



Original Communication

A new classification of zoophilia

Anil Aggrawal Director Professor

Forensic Medicine, Maulana Azad Medical College, New-Delhi 110002, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 22 January 2010

Received in revised form

24 November 2010

Accepted 5 January 2011

Available online 22 January 2011

Keywords:

Bestiality

Bestosexuality

Paraphilia

Zooerastia

Zooerasty

Zoophilia

ABSTRACT

Zoophilia is a paraphilia whereby the perpetrator gets sexual pleasure in having sex with animals. Most jurisdictions and nations have laws against this practice. Zoophilia exists in many variations, and some authors have attempted to classify zoophilia previously. However unanimity does not exist among various classifications. In addition, sexual contact between humans and animals has been given several names such as zoophilia, zoophilism, bestiality, zooerasty and zoorasty. These terms continue to be used in different senses by different authors, creating some amount of confusion. A mathematical classification of zoophilia, which could group all shades of zoophilia under various numerical classes, could be a way to end this confusion.

Recently a ten-tier classification of necrophilia has been proposed to bring an end to a similar confusion extant among various terms referring to necrophilia. It is our proposition that various shades of zoophilia exist on a similar continuum. Thus, each proposed class of zoophilia can be “mapped” to a similar class of necrophilia already proposed. This classification has an intuitive appeal, as it grades all shades of zoophilia from the least innocuous behavior to the most criminal. It is hoped that it would also bring an end to the existing confusion among several zoophilia related terms. In addition, since each proposed class of zoophilia can be exactly “mapped” to classes of another paraphilia (necrophilia), it may point to an “equivalence” among all paraphilias not yet explored fully. This area needs further exploration.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd and Faculty of Forensic and Legal Medicine. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Human sexual contact with animals has been known since Biblical times.¹ Several shades of zoophilic behavior are known, and several terms have been used to describe them. Some terms that have been used are zoophilia, zoophilism, zooerasty, zooerastia, bestiality, and bestosexuality. The range of sexual behaviors with animals include not just coitus, but a whole range of other sexual activities, including fellatio, cunnilingus, masturbation of animals,² anal intercourse,³ exhibitionism, frotteurism and voyeurism.⁴ Various terms currently used to describe these behaviors may be confusing, especially as different writers tend to use them differently. It may be useful to take a look at the most common meanings of these terms.

It was Richard Freiherr von Krafft-Ebing (1840–1902), who introduced the terms *zoophilia erotica* and *zooerasty* in 1894.⁵ Many authors use the terms zoophilia, zoophilism, zooerasty, zooerastia, bestiality, and bestosexuality interchangeably, there is supposed to be a subtle difference between them. *Zoophilia* and *zoophilism*

(Greek, *zoon*, animal; *philia*, love) are usually considered synonymous. These terms refer to a perversion, where the affected individual is both emotionally and sexually attracted to animals. Individuals engaged in this behavior – known as *zoophiles*, or simply *zoos* – begin to love the animals as their own family members and form a deep emotional bond with them. Sexual union with the animals arises as a part of that emotional bonding. Ebing talked about a similar condition *zoophilia erotica fetischistica*, in which a person is sexually aroused by just being close to animals, but he need not be interested in the animal's genitalia.⁶ The traditional use of the term *bestiality* refers to sexual contact between a human and animal, *without* the human developing any kind of emotional bonding with the animal. The animal is used simply as a vehicle for satisfying the lust. A bestialist is often seen more or less as an opportunist. He uses the animal for sex, when for instance, normal outlets for sex are not available.

Zooerasty or *zoorasty* is almost the same as bestiality, with the additional fact that here the offender, the zooerast, has a decidedly pathological component, i.e. he may prefer an animal even when other normal sexual outlets, e.g. women were available.

