EASTERN ROMAN EMPIRE
See Byzantine Empire.

ECONOMICS
Economics is the systematic study of the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services. The term may also refer to the activity itself, apart from the study of it. Non-procreative sexual behavior has generally been assigned to the sphere of leisure activity—and therefore excluded from economics proper. But there are economic aspects of homosexuality, both as overt sexual activity and as a mode of sociosexual expression.

Assets and Liabilities of Homosexuality with Respect to the Employee. Although it is usually thought of as a disadvantage, there are professions in which homosexuality can be an asset. It is an asset when it responds to a covert norm (as in interior decorating, dance, etc.), or provides a password to the fraternity. In the past there were professions in which celibacy was the rule, so that they offered the homosexual an escape from the heterosexual marriage into which he would otherwise have been forced by family pressures and social convention. In other situations it is a liability that must be hidden throughout life, as disclosure would result in dismissal or disqualification, or else block promotion beyond the entry level. Of course such dangers may be exaggerated by misperception, and many who have “come out” on the job have experienced no repercussions. Nonetheless, there are professions in which an upwardly mobile individual is virtually obliged to be married, and the spouse has a prescribed set of auxiliary functions that cannot eas-

ily be performed by an associate of the same sex, even if the two are living in a quasi-marital relationship. In these settings the homosexual is pressured to find an accommodation, contracting a marriage of convenience, sometimes even a “front” marriage with a lesbian.

In some jobs, discreet homosexuality can be helpful by fostering an inclination to travel unfettered by familial bonds. The absence of a wife and children (whose place of residence and schooling must be arranged while the husband serves a tour of duty abroad or in a hardship post) favors a flexibility that the heterosexual may not be able to match.

The mentor–protégé relationship can be the locus of a homosexual liaison which is all the more advantageous for the younger party, who instead of “marrying the boss’s daughter” takes on the boss himself as lover and protector. In this way working-class youths may achieve upward mobility by learning not only the elements of a business that might otherwise be closed to them, but also middle-class etiquette and speech patterns.

Homosexuality can be an obstacle to advance in bureaucracies such as the government or the corporate hierarchy where the lifestyle of the lower ranks is carefully scrutinized and even subjected to secret surveillance. This situation places the homosexual at a disadvantage in state socialist regimes that allow little or no opportunity for private enterprise. In capitalist countries the freedom always exists to create one’s own firm where no obligation to conceal one’s sexual proclivities from one’s superiors can arise. This capacity explains the profusion of small businesses with homosexual proprietors—
antique dealers, florist shops, men’s clothing boutiques, restaurants, bookstores—where the owner can be free to express his sexual orientation without fear of retaliation. Also, in such small firms a protégé–lover can benefit from a mentor relationship in which he learns the tricks of the trade and the other skills required for branching out on his own. In small businesses where profit margins are low, the monetary advantage to the owner of not having a spouse and children who represent a fixed and even mounting responsibility as the years pass is likewise considerable.

In recent decades, with the relaxation of gender role stereotypes in fields traditionally reserved to men, lesbians have been able to move ahead in such fields as business and law where a certain aggressiveness can be enhanced by freedom from the demands of a husband or the duties associated with child-rearing. On the other hand, the absence of a wife as auxiliary may impose a handicap on the woman who undertakes a career in a profession where such a “support system” has both social and psychological value.

Hustling. Male prostitution is an economic activity in and of itself, though mainly limited to those between the ages of 15 and 30. It can be practiced as a supplement to modeling or acting, or can be a way of earning money while in college or graduate school, when other opportunities of making a living would require too much time and be less remunerative as well. Finally, it can be a way of making contact with men in the upper echelons of the business and professional world and moving into a mentor–protégé relationship that will serve as a springboard for a later career. Unlike the female prostitute, the hustler is not automatically disqualified from a long-term relationship.

Economic Theory. In the field of economics as a social science, it is noteworthy that both Adam Smith and John Maynard Keynes were childless. It may be that their separation from the world of procreation and inheritance gave them the detachment they required to view the economic process dispassionately and analytically, as someone enmeshed in the human reproductive cycle could not have done. Keynes himself was a member of the Bloomsbury circle in which overt homosexuality was accepted along with other unconventional tastes and lifestyles.

The problem of the reproduction of human capital—from the genetic, not the educational standpoint—has been neglected by investigators preoccupied with the issues of capital formation at the macro- and micro-economic levels. The model of ancient Greek society suggests that while heterosexual relationships produce the raw human capital in the form of new age-cohorts, homosexual liaisons may assume the function of refining that human capital by providing the educational and initiatory experience which readies it for adult life.

Businesses Directed to the Gay Community. The advent of the gay liberation movement fostered the emergence of a whole range of enterprises catering primarily or exclusively to the homosexual or lesbian client. These take the form of bars, restaurants, bookshops, and bathhouses that served as social gathering places and areas of recreation. In addition, travel agencies and guest houses have taken advantage of the greater discretionary income of the childless adult and also of the wanderlust that leads many homosexuals to distant places and exotic lands in search of new partners. There are also services that provide escorts or computer dating in a manner that parallels similar enterprises with a heterosexual clientele. A press aimed at the homosexual or lesbian reader has taken root, with news features and personal columns oriented specifically to the needs and interests of a readership that could find nothing comparable in the establishment media. Through their advertising—without which they could not survive—these newspapers have established a symbiotic relationship with
gay businesses, in whose premises the papers are often distributed free. Clinics and counseling services have sprung up that address themselves specifically to the needs of gay and lesbian clients.

While gay radicals decry many of these commercial activities as mere mimicry of the capitalist norms of the larger society, the strength of the gay community may well liemore in the economic activities that it is able to support than in the political power which it is largely unable to wield because its members are so thinly dispersed over the territory of most self-governing political units. The Gayellow Pages for the USA and Canada and the Spartacus Guide now published in West Berlin furnish a fairly reliable annual index to this growing network of enterprises and services in many countries. Organizations of gay businessmen have been formed in a number of cities as well.

This web of commercial activity also explains the failure of a gay movement to arise in countries where state socialism precludes the creation of an economic power base, and where in turn there are no independent media in which group identity and solidarity could be cultivated. In the past enterprises catering to a gay clientele often fell under the control of the underworld because respectable businessmen wanted nothing to do with them and because of the need for protection from police harassment. With the lessening of the stigma, the economic development of the gay community is only a matter of time and of the prosperity of the nation in whose midst it resides. Moreover, the ability to convert economic power into political power may well be the key to the ultimate success of the movement for homosexual emancipation.

Warren Johansson

E N D U C A T I O N

Recent perspectives have focused on the place in our educational system of students and teachers who happen to be homosexual. Responding to the emergence of a broad-based gay and lesbian movement, some of these individuals have joined organizations for mutual support and defense against discrimination. There is, however, an older tradition that holds that homoerotic attraction itself has a significant place in the educational experience: the pedagogic eros.

Rationale. To understand the continuing role of same-sex patterns in education, it is useful to suspend, at least for the sake of argument, initial objections. In this light the rationale for a homoerotic component in education may be set forth in the following terms. The adolescent often has a homosexual phase of development that precedes the heterosexual one—a kind of "dry run" for the sexuality of adulthood that permits him or her to experience erotic stimulation and pleasure without incurring the danger of pregnancy. This homosexual phase may have as its object an adult who is not just the lover of the adolescent, but also a role model—appropriately of the same sex. A heterosexual liaison, apart from the unwanted reproductive aspect, would be discordant because the male youth can only mature into an adult man, the female into an adult woman.

If this reasoning is valid, the homosexual character of the initiatory process thus flows from biological and social constraints quite as logically as does the heterosexual character of the reproductive process. Every society has an objective need for the biological reproduction of its members—its demographic base—that far transcends the ephemeral attraction of a man and a woman for one another. In the same way it has an objective need for the reproduction of its traditions and values—its cultural base—that far transcends the ephemeral attraction of an adult and an adolescent of the same sex for each other. The shorter time-span of the pederastic attachment—conditioned as it is by biological stimuli—as compared with the heterosexual one is justified by its role in the service of the eros paida-
gogikos (the child-educating eros), which if successful must end in the maturing of the younger party and his or her emancipation from the transitory homoerotic and educational phase to enter the world of adulthood as a full-fledged member of society, while the heterosexual attachment serves the eros paidopoios (the child-creating eros), which is followed by responsibility for rearing the children from infancy to adulthood. The two expressions of the sexual drive are thus complementary and non-antagonistic in character; they represent the evolutionary underpinning of the social relationships obligatory for the twofold continuity of the human community, the biological and the cultural.

That the Judeo-Christian tradition has defamed the homoerotic urge and driven it underground does not alter the evolutionary legacy which is intimately linked with man's survival as a time-binding animal—one that does not simply reproduce its kind as the consequence of an irrational compulsion to procreate, but also must in each generation recapitulate the acquisition of the cultural heritage which must be learned, as much by the genius as by the mediocre or even talentless student.

The effort to suppress the homosexual component of education is unlikely ever completely to succeed, no matter what the means employed or the amount of pain and sorrow inflicted on those who violate the taboo. If the above reasoning be true, an educational program cognizant of the findings of modern psychology would do well to accept this phenomenon as a potentially serviceable part of the process of learning. Yet even if modern opinion were able to discard its prejudices, rehabilitation of the pedagogic eros would still face obstacles. To be sure, many would concede that the teacher requires some special appreciation of his or her pupils to muster—year in, year out—the instructional fervor needed to overcome their natural recalcitrance to learning. Yet, with the best will in the world, introduction of erotic bonds may conclude by retarding the process of maturation that for the student is the essential dynamic of the educational endeavor. While over the years the teacher has become accustomed to transferring his interest from one pupil cohort to another, the student—as a "first-timer"—may become fixated in the pattern of a relationship, which by its own character can only be transitory. It is also said that the pedagogic eros is asymmetrical, since the teacher is more powerful than the student. Yet many, perhaps most, human relationships are asymmetrical. This is true of education itself, whether one views it as a process of introjection—that is, the teacher helping the student progress by inspiration—or of elucidation, the Socratic midwifery whereby the teacher encourages the student to bring forth knowledge from inner resources.

Antiquity. The ancient Greeks were the first to practice and explore the full range of relations between homophilia and education. Although the origins of the institution of pederasty are lost in the mists of early Hellenic society, when it first emerges into view it is essentially initiatory, the paradigm being that of the older man who takes an adolescent under his wing to train him in military and manly virtues. In the course of time, and depending on the locality, this relationship became simplified into a merely erotic one. Sappho's school on the island of Lesbos shows that in some communities of ancient Greece a parallel pedagogic-erotic tradition existed for women and girls.

In Athens in the fifth century, however, with its high regard for education in the modern sense, the initiatory process was retained and reshaped so as to focus no longer on purely military virtues but on education in the modern sense, including—for the most gifted—philosophy. It is this conception that is recorded in Plato's dialogues. These writings also idealize a chaste kind of pederastic guidance in which the beauty of the boy is
cherished, but physical expression of the admiration is resisted. Nonetheless, it seems clear that many pederastic teachers did not resist. The direction of Plato’s Academy was itself conducted for several generations according to a succession from erastes to eromenos—lover to beloved—and these relationships do not seem all to have been without sexual expression. The heritage was taken up by the Stoic thinkers who recommended not so much total abstinence as moderation.

Eclipse of the Pedagogic Eros. The link between pedagogy and pederasty, which had become almost second nature to the Greeks, was not indigenous to the Romans; where it emerged among them it was thanks to philhellenism. It was Christianity, however, that finally severed the connection—or so it would seem. For by developing monasticism, by definition a same-sex community consisting of individuals of different ages, Christianity created a new set of temptations. The texts of the various Rules and penitentials contain instructions on how to avoid temptations. Nonetheless, it seems clear that in monasteries and nunneries there developed deeply rooted traditions of “particular friendships” that were passed on, in due course, to the same-sex elite schools of modern Europe.

The Italian Renaissance restored classical culture to a place of honor, and some thinkers, such as the Florentine Marsilio Ficino, began to advance cautious arguments in favor of restoring the link between pedagogy and eros. In the sixteenth century Camillo Scroffa wrote his Cantici di Fidenzio about the unrequited love of a Paduan pedant for his student, while in the Alciabide fanciullo a scola (ca. 1652) Antonio Rocco set forth a bold plea for sexual enjoyment as the culmination of the student-teacher relationship.

Educational reformers of the eighteenth century recognized that segregating adolescents in same-sex schools created a hot-house climate for homosexual sentiments and actions, and in time these were replaced by the “healthier environment” of today’s coeducational schools. The nineteenth-century English public school remained sex-segregated and, in conjunction with the reading of the Greek classics, led to the “higher homoeroticism” as found, for example, among the Cambridge Apostles.

The Twentieth Century. In the two decades preceding World War I, Central Europe was the scene of several important trends for social and sexual change. The youth movement known as the Wandervogelbewegung generated, as a byproduct, the book of Hans Blüher, Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen (1912), a work that forthrightly defended erotic relationships between men and boys as a positive contribution to the consolidation of social bonds. More elitist was the contemporary Stefan George circle, which sought to recruit a small group of highly gifted young men, who were also notable for their good looks. Educational in the more narrow institutional sense was the Free School Community founded at Wickersdorf near Weimar in 1906 by Gustav Wyneken (1875–1964). Wyneken advocated a new version of Greek paiderastia as an educational procedure for the initiation of privileged youth into art and culture. Unfortunately, Wyneken’s experiment was shattered by a series of charges and countercharges in 1920.

It is significant that the free-school movement of the Anglo-Saxon world—as seen, for example, at the famous Summerhill in England—never dared permit any sexual component. And in the United States, the “life adjustment” trend, which was not to peak until the 1940s, was strictly an adjustment to the heterosexual norm. In the 1940s and 1950s American teachers and college professors whose homosexuality was exposed were subject to instant dismissal in mid-semester, even if there had been no overt sexuality with students. Academic freedom or no, any academic who dared to write about homosexuality had to assume a posture of stern disap-
proval, or else conceal his identity behind an impermeable pseudonym.

The Ferment of Change. Change was not to come until the 1960s when demographic and social trends, catalyzed by the growth of the Counterculture and opposition to the Vietnam War, caused a loosening of traditional attitudes. The new educational theories seemed to bring life into the placid—sometimes almost comatose—purileus of educational theory. Yet this shakeup was less novel than it was assumed, going back to Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s eighteenth-century critique of authoritarianism in education. A number of the 1960s reformers were themselves gay. The most notable of these was Paul Goodman (1911–1972) who, largely self-educated, sought to bring an anarchist perspective to the theory of education.

In 1966 Stephen Donaldson founded the first gay student organization on the campus of Columbia University in New York City. Despite much opposition on the part of administrations, similar organizations sprang up in hundreds of North American college campuses. Shortly thereafter, but more cautiously, gay and lesbian teachers’ associations, usually comprising those in the primary and secondary schools rather than college teachers, appeared in a number of localities.

In 1973 the Gay Academic Union (GAU) was formed in New York City to bring institutional change and foster the development of gay studies programs in academia. In keeping with the liberationist ideas of the time, GAU expected that many faculty members would “come out” by acknowledging their homosexuality, and that some of these would offer courses in gay and lesbian studies. Yet by the end of the eighties there were probably fewer than fifty openly gay and lesbian tenured professors in an American university system that boasted more than 2000 campuses. Moreover, these faculty members tend to be concentrated in schools of second rank rather than in the Ivy League and the great state universities. The caution of many established teachers, combined with a covert “tracking system” that tended to shunt overtly gay faculty to the sidelines, served to reduce the number of “out” teachers. The situation with gay studies has been even more discouraging. No coordinated programs, such as those for women’s studies and black studies, took root, and there was even a dearth of individual courses. Much research and teaching has had to be organized in parallel, private institutions, such as Los Angeles’s ONE, Inc. Finally, in the 1980s the emergence of a more conservative social climate and the AIDS crisis have caused gay and lesbian students, especially in secondary schools, to assume a lower profile.

