



Citation: A. Federici (2025) Echoes of Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* in Scientific Periodicals: Sexual and Mental Pathology in Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Medical Discourse. Serie Speciale "Quaderni di Lea – Scrittori e scritture d'Oriente e d'Occidente" 7: pp. 81-98. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36253/lea-1824-484x-16030>.

Copyright: © 2025 A. Federici. This is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Firenze University Press (<https://oajournals.fupress.net/index.php/bsfm-lea>) and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

Echoes of Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* in Scientific Periodicals: Sexual and Mental Pathology in Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth Century Medical Discourse

Annalisa Federici

Università di Roma Tre (<annalisa.federici@uniroma3.it>)

Abstract

This essay proposes a corpus-based terminological analysis of the language of moral decadence, sexual deviance and mental degeneration introduced and/or popularised by Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*. It also investigates the resonance that this domain-specific terminology may have had in British medical journals between the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, when periodicals played a crucial role in propagating various forms of medical discourse. Corpus linguistics methodology is employed to scrutinise Krafft-Ebing's treatise, particularly to extract and contextually analyse specialised terms in the domain of sexual and mental pathology which might have contributed to the dissemination of psychiatric and sexological discourses of decadence and degeneration. Once a set of terms has been individuated, their frequency and collocational behaviour is examined in a corpus of scientific articles from a leading nineteenth-century specialist periodical, the *Journal of Mental Science*. Since terms represent concepts within a specific domain, this essay aims to bridge linguistic and historical investigation of medical discourse by demonstrating that a corpus-based terminological analysis can provide useful insights into the specialised knowledge, cultural values and ideological positionings of a particular community of experts, and the various domain-specific discourses it contributed to circulate.

Keywords: *Journal of Mental Science*, Medical Discourse, *Psychopathia Sexualis*, Psychosexual Pathology, Richard von Krafft-Ebing

Introduction

This essay proposes a corpus-based terminological analysis of the language of moral decadence, sexual deviance and mental degeneration introduced and/or popularised by such a seminal text in nineteenth-century medical-psychiatric literature as Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, first translated into

English in 1892.¹ It also investigates the resonance that this domain-specific terminology may have had in British medical journals between the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, when periodicals played a crucial role in consolidating “communities of scientific practitioners” (Dawson and Topham 2020, 2) characterised by an increasing intraprofessional specialism, as well as in propagating various forms of medical discourse. Corpus linguistics methodology, both quantitative and qualitative, is employed to scrutinise Krafft-Ebing’s treatise, particularly to extract and contextually analyse specialised terms in the domain of sexual and mental pathology which might have contributed to the dissemination – also facilitated by the ample diffusion of the periodical press – of psychiatric and sexological discourses of decadence and degeneration. Once a set of terms has been individuated (some of which were actually Krafft-Ebing’s coinages), their frequency and collocational behaviour is then examined in a corpus of scientific articles compiled by selecting texts from a leading nineteenth-century specialist periodical, the *Journal of Mental Science*, in which such terms have been found to occur by means of keyword searches within the journal’s archive.² Though limited to a single medical journal, the purpose of this second phase of the research is thus to verify whether terms indicative of particular discourses employed in *Psychopathia Sexualis* can be said to maintain the same collocational meanings and connotations when used outside their original context, i.e. in other kinds of scientific texts which at that time furthered the circulation of medical notions. Since terms represent concepts within a specific domain, this essay aims to show that a corpus-based terminological analysis can provide useful insights into the specialised knowledge, cultural values and ideological positionings of a particular community of experts, and the various domain-specific discourses it contributed to circulate. Between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, the continuous recreation of such influential discourses in a profusion of medical texts belonging to different genres (scientific treatises, articles, reports, etc.) determined the pathologisation of certain sexual behaviours and caused notions of sexual and mental malady to become cultural and ideological constructs.

1. Theoretical and Methodological Background

With the emergence of sexology (also known as sexual science or *scientia sexualis*) as a new scientific field of investigation in the second half of the nineteenth century, prominent psychiatrists and other specialists all over Europe became increasingly concerned with interpreting and classifying a wide array of sexual behaviours which were progressively perceived as aberrant and thus surrounded with an aura of pathology. Often basing their arguments on

¹ Krafft-Ebing’s treatise was originally published in German in 1886 and underwent a continuous transformation until the author’s death in 1902, being reissued in twelve expanded and updated versions. The first authorised English translation (by the American psychiatrist Charles G. Chaddock) of the seventh enlarged and revised German edition was published in 1892 by F.A. Davis, under the title *Psychopathia Sexualis, with Especial Reference to Contrary Sexual Instinct: A Medico-Legal Study*. In 1899, the only authorised English translation of the tenth German edition (as stated on the frontispiece) was published by Rebman as *Psychopathia Sexualis, with Especial Reference to Antipathic Sexual Instinct: A Medico-Forensic Study* (trans. Francis J. Rebman). On the way Krafft-Ebing’s ideas were often transformed in the English versions of his work, undergoing a process of Anglicisation and adaptation to a new cultural context, see Bauer 2003. This study posits that Rebman’s 1899 translation, in particular, “renders Krafft-Ebing’s call for tolerance toward a variety of sexual preferences as rather ‘unnatural’. The Anglicization of the original ideas ‘mutilates’ Krafft-Ebing’s observations, and by extension the bodies they describe” (387).

² The archive of the *Journal of Mental Science* (1858-1962) – founded as *The Asylum Journal* (1853-1855), then retitled *The Asylum Journal of Mental Science* (1855-1857) and currently known as *The British Journal of Psychiatry* (1962-) – is available at <<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/the-british-journal-of-psychiatry/past-title/journal-of-mental-science/all-issues/4F51B1E4B3F81774A5D21EE614CDDFD45>> (01/2025).

deterministic theories of hereditary degeneration, these experts embraced the idea that, in most cases, irregular sexual acts and sexual disorders were not just occasional deviations from the (heterosexual, procreative) norm or the consequences of unethical choices, but symptoms of hereditary/innate characteristics, pathological states of being, and ultimately forms of mental disease or moral insanity. Scholars have variously emphasised how, in the late nineteenth century, the proliferation of medical theories brought about “a fundamental metamorphosis of the social and psychological reality of sexual deviants from a form of behavior to a way of being”, such that “irregular sexual acts were not just viewed as immoral, but as the manifestation of an underlying morbid condition” (Oosterhuis 2000, 2-7; see also Oosterhuis 2012). Moreover, not only did the numerous publications which appeared in the flourishing field of sexual science systematically cross national, cultural, linguistic and disciplinary boundaries. In so doing, they also made “a substantial contribution to the emergence of a scientific discourse on sexuality, as a result of which, by the end of the nineteenth century, perversions could be recognized and discussed” (2000, 46). Although several influential (and at times contrasting) terminologies and nosologies were developed, the taxonomy “designed in Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia sexualis* eventually set the tone, not only in medical circles but also in everyday life” (*ibidem*), while definitions of sex, gender and normal vs deviant sexual behaviour continued to be reformulated and negotiated across different cultural contexts in the decades to come.

