunity. Brett Kahr (‘Four Unknown Freud Anecdotes’, *American Imago*, 67 [2010], 305) conjectures that Freud treated at least one ‘paedophile patient’ (‘in the 1930’s’) and provided supervision for another under the care of his student Theodor Reik. Freud owned the eleventh (1901) as well as earlier editions of Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia sexualis* (Frank J. Sulloway, *Freud, Biologist of the Mind*, New York: Basic Books, 1979 [1983, 296]).

¹¹⁹ F. Leppmann, ‘Die Sittlichkeitsverbrecher’, *Vierteljahrsschrift für gerichtliche Medizin und öffentliches Sanitätswesen*, III, 29 (1905), 277–318 +30, 34–86 (284, 309).

1910 still had little to add to Krafft-Ebing's provisional, descriptive account.¹²⁰ In 1912 Hermann Rohleder would claim to be the first to suggest that incest could be read as a corollary of *paedophilia* or *parthenophilia erotica*, matched with the suggestion that it should be punished only where involving depravity against children.¹²¹ The first to offer substantial discussions of paedophilia and gerontophilia, incidentally, had fallings-out with Freud–Moll and Stekel.¹²² The first dedicated psychoanalytic commentaries in English appear only in 1926.¹²³

As *hebephilia*, a new empirical gaze on *erotic age preference* is seen in the mid- to late-1950s, and soon became tied to *phallogometry* or penile plethysmography (the measurement of erectile circumference and/or volume in response to usually visual stimuli). The technique was originally developed by Czech sexologist Kurt Freund to facilitate 'diagnosis of sexual deviation', in particular the 'differential diagnosis between homosexuality and heterosexuality'.¹²⁴ It is here, in a series of Czech articles by Freund, that both sex-preference (including homosexuality) and age-preference (including *pedophilia*, *ephebophilia/hebephilia*, and *androphilia*)¹²⁵ are first, and simultaneously, 'diagnosed' in a psychophysiological test. Age of attraction soon became the mobilising research parameter for phallogometrists.¹²⁶ The mid-1960s goal was to turn a 'supposed' diagnosis arising from legal precedent (recidivism) and/or self-admitted preference into a 'test diagnosis' using *ex ante* age brackets. It resonated with a forensic interest in weeding out draft dodging 'pretenders' and more broadly with a largely clinical distinction hitherto mostly associated with homosexuality, between 'situational' and preferential offenders.

In the US, distinctions such as this would inform civil commitment procedures, especially from 1990, with the first 'sexually violent predator' law in California. It is indeed only in the 1990s – mostly the 2000s – that academic neologisms like *ganyphilia*, *hebephilia*, *adolescentofilie* (in Czech) and *juventofilia* (in Spanish) were seen aiming to designate discrete 'paraphilias'. *Chronophilia*, John Money's idiosyncratic term coined in 1986 to replace his slightly earlier classificatory nudges at 'fixation on age disparity' and 'age-discrepancy paraphilia', has remained an entirely speculative and normative

¹²⁰ Erich Wulffen, *Der Sexualverbrecher* (Berlin: P. Langenscheidt, 1910), 425–6.

¹²¹ Hermann Rohleder, *Die Zeugung unter Blutsverwandten* (Leipzig: G. Thieme, 1912), 160–1, 164.

¹²² Albert Moll, *Das Sexualleben des Kindes* (Berlin: H. Walthers, 1908), 199–222; Wilhelm Stekel, *Psychosexueller Infantilismus* (Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg, 1922), 311–44.

¹²³ Ernest E. Hadley, 'Comments on Pedophilia', *Medical Journal and Record*, 124 (1926), 157–62. John Cassity, in a paper read before the Washington Psychopathological Society on 28 June 1926, states that 'it has been only in the past decade that these [sex] offenders have been suspected as victims of psycho-pathological processes by the courts or by the people at large except those which were very obviously deranged individuals' ('Psychological Considerations of Pedophilia', *Psychoanalytic Review*, 14 [1927], 189–99).