In short, the bottle is half empty, but it is also half full. It is unlikely that there will be a return to the atmosphere of clandestinity and open contempt with which gay members of the college community had to contend in the 1950s. Many university administrations acknowledge the need to support gay and lesbian student organizations, and few are willing to tolerate antigay violence on campus. Gay studies courses may be scarce, but special campus events in what is often termed “gay pride week” offer informative lectures. Although faculty still find little encouragement in their efforts to expand teaching and research in this realm, an increasing number of serious scholars are writing and publishing on homosexuality in their own disciplines.


Edward II (1284–1327)

Plantagenet king of England. Born at Caernarvon, Edward was the first English Prince of Wales. Said by one four-
teenth-century chronicler to have "particularly delighted in the vice of sodomy," Edward's open homosexuality was a contributing factor in his overall lack of success as king.

Following in the footsteps of Edward I, the "Hammer of the Scots," was no easy task, and it was one for which Edward II seems to have been singularly unfitted. From his youth he showed himself to be rather irresponsible; he was an habitual and extravagant gambler, and on one occasion he precipitated his own exile from his father's court by recklessly breaking into a park belonging to the bishop of Chester.

In order to provide the prince with a role model of courteous martial behavior, Edward I introduced a young Gascon, Piers Gaveston, into his son's court in 1300. Ironically, Gaveston was to become Edward II's lover and a focal point of the baronial discontent that was to last throughout his reign, culminating in the king's deposition and murder in 1327.

In the spring of 1307 Edward I exiled Gaveston in an effort to restrain his son's behavior, but within a few months the aged monarch was dead, and Edward of Caernarvon had ascended to the throne. Gaveston was immediately recalled and elevated to the peerage as Earl of Cornwall. Soon thereafter he married the king's niece, Margaret de Clare, sister of the Earl of Gloucester. This sort of lavish display of patronage was ultimately to be the undoing of both Gaveston and Edward.

Dissatisfaction with the king's rule—and Gaveston's influence—surfaced as early as January 1308 in a statement of baronial grievances known as the Balaguine Agreement, drafted at the wedding of Edward II to Isabella of France, daughter of Philip IV ("the Fair"). But this warning went largely unheeded.

Indeed, upon his return to England from his marriage in France, Edward his reported to have ignored the other magnates and run to Gaveston, hugging him repeatedly while smothering him with kisses. A similar, and even more public, scene was played by the two at the banquet following the coronation of Edward and Isabella. Gaveston, resplendent in royal purple trimmed with pearls—looking like the god Mars according to one contemporary—was the center of attention. Indeed, the fact that Edward spent more time on the favorite's couch than on that of the queen was taken as an insult not only to the English nobility, but to the French royal house, represented at the banquet by the queen's uncles Charles d'Orléans and Louis d'Evreux and her brother, the future Charles IV.

The ultimate result of the banquet was Gaveston's second exile in as many years and Edward's assent to the appointment of a body of reformers, the Lords Ordainers. Gaveston spent the year between June 1308 and June 1309 as king's lieutenant in Ireland, and Edward spent the year working to restore his favorite. He achieved this, perhaps at the expense of more urgent concerns such as Robert the Bruce's rising power in Scotland, but learned little in the process.

Within months baronial discontent had resurfaced yet again, perhaps hastened by Gaveston's scurrilous nicknames for his fellow earls. A third exile for Gaveston ensued, followed by another swift but ill-conceived return. This time the favorite was hunted down and executed by the barons. A particularly vivid image of Edward's attachment to his favorite is presented by the ruby found on Gaveston's person when he was taken by the barons; "la Cérise" was valued at the phenomenal sum of one thousand pounds in 1312!

Edward's relations with the barons did not improve after Gaveston's death, but the king was not linked with another individual favorite until the emergence of Hugh le Despenser the younger in around 1320. There is less evidence of a sexual relationship between them, yet one has generally been presumed. If we are to be-
lieve the chronicler Jean Froissart, following her successful coup in 1326, Isabella ordered that Despencer’s genitals be cut off and burned before his eyes prior to his hanging.

As for Edward himself, the red-hot poker which is said to have ended his life has virtually become a symbol of his unfortunate reign. However, regardless of the exact nature of his death, it is incorrect, as has sometimes been suggested, to claim that Edward was deposed and murdered because of his homosexuality. His sexual behavior was used as a means of justification for events after his death, as part of what can only be called a propaganda campaign on behalf of Isabella and her paramour Roger Mortimer. Nevertheless, Edward II’s example was subsequently held up as a pointed warning to later kings—homosexual and/or ineffective—and their favorites, not only in England, but in France as well.


J. S. Hamilton

EFFEMINACY

Effeminacy is any of various forms of feminine or female-like behavior in a man. It tends to be disliked if not condemned in virtually every society—though, like other anxiety-arousing behavior, it can be the focus of wit and humor. In a few tribal societies where it is associated with shamanism it has been respected or feared.

By a kind of “opposites attract” reasoning, the effeminate man is generally assumed to want male partners in sex, and thus to be homosexual—a double error since effeminate men are sometimes notably heterosexual while, as the Kinsey re-

search found, most homosexuality is not marked by effeminacy, in fact, a very considerable amount of same-sex behavior “is found among ranchmen, cattlemen, prospectors, lumbermen, . . . groups that are virile, physically active.” (Kinsey et al., p. 457).

Similar and worse confusions have arisen in various descriptions of what effeminate behavior actually is. The psychoanalysts, noting certain exaggerations in effeminacy, have interpreted its gestures as take-offs or as caricatures of women or of femininity (Bieber). Less abusive interpretations have simply noted the similarities between effeminacy and femininity, usually concluding that female-like mannerisms in a man must originate from “identity” problems, such as a profound uncertainty about his maleness, or an overt identification with women, or with his “overclose” mother. The appeal of such insufficiency theories is remarkable. They are in line with popular notions of a homosexual’s “impairment” and “inadequacy” but fly in the face of important contradictions—not only from Kinsey but from a few perceptive clinicians: almost forty years ago Karen Machover demonstrated that, far from being “sexually confused,” effeminate males frequently have a sharper-than-average awareness of male/female differences, even when they identify more with women than with men.

But if effeminacy is not impaired maleness, if it does not spell male insufficiency, and is not necessarily homosexual, if it is not a fixation on one’s mother, nor a caricature of women, then what is it and where does it come from? Exactly where it comes from is too hard a question. [Like trying to say precisely why one person is more aggressive, or fussy, or good-natured than another, the answer is invariably multifaceted—too scattered among a maze of social, genetic and physiologic biases to permit confident answers.] But accurate and useful descriptions can be given.
No matter which effeminacy is involved—nelly, swish, blasé, or camp—it is a set of mannerisms quite like equivalent movements and gestures seen in women. Nelly and blasé movements are similar enough to be virtually identical in femininity and effeminacy. But the gestures of swish and camp are clearly more forceful in effeminacy, probably due to the higher musculature of males, thus inviting interpretations of their being "caricatures" of femininity. Similar gestures and high-animation movements seen in both women and effeminate men have been shown to come about in the same way, that is, they reflect particular attitudes toward just how, and how directly, to engage the environment. Just as a relatively aggressive, straight-line mode of affronting and engaging the environment is a hallmark of male movement, the rounded, relatively curvaceous movements of femininity pull away from so directly or aggressively engaging the environment.

For instance, when a man walks with a quick step but slightly pulls back from fully extending each stride, the result is a mincing gait—a set of movements that is decidedly softer, faster, and less brusk than is typical of men. Or, in various arm movements seen in swish and camp, a fast-moving outgoing gesture may at the last moment suddenly be pulled back or stopped from completing its path by the twist of a bent wrist, thus producing one of the high-speed, high-animation curves of swish, or one of the exaggerated stack-ups of emphasis seen in camp. The roundness of such moves is typical of femininity, while their energy and sharpness is decidedly male—the very combination that most characterizes the difference between femininity and effeminacy.

Thus it is not that effeminate movements copy or caricature feminine ones, but that both styles arrive at their curves and their relatively high animation from the same source: that is, the mental set of both femininity and effeminacy share the kinds of attitudes and the particular kinds of aggressive-readiness that cause them to select very similar styles of engaging the environment.


**C. A. Tripp**

**Effeminacy, Historical Semantics of**

Containing as its core the Latin word *femina* ("woman"), the adjective *effeminate* has been used to mean womanish, unmanly—and by extension enervated, self-indulgent, narcissistic, voluptuous, delicate, and over-refined. Applied to sexual orientation it has had two opposed senses: (1) seeking the company of women and participating in their lifeways (heterosexual), and (2) adopting the woman's role (homosexual). In reading older texts it is important to bear these differences in mind, for the term effeminate can be used slightly of a womanizer as well as of a "womanish" man.

*Classical Antiquity.* The ancient Greeks and Romans sharply differentiated the active male homosexual, the *paiderastes* (in the New Testament *arsenokoites*, literally "man-layer"), from the passive partner, the *cinaedus* or *pathicus* (New Testament Greek *malakos*; Hebrew, *rakha*). The Greeks also sometimes used the term *androgyynos*, "man-woman," to stigmatize the passive homosexual. Beginning with the Old Attic comedies of Aristophanes, the passive is a stock figure of derision and contempt, the active partner far less so. Because of the military ideals on which ancient societies were founded, passivity and softness in the male were equated with cowardice and want of viril-
ity. A seeming exception is the god Dionysus—whose effeminate characteristics are, however, probably an import from the non-Greek East.

In ancient Rome the terms mollis ("soft") and effeminatus acquired special connotations of decadence and enervating luxury. By contrast the word virtus meant manliness. The Roman satirists took sardonic delight in flagellating the vices of luxury that were rampant among the upper classes of a nation that, once rude and warlike, had succumbed to the temptations that followed its successful conquest and plunder of the entire ancient world. The classical notion of effeminacy as the result of luxury, idleness, and pampered self-indulgence is thus far removed from the claim of some gay liberationists today to kinship with the exploited and downtrodden. Juvenal’s Second Satire (ca. A.D. 100) ridicules several types of effeminate homosexuals: the judge attired in a filmy gown who hypocritically upbraids a female prostitute, the male transvestites who infiltrate a female secret society, and the degenerate scion of a venerable family who marries a horn-player in a lavish travesty of a wedding.

The Middle Ages. The old Icelandic literature stemming from medieval Scandinavia documents the condemnation of the argi, the cowardly, unwarlike effeminate (compare Modern German arg, "bad"). The Latin term mollites ("softness") entered early Christian and medieval writings, but often with reference to masturbation. It may be that the eighteenth-century English term molly for an effeminate homosexual is a reminiscence of Latin mollis.

Ordericus Vitalis, a historian chronicling the England of William Rufus (1087–1100), denounced “foul catamites” who “grew long and luxuriant locks like women, and loved to deck themselves in long, over-tight shirts and tunics.” Writing about 1120, William of Malmesbury recalled these courtiers with their “flowing hair and extravagant dress . . . [Then the model for young men was to rival women in delicacy of person, to mince their gate, to walk with loose gestures and halfnaked. Enervated and effeminate, they remained unwillingly what nature had made them; the assailers of others’ chastity, prodigal of their own.”

Modern Times. In the sixteenth century the French monarch Henri III assembled an entourage of favorites whose name mignon connotes effeminacy and delicacy. In French also the original meaning of bardache was the passive partner of the active bougre. English writings of the seventeenth and eighteenth century frequently denounced foppery, sometimes homosexual but more often heterosexual. Particular objects of scorn were the “Macaronis” of the 1770s, with their bright coats decked out with big bunches of ribbon, huge wigs, and betasseled walking sticks. In the view of Susan Shapiro such elegants attracted scorn because they were believed to threaten the very foundations of civilization. "They negate[d] the assumption that sex and gender identity are immutable, for their androgynous dress [was] constantly blurring, overlapping, and tampering with the supposedly fixed poles of masculinity and femininity."

Restoration times also witnessed the popularity of the self-referencing habit of male homosexuals adopting women’s names: Mary, Mary-Anne, Molly, Nance or Nancy, and Nelly. The habit occurs in other languages as well—Janet in Flemish; Checca (from Francesca) in Italian; Maricón (from María) in Spanish; and Adelaida in Portuguese.

Nineteenth-century English witnessed a semantic shift of a number of terms originally applied to women to provide opprobrious designations of male homosexuals. Thus gay had the meaning of a loose woman, prostitute; faggot, a slatternly woman; and queen (or queue), a trollop. Even today the popular mind tends to the view that gay men seek to imitate women, or even become women; the considerable number of unstereotypical,
masculine homosexuals are not taken into account.

The term "manned woman" had some currency for lesbians in the 1920s. In general, however, such terms redolent of sex-role reversal do not have the same significance for men as for women. Terma-
gant and virago, though pejorative, do not suggest variance of sexual orientation. The girl who is a tomboy has always been treated more indulgently than the boy who is a sissy. This difference between "womanly men" and "manly women" probably reflects the fact that our society clings to the notion that it is degrading for a man to be reduced to the status of a woman, while it is a step up for a woman to be credited with the qualities of a man. In fact some studies of the "androgyneous personality" suggest that even in today's changing social situation there is more practical advantage (in the business world and in politics) for a woman who "gets in touch with the other side of her personal-
ity" than a man who does so. Nonetheless, the men's movement has helped to break down some taboos, and men now feel less reluctance to cry or show strong affection.

Men who cross-dress as women are of two kinds. Some go to great lengths to make the simulation credible, an effort that may be a prelude to transsexualism. In other instances the simulation is imper-
frait, a kind of send-up. Although some feminists have interpreted such cross-dressing exercises as mockery of women, it is more likely that they signify a question-
ing of gender categories. In any event, transvestism is not normally held to lie within the province of effeminacy, which is thought to be the adjunction of feminine traits in a person otherwise fully recogniz-
able as masculine.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Hans Herter, "Effeminatus," *Reallexikon für Antike
und Christentum*, 4 (1959), cols. 620–50; Susan Shapiro, "'Yon Plumed Dande-
prat': Male 'Effeminacy' in English Satire and Criticism," *Review of English

*Wayne R. Dynes*
banishing the suspect category from the Manual altogether. Yet bitter reactions suggested that a majority of psychiatrists remained opposed to “normalizing” homosexual behavior. Their critics in turn alleged that client fees played a part in the opposition: if a whole category were to be deleted, a significant cohort of patients would disappear. However, this observation probably underestimates the deeply rooted character of American psychiatrists’ opposition to homosexuality. A committee was formed under Robert Spitzer to decide the practical management of the problem. To the disgust of gay psychiatrists, the definition excerpted above found its way into the third edition of the Manual.

Although the following years seemed to effect little change in the attitudes of many psychiatrists, gay professionals both within and without the organization continued to lobby for deletion of 302.00. Somewhat to their own surprise, this was achieved during the first half of 1986, again through the work of a committee headed by Robert Spitzer. (Another section of the new version of the manual says, with seeming neutrality, that some may wish to change sexual orientation, so that this type of client need not entirely disappear.) While pleased at the outcome, those critical of psychiatry as currently established held that the protracted maneuvers had shown unmistakably the political and value-ridden character of the discipline. Nonetheless, the American Psychiatric Association is now far ahead of the World Health Organization, which retains the classification of homosexuality as an illness.


