Gert Hekma

The homosexual, the queen and models of gay history

For many years, gay historiography has been pervaded by the problem of constructionism versus essentialism. Nowadays, most historians assume that forms of homosexual preferences and behaviours are historically, culturally, and individually shaped. Social constructionism is the dominant theory in gay history.[1] But one problem remains: if sexual conduct and preference have historical forms, when did these particular forms come into being, and how widely were they distributed? For Michel Foucault and Jeffrey Weeks, homosexuals and homosexuality date from the end of the nineteenth century when they, and so many other sexological neologisms, were introduced. Then, the homosexual was constructed as a person with a specific, often inborn identity, whose gender role was inverted, the

male homosexual being effeminate and the lesbian being masculine.[2] As Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, the first homosexual theorist of homosexuality (or Uranism as he termed it) formulated in Latin: *anima muliebris in corpore virili inclusa* – a female soul in a male body.[3]

Randolph Trumbach has asserted that the model of the homosexual can and should be traced back further, to about 1700, when the elements of gender inversion and sexual identity were perceptible in the mollies and sodomites who gathered in specialised clubs in London, Amsterdam and Paris. Trumbach has termed this model 'the queen'. Nineteenth century medical theories of homosexuality drew upon changes that had taken place one and a half centuries earlier, and brought little new to homosexual categorisations. Other historians of the eighteenth century have also claimed that the beginning of the concept of a homosexual, gender-inverted identity and its social counterpart, a sodomitical subculture, has to be placed around 1700.[4]

The model of the queen is a seductive concept for gay history because so much available material asserts the presence of gender-inverted homosexuality: males adopting female sex roles, often to facilitate gay sex. Immediately, questions arise about the visibility of this phenomenon, especially when it was so spectacular as travesty of genders. And really how similar are these different gender inversions? Does the molly of the 1730s really correspond to the homosexual third sexer of 1900, and to the gay man of today – and if so, how could so many men consider the first sexological books such eye-openers with regard to their sexual preferences?

There is also a missing link in the queen model, for who were their sexual partners? In most parts of the world and in most times, sexuality was based on inequality, with men sexually subjugating women, boys

or weaker males. In most cultures, penetration was the male sex act, being penetrated the female – although sometimes these roles were reversed. Sexual democracy with companionate marriages and equitable relations have existed hardly anywhere, except in modern Western countries.[5] Of course, there are many variations on the themes of gender, sexual subordination and penetration. Male-to-male sexuality took two forms: sex between men and boys, as with Greek pederasty and Melanesian boy-inseminating rituals; and the form of gender inversion, in which two persons of the same sex, but of different genders had sex, with the 'male' penetrating.[6] According to Trumbach, the most common homosexual form in Western Europe till 1700 was pederasty. Married men fell in love with 'ganymedes', younger men or boys whom they dominated.

But who were the lovers of the queens after 1700? Most probably these lovers were 'trade' – as they were called in the 1950s – working class young men who did not identify as queens and who were often soldiers, sailors or manservants. Many of them will have started their sexual career having sex with their male friends, continuing by having sex with queens, and ending up married to women. This pattern can be found everywhere in homosexual literature and archival sources. Of course, there is also the possibility of queens having sex and love relations with each other. Rictor Norton suggests that in England's gay subculture of the mollies, most of the mollies had sexual relations with other mollies, and not with trade.[7]

But why did the mollies adopt female habits, clothes, names and idioms when they were detested both as sodomites and effeminates? If they were indeed male-identified and if they had sexual relations among themselves, why should the mollies have endangered

their lives and exposed themselves to the opprobrium of their compatriots with these female customs that had no particular aim? If it was only camp irony, then they paid dearly for their jokes. According to my reading of literary and archival material of a later date, queens looked for trade, not sex with other queens. A variation on this theme was gentlemen who looked for sex with working class men. As one of my informers commented about sex with trade in the 1930s: 'the gentleman had to be the female in bed'. Sexual relations were based on a combination of class and gender inequality, the gentleman being superior in the ballroom, the male servants in the bedroom. The gentlemen were queens according to sex and gender ideology in their private encounters with trade, although they did not have to show gender inversion in public life. So, when we discuss the model of the queen, trade should be included, because queen and trade were mutually dependent.

