
Introduction

Translation and the Global Histories of Sexuality

HEIKE BAUER

Is the emergence of modern sexuality a global phenomenon? *Sexology and Translation* examines the shape and shaping of sexual ideas and related scientific practices and cultural representations in parts of Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and South America between the late nineteenth century and the period leading up to World War II. It brings together historians, literary and cultural critics, and translation scholars who explore how the textual and real encounters between an international band of writers, reformers, and medical doctors shaped ideas about “sex” across the modern world. The studies gathered here present original research and fresh conceptual insights on the intersections between sexuality and modernity in a range of disciplinary, cultural, and (trans)national contexts. They focus on the translations and mistranslations that occurred when bodies and desires were conceptualized in terms of “sex” and uncover hitherto unexplored avenues of exchange between different contexts and the key figures that shaped sexual debates during the inaugural period of the sexual science, 1880–1930s. While some of the chapters reconsider the more familiar European archives of sexology to reveal their affective development and debts to a wide range of cultural and scientific debates, others explore the development of modern sex research and related cultural and political debates in Russia, China, Japan, Egypt, Palestine, and Peru. Individually, these studies present new knowledge about the development of different national and transnational sexologies and their relationship to each other. Together they provide an important

corrective to the pervasive idea that sexuality is a “Western” construct that was transmitted around the world.

The collection shows that attention to translation—understood in the broadest sense as the dynamic process by which ideas are produced and transmitted—offers compelling new insights into how sexual ideas were formed in different contexts via a complex process of cultural negotiation. The Introduction draws out key findings that emerged out of the dialogue between scholars whose chapters examine the development of sexual sciences and discourses across the modern world. It contextualizes the research presented in the collection in relation to recent debates about the shape and methods of the history of sexuality and in so doing also addresses head-on some of the challenges that occur when distinct linguistic, disciplinary, and cultural contexts are brought into critical dialogue. *Sexology and Translation* extends understanding of how the intersections between national and transnational contexts, as well as the relationship between science and culture and discourse and experience, shaped modern sexuality. It substantively and theoretically reshapes existing scholarship on the histories of sexuality and modernity by demonstrating that the concept of “sexuality” was forged across the modern world at the intersections between science and culture via an intricate, and sometimes surprising, web of influences, disavowals, and allegiances that turned erotic desires, sexual acts, intimate relationships, and queer bodies into the contested markers of modernity.

Sexology (Re)Defined

One of the defining questions in critical studies of the formation of modern sexuality is what name to give the discursive, cultural, political, and medico-forensic fields in which sexuality gained shape. This collection uses the term “sexology” to describe the formation of a sustained, if not always systematic, scientific field of inquiry that emerged in the late nineteenth century and was dedicated to studying, theorizing, and sometimes “treating” sexual desires and bodies. But the term is also used here and elsewhere, often interchangeably, alongside other expressions such as “sexual science” and its Latin equivalent, *scientia sexualis*, as well as “sex research” and “sexual theory.”¹ The multiplication of descriptors, which can also be found within the chapters in this collection, reflects the fact that the emergence of the modern subject of sex is defined by fluid boundaries that frequently blur the distinctions between science and culture. Recent research has emphasized this point. In contrast to early studies of sexology that focused specifically on its medico-scientific and political contexts, a growing body of scholarship is exploring the literary and subcultural dimensions of modern sexuality formation to show that “sexology” is as much a product of culture as it is a strictly medico-forensic praxis.²