Ward Houser

EGYPT, ANCIENT

Egyptians of dynastic times were inclined to regard with equanimity a wide variety of sexual practices. Traditionally the pharaohs married their half-sisters, a custom that other peoples considered curious. Self-confident in their cherished habits and customs, the Egyptians nonetheless cherished a distinct sense of privacy, which restricted discussion of erotic themes in the documents that have come down to modern times. Most of our evidence stems from temples and tombs, where a full record of everyday life could scarcely be expected. Unfortunately, Egypt had no law codes comparable to those known from ancient Mesopotamia.

The realm of mythology provides several instances of homosexual behavior. In order to subordinate him, the god Seth attempted to sodomize his brother Horus, but the latter foiled him, and tricked Seth into ingesting some of his [Horus’s] own semen. Seth then became pregnant. In another myth the ithyphallic god Min analytically assaulted an enemy, who later gave birth to the god Thoth. Both these stories present involuntary receptive homosexuality as a humiliation, but the act itself is not condoned; in the latter incident the god of wisdom is born as a result. (In another myth the high god engenders offspring parthenogenetically by masturbation.) While it is sometimes claimed that the ancient Egyptians were accustomed to sodomize enemies after their defeat on the battlefield, the evidence is equivocal.

The “negative confessions” of the Book of the Dead contain a sentence that may be translated as “I have not had sexual relations with a boy.” This precept should not be generalized, and may be a reference to a need for maintaining ritual purity in the temple precincts in which it is found.

In what is surely history’s first homosexual short story, King Pepy II Neferkare (Pharaoh II; 2355–2261) makes nocturnal visits to have sex with his general Sisinne. This episode is significant as an instance of androphilia—sex between
two adult men—rather than the pederasty that was dominant in the ancient world. From a slightly earlier period comes the Tomb of the Two Brothers at Thebes, which the excavators have explained as the joint sepulchers of two men, Ni-ankhnum and Khnumhotep, who were lovers. Bas reliefs on the tomb walls show the owners embracing affectionately.

A dream book from a later period attests to the presence of male prostitutes of the ordinary kind; yet the institution of male temple prostitution, well established in Western Asia, seems to have been lacking. A woman's dream book contains two casual mentions of lesbian relations, which may have been common, though the evidence is scanty. Wall paintings frequently show women in "homosocial" postures of touching, grooming, and other nongenital expressions of affection. Queen Hatshepsut (reigned 1503–1482 B.C.) adopted male dress and even wore a false beard; these male attributes probably stem from her decision to reign alone, rather than from lesbianism.

A figure of particular interest is the pharaoh Akhenaten (Amenhotep IV, reigned ca. 1372–1354 B.C.), who was a religious and artistic reformer. Although this king begat several daughters with his wife, the famous Nefertiti, in art he is often shown as eunuch-like, with swollen hips and feminine breasts. According to some interpreters these somatic features reflect a glandular disorder. Other scholars believe that they are a deliberate artistic stylization, so that the appearance of androgyny may convey a universal concept of the office of kingship, unifying the male and the female so as to constitute an appropriate counterpart of the universal god Aten he introduced. Scenes of Akhenaten caressing his son-in-law Smenkhkare have been interpreted, doubtfully, as indicating a homosexual relation between the two.

Later Greek observers stressed the sexual exceptionalism of the Egyptians, especially the custom of brother-and-sister marriage. Some Egyptian figurines show a grotesque emphasis on the phallus, which was circumcised, while texts reveal an unusual inventiveness in devising hedonistic and medical enemas. In the area of homosexual behavior, however, our evidence does not suggest any radical departure from the broad Near Eastern pattern that homosexual relations might incur disapproval under certain conditions, but were not globally condemned. Most frequently they seem to have been simply aspects of daily life.


Wayne R. Dynes

ELIOT, THOMAS STEARNS (1888–1965)

Anglo-American poet and critic. Helped at first by his friend Ezra Pound, Eliot surpassed him in public esteem; during the last decades of his life, Eliot attained the position of a kind of aesthetic dictator of English and American literary standards. After his death his reputation fell somewhat, but he remains a formidable figure in the annals of literary modernism.

Raised in a St. Louis family of New England origin, Eliot received his major formation at Harvard and in postgraduate study in France, Germany, and Oxford, originally intending to become a teacher of philosophy. In 1910 in a rooming house in Paris he met a medical student, Jean Verdenal, who was to be his closest friend during his continental wanderings. A number of letters survive from Verdenal, though none of Eliot’s to him; in one the Frenchman speaks of the “undeniable influence and emotional power” that two close people have over one another. Their mutual friend, the aesthete Matthew Stuart Prichard, was almost certainly homosexual. Although several Ver-
denal transcripts were published in the 1988 edition of the _Letters_ by Eliot's widow, there are said to be others, which are perhaps harsher. Eliot's first masterpiece, _The Waste Land_ (1922), is dedicated to Verdenal, who was killed on military service not long after the start of World War I. For a long time critics viewed the poem as an impersonal commentary on the sorry state of Western civilization, but it is now known to derive from personal experience, especially Eliot's unhappy relations with his unstable first wife, Vivien. In view of this personal emphasis, the dedication to his deceased male friend may have been more telling than has usually been thought. In any event, the poem contains a homosexual reference, when a levantine merchant invites the narrator to a "weekend at the Metropole," that is, to a homosexual encounter.

Vehemently opposed in principle to any biography of him, Eliot succeeded in wrapping his inner self in a cloud of enigma. Ostensibly this reticence is grounded in his espousal of the doctrine of poetic impersonality. It may, however, have more personal roots. Eliot's first marriage with Vivien Haigh-Wood was undertaken quite suddenly in 1915, ostensibly on the rebound from an unrequited love for an American woman. There were no children, and Vivien spent much of the remainder of her life in mental homes. For many years Eliot shared bachelor quarters with another literary man, John Hayward. The "secret" of Eliot's personality, if such there be, may reside chiefly in his _fear_ of being taken as homosexual, since he was not given to manly pursuits such as athletic sports and hunting and the profession of poetry itself tends to be regarded with suspicion in the English-speaking world. Time will tell whether this is the case, or whether there is something more that has been held back by the official guardians of Eliot's reputation.


**Ward Houser**

**ELLIS, HAVELock** *(1859–1939)*

Pioneering British writer on sexual psychology. Descended from a family with many generations of seafarers, Henry Havelock Ellis was named after a distinguished soldier who was the hero of the Indian Mutiny. Early in life he sailed twice around the world and spent some years in Australia. In boarding school he had some unpleasant experiences suggesting a passive element in his character, and his attachments to women were often more friendships than erotic liaisons. At the age of 32 he married Edith Lees, a lesbian; after the first year of their marriage all sexual relations ceased, and both went on to a series of affairs with women. By nature an autodidact, Ellis obtained in 1889 only a licentiate in Medicine, Surgery, and Midwifery from the Society of Apothecaries—a somewhat inferior degree that always embarrassed him. More interested in his literary studies than in the practice of medicine, he nevertheless collected case histories mainly by correspondence, as his autobiography makes no mention of clinical practice.

One of his early correspondents was John Addington Symonds, who discussed with him the possibility of a book on sexual inversion, in which the case histories were the core and empirical foundation. Ellis recognized two conditions: "complete inversion" (= exclusive homosexuality) and "psychosexual hermaphroditism" (= bisexuality). In the midst of the writing Symonds died suddenly, and the book first appeared in German under the title _Das konträre Geschlechtsgefühl_ ("Contrary Sexual Feeling", 1896) with both names on the title page. In the atmosphere that prevailed after the disgrace of Oscar Wilde (May 1895), publication in England was problematic, but under doubt-
ful auspices the English edition was released in November 1897.

Sexual Inversion was the first book in English to treat homosexuality as neither disease nor crime, and if he dismissed the current notion that it was a species of "degeneracy" (in the biological sense), he also maintained that it was inborn and unmodifiable—a view that he never renounced. His book, couched in simple language, urged public toleration for what was then regarded as unnatural and criminal to the highest degree. To a readership conditioned from childhood to regard homosexual behavior with disgust and abhorrence, the book was beyond the limits of comprehension, and a radical publisher and bookseller named George Bedborough was duly prosecuted for issuing "a certain lewd wicked bawdy scandalous and obscene libel"—Sexual Inversion. In his defense Ellis maintained that the work aimed at "remedial treatment"—a hypocritical line that was to be followed for many decades thereafter by defenders of the homosexual. The trial caused Ellis and his wife much anxiety, though they ended without a prison sentence for Bedborough.

The book was to appear in two later editions as the second volume of Ellis' Studies in the Psychology of Sex, which in its final format extended to seven volumes covering the whole of sexual science as it existed in the first three decades of the twentieth century. The most iconoclastic stance in the entire work remained the calm acceptance of homosexuality. Ellis never endorsed the explanations offered by Freud and the psychoanalytic school, so that the third edition of Sexual Inversion (1915), which was supplemented by material drawn from Magnus Hirschfeld's Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes, published a year earlier, presented essentially the standpoint of 1904. The next in radical character was the measured discussion of masturbation, which Victorian society had been taught to regard with virtual paranoia as the cause of numberless ills. The mes-

sage of all his writings was that sex was a joy and a boon to mankind that should be embraced with ardor but also with knowledge. If many of the views expressed in his work are dated, the frame of mind in which the author approached his subject, tolerant and condoning rather than vindictive and condemnatory, served to move educated opinion in the English-speaking world in the direction of the reforms that were to be realized only in the wake of the Wolfenden Report of 1957.

Parallel with Magnus Hirschfeld in Germany, Ellis further distinguished transvestism from the homosexuality with which it had been confounded since Westphal's paper of 1869, except that he proposed the name "eonism," from the Chevalier d'Eon, a French nobleman of the eighteenth century who habitually dressed as a woman. Man and Woman, first published in 1894, continued to be revised down to 1927; it was a study of "secondary sexual characters," in contemporary terms the problems of gender, of women's rights, and of women's place in modern society, again in a spirit of sympathy and toleration that has not lost its relevance to the issues debated at the close of the twentieth century.

In addition to his own insights and research, Havelock Ellis helped to diffuse the findings of continental scholars, making accessible to a broad audience—one that hitherto had been subjected to a literature meant to inspire shame and fear—a comprehensive body of knowledge of human sexuality. His enlightened approach to homosexuality marked the first step toward overcoming the Victorian morality that had shrouded the subject in ignorance and opprobrium.


Warren Johansson

EMPLOYMENT
See Discrimination, Economics.
ENCYCLOPEDIAS

See Dictionaries and Encyclopedias.

ENGLAND
The history of homosexual behavior in England between the eleventh and the twelfth centuries can be divided into two periods, the traditional and the modern, with the break occurring around 1700. The evidence for the earlier period is slender until the seventeenth century, but the evidence after 1700 eventually becomes overwhelming. The two periods are distinguishable by differences in the dominant mode of homosexual behavior. The behavior of men is always more easily documented than that of women, but roughly the same patterns can be found in both genders, even if the changes after 1700 were differently timed for men than for women.

Basic Features of the First Paradigm. Between 1100 and 1700 sexual relations between males were usually between an active man and a passive boy. The man was usually attracted to women as well, and it is an error to suppose that such men were really interested only in boys. The boys were valued for their feminine characteristics: slight bodies and smooth skin. They were often encouraged to dress in a way that was seen as effeminate.

Effeminacy could also be a characteristic of two kinds of adult males. There were, first, men who liked to take the passive role and were thought to be peculiarly corrupt for surrendering male dominance. They were consequently sometimes seen as hermaphrodites and confused with actual physical hermaphrodites. Some of the latter did go back and forth between genders, but they were held guilty of sodomy for doing so. There was, however, a second category of men accused of effeminacy: namely those who liked the sexual company of women so much that they were thought to have come under their power. Sodomy had a similar range of meaning: anal sex with women and with males, and genital sex with animals. And references to Sodom could be made simply to describe a general situation of rampant sexual irregularity.

This sexual behavior has to be seen as part of a general cultural system that emerged in the twelfth century and lasted until the seventeenth; there were only minor adjustments in the system after 1500 as a result of the Renaissance and the Protestant Reformation. This new western European culture produced its own pattern of family structures, sexual behavior, and gender roles. Aristocratic families adopted a patrilineal ideology. Marriage for men was late. Monogamy was enforced and divorce forbidden. Many in the general population never married, and priestly celibacy was promoted. Sexual relations outside of marriage were forbidden. But a regulated prostitution was tolerated for fear, as Thomas Aquinas said, that the world would otherwise be overrun with sodomy. Sodomy and all sexual acts which were not procreative were peculiarly sinful. But sexual acts between males nonetheless occurred. They can be documented in the royal court, in monasteries and colleges, and in the large cities like London, which were a part of this new world. But it is not until the seventeenth century that one can show the male peasant who had a wife and seduced the local boys.

The Medieval Development. At the end of the eleventh century the king, William Rufus, was accused of sexual irregularity, but only one writer claimed that his vices included relations with youths. Two years into the reign of his successor (1102), a church council did condemn sodomy. Anselm, the Archbishop of Canterbury, sought, however, to limit the effects of the condemnation, because many would not have known that sodomy was a grave crime. Henry's son, Prince William, was drowned in a shipwreck in 1120. This was blamed on the effeminacy and sodomy of his companions, but it is not clear what the relationship was be-
between these two characteristics. Henry's great-grandson, Richard I (the Lion-Hearted), was of course a most brave and chivalrous knight, who was also observed to be passionately fond of the king of France, and who was frequently rebuked for his fondness for males. Archbishop Anselm promoted friendships between monks. Aelred of Rievaulx, another saintly abbot, also did so. It is clearer that his friendships were based on physical attraction, but he presumed that such relations would not be carnal, except perhaps among adolescents. The libertine Latin poems of the time which circulated in England and elsewhere always stated that the authors desired both boys and females and spoke of boy prostitutes in the towns. Richard of Devizes described these boys in late twelfth-century London—smooth-skinned, pretty and passive—and placed them among the rest of the city's low life: dancing girls, actors, beggars and magicians.

By the end of the thirteenth century the new culture of the twelfth had become a fully organized system of a kind in which most sexual activity was viewed as dangerous. The law codes now reflected this. In Edward I's reign a law was promulgated punishing with death sexual relations with Jews and with beasts, as well as between sodomites. Edward's successor, Edward II, was hounded by his enemies, in part because of his lovers. He was killed by having a red-hot poker thrust up his anus. But it is unclear whether many men were actually tried for sodomy, as they were in the contemporary Italian cities. At the end of the fifteenth century there was sodomy in London: one man publicly boasted that he had committed sodomy with another, and a married man was called "a woman" because he grabbed priests between their legs. But both of these involved sex between two adults. It may have been that relations of men with boys were not much noticed.

The Reformation and After. In the sixteenth and the seventeenth century England went through the upheavals associated with the Reformation, but these do not seem to have made much difference for sodomy, except that a statute in Henry VIII's reign took jurisdiction over sodomy with "mankind or beast" away from the ecclesiastical courts. The common law courts interpreted the statute as condemning anal intercourse and bestiality, but not sexual relations between women.

In the seventeenth century, when the evidence grows more detailed, one can observe patterns of behavior rather similar to those of the twelfth century. The royal court had a bad reputation under James I and William III who had their male favorites, as well as wives, and in William's case, a mistress too. London had more sodomy cases than anywhere else in the country. There were boy prostitutes who, like the female ones, clustered around the theatres. A male libertine culture flourished in which men pursued women and youths. Shakespeare wrote his sonnets in part for a youth and in part for a woman. Marlowe said St. John was Jesus' boy. Lord Castlehaven watched his male servants have sex with his wife, and then had sex with them. Lord Rochester had wife, mistress, and page, all as sexual companions. And Captain Rigby and the other London beau took to boys as safer when too many of the whores were infected. But it could all be dangerous: Castlehaven was executed and Rigby stood in the pillory.

