The Uranian and Urania in the Distinctively Ethical, Religious and Intellectual Life: in the Distinctively Aesthetic Professions and Environments: Types and Biographies.

In intellectual developments of civilization, through philosophy, religion, in the liberal arts, in phases of aesthetics, we find the Uranian to be either scholar or amateur. Turning to homosexuals classically called "sensitive" or "rhetorical" or "intellectual," in such careers as philosophers, religious teachers, writers, poets, romancers, dramatists, musicians, painters, actors, architects, they are bewideringly numerous. Readers who know only the more conventional acts of biography, where all the "cita sexualis" of man can be "edited away"—especially if abnormal—easily become skeptical when told that such and such a person has been Uranian. But sooner or later one can tell himself that countless such statements are true.

In philosophy and ethics, clarifying the profoundest principles of social and aesthetic life, Plato remains foremost; forever incorporated with Socrates. It is hardly needful to point out the Greek homosexuality pervading the Platonic-Socratic attitude toward love. An exalted pederasty, but manifestly pedaste; the physical passion for a beautiful youth, as well as the love for what in him wins intellectual and moral admiration—these are fundamental to the Socratic system. Eros is anything but "phallic", as exhibited from the "Pythia", "Lysis" and the analytical "Banquet". Corresponding indifference to heterosexual love, the sense of its triviality compared with the man-to-man passion, are marked in Plato. The reader has only to take one of
the complete, “unbowdlerized editions of Plato, to be convinced. Nothing can explain away homosexualism, pederastic love, in Platonism. Sensitive-minded and dishonest schools” of Platonists have tried to do this, ever since the beginnings of our Hellenic Christianity. Socrates himself was unquestionably homosexual. He idealized the physical as well as the intellectual, in social relationships to a young man. We realize as we study his personality and teaching, how justifiably Socrates himself could be called “a corruptor of youth.” There is constant evidence of his practical homosexuality. It meets us off-hand in dialogue between Socrates and beautiful youths; such as that occurring in the “Phaedrus.” Or, one can cite what we find Plato setting forth in the way of Socratic concepts, in the “Lysis,” the “Charismes” and the highly suggestive “Banquet.” The first questions of the “Protagoras” are not merely ironical or idealizing ones—“Whence come you, Socrates? Can there be any doubt that you come from the chase after Alcibiades? And indeed when I saw him lately, he appeared still beautiful: though, between ourselves, Socrates, he is now a man, he is growing a pretty strong beard... Surely, though, you have not met with any one more beautiful in this city, at least?” In the “Lysis,” we have approving reference to the homosexual love between young Hippothales and the lad Lysis, as to the one-sided passion of Hippothales for Lysis, inasmuch as a young Athenian, Menexenos, is beloved by Lysis. Hippothales declares himself “delirious,” and “mad” with his passion. In the first third of the “Phaedrus,” we meet with a considerable analysis of homosexual sentiment. In “The Banquet” we find carefully stated the Platonic statement as to the “two Venus’s”, the nobler or man-to-man love, a product of the Uranian Venus: and the commoner, grosser sort—love for woman. Here occurs the beautiful theory that the German Grillparzer has woven into verse: the creation of a protosex, a bisexual human type which has been divided. Each of the moieties is ever seeking thro the world his missing fellow; each when met is immediately drawn to the other, no matter what the outward, organic sex. In the “Banquet,” Plato speaks also with definiteness enough of the theory of a composite sex, a third sex, an intersex, as having existed, but no longer in the scheme of creation and reproduction. All these and other matters enter into the Socratic-Platonic systems of love: a structure that essentially was made up of a certain amount of philosophic rhetoric and idealism, with a large medium of physical homosexualism. The fire of bodily desire burns through the most important Platonic references to the topic, and complex Socratic love-philosophizings amount chiefly to an agreeably simple pederasty.

The importance of the classic Greek belles-lettres in the history and study of homosexual Hellas will be further touched upon presently: especially as to lyric and dramatic poets.

Roman Philosophy. The classic Latin philosophy, social or Roman or pan-Germanic, adds nothing to our knowledge of Roman analysts ofuranism—personally or otherwise. The Roman philosophic mind occupied itself with other explorations. We have no Latin Socrates, Lucullus, Seneca, Cicero, are not engaged with it. We know of no important Latin philosopher who was himself uranian, though doubtless many were such. One of the obscure sophists, whose attitude toward similar-sexual instincts can be causally queried, was Favorinus of Arles (A.D. 135) the tutor of Aulus Gellius; who was a physical hermaphrodite.

