This essay investigates the shifting centrality/marginality axis of scientific authority in nineteenth century Britain by comparing two key works of the newly-developed discipline of sexology: Psychopathia Sexualis (1886-1902) written by the German Richard von Krafft-Ebing’s (1840-1902), and Sexual Inversion (1897) written by the Englishmen Addington Symonds (1840-1893) and Havelock Ellis (1859-1939). An examination of the production and dissemination of the two works shines a light on the contested authorial positions within the new discipline. It reveals that the boundaries between the role of sexological scholar and/or scientist, and that of the sexological case study of the sexual invert were fluid. The psychiatrist Krafft-Ebing developed new sexual taxonomies and published them in the twelve revised editions of his magnum opus on sexuality. Ellis, Victorian scientist and literary scholar, is today better remembered for his involvement in the first study of same-sex sexuality in English than his co-author Symonds, a Renaissance scholar, literary critic, and self-confessed ‘sexual invert’, who had initiated the production of the work. By comparing the production of the Psychopathia Sexualis and Sexual Inversion and how they
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impacted on British culture, I hope to unveil some of the forces that shaped the battle for sexological authority in late-nineteenth century Britain. I argue that, unlike in German and other European branches of sexology, which were firmly anchored within scientific tradition, British sexology was partly indebted to the literary realm. This in turn influenced the way British sexologists tried to establish their authority in the new discipline. The question of centrality versus marginality is therefore closely tied in to definitions of science, literature and sexual identity.

**Krafft-Ebing and the German tradition**

*Psychopathia Sexualis* had been written originally as a medical reference book for use by jurists in the courtroom. It aimed to record and understand human sexuality. What was so new and original in Krafft-Ebing's work was not only that for the first time sexual behaviour was theorized in a scientific text, but that the people could articulate their own narratives, at least in part. With the help of these often sexually explicit case studies, Krafft-Ebing attempted to find new taxonomies for the understanding of sexuality. His authority was derived from the analysis of subjective accounts, rather than from anonymous empirical study. For the reader, this offered the possibility to identify and also, crucially, to identify with various sexual identities and sexual preferences. This may help to explain why *Psychopathia Sexualis* remained in print to this day- the most recent German edition was published in 1997; the most recent English edition is from 1999.

Krafft-Ebing wrote *Psychopathia Sexualis* towards the end of his career. A look at its publishing history shows the popularity of the work. Krafft-Ebing revised it twelfth times between 1886-1902 (later, some of the posthumously published versions under different editors sometimes significantly modified the original text). Each of
Krafft-Ebing’s revisions was published by the distinguished Ferdinand Enke publishing house, which was one of the best known of the few German specialist medical publishers of the time.¹ In 1892, *Psychopathia Sexualis* was first translated into English by the American psychiatrist Charles Gilbert Chaddock (1861-1936).² It was based on the seventh German edition. Numerous translations of different editions and 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.³ Next to Chaddock, the Englishman F. J. (Francis Joseph) Rebman (1852-1946) translated the work into English. The medical book was such a success that after Krafft-Ebing’s death his sons entered a dispute with the publisher Enke about the income generated by the work and about who was to edit the following publications.⁴

By the time of its first publication, Krafft-Ebing had made himself a name as a psychiatrist. He held one of the most prestigious chairs in psychiatry in the world at Vienna. He had been awarded a vast number of honorary fellowships and received distinguished professional accolades.⁵ Tellingly, whilst *Psychopathia Sexualis* was used in German courtrooms, it was not acknowledged as an authoritative ‘scientific’ work in Britain and the study of sex experienced some censorship. Whilst Krafft-Ebing was revered as a psychiatrist, his sexological work was at the time not highly estimated in ‘mainstream’ British medical circles. This is revealed in his obituary in the *British Medical Journal*, which says about Krafft-Ebing:

> His name was brought into somewhat unfortunate prominence by his book entitled *Psychopathia Sexualis* … The Book has gone through many editions, but this questionable popularity has been due rather to the curiosity of the
public than to the appreciation of the medical profession. Krafft-Ebing, however, made many valuable contributions to neurology for which his name must be held in honour.  

The obituary makes the distinction between Krafft-Ebing’s credentials as a neurologist and what is seen as his popular acclaim as a sexologist. *Psychopathia Sexualis* is described as a popular, rather than a scientific work. As Krafft-Ebing was at the centre of the new discipline, this pushed him to the borders of medical science. Sexology was thus clearly marginalized as a scientific discipline in Britain.