Alternative models: friendship, male promiscuity and gay cohorts

Moreover, there have been other models of homosexuality in the era from 1700 till the present in North-Western Europe, the region Trumbach considered. The main examples are the modern gay (whom Trumbach however sees as an effete gender-crosser), and the cult of friendship which started with Romanticism at the end of the eighteenth century and continued until World War II. It was a masculine ideal that had nothing to do with the effeminacy of the mollies. The cult of friendship was very highly regarded in Germany, but England and Holland also had some prominent supporters around 1800. Eulogists of friendship never compared it with the effeminacy of sodomites (very

much an urban phenomenon), but to Greek pederasty. Against the rationalism of the Enlightenment, several philosophers of the Counter-Enlightenment and Romanticism stressed the importance of the senses and defended friendship or male Eros as a sensual affair. Hamann in Germany and Hemsterhuis in Holland praised the delights of a sensual friendship, clearly stating it had nothing to do with the beastliness into which Greek pederasty had degenerated. The question was always left open as to what was beastliness, what was friendship and what was considered to be border-line. Presumably, sodomy or anal intercourse was beastliness, but what about mutual masturbation? Several writers, indeed, ventured into erotic relations with younger men, such as Johann Winckelmann in Germany and Johannes Kneppelhout in Holland, with the poet August van Platen as the most famous homosexual example. The proponents of Eros and friendship were literary figures who circulated in the upper classes, whose orientation was towards life at the courts, universities, boarding schools or in the army, and who had little idea of the sexual underworlds of the city.[8]

About 1900 Magnus Hirschfeld launched his campaign to decriminalise unnatural fornication in Germany, and founded the first homosexual movement in the world. His defence of homosexual love was based on his theory that homosexuals were an intermediate sex, whose sexual preferences were inborn and could not be changed.[9] At the same time, there was a competing group of men who defended male love, *Die Gemeinschaft der Eigenen*, the Community of the Specific. They stressed that the love of friendship had nothing to do with gender inversion, and did not exclude heterosexual relations. They followed a Greek ideal of friendship and love. According to Benedikt

Friedländer, there were three kinds of love: maternal love, love between spouses, and male love. Women belonged at home and had to care for and love the children; marriage was the bridge between the privacy of the home and the public realm where men belonged; and male eros was the foundation of culture and politics, in the sense of *Freundesliebe* (love of friends) and also of men educating boys to public life because they loved them. It was an eroticised version of romantic German ideals of *Bildung* (cultured socialisation), that already had a strong sensual component. This *Freundesliebe* was far removed from the idea of gender-inversion, a third sex or the queen.[10]

The most common form of homosexual behaviour was, however, something quite different. It was to be found not in the proud tradition of friendship and male eros, nor among the mollies Trumbach studies, nor among the third sexers of Hirschfeld. Because marriage occurred relatively late in Western societies, and women had to remain virgins until they married, males had few sexual avenues – prostitution being their main sexual option. The cities of nineteenth-century Europe harboured many whores.[11] But even if unmarried men had this chance, many of them, certainly the younger and poorer ones, did not have the money to pay for prostitutes. Research conducted by the city of Amsterdam revealed that the clients of the city's bordellos in the nineteenth century were mainly older married men, and not the unmarried younger ones for whom nineteenth-century authorities had organised a system of medical control of prostitutes. The report on this research resulted in the prohibition of bordellos in Amsterdam. Apparently the younger and poorer males had sexual outlets elsewhere or abstained from sexual relations.[12]