Apostolic and Primitive Christians. We have seen in the earlier portion of our study that Christianity, from its organized ecclesiastical start, opposed homosexuality as the vice of vices: and that especially as maritallity and
hagiology matured, the Church was hostile to all pharisaic
ism as tending to undermine idealism of the Virgin
Mary, and of woman-saints. As such cults, especially of the
Virgin, became of the first importance in Latin Greek
and Oriental Christianity, similisexual intercourse was
blasted with the blackest curses. It tended to dimin-
ish marriages, and the rearing of Christian families.
Yet the really Apostolic attitude toward uraniam is not
particularly severe in the Canon. St. Paul rebukes it, as
part of the social paganism which he would root out.
Yet what Paul, a Jew by birth and education, says
against it is not stronger than his injunctions against
irregular heterosexual relations, fornication, adultery. When
he declares that “abusers of themselves with men” are
not to inherit the Kingdom of God, and when he speaks
of the topic in the often-cited passages in his Epistles,
the apostle seems to animadvert against bestiality,
vicious prostitutes of either s.x, hired eunuchines and
degraded lesbians, as much as against homosexuality.
The other apostles are even more casual in their refer-
ences, reprimanding particularly the gross and venal
aspects of heathen similisexuality. But the Post-Apostolic
Christianity developed and fortified denunciations of the
homosexual as the almost nameless sinner of sinners.

Christ and Uranism. Christ himself so far as any records
that we possess inform us, never rebuked homosexuality. We can believe that Christ’s silence was
of intention: its origin being finest moral perspectives,
profoundest intuitions into Nature’s ethics. Adultery, a foe
to social order (though to be pardoned) is denounced, with
other carnal sins. But of homosexuality, so common about
him, in all classes of Hebrew, Syrian, or Roman social life.
Christ says not a word.

Indeed, as we study Gospel narratives and familiarize
ourselves with Christ’s emotional personality, have we not
cause to believe that Christ was an Uranian? — the
highest type of Uranian that the world could see. There
is nothing ignoble, nothing at all lowering in this the-
ory. The ideal Christ in omniscient sympathy must be
profusely acquainted with all human love, the Uranian’s
emotions included. We cannot separate from Christ such
intimacy with mortal nature, with the innermost soul?
Again, no negative trait in Christ is so clearly indi-
cated as his reserved interest in women. Christ is unmoved
by warmer sentiment for women than friendship. He is
affectionate and interested toward them as only their
brother, friend, teacher. On the contrary, his sentiment
for Lazarus is openly passionate: he loves, he laments in
tears, he restores the dead young man to life. Christ’s
love for John is spoken of as jealously observed; explicit
with even the physical demonstrativeness of the picture of
so young a Disciple leaning on his Master’s heart; as
nearest and dearest, even at Golgotha. The type present-
ced by painters from the first has always depicted a
young, fair, femininely boyish John. In fact, references
to “love” in connection with Christ’s life occur only
when young men, not when women, are spoken of; notably
the “young man” whom Jesus “loved” — again an in-
tentional phrase. Christ’s personality and career; his vivid
attraction to total strangers: the immediate spell that,
right and left, he exercised on all men, so that they
left everything for his sake; his magnetic charm over each
human creature, young or old, who came within personal
contact with him, are all traits of the mysterious powers of
a noble and beautiful Uranian. Such a type casts its
spell inevitably over woman also, though unmoved sex-
ually by womanly beauty. One may even ask whether
the treason of Judas was the madness of a jealous homo-
sexual passion, on the part of the betrayer; in a hatred
of John, or of whomsoever else. We may also remember
that Christ was a Jew, and that his apostles were of an
Oriental race inclined to homosexual passions.

To many anuranian not only the conviction that his homosexual instinct is worthy, but also the thought of Christ as an anuranian, as understanding the gnarled of the homosexual's joys and sorrows, are consoling and elevating. An English similesexual was to the author of this study: "The idea of Christ as possibly an Urning has saved me from loneliness, from solitude, from fear of self-respect and of faith, as to this world and the next!"

