Heike Bauer

"Not a translation but a mutilation": The Limits of Translation and the Discipline of Sexology

In 1934, the *Medical Critic and Guide* published a review by William Robinson entitled "Sexological Literature Pirates." Robinson's use of "piracy" referred to the translations of the work of one of the most influential sexologists of the time, the German Magnus Hirschfeld. Robinson dismissed *Sexual Pathology* (1932) and *The Sexual History of the World War* (1934), abridged and modified English versions of Hirschfeld's *Sexualpathologie* (1917–1920) and *Sittengeschichte des Weltkriegs* (1930), claiming that they were "not a translation, but a mutilation" of the original texts.[1]

Robinson's idea of "mutilation" encapsulates the close conceptual links between the textual *corpus* and the sexual body in late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century sexological discourses. In this article I intend to use sexology as a means to test the bounds of translation. Unlike investigations that focus on the translation of individual texts, I look at the discipline of sexology more widely, which allows for broader comparisons between issues of translation and emergent discourses. I take Robinson's bodily metaphor as the starting point for rethinking how the production of sexual ideas illustrates the limits of translation. The textual processes of translation are akin to the discursive practices of sexology, which sought to theorize sexual behavior, at least initially, by examining it as a manifestation of the body.

I analyze the translation and dissemination of select works of three key German sexologists, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1925–1895), Richard von Krafft-Ebing (1840–1902), and Magnus Hirschfeld (1869–1935). My basic premise is that both translation and sexology are informed by cultural circumstance. The impact of the cultural context on issues of translation has been recognized since Walter Benjamin addressed the question of what he called the "translatability" of a work. Benjamin engaged with the idea that certain texts appear more "translatable" than others. Analyses of translation often focus on a distinction between *translatability*, which problematizes the different forms of translation among languages and media, and *un-translatability*, denoting the impossibilities of translating certain acts and concepts. However, this model does not take account of the fact that some ideas appear to

The Yale Journal of Criticism, volume 16, number 2 (2003): 381–405

need no translation at all. The impact of cultural circumstance necessitates more than just a binary understanding of "translatability." In addition to "translatability" and "un-translatability," I therefore consider what I want to call the concept of *a-translatability*, which, as the prefix implies, suggests that there exist culturally determined concepts that are *without translation*. They can, but, crucially, do not need to be translated in order to be widely disseminated.

Theories of translation are closely tied in to the contemporary intellectual climate within a particular cultural moment. During the nineteenth century, ideas about translation were commonly based on the notion that translation should be a precise rendering of the original text. Walter Pater typically likened translation to "the copying of a drawing or other design upon transparent tracing paper"; in other words, he understood a translation as an exact replica of the original.[2] By implication, any perceived deviation from the original would be classified as inauthentic. Similarly, the early sexologists believed that sex and sexual practices were manifestations of an essential body, and that there exists a "true" body, in the sense of a "natural" bodily norm against which all "deviation" could be observed and measured. This "deviancy" included both practices that endorsed actual mutilations of the body such as cutting, flogging, and the mutilation of corpses, and also non-disfiguring concepts such as homosexuality. Crucially, the sexologists considered both the "natural" and the "deviant" body authentic, rather than merely judging "deviancy" as the unsuccessful replication of the "norm." This meant they saw different bodies as original sites for investigation. Sexological discourses therefore reproduced in textual form what were perceived to be a range of bodily phenomena. In other words, the practitioners engaged in the new recording, analyzing, and theorizing of sex aimed to translate what they perceived to be the original corporeality of sexuality, gleaned from empirical observations of a range of subjects, into theories that could be noted down on paper. From this perspective it is telling that Robinson would choose the metaphor of the mutilated body to describe what he thought of as an inaccurate rendering into English of Hirschfeld's texts. If the sexologist based his theories at least in part on descriptions of the body, then any textual changes in translation are analogous to the "mutilation" of the body of the subject.

The translation of the newly formulated concepts of sexuality among languages and media has hitherto received little critical attention. Since Michel Foucault defined sexuality as "the correlative of that slowly developed discursive practice which constitutes the *scientia sexualis*," critics have paid much attention to the ways in which sexology impacted the formation and regulation of sexuality, often considering the discursive practice akin to a distortion of subjective

experience while taking for granted the sexological writings and their translations, possibly distorting the makeup of the new discipline.[3] Only recently have critics such as Harry Oosterhuis, in his seminal study of Krafft-Ebing (2001), started to acknowledge the need for assessing the sexological theories within their specific cultural context, pointing out how different cultural backgrounds influence the production, dissemination, and the understanding of sexological theories. I take these recent developments further and argue that the sexological theories themselves were products of translation, shaped by cultural circumstance. The new discipline brought together international practitioners who engaged with ideas and concepts that originated in a range of different languages. Thus it lends itself to a discussion of translation. In tracing some of the (different) ways in which the new ideas were disseminated and translated in English, I aim to rethink the intricate processes of translation.

I use the term translation in this context to describe both the translating of a text from German into English, as appropriate mainly to Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, and the summarizing and editing of German ideas in English, which describes the processes the work of Ulrichs and Hirschfeld underwent. Each of the three medical or legal thinkers argued for and explored the existence of different sexual identities. In so doing, they embedded into their theories and empirical research a combination of both the personal circumstances of the individual and broader assumptions derived from their specific national and cultural backgrounds, here the period from around the time of the foundation of the German Empire in 1871 until the beginning of World War II. Translation can thus usefully be described as a process of trans- and cross-cultural negotiation and re-formulation of ideas, governed by socio-historical circumstance.

This model attempts to disentangle translation from the literary realm and the prevalent assumption that questions of translation are only of any real significance in relation to literary texts. It challenges assumptions of the easier "translatability" of scientific texts, instead discussing them as cultural productions subject to similar influences as literary texts. According to Lawrence Venuti, the translator can be either an artistic genius or a conscientious craftsperson, in the same way that according to Coleridge a "true" poet can be distinguished from a mere writer.[4] This idea of the translator as artist has since gained widespread recognition. However, I want to foreground the Benjaminian idea that, unlike the writer, the translator can manipulate the texts with which he (not in these specific cases, she) is working, while claiming merely to record, to reproduce, and to disseminate someone else's truth. Benjamin adapted Baudelaire's notion of the *flaneur* for the translator, which implies the translator's casual, even unnoticed, par-

taking in cultural production.[5] Behind his façade, the translator can in fact create a set of meaning that may differ considerably from what had been said originally.[6]

Benjamin took account of the influence of the cultural context on language. His reflection on the "task of the translator" includes an observation on the constitution of language that provides a useful tool for the analysis of the work of the sexologists as well as their translations. First, Benjamin notes, one has to distinguish between *was* [what] is meant by a word or a phrase, and then one needs to consider *wie* [how] this is meant. He gives the example of the German and the French words for bread, *Brot* and *pain*. The entity of *what* these two words mean is the same, yet *how* they are understood in the two languages differs: native German speakers will be led by their culturally-determined chain of association to the image of a loaf, whereas a French person is more likely to think of a baguette.[7]

The distinction between *what* and *how* proves to be vital for the understanding of the works of German sexologists, specifically Krafft-Ebing and Hirschfeld, and their English translations: the acts and behaviors described may be the same, yet how they are understood and interpreted can be rather different. Jeffrey Weeks, among others, points out that in different cultures different meanings are given to sexual acts, and indeed there has been a vast amount of anthropological-ethnographic studies on the specifics of certain sexualities and genders in different cultural spaces.[8] Recent scholarship has engaged with the ways in which notions of sexual perversion and sexual identities throughout Europe were *not* necessarily understood in the same way.[9] The trial and imprisonment of Oscar Wilde in 1895 is a key example thereof, mirroring the different contexts of the spread of sexual knowledge within Europe. As Nancy Erber argues, Wilde's homosexuality could be intellectualized in a far more detached way in France than in Britain, where Wilde's trial was closely tied to contemporary debates about masculinity. In France, Wilde's "foreigness" was both a point of attack for the condemnation of homosexuality, and a shield behind which a relatively safe discussion of homosexuality was possible.[10]