While the history of sexology can no longer be called an emerging field—scholars have, after all, been excavating since at least the 1980s how sexuality was constructed, regulated, and lived in the past—it is fair to say that our understanding of it has been shaped by American and a selection of European perspectives.³ By “us” I here mean primarily critics publishing in English and located in Anglo-American universities, although scholars based in others regions, especially perhaps in central Europe and Australia, have also made significant contributions to the field that has become known as the history of sexuality. Broadly speaking, it is fair to say that initially at least the history and historiography of sexology focused almost exclusively on (central) European and North American contexts.⁴ The scholarly “rediscovery of sexology” in these regions, as Rita Felski has noted, “is largely due to the emergence of the gay rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s and a growing interest in constructing a history and tradition of same-sex desire.”⁵ It owes significant intellectual debts to the work of the French philosopher Michel Foucault. Foucault, whose three-part series of studies on *The History of Sexuality*, including *La volonté de savoir* (*The Will to Knowledge*, 1976), *L’usage des plaisirs* (*The Use of Pleasure*, 1984), and *Le souci de soi* (*The Care of the Self*, 1984), made sexuality central to the way in which the constructions of self and its location in modernity are understood.⁶ Concerned with the relationship between power, discourse, and the subject, Foucault argued that the formation of a *scientia sexualis* in the late nineteenth century and the related emergence of a new vocabulary of sex (words such as “homosexuality” and “fetishism” were coined at the time) marks a distinct moment in the shaping of Western modernity, signaling a shift from religion to science and producing a modern sexual subject that is classified according to its desires and bodily acts. Rejecting grand narratives about linear progress, Foucault developed instead methods of historical research that are concerned with the excavation of “hidden” meanings and power structures (a method he called “archeology”) and the deconstruction of how ideas and norms have come to be established over time (what he called “genealogy”).

These methods have become hugely influential, including in studies that address the critical absences in Foucault’s work such as his silence on issues of gender and race or his disregard of feelings, experience, and lived reality in historical analysis.⁷ Only relatively recently, however, have critics also confronted what is arguably one of the most problematic yet pervasive features of Foucault’s work: the distinction between a predominantly “Eastern” (or obsolete Roman) *ars erotica* and the *scientia sexualis* that according to Foucault characterizes “Western” modernity.⁸ Critics such as Naoki Sakai have pointed out that in Foucault’s work, “the notion of Western culture or its unity is never under suspicion,” noting that his construction of an Eastern versus Western sexual binary encourages reductive, and often ste-

reotypical, perspectives in cultural and historical research.⁹ Yet what is still missing from the growing body of scholarship on the histories of sexuality in different parts of the world is a deeper understanding of the comparative, transnational, or global dimensions of modern sexology. *Sexology and Translation* addresses this gap. The studies gathered here track the emergence of sexual discourses and disciplines in different parts of the world, 1880–1930, expanding the definitions of sexology to include a wide range of cultural, scientific, and political phenomena to show that sexuality became a defining feature of global modernity.

Sexology across the Modern World: A Global History?

The geopolitical frameworks of modern sexuality are contested. Initially at least, histories of sexuality and modernity have tended to be framed specifically in relation to colonialism, reflecting the fact that both the discipline of sexology and the modern concept of sexuality emerged at that moment in the late nineteenth century when European colonialism violently expanded in Africa, Asia, and South America. This scholarship has shown that in Europe, as Ann Laura Stoler has noted, “the discursive and practical field in which nineteenth-century bourgeois sexuality emerged was situated on an imperial landscape where the cultural accoutrements of bourgeois distinction were partially shaped through contrasts forged in the politics and language of race.”¹⁰ The work of Stoler and other postcolonial historians has importantly turned attention to the implication of sexual discourses in colonialism to reveal both the racialized constructions of sexuality in Europe and the fact that, as Edward Said has influentially noted, a reductive sexualized deployment of the “Orient” underpins the very construction of “Western” civilization itself.¹¹ More recently, postcolonial scholars have scrutinized the problematic legacies of colonial conceptions of sexuality and their reemergence in contemporary political discourse. Jasbir Puar, for instance, has argued that in the twenty-first century sexual rights discourse has become part of the rhetorical arsenal by which certain states declare their own modernity and justify attacks on, and the oppression of, other peoples and territories.¹² At the same time, historians of sexuality have also begun to scrutinize the geopolitical frame of debate by turning attention to the histories of modern sexuality in different parts of the world including India, the country sometimes considered “the birthplace of sexology.”¹³ A new project led by Veronika Fuechtner and Douglas Haynes, for example, specifically explores the limits and possibilities of studying a “global history of sexuality 1880–1950,” while the proliferating scholarship on the histories of sexuality in Asia, Africa, and South America continues to decenter the

focus on Europe and North America, which dominated the history and historiography of sexuality in the twentieth century.¹⁴

