

tersexes are constantly working-out about us, with or without social recognition and sanction, their own sexual instincts. Too often such types are not only unknown to their fellow-men for what they are, but also too often not known to — themselves. Especially do we find them the victims of sexual repression, seekers after a sexual expression that they cannot obtain without disgraces, dangers, and crimes. Not less especially are they petitioners for at least a tentative, a cautious consideration and tolerance, social and legal; fugitives from miseries and injustices which an unreasoning and ill-informed world, with its tendency to generalize, has far too little suspected. It is true that they present inevitably and often painfully, whether taken as individuals or as classes, many traits, claims, theories, impulses, practices, deviations from the more or less normally human, which cannot be tolerated in ethics and social life by even philosophic justice however dispassionate. They have sex-idioms that repel and terrify us, no matter how elastic is our human sympathy. But admitting all which will deepen around them this undeniable shadow, the fact remains that a great proportion of Intersexual lives are led and probably for a long time to come must be led, under a sexual, social and moral ban that blots our human civilization. Day by day is continued about us, no matter with what outward serenity a chronicle of underserved martyrdom that can be dramatic beyond any description in its emotional currents, demanding relief by a psychiatric enlightenment not yet more than begun.

CHAPTER III.

Alterosexual Love and Friendship: Similisexual Love and Friendship.

Before we enter further upon analyses of Eros and Uranian and Uranian Intersexes, some considerations of this chapter and its successor will be of importance to those who for the first time find themselves analytically sexual feelings.

As distinguished from other human emotions, love, as distinguished from friendship, is the attraction exerted on one human being over another through the intensity of our aesthetic sensitiveness; the quality of the object, more or less refined, for beauty. The feeling is thus distinctively our wish to *possess* the object of love by physical connection with ourselves. We unite ourselves to the being that we love, as far as possible by a physical nearness. At the moment, we seek often to give ourselves up, in an absolute personal surrender. The two impulses, the wish for possession, and the impulse to surrender, are inextricably bound together in real love, and as a rule cannot be parted. The wish for possession, the impulse to give ourselves as we are, must be both physical and psychical, if one is to feel the fullest mystery of love as a passion. If the attachment be only physical it is not perfect love, if it be only psychologic, if we do not have and so much the physical possession, nor feel the surrender ourselves as a matter of course in at-

taining it, then again we do not fully *love*. There must be the duality of feeling.

Friendship as Distinguished from Love. Now, friendship, as that feeling is commonly understood, does not include this dual desire: this seeking for physical possession. Friendship sometimes hardly demands large psychical possession, or feels a profound spiritual self-surrender. The physical thrill is not of it, no matter how ardent may the friendship be. Logically and clearly, friendship is divorced from the sexual attraction so inseparable from love, and from love's great master-principle of attraction. Our intense admiration of the mere *beauty* of a man or woman, that is to say of what seems to us their beauty, is not determining in friendship. Hence friendship can never be as vivid and masterful a power, not to say passion, as love. The latter ever remains the most vivid, mysterious and elementary emotion of the human race.

Similisexual Friendships: Heterosexual Friendships. If friendship be free from real love-emotion, then friendship will be found to reach its truest expression between individuals of the same sex. It represents thus what we will call "similisexual friendship". I am not disparaging here warm and dispassionate friendships between the opposite sexes, constantly met, and so-called (by a term long mis-used) "Platonic" in their nature. In place of that phrase we will call these "heterosexual friendships". But, no matter how firm and deep are countless instances of heterosexual friendships between persons of the opposite sexes, they do not compare favourably with similisexual friendships. Too frequently they attack elementary purity of the sentiment. Frequently also are they more or less sustained with self-deceptions; no matter what arguments and examples may bring against such a charge. We shall find it needful presently to question nicely the nature of many heterosexual friendships.

We shall be obliged also to question, even more sharply the close study of the Uranian and Uraniad life, the number of many similisexual ties, whether between men and men, or women and women; and our conventional notions of them are likely to be changed before the analysis of this study will be finished. The whole theory of so-called Platonic friendships, of psychic ties of heterosexual kind, is ill-sustained by realities in human-natural social history. The finest, most unalloyed friendship must be similisexual: even if we admit presently, in a sort of paradox that many relationships seeming precisely heterosexual friendships are not so: many that seem not so being really such.