The development of sexology and sexual pathology during the second half of the nineteenth century – a process in which the publication of the first German edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis* in 1886, followed by translations into several languages, definitely marked a milestone – must be situated within the context of major currents in psychiatry and general theories of psychopathology, especially their strong correlation between body and mind. Oosterhuis notes that, while at that time “psychiatrists often relied uncritically on conventional standards of sexual conduct in their diagnosis of perversion, thereby equating immorality or mere non-conformity to mental disorder” (56), Krafft-Ebing’s deep interest in sexual deviance “grew out of his experience in asylum psychiatry, where he was confronted with sexual disorders of patients in connection with already established mental pathologies” (131). Furthermore, over the course of the nineteenth and well into the early twentieth century, research articles and reviews published in medical journals – in addition to monographs and case histories – occupied a central role in the circulation of specialised medical knowledge as well as its related terminology, bearing witness to an active exchange of ideas across different scientific communities. Physicians employed the periodical press to report not only their research findings in various medical branches and disciplines along with case records and news aimed at professionals as well as educated lay persons, but also their social and moral opinions on a variety of subjects. According to Peterson, this justifies an increasing scholarly interest in both “the social construction of medical knowledge” and “the relationship between medical science and issues of gender” (1994, 23), as well as sexuality and morality in nineteenth-century Britain – issues which regularly found their way into the medical literature of the time. Besides drawing on prevailing ideologies of physical/mental disease, sexual deviance and moral decadence, the nineteenth-century medical construction of the sexual sphere was clearly indebted to a growing medical specialism and its various vocabularies and discourses. Professional medical journals contributed to the dissemination of an increasingly specialised terminology emanating from physiology, psychiatry, gynaecology, sexology and other medical areas, progressively publicising dominant discourses among educated readerships. If it is true, as scholars have often remarked, that *fin-de-siècle* “medico-scientific thinking [...] transgressed boundaries, not just those of binary genders and normative understandings of sexuality, but

also national, medical and disciplinary ones” (Linge 2018, 396), the same applies to a number of textual venues which collectively contributed to the circulation of medical terminology concerning a variety of psychiatric disorders associated with particular sexual behaviours.

Despite the wealth of scholarly work on nineteenth- and early twentieth-century medical science, its intersections with social/moral and sex/gender issues, as well as its ample diffusion through the periodical press (see Bynum, Lock and Porter 1992; Peterson 1994; Frampton 2020a and 2020b, *inter alia*), linguistic analyses supporting widespread reference to such medical, gendered or sexological discourses – whether informed by discourse analytic, terminological, or other kinds of approaches – seem to be lacking. The critical literature published to date, though shedding light on the pathologisation of sexuality in the late nineteenth century and the transformation of certain sexual behaviours into medical categories, cannot be said to have contributed significantly to a systematic investigation of medical terminology in texts dating back to such a crucial period in the development of medical professionalism, specialisation and discourse. After briefly setting these psychiatric and sexological discourses in context, the purpose of the present essay is thus to show that a corpus-based terminological analysis of both Krafft-Ebing’s influential textbook, which has rightly been defined “an extensive repository of late nineteenth-century sexual deviance” (Schaffner 2012, 48), and related articles, published in a leading medical periodical like the *Journal of Mental Science*, can be used to cast new light on the language of sexual and mental pathology in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century medical discourse. More specifically, this study takes *Psychopathia Sexualis* as a reference text and as an object of terminological analysis not only because it constitutes a seminal work in nineteenth-century medical, psychiatric and sexological literature (and therefore a representative sample of both its genre and the specialised domain whose terminology is to be charted), but also because it can provide illuminating insights into the language of moral decadence, sexual deviance and mental degeneration it contributed to develop and diffuse. Scrutinised as a “terminologically relevant textual corpus” (Sager 2001, 762) and a “representative sample of a particular language or subset of that language” (Bowker and Pearson 2002, 10), Krafft-Ebing’s treatise, alongside related periodical texts showing the consequence of its lexicon, reveal the advantages of applying corpus linguistics methodology to terminological investigation.

Gamper and Stock describe corpus-based terminology as “a working method which explores a collection of domain-specific language material (corpus) to investigate terminological issues” (1998, 149). The usefulness of corpus-based methodology for terminology research and management, particularly (semi-)automatic term recognition and extraction from domain-specific corpora, has long been recognised (see Meyer and Mackintosh 1996; Ahmad and Rogers 2001; Bourigault, Jacquemin and L’Homme 2001; Heylen and De Hertog 2015; Daille 2017). Frequency and keyword lists, usually providing considerable information about the sort of topics dealt with in a corpus, can be used to identify subject-specific words or multiword units (mostly in the form of noun phrases, which are argued to be highly prevalent in technical domains) as term candidates.³ In addition, concordancing enables researchers to build up a picture of term candidates within a particular domain by seeing which other words co-occur with them and identifying typical collocation patterns. In the present study, the Words tool in

³ Heylen and De Hertog contend that “multiword terms are by definition semantically more specified than their single word counterparts”, since “the semantic scope of the head narrows down due to semantic restrictions imposed by its modifier” (2015, 206). For this reason, “the theoretical terminological ideal that a term has a one on one relationship with the concept it represents, serves as an immediate steppingstone to the practical focus on multiword terms” (*ibidem*).

#LancsBox software package (Brezina, Weill-Tessier and McEnery 2021) was employed first to analyse the occurrence of content words belonging to particular grammatical classes (nouns and adjectives as the most typical constituents of term patterns) relevant to the topic under investigation, and then to focus specifically on terms for sexual as well as mental pathological conditions. The Ngram and KWIC (Key Word in Context) tools were used, respectively, to examine collocational patterning and to provide co-textual information (usually within a span of ten words to the right/left of the node word) about items previously identified and selected as particularly relevant using frequency-based techniques.

Considering that collocation relates to “the characteristic co-occurrence patterns of words” (McEnery, Xiao and Tono 2006, 56), Baker and Levon maintain that “a word’s collocates can be revealing in terms of the ways that its meaning is created. If a word has a set of collocates that are used to imbue a certain attitudinal meaning, then this can be referred to as a discourse prosody” (2016, 113), whether positive or negative. In *Terms in Context*, one of the first attempts to integrate terminology studies and corpus linguistics with a view to developing a methodology for retrieving information about terms from corpora, Pearson suggests that, in addition to their meaning *per se*, when term candidates are used as search nodes, “information about the use of the term and about related terms can also be retrieved” (1998, 200). KWIC is a concordance search focused precisely on particular words in their immediate co-text, which can be used to explore collocational relationships aimed at individuating term candidates, the basic notion being that “the frequent co-occurrence of two or more words in sequence is an indication that these words belong together and form a multiword term” (Heylen and De Hertog 2015, 209). However, exactly as raw frequency of types is not particularly indicative *per se* as far as the individuation of terms is concerned – since “words that may not appear frequently in a specialized text or corpus may still be unusual (and therefore an indicator of text or domain specific terms)” (Bowker and Pearson 2002, 149) – it is equally instructive to bear in mind that “whereas the regular co-occurrence of two frequent words [...] is not very surprising, a frequent co-occurrence of two not so frequent words [...] does indicate that the word combination could be a fixed expression and potentially a term” (Heylen and De Hertog 2015, 209).

In addition, this study shares Baker’s view that corpora are “repositories of naturally occurring language” and “reveal repetitions or patterns which [...] are suggestive of discourse traces” (2010, 124). In other words, “attitudes and consequently discourses are embedded in language via our cumulative, lifelong exposure to language patterns and choices” (2006, 175). Although we are often unaware of the patterns of language we encounter in different contexts, corpora can be particularly helpful to identify them, since “they emulate and reveal this cumulative exposure” (*ibidem*).⁴ The late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a period which witnessed “an explosion of new sexual language” (Oosterhuis 2000, 44) and a veritable “‘discursification’ of sex”, or entrance of sexual matters “into dominant discourses, notably those of science and medicine” (Linge 2018, 383). Considering that the medical-psychiatric textbook and the journal articles scrutinised in the present essay represent only some instances of the vast scientific literature produced at that time, the general public’s cumulative exposure to these medical and sexological discourses and terminology was most certainly considerable, and likely to have contributed to contemporary worldviews and ideological constructs.

⁴ Similarly, Hunston refers to the way “patterns of association – how lexical items tend to co-occur – are built up over large amounts of text and are often unavailable to intuition or conscious awareness. They can therefore convey messages implicitly and even be at odds with an overt statement” (2002, 109).

