



On Behalf of Hermaphrodites and Mongrels: Refocusing the Reception of Magnus Hirschfeld's Critical Thought on Sexuality and Race

J. Edgar Bauer

To cite this article: J. Edgar Bauer (2021) On Behalf of Hermaphrodites and Mongrels: Refocusing the Reception of Magnus Hirschfeld's Critical Thought on Sexuality and Race, Journal of Homosexuality, 68:5, 777-801, DOI: [10.1080/00918369.2019.1661686](https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1661686)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1661686>



Published online: 01 Oct 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 607



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



On Behalf of Hermaphrodites and Mongrels: Refocusing the Reception of Magnus Hirschfeld's Critical Thought on Sexuality and Race

J. Edgar Bauer, PhD

ABSTRACT

German-Jewish physician, sexologist and critical race theorist Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935) was arguably one of the most significant sexual thinkers of the twentieth century and a renowned sexual minority rights advocate. Hirschfeld's sexual-emancipatory engagement has been widely acknowledged. But his groundbreaking universalization of sexual intermediariness and the resulting dissolution of binary, triadic or otherwise finite schemes of sexuality have been mostly ignored or misrepresented in intellectual history. A relevant exception in this regard is the way sexuality historian Manfred Herzer has shortly approached the "doctrine of sexual intermediaries" as the "key concept" of his thought. While assessing and setting in historical perspective Herzer's interpretive contentions, the present study foregrounds Hirschfeld's Darwinian-inspired, non-essentialist naturalism as the ontic support for the new sexual and race regime he envisaged. By conceptualizing the potential in-finitization of sexualities and races, Hirschfeld was envisioning an unprecedented path toward the Messianic—albeit a-theological—goal of intra-historic liberation.

KEYWORDS

Binary sexuality; closed sexual taxologies; de-finitization (or in-finitization) and emancipation of the sexes; male pregnancies; Messianic thought; sexual categorizations and natural continuities; sexual and racial individuality; sexual intermediariness and racial hybridity; third sex; universalized hermaphroditism

"[A]lle geslachtelijk ontstane wezens zijn dubbelwezens, die levenslang hun dubbelen oorsprong verraden, en die in bijzondere gevallen dit op zeer bijzondere en in het oog springende wijze doen."

Hugo de Vries: *Bastaardeering en Bevruchting* (de Vries, 1903, p. 450)¹

"Since I have never encountered a person of no color, I assume that we are all persons of color."

Melvin Dixon: *Love's Instruments* (Dixon, 1995, p. 73)

1. Since the 1980s, five book-length publications have been issued in the United Kingdom and in Germany focusing on the life and work of sexologist and sexual minority rights activist Magnus Hirschfeld (1886–1935). Of these biographical studies, Manfred Herzer's recent *Magnus Hirschfeld und seine Zeit* [Magnus Hirschfeld and His Time] (Herzer, 2017) is certainly the most comprehensive. Compared with Herzer's previous Hirschfeld biography published in 1992 and updated in 2001 (Herzer, 1992, 2001), the new volume

analyzes more closely the notion of *sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (sexual intermediary degrees) as “the central concept in [his] thought” (Herzer, 2017, p. 119). Although Hirschfeld’s *Lehre* (doctrine) of sexual intermediaries constitutes—as Herzer suggests—the liberatory “Gospel” (Herzer, 2017, p. 388) at the core of his work, it has been consistently repressed, and almost eliminated, from the cultural memory of the West.

2. Herzer’s new assessment of Hirschfeld’s work contrasts with the repeated attempts by German-language publicists to disparage the sexologist’s epistemic achievements. Among his many detractors, one decried the “exiguity of knowledge” (Dannecker, 1978, p. 47) conveyed in his writings. Others deemed that Hirschfeld was “ambitionless from the point of view of thought” (Sigusch, 1985, p. 244), or “remained as theoretician superficial and incomplete” (Haeberle, 1984, p. xx). Less polemical but equally disinformed, Charlotte Wolff (1897–1986), a German-born British psychologist and author of the first Hirschfeld biography, contended that “Hirschfeld’s theory of sexual intermediaries has not survived” (Wolff, 1986, p. 154). More nuanced in his estimate, Ralf Dose acknowledged on principle the significance of Hirschfeld’s *Zwischenstufenlehre*, but divested the “special case” of hermaphroditism (Dose, 2005, p. 97) from the catalyzing role Hirschfeld assigned to it in terminating the subsumption of individuals under the categorial hypostatizations of “man” and “woman.”

3. The evaluation of Hirschfeld’s scientific accomplishments Herzer has recently undertaken suggests a far-reaching revision of the stance he had maintained in previous publications. Thus, in stark contrast to his latest views, Herzer posited in the biography he issued in 1992 that Hirschfeld’s own concept of sexology was already antiquated in the 1930s and that it became, with the publication of the Kinsey Reports in 1949 and 1953, a closed chapter in the history of sexology (Herzer, 1992, p. 7). As Herzer published in 2001 the revised version of the biography, he apparently still upheld his initial views on the obsolescence of Hirschfeld’s work. However, in the volume’s foreword titled “The Hirschfeld Research in the 1990s,” Herzer remits to the “new interpretation of Hirschfeld’s *Zwischenstufenlehre*” (Herzer, 2001, p. 7) proposed by J. Edgar Bauer in a monographic study of 1998 (Bauer, 1998). This mention was significant, inasmuch as Bauer’s approach pointed in a direction antithetical to the stance, which mainstream Hirschfeld scholarship and Herzer himself had been championing for years. Unsurprisingly, Herzer, at the time, deemed Bauer’s interpretive claims—especially those concerning the principled dissolution of the man/woman hiatus (Herzer, 2003, p. 72)—thoroughly unacceptable.

4. Herzer has made no attempt to explain in his 2017 volume why his current views stand out so markedly from his earlier assessments of Hirschfeld’s work. His silence over this discrepancy is understandable, since proceeding otherwise would have implied calling to question the

acceptance that his own past contributions on Hirschfeld had enjoyed in Germany for years. Even so, Herzer's decision not to thematize the shift in his approach is a source of unnecessary confusion, especially if one takes into account that his latest take on Hirschfeld's sexual doctrine coincides, to a large extent, with the elaborations, which Bauer had forwarded in "Der Tod Adams" more than two decades ago, and which Herzer explicitly dismissed in several publications. He explained in detail his rejection in the course of a written debate between him and Bauer, which was issued in three installments by each side (Herzer, 1998, 1999, 2003; Bauer, 1999, 2002a, 2007). Strangely enough though, Herzer opted for ignoring in his 2017 biography the occurrence and the results of the debate, as well as the precisions concerning Hirschfeld's *doctrine*, which Bauer had set forth over several years in *Capri*, the journal Herzer has been editing since 1987. This historiographic backdrop would not be worth mentioning in this context, if Herzer's earlier publications had not contributed to aggravating the discredit of Hirschfeld's core epistemic positions for the sake of aggrandizing his significance as a sexual reformer and political activist.

5. Despite pursuing an overall socio-historical design, Herzer's 2017 publication shied away from setting in historical perspective and questioning not only the depictions of Hirschfeld as being a mere "compiler" (Dannecker, 1978, p. 47), "scientifically unrefined" (Sigusch, 1985, p. 246), or "an un-theoretical head" (Lindemann, 1993, p. 97), but also—and more importantly—the systematic neglect of his writings. On the whole, Herzer seems unconcerned by the fact that the rhetorical disparagement of Hirschfeld's oeuvre only served to distract from his trailblazing critical contentions, prompting interest, instead, in the less demanding domain of his political and organizational endeavors.² In any case, Herzer acknowledges by now the significance of "Hirschfeld's thought" (Herzer, 2017, p. 119) in general, and of his sexual doctrine as a critique of closed schemes of sexual distribution in particular (Bauer, 2005, 2006). Considering that in his latest publication Herzer proposes no alternative to Bauer's interpretation of Hirschfeld's conception of sexual intermediariness (Bauer, 2004) and sexual individuality (Bauer, 2002b, 2003), it seems safe to assume that he is thereby signaling his agreement with the *close readings* on which Bauer based his understanding of the sexologist's *Lehre*.

6. Jörg Litwischuh and Michael Schwartz, the coauthors of the four-page text that serves as preface to *Magnus Hirschfeld und seine Zeit*, praise at length the way Herzer approaches the biographe, but avoid even mentioning his assessment of Hirschfeld's *Lehre* as the kernel of his sexology. In general, Herzer surmised that, if Hirschfeld at times downplayed the role of his sexual doctrine to that of a mere "distributive principle," it was because he deemed inappropriate to overtax sexual majorities with the realization that, "without exception, every human being is an *hermaphrodite*" (Herzer, 2017, p. 388; emphasis added). It seems, however, that Herzer did not contemplate the

possibility that such a counterintuitive insight would also overtax the prefacers of his own book. While the coauthors declare on principle that “Hirschfeld’s scientific engagement should undoubtedly be subjected to some critique” (Litwischuh & Schwartz, 2017, p. 2), the type of scrutiny they envisage dispenses—inexplicably—with any discussion of the *articulus stantis et cadentis* of Hirschfeld’s sexology. This weighty omission possibly becomes less astonishing if one considers that the footnote appended to the sentence just quoted remits to a passage in Volkmar Sigusch’s *Geschichte der Sexualwissenschaft* [The History of Sexology] (see Sigusch, 2008, p. 223), in which Hirschfeld’s sexological conception is compared with that of his contemporary Albert Moll (1862–1939). Regrettably, the section referred to offers no specific critique of Hirschfeld’s “scientific engagement,” let alone of his sexual doctrine.³

7. The disregard of Litwischuh and Schwartz for Herzer’s latest focus on the Hirschfeldian *Lehre* is in line with the strategy Sigusch deployed over the lapse of more than a generation to belittle the sexologist’s accomplishments. Tellingly, Sigusch decided in earlier years to apostrophize Martin Dannecker as “the best expert in the field of the sexual intermediaries far and wide” (Sigusch, 1990, p. 32). It appears however that neither Dannecker nor his panegyrist ever offered convincing arguments for or against considering sexual intermediariness as the configuring pattern of the human sexual condition. Although Herzer’s new book clearly addresses the issue (Herzer, 2017, pp. 385–390), the question remains unanswered as to why the publisher, Herzer, or both accepted that the volume be introduced by a preface that passes over in silence its most relevant contribution to the understanding of Hirschfeld’s work. To raise the issue is apposite not just because the logo of the *Bundesstiftung Magnus Hirschfeld* on the book’s back cover certifies that the publication has been grant-aided by that German federal foundation, but because, of the two prefacers, one is the director, and the other the chairman of the professional advisory board of the Hirschfeld foundation in Berlin (Litwischuh & Schwartz, 2017, p. 4). It is something of a puzzle why a book that redresses the most misrepresented aspect of Hirschfeld’s oeuvre is prefaced by a text that contributes to depreciating his sexual thought by means of a conspicuous *non-dit*.