Must Desire There is no grossening of human-nature, no injustice to the finer psychic qualities when we accept the idea that love from one human toward another must include the wish to possess physically, and the yearning to give oneself, physically, such a rule seems to accentuate the merely brutish nature in man, we cannot get far away from the animal. If we are honest with ourselves and humanity we must not try to get away from it. Love must not suppress the sexual desire, the wish for physical possession of beauty. So long as we cannot discern clearer than this the place of the brute-world in the mysterious scheme of Nature we need not be too conservative without admitting ourselves as animals in many instances. Here may be noted, à-propos of the brute-world, that friendship between beasts is a sentiment much less often met than is one or other degree of sexual admiration and attraction. Interesting examples of friendships between brutes, wild or domestic, are often met; but they are proportionate to the tendency of animals toward friendship through heterosexual love, or similisexual love, as will be touched on later.

"Natural Affections." In speaking of human love, we must differentiate in it certain strong affections often called love—maternal love, filial love, fraternal love, and so on. Such sentiments however spontaneous, deep and pure, are not love, as that sentiment really is, and as it should be distinguished from all non-sexual phases of our regard. Parental, filial, fraternal affections are called "love" only by a thousand-year-old looseness of ideas and terms. Such sentiments ought to be classed more popularly as "natural affections" just as by that term they are classed legally. However beautiful, they are far less certain, less genuine less obscure and less mysterious than love. They refer rather to friendship. They lack the essential sexual note, the desire for *possessing* beauty. Indeed we may grade the various kindly human sentiments that we feel for our fellow-beings as thus: love, friendship, natural affection, friendly human interest.

Similosexual Love. The instant that the physical desire with or without a concurrent spiritual desire, springs up in us, stirred to life by a quickening sense of physical beauty in the object of our interest, then there cannot be a logical question of our sentiment being more than mere strong friendship, or more than a minor "natural affection." We are in the presence of passion sexual love of such love in its lighter or more vehement character perhaps, but of erotic love. It is love, no matter what are the real or supposed sexes of the persons concerned. The instant that even vaguely we want to possess, and even vaguely feel that we would be willing to surrender ourselves along with the possession, then no matter how "impossible" how terrifying, how bewildering such an impulse be to us we love, we love sexually. From friendship, we are already far afield.

Similosexual Love But with this logical and inevitable conclusion, we come face to face with a convention long-sustained in generally intel-

not admitted as
Legitimate in
Man.

ent circles of human thought, with which we are put in a startling and bewildered warfare. During a long evolution of centuries, including especially those influenced by Jewish and Christian theological systems of morals, it has been affirmed and re-affirmed, has been asserted in public literature and in private conversation, has been held as a basal truth, that a man should love, should be sexually drawn to, a woman only; never to another man. In like manner, that a woman should love, should be attracted sexually, only to a man; never to another woman.

It has been assured, peremptorily, argumentatively, for almost a couple of thousand years, that if a man do not keep his sexual nature going out toward a woman, something is distinctly minus in his body or in his mind. But if he goes a step farther, and not only does he feel a sexual attraction to woman, but by some mysterious psychologic processes finds himself sexually attracted to a woman, feels an admiring physical desire for them, feels their beauty, feels concurrent yearning to surrender himself physically to a man, youthful or elder, then he is considered an abnormality, a shocking degenerate from manhood, a monster or a maniac. During long centuries the laws of the majority of European nations have recognized such a man only as a monster and a felon, and in respect of his working-out his sexual nature, of the kind, he ranks legally as a felon, in even the most civilized countries to-day.

It has been the popular ethical attitude of the world toward those mysterious, ungovernable impulses by which a certain equally large proportion of women are, in common to the generality of the sex, drawn toward other women, by sexual love, often along with complete sexual attraction toward men.

Woman's Simi-
lsexual Love
Less Rebuked by
Society and
Law.

