Valois homosexual, and a type in general of the unprincipled, vicious, effeminate prince. Three of Henri's so-called "mignons" (a word that turned into the English "minions" now has lost its full offense) were François Manigron (Duc de Bellegarde), the Duc d'Epernon, and the even more celebrated Quélus. To all of them Henri was attached by passions that bordered on erotic mania; to none so much as to Quélus. The assassination of Quélus brought Henri to a morbid climax of grief. Like that of Alexander the Great for Hephaestion. Another royal French homosexual was Louis XIII, a somewhat more tolerable uranian, but not much more so in the weakness, fatuity, faithlessness and selfish egotism that gave full play to the statecraft of Richelieu. The most impassioned uranistic love of Louis XIII was that for Henri d'Effiat, better known as the Marquis de Cin-Mars. Not only a private and political vengeance made Richelieu inflexible in demanding the death penalty for this young nobleman, when Cin-Mars was detected in his famous conspiracy: for the great Minister was resolved to break forever the sentimental influence of Cin-Mars on Louis. Cin-Mars seems romantically homosexual also in his relation to his nearest friend, François-Auguste de Thou, the son of the historian. De Thou was a quite different type from Cin-Mars. Highly intellectual, profoundly moral and religious, the latter trait was emphasized even to pietism in de Thou. But his passion for young Cin-Mars — considerably his junior — was intense. De Thou not only joined in the ill-starred plot in devotion to d'Effiat, but may be said to have deliberately thrown away his life, rather than survive his friend. Both ascended the scaffold at Lyons.

Another French sovereign, one of wholly different stamp from the two just named, the marvellously politic tyrannical, superstitions, cruel Louis XI, impresses one as an innately uranistic nature: uniting it with a cold-blooded homicidal mania worthy of Caligula. One of Louis's special favourites (see Comines's annals) was Cressol, Governor of Dauphine (1473). A woman-despisir, turning to sexualit furiously when cynical passion moved him, Louis XI is a dark shape in the gallery of vaguer royal homosexuals.

Philippe d'Orléans, the Regent of France, a prince of fine natural qualities, but corrupt to the marrow early in his manhood, casts a particular shadow across the line of kingly homosexuals. His orgies, in the Palais-Royal and elsewhere, have been given sufficiently in detail for many generations of readers of French backstairs scandal. One such "affair" between Philippe and a certain much petted companion, the Abbé de Choisy, is distinguished. The same Abbé de Choisy furnishes possibly the most brilliantly demoralizing, cynical type of an uranian courtier to be met in French print. The canstic private correspondence of the Regent's German mother, Elizabeth-Charlotte, Princess Palatine, by her marriage, Duchess of Orléans (1652-1721), throws fugitive light on aristocratic uranism in Paris under the Regency — anything but to its respectability. Numerous other records, even more graphic and at first-hand as depictions, are at the service of the curious.

The period of the Regency, as also that of Louis XV, developed aristocratic French uranism so much that really scandalized remark on it was not over-common. The Bachaumont Memoirs, the secret "Journal" of the Police Inspectors under Sartine, the Cheverney, d'Argensol, Babier and similar records, offer interesting witness to this. About 1760, for instance, we are told quite casually that the Italian ambassador Erizzo... has just given to young Fleury, an actor in the Montsien troupe a cabriolet and horse, so that Fleury can come oven to Paris... The Ambassador keeps Fleury, just as he would a pretty woman... Some days ago, coming from a supper with the Duc d'Aprignon the Ambassador went to bed with Fleury:
and gave him a ring worth fifty louis d’or and twenty-five louis d’or in cash.... They say positively that the Ambassador has just settled an income of eight thousand livres on Fleury, over and above thirty louis d’or a month....

Under the Regency and during all of the reign of Louis XV, the garden and arcades of the Palais-Royal were notoriously and practically without any hindrance evening by evening, the grand pederastic resort and market for homosexual prostitution in Paris. Very distinguished personages were not above resorting thither. Handsome boys, frequently of tender age, were openly bargained-for between their parents or other keepers, and Parisian gentleman of wealth and rank; while adult types of the profession, or amateurs, intrigued in unabashed gayety and assurance.

The Due de Vermadeloix, is an addition to the list of aristocratic French Uranians. Whether the mysterious Chevalier d’Éon was one or not — at most, in part — is to be questioned. His memoirs do not determine him nor do the many records from others, as to his being wholly free from uraniamism. Of him, more in another chapter, as of some others we have mentioned.

