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 simulian sexual 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 mind and 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 tender form,
And look beyond the earth;
And in the hill-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.

S simulian Sex in the Brute World; in Primitive, Barbarous and Semi-Civilized, and under Ancient Civilizations and Religions; and Unified Statutory Law.

...the distinctly individual and biographic contents of this work will be regarded by the less philosophic with more than these preliminary analyses of various aspects of simulian passion. But only through these considerations together with full intelligence on the narratives and statistical memoranda of Uranian and Uranian types.

Love. When we look into simulianism in the brute-world we soon discern that nothing more the misuse of a term than to speak of sexual passion as “against nature,” an “unnatural” and so on. Everyday observation, wherever wild and domesticated tamed are to be watched, convinces us of the propensity. The entire chain of beasts, birds, reptiles, and rather in proportion to advances in nervous organism, practice simulian habits of impulses and deliberate choice. By an definition of phrase, the tendency is called both natural” and a “bestial” one. In the mammals, such as the dog, the camel, the ass, the elephant, all of the Ursine, Ine, bovine and rodent families larger and the smaller felidae, and in particular the carnivores, entire genera are given to it. In Dr. interesting work on Omen and Society he gives many
instances. The preference on the part of the animal for sexual gratification with its own sex instead of with the opposite one, does not necessarily originate in the fact that the male, for instance, has no access to the female for heterosexual copulation. On the contrary his inclination seems deliberate, often to obstination.

In birds the tendency is also general. A great portion of birds make no distinction whatever between copulating with the male or the female; actively or passively participating in it. The same obedience to either the active or passive role is observed in many common beasts. One of our domestic animals giving us every day the most common proof of making no distinction as to sexual passion, the dog, is rarely willing to be passive in this act; though the dog, occasionally, seems to prefer that form. The word “dog” in all oriental languages, especially in Scriptural usages, is synonymous for sodomite, e.g.

In the entomological kingdom most interesting habits of deliberate, preferred simulisexual intercourse between male insects have been minutely observed and recorded. The reader is referred to the notes of Professor Karsch of Berlin, and to Kelch, Noel, Osten-Sacken, Lacassagne, and others, either directly or as cited by Moll, Ellis, and others when treating of human simulisexualism. But the naturalist does not discover any new general principle when studying the instinct in the animal-world. Philolaus and Aristotle noted it, and even argued from it toward the general problem.

We may also take note of the fact that botany is altogether silent on the question of simulisexual relations between plants. Something much like (strange as it seems) deliberate simulisexual intention has been studied by several botanists of authority in connection with research into fertilization and cross-fertilizations.

We turn to primitive man; or at least to those periods of human social and racial existence, when the attitude of individuals or nations toward sexual passion when men were un influenced by artifices, and followed the lead of plain natural

It was a primitive, natural predisposition in human natures, while also appearing to be to be a component of aesthetic and intellectual cultivation. In civilizations it is almost an inevitable accompaniment, ever working along the nervous lines of aesthetic susceptibility. But also it occurs distinctly where such concepts are rudimentary. The savages of Central Africa and East-Indian islands, the Esquimaux, the Inflammans and Red Indian tribesmen, the barbaric archipelagos of the Pacific, are all given sexual practices, whether between men and men or between women and women, but especially in its male form among that mystic and ever-primitive race, the passion of the male for the male, and its physical gratification is current, especially in European Zygamenhum. The ancient Scythians and Tartars followed the instinct of sexual relations between males by a special class of well-conducted male prostitutes recognized by that warlike people. The primitive

and Gothic races were given to it, coincidental
with their strongest military periods. To-day it is of the racial traits of their descendants. The Etruscan, with all that was Egyptian, morally, socially and religiously, were peculiarly given to simile homosexuality, or whoever, whatever, is typified by Moses, the far-seeing law-giver, had his mind fixed on, not the deliverance of his race but on its uttermost expansion as a people, a fighting people. There were and the campaigns before the Hebrews for their establishment as a dominant race. Hence Mosaic laws set severe penalties against masculine simile homosexuality. The new nation was made populous as well as prosperous. Every individual male was to count. Every family was to increase and multiply. or the military occupation of the Promised Land would be impossible. Accordingly the early Hebrew legislation reaped a distinctly male basis, and branded as a moral and religious impotence that any impulse that has no natural, no spiritual reason for such prohibition. More than has the classifying for another beast as a "clean" or "unclean" by diet. The Mosaic ban of simile homosexuality had a relation to economy of sexual powers, and to popu-

in Assyrian. In the social life of those great peoples, Babylonian and Egyptian, the Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian nations, simile homosexuality, at least between males, was more or less a recognized and even legitimate factor both physiologic and spiritual. The sexual charm of the individual male, the influence of his beauty as an esthetically, force on his own sex, appears to have been taken for granted as natural, and sodomy was disapproved. There was a prevalence of female simile homosexuality we have no historic record, but its existence is beyond doubt. Early legislation took little or no control of the simile homosexuality impulses and habits. In Egypt there seems to have been no period when men were not accustomed to give the course, as by natural right, to the passion. In all dynasties, in all classes, in the army, the priesthood, in every life, it was well-known.

Why Simile Homosexuality was so Severely Denounced by the Mosaic Code. Here we may notice a matter, referring to Egypt, that will be found significant, painfully so when presently we look at the attitudes of modern criminal-law towards the passion. In Egypt, at the time of Moses and the Jews, servitude, simile homosexuality could be easily a deterrent, of importance to increase of population. It was especially the check of the male and "war-available". Sexual intercourse between men was a fee to normal sexual satisfaction, and therefore heterosexual love, and so to early marriages and offspring. Undoubtedly the habit was rooted in the Hebrew people when, for generations captive to the Egyptian race, satura

Naturally one is told by surprised objectors to this plain fact, that the "earlier," "ante-Mosaic," civilization opposed simile homosexuality; punished mercilessly sexual intercourse of the kind. So we have been informed, especially the story of Lot and the mysterious episode of Lot and the wicked men of Sodom is cited. But such objectors will do well to remind once for all (likely for the first time) that Sodom was the epitome of Lot the wicked men of Sodom is cited. But such objectors will do well to remind once for all (likely for the first time) that Sodom was the epitome of its simile homosexual tastes and practices, that Sodom was really given to such. Further, it is also proof that homosexual intercourse was ever in Sodom, ever was or is an offense to God, even a dualistic concept of God; nor that what the constitution-books, and pulpit-parlance especially, have
so long termed "sodomy" should ever have such a meaning. The incident of Lot and his guests, and of the mob that attacked Lot's house in Sodom with the clamorous "Bring out the men, that we may know them," if correctly read, is simply a common civics episode of a suspicious Oriental town. A mob-element being excited, feared some political treachery; and violated the hospitality that Lot had offered to two strangers, supposed to be spies, or what else, by the unfriendly crowd. There is no textually or other reason to give the verb "know" a sexual value. There is no warrant for sexual colouring of the affair. Almost exactly the same incident occurs in another defense of guests; as is set forth in Judges XIX. v. 16-27 (re-told in Chap. XX, 1-16), in the night-attack of the curious and alarmed townsmen of the city of Gibeah. There, too, a stranger, a Levite, had been taken into a house, with the same Eastron hospitality, and saved his life by allowing his concubines to be the victim of the mob, precisely as Lot offered his virgin daughters. Both episodes are plainly tales of violated hospitality. The same devices to appease the citizens are mentioned; but there is no evidence even in the last detail of sexual insults to the guest. In the story of the Levite, we distinctly read that the object of the attack was because "they thought to have slain" him, and Sodom's mob included both "young and old, all the people from every quarter." The two stories are absolutely Oriental "guest and host" duties and claims.

The Mosaic charge to Israel that similitude homosexual was an abomination in the sight of the Jewish Jehovah, a particular moral enormity meriting death, had no basis in any moral "revelation to Moses," any more than the other wise provisions of the Mosaic Code. The warning and the death-penalty, were inserted for directly practical motives, not theological nor ethical objections. (The same words that are used of similitude relations as a "sin," refer to many other matters often; to what we consider

...
fication is simply a relic of ancient Jewish, semi-civilized dispensations. Legislation against it utters a moral-social sentiment with which we have, today, rightfully, little or nothing to do.