2. Corpus Analysis and Discussion

2.1 Psychopathia Sexualis

To serve the purposes of the present study, the two English editions of Krafft-Ebing's work were loaded into #LancsBox as two separate corpora, namely *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 (201,734 tokens, 14,479 types, 12,912 lemmas) and *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1899 (192,242 tokens, 17,051 types, 15,201 lemmas). For a preliminary analysis, the Words tool in #LancsBox was employed to generate a wordlist ordered by frequency for each corpus,⁵ and to select nouns and adjectives which might be of any relevance to the issue under consideration, that is, the language of moral decadence, sexual deviance and mental degeneration introduced and/or propagated by such a seminal text, as well as the resonance that this domain-specific terminology may have had in British medical journals between the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Subsequently, the KWIC tool was used to generate concordance lines for the items previously selected as relevant and identify equally relevant collocates within a span of ten words to the right/left of the node word, which might together form multiword units meeting the salience criteria illustrated above. As a general methodology in corpus-based terminology, in KWIC searches which use as node words term candidates previously extracted from wordlists, sorting the output to the left shows modifier-head patterns where the term candidate is the head, while sorting to the right highlights modifier-head patterns where the term candidate is the modifier. In the analysis of Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, not only were concordances sorted alphabetically in order to make such patterns easier to identify, but they were also expanded so that larger portions of text could be read and contextual information obtained (although quoting such passages in full will not be possible owing to space constraints).

Based on the analysis of concordances, the discussion will mostly focus on the following terminologically relevant lexical items extracted from the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus, namely the nouns *onanism* (freq. 178), *masochism* (172), *perversion(s)* (131), *urning(s)* (120), *pederasty* (118), *sadism* (106), *fetichism* [*sic.*] (97), *homosexuality* (43), *hyperaesthesia* (34), *degeneration* (33), *satyriasis* (20), *perversity* (18), *paraesthesia* (15), *inversion* (13), *nymphomania* (11), *urningism* (4), *uranism* (2), as well as their typical collocates. Although most of these nouns already possess such a degree of specificity in the domain of sexology as to achieve status as single word terms, analysing their co-textual environment is particularly instructive for the emergence of close connections between the fields of sexual pathology and psychopathology which might substantiate critical readings of a late nineteenth-century shift from old-established interpretations of sexual aberrations as vice to emerging views of sexual aberrations as mental illness. This applies even more emphatically to lexical items such as *perversion*, *degeneration*, *perversity* and *inversion*, which are too generic to count as terms in the domain under investigation (since they can also be used in other contexts, different from the psychosexual sphere), but may acquire specificity, particular connotations and thus terminological and discursive relevance in the field by virtue of pre-/postmodifying adjectives, nouns and phrases, or other items in their immediate co-text.

⁵ As noted in the previous paragraph, though frequency lists of types may provide useful information concerning the "aboutness" of a corpus, raw/normalised frequency is not an accurate criterion for identifying terms. For this reason, in the analysis of both Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* and the articles selected from the *Journal of Mental Science*, the entire wordlists were scrutinised.

Quite interestingly, the term *onanism* (178), which has Biblical origins and has been in use since the early eighteenth century, is by far the most frequent noun related to sexual as well as psychical deviance in *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892, which speaks to the author's (and the nineteenth-century) deep concern about non-procreative sexual practices and related moral and mental degeneration. Oosterhuis posits that "the causal link between onanism and nervous and mental diseases would be reiterated again and again in the nineteenth century" (2000, 27). An analysis of concordance lines for *onanism* in the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus discloses noun phrases such as "manual onanism" (2), "mental onanism" (2), "mutual onanism" (31), "the vice of onanism" (1), "passive onanism" (1), "physical onanism" (1), "psychical onanism" (2), "solitary onanism" (4), alongside the binomials "onanism and coitus inter femora" (1), "onanism and manustupration per feminam" (1), "onanism and pederasty" (1), "onanism and spermatorrhoea" (1), "onanism or pederasty" (1), "onanism or sodomy" (1). The occurrence of premodifying adjectives like "mental", "physical" and "psychical" suggests that this kind of aberration regards the body (as a sexual practice) as well as the mind. Being conceived as such, it is closely related to other aberrant practices such as "coitus inter femora", "manustupration per feminam", "pederasty" and "sodomy". It seems reasonable to assume that the relatively high frequency of this term together with its nearest collocates in an authoritative textbook which had an international circulation for several decades might have helped to propagate old-established discourses of masturbation as "vice" and immoral conduct, alongside new psychopathological approaches to onanism, also in relation to other forms of sexual deviance.

The term *masochism* (172) was coined by Krafft-Ebing himself from the name of the Austrian writer Leopold von Sacher-Masoch, specifically to designate a form of sexual pathology described in his work. In *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892, *masochism* acquires a negative semantic prosody mainly via its most typical collocates. An analysis of concordance lines for *masochism* reveals binomials such as "bondage and masochism" (3), "sadism and masochism" (5), "masochism and fetichism" (1), "masochism and sadism" (13), "masochism and shoe-fetichism" (2). Other interesting occurrences are complex noun phrases like "masochism in individuals of contrary sexuality" (1), "the infrequent perversion of fully-developed masochism" (1), "ideal masochism, with rudimentary sadism" (1), "masochism as a rudimentary contrary sexual instinct" (1), "the pathological facts of masochism and sadism" (1), "the perversion of masochism" (1). Chiefly associated with disease, with other perversions, or with contrary sexual feeling (a phrase introduced by the psychiatrist Carl von Westphal in the late 1860s), the term *masochism* – owing to the wide resonance that Krafft-Ebing's work had in both medical circles and the general public – entered psychiatric and sexological discourse and determined the way in which a male subject at the *fin de siècle* might be imagined as "perverting normative masculinity by abdicating his penetrative agency and relocating his pleasure in bodily zones other than the penis, which was considered the only legitimate organ of male pleasure" (Moore 2009, 138). As medical historians have often remarked, such manners of envisioning and discursively constructing this kind of psychosexual pathology can be seen as "reflecting widespread social anxieties about masculinity in middle-class life and confirming visions of national threat and racial degeneration" at a time when "sexual perversion as degeneration was being rethought" (139).⁶

In the context of this late nineteenth-century revisionist attitude, the higher frequency of the lemma *perversion* (131) as compared to *perversity* (18) in the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus suggests the greater importance attributed by Krafft-Ebing to perversion – considered

⁶On nineteenth-century constructions of masochism, see also Stewart 1998 and Noyes 2018.

as a psychopathological condition for which the patient cannot be held fully responsible, and thus needs psychiatric evaluation and treatment – than to perversity, which he merely regarded as deliberately sinful behaviour. These different conceptualisations can be interpreted as both indicative and productive of a shift from a broader view of sexual deviance as a variety of immoral acts to sexual deviance explained as mental illness, although it was still much debated at that time whether such illness was inborn or acquired. Though not possessing the same degree of specificity as, for instance, sadism or masochism, the noun *perversion* (from the Latin *pervertere*, i.e. “to turn upside down”, “to subvert”, “to cause to deviate” and “to redirect”) is suggestive of an important discursive change which Krafft-Ebing’s work most probably contributed to enact. Schaffner has noted that “it was only in the course of the nineteenth century that the term ‘perversion’ took on increasingly sexual associations” and was deployed “more and more frequently to refer to ‘sexual behaviour or preference that is different from the norm’ and ‘that which is considered to be unacceptable or socially threatening, or to constitute a mental illness’” (2012, 3). An analysis of concordance lines for the lemma *perversion* shows that, in the text under examination, this word is typically found in binomials such as “abnormal perversion or moral perversity” (1), “paraesthesia and perversion of sexual instinct” (1), “neurosis and sexual perversion” (1), alongside noun phrases of varying degrees of complexity:

“abnormal perversion of the mental and sexual life” (1), “acquired perversion” (1), “congenital or acquired perversion of the sexual instinct” (1), “congenital perversion” (1), “the grossest perversions of the sexual act” (1), “the most horrible perversions and acts” (1), “masochistic perversion” (1), “moral and mental perversion” (1), “monstrous perversions of the sexual life” (1), “pathological degree of perversion” (1), “psychical perversion” (1), “psycho-sexual perversion” (2), “repugnant perversion” (1), “sadistic perversion” (1), “sexual perversion(s)” (23), “congenital sexual perversion” (1), “perversion in a degenerate individual” (1), “perversion of sexual feeling” (1), “perversion(s) of the sexual instinct” (17), “perversion of the instinct with perverse sexual acts” (1), “perversion of the psychical vita sexualis” (1), “perversion of the sexual desires” (1), “perversion(s) of the sexual life” (3), “perversion of the vita sexualis” (4).

