

Uranismus complicatus: Scientific-Humanitarian Disentanglements of Gender and Age Attractions

DIEDERIK F. JANSSEN

Independent Researcher

IN 1891 BERLIN PSYCHIATRIST and hypnotist Albert Moll alluded to the possibility that in the nineteenth century, Western European male homosexuality underwent a “shift of preference” (*Geschmacksveränderung*) from youth to mature men.¹ How to date such a shift proved problematic, as nonforensic and even forensic data on such preferences were few. Moll cites midcentury reports from the Mediterranean shores to the Far East that suggested that the ancient Greek pattern of age-disparate liaisons involving youths and boys was (still) à la mode, while Claude-François Michéa’s 1849 clinical use of the term *philopédie*, for instance, heavily implied it.² Where the ancient system of “boy” love (*paiderastia*) had commonly been approached philologically with inferences of cultural diffusion and significance, a new domestic “urban modality” (*grosstädtischen Form*, in the words of one commentator, August Krauss) of age parity gave rise to clinical theories of constitutionally “contrary sexual feeling” by pioneer advocate for “man-manly sexual love” Karl Heinrich Ulrichs and by Moll’s Berlin colleague Carl Westphal.³ Moll agreed with Ulrichs that the new forms of male same-sex

I gratefully acknowledge the most generous time and editorial care devoted by Dr. Annette Timm—rare blessings.

¹ Albert Moll, *Die conträre Sexualempfindung* (Berlin: Fischer, 1891), 101–2. The inference reappears in the second (1893), though not in the third (1899), edition.

² Claude-François Michéa, “Des déviations malades de l’appétit vénérien,” *L’union médicale* 3, no. 85 (1849): 338–39. Michéa may have intended the term *philopédie* as a transliteration of Plutarch’s term *φιλοπαιδεία*, which was generally translated as “love of/for boys” or “male love.” The term and sense of *amour Philopaedique* occur in an eighteenth-century French translation of Pseudo-Lucian texts. See in particular *Erôtes* (*Amores; Affairs of the Heart*), which counters Plutarch’s *Amatorius* in favorably comparing the love of boys to the love of women. See Lucian of Samosata, *Œuvres du Lucien* (Paris: J.-F. Bastien, 1789), 3:547, 579, 581, 583, 596, 598, and 600. While *Erôtes* does not contain Plutarch’s *φιλοπαιδεία*, it does contain five uses of *παιδεραστειν*, “to be a lover of boys.”

³ August Krauss, *Die Psychologie des Verbrechens: Ein Beitrag zur Erfahrungsseelenkunde* (Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1884), 174–80; Numa Numantius [Karl Heinrich Ulrichs], *Vindex: Social-juristische Studien über mann-männliche Geschlechtsliebe* (Leipzig: Matthes,

relationships seen in German cities provided evidence for considerable variety in age preference—"differences of taste" (*Geschmacksrichtung*) that, from Ulrichs onward, were caught up with the exercises in etiology, demarcation, and subclassification that these emergent theories demanded. If *some* homosexuality was possibly innate, what about its varieties? As examined below, the increasingly typologizing question of example and seduction ("acquired pederasty"), for instance, rendered age preferences and age differences pivotal challenges to the generations of scientific-humanitarian elucidation of *inborn* species of sexual orientation to follow.⁴

At one level, the issue appeared to be a straightforwardly empirical one. On the basis of fifty *Urning* (male homosexual) cases, the author of an 1882 German pamphlet stated of the two main types he here distinguishes, masculine youth-loving *Pädicatoren* and feminine man-loving *Pathici*, that their number was identical.⁵ Two separate questionnaires on homosexuality of the next decade, one drafted by Georges Saint-Paul and another by Magnus Hirschfeld, were the first to empirically explore the finding, and in 1914 Hirschfeld cited a similarly even (45/45 percent) ratio between what he called *ephebophiles* and *androphiles*.⁶ The terms had reifying, naturalizing potential; but if Hirschfeld's epochal work accomplished "a principled re-inscription of sexual [and even racial] difference in an expansive framework of natural continuity," as J. Edgar Bauer has argued, such a programmatic appreciation of continuity was

1864); C[arl] Westphal, "Die conträre Sexualempfindung: Symptom eines neuropathischen (psychopathischen) Zustandes," *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten* 2, no. 1 (1869): 73–108.

⁴ Not much is known about the female case. One 1830s book on prostitution in Paris remarks of *tribades* that pairs often displayed a "significant difference in age and charm"—a description that Cesare Lombroso cited a half-century later but could not substantiate with his own research. See A.-J.-B. [Alexandre-Jean-Baptiste] Parent-Duchâtelet, *De la prostitution dans la ville de Paris*, 2 vols. (Paris: J. B. Baillière, 1836), 1:163–65.

⁵ W[?] Bernhardt, *Der Uranismus: Lösung eines mehrtausendjährigen Räthfels* (Berlin: Verlag der Volksbuchhandlung, 1882), 24.

⁶ Laups [Georges Saint-Paul], "Enquête sur l'inversion sexuelle," *Archives d'anthropologie criminelle* 9 (1894): 105–8; Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (Berlin: Louis Marcus, 1914), 280–81. Saint-Paul's questions probed any sexually perverted "love for an old man" and, in old age, any "amour coupable pour des enfants" (sinful love for children). Edward Irenaeus Prime-Stevenson's later survey (Xavier Mayne, *The Intersexes: A History of Similisexuality as a Problem in Social Life* [privately printed, 1908]) was intended as a self-test for homosexuality. It asks: "Does similisexual [same-sex] desire of this sort direct itself strongest to very young boys? (If Uraniad [lesbian]: to very young girls?) To older youthful persons? To individuals in their early or latter [*sic*] teens?—older? or for distinctly mature individuals?" (628). Of further note, a "questionnaire on homosexuality" published in 1918 claims to have been the first one on "homosexualists" "in the history of culture." Question 33 asks for "upper and lower age limits of individuals that attract, with indication of subject's own age at the different periods." Unpaginated insert in Earl Lind (pseud.), *Autobiography of an Androgyne* (New York: Medico-Legal Journal, 1918).

hardly extended to gradations in age preference.⁷ Unlike Moll, Hirschfeld long delayed theorizing *ephebophilia*, and it is ironic that throughout his oeuvre, he reified and pathologized the contiguous category of *pedophilia*. Hirschfeld's work also never led to a further nuancing of age preferences, such as seen after his death.⁸

Moreover, Hirschfeld only gradually tried to resolve the politically charged and forensically critical question of age preferences from within his career-making *Zwischenstufenlehre*—his theory of intermediate sexual stages. As had Ulrichs and Moll, Hirschfeld eventually attempted to contain the question of erotic age preference within the larger, biomedical scope of sexual constitutions, historically converging with a more general movement toward *Konstitutionslehre*—the theory of constitutions. But in doing so, he failed to explore the many possible implications. In 1926 Hirschfeld noted that his politically expedient allegiance to the legal status quo, especially the age of consent, made him disinclined to apply his overriding interest in establishing natural continuities to the case of erotic age orientation or to its purported intrapsychic correlate, psychosexual maturity.⁹ In Germany as elsewhere, debates about the appropriate age for sexual consent raged between activists, the medical community, and policy makers, but they never had a straightforwardly scientific relation to nature's timing of male sexual maturity. From its inception, Hirschfeld's strategy had been to *establish* a gap between natural and eligible timetables for sexual expression, but he reconsidered this on later occasions and ended up having to strike a precarious balance between entrenching novel reifications (“pedophilia”) and normalizing others (“ephebophilia”).

*PÄDOPHILIA EROTICA HOMOSEXUALIS: “HOMOSEXUAL PEDOPHILIA”
AS A COMPLICATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY*

Hirschfeld's inspiration, Ulrichs, postulated in the mid-1860s that male youths had the “girlishness” (*Mädchenhaftigkeit*) that would please the

⁷ J. Edgar Bauer, “Sexuality and Its Nuances: On Magnus Hirschfeld's Sexual Ethnology and China's Sapiential Heritage,” *Anthropological Notebooks* 17, no. 1 (2011): 5–27, here 15. Heike Bauer has more recently examined Hirschfeld's work while being attentive to “complex synchronicities between the histories of male same-sex sexuality and child sexual abuse debates” (*The Hirschfeld Archives: Violence, Death, and Modern Queer Culture* [Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2017], 58).

⁸ Clearly modeled after Hirschfeld's *Ephebophilie*, the nominal specification of (homosexual) *hebephilia* (attraction to pubescents) entered the Anglophone forensic literature only in 1955; the term *Hebephilie* does not seem to have entered the German language until 1965. Moll briefly acknowledged the existence of men attracted to girls in their early teens (*Backfischalter*) but did not specifically name the phenomenon.

⁹ Magnus Hirschfeld, *Geschlechtskunde: Auf Grund dreissigjähriger Forschung und Erfahrung; Vol. I: Die körperseelischen Grundlagen* (Stuttgart: Julius Püttmann, 1926), 606–7.

more manly *Urnings* he called *Mannlings*.¹⁰ Ulrichs's well-known original idea (and self-image) of an *Urning* was rather that of a *Weibling*: a proper "woman's soul in a male body" looking for properly mature men. By 1868 Ulrichs had located the types within a "ganz regelmaige Reihenfolge von Zwischenstufen" (very gradual succession of intermediate stages) in psychosomatic build (*Habitus*) and concomitant gender/maturity preferences. This conjecture inspired clinical-typological concepts of homosexuality well into the 1920s, though *Urning* typologies by many later commentators (such as Bernhardt) regressively dropped Ulrichs's sense of gradual succession.¹¹ As late as 1926, for instance, Moll applied the category of "sexual inversion" proper only to cases of males attracted to *adult* males,¹² while as late as 1915 Havelock Ellis endorsed Moll's conviction that "a sexual attraction for boys is, no doubt, . . . that form of inversion which comes nearest to normal sexuality, for the subject of it usually approaches nearer to the average man in physical and mental disposition."¹³ Saint-Paul similarly considered same-sex *paidophilie*, or rather *phbophilie* (such as that of Oscar Wilde), "hardly a deviation." It expressed itself less as *perversion* and more as *perversity*, and thus it had a less damning prognosis.¹⁴ Other

¹⁰ See Diederik F. Janssen, "Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: First Theorist of Erotic Age Orientation," *Journal of Homosexuality* 64, no. 13 (2017): 1850–71.

¹¹ The dichotomy between passive male lovers and active boy lovers is defended matter-of-factly, for instance, in an interim report submitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by its Subcommittee on Investigations Pursuant to S. Res. 280, *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Pervers in Government* (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1950), 2–3.

¹² Albert Moll, "Perverse Sexualempfindung, psychische Impotenz und Ehe," in *Krankheiten und Ehe*, ed. Hermann Senator and Siegfried Kaminer (Munich: J. F. Lehmann, 1904), 667–717, esp. 680–81. See also Albert Moll, "Psychopathia Sexualis," in *Handbuch der Sexualwissenschaften*, 3rd ed., ed. Albert Moll (Leipzig: Vogel, 1926), 2:739–840, esp. 797; and Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 16th/17th ed., ed. Albert Moll (Stuttgart: Enke, 1924), 403, 408. One of the individuals Moll discussed in 1924 came to the same conclusion after reading Krafft-Ebing (ibid., 405–8).

¹³ Ellis's inverts who were "most strongly attracted to youths,—preferably of about the age of 18 to 20," grew in number from "only six" of thirty-six discussed cases in 1896 and "about 11" of forty-nine in 1901 to "about 18" of eighty in 1915. See Havelock Ellis (initially with John Addington Symonds as second author), *Sexual Inversion* (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1897), 286–87; its 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1901), 167; and its 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Company, 1915), 286–87. Ellis briefly notes in 1915 that Hirschfeld's division of "ephebophils" and "androphils" [*sic*] "seems to hold good of British and American inverts" (ibid., 289n2). Ellis does not use the term *paidophilia* until 1905 ("Erotic Symbolism," *Medicine* [Detroit] 11, no. 10 [1905]: 747–55) and never in this context. He did not systematically report on inverts' respective ages.

¹⁴ Saint-Paul coined the term *phbophilie* ("amour pour l'phbe") in Laupt [Georges Saint-Paul], *Tares et poisons: Perversion et perversit sexuelle* (Paris: Carr, 1896), 168, 186, 296–97. The book was reissued as Laupt [Saint-Paul], *L'homosexualit et les types homosexuels* (Paris: Vigot, 1910). Saint-Paul uses the term only once (296), apparently as a corrective for the term *paidophilie*, which he employs throughout but fears might be misunderstood to imply young children.

twentieth-century German sex reformers similarly subscribed to ideas of same-sex attraction that aesthetically and erotically equated femininity and male youthfulness, satisfying an “opposites attract” conception of erotic taste that normalized male same-sex attractions when age boundaries were crossed.¹⁵ Some disagreed but did confirm a surplus of attraction to “boys” in case material.¹⁶ Freud’s concepts of narcissism in homosexuality were predicated on the assumption that homosexuals are attracted to younger partners, while other influential psychoanalysts proposed Ulrichsian gender/age preference typologies (most notably, Sándor Ferenczi), discussed pedophilia only as a subtype of homosexuality (notably, Isidor Sadger, apropos a critique of Hirschfeld), or, like Otto Fenichel, nestled their theories of the former securely within the framework of the latter.¹⁷ Contemporaneous neo-Hellenic movements such as that of *Die Eigenen*, meanwhile, understood homoerotic relationships as being animated by the pedagogical goal to turn boys into men. Their motif of the *Männerbund*—all-male cliques divided between “age classes” (*Altersklassen*)—and its associated father-son-style intrigue was still being drawn on to describe typologies of age-preferential homosexuality in the 1950s, for instance, by Berlin psychiatrist Johannes Heinrich Schultz, here in updated theoretical frames of “total personality” (*Gesamtpersönlichkeit*).¹⁸ Age attractions and preferences, in sum, were and long remained integral to German sexual orientation theories.¹⁹

How intractable this problem was in medical terms is illustrated in Moll’s accounts of the variation in age preference he had observed; he vacillated

¹⁵ See, for example, J. E. Meisner, *Uranismus oder sogenannte gleichgeschlechtliche Liebe: Ein Beitrag zur Aufklärung* (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1906?), 21.

