

Hubert Kennedy

Reviews of Seven Gay Classics

Peremptory Publications

Concord, CA

2003

© 2003 by Hubert Kennedy

Reviews of Seven Gay Classics is a Peremptory Publications ebook. It may be freely distributed, but no changes may be made in it.

Comments and suggestions are welcome. Please write to hubertk@pacbell.net.

Contents

Introduction	4
<i>Sexual Inversion</i>	6
by Havelock Ellis and John Addington Symonds	
<i>Die Buecher der namenlosen Liebe</i>	12
by John Henry Mackay (“Sagitta”)	
<i>Renaissance des Eros Uranios</i>	17
by Benedict Friedlaender	
<i>The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds</i>	22
edited and introduced by Phyllis Grosskurth; <i>Male Love: A Problem in Greek Ethics and Other Writings</i>	
by John Addington Symonds, edited by John Lauritsen	
<i>Die dorische Knabenliebe: Ihre Ethik und ihre Idee</i>	26
by Erich Bethe	
<i>The Riddle of “Man-Manly” Love:</i>	29
<i>The Pioneering Work on Male Homosexuality</i>	
by Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, translated by Michael A. Lombardi-Nash	
<i>Eros: Die Männerliebe der Griechen, ihre Beziehungen zur Geschichte, Erziehung, Literatur und Gesetzgebung aller Zeiten</i>	35
by Heinrich Hössli	

Introduction

Beginning in 1977 I published over sixty book reviews in gay publications. Some of the reviews I wrote—and the books I reviewed—are best forgotten. But other reviews deserve a second reading. This is particularly true, I think, of the seven book reviews collected here, since these books are classics of gay literature. Five are reprints of older works; one is a new translation of an older work; one is a work whose publication was delayed for many years.

Five of the books reviewed were originally written in German. This reflects the fact that the modern gay movement had its origins in Germany (as well as reflecting my own special interests). Apart from the works of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, whose translation by Michael Lombardi-Nash is reviewed here, only parts (but almost all) of the “Sagitta” writings of John Henry Mackay have appeared in English. I believe that the other German books are unlikely to see an English translation. For this reason, in my review of the writings of Heinrich Hössli in particular I quoted liberally from the text, so as to make available in English what I saw as most important in his book. It is my hope that readers will find this kind of review helpful—and welcome.

The seven reviews are presented in the order that I wrote them, not in the order of the first publication of the books. The first is a review of *Sexual Inversion*, by Havelock Ellis and John Addington Symonds. Its interest lies in what it tells us about the views and person of Symonds, England’s early champion of the homosexual cause. The second review reflects my special interest in the writings of the anarchist and boy-lover John Henry Mackay. The third review is of the major work of his friend Benedict Friedlaender. The two shared many views, but not all. The fourth review, of Symonds’s *Memoirs*, again tells of him—with some unavoidable repetitions.

The fifth review is of a slim book (originally a journal article) by Erich Bethe that is the only one of the six that was not (obviously) meant to promote the cause of homosexual emancipation. The sixth review here, of the English translation of the writings of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, was the occasion to recall once again the contributions of that redoubtable author, whose works have been a special study of mine. The seventh and final review is of the Great Hössli Edition, which includes the original two volumes of the re-

markable Swiss pioneer Heinrich Hössli, along with a third volume of supplementary material.

If there is a theme running through these works (and my reviews of them), it is that the modern world has still not come to terms with the boy-love of the ancient Greeks. The current hysteria over “child molestation” will not allow a rational discussion of the topic. Perhaps these classics of “gay” literature can still contribute to an understanding of the problems involved. It is certain that the topic will remain with us.

Hubert Kennedy

SEXUAL INVERSION by Havelock Ellis and John Addington Symonds

When the first edition of *Sexual Inversion* appeared in London in 1897 it was immediately suppressed, not by enemies of either of the authors, but by a friend of one of them. Horatio F. Brown, whom Symonds had appointed his literary executor at the time of his death four years earlier, bought up all available copies of the pioneering work (some had already been distributed) and persuaded Ellis to omit Symonds's name from the title page, as well as other evidence of authorship, from all future editions. Ellis quickly brought out a revised edition that same year. (These two editions will be referred to as "1897a" and "1897b", respectively.) Since, according to Ellis, the 1897a edition was never "officially" published, the next edition (Philadelphia, 1901) was the Second Edition.

The 1901 edition was published in America because of the fate of the 1897b edition, which was even more unpleasant than that of the 1897a edition. In a typical move, the London police used it to crush the Legitimation League, which they suspected of being a "haunt of anarchists." In 1898 George Bedborough, a bookseller, was secretary of the League, a small society dedicated to sex reform and, in particular, to advocating changes in the law relating to illegitimacy. The police charged him with selling "a certain lewd, wicked, bawdy, scandalous and obscene libel," namely the 1897b edition of *Sexual Inversion*, and persuaded him to plead guilty. Thus the police achieved the double victory of crushing the Legitimation League and of effectively banning the book. A Free Press Defense Committee had been organized, but was never allowed to testify, since the book itself was never on trial.

A further result of the trial was Ellis's determination to publish all future volumes of his *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* outside of Britain, and in the preface to the Second Edition (1901) he vigorously declared that "this is the only edition of my book in English authorized by me. Any other edition of this book or of any volume of my *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* is issued without my authorization and against my wish" (p. iv).

Both of the “first” editions are, of course, rare, but it is the original, with Symond’s name on the title page, which Arno Press reprinted in 1975 in their series on Homosexuality: Lesbians and Gay Men in Society, History and Literature. Inevitably the interest of today’s reader in the earlier edition of *Sexual Inversion* will be concentrated on Symond’s contributions—what they tell us of his mature views on homosexuality and of his personal life. This is in spite of the several biographies which have been published, since even the apparently frank book by Phyllis Grosskurth (*The Woeful Victorian; A Biography of John Addington Symonds*, 1964; Arno Press reprint, 1975) leaves one wanting to hear it in Symonds’s own words. Ironically, this should now be possible, since the embargo placed on Symonds’s Memoirs expired in 1976, but I am informed that, although Dr. Grosskurth has edited the Memoirs for publication, she has not found an interested publisher.

John Addington Symonds (1840–1893) is best remembered as the author of *Renaissance in Italy* (7 vols., 1875–1886), but that remarkable work did not exhaust his literary talents. Ph.D. theses continue to be written about his work (Mary Jane Loso, 1957–58; Phyllis Grosskurth, 1962). Symonds was also a prolific letter writer and, despite Edmund Gosse’s bonfire, in which much precious material was destroyed, over 2000 letters have remained for publication. (The story of this bonfire is told in *The Letters of John Addington Symonds*, edited by Herbert M. Schueller and Robert L. Peters, Detroit, 1967–69, vol. 2, p. 381 fn.) It was Symonds who elicited from Walt Whitman the famous letter of August 19, 1890, in which he claimed to have six children—a letter which has caused biographers of Whitman countless headaches.

For the current generation of gay liberationists, Symonds represents the beginning of the “movement.” However timid his efforts to “speak out,” as he called it, we recognize him as a pioneer in the effort to help others come to grips with their sexual orientation and accept it. However quaint his theories and those of his German contemporary Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–1895) now seem, and however muted an echo of Ulrichs’s cries of righteous indignation over society’s treatment of homosexuals Symonds’s writings were, his very understatement speaks to us forcefully and poignantly. He says of himself in *Sexual Inversion* (1897a):

It has been, I may truly say, the greatest sorrow of my life to watch the gradual dwindling and decay of emotions which started so purely and ideally, as well as passionately, for persons of my own sex in boyhood; to watch within myself, I repeat, the slow corrosion and corruption of a sentiment which might have been raised, under happier conditions, to such spiritual heights of love and devotion as chivalry is fabled to have reached—and at the same time to have been continually tormented by desires which no efforts would annihilate, which never slumbered except during weeks of life-threatening illness, and which, instead of improving in quality with age, have tended to become coarser and more contented with a trivial satisfaction (pp. 147–48).

This passage is undoubtedly autobiographical, although it is presented as anonymously as Symonds's own Case History (No. 18). Ellis merely refers to it as being “in a vigorous document by a very able writer.” While the Case History was kept in later editions, this particularly revealing passage was already omitted from the 1897b edition and appears to exist only in the 1897a edition of *Sexual Inversion* (if, indeed, it is not in Symonds's Memoirs).

I say that this passage was omitted from the 1897b edition of *Sexual Inversion*, but I admit I have not seen that edition. (An inter-library loan request sent to the only library listed in the National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints, as having a copy was unsuccessful.) I base my conclusion on Ellis's statement in the 1901 edition that “the only omission made is that of a brief appendix written for me by a woman physician” (p. iv). Since the passage in question is not in the 1901 edition, it was probably not in its immediate predecessor. Of course, Ellis is not entirely to be trusted in these matters, since he says in the preface to the 1897a edition that “every fragment of the book which belongs to Symonds is definitely assigned to him” (p. xiii), a statement which is patently untrue.

That this passage is by Symonds becomes apparent when one notes that it is sandwiched between sentences which appear consecutively in Chapter 7 of Symonds's *A Problem in Modern Ethics*. This essay was not published in his lifetime, but fifty copies were privately printed in 1891. (The posthumous edition of 1896 has also been reprinted in the Arno Series on Homosexuality.) Parts of it were distributed throughout *Sexual Inversion*, all identified by Symonds's name, except the part containing the quoted passage. In fact, the entire Appendix C, “Ulrichs's Views,” is taken from Chapter 7 of *A Problem*

in *Modern Ethics*. The reason for omitting Symonds's name from the quoted passage was, of course, that it identified its author as homosexual.

Although the material by Symonds which Ellis included in *Sexual Inversion* was relegated to footnotes and appendices, it had a certain unity and his name gave it authority. In the revision the retained material was incorporated into the text, making it smoother reading, but the removal of Symonds's name took all force and unity from his statements. How is one to react to facts reported by "a correspondent remarks," "I am informed," "a critic pointed out," "writes 'Z.' to me," or, indeed, "some of my correspondents"? I count at least twenty places where such changes have been made. In addition, Ellis eliminated Symonds's Appendix E, "Notes on the Concubinus" (pp. 276–78), and Appendix A, "A Problem in Greek Ethics" (pp. 163–251). This last was published here for the first time, although ten copies had been privately printed in 1883. In bulk and substance it is by no means the least important part of this book.

Other deletions are too numerous to list, and are mostly of little moment, but one tantalizing bit of information may be mentioned. Ellis wrote regarding Symonds that "he had proposed to write at some length regarding homosexuality in Switzerland, where he considered that it plays a prominent part" (p. 12). (Symonds had mentioned this in a letter to Ellis on September 29, 1892.) Symonds's views would indeed have been of interest! But it is a measure of how much the social climate has changed, that the views of Symonds, and still more those of Ellis, seem so very restrained and cautious now. A strong historical perspective is needed in order to see how progressive they were, despite their unquestioned assumptions about homosexuality.

In the 1970s there has been a plethora of autobiographies by proud homosexuals, from football heroes to successful politicians, but how refreshing the thirty-one case histories in *Sexual Inversion* must have seemed, after the clinical cases in Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis*, and those of Tarnowsky in St. Petersburg and Tardieu in Paris! Some of the case histories were collected by Symonds, others by Ellis, including those of his wife, Edith (No. 31), and Edward Carpenter (No. 6). These were, of course, presented anonymously, indeed distorted to further disguise them. According to Arthur Calder-Marshall (*The Sage of Sex: A Life of Havelock Ellis*, 1959), these distortions—for example, Ellis's omission, in the history of his wife, of the death of her mother and the cruelty

of her father and stepmother—took away what “small scientific interest” they had. But this opinion seems to be based on Freudian presuppositions, since he notes that, except for Edith, Carpenter, and Symonds, Ellis was unable to cross-examine his subjects and he comments: “But, even if he had, he would have been more concerned to explore the hereditary background for other cases of inversion, morbid traits, etc., than, for example, the subject’s attitude to father and mother” (p. 152).