Scandinavia. Gustavus III of Sweden, the son of the great Vasa, brilliantly endowed and fascinating, full of soldierly quality, was philharmonic to his heart’s core. The assassination of Gustavus at a courtball, in consequence of the Ankerström Conspiracy referred itself to an under-welt of homosexual circumstances and relations, known to Ankerström, to Axel Fersen, to Ribbing and to others of the King’s favorites.

Several royal Muscovite homosexuals have reigned. One was Paul I. The other was no less than Peter the Great. Peter is a further instance of dionism and uraniamism, blended in one individual. Vehemently erotic as a young man, he was given to homosexual intimacies while a frequentor of women. The dualism of taste did not disappear as Peter grew older. In view of his relations with both sexes, and of his wonderful energy of character, there appears much of the Oriental in Peter’s complex, ungovernably animal tendencies. A special uraniam favorite of Peter was the celebrated parvenu Menschikoff. The notorious uraniamism of Alexander I of Russia, has already been mentioned. But Alexander was not the last of Russian princes to be known as an Uranian. Two conspicuous seions in our own day have been actors in “affairs” that excited brisk comments in other cities than St. Petersburg.

Eland’s James Stuart. We turn again to the history of English sovereigns. James I, an eccentric mixture of the kingly and unkingly — of the well-balanced and the “just not mad” — was, first and last, a consistent Uranian. His court became aware of it, even to its use by state-intriguers. James never could resist a handsome young man. Once in love with him, James was almost incredibly indifferent to moral un-worth behind mere beauty of body, exactly as dionistic princes have been mischievously bewitched by mistresses. The histories of James’s chief favorites are good illustrations of the dangers of becoming a royal pet. Unluckily, James was incompetent to protect the young objects of his passion from the consequences of their elevation to his favour, or from the results of their own follies and crimes. His liking, too, was a shifting equation. Not simply a pederast, that quality distinguished fractionally James’s sentimental intimacies with beautiful youths. Good-looking lads were deliberately put in the way of the royal Uranian to make use of his passion, either for themselves or others. James was always eager to teach an ephalus Greek
or Latin — and Greek and Latin morals. Two or three of these favourites played pernicious roles, even to disturbing the English throne. Prominent was Robert Carr, a mere groom of the stables, but of unusual beauty, brought into the eye of the king by what was not just an accident — a fall during a pageant. Of young Carr, James became dotingly fond. The boy was so swiftly the recipient of estates, titles, privileges and so on, especially as Earl of Somerset, that scandal and hatred could not well have failed soon to attach to him. Carr was a thorough-going young reprobate, devoid of heart or conscience, boasting of his sovereign's very weakness him; and in time instigated the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury. Carr was essentially a dionian; his relations to James were of the most mercenary sort au fond. With some difficulty, he was saved from the death that he deserved. But the rest of his life passed in obscurity and want; for James had turned to a new favourite, George Villiers, a remarkably handsome young student at Cambridge. Villiers ultimately was made Duke of Buckingham: the famous "Steeenie", for his royal lover. The reader need not be reminded that Buckingham was, however, a man of other and better traits than the fair-faced predecessor, Carr. In Buckingham's hands rested then, much of the statesmanship of two successive reigns: and his murder in 1628 was rather more than a merely sentimental incident. It was a-propos of this favourite of James I that the royal Uranian himself one day declared — "I am neither a god nor an angel — and I confess to loving those dear to me more than other men. You may be sure that I love the Earl of Buckingham more than any one else. Christ had his John, and I have my George!"

In the reign of Charles I, occurred the famous divorce case of Lord Audley on similisexual grounds of explicit detail, a celebrated scandal of its epoch.

The English Commonwealth by its iron-bound, Hebraic, code of social and political life, made a profession of turning England into a second Canaan, with a Pentecostal conscience as to thought and word and deed. Did it banish homosexuality? Could such a super-abomination of fleshly sins, according to Christian ideas, find any nourishment, while Cromwell was at the head of the nation? — with every parson and hedge-preacher, Levites in hand, a censor and a judge over his neighbour? We may be certain that not a thousand Cromwells, not the most sharp-seeing religious tyrants, of even Protestant sort, could root it out; any more than could the confessors of the Roman Church or the harshness of civil laws. Natural instinctive in Anglo-Saxons, it would defy the cant of pietism, the rule of Moses and the Prophets. One brilliant leader of the Cavalier party, Montrose, is said to have been Uranian. We may observe here, by the by, that in the Scotch temperament, as in the Irish, there is a vivid, racial element of homosexuality.