In addition, *perversity* interestingly occurs as head in noun phrases with analogous pre-/postmodifiers: “moral perversity” (1), “sexual perversity” (3), “perversity in the sexual act” (1), “perversity of sexual activity” (1), “perversity of sexual acts” (1), “perversity of the sexual instinct” (1). On the whole, although *perversion* and *perversity* designate different concepts – i.e. congenital/acquired disease and vice, respectively – in Krafft-Ebing’s view, they can be found in similar co-textual environments. Moreover, both nouns establish a close connection between the psychical and the sexual sphere via the common ground of pathology and abnormality, that is, by referring to a characteristic in a person’s mind, body or behaviour that is not usual and might therefore cause illness or disturbance. *Perversion*, in particular, is also subject to negative evaluation via premodifying adjectives such as “grossest”, “horrible”, “monstrous” and “repugnant”, and is frequently associated with an individual’s moral degeneration.

Sadism (106), also coined by Krafft-Ebing after the infamous figure of the Marquis de Sade, is generally used as an unmodified, single word term in *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892, typically related to either perversion or inversion of the sexual feeling. This is demonstrated by the presence in the corpus of binomials such as “fetichism and sadism” (1), “masochism and sadism” (13), “sadism and contrary sexual instinct” (1), “sadism and fetichism” (1), “sadism and masochism” (5). Though infrequent, the occurrence of the noun phrase “symbolic sadism” (3), moreover, attests to what was conceived as the psychosexual nature of a perversion which depends on the power of the imagination and often on elaborate theatrical stagings. The reverberations of this neologism outside *Psychopathia Sexualis* must have been

significant, if one is to trust scholarly readings of sadism as “the source of a lively interest in medical, psychiatric, and criminological texts of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries”, in which “following Krafft-Ebing, the term became widely used to describe all kinds of murderous and violent behaviors involving sex as well as to describe the natural instinct of domination assumed for men in heterosexuality” (Moore 2009, 148).

Introduced in an 1887 article by Alfred Binet (“Le fétichisme dans l’amour”) as a category under which all sexual deviations could (in his view) be subsumed, the term *fetichism* [*sic.*] (97) forms the following binomials and noun phrases in the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus: “masochism and fetichism” (1), “sadism and fetichism” (1), “erotic fetichism” (6), “erotic (pathological) fetichism” (1), “the pathology of fetichism” (1), “pathological fetichism” (9), “physiological fetichism” (5), “psychical fetichism” (1), “sexual fetichism” (1), “shoe-fetichism and masochism” (1), “fetichism and sadism” (1). In line with other psychosexual categories with which it is associated, the widespread use of *fetichism* in both Krafft-Ebing’s work and in nineteenth-century medical discourse contributed to strengthening the notion of abnormal sexual behaviour as a kind of disease (as the noun “pathology” and the adjective “pathological” demonstrate) affecting not only the body and its (sexual) functions, but also the mind (as shown by the adjectives “physiological” and “psychical”).

The terms *urning(s)* (120), *urningism* (4) and *uranism* (2) are traditionally attributed to the German lawyer and writer Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, who coined them in his 1864 treatise *Vindex: Social-juristische Studien über mannsmännliche Geschlechtsliebe* to refer to same-sex desire between men. Looking for relevant patterns of association in *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892, one can find the binomial “pederasts and urnings” (1), alongside the noun phrases “congenital urning(s)” (6) and “treatment of urnings” (1). Though infrequent, these occurrences may be noteworthy from a terminological (and ideological) point of view, since a noun denoting erotic gender preference acquires the connotations of a diseased state of being via collocates which are usually employed to characterise medical conditions. Nevertheless, it should be noted that there is no evidence of discriminatory usage of these and other terms referring to same-sex desire in *Psychopathia Sexualis*, since all aberrant practices, whether homosexual or heterosexual, were equally conceived as psychosexual maladies owing to the fact that they represented departures from what was commonly accepted as normal behaviour.

Linge remarks that “the fin de siècle was a time during which discourses about sexuality and sexual types multiplied” (2018, 385). However, “the diverse terminology of sexual identity and orientation in the 1890s in Germany and Britain – the ‘homosexual’, the ‘invert’, the ‘Uranian’ – was inherited from discussions that took place in the preceding decades” (*ibidem*). More specifically, the noun *homosexuality* (43) was coined in the late 1860s by the German-Hungarian writer Karl Maria Kertbeny as a term – like *urningism* and *uranism* introduced by Ulrichs – “of a nonmedical, proto-emancipatory origin” (Oosterhuis 2000, 44). Not in current use during the late nineteenth century, *homosexuality* was reintroduced, popularised and incorporated as a medical term around 1890 by Krafft-Ebing himself, who sharply distinguished it from *sodomy* and *pederasty*, which specifically involved anal intercourse. In the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus, the single occurrences of the expressions “contrary sexual instinct, or homosexuality” (1) and “homosexuality, or contrary sexual instinct” (1) clearly identify homosexuality as abnormality or deviation from the (heterosexual) norm. Even more remarkable is the presence of the noun phrases “acquired homosexuality” (18) and “congenital homosexuality” (17), which conceptualise homosexuality as a disease or medical condition either existing since birth as part of an individual’s character (and therefore not likely to change), or encountered at a particular stage of one person’s life. Linge also observes that “Kertbeny was not invested in a debate about whether homosexuality was innate, acquired or

pathological” (2018, 386). His argument, “more than any investment in scientific debates about homosexuality, relates much better to a libertarian position” (*ibidem*). This proves, therefore, that “the term *homosexuality* became a concern for medical explanatory models of insanity and morbid sexual behaviour only in late nineteenth-century medical-psychiatric discourse, and particularly within a process of ‘scientification’ [...] of homosexuality” (383) to which Krafft-Ebing’s treatise greatly contributed. The medical debate on same-sex desire was at that time so intense that, by the turn of the twentieth century, the terms *urningism*, *uranism* and *homosexuality* had become near-synonyms employed to designate what was otherwise referred to as contrary, inverted or antipathic (i.e. non-heterosexual) sexual feeling or instinct. Since, as noted above, the origins of such terms are far from strictly medical, the process of medicalisation of aberrant sexual conduct took place in the context of late nineteenth-century psychiatry and sexology, where these behaviours assumed connotations of innate/acquired pathological conditions. Though signalling a kind of departure from the normal, such connotations were not necessarily negative, since they referred to a way of *being* which had biological causes and thus needed medical intervention, rather than a way of (mis) *behaving* as a result of unethical or immoral choices.