For the student of intellectual history, of sex research, and of the early “homosexual emancipation” movement, this book is a precious document. The gay man-in-the-street, however, may react as did one of Ellis’s subjects, “a man of social and literary distinction” (!), after a friend had tried to interest him in the “scientific aspects of the subject”:

I love my friend, and he loves me:
A better pair could never be;
And yet you say that I am mad,
Or else you swear that I am bad;
And all because I am not you!
Krafft-Ebing, or Tarnowsky, or Tardieu!

(This and the two other stanzas of “Unisexuality Cujusdam Responsio” on p. 127 of the 1897a *Sexual Inversion* were omitted from later editions.)

No one can fail to grasp something of Symonds’s struggle to realize his own personality, to overcome the centuries-old prejudice against homosexuals, which he had internalized, and having finally achieved a degree of peace, to help his fellow sufferers. Not everyone, however, can appreciate the difficulties involved. As Symonds said in a sentence omitted from later editions:

The sense of sin and crime and danger, the humiliation and repression and distress to which the unfortunate Pariahs of abnormal sexuality are daily and hourly exposed—and nobody but such a Pariah can comprehend what these are—inevitably deteriorate the best and noblest element in their emotion (p. 147).

There are some things, it seems, which can only be fully understood by those who have had similar experiences, and one of them, perhaps, is Symonds's devotion to the Greek ideal of love as described in Plato's *Symposium*. Ellis, who included Symonds's learned essay on "A Problem in Greek Ethics" in the early edition only because Symonds had insisted on it, wrote: "I am unable to see that homosexuality in ancient Greece—while of great interest as a social and psychological problem—throws light on sexual inversion as we know it in Finland or the United States" (p. 24). I can testify, however, that as an adolescent in a small village in central Florida in the 1940s, it was precisely the discovery of Plato's *Symposium* which convinced me that I was not alone in the universe, however alone I felt at that time and place.

The most progressive voice in the book is not that of Ellis nor even Symonds, but a "Professor X," who has recently been identified as James Mills Peirce (1834–1906), Professor of Mathematics and first Dean of the Graduate School of Harvard University. In a letter to Symonds published in the 1896 German translation of *Sexual Inversion*, as well as in the 1897 and 1901 editions in English, but later omitted, he wrote:

I clearly believe that the Greek morality on this subject was far higher than ours, and truer to the spiritual nature of man; that our civilisation suffers for want of the pure and noble sentiment which they thought so useful to the state; and that we ought to think and speak of homosexual love, not as 'inverted' or 'abnormal,' as a sort of colour-blindness of the genital sense, as a lamentable mark of inferior development, or as an unhappy fault, a 'masculine body with a feminine soul,' but as being in itself a natural, pure and sound passion, as worthy of the reverence of all fine natures as the honourable devotion of husband and wife, or the ardour of bride and groom (p. 274).

Hubert Kennedy

Gay Books Bulletin, No. 6 (Fall 1981), pp. 12–14

DIE BUECHER DER NAMENLOSEN LIEBE, John Henry Mackay (“Sagitta”)

Verlag Rosa Winkel, Berlin, 1979, DM 40.–, 496 + 400 pages.

In their book *Roommates Can't Always Be Lovers* (1974) authors Lige Clarke and Jack Nichols report a letter from a German immigrant, who recalls that in 1920 he was leader of an organized gay group in his hometown: “We named it Sagitta (Arrow).” He does not say, and has probably forgotten, why the name “Sagitta” was used, but it was most likely in recognition of the pseudonymous author of the two volumes of *Die Buecher der namenlosen Liebe* (The Books of the Nameless Love), whose publication by the Verlag Rosa Winkel in 1979 was described in GBB No. 4 as “the outstanding landmark in the program of reprints of older classics.” As requested in his Will, these books have been issued, for the first time, with the true name of the author, John Henry Mackay (1864–1933).

Unable to accept the “third sex” theory of Magnus Hirschfeld, as reflected in the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (Yearbook for Intersexual Variants), edited by Hirschfeld from 1899, and distressed by the exclusion of man/boy love from the program of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, formed in Berlin in 1897 by Hirschfeld and others, Mackay, who had been living in Berlin for a decade and was himself a boy-lover, decided in 1905 to begin a campaign to rally boy-lovers to “the cause.” He planned to use his talents as a writer to produce a series of short books in various literary forms, which he hoped would unite boy-lovers by bringing them out of their individual isolation. He was unsure of their numbers, but believed they were only waiting for a spokesman.

The first two books appeared in 1906: *Die namenlose Liebe, ein Bekenntnis* (The Nameless Love, A Witness, 29 pages) and *Wer sind Wir?* (Who Are We? 62 pages, in verse). Perhaps the only review of these books was published in 1908 in the new *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* (Journal for Sexual Science), and as might be expected in a journal also edited by Hirschfeld, the reviewer was not sympathetic. After noting that the book in verse contains “rhythms of often unusual beauty,” he adds: “A complete poem is a picture that requires neither an excuse nor a justification, nor yet a polemic.

Therefore I find the prose of the first book superfluous.” He then says that the pamphlet *Sagitta* has just sent out will not win him new friends. “A pity for the wasted effort.”

The pamphlet referred to was *Gehoer! Nur einen Augenblick!* (Listen! Only a Moment!), which, in a change of plans, Mackay addressed to the general public. He was prompted by the unexpected discussions of homosexuality in the press following public accusations of homosexuality among the emperor’s close advisors. In an appeal for understanding, Mackay gathered the arguments against man/boy love and tried to answer them all at once. The pamphlet was sent gratis to many libraries and, with the financial help and insistence of Mackay’s friend Benedict Friedlaender, to the heads of Evangelical (Lutheran) boys’ clubs. Several ministers brought charges of giving offense and, after a lengthy trial, the pamphlet and the two books were declared obscene and the publisher given a warning and a stiff fine, which was paid, in fact, by Mackay. In all, the affair cost him 6300 marks (about US \$30,000 in today’s currency). In the meantime, Mackay published *Am Rande des Lebens, die Gedichte der namenlosen Liebe* (On the Edge of Life: Poems of the Nameless Love, 1909), which was not bothered by the police.

Volume 1 of the present reprint was first published in Paris in 1913 and contains, besides the three books and pamphlet mentioned above, a short one-act play and the novel *Fenny Skaller*. In a lengthy introduction Mackay tells the history of his campaign. There was a second edition in 1924. Volume 2, *Der Puppenjunge* (The Hustler, 1926), the last publication of “*Sagitta*,” is a long novel of teenage hustlers in Berlin of the 1920s.

John Henry Mackay was born on 6 February 1864 at Greenock, near Glasgow, Scotland. His father died less than two years later and his mother, née Luise Ehlers, returned with her young son to her native Hamburg. Thus Mackay grew up a German, despite his Scottish name. From his mother, who was of a well-to-do merchant family, Mackay received an income sufficient to pursue his chosen career as a writer, and two years before her death in 1902 he received a lump sum, which allowed him to purchase an annuity guaranteeing a lifetime income—or so he thought, for the value of the annuity was wiped out by the runaway inflation in the aftermath of World War I. He died in poverty in Berlin on May 16, 1933.

The novel *Fenny Skaller*, which is largely autobiographical, presents the story of a man who slowly and painfully becomes aware of, and comes to terms with, his love for

teenage boys. The protagonist, Fenny Skaller, spends an evening reviewing his collection of photographs of ten boys he knew at various stages of his life. The difficulty he had accepting himself is illustrated by the fact that only with the seventh boy did he finally have a satisfactory sexual experience. In each of the ten “pictures” (as the chapters are called), Mackay comments on current attitudes toward homosexuality in general and man/boy love in particular.

Der Puppenjunge presents the seamy side of gay life in Berlin of the 1920s in a story of teenage hustlers and their johns. Mackay blames the boys’ empty and sordid lives on a hypocritical police system and the bourgeois morality that supports it. The hustler whom Hermann Graff, Mackay’s rather naive protagonist, falls in love with is unable to appreciate, or even recognize, his love until too late. The novel is overlong and dwells too much on the sufferings of Graff, but is a fascinating portrait of the times, and at least ends on a hopeful note as Graff, after serving a prison sentence for indecent acts committed with a minor, resolves to return to Berlin and be stronger than the system.

Mackay stated in his Will: “I was Sagitta. I wrote these books in the years in which people thought my artistic powers extinguished.” Indeed, by the time of the Sagitta books, Mackay had produced a very respectable body of works, which he republished in 1911 in a collected edition of eight volumes (available in many libraries in the United States). This included much lyric poetry, plays, novellas, short stories, a novel, and a non-novel *Die Anarchisten* (The Anarchists, 1891), which had an English translation. This last and *Sturm* (Storm, 1888), a volume of anarchistic verse, were Mackay’s best known works. Also in 1908 Mackay published his biography of Max Stirner (pseudonym of Kaspar Schmidt, 1806–1856), the philosopher of egoism. This was followed by another anarchistic work, *Der Freiheitsucher* (The Freedom Seeker, 1920), as well as poems, a play, a novella, and a final volume of memoirs. It was as an anarchist writer, however, that he was best known; and he himself was proudest of *Sturm* and thought *Der Freiheitsucher* his most important work.

Mackay’s personality and influence are reflected in a letter written by the composer Richard Strauss to his father in 1892: “In Berlin I made the charming acquaintance of the Scottish poet John Henry Mackay, the great anarchist and biographer of the Berlin philosopher Max Stirner.” Strauss used love poems of Mackay as texts for two of the four

songs of his Opus 27, which was a wedding gift to his bride in 1894. “Morgen” (Tomorrow) and “Heimliche Aufforderung” (Secret Invitation), while avoiding any indication of gender, were undoubtedly inspired by Mackay’s love for boys and have become among the most popular of Strauss’ songs. Strauss later gave musical settings for two other poems of Mackay, and there were also settings by Arnold Schönberg and Eugen d’Albert.

Mackay’s anarchistic views are primarily found in his two Books of Freedom, as he called them (*Die Anarchisten* and *Der Freiheitsucher*), which he dedicated to his American friend Benjamin R. Tucker. Mackay met several of the leading American anarchists on a visit to the United States in 1893: he was one of a trio of men who lunched with Emma Goldman on the first day of her famous New York trial. Mackay’s solution to the “social question” was his philosophy of individualistic anarchism, which he found confirmed in the writings of Max Stirner, and which was close to the views of Tucker and his American colleagues. He opposed this view to that of communistic anarchism, which held that the good of society was more important than the good of the individual. For Mackay the individual was supreme. Believing that passive resistance is the strongest weapon against the tyranny of government, he denounced terrorism. And against those who said that chaos would follow the downfall of government, Mackay argued that people would then enter into voluntary associations, which would be more efficient than those enforced by brute power. His slogan was “Equal freedom for all,” i.e., the touchstone of whether an action is allowed is to ask if it diminishes another’s freedom to less than one’s own.