In the colleges and the schools, there were fellows and masters who seduced their students. In the countryside, there were ordinary poor men who had a taste for sodomy. They were usually married. They might also be as interested in buggering the horse, or the cow, as the boy. If caught they might suffer death or public mockery. But the mockery was never on the ground that they were effeminate. They were wicked but manly. Only in the few cases of adult males who took the passive role with another man, was sodomy seen as leading to the upset of behavior proper to the two genders.
The Shift to a New Paradigm.
This system of some six hundred years standing began to unravel in the 1690s and in the first decade of the eighteenth century, as the culture of modern Western society began to crystallize all over northwestern Europe, in the Netherlands, in France, and in England. Like the previous culture of the twelfth century, it produced a distinctive familial, sexual, and gender system. Marriage became romantic, companionate and universal, and divorce grew more commonplace. Women and children were in theory held equal to adult males, but in practice the two genders were presumed to exist in separate spheres. Most individuals were thought to desire only the opposite gender. Adult males who desired males were socialized to be sexually passive and effeminate, and were given a status equivalent to those women who became prostitutes. This new role for men was established by 1750, but a comparable change did not occur for women until just before 1900.

The adult effeminate sodomite or molly, as he was popularly called, can be documented from the London sodomy trials of the first thirty years of the eighteenth century. Such men met each other in the parks, latrines, and streets, much as prostitutes met their customers. They consummated their acts either there or in a public house or tavern. In these mollies, houses most men adopted feminine characteristics in speech and gesture, and took women’s names. Sometimes there were balls when they dressed as women. A few men seem to have spent most of their time in female dress, and to have been referred to entirely as she and her. There were raids by the constables, and those found guilty were either pilloried, fined and imprisoned, or executed if anal penetration could be proven.

It now became much more dangerous for an adult man to make a pass at an adolescent boy than it had been under the previous system. Boys could now tolerate only with difficulty any suggestion that they passed through a period of sexual passivity. Some boys ran for the constable if they were simply touched; others would allow themselves to be treated and perhaps felled but would resist a continued relationship that might compromise them with their peers. A few boys were identified as future sodomites by their effeminacy and their affectionate ways toward males. These boys were sometimes sexually abused by men who would themselves have denied that they were sodomites, and sometimes they were seduced by a fellow sodomite. But physical affection between most men, such as kissing in greeting, was given up as potentially compromising. Male clothes were increasingly differentiated from women’s in sobriety of color and cut. Some trades like making women’s clothes were avoided because sodomites practiced them. A thriving trade in the blackmail of seemingly effeminate men grew up. They paid under the threat that the blackmailer would swear sodomy against them. In some cases they were actually sodomites.

The old bisexual libertine did not entirely disappear. But it was now said that they simply used marriage to screen themselves from notoriety. In some cases this was probably true. But seafaring men who were isolated on ships at sea still seduced the cabin-boys in the old way. And when prisons at the end of the century became segregated by gender, something similar occurred. Consequently separate wings for boys, adult men, and sodomites were established in the London house of correction.

In the countryside, however, and perhaps also in parts of working-class life, the old and the new systems coexisted into the early twentieth century. The upper classes accepted the new system. Aristocrats who were discovered to have transgressed against it were separated from their wives and sometimes had to go live abroad, especially in Italy where the old system still prevailed. Lord Byron’s life in the early nineteenth century when contrasted
with Lord Rochester's in the late seventeenth perfectly shows the difference between the two systems of homosexual behavior: Rochester with wife, mistress, and boy, and his social position intact; Byron ostracized, separated from his wife, and guiltily indulging his taste for males only in Italy and Greece.

The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. In early nineteenth-century England, more men were hanged for sodomy than in any other period, apparently. The new system was being enforced with a brutal relish. But after 1830 the hangings ceased, and in 1861 the death penalty was repealed. Throughout the century a thriving underground of male prostitution can be documented in London. There were as well mutual acts between persons of the same social class who had met in parks, latrines and pubs; many of these were effeminate to some degree, and a few of them were transvestite. Middle-class boys in public schools often had considerable homosexual experience, and there were networks of friends among adult men, the most famous of which was revealed when Oscar Wilde was accused by the father of his younger, effeminate lover. London's Anglo-Catholic churches also became noted as meeting places for homosexual men, confirming every stout-hearted Englishman's worst suspicions of the connections between popery and sodomy.

At the end of the nineteenth century two important changes occurred. A lesbian role for women began to emerge which paralleled the male role of the early eighteenth century. And there appeared a new way of talking about same-gender sexuality which did not use the language of the streets but the language of psychological deviance. Both trends can be placed in a line of development which led to the repeal of the laws against consensual homosexual acts in 1967, as well as to the development of a gay rights movement in the two decades after 1969.

Women, as of desiring men, though it was sinful to do so. They damaged their gender standing only if they dressed as males, married women, and used an artificial penis, as a few did. This was still the case in the 1750s. By the early nineteenth century, affectionate friendships between women were allowed and protected by the presumption of female asexuality. But in the late nineteenth century there appeared female couples, one of whom was masculine in dress and manner, and neither of whom desired men. It is still unclear, however, why this should not have occurred until that point.

At the same time, men like J. A. Symonds who were sodomites, and others like Havelock Ellis who were sympathetic, set out to explain what came to be called homosexuality. They treated it as a psychological condition that could be explained either biologically or by the dynamics of individual experience. They did not see it as a social role. By the 1950s, liberal opinion had learned to speak easily enough of the phenomenon that the Wolfenden Committee could be appointed and the law changed in 1967. But two generations of increasing self-consciousness on the part of gay men and lesbian women led them in the following decade to openly declare their sexual orientation and to demand a fuller social acceptability. In the 1980s the reaction to the appearance of the AIDS virus among gay men showed the continued existence of homophobia in the general population, and was partly used to justify repressive measures by the government and in the churches.

See also Anglo-Saxons; London; Social Construction.

ENGLAND


ENLIGHTENMENT

The Enlightenment thinkers—the philosophes—who flourished in the eighteenth century sought to give practical effect to the era’s fundamental advances in knowledge. The trend represented both a prolongation and a departure from the Age of Reason of the previous century. Continuing to rely on the application of rationality as the solution to problems, the Enlightenment shifted attention away from pure thought and natural science to ethics and human happiness. Firm believers in progress and the value of education, the philosophes were strongly secularist, viewing established religion as a major source of continuing human ills. The movement’s two heroes were Confucius and Socrates, the humanistic philosophers of East and West. Because of its commitment to human betterment, the Enlightenment has been called the “Party of Humanity.”

Basic Problems. For many today the word “Enlightenment” retains a halo owing to the underlying metaphor of illumination and also to its social optimism and humanism. Moreover, films and other modern popular presentations have spread the idea that the eighteenth century was an era of joyful and unrestrained sexual hedonism. Before endorsing this view, it should be remembered that this was the period in which the great masturbation scare began—the claim that physical weaknesses of all kinds, leading to insanity and death, were the inevitable result of this harmless practice. The hysteria began with an anonymous English publication, Onania; or, the Heinous Sin of Self-Pollution, and all its Frightful Consequences in both Sexes, Considered (1707–08), continued in the Swiss Dr. Tissot’s L’Onanisme; ou dissertation physique sur les maladies produites par la masturbation (1760), and was even enshrined in the great French Encyclopédie, the pantheon of the Enlightenment, under the article “Sodomie.”

Rather than taking it at its own evaluation and that of its latter-day admirers, one should examine the Enlightenment critically and historically, and distinguish the contingent and personal views of individual thinkers from overarching principles. Diderot and Voltaire harbored some conventional anti-Jewish prejudices, yet the overall thrust of their rhetoric promoted the emancipation of European Jewry. Also, Voltaire praised enlightened despots, but furthered the recognition of individual rights and of political democracy.

Individual Thinkers. In a brief, but suggestive passage Baron Montesquieu
(1689–1755), hereditary judge of the parliament of Bordeaux, puzzled: “It is curious that we recognize three crimes, magic, heresy, and the crime against nature [homosexuality], of which one can prove that the first does not exist, that the second lends itself to an infinite number of distinctions, interpretations, and limitations, and that the third is frequently obscure; all three are punished by burning.” Same-sex conduct, of which Montesquieu disapproved, he saw as being fostered by social conditions (The Spirit of the Laws, XII, 6; 1748). Elsewhere he charged that Christian asceticism was Malthusian in its consequences, robbing the Roman Empire of manpower for its wars and causing its decline—thus implying that sexual activity should be procreative.

Famous for his comparison of the human body to a machine, the materialist philosopher Julien Geoffroy de La Mettrie [1709–1751] advocated hedonistic ethics with an emphasis on satisfaction, including sexual gratification.

Anticipating twentieth-century media, Voltaire [1694–1778] made clever use of the press to mobilize public opinion against injustices. In the Calas case of 1762, for example, he showed how a Protestant had been wrongly executed out of religious bigotry. Tireless in his indictments of the cruelty, arbitrariness, and irrationality of the French legal system of his day, Voltaire’s voice was unfortunately raised only slightly in defense of sodomites, who were still being put to death. In the article on “Socratic Love” in his Philosophical Dictionary (1764), he makes it clear that although he personally found homosexuality repellent, it should be regarded as an aberrant taste, rather than a crime. He also gives historical instances of famous homosexuals, anticipating a device that homophile apologists were to use abundantly during the twentieth century.

The prolific Denis Diderot (1713–1784), co-editor of the great Encyclopédie, wrote on virtually every topic in human affairs. In a guarded, though for its time unusually frank, discussion of the limits of sexual expression, “The Conclusion of the Conversation between D’Alembert and Diderot” (1769), he states: “Nothing that exists can be either against nature or outside nature. I don’t except even voluntary chastity and continence, which would be chief crimes against nature if one could sin against nature.” Diderot anticipated twentieth-century sexologists in holding to the hydraulic metaphor of sexual energies, which demand an outlet. His animus against chastity is also linked to his hostility to the ascetic morality of Christianity, to which he gives full sway in his novel, La Religieuse [1760; not published until 1796]. In this melodramatic work he presents a catalogue of anguish and horrors, not excluding lesbianism, which he deems the result of involuntary collective seclusion of women in convents. To berate Europe for its unnatural restrictions, Diderot’s “Supplement to Bougainville’s Voyage” (1772) uses the device of a South Sea island paradise of heterosexual satisfactions that combined, quoting Horace, the pleasurable with the useful, so that women who had passed the childbearing age were supposed to refuse coitus. In keeping with general eighteenth-century opinion, he disliked masturbation. His reasoning on sexual morality is Janus-like: while criticizing its asceticism, he retained the procreative bias of Christian thought in fostering a naturalistic sexual morality that set definite limits on nonconformity, and so created a secular rationalization of the religious argument that homosexuality is unnatural. In this way Diderot anticipated the “social materialist” homophobia of Communist nations today.

The Italian Marquis Cesare Beccaria [1738–1794] sought to apply a kind of Occam’s razor to laws. In his view, draconian punishments, including those against sodomy, were not achieving their aim. He also proposed a sociogenic explanation of homosexuality, which he held was fos-
tered by the one-sex populations of total institutions, such as boarding schools and prisons. The corollary was that undesirable behavior could be lessened by altering the design of human institutions. As this example shows, the Enlightenment was concerned not only with lifting the burden of inherited irrationality, but with proposing new devices of social control, ones which, by virtue of their good intentions, might be all the more oppressive. Thus the Enlightenment is the ancestor not only of modern liberalism but also of state socialism.

Evaluation. The philosophes forged powerful arguments to discomfit tyrants everywhere. Yet the passage of time has revealed some weakness in their thought: an overemphasis on reason itself, to the neglect of feelings and sentiments, which have often swayed humanity. To a large extent this onesidedness was corrected and superseded by the ensuing romantic approach begun by Jean-Jacques Rousseau. There was a vital survival, however, in the work of Jeremy Bentham, whose carefully considered theories of homosexual emancipation were regrettably not published in his lifetime.

In political philosophy rationalism has tended to yield to the seductions of constructivism, as F. A. Hayek has termed it. This is the tendency to assume that one can sweep away existing habits and preferences, and then create a new society by fiat according to a deductive idea of how humanity should be. In this heady vision, the old divinities depart—but society becomes the god. In this outcome, the tyranny of the majority is scarcely avoidable. Or contrariwise, in keeping with the doctrine of self-interest, the wishes of the individual become the only criterion. The farthest reaches of this second avenue were trodden by the most radical of the Enlightenment thinkers, the Marquis de Sade. Without fear of punishment in an afterlife and the restraining bonds of tradition, how can we be certain that human beings will not simply abandon themselves to a maelstrom of self-indulgence? This question, which might be tiresome in a conventional moralist, gains force in Sade's novels, with their detailed visions of cruelty. Sade was the first great creator of a dystopia, a negative vision of society in which the trends of his day found their utmost logical extension.

The mainstream, or positive utopian aspect, of the Enlightenment held that human nature is, or ideally should be, uniform. Thus present diversities will yield to a new universalist ideal of humanity and of uniformly applicable principles of law. And the Enlightenment thinkers, while deists, did not deny the need for institutions as arbiters of morality—which in practice meant the ascetic morality which was to blight Victorian society with its exaltation of "the sacred marriage bond" and the social-purity movements which relegated homosexuals to the underworld of vice that was to be eradicated. Even if Frederick II the Great, Joseph II, and other enlightened despots abolished the death penalty for sodomy in the eighteenth century, the Code Napoléon did not keep the Paris police under the Third Republic from establishing a vice squad.

No organized movement for homosexual rights emerged during the Enlightenment; only at the end of the nineteenth century did the earlier trend toward freeing disadvantaged groups and empowering them finally reach the despised and outlawed homosexual community. Still, to the extent that its supporters can draw on the intellectual capital of the earlier trend, the struggle for gay rights counts as part of the "unfinished business of the Enlightenment." The appeal to knowledge as the ground of human freedom has deep resonance. Yet the empirical study of homosexuality owes little or nothing to the Enlightenment; it stems from nineteenth-century innovations in the fields of biology and psychiatry. This research is often of intrinsic value, but in and of itself it clearly has not accomplished the emancipation of homosexuals.
Human beings are only in part rational creatures, and lingering myths and fabrications have proved hard to eradicate from the popular mind. Sober reflection indicates that Enlightenment in the sense of education and the spread of knowledge must be fused with an effective political program that can secure recognition of the innate diversity of human beings as the bulwark of fundamental rights.


Wayne R. Dynes

ENRIQUE IV
See Juan II.

EPHEBOPHILIA

The word “ephelophobia” refers to an erotic attraction to maturing male youth, and as such stands in contrast to terms such as androphilia [love of one adult male for another], gerontophilia [love of the old], pedophilia [whether this term is restricted to love of prepubescent children or includes adolescents as well], and “puberophilia” [love of pubescents].

Terminology. The term ephelophobia seems to have been coined by Magnus Hirschfeld in his Wesen der Liebe (1906), where he applied it to sexually mature youths from puberty up to the age of 20; in his 1914 magnum opus, Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes, Hirschfeld specified the range of love objects as from “the beginning to the completion of maturity, so approximately ages 14–21.” The German researcher estimated that 45 percent of all homosexuals were ephelophiles. For women, he used the term “parthenophiles.”

The Greek word which Hirschfeld borrowed for his compound, ephelos, is of various meanings, used for one arrived at adolescence or manhood [at 16 to 18, depending on locality] or at the prime strength and vigor of youth. It seems, however, to have referred to the older youths, those with bearded faces who had outgrown the stage at which they were appropriate as the younger partners in pederasty, but not yet old enough to marry: the prime age for military service. The ancient Greek age of puberty was likely in the mid-teens rather than the younger ages typical of contemporary Western society.

