

living in a demimonde of vicious and corrupt associates who revel shamelessly in drunken orgies. The impudent Mark Antony had a clientele of drunkards and debauchees like himself, his house was *impudica*, "unchaste," and he himself was *impurus*, which is to be understood as the equivalent of Greek *akáthartos*, "impure," the term applied to the passive-effeminate homosexual who is defiled by the lust of others. The antithesis was the virile man who guards his honor in his relations with other men, who has not submitted to their sexual advances. Accordingly, the followers of Cataline were denounced as young men who are *impuri impudicique*, ready *amare et amari*, "to love and to be loved," hence having both active and passive homosexual relations in a promiscuous manner. At the same time Cicero defended the honor of his clients by saying that the accusations against them are no more than malicious gossip.

The character of the freeman stood in contrast to the baseness of the slave who freely lent himself to the unchaste desires of his master. According to Cicero, Verres surrounded himself with slaves whose degradation infected his whole entourage, while treating free men as if they were slaves. The same inversion of the social hierarchy attached to Clodius as the heir of Cataline. The term *patientia* used with reference to Verres implies the passivity in sexual relations that is degrading and unworthy of a free man, just as in the case of Mark Antony, charged with having "prostituted himself to all," much like the Timarchus whom Aeschines had denounced centuries earlier in Athens for a like failing. The other aspect of passive homosexuality was the lapse into effeminacy, so that Cicero's enemies were accused of delight in luxury, the adoption of women's gestures, and the wearing of feminine clothes and makeup.

Cicero's rhetoric thus had two sides: the attempt to discredit opponents by inflammatory imputations of homosexual conduct and of sexual immorality

in general—a type of smear to be followed in political life down to modern times; and his rigorous demarcation between the active and the passive partner in sexual relations, the active role being the only one worthy of a man and a citizen, the passive role being equated with effeminacy and servility. This view has its roots in the primary distinction made by classical civilization between the active and the passive which, however, Cicero heightened for his own tendentious ends.

See also McCarthyism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Françoise Gouffroy, "Homosexualité et idéologie esclavagiste chez Cicéron," *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 4 (1978), 219–62; Ilona Opelt, *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1965.

Warren Johansson

CINEMA

See Film.

CIRCLES AND AFFINITY GROUPS

Sociologists treat the group as a plurality of individuals defined by some principle of recruitment and by a set of membership rights and obligations. Sometimes these groups may be visible, as in the case of medieval guilds and modern collegiate fraternities and sororities; in other instances, as the freemasons and the illuminati, they are more or less secret. Homosexuals and lesbians do not belong in toto to any such well-defined grouping, though outside observers, such as the French literary critic Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve, have sometimes perceived them as forming such a fraternity. The clandestine marks of recognition whereby gay men and lesbians have communicated their nature to one another recall the more structured gestures of freemasons. Such comparisons aside, it is more useful to posit small groupings within the larger

pool of homosexuals, and to employ looser concepts of association—such as circles, coteries, and cliques—as well as the contemporary notion of networking, involving patterns which are nurtured by individuals interacting with others.

During the mid-eighteenth century the University of Leiden was the center of a remarkable homoerotic student circle, as documented by G. S. Rousseau. This mainly British group included the poet and physician Mark Akenside, as well as John Wilkes and Baron d'Holbach, who were both to distinguish themselves as radicals. At the end of the century a network formed around Lord Byron, though this was geographically dispersed. The 1895 trials of Oscar Wilde served to make his London circle only too visible.

The Cambridge Apostles and Bloomsbury. A relatively well-documented instance of a secret society with strong, continuing homoerotic overtones is the Society of Apostles founded by students at Cambridge University in 1820. Members gathered once a week to hear papers on controversial topics. The first members of this distinguished intellectual club were mainly clergymen, and apparently of impeccable moral character. By the 1840s, however, intimations of homosexuality begin to emerge—though sometimes only in the form of the “Higher Sodomy,” that is, nonsexual male bonding and a conviction of the innate superiority of men over women. In the early years of the present century the Society served as a refuge for some gifted homosexuals who were made cautious by the reverberations of the Wilde affair. In the 1920s Anthony Blunt and Guy Burgess, both Apostles, became converted to Marxism and entered a clandestine career of espionage for the Soviet government. Once unmasked, their activity occasioned hostile speculation about a purported connection among the upper classes, homosexuality, and spying. After World War II, however, the homosexual complexion of the Society faded.