Such issues of "translatability" are challenged by the translation of Krafft-Ebing's work, which reveals that a text may be translatable while simultaneously being modified in translation to better fit the translator's cultural context. That this is distinct from the notion of "un-translatability" is illustrated by the work of Hirschfeld, which specifically shows the impossibility of translating certain acts and concepts among languages. However, issues of translation are not confined to the distribution and transformation of texts among languages. Beyond the nationally specific cultural context, there exists a broader Western humanist frame of reference, which accounts for the fact that certain ideas are a-translatable. They display a congruency between

what is meant and how it is meant, which is indebted to their larger cultural history. This is particularly the case with concepts derived from classical sources such as Ulrichs' theories. Such concepts already exist in translation in terms of language and historical time span, which is why their contemporary adaptations may be understood in different national contexts without further modification. My analysis, which takes account of the sexologists' background in an attempt to offer a corrective to some persistent critical misconceptions, proposes that the discipline of sexology reconfigures ideas about translation and calls for a reconceptualization of notions of the "translatability" of texts and concepts.

Modes of Translation

I. Translatability and the Anglicization of Psychopathia Sexualis

Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* offers the most conclusive example of what I want to call cultural modification, a subtle and at times oblique process of transformation that occurs when translating among languages. Cultural modification impacts on and challenges the "translatability" of a work, but it does not render it untranslatable. The translation remains largely true to the original, while inflecting it with different cultural meanings. Krafft-Ebing's ideas were transformed in the English version of his work, which has hitherto mostly escaped critical attention. Specifically, they underwent a process of Anglicization, that is, the translator adapted Krafft-Ebing's text to make it fit into the specific cultural context of late-nineteenth century Britain. Here, like with all translation, the translator's manipulation of the original text may be a mixture of conscious and unconscious decisions that depend on his cultural circumstance. The changes may go almost unnoticed, but still reflect back onto the original author as they affect the reception of the work. They question the "translatability" of the text, revealing how the translator is enmeshed within a specific cultural context. If Krafft-Ebing aimed to translate bodily observations into textual theories, then the translator's modifications are equally tied in to the material sphere. Similar to the sexologists' understanding of "natural" and "deviant" bodies, both original text and translation are nevertheless authentic productions.

Krafft-Ebing spent the first and formative stage in his career as a psychiatrist at the Illenau in Achern/Baden, one of the first German psychiatric hospitals to introduce the no restraint principle, which had evolved in England.[11] The asylum was famous for its advanced facilities and the humanitarian treatment of its patients, which followed the principle that all mental illness was not just a physical disorder, but a "disease of the soul," which nevertheless manifested itself physically.[12] After Illenau, Krafft-Ebing spent some years on the move: he briefly

had his own practice in Baden-Baden, then served in a military camp in Rastatt during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71 before taking over as head of the electrotherapeutic institute in Baden-Baden. This was followed by his move into academia: he spent a year as professor of psychiatry at Strasbourg University before moving to Austria where he spent the remainder of his life, first at Graz University and the nearby Feldhof psychiatric asylum, and later in Vienna. Krafft-Ebing was fascinated with what he perceived to be the myriad of shades of human sexuality, and he made famous sexual practices such as "Sadismus" [sadism] and "Masochismus" [masochism].[13] Much of his terminology is still in use today. In 1899, Krafft-Ebing joined a campaign led by Hirschfeld and signed a petition presented to the Reichstag to obtain the revocation of the infamous paragraph 175 of the German Criminal Code, which criminalized homosexuality.[14] The fact that he actively supported the decriminalization of homosexuality has often been overlooked, which may be partly due to the way his most important work was translated.

Psychopathia Sexualis was ostensibly written for use by the medical profession and as a reference guide for the proceedings in the courtroom. The foreword to the first German edition explicitly states that the author directed his work at "Männer . . . ernster Forschung auf dem Gebiet der Naturwissenschaft und der Jurisprudenz" [serious scholars in the sciences and in law], and that he had chosen "einzelne, besonders anstössige Stellen statt in deutscher, in lateinischer Sprache zu geben" [to translate certain especially offensive passages from German into Latin].[15] While Krafft-Ebing deliberately uses Latin exclusively, he also assumes that the Latin passages would be widely understood in scholarly and scientific circles. He maintains a strategy of using translation as a means to articulate the otherwise unspeakable. However, he nevertheless expresses the hope that there would be a variety of people "die in dem sonst nur Männern der Wissenschaft gewidmeten Buche Aufklärung und Trost hinsichtlich rätselhafter Erscheinungen ihrer eigenen Vita sexualis suchen und finden" [who will search for and find in this book enlightenment and consolation regarding mysterious phenomena of their own sexual life].[16] In other words, he was convinced that it was sufficient to understand the passages in the vernacular to make sense of the whole work. Here Krafft-Ebing's use of translation appears a mere smokescreen to uphold the scientific form of the work, rather than a discouragement of the layperson to engage with the text.

The first edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis* was a slim, 110-page volume containing just forty-five case studies. By the time the twelfth edition was published in 1902—the last one Krafft-Ebing edited—the volume had expanded to a staggering 238 case studies, spread out over 437 pages.[17] This mirrors the rapid development of Krafft-Ebing's

work, accompanied by his shift toward the promotion of tolerance for the phenomenon of homosexuality, which he called "konträre Sexualempfindung" [sexual inversion].[18] Krafft-Ebing believed "sexual inversion" to be congenital and initially viewed it as a degenerate vice.[19] However, when he investigated the stories of more and more inverts, he came to see homosexuality as part of nature. That is, he considered sexual inversion a natural variation akin to, say, differences in eye color. He drew a distinction between *Perversion* [perversion], homosexuality as inborn and natural, and *Perversität* [perversity], homosexuality as the chosen vice of some degenerates.[20] This somewhat complicates Krafft-Ebing's views on the body. He distinguishes between the "natural" sexual body of "perversion" and an "unnatural" sexual body of "perversity," which seems to suggest that the "acquired perversity" is not authentic, as it interferes with the congenital body. However, for the purpose of observing and recording "perversity" on paper, Krafft-Ebing would consider it no less original than the innate "perversion."

A look at the publishing history of *Psychopathia Sexualis* shows the key role of translation for the work. Krafft-Ebing revised it twelve times between 1886–1902 (some of the later prints under different editors significantly modified the original text). Each of Krafft-Ebing's revisions was published by the distinguished Ferdinand Enke publishing house, one of the best known of the few German specialist medical publishers of the time.[21] In 1892, *Psychopathia Sexualis* was first translated into English by the American psychiatrist Charles Gilbert Chaddock (1861–1936).[22] It was based on the seventh German edition. Numerous translations of different editions by different translators were to follow, published by various publishing houses on both sides of the Atlantic, ranging from the highly regarded medical publisher Physicians and Surgeons Book Company in New York to London's popular Heinemann house.[23] Next to Chaddock, F. J. (Francis Joseph) Rebman (1852–1946) was the main translator of the work into English. Here I compare the first chapter of Rebman's translation of the twelfth German edition to the first chapter of the original twelfth German edition, the last edition Krafft-Ebing worked on. I argue that Krafft-Ebing's ideas were Anglicized when they were translated from German into English—in other words, they were adapted to the new cultural context. The differences between the German and the translation mirror prevalent themes of English society in the 1890s, especially sexual anxieties relating to pollution, degeneracy, and above all the upholding of the British Empire. Somewhat ironically, Rebman's translation renders Krafft-Ebing's call for tolerance toward a variety of sexual preferences as rather "unnatural." The Anglicization of the original ideas "mutilates" Krafft-Ebing's observations, and by extension the bodies they describe.