A number of other terms have been used for zoophilia, one of the most common being *sodomy*. Originally, the term sodomy, was

E-mail address: anil@anilaggrawal.com.

used to refer only to male homosexuality or pederasty.⁷ However later it came to include several abnormal sexual acts and perversions especially bestiality. In fact, the term sodomy came to be used to denote any sexual activity that was non procreative, such as masturbation, oral-genital contact, oral-anal contact, anal intercourse and bestiality.⁶ In most modern jurisdictions however the term sodomy is reserved for anal intercourse only. *Buggery* is another term that has been used in the past, as a synonym for bestiality. The more recent term *zoosexuality* describes the full spectrum of human-animal orientation.

Some variants on the theme of zoophilia (involving another co-existing paraphilia) are *necrozoophilia*, sexual attraction to dead animals (also known as *necrobustiality*) and *zoosadism*, zoophilic sadism or bestialsadism (torture of animal during sexual contact). Zoosadism is partly explained by the hypothesis that some aggressive children and adolescents, who get less chance to live out their aggression in interpersonal relations turn to zoosadism.⁸ Sometimes there is a desire to be transformed into the animal, the paraphiliac has had contact with.⁹ This can be understood as a narcissistic tendency and is not necessarily related to lycanthropy (a mental illness in which a patient believes he or she is, or has transformed into, an animal and behaves accordingly).

1.1. Proposed classification of zoophilia

The various terminologies that are currently used to describe various shades of zoosexual behavior are at best vague and are not used universally in the same sense by all authors. The terms zoophilia, zoophilism, zooerasty, zooerastia, bestiality and bestiosexuality have been used by different authors to describe different shades of zoosexual behavior. Similar situation exists for some other paraphilias of which necrophilia is a notable example. To address this issue, a ten-tier classification system for necrophilia has been proposed, which classifies various shades of necrophilia mathematically into ten classes.¹⁰ This classification groups all necrophiliacs into a continuum with pathologically least deviant being grouped in class I and the most deviant in class X (Table 1).

From a study of literature on zoosexual behavior and reported cases, it appears that zoosexual behaviors could be similarly classified, with each zoophiliac class being conveniently “mapped” to a distinctive necrophilic class. It must be kept in mind that cases

from all these classes may not be reported in literature simply because the “aggrieved party” is an animal, which is unable to complain. Cases belonging to more severe classes are more often reported in literature. A more complete listing of individual cases belonging to each class is mentioned elsewhere.¹¹ The proposed classification is as follows:

1.1.1. Class I zoosexuals: human–animal role-players

Class I zoosexuals do not use animals for sex at all, just as class I necrophiles do not have sex with dead people. In other words, they are mere role-players. They would rather want their human partners to act as animals during sex, because the thought of having sex with animals excites them. Also known as pet play, pony play, ponyism or pup-play, human–animal role-play thus involves one participant taking on the role of a real or imaginary animal in character, including appropriate mannerisms and behavior. Thus it is a kind of *sexual role-play*.

The principal theme of human-animal role-play is usually the voluntary or involuntary reduction (or transformation) of a human being to animal status, and focus on the altered mind-space created. The most common examples of “conversion” are canids (pup, dog, wolf), felines (cat, kitten, lion) and equines (pony, horse). The activity is common among people with a *transformation fetish* (A form of sexual fetishism where a person becomes sexually aroused by descriptions or depictions of transformations, usually the transformations of people into other beings, animals or objects). Human-animal role-play is also used in a BDSM context, where the partner is reduced to the status of an animal as a symbol of showing authority and dominance.

1.1.2. Class II zoosexuals: romantic zoophiles

Would keep an animal as a pet in order to get a psychosexual stimulation. Would not actually indulge in sex with the animals. Ebing's *zoophilia erotica fetichistica* would fall under this class.

1.1.3. Class III zoosexuals: people having a zoophilic fantasy – zoophilic fantasizers

These people fantasize intercourse with animals, but do not indulge in actual intercourse. May masturbate in the presence of animals. Zoophilic voyeurism (also called mixoscopic zoophilia or faunoiphilia) and zoophilic exhibitionism would fall under this category.