**Havelock Ellis and British sexology**

Sexology’s marginal role in British science is reinforced by its partly literary tradition. Ellis’s career began as a teacher and literary critic, yet in order to gain scientific credibility, he embarked on a medical degree at the University of London. He does not seem to have much enjoyed it. In 1889, he graduated with the Licentiate of the Society of Apothecaries, the lowest possible medical diploma, which had only recently been introduced. Ellis did not take up practicing medicine. Instead he decided what he called to apply “the scientific spirit … to life”, that is he embarked on his sexological studies.  

Ellis appears similar to Krafft-Ebing in that both men had received medical training and, not being themselves homosexual, could claim to approach the subject with scientific objectivity. Unlike Krafft-Ebing, Ellis did not, however, display particular interest in inversion as a sexological subject and unlike the German medical man, his claim to medical authority was somewhat spurious. Ellis devoted his subsequent sexological studies mainly to issues related to ‘heterosexuality’, whereby he famously, if at the time anonymously, analysed his own proclivities as an urologist. Like Symonds, whose sexological productivity was
solely devoted to the subject of sexual inversion, in Ellis’s work the boundaries between ‘case’ and sexologist were at times unstable.

Ellis was proud of the leading role he played in contemporary scientific and literary developments. When he moved to London in 1879 he almost immediately started to successfully publish literary-critical essays and articles in the periodical press. One of the most influential of these was an essay entitled ‘Thomas Hardy’s Novels’, published in *The Westminster Review* in 1883. It elicited a positive response from Hardy himself. In the late 1880s, Ellis established himself as the general editor of two of the most important literary and scientific series of the time. He became the general editor of *The Contemporary Science Series*, which published works by the leading European scientists and sexologists of the time. The first volume in the series was Geddes and Thomson’s *The Evolution of Sex*, other volumes included Paolo Mantegazza’s *Physiognomy and Expression*, Albert Moll’s *Hypnotism*, and Cesare Lombroso’s *The Man of Genius*, as well as Ellis’s own publications *The Criminal* (1890) and *Man and Woman* (1904). At the same time, Ellis had also taken on the general editorship of *The Mermaid Series*, which re-published the plays of English Renaissance dramatists, including the works of Christopher Marlowe and John Ford, edited by Ellis himself. Under Ellis’s editorship A.C. Swinburne wrote an introduction to Thomas Middleton’s plays, Ernest Rhys edited the volume of Dekker’s plays, Edmund Gosse introduced the work of Shirley, Arthur Symons edited the Massinger volume, and John Addington Symonds edited the works of Webster, Cyril Tourneur, and Thomas Heywood.

Towards the end of his life, in 1934, Ellis published a collection of hitherto unpublished notes and essays entitled *My Confessional*. This supplemented the autobiography *My Life* with further insights into his intellectual production. *My
Confessional includes a short treatise on the current state of the sciences entitled 'Make room for the Pioneer!', which is typical for Ellis’s assessment of his own work. He commented:

In every spiritual and material field we are pushing the known into the unknown, carrying the torch of science to disperse the gloom around us, harnessing the great forces of Nature to our small forces for the immense magnification of our power over the world, penetrating, as none ever penetrated before, into the obscure mysteries of the mind, planning for practical realization schemes of social reorganization which of old were merely the dreams of philosophers or the abortive struggle of madmen.¹¹

This triumphant, Nietzschean account of scientific progress is typical for Ellis’s thinking. Steeped in literary tradition, he saw himself in the centre of new scientific developments. For Ellis, scientific progress went hand in hand with what he considered intellectual advancement, whereby the “torch of science” illuminates both “spiritual” and “material” concerns.

Belief in progress as well as in his own role as a philosophical-scientific pioneer characterized Ellis’s career. His involvement with the literary, political, and scientific movements of the day make him a key figure for the production and distribution of sexual knowledge in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain. Sexual Inversion was in a sense the pinnacle of Ellis’s achievements, as it was arguably the widest reaching of all of his work. Rather ironically, Ellis later dismissed the work’s importance. It is crucial to remember that Sexual Inversion was part of a wider ranging body of literary and literary-scientific works produced by Ellis over a period of more than thirty years. Like Symonds, Ellis’s intermediary role between sexology
and literature is typical for British sexology, a discipline that remained very much at the margins of nineteenth century science.