¹⁶ Rudolf Fleischmann, “Beiträge zur Lehre von der konträren Sexualempfindung,” *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 7, no. 1 (1911): 262–317. Of thirty “sexual pervers” put at Fleischmann’s disposal (by Emil Kraepelin), twenty were attracted to “boys” (*Knaben*) and ten to partners over age twenty-one.

¹⁷ See Diederik F. Janssen, “Stepchild of Psychoanalysis: ‘Paedophilia’ in Early Psychodynamic Thought,” forthcoming in *History and Psychoanalysis*. Ferenczi’s 1914 dichotomy of subject-homoeroticism and object-eroticism juxtaposed man-loving passive/effeminate inverts and boy-loving active/masculine inverts (“Zur Nosologie der männlichen Homosexualität [Homoerotik],” *Internationale Zeitschrift für ärztliche Psychoanalyse* 2, no. 2 [1914]: 131–42). Only the former would amount to a Hirschfeldian “intermediate sexual type.”

¹⁸ Johannes Heinrich Schultz, *Organstörungen und Perversionen im Liebesleben: Bedeutung, Entstehung, Behandlung, Verhütung* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1952), 209–13.

¹⁹ In Anglophone sexology, the problem has long remained implicit. The *Oxford English Dictionary* traces the term *sexual orientation* back to 1931. It occurs earlier, however, for instance, in a 1913 quasi-clinical article venturing that most of women’s allure lies not in the primary but in the “full development and accentuation of the secondary sexual character” (Douglas C. [Crawford] McMurtrie, “Figure Characteristics in the Female as Factors in Sexual Allurement—the Influence of the Corset,” *Lancet-Clinic* [Cincinnati] 110, no. 7 [1913]: 171–74, 172. Similar observations had been offered already by Havelock Ellis, *Man and Woman: A Study of Human Secondary Sexual Characters* (London: Scott, 1894), 19–20; and C. H. [Carl Heinrich] Stratz, *Die Schönheit des weiblichen Körpers* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1898), 43–48.

between anthropologically appreciating *Knabenliebe* (boy love) as a custom, speculating about incomplete sexual differentiation in *Urnings*, and assuming that object choice was situationally determined (as in the case of “pedophile” teachers). This last medicoforensic specification was indeed one way of engaging with the problem. Translating Ulrichs’s proposal to disqualify prepubescent partners from the continuum of *Urnigtum* (male homosexuality), already in 1891 Moll qualified a “penchant for immature girls and boys” or “for elderly men” in terms of a “sexual perversion complicating contrary sexual feeling [*Complication der conträren Sexualempfindung*].” In 1896 Richard von Krafft-Ebing’s provisional term *Pädophilie erotica* formalized this psychiatric categorization by describing attraction to same-sex prepubescents as “a special anomaly . . . within the scope of homosexuality.”²⁰ In what follows, I will sketch out how this medicalized and reified delineation of “the pedophile” as a newly identified “stepchild of nature” (Krafft-Ebing’s pet name for sexual misfits) became instrumental in disentangling and disaggregating the increasingly contested phenomena of *Konträrsexualismus* (sexual inversion) and *Paraphilie* (paraphilia) generally.

Research on constructions of “the child sex offender” in imperial, Weimar, and Nazi Germany has tended to leave open the question of how the category of pedophilia came to inform the legal and social response to sex offences.²¹ Medical jurisprudence gave only vague guidance on how to categorize offences against same-sex minors,²² and the question of how to understand age-disparate erotic preferences was all but ignored by forensic specialists. Occasional allusions to pedophilia in French forensic psychiatry into the 1890s did insinuate a place within the larger scope of “pederasty,” but here erotic interests illustratively remain tied to acts, not beloveds. Parisian forensic physician Charles Vibert (a student of the doyen of French forensic medicine, Paul Brouardel) writes as late as 1893 that in

²⁰ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, “Ueber Unzucht mit Kindern und Pädophilie Erotica,” *Friedreich’s Blätter für Gerichtliche Medizin und Sanitätspolizei* 47 (1896): 261–83. See Diederik F. Janssen, “Chronophilia: Entries of Erotic Age Preference into Descriptive Psychopathology,” *Medical History* 59, no. 4 (2015): 575–98.

²¹ See, for example, Brigitte Kerchner, “‘Unbescholtene Bürger’ und ‘gefährliche Mädchen’ um die Jahrhundertwende,” *Historische Anthropologie* 6, no. 1 (1998): 1–32; Kerchner, “Körperpolitik: Die Konstruktion des ‘Kinderschänders’ in der Zwischenkriegszeit,” in *Politische Kulturgeschichte der Zwischenkriegszeit 1918–1939*, ed. Wolfgang Hardtwig (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2005), 241–78; and Tanja Hommen, “Körperdefinition und Körpererfahrung: ‘Notzucht’ und ‘unzüchtige Handlungen an Kindern’ im Kaiserreich,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 26, no. 4 (2000): 577–601.

²² The well-documented 1905 prosecution of Vienna physiologist Theodor Beer for alleged indecencies with thirteen- and fifteen-year-old brothers drew responses from city notables Karl Kraus and Sigmund Freud, neither of whom invoked Krafft-Ebing’s diagnosis. Beer himself complained of being slandered as a *Konträrsexual* and as a *Päderast*. Karl Kraus, “Die Kinderfreunde,” *Die Fackel* 7, no. 187 (1905): 1–28; 189:18–26; 191:14–18. Freud’s opinion is recorded in “Die Affäre des Prof. Beer,” *Die Zeit* [Vienna], 27 October 1905.

some cases “it is the continuous contact with small children that encourages pederasty; thus, it is not unusual for teachers to engage in these practices. It seems that these men, who continue to have relations with their wives or mistresses, often have no inclination either for passive pederasty or for pederasty exercised on men, but only for that exercised on small children.”²³ Overseas observations by a student of Alexandre Lacassagne, the French pioneer of criminal anthropology and legal medicine, had him define *pédérastie* as “amour des jeunes enfants” (love of young children), dubiously distinguished from *sodomie*—dubiously so because he connected the latter no less with victimization of the young.²⁴

That uses of terms were changing is evident in André Gide’s 1918 diary entry, in which he famously divided homosexuals into *pédérastes* (men “who, as the word indicates, [fall] in love with young boys”), *sodomites* (“whose desire is addressed to mature men”), and *invertis* (who “[assume] the role of a woman and [desire] to be possessed”) and identified himself with the first category.²⁵ Consistently explicit distinctions between pedophilia (*avant la lettre*) and homosexuality in work by Ulrichs, Karl-Maria Kertbeny, Gustav Jäger, Krafft-Ebing, Moll, John Addington Symonds, and Marc-André Raffalovich had been rare occasions for both clinical entities to gradually assume forensic identities. In the fourth, 1889 edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, Krafft-Ebing explicitly ruled out the possibility that *Urnings* would fancy prepubescents and even leaned toward arguing that a penchant for same-sex adults precluded the desire to seduce youth, in particular in an influential 1894 thought piece in which he proposed eighteen as the age of consent for same-sex partners.²⁶ One year before his death, Krafft-Ebing retracted much of his qualification of homosexuality as a pathological condition in Hirschfeld’s *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (Yearbook for sexual transitions), notably an occasion for him to repeat that *pedophilia vera* (true pedophilia) is a “distinct perversion of the sexual life [*Vita sexualis*]” and to claim that it is *distinctly atypical* of homosexuals.²⁷ Indeed, Krafft-Ebing consistently cited the rarity of pedophilia in homosexuals as evidence that homosexuality and heterosexuality are “equivalents.” Hirschfeld, in similar

²³ Charles Vibert, “Viol, et attentats aux moeurs,” in *Nouveau dictionnaire de médecine et de chirurgie pratiques*, 40 vols. (Paris: J.-B. Baillière & fils, 1886), 39:484–510, esp. 499. Reiterated in Vibert’s *Précis de médecine légale* (Paris: J.-B. Baillière & fils, 1893), 328.

²⁴ A[dolphe] Kocher, *De la criminalité chez les Arabes au point de vue de la pratique médico-judiciaire en Algérie* (Paris: J.-B. Baillière & fils, 1884), 176. Kocher writes that *pédérastie* would “consist mainly of touching, [and] is observed among the Arabs, but less frequently than sodomy. Their brutal passions do not find in this trade a sufficient appeasement.”

²⁵ The diary was not published until 1939. André Gide, *Journal, 1889–1939* (Paris: Éditions de la Nouvelle revue française, 1939), 671–72.

²⁶ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Der Conträrsexuale vor dem Strafrichter* (Leipzig: F. Deuticke, 1894), 9, 29–30, and 32–34.

²⁷ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, “Neue Studien auf dem Gebiete der Homosexualität,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 3 (1901): 1–36, 6.

fashion, explicitized absence of an interest in prepubescents in early case studies of sexual intermediacy.²⁸

Krafft-Ebing's empirical basis for *Pädophilie erotica homosexualis* (homosexual pedophilia) was precariously small.²⁹ The cases of pedophilia that he explored in 1896 all pertained to preferences for the opposite sex, a fact that had Krafft-Ebing initially define the diagnosis as heterosexual,³⁰ and he could cite only one homosexual case from the existing literature: a French account of an Algerian who claimed to have turned "pedophilic" after being seduced, at age twenty-two, by a twelve-year-old boy. He added three "boy-lover" cases in an 1899 elaboration.³¹ In the 1901, eleventh edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, Krafft-Ebing claimed two further cases but never discussed them.³² But the way that he presented information about homosexual age preferences remained unsystematic, and his increasing emphasis on the fetishistic origins of (especially same-sex) pedophilia doubtfully relied on inferred causality between alleged events in defendants' own sexual histories and their admitted sexual preference.³³ Furthermore, diagnostic criteria (interest in prepubescent partners but not those "approaching puberty") were culturally intuitive but arbitrary and legalistic, and Krafft-Ebing did not always apply these age criteria consistently.

Krafft-Ebing never fully developed a theory of age preference. Moll, who characterized cases of same-sex attraction to nonadults as "extremely com-

²⁸ Magnus Hirschfeld, "Ein Fall von irrtümlicher Geschlechtsbestimmung (Erreur de sexe)," *Monatsschrift für Harnkrankheiten und sexuelle Hygiene* 2, no. 1 (1905): 53–59, 55; Hirschfeld, "Ein seltener Fall von Hermaphroditismus," *Monatsschrift für Harnkrankheiten und sexuelle Hygiene* 2, no. 5 (1905): 202–10, 207.

²⁹ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, "Drei Conträrsexuale vor Gericht," *Jahrbuch für Psychiatrie und Neurologie* 19 (1900): 262–82.

³⁰ Krafft-Ebing, "Ueber Unzucht," 278; and *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 10th ed. (Stuttgart: Enke, 1898), 338, which Hirschfeld seems to cite in Hirschfeld, *Sexualpathologie. Teil I: Geschlechtliche Entwicklungsstörungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Onanie*, unrevised 2nd ed. (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1921), 51. An appendix on the "pathology of the instincts" in a 1901 translation of James Williams's *Principles of Psychology* lists Italian psychiatrist Giulio Cesare Ferrari's gender-qualified version of the term *pedofilia eterosessuale* without defining or referencing it. See *Principii de psicologia* (Milan: Società editrice libraria, 1901), 744.

³¹ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Arbeiten aus dem Gesamtgebiet der Psychiatrie und Neuro-pathologie*, 4 vols. (Leipzig: Barth, 1899), 4:91–127.

³² *Ibid.*; and Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, 11th ed. (Stuttgart: Enke, 1901), 379. Elsewhere ("Flagellatio Puerorum als Ausdruck des larvirten Sadismus eines paedophilen Conträrsexualen," *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und psychisch-gerichtliche Medicin* 58 [1901]: 545–57), Krafft-Ebing discussed a man who was exclusively interested in spanking bare-bottomed boys who were "approaching puberty," that is, boys who were precisely *pubertati proximi*, or not within the pedophilic range.

³³ Most of the small number of late nineteenth-century forensic sexologists who dealt with same-sex child molestation assumed some form of acquired pathology, for example, the Italian criminal anthropologist Pasquale Penta, "Dei perversimenti sessuali," *Archivio delle psicopatie sessuali* 1 (1896): 1–7, 17–20; and Penta, "Un pedofilo fellatore," *Rivista mensile di psichiatria forense, antropologia criminale, e scienze affini* 6 (1903): 477–505.

mon,” did offer such a theory between 1897 and 1898. Age-preferential variety was, in fact, key to Moll’s assertion that “a whole number of varieties” of same-sex attraction existed; indeed, it was key to his idea that “all possible transitions” between masculine and feminine erotic response were possible. This significantly problematized the grand and often simplified question of homosexuality’s heritability. Moll believed that if anything was congenital about homosexuality, it was “gendered complexes of receptivity” (*Komplexe von Reaktionsfähigkeiten*), which, depending on external factors, drew noninverted men to women, or to not fully masculine boys, or (in many cases) to both.³⁴ In his examination of nonheterosexual cases, he argued that age preferences could be the result of stagnated development of a particular “response complex,” or an intermixture of gendered elements in otherwise intact (in other words, gender-polarized) complexes.³⁵ One possible implication was that a homosexual interest in peers at an age of incomplete differentiation might become fixed—to that age.³⁶

Moll’s conceptual apparatus seems to have had little influence on other contemporary experts on homosexuality, and although he held on to it into the 1920s, he never elaborated further. The international reception of Krafft-Ebing’s diagnosis of pedophilia was similarly slow and lukewarm. This was likely due to a combination of factors: sexual offenders’ proclivities were not straightforwardly pertinent to a determination of legal culpability in Europe and North America at the time; key texts had not been properly translated, or some discussions had, in fact, misrepresented Krafft-Ebing’s nosological innovation posthumously. Moreover, it was not embraced by the preminent sexologists of the day. Ellis and Moll repeatedly and approvingly cited a 1905 systematic study of child molesters by the Berlin forensic psychiatrist Friedrich Leppmann, who doubted that there was such a thing as an inborn penchant to molest children.³⁷ In that same year, Ellis associated sexual desire for children or the elderly (*paidophilia* and *presbyophilia*) with his notion of erotic symbolism (his conception of fetishism), though, like Krafft-Ebing, he never addressed implications for erotic age

³⁴ Albert Moll, “Probleme in der Homosexualität,” *Zeitschrift für Criminal-Anthropologie, Gefängniswissenschaft und Prostitutionswesen* 1, no. 2 (1897): 157–89; Albert Moll, *Untersuchungen über die Libido Sexualis* (Berlin: Kornfeld, 1897–98), 1:190–94, 477–82.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 480–81.