More than this, however startling to us, let us observe also that simulism (oral and uncivilized) has never by right known any essential, even inferred, prohibition in the real Christian system. For, the position of the Gospel narratives, the attitude and expressions or silences of Christ as to it, point out differentially the fact that what the Apostles affirmed of it was on their own authority: merely part and parcel of the Judaism with which, from the very beginning, Christianity has been so loaded down. From that it suffers today only too much. The purest New Testament ethical dispensation we should ignore homosexuality. When we look closely into the finer origins of gospel ethics, Our criminal laws, so much infused with old Canon Law, with mediaeval religious views, have perpetuated the hostile sentiment and error. In fact, the attitude of Christ toward many recondite human relations raises the question of how far Christ himself is an illustration of the emotion of sensual love, with its concurrent reverence toward any warmer relationships to woman than that of son or friend or teacher. We also justly can infer that Apostolic Christianity pronounced against intersexualism through policy, quite as much as through moral antagonism of Jewish colour.

Simulism in Greece We reach now the race and the civilization commonly most associated with simulism (oral and uncivilized), as an open element of emotion and civilized life. The passion early received one of its names, "Greek love." from significance in almost every period of Hellenic society. It was instinctive to the Greek temperament, a temperament at once rugged and yet aesthetically sensitive as in no other race. Simulism long-time has been spoken of as "Greek friendship." This is a misleading term, since simulism was distinguished by Greek psychologists and philosophers and legislators from friendships between men and men, or women and women, on lines that have differentiated it in the preceding chapter. We may indeed say that certain of the finest epochs of Greek military predominance, and aesthetic sensitiveness were informed saturated, ruled by homosexuality. That a man should be sexually attracted, entranced, by the corporeal beauty of another male being, as well as woman to him by intellectual and moral attractions in the object of his passion, was regarded as wholly natural. The sentiment was not expressed exactly as the heterossexual love was expressed. It was admired, idealized and revered. Heroic Greece, unlike Greece, pacific Greece, philosophical Greece, aesthetic Greece, recognized its natural impulses, the man's sexual love for a man or for a youth, at certain periods was accounted purer, more elevating, and manly than love for woman. The Greek was a passionate womanizer frequently. But the sentiment for mistress or betrothed or wife was, over again, ranked as inferior to the old and mysterious simulism. This, instead, became a leaven and lever in statecraft. It strengthened the young warrior's spirit in battle, as he fought for, or with, the "dear companion." It struck down tyrants, galvanized life into art and letters. Idealized human nature, was prehistorically a part of the Olympian system of Hellenic mythology, from Jupiter downward. Especially was it a strange rise to the Platonic theory of the Two Vestures; the one Pandæmonia inspiring the heart with love for the other sex; the other a Venus Urania, the greater and more sovereign Venus, that inspires a man's passion for a man. It endured through many Hellenic periods, though subjected to important civil attitudes, including hostile ones. Greece to-day knows it, as does the rest of the modern world, though in its relatively clandestine relation to
daily life. As Hellenic society and states declined, the
phases of simulsexual love altered; its quality abused, becom-
ing vulgarized in tone and idealism. It transferred itself
under such derogatory phases, into the Roman social fabric,
though it was not in the least new to Etruscan, Greek
and early Latin civilizations. Even today, it survives in
a particular frankness and purity in a spot near its or-
iginal Grecian home. A simulsexual love between men,
that frequently offers much of the heroic and ideal,
is found in the wild and reticent clans of the Albanians;
honourably recognized by that warlike and imaginative
race as a distinct sentimental factor; and there, too, as a
sentiment by no means of the "disembodied" type.

**Was Simulsexual Love Primitive, and of the Heroic instinct in Hellenic life?**

Certain students of the simulsexual instinc-
t in Greek society, partic-
ularly the Heroic and Homeric Epochs recognized only a
spiritual, intellectual love between man and man; a sent-
iment intensely romantic and absorbing, even to exclud-
ing love for woman, but without the wish for physical grat-
ification. We are asked to recognize in the bond between
men, for instance, Achilles and Patrocles only this abstrac-
ted and ideal love. The notion is incorrect. The mistake ori-
geniated with the wish of later apologists to gloss over the
true elements of such relationship. Especially did such a
view become part of the aim of Judaic and Christian
ethics to define simulsexual love between men as a de-
praved pagan impulse: not compatible with elevated
heathenism, or with finer heroic temperaments. The same
insistence on such heroic "friendship" as having no phys-
ical undertone, has dealt dishonestly with Biblical and
other Oriental male affinities: with thousands of moder-
historic examples. It has been accentuated by a sort of per-
verse suppression of biographical details; by following too
reticent or too ignorant guides.

**The Distinctions in Hellenic Love.**

But we must point out that the Greeks
themselves made at least three important
distinctions, as to homosexualism, during various periods
of their social fabric. They did, indeed, recognize a merely
spiritual passion and bond, untouched by physical desires.
This type, however, it was confused with a much less
ideal sentiment, existed and it was much hated; as it
observed. But it was not love, but friendship, at its
highest throbs. As regards the sexual, the idealists in Greece
permuted to this psychic relationship, as details of its
spirituality, were blended with physical desires. A calmer
sentiment bespeaks maturity of the ages, minds and ten-
gers in the two friends. Second, we find current in Greece
a simulsexual physical love confessedly, or under a veil;
including high idealism, intellectual companionships, com-
pletion of the friend's existence, along with the physical
passion for him, and its natural satisfaction. This is a
form of simulsexual passion and love-sentiment in which
the friends are relatively of equal and fairly mature ages.
It needs a ripened emotionality on both sides, a harmo-

nization and balanced union. Last, we must record the fact
that as Greek social civilization developed at the expense
of its heroic quality, as Greek military spirit weakened,
and increased in the aesthetic, the Hellenic sense of merely
beauty, with his desire of mere physical possession
of youth. This sentiment we know today under the phrases
Pederasty, or boy-love, on the part of the man. Beyond
doubt, this was and is a lower, in some sense a deca-
der, aesthetic emotion. It was probably wrought into
the Greek temperament by Oriental and outside influ-
ence, at least they developed it materially. It was the
rendor of the Hellenic to his more superficial sense of
beauty, indeed, a peculiarly winning expression of human
beauty; but one divorced from too large degree from the
intellectual dignity and mature beauty that enters into
this simulsexual love. In such a sentiment lurks contra-
vention of childhood, damage to emotional tranquillity and innocence of youth. It becomes a baneful social influence, and a menace to national and individual well-being, whichever in Greece, or any other land, whether in past epochs, or about us to day.