Krafft-Ebing opens his work with some general observations on the

relationship between sex and society. He claims that among primitive people man "strebt nach den schönsten Individuen des anderen Geschlechts und erfüllt damit eine Art geschlechtliche Zuchtwahl" [desires the most beautiful individual of the opposite sex in his choice of sexual breeding partner].[24] Rebman embeds this idea into the scientific debate in Britain when he terms the process "a sort of instinctive selection of the fittest."[25] This choice of words carried specific connotations in the contemporary British context. First, it resounded the relatively newly emerged evolutionary theory as first proposed by Charles Darwin in *The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection* in 1859, and further developed in his *The Descent of Man* (1871). Darwin claimed that evolution is the process in which the "fittest" (that is the strongest and best adapted species) secures its own survival by eliminating the weaker species.[26] Second, this notion of fitness was then adapted into British imperialist thinking. As William Greenslade pointed out, it was only the "fit" man who could serve his Empire, and so "fitness" was considered essential for the imperialist masculine identity of the male subject. A lack of "fitness" was seen to be the sign of a weak and effeminate male, and was ultimately associated with sexual degeneracy.[27]

The change of words from the "choice of sexual breeding partner" (which seems at least to imply that the choice is made due to sexual desire) to that of the "instinctive selection of the fittest" (which seems to imply that the choice is influenced by imperial concerns) carries two related meanings. First, it re-iterates that heterosexuality is the only acceptable form of sexuality by pointing out that even primitive man was instinctively aware of the importance of choosing the right sexual partner from the opposite sex. This was considered the "natural" process, based on the assumption that there exists one "natural" body. Second, it warns that choosing a wrong sexual partner (for example one from the same sex) would be degenerate. Degenerate sexual behavior would then be not only against nature, but it would also undermine the strength of the British Empire. Rebman's subtle change of phrasing, whether deliberately or unconsciously, considerably modifies some of the basic assumptions of Krafft-Ebing's text.

Rebman adheres to the concept of evolutionary theory in relation to women as well as men. When discussing female virtuousness Krafft-Ebing states that "[w]ahrhaftig ist weibliche Schamhaftigkeit eine erblich gezüchtete Frucht der Kulturentwicklung" [female modesty is indeed a hereditary fruit of the development of civilization]. He continues with the observation that "die Frauen sind den Männern in der natürlichen Psychologie der Liebe weit überlegen, teils hereditär und durch Erziehung" [women are far superior to men in the natural psychology of love, partly because of hereditary and educational influences].[28] Rebman's translation attributes this development specifically

to evolutionary influences. He writes that "[t]o discuss here the evolution of . . . the most graceful of virtues in women is out of place, but most likely it is an outgrowth of the gradual rise of civilization." He continues that "[w]oman far surpasses man in the natural psychology of love, partly because evolution and training have made love her proper element, and partly because she is animated by more refined feelings."[29] The reference to evolution underpins Rebman's Darwinist frame of reference. He suggests that woman's virtuousness arises out of civilized development, as exemplified in the development of the Empire. It thus depends on the "proper" sexual conduct he has outlined earlier. Krafft-Ebing's emphasis on hereditary factors on the other hand suggests that he took a Mendelist approach, that is, he believed homosexuality to be akin to a Mendelist recessive, a naturally occurring infrequency that is equal in value to the so-called norm. This infrequency would operate on an individual basis, rather than that of "species" (or Empire). This may have influenced Krafft-Ebing's belief in the naturalness of homosexuality. Rebman's evolutionary approach on the other hand puts forward the Darwinist belief in the slow but constant "improvement" of society through elimination of characteristics that vary from what is considered the "natural" norm. The effect of Rebman's translation was to represent homosexuality, if perhaps only subconsciously, as an aberration. The translation, by process of cultural modification, changes the "scientific truth" of Krafft-Ebing's text into its opposite.

Rebman's modifications operate on a relatively small semantic scale, which may explain why they have been often overlooked. He shares many of Krafft-Ebing's sentiments, but imparts them with specific cultural inflections. For instance, both Rebman and Krafft-Ebing are anti-Islamist, but Rebman specifically embeds this in a Protestant frame of reference. One of Krafft-Ebing's main criticisms of Islam is that "[u]nter allen Umständen schloss der Islam das Weib von der Betätigung am öffentlichen Leben aus und hinderte damit seine intellektuelle und sittliche Fortentwicklung" [Islam excluded woman under all circumstances from public life, hindering her intellectual and ethical development].[30] He contrasts this with Christianity, in which "die Tugenden und Fähigkeiten des christlichen Weibes als Hausfrau, Erzieherin der Kinder, gleichberechtigte Gefährtin des Mannes, sich herrlich entfalten konnten" [the virtues and abilities of the Christian woman can blossom in the roles of housewife, educator of the children and as equal partner of man].[31] Krafft-Ebing seems internally incoherent insofar as he emphasizes that the Christian woman's virtues and abilities arise from her role within the household, yet he criticizes the confinement of the Islamic woman to this role and claims that her lack of influence in public life accounts for her lower intellectual and moral development. Rebman takes on board this incoherence and

adds a pinch of Protestant work ethic when he states that "[a]bove all things Islamism excludes woman from public life and enterprise, and stifles her intellectual and moral advancement."[32]

The argument that Rebman's translation is colored by English Protestantism (Krafft-Ebing was Catholic) is reinforced by his negative or Puritan attitude towards matters of the body. English anxieties concerning social purity had led to the enforcement of the Contagious Diseases Acts in the late 1860s and 1870s, which held prostitutes responsible for the spread of venereal diseases.[33] The fear that "fallen" women would corrupt and infect upright male citizens was prevalent in Victorian society. Krafft-Ebing was careful to place ethical responsibility again onto the individual, rather than onto women as a group. He simply warns that every Christian "läuft . . . jederzeit Gefahr, von der lichten Höhe reiner und keuscher Liebe in den Sumpf gemeiner Wollust herabzusinken" [is always in danger of falling from the heights of pure and chaste love into the morass of common lust].[34] Although the English version does not overtly blame women more than men, the danger is intensified and made more tangible, as "the Christian . . . often drags pure and chaste love from its sublime pedestal and wallows in the quagmire of sensual enjoyment and lust."[35]

Krafft-Ebing simply acknowledges the existence of temptation, yet for Rebman physical temptation seems inevitably to lead to a downfall, revealing a decidedly Puritan stance regarding sex and the body. Rebman's aversion to matters of the body and his negative presentation of sexual behavior per se is further highlighted in the translation of sexual development in puberty. Krafft-Ebing observes that "[d]ie psychologische Reaktion des Sexualtriebs in der Pubertät gibt sich in mannigfaltigen Erscheinungen kund, denen nur gemeinsam der affektvolle Zustand der Seele ist" [the psychological reaction of the sexual drive during puberty finds manifold manifestations which only have in common the emotional state of the soul].[36] Rebman turns this into the awakening of "psychological reactions of animal passion [that] manifest themselves in the irresistible desires of intimacy."[37] Here again Rebman presents the sexual drive as inherently dangerous, as animal-like and hence "unnatural" and uncivilized, which ultimately presents a threat to the stability of the Empire. Rebman's condemnation of sexual behavior is reflected in his translation: by modifying Krafft-Ebing's text, he regulates Krafft-Ebing's views on sex and the body. This in turn may be seen as an attempt to control the sexual body of the reader. In other words, Rebman's modifications aim beyond the textual realm, encouraging the real suppression of sexual behavior.