³⁶ Moll, “Psychopathia Sexualis,” 767.

³⁷ Leppmann had already expressed his hesitation to infer age preference from victim age in August 1895 at a conference discussion on lust murder. Friedrich Leppmann, cited in *Mitteilungen der Internationalen kriminalistischen Vereinigung* 5 (1896): 505–6. Unbeknownst to Ellis, Leppmann’s later heterosexual cases did align with Krafft-Ebing’s notion of age fetishism. See Friedrich Leppmann, “Zur ärztlichen Begutachtung von Sittlichkeitsverbrechern (§176,3 St.G.B.),” *Ärztliche Sachverständigen-Zeitung* 18, no. 10 (1912): 202–5. Much later, Leppmann acknowledges Hirschfeld’s concept of infantilism in “Essential Differences between Sex Offenders,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 32, no. 3 (1941): 366–80.

preference in general.³⁸ Few of the scholarly invocations of the neo-Greek term *pedophilia* (including Ellis's) make reference to Krafft-Ebing or his superordinate category of age fetishism, and the term is defined in various ways in medical dictionaries and, from the 1920s onward, textbooks on abnormal psychology.³⁹ Well into the twentieth century, pedophilia remained a fundamentally contested category with a largely conjectural clinical relevance and conspicuously underexplored psychodynamic profile.⁴⁰

SCIENTIFIC-HUMANITARIAN CONCEPTS OF AGE ATTRACTIONS

Despite the medical establishment's relative indifference to theories of age-disparate and same-sex attraction, age was consistently critical to contemporary sexual emancipation efforts in Berlin. This explains attempts by special pleader Hirschfeld to substantiate Krafft-Ebing's findings about same-sex age preference with survey data and biomedical theory after his death in 1902. Whereas German research and advocacy concerning homosexuality were importantly occasioned by adverse legislation, the age of consent would be consistently thematized in legal reform efforts, often in terms of scope expansion.⁴¹ Interwar sexual reform efforts by the World League for Sexual Reform and Friedrich Radszuweit's Bund für Menschenrecht (Association for Human Rights) tended to define the "consenting adult" more conservatively than existing German-Austrian law (with an age of consent of fourteen).⁴² Meanwhile, the cultural trope of homosexual

³⁸ Ellis, "Erotic Symbolism."

³⁹ The 1908, seventh revision of Otto Roth's *Klinische Terminologie* (Leipzig: G. Thieme, 1908), 454, already included the full term and concept, with a reference to Krafft-Ebing (the sixth of 1902 had not). In contrast, Gould's *Practitioner's Medical Dictionary* (published in Philadelphia and running three editions between 1907 and 1916) did not include the term until the work was, posthumously in 1926, renamed *Gould's Medical Dictionary*. Dorland's *American Illustrated Medical Dictionary* did not include the lemma *pedophilia* until its 1915 (eighth) edition, and here it was only to denote "the condition of being fond of children." Arturo Morselli's *Manuale di psichiatria ad uso dei medici e degli studenti*, 2nd ed. (Naples: Idelson, 1921), 202, defined *pedofilia* as "boy-love" (*amore dei ragazzi*).

⁴⁰ One mid-1960s report about 184 child molesters, for instance, found no support for the existence of "real" ("endogenous" and exclusive) pedophilia: Günter Weiß, *Die Kinderschändung* (Hamburg: Kriminalistik Verlag, 1963), 114–17. An influential Dutch contemporary forensic psychiatrist agreed that "real pedophilia," as sui generis aberration, would not exist: M[achiel] Zeegers, *Seksuele delinquenten: Forensisch-psychiatrisch onderzoek* (Amsterdam: Schektema & Holkema NV, 1966), 53–60.

⁴¹ Paragraph 175, following the Prussian Paragraph 143, banned male "unnatural fornication" regardless of age. The age of consent was defined across several paragraphs, including 174/1, 176/3, 182, and eventually also 184a and 175a/3. For historical details, see Kai Sommer, *Die Strafbarkeit der Homosexualität von der Kaiserzeit bis zum Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998), 163–346; Christian Schäfer, "Widernatürliche Unzucht" (§§ 175, 175a, 175b, 182 a.F. StGB): *Reformdiskussion und Gesetzgebung seit 1945* (Berlin: BWV Verlag, 2006), 17–45.

⁴² The Weltliga für Sexualreform auf sexualwissenschaftlicher Grundlage sought the decriminalization of same-sex acts for mutually consenting adults. See *Sexual Reform Congress*,

seduction that was common in both the Weimar and Nazi eras liberally bled into censorship efforts and contributed to concerns about age attractions well beyond the pedophilic.⁴³ In 1918 one of the founding fathers of modern psychiatry, Emil Kraepelin, famously warned that seduction led to homosexuality; he made no definite distinction between homosexuals and same-sex pedophiles, and he proposed an age of consent of twenty-one.⁴⁴ Moll agreed, similarly warning against the threat of seduction and claiming that Hirschfeld's sexual-reform advocacy and questionable research methods increased the danger.⁴⁵

By the time the Nazis came to power in 1933, an ossified stereotype of inverters as seducers of youth and "child molesters" (*Kinderschänder*) had taken hold. These views were enshrined into law through the introduction of Paragraph 175a, which explicitly enabled prosecution of "corruptors" and "seducers" (*Jugendverderber* and *Jugendverführer*) accused of having liaised with same-sex youth between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one. Paragraph 175a/3 categorized same-sex sexual relations with those under the age of twenty-one as *schwere Unzucht* (aggravated fornication), a scope expansion that was only incrementally repealed beginning in the late 1960s. In 1936 the Central Office for the Combating of Homosexuality and Abortion (Reichszentrale zur Bekämpfung der Homosexualität und der Abtreibung) was set up with the specific goal of protecting German youth.⁴⁶ The death

July 1–5, 1928, Copenhagen: Proceedings of the Second Congress of the World League for Sexual Reform (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1929), 164. The Bund für Menschenrecht proposed an age of consent of eighteen, insisting, as Radszuweit put it, that "the respectable homosexuals, who seldom come into conflict with the law, belong neither to the seducers of [male] youth nor to male prostitution." Quoted in Glenn Ramsey, "Erotic Friendship, Gender Inversion, and Human Rights in the German Movement for Homosexual Reform, 1897–1933" (PhD diss., State University of New York, 2004), 267n93.

⁴³ See Laurie Marhoefer, *Sex and the Weimar Republic* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), 34–36, 44–45, 120–22, and 127–28.

⁴⁴ Emil Kraepelin, "Geschlechtliche Verirrungen und Volksvermehrung," *Münchener medizinische Wochenschrift* 65, no. 5 (1918): 117–20. Although one of Kraepelin's case studies of same-sex attraction aligns with the ones discussed by Krafft-Ebing, the term *pedophilia* notably does not appear in his work until the posthumous ninth edition of his *Psychiatrie: Ein Lehrbuch für Studierende und Ärzte*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Barth, 1927).

⁴⁵ See Albert Moll, "Paragraph 175," *Die Zukunft*, 27 May 1905, 315–20; Albert Moll "Inwieweit ist die Agitation zur Aufhebung des §175 berechtigt?," *Deutsche medizinische Wochenschrift*, 14 November 1907, 1910–12; and Albert Moll, "Inwieweit ist die Agitation zur Aufhebung des §175 berechtigt?," *Die Umschau*, 7 December 1907, 985–87. Remarkably, in 1910 Leo Jacobsohn cited Moll as claiming that for homosexuals per se, "preferred objects are children 11–13 (pedophilia) and 17–20 years of age" ("Vorträge über die Grundzüge der modernen Psychologie und Psychiatrie, veranstaltet vom preußischen Zentralkomitee für das ärztliche Fortbildungswesen," *Die Therapie der Gegenwart* 51 [December 1910]: [557]).

⁴⁶ After 1940, "corruptors" of youth of all ages were subject to internment in concentration camps, as were male prostitutes. See Claudia Schoppmann, *Nationalsozialistische Sexualpolitik und weibliche Homosexualität*, 2nd ed. (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus Verlag & Media UG, 1997), 52, 189, and 197–98; Jürgen Müller, *Ausgrenzung der Homosexuellen*

penalty was called for in Hitler Jugend contexts (enrolling youths aged 14–18, with ages 10–14 in its *Jungvolk* division).⁴⁷ Other legislative developments had less clear grounding in criminological or psychiatric categories. The 24 November 1933 “habitual offender” law (Gesetz gegen gefährliche Gewohnheitsverbrecher und über Maßregeln der Sicherung und Besserung), which came into effect on 1 January 1934, called for the castration of recidivist child molesters over the age of twenty-one who were judged to be “dangerous sex offenders” (*gefährlicher Sittlichkeitsverbrecher*).⁴⁸ We can presume that a diagnosis of pedophilia would have made designation as a dangerous sex offender more likely and that increasing awareness of such a condition influenced the design of the law, though extant analyses make it difficult to determine how central the category was to the application of the law. Some forensic experts of the period, such as Franz Rattenhuber, documented a diagnosis of pedophilia to have been frequently arrived at in castration cases, but most others, including those who had conducted earlier castration studies, failed to mention pedophilia in case studies.⁴⁹

As Harry Oosterhuis, Hubert Kennedy, Robert Deam Tobin, and others have pointed out, debates about the age of consent (*Schutzalterfrage*) and age differentials within same-sex relationships had the potential to divide the diverse stakeholders engaged in discussions about sexual diversity in the interwar period.⁵⁰ While Hirschfeld’s medicolegal activism was focused on clinical-typological, forensic, and etiological questions, other groups, such as contemporaneous neo-Hellenic movements like the *Gemeinschaft der*

aus der “Volksgemeinschaft”: *Die Verfolgung von Homosexuellen in Köln 1933–1945* (Cologne: Emons, 2003), 170; Burkhard Jellonnek, *Homosexuelle unter dem Hakenkreuz: Die Verfolgung von Homosexuellen im Dritten Reich* (Munich: F. Schöningh, 1990); and David Snyder, “The Prosecution and Punishment of Sex Offenders in the Wehrmacht, 1939–1945” (PhD diss., University of Nebraska–Lincoln, 2002), 176–83, and 306–9.

⁴⁷ Geoffrey J. Giles, “The Denial of Homosexuality: Same-Sex Incidents in Himmler’s SS and Police,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 11, nos. 1–2 (2002): 256–90.

⁴⁸ “Aus dem Gesetz Gegen Gefährliche Gewohnheitsverbrecher und über Massregeln der Sicherung und Besserung,” *Klinische Wochenschrift* 13, no. 9 (1934): 339–42.

⁴⁹ See Franz Rattenhuber, *Der gefährliche Sittlichkeitsverbrecher* (Leipzig: Ernst Wiegandt, 1939), 77–79. For an example of analyses not mentioning pedophilia, see Franz Bonk, “Zur Indikation der Entmannung von Sittlichkeitsverbrechern auf Grund von 180 Beobachtungen,” *Deutsche Zeitschrift für die gesamte gerichtliche Medizin* 32, no. 4 (1940): 339–65. For discussion of earlier castration studies, see a Swiss study by Ch[arles] Wolf, *Die Kastration bei sexuellen Perversionen und Sittlichkeitsverbrechen des Mannes* (Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co. Verlag, 1934), 207–8, 234–36.

⁵⁰ Harry Oosterhuis and Hubert Kennedy, eds., *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany* (New York: Harrington Park Press, 1991); Robert Deam Tobin, *Peripheral Desires: The German Discovery of Sex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), chap. 2; Samuel Pechin, “Le crépuscule de l’Éros adolescent dans l’Allemagne wilhelminienne: Origines, enjeux et fonctions” (PhD diss., Université Michel de Montaigne, Bordeaux III, 2015); and Stefan Micheler, *Selbstbilder und Fremdbilder der “Anderen”: Männer begebende Männer in der Weimarer Republik und der NS-Zeit* (Konstanz: UVK, 2005), 223–26.

Eigenen (an organization whose difficult-to-translate name Oosterhuis and Kennedy render as “community of the self-owners”), consistently depicted themselves as sponsoring “a cult of youthful beauty, as was customary at the height of antiquity,”⁵¹ and therefore more closely resembled the less outgoing British-American circle of “Uranian” poets. Hirschfeld’s and Ulrichs’s earliest critics were more inclined to develop lofty concepts of *Freundesliebe* (love between friends), *Lieblingsminne* (lovers’ affection), *Eros Uranios* (Uranian eros), or “pedagogical eros” than they were to appreciate medicalized categories of attraction. Accordingly, they dwelled on the emotional and ethical bonds between men and youth (*Jünglinge* or *Knaben*): their communal culture of mind rather than their supposed inner natures.⁵² In 1902 Otto Kiefer published two booklets about *Jünglings-Liebe* (love of young boys), which he described as “the ideal covenant of love between a mature [*gereiften*] man and mature youth [*erwachsenen Jüngling*].” John Henry Mackay began publishing apologies for the at the time “nameless love of boys and youth” in 1906.⁵³

While these conceptual and terminological gestures were invariably reviewed in Hirschfeld’s *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, they found essentially no resonance in his medicolegal project.⁵⁴ This was in part strategic evasion. In a *Jahrbuch* article reporting on a survey facilitated by the Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee (Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, founded by Hirschfeld and others in 1897), natural scientist Benedikt Friedländer established that among 104 mostly homo- or bisexual respondents, the majority would fall under the heading of “love of youths” (*Liebe zu Jünglingen*), defined as the ages between sixteen and twenty-two or twenty-four.⁵⁵ In 1904 Friedländer toyed with a quasi-scientific distinction between *Paederast*, *Gynaekerast*, and *Amphierast*—a schema that he never used again, however.⁵⁶ But Hirschfeld manages to dodge

⁵¹ Cited in John Roper, “The Gemeinschaft der Eigenen and the Cultural Politics of Homoeroticism in Germany, 1896–1933” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2014), 95n198.

⁵² Elisar von Kupffer, “Die ethisch-politische Bedeutung der Lieblingminne,” *Der Eigene*, n.s., 1, nos. 6/7 (1899): 182–99. Restated in the magazine’s self-adverts: *Der Eigene*, June 1903, 432.