8. Prior to the publication of Herzer’s first Hirschfeld biography in 1992, the idea that the sexologist’s true significance was restricted to his sexual-emancipatory activities had become the undisputed doxa of many publicists and journalists. Interestingly enough though, it was not Herzer, but sexuality historian Rainer Herrn who pointed to Volkmar Sigusch as having raised the question whether “Hirschfeld should be regarded as a scientist at all” (Herrn, 2009, p. 284; see Sigusch, 1990, p. 32). In this context, Herrn also mentions the dissenting estimate of those who, like J. Edgar Bauer, have argued that “an objective appraisal of the theoretical kernel of Hirschfeld’s life work still

has to be made” (Herrn, 2009, p. 284; see Bauer, 1998, p. 17). Against this backdrop, it is well to remark that the two positions Herrn sketches were not the result of contradictory textual interpretations, but of the decision for or against a careful examination of the meaning and scope of Hirschfeld’s writings. On the one hand, Sigusch acknowledged the influence of the sexologist’s activism on the worldwide emergence of sexual minority rights movements, but scrupulously shunned engaging in a hermeneutical scrutiny of the epistemic premises that inform Hirschfeld’s sexology as a whole. Bauer, on the other hand, took into account the obvious historical impact of Hirschfeld’s sexual-emancipatory endeavors, but considered it to be a socio-political reflection of the profound re-conceptualization of sexual difference, which anyone decided to peruse the Hirschfeldian corpus can ascertain with ease.

9. While avoiding to confront Sigusch’s obstinate deprecation of Hirschfeld’s work, Herzer acknowledged Bauer’s assessment of the sexologist’s thought as an “epoch-making brake with the image of man as determined by sexual dimorphism” (Herzer, 2017, p. 394; Bauer, 1998, p. 17). Despite keeping silent about his shift toward reappraising the *Zwischenstufenlehre*, Herzer’s factual reorientation appears to indicate his realization that the perspectives offered by Marxian sociology, Enlightenment dialectics or gender studies can enrich, but not substitute close readings of Hirschfeld’s oeuvre. Furthermore, Herzer seems to have attained a better understanding of how evolution theory, ontological monism and the history of non-occidental religiosities helped configure the sexologist’s worldview. Especially relevant in this regard is Herzer’s depiction of Hirschfeld’s close association with the *Deutscher Monistenbund* [German Monist Association], and Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919), its prominent Darwinian founder. However, given that, besides Darwin, it was early modern Italian thinker and philosophical martyr Giordano Bruno (1548–1600), who became the decisive inspiring figure of Haeckel’s *weltanschauung*, there seems to be no cogent reason as to why Herzer ignores the affinities between Bruno’s conception of “*natura naturante*” (Bruno, 2002, p. 702), and the ontic assumptions of Hirschfeld’s sexology. Equally questionable is Herzer’s neglect of the fact that Bruno’s principled dissolution of the man/woman *bimembrum* anticipated by three centuries Hirschfeld’s own sexological deconstructions (see Bauer, 2012b).

10. Although Herzer discusses Hirschfeld’s reception of Darwinian evolution theory, he disregards the paramount relevancy of Darwin’s elaborations on hermaphroditism to the sexologist’s *Lehre*. Already in his very first sexological treatise (Ramien, 1896), Hirschfeld echoed Darwin’s stance on the intrinsically bisexual nature of humans and their mammifer ascendants. Significantly, Darwin remarked around 1833 that “[e]very man & woman is hermaphrodite [...]” (Darwin, 1987, p. 384), and later corroborated his initial insights, as he detailed in 1871 that, in their being, human individuals replicate their lineage from “some extremely remote progenitor of the

whole vertebrate kingdom [that] appears to have been hermaphrodite or androgynous” (Darwin, 1981, Part I, p. 207).⁴ As an advocate of these premises, Hirschfeld depicted Darwin as one of the first natural scientists in the nineteenth century to rediscover the “ur-idea of human double sexuality” (Hirschfeld, 1926, p. 485), which had been buried by the ruins from Greece and Rome, but had nevertheless survived in the European literary tradition, as well as in form of some remarkable paintings and sculptures (see Hirschfeld, 1930b, pp. 487, 488, 494, 495, 496, 547).⁵ As Hirschfeld further contended, Darwin had sought to revitalize the Heraclitean philosopheme that “the world is not a Being, but a Becoming, that in it only the inconstant is constant [...]: *panta rhei* [...].” (Hirschfeld, 1928, p. 538). Besides agreeing with the way Darwin regarded “every production of nature as one which has had a history” (Darwin, 1985, p. 456), Hirschfeld concurred with his observation that the indomitable urge of nature toward variability is “still acting round us” (Darwin, 1985, p. 343).

11. Darwin’s evolution-based hermaphroditization of human sexuality provided the systemic warrant for Hirschfeld’s universalized conception of sexual intermediariness. Moreover, Darwin’s *rediscovery* of the ancient Greco-Roman notion of bisexuality became the paradigm for Hirschfeld’s search after articulations of non-binary patterns of sexual difference among trans-Mediterranean world religions and their mythologies.⁶ Hirschfeld’s own findings in this regard contributed to further consolidating his programmatic sexual *Aufklärung* (see Hirschfeld, 1929, p. 1–3), inasmuch as they allowed him to instantiate religious attitudes toward sexuality at odds with church Christianity’s suppression of sexual complexity and variability. In his characteristically fin-de-siècle interpretive approach of Far-Eastern spiritual traditions, Hirschfeld followed the lead of two of his preferred nineteenth-century authors: German counter-idealistic philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860),⁷ and American transcendentalist poet Walt Whitman (1819–1892).⁸ Broadening the scope of their observations, Hirschfeld made pregnant remarks on the traditions of Hinduism, Buddhism and Tao that highlight the way non-Abrahamic religions project onto the ambit of the divine representations of sexuality conflicting with Western sexual normativity (see, for instance, Hirschfeld, 1933, pp. 48–49, 281, 1926, pp. 336, 485). By not thematizing the sexologist’s ethnological focus on non-monotheistic world religions, Herzer has helped cement the widespread neglect of one of the main sources of Hirschfeld’s trans-occidental, cosmopolitan “panhumanism” (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 392) as the culmination point of his monistic weltanschauung.

12. Despite offering a wealth of informative details regarding the sexologist’s relation to Judaism and his own Jewishness, Herzer’s elucidations are shaped by the misleading assumption that Hirschfeld’s Jewish self-understanding was the result of the minority status imposed on him by “anti-

Semitic terror and fascist propaganda” (Herzer, 2017, p. 367). Moreover, from the fact that Hirschfeld was an “atheistic Jew” (Herzer, 2017, p. 12), Herzer appears to conclude that he was not truly concerned by the spiritual and cultural traditions from which he emerged. Accordingly, Herzer detects in Hirschfeld, at most, a possibly Messianic-inspired hope for a future where his work would at last be recognized. Aside from insinuating that Hirschfeld harbored such rather puerile expectations, Herzer dispenses with discussing the Jewish form of historical temporality in which Hirschfeld inscribed his notion of an open-ended, and thus non-eschatological process of socio-political liberation, whose point of departure is the close observation and study of sexuality as the foremost catalyzer in the humanization of the species.⁹ This major omission prompts the question as to whether Herzer was actually aware that the Messianic—albeit non-theistic—conception of history that surfaces in Hirschfeld’s oeuvre also informed the notions of temporal becoming that underpin Marxism and the Zionist project.

13. Hirschfeld related his conception of intra-historical liberation to the Ahasverian restlessness of the Jewish people as the heirloom from their nomadic ur-history (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 329). Thus, while their irrepressible “impulsion toward the vastness” (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 329) hindered the Jews from finding a true homestead, it also prepared them for the “great human mission” (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 390) of achieving “a redemption of humanity” (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 144). Essentially, Hirschfeld’s grasp of the nomadic “yearning for freedom” (Hirschfeld, 1933, pp. 231, 329) entails renouncing the spatial rootedness in what is familiar, in order to embrace the ethical task of *liberation* within the immanence of history. If deployed within the ambit of Hirschfeld’s own epistemic endeavors, the metaphorical uprooting process begins by abandoning the figmental compartmentalization of sexuality and race, and acknowledging that, without exception, all human beings are—as regards their sexuality—“intersexual variants” (Hirschfeld, 1986, p. 49), and—as regards their race—“hybrids” (Hirschfeld, 1938, p. 198). Hirschfeld’s deconstructive pursuits in this regard conform with the epistemic paradigms of his time, but are at the same time framed within an ethical conception of historical purpose, in correspondence to his life motto: *per scientiam ad justitiam*.¹⁰ Had Herzer confronted the textual evidence for the nomadic-Messianic patterns of Hirschfeld’s thought, he would have been less prone to decry the sexologist’s post-theological Messianism as a “stubborn social-democratic faith in progress” (Herzer, 2017, p. 12).