Since sexual crimes (especially sex in public) were

prosecuted in Amsterdam, many men did indeed have other outlets, among which homosexual ones were very important. Legal papers indicate that the number of prosecutions and convictions was low (10 per year for Amsterdam around 1900 for homosexual offences), but circumstantial evidence from the prosecutions and from other sources makes it quite clear that many parks and public conveniences functioned in 1900 as homosexual meeting places, as they had done in the eighteenth century.[13] Most men who were arrested in toilets and elsewhere for gay sex did not show the characteristics of the queen. They were mostly working class men who looked for pleasure, like the soldiers who came before the military courts, and who were not in the least effeminate. Sometimes there is a suggestion that a man was queer, for example because he had a long-standing male lover, but in most cases their pleasures seem to have been accidental sexual adventures. The most important source of convictions was neither queens nor pederasts (sexual relations with minors under 16 had been a criminal offence in the Netherlands since 1886), but working class men whose masculinity was rarely questioned. Of course, gender identity was not a topic in the courts: reports in the criminal archives are rather elaborate and broached many topics, but seldom gender identity. Twice, men approached for sex in public places resisted the temptation and stated that they felt they had been put in a female position, which indicates that the queer would-be seducers were considered to be aggressive, masculine men, and not effeminate weaklings.

Of course, mollies who liked to dress up and show off their feminine qualities often appear in the literature on homosexuality. Certainly they offered social images of male love that many people were acquainted with. It is very probable that queens started their sexual

careers in the world of male promiscuity before entering their female roles. The model of the queen was certainly not the only model for homosexuality since 1700, and many people did not live and love according to this model.

Quite another proposal for historical analysis of homosexual preferences and behaviours is put forward by Gilbert Herdt. From his research on Chicago's gay history, he claims there have been four cohorts of men in this century, each representing a certain lifestyle. The first cohort of invisibles did not even belong to a community (1900-1945). The second cohort of closet homosexuals formed a community but kept their sexual preferences secret (1945-1969). The third and fourth cohorts are gay men before and after AIDS. Before AIDS, gay men developed a hedonistic, promiscuous lifestyle and stressed their masculine identity (1969-1982); after AIDS, they put more emphasis on relations and solidarity (1982-now).[14] We might now add the 'queer' stage, with a new radicalism that unites all sexual variations. These cohorts indicate that the model of the queen is too general a concept, even more so if applied across three centuries. But however interesting Herdt's analysis may be, there are many problems associated with it, because there are invisible and closeted gay youngsters even today, 25 years after the Stonewall riots. It is too simplistic to claim that these people are living in the past; perhaps a closeted lifestyle is the best way to realise their desires or survive in their particular environment. The queen model yields problems too, but it directs our attention to some important aspects of sexual modelling.

Intermezzo: the queen and the *berdache*

The models of queen and homosexual show some striking similarities, the most important being that both stress identity and femininity. But comparable appearances do not have to represent similar contents. The same can be asked for all the third-gender forms that anthropology discusses: are the *xanith* from Oman, the *waria* from Indonesia, the *hijra* from India, the native American *berdache* comparable figures, or are they quite different because of divergent contents, contexts and consequences?[15] Many of these third genders had religious functions, whereas the queen was an abominable sinner. The queen was a sexual persona, the other third-genders probably less so. The question of the importance of the sexual identities and behaviours of these third-genders has not been resolved. In Indonesia, diverse forms (*waria*, gay) exist next to each other independently, suggesting their irreducibility, even in one culture. We should be very careful not to overstate either similarities or differences. Even when certain forms show a strong resemblance, we should be wary of equating these forms too readily.

Between social conventions and sexual meanings

Sexual desire is always specific. It does not aim at women or men in general, but always at specific attributes or situations. It has a highly individual and fetishistic character. Private sexual desires are results but also basic elements of the socio-sexual system in which the individual takes part. This may be the sex/gender system of Gayle Rubin, Trumbach's queen model, or the sexual politics Foucault and others have described.[16] With such general concepts, the interaction between social models and private wishes is mostly overlooked. There are always discrepancies between sexual systems and individual choices.