How to discuss sexology in and across different cultural and geopolitical contexts without either essentializing or overemphasizing differences, and without perpetuating racist stereotypes and reductive ideas about the outward flow of ideas from a colonial center to its peripheries, remains one of the most important questions in debates about sexuality. This line of questioning is often pursued under the mantle of transnational studies, a concept that frames the intersections between gender, sexuality, race, and class in a broader global context by emphasizing that the exigencies of capitalism, rather than national boundaries, shape the conditions of human existence. Elizabeth Povinelli and George Chauncey Jr., writing in the late 1990s about what has become known as the “transnational turn” in sexuality studies, have defined the concept in terms of critical attention to “the dense, variegated traffic in cultural representations, people, and capital [that] increasingly characterizes the social life of people around the world.”¹⁵ Where much of the early focus on the transnational was on North American contexts—a focus that led Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan to observe that while “the term *transnational* can address the asymmetries of the globalization process . . . it has already become so ubiquitous in cultural, literary and critical studies that much of its political valence seems to have become evacuated”—a recent explosion of scholarship on sexual subcultures and the histories of sexuality in Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Caribbean has complicated understanding of the transnational frameworks and the intersections between sexuality and modernity in different parts of the world.¹⁶ Recent studies of sexology in Europe and North America have explored the complex circuits of exchange by which sexual ideas and politics were formed in these contexts.¹⁷ New scholarship on the less frequently discussed regions of Europe as well as parts of Africa, Asia, and South America in turn has excavated diverse histories of sexuality in these regions of the world.¹⁸ Together, these histories offer rich insights into culturally specific histories of sexuality and the synchronic emergence of modern sexuality within different national contexts.

Sexology and Translation builds on and expands this research by exploring how encounters between science and culture, and discourse and experience, shaped the emergence of modern sexual discourses and identities in Austria, China, Egypt, England, France, Germany, Japan, Palestine, Peru, and Russia. The collection deliberately uses the formulation *across the modern world*—in place of, say, transnational or global history—to define its scope. This is not to deny the usefulness of either of these perspectives but to emphasize that *how* we approach sexuality shapes our understanding

of the intersections between local and global contingencies. The studies of the emergence of modern sexual discourses in a range of cultural contexts gathered here scrutinize the shapes and shaping of modern sexology from a range of angles. Some chapters explore how a cross-national flow of ideas and people shaped the traditional European centers of sexological research, while a chapter on Russia tracks the contested boundaries of Europe and their impact on sexological exchange. A cluster of studies on the histories of sexology in the Middle East, China, Japan, and Peru in turn examines the formation of modern sexual debates on the intersections between indigenous and transnational knowledges, thus making clear that the *scientia sexualis* was not only, as Foucault would have it, a Western phenomenon. By bringing together studies that track the connections and similarities between sexuality discourses in different cultural and national contexts, the collection pays attention to how ideas moved in and across different parts of the globe and intersected with culturally specific concerns along the way. It thus addresses debates about the national, transnational, and global histories of sexology even as it conceptualizes the emergence of a *scientia sexualis* in terms of dynamic movements that demonstrate that there are structural similarities in the way “sex” came to be spoken about across different parts of the world between the 1880s and the 1930s, a transformative period in history.

Describing this research as history that looks *across the modern world* aligns the collection with the concerns of queer studies. For the word “across”—which can be defined in terms such as “not straight,” “askance,” “at odds”—resonates with the “traversing” and “twisting” that, in Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s famous observations, describes the meaning of “queer.”¹⁹ Yet the collection deliberately uses the expression “across” in place of the critically charged “queer” to indicate that while some of the chapters directly engage with concepts or methods associated with queer theory (both Chiang and Cryle, for instance, trace genealogies, while Bauer considers the affective shaping of sexology), all the studies included here move in critical directions that run against established narratives about the formations of a sexual science and its scope.²⁰ They look in different directions, glancing sideways, backward, and ahead as they explore the emergence of modern sexology and sexuality discourses.