14. Discussing sexual typologies, Herzer refers to two brief passages that reflect Hirschfeld’s unease with regards to the categorial reduction of individuals. In the main text of the biography, Herzer cites an early formulation of Hirschfeld’s critical approach of the issue: “A schematic quality clings to every scheme” (Hirschfeld, 1906, p. 282; Herzer, 2017, p. 202). Then, Herzer adduces in a footnote another version of Hirschfeld’s earlier criticism followed by a terse encapsulation of his take on the individual’s difference: “Every scheme

is schematic. Inexhaustible, unlimited is the differentiation of human individualities” (Hirschfeld, 1923, p. 72; Herzer, 2017, p. 202). Although both quotes are extracted from a sexological context, they could also sum up the critique of race-distributive schemes that Hirschfeld deploys on the assumption of a continuum of racial mixtures. Not by chance, the Nazi-persecuted and exiled Jewish sexologist conveyed in the year of his passing: “Biologisch genau genommen, sind alle Menschen Bastarde [...]” (Hirschfeld, 1935a, p. 8). The corresponding statement reads in a text posthumously issued in English: “Strictly speaking, from the point of view of biology, all human beings are hybrids” (Hirschfeld, 1938, p. 198). While Herzer left no doubt about the liberatory entailments of considering every human being a “hermaphrodite” (Herzer, 2017, p. 388), his treatment of Hirschfeld’s race critique (see Herzer, 2017, p. 379) fails to address the significance he attributed to the universalization of racial mixity as an epistemic and ethical issue, which goes beyond meeting the immediate urgencies imposed by Nazi racism.

15. The contours of Hirschfeld’s approach of race were already laid out in the nineteenth chapter of *Geschlechtskunde* II (Hirschfeld, 1928, pp. 527–659). Further elaborations followed in the installments published in Prague between 1934 and 1935 under the title *Phantom Rasse. Ein Hirngespinnst als Weltgefahr* [The race phantom. A chimera as world danger]. Finally, a book entitled *Racism* (1938) presented the English translation of a German-written text with affinities to the article series.¹¹ Despite being sketchy, the last two publications constitute indispensable sources for assessing Hirschfeld’s reconceptualization of race difference as a matter of strict individual distinction and at the antipodes of any group predominance, “Aryan” or otherwise.¹² Significantly, Hirschfeld found in the work of evolution theorist and eminent taxonomist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744–1829) prefigurations of his arguments against the segmentation of natural continuities and the elevation of the resulting excisions to the rank of ontic factualities. Not by chance, Hirschfeld refers to the Lamarckian contention that, “with regard to the infinite fullness of inherited characteristics and forms, [...] all classifications of living beings are ultimately only ‘artificial instrumentalities’: [...] Nature herself knows neither classes nor species” (Hirschfeld, 1935b, p. 7; see, 1928, p. 654, 1938, p. 249).¹³ Although Herzer reckons with Hirschfeld’s indebtedness to the French naturalist (Herzer, 2017, p. 379), he omits relating Hirschfeld’s grasp of the continuities of Nature to the aim he ultimately envisioned: the historical emergence of man’s post-categorical humanness.

16. In the last lines of his 2017 volume, Herzer quotes from a text Hirschfeld published in 1934, where he relates “biology” to the verse of Isaiah 6, 13 concerning the persisting “rest” (Herzer, 2017, p. 395). In the cited passage, Hirschfeld expressed confidence that, despite the Nazi censorship and burning of books on dissident sexualities, “‘a rest will remain.’ A rest will indeed remain, a but, from which once again new life blossoms” (Hirschfeld, 1934, p. 3; 2015, p. 39). Without mentioning Isaiah by name, Hirschfeld was actually remitting to the Hebrew

prophet, whose universalism constitutes—in the words of neo-Kantian philosopher and Hirschfeld’s older Berlin contemporary Hermann Cohen (1842–1918)—the culmination point of Jewish Messianism (Cohen, 1978, p. 140; see Isaiah 56, 7). Herzer’s inclusion of Hirschfeld’s reference to Isaiah, however, was certainly not meant as a corrective to his repeated disregard for the secular Jewish Messianism, which marks the form of historical temporality deployed in Hirschfeld’s world travel report (see Bauer, 1999, July, pp. 73–75). Indeed, mindful of the classical notion that the end of time recovers its primal beginnings, Hirschfeld—in the concluding passage of *Weltreise*—first averred that only human love brings back Paradise Lost, and then went on to cite the “words of hope” expressed by libertarian poet Ferdinand Freiligrath (1810–1876): “es kommt die Zeit trotz alledem” (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 392)—literally: the time comes despite all of this.

17. The four-line strophe Hirschfeld cites at the end of *Weltreise* is part of a lyrical text titled “Trotz alledem,” which Freiligrath adapted from a poem by Scotland’s national bard Robert Burns (1759–1796). Originally captioned “Is there for Honest Poverty,” Burns’s poem has become mostly known as “A Man’s a Man for a’ That.” Freiligrath’s German rendering, which was first issued in 1844, appeared four years later in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, a newspaper published by Karl Marx (1818–1883) in Cologne, Germany. The portion Hirschfeld quotes corresponds to the final verses of the poem, which in the English original run:

For a’ that, an’ a’ that
It’s comin yet for a’ that,
That Man to Man, the world o’ver
Shall brithers be for a’ that (Burns, 2001, p. 513).¹⁴

From Hirschfeld’s “biologico-psychological outlook” (Hirschfeld, 1938, p. 289), the universal brotherhood suggested in the strophe is not just a matter of liberal-socialist ideals. For the salutary “coming time” Hirschfeld envisions actually surpasses the expectancies of poets and artists, who in good conscience adhere to the hypostatization of categorical excisions in the ambit of sexuality and race. After divesting closed human taxologies from their seeming self-evidence of old, Hirschfeld targets the self-misapprehension of cultures as though they were the result of racial purity. Thus, against the fascist and fascistoid propaganda of his time, Hirschfeld unequivocally declared: “culture is the result of racial mixings, and only this mixing saves from barbarism” (Hirschfeld, 1935d, p. 8). With its concision, the enunciation appears designed to resume the lessons Hirschfeld had learnt not only as a Jewish non-“Aryan” confronting German racism, but also as a world traveler, who had acquainted himself in Asia and Africa with the greatest cultural diversity that humankind’s racial spectrum ever brought about.

18. Mainstream sexuality history has hardly shed any light on Hirschfeld’s sexual doctrine and the reasons for its negligible reception for the most part of the twentieth century. Instead, the focus of sexual research has been first and

foremost on Hirschfeld's sexual minority rights activism and the way it came to fruition in the gay/lesbian emancipatory movements that have flourished the world over. Against this backdrop, it is apposite to note that most sexuality scholars have not only missed Hirschfeld's de-finitization of sexuality's distributive schemes, but at times even misrepresented his texts as if they would propose a hypostatized sexual category designed to supplement the man/woman dichotomy, and accordant with the "third sex" as conceptualized by Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–1895),¹⁵ or the "intermediary sex" furthered by Edward Carpenter (1844–1929) (Carpenter, 1908). By contrast, Fourierian-Marxist philosopher Guy Hocquenghem (1946–1988) was one of the very few to acknowledge that Hirschfeld's reconceptualization of sexual difference implied surpassing the man/woman binary and its possible third-sex supplementation for the sake of irreducible individual sexualities.¹⁶ It is regrettable, however, that post-1968 gay and queer publicists, mostly concerned with finding an identitarian niche of their own, have prevalently opted for ignoring the dismantlement of the man/woman/third-sex tripartition, which Hirschfeld undertook already in his early writings, and which Hocquenghem regarded as the critical kernel of the sexologist's oeuvre.¹⁷

19. The paradigm shift Hirschfeld propounded as regards the grasp of sexual and race difference grounded in a conception of Nature, which dispenses with the imposition of anthropomorphic patterns of separation on the ascertainably continuous deployments of life. Having read Darwin from an early age, Hirschfeld was certainly aware of his repeated mention of the "old canon of natural history": "Natura non facit saltum" (Darwin, 1985, pp. 223, 233, 236, 263, 435, 445), as well as of the role he assigned to the "great principle of gradation" (Darwin, 1985, p. 248) in the history of life (see Bauer, 2012a, pp. 86–91). Hirschfeld recurred to the Latin dictum and similar modern formulations of the ancient principle of natural continuities (Hirschfeld, 1926, pp. 545–546),¹⁸ to underpin his own new challenge to the accepted categorial compartmentalizations of human sexuality and race. As Hirschfeld never tires to underscore, such arbitrary partitions had been invested throughout Western cultural history with the prestige of godly-sanctioned or nature-given, incontrovertible facts. Moreover, these partitions were consolidated on a planetary scale in Hirschfeld's lifetime, as the influential Olympic movement disseminated its two-sexes-and-five-races ideology.¹⁹ Undaunted by this kind of newly formed unthinking majorities, however, Hirschfeld stood out as one of the few who perceived, and responded to, the need for a new conceptual and symbolic order of the two core markers of humanity's diversity. The prevailing non-reception of Hirschfeld's deconstructive insights makes all the more patent the unease provoked by his attempt to re/think the individual's sexual and race difference without recurring to figmental hypostatizations (see Bauer, 2006).

20. Hirschfeld considered that the exuberance of human sexual variability converged with the “surprising diversity,” which the modern study of the “love life” of plants and animals reveals (Hirschfeld, 1908, p. 10).²⁰ Accordingly, doubts began to emerge about the tenability of the male/female chasm once the evidence became widely available that human and non-human male individuals can occasionally excrete milk, as had been reported, for instance, by Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840)—one of the founders of zoology and anthropology as scientific disciplines—(Blumenbach, 1779, p. 22 [2. Abschnitt, § 13]) and by Charles Darwin himself (Darwin, 1985, pp. 428–429; see also, 1981, pp. 125, 130, 209).²¹ Against the backdrop of these observations, the chances are that Hirschfeld would not have been overly surprised to learn that, of late, fatherly lactation patterns on a regular basis have been ascertained in a fructivore, near threatened species of Southeast-Asian megabats named *Dyacopterus spadiceus* (Thomas, 1890) (see Swaminathan, 2007). Striking, but certainly not beyond the pale of Hirschfeld’s Brunian conception of Nature, are recent medical discussions on how to induce ectopic pregnancies with the assistance of biotechnologies in male individuals, thus enabling them to become true biological mothers. The possibility of factually undermining the biological axiom that only female individuals are capable of giving birth had already been envisaged more than two decades ago by renowned British gynecologist Robert Winston (born 1940), who emphatically declared: “There is no doubt that men could get pregnant” (Winston, 1999, p. 207).²² Needless to say, this kind of unwonted perspectives on human sexuality remain alien to Herzer’s discussion of the Hirschfeldian *Lehre*, although they accord well with the uniquely modulated hermaphroditism, which Darwin and Hirschfeld attributed to every sexed individual.