Individuals live off the sexual system in which they

take part; they obey and also transgress its dictates. Social historians and sociologists are looking for rules that are not in general very evident, and are certainly not evident when it comes to sex, as rules work most often subconsciously. Sexual precepts depend on gender, class, ethnic or religious group, place and social context, and so on. Norms may be differently explained, as is clear from legal debates. Sexual desires are enacted in complicated ways, often against the grain of rules. Forbidden fruits are more seductive than those you are allowed to eat. Moreover, sexual desires are mostly formed in circumstances that are not explicitly sexual. Individuals attribute sexual meanings to social facts that are not intended to have an erotic meaning. To give some examples: the flogging of boys in English boarding schools was a punishment, not something to elicit erotic feelings, but it did so.[17] Sports are meant to be non-erotic, but generate sexual feelings. Nobody could have predicted that plastic bags would be used shortly after their invention for autoerotic experiments.[18] Social systems have explicit and hidden sexual aspects; they serve norms, and make certain transgressions possible. Transgressions always come from the system itself and belong to it. Some are more or less structural aspects of the system (as homosexual identity has been for a hundred years); others are fuel for change in the system.

Every individual has to cope with the sexual system into which he is socialised. It is the model he has to face. Most people seem to have few problems in adapting to the sexual norms they encounter, and in following the path laid out for them. Sexual systems are capable of integrating many sexual desires, including those that are at odds with the system. Unformed desires are even more malleable. Many fetishistic pleasures are easy to subsume under other, 'normal' cov-

ers.[19] Variant sexual wishes are often experienced in normal forms with the help of fantasy. Most societies allow, under certain conditions, for behaviours that border on the illicit, as adultery, prostitution, incest and homosexuality have been in Western societies.

Trumbach's model of mollies was a local institution for conduct that contravened social and even legal norms. But the mollies also mimic heterosexual structures of desire and follow the pattern of sexual attraction as gender opposition.

The model of queen and trade is a copy of the model of marriage, with trade as male and queen as female. This model may have been an original solution for men with homosexual preferences (also for trade), but it is traditional as it continues to define sexual desire as an attraction between opposites.[20] But according to Norton's study, as well as my own research on the recent Amsterdam gay and lesbian bar culture, the model was for many mollies or queens not the quintessence of their love-life.[21] I presume this model was most relevant as an organising principle for sexual traffic. It regulated the sexual transactions of mollies and straight men, but said little about their private pleasures and preferences.

Older gay pornography illustrates clearly the divergence of sexual preference and practice in a remarkable form: presumably heterosexual young men are being sucked by gay men while they glance cursorily at pornography depicting nude women. They are acting gay while imagining straight sex. This indicates how easy it can be to adapt to sexual forms one does not desire. Mollies could attract the attention of trade with most success by transforming themselves into shameless women who were after sex. Unsurprisingly, the mollies are quite often described as he-whores. Most men with homosexual preferences will have adopted

this model without fully transforming into mollies. There were many shades in the model of queen and trade, and some men will have found gay sex in other places and in other ways, for example by joining the navy or merchant navy, becoming monks or living in boarding schools or other homosocial institutions.[22] And of course there were also men who adopted the behaviours of the mollies but did not look for gay sex. The model of queen and trade facilitated homosexual relations, foremost in the urban environment of molly houses and already less so in cruising places in parks and around public conveniences. Men of all kinds looked for anonymous sexual outlets in places where there was less dependency on gender models and less danger to be outgendered, or put in the female category.

Not all homosexual preferences and behaviours were guided by the queen model, either in the eighteenth or the twentieth century. It has been an influential model for men looking for same-sex relations. It was operative in the gay bar culture in the eighteenth century, and ever since the medical and emancipatory theories of homosexuals as a third sex were developed, it influenced many people with and without homosexual preferences. But next to this model, promiscuous and anonymous male loves abounded in parks and toilets and in homosocial institutions, most of them not based on this queen model.