**Symonds, autobiography and the literary-philosophical tradition**

If sexology held a marginal position amongst British science, the autobiographically inspired literary-philosophical sexological works of Symonds were marginalized amongst sexology itself. A Victorian man of letters, poet, married sexual invert, and sexologist, Symonds described his life work in his *Memoirs* as follows:

> Trying to evade the congenital disease of my moral nature in work, work has drained my nerves and driven me to find relief in passion. The subjects with which I have been occupied – Greek poetry, Italian culture in one of the most lawless periods of modern history, beauty of nature and the body of man – stimulate and irritate the imagination.\(^\text{12}\)

Here Symonds evoked the intricate connections between his scholarly work and his sexual identity – the ‘congenital disease’ of his moral nature refers to his own homosexuality, or sexual inversion, as he preferred to call it. When reading Symonds’s *Memoirs*, it becomes apparent that in fact he did not feel his homosexuality to be a disease, but a creative stimulant that lay behind the production of all of his published work. His publishing portfolio includes more than a dozen monographs, numerous articles and reviews in leading periodicals and a series of editions.\(^\text{13}\) Moreover, he is the author of two of the first treatises on homosexuality in English, *A Problem in Greek Ethics* (1883) and *A Problem in Modern Ethics* (1891). Symonds’s sexological work was inextricably linked to his autobiography as well as to the literary realm. As a result of his position as both scholar and invert, his
authority in the discipline of sexology was belittled by contemporaries, including Ellis.

A reading of Symonds’s two sexological pamphlets provides fruitful insight into the beginnings of British sexology. Symonds’s sexological studies commence in 1883 with *A Problem in Greek Ethics*, which can be seen as his preliminary study on the subject of inversion. Here he analysed the historical context for male same-sex love, by tracing its origin back to the civilisation of ancient Greece. In so doing, Symonds deliberately wanted to fill a gap in sexological scholarship. The treatise opens thus:

For the student of sexual inversion, ancient Greece offers a wide field for observation and reflexion. Its importance has hitherto been underrated by medical and legal writers on the subject, who do not seem aware that here alone in history have we the example of a great and highly developed race not only tolerating homosexual passions, but deeming them of spiritual value and attempting to utilise them for the benefit of society.  

Symonds begins his investigations of sexual inversion by asserting the need to look at literary-philosophical history. He is familiar with continental scholarship on the subject, and emphasises the need for an approach that goes beyond the mere medico-forensic realm of European sexology.

Whilst *A Problem in Greek Ethics* is solely indebted to Symonds’s classical scholarship, his second sexological work, *A Problem in Modern Ethics* documents how Symonds’s understanding of sexuality was also partly derived from his study of European sexology. One could usefully call *A Problem in Modern Ethics* the first ‘reader’ in sexology. It presented a critical anthology of the hitherto published sexological scholarship. Unlike the sexologists, who scrutinized the life of a variety of
individuals, Symonds now scrutinized the works of the sexologists. From a scholarly perspective, he engaged with the subject of sexual inversion that in all other respects dominated his life, as he notes in his Memoirs:

The underlying preoccupation of my life has been a tyrannous emotion, curbed, suppressed for the most part, but occasionally indulged with spasmodic violence. Literature takes the second place; and for this reason ... I have never been able to take it very seriously.\textsuperscript{15}

If indeed for Symonds literature had, as he claims, a subordinate role, it nevertheless gave his life the structure, financial backing and not least the language that was to enable him to write \textit{A Problem in Modern Ethics}. Together with its reprint in the German edition of \textit{Sexual Inversion}, \textit{A Problem in Modern Ethics} provides the clearest insights into Symonds’s understanding of his own sexuality, as well as an invaluable critical account of contemporary sexology. And, despite Symonds’s ranking of literature on ‘second place’, \textit{A Problem in Modern Ethics} unmistakeably links sexology and literature as the space where discourses on homosexuality were possible.

\textit{A Problem in Modern Ethics} is, like the body of works it examines, superficially directed ‘especially to medical psychologists and jurists’, yet Symonds makes clear that he does not really believe in such an ostensibly exclusive readership. He writes: ‘Those who read these lines will hardly doubt what passion it is that I am writing at’. He continues: ‘surely it deserves a name ... inverted sexuality’.\textsuperscript{16} Symonds here situates the work and his role as its author within an autobiographical frame. He foresees the reader’s reaction to the treatise as similar to his own readings of sexological texts, as he had obviously himself gained access to the apparently exclusive medico-legal works of European sexologists. Unlike the sexologists,
Symonds makes explicit reference to the lay readership, which his work will undoubtedly attract. He thus makes an autobiographical-scholarly claim for authority. Unlike other sexologists, he aims his text not at the medical profession, but at the general reader.