21. Drawing on his initial theses advanced in *Sappho und Sokrates* (Ramien, 1896), Hirschfeld pointed out in his study on *Sexual Intermediaries* as regards sexual individuality:

“From a strictly scientific point of view, one should not speak at all of men and women, but only of human beings, which are *to a large extent* male or to a large extent female” (Hirschfeld, 1913, p. 4; emphasis in original).

While suggesting that the aim of his critical endeavors was not merely to redefine what it means to be a *man* or a *woman*, but to irreversibly dissolve both concepts, Hirschfeld deemed advisable not to exasperate the male or female self-understanding of his reading audiences (Herzer, 2017, p. 388). Thus, following reliable intellectual manners going back to the Enlightenment, Hirschfeld at times assuaged possible objectors by limiting the validity of his claims to the domain of theory, i.e., the ambit where the truth of a scientific matter is decided. That semi-rhetorical provisos of this kind still have not lost their *raison d’être* becomes apparent when considering that Hirschfeld’s re-conceptualization of the core markers of human difference opened up possibilities, which were generally deemed beyond the

bounds of the reasonable—or even the imaginable—throughout most of the twentieth century.²³ Despite its many detractors, however, the rationale of Hirschfeld’s de-finitizing claims seems corroborated, when male-to-female transgender theorist Kate Bornstein (born 1948) depicts the crux of the perplexity that arises once the immemorial assumptions regarding sexual difference are left behind for good: “I identify as neither male nor female, and now that my lover is going through his gender change, it turns out I’m neither straight nor gay” (Bornstein, 1995, p. 4). Similarly, Robert Winston’s aforementioned prognostication on male pregnancies is apt to indirectly validate the salutary unease generated by Hirschfeld’s dispensation with the alienatory comforts of factitious compartmentations. Although to date no genetic man is known to have given birth to a child, the hiatus between the natural motherhood of women and the possible, bio-technologically assisted motherhood of men seems to be closing. Ever since Winston’s estimation, several trans-male individuals have given birth. Of late, one of them unapologetically declared shortly before parturition: “Yeah, I’m a pregnant man” (Gardy, 2018, June, p. 16).

In a visionary piece entitled “Here Comes Your Messiah,” San Francisco Renaissance poet and member of the *Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence* James Broughton (1913–1999) lets his lyrical alter ego apprise about the sexual future of the human past:

“But I am Adam with his Eve still enribbed” (Broughton, 1983, p. 84).

*

Notes

1. “All entities that come into being by means of sexuality are double entities, which betray their origin throughout their lives, and do this, in some cases, in a very special way that immediately meets the eye.”
2. A case in point is a 2003 conference meant to celebrate Hirschfeld’s life accomplishments. Its title reflected the hosts’ estimate concerning the true relevancy of the sexologist: *Der Sexualreformer Magnus Hirschfeld* (Kotowski & Schoeps, 2004). Arno Orzessek, a careful observer of the scholarly event in Potsdam, Germany, wrote an article that appeared in one of the country’s leading newspapers. In the piece, Orzessek pointed to the lacking preparedness of the participants to discuss issues of theoretical import, noting with regard to a paper presented by J. Edgar Bauer on Hirschfeld’s understanding of Judaism (Bauer, 2004):

The first signs of a complete interpretation of the Hirschfeld phenomenon became apparent. However, the conference [attendants] did not want to discuss the issue. They preferred to deepen themselves in the earthly hero, who collected sex-toys, filled Europe’s conference halls and appeared in several novels [...]. (Orzessek, 2003, p. 14)

3. Not unlike the aforementioned prefacers, a recent reviewer of Herzer's volume has consistently shunned assessing his depiction of Hirschfeld's *Zwischenstufenlehre* as the epistemic core of his critical sexology. This omission is hardly surprising, since for Florian Mildenberger, the author of the review, "sexual intermediariness" appears to be only a pathological or exceptional sexual configuration, not the structural principle of the human sexual condition. In the footsteps of the prefacers, the reviewer also remits to Volkmar Sigusch to underpin his arguments. In his zeal for the cause of discrediting the sexologist, Mildenberger declares that, by 1929, Hirschfeld had completely failed as a scientist: "Hirschfeld was at the end of the tether—neither the Nazis nor envious allies were necessary to attain that result" (Mildenberger, 2018, p. 197). Since no serious attempts are on record seeking to belie Hirschfeld's reception of Charles Darwin's universalization of hermaphroditism, or to falsify his sexual *Lehre*, it is hard to imagine which reasons Mildenberger could adduce in support of his fantasies concerning the break-down of Hirschfeld's sexological program.
4. In a passage underscoring Darwin's views on the human hermaphroditic heritage, Hirschfeld quotes from a letter Darwin wrote to Scottish geologist Charles Lyell (1797–1845) on January 10, 1860. The citation (Hirschfeld, 1928, p. 545) is a passage from the post scriptum Darwin appended to his letter to Lyell, asserting: "Our ancestor was an animal which breathed water, had a swim-bladder, a great swimming tail, an imperfect skull & undoubtedly was an hermaphrodite! Here is a pleasant genealogy for mankind.—" (Darwin, 1993, p. 28/Letter 2647; emphasis in original). An editorial footnote included in *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin* indicates that Lyell made annotations relating to the letter on the cover. Among other things, Lyell remarked: "Man originally an hermaphrodite" (Darwin, 1993, p. 29/Letter 2647).
5. Besides embracing Darwin's take on hermaphroditism, Hirschfeld acknowledged the existence of an ancient strand of theo-mythological and proto-historical speculations on the issue. In this connection he pointed out that the first comprehensive effort to assess and interpret the universal occurrence of these narrative materials was made by Dutch physician and sexual researcher Lucien von Römer (1873–1965) in his 1903 study entitled *Über die androgynische Idee des Lebens* [On the Androgynous Idea of Life], where he contended that almost every religion had conceptualized and represented its highest or unique God as androgynous (Römer, 1903, p. 715). Moreover, Römer stressed that the correspondence between the conception of hermaphroditism upheld by German physiologist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840) and the "new theory concerning the uranians" was "complete" (Römer, 1903, p. 899). In drawing this comparison, however, Römer left unmentioned the fact that Blumenbach's suppletive views on hermaphroditism as well as the fin-de-siècle man/woman/uranian tripartition were at odds with Hirschfeld's take on the universality of sexual intermediariness. Although Römer quoted Hirschfeld's *Sappho und Sokrates* (Hirschfeld, 1902; Ramien, 1896, 1902) extensively in *Het uranish gezin* (Römer, 1905, pp. 74–76), he neglected the import the sexologist assigned to the Darwinian notion of hermaphroditism. That Römer recurred to Blumenbach and not to Darwin for support of his own views, possibly reflects his reluctance to ascribe hermaphroditism not just to a specific sexual group, but also to those who, on account of their lacking capacity for self-observation and introspection, understand themselves as being either man or woman.
6. In *Geschlechtskunde* IV, Hirschfeld presents a vast selection of pictorial materials beginning with photographs of Charles Darwin and three other major sexology pioneers. Thereafter, the volume includes eleven depictions of humanity's prototypical parents. Among them is a drawing captioned "Ancient Chinese Representation of the

First Human Couple” (Hirschfeld, 1930b, p. 14) that clearly stands out from the rest. While all other depictions represent two differently sexed human beings, the Chinese drawing features a bipedal individual with two sets of heads and upper bodies that suggest a stark male/female contrast. Notwithstanding its unequivocally Chinese cultural marks, the drawing evokes similar Western depictions of the original human being as a hermaphrodite (see Roob, 1996, pp. 450–464). Interestingly enough, *Geschlechtskunde* II relates the Cabbalistic and mystical notion of a hermaphroditic Creator of the originally ambisexual Adam to comparable conceptions advanced by Lao-tsu, Confucius, and artists within the Buddhist tradition (Hirschfeld, 1926, p. 485).

7. Hirschfeld regarded with esteem, but did not share Schopenhauer’s pessimistic outlook (Hirschfeld, 1928, pp. 216, 373, 529), which—in accordance with its Hinduistic and Buddhist intellectual rootage—purports the philosophical denial of life and love (Hirschfeld, 1928, p. 417). In Schopenhauer’s understanding, the unconscious will reaches in human consciousness the capacity to unveil the existing world as a representation, in which individuality emerges as an appearance that hinders the will from attaining its final liberation from existence. In a sense, Schopenhauer’s philosophy implies a more fundamental opposition than that of Christian theology to Hirschfeld’s own embracement of the “endless chain of love,” which stretches from each individual to the first awakening of life (Hirschfeld, 1928, p. 542), enabling the potentially limitless proliferation of human sexual forms and their possible combinatories. Despite Schopenhauer’s depiction of other-sex sexualities as counter-liberatory (because theoretically generative) and of same-sex sexualities as an “outrageous paradox” of nature (Schopenhauer, 1977, p. 659), his seminal philosophical reception of Far-Eastern ascetic pessimism helped prepare Hirschfeld’s first-hand encounters with non-Mediterranean religiosities during his world trip. Significantly though, Hirschfeld’s predilection for Chinese culture drew his attention to Taoism and Confucianism as spiritual traditions alien to the other-worldly asceticism inherent in India-originated religious worldviews.
8. Walt Whitman is not mentioned in Herzer’s 2017 volume, although Hirschfeld considered him one of the most significant poets of modern America (see Hirschfeld, 1984, p. 672), whose “grand epic” revealed “which richness of poetic nuancing can be developed on the basis of a homosexual psyche” (Hirschfeld, 1984, p. 509). Moreover, Hirschfeld refers to the “poet of the camarados love” as a preeminent example of the “strongly spiritualized homosexuality,” which is “frequent in America” (Hirschfeld, 1984, p. 551). As an evolutionary monist, Hirschfeld was especially appreciative of Whitman’s transcendentalist-inspired *weltanschauung*, and well aware that he sought to rank his own poetry in the universal history of religions (see Carpenter, 1906, p. 94–102). In general, Hirschfeld’s perceptive remarks on Whitman’s work and personality are at odds with Herzer’s tendency to banalize the sexologist’s a-theological stance into an unsophisticated form of secularism.
9. The Jewish conception of Messianic temporality deployed by Hirschfeld implies the rejection of post-historical or apocalyptic notions of other-worldly transcendence. Instead, Hirschfeld recurs to a strictly immanent framework centered on the interminable pursuit of justice as the true meaning of historical becoming. Hirschfeld’s views on the issue accord well with the distinction advanced by philosopher Hermann Cohen (1842–1918) between (Platonic, Christian, supernatural) eschatology and (this-worldly, Jewish-prophetic, future-oriented) Messianism. In Cohen’s understanding, Israel’s conception of Messiah purports the “infinity of his coming” (Cohen, 1978, p. 291), not the closure of history (see Cohen, 1978, p. 340).