Table 1
Major characteristics of each of the ten classes of necrophiles.

Class	Tentative name	Major characteristics
I	Role players	Do not want to have sex with a dead person. Enjoy sex with a living person pretending to be dead.
II	Romantic necrophiles	Bereaved people, who would mummify a part of the body of their recently departed loved ones, and keep it with them in order to get a psychosexual stimulation. Would not show a similar interest in any other dead body, i.e. body of a person with whom they were not romantically involved in life.
III	Necrophilic fantasizers	Fantasize intercourse with the dead. May visit cemeteries and funeral parlors and may masturbate in the presence of the dead.
IV	Tactile necrophiles	Interest in dead bodies increases to the level of touching them. Like to stroke erotic parts of a dead body, such as breasts. May manipulate sexual organs of the dead in order to get an orgasm.
V	Fetishistic necrophiles	Cut up parts of a dead body – say a breast – mummify it, and keep it in their possession to use it as a fetish for their necrophilic activities. Differ from class II necrophiles in the sense that they (class V) do it with the bodies of strangers with whom they held no romantic relationship in life. Thus they do not do it merely to fill a psychosexual vacuum left by the death of their loved ones.
VI	Necromutilomaniacs	Interest in dead bodies is <i>more</i> than merely touching them. Necrophilic pleasure comes from mutilating a dead body.
VII	Opportunistic necrophiles	Actual sexual activity with the dead starts from this class. Normally these necrophiles would be content to have sexual intercourse with the living, but if an opportunity arose, would not refrain from having sexual intercourse with the dead. Necrophilic mortuary attendants belong to this class.
VIII	Regular necrophiles	The so-called “classic” necrophiles. They do not enjoy sexual intercourse with the living and prefer dead bodies for intercourse. They can however have sex with both living and dead persons. In this sense they differ from class X necrophiles, who can have sex <i>only</i> with dead persons.
IX	Homicidal necrophiles	This penultimate category is the most dangerous of all, in the sense that they would kill a person in order to have intercourse with him or her. They are however capable of having sexual intercourse with the living, but the need for sexual intercourse with the dead is so great that they must kill human beings in order to have sexual intercourse with their dead bodies.
X	Exclusive necrophiles	Sexual intercourse is possible <i>only</i> with the dead, with the complete exclusion of living partners.

1.1.4. Class IV zoosexuals: tactile zoophiles

Interest in animals increases to the level of touching them. These are the people, who get sexual excitement by touching, stroking or fondling an animal or their erotic parts, such as genitals or anal and perianal area. Some would rub their genitals against animals, as a source of pleasure (zoophilic frotteurism).

1.1.5. Class V zoosexuals: people having a fetishistic zoophilia – fetishistic zoophiles

People belonging to this class may be called animal fetishists. They preserve parts of animals, especially furs and use this as a fetish for their zoophilic activities. The touch of soft and silky fur of animals may act as an erotic stimulus, just as ordinary fur does for a fetishist. Other common fetish objects such as shoes would not sexually stimulate this group. The fetish object must be part of an animal. Randall and associates¹² narrate an interesting case, where the tongue of a deer was used as a masturbatory tool.

1.1.6. Class VI zoosexuals: sadistic Bestials

Sexual pleasure comes from sadistic activities with an animal, such as torturing it (*zoosadism*, *zoophilic sadism* or *bestialsadism*). People up to this class, use animals for sexual excitement, *without* actually engaging in intercourse with them. Bartmann and Wohlsein¹³ describe traumatic injuries in 193 horses over a four year period, out of which at least ten cases were due to acts of zoophilism and zoosadism. The injuries were caused by gunshots, or by spear like instruments or knives. Only seven could be saved by surgical or medical treatment. Wochner and Klosinski⁸ studied 1502 aggressive children and adolescents who had been presented and treated at the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry at the University of Tübingen, and found that out of them 25 had been zoosadists. These were exclusively boys (23 out of 25). The age distribution of the zoosadists showed an increased incidence in 13, 17 and 18 year olds which could be connected with problems of puberty, group constraints and proving virility. Compared with a control group of “only aggressive” patients, organic brain damage owing to complications of pregnancy or delivery, difficult and harsh upbringing by the parents and absence of a positive father figure could be demonstrated in the zoosadists. One third of the zoosadists showed additional disorders of sexual behavior and the sexual-sadistic component was manifested in the zoosadistic action.