⁵³ Reiffegg [Otto Kiefer], *Die Bedeutung der Jünglings-Liebe für unsere Zeit* (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1902); Pugnator [Otto Kiefer], *Triumph der Liebe: Aus den Papieren eines Geächteten* (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1902); Sagitta [John Henry Mackay], *Die namenlose Liebe: Ein Bekenntnis* (Treptow: Bernhard Zack, 1906).

⁵⁴ Eugène Wilhelm lamented Kiefer’s imminent depiction of (platonic) pedophilia as common to homosexuals and as natural. Numa Praetorius [Wilhelm], “Bibliographie der Homosexualität,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 5 (1903): 943–1156, 1086.

⁵⁵ Benedikt Friedländer, “Entwurf zu einer reizphysiologischen Analyse der erotischen Anziehung unter Zugrundelegung vorwiegend homosexuellen Materials,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 7 (1905): 389–462, 412.

⁵⁶ Benedikt Friedländer, *Die Renaissance des Eros Uranios* (Berlin: Verlag “Renaissance” Otto Lehmann, 1904), 19, 86, 73–74, 201, 207; and Friedländer, “Bemerkungen zu dem Artikel des Herrn Dr. Rüdin über die Rolle der Homosexuellen im Lebensprozess der

commentary on the key question of age even in his untitled preface to Hans Blüher's 1912 book about erotic overtones within the German hiking clubs for youth, known as the Wandervogel movement.⁵⁷ Unlike Krafft-Ebing, in 1899 Hirschfeld appeared to have accepted Ulrichs's *Weibling/Mannling* distinction, including its implications for age preferences; his questionnaire included one question begging respondents' identification with either category.⁵⁸ Hirschfeld had sponsored the reprint of Ulrichs's pamphlets in 1898, and he echoed Ulrichs's early characterization of pedophilia as both "morbid" (*krankhaft*) and criminal.⁵⁹ These foundational demarcations had been, and to Hirschfeld's Scientific-Humanitarian Committee remained, vital for legal reform, and going forward, the latter came to lean heavily on Krafft-Ebing's earlier affirmations of these boundaries.⁶⁰ Articulating the political stance of the fledging committee, its legal expert, Eugène Wilhelm, asserted already in 1899 that any popularly insinuated correlation between "homosexuality" and attraction to minors had been scientifically discounted.⁶¹ Each of Wilhelm's earlier three legal com-

Rasse," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* 1 (1904): 219–25. In a comparable intervention into nomenclature and conceptual apparatus, Von Kupffer designated men loving both women and male youths *bibeterosexual* (i.e., loving two kinds of "otherness") and masculinity-loving *Urnings contrary-heterosexual* (i.e., loving that which contrasts their inner disposition but contrary to expectations raised by their sex). Elisar von Kupffer (Elisarion.), "Giovann Antonio—il Sodoma, der Maler der Schönheit: Eine Seelen- und Kunststudie," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 9 (1908): 71–165, 94–95.

⁵⁷ Magnus Hirschfeld in Hans Blüher, *Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen: Ein Beitrag zur Erkenntnis der sexuellen Inversion* (Berlin: Bernhard Weise, 1912), 5–7. The work's relevance for "homosexuality" was largely discounted in reviews, including Wilhelm's: Numa Praetorius, "Die Bibliographie der Homosexualität aus dem Jahre 1913," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 14, no. 3 (1914): [342–50]. See also Arthur Weil, "Hans Blüher und die Homosexualität," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 21, nos. 1–2 (1921): 3–39.

⁵⁸ Magnus Hirschfeld, "Die objektive Diagnose der Homosexualität," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 1 (1899): 4–35, 26, 33.

⁵⁹ Ulrichs uses these words in Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, *Memnon II* (Schleiz: Heyn, 1868), 19; and Ulrichs, *Argonauticus: Zastrow und die Urninge* (Leipzig: Serbe, 1869), 35, 42–43. Hirschfeld echoed him in Th. Ramien [Magnus Hirschfeld], *Sappho und Sokrates* (Leipzig: M. Spohr, 1896), 34; and Hirschfeld, §175 des Reichsstrafgesetzbuchs die homosexuelle Frage im Urteile der Zeitgenossen (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1898), 47, 64. Ulrichs's opinion was qualified by his apparent acquaintance in 1856 with a purportedly exclusively pedophilic *Dioning* ("heterosexual": *Argonauticus*, 42–43) showing no "additional" signs of sickness and the further intrigue that Ulrichs's later work on homosexuality was preceded, possibly even cued, by his advocacy in 1862 of a man accused of untoward liberties with a boy presumed to be age fourteen or under. See Hubert Kennedy, "Johann Baptist von Schweitzer: The Queer Marx Loved to Hate," *Journal of Homosexuality* 29, nos. 2/3 (1995): 69–96, 86, suggesting Hirschfeld purposively covered up the boy's presumptive age in 1914 references to the case.

⁶⁰ See Krafft-Ebing, "Neue Studien."

⁶¹ Numa Praetorius [Eugène Wilhelm], "Die strafrechtlichen Bestimmungen gegen den gleichgeschlechtlichen Verkehr historisch und kritisch dargestellt," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 1 (1899): 97–158, esp. 105n22, 152.

mentaries on homosexuality, published anonymously between 1892 and 1897,⁶² built on Krafft-Ebing's appeals for legal clemency for consenting "adults" over the age of fourteen. Like most contemporary campaigners for homosexual rights at the turn of the century,⁶³ Hirschfeld agreed that pedophilia ("inclination to immature [*unerwachsenen*] individuals") was rare in homosexuals (*Conträrsexuellen*), or at least as rare as it was in "normal sexuals" (*Normalsexuellen*). He maintained this opinion well into the Weimar era, repeating it almost verbatim in 1897, 1901, and 1925.⁶⁴ The apparent consensus within the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee was that "pedophilic homosexuality, that is, a genuine love of boys [*wirkliche Knabenliebe*]," whether or not it was rooted in a perversion, had "nothing to do" with the group's mission.⁶⁵ This perspective was shared by one of the future cofounders of the Dutch branch of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, the criminal anthropologist Arnold Aletrino, when he considered desires for prepubescent boys a "morbid inclination" independent of homosexuality.⁶⁶ Scientific-Humanitarian Committee deputy chairman Georg Merzbach and *Jahrbuch* contributor Alfred Kind, among others, specified that child sexual abuse and pedophilia were connected to other "complications of homosexuality" such as sadism.⁶⁷ In his 1908 article, Kind described finding several cases of

⁶² Dr. jur. *** [Eugène Wilhelm], "§175 des deutschen Strafgesetzbuches und die Urningsliebe: Mit einem Nachwort von Professor Dr. Krafft-Ebing," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 12 (1892): 34–54; Dr. jur. M. [Wilhelm], "Noch ein Wort zu Krafft-Ebing's 'Der Conträrsexuale vor dem Strafrichter': Eine Entgegnung auf den Aufsatz von Herrn Medicinrath Hüpeden," *Der Gerichtssaal* 52, no. 5 (1896): 371–85; Dr. W. [Wilhelm], "Die 'Verkehrtheit des Geschlechtstriebes im Strafrecht': Eine Entgegnung auf Dr. Hoegel's gleichlautenden Aufsatz im Gerichtssaal Bd. LIII Heft 1 und 2," *Der Gerichtssaal* 53, no. 6 (1897): 443–49.

⁶³ See, for example, van Erkelen, *Strafgesetz und widernatürliche Unzucht* (Berlin: Fischer, 1895), 16–17.

⁶⁴ *An die gesetzgebenden Körperschaften des Deutschen Reiches*, n.d. [1897], digital collections, Universitätsbibliothek der Humboldt-Universität, Berlin; Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Comité, *Was muss das Volk vom dritten Geschlecht wissen! Eine Aufklärungsschrift* (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1901), 26; Institut für Sexualwissenschaft, Abteilung für Sexualreform; Wissenschaftlich-Humanitäres Komitee, §267 *des amtlichen Entwurfs eines allgemeinen deutschen Strafgesetzbuches "Unzucht zwischen Männern"* (Stuttgart: Püttmann, 1925), 21.

⁶⁵ Numa Praetorius [Eugène Wilhelm], "Die Bibliographie der Homosexualität" *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 9 (1908), 601.

⁶⁶ Arnold Aletrino, "La situation sociale de l'Uraniste," *Archives d'anthropologie criminelle, de criminologie et de psychologie normale et pathologique* 16 (1901): 519–34, 531.

⁶⁷ Alfred Kind, "Ueber die Komplikationen der Homosexualität mit andern sexuellen Anomalien," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 9 (1908): 35–69; Georg Merzbach, *Die krankhaften Erscheinungen des Geschlechtssinnes* (Vienna: Hölder, 1909), 231, 432, 441; Georg Back [Merzbach], *Sexuelle Verirrungen des Menschen und der Natur* (Berlin: Standard-Verlag, 1910), 159–74. Kind's term *Pädophilie* is notably undefined, other than impractically equated with "Greek love" (following Rohleder, discussed later in this article on p. 119, n. 88).

“pedophilia” among 550 interviewed homosexuals.⁶⁸ Hirschfeld similarly viewed pedophilia as a form of *Uranismus complicatus*—a “complication of homosexual predisposition.”⁶⁹

Although Moll’s 1897–98 theoretical inferences about response complexes were considered plausible within Scientific-Humanitarian Committee circles, his inference that preferences for prepubescents were frequent in homosexuals was rejected by Wilhelm.⁷⁰ In time, Wilhelm admitted that the matter was “sociopolitically” and legally—not just scientifically—delicate in the context of “homosexual” advocacy and research.⁷¹ In any case, he only ever examined pedophilia in legal terms; he in particular weighed the satisfaction of an “inborn” pedophilic drive against the children’s sexual integrity.⁷² Hirschfeld’s interest in age preference initially also remained restricted to legal reform proposals (which entailed essentially similar interventions as proposed by Friedländer, sponsor of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee and later cofounder of the *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen*); the goal was to repeal Paragraph 175 and to establish an acceptably high and gender-neutral age of consent.⁷³ This also entailed degendering existing seduction laws, in that Paragraph 182, which criminalized the seduction of an “unblemished” (*unbescholten*), or chaste, girl under age sixteen (*Geschlechtsschutz*), would have to be replaced by a more gender-neutral legal framework aimed at the protection of children and youth (*Kinderschutz/Jugendschutz*). Hirschfeld took note of both ancient and contemporary European legislation regarding homosexuality as it related to the age of consent, as surveyed by Wilhelm,⁷⁴ and he framed his formal petition against Paragraph 175 in 1897 by proposing a gender-neutral age of consent of sixteen, two years above the long-standing (and still current) consent age of fourteen.⁷⁵

⁶⁸ Kind, “Ueber die Komplikationen,” 44, 56–67. Other complications involve fetishism, for instance, directed at “well-shaped boys’ legs” (66).

⁶⁹ Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität*, 306, 939–40.

⁷⁰ Numa Praetorius, “Die Bibliographie,” 737–46, 741–43.

⁷¹ Praetorius, “Die Bibliographie,” 425–620, 536.

⁷² Eugen Wilhelm, “Die rechtliche Beurteilung des ärztlichen Rates zum illegitimen Geschlechtsverkehr,” *Sexual-Probleme* 8, no. 9 (1912): 605–21, 620–21.

⁷³ Magnus Hirschfeld, “Kritik des §250 und seiner Motive im Vorentwurf zu einen Deutschen Starfgesetzbuch,” *Archiv für Kriminologie* 38, nos. 1/2 (1910): 89–119; Anon., “Schutzalterfrage,” *Vierteljahresberichte des wissenschaftlich-humanitären Komitees* 2, no. 4 (1911): 362–65; 3, no. 1 (1911): 12–31; 3, no. 3 (1912): 276–81; Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee, *Gewichtige Stimmen über das Unrecht des §175 unsers Reichstrafgesetzbuchs* (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1913), 60–67; Benedikt Friedländer, “Kritik der neueren Vorschläge zur Abänderung des §175,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 8 (1906): 301–49; Friedländer, *Die Liebe Platons im Lichte der modernen Biologie* (Treptow bei Berlin: B. Zack, 1909), 11.

⁷⁴ Praetorius, “Die strafrechtlichen Bestimmungen,” 106, 145, 153–54.

⁷⁵ *An die gesetzgebenden*, n.p. / Hirschfeld, “Petition,” 241. For at least one commentator (Guido Weber, then superintendent of Sonnenstein Asylum near Dresden), sixteen

Hundreds and eventually thousands of signatories agreed, including Krafft-Ebing and Moll.⁷⁶

Interestingly, Hirschfeld eventually had *pedophilia* named as a type of male homosexuality—as a condition that was not specific to, but clearly falling within the scope of, homosexuality. Hirschfeld quite possibly had more research experience with such age attractions than anyone at the time, indeed for many years after, claiming acquaintance with “thirty to forty” cases by 1907.⁷⁷ Yet in 1908 he maintained that he had seen too few men and women who had offended against children to say something definitive about this “important anomaly.”⁷⁸ Although Hirschfeld excluded pedophilia from the three-tier typology of homosexuality that he advanced in 1906, which encompassed the “quite sharply” distinguishable categories of *Ephebophilen*, *Androphilen*, and *Gerontophilen*, he added it to the spectrum of possible homosexual inclinations in his 1914 magnum opus, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*.⁷⁹ He estimated the prevalence of these four subcategories at 5, 45, 45, and 5 percent, respectively.⁸⁰ He must have encountered the terms in two very different sources: Krafft-Ebing’s forensic texts and Saint-Paul’s pseudonymously published typological work on homosexuality. Hirschfeld likely took the terms *Ephebophilen* and *Androphilen* from Saint-Paul; he definitely took note of the other two as used by Krafft-Ebing.⁸¹ Hirschfeld repeatedly cites Saint-Paul’s book,⁸² though, curiously, not with reference to the subject of homosexual classification. Hirschfeld’s 1914 use of the noun *pedophilia* to denote an extreme erotic

was still not high enough (“Über eine Petition an die gesetzgebenden Körperschaften des Deutschen Reiches um Abänderung des §175 des Strafgesetzbuches,” in *Jahresbericht der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Heilkunde in Dresden 1898–1899* [Dresden: G. A. Kaufmann, 1898], 129–47, 145).