The English Restoration, Georgian etc., Periods. Another aspect of English social ethics. That most scandalously immoral, that most cruelly licentious of royal courts, which centered on Charles II and his crew of familiars, male and female, was by no means wholly heterosexual; in spite of its putting a premium on feminine harlotry. Homosexual intimacies, often of repulsively gross sort, were a social jest. The curious can study this state of affairs in the secret diarists, the prurient back-stairs chroniclers of the time; can trace it also in the grosser satirical poets and dramatists of the date. Pepys has hints of it, though Pepys is chiefly preoccupied with heterosexual gossip as to the frail ladies of Whitehall. There is a curious pathos in one of Pepys's serious anecdotes, vaguely Uranian of motif — the foolish quarrel between "Sir H. Bellasis" and his best...
friend, "Tom Porter," in 1667, which led to their fatal duel; of which affair all London talked with wonder and pity.

In the reign of Queen Anne and of the first Georgian sovereigns there were enough suggestions of homosexual intimacies between personages in high society and politics to receive cutting allusions of poets and other satirical writers. Lampoons and squibs of such kind flew about the clubs and coffee-houses. Pope has biting references to such Court-favourites as Lord Hervey — "Sporus, that mere white curl of asses-milk."

In the Guelphic blood have been remarkable, from time to time, traces of reaction from a notorious heterosexualism to a notorious homosexuality. The Hanoverian dynasty has shown it. George III., when a young man, was charged by common report with sexual intimacy with his personal and political favourite, Lord Bute. The caricaturists of the time are prodigal of allusions to this accusation. Bute, when prime minister, was the subject of countless pasquinades not omitting it. It is to this sort of gossip that Byron refers in his poem "The Vision of Judgement" when he declares that the annals of George III. show — "How to a minion first he gave the helm.

George the Fourth seems to have been consistently heterosexual. But his brother, Ernest, Duke of Cumberland, who in his younger days had the family-beauty, early was marked out in English society for uranian amours; and eventually had to appear in a court of justice because of the murder of his valet Sellis — an affair about which floated a thick cloud of homosexuality. Between the Duke and certain members of his household there had been criminal intimacies. The trial mentioned was the sensation of the hour. Sellis was supposed to have had a connection with the Duke, and to have been supplanted by another servant, Neale. According to another theory, Sellis who was found dead in his room, with his throat cut, in circumstances that precluded ideas of suicide) was murdered by the Duke, because Sellis had threatened the latter with exposure of his intimacy with Neale. The Duke got out of the affair with great difficulty. He became presently King of Hanover, and was the center of a German court plentiful in homosexual interests.

Within the present generation of English royalty, another princely personage (since deceased) was supposed to be among an aristocratic clique implicated in a famous London homosexual escamandre. It is, in fact, believed that this affair was "hushed up" so expeditiously, because it came so near to the throne; certain other high-born participators gaining time to "leave their country for their country's good."

The wide prevalence of Uranian relationships in British "high society" today is too well attested, too familiar the world around by more or less noted scandals and odious legal processes, to require extensive reference here. Several phases of it must be cited in other sections of this study, in appropriate connections. Mayfair's sensational divorce-proceedings have added evidence to the aggregate. Of the simulsexual tastes of Englishmen of "our finest social circles" at home, a tacit evidence is their persistent residence abroad in countries where they can feel safer from suspicion and from blackmailing scandals. One eminent personage in British political life, who once reached the highest honours in a career that has appeared to be taken up or thrown by with curious capriciousness or hesitancy, is a constant absentee in his beautiful home in Southern Europe, whence only gentle rumours of his racial homosexuality reach his birth-land.