10. In the third volume of *Geschlechtskunde*, Hirschfeld makes a brief reference to German poet, philosopher and playwright Friedrich Schiller (1759–1805) in connection with the genesis of his own life motto. The passage remits to a sentence by Schiller, stating: “Der gnädigste von allen Richtern ist der Kenner.” Although it is not clear which of the many editions of Schiller’s *Kleine Schriften* Hirschfeld references as the source of the quote, it certainly stems from the poet, for it is included in his lyrical poem entitled “Prolog” (1787) (Schiller, 1975, p. 124). Schiller’s aphoristic verse translates as: “The most merciful of all judges is the expert.” Since Schiller was one of Hirschfeld’s preferred German poets, it is all the more significant that he proposes to substitute the phrase “der gnädigste von allen Richtern” by his own corrective formulation: “der gerechteste von allen Richtern” (the most just of all judges) (Hirschfeld, 1930a, p. 726). By underscoring that justice, and not mercifulness, is the factor that determines the expertise or connoisseurship of a judge, Hirschfeld was preempting the widespread sublimatory or idealizing strategy of hailing mercy in order to avoid confronting the actual challenges posed by the pursuit of justice. To conclude, Hirschfeld mentions the Latin phrase “*Per scientiam ad justitiam*” followed by its translation in German: “Durch Wissenschaft zur Gerechtigkeit,” but without making explicit that he was dealing with the motto of his life. The significance of Hirschfeld’s precisions can hardly be missed, if one considers that the Latin maxim was engraved on Hirschfeld’s tomb slab at the Cimetière de Caucade, in Nizza, France (see McLeod & Soetaert, 2010).
11. Herzer bases his elaborations from 2017 on race almost exclusively on the 1928 volume of *Geschlechtskunde*. In one of the final chapters of his biography though, Herzer utilizes as caption the English title of Hirschfeld’s posthumously published *Racism* (Herzer, 2017, pp. 379–381), but without analyzing its contents or mentioning it in the bibliography. Herzer does not analyze or reference the German-language installments entitled *Phantom Rasse* either, contenting himself with mentioning that *Racism* is the “expanded English version” of the article series (Herzer, 2017, p. 381). These omissions are all the more contestable, given Herzer’s own indication that the German term *Rassismus/Racismus* appears in Hirschfeld’s writing for the first time in *Phantom Rasse*, and that he either took it over from an unidentified source, or—like in the case of the concept of *Transvestiten*—coined the term himself (Herzer, 2017, p. 381). Having focused on Hirschfeld’s treatment of race in *Geschlechtskunde* II, Herzer felt free to obviate any discussion of the new race-relevant issues Hirschfeld examined in the subsequent publications of 1934/1935 and 1938. Moreover, Herzer passes over in silence the divergences between *Phantom Rasse* and *Racism* as regards their argumentative progression, content distribution, thematic accentuation and paragraph headings. Although Hirschfeld brought to bear in *Geschlechtskunde* the theoretical perspectives condensed from his life as a Jew in a gentile world, he could hardly have anticipated at the time the devastating consequences of Hitler’s *Machtergreifung* in 1933. It was in this context that Hirschfeld denounced Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg (1893–1946) for pretending that the “fate of race [is] the condition of an ethics” (Hirschfeld, 1935d, p. 8) and elevating “the notions of peoplehood and race to the rank of a religion” (Hirschfeld, 1935c, p. 8).
12. In a written intervention from 2003, Herzer agreed with Bauer’s contention that Hirschfeld deployed his individualizing perspective not only with regard to sexuality, but also to race, thereby gaining “a completely new approach to the critique of any racism” (Herzer, 2003, December, p. 72; see Bauer, 2002a, December, pp. 89–90). Herzer’s acknowledgment, however, did not prompt him to analyze in his 2017 volume Hirschfeld’s post-1933 reactions to the Nazi race ideology.

13. The passage Hirschfeld paraphrases reads in Lamarck's original text: "[la] classification des animaux [...] est un produit de l' art [...] que, malgré les apparences contraires, [...] ne tient réellement rien de la nature" (Lamarck, 1809, p. 103).
14. Robert Burns's final version of "A Man's a Man for a' That" (1795) (Burns, 2001, pp. 512–516) includes no term equiparable to the German notion of *Zeit* mentioned in the translation Hirschfeld quotes. However, the last eight verses of the original song (Burns, 2001, p. 513) are remindful of the end-historical conception of *Kingdom* (βασιλεία), in which the non-christological Jesus (Matthew 6:10; Luke 11: 2) seems to encapsulate the Jewish understanding of the Coming World (עולם הבא) and of the Coming Time (עתיד לבוא). Moreover, *Zeit* is not mentioned in Ferdinand Freiligrath's German rendition of the strophe from December 1843 (Freiligrath, 1844, p. 99), nor in his revised version of the poem published five years later (Freiligrath, 1849, p. 68). In 1845, however, the *Rheinische Jahrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen Reform* published a poetical florilegium that included as motto of one of its contributions a portion of the poem corresponding to the citation in *Weltreise* (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 392). The second line of the strophe quoted by Hirschfeld is identical with the one included in the *Jahrbücher's* version (Püttmann, 1845, p. 366). By opting for the German rendering of the strophe that mentions the term *Zeit* explicitly, Hirschfeld seems to underscore the dimension of concrete historicity inherent in the "panhumanism and cosmopolitanism" (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 392) that sustain the ethnological descriptions of *Weltreise*. From this perspective, what Hirschfeld designates as "yearning for Zion" (Hirschfeld, 1933, p. 389) evinces itself as the Messianic drive toward a cultural futurity that relinquishes, on principle, any claims to the permanence of a spatial/territorial groundedness.
15. German sexological pioneer Karl Heinrich Ulrichs was the leading propounder in the nineteenth century of a "third sex" that supplements the male/female binomial. Aiming at redefining sexuality within a triadic scheme of sexual modes, Ulrichs posited that male uranians as well as their female counterparts appertain to a separate, hermaphroditic-like class clearly distinguishable from normal men and women (Ulrichs, 1994b, p. 5). Despite proposing a closed third-sex category, Ulrichs admitted that "sexual dualism" is present embryonically in every human individual, but manifests its full scope only in biological hermaphrodites and Uranians (Ulrichs, 1994a, p. 68). Importantly, Ulrichs's identitarian construct of the sexual *third* should not be equiparated with any other forms of alternative sexuality, since, as he declared, "[w]e are not concerned by any possible intermediary degrees" (Ulrichs, 1994a, p. 46). In the last resort, Ulrichs's categorial suppletion was the result of a conscious neglect of sexual intermediariness, which, for Hirschfeld, became the cornerstone for uncovering the subjacent natural continuum of sexual variability.
16. In *Race d'Ep*, Hocquenghem devoted a whole "translude" to the role played by Hirschfeld's *Institute for Sexual Science* in envisioning a historical passage from Nazi barbarism to the Sixties. In this framework, an old lady named Hélène—who is presented as Hirschfeld's former secretary, but who "n'existe bien sûr que dans l'imagination de l'auteur..." (Hocquenghem, 1979, p. 145)—, recalls her experiences at Hirschfeld's Berlin *Institute*, which the Nazis destroyed in 1933. Noteworthy is the perspicacity fictive Hélène displays in her depiction of Hirschfeld's understanding of sexual difference (Hocquenghem, 1979, pp. 147–148) as being not a matter of two mutually exclusive sexes, but of gradual nuances configuring the specific sexual intermediariness of the individual. As could be expected, Hocquenghem's elaborations on Hirschfeld's understanding of sexual difference hardly received any attention among