1.1.7. Class VII zoosexuals: Opportunistic zoosexuals

Actual sexual activity with animals starts from this class. Normally these zoosexuals would be content to have sexual intercourse with the living, but if an opportunity arose, would not refrain from having sexual intercourse with animals. Such activity may be seen in incarcerated or stranded persons, or when the individual sees an opportunity to have sex with an animal with no one around (e.g. a shepherd taking cattle away for grazing on a lonely farmland). Attendants of animal houses also belong to this class. People belonging to this class do not love animals at an emotional level.

1.1.8. Class VIII zoosexuals: regular zoosexuals

The so-called “classic” zoophiles. They do not enjoy sexual intercourse with humans and prefer animals for intercourse. They can however have sex with both humans and animals. In this sense they differ from class X zoophiles, who can have sex *only* with animals. This class has subclasses including activities such as fellatio, cunnilingus, masturbation of animals and anal intercourse with animals. These are the people, who love animals at an emotional level, and express their love through sexual intercourse. They have sex with animals, as one would normally have with human partners. These people tend to love animals, and by and large do not hurt or harm animals.

A subclass exists within this class, which may be called “*regular zoophilia by proxy*”. In this case, the person – instead of himself having sexual intercourse with an animal – may force his or her partner to have a sexual act with an animal. This happened in *R v Bourne (1952) 36 Cr App R 125 (CCA)*, in which the husband forced his wife to submit to a dog inserting its penis into her vagina. The husband was convicted of aiding and abetting his wife to commit buggery and sentenced to eight years in prison. The wife was not punished, since she acted under duress. In *R v Tierney (1990) 12 Cr. App. R.(S) 216*, the defendant took photographs of his wife having intercourse with his Alsatian dog for his own continuing satisfaction. In this case, three months’ imprisonment was given to the accused, but not to his wife, because she consented to perform the act in desperation in order to retain her husband’s affections.

1.1.9. Class IX zoosexuals: homicidal bestials

These zoophiles need to kill an animal in order to have intercourse with it (*necrozoophilic*). They are however capable of having sexual intercourse with living animals, but the need for sexual intercourse with the dead animals is so great that they must kill animals in order to have sexual intercourse with their dead bodies. The noted killer Jeffrey Dahmer (1960–1994) is reported to have collected animal carrion from road, dissected them and masturbating, as he found the glistening viscera of animals sexually arousing.¹⁴ In November 2006, Bryan James Hathaway, 20, of Douglas County, Minnesota was arrested for having sex with a deer carcass he found on the side of the road while bicycling. He was charged with violating a law against “sexual gratification with an animal.” He was placed on probation, and was also sentenced to be evaluated as a sex offender and treated at the Institute for Psychological and Sexual Health in Duluth.

1.1.10. Class X zoosexuals: exclusive zoosexuals

Sexual intercourse is possible only or mostly with animals, with virtually a complete exclusion of human partners. This group has been called zoerasts by some writers.