Various Historian. In fact, every period of social history has an interminable catalogue of homosexuals of quality. We have already encountered them in course of
observations in preceding chapters, when speaking of classic Greece and Rome. They multiply as we review the Middle-Ages, the Renaissance courts, castles, palaces and camps. It is an aristocracy of all ages of life. Gallant young Conradin of Hohenstaufen and his beloved and not less gallant cousin, Frederick of Baden, those two brave boys only in their teens. united 1298) in perhaps the most pathetic tragedy of political murder in history; Prince Eugene of Savoy, the famous Ban of Croatia, Joseph Jellachich (1801-1859); Count Wenzel-Anton von Kallmitz (1711-1794), the colossally active, efficient, cultured chief-minister under Maria-Theresia; Prince Heinrich of Prussia, (1726-1802) the brother of Frederick the Great, — as superior a general, as accomplished a man of letters and arts as was the great Frederick himself; Baron von Polnitz, the philanthropic Count von Zinzendorf; Cambaceres, patriot and statesman, Count Khevenhuller, the Austrian soldier and statesman under the Maria-Theresia regime, and the victor over Turkey, Russia, France and Germany; the terrible Robespierre, whose homosexual relations with young Duplay, during his most sangüinary Revolutionary days seem to indicate his temperament as one of maniacal bloodlust and eroticism. • Prince Kolowrat-

* During Robespierre's long sojourn in the Duplay family, his intimacy with the handsome young son — eighteen years old — was increasingly a topic of scandal and satire behind the back of the dreaded Incorruptible. For the persistent legend of any romantic tie with Elsomus Duplay, one of the daughters of the family, a girl whom Robespierre maintained a fraternal and father-bred attitude toward her, of Robespierre's taking sexual interest in any woman no evidence sustains, siting. As to the lad Jacques-Michel Duplay, an indication of the scandal occurs in the fact that when the boy was hustled into the Prison of Sainte-Pélagie, on the 9th of Thermidor, somewhat after Robespierre had been brought thither, one of the prison-crowd called out — "Ladies and gentlemen, I beg to announce to you the arrival of Robespierre's gamское — along with his Prime-Minister!" The latter reference was to young Duplay's father.

Lickinsky (1778-1861), distinguished as minister of Austrian affairs, as patriotic Bohemian, and as a true Maecenas in the development of Viennese art and letters. All these men, so diverse in type, have shown more or less unequivocally their intersexual impulses. The royal portrait gallery (which will be considered more in detail presently) also offers the eccentric Prince Adolph-Friedrich of Mecklenburg (1768-1794) among curiously emasculated Huns: Leopold-August, Duke of Saxo-Coburg, (1772-1870); see later; and King Frederick-Charles of Württemberg, who was noted for his homosexual relationships, little concealed. One of his favorites, von Dillen, had been a grocer Dillen; who rose to the nobility by his compliances. The same royal Court, at Stuttgart, in the earlier eighties of the last century, was the scene of a complicated political and homosexual drama, reminding one of the dilemmas of King Edward II of England; in the ascendancy, notoriously homosexual, gained over King Charles by two American favorites, neither of whom much passed his teens, both of humble origins. They fairly exploited the enamoured king — for their common benefit — instead of being rivals as truly Yankee stroke of cynical practicality until they were expelled the city, by a ministerial coalition against them; ending thus the famous "Jackson-Woodeck Affair" of 1884. One of the most esteemed and admired of the Austrian arch-dukes of the present line, whose striking soldierly personality is seen towering above most other conspicuous assistants at high and fashionable functions; his relative, of the elder archducal circle; also a young scion of the same great gens, the hero of a serious homosexual scandal in London, at the time of the last Coronation, to which he had been sent among other representatives of the Imperial Court: Prince A — of A — recently divorced under circumstances of homosexuality; an enormous list of tautonic homosexuals of blue-blood — all could lengthen the procession. The painstaking and never – rash Wissenschaftlich-
Humanitäre Komitee in Berlin, has lately put in its table of statistical estimates, an average of five per cent of the German aristocracy as being homosexuals; two persons in each forty. The army-percentage must also be considered. (See other chapters.)

Particularizing Germany, the newest “Berlin Scandals” as they have been called (for which there is room for only a few lines in this book) are showing how German homosexuality wears the broad-striped toga: approaches the throne now as ever; is perhaps even more contemporaneously born in the purple than might prudently be admitted. The “Harden Cases,” and their immediate successors, which have not spared even an Imperial Chancellor (though in his instance there was no obvious personal foundation for the suggestion—repudiated as a libel have been of indirect as well as direct bearings. There can be little doubt that the Schollenburg, Molike, Eulenburg, Hohenau and Lyman cases, as others, have been got out of nervous public attention as quickly as possible, to avoid compromising hundreds of aristocratic sissipanipals in Germanic territory. The notorious scandals before Berlin aristocracy, in 1903 known as the “Affair of the Lakes”, in which a clique of young scions and old ones, mostly rich and titled residents along the beautiful shores of the Muggelsee, were in the habit of quiting their villas at night, and sailing around the lake, naked but not at all ashamed, their boats wreathed in garlands, lighted with torches and lanterns—among orgies of the sort described by Tacitus, more or less imitated—were distinguished for notably born participators. The need of interrupting these proceedings without making too great an aristocratic scandal gave the Berlin courts much trouble. Matters were compromised after the most unavoidable arrests, and by fines and hints to self-exile.