- German-language sexologists. In Herzer's 2017 biographical volume, Hocquenghem's name is not even mentioned.
17. In this connection it is of interest to note that lesbian writer and theorist Monique Wittig (1935–2003) challenged the binomial conception of sexual difference in a way that is strongly remindful of Hirschfeld's critical demarche. In a passage of her philosophical essay "Paradigm," in which she discusses the issue of sexual subjectivities beyond alienation, Wittig declares: "For us there are, it seems, not one or two sexes, but many (cf. Guattari/Deleuze), as many sexes as there are individuals" (Wittig, 1979, p. 119). The reference within the quote is to the authors of the modern philosophical classic *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie. L'Anti-Œdipe*. Since the two French philosophers, like Wittig, premise the co-extensiveness of the number of human individuals and sexual varieties (Deleuze & Guattari, 1999, p. 352), they appear to echo Hirschfeld's postulation of potentially infinite sexualities. Gender theorizer Judith Butler (born 1956) is among the few to have explicitly targeted Wittig's unequivocal de-finitizing strategy, pointing out that "[t]he limitless proliferation of sexes [...] logically entails the negation of sex as such" (Butler, 1999, p. 151). Against the challenge posed by categorially non-subsumable sexual singularities to the arbitrariness of any finite sexual-distributive scheme, Butler conjures the specter of the end of sexuality, as though she were unaware that Darwin's universalization of hermaphroditism and Hirschfeld's premise concerning the individual modulation of the male/female polarity led to the proliferation of sexual forms, not to their cancellation.
 18. With a view to his arguments concerning the continuity of sexual forms, Hirschfeld set as motto on the book cover of *Geschelechtsübergänge* (Hirschfeld, 1913) a sentence taken from a treatise by German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz (1646–1716): "Tout va par degrés dans la nature et rien par sauts" (Leibniz, 1978, p. 155 [IV, 16,12]). In the title page of the volume, however, the same sentence is assigned to "Comenius, Leibniz, Linné." Moreover, in the text itself Hirschfeld indicates that the Latin axiom "natura non facit saltus" was originally formulated in this form by Carl von Linné (1707–1778) in his *Philosophia botanica* (1752) (see Linné, 1792, p. 27). Hirschfeld then adduces two further authors who had formulated similar views on Nature prior to Leibniz. Hirschfeld mentions at first Czech pedagogue Amos Comenius (1592–1670), who postulated in 1638: "[...] Natura & Ars, nusquam saltum faciunt, nusquam ferunt" (Comenius, 1638, A §, p. 41). Going further back in time, Hirschfeld then cites from a text titled *Discours véritable de la vie, mort, et des os du géant Theutobocus*, penned by a man named Jacques Tissot and originally published in 1613 in the city of Lyon, France. Hirschfeld quotes only the last eight words from the following passage: "Operatur natura quantum, et quandiu potest, sans neantmoins faire aucun sault ab extremis ad extrema: natura enim in suis operationibus non facit saltum" (Tissot, 1859, p. 248).
 19. In their publications and organizational activities, Pierre de Coubertin (1863–1937) and the *International Olympic Committee* operated from the outset with the unexamined assumption that human beings can be adequately categorized as being either male or female. While the Olympic Movement conspicuously sanctioned dichotomous sexuality, its deployment of a closed taxonomy of race is less evident, but undeniable upon closer scrutiny of the historical backdrop and scope of the main Olympic symbol: the five interlaced rings created by Coubertin in 1912. Indeed, the colored rings that grace the white background of the Olympic flag reflect the perhaps most salient chapter in the reception history of the ideas propounded by German physiologist and anthropologist Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840) concerning the presumed five fundamental races of humanity in their correlation with the five inhabited continents

(see Blumenbach, 1779, pp. 63–64). The 2018 edition of the *Olympic Charter* states that the Olympic symbol of the five interlaced circles “represents the union of the five continents and the meeting of athletes from throughout the world at the Olympic Games” (Olympic Charter, 2018, p. 23). Given its stress on the aim of bringing about a rapprochement of athletes from the five continents, however, it becomes apparent that the document assumes the preexistence of a global discord between distinctly categorizable human races. Accordingly, the general interpretive assumption in the 1940s was that each of the five colored circles corresponded to a specific continent, and therefore, to the original race assignable to its inhabitants. Unlike the discreteness of the interlaced rings on the Olympic flag, the core idea of the “rainbow” flag created in 1978 by US-American artist, GLBTQ activist and vexillographer Gilbert Baker (1951–2017) comes closer to symbolizing the vision of naturally continuous sexualities and races in accordance with Hirschfeld’s dissolution of finite human taxologies. Baker’s flag, however, fails to reflect the uninterrupted color fluidity of a natural rainbow as a symbolic paradigm for the representation of sexuality and race. The juxtaposition of the flag’s six (or in some cases eight) well circumscribed strips of color, appears to suggest a mere supplementation of an initially closed set of alternatives—binary or otherwise—, and not their thorough dismantlement. Signally, the color discontinuities on the rainbow flag were preserved in the way the White House was lit up on June 30, 2015 to commemorate the US Supreme Court’s decision to legalize same-sex marriage. Contrastingly, Black US-American poet and radical lesbian feminist Audre Lorde (1934–1992) has advanced a consistent attempt to overcome human taxologies of separation in her poetical approach of West Africa’s mythological “Rainbow Serpent” and the uninterrupted sequence of color hues it denotes. In the last resort, the symbolic ontology of continuous gradations her poetical oeuvre conveys is meant to debunk and overcome the trans-cultural pervasiveness of the categorial compartmentalizations, which structure the two core domains of human difference: sexuality and race (see Lorde, 1997; Bauer, 2018, pp. 251–256).

20. The 1900 treatise on animal same-sex sexuality by entomologist and anthropologist Ferdinand Karsch-Haack (1853–1936) was a truly pioneering contribution (Karsch (-Haack), 1900). Based on his work, sexual researcher L. S. A. M. von Römer (1873–1965) ascertained in 1905: “[...] men kan zelfs bijna geen diersoort noemen, of er zijn verschijnselen van uranisme daarbij aangetoond” (Römer, 1905, p. 62). Karsch-Haack’s study foreshadowed the contemporary research on animal sexual diversity by Canadian biologist and linguist Bruce Bagemihl (Bagemihl, 1999). For a brief overview of ascertainable biological facts that contradict the pervasive assumption that heterosexual binarity and other stereotypes constitute “nature’s way” among sub-human vertebrates, see Roughgarden (2009), pp. 27–28.
21. In *Het uranish gezin* (1905), L. S. A. M. von Römer mentions a report written in 1846 by Greek anthropologist Bernard Ornstein (1809–1896) depicting how his extraordinarily corpulent host in the city of Galixidi, Greece, was led by the circumstances of his family life to become “een zogenden vader” (Römer, 1905, pp. 69–70). As regards the first recorded, regular lactation of a child by a transgender woman, see Barr, February 14, 2018. On the issue of male lactation among human and non-human animals, (see Kunz and Hosken, 2009; Hosken & Kunz, July (2009)).
22. The objective possibility of male pregnancies points to a future actualization of generative potentialities in the human species, which, despite being to the present hardly imaginable, stem in fact from what Giordano Bruno conceptualized as the inexhaustibly creative *natura naturante*. Although Hirschfeld himself did not foresee that individuals generally categorized as biological men could give birth and become

mothers, this striking recourse is implied by the Hirschfeldian postulation of universalized sexual intermediariness. For in cases where the sexed individual's share of femaleness does not allow for pregnancy and parturition, it is—at least on principle—susceptible of being enhanced by artificial means to accomplish both ends. On this assumption, human inventiveness brings female latencies to fruition in a way that terminates the immemorial male/female distribution of sexed individuals, thereby uncovering deeper layers of Nature's ways *in sexualibus*. Signally, the insight into the ascendancy of the inexhaustible powers of nature over the finitude of human creativity was hinted by Hirschfeld as he contended that “Nature dominates man, more than man dominates nature. With this fact, which redounds more to the advantage than to the harm of humanity, we have to content ourselves for better or worse” (Hirschfeld, 1986, p. 165). Like Bruno, the “great monistic philosopher” (Hirschfeld, 1986, p. 138), Hirschfeld upheld the Aristotelian premise that nature does not imitate art (Aristotle, 1958, *Protrepticus* 11 (Ross) (W11)), but, rather, that art imitates nature (Aristotle, 1970, II, 2, 194 a 21). As a consequence, even the most diversified cultural articulations of sexual difference evince only a faint resemblance to the profuse sexual variability Nature is constantly displaying. Against this backdrop, the aberrance of sexual minorities from the cultural norm underlines the insufficiencies of mainstream conceptions of sexual naturalness in denial of the Aristotelian postulate that ἡ δὲ φύσις οὐδὲν ποιεῖ παρὰ φύσιν (Nature makes nothing contrary to nature) (Aristotle, 1968, XI, 711a7 [Progression of animals]) (See Aristotle, 1963, IV, 4, 770b12). Accordantly, male pregnancies are not indicative of a utopian revolt *against Nature*, but reflect, rather, a counterintuitive design to debunk the closures imposed on Nature throughout cultural history. Having disclosed the “anthropological varieties” (Hirschfeld, 1986, p. 172) of sexuality as intrinsic to the deployments of life, Hirschfeld had all the more reasons for considering Nature as the source of the “sexual pervasiveness” (Hirschfeld, 1986, p. 180) marking all things human.

23. The perhaps most influential neglecter of Hirschfeld's thought on sexual difference was French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926–1984). Given Foucault's consistent avoidance of issues concerning the epistemic status of corporeal sexual binarity and sexual intermediariness, one of the most unrewarding portions of his four-volume *Histoire de la sexualité* is the one titled “Scientia sexualis” (Foucault, 1976, pp. 69–98). Despite being the editor of an autobiographical account penned by Herculine Barbin (Foucault, 1978), whom he limned as “ni femme aimant les femmes ni homme caché parmi les femmes” (Foucault, 1994, p. 121), Foucault deemed possible to outline a history of modern sexuality in the glaring absence of Darwin's and Hirschfeld's core sexological insights.

Acknowledgments

The interpretation of Magnus Hirschfeld's work that underpins this contribution was delivered at the 2013 *Public Intellectuals Conference*, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, April 25–27, 2013.

References

- Aristotle. (1958). *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta*. . Recognovit Brevique Adnotatione Instruxit W. D. Ross. Oxford, UK: E Typographeo Clarendoniano.