But in the case of such abnormal impulses on the part of women, it is important to observe that both socially and legally the matter is far lighter regarded. In fact, it is often smiled at as a feminine peccadillo of perverseness, a womanish weakness or sentimental excess, neglectable compared with what is called "unnatural" love in a man. The organic and bodily expression of a woman's sexual passion for another woman is less concrete than is the erotic embrace of the male. This, too, affects the general social sentiment. A woman giving way to similesexual temperament is not a felon. Scarcely ever is her impulse spoken of by law-codes. The Mosaic Canon, so severe as to similesexual love between men, and made the basis of much of our modern system of ethical law, ignores women in its denunciations, wholly. The New Testament Canon, the continuation of the Mosaic system in large part, makes no references to female impulses of the sort, except in the Pauline pastoral to the Romans.

Established In-
tolerance of the
Modern World
toward Similesex-
ual Love.

Such is a brief statement of similesexual love, and of its positive distinctions from friendships; whether heterosexual or similesexual. We are all of us familiar, from youth up, with the attitude of the world, intolerant, horrified, arbitrary, toward any mature phases of it. We have heard it mocked in our boyish school-days, often with boyish hypocrisy. We have grown to manhood and to womanhood, accepting it as a vice and perversion, rightfully opposed by law, by all sound social morality. We have turned marvelling from the examples incessantly coming to light, existing all the world over, of especially a man's sexual love for another man. We have also restrictedly, confused it with a phase of it that demands always a swift and a severe repression, the debauchery of immature and innocent youth. We have wondered

at the revelations of medical specialists' pamphlets; at the testimony in a police-court dock during some "scandal-trial". By our elementary moral education, we have been taught that such a passion to-day is a perverse relic to pagan and barbarous morals. Homosexual love, for instance, in particularly the Oriental and African races, we are told should mean imperfect moral education and regrettable racial instincts that are inferior to the Anglo-Saxon temperament and to Anglo-American ethics; a relic of sheer primitive Eastern and Latin barbarism, to which the civilized world lapses, just as a man commits a nastiness or tells a lie, because he has inherited grown evil predispositions. That such similesexual love is now as ever, capable of agreement with the finest and most social and moral civilization, the most distinct and most superior, with the strongest religious quality of the race or the individual—these ideas will not be entertained for a moment by the average Anglo-Saxon. He regards it as out of discussion. He has not even found it worth while, as a special and ethical problem, to think about them seriously, in his life.

the In-
tolerance
admiss-
ible on
the

It is true that, gradually, a more thoughtful element in general society has reflected uneasily, unwillingly. Confronted with the history, with broad anthropologic theories, with the appalling incidents in all classes of contemporary life, and with the discussions of foreign psychologists set before them, many men and women have altered their attitude of repugnance even to look at the topic. Some English psychologists have gone so far as to reach, and to remain in, a tolerantly conservative position toward it. They have met with too many facts feeling honestly clear as to old theories, however established. But this conservative class has not gone further than the admission that "a dark problem exists", "an unexplainable element in psychology".

is involved. If one argue with them against classifying all homosexual impulses with barbarism; pointing out that precisely this instinct of similisexual love between man and man has always existed, side by side, with the finest social life, with the most virile militarism, with the highest moral and aesthetic civilizations of the past, even to being recognized as a great factor for social good, the argument is not accepted for a moment.

Similisexual
Love Especially
Declared Con-
trary to Christian
Morals.

For, one is assured that no ancient civilizations obeyed the Christian Dispensation, or compare well with it; that Christian morals as the basis of all sound social and moral law, abhor the homosexual impulse; that the Christian Scriptures have placed it in the category of gravest sins and felonies; and that homosexuality entered into the decadence of races and nations, as an essential factor. We are also informed that similisexual love "has relatively disappeared": is more and more forgotten, has become a vagabond a moral perversion from humanity to-day, in all "high civilizations" and all "superior moral life". We are assured that human nature has emphatically "changed," in this respects as in others thanks to especially the powerful influence of the contemporary Judaic-Christian basis of social ethics. To all such replies, or to others equally without foundation in fact, one can quote only Christopher Sly, and exclaim that for the sake of those who believe possible such an atrophy of human nature, and who ignore plain and too-often distressing facts, "Tis an excellent piece of work: would it were done!" We shall in another chapter estimate more minutely this matter.

Salient Aspects
of Masculine
Friendships.

Let us now turn to what is generally accepted as friendship between men and men. We will revert to what has been termed "similisexual friendship as distinguished from love; and will narrow

our terminology by calling such masculine friendships "homosexual" friendships. I use the word "friendship" in this connection subject to general ideas on the matter; in fact, till I can make clearer to the reader the true nature of its tie, in numerous examples about us.