Together with *paradoxia* (used to refer to abnormal periods of sexual activity, such as childhood or old age) and *anaesthesia* (i.e. absence of sexual drive), the terms *hyperaesthesia* (34) and *paraesthesia* (15) form part of the scientific nomenclature introduced by Krafft-Ebing to distinguish between different classes of sexual aberrations. While *hyperaesthesia* designates a pathological increase in sexual drive, *paraesthesia* defines sexual behaviour directed either at a wrong aim (i.e. not directed at coitus) or arising from a wrong object of desire (be it human or nonhuman, as was the case with bestiality). In *Psychopathia Sexualis 1892*, such sporadic terms as “cerebral hyperaesthesia” (1) and “psychical hyperaesthesia” (1) are nonetheless noteworthy since they demonstrate the mental nature of this illness, whereas more frequent phrases like “sexual hyperaesthesia” (7), “hyperaesthesia and paraesthesia sexualis” (3), “hyperaesthesia sexualis” (10), “paraesthesia of sexual feeling” (1) and “paraesthesia sexualis” (7) denote anomalies in the sexual sphere and highlight the frequently pathological nature of sexual feelings. Within the context of an abnormal intensity of sexual drive, Krafft-Ebing also theorised *satyriasis* (20) and its female equivalent *nymphomania* (11) as morbid intensifications of desire and thus as forms of hyperaesthesia. Discussing satyriasis in relation to pressing concerns about pathological male desire and modern civilisation at the *fin de siècle*, Verhoeven suggests that this and other sexual aberrations “played a role in the construction and policing of a dominant ideal of male sexuality” and that “the key to this ideal was a delicate balance between desire and restraint” (2015, 27). On the one hand, “men were urged to practice self-control”, while on the other “too much restraint could be just as problematic” and result in mental and sexual disorders (*ibidem*). “The point of the satyriasis diagnosis”, Verhoeven concludes, “was to warn men of the dangers of losing control. [...] As the embodiment of degraded manhood, understood in terms of either effeminacy or primitive savagery, the satyr was the rogue figure against whom ‘normal’ men could gauge their own respectability” (44). It is worth noting that, in the *Psychopathia Sexualis 1892* corpus, the relatively infrequent term *satyriasis* (20) appears in expressions like “chronic satyriasis or nymphomania” (1), “satyriasis accompanied by perverse sexual instinct” (1), “satyriasis and nymphomania” (4). The strong association between exaggerated sexual appetite in men and in women (whether directed at individuals of the same sex or at individuals of the other sex) suggests that, despite their different degree of subversiveness (the possibility that women might have a boundless and active sexuality contradicted the tenets of medical science, according to which female sexual drive was passive and less powerful than the average man’s), medical attention was focused on *satyriasis* and *nymphomania* as excess, which was typically related to perversion, abnormality, irrationality and thus to mental disorders.

Finally, both *degeneration* and *inversion* are generic words which nonetheless acquire particular discursive relevance, as well as medical-psychiatric and sexological connotations, in the context of Krafft-Ebing's work and within the broader historical and cultural milieu in which this is situated. Scholars have variously drawn attention to the overwhelming influence of degeneration theory – originally formulated by the French psychiatrist Bénédict Augustin Morel in his *Traité des dégénérescences physiques, intellectuelles et morales de l'espèce humaine* (1857) – at the *fin de siècle*. Its impact was so strong in both medical and non-medical contexts that “by the 1880s degeneration had become the dominant framework for understanding mental disorders” and ultimately “an explanation for virtually every pathological phenomenon” (Beccalossi 2012b, 29; see also Beccalossi 2012a). Against the backdrop of European psychiatrists' prompt adoption of degeneration theory, Engstrom and Kendler have spoken about its “pervasiveness in Richard von Krafft-Ebing's influential textbook”, the reliance on “both Darwinian and Morelian notions of heredity in his psychiatric theorizing”, as well as his “strong emphasis on mental degeneration” (2013, 1348–49). Though the frequency of *degeneration* (33) is relatively low in *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892, it is instructive that the noun collocates with adjectives such as “mental” (1), “neurotic” (1), “pathological” (1), “psycho-physical” (1), “psychical” (4) and “psycho-sexual” (1), all together construing degeneration as a condition of morbid decadence investing the entirety of an individual. Such patterns of association for a lexical item which does not clearly possess the specificity of a term in a specialised domain, but which acquired a particular meaning in late nineteenth-century medical-psychiatric discourse, demonstrate that Krafft-Ebing absorbed and elaborated on the notion of degeneration, conceived as a progressive decline leading from a deterioration of physical and mental qualities to sexual sterility and ultimately self-extinction. Even more interestingly for the purposes of the present study, the context of use of the noun *degeneration* also highlights the potential that *Psychopathia Sexualis* had, in turn, to further expand degeneration theory, especially the widespread view that “no other aspect of human experience was as closely tied to the concept of degeneration as sexuality” (Beccalossi 2012b, 30). Beccalossi has also convincingly illustrated how, in the period under examination, same-sex desire was medicalised in parallel with the emergence of sexual inversion as a psychiatric category: “studies of sexual inversion were part of medical science's growing interest in ‘sexual aberrations’, an area that had been conventionally associated with mental illness” (225). In the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus, the noun *inversion* (13) occurs in relation to both the psychical and the sexual sphere and, whether referring to an inborn condition or not, has clear connotations of abnormality and disease, as shown by its typical collocation patterns: “mental inversion” (1), “sexual inversion” (1), “congenital inversion of sexual instinct” (1), “inversion of the sexual feeling” (1), “acquired inversion of the sexual instinct” (3), “abnormal inversion of the sexual instinct” (1), “inversion of the sexual instinct” (4).

The 1899 English edition of *Psychopathia Sexualis* did not introduce significant new terms. A comparison between the wordlists generated for the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus and the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1899 corpus mainly shows that, while the relevant lexical items and their typical collocation patterns remain largely the same, more or less significant differences regarding their frequency may occur. As a case in point, the phenomenon labelled *inversion* is much foregrounded in the 1899 text (72 occurrences vs 13 in the 1892 text), whereas the practice of *onanism* is given less prominence (115 occurrences vs 178 in the 1892 text). Nevertheless, it seems interesting to focus briefly on the noun phrase *paedophilia erotica* (6), coined by Krafft-Ebing himself according to scholars such as Oosterhuis (2000 and 2012) and Janssen (2015

and 2018),⁷ and the adjective *antipathic* (78), also featuring in the new, slightly modified title chosen for the second English translation of the book. The few but terminologically significant occurrences of *paedophilia erotica* in *Psychopathia Sexualis 1899* are accompanied by appositions/definitions/paraphrases such as “morbid disposition”, “psychosexual perversion”, “sexual perversion” and “morbid sexual impulse”, connoting paedophilia as mental and sexual illness as well as sickly perversion or deviation from the norm.⁸ These articulations add significantly to the negative semantic prosody that *pederasty* (118) carried since the 1892 translation. In the *Psychopathia Sexualis 1892* corpus, this term features in multiword units such as “contrary sexual instinct and acquired pederasty” (1) – which shows that the late nineteenth-century “attention to erotic age preference occurred in the context of emergent attention to erotic gender preference” (Janssen 2015, 575) – alongside “active pederasty” (8), “bestiality and pederasty” (1), “onanism and pederasty” (1), “the vice of pederasty” (1), “passive pederasty” (23), “pederasty and bestiality” (1), which cumulatively construct pederasty as vice, and a kind of perversion on a par with other sexual aberrations. Though paedophilia (an erotic age preference) did not necessarily involve same-sex desire as was the case with pederasty (an erotic gender preference), both were conceived as sickly anomalies of the psychological and the sexual sphere. As for the occurrence of *antipathic* – which Krafft-Ebing intended as a synonym for “contrary” or “inverted” – in the *Psychopathia Sexualis 1899* corpus, the adjective typically appears in premodifying position in noun phrases such as “antipathic sexual feeling” (6), “antipathic sexual instinct” (48), “antipathic sexuality” (12), “antipathic vita sexualis” (1), often preceded by other adjectives like “congenital”, “abnormal”, “acquired” and “pathological”, again identifying sexual inversion (whether inborn or not) as disease.