2. Discussion

Bestiality and zoophilia are not mentioned in the first two editions of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM), published by the American Psychiatric Association.^{15,16} Zoophilia as a paraphilia made its first appearance in DSM-III, and was categorized as mental disorder number 302.10.¹⁷ Under the diagnostic criteria for zoophilia the following description was given, “The act or fantasy of engaging in sexual activity with animals is a repeatedly preferred or exclusive method of achieving sexual excitement”. According to the manual, “the animal may be the object of intercourse or may be trained to sexually excite the human partner by licking or rubbing. Usually the preferred animal is one with which the individual had contact during childhood, such as a household pet or farm animal. The animal is preferred no matter what other forms of sexual outlet are available.”¹⁷ No information was provided regarding the age of onset. The manual mentioned that “initially in the course of the disorder there may also be sexual arousal by humans. As time progresses, however, the animal becomes the most powerful sexual stimulus. This usually occurs by early adulthood and the course then becomes chronic. Nonpathological sexual activity with animals may occur because of the unavailability of suitable human partners or as a form of sexual experimentation. In such instances the use of animals is not the consistently preferred method of achieving sexual excitement.”

In the revised, third edition of the DSM (DSM-III-R), “zoophilia” was removed as a disorder by itself. The diagnostic committee that worked on the paraphilia section of the DSM-III-R concluded that

“zoophilia is virtually never a clinically significant problem by itself”.¹⁸ They omitted it as a formal diagnosis and listed “zoophilia” in the diagnostic label of “Paraphilia Not Otherwise Specified” (302.90).

Subsequent editions of DSM continued the tradition of not listing zoophilia as a separate disorder. The latest edition, DSM-IV-TR¹⁹ likewise does not assign any specific or unique code to zoophilia. Instead along with several other uncommon paraphilias (seven of which are specifically named), zoophilia is grouped under the code 302.9 (Paraphilias Not Otherwise Specified). Code 302.9 states:

This category is included for coding Paraphilias that do not meet the criteria for any of the specific categories. Examples include, but are not limited to, telephone scatologia (obscene phone calls), necrophilia (corpses), partialism (exclusive focus on part of body), zoophilia (animals), coprophilia (feces), klismaphilia (enemas), and urophilia (urine).

International Classification of Diseases, ninth edition, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) considers zoophilia significant enough not only to mention it separately, but even assign a code to it (302.1). Neither any edition of DSM, nor any edition of ICD attempt to classify various shades of zoophilic behavior further.

Attempts have been made earlier to classify zoophilic behaviors but no classification is as mathematical and as precise as the current one. Mostly subjective terms have been used to classify various shades of zoophilic behavior which can be construed differently by different authors. Furthermore, they are not amenable to computer classification. The modern classification suggested in this paper is shorn of these drawbacks. Shaffer and Penn²⁰ deal with one of the most detailed treatments of zoophilia and list at least sixteen different types of paraphilia involving animals (Table 2), but they also do not make any mention of various shades of zoophilic behavior.

Massen²¹ is perhaps the only author, who distinguishes various shades of zoosexual activity. These forms, which increase gradually in severity from 1 to 9, may overlap frequently. Several of them may occur in combination. These forms are:

1. Incidental experience and latent zoophilia
2. Zoophilic voyeurism (also called mixoscopic zoophilia or faunoiphilia)
3. Frotteurism (rubbing against animals, physical contact as source of pleasure) [Massen actually uses the term frottage, but since frottage is generally taken to mean consensual rubbing, and frotteurism, non consensual, the latter term is preferable here]
4. The animal as a tool for masturbatory activities

Table 2
Different types of zoophilia as listed by Shaffer and Penn.²⁰

Paraphilia	Arousal from
Aelurophilia	deriving gratification from cats
Anolingus	arousal from licking lizards
Arachnephilia	arousal from spiders
Avisodomy	breaking the neck of a bird while penetrating it for sex
Batrachophilia	arousal or attraction to frogs
Bee stings	use of bees, such as to sting genitalia
Canophilia	arousal from dogs
Cynophilia	arousal from sex with dogs
Entomophilia	arousal from insects or use of insects in sexual activity
Entomocism	arousal from insects or use of insects in sexual activity
Formicophilia	enjoyment of the use of ants or insects for sexual purposes
Melissophilia	arousal from bees
Musophilia	arousal from mice
Necrobetialism	arousal from having sex with dead animals
Ophidiophilia	arousal from snakes
Ornithophilia	arousal from birds
Phthiriophilia	attraction to lice

5. The animal as a surrogate object for a behavioral fetishism (somasochistic practices, sexual murder, zoosadism etc.)
6. The animal as fetish (fixation on one specific kind, breed or individual)
7. Physical contact and affection
8. The animal as a surrogate for a human sex partner
9. The animal as deliberately and voluntarily chosen sex partner.