In an interesting autobiography, written about 1890, a Dutch naval officer enumerates all his sexual escapades on board ships of the navy. In the opening part of his story, he claims to be an inborn homosexual who showed in his youth female predilections. He certainly has read the relevant literature on which his tales of being a member of a third sex are based, but when it comes down to sex, he forgets about theories of female souls in male bodies. Only when he was dismissed from the navy because of his sexual behaviour did he ask for redress using the medical theories of his time as a justification of his homosexual identity. But in the process of writing, he did not realise that his vindication of an identity did not include an excuse for his promiscuous behaviour that most emancipatory theories of an inborn homosexuality opposed. He tried to use the theory for a rehabilitation that was not awarded to him and forced his sex life into an effeminacy that did not match it.[23]

The same can be repeated for many early sexological studies. They define the characteristics of sex perverts, but the cases the doctors cite do not always fit well with the types they construct. The desires are sometimes far removed from the typologies, certainly in the earliest period around 1880 when the herbarium of perversions was in rapid development. We have to further realise that the published cases (letters from private individuals, requested autobiographies from the insane and court reports) in books like Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886) were rewritten by the medical authorities, and to date there is still no study comparing the actual texts they received with the selections they chose to publish. The typologies of sexual perversions developed by the early sexologists became slowly more precise and more firmly established in science and society. The work of the missionaries of sexology such as Magnus Hirschfeld, August Forel, Havelock Ellis and Sigmund Freud contributed greatly to the popularisation of ideas about sexual perversions. Many contemporary accounts affirm that their ideas regulated as well as promoted certain sexual practices. Regulated because many people organised their lives in accordance with those ideas; and promoted since many people also discovered their sexual preferences as a direct result of becoming familiar with the literature. However,

although the sexologists succeeded in constructing new models of sexual desire, they regularly had to face opposition both from science and society on major and minor points and occasionally had to change their ideas accordingly.

Medical theories had an immediate effect on sexual perversions: not only did they bring sexual variations into the open, they also promised solutions for sexual behaviours considered abnormal and undesirable. Except for psychological cures, two points were stressed: doctors urged their patients not to pursue the more transgressive sexual acts such as promiscuous, anonymous or anal sex. And they promoted healthy heterosexual relations to prevent all kinds of sexual, especially homosexual, 'perversions'. Sex-segregation became a danger and co-education a solution. The successor to Krafft-Ebing in German sexology, Albert Moll, and the Sex-Pol leader, the Freudian Wilhelm Reich, followed this line of thinking. They opposed homosocial arrangements that had always concealed homosexual relations and homoerotic love. In sexological policies at least two different approaches and theories were developed. On the one hand, inborn sexual perversions which the sexologists did not wish to censure were to be restrained by urging the inverts themselves not to indulge in their preferred behaviours (anal sex, pederasty and promiscuity being the most strongly opposed). By defining the third sex as an inborn condition of a tiny minority, the doctors moreover succeeded in defining a strict borderline between normality and abnormality and shielded most 'normal' people from the possibility of being a member of the intermediate sex. On the other hand, sexual perversions that originated in social circumstances, which the doctors condemned utterly, were to be prevented by any means necessary. Both theories and their consequences were defended at

the same time. Despite their apparent contradiction, both models were, in fact, complementary.

Manfred Herzer has described the politics of Naziism as they related to homosexuality. All the theories existing were used in formulating the Nazis' policies on the subject. Firstly, they faced the difficulty of having many homosocial institutions such as Röhm's SA, which evidently encouraged homosexuality. Secondly, according to the earliest Nazi theory, homosexuality originated from seduction, but they also believed it could be a behaviour learned in early youth and they allowed psychologists to 'cure' homosexuals. Thirdly, the experiments carried out on homosexuals in concentration camps were based on the theory that homosexuality was an inborn gender-inversion. Clearly, the Nazis used quite different theories depending on the likelihood of their ability to combat homosexuality, and this led to a range of different preventive measures. Most often, however, homosexual acts were seen as learned behaviour. Germans who were seen to have this abnormal behaviour could, it was thought, be cured and made fit again for the most important aims of the Nazi state: reproduction and the army.[24]

Models and theories are liable to opportunistic uses. Which are applied often depends mainly on the existing social conditions. One question which remains is how to determine hegemonic concepts of male love and homosexuality. Another is what these models may mean in actual social encounters or their relevance to personal preferences and fantasies.