At the deep, often unaccountable, friendships between men, whether historic or commonplace, whether observed in instances of others or in our own personal experience, has the reader never questioned if there be not a warmer, often more obscure and irresistible impulse underlying the sentiment? Certainly the need of referring to many intensely intimate, passionate and "reasonless" homosexual friendships, so-called, to some sexual mystery often impresses itself on the psychologist. Various instances in such relationships quicken our suspicion. Conspicuously and disconcertingly occurs a new version of the old boy rhyme about Dr. Fell: we do not know, after all, if he like Jack or Harry, we only know that we do not know him. Much opposes our sentiment often. But nothing can be done about it.

Coming
ness of
In Male
hips Off-
on Sim-
Friend-
Puzzle
overs.

One frequent characteristic is that the friendship between two men are not obviously harmonious psychologically: not in their classes, their temperaments, their educations, intelligences, tastes, prejudices, practical interests and so forth. Another curious objection is met when the two friends are not spiritual enough to be influenced by the intellectual currents, and are peculiarly averse to the intellectual way to finer sorts of sentimentalities; contenting themselves from the world any lapse toward such "weakness," which seems to them. Again one understands less the basis of "friendships" when the time has been too short to develop so strong a mutual attraction to be developed by gradual knowledge and study of one another. For, in homosexual friendship, as in alterosexual love,

one man merely crosses the pathway of the other. A few words, a few glances—and lo, relations perhaps mutually in a perfect balance or perhaps quite unequal, but affecting henceforth whatever are life and character for each or for one the two men, spring into irresistible activity. Scarcely yet quite aware of each other's existence and Ego, a mutuality still unreasoned-out, a flower of passion vague or absolute, germinated and ripened like the Hindoo juggler's mango-tree illusion, such an emotion crystallized to one of the most beautiful psychologic situation that human nature experiences. This suddenness, of friendship as a thing illogical as sudden love, is an every-day phenomenon. The men concerned in it are of every class and type. The same conditions of mystery in such processes apply, of course, to many sudden, intimate friendships between women.

The word "passionate" was written a moment ago in speaking of the intenser and more concentrated ardour of male homosexual friendships. With that quality we reach what sharply engages the attention of the explorer into psychology of the affections. For, ever and ever again in these warm, profound, apparently normal homosexual friendships, can be divined, or else is outspoken, the relative incapability of any woman to be an important sentimental and sexual influence over such preoccupied nature. The men concerned, or one of them, may present the type of the firm "holder-off" from any relations to women except what are relatively secondary, even apathetic. This is, to woman as a sex. She seems to have no power over the deepest emotional nature, in such men. She plays only a superficial, tolerated, casual rôle in their lives from day to day. Such men seem to say of love for a woman

"It is to be all made of fantasy,
All made of passion, and all made of wishes,
All adoration, duty and observance,

And so am I for—no woman!"

Men Classed
According to
Standpoint
of Women:
1. Woman-Hater,
2. Woman-Tolerator,
and
3. Woman-Worshipper.

We can indeed separate men, roughly-classed, into three distinct groups as to their social attitudes toward woman. They are either woman-haters, or woman-tolerators, or woman worshippers. These three divisions take in pretty completely male society, past and present. The woman-worshipper, or worshiper, is the most frequently met, provided we can judge of the sincerity of his outward demeanor. But often more politic than sincere: appreciating the need of playing his deferential rôle to the full. For this type, the woman-worshipper, frequently is distinguished to us in history, biography and daily social life as the most intimate relationship, only if united by friendship of a passionate sort with some man-friend.

The same statement is more clearly true of the second-class, the woman-tolerators. Their attitude—civil, reticent, dispassionate toward women-acquaintances protects them from critical rebuke from women: but includes no real homage to woman as a responsible factor in the mental or physical well-being of such males. This attitude is not of the sort to approach on such men as generally selfish or utterly unimpressionable. Often they are nothing more.