In many ways Mackay would be sympathetic with the current call to “get the government off our backs,” but he was too thoroughgoing an anarchist to accept anything less than a demand for the total dissolution of government, and hence would be unable to ally himself with those who see the reduction of taxes, for example, as a goal. Rather, Mackay saw the refusal to pay legal taxes as a strategy to bring about the disappearance of all government.

Profoundly disappointed by the failure of his campaign to rally other boy-lovers to “the cause” and dismayed by the public reaction to his writings (“there is perhaps no class that exceeds Evangelical ministers for pettiness, intolerance, and dark fanaticism”), Mackay came to see the solution of the problems of boys and their lovers as one with the

“social question” in general, i.e., not in gaining an understanding of man/boy love from the public, but in gaining general acceptance of the principle: Equal freedom for all.

Many modern gay activists seem as determined as Hirschfeld was to exclude the issue of man/boy love from discussion, but for those of us who believe that this issue is at the cutting edge of gay liberation the forceful and charming John Henry Mackay is a genuine pioneer, and his writings are a precious and inspiring document of our struggle.

Bibliographic Note.

An excellent full-length biography is *Der Bahnbrecher John Henry Mackay: Sein Leben und sein Werk* (The Pioneer John Henry Mackay: His Life and His Work) by K. H. Z. Solneman (Freiburg in Breisgau: Verlag der Mackay-Gesellschaft, 1979). The overpriced (\$75 at last report) *Germany's Poet-Anarchist: John Henry Mackay* by Thomas A. Riley, subtitled “A Contribution to the History of German Literature at the Turn of the Century, 1880–1920,” contains interesting material on Mackay’s literary works, but shows little understanding of anarchism—and none at all of man/boy love. I have told the story of Mackay’s campaign for the recognition of man/boy love in an article “John Henry Mackay, Anarchist of Love” in *The Alternate* Vol. 3 No. 18 (March 1981), pp. 27–31.

Hubert Kennedy

RENAISSANCE DES EROS URANIOS

Benedict Friedlaender

Arno Press, New York, reprint 1975, 27.50, xvi + 322 + 88 pages.

Although only 38 years old at the time of the publication of his *Renaissance des Eros Uranios*—the title may be roughly translated as Rebirth of Greek Love—Benedict Friedlaender (1866–1908) already had a publishing record many university professors would envy. Already in 1888 had appeared his dissertation on the central nervous system of the earthworm, and this was followed by articles and books on a variety of topics, including animal motion, physiological periodicity, volcanoes in Italy and Hawaii, anthropological studies (based on travel to Hawaii and Samoa), political and economic movements of the time, and nudism. Friedlaender was not a professor, however—he has been described by James D. Steakley in *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany* (Arno Press, New York, 1975) as a “wealthy private scholar”—and his later publications reflect his active role in the movement described by Steakley, who notes that in 1902 Friedlaender was a founder, along with Adolf Brandt and Wilhelm Jansen, of the Community of the Exceptional (*Gemeinschaft der Eigenen*).¹ Despite being one of the Exceptional, he was also a member of the Scientific Humanitarian Committee, led by Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935), and published a number of articles in Hirschfeld’s *Jahrbuch for sexuelle Zwischenstufen* before leaving the Committee in 1906.

By 1906 Friedlaender had found in John Henry Mackay (1864–1933) a friend whose views on homosexuality were closer to his own than those of Hirschfeld and the Committee. Although Friedlaender did not share Mackay’s political philosophy of individualistic anarchism, he did believe in Mackay’s efforts to gain an acceptance of boy-love and he helped subsidize a propaganda pamphlet on the subject. Ironically contributing, since the pamphlet was later confiscated by the police and declared obscene, to the legal termina-

1. Added in 2003: I here accepted Steakley’s translation of “der Eigene” as “the exceptional”. Having later made a study of that movement—and read Stirner—I believe the translation should be “the self-owner”. The correct date of the founding of the *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen* is 1903.

tion of Mackay's campaign. (See the review of Mackay's *Buecher der namenlosen Liebe* elsewhere in this issue.)

The question of possible censorship of his own *Renaissance des Eros Uranios* was clearly on Friedlaender's mind as he was writing it. He was particularly concerned by the confiscation in 1903 of Elisar von Kuppfer's *Lieblingminnc and Freundesliebe in der Weltlitteratur* (Courtly Love and Comrade Love in World Literature, 1901), a collection of literary excerpts, mostly from famous authors, treating same-sex love and friendship, that Friedlaender thought "signaled a new phase of the emancipation movement" (p. 66). Friedlaender appears to lean over backwards in his caution, however, and it is not clear how seriously we are to take his repeated statements that he not only does not advocate sexual acts, but even condemns those that lead to orgasm, when the main point of the book is that erotic attraction between men and youths is a natural phenomenon, which should be recognized and allowed to flourish. Of course, his condemnation of the "coarser sexual acts" is not as severe as the judgment of those he criticizes, mainly priests and others imbued with a "spirit of asceticism."

If it is difficult for us to be aware of the extent to which, as Friedlaender writes, "a circumspect and discreetly contained exposition of the ABCs of love was still required," it is equally difficult to appreciate his total rejection of any equality of the sexes. Steakley says of this: "Friedlaender's anti-feminism should be seen in the larger context of contemporary German society, whose middle class tended to view the concept of equality as a leftist political slogan, certainly not as a self-evident principle or a biological given. Friedlaender was part of a much larger wave of reaction against the feminist movement." Still, the fact that his reasoning is based on the assumption that women are the "inferior sex" (*sexus sequior*) vitiates much of his argument for a rebirth of Greek love. Thus, the value of his book lies less in his own explanations than in his criticism of the theories of others.

Friedlaender effectively criticizes the "third sex" theory of homosexuality, which Hirschfeld had adopted, with modifications, from the writings of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–1895). As Friedlaender says:

The difference between the interpretation presented here and that of Ulrichs, which medical doctors have followed, consists in this: I explain same sex love, not through the assumption of a mixing in of characteristics of the other sex and not by the hermaphroditic predisposition of human embryos, but by the fact that human beings are social creatures and that among all social animals there must be present a physiological attraction, i.e., subjectively speaking, a physiological, and thus sensual, love also between individuals of the same sex (p. 228).

Friedlaender notes, however, that it was probably important to have medical doctors speak out, despite the resulting “sickness theory” of Richard von Krafft-Ebing (1840–1902), for progress is made by small steps. Friedlaender’s comment is prophetic:

Thus the predominant interpretation, at the turn of the century, of same-sex love as a kind of “psychopathia” or sickness is to be viewed as a transitional stage. What in antiquity and outside Christian Europe and its cultural transplants was self-evident and even in its degenerate forms usually judged mildly, became in the ecclesiastical Middle Ages a vicious inclination and a punishable crime of the worst sort. Most now consider it a “sickness” that needs healing. It will come to be seen next that this sickness has a distinct advantage over the others, in that it disappears if the most elementary natural rights of freedom are restored and the sick are left in peace (p. 56).

A more particular objection to Ulrichs’s theory had been made by the Harvard University mathematics professor James Mills Peirce (1834–1906), who wrote in a letter to John Addington Symonds: “There is an error in the view that feminine love is that which is directed to a man, and masculine love that which is directed to a woman. That doctrine involves a begging of the whole question.” Peirce’s letter was first published anonymously in the German translation (1896) of *Sexual Inversion* by Havelock Ellis and J. A. Symonds (English edition, 1897, reprint by Arno Press, New York, 1975; reviewed in GBB 4). Friedlaender gives no indication that he had read this letter, but he shares the view expressed:

The theory begins with the assumption that love directed to men is in general a characteristic of the female sex. The very starting point is not unobjectionable. The idea that love directed to a man or to a youth is exclusively a female characteristic, is just not an empirical fact of nature, but

is rather in a much higher degree an assumption of convention and a demand or a consequence of geographically and historically restricted custom (p. 73).

Friedlaender's own assumption is that men are by nature bisexual (again agreeing with J. M. Peirce), so that not only men who are exclusively homosexual are extreme cases, but also those who are exclusively heterosexual. Playing on Ulrichs's theory, which posits a germ for same-sex love, whose development produces *Urninge*, or homosexuals. Friedlaender proposed the term *Kümmerlingc* (stunted beings) for exclusive heterosexuals. (This term is not, pace Jim Steakley, used for exclusive homosexuals.)

In searching for the physiological basis of same-sex attraction, Friedlaender considers at some length the discovery by the zoologist Gustav Jäger (1832–1917) of the important role odors play in physical attraction and repulsion, and he takes up Jäger's suggestion that men who attract other men may do so because their scent is, as it were, supervirile. Friedlaender is, I think, not entirely convinced by this theory, but he proposed it as at least having an experimental scientific basis, whereas the Ulrichs-Hirschfeld theory, according to Friedlaender, has no demonstrable foundation. Few today would deny that odors play a role in sexual attraction, but most have stopped searching for a simple cause of homosexuality and are as unlikely to accept this theory as they would be to join Jäger's natural clothing movement (e.g., wearing wool, not cotton, underwear). Friedlaender is quite clear, however, that it is not necessary to find a cause for same-sex love, since it is a basic human drive. The need is rather to remove the restraints that the age-old conspiracy of priests and women has imposed on social relations among men. Thus he believes that too much effort had been directed toward legal reform. "The true enemy," he says, "is not that backwards law, but rather the structure of errors and superstition on which it is based" (p. 96).

Politically the advocates of legal reform were associated with Marxian socialism, which Friedlaender had strongly criticized in his book *Die vier Hauptrichtungen der modernen socialen Bewegung* (The Four Principal Directions of the Modern Social Movement, 1901). Of the other three "directions" discussed, Friedlaender also firmly rejected communistic anarchism, declared himself a disciple of Eugen Dühring (1833–1921) with regard to natural rights, and an admirer of Henry George (1839–1897), whose

book *Progress and Poverty* (1879) advocated a single tax on land. Friedlaender had mentioned Mackay's individualistic anarchism only in passing, noting that it has little political or economic importance, but is quite correct regarding the conduct of one's personal life, and he approaches Mackay's principle of "equal freedom for all" when he writes in *Renaissance des Eros Uranios* that "true freedom does not consist of the rule of the majority, but rather in this, that each leaves the other in peace, in all conceivable circumstances, so far as possible (and the truly justified bounds are much wider than government-advocates imagine)" (p. 247). Further: "If the anarchistic rejection of each and every law overshoots the mark, it still contains some truth, namely: as few laws as possible!" (Appendix, p. 13).

Arno Press is to be praised for including *Renaissance des Eros Uranios* in "The Arno Series on Homosexuality": it is an important historical document and a valuable aid in understanding the early history of our movement. If many of Friedlaender's views, such as his extreme anti-feminism, have been rejected, others are just now being taken seriously. Friedlaender questioned, for example, the view that the proportion of homosexuals in the population is constant and independent of custom and mores, as well as the assumption that bisexuality is rare. His view of the value of "coming out" has a distinctly modern ring:

To be open is also the more decent and noble attitude. Granted, reckless honesty in this direction still carries a certain social danger, but, like most dangers, it is easily overestimated and, as a result of the selfless courage of the pioneers, is today already considerably reduced. Therefore, sincere honesty is to be named as the very first, the most respectable and effective weapon (p. 307).

Benedict Friedlaender must be counted as one of those pioneers.

Hubert Kennedy

The Advocate, no. 415 (5 Mar. 1985), supplement, *The Advocate Review of Books*, no. 1: 3, 5.