Historians are not very good at finding a balance between cultural models and social preferences because, in most cases, the necessary material is absent. There may be as many clues about private desires in sexological literature as in books on the interpretation of dreams in ancient Rome.[25] Cultural representations of

sexuality in (auto)biographies, novels, poetry and visual art may be a source of information, but it is often difficult in the case of material for publication to separate private preferences from public (and literary) conventions. Such problems make it almost impossible to answer questions about the confluence of private desires and social norms solely from archive sources. Only recently have historians started research into the history of sex and sexuality. As this historical interest moves into its next phase, we need to develop a more precise understanding of the complex interrelationship between private meanings and public models. In doing so, we will find that historic norms are rarely clear; historic desires even less so.

Notes

1 See for example Ed Stein (editor), *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy* (New York, 1990).

2 Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité 1: Le volunté de savoir* (Paris, 1976); Jeffrey Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society* (London, 1981).

3 See Hubert Kennedy, *Ulrichs: the Life and Works of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Pioneer of the Modern Gay Movement* (Boston, 1988).

4 Randolph Trumbach, 'Gender and the homosexual role in modern western culture: the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries compared' in Dennis Altman et al, *Homosexuality, Which Homosexuality?* (Amsterdam, 1989), pages 149-169. See also his 'Sodomitical assaults, gender role and sexual development in eighteenth-century London' in K Gerard and G Hekma (editors), *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe* (New York, 1989), pages 407-429; 'The birth of the queen: sodomy and the emergence of gender equality in modern culture, 1600-1750' in Martin B Duberman, Martha Vicinus and Geroge Chauncey Jr (editors), *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (New York, 1989), pages 129-140; and 'London's Sapphists: from three sexes to four genders in the making of modern culture' in J Epstein and K Straub (editors), *Body Guards: the Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity* (New York and London, 1991), pages 112-141. Authors like Alan Bray, Dirk Jaap Noordam and Theo van der Meer sustain similar ideas: see their articles in *The Pursuit of Sodomy*.

5 The concept of 'sexual democracy' is borrowed from André Béjin's critical essay on Masters and Johnson, 'Le pouvoir des sexologues et de la démocratie sexuelle' in Philippe Ariès and André Béjin (editors), *Sexualités occidentales*, a special issue of *Communication* 35 (1982), pages 178-191.

6 For a discussion of forms of homosexuality, see David Greenberg, *The Construction of Sexuality* (Chicago, 1988), pages 25-65. For Melanesia, see Gilbert Herdt (editor), *Ritualised Homosexuality in Melanesia* (Berkeley, 1984).

7 Rictor Norton, *Mother Clap's Molly House: the Gay Subculture in England, 1700-1830* (London, 1992). His supporting material is not very convincing, but he makes the interesting point that the mollies were not looking for sex with trade in the period which he studies (1700 to 1830), as homosexual men did between the 1860s and the 1950s. It may also be that the mollies had love relations with each other, and sex with trade.

8 Hans Dietrich [Hellbach], *Die Freundesliebe in der deutschen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1931); Gert Hekma, 'Sodomites, platonic lovers, contrary lovers: the backgrounds of the modern homosexual' in *The Pursuit of Sodomy*, pages 433-456; Paul Derks, *Die Schande der heiligen Päderastie: Homosexualitat und Oeffentlichkeit in der deutschen Literatur, 1750-1850* (Berlin, 1990) and Jeffrey Richards, 'Passing the love of women: manly love and Victorian society' in J A Magnan and James Walvin (editors), *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class Masculinity in Britain and America* (New York, 1987), pages 92-122.

9 See Manfred Herzer, *Magnus Hirschfeld: Leben und Wek eines jüdischen, schwulen und sozialistischen Sexologen* (Frankfurt a M, 1992).

10 See especially Harry Oosterhuis (editor), *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany: the Youth Movement, the Gay Movement, and Male Bonding before Hitler's Rise* (New York, 1991).

11 Judith Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Chicago, 1992).

12 See my *Homoseksualiteit, een medische reputatie* (Amsterdam, 1987), pages 83-92 (male promiscuity) and 149-160 (prostitution).