Rebman's concern with sexuality is tied to larger political issues pertaining to the British Empire. Krafft-Ebing simply observes that civilization develops with the "Sesshaftwerden der Menschen aus früherem Nomadenleben" [people giving up their nomadic life and

settling down].[38] Rebman adds that the "development is hastened wherever nomadic habits yield to the spirit of colonization."[39] He overtly promotes both the Empire and the idea that by colonization, it will "civilize" other people. The sense of Rebman's wish to conserve the Empire gains further momentum in his translation of Krafft-Ebing's observations on decadence. Krafft-Ebing states that in "Zeiten des staatlichen Verfalls treten vielfach geradezu monströse Verirrungen des sexuellen Trieblebens auf, die . . . zum Teil auf psycho-oder wenigstens neuro-pathologische Zustände in der Bevölkerung sich zurückführen lassen" [times of the decline of the state, one can often find almost monstrous aberrations of the sexual drives. However, these can be traced partly to psycho-pathological or at least neuro-pathological conditions within the population].[40] In other words, they are individual aberrations. According to Rebman, however, "they can always be traced to the psycho-pathological or neuro-pathological conditions of the nation involved."[41] Rebman again appeals to the responsibility of the individual toward the nation.

Liah Greenfield claims that "the idea of nation" first came into being in England.[42] She argues that English society was a rational one not inclined to the "collective hallucinations" of, say, Germany or France, which led to patriotic outbursts in these countries.[43] Rebman's obsession with national consciousness and the Empire, and especially his concern with the impurities of the flesh, undermines this idea, especially given that, as the Contagious Diseases Act illustrates (it was strictly implemented in military garrisons), a substantial part of the imperial project as a whole was the controlling of sexual behavior. Rebman's translation certainly supports the imperial project, and this bias effectively brings into question the neutrality of translated scientific texts.

The Anglicization of *Psychopathia Sexualis* illustrates the process of cultural transformation that impacts on translations among languages. Here the translator's choice of expression reshaped ideas about sexuality espoused in the original text, which affected its reception. Many of Krafft-Ebing's critics of the twentieth century fin de siècle seem to have overlooked or ignored the possibility that the translator's cultural contexts may have left their mark on the original work.

Krafft-Ebing has been vulnerable to criticisms based on earlier editions of *Psychopathia Sexualis*, and stemming from only a superficial study of his work. Sheila Jeffreys claims, for example, in an utterly negative assessment of Krafft-Ebing, that he created the stereotype of the masculine lesbian in order to discredit the new feminist movement. She even insists—without providing a reference—that he invented "a form of ejaculation in women [to provide for] contemporary men's pornography."[44] Lillian Faderman, who is aware that Krafft-Ebing's views were by no means static, still fails to register this significance.

She assigns this information to a footnote, dismissing Krafft-Ebing's gradual move toward the acceptance of homosexuality as inconsequential.[45] Michel Foucault, arguably the most influential sexuality theorist of the late twentieth century, simplifies Krafft-Ebing's achievement, seeing him as one of the leading people to turn "[t]he sodomite [who] had been the temporary aberration [into] the homosexual [who] was now a species."[46] Foucauldian criticism, while providing important insights into the making of sexuality, has neglected to examine the making of sexology and its texts.

Rebman's take on sexuality may have colored these responses to Krafft-Ebing's work. For the purpose of this investigation it is of secondary importance whether Rebman deliberately or unconsciously aimed to tailor Krafft-Ebing's text for the benefit of imperial thought. Primarily, the case of *Psychopathia Sexualis* illustrates the volatility of the translated text, which affects the reception of the work. *What* is meant by the original text is different from *how* it is understood by the translator. This does not mean *Psychopathia Sexualis* is not a translatable text. However, in the same way that the sexologists understood different bodies, including mutilated bodies, as "original" manifestations, Rebman's translation, although not a neutral replication of Krafft-Ebing's text, needs to be understood as an authentic cultural production.

II. Un-translatability and Magnus Hirschfeld's Ideas on Sexuality

While issues of "translatability" have largely been ignored by sexology critics today, at the beginning of the twentieth century sexologists themselves were aware of the issues involved. In his writings, Magnus Hirschfeld paid attention to the fact that certain acts and ideas were untranslatable among languages. His work reflects the Benjaminian distinction between *what* and *how*, particularly his more ethnographically oriented studies. Hirschfeld gave papers in both German and English, which reveal, albeit with different inflection, a transformation of concepts similar to that found in the translation of *Psychopathia Sexualis*. However, while the translation of Krafft-Ebing's work inflected the text with particularly English connotations, Hirschfeld presented a paper in German that depended on a self-consciously German inflection in his choice of terminology. Its connotations were not translatable into English.

Hirschfeld saw himself in the tradition of Ulrichs and Krafft-Ebing as one of the great promoters of the understanding of homosexuality.[47] Of the three, he was certainly the most international in outlook, actively seeking to bring together sexologists from different parts of the world.[48] Hirschfeld came from a Jewish family of doctors from the Baltic seaside town of Kolberg. He initially studied languages and philosophy before beginning his medical training, which took him east

to west, south to north, at the universities of Breslau, Strasbourg, Munich, Heidelberg, and finally Berlin, where he graduated. During his university years, he turned his back on the Jewish religion. After the completion of his studies he traveled to the United States. On return he opened his own practice in Magdeburg in 1894, following family footsteps and specializing in neuropathy. In 1896, he moved to Charlottenburg near Berlin and published his first sexological work *Sappho and Sokrates*.

Hirschfeld was a self-acknowledged homosexual, using his medical training as the background for his many activities relating to the promotion of the acceptance of homosexuality. The most significant among them included the foundation of the *Wissenschaftlich-Humanitäres Komitee* [Scientific-Humanitarian Committee] in Berlin in 1897, which had as its main aim the abolition of Paragraph 175 and the launching of the first scholarly journal on homosexuality, *Die Zeitschrift für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* [Yearbook for Sexual Intermediaries] in 1899.[49] Similar to his predecessors, Hirschfeld's believed that homosexuals belonged to a "third sex," using the term for the title of one of his best-known studies, *Berlins Drittes Geschlecht* [Berlin's Third Sex], published in 1904.

Hirschfeld involved himself directly in the dissemination of his own work in English. Most of his studies took place in Berlin, where his Institut für Sexualwissenschaft [Institute for Sexual Science] attracted large numbers of people from throughout the world, among them the London-based Australian physician Norman Haire and the American writer Christopher Isherwood. While the Institut is perhaps best known for its work with homosexuals, it offered support to a far wider range of the population. For instance, it gave marital advice and held contraception sessions.[50] Under the threat of Nazism, Hirschfeld went on a world lecturing tour in 1930, which took him to Britain and North America, but also to such far away countries as Japan, the Philippines, India, Egypt, and Palestine. The journey was to be captured in a book, *Die Weltreise eines Sexualforschers* (translated as *Men and Women: The World Journey of a Sexologist*).[51]

Hirschfeld was one of the founders of the World League for Sexual Reform (W.L.S.R.), which held its first congress in Berlin in 1921. In a sense, the organization was the logical outcome of the international makeup of sexology. In 1928 it met in Copenhagen, and in 1929 in London.[52] During the Copenhagen meeting, the W.L.S.R. established its aims and constitutes. Its preamble defined them as follows: "The International Congress for Sexual Reform on a Scientific Basis appeals to the legislators, the press and the peoples of all the countries, to help to create a new legal and social attitude (based on knowledge which has been acquired from scientific research in sexual biology, psychology and sociology) towards the social life of men and women."[53] This

emphasizes both the league's international scientific outlook and draws attention to the fact that the body remained one of the main means for the study of sexuality, in particular through the subdiscipline of "sexual biology."