Translation: A Critical Framework for the History of Sexuality

Translation provides a useful framework for discussing the emergence of sexual science and discourses in different parts of the world, including in terms of distinct cultural histories and their points of contact. Extending

Walter Benjamin's influential conceptualization of translation as the subject of cultural contingency, scholars have used the concept specifically to address issues of power, subjectivity, and cultural politics.²¹ Susan Bassnett, in the most recent edition of her influential *Translation Studies*, sums up key points of debate when she writes that "the movement of peoples around the globe can be seen to mirror the very process of translation itself, for translation is not just the transfer of texts from one language into another, it is now rightly seen as a process of negotiation between texts and between cultures, a process during which all kinds of transactions take place mediated by the translator."²² Bassnett's emphasis on negotiation, transaction, and the role of the translator draws together the insights gained by postcolonial critiques that have turned to translation to conceptualize the unequal distribution of power and its relationship to subjectivity and identity formation, and the findings of literary and cultural scholars who have argued that translation and translators play a central but often overlooked role in cultural production.²³ That translation also lends itself specifically to research on the history of sexuality is suggested by Naoki Sakai and Jon Solomon's argument that the violent institution of modernity can be understood in terms of a "biopolitics of translation."²⁴ They make the case for a "politically-informed discussion about the production of both social relations and humanistic knowledge [especially] in the context of anthropological difference inherited from colonialism," a discussion that challenges Foucault's Occidentalism and replaces it with a more nuanced understanding of the racialized processes by which bodies entered modernity.²⁵

The collection expands the debates about translation to ask new questions about how bodies and desires came to be apprehended and politicized around the turn of the last century. How were sexual ideas formed? In what ways did national and transnational concerns shape the emergence of sexology in different parts of the modern world? How were the new sexual discourses received? Addressing these questions from a translation perspective reflects the historical context in which sexuality emerged. At the moment in time when debates about sexuality took hold in scientific, legal, political and cultural spheres, many of the experts and lay women and men involved in these debates could read more than one language, which enabled the rapid transmission and development of sexual writings. Works such as Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, for instance, which was a key text in the emergence of European medico-forensic sexology, quickly gained influence in different cultural contexts despite the fact that it took half a dozen years before the German text was translated, first into English and soon into other languages including Japanese, Dutch, French, Russian, Hungarian, and Italian.²⁶ Krafft-Ebing published the first German edition in 1886, revising and enlarging it in a total of twelve editions published during his lifetime.

It was the tenth German edition that was first translated into English and published in the United States; a British edition soon followed that differed from the American translation in a number of ways, suggesting that it was Anglicized for the British market.²⁷ A number of contributors to this collection engage with different editions and translations of *Psychopathia Sexualis* and other sexological works. Sometimes they explicitly show that an understanding of publication history can offer substantive insights into the history of sexuality, while at other times the choice of edition reflects the current availabilities of texts. The individual chapters furthermore make clear that issues of language, as well as publication history, significantly shaped the field as both multilingualism and translation between languages was crucial in the development of modern sex research. The linguistic boundaries of sexology reflect the ties of modern sexuality to the unequal cultural politics of colonialism, as in some countries such as Peru the language of the colonizer became the language of modern sexuality. But they also indicate that sexuality was implicated in complex ways in the political and economic transformations of modernity, which enabled cross-cultural collaborations and the exchange of knowledges and ideas even as they also reinforced the inequalities put in place by colonialism.