Symonds said of *A Problem in Modern Ethics* that it was ‘one of the few adequate works of scholarship [he could] can call [his] own’. In preparation for this investigation of homosexuality, Symonds had carefully studied the material that had hitherto been published on the subject. The treatise accordingly opens with a bibliography of the books he had consulted, which spans the range of different disciplines and viewpoints on the subject of sexual inversion in Europe. It includes the French forensic physician Tardieu and his countryman, the psychiatrist Moreau de Tours, the Italians Mantegazza and Lombroso as well as the German forensic physicians Casper and Liman, and, of course, Krafft-Ebing. Significantly, all of the English-language works on the bibliography are literary. They include the tenth volume of Sir Richard Burton’s *Arabian Nights* (1885), and Walt Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass* (1889-1890) and *Democratic Vistas* (no date). While there did not, of course, exist a comparable British body of sexological works at the time, it is noteworthy that Symonds had eschewed scientific British works on sex such as Geddes and Thompson’s recent biological study *The Evolution of Sex* (1889).

The bibliography reveals that Symonds read German, French and Italian, with German his preferred foreign language. While his sexological knowledge as a whole was based on the wide spectrum of European sexology, it is the German homosexual activist and writer Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825-1895) who emerges as the greatest influence on Symonds. The two were regular correspondents and Symonds once visited Ulrichs in Italy. Symonds lists fourteen of Ulrichs’s publications, both under
the latter’s real name and under his pseudonym *Numa Numantius*. This comprises a comprehensive list of all of Ulrichs’s studies of sexual inversion as well as Ulrichs’s literary works. None of these texts were published outside Germany, although most of them were available in the library of the British Museum. As Symonds spent relatively little time in London – and by the time of writing *A Problem in Modern Ethics* he had permanently moved with his family to Switzerland – it appears feasible that he actually owned most of Ulrichs’s publications himself. In other words, Symonds was in possession of the works of an authority important in sexology.

The fact that Symonds as a literary scholar came from outside the medico-legal realm, the sphere which provided the background to the works of the European sexologists, provides a vital clue for understanding how sexological knowledge was disseminated and understood in Victorian Britain. For Symonds, literature aided his sexological studies, which provided the one space for consolidating his scholarly pursuits and personal desires. Symonds thus plays a central role in the emergence of British sexology. He provides a key link between German sexology and British thinking in the late nineteenth century. He was not only personally acquainted with some of the best-known writers and thinkers of his time, but he was also familiar with the most prominent sexologists and engaged with their theories. He contributed to the discipline of sexology both as a critic and as a ‘case’, initially in his *Memoirs* and later as Case XVII in *Sexual Inversion*. He was clearly conscious of the fact that his intellectual interests were not merely scholarly-theoretical, but that his life was testimony to his ethical, philosophical and medical beliefs. Contrary to his reception, he thought that his autobiography lend authority to his sexological writings.

*Sexual Inversion*
It was in 1892 that Symonds implored his fellow man of letters Arthur Symons (1865-1945) to approach Havelock Ellis and ask him whether Ellis would consider collaborating with Symonds on a book on *Sexual Inversion*. Ellis, who had recently made himself a name as a sexologist with the publication of *The Criminal* (1890), was at the time working on *Man and Woman: A Study of Human Secondary Characters* (1894). This he regarded a preliminary study for what he was later to describe as his “chief life-work”, the seven volumes of *The Psychology of Sex*. Ellis agreed to collaborate with Symonds. In his autobiography, he recalled how the work on the book was to be shared:

I drew up a scheme of the book with the parts I proposed to be assigned to each author. [Symonds] accepted my scheme, remarking that I had assigned the most important chapter to myself but making no demur. I had no wish to take chief share, but it seemed clear to me that it was on the scholarly and historical side alone that Symonds could properly come into the book.

Ellis’s dismissive tone of Symonds’s apparently non-scientific involvement in the project characterizes how by the time of publication his attitude had changed towards both his co-author, who had died before the book went to print, and towards the project itself. In retrospect, Ellis considered Symonds’s death serendipitous ‘because the significance of a book on inversion would have been greatly discounted by the fact that one of the writers was known to many as personally concerned in the question of homosexuality’. For Ellis it was the same biographical facts that Symonds had found authoritative that derided Symonds’s expertise. Contrary to Ellis’s claims, Symonds’s contribution made up roughly half of the content of the first edition of *Sexual Inversion*. He thus helped to produce the first English sexological
textbook, yet it was Ellis alone, who, somewhat unjustifiably, was henceforth to be known for his role as its author.