In current usage, the term seems to have dropped the youngest segment of Hirschfeld’s definition, those adolescents just emerging from puberty, and focused on the later years, 17–20. In many societies, this age group is treated as adults for consent purposes, drawing a strong legal and practical boundary between ephelophobia as currently used and the sexual attractions to younger ages. In other societies, ephes are legally on a par with younger children, but in practice sexual activities with them are not as harshly repressed as with the younger group.

According to Hirschfeld, two ephes in love with each other are both ephelophiles, but as attraction of same-aged persons is not of special intrinsic interest, this article will focus on adult ephelophobia.

Popularity of Ephelophobia. Most male prostitutes and models for homosexual pornography seem to be drawn from the ranks of ephes, supporting Hirschfeld’s observation that ephelophobia is a major component of adult homosexuality [in modern Western cultures].

Aesthetic considerations [which may well have biological roots related to the best ages for childbearing] under which in most cultures males prize youthfulness in their sexual partners, whether male or female, play a role in this attraction, but other factors are also significant.

Sex researcher Alfred Kinsey’s 1948 finding that the statistically average white American male reaches his peak sexual activity [measured in orgasms per week] at the age of 17 points to the widely
held belief that ephbes are the most sexually energetic male population group.

Seventeen also appears to be the age at which the average male attains his fully mature erect penile length. This fact, together with other observations, suggests that ephbophiles may be more interested in the late teenager's fully developed and highly energetic maleness, in contrast to pedophiles (here understood as those attracted to younger boys) who seem to be interested in more androgynous or even feminine features (hairlessness, smaller stature, lack of muscular development) and for many if not most of whom the greater sexual interest is in the boy's passive/receptive capabilities. In the classical Greek model of pederasty, the boy's penis played no role.

The combination of heightened sexual energy with a lack of heterosexual outlets (owing to marriage ages in the twenties and restrictions on pre-marital opportunities) and low incomes (characteristic of males still in school, military service, or just beginning to acquire work experience) has in many societies made heterosexual ephbes more available for trade (one-sided) relationships with homosexuals than any other group of heterosexual males.

For many ephbophiles, the naiveté of ephbes is a source of attraction, their enthusiasm for new experiences (including sexual and romantic involvements) contrasted with what is perceived to be the more jaded and sceptical attitudes of other adults.

Psychology of Ephbophilia. Almost nothing of an academic nature has been written about ephbophilia from a psychological perspective. Dr. John Money, who distinguishes the ephbophile from the pedophile, claimed, in his introduction to Theo Sandfort's Boys on Their Contacts with Men (New York, 1987), that "the true ephbophile has an adolescent erotosexual status and is attracted toward, and attractive to teenagers." This idea seems to harken back to the Freudian concepts of arrested development which at one time were supposed to explain adult homosexuality. Certainly, there are ephbophiles who feel most comfortable in the company of ephbes and share many if not most of their tastes, attitudes, and interests. Yet many adults who are sexually attracted to ephbes, and would chose them as prostitutes, pornographic models, or occasional companions, nevertheless do not feel drawn to the social, psychological, or cultural aspects of late adolescence; they do not identify with the adolescent nor with adolescent characteristics in themselves, and hence display no interest in deep personal relationships with ephbes. Presumably, Money would not consider these men "true" ephbophiles.

Ephbophilia is quite striking in prisons and jails, but there the ephbes, being the youngest people present, are prized by heterosexuals as being less "masculine" than adults, and the psychological dynamics of it are quite different from homosexual ephbophilia.

History. The historical development of ephbophilia has yet to be written. The ancient Greeks acknowledged this trait with the term philéfebos (fond of young men) and philoboupais (one who is fond of over-matured boys, "bull-boys" or "husky young men"), but generally slighted it in favor of the pederastic preference. Nevertheless, the athletic games of which the Greeks were so fond featured nude ephbes, the size of whose members received public acclaim, and the victors basked in adulation; Pindar wrote odes to them. (Contemporary athletics, especially at the high school and college levels, still display widespread, if sublimated, ephbophilia on the part of their adult male fans.)

The ancient Romans seem to have drawn a distinction between ephbic prostitutes, who were sexually passive, and those in their twenties (cinaedi), who were sexually active. By the time of the Renaissance, the ephbic ideal as seen in Michelangelo's classic statue of David
(1503-4) had gained wide currency. In contrast, there seems to be little evidence of ephebophilia in the literary tradition of the Islamic countries.

By the mid-nineteenth century, in America Walt Whitman was composing erotic poems of clearly ephebophilic nature, followed by John Addington Symonds with his attraction to strapping young Swiss peasants and robust gondoliers, while in England the ephebic soldiers of the Guards were prized sexual partners.

Examples of ephebophilia in literature include Herman Melville’s Billy Budd and Christopher Isherwood’s autobiographical works, in politics the British imperialist Cecil Rhodes, in art Marsden Hartley, in film Maurice, in popular music Pete Townsend of The Who (“Rough Boys”), in photography Bruce Weber.

Conclusion. In the twentieth century, the dominance of the androphile model of male homosexuality has tended to subsume, appropriate, and obscure the ephebophilic current, and to consider it as a mode of adult–adult relationships rather than as a distinctive type of preference. As it becomes clearer to the research community, however, that the umbrella of homosexuality (and indeed, of sexuality itself) covers a wide variety of behaviors rather than a unitary phenomenon, it can be hoped that further investigation of ephebophilia will result.

Stephen Donaldson

Epicureanism

Knowledge of Epicureanism, the classical rival of Stoicism, is fragmentary because Christians, disliking its atheistic materialism, belief in the accidental existence of the cosmos, and ethical libertarianism, either failed to copy or actually destroyed the detested works. Of all the numerous works composed in antiquity, only Lucretius’ philosophical poem De rerum natura survives intact. Diogenes Laertius reported that Epicurus wrote more than anyone else, including 37 books On Nature. A typical maxim: “We see that pleasure is the beginning and end of living happily.”

Epicurus [341-270 B.C.], the founder of the school, served as an ephbe in Athens at 18 and then studied at the Academy, a fellow classmate of Menander, when Aristotle was absent in Chalcis. Having taught abroad, where he combated the atomist philosophy of Democritus, he returned to Athens and bought his house with a garden in 307/6. There he taught until his death, allowing women and slaves to participate in his lessons—to the shock of traditionalists. Only a few lines of his works survive. Apparently he likened sexual object choice, whether of women or boys, to food preferences—a parallel that often recurred in later times. His beloved Metrodorus predeceased him.

The Epicurean school, consisting of scholars who secluded themselves from society in Epicurus’ garden, lived modestly or even austerely. Stoics, however, libeled the secretive Epicureans because of their professed hedonism, accusing them of profligacy of every kind despite the fact that Epicurus felt that pleasure could be attained only in restraint of some pursuits that in the long run bring more pain than the temporary pleasure they seem to offer. Natural pleasures are easily satisfied, others being unnecessary. The ideal was freedom from destiny by satisfying desire and avoiding the pain of desires too difficult or impossible to satisfy. By freeing man from fear of gods and an afterlife and by teaching him to avoid competition in politics and business it liberates him from emotional turmoil. Friendship was extremely important to Epicureans.

Like its rival Stoicism, Epicureanism along with many other Greek tastes became popular in the late Roman Republic. Lucretius (ca. 94-55 B.C.) seems not to have added any ideas to those taught by Epicurus himself. But others, like the fabulously rich general Lucullus, whose banquets became proverbial, excused their gross sensuality by references to Epicurus’
maxims. Julius Caesar proclaimed himself an Epicurean. Under the Empire Stoicism vanquished its rival and vied with Christianity, which when triumphant anathematized Epicureanism.

The text of Lucretius survived into the Renaissance and was disseminated in printed editions that naturally provoked intense controversy, since the author's materialism and polemics against religion called forth unmeasured attacks and subtle defenses. The author became the favorite of a small coterie of materialists, of the libertines in the seventeenth century, then of the Enlightenment thinkers, and finally of the Soviet Communists, who naturally ranked Epicurus above Plato as the greatest philosopher of antiquity. The rehabilitation of Epicurus was the achievement of Pierre Gassendi (1592–1655), a priest of unimpeachable orthodoxy. Acquainted with most of the leading intellectuals of his time, though not himself a great scientist or a great philosopher, Gassendi exerted enormous influence on both Newton and Leibniz.

For others Epicureanism was a respectable philosophical cloak for mocking impiety or lighthearted sensuality. The intelligent courtesan and leader of fashion Ninon de l’Enclos was of this stamp, while Melière and Cyrano de Bergerac admired Epicurus and Lucretius for their candor, their courage, and their sensible view of life. The Epicurean outlook, accepting sensual pleasure as a good and not as the necessary evil which an ascetic morality would barely allow, opened the way to a more tolerant attitude toward the forbidden forms of sexual expression that is implicit in the work of such philosophers as La Mettrie and of legal reformers such as Beccaria, not to speak of the Marquis de Sade. So Epicurus contributed to the Enlightenment trend toward abolition of the repressive attitudes and laws with which Christianity had burdened all forms of nonprocreative gratification. See also Libertinism.


William A. Percy

EPISCOPALIANISM
See Anglicanism, Protestantism.

ESPIONAGE
In our society the role of espionage operative is one that has certain affinities with homosexuality. Because the homosexual is forced from his mid-teens—from the moment of self-discovery—to lead a double life, the normal boundaries between candor and deception, between loyalty and disloyalty, between self-concealment and self-revelation may be effaced so that a morally ambiguous existence becomes second nature. Unless he has “come out of the closet,” the homosexual is compelled to deceive others as to his real intents and motives in the most private sphere of his life, and he can with relative ease transfer this art of duplicity to his professional activity. The self-discipline that comes from learning to conceal a secret but to live with it for years on end is also an asset of homosexual character that lends itself to a career in espionage. Then, too, the homosexual, typically unmarried, is free of the usual family ties—the “hostages to fortune”—that make the heterosexual loath to leave his home for prolonged service “in the field,” often under the assumed identity that is crucial to his intelligence-gathering role. That is why the successful homosexual is sometimes also the best actor, diplomat, undercover agent, and spy; indeed this very skill in maintaining a façade that convinces the outside world of his “normality” was cited by psychiatric authors of the 1890s as a proof that homosexuality could not be a disease, since the mentally ill are totally unable to orient their behavior with such constant finesse.
Moreover, the homosexual may also harbor a grudge against the society that oppresses him and in rare cases feel justified in harming it as an act of retribution, so that betrayal becomes revenge for past wrongs. John Costello has argued that this motive was important for Anthony Blunt. That he is in certain respects an eternal outsider can deprive him of the final motive for identifying with the governing forces of the society in which he lives. And his involvement in a clandestine network that flourishes in spite of society’s prohibitions and sanctions makes him part of a counterculture that can create its own loyalties and direct its own channels of information and influence.

A further consideration is that the sexual activity of the homosexual exposes him to pressure and blackmail if it becomes known to interested third parties. Magnus Hirschfeld and his supporters made this a prime argument for repealing Paragraph 175 of the Penal Code of Germany, but the echo of their propaganda boomeranged when, during the 1950s McCarthyism, homosexuals were branded as security risks by the United States Government and dismissed from positions even in areas that had nothing to do with military or diplomatic functions.

The earliest instance of a homosexual’s using his contacts for espionage purposes that became publicly known was that of the First Secretary of the French Legation in Berlin, Raymond Lecomte, who infiltrated the circle around Prince Philipp von Eulenburg and revealed to the Quai d’Orsay that Germany was bluffing in the first Morocco crisis (January–April 1906). This episode provoked open charges against Eulenburg on the part of the journalist Maximilian Harden, leading to the trial and disgrace of the Kaiser’s intimate friend. Then in 1913 the Austrian authorities discovered that Alfred Redl, the homosexual head of the military intelligence service of the Dual Monarchy, had been acting as a double agent on behalf of Russian officials who had taken advantage of his need for money. A contrasting case is that of the celebrated [T. E.] Lawrence of Arabia, who functioned on his own country’s behalf in reconnaissance and subversion in the Ottoman Empire before and during World War I.

More recently, in the era of the cold war the case of two British diplomats, Guy Burgess and Donald Maclean, was paraded before the public to demonstrate that homosexuality was tantamount to sympathy for communism and proclivity for treason. The art historian Anthony Blunt was also implicated, but his part in the affair did not come to light until many years later, when he was stripped of his knighthood. It was subsequently claimed that Blunt was the ringleader, using his knowledge of the sexual proclivities of the British establishment for blackmail to advance his work for the Soviet cause.

In February 1950, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin made “sex pervets in government” an issue with which to attack the Truman Administration, and a Senate subcommittee of 4 Democrats and 3 Republicans upheld his charges—even though the only case which it could cite was that of Redl in 1913—after another investigation had accused him of perpetrating a “fraud and a hoax” on the Senate by using unimportant and public information as the basis for groundless assertions, mainly that some Federal employees had been members of the Communist Party. [See McCarthyism.]

For two decades a policy of excluding homosexuals from “sensitive” positions prevailed in official circles in the United States and its allies, and it is only recently that the public position of the State Department and other administrative agencies has begun to change. Behind the scenes, however, the reality was probably little different from what it has been in the past, simply because the heterosexual cannot always acquire the art of duplicity which the homosexual must often master as a condition of survival in an unyieldingly hostile environment. The politically
compromising nature of successful espionage—and the fact that records of such operations belong to a nation's most secret and inaccessible files—will keep the full truth from being known for decades if not generations. Only the breakdown of society's taboos could genuinely alter the situation—and perhaps deprive a few homosexuals of the motive for mastering an exceedingly dangerous but sometimes psychologically and financially rewarding profession.


Warren Johansson

**ETHICS**

Ethics may be defined as a body of moral principles which are capable of application to human conduct. The term also designates the branch of philosophy that studies such principles.

In recent times the general ethical upheaval in Western civilization occasioned by the decline of Christianity and the rise of relativism has substantially eroded the earlier consensus on ethical norms. The resulting pluralism and openness has had a leveling effect, making it possible for such formerly marginalized groups as homosexuals to have their concerns addressed on the same plane of seriousness as the mainstream. Nonetheless, the lingering sense of guilt that afflicts some gay men and lesbians may foster a gnawing sense that they are somehow deficient in ethical responsibility.

It is a notable fact that homosexuals, a stigmatized minority, nonetheless remain basically law abiding and respectful of the rights of others. They scarcely live in the profligate state of "unconditional self-surrender to the immoral" that is the caricature of the hostile ignorant.

*Ethical Dilemmas of Homosexuals.* Few ethical questions are pertinent to homosexuals alone, but several need to be considered as they are of frequent occurrence in daily life.

Older analyses of the matter contain discussions about whether it is right to engage in homosexual activity at all. Those who take this position almost invariably base their arguments on some particular tradition of religious rigorism or asceticism. In the sense that human sex organs make the behavior possible, homosexuality is not unnatural; nor is it per se injurious. It is a reasonable assumption, in view of the collapse of the earlier consensus rooted in Judeo-Christian precepts, that the censorious view that homosexual acts are in and of themselves unethical will continue to recede in prominence and plausibility.