Our discussion of Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis* as a terminologically relevant textual corpus has mainly dealt with a number of lexical items (predominantly nouns and their modifiers) which, in the majority of cases, possess such a degree of specificity in the domains of psychopathology and sexology as to achieve status as terms. On the whole, these nouns often occur as single word terms on their own, but also allow the individuation of more or less complex nominals pertaining to the bodily (sexual) and the psychological spheres, and equating sexual pathology with moral and mental insanity, which might have contributed to the dissemination of psychiatric and sexological discourses of deviance, degeneration and decadence between the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century. Furthermore, by differentiating between the normal and the abnormal, and by identifying sexual variance as morbid deviation and mental illness, in our dataset this terminology uncovers discourse patterns related to the late nineteenth-century (psycho)pathologisation of certain sexual behaviours, which may have caused some of these notions of sexual and mental malady to become social, cultural and ideological constructs.

In conclusion, examining the concordances of a selection of terms and term candidates reveals that, even in instances where certain words occur fairly infrequently in a corpus, a corpus-based approach can be quite productive not only for retrieving patterns which would go

⁷ Janssen explains that “the term entered [...] *Psychopathia Sexualis* in the tenth German edition of 1898, the English language in that edition’s 1899 translation, the French language (as *pédophilie érotique*) in 1900 and the Italian language (*pedofilia erotica*) about 1902” (2015, 587).

⁸ As to *paedophilia* and *paedophile*, Janssen has amply demonstrated that, since their appearance in the late nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth century, these terms “can be said to have facilitated many of the problems of reification, ‘othering’, scapegoating, medicalization, projection and normalization known to have informed the conceptualization of homosexuality, and other dimensions of sexual variation, in the most historically decisive and defining ways”, to the extent that “homosexuality and paedophilia were ubiquitously conflated until a few decades ago” (2018, 64).

unnoticed in manual textual reading, but also for studying the use and semantic prosody of those words in a given context, alongside the particular discourses, representations and ideologies they contribute to. Terminological evidence, therefore, can be said to substantiate critical views of the late nineteenth-century construction of sexual deviance as mental and physical illness, as well as “a matter of personal identity” (Oosterhuis 2000, 7) rather than vice and immorality. As often noted in the literature, “by naming and classifying virtually all nonprocreative forms of sexuality”, Krafft-Ebing “was one of the first to synthesize medical knowledge of sexual perversion” (47). While terms already in use (like *onanism*, *pederasty*, *fetichism*, *homosexuality*, *satyriasis*, *nymphomania*, *urningism* and *uranism*) acquired further visibility and sometimes new connotations in his work, for neologisms such as *masochism*, *sadism*, *hyperaesthesia sexualis*, *paraesthesia sexualis* and *paedophilia erotica*, this kind of discursive construction clearly took place through the linguistic act of naming specific disorders, at a time when medical categories encompassing diverse forms of mental illness associated with particular sexual behaviours would find their way into scientific texts and reinforce ideas of sexual, mental and moral degeneration.

2.2 The Journal of Mental Science

Comparing the results discussed above to data obtained from quantitative and qualitative analysis of a corpus of scientific articles published between the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century can provide valuable insights into the circulation of medical sexual knowledge and its specialised lexicon across different national, cultural, linguistic, disciplinary and generic boundaries in the historical period under examination. Among various professional periodicals, the *Journal of Mental Science* became since its inception in 1858 a leading publication in the field of psychiatry, regularly publishing such heterogeneous materials as original research articles, case histories, reviews of current medical literature, reports from societies and news of various kinds. This highly specialised venue thus testifies to a lively intellectual debate among international communities of scientific practitioners characterised by an increasing professional specialism. By means of keyword searches for the terms previously discussed (*onanism*, *masochism*, *perversion(s)*, *urning(s)*, *pederasty*, *sadism*, *fetichism*, *homosexuality*, *hyperaesthesia*, *degeneration*, *satyriasis*, *perversity*, *paraesthesia*, *inversion*, *nymphomania*, *urningism*, *uranism*, *paedophilia erotica*) within the full text archive of the *Journal of Mental Science*, a total of 450 articles were collected,⁹ which allowed the creation of a specialised corpus, named *JMS* corpus, amounting to 1,612,596 tokens, 55,494 types and 51,781 lemmas. In order to scrutinise the resonance that the terminology introduced and/or popularised by Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* may have had in contemporary periodical culture, each search was limited to articles published between 1866 (when the first German edition of the text appeared and began to be reviewed and discussed in international medical publications) and 1920. This date was chosen as *terminus ad quem* owing to the fact that, starting from the first decades of the twentieth century, sexual aberrations were mainly interpreted through the lens of Havelock Ellis's and Sigmund Freud's psychoanalytical theories. By applying a KWIC search to the corpus, it was then possible to

⁹ Of these 450 articles, 30 were gathered by searching for the keyword *onanism*, 23 for *masochism*, 245 for *perversion(s)/perversity*, 5 for *urning(s)*, 5 for *pederasty*, 20 for *sadism*, 25 for *fetichism*, 55 for *homosexuality*, 2 for *satyriasis*, 33 for *inversion*, 5 for *nymphomania*, 1 for *urningism* and 1 for *uranism*. Whereas search for *hyperaesthesia sexualis*, *paraesthesia sexualis* and *paedophilia erotica* produced no direct results in the time span 1866-1920, the noun *degeneration* (often used in non-pertinent ways) was found to occur in 1796 articles, and was therefore excluded from the analysis for practical reasons.

investigate the frequency and collocational behaviour of the set of terms previously extracted from *Psychopathia Sexualis*, and establish whether they maintain the same connotations when employed outside their original context.

It is perhaps unsurprising that, in the *JMS* corpus, the nouns *perversion(s)* (465), *degeneration* (330) and *inversion* (228), owing to their lack of intrinsic specificity, are by far the most common lexical items among those under scrutiny. Nevertheless, their high frequency suggests that the concepts they designate were objects of intense debate within the medical-psychiatric community between the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century. Moreover, their nearest collocates circumscribe the context of use of these nouns – which might also, at that time, generically refer to any kind of dysfunction concerning a bodily organ or system – to the mental, moral and sexual sphere, in line with the patterns of occurrence found in *Psychopathia Sexualis*. In this regard, it may be instructive to talk about shared knowledge, cultural values and ideological positionings among leading professionals operating in the same area of expertise. By way of example, a lemmatised search for *perversion* in the *JMS* corpus reveals that the noun can be found in phrases such as the following:

“acquired perversions” (3), “auto-erotic perversion” (3), “organic brain perversion” (1), “congenital perversion” (6), “insane perversions” (1), “moral and instinctive perversions” (2), “mental perversion(s)” (15), “moral perversion(s)” (36), “morbid perversions of the mind” (1), “morbid perversion” (3), “nervous perversion” (1), “treatment of perversions” (4), “psychical perversion” (1), “neurotic and psychotic perversions” (3), “sex perversions” (1), “sexual perversion(s)” (161), “congenital moral, social, and sexual perversions” (1), “acquired and congenital sexual perversion” (2), “congenital sexual perversion(s)” (13), “the psychical phenomenon of sexual perversion” (3), “practices of sexual perversion” (2), “perversion of mental action” (1), “perversion of mental function” (1), “perversion of mental processes” (1), “perversion of moral and sexual nature” (3), “perversion of nervous and mental states” (1), “perversion of psychical acts” (1), “perversion of the highest cerebral functions” (1), “puzzling perversions of the human mind” (1), “perversion of the moral nature” (1), “subtle perversions of the reasoning power (monomania)” (1), “perversion of the reproductive instincts” (1), “perversions of the sexual and reproductive functions” (1), “perversions of the sexual instinct” (4), “perversions of the sexual propensity” (1).