Coincidentally we find St. John, the supremely Beloved of Christ, eminently the herald of the fullest gospel of human love. This message runs through the Johannine Epistles like a passionate leading theme in some celestial symphony. "Love one another." "Little children, love one another—" "There is no fear in love, for perfect love casteth out fear." "That we should love one another." Is such an insistence of the gentle Apostle addressed exclusively to a sexless life of the spirit?

St. Augustine. The primitive Church did not lack the note of homosexual feeling, in the case of saintly men. St. Augustine is an example. The history of Augustine's relation to his passionately-loved young friend in Thagaste, his retrospects of his influence over him, afford one of many human passages in his famous "Confessions." Thus writes Saint Augustine:

"About this time, as I began to teach in my birthplace, I made a friendship with a young man between whom and myself was such a conformity of inclinations and of sentiments as to make me love him above anything that one can express. We were both of that age, in the flower of our youth; we had been at school together.

Not only adultery but fornication, and many another long-recognized offense, according to Jewish theology and daily life, were particularly by Christ, some of them more than once. But as to what might have been thought one of the chief immoralities and views under the law, he is silent: no matter how near his discourses might bring him to a direct allusion

But that former degree of friendship between us did not approach that which now followed, if in fact one can call it friendship, for there is only one true friendship, the tie of that love which our hearts are filled by the Holy Spirit;"

"Nevertheless, between myself and this young man, there was a tenderness that is incredible. It was founded, as I have said, on a perfect conformity of inclinations and sentiments. He would have brought to me all the holy and healthful doctrine in which I had been brought up though in them he had, for all that, been much less practical instruction; while I would have thrown him back toward those fancies and pernicious suggestions which so afflicted my mother, and made her shed so many tears on my account. But we understood each other, even in error, and this perfect union of our hearts made it impossible for me to live without him. But thou, O Lord! who art at the same time the God of chastisements and of pity, thou didst serve us two as a master serves runaway slaves: since scarce had I enjoyed one year the sweetness of this friendship which was the greatest joy of my life, than Thou didst remove from the world him whom I loved. The young man sickened of a violent fever, and therewith fell into such a sweating, all at once, that they thought it was of death; and he remained a long time unconscious. As there seemed no more hope of him, they baptized him, though he did not know of it. I made nothing of this, convinced that what had taken place, merely a thing done to him corporally, would not affect our relationship. But not so went the matter. I waited eagerly till he could speak with me of what had occurred; for I did not quit him, our attachment for one another not suffering me to leave his side for a moment. So as soon as he was better, I began to rally him, on that baptism which had been given him while he had been so unwary of it, never dreaming that he would not join in my mockery. But he showed a horror of me now, as if I had been his worst enemy, and with a frankness that astonished me, so unexpected was all this, declaring that if I wished him to keep to our friendship I must avoid such discourses. I was much amazed to hear him speak so strongly, but I restrained myself and waited till he should become well and strong enough to talk with me as to what was in my mind; when Thou, O Lord! didst take him away from my seductions and madness, and by one stroke that was to be, by and by, my consolation that didst set him safely in Thine own bosom. For, a few days after, when I was absent, he relapsed to the same fever, which thereewith ended his life."
The grief of that loss made a strange impression on me; who had seen me till now. I had been on toward only trouble and darkness in my soul. I saw death everywhere. My country became a kind of exile, my own dwelling grew intolerable; and all that had been such a joy when I could partake of it with him became torture, having him no more. Mine eyes sought him everywhere, and found him nowhere; what I beheld instead filled me with abounding, for I saw him in no place, and because each spot which he was alive had always seemed to say to me: "Look, he is coming! You will soon meet him." Now was silent. I did not know myself. I found solace only in my tears, and they became new for me what had been my friend.

Behold to what a state of soul was I brought, oh my God! Thon my only hope, who dost purify my heart from the stains of these too-passionate friendships. Thou who now keepest mine eyes fixed on Thee, and who forbiddest me to fall into the snares which surround me... While my friend lived, it seemed to me that his soul and mine were almost the same in two bodies. And so when he was dead, life became a hollow thing to me, inasmuch as I could not grow wanted to live without the other half of my soul... What madness it is not to know how to love mankind as we should love all that was so kind! My heart was utterly torn, bleeding. I knew not what to do. The cool shades of the woods, sports and music, perfumes, good cheer, whatever we love, is to impress our senses, induce or poetry, in short all that had been life to me, without him now became hateful and as naught save something for sighs and tears."