But once this negative and anti-humanistic approach is discarded, other concerns arise. For the practicing homosexual or lesbian, maintenance of the closet—the age-old habit of hiding heterodox sexual preferences—poses a challenge. Should one refrain from coming out to one's parents in order to spare them stress, or will they benefit from the disclosure in the long run? Should an individual refuse to take his lover on a holiday visit to his parents in order to save them emotional turmoil? Is the obligation to live a truthful life higher than the duty to avoid causing others distress? Should one reveal one's sexual identity to blatant homophobes, or to personal enemies who may use the fact to one's patent disadvantage? To what extent is it ethical to "pass" at all? In the heyday of gay liberation in the 1970s it was often maintained that every gay person's obligation is to come out. However, there is general agreement that coming out remains in the last analysis a personal decision; it is wrong to reveal someone else's homosexuality without his or her consent (this reservation is sometimes termed "closet rights").
Then there are issues of fairness to sexual partners. Some commentators grounded in conservative religious traditions hold that sexual conduct is only permissible with a partner to whom one has pledged lifelong fidelity. Such a conclusion is for the most part binding only within the context of a larger commitment to a religious tradition. Setting this restriction aside, other questions crowd in. Given the sexual pluralism to which many gay men are accustomed, are they not especially prone to sexual objectification? Is such objectification necessarily immoral in and of itself? What about "cheating" on partners? If one has been engaging in "extramarital" sex, what precautions must one take to protect one's regular partner from possible exposure to venereal disease? In practice questions of this kind can often be resolved by frank discussion with the partner, or in some settings by an implicit mutual agreement. Thus if two men meet at a gay bathhouse each can assume that the other has no reservations about sexual objectification.

It is difficult to say whether one should attempt to formulate a broader code of morality for homosexuals. Even this structure would probably be best accommodated in the larger framework of the values of the society. For example, in traditional China it was believed that each individual has a duty to his ancestors to produce offspring. The toleration of homosexuality that existed there reflected the fact that this precept was generally honored. Thus in China a homosexual ethic might include a concession to spending at least part of one's life in heterosexual marriage, a concession that Western homosexuals feel no obligation to make.

University courses in ethics rarely consider homosexuals and their distinctive problems, and extrapolations may be difficult. Further, homosexual writers and organizations—apart from religious groups—tend to neglect this realm. Even psychological questionnaire studies on truthfulness and honesty pose queries that make virtually every homosexual seem to be living in a world of duplicity and moral unreliability. Fusing with existing prejudice, this outcome has lead some hostile observers of the gay lifestyle to the mistaken conclusion that the homosexual is trapped in a maze of concealment and deception that makes him a dubious confidant or employee.

This neglect of ethics on the part of gay organizations is in part a legacy of the ignorance of earlier decades followed by the "anything goes" mentality of the 1960s, but it may reflect a deeper sense that morality is a matter of personal privacy and judgment, or of justifiable diplomacy in private life. Admirable as such restraint may be in principle, it tends to leave the young person in search of guidance with only slender resources. In practice one may obtain some help from a sympathetic counselor, but the value of such advice depends on the competence and insight of the giver.

Research Problems. A different set of problems arises in connection with social-science research conducted on homosexual subjects. In order to obtain optimal samples, modern techniques require random selection of the members of the survey "universe," with replies from all or almost all of those queried. In speaking to those who are planning to vote in an election for president this goal is not difficult to achieve, but with a private [even for some persons still taboo] realm such as sexuality the obstacles are almost unsurmountable. In the course of his research for a monograph on toilet sex, Tea Room Trade [Chicago, 1970], Laud Humphreys noted the licence plate numbers of the patrons [who had come by car] and, after tracing them, interviewed the participants in their homes. Although the names were not disclosed, some other scholars felt that an invasion of privacy had occurred. In the 1980s concerns were raised about the ethics of testing new drugs for AIDS. With increasing sensitivity among researchers to ethical practices with human subjects,
inappropriate procedures are likely to be subjected to vigorous criticism and subsequent corrective action—at least in democratic societies.

Wayne R. Dynes

ETHNOLOGY

See Anthropology.

ETHNOPHAILSM

This rare term (coined by Abra-
ham Roback) serves as a useful designation for the chauvinistic practice of human groups to attribute the origin—or at least prevalence—of social failings to neighboring groups or peoples. Thus we speak of German measles, of taking French leave, and of going Dutch. In former times Italians blithely dubbed syphilis the mal francese (or morbus gallicus), while Frenchmen returned the compliment with their mal florentin (or mal de Naples).

In the case of homosexual behavior, ethnophaulism is not only a type of group slander, but it also reflects a curiosity to trace the custom to its purported source, in keeping with "popular diffusionism," which overlooks the possibility that such behavior patterns are human universals. Thus, in eighteenth-century England, when native homosexual behavior had been documented for centuries and when important innovations seem to have been occurring in the conceptualization of homosexual acts, the fashion continued to ascribe the custom to Italy.

Divided as they were into many competing city states, the Greeks were given to ascribing unusual sexual predilections to neighboring, but distinct Hellenic groups, as well as to foreigners. Ostensibly special proficiency in fellatio obtained among the inhabitants of the island of Lesbos (its association with female homosexuality became commonplace only in comparatively recent times) and the alien Phoenicians. At various times unusual fondness for pederasty was remarked in Crete [Plato and others held that the institution began there], at Sparta, Chalcis, and the island of Siphnos. To become blatantly homosexual was sometimes called "taking ship for Messalia," after the ancient Greek colony on the site of modern Marseille, which perhaps acquired its renown through propinquity with the notoriously homosexual Celts. The Scythians, northern neighbors of the Greeks, were associated with a particular type of effeminacy. Among a basically tolerant people such as the Greeks, these ethnophaulic appellations have more the character of a bemused chiding than harsh reproach, much as we would say today "X is German and likes to work hard," or "Y's Scottish background makes him thrifty."

In the first century B.C. the Roman writer Cornelius Nepos seems to have been the first to describe pederasty simply as "Greek love." The Romans themselves were often charged with special devotion to the "posterior Venus" with various wordplays on the palindrome Roma = Amor.

In later times in Europe there were various expressions associating sodomy with Italy. In 1422 the Zutich Rat- und Rechtbuch, a legal text, designated the practice by the verb flozenzen, suggesting that the city of Florence had developed a particular reputation in this regard. Pierre de Brantôme (ca. 1540–1614) described the fashion for lesbian liaisons in sixteenth-century France with the Italian phrase "donna con donna" (lady with lady). At the courts of Louis XII and XIV male homosexual proclivities were traced to Italy, as in the Sun King's sarcastic comment "La France devenue italienne!" In England Sir Edward Coke (1552–1634) thought that Lombard bankers had introduced sodomy in the late Middle Ages, while in the eighteenth century Italian opera was held to be a source of new infection. Ironically, Mussolini was later to reject a proposal to criminalize homosexuality in his country on the grounds that its practice was limited to rich foreign tourists. The rural
inhabitants of Albania, who until recently boasted a rich indigenous tradition of pederasty, nonetheless sometimes designated their custom as madžupi, derived from madžūp, “Gypsy,” implying that pederasty had been brought in from the outside by this wandering people.

Some French writers localized the customs in other zones of the Mediterranean littoral. French trade with Arab countries and the occupation of North Africa (beginning in 1830) are probably responsible for the popularity of such expressions as moeurs levantines and moeurs arabes. Just after the turn of the century, the Krupp and Eulentburg-von Moltke scandals contributed greatly to the popularity in a hostile France of the expression vice allemand, apparently reviving a notion current there in the time of Frederick II the Great in the second half of the eighteenth century. The temptation to hurl such charges becomes particularly great in wartime as seen in an absurd volume by Samuel Igra, Germany’s National Vice (London, 1945), which even alleges that Hitler had been a male prostitute. A more general type of ethnophaulism, found both in Communist and some Third World countries, claims that the Western industrial nations collectively are declining because of their tolerance of “unnatural vice.” As a kind of silver lining, if only that, we may be grateful that the appearance of AIDS, whose spread has been connected both to Africa and the United States, has not led to any general international label of origin. While such hopes must be proffered with diffidence, perhaps some degree of reason is beginning to prevail in these matters.

See also Fascist Perversion.


Wayne R. Dynes

ETIOLOGY

Etiology is the study of the factors that contribute to the occurrence of a disease or abnormal condition. As such the term has been employed in inquiries and speculations regarding the causes of homosexual behavior. In medicine the significance of etiology is that it is the necessary starting point for therapy and even more for prophylaxis, to which modern public health programs owe their chief successes in the eradication of disease.

Historical Perspectives. The application of the idea of etiology to same-sex behavior stems from several judgmental perspectives. The broad outlines of their reasoning are as follows. (1) If homosexuality is mere depravity—moral failure rooted in individual caprice and self-indulgence—then society is justified in ostracizing and punishing those who engage in it. Such measures would serve as a warning to others to amend their conduct, which they can do through an exercise of free will. (2) If, however, homosexuality is a psychological condition that has arisen independent of the conscious will of the individual, then therapeutic measures of one kind or another are called for. These must be imposed for the good of the individual and that of society. (3) Yet again, the homosexual may be simply manifesting an inborn and unmodifiable condition determined by hereditary or genetic factors; then society is well advised to leave him alone as neither punishment nor therapy will change his orientation.

The Pathological Explanation. For many centuries the first interpretation—the abuse of free will—was virtually the only one admitted in Christian Europe, and accordingly habitual sodomites were seen as criminals and outcasts for whom no punishment could be too severe. The matter fell in the realm of the criminal law and the role of the forensic physician was ancillary. Only in the nineteenth century, when the early homophile apologists had drawn the attention of psychiatrists such as Karl Westphal and Richard
von Krafft-Ebing to the existence of exclusively homosexual individuals, did the notion of sexual inversion as a pathological state raise the question of etiology, properly speaking. The psychiatrists of the late nineteenth century were inclined to organic explanations that made homosexuality a consequence of hereditary degeneration of the central nervous system—and some people even now thoughtlessly brand homosexuals as "degenerates." Little do they suspect that with the acceptance of the findings of Mendel and Weismann that acquired characteristics cannot be inherited—for good or for ill—the notion of hereditary degeneration ceased to exist for medical science.

A variant was that homosexuality resulted from the psychological vicissitudes of early childhood. This idea had a few adherents in the nineteenth century, but found much broader support in the twentieth, thanks to such psychiatrists as Albert von Schrenck-Notzing and psychoanalysts of whom Isidor Sadger and Alfred Adler are the most outstanding. In the view of such writers, homosexuality was a fixation in a stage of psychological development which normal individuals left behind on their way to adult heterosexuality. An assortment of fears and attachments in childhood left an indelible impression on the psyche of the individual, and this complex of factors triggered a homosexual orientation. This thinking offered a rationale for the compulsory psychotherapy imposed upon some young homosexuals by their parents and upon others by judges in lieu of a prison sentence.

The Shift to a More Positive View. During the same period a very different view emerged. As early as 1896 such defenders of homosexual rights as Magnus Hirschfeld, Marc-André Raffalovich, and Albert Aletrino held that homosexuality was a non-pathological variation within the human species, inborn and unmodifiable, occurring in all races in all epochs of history in approximately the same degree and with roughly the same range of constitutional types. And in fact more than a century of medical and biological research has failed to discover any common denominator in exclusively homosexual subjects other than their sexual orientation. If a specific cause underlies the sexual orientation of such individuals, genetic science has thus far been unable to identify it.

Other Etiologies. Other explanations have been defended from time to time. One is that hormonal imbalance or some glandular abnormality causes homosexuality, but therapies grounded in these assumptions have had little result. The attempt of biologists such as Richard Goldschmidt to prove that all homosexuals were constitutional intersexes ("disguised" members of the opposite sex) has also found no confirmation. Moralizing psychiatrists such as Edmund Bergler have argued that homosexuality is the outcome of the seduction by older homosexuals of adolescents who are then trapped in an orientation into which they initiate younger males in their own adulthood—a view paralleling the interpretation offered by the second edition of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia published at the end of Stalin's lifetime. And simple-minded fundamentalists believe that homosexuality is the result of demonic possession or some equally malign spell cast by the evil powers of another world.

Edward O. Wilson and other advocates of sociobiology have offered several explanations based on the concept of "inclusive fitness." In this view homosexuals and lesbians who have no offspring of their own assure the transmission of their genes by helping siblings and their children. This factor would account for the transmission of a trait that otherwise cannot be accounted for in modern Darwinism.

A fifteen-year longitudinal study by Richard Green defined sissy boys as cross-dressing, role playing as girls, frequently playing with dolls, and avoiding
rough-and-tumble sports. Such boys were found to be much more likely to become homosexual than a control group. This finding, though it has been supported by several other scholars, probably cannot be generalized, since a large proportion of adult homosexuals report no effeminacy in childhood, while others were without excessive difficulty able to suppress the traits, becoming masculine in appearance while still homosexual.

**Correlations and Ulterior Motives.** Whatever the etiology proposed by a given author, the political correlation has been fairly clear. With a bare handful of exceptions, those who believed in the genetic or constitutional determination of homosexuality have been supporters of gay rights. Conversely, many who upheld the theory of the neurotic or environmental origin of the condition (which they tended to regard as a “disease”) have, historically, been antagonistic to the homophile movement. More recently, however, many anthropologists and sociologists, even if they profess that human behavior is by large culturally rather than biologically conditioned, have expressed toleration for a plurality of lifestyles. The old school racked its brains to discover rationalizations for refusing to abolish the medieval laws, to recognize gay organizations, or to grant plaintiffs in court cases the rights which they sought. In not a few instances a kind of ideological shadow boxing occurs; those who insist upon the neurotic causes of homosexuality in reality think of it as depravity, while those who champion the genetic origin are obliquely dismissing the moral condemnation that derives from Christian theology with its absolute rejection of all “non-procreative” sexual activity.

**Future Directions.** A valid account of the causes of homosexual behavior must take account of the dialectic of sexual dimorphism. In so doing it must attempt a unified-field theory of sexual development that will account for the whole spectrum of orientation, including shifts within a single individual's lifetime. Thus heterosexual behavior demands an explanation as much as homosexual conduct. Also, a distinction must be drawn between the macroevolutionary causes of homosexuality (Why do homosexual behavior and response occur in *homo sapiens*? Why does exclusive homosexuality occur?) and the microevolutionary causes (Why do homosexual response and behavior occur in a particular individual? Why is a given individual exclusively homosexual?). Not only must teleological conceptions of the “purpose” of sexuality be discarded in order to reach a scientific answer to the above questions, but the perspectives of different disciplines must be brought to bear to separate the phylogenetic from the ontogenetic (the species-wide phenomenon from the individual case history).

A solution to the question of causes will involve a rethinking and revision of the confusions introduced by the older concepts of etiology, fraught as they are with the insinuation that homosexual behavior is tainted with pathology. No progress can be made as long as research is hobbled with such an a priori judgment. The answer will also require integration of new scientific perspectives and findings which are still unfolding.


*Warren Johansson*
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**ETRUSCANS**

The Etruscans were the dominant people in central and northern Italy from the ninth to the second centuries B.C. Their civilization stood at its prime from the sixth to the third century B.C., but the language has not for the most part been
ETRUSCANS

interpreted, so that our knowledge of them must rest at present on an examination of their art.

Most of what has been discovered is the contents and decorations of tombs. As the goods found in them show, the Etruscans had close cultural and commercial ties with the ancient Greeks. Indeed, Otto Brendel states that “Etruscan is a branch of the civilization which we call classical,” going on to say that “it constitutes the only known case of a contemporary classical art apart from the Greek.” The achievement of the Etruscans has been obscured by their conquerors, the Romans, whom they greatly influenced.

Etruscan civilization incorporated an unmistakable male homosexual element, readily seen in tomb frescoes, bronze sculptures, utensils, urns (cistae), and mirrors. This is not to say that Etruscan art does not celebrate heterosexuality (which it does), but rather that homosexual components are strongly present, as with both the Greeks and the Romans.