Moreover, this noun also occurs in binomials such as:

“sexual anomalies and perversions” (4), “mental defects and perversions” (1), “moral imbecility and perversion” (1), “sexual intemperance and perversions” (3), “mental enfeeblement and perversion” (1), “anomalies and perversions of cerebral (psychical) development” (3), “variations and perversions of the sexual propensity” (1), “mental or moral instability or perversion” (1), “masturbation and sexual perversion” (1), “sexual perversion(s) and inversion(s)” (5), “neurasthenia and sexual perversions and inversions” (2), “obsession and sexual perversion” (1), “paranoia and sexual perversion” (1).

As was the case with the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus, in the *JMS* corpus the noun *perversity* (48) shares with *perversion* an analogous co-textual environment, occurring in phrases and binomials like “psychic eccentricity and perversity” (1), “innate perversity of sexual instinct” (1), “moral deformity and innate perversity” (1), “mental perversity” (2), “moral perversity” (17), “sexual perversity” (7), “perversity of brain function” (2) and “perversity of sexual instinct” (1). Quite similar to these are also the patterns of association of the nouns *degeneration* and *inversion*, which strengthen the nexus between mind and body/sex, and include:

“mental and bodily degeneration” (1), “cerebral degeneration” (2), “moral and mental degeneration” (1), “mental degeneration” (7), “moral degeneration” (2), “neuropathic degeneration” (2), “neurotic degeneration” (1), “insanity of degeneration” (1), “psychical degeneration” (1), “degeneration and men-

tal disease" (1), "degeneration or moral perversion" (3), "congenital inversion" (8), "acquired psychic inversion" (10), "psychic inversion" (28), "sexual inversion" (101), "congenital sexual inversion" (7), "inversion of somatic sexual characters" (8).

Focusing attention on terms in the specialised domains of psychopathology and sexology occurring in the *JMS* corpus, it can be observed, for instance, that the co-text of *homosexuality* (133) – which includes "inborn homosexuality and pseudo-homosexuality" (4), "pathological cases of homosexuality" (2), "homosexuality and insanity" (2) and "homosexuality or sexual inversion" (6) – makes the connection with mental insanity quite explicit, thus adding the connotation of diseased state to a term simply denoting gender preference. The strong association between psychopathology and sexual pathology also emerges from the typical collocates of *onanism* (66) and *fetichism* (58) in the *JMS* corpus, which largely coincide with those found in the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus, i.e. "dementia from onanism" (2), "mental onanism" (4), "solitary and mutual onanism" (6), "the mental form of onanism" (1), "the vice of onanism" (2), "erotic fetichism" (5), "pathological fetichism" (2) and "sexual fetichism" (1). In these cases, it seems again reasonable to assume that terms in the field of psychosexual pathology freely circulated in the medical literature of the time together with their common patterns of association, which may have caused notions of sexual and mental malady to become cultural and ideological constructs. Furthermore, the close connection between *nymphomania* (13) and *satyriasis* (6) as manifestations of an equivalent diseased state in women and in men, respectively, persists in the *JMS* corpus as in the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus, as shown by the presence of the binomial "nymphomania and satyriasis" (6). The same argument applies to the reciprocal types of perversion *sadism* (103) and *masochism* (81), alongside their correlation with other kinds of sexual aberrations, as revealed by the occurrence of binomials such as "homosexualism and sadism" (2), "masochism and sadism" (1), "sadism and fetichism" (10), "sadism and masochism" (29). However, apart from these associations, the immediate co-text of *sadism* and *masochism* in the *JMS* corpus reveals that, as in the *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1892 corpus, these are chiefly used as unmodified, single word terms. What is particularly significant for the purposes of the present study is that some of the neologisms traditionally attributed to Krafft-Ebing are quite infrequent in the *JMS* corpus – as is the case with *paedophilia erotica* (3) – and may express meanings which are not pertinent to the semantic domain under scrutiny. For example, both *hyperaesthesia* (4) and *paraesthesia* (2) denote derangements of the sensory functions, with no specific reference to sexual feelings. Moreover, none of their occurrences collocates with the adjectives *sexual/sexualis*, or refers to the psychosexual sphere.

It could be concluded that, in spite of both Krafft-Ebing's international renown and the status of the *Journal of Mental Science* as a leading specialist publication in the domain of psychiatry, the resonance that such a seminal text in nineteenth-century medical-psychiatric literature as *Psychopathia Sexualis* had in the language employed in this specific periodical was quite diffuse. With the exception of *sadism* and *masochism*, echoes of Krafft-Ebing's terminology can be found chiefly in relation to lexical items which do not possess the specificity of terms (but which nonetheless acquire precise connotations and particular discursive relevance by virtue of some of their nearest collocates) or to terms which were already in use within coeval medical communities (and which *Psychopathia Sexualis* certainly contributed to propagate). Even so, evidence gathered from a corpus-based terminological analysis of quite a large set of research articles, reviews and other periodical texts does not contradict critical views of the crucial role played by scientific periodicals in the diffusion of medical knowledge and its discourses over the course of the nineteenth century (and beyond). Future research might be directed at scrutinising

other journals or other textual genres, so as to expand the focus of this kind of terminological investigation. Moreover, the data obtained from quantitative and qualitative analysis of the *JMS* corpus do not undermine the terminological relevance of Krafft Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* as a textual corpus. As previously shown, this work definitely provides illuminating insight into the ideologies, cultural values, specialised knowledge and language of a particular discourse community at a particular historical moment.

Concluding Remarks

As Geeraerts observes, “terminologies – the lexical components of specialized languages – emerge from theoretical and technological innovation: new scientific insights and novel tools enrich the conceptual and practical environment of the specialists, and in the process expand their vocabularies” (2015, xvii). Sharing Bauer's view that “the historic evidence of sexology lies to a large extent in its textuality” and that “the language of the *scientia sexualis* is crucial to reconstruct some of the meanings of sexual concepts at the point of their inception” (2009, 50), this study applied corpus linguistics methodology to late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century medical discourse, with a view to bridging linguistic and historical analysis, and investigating the interplay between terminological dissemination and cultural ideology. Two specialised corpora were used to identify relevant terms in the domains of psychiatry and sexology and provide evidence for their usage by a community of experts in a specific historical period. The recurrence of terms such as *homosexuality*, *onanism*, *sadism*, *masochism*, *fetichism*, *nymphomania* and *satyriasis* both in Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* – which has rightly been labelled a “highly eclectic encyclopedia of sexual aberration” (Oosterhuis 2000, 46-47) – and in a corpus of scientific articles published in the *Journal of Mental Science* – which furthered knowledge of those sexual aberrations within medical circles – clearly testifies to the diffusion of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century discourses of moral decadence, sexual deviance and mental degeneration. At a time when “doctors struggled to locate with any precision the exact point at which normal became abnormal”, and when “the difficulty of constructing a coherent code of [...] sexuality was remedied by the presence of a deviant Other” (Verhoeven 2015, 28), Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, on a par with contemporary periodical and non-periodical publications, can be said to have contributed significantly to the circulation of medical terminology concerning a number of psychiatric disorders associated with particular sexual behaviours, alongside a broader discursive construction of the sexual sphere as diseased and degenerate.

The reason why nineteenth-century medical preoccupation was constantly with the abnormal rather than the normal, Verhoeven contends, is that the normal or healthy could only be constructed *ex negativo*, and that the deviant and degenerate other “served an important function by throwing into relief the virtues of the normal man” (*ibidem*). Similarly, Beccalossi remarks that “in the nineteenth century, medical science's understanding of the ‘normal’ depended problematically on its understanding of the ‘pathological’”. In psychiatry in general, and in sexological writings in particular, the boundary between normal and abnormal was not clearly set” (2012b, 220). In what has been labelled the “uniquely late-nineteenth-century precariousness of normalcy” (Moore 2009, 157), terms like *sadism*, *masochism* and *fetishism*, among several others, did not just designate disease categories, but also “described extremes on a graded scale of health and illness, and explained aspects of ‘normal’ sexuality” (Oosterhuis 1997, 73). This new terminology construing and classifying sexual aberrations as psychopathologies was eventually found to blur any easy distinction, and to voice the tensions, not only between normal/abnormal or healthy/degenerate, but also between the

mental and the physical spheres. The study of medico-scientific discourse formulated within a specific professional domain in a specific historical period remains, therefore, a privileged means of bringing such terminological implications to the fore.