¹²⁴ Kurt Freund, 'Diagnostika Homosexuality u Mužů', *Československá Psychiatrie*, 53 (1957), 382–94; *Die Homosexualität beim Mann* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1963; 1965 2nd edn), 39 et seq. Interestingly, many 'nondeviant men' and homosexuals showed erectile response to adolescents and even children. Without legal precedent this was considered of little diagnostic relevance. On Freund see Věra Sokolová, 'State approaches to homosexuality and non-heterosexual lives in Czechoslovakia during state socialism', in Hana Havelková and Libora Oates-Indruchová (eds), *The Politics of Gender Culture Under State Socialism* (London: Routledge, 2014), 86–7.

¹²⁵ Men with preference for adult women were not called 'gynephiles' until a 1980 article by Freund ('Therapeutic Sex Drive Reduction', *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 62 [1980], 5–38). Instead they were called 'normals'.

¹²⁶ Same-sex sexual activity between consenting adults was decriminalised in Czechoslovakia in 1961, if anything catalysed by Freund's failure to convert homosexuals. In 1968, in the wake of the Prague Spring, Freund fled to Canada, where homosexuality was being decriminalised by the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1968–69.

gesture.¹²⁷ Money actively sought to populate the small ‘chronophilia’ family (coining *infantophilia/nepiophilia*), and repeatedly complained about the absence of terms such as *twentiophilia*, *thirtiophilia* ‘and so on’, stating that such terms would enrich ‘nosology’ and inform ‘diagnosis’ of people’s ‘lovemap’.¹²⁸ For a clinician highly sensitive to the medicalisation and politicisation of sex, this seems careless use of terminology: Money reported no cases and no evidence supporting the existence of a ‘chronophilic’ subgroup of paraphilias, nor data that would establish the conceptual validity of chronophilia (in evidence when ‘the paraphile’s sexueroetic age is discordant with his/her actual chronological age and is concordant with the age of the partner’), nor, finally, did he empirically consolidate the status of ‘mental disorder’ for any so-called paraphilia (to date, paraphilias lack biomarkers).

The 2013 passage from *paraphilias-as-mental-disorders* to *paraphilic disorders* did little to solve these basic, nineteenth-century problems. If anything, the ‘lived metaphors’ of disease, trauma and therapy seem to have become more fundamental to Western responses to sex crime than ever. Greatly exceeding the boundaries of a strictly medical history, psychiatric and psychoanalytic notions (*Sexualtrauma* [sexual trauma]; *Verdrängung* [repression]) have been greeted with a massive socio-political and legal appropriation. Both in the UK and the US, this development seems traceable ‘with some precision’ to media coverage of sexual minorities and sex crimes in 1977/8.¹²⁹ As Simon Cole¹³⁰ has spelled out, ‘paedophilia’, within the resulting culture of truth-unearthing, memory-recovering and conspiracy-revealing, figures quite diffusely as a mental, institutional and cultural morbidity. Legal, psychiatric and culture-critical dimensions of the term are today rarely cleanly distinguished, surprisingly even in many legal, clinical and historical communications.

¹²⁷ John Money, ‘Paraphilias: Phyletic Origins of Erotosexual Dysfunction’, *International Journal of Mental Health*, 10 (1981), 75–109 (97–8); ‘Paraphilias: Phenomenology and Classification’, *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 38 (1984), 164–79; *Lovemaps* (New York: Irvington, 1986), 69–72, 216.

¹²⁸ John Money, ‘Pedophilia: A specific instance of New Phylism Theory applied to paraphilic lovemaps’, in Jay Feierman (ed.), *Pedophilia: Biosocial Dimensions* (New York: Springer, 1990), 452; *Reinterpreting the Unspeakable* (New York: Continuum, 1994), 206.

¹²⁹ Philip Jenkins, *Intimate Enemies: Moral Panics in Contemporary Great Britain* (New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1992), 73. According to Jenkins, the trope of ‘Pedophilia was central to [US] anti-gay rhetoric until the mid-1980s, when it was largely replaced by the still more effective terror weapon of AIDS’ (*Moral Panic: Changing Concepts of the Child Molester in Modern America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998, 125).

¹³⁰ Cole, *op. cit.* (note 21), 312.