**Attitudes of Greek Society toward Pederasty.**

Pederasty became a most influential sentiment in Greek life, during numerous periods of greater or lesser importance and interest. As its harmful relations to youth became clearer understood, it was directly legislated against, often most severely, by Greek lawgivers; sometimes was strongly repudiated socially. But this hostile attitude was a fluctuating matter. Through long epochs of all that was most Greek, boy-love was regarded as quite as legitimate and ideal a sentiment as the love of a man for a woman, or even more so. General was the passion of a man, not merely a young man, or a lad, for the loveliness of a boy just verging on manhood, and so uniting especially the potency of the masculine physique with the grace of the feminine, and at the same time offering the spontaneous psychic charm of youthful, boyish natures. Pederasty-adoration was outspoken and accepted by all classes. Philosophers and poets to statesmen or the humblest citizens. The Greek lyric and dramatic writers made it their theme. Theognis, Anacreon, Pindar, Melanippe, Ennion, Sophocles, Plato, Lucian, Athenaeus, and so on in an endless succession, "married it to immortal verse." To noble prose or to learned study. Amusingly, we discover how Socrates juggled rhetorically with it. For, it is true that we find the Greek philosophers, eternal straw-splitters, often insisting on fine distinctions in the quality of their sexual passions. His relationships to one or another pederasty, they persisted in giving it as far as possible an intellectual and educational and other complexion. They draped elegantly its nude physical quality, they made it what we might call pedophily, in place of pederasty. The average Greek pedophilist in vigorous and normal life, who repudiated all idea of bodily desire in his passion for a beautiful youth. Socrates cannot be acquitted of just such real and natural sort of similosexual love of the pederastic sort. His admirations and intimacies were not merely psycho-pedophilic: no matter what are specious counter-arguments or such occasional anecdotes as that well-known one by Aristides—a tale of dubious sincerity. Indeed much of what is written as "apologetic" and conservative of pederasty in Hellenic temperaments is rhetoric. Some pages of Plutarch and of Athenaeus are lavish in instances of the fact that every phase of Hellenic society was influenced by the physical passion of the male for the male. Grave political events could turn on such a sentiment, and even valuable national concomitants. In Plutarch's Life of Pelopidas, a considerable account occurs of the celebrated "Sacred Band," originated by Gorgias, exclusively composed of young warriors. Each one was the declared lover of some comrade, his associate in battle. Hence, with whom his career and life were indissolubly connected in a homosexual emotion, tending toward their mutual advance in bravery and virtue. The story of Aristides specially recognizes the fact that the life-long friendship between Aristides and Themistocles took its course in a cause of their early rivalry for the love of a certain youth called Stesilao스 of Keos, spoken of "as the most beautiful young man of his time:" for the exclusive possession of whom the two men struggled obstinately. Plutarch says that this Stesilaos "was adored by them both with an affection that passed all bounds." Agesilaos the that we find the Greek philosophers, eternal straw-splitters, often insisting on fine distinctions in the quality of their sexual passions. His relationships to one or another pederasty, they persisted in giving it as far as possible an intellectual and educational and other complexion. They draped elegantly its nude physical quality, they made it what we might call pedophily, in place of pederasty. The average Greek pedophilist in vigorous and normal life, who repudiated all idea of bodily desire in his passion for a beautiful youth. Socrates cannot be acquitted of just such real and natural sort of similosexual love of the pederastic sort. His admirations and intimacies were not merely psycho-pedophilic: no matter what are specious counter-arguments or such occasional anecdotes as that well-known one by Aristides—a tale of dubious sincerity. Indeed much of what is written as "apologetic" and conservative of pederasty in Hellenic temperaments is rhetoric. Some pages of Plutarch and of Athenaeus are lavish in instances of the fact that every phase of Hellenic society was influenced by the physical passion of the male for the male. Grave political events could turn on such a sentiment, and even valuable national concomitants. In Plutarch's Life of Pelopidas, a considerable account occurs of the celebrated "Sacred Band," originated by Gorgias, exclusively composed of young warriors. Each one was the declared lover of some comrade, his associate in battle. Hence, with whom his career and life were indissolubly connected in a homosexual emotion, tending toward their mutual advance in bravery and virtue. The story of Aristides specially recognizes the fact that the life-long friendship between Aristides and Themistocles took its course in a cause of their early rivalry for the love of a certain youth called Stesilaoς of Keos, spoken of "as the most beautiful young man of his time:" for the exclusive possession of whom the two men struggled obstinately. Plutarch says that this Stesilaos "was adored by them both with an affection that passed all bounds." Agesilaos the
approval of all such sentiments, Agesilaos seems to have transmitted his simili-sexualism to his son, Archidamæo, for we have an account of Archeidamos as the lover of a beautiful lad named Kleomenes, the same youth who presently died a glorious death in battle, and upon whose body another young man named Panteus committed suicide in his intense grief and love. An historical incident worthy the pen of a Vergil. Again, in the history of the tyrannical Demetrius comes the story of Damocles—the Beautiful.” This boy was famed far and wide for his surpassing loveliness. Demetrius was determined to possess him, and laid all manner of plans to that end. The boy would none of him. One day, the tyrant, inflamed with his lust, surprised the boy alone, in a private bath; for Damocles had avoided all public places of the kind, so hateful to him was the passion of the prince. Finding that this time he was helpless, the lad threw himself into the boiling water, and so perished, rather than allow himself to be enjoyed by a man whom he loathed.

Many more historic passages to the point can be cited from Hellenic authors of history. We shall see later what belles-lettres afford, in the same key.

In short, simili-sexual love and its intercourse in Hellenic life was, for the most part, put on a footing with heterosexual love, even when it narrowed itself, not to say degenerated, to pederasty as a merely physical rather than spiritual impulse. When pederastic, it was not legislated against nor frowned-down, except when dangers to the intellectual, moral and physical development of the lad and disturbance in the family were perceived, and properly made a serious consideration. It was satirized as a weakness, reproved as a lapse, by philosophers and poets when it was not excepted against in any statutory manner.
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**Feminine simili-sexualism in Greece**

The simili-sexual passion between women appears with distinctness in Greek social and enters into Hellenic literature with emphasis. It, in fact, received a specific name, Lesbianism, from the relationship of the great woman-poet of Hellas to the passion. “Greek love” as a term has been long applied most as particularly to female simili-sexualism, and to the grosser phases, as it has been to masculine passion. But no legislative notice was taken of feminine simili-sexualism by Greek statutory law. Society smiled at it, ignored it; just as is the case today. It never acquired any dignified philosophic or other recognition in Greece, any time: apparently being relegated to the indifference that was felt toward much that was feminine, by Hellene.

**Sextile love**

Rooted in the primitive Etruscan and Latin peoples, a covert passion in the earlier and less aesthetic Roman State, strengthened by Greek and Oriental influences in proportion to the progress and loss of idealism in later periods of Roman civilization, the sexual passion of the male for the male endured Rome with cumulative vigour. Throughout classical and pagan epochs it was, successively, either tolerated, or merely spasmodically reprehended as a civil sin; rather than treated through any general moral question of it; or satirized, idealized, glorified; or simply taken for granted. We are often assured that primitivo in society was a stranger to it, or regarded it as a tolerable disgrace. This is not the fact, any more than that it became first influential in Latin character through importation from Greece. It did however suffer shameful denunciations from Greek ideals, when Roman corruption social morals was at the fullest, along with the Roman foolishness that distorted so much of what in Greek conditions was richly ideal and spiritual.
In Primitive Rome. Rome republican and monarchical. Rome military and pacific. Rome in power, decadence. Rome similosexual as to love. Under the Roman Republic, a certain vague attitude of rebuke to it seems to have existed, but not as to feminine similosexual practices and to the protection of innocent youth from debauchery. The Lex Julia, another early law dealing with the matter, is also obscure in its scope. We must note the presence of a special legislation of some sort that related to soldiers when in military service, needing a bodily vigour not to be impaired in camps and barracks. This latter detail, by the way, is to-day recognized in modern Italian law, which otherwise takes no notice of sexual passions or practices between men and men, and youths, women and their own sex, unless public decency is openly outraged, force used, or minor youth debauched.

In Imperial Rome. Under the Roman Empire, however, simuliselual love reached a degree of open acceptance, on a sentimental footing, in Roman society that met no repudiation of it by popular notions. We have but to turn to the pages of the finest lover or the rankest writer of Latin literature, to the historians and biographers of the golden-decadent Roman world, whether giving us picture of the Palatine or the Suburra, to find it writ large. Legions cared little for it, save now and then some protective laws; ministers to minors, among these Domitian's prohibitive acts against prostitution of young children, which Metellus received with such fulsome praise in an epigram. The sentiment in the epoch of the first Caesars degenerated progressively. It became cruelly pederastia, losing all qualities of manly idealism. All phases of it obtained. Its proselytes were legion. The Augustan Age was full of it. One need only to read his Virgil, and the pages of Suetonius, Dion Cassius, Tibullus, Catullus, Juvenal, Petronius, Martial, where each has written part of the long record of our theme, the passion in us how gross or spiritual was the passion in Rome. The Empire was filled full with the attitudes of high Roman philosophy, did not affect the public mind, that simuliselual love was contrary to nature, rooted out as an evil impulse in the human soul, became fixed. Even as late as the reign of Severus (A.D. 222-235) the Roman law dealt with the debauchment of minors. The same reserve is seen in the high moral standards and literature of such late legislators as the Emperors Philip, Philip the Back, Victor.