References

- Ahmad, Khurshid, and Margaret Rogers. 2001. "Corpus Linguistics and Terminology Extraction". In *Handbook of Terminology Management: Volume 2, Application-Oriented Terminology Management*, edited by Sue Ellen Wright and Gerhard Budin, 725-60. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 2 vols.
- Baker, Paul. 2006. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London-New York: Continuum.
- . 2010. *Sociolinguistics and Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Baker, Paul, and Erez Levon. 2016. "'That's what I call a man': Representations of Racialised and Classed Masculinities in the UK Print Media". *Gender and Language* vol. 10, no. 1: 106-39.
- Bauer, Heike. 2003. "'Not a translation but a mutilation': The Limits of Translation and the Discipline of Sexology". *The Yale Journal of Criticism* vol. 16, no. 2: 381-405.
- . 2009. *English Literary Sexology: Translations of Inversion, 1860-1930*. London-New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beccalossi, Chiara. 2012a. "Female Same-Sex Desires: Conceptualizing a Disease in Competing Medical Fields in Nineteenth-Century Europe". *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* vol. 67, no. 1: 7-35.
- . 2012b. *Female Sexual Inversion: Same-Sex Desires in Italian and British Sexology, c.1870-1920*. London-New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bourigault, Didier, Christian Jacquemin, and Marie-Claude L'Homme (eds). 2001. *Recent Advances in Computational Terminology*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bowker, Lynne, and Jennifer Pearson. 2002. *Working with Specialized Language: A Practical Guide to Using Corpora*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Bynum, William F., Stephen Lock, and Roy Porter (eds). 1992. *Medical Journals and Medical Knowledge: Historical Essays*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Daille, Béatrice. 2017. *Term Variation in Specialised Corpora: Characterisation, Automatic Discovery and Applications*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dawson, Gowan, and Jonathan R. Topham. 2020. "Constructing Scientific Communities". In *Science Periodicals in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Constructing Scientific Communities*, edited by Gowan Dawson, Bernard Lightman, Sally Shuttleworth, *et al.*, 1-32. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Engstrom, Eric J., and Kenneth S. Kendler. 2013. "Richard von Krafft-Ebing's Views on the Etiology of Major Psychiatric Illness". *Psychological Medicine* vol. 43, no. 7: 1345-52. doi: 10.1017/S0033291712001833.
- Frampton, Sally. 2020a. "'A Borderland in Ethics': Medical Journals, the Public, and the Medical Profession in Nineteenth-Century Britain". In *Science Periodicals in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Constructing Scientific Communities*, edited by Gowan Dawson, Bernard Lightman, Sally Shuttleworth, *et al.*, 311-36. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 2020b. "The Medical Press and Its Public". In *The Edinburgh History of the British and Irish Press, Volume 2: Expansion and Evolution, 1800-1900*, edited by David Finkelstein, 438-56. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 3 vols.
- Gamper, Johann, and Oliviero Stock. 1998. "Corpus-Based Terminology". *Terminology* vol. 5, no. 2: 147-59.
- Geeraerts, Dirk. 2015. "Foreword". In *Handbook of Terminology: Volume 1*, edited by Hendrik J. Kockaert and Frieda Steurs, xvii-xix. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 3 vols.
- Heylen, Kris, and Dirk De Hertog. 2015. "Automatic Term Extraction". In *Handbook of Terminology: Volume 1*, edited by Hendrik J. Kockaert and Frieda Steurs, 203-21. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 3 vols.

- Hunston, Susan. 2002. *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janssen, Diederik F. 2015. "‘Chronophilia’: Entries of Erotic Age Preference into Descriptive Psychopathology". *Medical History* vol. 59, no. 4: 575-98. doi: 10.1017/mdh.2015.47.
- . 2018. "Stepchild of Psychoanalysis: ‘Paedophilia’ in Early Psychodynamic Thought". *Psychoanalysis and History* vol. 20, no. 1: 59-87.
- Journal of Mental Science*, <<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/the-british-journal-of-psychiatry/past-title/journal-of-mental-science/all-issues/4F51B1E4B3F81774A5D21EE614CDFD45>> (01/2025).
- Krafft-Ebing, Richard von. 1892. *Psychopathia Sexualis, with Especial Reference to Contrary Sexual Instinct: A Medico-Legal Study*, translated by Charles G. Chaddock. Philadelphia-London: F.A. Davis.
- . 1899. *Psychopathia Sexualis, with Especial Reference to Antipathic Sexual Instinct: A Medico-Forensic Study*, translated by Francis J. Rebman. New York-London: Rebman.
- Linge, Ina. 2018. "German and British Sexual Sciences Across Disciplines at the Fin de Siècle: ‘Homosexuals’, ‘Inverts’ and ‘Uranians’". In *The Edinburgh Companion to Fin-de-Siècle Literature, Culture and the Arts*, edited by Josephine M. Guy, 383-400. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McEnery, Tony, Richard Xiao, and Yukio Tono (eds). 2006. *Corpus-Based Language Studies: An Advanced Resource Book*. London-New York: Routledge.
- Meyer, Ingrid, and Kristen Mackintosh. 1996. "The Corpus from a Terminographer’s Viewpoint". *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* vol. 1, no. 2: 257-68.
- Moore, Alison. 2009. "Rethinking Gendered Perversion and Degeneration in Visions of Sadism and Masochism, 1886-1930". *Journal of the History of Sexuality* vol. 18, no. 1: 138-57.
- Noyes, John K. 2018 [1997]. *The Mastery of Submission: Inventions of Masochism*. London-Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Oosterhuis, Harry. 1997. "Richard von Krafft-Ebing’s ‘Step-Children of Nature’: Psychiatry and the Making of Homosexual Identity". In *Science and Homosexualities*, edited by Vernon A. Rosario, 67-88. New York-London: Routledge.
- . 2000. *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity*. Chicago-London: Chicago University Press.
- . 2012. "Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll". *Medical History* vol. 56, no. 2: 133-55. doi: 10.1017/mdh.2011.30.
- Pearson, Jennifer. 1998. *Terms in Context*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Peterson, Jeanne M. 1994. "Medicine". In *Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society*, edited by Jerry Don Vann and Rosemary T. VanArsdel, 22-44. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sager, Juan C. 2001. "Terminology Compilation: Consequences and Aspects of Automation". In *Handbook of Terminology Management: Volume 2, Application-Oriented Terminology Management*, edited by Sue Ellen Wright and Gerhard Budin, 761-71. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 2 vols.
- Schaffner, Anna Katharina. 2012. *Modernism and Perversion: Sexual Deviance in Sexology and Literature, 1850-1930*. London-New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stewart, Suzanne R. 1998. *Sublime Surrender: Male Masochism at the Fin-de-Siècle*. Ithaca-London: Cornell University Press.
- Verhoeven, Timothy. 2015. "Pathologizing Male Desire: Satyriasis, Masculinity, and Modern Civilization at the Fin de Siècle". *Journal of the History of Sexuality* vol. 24, no. 1: 25-45.

Software

- Brezina, Vaclav, Pierre Weill-Tessier, and Tony McEnery. 2021. *#LancsBox v.6.x*. Lancaster: Lancaster University. <<http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/lancsbox>> (01/2025).