When Symonds died in 1893 Ellis had, however, been left with the completion of *Sexual Inversion*. Prior to that the two men, who had never met, conducted their working relationship entirely through letter correspondence. Symonds contributed the historical-philosophical background to *Sexual Inversion*, which consisted largely of reprints of his two previous treatises on the subject *A Problem in Greek Ethics* and *A Problem in Modern Ethics*, and he provided a number of case studies in addition to his own. Ellis undertook the sexological analysis of the materials. With Symonds’s death, the project came to a halt and only two years later, in 1895, did Ellis decide to have *Sexual Inversion* published. He arranged for it to be translated into German and then first published in Germany as the path had already been opened not only by the works of Krafft-Ebing, but also for example the Berlin-based physicians and sexologists Albert Moll (1862-1939) and Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1933). *Sexual Inversion* was translated by the physician Hans Kurella, whom Ellis had previously met at the International Medical Congress in Rome in 1894. The book was published in Leipzig in 1896 as Volume VII of the Bibliothek für Sozialwissenschaft [Social Science Library], the editorial board of which included Ellis himself as well as the Italian sexologist Cesare Lombroso. Kurella translated *Sexual Inversion* as *Das Konträre Geschlechtsgefühl*, a term coined by Moll in 1891. Ellis objected to this translation, presumably partly because Moll’s own book had appeared under the same title. Unlike the later English translation *Das Konträre Geschlechtsgefühl* had both Ellis’s and Symonds’s name on the title. Its publication did not differ from that of other authoritative scientific studies.
The situation was different in Britain. *Sexual Inversion* was first printed in English by Wilson and Macmillan. When the book was bound and ready for distribution, Symonds’s family put pressure on his literary executor Horatio Brown and demanded that Symonds’s name be removed from the work. Brown blocked the distribution of *Sexual Inversion*, although a few copies escaped being pulped.

Ellis then reworked *Sexual Inversion* by removing all reference to Symonds’s name. From the new edition, he completely excluded Symonds’s ‘Homosexualität in Griechenland’ [homosexuality in Greece], which forms chapter three of the German edition, as well as two appendices, ‘Zusat zu Kapitel III’ [appendix to chapter III], a discourse on Roman same sex love, and ‘Zusat zu Kapitel IV: Soldatenliebe und Verwandtes’ [appendix to chapter IV: soldier love and related matters]. Both appendices had been written and signed by Symonds. The abridged edition was then published in Britain in 1897 by the ‘Watford University Press’ of a certain ‘Dr Robert De Villiers’, who was later revealed to be the German fraudster Georg Ferdinand Springmühl von Weissenfeld. One of the copies of *Sexual Inversion* came into the possession of a small society called the Legitimation League, which advocated a reform of marriage laws to give rights to children born to unmarried parents. The society’s secretary was called George Bedborough. He unknowingly sold a copy of *Sexual Inversion* to a policeman and was arrested and tried for distributing ‘obscene’ material, under the same act under which Radclyffe Hall’s novel *The Well of Loneliness* was prosecuted in 1928. *The Well of Loneliness* was the first English novel to present a literary case study of female sexual inversion, and as such it has become what one might call a classic of lesbian writing. Its trial appeared to be a repeat of the 1897 trial of *Sexual Inversion*, when Bedborough was found guilty, and which resulted in *Sexual Inversion* being banned in England.
thus legally treated in the same way as Hall’s novel was to be. However, unlike *The Well of Loneliness, Sexual Inversion* has to this day not been published in Britain. The Philadelphia-based press F.A. Davies, which also published translations of Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis*, published *Sexual Inversion* in America, and thus made it available in English. Despite the ban, the work became a reference text for late-Victorian notions of homosexuality in Britain.

During the late nineteenth century, sexological authority in Britain was a complex, unstable construct. As we have seen in the assessment of Krafft-Ebing’s work, whilst his role as a sexological authority had been acknowledged, the discipline itself was marginal within the sciences. This was reinforced by British sexology’s distinct literary tradition, which played a role even for a more scientific-oriented sexologist such as Ellis. Symonds was furthermore marginalized as a sexologist within the discipline itself, partly due to his literary-philosophical approach and partly because of his own autobiography. At the beginning of the twentieth century, new disciplines such as psychoanalysis and sociology entered the scientific mainstream and largely took over sexology’s predominant role in the analysis of sex. In recent years, post-Foucauldian criticism has been slow in a reassessment of sexology. However, by the late twentieth century, the posts of sexological authority clearly have shifted. Krafft-Ebing has been vilified and Ellis has received criticism. Symonds on the other hand has undergone a scholarly revival, if on a very small scale. His self-acknowledged homosexuality has moved him towards the centre of studies in the history of same-sex sexuality. Sexological authority thus remains an unstable notion, shifting from and to the centres and margins of contemporary critical discourses. The scholars, scientist
and sexual inverts, key figures that made the discipline, constitute the axis of this movement.
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