In Rome. That in the voluptuous and decadent school of the Twelve Caesars (the Neronian reign) the whole aspect of simuliselual love became open to outraging all sense of aesthetics, social convention, virility is only too plain. But it was no product; no product of mere late-Roman rottenness. Augustus and warlike and philosophic and ethic for private citizens, were given to homosexual love. The matter what were their relations to women; there too, at a time when ordinary and heterosexual love limit to its open vehemence, and to honour or Leopold Caesar seems to have been in all years of his reign, unqualified passive pederast; satirized as "every man, and every woman's man." His relations Niceratus, King of Bythnia, and to his favorite who later became the great Augustus, were the essence of his day. Augustus the noblest figure of human imperial succession, was simuliselual, where means confined his intimacies to those great predecessor. We find the theater-crowds were legion. The presence of Augustus, as to his habits of the arts and there is one reference in Plutarch (in the ethus, Dion Cassius, Titus, Juvenal, Petronius, Petronius) to a certain youth called by a significant name "Delicias," who had been a favourite of
Augustus when the great emperor was only Octavianus, a conspiracy which ended tragically the career of Sertorius. The plot came to a climax because of the mixing in it of beautiful young pederasts, Manlius and Ambitius; the story of Manlius, a high officer in the army, was weak enough to disclose the plot against the commander to his mistress and the secret began to spread untimely. In the same year, Caius Lucius, a valiant soldier, a nephew of Marcus Arpinus, were told by Plutarch of the passion of Lucius for another young officer in his service named Trebonius. Lucius would not yield himself. Caius Lucius contrived to lure the young man to his tent one night, and attempt to violate him. Trebonius killed Lucius with his own hands. This affair made a great scandal. One of the earliest
social acts of Cato the Censor was to degrade Quintus Flamininus, a brother of the great Titus Flamininus, from office, and from his seat at public speeces because of a most inhuman crime. Lucius Quintus Flamininus kept a beautiful boy, whom he loved ostentiously, as a simissexual plaything. The lad pettishly complained once that in the circus he "had never a man die". Flamininus ordered that a slave should be brought at once to the dining-room where they then were to be executed. Plutarch tells the same gruesome tale in his account of Titus Flamininus. Plutarch mentions the homosexualism of Pompey. There are other references more or less pertinent to a study of homosexuality at Rome, at various epochs that far precede the rest of the evidence of the Roman character or State. With the laxities and lost ideals of the imperial periods, the perversion had full movement. Almost each succeeding prince and his court, illustrated it. We trace it onward, through the reigns of Caius, of Claudius, and so on, to the immortal passion of Trajan for Attia and to princes and epochs far beyond. The emotion fails of appearing. But it was, as I have pointed out, strikingly pederastic. Hence it deteriorated; ever
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 simulisexual 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 mate friend. We shall understand shortly why this is inestimably of such intense personal significance to him, 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 rusky drop of manly blood
The surging sea outweists,
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 tender form,
And look beyond the earth;
And is the mill-pond of our fate,
A sympath 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.

Simulisexual 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 chapter will be regarded by the less philosophic with more interest than these preliminary analyses of various aspects of simulisexual passion. But only through these considerations can we enter, with full intelligence on the narratives and clinical memoirs of Uranian and Uranid types.

Simulisexual Love: When we look into simulism in the brute-world we soon discern, that nothing more is the misuse of a term than to speak of sexual passion as "against nature", an "unnatural" act, and so on. Everyday observation, wherever wild beasts or tame are to be watched, convinces us of the natural propensity. The entire chain of beasts, birds, reptiles, and rather in proportion to advances in the study of nervous organism, practice simulisexual habits, by inborn impulses and deliberate choice. By an over-breadth of phrase, the tendency is called both "unnatural" and "bestial" one. In the mammals, mammals, the dog, the eel, the ass, the elephant, all members of the urine, impine, 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. King's interesting work on Onanism he gives many
instances. The preference on the part of the animal for sexual gratification with its own sex instead of with the opposite one, does not necessarily originate in the fact that the male, for instance, has no access to the female for heterosexual copulation. On the contrary his inclination seems deliberate, often to abstinence.

In birds the tendency is also general. A great portion of birds make no distinction whatever between copulating with the male or the female: actively or passively participating in it. The same obedience to either the active or passive role is observed in many common beasts. One of our domestic animals giving us every day the most common proof of making no distinction as to sexual passion, the dog, is rarely willing to be passive in the act; though the dog, occasionally, seems to prefer that form. The word "dog" in all oriental languages, especially in Scriptural usages, is synonymous for sodomite, etc.

In the entomological kingdom most interesting habits of deliberate, preferred similisexual intercourse between male insects have been minutely described and recorded. The reader is referred to the notes of Professor Karsch of Berlin, and to Keelch, Xoel, and others, either directly or as cited by Moll, Ellis, and others when treating of human similisexualism. But the naturalist does not discover any new general principle when studying the instinct in the animal world. Plato and Aristotle noted it, and even argued from it toward the general problem.

We may also take note of the fact that botany is altogether silent on the question of similisexual relations between plants. Something much like (strange as it seems) deliberate similisexual intention has been studied by several botanists of authority in connection with research into fertilization and cross-fertilizations.

Primitively. We turn to primitive man; or at least to the far-away periods of human social and racial existence. That was the attitude of individuals or nations toward similisexual passion when men were unimfluenced by artifical cultures, and followed the lead of plain natural impulses?

That it was a primitive, natural predisposition in human nature, is hardly contestable, even if the scruples of troglodytes and lacon-steine savages do not speak of it. The truth seems to be that Oriental and Latin and Hellenic writers found it common in the barbarous nations with whom they came into contact, in war or peace. Today, the explorers in the wilds of the savage-world have found it rooted, contrary to theories of its relation to advanced aesthetic life. The savage still regards it largely as of no import, morally or psychologically. Similisexual love, the will to satisfy it, among its paradoxes this one, it pervades quite simple natures, while also appearing to be a secondary consequence of aesthetic and intellectual cultivation. In refined civilizations it is almost an inevitable accompaniment, ever working along the nervous lines of aesthetic susceptility. But also it occurs distinctly where society’s concepts are rudimentary. The savages of Central Africa and East-Indian islands, the Esquimaux, Patagonian and Red Indian tribesmen, the barbaric races in the archipelagoes of the Pacific, are all given similisexual practices, whether between men and men or between women and women, but especially in its male form. Among that mystic and ever-primitive race, the Australian, the passion of the male for the male, and its resultant physical gratification is current, especially in its male form. The ancient Scythians accepted the instinct of sexual relations between males as a special class of well-conducted male prostitutes organized by that warlike people. The primitive Dacian and Gothic races were given to it, coincidental
with their strongest military periods. To-day it is one of the racial traits of their descendants. The Etruscans were peculiarly given to similisexualism and the Tuscan and Umbrians have inherited its passions. It was a part of the Aztec social system, and even of Aztec religion, and Central America and South America know it instinctively.

In Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian Races, peoples, the Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian nations, similisexual love, at least between males, was more or less a recognized and even legitimate fact both physiologic and spiritual. The sexual charm of the male, the influence of his beauty as an entrance force on his own sex, appears to have been taken for granted as natural, and seldom was discontented.

There is a prevalence of female similisexualism we have no historic record, but its existence is beyond doubt. Early legislation took little or no control of the similisexual impulses and habits. In Egypt there seems to have been a period when men were not accustomed to give it course, as by natural right, to the passion. In all dynasties, in all classes, in the army, the priesthood, in all life, it was well-known.

Why Similisexual Love was so Severely Punished by the Mosaic Code. Here we may notice a matter, referring to Egypt, that will be found significant in modern by the Mosaic Code.

The attitudes of modern criminal-law toward the passion. In Egypt, at the time of Moses and the Jews, servitude, similisexualism could be easily a deterrent, of importance, to increase of population. It was especially check of the male and “war-available”. Sexual intercourse between men was a foe to normal sexual satisfaction, to heterosexual love, and so to early marriages and offspring. Undoubtedly the habit was rooted in the Hebrew people when, for generations captive to the Egyptian race, naturally

With all that was Egyptian, morally, socially and religiously, or whoever, whatever, is typified by Moses, the deliverance, far-seeing law-giver, had his mind fixed on not the deliverance of his race but on its uttermost to consider the people as a people, a fighting people. There were ancient campaigns before the Hebrews for their establishment as a dominant race. Hence Mosaic laws set severe penalties against masculine similisexualism. The new nation was to be relatively populous and prosperous. Every individual male was to count. Every family was to be allowed to increase and multiply, or the military occupation of the Promised Land would be impossible. Accordingly early Hebrew legislation repudiated on a distinctly moral basis, and branded as a moral and religious sin an impulse that has no natural, no spiritual realization. Such prohibition any more than has the classing of one beast as a “clean” or “unclean” beast. It was the socalled “ancient” law of the district. The Mosaic ban of similisexualism had a relation to economy of sexual powers, and to popula-