The declared, or undeclared woman-hater. The declared, or undeclared woman-hater, in all sorts of protean forms, frequently exaggerates his pose and enmity. Sometimes, too, his hostility toward woman is neither his joke nor that of acquaintance. His gradations vary from downright boorishness to courteous scorn: and of course they may be the result of some painful experience: not enmity that springs from inborn repugnance or indifference. Succeeding in this study can painfully illustrate this fact. But

frequently the woman-hater, outspoken or tacit, is neither an eccentric nor a misanthrope: but a gynophobe by his inborn, unchangeable nature. With such women-haters, when men of finer mould and character, we are likely to meet often an interesting special type, the man born for friendship, for "friendship" only: with his own sex only. We discern that his emotional nature is anchored to that, is satisfied with that. Such a man's innermost soul is created to thrill in that masculine atmosphere, and in no other. "Friendship" becomes the secret fire and spirit-throb of his social existence. In such a sentiment arise his profoundest, his most sacred joys and griefs, his most vivid enthusiasms and repulsions. There give themselves instinctively his sharpest differences, his passionate dependencies, his most humbling reconciliations, his noblest sacrifices, fullest altruisms, even to utter self-forgetfulness. By this spell the man's Ego also can commit itself to melancholy errors, to cruel disillusionment of sentiments: can become subjected to an hundred influences for good or harm in his character and life, all exact as in that other more widely understood relation — that of a woman — the alterosexual love. This deep "friendship" (again I am using a term subject frequently to question) often develops when both parties, or one of the two men, can be set down distinctively as woman-tolerator, woman-hater. Less frequently it comes to our notice with the woman-worshipper, though we shall see presently how it can be consistent in a most significant degree, with the outward professions of some absolute Don Juan.

Observation of A happy medium between the woman-hater and the woman-tolerator, one frequent in smart social life, is admirably defined by the brilliant French dramatist, Donnay, in a dialogue between two men, in his penetrating psychologic comedy "Amant" where the cynical de Sambré ridicules the woman-adorer Vêtheuil for his servitude to the sex. De Sambré says

...I have had commerce, that's the word, with different womenkind. You never loved any of them!... My dear fellow, it's all very well. The Orientals, they have perfectly understood woman; they put her in the place where she belongs. We don't live in the East but in the Occident; so of course it isn't a matter of making women wear veils, of keeping them shut up between four walls and such; but there is the necessity for us of shutting up the women morally, intellectually, in a harem. That is to say, we don't permit her to go wandering around in the domain of our emotions any more than in the avenues of our hearts, the streets of our occupations. You understand?... Oh yes, you ask what is to be done if she deceives us? as is inevitable, for she will bore you to death in the moral harem. Let her deceive! Do you think a woman of such conditions does not trouble a man any more that is a man? Her power over a man is curiously reduced; then she gives herself, whether to you or to your neighbour, you can reduce the fact down to real value, and not to a fictitious value, which is one of our prejudices, our pride, our fancies... You suppress your country, you suppress paying your court, jealousy, all such things which take up an enormous amount of time, when even they don't make up a man's entire life! Look at the sort of man who lives up to fifty years of age is still influenced by women! He can do nothing but be useful, serious, in life. How old are you, Vêtheuil? I am thirty-four perhaps. What have you done with your life? You have lost it in women's bedrooms, till now you are fairly buried under the skirts of the women, sunk in the middle of the mire of the world, like a diver under his glass bell, as Jean-Paul said. Ah, my dear fellow! there are more interesting things than women, more interesting problems to solve, in any science you

...types of The types of great "friendships", of friendships of passionate intimacy, between two men of equal and sensitive mutuality through life, or long periods of life, have multiplied through the world's social history. Such male pairs have become household names; beloved ideals forever. We have carried them to the very nursery, to school-forms and our earliest personal interests in humanity to meet them. Legend, history and religion blend in their circle. They are so common that even in our own unromantic date, that they make it needless to mention here more than a few classical instances, Damon and Pythias, Orestes and Pylades, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, Nisus and Euryalus, and for the Great and Hephaestion, Julian the Apostate