This is the language of pagan homosexuality, of pagan philosophy, much more than the utterance of ascetic, Christian self-flattery. Augustine reverts to this early passion as if its human sweetness suddenly exhaled into the air of his cell; as if for a moment he was again the young Uranian man of the world, not a Christian saint. His outcry as to why we cannot better regulate our hearts has its eternal echo in the Uranian soul.

A bibliography of references to similitudes in the early ecclesiastical fathers and commentators presents many works of importance in considering the cloistered homo-

sexual, the Uranian who was also an anchorite; and the solicitude that he caused the Church and the laity. Johannes Cassianus, Peter Damian, and many more are attentive to him. Sometimes the sexual assignations are curious, as when we find Dolemen, in his famous "Instructions," of the opinion that "cum conjurerem ut esset tentatio non est peccatum" between cloistered religiosi.

Modern philosophy offers the names of Modern philosophers. Erasmus of Rotterdam, of Spinoza, of Sir Isaac Newton, of Bonaparte, of Hegel, of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, as among those who either were homosexual, personally, or who contemplated the instinct from a liberal standpoint. Almost in our own day, the great nature-student Virchow wrote to Ulrichs in acceptance of the Intersensual theory. Virchow expressing a conviction that the Uranian should be free in making the relationships it invited. Schopenhauer terms homosexuality a passion so "universal and ineradicable" that it must be a part of our inborn human nature, and self-justified ethically. Also the naturalist and explorer, Gustav Jaeger, considered homosexuality a principle "inborn in the individual," through which he originates in an unalterable "disharmony" with woman, and can be in sexual key with only a masculine type: in many instances impossible of alteration as a natural expression.

Among the greater philosophers, perhaps the profoundest humanist of the Renaissance epoch, was Erasmus of Rotterdam. Erasmus was homosexual is one of the many interesting studies in circumstantial evidence of biography. Again, the eccentricities of life and of ritus sexualis on the part of the great English philosopher Sir Isaac Newton, his hatred of women sexually, have cast a colour of Uranianism over the personality of the elaborator of the theory of gravitation. There is some ground to infer that Spinoza, gentle natured and noble-hearted, an
Italian Jew by race, and as cold to women sexually as he was warm in friendship (especially with one intimate) was simulsexual. Among quite modern philosophers whose biography and teaching have uranian currents was Friedrich Nietzsche. There can be little doubt that Nietzsche’s passionate hero-worship of Richard Wagner was homosexual at its most climactic stage, and that Nietzsche’s bitter disappointment in Wagner’s sexual personality, as he came to know it better, and Nietzsche’s feeling that an idol had been shattered—the glory of which had been largely in the worshipper—were factors in the advance of Nietzsche’s mental distresses and overthow. We are warned by Coleridge that “to be wroth with one we love doth work like madness in the brain.” The writings of Nietzsche have various references to homosexual love, including the epigrammatic counsel—“Sonder physisch: und wenn möglich donysisch.” in “Zarathustra.”

**Servetus.** The accent of homosexuality occurs in the personality of Michael Servetus, the Spanish physician and theologian, who during the fierce civil-wars of Calvinism, became so special an object of Calvin’s intolerance that his doom to be burned alive at Geneva, in 1553, is constantly charged to Calvin. Servetus was an Aragonese. At first a physician and engrossed in secular life and social concerns, he went in 1530 to Strassburg. The first of his series of theological polemics attracted so much attention that Servetus gave himself wholly up to disputations in the fields of religion and philosophy. One of the most learned and argumentative minds in dogmatic cross-currents, he was not long permitted to escape the controversial anger of Calvin. His book “Christianismi Restitutio,” published at Lyons in 1540, especially drew on Servetus the bitterest denunciations of intolerant Calvinists, and of their chief, Servetus imprudently put himself in the power of his fanatical spiritual adversaries. In Geneva, he was arrested as a dangerous heretic; and after a vainly heroic defense, he was burned to death (with peculiarly cruel torment) at Champel, on October 26, 1553. A noble homosexualism characterized Servetus. Intellectually he was a sort of universal genius, far beyond his theological dialectics. His medical learning was immense for his time; his discovery of the circulation of the blood (an honour to him far in advance of later claimants) gives him ever a high place. He was also a brilliant geographer, physicist, astrologer, mathematician, botanist, and much else: all before his middle years.