Naturally one is told by surprised objectors to this plain fact, that the “earlier,” story of “ante-Mosaic,” civilization opposed similisexual love; punished mercilessly sexual intercourse of the kind. So we have been informed, especially the story of Lot and his mistresses. But such objectors will do well to understand once for all (likely for the first time) that the episode of Lot and the wicked men of Sodom is not afforded any grounds for arguing that Sodom was based on account of its similisexual tastes and practices. That Sodom was really given to such. Further, no proof that homosexual intercourse was ever had to Sodom, ever was or is an offense to God, even as the anti-vestic concept of God; nor that what the statutes-books, and pulpit-parlance especially, have
so long termed "sodomy" should ever have had such a meaning. The incident of Lot and his guests, of the mob that attacked Lot's house in Sodom with the charge of
ous "Bring out the men, that we may know them!"
correctly read, is simply a common civic episode of a suspicious Oriental town. A mob element being exci...tious hospitality that Lot had offered to two strangers, supposed to be spies, or what else, by the unfriendly crowd. There is no textual or other reason to give the verb "know" a sexual value, nor warrant for sexual colouring of the affair. Almost exactly the same incident occurs in another defense of guests; see forth in Judges XIX. v. 16-27 (re told in Chap. XX, 9) in the night-attack of the curious and alarmed townsfolk men of the city of Gibeah. There, too, a stranger, a Levite, had been taken into a house, with the same Eastern hospitality, and saved his life by allowing his concubines to be the victim of the mob, precisely as Lot offered his virgin daughters. Both episodes are plainly taken as violations of hospitality. The same devices to appease the citizens are mentioned; but there is no evidence even in these last detail of sexual insults to the guest. In the story of the Levite, we distinctly read that the object of the attack was because "they thought to have slain" him and Sodom's mob included both "young and old, all the people from every quarter". The two stories are absolutely Oriental "guest and host" duties and claims.

The Mosaic charge to Israel that simisexual relations was an abomination in the sight of the Jewish Jehovah; a particular moral enormity meriting death, had no basis in any moral "revelation to Moses," any more than other wise provision of the Mosaic Code. The warning of the death-penalty, were inserted for directly practical motives, not theological or ethical objections. The very words that are used of simisexual relations as a sin refer to many other matters often; to what we consider minor offenses). Let us note, for other example, the usage of Onan. There is absolutely no ground in the in...ries: Onan and the spilled seed, for regarding mas...tion as a moral obliquity. Onan was not punished, but was a moral sexual dereliction per se; but for negligence to marry his brother's widow, and to raise a family for his brother's name, a breach of religion, and civil-custom, in Onan's early day. Onan, like those men, has his name used as a reproach against our posterity, by an injustice to the man and his relation. We can admit that the Mosaic Code put sexual passion and its gratification in line with grave social, religious offenses, with rape, murder, idolatry, bestiality. But such a juxtaposition and the death-penalties for homosexual relations should never have been established by later and non-Israelitish peoples as referring sexual intercourse, between men and men, or women to the unnatural, or to the ethically

There is interest in our also noticing here that Moses so plainly includes bestiality as an offence, distress on feminine intercourse with a beast, he has no allusion to simisexual passion between two men general as it must have been in the Egyptian and Hebrew social life.

We are thus brought all at once to a later civil law peculiarly important, a startling but irresistible conclusion. Our general fabric of Christian and modern and Christian law, directly and indi...being so considerably informed by ideas and provisions of the Mosaic Code, in spite of the weight of Roman and other legislative codes that have been included into modern legislation and ethical feeling, we recognize that the attitude of Christian civilization and of Christian morals toward simisexual love and its grati-
fication is simply a relic of ancient Jewish, semi-civilized society. Homosexuality often was distinguished by Greek psychologists as "Greek friendship". This is a misleading term, since it suggests a moral-sentiment with which we have, today, rightfully. It is no more or nothing to do.

More than this, however startling to us, let us observe that in ancient Greece, also that between certain times, the term "Greek friendship" has never by right known any kind of sexual sentiment. For, the position of the Gospel narratives, the attitude and expressions or silences of Christ as to it, prove differentially the fact that what the Apostles accepted or denied was the question of what it was on their own authority: merely part of the Judaism with which, from the very beginning, Christianity has been so laden down. From this it suffers to-day only too much. The purest New Testament ethical dispensation ever should ignore homosexuality.

When we look closely into the finer origins of Greek culture, our criminal laws, so much infused with old Canaanite precepts with mediaeval religious views, have perpetuated the most hostile sentiment and error. In fact, the attitude of Christ toward many recondite human relations raises the question of how far Christ himself is an illustration of the development of similisexual love, with its concurrent rejection toward any warmer relationships to woman than that of son or friend or teacher. We also justly can infer that the Apostolic Christianity pronounced against intersexual intercourse, quite as much as through moral antagonism of Jewish origin.

Similisexual Love. We reach now the race and the epochs of history. The passion commonly most associated with similisexual love, as an open element of emotion and expression of life. The passion early received one of its names, "Greek friendship", from the period of Hellenic society. It is instructive to the Greek temperament, a temperament at once rugged and yet aesthetically sensitive, to see in no other race, similisexual long-time been split into two worlds.

Greek epochs. From the ancients to the modern world, similisexual love has been a mysterious similisexual flame. This, instead, spread through many Hellenic periods, though with the contrary effect. Especially in the Platonic theory of the Two Venuses, some deities inspiring the heart with love for the one, and the other a Venus Urania, the greater and more exalted. Venus, that inspires a man's passion for a woman, showed through many Hellenic periods, though in its relatively clandestine relation to
daily life. As Hellenic society and states declined, the phases of simulipseudo love altered; its quality abused, being vulgarized in tone and idealism. It transferred itself under such derogatory phases into the Roman social fabric; though it was not in the least new to Oscan, Etruscan, and early Latin civilizations. Even today, it survives in a form which allows a particular frankness and purity in a spot near the original Grecian home. A simulipseudo love between a man and a woman that frequently offers much of the heroic and ideal love of the wild and reticent clans of the Albanian race, is also honorably recognized by that warlike and imagination race as a distinct sentimental factor; and there, too, the sentiment was by no means of the "disembodied" type.

Was Simulipseudo Love Primitive? and of the Heroic sentiment in Hellenic life have claimed for the earliest periods of Greek society, particularly the Heroic and Homeric Epics. Recognized in the spiritual, intellectual love between man and man; a sentiment intensely romantic and absorbing, even to exclusiveness for woman, but without the wish for physical identification. We are asked to recognize in the bond between Achilles and Patroclus only this abiding and ideal love. The notion is incorrect. The mysticism, enlivened with the wish of later apologists to gloss over true elements of such relationship. Especially did such a view become part of the aim of Judaic and Christian ethics to define simulipseudo love between men as" proved pagan impulse: not compatible with civilized life. Heathenism, or with finer heroic temperaments. The insistence on such heroic "friendship" as having no physical undercurrent, has dealt dishonestly with Biblical interpretation. The sentiment of the Hellenic to his more superficial sense of love. Indeed, a peculiarly winning expression of human beauty that enters into simulipseudo love. In such a sentiment lurks contra-
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approval of all such sentiments. Agesilaos seems to have transmitted his similisexualism to his son. Agesilas; for we have an account of Archidamos as the lover of a beautiful lad named Kleomenes, the same who presently died a glorious death in battle, and whose body another young man named Pantenus committed suicide in his intense grief and love: an historical incident worthy of the pen of a Vergil. Again, in the history of tyrannical Demetrius comes the story of Damocles, "Beautiful." This boy was famed far and wide for his surpassing loveliness. Demetrius was determined to possess him, and laid all manner of plans to that end. Through his lust, surprised the boy alone, in a private bath. But Damocles had avoided all public places of the kind. He was mortal to him was the passion of the prince. For that this time he was helpless, the lad threw himself into the boiling water, and so perished, rather than himself to be enjoyed by a man whom he loathed.

Many more historic passages to the point can be quoted from Hellenic authors of history. We shall see what belles-lettres afford, in the same key.

In short, similisexual love and its intercourse in Hellenic life was, for the most part, put on a footing with legal sexual love, even when it narrowed itself, not to degenerated, to pederasty as a merely physical impulse than spiritual impulse. When pederastic, it was not tolerated against nor frowned-down, except when did to the intellectual, moral and physical development of a lad and disturbance in the family were perceived, at which it was satirized and reproved as a lapse, by philosophers and when it was not excepted-against in any other manner.