The proposed classification builds upon this classification and takes cues from a similar earlier classification proposed for necrophilia. However the real test of this classification would come with time, as more and more cases of bestiality and zoophilic behaviors are reported and each finds a niche in one or the other suggested classes. If a given case falls outside of the suggested classes, the classification would need a revision.

Table 3 compares various necrophilic classes with equivalent zoophile classes. On studying this table, it becomes quite obvious that a kind of “paraphilic equivalence” exists between necrophilia and zoophilia. This kind of paraphilic equivalence is perhaps prevalent among other types of paraphilias too and needs further exploration.

2.1. Difficulties in applying this classification to clinical practice

No major difficulties are foreseen in applying this classification to clinical practice. However a detailed history is absolutely necessary to bring out the exact shade of zoosexual behavior. This may not always be forthcoming as the patient may not feel confident and/or comfortable with the therapist. History of more “damning” behaviors (eg sadistic bestiality, i.e. class VI onwards) may not be given away easily by the patient either for shame or fear of legal repercussions. An environment of complete trust must be built by the psychologist and psychiatrist towards the patient to elicit a detailed history. If need be, additional history may be elicited from spouse, other family members and neighbors.

The classification may have an impact on possible therapeutic modalities also. People suffering from class I till class V may be treated by simple behavior modification techniques. People suffering from higher classes would need more rigorous treatment modalities. This may include pharmacological treatment such as antiandrogens including Medroxyprogesterone acetate, Cyproterone acetate and Leuprolide acetate.^{22,23}

2.2. Clinical, forensic and research advantages

Like all classifications, this classification would have clinical, forensic and research advantages.

- (1) Clinically if mild types of paraphilias (class I till V – tentatively called “leptozoosexuality” or mild zoosexuality) are distinguished from more severe types (class VI till class X – tentatively called “baryzoosexuality” or severe zoosexuality), one can decide about the treatment modalities for each. They would be different as mentioned in the above section.
- (2) Laws of most countries do not consider classes I till classes IV as illegal or worthy of punishment. Even class V (fetishistic zoophilia) is normally not a criminal behavior until and unless it involves stealing (of furs etc). Higher categories of zoosexuality are punishable in most jurisdictions. Thus the classification is important forensically in that not all zoosexuals are criminally responsible for their behavior. A correct classification of their behavior is necessary to be explained to the judges and jury.
- (3) The classification offers research advantages too. Currently the classification of zoosexuality do not exist, and whatever are available are not mathematically graded. Thus they are not only

Table 3
Comparison of various necrophile classes with equivalent zoophile classes.