“J. A. Symonds: The Struggle Between Desire and Damnation”

Reviewed by Hubert Kennedy

The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds edited and introduced by Phyllis Grosskurth
Random House hardbound, 320 pp. \$19.95

Male Love: A Problem in Greek Ethics and Other Writings by John Addington Symonds
edited by John Lauritsen, Pagan Press (23 St. Mark's Place, New York, NY 10003) pa-
perbound, 161 pp., \$5.95

John Addington Symonds (1840–1893), poet, literary critic, and scholar of the Italian Renaissance, was one of the most prominent English men of letters in the late 19th century. Since he was plagued by ill health much of his life, his production is all the more impressive: more than two dozen published books and innumerable articles and reviews, including 14 signed entries in the scholarly 11th edition of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. He was best known for his monumental *Renaissance in Italy* (7 vols., 1875–86), a work of vast learning (and more than 2,000 pages in the Modern Library edition of 1935). Yet our interest in the man today centers on two works not published in his lifetime: his *Memoirs* and *A Problem in Greek Ethics*. The *Memoirs* appear now for the first time; *Greek Ethics* appears in what editor Lauritsen calls a “Centennial Edition,” for Symonds had a few copies printed privately in 1883 for circulation among his friends.

Since his memoirs describe Symonds' own sexual experience, they were clearly not meant for immediate publication. His literary executor, H. F. Brown, passed the work on to Edmund Gosse, who deposited it in the London Library. The manuscript was not to be published before 1976, but Phyllis Grosskurth was given access to it while preparing a Ph.D. thesis on Symonds, which resulted in her book *The Woeful Victorian: A Biography of John Addington Symonds* (1964; Arno Press reprint, 1975). Although Grosskurth

frankly revealed Symonds' homosexuality, she showed a strong Freudian bias in her discussion, a bias that continues 20 years later in her introduction to the *Memoirs*. We can be grateful, however, to be able at last to read this unique history in Symonds' own words.

Symonds' autobiography gives a detailed account of his sexual misery. On reaching puberty at age 15, he began to have wet dreams and to masturbate every week for about eight months. He then discussed all this with his father, a physician, who advised against masturbation. Symonds followed this advice, but "the nocturnal emissions, after he had abandoned self-abuse, became very frequent and exhausting." (The last statement is from his case history, published anonymously in 1897 in *Sexual Inversion* by Havelock Ellis and Symonds.) We note the Victorian perception of these emissions as "exhausting": similarly, he reported in his memoirs that he "suffered from seminal losses." Thus it is not surprising that his doctor treated this distress by "tonics such as quinine and strychnine" instead of telling him, as a responsible doctor would today, to continue to masturbate, for regular orgasms are healthy. At age 23 Symonds' "terrible disturbance of the reproductive organs" was further treated by cauterization through the urethra. It is no wonder that the next recommended treatment, marriage, appealed to him, despite the fact that his erotic interest was always in males. Symonds was married within the year.

For many homosexuals the unpleasant experience of being "different" while growing up is often relieved by the discovery of others with whom one can comfortably identify. For Symonds this happened at age 17 when he read Plato's *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*. "I had obtained the sanction of the love which had been ruling me from childhood.... I now became aware that the Greek race—the actual historical Greeks of antiquity—treated this love seriously, invested it with moral charm, endowed it with sublimity." Alas, Symonds saw himself as unique in his own time. His life continued to be a struggle between his erotic desires and the necessity he felt to conform—and not only outwardly—to the demands of conventional Victorian morality. His autobiography, written near the end of his life, is a moving account of his struggle for self-acceptance, a goal he never quite attained. His homosexual nature remained "my life's wound," "my inborn insanity," "incurable malady," "own besetting vice."

Symonds' reputation as a pioneer of gay liberation is based on events in the very last years of his life, notably his collaboration with Ellis on *Sexual Inversion*, which first ap-

peared in German translation in 1896, three years after Symonds' death. But when he began writing his memoirs in 1889, he believed he was one in a thousand, an opinion he sharply revised after reading in the extensive German literature on homosexuality, including the writings of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–1895), whom Symonds visited in Italy in 1891. (In a rare slip Grosskurth notes that the writings of Ulrichs were read by Symonds “during the sixties,” but this is explicitly denied by Symonds in the memoirs.) Although Symonds was impressed by Ulrichs' positive view of homosexuality, he did not accept his general theory. Nevertheless, he carefully presented this theory in his privately printed *A Problem in Modern Ethics* (1891) and again in the original English version of *Sexual Inversion* (1897). Thus it was through Symonds that Ulrichs' views became known to English-speaking readers.

A Problem in Greek Ethics makes up about half of *Male Love*, the second book under review here. This lengthy essay, which was also printed in *Sexual Inversion*, had been printed privately in 1883 in only 10 copies. (The difficulty of publication is illustrated by the fact that a typesetter of that very limited edition wrote him to “to upbraid me for my iniquity”.) *Male Love* also includes selected chapters from *A Problem in Modern Ethics*, a chapter on “The Genius of Greek Art” from Symonds' *Studies of the Greek Poets* (1873), three letters to Edward Carpenter, bibliographies by editor John Lauritsen and an attractive foreword by poet Robert Peters, coeditor of *The Letters of John Addington Symonds* (3 vols., 1967–69).

Symonds brought to *Greek Ethics* the same depth of scholarship shown in his *Renaissance in Italy*. His description of what the Greeks call *paidierastia*, or boy-love, is charming and cogently argued. He argues that boy-love *as the ancient Greeks practiced it* was a great and wonderful thing. What is not clear is the extent to which he thought this chivalrous ideal could be achieved again. The disillusion that followed his own discovery of the reality behind that Greek ideal is vividly described by him in *Sexual Inversion*.

The fact that homosexual passion played such a prominent role in one of the world's great civilizations may not have the central importance for us that it had for Symonds, but it remains of interest. Editor Lauritsen rightly says of Symonds' summary of Greek love: “In many ways—felicities of translation, insights, inductive argumentation—this work has never been surpassed.”

Symonds had begun writing his essay early in 1873, and some of the material was included in his *Studies of the Greek Poets*. As a motto for that book—and for his own life—he chose Goethe’s expression: “To live resolutely in the whole, the good, the beautiful.” It was Symonds’ tragedy that he was never really able to see his own homosexuality as a good. For this reason his, *Memoirs* is a frustrating account, as he again and again fails to draw the obvious conclusion from his own experience. It is also a poignant record of difficulties that gay people faced in the past and have even now not completely overcome.

Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia 2 (1990), no. 2: 60–61.

Die dorische Knabenliebe: Ihre Ethik und ihre Idee

Erich Bethe, preface and appendix by Wolfram Setz (Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel, [1988]), 48 pages

The Verlag rosa Winkel first reprinted Bethe's valuable article as a separate pamphlet in 1983; a debt of gratitude is due for again reprinting it. First published in 1907 in a journal of philology, the *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, it is perhaps most valuable for its elucidation of the various terms associated with the cultivation of boy-love in Greece in the 7th to 5th centuries B.C. While Dr. Wayne Dynes has noted, "Bethe's attribution of the origin of the Greek institution of pederasty to the Dorian influx has been weakened by recent criticisms by Sir Kenneth Dover,"¹ it is still an excellent introduction to its subject, and indispensable for those with a scholarly interest.

Bethe himself notes that his was the first serious treatment of the historical problem of Greek boy-love since it was touched upon by F. G. Welcker and C. O. Müller in 1823 and 1844, respectively. (In his preface Wolfram Setz incorrectly states that Bethe meant an 1837 article by M. H. E. Meier.²) Bethe may have been prompted to investigate the topic by related articles which had been appearing in Magnus Hirschfeld's *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* since 1899; he cites several authors from that journal—which, in a charming slip, he once calls the "Jahrbuch für homosexuelle Zwischenstufen". Among them is Benedict Friedlander who, in his book *Renaissance des Eros Uranios* (1904), urged a rebirth of the Greek ideal. Bethe does not go this far, but his evenhanded treatment was still considered a breach of scholarly propriety in the eyes of his fellow classicists, as Setz points out in his preface.

The first half of the pamphlet covers the by now familiar documentation of the existence and acceptance of the institution of pederasty in various Greek states, though Be-

1. Wayne R. Dynes, *Homosexuality: A Research Guide* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1987), p. 81.

2. M. H. E. Meier, "Päderastie", *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, vol. 9 (1837), pp. 149–89.

the admits that some of this will be accepted “only by one who has overcome moral prejudices in an historical consideration through scientific work.” Having established that the basic idea of institutionalized paederasty was the transmission of manly virtues, the *arete* of a man, from one generation to the next, Bethe asks the interesting question, “How did they think it possible that a man could transfer his *arete* to boys through love?” This leads to a discussion of the seat and substance of the soul, and Bethe concludes that for the Greeks the man’s *arete* was (contained in) his sperm and that this had to be received through the anus in the act of love. (He expressly rules out transmission through the mouth.)

In an interesting footnote, Bethe speculates on the possibility that the penis was considered the seat of the soul and finds analogous confirmation of this view in the ancient practice of cutting off the penis of one’s enemy after battle. He cites the Biblical report, “Wherefore David arose and went, he and his men, and slew of the Philistines two hundred men; and David brought their foreskins, and gave them in full tale to the king, that he might be the king’s son-in-law. And Saul gave him Michal his daughter to wife.” (I Samuel 18:27) A colleague of Bethe had pointed out that although the term used is literally “foreskin”, here it means “foreskinned penis”, as characteristic of the uncircumcised Philistines in contrast to the Israelites. As Bethe notes, “It is clear that foreskins were not cut from the conquered enemies as trophies, but rather the entire penes.”

In his argument by analogy Bethe cites reports of the transmission of manly virtues through sperm among various primitive peoples, in the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* and elsewhere. Much of this must have been unconvincing to his fellow classicists, but, as Setz points out in his preface, it has found more acceptance among those whose “view goes beyond the Hellenic horizon.” Setz mentions in particular the recent work of Gisela Bleibtreu-Ehrenberg.

There is a charming picture on the cover of the pamphlet, taken from K. J. Dover’s *Greek Homosexuality* (1978), showing a man fondling a boy’s genitals. Curiously, Bethe makes no mention of the sexual pleasure which boys must have enjoyed in the long age of Greek boy-love, which, however, finally came to an end. Bethe concludes his essay:

The idea from which paederasty had developed as a civil institution among the Dorians could not last in the long run, even in their states which turned away from civilization. It had to collapse with them, and if it survived, it could only be in secluded regions or, deep under the cultured class, among the lower class as a superstition, which, even if it again gained a new form, as among the Barbelognostics, for example, was still acceptable only in the lowest classes. But boy-love remained as a universally practiced pleasure and was considered throughout the whole of antiquity and in the whole wide Hellenic cultural domain precisely as a necessary element of elegant, cultivated Greek life. It was only the Christian church, which has always been especially zealous against this heathen vice—not even excepting the Gnostics—that banned paederasty from Christian society and, since it was unable to do so through spiritual means, brought its criminal punishment into force in the year 342.

Hubert Kennedy

As published in the *Journal of Homosexuality* 33(2) (1997): 125–131.

Originally published in the *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 26(2) (April 1997): 220–224.