The earliest homosexual image appears on the fresco of the rear wall of the so-called Tomb of the Bulls at Tarquinia (one of the earliest tombs excavated to date, from ca. 540 B.C.), showing what is almost certainly one man anally penetrating another who has horns and who is, in turn, being charged by a bull. The iconography of this tomb has not been satisfactorily interpreted but it may have religious connotations. Symposium scenes were popular in the fifth century; they frequently featured naked and semi-naked male dancers and musicians in an all-male setting and bring to mind similar contemporary scenes on Greek vases, which have been found massively in Etruscan graves.

Bronze sculptures celebrating the nude male body inaugurated an Italian sculptural tradition which continues to the present day. These statues show close links with Etruscan terracotta sculptures and with Greek sculpture. Naked males frequently appear on Etruscan candelabras and incense burners in the form of satyrs or sportsmen. They become an elaborate motif on the handles of the lids of cistae dating from the early fourth century B.C.; these were apparently toilet boxes and were buried with the owner. Some of the earliest examples feature two clothed warriors carrying a dead warrior (also wearing clothes), but later all three figures are naked. By the late third century they become even more openly homoerotic—as on a cista in the Museo Archeologico, Palestrina, which shows Dionysus and a satyr.

The sides of cistae were frequently engraved with scenes from Greek mythology. The Chrysippos cista (ca. 350 B.C.; Villa Giulia, Rome) features the homosexual abduction of Chrysippos by Laios. The largest and finest cista, the so-called Ficorini Cista (ca. 400 B.C.; Villa Giulia), signed Novios Plauus in Latin, is virtually a symphony to the nude male body showing it in seventeen separate poses (two other figures are clothed). One naked figure, with his back to us and one arm tantalizingly covering his anus, puts his arm around the neck of another unconcealed male, who wears only a helmet and gazes longingly at him. Another, by contrast, offers his backside to the viewer: a pose which was to be repeated in frescoes in Pompeii and later in oil paintings from the Renaissance on and was to become a classic motif suggesting homosexuality. The eroticism of this cista suggests that the artist was homosexual.

Engravings behind Etruscan bronze mirrors also celebrate the male body in homoerotic terms. Some, such as a mirror displaying Hercules and Atlas (ca. 460 B.C.), are little more than an excuse for depicting the naked male body. In another mirror, a naked youth reaches up to kiss a rather mannish woman while another gazes longingly at the youth’s body (ca. 450 B.C.); while such a mirror may have been used by a woman, its underlying male homoeroticism is undeniable. Some bronze mirrors were cast in relief: one late-fifth-century example depicts the homo-
sexual abduction of Cephalos by Eos; another, one of the most tantalizing objects in Etruscan art, depicts two naked winged males, one of whom holds what is apparently a dildo, flanking a naked frontal youth.

The largest collection of Etruscan art adorns the Villa Giulia in Rome, a museum entirely devoted to artefacts of this ancient people. The monograph of Otto G. Brendel discusses the major surviving objects.


Paul Knobel

ETYMOLOGY

The discipline of etymology seeks to explain the origin of words, whether they are inherited from a reconstructed parent language, borrowed from a known foreign tongue, or simply invented in historic time. The etymologist examines the earliest attestations of a word, variations in its form, explanatory glosses or comments in early texts, parallels in other languages, and terms derived from the same root or related in meaning to ascertain what was the source of the word. A secondary matter is the history of a word or word family, the changes in meaning or frequency of use over centuries or even millennia, and the role which a particular term may play in the political or cultural life of the speech community to which it belongs, or in the case of international terms, even of the entire world.

The word lesbian, for example, serves in all the modern languages of Europe to designate a woman erotically attracted to her own sex; it is derived from the Greek island of Lesbos, where the poetess Sappho lived in the sixth century before our era. Sodomite, the term used in medieval Europe for the sinner guilty of unnatural vice, comes from the city of Sodom, which according to Genesis 19 was destroyed by a rain of brimstone and fire on account of the depravity of its inhabitants. Bugger, a word attested in English beginning with the law of Henry VIII in 1533, stems from the Old French bougre, “heretic”, then “sodomite” and even “usurer,” which in turn came from Medieval Latin Bulgars—name of the Slavic people who called themselves bulgarinu—because their land was a center of the Bogomil heresy akin to the Catharism of Southern France. Tribade, the older word for “lesbian” in European languages, came from the Classical Greek tribêin “to rub,” hence tribades were women who obtained erotic satisfaction by friction against each other’s bodies. Homosexual, by contrast, is a modern term invented by the German-Hungarian translator and bibliographer Károly Mária Kerényi in 1869 from the Greek homo, “same,” and Medieval Latin sexualis, “sexual,” on the model of French unisexual and bisexuel which had been introduced as terms of botany in the 1790s. Pederast, a word whose meaning differs from language to language in modern times, is the Classical Greek paiderastes which unambiguously denoted “boy-lover.”

An ancient doctrine, now discarded, maintained that similarities in the form of words are not accidental, but offer a key to understanding. Thus Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636) referred the Latin name of the kite, milvus, to mollis, “soft, effeminate,” attesting to the supposed homosexual proclivities of the bird. The search for such links probably stems from a quasi-magical world view, in which knowledge of the true meanings of words gives the privileged knower control over things.

Such associative techniques, resting on foundations as old as Plato’s dialogue Cratylus, are not unlike folk etymologies, which stem from the effort of naive and uneducated speakers to explain unfamiliar terms by relating them to the lexical core of a language. At times these folk etymologies can lead to the deformation of a word in popular speech which ultimately
finds its way into the literary language. A good example of this in Modern English is faggot for “effeminate male homosexual.” The folk etymology of this word is that it derives from the male sodomites who were used as faggots (bundles of firewood) when witches were burned at the stake. Little does it matter to the folk mind that the word is attested in its homosexual meaning only in American English in 1914, that it comes from the dialectal use of faggot (and fadge) in the sense of “fat, slovenly woman,” and that the penalty for buggery in English law was hanging, not burning at the stake, which was the punishment of heretics until the homosexual monarch James I put an end to the practice. The speaker who knows faggot only in its primary meaning (and does not consult such a source as Wright’s English Dialect Dictionary) can accept such an explanation because it matches his imperfect command of the range of senses of the word with his hazy recollection that “in the Middle Ages people were burned at the stake for various crimes that offended the church.”

The origin of dyke in the sense of “lesbian” (with the variant bulldyke) has inspired several folk etymologies, because the exact source of the term is unknown. One of the more fanciful interpretations is that the word is a deformation of Boadicca, the name of the British queen who fought against the Roman invaders. A more recent interpretation of the second syllable of bulldyke is that it comes from the American slang expression “to be diked out,” presumably in male attire. A possible etymology is that the second element is the word tyke in the meaning “bitch,” attested in English and other Germanic languages; a bulldyke would then be “a bitch who behaves like a bull” (the male animal par excellence). In American English tyke has gone its own way to become an endearing expression for a child, hence the organization of lesbian mothers Dykes ’n Tykes.

The English language may lend itself to etymological curiosity and speculation more than others because so much of its vocabulary is foreign, hence the perennial question “What does it mean?,” while the native vocabulary is often opaque to the specialist because its origins are lost in the obscure centuries of Middle and Old English. Also, in the sexual realm there has been a long battle between the vulgar terms banned from literature and public life and the learned euphemisms that were created or borrowed so that certain topics could be discussed at all. It is commonly believed that the little “four-letter words” that cannot be used in polite conversation are of Anglo-Saxon origin, when in fact most of them are not attested in the Old English period, and Anglo-Saxon had its own sexual vocabulary, now lost even in the British dialects.

The etymon of a word was supposedly its “true” meaning, but to the professional linguist it is only an earlier meaning or form. In the case of the modern languages most words can be traced to sources attested in medieval and ancient writing, and recent coinages can often be assigned to a particular author who first used them in speech or print. For the general public, literature on “word origins” can be an entertaining set of anecdotes, while for the specialist the discipline of etymology is a clue to problems in cultural history, as words can preserve customs and beliefs of bygone eras even when their primary meaning is lost in the mists of time.

See also Language and Linguistics.

Warren Johansson

EUGENE, PRINCE OF SAVOY (1663–1736)
Austrian general and statesman. Born the son of Eugène Maurice count of Soissons and Olympia Mancini, a niece of Cardinal Mazarin, Eugene was destined for the clerical profession by Louis XIV,
but in 1683 fled from Paris to the court of the Holy Roman [Austrian] emperor, as he was denied entry into the French army. In 1697 he was entrusted with the high command in the Turkish war (1683–99), and at Cénta on September 11, 1697, he won a decisive victory against the sultan’s forces. In the War of the Spanish Succession his victories over the French at Carpi and Chiari (1701) contributed to the conclusion of the Grand Alliance at The Hague. The victory over France and Bavaria at Höchstädt on the Danube on August 13, 1704 was the outcome of his strategic planning and collaboration with the British under the duke of Marlborough. After the death of margrave Ludwig Wilhelm of Baden, Eugene was named imperial field marshal by the Diet. Fighting alongside Marlborough once more, he won victories at Oudenaarde (1708) and Malplaquet (1709). He was commissioned by the emperor to conduct the preliminary peace negotiations at The Hague in 1709, and to represent Austria at the peace conference at Rastatt and Baden in 1714. In the Turkish War of 1714–18, after victories at Petrovaradin and Temesvár he besieged the fortress of Belgrade, where on August 16, 1717, he defeated an enormous Turkish relief force and by capturing Belgrade decided the outcome of the struggle. Court intrigues and a subsequent crisis in which Eugene was involved ended with his complete vindication, but led him in 1725 to renounce the governor generalship of the Austrian Netherlands which he had occupied since the War of the Spanish Succession.

Eugene of Savoy was the most talented general of his day and a far-sighted politician as well, one who replaced the dynastic outlook of the seventeenth century with the concept of raison d’état. A generous patron of the arts and sciences, he entertained relations with Montesquieu, Voltaire, Leibniz, and the historian Mura- tori; in Vienna he had the Belvedere Palace built by Johann Lukas von Hildebrandt. In nationality and character he was Italian; although he understood German, he never wrote a sentence in that language. As a general and a statesman he served the multi-national Habsburg monarchy and the Holy Roman empire; his political horizon was still that of the feudal order based on a harmony of the estates, not the democratic outlook of the later eighteenth century. In the twentieth century German National Socialism and Italian fascism claimed him as one of their predecessors in the struggle for a “new order” in Europe—rather anachronistically, although he did acquire Hungary and the South Slavic lands for the Habsburg crown.

Eugene lived at a time when his lack of interest in the opposite sex could be lauded by naive panegyrist as meaning that he was “chaste and pure as a seraph.” His long association with countess Eleonora Bathány led to no greater intimacy than card playing, never to marriage. His enemies, however, whispered that he “does not bother with women, a couple of handsome pages are his métier.” He even received the nickname “Mars without Venus.” His best friend at the court of Louis XIV was also homosexual, the Prince de Turenne, who accompanied him on his flight to Austria. But while the prince repented and returned home, Eugene vowed that he would set foot on French soil again only at the head of a hostile army—and kept his word. Only a few anecdotes surfaced in regard to his sexual life, but these tell enough. One is a soldier’s song in kitchen Latin that alludes to his voyage on the Rhone River with his friend, the marquis de la Moussaye. When a storm broke out, the general dreaded the worst, but the Marquis consoled him with the words: Securæ sunt nostræ vitæ/ Sumus enim sodomitas/ Ignem tantum peritiur/Landeriri, “Our lives are safe/ For we are sodomites/Destined to perish only by fire/ We shall land.” A comment made by Schulten- berg in 1709 should probably read that the prince enjoyed “la petite débâche et la [p]il de la dela tout,” which means that he derived his sexual gratification from
the virile member—of others. So Eugene of Savoy was one of those military figures whose homosexuality freed them to devote their lives to a dangerous career without the distractions of a wife and family, and he is remembered as one of the ablest generals in Austrian history.


*Warren Johansson*

**EULENBURG UND HERTEFELD, PHILIPP FÜRST ZU (1847–1921)**

German politician and diplomat, an intimate of Kaiser Wilhelm II. A former guards officer, jurist, and owner of a vast estate, he entered the German diplomatic corps in 1877. Eulenburg formed a close personal relationship with the future Kaiser in 1886 thanks to which he was able to play a key role in German politics that far exceeded his official position as Ambassador to Austria-Hungary (1894–1903). He both reinforced the megalomania of the Kaiser and judged him critically, but also acted as intermediary between Wilhelm II and the Foreign Office.

Eulenburg was the center of a homosexual clique that was effectively penetrated by the first secretary of the French legation and later ambassador to Berlin, Raymond Lecomte (1857–1921), who used his position to reveal to the Quai d’Orsay that Germany was bluffing in the Morocco crisis of January–April 1906, which ended in a French diplomatic victory at the Algeciras Conference. This reverse for Germany inspired a bitter attack on Eulenburg and his circle in November 1906 by Maximilian Harden, the jingoist editor of *Die Zukunft*, an influential political weekly. In the series of trials that followed, Harden was victorious and Eulenburg was exposed as a homosexual and socially ruined, spending the remaining years of his life in isolation on his country estate, though he was spared the final disgrace of imprisonment. The **Scientific-Humanitarian Committee**, the homosexual rights organization headed by Magnus Hirschfeld, who testified as an expert witness, suffered a severe setback and loss of support, and the monarchy itself was exposed to such humiliation that the whole subject has been a “blind spot” for German historians ever since. Although this episode was the Watergate of the Second Reich, references to it in standard works are laconic and uninformative. In all likelihood, the missing piece in the picture was Wilhelm II’s own homosexuality—hence the peculiar attachment that gave Eulenburg such influence over his sovereign in the shaping of German foreign policy, which Lecomte in turn intercepted to his country’s advantage. Ironically enough, it was the journalistic use of the term *homosexual* in the vast contemporary coverage of this scandalous affair that confirmed it as the usual word for the subject in German and the other modern languages.


*Warren Johansson*

**EUNUCHS**

Eunuchs are men or boys whose testes or external genitals have been removed. This condition differs from other physical defects such as amputation of the hand or foot or removal of the eye in that, at various historical epochs it was intentionally created, so that the eunuch had not merely a physical or medical but also a social definition.

*Antiquity.* The practice of castrating slaves or prisoners of war began in the Ancient Near East and reached Greece
as a cultural influence from the Orient. The Greeks themselves anachronistically ascribed the invention of the eunuch to the legendary Assyrian queen Semiramis. In Babylonia and Assyria (Mesopotamia) eunuchs played a major role both as officials of the royal court and as members of the priestly castes in the temples. Eunuchs held the highest offices as chamberlains of the sovereign and as provincial governors. The heterosexual employ of the eunuch, then and later in the Islamic Middle Ages, was as guardian of the harem. In religion the assimuru and kurgaru had both erotic and mantic functions, serving as hierodules and as practitioners of incantation and magic, particularly in connection with the cult of Ishtar, who had supposedly consecrated their status. The Akkadian texts describe the eunuch as sinnisanu, "effeminate," and even as a "half-man," anticipating the Latin seminvir. The courtier served his ruler sexually much as the hierodule served the worshipper—in the passive role.

In Greece the keeping of eunuchs as slaves began gradually toward the end of the fifth century B.C., increased during the Hellenistic period, and reached Rome in the second century, becoming more frequent under the principate and then the empire. Eunuchs as costly slaves serving their masters in highly personalized functions were part of the economic stratification of Greco-Roman society: they were acquired by the wealthiest classes to perform the functions of housekeeper, valet, guard, and tutor. The political role of the eunuch was a function of the Orientalization of the Hellenistic and Roman administrations; where the Greek presence was strongest, eunuchs only exceptionally acquired power and influence at court; but where the layer of Hellenization was thin and superficial, eunuchs were able to assert their age-old position in the political hierarchy. The eunuchs' interests, while coinciding with those of the ruler, often collided with those of the upper strata of the aristocracy, so that they excellently served a centralizing monarchical power.