⁷⁶ *An die gesetzgebenden*. Beyond this early programmatic context, Hirschfeld fully acknowledged that consent age was an intractable issue ultimately hinging on the “*Präsumtio juris*” (presumption of law) that minors do not consent. In 1930 he opined it should not be higher than one year above the average menarche age (regardless of gender), which would place it at age fourteen or fifteen. See Magnus Hirschfeld, *Geschlecht und Verbrechen*, ed. J. R. Spinner (Leipzig: Verlag für Sexualwissenschaft Schneider & Co., 1930), 274–91.

⁷⁷ Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Kenntnis der homosexuellen Natur eine sittliche Forderung* (Berlin: F. Stolt, 1907), 58.

⁷⁸ Magnus Hirschfeld, “Über Sexualwissenschaft,” *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* 1, no. 1 (1908): 1–19, 15.

⁷⁹ Magnus Hirschfeld, “Vom Wesen der Liebe: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Frage der Bisexualität,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 8 (1906): 1–284, 64n1, 198.

⁸⁰ Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität*, 280–1, 305.

⁸¹ Hirschfeld’s footnote to Wilhelm’s review: “Auch ich habe wiederholt Neigung zu Greisen, dagegen zu Kindern höchst selten bei Homosexuellen beobachtet (D.H. [Die Herausgeber])” (I, too, have repeatedly observed in homosexuals a penchant for old men—very rarely, on the other hand, for children [The Editor (i.e., Hirschfeld)]). In Numa Praetorius [Eugène Wilhelm], “Die Bibliographie der Homosexualität für das Jahr 1901 mit Ausschluss der Belletristik,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 4 (1902): 775–920, 828n1.

⁸² Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität*, 28, 561, 672, 971.

same-sex age preference departs from all previous uses, however, including nineteenth-century neoclassical references either to child loving or Greek-platonic boy loving,⁸³ Krafft-Ebing's 1896 "psychosexual perversion," Saint-Paul's 1896 adolescent-oriented same-sex *paidophilie*, and Ellis's 1905 genderless *paidophilia*.⁸⁴ By 1914, in any case, Hirschfeld's use of the term was already burdened by the distinction between Moll's (and Krafft-Ebing's) taxonomical concept of a "pedophilic complication of homosexuality" and his own (anticipated by Max Marcuse two years earlier) of a "homosexual of the particular pedophilic type."⁸⁵

In his 1914 magnum opus, Hirschfeld influentially advanced the argument that there is a clear analytic distinction between "personal character" (*persönlichen Eigenart*), by which he meant the range of gender presentations (*Habitus*) from strongly virilized to strongly feminized, and "orientation" (*Triebrichtung*), by which he meant age preference.⁸⁶ We can appreciate how reifying this gesture was if we compare Hirschfeld's categories to the theoretical schema of age-differential-based types of erotic attraction proposed a decade earlier by Lucien von Römer, a future cofounder of the Dutch branch of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee.⁸⁷ For instance, von Römer describes a *brotophile* as a man with no specific age preference, a *helicophile* as preferring partners of the same age, and *manthanophilia* as the affliction of a loving teacher, ideally to be reciprocated by a student's *didaskalophilia*. Hirschfeld explicitly rejected all of these terms in 1914, conceptualizing (same-sex) age-based preferences instead as immutable and indeed *age* based, not *age differential* based.⁸⁸

⁸³ *Pädophilie* (child loving) is a neo-Greek dictionary term attested in, for example, Wilhelm Traugott Krug, *Allgemeines Handwörterbuch der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1838), 5:110. *Paedophilie* (or *paidophilia*) is also a neo-Greek synonym for ancient Greek *philopaideia* (boy loving) attested in, for example, Julius Rosenbaum, *Geschichte der Lustseuche im Altertume* (Halle: Lippert & Schmidt, 1839), 123.

⁸⁴ The corresponding terms Hirschfeld coined at the 1914 occasion for women's interests in prepubescent girls and elderly women (*Korophilie* and *Graophilie*, respectively) have, certainly in connection to the two modal categories of *Parthenophilie* (adolescent girls) and *Gynäkophilie* (adult women), remained virtually uncited today, and Hirschfeld offered neither a vocabulary nor comparative data for heterosexual or bisexual variants of any age preference. Hirschfeld's *Parthenophilie* echoes Hermann Rohleder's 1912 term *Parthenophilia erotica* (*Die Zeugung unter Blutsverwandten* [Leipzig: G. Thieme, 1912], 164).

⁸⁵ Ch[arles] Ladame, "Homosexualité originaire et homosexualité acquise," *Archives de l'anthropologie criminelle* 29 (1914): 262–86; Max Marcuse, "Ein Fall von vielfach komplizierter Sexualperversion," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie* 9, no. 1 (1912): 269–300, 295–96. Marcuse's case warranted a footnote to Freud, but it was also complicated, among others, with concurrent Hirschfeldian diagnoses of sexual intermediacy and *Transvestismus*.

⁸⁶ Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität*, 273, 305.

⁸⁷ L. S. A. M. [Lucien Sophie Albert Marie] von Römer, "Vorläufige Mitteilungen über die Darstellung eines Schemas der Geschlechtsdifferenzierungen," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 6 (1904): 327–58.

⁸⁸ Sexologists including Hermann Rohleder and Auguste Forel importantly anticipated

Hirschfeld never explicitly outlined the methodology he had used to estimate his percentage distributions of age preferences, though he would have inferred them from the questionnaires that he distributed to willing subjects from 1899 onward and that he began to call the “Psychobiological Survey” (*Psychobiologischer Fragebogen*) circa 1915. Although the various iterations of the questionnaire asked increasingly detailed questions about age preference, on the latter subject they never led to anything beyond Hirschfeld’s 1914 estimations. The first published version of the survey contained eight-five questions and probed Ulrichs’s categorization of homosexual types while also inquiring into the lifetime prevalence of attraction toward prepubescents.⁸⁹ The 1908 version contains ninety questions and more explicitly enquires about upper and lower limits of age of attraction, the relationship of this attraction to the respondent’s own current age (seemingly inspired by von Römer’s schema), and whether age preference changed circa the respondent’s pubescence.⁹⁰ There is also a specific question about whether an eventual inclination to prepubescents had been “gratified.” The 127-item questionnaire published in 1914 was the first version of the survey to demonstrate a clear separation between questions about age attraction (Q93), those about the gender attributes (*Geschlechtstypen*) toward which one was attracted (Q97), and those referring to the “attraction to immature persons” (Q113).⁹¹ A

Hirschfeld in following Krafft-Ebing’s admittance of pedophilia and homosexuality concurring. Rohleder’s 1907 otherwise behavioral typology of female homosexuality had included *Pädophilie erotica homosexualis feminarum*, but he cites no cases. Its male pendant was just as problematic: Rohleder’s category of male *Pädophilie* designated platonic “Greek love” oriented inclusively to *Knaben* and *Jünglinge*. Hermann Rohleder, *Das perverse Geschlechtsleben des Menschen, auch vom Standpunkte der Lex lata und der Lex ferenda* (Berlin: Fischer, 1907); Rohleder, *Die homosexuellen Perversionen des Menschen auch vom Standpunkt der Lex lata und Lex ferenda* (Berlin: Fischer, 1912), 3rd ed., 261–76, 377–78, 502–3. Wilhelm’s *Jahrbuch* review, which specifically reflects on age preference, defended Hirschfeld’s against Rohleder’s typology (Praetorius, “Die Bibliographie,” 1908, 534–36). In a comparable intervention, Wilhelm resisted fellow jurist Max Rudolf Senf’s psychodynamic suggestion that a grown man’s proclivity for youths connoted a narcissistic species of *Inspirationserotik*. Max Rudolf Senf, “Narzissmus,” *Sexual-Probleme* 9, no. 3 (1913): 153–65. Wilhelm argued that such an interest simply belongs to “normal homosexuality” (*gewöhnlichen Homosexualität*). Numa Praetorius [Wilhelm], “Die Bibliographie der sexuellen Zwischenstufen” [continued], *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* 5, no. 2 (1918): 71–78. The prominent Swiss sexologist Auguste Forel acknowledged the existence of male and female homosexual *pederosis* (a term he coined in 1905). In a 1911 speech, he warned about the combination of homosexuality and *pederosis* (among other perversions) and particularly about the seduction of young girls by older women. Auguste Forel, *Die sexuelle Frage, Gekürzte Volksausgabe* (Munich: E. Reinhardt, 1913), 140; and “Einiges über Homosexualität,” as reviewed by Hans W. Maier in *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie: Referate und Ergebnisse* 3 (1911): 773–74.

⁸⁹ Hirschfeld, “Die objektive Diagnose,” 33–34 (Q74 and Q79, respectively).

⁹⁰ This version is provided in Herman Nunberg and Ernst Federn, eds., *Minutes of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, Vol. 1: 1906–1908* (New York: International Universities Press, 1962), 379–88 (see Q71 and Q77).

⁹¹ Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität*, 240–63.

specific question regarding gerontophilia only appears in later versions of the survey.⁹²

Hirschfeld's figures initially attracted little criticism, despite the fact that his distributions for the four categories of age preference remained identical for both women and men (5, 45, 45, and 5 percent), suggesting that the statistics were more a reflection of Hirschfeld's advocacy goals than a product of actual research. Doubts about the origins of his statistics are justified given the fact that in 1914 he identified all age-preference statistics as estimations, not findings (notably unlike results from his 1903–4 famous student survey of the prevalence of homosexuality, which, however, had disregarded age preference). Hirschfeld refrains from analyzing age preferences with respect to their etiology, onset, possible changeability, overlap, cultural variation, or correlation with age or with gender preference, remarking without any obvious support that they appeared largely unchangeable. Hirschfeld's recognition of both a pedophilic subgroup (*Nebengruppe*) and an ephebophilic majority (*Hauptgruppe*) of "homosexuals" was politically and legally delicate, explaining why Hirschfeld made homosexuality's main typological parameter, age preference, say so little about sexual diversity. With preferred ages of "about 16–20" or "about 14–21" for ephebophilia (Hirschfeld's definitions in 1906 and 1914, respectively), the category honored the natural demarcations of pubescence and maturity, as had age-preferential categories proposed by Ulrichs, Moll, Krafft-Ebing, Ellis, and Saint-Paul, among others. While Hirschfeld advanced beyond the 1890s tendency of homosexuality theorists in refusing to correlate gender presentation and age preference, the specter of this association reemerged even in contributions from Hirschfeld's Institute for Sexual Science as late as 1925.⁹³ The few German-language authors to invoke the term *Ephebophilie* (whether ally or critic—such as Hermann Michaëlis, Siegfried Placzek, and Eugen Kahn) tended not to cite Hirschfeld, and they generally associated the desire for prepubescent love objects with a masculine habitus.⁹⁴ Other than in the pages of the *Jahrbuch*, Hirschfeld's typology of age preference was rarely cited approvingly by others, though an English reviewer, Leon Pierce Clark, did mention it in his 1914 review of current research,⁹⁵ and

⁹² Magnus Hirschfeld, *Geschlechtskunde: Auf Grund dreissigjähriger Forschung und Erfahrung; Vol. II: Folgen und Folgerungen* (Stuttgart: Julius Püttmann, 1928), 56 (Q120 and Q121); and *Sex in Human Relationships* (London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1935; originally published in 1935 in French), 104, 107–8 (Q97, Q118, and Q119).

⁹³ Walter Wolf, "Erblichkeitsuntersuchungen zum Problem der Homosexualität," *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten* 73, no. 1 (1925): 1–12.

⁹⁴ Hermann Michaëlis, *Die Homosexualität in Sitte und Recht* (Berlin: Hermann Dames, 1907), 5; [Siegfried] Placzek, *Das Geschlechtsleben des Menschen* (Leipzig: Thieme, 1922), 147; Eugen Kahn, "Die psychopathischen Persönlichkeiten," in *Handbuch der Geisteskrankheiten*, ed. Oswald Bumke (Berlin: Springer, 1928), vol. 5, pt. 1, 227–487.

⁹⁵ Leon Pierce Clark, *A Critical Digest of Some of the Newer Work upon Homosexuality in Man and Woman* (Utica, NY: State Hospitals Press, 1914), 24–25.

several French authors had earlier briefly alluded to it.⁹⁶ Hirschfeld himself rarely used the terms except where he was explicitly outlining categories of homosexuality. One of the few people to use the term *Ephebophilie* was the classicist Paul Brandt, who was a patron of the *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen* and who deployed it anachronistically in his writings about ancient Greece.⁹⁷

That Hirschfeld was less than entirely convincing or clear about age preference is apparent in the range of reactions to his estimations. In an influential 1922 article, University of Tübingen psychiatrist Robert Gaupp cited Hirschfeld as stating that 50 percent of *Urnings* posed a threat to youth given their age attraction, a hostile but predictable reading.⁹⁸ In an international review, this read as “fifty percent of *Urnings* are pedophilic.”⁹⁹ In 1921 Viennese psychoanalyst Isidor Sadger, a one-time *Jahrbuch* contributor, accused Hirschfeld of downplaying data on *Urnings*’ pedophilia and anal intercourse, though he could cite no new research.¹⁰⁰ Some data from Berlin on age preferences did subsequently surface, albeit in Dutch and French literature. A Dutch psychiatrist reported in 1922 that on the basis of 570 individuals studied at Hirschfeld’s institute, fifty-eight (10.2 percent) had a primary preference for those under seventeen, and 154 (27 percent) for those between seventeen and twenty-one.¹⁰¹ These figures were

⁹⁶ Marc-André Raffalovich, “Chronique de l’unisexualité,” *Archives d’anthropologie criminelle* 22 (1907): 606–767, 613; Eric Simac, “Le problème de la bisexualité,” *Archives d’anthropologie criminelle* 24 (1909): 657–93, 677; and A. [Auguste Armand] Marie, “Dégénérescences et psychopathies,” *Traité internationale de psychologie pathologique* 2 (1911): 495–604, 585.