**Boza.** Another brilliant religious light in the early history of Calvinism, the much prized Beza, is accused circumstantially of being Uranian; as by his own confession withal. Beza (1519-1605) was born Théodore de Bèze, at Vêzelay, in Burgundy. After lively secular years in Paris, having decided on the profession of religion, he passed from Catholicism to a strongly Calvinistic theology: becoming a distinguished factor of the Reformation. Two intimate friendships, one with a certain “Pomponius” and another with a remarkably beautiful youth named Audierne, were of so passionate a nature, according to Beza’s descriptions in his Latin poems (the indiscreet “Juvenilia” that classic language need not be much more confessional. Much was made of this when Beza apostatized. Fierce and many were the attacks on his sexual morals. Franz Baldwin, E. Claudius de Saintes, Jerome Balser, Cocceins, Bisselius, Mainbourg, Bailleul, in the course of the XVII Century, and in the XVIII the polemist Daniel, virulently proclaimed Beza not only a vile heretic, but a sodomite. One cannot get help admiring the basis of uranian accusations when we glance at Beza’s verse. The fact that in later life he was twice married of course does not negative his early memoranda as to “the beautiful Audierne, and the beloved Pomponius.” The lament for Pomponius included in the “Juvenilia” says, for instance:
One of Beza’s longer Latin poems, entitled “Theodorus Bezae de Sue in Candidam et Audebertum Benevolentia”, deals with Beza’s young friend, the lad Audebert, and a young woman named Candida; depicting Beza’s conflict in loving the young man as much as he loves the lady, and his inability to lessen his passion for Audebert, even though Candida jealously demands that he shall do so. One passage beginning “Sed utram rogo proferam decorum? Utram invicem me deceat priorum?”—may be translated thus: “But which of these two, I ask myself, is most to me? Which one should I first seek to see again? Who could be dearer to me than art thou, Candida? But whom could I ever place in my heart before thee, Audebert? Yes, if I should cut myself into two parts, one part would be Candida’s but the other would be Audebert’s”. There are several such episodes, Beza’s fierce Catholic enemy, Balse, in one of his attacks on the historian, in the lines “Spintria nunc fueras” etc., declares — “Awhile ago you were a passive sodomite and a filthy poet: now all at once you have turned yourself into a man learned in the Holy Scriptures!” Also Lagainus exhales, in an arrangement of Beza — “He was tortured by burning lust for his young Audebert, a remarkably handsome boy, with whom he was united in a sodomistic love.” Beza was even accused of being ill, owing to certain sexual excesses, in Paris, says Xaintes (de Sanctis) “Instead of your Audebert, now you have embraced Calvin, and so have substituted a spiritual male-whore for a carnal one; thus being still what you were,—a sodomist.” All which may be called rather plain talking between holy conversationalists!

The Clergy and The topic of Arabian clergy especially sensualism, in the history of the Catholic and Orthodox priests, bishops cardinals and popes, in every degree of moral and intellectual endowment, would make easily a volume by itself. From the hermits of the Theban, whose orisons and mortifications of the flesh could not purge them of sexual desire, up to the occupants of the Chair of Peter, the Roman hierarchy have been sensualistic. The debaucheries of homosexual pontiffs, such as Alexander VI, Sixtus IV, John XXII, Julius III, and others exhibited especially pederastic passion in the higher priesthood. The Monastic Orders, century by century of their existence, have been sorely troubled (or else practically have not been troubled at all) by invincible homosexuality in the cloister. The austerities of the Carthusians and Trappists, the intellectualism of the Jesuits and Benedictines, the fervid piety of Dominicans, Franciscans and any others, have never eradicated it; and in some chapters of Church-history we find that they thought best to tolerate it. Today it flourishes in the Catholic seminary and the parish rectory. We must not argue that its existence implies the unspirituality of the Church, and a dismissal of moral conduct. Where it is not inborn, it has much to do with the celibate life of the Catholic ecclesiastic, the attitude of personal reserve toward woman that he must cultivate. One can even trace an antiquated spiritual-sexual casuistry in it. It is contagious in the novitiate. Many a diocesan priest becomes perceptibly homosexual before he has received his tonsure. The theory of a strictly celibate clergy is untenable in natural and social morality. It rests on no divine authority. It is a human abnormalism, except when invited by a distinct frigidity of temperament, a weakly frame, or advanced years. Unfortunately, a young priest usually has vigour of bodily constitution, and often has quite as strong, or even stronger, impulses to sexual intercourse than the average. A sedentary life increases his emotion.
A proportion of such clergy are born uranians. Strange dramas are played in their clerical surroundings. In religious schools for the laity, under ecclesiastical care pedantry is a common weakness of the cassocked tutus. Of this, another chapter of the present study speaks.