and Sallustius, stand forth out of Grecian and Roman classics. David and Jonathan, Christ and John, the beloved young Disciple, are familiar Biblical "friendships" of exceeding beauty and sentimental tenderness. Coming down into the light of common day the list shines brightly. All tempers, all races, all professions add to it, be its colouring now of one tinge, now of another. Michael Angelo Buonarrotti and Tommaso Cavalieri, Cinq-Mars (Henri d'Effiat) and François de Thou, Shakespeare and the young Earl of Southampton, Sir Philip Sydney and his three beloved friends Greville, Dyer and Langue, Montagne and Étienne de la Boetie, Erasmus of Rotterdam and "that one companion of my innermost life"; the learned Beza and his "other self", young Audebert; Edward II of England and Piers Gaveston; James I of England and those intimacies, so strangely passionate which James maintained with Robert Carr, Villiers, (Buckingham) and others; Frederick the Great with Baron Trenck, Lieutenant Kette, Graf von Görz, and others; the dauntless Charles XII of Sweden with brother-soldiers sometimes far inferior in rank: the philanthropic Bishop Jocelyn of Clogher and the ill-fortuned soldier Henry Moyerly; Lord Byron with Lord Clare, Nicolo Giraud and Eddleston; Horace Walpole in the one—perhaps—deep sentiment of Walpole's life, Sir Henry Conway; Grillparzer and Georg Altmüller; the masterly historian Johannes Müller and Bonstetten; the unhappy Ludwig II of Bavaria with many men whose kingdoms were only of art or letters, including Richard Wagner, and the gifted and erratic actor Joseph Kain; the fiery General Skobelev and his mysterious "Vassilienski"; not to mention two or three others; General Gordon brave yet tender, with Lord Arthur Hamilton—but no need to cite further the record of typically profound "friendships". Worth noting is the fact that many of them refer us not only to aesthetic life, but to the military profession and temperament, to the most genuine and even stalwart masculinity of physiques and occupations, with no trace of

subtle shade of effeminacy, or of a degeneracy of mind or body in such men-types.

Nor are impressive and fine homosexual and similar "friendships" the property of cultivated natures only. The humblest circles of a country village, the regiment of foot-soldiery, the ship, the factory, the prison-pen and the chain-gang, tell the same story of one man's heart meeting another's heart, with a result that the Scriptural words long ago ranked truthfully as "passing the love of women." And in natures otherwise immature we find striking examples of a ripened and profound sentiment. Between mere lads, youths in schools and colleges, are evolved sex-dramas of tragical force; would the father of the man in this, as in other

olve Ele- In a large proportion of such typical
of Many "homosexual friendships" no third party
ground. "friendships" so- is in a position to perceive the real origin
and cor- and quality of the sentiment. The world
Dispute. and quality of the sentiment. The world
ly granted that it is based in a strictly intellectual
It is regarded as a mental affiliation, primarily
of tastes and circumstances more or less matter
That it can be an absolutely or partially erotic
an irresistible sexual attraction, a love, a sexual
of the man, either completely or fractionally, this
ly not perceived. Nor is popularly admitted that
ground for such a construction of it can exist in
and moral human natures. Little is the fact un-
that while many, many such friendships do,
begin and progress as relatively spiritual and
hate relations, they can develop into a similisexual
which love is their mystic *raison d'être*, without
vious attributes of it in natures concerned. Cert-
into similisexual, homosexual loves, qualified as
ships" can be fused much that is wholly intellectual,
sexual. But when the subtle erotic quality wakens,

either earlier or later in the bond, often it never loses its dominant chemical force in the tie till the bodily powers and sex-emotion alike decline with declining life, quite as in the case of alterosexual love. But let us observe that merely to suggest the presence of sexual passion on the part of either friend, the workings of a conscious or sub-conscious sexual nature, "the desire for beauty," is to meet a shocked, a disgusted incredulity. "Surely we know better than that!" No, no! In such a friendship as So-and So with So-So, no such abominable perversion exists." So cries, perhaps, the reader of these lines, as he reflects on examples of close and tender masculine intimacies that he feels sure he "knows inside-out," either historic ones or as mere instances about him that are pertinent; or as he recalls his own friendships. The suggestion of physical impulses in them seems to the average observer vis-à-vis with what he calls virility monstrous and unnatural. In fact, the idea of a physical passion between man and man, as between women and women, he cannot "understand," can not conceive of concrete satisfaction. It seems to him to outrage all sexual logic, the logic of virility and femininity; especially virility. There will be time presently to discuss whether in masculine friendships the element of a satisfied physical desire offers anything unnatural and abnormal. We will study the Uranian and Uraniad Intersexes we come upon that matter.

The "Sexual Germ" in Friendships.