13 See Theo van der Meer, *De wesentlyke sonde van sodomie: Sosomieten en sodomieten vervolgingen in Amsterdam 1730-1811* (Amsterdam, 1984) and my 'Wrong lovers in the nineteenth century Netherlands' in *Journal of Homosexuality* 13 (1987), pages 43-55.

14 Gilbert Herdt, '"Coming out" as a rite of passage' in Gilbert Herdt (editor), *Gay Culture in America: Essays from the Field* (Boston, 1991), pages 29-67, in particular pages 33-34.

15 See for example W Williams, *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture* (Boston, 1986); W Roscoe, *The Zuni Man-Woman* (Albuquerque, 1991); S Nanda, *Neither Man nor Woman: the Hijras of India* (Belmont, 1990) and R Oostvogels, '"Vrouwen met een pik": derde genderin Jakarta' in *Homologie* 14:1 (January 1992), pages 4-9.

16 Gayle Rubin, 'The Traffic in Women: Notes on the "Political Economy" of Sex' in Rayna R Raiter (editor), *Towards an Anthropology of Women* (New York, 1975), pages 157-210; Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la Sexualité 1: La volonté du savoir* (Paris, 1976).

17 Ian Gibson, *The English Vice: Beating, Sex, and Shame in Victorian England and after* (London, 1978).

18 See Robert R Hazelwood, Park E Dietz and Ann W Burgess (editors), *Autoerotic Fatalities* (Lexington and Toronto, 1983).

19 The concept of fetishism is used following the theory of A Binet, *Le fétichisme dans l'amour* (Paris, 1888), who attributes a great influence to strong impressions in childhood on the specific contents of the sexual desires of the adult.

20 The most extreme definition of sexual desire as attraction between opposites was Otto Weiniger's theory. He stated that individuals are never 100% male or female, but that a couple realises always 100% masculinity and 100% femininity, so the lack of maleness in one partner is compensated by the other. It did not matter if the couples were homo- or heterosexual. See his *Geschlecht und Character: Eine prinzipielle Untersuchung* (Wien and Leipzig, 1903). Germans had a very strong obsession with the combination of sex and gender, as the theory of the third sex of Hirschfeld makes clear. An alternative theory was developed by Heimsoth who defended the position that sexual desires also exist between persons who have the same position on the gender-scale. Thus a masculine man may love a masculine man. To indicate this specific form of desire, he coined the term homophile (love for the same). See K G Heimsoth, *Hetero-und Homophilie* (Rostock, 1925).

21 Norton, op cit; my *De roze rand van donker Amsterdam: de opkomst van een homoseksuele kroegcultuur, 1930-70* (Amsterdam, 1992).

22 See for example B R Burg, *Sodomy and the Perception of Evil: English Sea Rovers in the Seventeenth Century Caribbean* (New York and London, 1983); J Chandos, *Boys Together: English Public Schools 1800-1864* (London, 1984); and for a fascinating contemporary example Danny Danziger, *Eton Voices: Interviews* (London, 1988).

23 P F Spaink, 'Bijdrage tot de casuïstiek der urningen' in *Psychiatrische Bladen* 11 (1893), pages 143-165, reprinted in my *Honderd Jaar Homoseksuelen: Documenten over de uitdokter-ing van homoseksualiteit* (Amsterdam, 1992), pages 39-67.

24 Manfred Herzer, 'Homosexualität als Gegenstand der Sexualwissenschaft unter dem Nationalsozialismus' in *Beiträge zur Sexualforschung* Band 63 (Stuttgart, 1987).

25 See for sexology Klaus Müller, *Aber in meinen Herzen sprach*

eine Stimme so laut: Homosexuelle Autobiographien und medizinische Pathographien im neunzehnten Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1991) and for classical Rome Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité 3: Le souci de soi* (Paris, 1984) and S R F Price, 'The future of dreams: from Freud to Artemidoris' in D M Halperin, J J Winkler and F I Zeitlin (editors), *Before Sexuality: the Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1990), pages 365-388.