- Aristotle. (1963). *Generation of animals*. With an English translation by A. L. Peck. London, UK: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Aristotle. (1968). *Parts of Animals*. With an English translation by A. L. Peck. *Movement of Animals. Progression of Animals*. With an English translation by E. S. Forster. London, UK: William Heinemann / Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Aristotle. (1970). *The physics*. In two volumes. With an English translation by Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford. London, UK: William Heinemann / Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bagemihl, B. (1999). *Biological exuberance: Animal homosexuality and natural diversity*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Barr, S. (2018, February 14). Transgender woman becomes first in the world to breastfeed. The patient was the primary source of nutrition for her newborn baby for six weeks. *The Independent* (London, UK). Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/transgender-woman-breastfeed-first-world-milk-baby-new-york-tamar-reisman-zil-goldstein-mount-sinai-a8209946.html>
- Bauer, J. E. (1998). Der Tod Adams. Geschichtsphilosophische Thesen zur Sexualemanzipation im Werk Magnus Hirschfelds. In M. Herzer (Ed.), *100 Jahre Schwulenbewegung. Dokumentation einer Vortragsreihe in der Akademie der Künste* (pp. 15–45). Berlin, Germany: Verlag rosa Winkel.
- Bauer, J. E. (1999, July). Über Hirschfelds Anspruch. Eine Klarstellung. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 29/30, 66–80.
- Bauer, J. E. (2002a, December). Magnus Hirschfeld: *Per scientiam ad justitiam*. Eine zweite Klarstellung. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 33(34), 68–90.
- Bauer, J. E. (2002b, December). “43 046 721 Sexualtypen.” Anmerkungen zu Magnus Hirschfelds Zwischenstufenlehre und der Unendlichkeit der Geschlechter. *Capri*, 33, 23–30.
- Bauer, J. E. (2003, November). Geschlechtliche Einzigkeit. Zum geistesgeschichtlichen Konnex eines sexualkritischen Gedankens. *Capri*, 34, 22–36.
- Bauer, J. E. (2004, April). Magnus Hirschfelds *Zwischenstufenlehre* und die *Zwischenstufentheorie* seiner Interpreten. Notizen über eine rezeptionsgeschichtliche Konfusion. *Capri*, 35, 36–44.
- Bauer, J. E. (2005, May). Magnus Hirschfeld: Der Sexualdenker und das Zerrbild des Sexualreformers. *Capri*, 37, 5–18.
- Bauer, J. E. (2006, October). Die Devise und ihr Nachklang. Zur allerneuesten Fortsetzung der Nicht-Rezeption von Magnus Hirschfelds *sexueller Zwischenstufenlehre*. *Capri*, 39, 7–26.
- Bauer, J. E. (2007, June). Magnus Hirschfeld: Sexualidentität und Geschichtsbewußtsein. Eine dritte Klarstellung. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 37/38, 109–120.
- Bauer, J. E. (2012a). Darwin, Marañón, Hirschfeld: Sexology and the reassessment of evolution theory as a non-essentialist naturalism. In S. G. Da Silva, F. Vieira, & J. B. Da Silva (Eds.), *(Dis)Entangling Darwin: Cross-disciplinary reflections on the man and his legacy* (pp. 85–102). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bauer, J. E. (2012b, May). Giordano Bruno: Das Mann/Frau-*Bimembrum* und die Definitisierung der Geschlechter. *Capri*, 46, 3–23.
- Bauer, J. E. (2018). “At the core of the broken fruit”: On Audre Lorde’s self-definitions and the critical deployment of the Dahomey/Yoruba lore. In H. V. Williams (Ed.), *Bury my heart in a free land. Black women intellectuals in modern U.S. history* (pp. 245–263). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger/ABC-Clio.

- Blumenbach, J. F. (1779). *Handbuch der Naturgeschichte*. Band I. Sechste Auflage. Göttingen, Germany: Bey Johann Christian Dieterich.
- Bornstein, K. (1995). *Gender outlaw. On men, women, and the rest of us*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Broughton, J. (1983). *Ecstasies. Poems 1975-1983*. Paintings by Galen Garwood. Mill Valley, CA: Syzygy Press.
- Bruno, G. (2002). *De la causa, principio et uno*. Commento di Giovanni Aquilecchia. In G. Bruno, *Opere italiane* (Vol. primo, pp. 591–746). Torino, Italy: Unione-Editrice Torinese (UTET).
- Burns, R. (2001). *The Canongate Burns. The complete poems and songs of Robert Burns*. Introduced by Andrew Noble. Edited by Andrew Noble and Patrick Scott Hogg. Edinburgh, UK: Canongate Classics.
- Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity* (Tenth ed.). New York, NY & London, UK: Routledge.
- Carpenter, E. (1906). *Days with Walt Whitman. With some notes on his life and work*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company; London, UK: George Allen.
- Carpenter, E. (1908). *The intermediate sex. A study of some transitional types of men and women*. London, UK: Swan Sonnenschein & Co./ Manchester, UK: S. Clarke.
- Cohen, H. (1978). *Religion der Vernunft aus den Quellen des Judentums* [1919]. Nach dem Manuskript des Verfassers neu durchgearbeitet und mit einem Nachwort versehen von Bruno Strauss. 2. Auflage. Wiesbaden, Germany: Fourier Verlag.
- Comenius, J. A. (1638). *De sermonis latini studio, per vestibulum, januam, palatium, & thesauros latinitatis quadripartito gradu plene absolvendo, Dissertatio Didactica* [...]. Autore J. A. Comenio. Impensis Haeredum Davidis Mullari Bibliopolae Vratislaviensis.
- Dannecker, M. (1978). *Der Homosexuelle und die Homosexualität*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Syndikat.
- Darwin, C. (1981). *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex* [1871]. With an Introduction by John Tyler Bonner and Robert M. May. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Darwin, C. (1985). *The origin of species by means of natural selection or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life* [1859]. Edited with an Introduction by J. W. Burrow. London, UK: Penguin Books.
- Darwin, C. (1987). *Charles Darwin's notebooks, 1836-1844. Geology, transmutation of species, metaphysical enquiries*. Transcribed and edited by P. H. Barrett, Peter J. Gautrey, Sandra Herbert, David Kohn and Sydney Smith. London, UK: British Museum (Natural History). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Darwin, C. (1993). To Charles Lyell. 10 January [1860]. In F. Burkhardt (Ed.), [C. Darwin], *The correspondence of Charles Darwin. 1860* (Vol. 8, pp. 28–29). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- de Vries, H. (1903). Bastaaardeering en bevruchting. *De Gids*, 67, Tweede deel, 403–450.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1999). *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie. L'Anti-Œdipe*. Nouvelle édition augmentée. Paris, France: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Dixon, M. (1995). *Love's instruments*. With an introduction by Elizabeth Alexander. Chicago, IL: Tia Chucha Press.
- Dose, R. (2005). *Magnus Hirschfeld. Deutscher – Jude – Weltbürger*. Teetz/Berlin, Germany: Verlag Hentrich & Hentrich/Stiftung Neue Synagoge Berlin, Centrum Judaicum.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *Histoire de la sexualité. 1: La volonté de savoir*. Paris, France: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (Ed.). (1978). *Herculine Barbin dite Alexine B. présenté par Michel Foucault*. Paris, France: Gallimard.

- Foucault, M. (1994). Le vrai sexe [1980]. In M. Foucault, *Dits et écrits. 1954-1988*. Volume IV: 1980-1988 (pp. 115-123). Édition établie sous la direction de Daniel Defert et François Ewald avec la collaboration de Jacques Lagrange. Paris, France: Éditions Gallimard.
- Freiligrath, F. (1844). Trotz alledem. Nach Robert Burns. In F. Freiligrath, *Ein Glaubensbekenntniß. Zeitgedichte* (pp. 95-99). Mainz, Germany: Verlag von Victor von Zabern.
- Freiligrath, F. (1849). Trotz alledem! (variirt). In F. Freiligrath, *Neuere politische und soziale Gedichte* (pp. 65-68). Erstes Heft. Köln, Germany: Selbstverlag des Verfassers; St. Louis, Flor. Schuster.
- Gardy, D. (2018, June 16). A family in transition. Two fathers and the baby girl they never expected. Photographs by Jack Molloy. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/16/health/transgender-baby.html?em_pos=medium&emc=edit_sc_20180619&nl=science-times&nl_art=3&nid=21692503emc%3Dedit_sc_20180619&ref=headline&te=1
- Haeberle, E. J. (1984). Einleitung. In M. Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (pp. v-xxxi). Nachdruck der Erstauflage von 1914 mit einer kommentierenden Einleitung von E. J. Haeberle. Berlin, Germany/New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Herrn, R. (2009). Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935). In V. Sigusch & G. Grau (Eds.), *Personenlexikon der Sexualforschung* (pp. 284-294). Frankfurt am Main, Germany & New York, NY: Campus Verlag.
- Herzer, M. (1992). *Magnus Hirschfeld. Leben und Werk eines jüdischen, schwulen und sozialistischen Sexologen*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany & New York, NY: Campus Verlag.
- Herzer, M. (1998, December). Hirschfelds Utopie, Hirschfelds Religion und das dritte Geschlecht der Romantik. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 28, 45-56.
- Herzer, M. (1999, December/2000, March). Hirschfeld und das Unaussprechliche. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 31/32, 47-50.
- Herzer, M. (2001). *Magnus Hirschfeld. Leben und Werk eines jüdischen, schwulen und sozialistischen Sexologen*. 2. Auflage. Hamburg, Germany: MännerschwarmSkript Verlag.
- Herzer, M. (2003). Die Auflösung. Das Schweigen. Hirschfeld als Prophet. Nachklänge zu J. Edgar Bauers Hirschfeld-Deutung. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 33/34, 72-77.
- Herzer, M. (2017). *Magnus Hirschfeld und seine Zeit*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Oldenbourg.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1902). *Sappho und Sokrates, oder Wie erklärt sich die Liebe der Männer und Frauen zu Personen des eigenen Geschlechts?* Leipzig, Germany: Max Spohr.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1906). Vom Wesen der Liebe. Zugleich ein Beitrag zu Lösung der Frage der Bisexualität. *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, 8, 1-284.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1908, Januar). Über Sexualwissenschaft. Programmartikel. *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft*, 1, 1-19.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1913). *Geschlechts-Übergänge. Mischungen männlicher und weiblicher Geschlechtscharaktere (Sexuelle Zwischenstufen)*. 2. Auflage. Leipzig, Germany: Verlag von Max Spohr.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1923). Vorbemerkung des Herausgebers. *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, 23, 70-72.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1926). *Geschlechtskunde auf Grund dreißigjähriger Forschung und Erfahrung bearbeitet. Band I: Die körperseelischen Grundlagen*. Stuttgart, Germany: Julius Püttmann, Verlagsbuchhandlung.