Hirschfeld gave the opening address in English at the 1929 Congress in which he emphasized that sexology was not only a cross-disciplinary, but a cross-cultural discipline.[54] He also presented a short paper entitled "Der Begriff des Unzüchtigen." This was reprinted in the conference proceedings together with an English translation titled "The Conception of 'Indecency.'" This presents a lucid example of how a specific cultural context impacts on the understanding of certain ideas. In particular, it illustrates the limits of translating cultural connotations among languages. Norman Haire, president of the W.L.S.R., in his foreword to the proceedings, addressed the difficulties of publishing the different conference papers, which had to be translated from four different languages. He remarked that "some of the translations have been furnished by the authors themselves and bear plainly the imprint of a foreign hand, one or two of the papers were obscure even in their language, and not so easy to translate."[55] The policy of whether or not a paper was translated appears inconsistent, which perhaps suggests that it may have been up to the presenter to choose the language(s) of his or her paper. It is not clear whether Hirschfeld translated his paper himself, but this is of no bearing for the differences between the German and the English texts. The implications and connotations of both are clearly governed by cultural circumstance.

When Hirschfeld talks about the legal context of the "Begriff des Unzüchtigen," he mentions that it used to be applied only if a form of "Geschlechtsverkehr" [sexual intercourse] had taken place, for example "Blutschande" or "Notzucht."[56] "Blutschande" and "Notzucht" are rendered in English as "incest" and "rape."[57] However, "Blutschande" literally translates as the "disgrace, or rather the violation of the blood." Sander Gilman points out that this concept originally denoted what was thought to be "a 'real' pollution of the blood by the sexual contact between relatives," but in the changing political situation of the nineteenth century "this concept moves from signifying incestuous behavior to meaning the violation of the purity of the race."[58] He also claims that this is why Hirschfeld, among others, preferred to use the term "Unzucht" [indecency] in order to avoid racial discrimination. In this paper, however, Hirschfeld deliberately uses the term "Blutschande." I suggest that in so doing he exposes its darker connotations. He explains that "[w]o früher vielfach nur der eigentliche Geschlechtsverkehr unter Strafe stand, beispeilsweise bei der Blutschande, Notzucht etc., soll in Zukunft auch die unzüchtige Handlung bestraft werden" [formerly only actual sexual intercourse was punishable, for example the pollution of the blood, rape, etc., now

all indecent actions are punishable].[59] This is an implicit critique of the rise of the anti-Semitic movement in the explosive climate of late Weimar Germany, which Hirschfeld explicitly links to the homophobic legislation. The specific political meaning of Hirschfeld's choice of words depends on its contextualization within a particular historical moment in Germany, which is lost in the English version.

There are two possible explanations for the differences between the German and English papers: one, it might simply have been translated by an English speaker who was not aware of the complicated connotations "Blutschande" carries in German. Two, Hirschfeld might have written the paper *specifically* for a German (-speaking) audience as a warning against the dangerous anti-Semitic developments in the country. In either case, it is the cultural context that governs the understanding of the concept. A third possible explanation—that Hirschfeld simply might have changed his mind between the two versions—seems highly unlikely: as they both appeared in the same conference proceedings, he would have worked on them at the same time, which suggests he would have maintained the same point of view in both texts. The fact that the concept of "Blutschande" is a metaphor of the body does not mean the body is understood the same way within different cultural contexts. Hirschfeld moves away from the idea of an essential universal body, which had informed the writings of Krafft-Ebing. Instead he points out that both bodies and concepts are cultural constructs dependent on a specific frame of reference. The complex cultural connotations of "Blutschande" therefore render the concept untranslatable.

Hirschfeld's progressive work set the tone for future studies of human sexuality, and it significantly reveals his own awareness of cultural variation within the discipline. While he never lost his concern with local issues, particularly pertaining to Berlin, he was an internationalist in outlook with an enduring interest in human sexual behavior in various cultural contexts. He was particularly interested in comparing the situation of homosexuals in different European nations. His *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* [The Homosexuality of Man and Woman] (1914) investigates links between homosexuality and nationality. He conducted empirical studies and then concluded from the resulting statistics that there is no marked difference in number of occurrences of homosexuality within the Germanic and Anglo-Saxon area and its colonies. He believed this supported his theory that homosexuality is a consistent biological variation of sexuality.[60]

However, akin to Benjamin's understanding of translation, Hirschfeld was aware that *how* homosexuality is practiced might vary in different countries. He proposed that the kind of sexual practice considered the "norm" might differ from country to country (in Finland, for example, Hirschfeld claimed that homosexuals hardly ever practice

anal intercourse, which, in his opinion, accounts for their relatively high social status).[61] He also stressed that the very same sexual acts might be conducted with distinct expectations in different cultures. To illustrate this point Hirschfeld used the example of mutual masturbation between men, which he found to be the single most common sexual practice among homosexuals in Europe. Unlike in other European countries, however, where mutual male masturbation was the result of either a brief courting period or prostitution, in England Hirschfeld observed what he termed *in English* (in a text otherwise written in German) the practice of "silent sin": the mutual groping, touching, and masturbating of two strangers of the same sex that takes place in a crowd and is characterized by complete anonymity. Indeed, the people involved do not exchange a single word.[62] Hirschfeld saw the origins of this in what he called, again *in English*, the "conspiration of silence" [sic] of the English public with regards to homosexuality, thereby attributing a particular sexual practice to the specific makeup of English society. [63] Furthermore, he considers the practice untranslatable, evidenced by the fact that he uses English terminology to describe it in a German text. He wrongly reproduces the English word "conspiracy," which draws attention to the fact that both the terminology and the practice it refers to are not part of Hirschfeld's own linguistic and cultural background. Interestingly, he also records the reaction of a German man who took part in such an "English" mutual masturbation and was stunned to discover that his stranger-partner had no interest in any conversation. Hirschfeld's work highlights that acts and concepts are not always translatable among languages. Sexual practices that are performed, for example, in Germany, are not necessarily understood the same way in England, but like the texts and theories that try to explain them, they are subject to cultural context, which may render them untranslatable.

III. A-translatability and the Work of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs

Krafft-Ebing and Hirschfeld's writings specifically problematize the binary notions of "translatability" and "un-translatability." However, if one assumes they are influenced by cultural circumstance, the question arises whether wider cross-national cultural traditions may equally impact on the issue of translation. At this point it is crucial to disrupt the chronology and take a look at the work of Krafft-Ebing and Hirschfeld's most influential predecessor, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs. By opening up a wider cultural frame of reference, Ulrichs' work accounts for the fact that certain concepts can be understood in different national contexts without needing to be translated. When formulating his own theory of homosexuality, Ulrichs made use of a broader cultural concept derived from classical sources, which may help ex-

plain why his ideas have been widely disseminated but his actual writings left untranslated.