THE RIDDLE OF "MAN-MANLY" LOVE: THE PIONEERING WORK ON MALE HOMOSEXUALITY. By Karl Heinrich Ulrichs. Translated by Michael A. Lombardi-Nash. 2 vols. *Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994, 712 pp.*

Karl Heinrich Ulrichs was the first to formulate a scientific theory of homosexuality. Indeed, his theory implicated, as Klaus Müller (1991) has emphasized, “the first scientific theory of sexuality altogether” (p. 24). It was set forth and elaborated in the first five of his twelve writings on *The Riddle of “Man-Manly” Love*. “Man-manly” is the translator’s coinage for the term “mannmännlich,” which was coined by Ulrichs. His most important coinage, in an attempt to counteract the previously used pejorative terms, was “Urning” (the subject of man-manly love), in contrast to “Dioning” (the real man). The term “homosexuality” (Homosexualität) was first published (anonymously) by Karl Maria Kertbeny in 1869, but was earlier used by him in correspondence with Ulrichs. Ulrichs never used “homosexual,” preferring “Urning” and the positive connotations it had for him. By the turn of the century both terms—and others besides—were used for this phenomenon; by the mid 1900s “homosexual” had become the commonly used term.

Ulrichs’s intention in his writings was not merely explanatory, but also—and especially—emancipatory. In this he was the first in a long and continuing line of researchers who believe that a proof of the “naturalness” of homosexuality, i.e., the discovery of a biological basis for it, will lead to equal social treatment of hetero- and homosexuals. If this attempt seems quixotic to many of us, it is nevertheless of historical importance and we can gain insight into it by studying its origins in the writings of Ulrichs.

The son of an architect in the service of the Kingdom of Hanover, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs was born on 28 August 1825 on his father’s estate of Westerfeld near Aurich. Following his father’s death in 1835, Ulrichs moved with his mother to Burgdorf, to live with her father, a Lutheran superintendent. Ulrichs studied law in Göttingen (1844–46) and Berlin (1846–47) and, after the official examination in 1848, was in the civil service of Hanover until December 1854, when he resigned in order to avoid being disciplined.

His homosexual activity had come to the attention of his superiors and, although homosexual acts were not then illegal in Hanover, as a civil servant he could be dismissed. For the next few years Ulrichs earned his living as a reporter for the important *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg) and as secretary to one of the representatives to the German Confederation in Frankfurt am Main. He also received an inheritance from his mother on her death in 1856.

The first five of his writings on the riddle of “man-manly” love were written in the years 1863–65 and published under the pseudonym Numa Numantius. This series was later continued under his real name; the twelfth and last appeared in 1879. In 1880, Ulrichs left Germany to spend the last fifteen years of his life in exile in Italy, where he earned his living by tutoring foreign languages and publishing a journal that was written entirely by him in Latin; its goal was to revive Latin as an international language. He died in Aquila on 14 July 1895.

Ulrichs later recalled that he had noticed signs of his homosexuality at age fifteen, but it was only when he was twenty-one, as a student in Berlin, that he became convinced of the inborn nature of his sexual orientation. The forensic expert Johann Ludwig Casper had already in 1852 stated that “pederasty” was inborn in many cases, but Ulrichs learned of this only in 1864. Most probably it was his own experience and feelings that led him to this conviction; in his writings he often used himself as illustration for his arguments. The essential point in Ulrichs’s theory of homosexuality is the doctrine that the male homosexual has a female psyche, which he summed up in the Latin phrase: *anima muliebris virili corpore inclusa* (a female psyche confined in a male body). An autobiographical manuscript of 1861 shows that he had still not arrived at this concept. Rather, he had sought to explain the attraction that men had for him by a “passive animal magnetism” (see Kennedy, 1988, pp. 44–45). Although Ulrichs continued to use the language of animal magnetism in describing sexual attraction, he soon believed that he had discovered a scientifically more acceptable theory of the cause of homosexuality as a result of his study of the literature on hermaphrodites. He assumed that human beings were indeed born with either male or female sexual organs, but that there were at times exceptions to this rule of nature, which he found described in the scientific literature. Correspondingly, Ulrichs assumed that there are also exceptions to the rule of nature that persons with male

sexual organs are attracted to women. Since the direction of the sexual attraction is not uniform, it follows that this is caused, not by the body, but by the psyche. But since, according to Ulrichs, sexual attraction to men is always of a female nature, it follows that the psyche of those who are attracted to men must be female.

It may be recalled that the chromosomal basis of sexual differentiation was discovered only in the twentieth century. Since the sexual organs are not differentiated in the early stages of the embryo, Ulrichs argued that there was a possibility of developing either way, and saw this view confirmed by the existence of hermaphrodites with both types of sexual organs. He postulated the existence of a germ (Keim) of development that would determine whether the sexual organ developed as male or female. To explain the possibility of a sexual drive in apparent disharmony with the individual's sexual organs, he likewise postulated the existence of a germ that determines the direction of the sexual drive. Thus, Ulrichs argued, while the rule of nature was that these two germs in an individual give the same direction of development, male or female, there could be occasional exceptions that would produce people like himself, who were neither fully men nor fully women, but rather, as he called it in his first publication on the subject in 1864, a "third sex." From this also followed the theoretical possibility of a "fourth sex," with a female body and a male psyche, but he was unacquainted with any at that time.

Ulrichs's goal was to free people like himself from the legal, religious, and social condemnation of homosexual acts as unnatural. For this he invented a new terminology that would refer to the nature of the individual and not to the acts performed. Casper, for example, had used the term "pederast" from the Greek for boy-lover. Yet the meaning of this term had been confused with the Latin "paedicatio" (anal intercourse), so that the two had become synonymous.

As a confirmation of his theory, Ulrichs cited the "female characteristics" that he found in himself and other Urnings. By the end of 1864, however, his increasing contacts had convinced him that things were not as simple as he had thought. Thus, there were men who loved women and men alike, there were men who loved other men "tenderly and sentimentally" but desired women sensually, etc. To accommodate these possibilities he expanded his theory and assumed that there was not one germ for the sexual drive (as he had at first assumed), but two: one for "tender-sentimental" love and one for sensual

love. The terminology likewise expanded to include the terms “Uranodioning,” “konjunktiver Uranodioning,” “disjunktiver Uranodioning,” and others. The essential thought for Ulrichs was that all these various types of love were natural to the individuals concerned and as a consequence were neither sinful nor criminal, as most of the German penal codes stated. In 1868 in *Memnon* (the seventh of his writings), Ulrichs gave a final form to his theory. There was no basic change, but the material is better ordered and more complete. Thereafter his writings on the topic of homosexuality concentrated on its legal and social aspects.

Although Ulrichs’s theory was original, it was certainly influenced by the scientific discourses of the time and reflected “the perceptual interest in the new science of the human being” that, around 1800, as Claudia Honegger (1991) has pointed out, “was directly concerned with determining more closely the connection between the bodily disposition and psychological capacity” (p. 56). Ulrichs was influenced above all by nineteenth-century advances in biology, especially in embryology. And he was very much a man of his time. Thomas Laqueur’s (1990) statement, “Sexuality as a singular and all-important attribute with a specific object—the *opposite* sex—is the product of the late eighteenth century. There is nothing natural about it” (p. 13), would have had no meaning for Ulrichs. It is precisely its “naturalness” of which he was most convinced. Laqueur speaks of the “new slogan” (new in 1800) that “opposites attract” (p. 152); for Ulrichs the principle that “opposites attract” was an assumption of his theory that caused him great difficulty, but which he never questioned.

Ulrichs’s interests were varied and he showed talent in several fields (he was, for example, a master of the Latin language), but his major efforts were given to his struggle to gain a more enlightened and humane treatment for his fellow Urnings. The driving force behind this long campaign was his strong sense of justice and deep feeling of righteous indignation. He compared his efforts to those in the previous century to eliminate torture and the persecution of witches. He intervened privately with legal briefs and publicly with his propaganda booklets. For the most part, his efforts fell on deaf ears; on the rare occasions that his writings were mentioned, they were usually rejected with derision, the final argument always being that he could not be taken seriously, especially since, as a self-proclaimed Urning, he was arguing *pro domo*. Thus he was unable to bring about

repeal of any anti-homosexual law, and indeed in his lifetime the harsh Prussian law was extended to all parts of Germany.

Although Ulrichs's theory was as scientific as any other of his time, it lost the force of its original simplicity when further observation required the accommodation of more and more varieties, so that its structure began to resemble the epicycles of the later Ptolemaic theory of the universe. A more basic objection can be raised to his assumption that the love directed toward a man must be feminine, and indeed such objections were raised before the end of the century. But Ulrichs's goals and theory were revived by Magnus Hirschfeld, who, in 1898, edited a somewhat truncated edition of Ulrichs's twelve writings on the riddle of "man-manly" love. (The present translation is of the original publications.)

To judge the quality of the translation, I read volume one in parallel with the original German. Ulrichs's writings pose special translation problems: he was a trained lawyer and a classical scholar, and did not hesitate to mix languages; his legal arguments are closely reasoned, with precise legal terms, and it is here that the translator had most difficulty.

The description of Ulrichs's biological theory, however, is particularly well done, with only a few slips. In discussing the embryonic development of the Urning on page 166, for example, "Specification Beta" should be "Specification Gamma" and, in the following paragraph, the phrase "by means of its suppressive activity, it accidentally creates mammary glands and female orifice instead of the male member" is wrong. This should read: "affects by chance with its suppressive activity precisely mammary glands and female orifice, instead of the male member, but develops the male member" (mit ihrer unterdrückenden Thätigkeit statt des Membrum zufällig gerade Brustdrüsen und Höhle trifft, das Membrum aber entwickelt). On page 302: "The germ of the sexual drive rests naturally in the deepest concealment. In its primitive beginnings, however, it is already essentially planted in the embryo. Then, of course, all it has to do later is to be penetrated by outside forces." The last sentence, however, explains the second and should be: "For, otherwise, it would have to be brought in later from outside" (Denn sonst müßte er später ja von außen her hineingetragen werden).

On page 321, the anachronistic term "homosexuality" should be "uranization." On

page 423, the term “homophobia” is not only anachronistic, but inaccurate. The sentence “Of all human phobias I least understand homophobia” should read: “Among all kinds of fear, I know the fear of people’s opinion the least” (Unter allen Arten von Furcht kenne ich Menschenfurcht am wenigsten).

For the first six of Ulrichs’s writings, the translator has rather cleverly incorporated Ulrichs’s footnotes into the text. The translation is straightforward, fairly literal, and workmanlike, often very well done. It is, however, imprecise in a number of passages. For the most part, they will not detract the reader from a basic understanding of Ulrichs’s points. Altogether, this translation, which has a nice introduction by Vern L. Bullough, can be very useful for someone who wishes to become acquainted with the work of this pioneer. Those who read German will want to read the original, which, happily, is again available (Ulrichs, 1994).

Reviewed by Hubert Kennedy, PhD*

REFERENCES

- Honegger, C. (1991). *Die Ordnung der Geschlechter: Die Wissenschaften vom Menschen und das Weib, 1750–1850*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.
- Kennedy, H. (1988). *Ulrichs: The Life and Works of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Pioneer of the Modern Gay Movement*. Boston: Alyson Publications.
- Laqueur, T. (1990). *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Müller, K. (1991). *Aber in meinem Herzen sprach eine Stimme so laut: Homosexuelle Autobiographien und medizinische Pathographien im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel.
- Ulrichs, K. H. (1994). *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mann männlichen Liebe* (Hubert Kennedy, Ed.). 4 vols. Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel.

*Hubert Kennedy is Research Associate in the Center for Research and Education in Sexuality, San Francisco State University. This review was originally published in *Archives of Sexual Behavior*.

Journal of Homosexuality 35(2) (1998): 85–101.