Meantime, however displeasing to the reader, let it be affirmed that all friendships between men have a sexual germ. Also one declares it as a perfectly assured fact, in hundreds of instances of noble and honoured friendships, those suggesting the "model," the "ideal" sort, between men that the concrete sexual tie and its satisfaction, have been of the first importance in the relation. That has been originally its master-factor. That has rendered such

called "friendships" the most concentrated and absorbing of bisexual loves. No matter what have been the biological glosses and subterfuges, no matter what have been the available fictions, no matter how indignant have been the denials, the real bond was welded by a profound, profound, noble, passionate sexualism. Such too, are the tales that every day could disclose about us, right and left. Everywhere are the ties absolutely embodying the Platonic, eternal sentiment; yet trembling at revelation to the outside world. The link is a marriage of body as well as of the soul. It is a love: not a friendship. It is the supremely virile love, expressing the human nature, naturally and inevitably, ever has revealed itself in a vast proportion of all races and grades of mankind. But such physical erotism in multitudinous instances has not a jot impaired the high spiritual quality of the relation. It has often enriched it. The psychic and physical have been blent in it, in an harmonious unity, too subtle and natural for vulgar analysis. The physical and the spiritual passion have been each the complement of the other, by Nature's initiative, and by Divine

**Inductive-
Deductive
Toward
the
Many.
The Un-
Present-
conscious.**

We may often be misled by one trait external to such mysterious passion in similisexual intimacies—the attitude of one or both friends toward women. Damon is not a woman-hater, not a mere woman-tolerator, perhaps; but a woman-amateur, being a *coureur des femmes* at least by repute. He often plays his social role of woman-enthusiast, with the finest touches of art and nature. But the two know what we do not know. Their comedy can be laughed at or deplored by them, according to its difficulties and necessities. Marriage can hide the real situation of the similisexual love. But marriage can try in vain to expel it. Damon remains Damon, Pythias remains

Pythias, to one another, no matter what upper currents of their emotional life help them or oblige them to keep their secret. In the majority of such really similisexual bonds, the attitude toward women ranges from the generally cordial and admiring, but never self-committing, to the cold and aloof one. The man never wholly surrenders himself; even when he appears to do so. His real self, his full, absolute Ego, surrenders only with his male friend. We shall understand shortly why this is inevitably of such intense personal significance to him, for his joy or grief, for his good or ill; why so often he feels, with a sentiment far deeper and more sexual than is guessed, the message in Emerson's vibrant lines on male friendships, and the "hidden life" in them:

"A ruddy drop of manly blood
 The surging sea outweighs,
 The world uncertain comes and goes,
 The lover, rooted, stays.

 My careful heart was free again:
 "O, friend," my bosom said,
 Through thee alone the sky is arched,
 Through thee, the rose is red!
 All things through thee take nobler form,
 And look beyond the earth;
 And is the mill-round of our fate,
 A sun-path in thy worth!
 Me, too, thy nobleness has taught
 To master my despair;
 The fountains of my hidden life
 Are through thy friendship fair."

CHAPTER IV.

Similisexual Love in the Brute World; in Primitive, Barbarous and Semi-Civilized Man; in Ancient Civilizations and Religions; and under Ancient and Modern Statutory Law.

The distinctly individual and biographic contents of this study will be regarded by the less philosophic with more interest than these preliminary analyses of various aspects of similisexual passion. But only through these considerations can one enter with full intelligence on the narratives and their clinical memoranda of Uranian and Uraniad types.

Similisexual Love in the Brute Creation. When we look into sexualism in the brute-world we soon discern that nothing could be more the misuse of a term than to speak of similisexual passion as "against nature", an "unnatural" impulse, and so on. Everyday observation, wherever wild animals or tame are to be watched, convinces us of the rooted propensity. The entire chain of beasts, birds, fishes, reptiles, and rather in proportion to advances in fineness of nervous organism, practice similisexual habits, by inborn impulses and deliberate choice. By an old contradiction of phrase, the tendency is called both "unnatural" and a "bestial" one. In the mammals, the horse, the dog, the camel, the ass, the elephant, all members of the ursine, lupine, bovine and rodent families, the larger and the smaller felidae, and in particular the ape and monkey, entire genera are given to it. In Dr. Garnier's interesting work on Onanism he gives many