It is of interest to notice that, _nolens_, an attitude of philosophical and scientific toleration of similissexuality is to be observed in the Roman clergy today; quite another matter, of course, than mere compliance toward vice. A priest, whose confidential opinion of the prevalence of uranian instincts in superior moral natures was asked some years ago, by means of a species of circular-letter addressed to the Catholic pastorate, issued by the Naturwissenschaft Komitee in Berlin, wrote: "The best and most learned and most pious men have frequently the homosexual instinct. I am convinced that just because of this fact, many men enter into a monastic life, fleeing solely from the homosexual desires, ignorant of inclinations to the other sex. I am also convinced that the homosexual man has a far harder battle with himself than has the heterosexual. I have even advised penitents to go away to oriental countries to live, where such unfortunate natures are not punished by laws as criminals. Particularly do I recall the suicide of one popular man, on account of being blackmailed by a studio-assistant, with whom he had been culpable."

Another Catholic pastor stated that his experience in his profession, and his opinions, had convinced him that if female prostitution is to be tolerated, then there should be no penalty for male sexual intercourse; and that having known many such individuals he believed that the general excellence or unworth of a character has no connection with the homosexual impulse. He wrote: "I have known two individuals, formerly young parishioners of mine, who are each homosexual, but always patterns of Christian morality, whether of old or of to-day."

In the same confidential symposium of ideas of present-day Catholic priesthood in Germany concerning uranianism some twenty-five replies to the circular-letter mentioned were received, such replies being, of course, anonymous as to publication. Some of the writers alluded to the theory, not now, that Saint Paul was not free from homosexual instincts, if indications in the Epistles be accepted.

The reader is referred to the interesting correspondence mentioned, as it appears in the "Jahrbuch für Sexuelle Zwischenstufen" (Max Spohr, Leipzig) edited by Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld; Volume II, pp. 161-203. Also as an instance of minute study of the Biblical attitude toward similissexuality, may be remarked a contribution made by a Catholic clergyman (anonymous) in the fourth volume of the same "Jahrbuch". In that study, the commentator reviews practically every pertinent passage of the Scriptures; and, as a scholarly priest, he reaches the conclusion that there is no authority for holding decent homosexual love as a sin in the eyes of God, or of society. Instead he finds every reason to think uranians the victims of a warping of social common sense, by mere dogmatic influences.

Removals of the Catholic clergy for similissexual scandals are incessant. The Continental newspapers especially show this, each year. Several grave affairs of the sort are current in the press, as these pages are written: one of them involving a priest distinguished for high attainments and for social and ecclesiastical respect. The murder in 1857 of the saintly and almost adored Archbishop Sibour of Paris, which tragedy occurred while the Archbishop was at the altar, came through the uranian frenzy of the murderer, himself a priest. It was an episode that cast all Paris, not to say all France, into mourning.
As may be supposed, in Italy and Spain crimes connecting Catholic clergy with Uranian habits are not rare. The recent murder of a priest in Naples (which case is before the court as these lines are written) by another ecclesiastic has proved, by the confession of the survivor to have had a homosexual liaison between the two men, and a scene of jealousy as the source of the affair, known as the Adorni Costantini assassination.

The College of Cardinals, in very recent years, has had several members of whose phallicistic tastes gossip has been eloquent; including one distinguished politician of the cappa magna, some years deceased. Another member of the Sacred College, a contemporary of high birth, with a distinguished career at apparently his back, long has had attached to his name the rumours of invincible Uranianism; and a soubriquet that his political enemies have lately lent him, because of his present policy toward his church, is frequently uttered with a sarcastic accent, to mark its double meaning.