Ulrichs came from a Hanoverian middle-class Lutheran family. He studied law, first in Göttingen and then in Berlin, where he passed his exams in 1848.[64] For the next six years he worked in Hanover's civil service. Ulrichs had to leave the service because of his homosexuality, and subsequently tried to make a living as a writer. This helps explain his subsequent political activism, which twice led to his imprisonment.[65] He was a fierce opponent of the increasing Prussian influence over the independent German states in the years before the foundation of the German Empire in 1871, as he foresaw the replacement of Hanover's relatively liberal Napoleonic Code with the repressive Prussian law that was to introduce the infamous Paragraph 175.

It is worth pausing to consider why Paragraph 175 was so significant. An (anonymous) article in the first volume of Hirschfeld's *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* reveals its implications: "Das deutsche Gesetzbuch nahm den Wortlaut des § 143 des preussischen Strafgesetzbuches in seinem § 175 auf und strafte die widernatürliche Unzucht mit Gefängnis d.h. mit 1 Tag bis 5 Jahren, sowie fakultativ mit Aberkennung der bürgerlichen Ehrenrechte" [the German Civil Code adopted the wording of § 143 of the Prussian Civil Code for its § 175 and punished unnatural and illicit behavior with between 1 day and five years in prison, with an optional revocation of civil rights].[66] In other words, the new law closely tied sexual behavior to issues of the state, threatening to revoke the civil rights of a person found to have engaged in sexual acts that deviated from what was perceived to be "natural" behavior. Implicit in this law was the assumption that an essential body that produces "natural behavior" exists, and that "unnatural deviation" could be measured against it. Ulrichs' legal training made it easier for him to anticipate fully the devastating effects of Paragraph 175. In 1880, he left Germany and moved to Italy, first to Naples, and three years later to Aquila, where he died in 1895.[67]

Ulrichs' search for a better understanding of homosexuality was shaped by his classical education. In his first major publication on homosexuality, *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mannmännlichen Liebe* [Studies into the Riddle of Man-Manly Love] published in 1864, Ulrichs, still under the pseudonym Numa Numantius, introduced the term "urning" to describe a homosexual. He defined an "urning" as follows: "Thatsache ist es, dass es unter Menschen Individuen gibt, deren Körper männlich gebaut ist, welche gleichwohl aber geschlechtliche Liebe zu Männern, geschlechtlichen Horror vor Weibern empfinden, d.h. Horror vor geschlechtlicher Körperberührung mit Weibern . . . . Diese Individuen nenne ich 'Urninge'" [The fact is that there are individuals who have a body of male build, but who feel sexual love towards men, and sexual horror towards women, that is,

horror of sexually touching women's bodies . . . . I call these individuals "urnings"].[68] He emphasized that "dem Uranier [wohnt] bis in die Wurzeln hinein eine weibliche Natur [inne] . . . . Der Uranier ist eine Spezie von Mannweib" [inherent in the Urning is a through and through female nature . . . . The Urning is a species of manwoman].[69] In other words, Ulrichs proposed that "urnings" belonged to a "third sex." He thought what he called the "species of manwoman" was an authentic bodily manifestation. This led to his famous definition of an "urning" as someone with "anima muliebris virili corpore inclusa" [a female soul confined in a male body].[70] Ulrichs did not reject contemporary conflations between sexuality and the body. But when the two-sex model failed to offer an explanation for the phenomenon of same-sex desire, he turned to older ideas to justify the "naturalness" of homosexuality.

Ulrichs had taken the term "urning" from Plato's *Symposium*, specifically the speech of Pausanias, which discusses love between men.[71] Pausanias distinguishes between various forms of man-manly love and desire, as the Greek term "erôs" contains both meanings.[72] According to Pausanias, there are two main distinctions in man-manly love. In his book *Prometheus*, Ulrichs actually quotes the relevant passage: "Die eine Liebesgöttin ist die mutterlose Tochter des Uranus, welche wir Urania nennen . . . . Die andere ist die Tochter des Zeus und der Dione, welche wir gemeine nennen . . . . Urania hat nicht Theil an weiblich, sondern an männlich allein. Darum ist Urania's Eros die Liebe zu Jünglingen. Wer von diesem Gott berauscht ist, wird hingezogen zu dem, was männlich ist. Ihn zieht an, was von Natur das Kraftvollere ist" [the one God of Love is the motherless daughter of Uranus. We call her Urania . . . . The other one is the daughter of Zeus and Dione which we call the common love . . . . Urania has no female part, only maleness. This is why Urania's eros is the love of boys. The one who is intoxicated by this god is drawn to maleness. He is attracted to that which is by nature more powerful].[73] Ulrichs translates this passage from Greek, adapting the voice of Pausanias to idealize the masculine male. Reflecting Aristotelian ideas about masculinity and femininity, Pausanias associates the male with the masculine and thus with reason, and the female with the feminine and thus with the body. In Aristotelian terms this leads to the heterosexual assumption that the masculine male and the feminine female would make the ideal pair of lovers. However, Pausanias idealizes the love between the manly man and the masculine boy. In so doing, he rationalizes same-sex love by associating it with reason. By implication he also suggests the corporeality of this love, as only reason together with the body provide the foundation of love. This logic, based on assumptions about the relatedness of sex and gender, formed the basis of Ulrichs' "urning" theory.

Ulrichs' dictum of homosexuality as a form of gender inversion was to become one of the most influential notions in the study of homosexuality.[74] While his works were not translated, this basic premise was widely cited and disseminated. In Germany, Ulrich influenced, among others, Carl Westphal, who coined the term "conträre Sexualempfindung" [contrary sexual feeling], and Krafft-Ebing and Hirschfeld, who cited Ulrichs on issues of gender and sexuality.[75] In France his theories were echoed in the works of Jean-Martin Charcot and Valentin Magnan, neurologists who first introduced the term "inversion sexuelle" into French, and Marc-André Raffalovich who was fascinated by what he called "l'uranisme." Raffalovich went to Oxford where he became friends with some of the most prominent authors and thinkers of his day, including Henry James, Aubrey Beardsley, Oscar Wilde, and Arthur Symons.[76] This circle of friends was also connected to John Addington Symonds and Havelock Ellis, who published a famous study on "sexual inversion" in English. While the theories differed in their assessment and evaluation of homosexuality, they all understood the basic Ulrichsian formula of "sexual inversion as gender inversion."

Why, given that Ulrichs was widely influential, were his works not translated? One might contend that the scientifically oriented sexologists feared to be too closely associated with a famous practicing homosexual and therefore did not want to be associated with a translation of his writings. However, this seems unlikely, given that Hirschfeld's works were readily translated. An alternate explanation may be that as a result of the Romantic legacy, middle- and upper-middle-class education, particularly in nineteenth-century Britain, often included knowledge of German. Thus, the translation of Ulrichs' theory may have been rendered unnecessary.[77] However, this does not explain why Krafft-Ebing's work was translated into seven languages soon after publication. I would argue that the influence of Ulrichs' ideas on theorists in different languages suggests they were easily understandable within different contexts without needing translation. This a-translatability derives from the fact that they are based on an older Platonic concept, which is part of the classical humanist tradition. To this day, the humanist tradition links different national cultures, providing a common source of cultural concepts that need not be translated among languages. For example, the story of Oedipus is known in different languages. While it may be translated into different media and literary genres, it is simultaneously associated with a specific story that needs no further translation. Similarly, both the term "urning" and the concept it denotes draw on older ideas that were understood in different Western countries.

Ulrichs himself may have been aware that the classical derivation of his new theory posed advantages for the dissemination of the concept.