⁹⁷ Of note, Brandt points out that both *ephebophilia* and *pedophilia* are neoclassical concoctions but nowhere credits Hirschfeld or Saint-Paul. Instead, he cites philologists, arguing that, philologically, *pais* and *ephebos* make for relevantly exchangeable prefixes. P. Stephanus [Paul Brandt], “Die Gedichte der Anthologie,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 9 (1908): 213–312, 291; Hans Licht [Brandt], “Homoerotik in den homerischen Gedichten,” *Anthropophyteia* 9 (1912): 291–300; Licht [Brandt], *Die Homoerotik in der Griechischen Literatur: Lukianos von Samosata* (Bonn: A. Marcus & E. Webers, 1921), 6; Licht [Brandt], *Sittengeschichte Griechenlands*, 2 vols. (Dresden: Paul Aretz, 1925–26), 1:264, 2:120.

⁹⁸ Robert Gaupp, “Das Problem der Homosexualität,” *Klinische Wochenschrift* 1, no. 21 (1922): 1033–38. Later Dutch works similarly cited a Hirschfeldian 50 percent. Examples include Johannes Hermanus van der Hoop, *Sexualiteit en zieleleven* (Arnhem: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1926), 203n1; and F. J. [Frederik Jacob] Tolsma, *Homosexualiteit en homoërotiek* (The Hague: Daamen, 1948), 13. In contrast, in 1940 one of the earliest of Dutch pro-homophile periodicals cited Hirschfeld’s figures to counter the perennial allegation of a *universal* homosexual youth fetish: John Bradley, “Om de vrije mens der nieuwe gemeenschap,” *Levensrecht* [3] (1940): 1–3, 2.

⁹⁹ Gaupp, “Das Problem,” anonymously reviewed in *International Medical and Surgical Survey* 4, no. 1 (1922): 75–76.

¹⁰⁰ Isidor Sadger, *Die Lehre von den Geschlechtsverirrungen (Psychopathia Sexualis) auf psychoanalytischer Grundlage* (Leipzig: Franz Deuticke, 1921), 112–19.

¹⁰¹ Stipulated in the antihomosexual Paragraph 248bis of the Dutch Penal Code, twenty-one was the same-sex age of consent (the general age of consent was sixteen). The law was current between 1911 and 1971 (except under German occupation, when Nazi legislation applied) and led to the 1912 establishment of the Dutch Scientific-Humanitarian Committee

an advance beyond Hirschfeld's 1914 estimations, and though coming close to adding up to Hirschfeld's 45 percent figure for ephebophilia, the author offered no explicit discussion. More remarkably, French psychoanalyst Angelo Hesnard claimed in 1929 that Hirschfeld personally gave him the following percentages: ephebophiles, 60 percent; androphiles, 30 percent; pedophiles and gerontophiles combined, 10 percent.¹⁰² However, Hesnard, purportedly in agreement with Havelock Ellis, disagreed with Hirschfeld, claiming that pedophilic homosexuality was much more prevalent. Hesnard ranked it second between the most typical ephebophilia and the less typical androphilia. Pioneering Dutch sexologist Bernard Prensela later cited Hirschfeld as having stated that *paedophilie* amounts to "10 percent at best" of homosexuals; his own limited patient sample suggested a 15 percent figure.¹⁰³

As Hirschfeld would in 1906, Moll began with a three-tiered model in 1904 (describing the categories of preference as under fifteen, between fifteen and twenty, and above twenty years of age). In 1921 he began using a four-tiered categorization of age preferences and added Hirschfeld's category of elderly attraction. It was only in 1921 that he referred to a sample of five hundred cases to estimate that "at minimum" 10–12 percent of homosexuals preferred immature boys (*unreife Knaben*), 55 percent were attracted to half-mature boys (*Halberwachsnen*), about 30 percent preferred fully mature men (*ausgereifte Männern*), and only some 2–3 percent were attracted to the elderly (*Greisen*).¹⁰⁴ Like Hirschfeld, Moll failed to delineate his methodology and, as cited, offers estimations instead of findings. As in his earlier work, Moll relied on this finding of age-preferential variation and upon homosexual men's supposed ubiquitous fixation on beardless youngsters as evidence against the existence of a congenital or hormonal origin for male homosexuality. The issue was all the more urgent given Moll's and Ellis's conviction that pedophilia could be produced situationally, "evidently as in no other perversion," especially in the "predisposed," such as schoolteachers and domestic servants.¹⁰⁵

division. H. C. [Henderik Catharinus] Valkema Blouw, "Homosexualiteit," *Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* 66 (1922): 1657–58. The data were offered as a rebuttal, however inefficient, to a Dutch physician conjecturing that homosexuals had a "pronounced preference for boys" (E. van Dieren, "Ongevaarlijke homosexeelen?," *Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* 66 [1922]: 1270–74). Similar laws existed for the Dutch Indies (Paragraphs 292, 293), where the governmental problem lay not so much with homosexuality (*homosexualiteit*) as with remunerated pederasty (*paederastie*; R. D. G. Ph. Simons, "Indrukken over de prostitutie en de homosexele prostitutie, en over het voorkomen van geslachtsziekten in Ned. Oost-Indië en West-Indië," *Nederlandsch Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* 83 [1939]: 5574–79).

¹⁰² A[ngelo] Hesnard, "Psychologie de l'homosexualité masculine," *L'évolution psychiatrique*, n.s., 1 (October): 45–61; Hesnard, *Psychologie homosexuelle* (Paris: Stock, 1929), 42–43; and Hesnard, *Traité de sexologie: Normale et pathologique* (Paris: Payot, 1933), 646.

¹⁰³ B[ernard] Prensela, *Sexuologie in de praktijk* (Amsterdam: Strengholt, [1940]), 257.

¹⁰⁴ Albert Moll, *Behandlung der Homosexualität: Biochemisch oder psychisch?* (Bonn: Marcus & Webers, 1921), 23–27.

¹⁰⁵ See, for example, Albert Moll, *Sexuelle Perversionen, Geisteskrankheit und Zurechnungsfähigkeit* (Berlin: L. Simion, 1905), 27. The 1924, "16th/17th" edition of Krafft-Ebing's

INTERSEXUALITY AND INFANTILISM

Various Hirschfeld historians claim that the Berlin Ärztliche Gesellschaft für Sexualwissenschaft und Eugenik (Berlin Medical Society for Sexual Science and Eugenics), which Hirschfeld cofounded in 1913, facilitated castration of “pedophilic” repeat offenders,¹⁰⁶ though little is known of the exact diagnoses involved. In 1928 Hirschfeld restricted indications for “therapeutic castration” to violent offenders and offenders against children. Castration would work miracles with recidivist *Kinderschändern*, but it would be less effective if offenders were senile or psychosexual infantilists.¹⁰⁷ Hirschfeld’s Berlin institute housed the world’s first “forensic sexology” department, but many of its pertinent research findings were likely lost when the archives of the institute were ransacked by Nazi students in 1933.¹⁰⁸ Hirschfeld never expressed doubt concerning the idea that erotic attraction to children is an “ego-dystonic” sexual morbidity that should be treated.¹⁰⁹ He claimed never to have seen a mentally healthy child molester, and he opined that all forensic cases warranted careful psychiatric examination.¹¹⁰ Krafft-Ebing had argued as much already in the early 1880s.¹¹¹ However, few forensic psychiatrists are known to have made the diagnosis in the first three decades after 1896. As Hirschfeld had, Moll served as an expert witness in abuse

Psychopathia Sexualis by Moll contains the latter’s views on homosexual age preferences, pedophilia, and gerontophilia (403–12, 518–42, 788–808). Here, Moll interestingly shies away from his earlier typology (405), stressing that age preferences (to peers) commonly shift with age and that even within pedophilia there are “all sorts of transitions” (*allerlei Übergänge*) targeting all ages, including teens, bisexual variants, nonexclusive cases, and adolescent variations in sexual “differentiation.”

¹⁰⁶ Manfred Herzer, *Magnus Hirschfeld: Leben und Werk eines jüdischen, schwulen und sozialistischen Sexologen* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus-Verlag, 1992), 121; Ralf Dose, *Magnus Hirschfeld: The Origins of the Gay Liberation Movement*, trans. E. H. Willis (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2014), 77; Florian Mildener, . . . *in der Richtung der Homosexualität verdorben: Psychiater, Kriminalpsychologen und Gerichtsmediziner über männliche Homosexualität, 1850–1970* (Hamburg: MännerschwarmSkript Verlag, 2002), 107.

¹⁰⁷ Magnus Hirschfeld, “Kastration bei Sittlichkeitsverbrechern,” *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft und Sexualpolitik* 15 (1928): 54–55.

¹⁰⁸ Hirschfeld’s infantilists were mostly heterosexual. Two extensive forensic case reports published in 1926 may give an adequate insight into his approach to child sex offenders in the mid-1920s. Both deal with (well-educated) men offending against prepubescent girls. Magnus Hirschfeld, “Schuldig geboren,” in *Sexual-Katastrophen: Bilder aus dem modernen Geschlechts- und Eheleben*, ed. L. Levy-Lenz (Leipzig: Payne, 1926), 1–106, esp. 19–39 (case reprinted in Hirschfeld, *Geschlecht und Verbrechen*, 291–300); *Geschlechtskunde I*, 613–20. The latter contains an extensive case description of a typical infantilist “constitutional pedophile” identified by the pseudonym of Dr. Ignatius; he underwent castration. In the former, a diagnosis of “arrested psychosexual development” was given, but there is no diagnosis of “pedophilia” in the institute’s report nor in the earlier forensic ones it reproduces.

¹⁰⁹ Hirschfeld, *Die Kenntnis*, 57–59.

¹¹⁰ Hirschfeld, “Vom Wesen,” 284; *Sexualpathologie. Part II: Sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1918), 64–65; *Geschlechtskunde I*, 613.

¹¹¹ Richard von Krafft-Ebing, “Die gerichtliche Psychopathologie im Jahre 1882,” *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 4, no. 1 (1884): 94–113.

cases involving same-sex teens and claimed that his *Assoziationstherapie* worked, but there is no record of him actually having treated pedophilia or ephophilia.¹¹²

After 1913 Hirschfeld's theorizing of pedophilia and eventually ephophilia became increasingly enmeshed with his *Sexualkonstitutionslehre*. Unlike Krafft-Ebing's concept of age fetishism but echoing Moll's 1897–98 conceptual frame, Hirschfeld came to associate pedophilic and gerontophilic object choice with arrested development, or “psychic infantilism.” Connections between somatic/genital infantilism, gender atypicality, and pederasty/perversion/hyposexuality had been of tentative nosological interest in the French medical literature as far back as the early 1870s. Anticipating Hirschfeld's *Zwischenstufenlehre* and his theorizing about infantilism, indeed, his attempt to integrate the former and the latter, a minor nineteenth-century medical literature portrayed male infantilists as a species of unfortunate, “monstrous” neuters whose effeminacy rendered them likely victims of perverted individuals. In contrast, effeminates (*féminins*) combined a feminine with an “ephebic” (youthful) physique, while “virilists” or “masculists” were virilized women.¹¹³ Work of Berlin neurologist Albert Eulenburg, Austrian psychiatrist and neurologist Gabriel Anton, and Anton's Graz colleague Heinrich di Gaspero associated infantilism generally with hyposexuality—a reduction of sexual desire.¹¹⁴ In a presentation to the

¹¹² Matthew Conn, “Sexual Science and Sexual Forensics in 1920s Germany: Albert Moll as (S)Expert,” *Medical History* 56, no. 2 (2012): 201–16. Suggestive of the slow adoption of the diagnosis across Western Europe until after World War II, Jens Rydström found only two diagnoses of “pedophilia” in 331 forensic psychiatric reports concerning same-sex sexual acts presented to the Swedish Royal Medical Board between 1920 and 1950 (versus forty-five of “homosexuality,” twenty-one of the generic qualification “abnormal sexual drive,” and thirty-four cases of “mental abnormality”). Jens Rydström, *Sinners and Citizens: Bestiality and Homosexuality in Sweden, 1880–1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 277. Likely more than two were diagnosed with “psycho-infantilism.” In the Netherlands, the term *paedophilie* was rarely used before 1950. The 1896 Dutch translation of Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* was based on its ninth edition, which did not yet contain the term. Auguste Forel's *paederosis* and Krafft-Ebing's *paedophilia erotica* appear in a 1907 Dutch translation of Forel's work (*Het sexueele vraagstuk* [Amsterdam: Graauw, 1907], 282–83); Ellis's *paidophilia* appears in a 1917 translation (*De geslachtsdrift en hare abnormale uitingen* [Baarn: Hollandia-Drukkerij, 1917], 10). By the 1950s, influential Dutch criminologists (including Jacob Maarten van Bemmelen) and forensic psychiatrists (including Franciscus Marinus Havermans) alternatively conflated pedophilia and homosexuality or proposed reserving the former term for heterosexual crimes. F. M. [Franciscus Marinus] Havermans, “Over paedophilie,” *R.K. Artsenblad* 30, no. 4 (1951): 91–97; F. M. [Franciscus Marinus] Havermans, *Opstellen over forensische psychiatrie* (Roermond-Maaseik: J. J. Romen & Zonen, 1956), 110; J. M. [Jacob Maarten] van Bemmelen, *Criminologie: Leerboek der misdaadkunde* (Zwolle: NV Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1958), 500–501.

¹¹³ Uncited by Hirschfeld, for instance, is the notable medical dissertation by Ferdinand-Valère Faneau de La Cour, “Du féminisme et de l'infantilisme chez les tuberculeux” (Paris: A. Parent, 1871), containing a seminal preface by Paul Lorain.

¹¹⁴ Hirschfeld (*Sexualpathologie. Part III: Störungen im Sexualstoffwechsel* [Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1920], 264) developed a developmental concept of “sexual constitution” securely

Berlin Medical Society for Sexual Science and Eugenics, later elaborated in a booklet coauthored with Hirschfeld, early Scientific-Humanitarian Committee member Ernst Burchard explicitly linked infantilism to erotic age orientation.¹¹⁵ Antedating Hirschfeld's 1914 *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, the 1913 booklet discussed six extensive case reports of male sex offenders who presented with varying combinations of somatic, genitourinary, general psychic, and "psychosexual" maldevelopment. Burchard and Hirschfeld observed that pedophilia was a cardinal outcome of psychosexual maldevelopment, rendering it a hallmark symptom of a more general spectrum of psychobiological developmental disorders rather than a unique perversion. The coauthors thus supported early forensic recommendations (such as those offered by psychiatrist Karl Heilbronner in 1900) that sexual perversions be studied within the larger spectrum of hormonal disorders.¹¹⁶

Between 1913 and 1926 Hirschfeld expanded his category of psychosexual infantilism and offered it as a corrective to existing, more general associations between "labile sexual constitutions" and pubertal timing disorders, on the one hand, and sex crimes and perversion, including homosexuality, on the other.¹¹⁷ His case studies in effect revitalized Krafft-Ebing's association of pedophilia with "degeneration."¹¹⁸ By 1918 Hirschfeld indeed began reading signs of infantilism as indicative of the "degeneration" Krafft-Ebing considered required for a *Pädophilie erotica* diagnosis.¹¹⁹ Hirschfeld's colleague Arthur Kronfeld, cofounder of the Institute for Sexual Science and

rooted in endocrinology and thus differently connected to the "perversions" than had been offered by Freud and his early followers, including Karl Abraham and Leopold Löwenfeld (the latter of whom published an entire monograph on the subject in 1911).