The Italian Renaissance. The social and political history of the Italian Renaissance is incidentally a history of ureanism in high-life, so infused that the emotion was a concurrent of patrician aestheticism, in all major centers of Italy’s awakened culture. Such families as the Baglioni, the Medici, the Borgia, the Sforza, the Visconti, offer numerous contrasted examples. Savonarola’s sermons in Florence vehemently dealt with such instincts. Its aristocratic tolerance was considered, by the Italian Church particularly, as the principal cause of scourges of the epoch—the plague, famines, invasions of the Turkish hosts, earthquakes and inundations. The jurist Carpiowins, as late as 1645, advocated the burning alive of all homosexuals, for the reason last mentioned! That homosexuality should flourish in the Renaissance in Italy, was natural, as a part of the return to Greek cults of the Beautiful. But it did not decline as that sentiment calmed; and it has not done so in Italy to-day, nor will it do so, especially in Central and South-Italy. The Italian is perennially heterosexual and homosexual, in a degree sometimes puzzling. He has by race-inheritance an intense sexual feeling for male beauty, along with his sensuous sexual appreciation of feminine charms. In Italian high life, especially where not strongly parianized, the Italian aristocrat as uranian or dorian never is rare.

King Ludwig II. One of the most melancholy and picturesque figures in recent royal homosexualism was King Ludwig II of Bavaria. King Ludwig is another example of the gifted Uranian inextricably “out of place,” by being born to a throne. He was a true Wittelsbach in his vividly intellectual and aesthetic sensibilities: with the concurrent Wittelsbach taint of madness in his blood. Aversion to Ludwig II as a careless ruler, as a vast spendthrift, through show-castles and Wagnerism, of his country’s revenues, as imitator of Louis XIV
of France in banality, not dignity, becomes less as we sit
the story of his life. From his betrothal with the Princess
Sophie of Bavaria Ludwig broke away, only because he
could not enter into marriage-relationships with any woman.
He could love only the male; and he loved many. The list
of his favourites is long: men distinguished for not only
their personal attractiveness, but for high mental or artistic
individualities, whether writers, actors, composers, singers.
—artists in every branch of aesthetics; His protégés in
the military—calling the youths in humblest life—it is
a remarkable catalogue. A literature exists on this topic,
elarged since the end of the King's career in the Lake
of Starnberg. Whether that fate was accident, suicide or
murder is not yet quite clear. The tone of some of King
Ludwig's letters to Wagner is nothing if not uranic.
as in this example: "My innermost Beloved! I have
just heard that you are one more entirely recovered. Oh,
with what an outburst of joy did I greet this news!
How I burn with longing for those tranquil, sacred,
hours, which shall vouchsafe to me once more the long-
missed sight of the being nearest to me of all on earth!
To death itself—your true Ludwig". The present King
of Bavaria Otto never has been more than a nominal ruler,
because of his insanity, and is slowly closing his life in
complete seclusion as a patient; but Otto, when entirely
same was also homosexual, and he has shown this sort of
eroticism since his madness deepened.

There is no need in lengthening this list. Obviously
into the demon-se of contemporary aristocratic life there
is both delicacy and difficulty in entering too frankly.
In the next chapter, we shall see how incessantly is
homosexual the man professionally of literary and aesthet-
ic callings. He is often aristocratic of position; is often
also of inner fibre than many kings and princes.

Differences in Sex. A-propos of the universality of philarr-
monic choice: the "philosophic" one nature, we may observe in aristocratic
Uranian of High
Class.