During his life, he became increasingly interested in the possibilities of the classical tradition. From his chosen Italian exile he published the journal *Alaudae* [Larks], the last journal to be written exclusively in Latin. Ulrichs printed it under the motto "linguam Latinam non esse delendam" [The Latin language must not die].[78] It included mainly poetry and prose writing, and according to Ulrichs: "*Alaudae* erstrebt im Verein mit einer Societät in London . . . die Erhebung des Latein zur völkerverbindenden Weltsprache" [The aim of *Alaudae*, in cooperation with a society in London, is to make Latin the world language that unites people of all nations].[79]

Key to Ulrichs' appeal for a Latin lingua franca is the wish for elimination of the need for translation. Despite the fact that translation was central to his own critical production, Ulrichs considered it a process of divergence that accounts for the disunity between different nations, which should eventually be eliminated. For Ulrichs, Latin offered the potential for a new or renewed understanding between different nations. In the nineteenth century in particular, Latin was still considered a-translatable, in particular in the scientific realm, as Krafft-Ebing's use of Latin illustrated. Translations of scientific works such as Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* retain their Latin passages, as knowledge of Latin was part of a scholarly education. The dissemination of *Alaudae* reveals that the journal's use of the old language appealed to individuals and institutions in different countries. While the journal's cooperation with the London Phoenix society (the London society alluded to in the quotation above) did not last long, Britain came to have one of the largest numbers of *Alaudae* subscribers.[80] The journal had private subscribers in most European cities, in America, Egypt, Asia, and even in New Zealand. It was also subscribed to by a number of libraries, the most noteworthy among them being the "apostolica Vaticana" [the Vatican Library in Rome], and the "bibliotheca musei Britannici Londiniensis" [the library of the British Museum (now the British Library) in London].[81]

Ulrichs' debts to classical sources may have been a deliberate attempt to aid the dissemination of his ideas. If this was the case, then the attempt was highly successful, as the popularity of his ideas demonstrates. Ulrichs' theory of homosexuality adds to the understanding of translation beyond merely offering insights into the genealogy of a new concept. The drawing on classical sources partly evades the issue of translation altogether, in the same way that Ulrichs' use of Latin eliminated the need to translate among contemporary languages. Simultaneously, Ulrichs' suggestion that homosexuality is a "third sex" encouraged a new understanding of various sexual bodies as equally authentic variations of the "natural" body. In other words, Ulrichs' premise, although still based on the assumption that sexuality is a bodily phenomenon, redefined how deviant sexual bodies, which had hitherto been denounced

as "unnatural" and thus inauthentic, were to be classified by subsequent sexologists. Ulrichs' theory is arguably the first translation of the "deviant" body as "natural." Its widespread influence is based on the fact that the classical source rendered the new concept a-translatable.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ ★

In a recent article on semantics, Sally McConnell-Ginet claims that people "attach some kind of concepts, some sort of cognitive structures, to the content words of their language."[82] She argues that this is influenced by social norms, which in turn depend on what she calls a "shared discursive history."[83] While McConnell-Ginet applies the term first of all to synchronic dialogue analyses, I consider it a key element for the makings of translation. Postmodern criticism privileges readings of the fragmented subject, yet I argue that it is vital to reconsider the subject's cultural context.

As Ulrichs' influential theory illustrates, in the nineteenth and early twentieth century the Humanist tradition still provided a diachronic shared discursive history that enabled the dissemination of ideas based on classical sources among languages without necessarily translating the idea. The case of sexology reinforces that translation depends on the cultural circumstance of the translator and thus on some kind of meta-narrative, albeit a volatile and fragile one. This may operate on a national, language-specific scale such as witnessed in the works of Krafft-Ebing and Hirschfeld. Rebman's translation of *Psychopathia Sexualis* gains its particular connotations first of all semantically, through the use of terms that trigger certain associations within the cultural context of late-Victorian Britain. It is not merely a transparent copy of the original text, but with its modifications and "mutilations" it is also an authentic text. The fact that not all concepts are translatable among languages is revealed in the writings of Hirschfeld. His work challenges translation on both a semantic and a social level, exposing a level of cultural determinism that renders certain concepts linguistically untranslatable and certain behaviors unintelligible when transferred between cultural contexts.

Issues of translatability, un-translatability and a-translatability are implicated in the discursive history of a particular cultural space. Similarly, the discursive practices of sexology are closely tied to epistemologies of the body. This is reflected in translation, which engages on a symbolic and political level with the regulation of the sexual body. If the analysis of the discipline of sexology calls for a reassessment of the boundaries of translation, then translation theory in turn questions sexology's role in the making of sexual identities. As Robinson realized, metaphors of the body may describe both the discursive practice of sexology and the textual concept of translation. However,

the processes involved are more intricate than Robinson suggests. Rather than considering the translations of sexological texts as mere "mutilations" of an original work, it is necessary to re-think both the discipline of sexology and the concept of translation as manifestations of cultural negotiation.

Notes

All translations from German and Latin are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

1 William Robinson, "Sexological Literature Pirates," *Medical Critic and Guide* 32 (1934): 151.

2 Walter Pater, "Introduction," in Dante Alighieri, *The Purgatory*, trans. Charles Lancelot Shadwell (London: Macmillan, 1892), xxxvi.

3 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume One: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (London: Penguin, 1990), 68.

4 Lawrence Venuti, "Introduction," in *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 1992). For the Coleridgean poetic doctrine see also Kathleen Coburn, ed., *Inquiring Spirit: A New Presentation of Coleridge from his Published and Unpublished Prose Writing* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951), 145–208.

5 Walter Benjamin, "Das Paris des Second Empire bei Baudelaire," in *Walter Benjamin, Gesammelte Schriften, Volume I. 2*, ed. Tillman Rexroth (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972), 511.

6 See for example Fritz Gutbrodt, "Poedelaire: Translation and the Volatility of the Letter," *Diacritics* 22 (1992).

7 Walter Benjamin, "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers," in *Walter Benjamin, Gesammelte Schriften, Volume IV 1*, ed. Tillman Rexroth (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972), 13–14.

8 Jeffrey Weeks, *Against Nature: Essays on History, Sexuality and Identity* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1991), 15.

9 See for example the excellent recent collections by Franz X. Eder, Lesley A. Hall, and Gert Hekma, eds., *Sexual Cultures in Europe: National Histories* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999); and *Sexual Cultures in Europe: Themes in Sexuality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

10 Nancy Erber, "The French Trials of Oscar Wilde," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 6.4 (1996).

11 For an account of Illenau's history see *Festschrift zur Feier des Fünfzigjährigen Jubiläums der Anstalt Illenau* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1892), 19 and 48.

12 Harry Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 78.

13 Paul Kruntorad, "Krafft-Ebing," in Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München: Matthes & Seitz Verlag, 1997), 11.

14 Magnus Hirschfeld, *Sexual Anomalies and Perversions: Physical and Psychological Development and Treatment. A Summary of the Works of the late Professor Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld, President of the World League of Sexual Reform, Director of the Institute of Sexual Research, Berlin, Compiled as a Humble Memorial by his Pupils* (London: Torch Publishing, 1936), 20. See also Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes, Nachdruck der Erstauflage von 1914 mit einer kommentierten Einleitung von E.J. Haeberle* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 969.

15 Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis: eine klinisch-forensische Studie* (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke, 1886), n.p.

16 Richard von Krafft-Ebing, "Vorwort zur zwölften Auflage," in *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München: Matthes & Seitz, 1997), n.p.

17 Kruntorad, 11.

18 Ibid., 12; and Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, 968.

19 See for example Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis: with especial reference to the antipathic sexual instinct: a medico-legal study*, trans. from 7th German edition by F.J. Rebman (New York: Classics of Psychiatry and Behavioral Science Library, 1892).

20 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 226.