¹¹⁵ *Medizinische Klinik*, 18 May 1913, 811–12; Magnus Hirschfeld and Ernst Burchard, *Der sexuelle Infantilismus* (Halle a.S.: Carl Marhold Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913); Hirschfeld, *Sexualpathologie I*, 29–65; *Geschlechtskunde I*, 603–8; *Sexualität und Kriminalität* (Vienna: "Renaissance," 1924), 13–15. The earliest mention of this infantilist concept of perversion occurs in M[agnus] Hirschfeld and E[rnst] Burchard, "Zu Dr. Stiers Artikel 'Ueber die Aetiologie des konträren Sexualgefühls,'" *Monatsschrift für Psychiatrie und Neurologie* 32, no. 6 (1912): 549–55, 554.

¹¹⁶ Karl Heilbronner, "Beitrag zur klinischen und forensischen Beurtheilung gewisser sexueller Perversitäten," *Vierteljahrsschrift für gerichtliche Medicin und öffentliches Sanitätswesen*, n.s., 3, 19, no. 2 (1900): 276–300.

¹¹⁷ Such as maintained by Berlin psychiatrist Karl Birnbaum, "Die forensische Bedeutung der sexuellen Psychopathien," *Sexual-Probleme* 9, no. 6 (1913): 372–91; Birnbaum, *Die psychopathischen Verbrecher* (Berlin: P. Langenscheidt, 1914), 162–77.

¹¹⁸ Hirschfeld, *Sexualpathologie I*, 51. Although in Europe the theory of degeneration lost ground around the time of World War I, as late as 1931 eugenicist Rainer Fetscher reported 30 percent of "endogenous degeneration" (*endogener Abartung*) among men convicted of child molestation and "morbid disposition" (*krankhafter Anlagen*) in first-degree family members ranging from 7.5 to 33 percent. Fetscher, "Kriminalbiologische Erfahrungen an Sexualverbrechern," *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft und Sexualpolitik* 17 (1930–31): 356–63, and 18:265, cited by Eduard Kohlrausch, "Sterilisation und Strafrecht," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Strafrechtswissenschaft* 52, no. 1 (1932): 383–496, 415.

¹¹⁹ Hirschfeld, *Sexualpathologie II*, 51.

head of its Department for Psychological Sexual Conditions (Abteilung für seelische Sexualeiden), spoke of an “underlying constitutional pathology” (*konstitutionspathologische Fundierung*). Forensic psychiatrists should accordingly examine child sex offenders for hypospadias, azoospermia, micropenis, cryptorchidism, congenital hypothyroidism, short stature, weak or delayed secondary sexual characteristics, or any juvenile or naive character traits or a suspiciously youthful appearance. In the same way that he viewed homosexuality as but one clinical manifestation of sexual intermediacy (which was to be found in some configuration or degree in any individual), Hirschfeld conjectured that probing beyond the sex offender’s pedophilia (or, for instance, his exhibitionism) would reveal a bigger somatopsychic picture of developmental stagnation. The hormonal determination of “maturational stages” (*Gradenstufen*) thus naturally presented a parallel to Hirschfeld’s doctrine of intermediate types, and it bolstered his overarching conviction in an extensive parallelism between body, psychic makeup, and gender/sex (*Körper, Seele, und Geschlecht*). Hirschfeld speaks of endocrinologically constituted “age types” (*Altertypen*) akin to “sexual types” (*Sexualtypen*) and of “deviations from sexually normal age types.”¹²⁰ He ventured that connections between what he considered to be the two “most important” of “abnormal sexual constitutions,” infantilism and “intersexuality,”¹²¹ were most apparent in men but were also exemplified by the “boyish” (*knabenhafte*) lesbian.¹²² (It is important to note that he did not use the term *intersexuality* to describe the condition of being born with ambiguous genitalia—what he called “pseudo-hermaphroditism”—but rather to denote a more general state of intermediate sexuality.)

While he repeatedly names pedophilia as a common if “often quite harmless” symptom of “sexual infantilism,” Hirschfeld nowhere specifies the frequency of infantilism in pedophilia, and he does not describe either as a symptom necessary or sufficient for diagnosis of the other.¹²³ In both his 1918 sexual pathology textbook (*Sexualpathologie*) and the 1920 unrevised reprint of *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, Hirschfeld maintained that 10 percent of homosexuals were afflicted with either pedophilia or gerontophilia. Although he eventually captured both infantile types and “sexually intermediate stages” in an intriguing 1923 diagram,¹²⁴ the place of infantilism in this all-encompassing biological model seems contrived. If born homosexuals and intersexuals could be considered

¹²⁰ Hirschfeld, *Geschlechtskunde I*, 605.

¹²¹ Magnus Hirschfeld, “Presidential Address,” in *World League for Sexual Reform: Proceedings of the Third Congress*, London, 8–14 September 1929, ed. Norman Haire (London: Kegan Paul, 1930), xi–xv.

¹²² Hirschfeld, *Geschlechtskunde I*, 605.

¹²³ As Wilhelm notes; see Numa Praetorius, “Die Bibliographie der sexuellen Zwischenstufen (Schluss),” *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* 5, no. 7 (1918): 239–44.

¹²⁴ Magnus Hirschfeld, “Die intersexuelle Konstitution,” *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* 23 (1923): 3–27.

nonpathological variants, how does this speak to the possible spectrum of “constitutional infantilists” or the causation of homosexuality?¹²⁵ Hirschfeld cites the legal specter of *Kinderschändung* as the only obstacle to speaking of this group as part of an extended and fluid spectrum.¹²⁶ In an elaboration of a university speech given on 16 March 1923, Hirschfeld suggests capturing the hypermasculine (“supervirile”) antifeminist ephebophilia of *Der Eigenen* (he was alluding to people like Friedländer, Blüher, and Gustav Wyneken) as representing a specific, often “pseudobisexual,” constitutional type; these often married men were *Erostypen* (the eros types).¹²⁷ But there were numerous loose ends in his system of categorization. What about ancient *paiderastia*? And how to explain gender preference in pedophilic infantilists? Considering Hirschfeld’s later world travels and his earlier argument that “sexual ethnology” was one of the four pillars of sexology,¹²⁸ what about cross-cultural perspectives, such as the cultural-historical approaches to sexual psychopathy by Iwan Bloch, who had moderated Krafft-Ebing’s pathologizing notion of *Pädophilie* already in 1903?¹²⁹ The concept of psychosexual infantilism certainly was versatile and had scientific-humanitarian relevance. Sidestepping contemporaneous psychoanalytic concepts of “psychosexual development” and reframing others, it provided a biological framework for known forensic-pathological conditions (senile involution, low IQ), and, unlike pedophilia per se, infantilism had implications for criminal capacity (legally defined in Paragraph 51).

Moreover, Hirschfeld’s analytic outlining of “psychosexual” infantilism drew attention to the extent, and the precise legal import, of variance in *normal* psychosexual development. Both Moll and Ellis had importantly been influenced by an 1894 article on sexual differentiation by Max Dessoir, who had hesitated to diagnose two cases of adult men who had as young adults experienced episodic and/or nonexclusive erotic receptivity to young boys.¹³⁰ Homosexuality may present as the interim outcome of a protracted and, in some cases, delayed differentiation of sexual proclivity,

¹²⁵ Arthur Kronfeld asks this question explicitly, considering it unresolved, in “Homosexualität,” in *Handwörterbuch der Sexualwissenschaft*, ed. Max Marcuse (Bonn: A. Marcus & E. Webers, 1923), 215–20, 217; and *Sexualpsychopathologie* (Leipzig: F. Deuticke, 1923), 59.

¹²⁶ Hirschfeld, *Geschlechtskunde I*, 606–7.

¹²⁷ See Marita Keilson-Lauritz, *Die Geschichte der eigenen Geschichte: Literatur und Literaturkritik in den Anfängen der Schwulenbewegung am Beispiel des Jahrbuchs für sexuelle Zwischenstufen und der Zeitschrift “Der Eigene”* (Berlin: Rosa Winkel, 1997), 60.

¹²⁸ Hirschfeld spelled out the problem of understanding *pathology* in the oblique light of “sexual ethnology” (that is, the comparative anthropology of sexuality) in a 1911 talk: “Sexualwissenschaft als Grundlage der Sexualreform,” *Die neue Generation* 8, no. 3 (1912): 115–26, esp. 124–25.

¹²⁹ Iwan Bloch, *Beiträge zur Aetiologie der Psychopathia Sexualis*, 2 vols. (Dresden: H. R. Dohn, 1902–3), 2:244–53.

¹³⁰ Max Dessoir, “Zur Psychologie der Vita Sexualis,” *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und psychisch-gerichtliche Medicin* 50, no. 5 (1894): 941–75.

Dessoir inferred. Similarly, one of Hirschfeld's cases dealt with a somewhat slow and boyish twenty-one-year-old homosexual youth who was alleged to have touched or mutually masturbated with a boy he thought was fifteen or sixteen. Hirschfeld placed the former youth's psychosexual age at sixteen or seventeen, placing him psychologically under the age of majority in the hopes of mitigating the judgment of his criminal capacity. Hirschfeld argued that the boy's homosexuality reflected less "an anomalous orientation of sexual drive fixed by predisposition [*Anlage*] and development" and more a "youthful stage of indecisive drive."¹³¹

Hirschfeld falls back on his initial 1906 age-preferential schema in 1923 and 1927 articles in which he offhandedly describes "ordinary homosexuality" as encompassing a spectrum from the ephebophilic to the gerontophilic.¹³² Hirschfeld may have sensed the growing social and political sensitivity to the implications of a category like ephebophilia, such as invoked by Gaupp. The 1924 Friedrich Haarmann serial murder case, involving mostly male teen victims and inspiring Fritz Lang's 1931 film *M*, heightened Weimar anxieties around homosexuality.¹³³ In his influential five-volume overview of sexual knowledge, *Geschlechtskunde* (1926–30), none of Hirschfeld's earlier categories for age preference were retained except the outliers, as symptoms of infantile sexual constitution.¹³⁴ Thus, the category of pedophilia remains dimensionally divorced from Hirschfeld's ur-concept of sexually intermediate types. It was mostly Hirschfeld's close colleagues who figured extreme age preferences as an outcome of underlying syndromes causing infantilism (that is, causing short stature or delayed puberty), though some criticized Hirschfeld's syndromal reading and concentrated more on elaborating the more specific dimension of psychosexual infantilism, which was being outlined differently in early psychodynamic theory.¹³⁵ Otto

¹³¹ Hirschfeld and Burchard, *Der sexuelle Infantilismus*, 20–22. See also Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität*, 303–4; and a case of a heterosexual sex offender in Hirschfeld, *Sexualpathologie I*, 54–58.

¹³² Hirschfeld, "Vom Wesen"; Hirschfeld, "Die intersexuelle Konstitution," 19; Hirschfeld, "Homosexualität," in *Sittengeschichte des Laster*, ed. L. Schidrowitz (Vienna: Verlag für Kulturforschung, 1927), 309.

¹³³ Contemporaneous sources identify Haarmann, as was Beer, as a *Püderast*, not as *pädophil*. Fritz Lang's *M* dealt with sexually motivated murder of girls (*Lustmord*), but neither the film nor its maker specified what in the film was called the "perverted urge" to kill. The diagnosis *pedophilia* was not in it, and in published commentaries on the film it may have rarely been invoked until the early 1990s.

¹³⁴ Hirschfeld, *Geschlechtskunde I*.

¹³⁵ Psychoanalyst Wilhelm Stekel (in 1906 a cofounder of the short-lived Wiener Vertretung des wissenschaftlich-humanitären Komitees) is most known for having psychosexual infantilism denote an underlying mechanism for pedophilia and gerontophilia, though as he explains (*Psychosexueller Infantilismus* [Berlin: Urban & Schwarzenberg, 1922], 7, 77–78), his psychodynamic understanding of it mostly excluded the endocrinological frame centralized by Hirschfeld. Stekel thus understood outlying age orientations more distinctly than Hirschfeld in terms of what he calls (after Friedrich Salomon Krauss) a "paraphilic" paradigm, specifically as evidencing a developmental stagnation of or regression to particular infantile patterns of behavior. These concepts were importantly anticipated by Otto Juliusburger.

Juliusburger (who worked closely with Hirschfeld and with the Institute for Sexual Science and who eventually took over the presidency of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee) agreed that infantilism was relevant to conceptualizing abnormal age preference (including gerontophilia). He briefly discussed two homosexual cases in a June 1914 lecture before the Berlin Medical Society for Sexual Science and Eugenics.¹³⁶ Kronfeld became the most prolific defender of Hirschfeld's clinical taxonomy and wrote the first of the institute's research monographs, *Sexus*, on the subject.¹³⁷ Both scholarly competitors such as Max Marcuse and collaborators such as the psychiatrist Berndt Götz engaged with Hirschfeld's description of pedophilia as a corollary of psychic infantilism in their descriptions of sex offenders against children.¹³⁸ The few Anglophone articles offering similar arguments in the subsequent decades were mostly written by exiled authors with ties to Berlin.¹³⁹ Hirschfeld's translated work on the subject, however, proved confusing, if anything.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁶ Otto Juliusburger, "Zur Lehre von psychosexuellen Infantilismus (Parathymie, regressive Psychopathie)," *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* 1, no. 5 (1914): 198–206; and Juliusburger, "Zur Lehre von den psychischen Entwicklungsstörungen (Infantilismus)," *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Psychiatrie und psychisch-gerichtliche Medizin* 72, no. 3 (1915): 200–246. The former article was favorably reviewed by Havelock Ellis in the *British Journal of Psychiatry* 62, no. 256 (1916): 207–8. This marked the topic's entry into the English literature.