The influence of the Apostles radiated into the larger community in several ways. William Johnson, later Cory (elected in 1844), became a leading member of the Calamite group of pederastic poets. In the early years of the present century, homosexual Apostles graduates, notably Lytton Strachey and John Maynard Keynes, formed an adult offshoot in London, which became known as Bloomsbury. The members of this more loosely constituted group of writers, artists, and thinkers were both homosexual and heterosexual (and bisexual in the case of Virginia Woolf and a few others), but they were united in their opposition to Victorian moralism and prescriptivism.

Expatriates in Paris. Across the channel at the same time there flourished in Paris an extraordinary constellation of expatriate lesbians, including Renée Vivien, Natalie Barney, Romaine Brooks, Margaret Anderson, Djuna Barnes, Gertrude Stein, and Alice B. Toklas. Sylvia Beach and her French lover Adrienne Monnier both ran bookstores, that were favorite gathering places of the avant-garde. These creative figures were not organized in a coherent group, but were nonetheless often perceived as such, giving Paris the reputation of a “Sapphic capital.” Male homosexual expatriates were less prominent in the French capital; the publisher and writer Robert McAlmon was an exception. A lesser center at the same period was Florence, which attracted both male homosexuals and lesbians.

The Beat Generation. After World War II the beat group of American writers emerged, the central figures being William Burroughs, Allen Ginsberg (both gay), and Jack Kerouac (bisexual). The venue of these writers was a shifting one, beginning in New York, and moving—depending on individual choice—to Paris, Mexico City, Tangiers, and San Francisco. The last city attracted its own creative circle, including the poet Robert Duncan and the filmmaker James Broughton. In conducting research

to document intellectuals and others of the past, it is important to be attentive to friendship patterns; the "birds of a feather" principle will often lead to unexpected liaisons.

General Features. Undoubtedly there are countless circles and cliques that have been lost from sight, having produced no creative figures worthy of remembrance. Indeed the pattern of the clique surrounding one or more "queens" (den-mother figures) was an almost ubiquitous feature of homosexual life before 1969. In the view of hostile outsiders, such groupings were stereotyped as "rings" on the pattern of criminal gangs. This idea need not be negative, however, as shown by the Swiss society (and magazine) *Der Kreis/Le Cercle* (1932–67), the name of which conjures up the metaphor of a ring. And when the American homophile movement emerged in the 1950s, most local groups were initially formed of people who had come to know each other through gay social cliques. This type of bonding also has its downside, and newcomers to activist groups, even today, may sometimes be dismayed by the invisible wall around the clique that controls the group.

Up to this point, groups have been discussed mainly in terms of interaction in single localities, cities in fact. Yet another type of linkage has existed in which individuals communicate over large distances, originally by mail, now also by telephone and computer modem. Such a pattern has often been the case in gay scholarship. In the nineteenth century the independent scholar K. H. Ulrichs (1825–1895) had a circle of correspondents, most of whose names remain unknown to us because of the caution that they felt obliged to observe. More public and institutional was the group formed by the Berlin **Scientific-Humanitarian Committee** (1897–1933), which had collaborators not only through much of Germany, but also in Austria, The Netherlands, Scandinavia, and the English-speaking countries. Today many gay and lesbian scholars, unable

to obtain academic posts, work as private individuals from their homes, relying on contacts with like-minded individuals to assist in developing and diffusing their discoveries and writings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Catherine van Casselaer, *Lot's Wife: Lesbian Paris, 1890–1914*, Liverpool: Janus, 1986; Richard Deacon, *The Cambridge Apostles*, London: Robert Royce, 1985; G. S. Rousseau, "In the House of Madam Vander Tasse: A Homosocial University Club in Early Modern Europe," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 16:1/2 (1988), 311–47.

Wayne R. Dynes

CIRCUMCISION

Male circumcision, or the cutting away of the foreskin of the penis, has been practiced by numerous peoples from remotest antiquity as a religious custom, while to some modern homosexuals it has an aesthetic and erotic significance. It has been speculated that the custom originated somewhere in Africa where water was scarce and the ability to wash was limited. Thus the Western Semites (Israelites, Canaanites, Phoenicians, Arabs, Edomites, Syrians), who lived in an area where water was never really plentiful, also observed the custom, while the Eastern Semites (Assyrians and Babylonians), in an area where water was more abundant, did not circumcise. This is true also of the Greeks and other Aegean peoples who always lived near the water.

In the fifth century B.C. the Greek historian Herodotus provided the following information about the ancient Egyptians: "They practice circumcision, while men of other nations—except those who have learnt from Egypt—leave their private parts as nature made them. . . . They circumcise themselves for cleanliness' sake, preferring to be clean rather than comely." (*Histories*, Bk. II). There is also some evidence that the Israelites learned it in Egypt (Exodus 4:24–26; Joshua 5:2–9). However, they may simply have adopted