À-propos, of the Uranian clergy of the Continent, there lately appeared in the sedate and Calvinistic Journal de Genève a cryptic little advertisement literary—which the present writer has not yet explained quite to his satisfaction, and so will leave to the queries of his readers: “L. Prêtres Homos-Scuels du Noviciat de Jersey 2. V. Leshin-Viersière, avec documents bien détaillés, 1898-1899.”

In the Greek Church, the permission to the clergy to marry lessens homosexual scandals, as it does heterosexual ones. But such episodes are not unusual.

The Established Church of England, and the ranks of an innumerable and sectarian Protestant clergy, the world over, are far less often scandalized by homosexual episodes than the Roman priesthood. There is certainly a considerable proportion of more or less distinctly Uranian pastors in Protestantism. Occasionally some individual case is manifested. One such has been recently before both the English and the American public. But the Protestant clergyman is freer to square his homosexuality, if he have it, with his general moral convictions, education, and religious ideas, without reference to a rule of ecclesiastical edictary, built up against the force of Nature, such as adds to the problem of sex for the Catholic priest.

Bishop Atherton. Remarkable homosexual personalities and dramas are met in the history of the English Church. One painful instance in that of the distinguished Bishop John Atherton (1698 - 1679) of Waterford, Ireland, and later also associated with Dublin. Few British churchmen have been more conspicuous for their intellect, their lofty spirituality of life, their social influence, and for a passionate philanthropy of the most practical sort. The downfall of Bishop Atherton, because of a homosexual scandal, in which he was hopelessly involved, and for which he suffered death, was almost an incredible religious tragedy, according to English notions at the time. Great efforts to save his life were made; but in vain—the more so as he had admitted the charge, and said that he desired to expiate it. A curious detail of Atherton’s case was his preparation, while in prison, of a long and learned study and defence of homosexual instincts, which document he nevertheless refused to utilize, and burned, before his appearing in court. He met his fate, in fact, in a state of abject contrition that much edified the religious world about him.

Bishop Jocelyn. Even more dramatic is the history of another great Irish churchman, Bishop Jocelyn, of the See of Clogher, in the early part of the nineteenth century.
Relatively a young man, though already advanced in dignity, Bishop Jocelyn was also an inborn uranian. After having had several homosexual relationships without detection, Jocelyn fell in love with a strikingly handsome young soldier, in the Life-Guards, stationed in the diocese, a trooper named John Moverly, who was also uranistic. The Bishop was handsome, genial, and a man of the world, though he filled his religious station becomingly. In 1822 the intimacy came to light. A great scandal ensued. Bishop Jocelyn fled to the Continent, and escaped punishment. The unlucky young Moverly was condemned to a long term of imprisonment. In fact his life was technically in danger, owing to the penalty then statutory in Ireland.

Pagan Religions. The topic of intersexualism, as a part of ancient or modern paganism and mythologies, is one of much material in detail, as may be supposed: which wide subject the writer is obliged at this time to pass over with only a reference, on account of changes in the plan of this work. A large proportion of antique religions, ecclesiastical societies, priesthoods, temple-confraternities, ceremonies and rites, more or less integrally have had to do with male-to-female, or with female-to-female sexualism, symbols and licenses of intercourse. Forms of worship among the Assyrians, the Phenicians, in several Asiatic, African, Oceanian, American cults have accepted such an element. The delineation of Antinous was developed —appropriately— toward pederastic practices, as part of the ritual. Buddhism in Japan and China has admitted homoseualism along with its covert phallic symbolism; and not until 1838 did the Japanese Government put a stop to the astonishing licenses of phallic and homosexual-feminosexual orgies, that used to take place at the temples of U-ji and Saidai-ji. Lamaism in Tibet has occult uranianism widely diffused through its organization, and monasteries are noted centers for debauchment of boys and for general homosexualism.

An Homosexual. Let us turn again from the distinctively intellectual Müllner, the famous German-Swiss historian (1752-1809), Müller's monumental works in history, particularly as to medieval Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and other parts of Europe, gave him the prime of his career the sobriquet of "a monster of learning," and his labours are not yet unconsidered. His general scholarship was profound, even in his youth. His life was passed in an unbroken literary activity, at successively Gottingen, Geneva, Bern, Mainz, Vienna, Berlin and Kassel. The eyes of the learned world were fixed on him wherever he was, with respect and wonder. Müller was absolutely homosexual. He was capable of sexual passion only for one or another of his friends, pupils or others; and he was highly idealistic in such emotions. Toward women, Müller was either extremely indifferent or an agreeable friend. Especially singled out by Müller in his uranian biography we find Baron Karl von Bonstetten, another eminent Swiss author, early associated with Müller. In physical aspects, Müller was perceptibly feminine, conveying no idea of his strong intellect; and his conversation suggested a brilliant, humorous, amiable but rather satirical — woman.