While translation thus serves as a framework for analyzing how sexuality traveled across linguistic boundaries, and the politics of this process, it can also help to conceptualize the construction of sexual desires and bodies. Many of the studies included here explore specifically how observations of the body and its desires were translated into new knowledge formations and disciplinary practices. This research addresses one of the fundamental questions in the modern history of sexuality: why sexuality? Or, to phrase this differently, they consider afresh why erotic desires and sexual acts have gained such a prominent role in modern debates about politics, science, and individual and collective subject formations. Here attention to translation extends the focus of analysis beyond same-sex issues and the medico-forensic literatures that have become so central to the history and historiography of sexuality. Instead the chapters gathered in the collection explore a range of contexts in which sex was discussed. They reveal, for instance, that existing conceptions of intimacy such as “love” were transformed at the same time as sexual “perversions” entered the modern imagination. By focusing on the productive exchange between science, literature, and other cultural formations, this research furthermore makes clear that the sexual body was a highly problematic construct from the outset, concerned with a perceived sexual lack as well as excess, and with heterosexual as well as same-sex acts and desires. The collection thus broadens understanding of sexology to reveal that the conception of sexuality was tied in complex ways to norms about the modern human.

The diverse critical approaches to sexology and translation gathered here share a concern with movement. Looking across the modern world, they describe the processes of travel, transfer, transmission, and transformation that shape the formation of ideas, knowledges, and disciplinary formations and their dissemination and reception. This research challenges critics who have argued that bringing together such a proliferation of concepts and metaphors under the umbrella term “translation” reductively smooths over vital distinctions that exist between them. Instead it shows that translation provides a framework for critical debates that would otherwise run alongside each other. Doris Bachmann-Medick in her assessment of the “translational turn”—or the use of translation as an analytical concept across the humanities—has argued that the critical potential of translation lies in its ability to move “right across the disciplines as a new means of knowledge and a methodologically reflected analytical category.”²⁸ The collection follows in her vein, making translation its focal point to bring together research that is methodologically and substantively wide-ranging. The project is prompted by the realization that while interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and cross-disciplinary approaches are feted in contemporary research in the humanities and social science, the dialogue between disciplines and fields of research is often fraught with the challenges of negotiating disciplinary conventions and following one-way trajectories that apply insights gained within one academic field to the study of another.

Sexology and Translation thus models a fostering of critical dialogue across literary and cultural studies, history, languages, and translation studies. Approaching the history of sexology from a translation perspective allows the contributors to maintain their disciplinary frameworks but also to develop comparative, transnational, and global perspectives. What emerges is less a single picture than a rough-edged mosaic of sexual modernity across the globe.

Navigating Sexology

The collection brings together studies of modern sexuality in Arabic-, Chinese-, English-, French-, German-, Hebrew-, Japanese-, Russian-, and Spanish-speaking contexts. They explore a wide range of sexual discourses, disciplines, and lives, employing approaches as diverse as Peter Cryle’s close intellectual history of the concept of frigidity and Liat Kozma’s social history of sex research in Egypt and Palestine. Some studies engage in the close reading of literary texts (such as Birgit Lang’s study of Sacher-Masoch’s novels; Jennifer Fraser’s reading of Peruvian feminist fiction; and James Wilper’s analysis of *The Intersexes*), while others explore sexual subcultures (Katie Sutton’s work on the “third sex”; Heike Bauer’s analysis of suicide and

homosexual community) or the shaping of sexual science and discourses in Britain (as examined by Kate Fisher and Jana Funke), China (the chapters by Howard Chiang and Leon Rocha), Japan (analyzed by Michiko Suzuki), and Russia (the focus of Brian Baer's chapter). There are many other ways of grouping together this work and pointing out similarities and distinctions in approach, subject matter, and the conclusions drawn in these analyses of modern sexuality. For instance, given the focus of the collection, it might be productive to read the individual chapters in sections that reflect the different intellectual and political traditions that have shaped the debates about translation as a critical tool—its debts to deconstruction, psychoanalysis, postcolonial theory, and linguistics—and that address key critical debates about translation: how to deconstruct the meanings and cultural contingencies of texts and ideas (the focus of the studies by Chiang, Cryle, Lang, and Wilper); how to conceptualize the relationship between language and subjectivity (explored by Bauer, Fraser, and Sutton); how to articulate the processes of, and issues at stake in, cross-cultural encounters (examined here by Fisher and Funke, Kozma, Rocha, and Suzuki); and, finally, what the field of “translation studies” itself, concerned with the relationship between source texts and their translations, adds to historical research (the focus of Baer's chapter). However, the collection is structured in three parts, which, while by no means seeking to close down other ways of navigating through the material, deliberately aim to draw out the contribution made by the collection to the history of sexuality.