The similisexual passion between women appears with distinctness in Greek social life, when it enters into Hellenic literature with emphasis. It received a specific name, Lesbianism, from the personification of the great woman-poet of Hellas to the "Greek love" as a term has been long applied particularly to female similisexualism, and to either phases, as it has been to masculine passion. As did by Greek statutory law. Society smiled at, and it: just as is the case today. It never acquired the implied philosophic or other recognition in Greek,Apparently being relegated to the indifference, if was felt toward much that was feminine, by antipathy.

Oriental influences in proportion to the progress and loss of idealism in later periods of Roman life, the sexual passion of the male for the male Rome with cumulative vigour. Throughout clas-legalistic epochs, it was, successively, either tolerated merely spasmodically reprehended as a civil sin rather than treated through any general moral or satirized, idealized, glorified; or simply it was not granted. We are often assured that primitive society was a stranger to it, or regarded it as a disgrace. This is not the fact, any more than that to Greek ideal, when Roman corruption of morals was at the fullest, along with the Roman moral, that distorted so much of what in Greek condi- condi-...
In Primitive Rome. Rome republican and monarchical, Rome in power, was in fact military and pacific. Rome in power, however, was a Rome simili-sexiualis as to love. Under the moral attitudes of high Roman philosophy, did not affect Roman temperaments. The Empire was filled full with decadence, was a Rome simili-sexiualis as to love. Under the remote Scythian Law that bore on it, we have visible data: that law appears to have referred to special pederastic practices and to the protection of innocent youth. The Lex Julia, another early law dealing with the matter, is also obscure in its scope. We note the presence of a special legislation of some kind related to soldiers when in military service, perhaps a bodily vigour not to be impaired in camps and barracks. This latter detail, by the way, is to-day recognized in modern Italian law, which otherwise takes no notice of sexual passions or practices between men and men, youths, women and their own sex, unless public decay is openly outraged, force used, or minor youth debauched.

In Imperial Rome. Under the Roman Empire, however, simili-sexiual love reached a degree of open acceptance, on a sentimental footing, in Roman society that met no repudiation of it by popular notions. We have but to turn to the pages of the finest flower or the rankest weed-growth of Latin literature, to the historians and biographers of the golden-decadent Roman world, whether giving us pictures of the Palatine or the Suburra, to find it writ large. Legislation, too, at a time when ordinary and heterosocietal limits of its open vehemence, and to honour of the Caesars Caesar seems to have been in all years of the unqualified passive pederast; satirized as "every man, and every woman's man." His relations for minors, among these Donatian's prohibitive against prostitution of young children, which Marcus received with such fulsome praise in an epigram, and sentiment in the epoch of the first Caesars degenerated into the mere pederast. It became crudely pederastic, losing all quality of manly idealism. All phases of it obtained. Its prostitution were legion. The Augustan Age was full of it. One only to read his Vergil, and the pages of Suetonius, Statius, Dion Cassius, Tibullus, Catullus, Juvenal, Petronius, and there is one reference in Plutarch (in the ministrum) to a certain youth called by a signi-notice "Delicias," who had been a favourite of...
Augustus when the great emperor was only Octavianus, a conspiracy which ended tragically the career of Sextus, came to a climax because of the mixing in it of the beautiful young pederasts, Mamilus and Andilus; the brother of Mamilus, a high officer in the army, was weak enough to disclose the plot against the commander to his mistress, and the secret began to spread untimely. In the meantime, Caius Lucius, a valiant soldier, a nephew of Marius, are told by Plutarch of the passion of Lucius for the same young officer in his service named Trebonius. Trebonius would not yield himself. Caius Lucius contrived to lure the young man to his tent one night, and attempt to violate him. Trebonius killed Lucius with his sword. This affair made a great scandal. One of the earliest acts of Cato the Censor was to degrade Quintus Flamininus, a brother of the great Titus Flamininus, from office, and from his seat at public games, because of a most inhuman crime. Lucius Quintus Flamininus kept a beautiful boy, whom he loved out of a desire as a simili-sexual plaything. The lad pettishly complained once that in the circus he "had never seen a man die." Flamininus ordered that a slave should be brought at once to the dining-room where they were to be executed. Plutarch tells the same gruesome tale in his account of Titus Flamininus. Plutarch mentions the homosexualism of Pompey. There are other references more or less pertinent to a study of homosexuality in Rome, at various epochs, that far precede the really notable evidence of the Roman character or State. With the laxities and lost ideals of the imperial periods, the passion had full movement. Almost each succeeding prince and his court illustrated it. We trace it onward, through the reigns of Caius of Claudius, and so on, to the immortal passion of Trajan for Avidia and to princes and epochs far beyond. The emotion fails of appearing. But it was, as I have pointed out, strikingly pederastic. Hence it deteriorated; eventually the people believed that many Romans felt it with its better-compounded elements; turning away from the physical passion.

The preponderance of the instinct of simili-sexual love among Roman women is of clear data, either through historians or belles-lettrists. By merely the references in Juvenal, we have plain enough inferences. It must have been almost as prevalent in the intimately small circles of social circles not referred to as of emotional consequence by the world; but rebuked by satirists. No Latin Sappho has been statutory codes paid attention to it, till the regime attacked it as a moral and religious threat to the masculine passion.

But the change was great on the advent of a New Faith into the social and legal and spiritual fabric of the pagan world. With the sternly prohibitory attitude toward so much that was human, Christianity that was and remains saturated in simili-sexual love began to take on swiftly, in the world a new aspect—that of a special and unique mission. Hitherto it had been distinctively such—a sin of moral wrong by religious conviction—only to the Jew. But the position was to be vastly strengthened in the face of the vasty social revolution, following the decline of humanism. All earthly passions were looked at as the primitive and Apostolic teachers. Profane sacrifices that drew the heart from God, and working-out of personal salvation, during a short earthly life. The hermits and ascetics implored and women to fight down all desires, save for love of God and the agonized Redeemer must absorb his passion. Thousands fled to the deserts to shut themselves away from the temptations of any human affections. The Mosaic positi-
ion toward simillosexual love was affirmed and ratified by presbyter and priest, by apostle and bishop. The clergymen of Sodom and Gomorrah was blackened into whole-ness by special sexual warning. The words of the Jewish ex ante-rius, who became a pillar of the New Faith, Paul, and the allusions of other teachers were cited to the Church, and the sentiments of other teachers were cited to the Church, and the sentiments of others were cast off as diabolic delusions against Nature as perfected by God. 

Pagan Aesthetics to be Eradicated. That this sentiment should take root in human heart, Patrician force is easily understood. Pagan love was the distinct tendency toward pagan aesthetics. That above all, must be rooted out, annihilated with all the earthy interests, other indulgences of the fleshly instinct. There was no place for them under the new dispensation. All profane love save altrustistic benevolence to our neighbour, was a peril. Heterosexual love was permissible enough any other sort vastly worse. Woman was a spectacle. Had not Christ held aloft from her?—even if he had not been the guest and friend of Martha and Mary. Marriage was tolerated for the laity; but the saintly must abide celibacy. The holy-minded must have no personal knowledge of carnal lust.

The Instant Hostility of the Roman Church to simillosexual love, bent on unholy sexual communion of Mariolatry. it the most depraved of instincts, increased just as the Catholic Church exaggerated its respect for the humble mother of the Redeemer. The new Faith demanded the worship of the Feminine-Abstract, the Blessed Lady, the Immaculate Virgin, a mysterious, strenuous cult, displacing by it the just adoration of Christ. Woman as typified by the Virgin, was held up as the ideal of the world-heart. Mariolatry, the fine flower of feministic concepts became the special policy of the Roman Church in a perpetual combat of male sexualism. Just as Christ had darkened existence with the gloom and gore of the Cross, so the sentiment-of Mary worship was to injure the social and sexual life of the male.

Canon Law. We have now to consider briefly other sexual-legal aspects. Under Constantine and Justinian the simillosexual passion took its place on to civil law as a felony, punishable with severity—castration and death included. With the break up of the Empire, and the parting of Europe from the East, the sexual laws and moral systems; but the Church were influenced directly by Roman and Chris- tian precepts. Hence the intolerant attitude to simillosexual love grew only the stronger. The Church, with its Canon Law, made it a special matter for ecclesiastical punishment, like heresy, apostasy and other spiri- tual offenses. It became abhorred as the vice of vices, the full-poison of the Beast in mankind. It was visited by fire and torture.