Eros: Die Männerliebe der Griechen, ihre Beziehungen zur Geschichte, Erziehung, Literatur und Gesetzgebung aller Zeiten by Heinrich Hössli. 3 vols. Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel, 1996. xxxiii + 304, xxxii + 371, 256 pp., 5 ills.

Until its demise in 1967, the Swiss trilingual gay journal *Der Kreis* almost annually published short excerpts from the writings of Heinrich Hössli. In 1964, on the hundredth anniversary of Hössli's death, a six-page selection appeared in *Der Kreis*. A German subscriber wrote to complain:

It is certainly a very praiseworthy and necessary undertaking, to commemorate Herr Hössli in an appropriate way, but must it really be done to this extent and precisely in the Christmas issue? Let us say quite honestly: the style of Herr H. has become for us simply indigestible. It is from an entirely other world, of the distant past, and it requires such an empathy and scientific interest that cannot be assumed for 99% of readers. . . .

With all good will and admiration for his accomplishment, I just believe that his statements have only historical value and belong in an archive. ("Für und wider" 7)

"Rolf" (Karl Meier, 1897–1974), the longtime editor of *Der Kreis*, replied:

His style may at the first attempt seem indigestible—it is certainly affected by its time—but is that not also so of many other works of that time, which are available to us without further ado?! Certainly Hössli's 700-page work is not to be compared to them. He himself complained again and again of his inability to present his statements so that they would revolutionize hearts and minds!! But allow me to also express an aggressive and hard word: whoever does not feel the flame of a deeply affected and valiant heart burning behind this "indigestible" style . . . would also be unable to separate the shell from the essential kernel in other works

written in past centuries on other themes! For the editor of the German-language section, as a Swiss in Switzerland, there was here nothing but a self-evident duty. Hössli's statements would probably have only historical value? Just once read in contrast, for example, public opinions of today and effusions of so-called authoritative "science" and you will have to admit that the small, courageous man from Glarus was far ahead of his time—and also of ours! ("Für und wider" 11)

For all the progress the gay movement has made since then, Hössli is still ahead of our time in some ways. For historical and other reasons, the republication of his writings from more than a century and a half ago is very welcome. His was a lone voice, the first to speak out publicly for the acceptance of male love (as he called it) after centuries of denial, repression, and condemnation.

This Great Hössli Edition consists of a facsimile reprint of the two volumes of his *Eros: Die Männerliebe der Griechen, ihre Beziehungen zur Geschichte, Erziehung, Literatur und Gesetzgebung aller Zeiten* (Eros: The Male Love of the Greeks, Its Relationship to the History, Education, Literature, and Legislation of All Ages; 1836–1838) and a supplementary volume containing a new introduction by Manfred Herzer, reprints of short biographies of Hössli and Franz Desgouttes by Ferdinand Karsch (1903), and the novella "Der Eros" of Heinrich Zschokke (1821). Wolfram Setz, the Verlag rosa Winkel editor responsible for this edition, also contributed an extremely useful index to the first two volumes.

Heinrich Hössli was born in Glarus, Switzerland, on 6 August 1784.¹ At age 26 he married the 25-year-old Elisabeth Grebel in Zurich. The couple did not live together: his wife remained in Zurich and he returned to Glarus. But he visited her often and they had two sons, both of whom later emigrated to the United States. By profession Hössli was a milliner, the first women's hat maker in Glarus, and he worked as a decorator, for example, at the royal court in Württemberg, where his wife was also employed. He was a successful businessman, so that he was able to live a comfortable, if restless life, moving his

1. Biographical information is taken from Karsch's biography in vol. 3, as well as from Hössli's own writings.

residence many times. Hössli died in Winterthur, Switzerland, on 24 December 1864 at the age of 80.

A turning point came in Hössli's life in 1817 when he learned of the execution of Franz Desgouttes for murder in the canton Bern, at the same time as he "observed another terrible story of the Eros so unknown to us" (1: 278). The execution of Desgouttes—according to Hössli, he was broken on the wheel²—filled Hössli with horror. It was then that he conceived what he afterwards referred to as his "idea," namely, that the understanding of male love of the archaic Greeks had been replaced through the centuries by such strong denial, repression, and condemnation, that even those men who by nature felt such a passion were unable to accept it as genuine and, as a consequence, saw themselves as evil and acted as such. The 32-year-old lawyer Franz Desgouttes had, in fact, murdered the man he loved, his 23-year-old assistant Daniel Hammeler, who had lived with him since age 16.

This revelation, that Greek love was an eternal part of human nature, and the dreadful consequences of the suppression of this knowledge, gave Hössli his lifelong mission. He studied the matter as best he could, but believed his schooling had not prepared him to present it adequately. Two years later, he packed his books and traveled to the popular German-Swiss writer Heinrich Zschokke (1771–1848) in the hope of persuading him to write a defense of his idea. In fact, Zschokke did publish some of Hössli's views in 1821, but only in the novella "Der Eros" in which the character Holmar represents Hössli, who later complained:

Herr Z. put my idea, at least in part and toward the end of the conversation, entirely in the mouth of Holmar, but really only so as at the conclusion of the conversation to draw him, Holmar, into doubt about everything he had had him say. . . . In my presentation there is no art, and no one will find less value in it

2. "Breaking on the wheel—a form of torture and execution formerly in use, especially in France and Germany. It is said to have been first used in the latter country, where the victim was placed on a cart-wheel and his limbs stretched out along the spokes. The wheel was made to slowly revolve, and the man's bones broken with blows of an iron bar" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed. [1911], 28: 585). Karsch reported that Desgouttes's execution was less painful than Hössli thought. According to the sentence of the court, he was "first strangled to death and then broken on the wheel" (3: 151).

than myself, But hopefully one will indeed understand that, if I had wanted to become a writer with this material, I would not have undertaken the especially severe sacrifice of that journey at that time. (1: 279–80)

Hössli was disappointed with the efforts of Zschokke, who had “spent the very least time” on his views: “I, on the other hand, have in the meantime purchased this idea with my life, as it were, as I now and again for the future must stake my existence for it” (1: 279). This was published in 1836. Hössli was now 52 years old and had indeed spent much of the previous 19 years studying the subject and struggling to express his view in a form that would “revolutionize hearts and minds.”

The publication of volume 1 of Hössli’s *Eros* brought further disappointment to him when it was censored by the Evangelical Council of Glarus. The result was that he was not allowed to sell the volume in Glarus and was forbidden to publish further volumes on the subject. But Hössli found a publisher in St. Gallen, and volume 2 of *Eros* appeared two years after the first. Hössli had material for a third volume, but his resolve to publish it was broken by the poor reception of the first two volumes and the fact that shortly after the publication of volume 2, the warehouse containing most of the copies of it burned. Manfred Herzer suspects that Hössli’s manuscript for volume 3 was bought by Ferdinand Karsch in Switzerland in 1902 and taken to Berlin, where it disappeared after Karsch’s death in 1936 along with other material in Karsch’s possession (3: 28).

Volume 1 is divided into nine sections, two of which establish themes that Hössli elaborates again and again. The first is that society treats those subject to Greek love in the way that previous centuries treated witches and heretics—as we would say today, those guilty of imagined crimes and victimless crimes. Hössli assumes that the false judgments about witches had been rejected by contemporary society and that all share a feeling of horror at the atrocities committed. He constantly shows his feeling of outrage at all injustice, but the case of witchcraft was particularly close to him. Anna Göldin, the last witch executed in Switzerland, was executed just two years before his birth—and she had lived in his house. This nearness in time suggests, as Karsch pointed out, that “the action of the Evangelical Council against Hössli was determined not merely . . . by his defense of same-sex love, but rather, and perhaps especially, by his irreligious way of

thinking, to which he gave frank expression by drawing witchcraft trials and beliefs, parsons and devils, into his work on the male love of the Greeks” (3: 90).

Hössli reminds us that two early opponents of the persecution of witches, “the venerable Jesuits Adam Tanner and Friedrich Spee, who in a noble humanitarian way were concerned with spreading light and mildness over the witch trials, were denied an honorable burial” (1: 13). “Whoever wrote against this world-curse had to put his honor and goods, body and life, into jeopardy; I am writing here against another, not a lesser one and I am just as uncertain of my fate as I am certain of the truth to be revealed here” (1: 55).

Hössli’s assumption that the persecution of witches had ended may not have been simply a rhetorical strategy, but it may appear so today in the United States, where we continue to be plagued by quite literal witch-hunts, when newspaper headlines continually alert us to “ritual satanic sexual abuse” etc. This is especially pointed up by the conference called in Salem, Massachusetts, on 14 January 1997 to protest modern witch-hunts on the 300th anniversary of Salem’s “Day of Contrition,” a day when, five years after the famous “witchcraft trials,” the entire community of His Majesty’s Province of the Massachusetts Bay, in obedience to a proclamation, took part in a day of fasting and remorse.³ Hössli’s argument, of course, is that the evil of male love, the “crime against nature,” is as much an insane idea as that of witches riding on broomsticks etc. “The sinner and the sin against nature—which there never was in nature any more than there were witches—these still remain with us with all the influence of the belief in witches and sorcery.” Recognizing his own pioneering role, he adds: “Here is the first serious attempt to oppose this” (2: 286). For the archaic Greeks—some, not all—male love was part of their nature, Hössli argues, and this fact remains so today, for nature does not change. Thus such men do not “sin against nature.”

This leads to Hössli’s second theme: “the unreliability of exterior characters in the sexual love of the body and the soul.” (This expression appeared on the second title page

3. One of the participants was Bob Fijnje, a Dutch citizen who, as a 14-year-old child-care worker, was tried for ritual abuse by Dade County, Florida, prosecutor Janet Reno (later U.S. Attorney General) and held without bail for over a year before his acquittal. “Imagine 300 years ago it was happening,” he said. “And people still haven’t learned” (Salem, Associated Press, 1/14/97).

of each volume of *Eros*.) You cannot tell by looking at a man, Hössli says, whether his sexual love is by nature for “the other sex” or for “his own sex.” Here Hössli appears to reject in advance an argument later used by homosexual liberationists in their theorizing about the nature of homosexuality, namely, that homosexuals will show characteristics—usually female characteristics—by which they can be identified. Hössli anticipated Karl Heinrich Ulrichs’s (1825–1895) doctrine of “a female soul confined in a male body” when he mentions the kabbalistic doctrine of the transmigration of souls—only to reject it as an explanation of male love.⁴

In his preface to volume 1, Hössli states the double nature of his theme: “The task to be accomplished has become a completely twofold one in my hands, namely, whether the love of Plato, the exclusive subject of his two dialogues, is nature, and then, under what conditions and consequences for our race may it be declared un-nature or to be something other than in Plato himself” (1: xvii). The two dialogues are *Symposium* and *Phaedrus*, which Hössli continually refers to, though he does not quote from them until near the end of volume 2.

Hössli’s rhetoric is full of righteous indignation:

It was a time when Catholic and Protestant priests held the burning of witches, heretics, weather-makers to be burnt offerings and announced their smoke to be sweet and pleasing to God—since the Devil’s kingdom was thereby destroyed. Who, you murderers of humanity, priests! often poor seduced seducers yourselves, who led you back to God then? (1: 15)

In the time of madness someone who does not go along with the madness is said to have no conscience, and this precisely always all the more when he is conscientious. (1: 47)

This madness is especially seen in the treatment of homosexuals—a word invented after Hössli’s writings (Hössli uses “we” to present the view of his time):

4. Ulrichs was a deep admirer of Hössli, but he arrived at his doctrine independently of Hössli—pace Warren Johansson (“Incarceration” 580).