Castration was most often inflicted on slaves without their consent to enhance their value as merchandise. The operation was usually performed on boys in childhood, but if the object was to market the boy as a catamite, castration was effected at the onset of puberty so that sexual response would be present. While Roman law forbade castration, it never sought to restrict the trade in eunuchs imported from foreign lands. The wealthiest members of the Roman upper class did not shrink from paying enormous sums for particularly handsome eunuchs.

The outstanding characteristic of the eunuch in the ancient mind was his effeminacy, equated with physical weakness and unfitness for military service. In the sexual sphere the eunuch was supposed to behave "like a woman," that is, to take the passive-effeminate role in a relationship with a man. In this role the eunuch was deemed neither male nor female, but as a kind of third sex, tertium genus hominum. The effeminacy and sterility of the eunuch were a stigma even in the pagan world, and more so in Christian times. On the other hand, the social isolation of the eunuch made him ever more dependent upon his master for advancement, and this assured his loyalty—a quality praised by ancient writers.

The mentality of the eunuchs and of those who kept them must be seen against the background of the markedly transsexualizing tendencies of Hellenistic and then Roman society. The Greeks in particular were aware that the practice of keeping eunuchs as catamites differed enormously from the pederastic relationship in which the emphasis lay in developing the virile qualities of the younger partner to ready him for his duties as warrior and as citizen. It was an aspect of Eastern sensuality and servility that contradicted and undermined the social values of paiderasteia. But when the conquests of Alex-
ander the Great broke down the barriers between Hellenic and Near Eastern cultures, the sexual customs of the Orient gained ground in the Hellenistic monarchies. Alexander himself loved the Persian eunuch Bagoas. As Hellenistic culture spread to Rome, so did the role of eunuchs as effeminated passive partners for Roman men. The general Fabius Valens (about 69) had a retinue of "concubines and eunuchs." Titus, Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, Commodus, Caracalla, Heliogabalus, and others were accompanied by such exoleti, and some emperors and other magnates even celebrated marriages with their favorite eunuchs. Nero went so far as to confer upon the eunuch Sporus the honors of an emperor. Roman moralists criticized the practice of castrating slaves as a violation of their human dignity and as an act of cruelty, even while Roman society tacitly acknowledged the right of the owner to use the slave as he desired.

The Judaeo-Christian Tradition. Judaism, possibly abreacting to the role that eunuchs played in the Ishtar-Tam-muz cult, formally excluded them from its sacral community (Deuteronomy 23:1). For that reason one of the most enigmatic utterances ascribed to Jesus is Matthew 19:12: "For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." For Christian theologians and commentators this verse has been a source of endless embarrassment; one can only surmise that it found its way into the text of Matthew from an ascetic circle on the periphery of the early Church where castration was recommended if not rigorously practiced as the ultimate denial of the sexual urge, and that the otherwise Judaizing author of the Gospel was unaware of the Old Testament strictures on the matter. The usual evasion has been to interpret all three parts of the verse as meaning "like eunuchs," and William Tyndale even translated the verse: "There are chast, which were so born out of their mother's belly...," but the reputation of the eunuch in antiquity was hardly for chastity, rather for passive-effeminate homosexuality—which would leave the Church in an even greater quandary, since the plain meaning of the verse makes the eunuch an ideal of asexuality. Some modern homophile apologists have even construed the first part of the triptych as an allusion to innate homosexuality, but such an interpretation ill fits the tenor of the passage. The verse well exemplifies the extra-Judaic sources of Christian sexual morality whose ascetic tendency directly contravened the established norms of Judaism itself.

But otherwise faithful to the Judaic tradition that rejected the eunuch, the Christian Church in its canon law nowhere prescribed castration as a penalty for any offense, so that castration as a punishment for sodomy in the royal and municipal law of the late Middle Ages cannot be ascribed to ecclesiastical influence or precept. The Church did not, however, forbid the secular authorities to inflict such penalties, nor did it prevent the making of castrati for singing in church choirs. In principle, however, since it opposed the practice of castration as a violation of the dignity of the human subject, the policy of the Church deprived the eunuch of his political and erotic functions, and ultimately made him disappear as a social category from the Western world.


Warren Johansson
EXILES AND ÉMIGRÉS

Over the course of the centuries, political vicissitudes and, after the rise of Christianity and Islam, religious bigotry have forced gay people to leave their own countries and seek refuge abroad. The ingrained adaptability and propensity for disguise and camouflage of homosexuals has often facilitated this process, but the coercive nature of the change has tended to induce a cautious temper in those upon whom it has been forced.

Historical Examples. The earliest known homosexual refugee fled the Greek island of Samos in the late sixth century B.C. The philosopher and mathematician Pythagoras escaped the tyranny of Polycrates, himself a pederast, who had made the island a great maritime power and cultural center. Later, in 521, when the Persians crucified him and suppressed pederasty there, the pederastic poets he had attracted to his court, Ibycus and Anacreon, fled.

There are no known instances of ostracism [banishment by popular vote] in ancient Greece for pederasty. The Romans knew a form of voluntary self-banishment called exsiliun. Magistrates would allow those guilty of a capital crime to escape, but they could never return to Roman territory.

In later centuries, when Christianity had influenced the Roman emperors to impose the death penalty for homosexual activity, the extreme penalty was sometimes commuted to banishment. Expelling the sodomite from its territory was sufficient to placate or at least deflect the divine wrath that would otherwise have spelled immeasurable woe for the state. In the great prosecution inspired by Protestantism of homosexuals in the Netherlands in 1730, 57 of the 250 men and boys who were convicted were put to death, while the majority were simply banished from the country. At other times culprits took to flight as a way of escaping burning at the stake, inflicted when the Inquisition “relaxed” sodomites to the secular authorities, or in England [which never allowed the Inquisition to enter] the hangman’s noose—or in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when English homophobia reached an apex, exposure in the pillory.

Some sodomites fled persecution to the Italian Renaissance cities even before the religious and other disputes of the sixteenth century in Europe caused much displacement of individuals who, for one reason or another, could not accept the new state of affairs in their native land—or the continuation of the old one. Among these was the French philologist and professor Marc-Antoine Muret [1526–1585], who had to escape to Italy to elude punishment for sodomy. Many by flight avoided prison and perpetual imprisonment or the galleys—the penalties meted out by the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions more often than burning at the stake.

Conversely, the abolition of the sodomy laws in France in 1791 and subsequently in other countries, including all the Latin ones [except Romania] and their colonies overseas, that adopted the Code Napoléon made these lands an appealing haven for northern European and Anglo-Saxon homosexuals. Even before the French Revolution the very wealthy eccentric William Beckford had found it prudent to leave England for Portugal. In the Napoleonic period three clergymen, the Rev. John Fenwick, the Rev. V. P. Littlehales, and the Bishop of Clogher were obliged to flee England. The case of the last-named individual, a member of an aristocratic Anglo-Irish family, was so notorious that in French his name became a sobriquet for a British sodomite. Two other Hibernian figures were more fortunate. Lady Eleanor Butler [1739–1829] and Sarah Ponsonby [1755–1831] fled Ireland together in 1778; in the following year they settled in a rustic cottage near Llangollen, Wales, where they resided un molested—and in fact increasingly admired—for the rest of their lives.
Two great poets of romanticism, George Gordon, Lord Byron, who was bisexual, and the exclusively homosexual Count August von Platen resided much of their lives in Mediterranean countries. The inspirational homeland of ancient Greek pederasty, Greece, not under the Napoleonic Code but under Ottoman Turkish influence, tolerated homosexuality as did all Moslem countries. Improvements in the ease and convenience of travel made expatriation an option for an increasing number, including John Addington Symonds, Frederick Rolfe ("Baron Corvo"), and the nonsense writer and artist Edward Lear. Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, the lonely German pioneer of homosexual rights, who began to protest even before in 1866 Russian prohibitions were imposed on his native Hanover, formerly under the Code Napoleon, passed his last years in L'Aquila in Abruzzi, where he died in misery in 1895, though not before Symonds had visited him. After his release from prison in 1897 Oscar Wilde departed from England for France, where he died three years afterwards. A few years later the French aesthete Count Jacques d'Adelshward Fersen, after a scandal involving some photographs of boys, found it wise to withdraw for a time to the island of Capri (where the emperor Tiberius had long before established a retreat replete with a swimming pool filled with boys and girls to service him). Capri was then entering its modern apogee as a place of residence of foreign homosexuals. In the last Byzantine capital in Sicily, Taormina, whose views of Etna vie with Capri's of Vesuvius, the German Baron Wilhelm von Gloeden produced his celebrated photographs of Sicilian boys and attracted other foreign pederasts. On the eve of World War I actual colonies of English and German homosexuals lived in Italy, where they had taken up residence after being compromised socially or legally in their own countries, scenic Venice, where Winckelmann was murdered, being a favorite, along with Florence and Rome, both beautified by Michelangelo.

Lesbians, even if less likely to be menaced by the law, still had to fear intolerant public opinion, particularly in Protestant lands. The Americans Natalie Barney, Sylvia Beach, Romaine Brooks, Gertrude Stein, and Alice B. Toklas preferred to reside in Paris. So too did Radclyffe Hall, after her novel The Well of Loneliness (1928) was banned in England. Vernon Lee, the lesbian writer on aesthetics, chose to live in Florence.

Refugees from Totalitarianism. The best known and most numerous examples of exile and emigration occurred as a result of the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes of right and left in the twentieth century. In the 1920s many talented figures fled Communist Russia and Fascist Italy, to be joined in the early thirties by refugees from Nazi Germany and at the end of the decade from the annexed or occupied countries of Europe and from Franco Spain. After 1945 a new wave of refugees from an Eastern Europe that fell under Communist domination was followed by still others from Cuba and Vietnam when these countries shared the same fate. In the 1980s the Mariel refugees from Cuba and the Sino-Vietnamese boat people are melancholy reminders of the intolerance of Communist states. It was a well-known if not well-publicized fact that many of the Mariel émigrés were homosexuals fleeing the repressive policies of the Castro regime in Cuba, which while proclaiming equality for women and attempting to overcome the inveterate machismo of Latin American culture made the lot of the homosexuals on the island far worse than it had been under the deposed Fulgencio Batista. Gay bars and synagogues have disappeared from Havana as from Berlin under the Nazis.

Unlike many earlier refugees who vegetated on the margin of the intellectual and cultural life of their host countries, the trans-Atlantic migrants of the 1930s
bonded with American society (and English to a lesser extent) and inspired its higher culture. Before their arrival America was a provincial backwater whose third-rate academic institutions contrasted sadly with the European universities, but had in some places, richly endowed, begun to rise with the introduction of the German model of graduate study in the late nineteenth century and to catch up as Europe squandered its youth in World War I. With their help, it became a dominant force in the intellectual life of the mid-twentieth century and an exporter of the software—the ideas, innovations, trade secrets, and patents—consumed by other nations. Significantly, with the retirement of the émigrés and their immediate pupils, American supremacy began to fade.

During the 1930s and early 1940s, because the thirty or so major American universities could not absorb the influx of new talent, many went to smaller or less elite schools. This enrichment contributed to today's polycentrism of American colleges—the fact that many campuses undistinguished before 1940 have become significant centers of learning. There were, inevitably, significant concentrations. With its cosmopolitan tradition, New York drew social scientists to the New School for Social Research and painters and sculptors to Greenwich Village, where Hans Hofmann's school provided the nucleus for abstract expressionism. The gay painter Pavel Tchelitschew, earlier a refugee from Bolshevik Russia, represented surrealism, with a notable influence on film and writing as well as the visual arts. At New York University's Institute of Fine Arts Alfred Salmony, formerly of Cologne, made many converts to Oriental art, his specialty.

Near New York City was the lodestone of the highly gifted, Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study, with Albert Einstein as its presiding spirit. In Germany Einstein, though himself heterosexual, had signed Magnus Hirschfeld's petition against Paragraph 175 of the Penal Code. At Princeton he was later to be joined by the distinguished medievalist, Ernst Kantorowicz, more or less openly gay and a former member of the Stefan George circle. At Berkeley Kantorowicz, along with Robert Oppenheimer who became director of the Princeton Institute, had stood out as one of a small number of faculty to lose their jobs because they had refused to sign the loyalty oath which was part of the anti-Communist furor of the late 1940s. As a homosexual Kantorowicz could have been deported for this act of defiance. Another medieval historian—the field seems to have an affinity with homosexuality—Theodor Mommsen, was affiliated with Princeton University and very attracted to the art historian A. M. Friend for a time. Princeton was also the home of the great Austrian novelist Hermann Broch, who there completed The Death of Vergil (1945).

Southern California was the destination of many artistically creative individuals. After a short stay in Princeton, the bisexual Thomas Mann settled in the Los Angeles area. His gay son Klaus also made his way to America. The Southern California scene was further enlivened by English gay exiles, including the novelist Christopher Isherwood, compelled to leave the Berlin he loved, and the actor Charles Laughton. The eccentric Anglo-Irish thinker Gerald Heard helped to lay the philosophical foundations for the gay movement. Also active in Southern California was the gay fashion designer Rudi Gernreich, who became the lover of Henry Hay, the founder of the American homophile movement. Hollywood gave refuge to many lesser figures in the entertainment world who found employment behind the scenes in the studios and were sometimes hunted by adherents of McCarthyism.

Not all gay émigrés went to North America. Outstanding exceptions were the Spanish poet Luis Cernuda, who settled in Mexico, and his compatriot the composer Manuel de Falla, who preferred Argentina. However, Latin American countries were
generally too underdeveloped economically and intellectually for such figures to make a permanent impress. In fact some refugees whose first haven was Latin America resettled in the United States.

Still others went to England. The philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein, who remained in the closet, had settled there before the rise of Hitler. Kurt Hiller, the leftist writer and gay activist, lived in Prague until the Munich accords made it necessary for him to flee to England, where he proved unable to adapt and returned to West Germany in 1955. Anna Freud, who had conducted a closeted lesbian lifestyle for a time in Vienna, accompanied her famous father to his exile in England, then lived and practiced psychotherapy there until her death.

Amnesty International still refuses to protest the persecution and imprisonment for reasons of sexual orientation of homosexuals in any country, despite the appalling treatment meted out to them by such diverse authorities as those of Islamic countries, notorious among them the late Ayatollah Khomeini, or secular governments such as Turkey’s on the one hand and Communist regimes on the other. In Argentina under the military junta in the 1970s the situation of the homophile movement deteriorated so badly that its leaders had to go into exile in monarchist Spain.

**Conclusion.** English and American prejudices and laws against homosexuality obliged homosexual refugees to hide their proclivities in order to gain entry visas and then get and retain citizenship papers. Hence it is often difficult to obtain accurate information on persons dead or alive. It may be inferred that homosexuals succeeded less often than their heterosexual colleagues in escaping from Europe and getting into the Anglo-Saxon democracies. Even when they succeeded, they faced discrimination in academia, where even now there are barely fifty tenured professors who are openly gay on all the more than 2000 American college and university campuses, and not five in the Ivy League.

The history of oppression and totalitarianism is far from ended, and America may in the future open its doors to still other émigrés from foreign lands. Three main categories may be discerned in the ranks of gay émigrés and exiles through the ages: [1] those who had to flee their native lands to escape severe legal and social penalties; [2] those who judged it prudent to emigrate to lessen the burden of social ostracism and potential conflict with the law; and [3] those who preferred life abroad, with the sexual privileges accorded the foreigner, particularly one with independent means, to a confined existence at home. The study of émigré colonies in exotic parts of the globe may shed additional light on the lives and fortunes of the gay exiles.


*William A. Percy*