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Gender identity is dimorphic, multivariate, and sequential in development. Its determinants are not exclusively biological/social nor prenatal/postnatal, but both. Its components are erotic and nonerotic. Its data are derived from experimental and clinical comparative psychoendocrinology, brain science, and cross-cultural ethnography. (The SSC® indicates that this book has been cited in over 460 publications.)
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The history of Man & Woman, Boy & Girl (M&W, B&G) dates from 1950 when, as a Harvard graduate student, I began a dissertation on the psychology of hermaphroditism and established contact at Johns Hopkins with Lawson Wilkins, the world's first pediatric endocrinologist. In 1951 I joined his clinic, renowned as a center for the treatment of congenital sexual disorders, to become the first pediatric psychoendocrinologist. Hermaphroditism continued to be a special research challenge.

So that sex role could be applied to the male/female role of the birth-defective genitals, before or after surgery, in 1955 I coined the term gender role,¹ from which gender identity later became split off. Gender role signifies all the ways, nongenital as well as genital, in which masculinity and femininity are experienced and publicly manifested, irrespective of genital disability.

I used different clinical syndromes to disentangle the relative influence of genetic sex, gonadal sex, internal and external genital anatomy, prenatal and pubertal hormonal sex, and the sex of assignment and rearing on the masculine or feminine outcome of gender identity and role [G-I/R]. By 1969 there was sufficient new knowledge in published psycho-hormonal outcome studies to justify its synthesis. Students who trained with me contracted to share the work load of research for publication in return for coauthorship. Anke A. Ehrhardt, coauthor of M&W, B&G, had recently completed her PhD research with me at the University of Düsseldorf. She remained there for a year, communicating by mail. I recall summer evenings that year, sitting in the yard of my historic rowhouse in the Johns Hopkins neighborhood, fighting with words, paragraphs, and concepts until 2:00 and 3:00 a.m., never having enough uninterrupted time, but finally winning!

The book was different from any sexological writings that preceded it, insofar as its guiding concept was not simply the determinants of sexual or reproductive behavior, but of differentiation as masculine or feminine, or maybe androgynous. It was also different because its table of contents traced differentiation through its developmental spectrum: from genetics through prenatal hormonalization, rearing, socialization, cross-cultural diversity, and hormonal adolescence into maturity—always with heavy reliance on human clinical material. The unification thus achieved is antithetical to the polarity of nature/nurture or biology/sociology. It generates citations of approval from unificationists and of outrage from opponents of both the medical mode and social determinism.

History may yet decree that the citations to M&W, B&G are generated less by science than by the politics of gender. There could hardly be a sex gap, whereas a gender gap is genitally neutered and respectable. The language needed the term in 1955 and assimilated it eagerly. M&W, B&G gave it scholarly status and scientific substance.

Since 1972 I have written reviews and textbook chapters on gender identity, among which I recommend "The development of sexuality and eroticism in humankind."² The prime heir of M&W, B&G, in the sense of being a summing up and consolidation of more new knowledge, is Lovemarks.³ Source materials for M&W, B&G are anthologized in Venuses Penises.⁴