21 Reinhard Wittmann, *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels: Ein Überblick* (München: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1991), 245.
22 James O'Leary and Walter L. Moore, "Charles Gilbert Chaddock: His Life and Contributions," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 8 (1953).
23 During Krafft-Ebing's lifetime, *Psychopathia Sexualis* was also translated into Russian, Japanese, French, Italian, Hungarian and Dutch. See Oosterhuis, 275.
24 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 2.
25 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, 1934), 2.
26 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London: John Murray, 1891), 45 and 58–59. This is the sixth edition. It is prefaced by a note on the translations of the work: "The third French and second German editions were from the third English, with some few of the additions given in the fourth edition. A new fourth French edition has been translated . . . of which the first half is from the fifth English, and the latter half from the present edition. A third German edition . . . was from the fourth English edition . . . . The second American edition was from the English second, with a few of the editions given in the third." As this extract proves, the translations and editions of *The Origin of Species* were at least as complex as those of *Psychopathia Sexualis*. It is interesting to note, however, that there appear to be different (that is having a different content) editions in England and America. Seeing that they are presumably written in the same language, this seems to suggest that the American edition was perhaps tailored to fit the American market. A similar tailoring may have taken place in Rebman's translation of *Psychopathia Sexualis*.
27 William Greenslade, "Fitness and the *Fin de Siècle*," in *Fin de Siècle/ Fin de Globe: Fears and Fantasies of the Late Nineteenth Century*, ed. John Stokes (New York: St. Martin's, 1992).
28 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 14–15.
29 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, 1934), 16–17.
30 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 5.
31 Ibid.
32 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, 1934), 5.
33 It was instrumental in the oppression of women. See for example Josephine Butler, "Letter to my Countrywomen, Dwelling in the Farmsteads and Cottages of England (1871)," in Sheila Jeffreys, *The Sexuality Debates* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987).
34 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 5.
35 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, 1934), 5.
36 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 7.
37 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, 1934), 7.
38 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 3.
39 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, 1934), 3.
40 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (München, 1997), 7.
41 Kraft-Ebbing, *Psychopathia Sexualis* (New York, 1934), 6.
42 Liah Greenfield, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 3.
43 Greenfield, 4.
44 Sheila Jeffreys, *The Spinster and her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality 1880–1930* (London, Boston and Henley: Pandora, 1985), 110.
45 Lillian Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship & Love between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (London: Junction Books, 1981), 453, n.5.
46 Foucault, 43.
47 Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, 967–971.
48 For an account of his travels aboard, see Magnus Hirschfeld, *Von einst bis jetzt, Geschichte einer homosexuellen Bewegung 1897– 1922*, ed. Manfred Herzer and James Steakley (Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel, 1986), 181– 192.
49 See Norman Haire, "Introduction," in Magnus Hirschfeld, *Sex in Human Relationships*, trans. John Rodker (London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1935), xii–xiii; and E.J. Haeberle, "Einleitung," in Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, vii.

50 Hirschfeld collaborated, for example, with the German feminist Helene Stöcker and her *Bund für Mutterschutz* [Society for the Protection of Mothers]. See Ralf Dose, "The World League for Sexual Reform," in Eder et al., *Sexual Cultures in Europe: National Histories*, 249.

51 Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Weltreise eines Sexualforschers* (Brugg, Switzerland: Bötzberg, 1933); Magnus Hirschfeld, *Men and Women: The World Journey of a Sexologist*, trans. O. P. Green (New York: G. P. Putman's Son's, 1935). The title of the English translation echoes Ellis's famous *Man and Woman* (1915).

52 Dose, 242–257.

53 *World League for Sexual Reform (Proceedings of the Second Congress): Sexual Reform Congress Copenhagen 1–5: vii: 1928* (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard and Leipzig: Georg Thieme, 1929), 8.

54 Hirschfeld's opening address in *World League for Sexual Reform (Proceedings of the Third Congress): Sexual Reform Congress London 8–14: ix: 1929* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Trubner, 1930), xi.

55 Norman Haire, *World League for Sexual Reform (Proceedings of the Third Congress)*, ix.

56 Magnus Hirschfeld, "Der Begriff des Unzüchtigen," *World League for Sexual Reform (Proceedings of the Third Congress)*, 430.

57 Magnus Hirschfeld, "The Conception of 'Indecency'" in *World League for Sexual Reform (Proceedings of the Third Congress)*, 637.

58 Sander L. Gilman, "Sigmund Feud and the Sexologists: A Second Reading," in *Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science: The History of Attitudes to Sexuality*, ed. Roy Porter and Mikulás Teich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 330–331.

59 Hirschfeld, "Der Begriff des Unzüchtigen," 430.

60 Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, 532.

61 Ibid, 538–539.

62 Ibid., 547.

63 Ibid., 549.

64 Ibid., 964.

65 Hubert Kennedy, "Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: First Theorist of Homosexuality," in *Science and Homosexualities*, ed. Vernon A. Rosario (New York: Routledge, 1997), 26–27.

66 *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen 1* (Leipzig: Max Spohr, 1899), 136.

67 *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen 1*, 137; and Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, 965–967.

68 Numa Numantius, *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mannmännlichen Liebe* (Leipzig: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1864), 1.

69 Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Letter to various family members, Frankfurt, 28 November 1862, reprinted in *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen 1*, 50.

70 For a homosexual woman the formula was "anima virilis muliebri corpore inclusa" [a male soul is confined to the female body]. Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, *Prometheus* (Leipzig; Gerbe'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1870), 19.

71 Plato, *The Symposium*, trans. Christopher Gill (London: Penguin, 1999), 12– 17.

72 Plato, x.

73 Ulrichs, *Prometheus*, 1.

74 Gert Hekma, "'A Female Soul in a Male Body': Sexual Inversion as Gender Inversion in Nineteenth-Century Sexology," in *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*, ed. Gilbert Herdt (New York: Zone Books, 1994), 213–239.

75 Krafft-Ebing and Ulrichs had engaged with each other's work soon after Krafft-Ebing started publishing: Ulrichs cited Krafft-Ebing in an essay he published in 1864. In 1879 Krafft-Ebing sent Ulrichs a letter in which he emphasized how much Ulrichs' work had influenced his own, which reinforces the influence of Ulrichs' ideas. Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, 967.

76 See Vernon Rosario, "Inversion's Histories | History's Inversion: Novelizing Fin-de-Siècle Homosexuality," in Vernon A. Rosario, ed., *Science and Homosexualities*, 93–101.

77 John Addington Symonds cites all of Ulrich's work in the bibliography of his own treatise on homosexuality, *A Problem in Greek Ethics being an Inquiry into the Phenomenon of Sex-*

ual Inversion addressed especially to medical psychologists and jurists, penned in 1873 and privately published in 1883. The British Library in London owns copies of Ulrich's works.

78 Niccolo Persichetti, *In Memoriam Caroli Henrici Ulrichs, Ephemeridis Cui Titulus "Alaudae" Auctoris: Sylloge* (San Casciano: Licinio Cappelli, 1896), 7; reprinted in Wolfram Setz, ed., *Karl Heinrich Ulrichs zu Ehren, Materialien zu Leben und Werk* (Berlin: Verlag Rosa Winkel, 2000).

79 Ulrichs, "Autobiographische Zeugnisse," in Setz, 43.

80 Ibid. and Persichetti, 7.

81 Persichetti, 7.

82 Sally McConnell-Ginet, "'Queering' Semantics: Definitional Struggles," in *Language and Sexuality: Contesting Meaning in Theory and Practice*, ed. Kathryn Cambell-Kibler, Robert J. Podesva, Sarah J. Roberts, and Andrew Wong (Stanford: CSLI, 2002), 151.

83 McConnell-Ginet, 153.