For the murderous, lying, mad, and insulting word “sodomite” (which we must know, since we use it), with cold, laughing nonsense and insolence we destructively decide the fate of thousands of our innocent fellow men; we proceed and carry out in crude, self-satisfied, indolent ignorance, and with inner justification, the process of disgracing and destroying them, and as it were, offer in a friendly way and, as we ourselves believe, the way of divine and human right, through opinion and law, our willing hands on every occasion, bringing their judgmental and destructive force into application, and then continue the disgraceful and criminal deeds of the most inhuman tribes and times with all barbaric insolence—for the sake of an insane word. (1: 48)

The rather literal translation of this quotation will give something of the flavor of Hössli’s style. Hössli himself quotes extensively from the writings of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), whose Enlightenment views he greatly approved, and a comparison shows that Hössli’s style was indeed, as Rolf pointed out, “affected by his time.”

In the third section of volume 1, Hössli lists 24 characteristics of the human race. The list reflects his Enlightenment views, for example, in reference to humanity’s goal:

To set this goal exclusively on the other side of the grave is not useful for the human race, but rather harmful. That can only grow there which is planted here, and to rob a human being of his existence here so as to reward him with another beyond our world is to cheat him of his existence. (1: 83)

Ulrichs, the first theorist of homosexuality (see Kennedy), noted that Hössli did not have a scientific explanation for the phenomenon (Ulrichs, *Memnon* 129), but he was as convinced as Ulrichs that it is inborn: “for I say that it is eternal nature and lies dormant in the child as certainly and truly ready as it is in the life of the adult male-loving man” (1: 105). As for the real sins against nature:

We have criminal laws against it, we have consecrated with human blood a madness, an illusion, a phantom, a peremptory order, a stupid lie, sat in the judge's seat and already slaughtered millions of completely guiltless human beings to this ghost, offered it the honor and strength of our race, just as to the phantom of witches and heretics in their day; we imagined that we rescued the honor of humanity and dishonored it—we lied about its crime, which it never committed, and practiced and glorified such as will remain its eternal stigma; one imagined to be eradicating an evil that did not exist and drew a pestilence over half the world; one boasted of exterminating vices that never were and committed the most dreadful crime on society, on man and nature; one pretended human rescue and sank millions into the abyss of inner contradictions and outer disgrace, and rescued no one! (1: 105–6).

Again and again Hössli compares our view with that of the Greeks:

It is certainly the most sublime, the most deserving-of-admiration bright side of the Greek national spirit, the triumph of their bright life, the eternal seal and sign of their knowledge and their actions, that they were at their highest precisely where we are lowest. (1: 117)

At times he can barely contain his feeling of injustice:

I am not speaking too freely, even if neither gently nor softly—oh I would be ashamed of such calm, for with whom am I speaking and about what?! I am speaking with the natural horror of a human, touched, convinced feeling that trembles beside the ruins of a sunken world, beside uncountable fellow men, strangled to death by blind force; they all sank, all, through a, through this greatest crying-to-heaven, bloody, and until this hour still unexposed world-murder—I am speaking here against this; the murdered are silenced. (1: 118)

As Manfred Herzer notes in his introduction, Hössli hesitates to speak of the physical side of Greek love; he constantly postpones its discussion to volume 3, which, alas, never appeared. But, while Hössli is quite clear that it was not merely corporal, he was also clear that it was not simply a matter of the spirit—what came to be called “platonic love,” i.e., without sexual desire. He is equally clear that sexual love involves the physical and the psychical: “The deep drive of the sensual and spiritual is inseparable in love” (1: 134). It is a point he makes over and over. He is, of course, arguing against both the modern critics who insisted that the love Plato spoke of was merely “platonic” and those who insisted that the Greeks wallowed in the depths of sensual vice.

Some critics had suggested that the love Plato talked about was really heterosexual love, but Hössli points out: “The two dialogues of Plato on love, and nota bene, on sexual love, can by no means refer to two-sex love. They are too clear—just look at them and decide” (1: 174). He gives a whole section, the seventh, to praise of Plato, his dialogues, and the Eros described in them: “To explain, where necessary, one of the words of the creations of his eternal spirit, which I have understood and experienced, is worth my life, calling, duty, and delight” (1: 179). (Note the suggestion here that Hössli has himself experienced this Eros.) “The Platonic philosophy . . . was the intellectual element in which the human nature of Eros moved intellectually, ethically, morally, philosophically” (1: 185). “But, his *Phaedrus* and his *Symposium* are until now lost treasures for our human science and our human lives” (1: 187). “Show me one book on our wide world that enlightens us about our mad idea and about *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* and their subject—I know none” (1: 89).

In section 8, Hössli points out how the world of the Greeks has been misrepresented, especially in the schools. It is astonishing how current some of this sounds, even after more than a century and a half.

It is in fact easier, more convenient, and cheaper to distance such studies from youth, curtly and slanderously, than to present them gradually, carefully researched, and with enthusiasm—whereby one runs the danger besides of coming into ill repute with the dear public, say, with a Herr A. B. C. or even a rock-solid Frau Gossip, by running against their basic system, annoying them, and reeking of

free-thinking and such like. They prefer to carry out their nonsense with the Bible and Christianity, which in fact are in and of themselves quite innocent and distorted. There lies the greatest part of the fault that the blessing of former ages does not bless us, does not belong to us, is set in shadows, and that the high, the glorious, and the eternal generally stand so wide from our path. (1: 201)

As witnesses to the wonders of the Greeks in general, Hössli gives some 30 pages to quotations from contemporary authors, including Lessing, Byron, Winkelmann, the Swiss historian Johannes von Müller (1752–1809, now thought to have been homosexual), and especially Herder. The final section of volume 1 then concentrates on various aspects of their love. “The Greeks believed, taught, and honored male love—they did not invent it nor introduce it, could not invent or introduce it; that is a belief for those who persecute witches and heretics, for half-humans, not for Greeks” (1: 243).

Plato treated, proved, presented, and clearly lectured on his eternal belief—like all the Greeks—in a natural sexual love of a man for a youth; with solemn earnestness he drew it as a natural phenomenon into the immeasurable sphere of action of his eternal intellect; the tendency of his truly divine writings is to ennoble such love, to find out the highest determination of its nature, to moralize—not to deny it or declare it infamous. . . .

It is a false apology for Plato, if one pretends and elaborates away and distorts what is in and on him, and says: he speaks of a love not rooted in the sexual sense or of the two-sex love, whereas he says a definite “no” to both. He speaks of the Eros of the Greeks. . . . He speaks of the love for the [male] beloved. (1: 253–54)

I say it again as loudly as I can and am able, to all the world and especially to all previous editors of the classics and all the mutilators of Plato. Plato wrote much and gloriously about love, and indeed about a love rooted in sexual life, yet not a single syllable about that of the two sexes!! (1: 255)

Hössli gives an example in which the editor even admits that he had changed the word “boy” to “girl” and concludes: “If, in our translations, we had been faithful, open, honest, rational, truthful, and clear to ourselves, then the truth in question here would thereby without doubt long since have been set right, redeeming many” (1: 269).

Volume 1 concludes with a brief discussion of same-sex love in contemporary (German) literature—brief, since Hössli can find only three instances. One is “the rabbinical doctrine of the soul” published by W. Menzel in 1834:

It explains, namely, the contradictions in the characters of the sexes and their often curious sympathies and antipathies by the transmigration of souls, so that female souls in male bodies clash with women and male souls in women with men, like same poles, but, contrariwise, in spite of the same bodily sex they are attracted because of the different sex of the souls. (quoted in Hössli 1: 235)

Hössli finds this explanation inadequate: “it is truly not taken from thin air; yet the strong King Friedrich I of Württemberg was not what we are accustomed to understand by a female soul” (1: 296).⁵ He also faults the method:

The Greeks found their explanation in the phenomenon itself, but we want first to find the phenomenon in the explanation. But phenomena do not conform themselves to our explanation, as the latter should conform themselves to the former. (1: 295–96)

In the preface to vol. 2 Hössli complains of the prohibition of vol. 1:

Do the citizens believe, does my fatherland believe in a justified suppression of the truth? If ever a book deserved or found recognition and special protection from the side of the authorities, the present one deserves such. (2: xi–xii)

5. Hössli probably learned about King Friedrich I of Württemberg while working at his court in Stuttgart.

Apparently he also received complaints about his style of writing, for he once again notes that he “never had the good fortune to really learn to read and write,” adding in a footnote:

That an indignation is visible in my writing here, which is ever increasing during the work through a constantly widening view, I myself see very well; I hoped in the beginning to fight against it—and instead I learned through conviction to honor it, so that I will not excuse myself for it. (2: xiv)

There were times, Hössli says, when he was tempted to give up, but:

then the power of human love and the truth with all its force gripped me again, and I sought, thought, and wrote further, and heedlessly, forgetting myself, deliberately turned my eyes away from all those who, because of it, as I well know, are working for my ruin. (2: xxxi–xxxii)

In the body of volume 2 of *Eros* Hössli reformulates and elaborates his theme. Although not formally divided into sections, vol. 2 may be seen as consisting of two parts: an anthology of male love and a defense of Greek love against what modern critics have made of it.

“I will first present this eternally present nature as one once present in undisturbed disclosures of life and show how it was and that it was” (2: 44). After a lengthy introduction, some 100 pages present an anthology of male love, which he calls “Voices and Witnesses.” This mainly includes examples from Greek, Roman, and Persian writings. He does not include Plato in his anthology, “But the dialogues of Plato witness higher and deeper than all these voices of earlier times for my idea” (2: 153). The next such anthology was published 62 years later by Elisarion von Kupffer (actually Elisar von Kupffer, 1872–1942). Kupffer included some of the same selections as Hössli (usually in his own translation, whereas Hössli, whose linguistic knowledge was probably limited, relied on translations already published); by then Kupffer was also able to include more modern

examples. Hössli follows his “Voices and Witnesses” with another 50 pages of commentary on their importance. He presents “Voices and Witnesses” from earlier times, for:

Where shall I seek them in ours? Among summons and criminal files—dig up their bones under the thousands of gallows, release them from their rusty chains, and ask in prisons: are you now Greek figures and products of our refined human understanding?! No, you disgraced ones, you depraved ones, you lost ones, you are now only what you can and must be, for yourselves and your time warning terror-figures of the human desertion of nature and barbarism. (2: 48)

Hössli lays great weight on the “Voices and Witnesses,” though he is aware that their import may be lost on some:

For one without character or conscience, concerned about all our contemporaries, whom he licks up to today for money and status, and tomorrow just as eagerly criticizes from other points, they may all be lost on him. . . . Too, one could believe that for a thinking intellect, an unprejudiced human sense, a feeling human being, nothing more would be required for the proof of everything in these “Voices and Witnesses” than to have displayed them. But the tough skin of all the old and so deeply rooted prejudices, which have, as it were, penetrated into the innermost feeling of life, and of the murderous madness sanctified by human blood—they also often turn the natural and correct impression of obvious truth from us, and therefore this section is on the whole just as little superfluous as the preceding ones. (2: 159–60)

Hössli castigates academics:

Whoever does not want to look for light and explanation over what has been presented up to now, over this part of the ancient, classic literature, over these voices of the sphere, of these and all times—he truly sits unworthily in that pro-

fessor's chair, whether of archaeology, law, or philosophy, in short, he stains the genius of the human race, in whatever direction it may be hallowed! (2: 161)

Hössli compares his detractors with witch hunters:

Whoever, in the face of this presentation, judges and slanders this writing in its origin and its tendency, I disdain him precisely all the more as he, in his blind respect for the masses, fancies himself great and good and pious and wise. He still belongs to all those who, in their day, in honor of God, supported and proclaimed and, with their pomp and position, glorified the belief in witches. (2: 168)

He notes the lack of study of the phenomenon of male love:

Let scholarship, to which religion also belongs, occupy itself here as everywhere, freely and unfettered and without disturbance; its time is near, the need for it has risen immensely. Do we want to set barriers to any branch of research into nature and still call ourselves rational human beings?! (2: 171)

He continues to stress the sexual nature of the love he is discussing:

What must and should these "Voices and Witnesses" prove for my idea? And what can they prove? A sexual love, a sexual life of the body and the soul, in each and every human nature. (2: 172)

We see two things excellently in these "Voices and Witnesses": first, that heroic friendship, that fine tenderness, that enthusiastic, burning soul-love, that wonder of strength and offering; and second, again that Greek exuberance, that compliance, that drive of the lower senses and pleasure, but on the whole a real and intrinsic sexual life, according to its physical and psychical nature, from the roots and fibers to the crown of the trunk. (2: 175)

And he continues to insist that it is nature:

That sexual life that rules in the “Voices and Witnesses” and is irrefutably and uniquely displayed in them is nature, which we have taken for merely free self-choice, for un-nature and non-nature, and, what is most important and remarkable, for the most vicious mania and choice, and for themselves and others a destructive raving, for the greatest crime against the love for the other sex, which is the only one scientifically, morally, and legally recognized by us. . . . Morals built on lies finally transform life itself into a lie. (2: 195–97)

The second part of vol. 2 is given to a refutation of nine false statements about the male love of the Greeks, namely, that it was: (a) sense of beauty, (b) soul-love, (c) degenerate, (d) choice, self-determination, (e) merely Greek love, (f) hardly or never present among us, (g) a vice like any other, (h) merely a heathen vice, and (i) (boy-) child abuse (2: 214).

It is in the details of his arguments that some of the most interesting discussions occur, for example, his argument that the male love of the Greeks was not a soul-love. Hössli equates “soul-love” with “friendship,” which leads to a discussion of the asymmetry of the love relationship.

And in friendship they are called friend and friend; it is mutual, equal, a dwelling in mind and soul, not absolutely needing the body, from nature exhibiting no sex and determined by no sexual conditions, and no physical arousal, dependent on none, and based on none; it is an incorporeal relation, and therefore we call it—and therefore the Greeks called such—friendship, and therefore one calls them friends: friend and friend. But, on the other hand, in all unions of male love an unequal, a double-relationship, an evident sexual influence must strike us, since, namely, they are always called the one loving and the one loved, the lover and the beloved, never two lovers, never two beloveds, as in friendship there are always said to be two friends, and everywhere the lover stands in a quite different relation to the loved one than, the other way around, the loved one to the one loving; and also not as in the love of the two sexes, or as in friendship, is the mutual exchange of feelings, the satisfaction of the same drive, the same inclination, the

same passion, the same origin predominant, assumed, or a precondition. Quite the contrary; it is always, in the most striking manner, counted as a purely natural human need, a behavior based on the purest concept of humane humanness and certainly connected with an anthropologically and scientifically proven natural existence, this yielding (*charizesthai*)⁶ under certain moral understandings, also under the laws; from this also is the reason that they are not called the two loved ones or the two loving ones, but rather always the loving and the loved, the loved and the loving. Lover and beloved, from the side of the lover: being moved, involuntary longing, seeking, mood of nature, yearning after possession, high passion for completing his physical-sexual and sexual-psychical, that is, his whole (Platonic) existence, Eros, the force of love. On the other hand, from the side of the beloved: offering, gratifying, favoring, satisfying a nature, approved and conceived in life and knowledge through the idea prevailing according to moral conditions (*charizesthai*), and by Plato especially sharply and thus clearly declared, described, and treated. (2: 221–23)

We can see here that Hössli has carefully studied his Greek model. And this is what he believes would prevail in modern times, if the old persecutions were removed. It is a far cry from the relationship of equality that is the model for many of today's gay liberationists. Hössli's immediate successor, Ulrichs, who used his own sexual activity as a model, also defended this "granting of favors" (*charizesthai*) by the beloved, but he soon learned of the possibility of two homosexuals loving one another. Hössli's experience was, no doubt, more limited (but see the next quotation). At any rate, Ulrichs's view was intimately bound up with his theory of the feminine nature of the homosexual. Hössli had no such theory, indeed, he rejected it, as was pointed out above. Nevertheless, he makes the following comment:

I have everywhere observed that this nature combines in itself the female as well as the male chief traits and characteristics of the soul and the temperament,

6. Hössli appears to have taken the Greek word *χαρίζεσθαι* (to grant someone a favor, to offer oneself) from a G. Schultheß, whom he quotes (1: 283).

with all their manifold strengths and moods. This is, to be sure, a subordinate trait on the whole, and yet of great and undetermined importance of itself from many viewpoints for the individual being and his self-determination in a hundred obscure cases, for the home and the school, for public and private life, for the whole treatment of the ordinary and the special human being. Already on this one truth alone is much right to be based; consequently, also, much wrong on its total lack.
...

For nature here makes an exception in nature from the common two-sex love, according to the life of the body and the soul, and the Greeks and all their wise men clearly perceived these individuals to be for the health of the single person and for that of the whole people; for they, these exceptions, are eternally and uniquely that human nature born for the Eros of the Greeks. (2: 299–300)

It is also clear for Hössli that the male love of the Greeks is age-asymmetric. In his refutation of “[boy-] child abuse” he points up the difficulties in discussing this—and here he could be speaking of today:

For the Greeks, two things belonged to it: the boy and the abuse; in it had to be the fact, as in murder a life and a killing. That among us, in our use of language, the point to be discussed here is mostly not the case, that, in addition to true child abuse, we also have one without a boy and without abuse, and treat it morally and legally like the other true one, cannot be denied. (2: 265)

Hössli then describes the Greek progression from boy to youth to man (reached at age 20). He expects the man to love a younger age, though it is not clear where he might draw a lower limit. Again he points to the difficulty:

Hence, for them a boy was not a youth, and a youth not a man; also between man and child there existed for them, in the two legally and philosophically determined stages, the boy-age and the youth-age, an entirely different—and I may also further say—more sacred, more fruitful, more examined, and more protected

field and sphere of the public and private human being to cultivate and harvest, than at times with us. They recognized there, for the stages of life and age, quite different principles and elements, boundaries and markers, of freedom and self-concern, of morals and laws, of limits and supervision, of civil and state duties and rights for the changing and harmonious course and development of a human existence, with all its changing strengths and conditions, than we do. (2: 266–67)

Against the proposition that male love is a vice, Hössli argues:

But love is not a vice and not a virtue; it can lead to both; it can also live between the two as absolute nature, but it is never a choice, always nature. . . . Just as the human being is created through love, so too is he created for love, and indeed for that which of itself, without human addition, is manifested, prevails in him. . . . The cultivation, the recognition or nonrecognition of his individuality, that decides over the entire worth and course of a human existence for the exterior and inner world. (2: 240–41)

And he reminds us again that he is speaking of “sexual love, that most powerful and deepest, even if most mistreated need of the human being” (2: 250).

Near the end of vol. 2, Hössli compresses a recapitulation of his themes (and even the print becomes crowded!)—and indicates some items left for discussion in vol. 3, among them the “bodily point” of the Eros of the Greeks:

There raises itself here now the question of testing, in a moral and legal way, the bodily point, on which that Greek granting (*charizesthai*) also was and could be only and uniquely connected, for an absolute discussion; for without this a satisfying conclusion of the whole task, an agreement on everything said until now, is not thinkable. Therefore here, but also only in the service of humanity and its science—no sin and no vice—to this settling, deciding, and with the Greeks indisputably obvious point . . . it is indispensable to dedicate a particular consideration, which is to happen in the next volume, with trembling for the shameless au-

dacity and obscene language, and permeated by the sacred shyness, which protects from such sacrilege. (2: 346–47)

Alas, we never got this discussion. In his introduction (in vol. 3 of our Great Hössli Edition), Manfred Herzer suggests another reason why not.

The shyness that obviously hindered him, he calls sacred, which is probably also part of the problem, for it is not sacred, but rather a result of the terrorist speech regulation of the spiritual and secular authorities, from which Hössli was not quite able to free himself. (3: 17)

A reader of Hössli today may, like the German reader of *Der Kreis* mentioned at the beginning of this review, find these volumes slow-going and remote. But Rolf was surely right when he found them inspiring and “far ahead of his time—and also of ours.” A comparison with the “public opinions of today and the effusions of so-called authoritative ‘science’” is telling. This is particularly true of current attitudes toward pedophilia. Pedophiles have been thoroughly demonized, along with anyone who does not condemn them, and the speech-terrorists allow no positive connotation of the term itself. Leaders in the gay movement and even gay scholars cite the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Psychiatric Disorders* for the “fact” that pedophilia is a “disease”—forgetting that only a few years ago “homosexuality” was also such a disease.⁷ Shortly before his execution, Franz Desgouttes made a public confession of sin in loving another man. Hössli compares this with the 18-year-old woman burned as a witch in 1651 who left a letter to her mother in which, like Desgouttes, she says she is glad to die for her sins. This can be compared today with those countless men who are not only forced, but even willingly admit their crime of loving a boy, having internalized society’s hysterical view of pedophilia.

Hössli’s writings do not merely “belong in an archive.” This “flame of a deeply affected and valiant heart” can still inspire us with its strong feeling for justice. It has more

7. In this very issue of the *Journal of Homosexuality*, for example, Walters and Hayes expressly equate “pedophiles” with “sexual molesters of children” and state, “pedophiles are soundly rejected by the gay, lesbian, and bisexual communities.”

than “only historical value”—but it has that too. As Warren Johansson wrote: “*Eros* ranks as the first sustained protest against the intolerance that homosexual love had suffered for centuries in Christian Europe” (“Hoessli” 545).

Hubert Kennedy

Hubert Kennedy, PhD, is a Research Associate at the Center for Research and Education in Sexuality, San Francisco State University. E-mail: hubertk@pacbell.net).

Works Cited

- “Für und wider die Zeitschrift.” *Der Kreis* 33.3 (March 1965): 6–11.
- “Incarceration Motif.” *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*. Ed. Wayne R. Dynes. New York: Garland, 1990. 1: 580–582.
- Johansson, Warren. “Hoessli, Heinrich (1784–1864).” *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*. Ed. Wayne R. Dynes. New York: Garland, 1990. 1: 544–545.
- Kennedy, Hubert. “Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: First Theorist of Homosexuality.” *Science and Homosexualities*. Ed. Vernon A. Rosario. New York: Routledge, 1996. 26–45.
- Kupffer, Elisarion von. *Lieblingminne und Freundesliebe in der Weltliteratur*. 1900. Preface by Marita Keilson-Lauritz. Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel, 1995.
- Ulrichs, Karl Heinrich. *Forschungen über das Räthsel der mann männlichen Liebe*. 1864–1879. Ed. Hubert Kennedy. 4 vols. Berlin: Verlag rosa Winkel, 1994.
- Walters, Andrew S., and David M. Hayes. “Homophobia Within Schools: Challenging the Culturally Sanctioned Dismissal of Gay Students and Colleagues.” *Journal of Homosexuality*, 35.2.