And yet, when the sentiment of the Legis- lative Christian code of morals and laws so charac- terized it, the homosexual passion persistently held firm place in humanity. It was only coming to the surface. By curious irony, the phenomenon became a special conservatory for its cultivation, it the mask of spiritual thing, the finer society of the medieaval Italian, and Gallic world was riddled-through with simillosexual love. Except when deteriorated to a vulgar obscenity, or when associated with moral and physical danger to the individual, thoughtful laic minds could not injure the moral and spiritual nature any more could the heterosexual love. How rebuke which indeed was often part of the finest
idealism and altruism? as natural in demanding its expression as thirst and hunger and sleep!

In Mediaeval and Renaissance Italy. Naturally the mediaeval period of the Renaissance was outspoken both in civil and canonical law against the passion. But soon this attitude became modified. The Renaissance especially revived the sentiment in the Italian soul, where it had never been lost, giving it renewed social force. The Italian-Hellenic psyche with its loveless aestheticism, declined to be coerced by any repugnant teachings as to this sort of love, or as to the punishment of the sinner. It became a more or less open phase of Italy's social life in all classes, especially the aristocratic, in Tuscany, Florence, Apulia and Sicily. With such papas as the Borgias and such princes as the Medici it was very considerably drastic. Laws against homosexual offences fell into disuse or were abrogated. In the Statutes of Siena which prescribed the most-cruel penalties for it, we find that their application was urged because otherwise "everybody" would be damned for it. Florence became enthusiastically populated, in vain Savonarola denounced it. Perugia, Verona, Venice, Milan, Naples, Rome, all towns of Italy, were distinct "Cities of Sodom" as they are today. And in Italy at this time, it assumed frequently its ancient Greek dignity of its old-time heroic beauty: a sentiment, for life and death, between the two men bound together in it. Christ, at the camp, palace and barracks, field and shop, it was regained its old estate. In Italy the King. There is much of the ironical, too, in discovering that, as indisputably simili-sexual loves have been glorified by painters, poets and moralists for centuries, under the name of marvellous and warm "friendships", either from ignorance or in reluctance to look into and to examine their real complexions. Some of these instances will have occasion to clarify in later parts of this study.

Antonie Cun- The German, Austrian, Keltic and Scandinavian races have always been instinctively simili-sexual. Their Christian system, and its codes of law, secular and spiritual, took special notice in Teutonic and Gallic Canon-Law of an impulse that seemed so perverse as to be a terror for punishment by axe and stake. Under the Cap-lingian Codes, Germany denounced simili-sexual acts between men, in 289 A.D., as punishable with death unless the criminal was peculiarly repentant. Later, invasions of the Saracens and the plague were laid to the secret existence in Central Europe; to the direct action of the anger of God, as "on Sodom". The French Law took the offence under its care. So did the English and French codes. In some cases the offence between men became a part of the legislation, but for the most part it was secularized. It was visited with excommunication, or banishment from the land, imprisonment, torture, burning at the stake or hanging till dead. Better times have given to the unfortunate offender, sometimes a reprieve. In France, nevertheless there was a degree even if in many instances we find the man castrated, decapitated, or burned; or all three. In Holland, Denmark and their vassals, simili-sexualism was made a capital crime; guilt of which was denounced by the literature of the age of Shakespeare and Milton, as an attribute of their deities. It was regarded popularly according to one or another degree of aversion, or legal reprehension, before the Christian epoch of the Northlands. With the acceptance of Christianity and the Roman and Civil laws on that basis, such relations between men were, of course, defined as capital sins and punished with death; a penalty frequently paid.

In England, Ireland and Scotland, through all Great Britain with its complex blend of Teutonic, Keltic, Anglo-Saxon and other psychologic traits, along with a high-
strung nervous organism, the impulse toward similitude of love between, especially, men has been a most vexing one. This in spite of all obstacles that religious, moral, legal obstructions against it. In no country of Europe today (contrary to a general notion) is it more an acknowledged current of masculine social life, whether elevated or depre
dicated in its phases. Subterfuges and conventional denuncia
crisis do not alter the plain facts before medico-psychologists. To the sensuous and sensual English organism homos
duality is innate. The iron-bound British social convention and the perpetuated errors regarding it whether from spiritual or physical standpoint, sternly denounce the ten
tendency of the Englishman to suppress or hide all manifesta
tions in him, makes easier his denial of it. Religious convictions and strong statutory laws unite for this purpose in Britain. We find it denounced, from the first Reformation period, as one of the supreme moral ob
ts and punished under the old laws of the land with the law of the land with the law.
In Scotland, where the instinct ever was and is, and where the formal death-penalties were abolished only recently, the Victorian Statutes are more humane, as we shall see, but still the British law knows no philosophic and question of attitude toward homosexuality, such as we shall presently remark in the cases of other European States. For England is horrified (or pretend to be) at the very mention of homosexuality. The Englishman affected to "understand" how classic and aesthetic Greece and Rome gave place to the feeling. Often he really dared not to believe that the references to it, which he reads on schooldays or in his study, refer to a concrete similitude emotion, physically gratified. He construes the very names of Propertius and Tibullus and the Greek poets, he reads the sonnets of Michel Angelo or Shakespeare, and "idealism" or "allegory"! He declares the homo
m flavored as a monstrosity, a freak of Nature, an act of weakness out of name, all this in solemn and gross ignorance or hypocrisy.

During all the social history of Asian, African and other Oriental civilizations, male love, particularly between males, has flourished side by side with heterosexual love; for the most part accepted as a natural and lawful passion. It was never deemed a matter for legal reproof under the finest Arabo-Saracen, Turkish and other epochs. It was cl
cently disparaged and satirized, by the Eastern literata for a hetero
cusal passion; but never was it morally dis
t except by severer, distinctly religious, minds.

The Arab and Persian gave himself up to it without the least Romantic and esthetic and voluptuous laissez-


his temperamen. The full glow of military subm

and the most brilliant epochs of letters and art were witnesses to it. Hafiz, Omar-Khayam, Abu-Nuwas, and others, have exulted in it. The intense romanticism, of delicate or gross eroticism. Now in the East, male similitude is acquired odorage has kept its pederastic tinge. The beautiful

the youth, growing into puberty, rather than the mature male, the woman in the Oriental heart. Thus accented,
current became so early open that half of the mass

and Arabic lyric love-verse makes the lover an
ject of passion "He" and "Him", not "She" and "Her", a fact till lately carefully suppressed by Arabs and others translators of Eastern poets. Today,

is as much a part of the Orient as ever.

Finally is it made an object of unfriendly social or legislation. The latter deals with the protection and with public decency, where concerned
With the advance of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, we began to find the philosophers, the legislators, the clergy beginning to question, print and otherwise, the real nature and moral weight of simili-sexual love. The instinct, rooted in the human instinct, a natural sin. Broad-minded jurists began to discuss what had hitherto been supposed to be out of any argument. The great thinker, Beccaria boldly, in the middle of the Eighteenth Century, put himself into a conservative, tolerant attitude toward the passion. So did certain others. The Eighteenth Century, with its many new currents of intellectual and political thought continued the conservatism. It required courage, but that was shown, in spite of scandalized rebuffs, by both Protestant and Catholic clergy. Voltaire, so influential today as admirably humanitarian, regarded simili-sexual love as an eccentricity, Nature originating in deep psychic mystery, and classing it with crimes. Beccaria had desired the simili-sexualist should be given opportunity to correct his moral education. Ideas advanced. By the end of the Eighteenth Century, the European laws laying down death-penalty for sexual intercourse decreased largely, largely a dead letter. There was no direct social control of the passion, no religious suffrance of a group tolerating it. But it met only imprisonment, loss of rights, fines and banishments and so on. Homosexuality was considered abject disgrace, but not felony. Not less, in few European statute-books was its punishment distinctly modified. The penalties were enforced, the statute was allowed to rust. Even so, this is the fact in some States of first-class influence.

Psychiatrists began to look into the problem of simili-sexualit as a matter primarily in the psychiatric province, and requiring new investigations. A large literature, and later on of criminology found it, now in one country another, particularly in work-writing specialists. Important contributions came presently from North America. Periodically, increasing room to contributions on it. The reforms of the French Code elicited favourable or unfavourable comment. The negative position of Italian and other nations also discussed with more interest and clearer understandings than had been earlier the tendency in most of Europe. With the analytic study of nervous sex-problems and sex-instincts, called scientific simili-sexualism grew firmer in Europe, decade by decade. Of much significance was the fact that the death bar in Germany, France, Italy and Austria, had to be sunk in legally recognizing the relations and sentiments of the kind, excepting, or if a menace to the morals of youth or public decorum, as proper for legislation. The Code Napoleon was and is such.