Class	Tentative name	Major characteristics of necrophile	Equivalent zoophiles
I	Role players	Do not want to have sex with a dead person. Enjoy sex with a living person pretending to be dead.	Do not want to have sex with an actual animal. Enjoy sex with a living person pretending to be an animal, or positioned like an animal as on all fours.
II	Romantic necrophiles/zoophiles	Bereaved people, who would mummify a part of the body of their recently departed loved ones, and keep it with them in order to get a psychosexual stimulation. Would not show a similar interest in any other dead body, i.e. body of a person with whom they were not romantically involved in life.	Would keep an animal as a pet in order to get a psychosexual stimulation. Would not actually indulge in sex with the animals. Ebing's <i>zoophilia erotica fetichistica</i> would fall under this class.
III	Necrophilic/Zoophilic fantasizers	Fantasize intercourse with the dead. May visit cemeteries and funeral parlors and may masturbate in the presence of the dead.	Fantasize intercourse with animals, but do not indulge in actual intercourse. May masturbate in the presence of animals. Zoophilic voyeurism (also called mixoscopic zoophilia or faunoiphilia) would fall under this category. Zoophilic exhibitionism would also be in this category
IV	Tactile necrophiles/zoophiles	Interest in dead bodies increases to the level of touching them. Like to stroke erotic parts of a dead body, such as breasts. May manipulate sexual organs of the dead in order to get an orgasm.	Interest in animals increases to the level of touching them. Like to stroke erotic parts of animals, such as genitals or anal and perianal area in order to get an orgasm. Some would rub their genitals against animals, as a source of pleasure (zoophilic frotteurism).
V	Fetishistic necrophiles/zoophiles	Cut up parts of a dead body – say a breast – mummify it, and keep it in their possession to use it as a fetish for their necrophilic activities. Differ from class II necrophiles in the sense that they (class V) do it with the bodies of strangers with whom they held no romantic relationship in life. Thus they do not do it merely to fill a psychosexual vacuum left by the death of their loved ones.	Preserve parts of animals, especially furs and use this as a fetish for their zoophilic activities. Other common fetish objects such as shoes would not sexually stimulate this group. The fetish object must be part of an animal.
VI	Necromutilomaniacs/Sadistic bestials	Interest in dead bodies is <i>more</i> than merely touching them. Necrophilic pleasure comes from mutilating a dead body.	Sexual pleasure comes from sadistic activities with an animal, such as torturing it (<i>zoosadism, zoophilic sadism or bestialsadism</i>).
VII	Opportunistic necrophiles/zoophiles	Actual sexual activity with the dead starts from this class. Normally these necrophiles would be content to have sexual intercourse with the living, but if an opportunity arose, would not refrain from having sexual intercourse with the dead. Necrophilic mortuary attendants belong to this class.	Actual sexual activity with animals starts from this class. Normally these zoophiles would be content to have sexual intercourse with the living, but if an opportunity arose, would not refrain from having sexual intercourse with animals. Attendants of animal houses belong to this class.
VIII	Regular necrophiles/zoophiles	The so-called “classic” necrophiles. They do not enjoy sexual intercourse with the living and prefer dead bodies for intercourse. They can however have sex with both living and dead persons. In this sense they differ from class X necrophiles, who can have sex <i>only</i> with dead persons.	The so-called “classic” zoophiles. They do not enjoy sexual intercourse with humans and prefer animals for intercourse. They can however have sex with both humans and animals. In this sense they differ from class X zoophiles, who can have sex <i>only</i> with animals. This class has subclasses including activities such as fellatio, cunnilingus, masturbation of animals and anal intercourse with animals.
IX	Homicidal necrophiles/zoophiles	This penultimate category is the most dangerous of all, in the sense that they would kill a person in order to have intercourse with him or her. They are however capable of having sexual intercourse with the living, but the need for sexual intercourse with the dead is so great that they must kill human beings in order to have sexual intercourse with their dead bodies.	These zoophiles need to kill an animal in order to have intercourse with it (<i>necrozoophilics</i>). They are however capable of having sexual intercourse with living animals, but the need for sexual intercourse with the dead animals is so great that they must kill animals in order to have sexual intercourse with their dead bodies.
X	Exclusive necrophiles/zoophiles	Sexual intercourse is possible <i>only</i> with the dead, with the complete exclusion of living partners.	Sexual intercourse is possible <i>only</i> with animals, with the complete exclusion of human partners.

not amenable to computerization, each class may be conceived differently by different workers. The proposed classification is neatly and mathematically based. This is amenable to computerization and can only be interpreted by every worker in one way only. As more and more cases of zoosexuality are classified under the new scheme, we can know the exact epidemiology of zoosexuality as it is prevalent by classes. This

is far more desirable than just to know the total epidemiological rate of zoosexuality as a whole in the population.