During Müller's life time, he was frequently spoken of as homosexual pederastic—by more or less tolerant friends, or by literary enemies. His return to Switzerland, and his continued residence there, were said to be his escape from serious scandals, and because he wished to live out of the legal jurisdiction of Germany. The let-
ters of the historian to Bonstetten were published by Gotta, Stuttgart, under the editing of Brun. Another collection, of miscellaneous sort, was issued by Orel in Zürich, edited by Füssli. The Bonstetten correspondence mentioned ("Briefe eines Jungen Gelehrten an seinen Freund") stirred up much comment, when in print. They number about one hundred and fifty, often being long. Nearly every page, each paragraph, speaks the heart of an Uranian lover before his beloved. In citing them one hardly knows where to begin. A few passages only are the following:

"Without you I can never be happy; with you all my misfortunes find their alleviation. You, lovers, are my eye-salve, since what heals my heart is my body's health. You love me as I love you. I shall love you till my death, sweet God! How far I am from you, my own Bonstetten! Among such ordinary mortals! And yet, my God! Bonstetten is mine. Remember ever, my Bonstetten, that you are my friend. No matter where I may live, still my greatest bliss is only you. Rejoice, you, too, at the beauty, the spirit, the spirit of wisdom I have learned and possess, my whole individuality, belong to you. Yes, dispose of my person as you choose. My dearest of all! I find our friendship indeed extraordinary, because no other feeling has any comparison with it. I love you even more than when in Hohenlohe. All that I have to give if at this moment I could embrace you! I feel what the unity of our two hearts would bring forth. Yes, my H—, I am yours and you are mine, I love you as no other man in this world. Our loves today can love another. I love other men just in the measure that they are like you. I hold it as the priceless bliss of life that in the twenty-first year of my age, by a chance, I found you out, among a group of forty-two other mortals, you who have been my brother throughout the many changes of my life, and who will be my companion until my death and whose heart is worthy to be the object of the whole overflowing stream of my friendship, you, the only one human being, among all others, who is noble enough and of a soul sensitive enough to love me as I love him?"

"The only thing that gives me anxiety is my fear that my friendship for you is not warm enough! My dearest, my friend! My heart is oppressed when I think of that four-days-long dream from the gods that has been ours... I count the hours and the instant until the post shall bring me news of my H—. I know not that ever another human being was loved as are you. Tell me: why is it that I love you always more and more? You are always within me, round about me. My dearest friend! Though I might be able to give my thoughts to you, then by going about with others! How is it possible to desecrate that which is consecrated to you? No friendship is like ours. We are Athenians, not Swiss. And if you and I know what is to be said to each other according to our sort of love, why, then should to others to love after their sort?"

There are many such epistles in this curious collection. Not often does the personal correspondence between two extremely learned men (for Bonstetten was also noted for his high qualities) keep such an uninterfered with and personal accent. In other letters we find Müller calling Bonstetten his Apollo, whose godlike beauty and grace have inspired Müller's heart. He names Bonstetten "co-ruler". He writes to Bonstetten in a fervent language, for a letter from this "friend" and in feminine unity for his welfare. He narrates his dreams of Bonstetten himself was an older man, and a quite personality, though equally homosexual. His reception of Müller's extravagant affection was more contained and dignified. Müller in his correspondence with another friend Kinkel, writes with similarly homosexual exercises; and there are interesting traces of rivalries and jealousies in the intimacy. In even the historical writings Müller a delicate colouring of Uranian feeling is to be marked, when he is dealing with biography, which Adams of it.

Winckelmann. The German archeologist and critic Winckelmann (1717-1768) not only was all his life an Uranian, and in sexual relations with friends or acquaintances of the same nature; but lost his life by undecisive intimacy. Whether Winckelmann was an "inborn" Uranian, or if his strong homosexualism was largely the result of aesthetic studies in Italy, where his life labours

— Transl. X. M.