The following paragraph will sum up for the reader the present relations of Statutory law, the more important European and other States toward simili-sexual love: more particularly the passion between the sexes, for today the statutes seem unwilling or indifferent toward the feminine sentiment and its practices, if not with the masculine.

Britain, where simili-sexual love is still a sentiment contrary to all human ethics, and with imprisonment at hard labour for life; and usually attempted, by imprisonment, also at hard labour, a term of exceeding ten years; and with loss of rights. The offender is a felon, of deepest
In Germany a shifting condition of affairs is noticeable. The public interest in homosexuality is immensely increased within a decade or so, as would be expected in a nation where the proportion of homosexual of all classes is so large. The topic is no longer regarded as absolutely in even social discussions by serious men and women. The law, intellectually of its grave social problem, the rights of the respectable homosexual, whether worker or peasant, is now under the ban of useless medieval legal provisions are constantly agitated. A petitionary movement has twice memorialized the German Legislature, endorsed by all professions and classes, in appeal for the suppression of references to homosexual intercourse, except such provisions as shall guard minor youth and preserve public decency. Eminent German political men have taken part in the effort to repeal the most useless or worse, paragraph of the law. This movement has been made part of the form of the Social Democratic party in Germany, all respect to that intelligent and powerful body of men and agitators, the connection has not yet proved adverse to the repeal of the laws concerned, as would be expected. The Clerical Party have bitterly and successfully resisted any changes. It is to be observed that before consolidation of the present day German Empire the laws of the States showed a humane and reserved aspect toward homosexuality. When the new Imperial Covenant required a more uniform system in the Criminal Code, the tolerance of homosexual liberty became fixed in laws throughout the Empire; except that there is no reference to penalties for feminine similians. Under the present (1910) Code, and according to Paragraph 155, a merely mutual and respectable similians in Germany.

Austria-Hungary by the Laws of 1852, including paragraph (155), the similians is punished by imprisonment from one year to five years, according to circumstances, and loss of civic rights can be inflicted. A tendency to a liberal construction of offenses in the Paragraph mentioned is noticeable, in spite of the going severe attitude. The continual occurrence of scandalous scandals has made something like a tacit admission of the sinfulness of judges and jury a plain necessity. But the law is still a felony under German law. An implication from its rigours is however to be noticed, in Vienna, in spite of Paragraph 155, a merely mutual manually performed, between two adults of a private nature, under private circumstances, as in one's own dwelling, is not punishable.

A more absurd interpretation of the law is not easily found; but it can be one of service to the sexual acts with any minor, however depraved, are felonious. A more absurd interpretation of the law is not easily found, but it can be one of service to

Austria-Hungary by the Laws of 1852, including paragraph (155), the similians is punished by imprisonment from one year to five years, according to circumstances, and loss of civic rights can be inflicted. A tendency to a liberal construction of offenses in the Paragraph mentioned is noticeable, in spite of the going severe attitude. The continual occurrence of scandalous scandals has made something like a tacit admission of the sinfulness of judges and jury a plain necessity. But the law is still a felony under German law. An implication from its rigours is however to be noticed, in Vienna, in spite of Paragraph 155, a merely mutual manually performed, between two adults of a private nature, under private circumstances, as in one's own dwelling, is not punishable.

A more absurd interpretation of the law is not easily found; but it can be one of service to the sexual acts with any minor, however depraved, are felonious. A more absurd interpretation of the law is not easily found, but it can be one of service to
considerably shown in legal proceedings, now and then, in Vienna. In Hungary, the penalty for the offense is one year, or more, according to circumstances.

In Switzerland exist curious differences in the attitudes according to the different Cantons and the laws. Generally defined, in the German-speaking cantons, the homosexual is punished, by a greater or lesser penalty of imprisonment, with here and there loss of hostile rights: whereas in the French-speaking cantons, the homosexual is not recognized as a criminal provided he does not coerce, nor offend public decency, nor debauch young. Briefly, the differences in the Swiss laws follow. In Canton Graubunden, no specific age of consent is set nor extenuating circumstances; penalty, imprisonment up to a term of three years. In Waadt (Vaud), the law specifies that “sodomy” shall not be punished except on formal complaint, more especially if debauchment of minor youth is shown: in which case the penalty is imprisonment for a term of from two months to fourteen years. In the Valais (Wallis) the law regards only the public decorum, not even specifically providing against debauchment of minors. In Schaffhausen, the law provides imprisonment of minor youth is shown: in which case the penalty is imprisonment for a term of from two months to fourteen years. In the canton of Obervay, the law provides a general penalty for all homosexual offenses—imprisonment “up to four years.” In Basel, there is also a general provision of punishment for all homosexual intercourse, by a term of imprisonment up to and ten years, according to the special grade of the offense. In Glarus, is a similar general provision for punishment by imprisonment from two years up to the Penal Code.

In Freiburg, sexual relations with a minor of less than eighteen years of age can be punished by imprisonment from eight years, and the public decorum is not to be offended; otherwise, the homosexual is relatively free. In Basel, like Freiburg, only when the offense is with a minor of less than 18 years, or if public decency is in question, can the homosexual be punished. In Basel, homosexual relations with minors apparently if under 18 have special penalties of imprisonment, and the circumstances opposed to public propriety are considered. Canton of Tessin (Ticino) debauchment of minors 2 years and under 15 years is punishable by imprisonment. In Geneva (a city where much homosexualism is permitted) there is no punishment except for the debauchment of minor youths; that is to say imprisonment for one month to one year if the minor be under 21, two years up to five years if the youth be less than twenty; besides regulations as to public decorum. In Appenzell, it is punished adults who offend between themselves, who debauch minor youth under 15, according to the law of fines and imprisonments, the latter ranging from twenty to twenty () years. In Schwyz, exists a general provision for homosexual offenses, with imprisonment from one to two years. In St Gall, the law regards only the public decorum, not even specifically providing against debauchment of minors. According to this or that sentiment, there also is met a just paragraph which provides special punishment against any homosexual intercourse between adults. In a large number of these different provisions in Switzerland, according to this or that sentiment, there also is met a just paragraph which provides special punishment against any homosexual intercourse between adults. In all these laws, the penalty for homosexual intercourse between males or females is punished: but in France, the Code Napoleon maintains its wise and just provisions. There is no legal recognition, no penalty for homosexual intercourse between males or females in France, unless public decency comes into the
In the United States of North America, the punishment for homosexuality is severe, in all the State-Codes. For instance, the laws of New York State against the least manifestations of it, punishing it with heavy imprisonments, are exemplary. It is a first-class felony. Nor is any other violation of it, by jurists, in general and clear consideration America at present, nor in the general public sentiment of the public.

Each day proves how are powerless all [legal means to lessen the similisexual impulse in humanity. It could only be put it out of the heart and the life-impulses of the soul in each class. Similisexual love flourishes today, not in the phase of finer or deteriorated character and vice from binding the master-bond of high souls to the living of sordid male prostitutes of a boulevard. Legally all penalties, all social intolerances, not a fact as the more personal material for the pages, but the practical study of the Intersexual races, the Indian and the Uraniad.

In Mexico, there is no penalty for similisexual relations except when under the conditions of actual publicity, or age, as set forth above. The same rule in Latin South-America in general.

In Italy, except when the offender is a soldier in military actual service, or if violence be used in the act of sodomy or when public decency is outraged or when minor children (under sixteen years old) are debauched, there is no legal opposition to of similisexual satisfactions. In Holland in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, in Belgium, Portugal, Spain, the Principality of Monaco, and in the United Kingdom, although there is no legal position taken against similisexual relation, except when it is a rape, or is exhibited in an offensive to public decency, or is corruptive of young morals.

It should be noted that the phrase “public decency” is often construed in a general sense by the courts of the countries concerned. Also the age of consent is variable; usually the boundary being fourteen but under some conditions twelve years, sixteen years, or even more.

In Asia, Africa, and South America where public opinion is tolerant, there is no legal punishment for similisexual relations.