- Hirschfeld, M. (1928). *Geschlechtskunde auf Grund dreißigjähriger Forschung und Erfahrung bearbeitet. Band II: Folgen und Folgerungen*. Stuttgart, Germany: Julius Püttmann, Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1929). Was wir wollen. *Die Aufklärung. Monatsschrift für Sexual- und Lebensreform*, 1, 1–3.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1930a). *Geschlechtskunde auf Grund dreißigjähriger Forschung und Erfahrung bearbeitet. Band III: Einblicke und Ausblicke*. Stuttgart, Germany: Julius Püttmann, Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1930b). *Geschlechtskunde auf Grund dreißigjähriger Forschung und Erfahrung bearbeitet. Band IV: Bilderteil*. Stuttgart, Germany: Julius Püttmann, Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1933). *Die Weltreise eines Sexualforschers*. Brugg, Switzerland: Bözberg-Verlag.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1934). Stand der Bewegung im geistigen Befreiungskampf der Homosexuellen. *Nový Hlas, Erste deutsche Beilage*, 2(4), 1–3.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1935a). Phantom Rasse. Ein Hirngespinst als Weltgefahr. *Die Wahrheit*, 14(2) (Fortsetzung 8), 7–8.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1935b). Phantom Rasse. Ein Hirngespinst als Weltgefahr. *Die Wahrheit*, 14(6) (Fortsetzung 12), 7–8.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1935c). Phantom Rasse. Ein Hirngespinst als Weltgefahr. *Die Wahrheit*, 14(8) (Fortsetzung 14), 7–8.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1935d). Phantom Rasse. Ein Hirngespinst als Weltgefahr. *Die Wahrheit*, 14(9) (Fortsetzung 14 [correction: 15]), 7–8.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1938). *Racism*. Translated and Edited by Eden and Cedar Paul. London, UK: Victor Gollancz Ltd.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1984). *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*. Nachdruck der Erstauflage von 1914 mit einer kommentierenden Einleitung von E. J. Haeberle. Berlin, Germany/New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hirschfeld, M. (1986). *Von einst bis jetzt. Geschichte einer homosexuellen Bewegung. 1897–1922*. Herausgegeben und mit einem Nachwort versehen von Manfred Herzer und James Steakley. Berlin, Germany: Verlag rosa Winkel.
- Hirschfeld, M. (2015, September). Stand der Bewegung im geistigen Befreiungskampf der Homosexuellen. *Capri*, 49, 37–40.
- Hocquenghem, G. (1979). *Race d'Ep. Un siècle d'images de l'homosexualité*. Avec la collaboration iconographique de Lionel Soukaz. Paris, France: Éditions Libres-Hallier.
- Hosken, D. H. & Kunz, D. T. (2009, July). But is it male lactation or not? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24(7), 355. Retrieved from [https://www.cell.com/trends/ecology-evolution/pdf/S0169-5347\(09\)00129-3.pdf](https://www.cell.com/trends/ecology-evolution/pdf/S0169-5347(09)00129-3.pdf)
- Karsch (-Haack), F. (1900). Päderastie und Tribadie bei den Tieren auf Grund der Literatur. *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, 2, 126–160.
- Kotowski, E.-V. & Schoeps, J. H. (Ed.). (2004). *Der Sexualreformer Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935). Ein Leben im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft, Politik und Gesellschaft*. Berlin, Germany: Be.Bra Verlag.
- Kunz, T. H. & Hosken, D. J. (2009). Male lactation: Why, why not and is it care? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24(2), 80–85. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2008.09.009
- Lamarck, J. B. (1809). *Philosophie zoologique. Tome premier*. Paris, France: Dentu, Libraire.
- Leibniz, G. W. (1978). *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement par l'auteur du système de l'harmonie preestablie*. In G. W. Leibniz (Ed.), *Die philosophischen Schriften*. Herausgegeben von C. J. Gerhardt. Bd. 5. Reprint der Ausgabe Berlin 1892. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag.

- Lindemann, G. (1993). Magnus Hirschfeld. In R. Lautmann (Ed.), *Homosexualität. Handbuch der Theorie- und Forschungsgeschichte* (pp. 91–104). Frankfurt am Main, Germany / New York, NY: Campus Verlag.
- Linné, C. V. (1792). *Caroli Linnaei, Botanicorum Principis, Philosophia botanica. Annotationibus, explanationibus, supplementis aucta cura et opera Casimiri Gomez Ortega*. Matriti: ex typogr. Viduae, et Filii Petri Marin.
- Litwischuh, J. & Schwartz, M. (2017). Geleitwort. In M. Herzer, *Magnus Hirschfeld und seine Zeit* (pp. 1–4). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Oldenburg.
- Lorde, A. (1997). Call. In *The collected poems of Audre Lorde* (pp. 417–419). New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- McLeod, D. W. & Soetaert, H. P. (2010). “Il regarde la mer et pense à son idéal.” Die letzten Tage von Magnus Hirschfeld in Nizza, 1934–1935. *Mitteilungen der Magnus-Hirschfeld-Gesellschaft*, 45, 14–33.
- Mildenberger, F. H. (2018). Book review: Manfred Herzer. Magnus Hirschfeld und seine Zeit. *Zeitschrift für Sexualforschung*, 31, 193–197.
- Olympic Charter. In force as from 9 October 2018*. (2018). Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- Orzessek, A. (2003, 17./18. Mai). Der Gott der Juden küßt nicht. Eine Tagung in Potsdam über den Sexualreformer Magnus Hirschfeld. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, Nr. 113, p. 14.
- Püttmann, H., (Ed.). (1845). *Rheinische Jahrbücher zur gesellschaftlichen Reform*. Erster Band. Darmstadt, Germany: Druck und Verlag von C. W. Leske.
- Ramien, Th. [= Magnus Hirschfeld]. (1896). *Sappho und Sokrates oder Wie erklärt sich die Liebe der Männer und Frauen zu Personen des eigenen Geschlechts?* Leipzig, Germany: Verlag von Max Spohr.
- Ramien, Th. [= Magnus Hirschfeld]. (1902). *Sappho en Socrates. De liefde voor het eigene geslacht*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Bauer.
- Roob, A. (1996). *Alchemie und Mystik. Das Hermetische Museum*. Köln, Germany: Taschen.
- Roughgarden, J. (2009). *Evolutions's rainbow. Diversity, gender, and sexuality in nature and people*. With a New Preface. Berkeley, CA; Los Angeles, CA; London, UK: University of California Press.
- Schiller, F. (1975). Prolog [Zur Wiedereröffnung des Theaters in Weimar am 8. Nov. 1787]. In F. Schiller, *Sämtliche Werke. Band III: Gedichte, Erzählungen, Übersetzungen* (pp. 124–125). Stuttgart, Germany: Deutscher Bücherbund.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1977). *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. Zweiter Band, Zweiter Teilband. In A. Schopenhauer, *Zürcher Ausgabe. Werke in zehn Bänden*. Band IV. Zürich, Switzerland: Diogenes Verlag.
- Sigusch, V. (1985). “Man muß Hitlers Experimente abwarten.” Volkmar Sigusch über den Sexualforscher Magnus Hirschfeld. *Der Spiegel*, 20 (13.5.1985), 244–245.
- Sigusch, V. (1990). Magnus Hirschfeld und die Hirschfeld-Renaissance. In V. Sigusch, *Anti-Moralia. Sexualpolitische Kommentare* (pp. 31–36). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Campus Verlag.
- Sigusch, V. (2008). *Geschichte der Sexualwissenschaft*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany & New York, NY: Campus Verlag.
- Swaminathan, N. (September 6, 2007). Strange but True: Males Can Lactate. Unless you are an Indonesian fruit bat, though, it probably won't happen naturally. *Scientific American*. Retrieved from <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/strange-but-true-males-can-lactate/>
- Tissot, J. (1859). *Discours véritable de la vie, mort, et des os du géant Theutobocus*. [Lyon, France: Par Jean Poyet, 1613]. In E. Fournier (Ed.), *Variétés historiques et littéraires*.

- Recueil de pièces rares et curieuses en prose et en vers*. Tome IX. (pp. 241–257). Paris, France: Pagnerre.
- Ulrichs, K. H. (1994a). *Vier Briefe* [1899]. In K. H. Ulrichs, *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mannmännlichen Liebe*. (Band 7 der Neuausgabe der Bibliothek rosa Winkel) (pp. 36–70). Herausgegeben von Hubert Kennedy. Berlin, Germany: Verlag rosa Winkel.
- Ulrichs, K. H. (1994b). *Vindex* [1864]. In K. H. Ulrichs, *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mannmännlichen Liebe*. (Band 7 der Neuausgabe der Bibliothek rosa Winkel) (pp. i–xii; 1–28). Herausgegeben von Hubert Kennedy. Berlin, Germany: Verlag rosa Winkel.
- von Römer, L. S. A. M. (1903). Über die androgynische Idee des Lebens. *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Homosexualität*, 5(2), 708–939.
- von Römer, L. S. A. M. (1905). *Het uranisch gezin. Wetenschappelijk onderzoek en conclusiën over homosexualiteit. Apologie voor het wetenschappelijk-humanitaire Comité in Charlottenburg en den schrijver naar aanleiding van: Tegen het onnadenkend steunen van een ergerlijke en gevaarlijke propaganda*. Een waarschuwend woord van Jhr. Mr. W. F. Rochussen. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Uitgave G. P. Tierie.
- Winston, R. (1999). *The IVF revolution. The definitive guide to assisted reproductive techniques*. London, UK: Random House.
- Wittig, M. (1979). Paradigm. In G. Stambolian & E. Marks (Eds.), *Homosexualities and French literature. Cultural contexts/critical texts* (pp. 114–121). Preface by Richard Howard. Ithaca, NY & London, UK: Cornell University Press.
- Wolff, C. (1986). *Magnus Hirschfeld. A portrait of a pioneer in sexology*. London, UK & New York, NY: Quartet Books.