The three closely connected parts that make up *Sexology and Translation* speak to key debates in the field. Their scope and rationale is explained in detail in the section introductions. Briefly, Part I, “Conceptualizations,” uses translation to explore key concepts in modern sexual discourse—frigidity, Darwinism, subjectivity, inversion—and considers what they can tell us about the intersections between scientific and literary culture in the shaping of modern sexuality. Part II, “Formations,” which pays particular attention to the global networks that shaped modern sexology, discusses the translations of sexual ideas and practices into “national” sexologies in England, Russia, Egypt, Palestine, and China. And the final Part III, “Dis/Identifications,” examines how sexological ideas were received by individual women and men, who in turn translated them into new political, disciplinary, and subcultural contexts. While there is clearly overlap between these sections, this structure nevertheless seeks to draw out the affinities as well as the distinctions and, sometimes, the contradictory findings of the diverse research gathered here.

Where earlier histories of sexology have focused specifically on same-sex histories, this collection finds a broader range of concerns relating to sexology as it explores the relationship between science and culture and between

experts and “lay” people in the gendered development of modern sexual politics. Examining the range of experiences associated with sexuality and the political concerns that shape them, the chapters included here make clear that sexology was not just the business of men but that feminist activists and writers made a significant contribution to the emergence and popularization of sexual discourse—nowhere more so than in Peru, where, as Jennifer Fraser’s chapter shows, feminist fiction rather than science was the primary space for the development of sexual ideas. Together, these studies reveal that sexual debates were closely tied in to issues of national politics and modern state formation, but that a material and conceptual traffic in ideas and people equally influenced the development of both national sexologies and transnational sexuality. Such an examination of the global translations of sexuality is thus much more than a project of tracing how certain ideas spread from a center to the margins. It is a way of asking new questions about the role of sexuality in shaping how the human came to be apprehended and politicized around the turn of the century. *Sexology and Translation* demonstrates that sexology was forged out of complex intersections between scientific and cultural debates across the modern world.

NOTES

1. Good overviews include Lucy Bland, *Banishing the Beast: Sexuality and the Early Feminists* (London: Penguin, 1995), 250–296; Joseph Bristow, *Sexuality*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2011); Sally Ledger and Roger Luckhurst, eds., *The Fin de Siècle: A Reader in Cultural History c. 1880–1900* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 291–312; Chris Waters, “Sexology,” in *Palgrave Advances in the Modern History of Sexuality*, ed. Harry G. Cocks and Matt Houlbrook (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2005), 41–63; Chris White, ed., *Nineteenth-Century Writings on Homosexuality: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1999).

2. I have explored the cultural dimensions of sexology in *English Literary Sexology: Translations of Inversion, 1860–1930* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009). See also Claudia Breger, “Feminine Masculinities: Scientific and Literary Representations of ‘Female Inversion’ at the Turn of the Twentieth Century,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 14, no. 1–2 (2005): 76–106; the six-volume *Cultural History of Sexuality* produced under the general editorship of Julie Peakman (London: Berg, 2010); Anna Katharina Schaffner, *Modernism and Perversion: Sexual Deviance in Sexology and Literature, 1850–1930* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Hugh Stevens and Caroline Howlett, eds., *Modernist Sexualities* (Manchester, UK: University of Manchester Press, 2000); Sarah Toulalan and Kate Fisher, eds., *The Routledge History of Sex and the Body, 1500 to the Present* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2013).