3. Conclusion

This paper attempts to classify various shades of zoosexual behavior in ten classes. Hopefully this classification would put an

end to some confusion that is currently present among various terminologies used to describe zoosexual behavior. Furthermore this classification also hints at a kind of “paraphilic equivalence” that exists between necrophilia and zoosexuality and perhaps other classes of paraphilias too.

Conflict of interest

None

Funding

None

Ethical approval

None

References

1. Aggrawal A. References to the paraphilias and sexual crimes in the Bible. *J Forensic Leg Med* 2009; **16**(3):109–14.
2. London LS, Caprio FS. *Sexual deviations*. Washington DC: Linacre Press; 1950.
3. Peretti PO, Rowan M. Zoophilia: factors related to its sustained practice. *Panminerva Med* 1983 Apr–Jun; **25**(2):127–31.
4. McNally RJ, Lukach BM. Behavioral treatment of zoophilic exhibitionism. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry* 1991 Dec; **22**(4):281–4.
5. Oosterhuis H. *Stepchildren of nature: Krafft-Ebing, psychiatry, and the making of sexual identity*. In: *The Chicago series on sexuality, history, and society*. Chicago, IL: University Of Chicago Press; 2000.
6. Aggrawal A. *Forensic and medico-legal aspects of sexual crimes and unusual sexual practices*. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2009.
7. Karpman B. *The sexual offender and his offenses*. 7th ed. New York, NY: Julian Press, Inc.; 1962.
8. Wochner M, Klosinski G. Child and adolescent psychiatry aspects of animal abuse (a comparison with aggressive patients in child and adolescent psychiatry). *Schweiz Arch Neurol Psychiatr* 1988; **139**(3):59–67 [Article in German].
9. Dittert S, Seidl O, Soyka M. Zoophilia between pathology and normality. Presentation of 3 case reports and an internet survey. *Nervenarzt* 2005 Jan; **76**(1):61–7 [Article in German].
10. Aggrawal A. A new classification of necrophilia. *J Forensic Leg Med* 2009; **16**(6):316–20.
11. Aggrawal A. *Forensic and medico-legal aspects of sexual crimes and unusual sexual practices*. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2009. 257–274.
12. Randall MB, Vance RP, McCalmont TH. Xenolingual autoeroticism. *Am J Forensic Med Pathol* 1990 Mar; **11**(1):89–92.
13. Bartmann CP, Wohlsein P. Injuries caused by outside violence with forensic importance in horses. *Dtsch Tierarztl Wochenschr* 2002 Mar; **109**(3):112–5 [Article in German].
14. Hickey EW. Paraphilia and signatures in crime scene investigation [chapter 9]. In: Hickey EW, editor. *Sex crimes and paraphilia*. 1st ed. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall; 2006. p. 95–107.
15. American Psychiatric Association.. *Diagnostic and Statistical manual of mental disorders*. 1st ed. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1952.
16. American Psychiatric Association.. *Diagnostic and Statistical manual of mental disorders*. 2nd ed. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1968.
17. American Psychiatric Association.. *Diagnostic and Statistical manual of mental disorders*. 3rd ed. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1980.
18. American Psychiatric Association.. *Diagnostic and Statistical manual of mental disorders*. 3rd ed. rev. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 1987. 405.
19. American Psychiatric Association.. *Diagnostic and Statistical manual of mental disorders*. 4th ed. Text rev. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association; 2000.
20. Shaffer L, Penn J. A comprehensive paraphilia classification system. In: Hickey EW, editor. *Sex crimes and paraphilia*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall; 2006. chap.8.
21. Massen J. *Zoophilie - Die sexuelle Liebe zu Tieren*. [Zoophilia - the sexual love for animals]. Köln: Pinto Preß Verlag; 1994. 57.
22. Codispoti VL. Pharmacology of sexually compulsive behavior. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 2008 Dec; **31**(4):671–9.
23. Saleh FM, Guidry LL. Psychosocial and biological treatment considerations for the paraphilic and nonparaphilic sex offender. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* 2003; **31**(4):486–93.