¹³⁷ Arthur Kronfeld, *Über psychosexuellen Infantilismus, eine Konstitutionsanomalie. Sexus*, vol. 1 (Bern: Ernst Bircher, 1921). Kronfeld repeatedly discussed the concept in writings between 1921 and 1926. Arthur Kronfeld, "Gerontophilie"; "Pädophilie"; and "Sexualkonstitution," in *Handwörterbuch der Sexualwissenschaft*, 2nd ed., ed. Max Marcuse (Bonn: A. Marcus & E. Webers, 1926), 207, 543, and 720–27; Kronfeld, "Der konstitutionelle Faktor bei sexuellen Triebanomalien nebst forensischen Bemerkungen (Fortsetzung und Schluß)," *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* 8, no. 3 (1921): 81–95, 93–94; Kronfeld, "Die Sexualität des Kindes," in *Sexualreform und Sexualwissenschaft: Vorträge gehalten auf der I. Internationalen Tagung für Sexualreform auf sexualwissenschaftlicher Grundlage in Berlin*, ed. A. Weil (Stuttgart: J. Püttman, 1922), 244–45; Kronfeld, *Sexualpsychopathologie*, 42–44, 72–73; Kronfeld, "Allgemeine Übersicht über die psychophysischen Funktionen und Funktionsanomalien der Sexualität beim Menschen," *Handbuch der normalen und pathologischen Physiologie* 14, no. 1 (1926): 781–82.

¹³⁸ Max Marcuse, "Pädophile Triebabweichung auf Grundlage eines psychischen Infantilismus: Ein ärztliches Gutachten," *Die Medizinische Welt* 1, no. 16 (1927): 580–82; Berndt Götz, "Über die gutachtliche Beurteilung eines Falles von psycho-sexuellem Infantilismus," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für die gesamte gerichtliche Medizin* 12, no. 1 (1928): 413–20; and Götz, "Sexuelle Kümmerformen und ihre strafrechtliche Bewertung," *Der sozialistische Arzt* 4, nos. 3–4 (1928): 15–17.

¹³⁹ Including Leppmann, "Essential Differences" (discussing heterosexual and homosexual cases). Another noteworthy article is Swiss psychoanalyst Arthur Kielholz's "Zur Begutachtung eines Falles von Päderosie," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse* 23, no. 3 (1937): 415–29. Kielholz employed Hirschfeld's psychobiological survey to analyze a case of heterosexual "pederosie," finding a history of cryptorchism but concluding with a Freudian concept of infantile perversion (427).

¹⁴⁰ A translation of Hirschfeld's 1914 "Classification of Homosexuals as to Age Preferences and Sex Acts," by Henry Gerber, appeared in *ONE Institute Quarterly: Homophile Studies* 5, no. 1 (Winter 1962): 20–29. However, Hirschfeld's perspectives of the infantilism-pedophilia connection appeared in English mostly in a posthumous book "compiled as a

AFTERMATH: UNCOMPLICATING HOMOSEXUALITY

Hirschfeld's nomination of age preference as a premier parameter of types of homosexuality enjoyed a variable, and contested, following. After Hirschfeld's death in exile in 1935, German and Dutch criminologists, psychiatrists, and ethnologists continued to discuss age preference in terms of types of homosexuality, though substantive discussion long remained confined to homophile organizations.¹⁴¹ Hirschfeld's terminology was occasionally employed by members of the surviving but increasingly censored Dutch division of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, and it shows up in post-World War II forensic psychiatric texts exploring homosexual pedophilia.¹⁴² Although Alfred Kinsey (1894–1956) did have a few of Hirschfeld's writings translated for his own use, none of Hirschfeld's categories for age preference appear by name in Kinsey's published work.¹⁴³ Studies and expert opinions informing the 1957 *Wolfenden Report* considered a taxonomical distinction between "paederasts and adult seekers"

humble memorial by his pupils" (compiled by Arthur Koestler and edited by Norman Haire) in a chapter entitled "The Eternal Child" (*Sexual Anomalies and Perversions* [London: F. Aldor, 1936], 81–97; later issued under the title *Sexual Anomalies* [New York: Emerson Books, 1948], 71–85, and eventually appearing in Dutch: *Handboek der sexologie*, ed. H. P. van den Aardweg [Amsterdam: Strengolt, (1955)], 83–94). The chapter notably wavers considerably between Hirschfeldian, Freudian, and Stekelian perspectives on psychosexual infantilism (not to mention that its title is an allusion to the Jungian trope of *puer aeternus*) and has virtually never been cited on the subject at hand.

¹⁴¹ Significant early Dutch discussions all occur in early homophile publications. They remain sporadic until the late 1950s but featured most of the Dutch homophile movement's notables: Arent van Santhorst [Jaap van Leeuwen], "Drie groepen homoseksuelen," *Vriendschap* 4 (April 1949): 2–6; Floris van Mechelen [Henri W. Methorst], "Bestaan er twee soorten homophilie?," *Vriendschap* 9 (December 1954): 173–76; Ohira [Jef Last], "Paedophilie en deskundigheid," *Vriendschap* 13, no. 7/8 (1958): 99–100; letters in *De Schakel* 44–46 (1958) and 59–63 (1959–60); O. Brunoz [Edward Brongersma], "Pedofilie: Een plaatsbepaling," *Vriendschap* 14 (June 1959): 87–88; Victor Servatius [Frits Bernard], "Ephebophilie en wetenschap: Stand van zaken," *Vriendschap* 15 (March 1960): 34–35; Louis Castine, "Vormen van homoseksualiteit," *C.O.C. Periodiek* 4 (1962): 8–12. Former member of the Dutch Scientific-Humanitarian Committee (Nederlandsch Wetenschappelijk Humanitair Komitee) and cofounder of its postwar successor, Cultuur en Ontspanningscentrum, Van Leeuwen interestingly distinguished three groups of "real homosexuals": man-loving feminine inverts, motherly yet masculine and age-fixated pedophiles (*paedophielen*), and a group of normal homosexuals bridging these two groups. He considered pedophiles to be "direct spiritual descendants [of] the ancient Greeks" and "born educators," arguing that they were in fact the "truest" homosexuals because they were the most "immune" ("utterly indifferent") to women.

¹⁴² J. H. [Johannes Herbert] Plokker, "Paedophilie," in *Sexuele misdadigheid*, ed. E. A. D. E. Carp (Amsterdam: Strengolt, 1949), 148–79.

¹⁴³ After Kinsey's death, Desmond Curran and Denis Parr quote Kinsey as having estimated that "paedophiliacs constitute only a small fraction, not more than 3%, of homosexuals as a whole" ("Homosexuality: An Analysis of 100 Male Cases Seen in Private Practice," *British Medical Journal* 1, no. 5,022 [1957]: 797–801). Curran elsewhere puts Kinsey's estimation at "one or two percent": Curran and Joseph Whitby, cited in *Wolfenden's Witnesses: Homosexuality in Postwar Britain*, by Brian Lewis (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 188.

inescapable,¹⁴⁴ but few British experts invoked Hirschfeld or Moll. In the German literature, Hirschfeld's arguments about male same-sex age preferences gained slightly more long-term traction, where they were being renegotiated well into the 1960s. Examples of scholars who actively engaged with Hirschfeld's categories include Hans Giese, who tried to reestablish Hirschfeld's Scientific-Humanitarian Committee in 1959 and eventually founded the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sexualforschung (German Society for Sex Research); Dresden physician Rudolf Klimmer, who was frequently named the last proponent of Hirschfeld's scientific humanitarianism; Hamburg "constitutional biologist" Willhart Schlegel, who took a leading role in the postwar repeal of Paragraph 175 and empirically probed the relationship between constitutional types of homosexuality and age preference; Heidelberg psychiatrist Walter Bräutigam, who characterized pedophilia as a "special problem of inhibited homosexuality"; Dutch theologian Herman van de Spijker (elaborating analogies of paradigmatic attractions he called *androtropy*, *gynecotropy*, and *pedotropy*, each subdivided by respective dimensions of *sexus*, *eros*, and *philia*); and, most internationally influential, Prague clinician Kurt Freund, who in 1960 independently tested the relationship between feminine identification ("Vorhandensein oder Nichtvorhandensein femininer Identifikation") and age preference and who designed a phalometric test for gender/age preferences.¹⁴⁵

Although law changes around homosexuality on both sides of the Atlantic would render the problem and politics of subcategorizing homosexuality increasingly a matter of embattling conflation with pedophilia, the inheritors of Hirschfeld's typology that I have named all considered pedophiles to form a special group of homosexuals. Moreover, all in their own way addressed ephebophilia. A postwar propagator of Hirschfeld's scientific humanitarianism, Giese wrote his 1946 medical thesis on types of homosexuality. He later offered the hybrid term *Adoleszentophilie* to denote an erotic focus on

¹⁴⁴ Brian Lewis aptly qualifies the distinction as "political rather than merely descriptive" ("Wolfenden, Paederasty and Paedophilia," <http://notchesblog.com>, 14 April 2016).

¹⁴⁵ See Hans Giese, *Der homosexuelle Mann in der Welt* (Stuttgart: F. Enke, 1958), 73–74, 276–77 (Q39 in his survey); Giese, "Zur Diagnose Pädophilie," *Beiträge zur Sexualforschung* 34, pt. 2 (1965): 24–29; Rudolf Klimmer, *Die Homosexualität als Biologisch-Soziologische Zeitfrage*, 3rd ed. (Hamburg: Verlag für kriminalistische Fachliteratur, 1965), 194–202; Willhart S. Schlegel, *Körper und Seele: Eine Konstitutionslehre für Ärzte, Juristen, Pädagogen und Theologen* (Stuttgart: F. Enke, 1957), 126–30; Walter Bräutigam, *Formen der Homosexualität* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1967), 38–45; Antonius M. J. M. Herman van de Spijker, *Die gleichgeschlechtliche Zuneigung: Homotropie; Homosexualität, Homoerotik, Homophilie und die katholische Moraltheologie* (Olten und Freiburg im Breisgau: Walter-Verlag, 1968), passim; and Kurt Freund, "Das Syndrom der Homosexualität beim Manne," *Psychiatria et Neurologia* 140, nos. 5–6 (1960): 476–98; Freund, *Die Homosexualität beim Mann* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1963), 332–37. After 1968 Freund exported his forensic study of age preferences to Canada. On Giese's role in subsequent discussions about homosexual age preference, see Magdalena Beljan's *Rosa Zeiten? Eine Geschichte der Subjektivierung männlicher Homosexualität in den 1970er und 1980er Jahren der BRD* (Bielefeld: transcript, 2014), chap. 5.

youths,¹⁴⁶ but of course he would not have it denote abnormality, and he seemingly never used the term again. By the time of the American Psychiatric Association's 1973 declassification of homosexuality per se, homosexuality and pedophilia (and briefly, in the Anglo-American experience, pederasty, or "man-boy love") research and advocacy had drifted so far apart that Hirschfeld's classification system no longer seemed relevant. Surveys seeking to establish counts of same-sex age preferences were still being conducted into the mid-1960s, but methods of recruitment remained barely suited to arbitrate in Hirschfeld's original problem of subclassification. By 1965 Giese had reported that of 187 homosexual men he had seen in his outpatient consultancy, 6 (3.2 percent) were *pedophiles*. According to his survey data, however, while 4.4 percent had pedophilic interests, only 0.3 percent (or only one respondent) had such interests exclusively, while 57 percent were inclusively and 4.4 percent exclusively youth oriented. In their 1974 landmark study, *Der gewöhnliche Homosexuelle* (The normal homosexual), Martin Dannecker and Reimut Reiche also found exactly one exclusive pedophile, or 0.1 percent of those surveyed.¹⁴⁷

Appreciating Hirschfeld's legacy against the background of this extended and arguably ongoing discussion of sexual typology leads to the conclusion that mounting urgency to legalize sex between consenting adults importantly, if never uncontroversially, cocreated normal homosexuality and (same-sex) pedophilia in Wilhelmine and Weimar Germany. However, pedophilia hardly became an organizing cultural trope until homosexuality's legal consolidation and, arguably, early 1970s modeling on gay liberation by "pedophile emancipation." Taking up arguments from Ulrichs and Krafft-Ebing, though choosing to overlook importantly comparable and less classification-bound efforts by his rival Moll, Hirschfeld successively characterized age attractions on either extreme of the spectrum as discrete deviations, types of homosexual inclination, pathological symptoms (of psychosexual infantilism), or dimensions of specific (infantile) sexual constitutions. Hirschfeld's era and politics rendered ephebophilia a risky distinction, and his focus on this concept required him to cede related questions of identity, community, biography, and historicity to others, especially to the *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen*. Such questions ended up being posed even into the 1990s in Western Europe, though Anglo-American anthropological-historical categorizations of "homosexualities" of the 1980s held "age-stratified" varieties increasingly at a cultural and historical distance.¹⁴⁸ Nonegalitarian homosexuality, in other words, was increasingly exotified where it was not pathologized. Pedophilia became a topic of interest in gay

¹⁴⁶ Giese, "Zur Diagnose," 24.

¹⁴⁷ Martin Dannecker and Reimut Reiche, *Der gewöhnliche Homosexuelle* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1974), 123, 284–96.

¹⁴⁸ See Diederik F. Janssen, "Age-Stratifying Homosexualities in the Social Sciences," *Sexuality & Culture* 21, no. 1 (2017): 300–322.

Left, and generally leftist, circles on either side of the Atlantic, particularly in the 1970s and particularly in Germany and the Netherlands.¹⁴⁹ But in international LGBT advocacy circles, the term soon came to be juxtaposed to homosexuality in increasingly diametrical, and politically banal, terms. Uranism, it would seem, has never been more uncomplicated.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

DIEDERIK F. JANSSEN is an independent researcher residing in the Netherlands. He is managing editor of the *Journal of Men's Studies* and editor of *Boyhood Studies*.

¹⁴⁹ Franz Walter, Stephan Klecha, and Alexander Hensel, eds., *Die Grünen und die Pädosexualität: Eine bundesdeutsche Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).

Copyright of Journal of the History of Sexuality is the property of and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.