3. Influential national and regional histories of sexuality include Matt Cook, *London and the Culture of Homosexuality, 1885–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); John D’Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988); Laura Doan, *Fashioning*

Sapphism: The Origins of a Modern English Lesbian Culture (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001); Lisa Duggan, *Sapphic Slashers: Sex, Violence, and American Modernity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Dagmar Herzog, ed., *Sexuality and German Fascism* (Oxford: Berghahn, 2005); Janice M. Irvine, *Disorders of Desire: Sexuality and Gender in Modern American Sexology* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005); Frank Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-Moral Politics in England since 1830* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987); Harry Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Vernon A. Rosario, *The Erotic Imagination: French Histories of Perversity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); James D. Steakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany* (Salem, NH: Ayer, 1975); Jennifer Terry, *An America Obsession: Science, Medicine, and Homosexuality in Modern Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999); Martha Vicinus, *Intimate Friends: Women Who Loved Women, 1778–1928* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

4. Next to the histories of sexuality mentioned previously, the following studies have helped define the field: Lucy Bland and Laura Doan, eds., *Sexology in Culture: Labelling Bodies and Desires* (Cambridge: Polity, 1998); Lawrence Birken, *Consuming Desire: Sexual Science and the Emergence of a Culture of Abundance, 1871–1914* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988); George Chauncey Jr., “From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: Medicine and the Changing Conceptualisation of Female Deviance,” *Salmagundi* 58–59 (1982–1983): 114–146; Carolyn J. Dean, *Sexuality and Modern Western Culture* (New York: Twayne, 1996); Martin B. Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey Jr., eds., *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (New York: New American Library, 1989); Lisa Duggan, “From Instincts to Politics: Writing the History of Sexuality in the U.S.,” *Journal of Sex Research* 27, no. 1 (1990): 95–109; Lesley Hall and Roy Porter, *The Facts of Life: The Creation of Sexual Knowledge in Britain, 1650–1950* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995); David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York: Routledge, 1990); Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); Vernon A. Rosario, ed., *Science and Homosexualities* (New York: Routledge, 1997); Jeffrey Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800* (London: Longman, 1981).

5. Rita Felski, “Introduction,” in Bland and Doan, *Sexology in Culture*, 4.

6. For a critical overview of Foucault’s work, see Lisa Downing, *The Cambridge Introduction to Michel Foucault* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). This is the first work of this kind to pay attention to how issues of translation have shaped the Anglophone reception of Foucault.

7. Important interventions include Carolyn J. Dean, “The Productive Hypothesis: Foucault, Gender and the History of Sexuality,” *History and Theory* 33, no. 3 (1994): 271–296; Joan Scott, “The Evidence of Experience,” *Critical Inquiry* 17, no. 4 (1991): 773–797; and, more recently, Roderick Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Towards a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).

8. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, *An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (London: Penguin, 1990), 58. See Chapter 8 in this volume for a discussion of Foucault’s changing views on this binary.

9. Naoki Sakai, “The Dislocation of the West,” in *Traces 1: Spectres of the West and the Politics of Translation* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2001), 92. See also

Naoki Sakai and Jon Solomon's critique of Foucault's Occidentalism in *Translation, Biopolitics and Colonial Difference* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2006).

10. Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).

11. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 1978). This field of research is vast. It ranges from early assessments of gender and colonialism such as Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), and inward-looking studies of how colonialism affected the colonizers, such as Ronald Hyman, *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1990), to more recent critiques of the production of racialized sexual norms and their legacies, such as Ferguson's *Aberrations in Black*; Valerie Rohy, *Anachronism and Its Others: Sexuality, Race, Temporality* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2009); Siobhan B. Somerville, *Queering the Color Line: Race and the Invention of Homosexuality in American Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Sylvia Tamale, ed., *African Sexualities: A Reader* (Cape Town: Pambazuka, 2011); Omise'eke Natasha Tinsley, *Thieving Sugar: Eroticism between Women in Caribbean Literature* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).

12. Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); and her "Rethinking Homonationalism," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 45 (2013): 336–339.

13. Veronika Fuechtner, "Indians, Jews and Sex: Magnus Hirschfeld and Indian Sexology", in *Imagining Germany, Imagining India: Essays in Asian-German Studies*, ed. Veronika Fuechtner and Mary Riehl (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2013), 120.

14. Veronika Fuechtner, Douglas E. Haynes, and Ryan Jones, eds., *Towards a Global History of Sexual Science, 1880–1950* (forthcoming). See also notes 17 and 18 for recent studies of sexuality that expand the geopolitical boundaries of debate.