Uranians two distinct expressions of personal
tastes marked out as to homosexual connections. There
is the sort of Uranian, himself a gentleman, who is
attracted only to individuals of his own grade; desiring
intercourse sexually only with a man of refinement of
physique and of superior psychic individuality. The other
class, however aristocratic, seeks always lower social types
for partners; demands coarser physiques and unrefined
and untrained natures; this choice along with particular
aversion to sexual intercourse with equals or superiors.
Such aristocratic simulacras may be called "philosoph-
ics," or lovers of "the man of the mob," the rayon from
the slums; and the preference often turns out a dangerous
one as we shall see later. But it is an idiom quite as
marked as sexual dislike of women. We find the prince
who would rather be embraced by a dragoon, the peer
who prefers a butcher or a blacksmith, the cultivated
leader of a social circle to whom only a common waiter,
or a rough mechanic, appeal sexually. In such "philos-
ophic" Uranians — extremely numerous — just as among
heterosexuals, we have a psychic problem illustrating
the fact that like seeks unlike, and that sexual love is
often an entity out of dissimilarity. But constant sexual
association with lower intellectual or social homosexuals
impairs the manly idealism, coarsens the nature,
and destroys the original refinement of its victim. In
homosexual love, as in heterosexual love and friendship,
the man easily becomes what his company is; especially
under circumstances so potent on the psychic essence.

The Royal Fran—

A distinction is not always easily made
between the sort of woman in high and
responsible station—a queen, warrior or political leader—
who is notably masculine in her intellect, her tastes.
her habits, and with little or no amorous bias through her career; and the really simisexual woman the Uraniad. Types of female sovereigns showing minds and dispositions male rather than female, are presented familiarly to us in Elizabeth of England, in Catherine de’ Medici, in Christina of Sweden, and so on. But many are indistinctly uranial, if at all so. Elizabeth of England was certainly a normal woman in the meekest private life of a nominally “Virgin Queen” — about whom there must be talk of “no scandal”. Catherine of Russia is said to have become uranidistic as she grew old. In the royal house of Wittelsbach there has been a strain of female contra-sexualism, along with the excessive heterosexuality and uranismism of the males. Three princesses, two of them becoming sovereigns, are recent illustrations; in each case with tragic circumstances in their histories and one of them ended recently in an abominable assassination that shocked the civilized world.

The Soldier-Urania. Many presumptive examples of the intersexual female, the virile uranial, occur with the veritable woman-at-arms: queen or peasant. In her mannish temperament are to be added the unfeminine traits of physical and moral courage, and her masculine muscularity. The woman-warrior has been a picturesque interloper in camp and battlefield, ever since wars were waged. The old legends of the Amazon race and of the Centaurs are deviations from realities, the woman who much preferred to wield a spear rather than bear a child, and the man who so dominated his horse that he seemed a part of it.

Classic types of amazonians are plentiful. Among early ones we have the Biblical Deborah, savior, judge and captain over Israel — all at once. We have Bondica, Boudicca, Tonyris, Zenneba, Jeanne d’Arc, Margaret of England, the terrible women-warriors of the houses of Flanders and Penthièvre — every school-girl knows them. The pages of mythology and romance furnish a long array of soldierly ideals: Semiramis, Penthesilea, Thalestris, Camilla, Bradamante, Brindamuri. Hippolytus, the screaming Valkyrs the resplendently divine Minerva — that noblest conception of female divinity ever evolved by human imagination in any religion — and the mystic, cruel Bellona. Diana is un-feminine. Even Venus enters the battlefield, in Homer and Vergil. Apart from myths, the military spirit seems almost supreme in such uranial types as Samara, the heroine of the defence of Ancona, the American Molly Pitcher, the valiant Anna Luhring, of Bremen; or the Hungarian heroines of Erlau’s siege, who fought like the strongest and bravest of men. In many savage tribes to-day women are as expert fighters as the men. But despite outward virility in such types, we cannot classify them as true Uranias: for their amorous instincts are either too unclear, or else are more or less conclusively heterosexual. We say “But yet a woman.

Sudden political upheavals create the soldiering amazonian. Sometimes she is fiercer and more sanguinary than most men. In the French Revolution period, the Vendée campaigns elicited squads of women, fighting in the ranks. Remarkable examples of feminine soldiering enter into the savage Chouan chronicles: But we may note that the French Revolution, though in the Vendée productive of notable heroines of camp and battle, does not afford us so many examples of women-soldiers, who were drawn to combat by patriotism and natural firmness of nature, as it does instances of women who were détraquées; unhgressive in their blood-thirstiness and in sheer passion for excitement; lower-class amazons particularly. One realizes such a strain of sanguinary unfemininity in Latins, at a Spanish bull-fight or a French guillotining. Such were the terrible tricéphades at the guillotine, in 1792-93-94.