15. Elizabeth A. Povinelli and George Chauncey Jr., "Thinking Sexuality Transnationally: An Introduction," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 5, no. 4 (1999): 442.

16. Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, "Global Identities: Theorizing Transnational Studies of Sexuality," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 7, no. 4 (2001): 663.

17. Bauer, *English Literary Sexology*; Peter Cryle and Christopher Forth, eds., *Sexuality at the Fin de Siècle: The Makings of a "Central Problem"* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008); Leila Rupp, *Sapphistries: A Global History of Love between Women* (New York: New York University Press, 2009); Schaffner, *Modernism and Perversion*.

18. While widely diverging in terms of approach and subject matter, the following studies decenter Anglo-American perspectives on sexuality and indicate the range of new scholarship in the field: Chiara Beccalossi, *Female Sexual Inversion: Same-Sex Desires in Italian and British Sexology, c. 1870–1920* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Pablo Ben, "Male Sexuality, the Popular Classes, and the State: Buenos Aires, 1880–1955" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2009); Howard Chiang and Ari Larissa Heinrich, *Queer Sinophone Cultures* (London: Routledge, 2013); Alison Donnell, "Caribbean Queer: New Meetings of Place and the Possible in Shani Mootoo's *Valmiki's Daughter*," *Contemporary Women's Writing* 6, no. 3 (2012): 213–232; Sabine Frühstück,

Colonizing Sex: Sexology and Social Control in Modern Japan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003); Liat Kozma, *Policing Egyptian Women: Sex, Law and Medicine in Egypt 1850–1882* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2011); Dan Healey, *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia: The Regulation of Sexual and Gender Dissent* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Jonathan D. Mackintosh, *Homosexuality and Manliness and Postwar Japan* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2010); Fran Martin and Ari Larissa Heinrich, eds., *Embodied Modernities: Corporealities, Representation, and Chinese Cultures* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2006); Fran Martin, Peter A. Jackson, Mark McLelland, and Audrey Yue, eds., *AsiaPacifiQueer: Rethinking Genders and Sexualities* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008); Joanna Mizielinska and Robert Kulpa, eds., *De-Centring Western Sexualities: Central and Eastern European Perspectives* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2011); Ishita Pande, *Medicine, Race and Liberalism in British Bengal: Symptoms of Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2012); Tse-Lan Sang, *The Emerging Lesbian: Female Same-Sex Desire in Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Michiko Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women: Love and Female Identity in Prewar Japanese Literature and Culture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010); Ruth Vanita, ed., *Queering India: Same-Sex Love and Eroticism in Indian Culture and Society* (New York: Routledge, 2002).

19. *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “across.” Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has famously pointed out that “queer” takes its name from a word whose “Indo-European root *twerkw* . . . also yields the German *quer* (traverse) [and] Latin *torquere* (to twist).” Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Tendencies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), xii.

20. Recent works on the conceptual boundaries of queer history include Laura Doan, *Disturbing Practices: History, Sexuality, and Women’s Experiences of Modern War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013); Noreen Giffney, Michelle Sauer, and Diane Watt, eds., *The Lesbian Premodern* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Janet Halley and Andrew Parker, eds., *After Sex? On Writing since Queer Theory* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

21. Walter Benjamin, “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers,” in Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Tillman Rexroth (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1972), 4 (1): 9–21.

22. Susan Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 4th ed. (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014), 6.

23. See Emily Apter, *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006); Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Gayatri Spivak, “The Politics of Translation,” in her *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 179–200; Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed. (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2008).

24. See Jon Solomon, “Translation, Violence, and the Heterolingual Intimacy,” *eipcp* 9 (2007): n. 16, available at http://eipcp.net/transversal/1107/solomon/en/#_ftnref16.

25. *Ibid.*

26. Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature*, 275n54.

27. I have explored the publication history in *English Literary Sexology*, 30–31.

28. Doris Bachmann-Medick, “Introduction: The Translational Turn,” *Translation Studies* 2, no. 1 (2009): 4.