

dicted Magnus Hirschfeld's notion that homosexuals were a biological **third sex** led—together with a tendency (not confined to psychoanalysis) to deny the **constitutional** bases of behavior—to the assertion that homosexuality was purely the result of "fixation" in an infantile stage of sexual development provoked by the action or inaction of the parents. The corollary was that individuals with varying degrees of homosexuality were forced into prolonged therapeutic sessions, or even subjected to cruel applications of electric shock—invented only in 1938 by Ugo Cerletti—and other measures designed to "cure" them. In the popular mind the belief that homosexuality is somehow a failure of psychological development has its underpinning in the Freudian concepts.

Freud's contribution to the psychology of the intolerance of homosexuality has, on the contrary, never been fully appreciated and utilized by the psychoanalytic profession. Yet by freeing the thinking of the educated classes from the taboos that enveloped sexuality in the Victorian era, Freud strongly promoted the demystification of the whole subject and made possible a gradual onset of rationality in place of the horror, disgust, and condemnation that had been the norm until recent times. Although seldom quoted in the continuing legal debate over gay rights, his legacy has quietly worked in favor of toleration—as Freud himself would have wished.

On his eightieth birthday Freud was honored with an address composed by Thomas Mann and signed by some two hundred European intellectuals which congratulated "the pioneer of a new and deeper knowledge of man." It went on to say that "even should the future remould and modify one result or another of his researches, never again will the questions be stilled which Sigmund Freud put to mankind; his gains for knowledge cannot be permanently denied or obscured." The weaknesses and shortcomings of Freud's legacy were in no small part failings of the

science of his own day. He had to study the final product of conscious and unconscious mental activity; future generations, thanks to new devices for sounding the brain and the central nervous system, will be able to correlate these with the underlying physiological processes. Pioneer that he was, he ventured at times into fields that were beyond his own command, but left foot-steps which others, endowed with a surer perspective, would follow into the heart of the matter. To homosexuals he bore no ill-will, to religion he had no commitment, to intolerance of sexual expression he gave no sanction, and by tearing away the curtain of irrationality and superstitious fear that had for so long enveloped sexuality in general he set the stage for the forces of reason that must someday overcome the misunderstanding and injustice that homosexuals have endured in Western civilization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Kenneth Lewes, *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Homosexuality*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988; Timothy F. Murphy, "Freud Reconsidered: Bisexuality, Homosexuality, and Moral Judgement," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9:2/3 (1983-84), 65-77.

Warren Johansson

FRIEDLAENDER, BENEDICT (1866-1908)

German natural scientist, thinker, and leader in the homosexual emancipation movement. In 1903, he cofounded the "Gemeinschaft der Eigenen" ("The Community of the Exceptional," but "eigene" also means "self," "same" [sex], and, in reference to Max Stirner's anarchist philosophy, "self-owner"), along with Wilhelm Jansen and Adolf Brand. Although also a member of Magnus Hirschfeld's **Scientific-Humanitarian Committee**, he did not agree with the Committee's exclusive emphasis on explaining homosexuals as a **third sex** who by their nature were creatures that exhibited the external attributes of one gender while possessing the

"soul" (character, emotions) of the opposite gender. Friedlaender led a move to split the Committee in 1907, but it failed in part due to his death in 1908 and to Hirschfeld's successful outmaneuvering of the "secessionists."

These men desired a renaissance of the male-male bonds which had formed so important a part of culture in ancient Greece. Their ideal would be realized in a homoerotic relationship, usually between an adult man and an adolescent boy. The base, animal desires were reserved strictly for procreative purposes; thus, woman's role in their utopia was strictly subordinated to that of the male. His notion of "physiological friendship" did, however, lead to the assumption that male bonding would find expression in physical acts. To be sure, several of the Community's members, including Friedlaender and Brand, were married. Friedlaender expounded this philosophy at length in his treatise *Die Renaissance des Eros Uranios* (1904). This work greatly influenced the theories of Hans Blüher as to the cohesive and driving forces of homosexuality within society (see esp. Blüher's *Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft*, 1917-19).

The Community's defense of male-male "love" (i.e., friendship) evinced an elitist character which looked longingly toward the past. It demonstrated a decidedly hostile attitude toward the modern era with its supposed evils of urbanization, socialism, and women's liberation, all of which made more difficult, if not impossible, the unity of body and soul because they dragged all men down to the basest level.

James W. Jones

FRIENDSHIP, FEMALE ROMANTIC

The Renaissance interest in Platonism encouraged a revival of passionate friendships between men, reflected in works such as Montaigne's "On Friend-

ship," Castiglione's *The Book of the Courtier*, Timothe Kendall's "To a Frende," William Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, and Thomas Lodge's *Euphues Shadowe*. Literary examples of such relationships between women are less numerous in the Renaissance, but they may be found in work such as Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde*, and later, in the seventeenth century, in many of the poems by Katharine Philips. It is in the eighteenth century that such relationships, which came to be called "romantic friendships," became common. Romantic friendship between women was socially condoned, originally because it was not believed to violate the platonist ideal, and later for more complex reasons. But while it is true that love between women was "in style," women's experiences of that love were no less intense or real for their social acceptability.

The Ladies of Llangollen. Such passion in the eighteenth century was not believed seriously to violate any code of behavior, even when it was taken to such extremes that women eloped with each other, as did the Ladies of Llangollen—Eleanor Butler and Sarah Ponsonby—in 1778. When Sarah's family discovered that she had run off with a woman instead of a man, they were relieved—her reputation would not suffer any irreparable harm (as it would have had her accomplice been male). Her relative Mrs. Tighe observed, "[Sarah's] conduct, though it has an appearance of imprudence, is I am sure void of serious impropriety. There were no gentlemen concerned, nor does it appear to be anything more than a scheme of Romantic Friendship."

The English, during the second half of the eighteenth century, prized sensibility, faithfulness, and devotion in a woman, but forbade her significant contact with the opposite sex before she was betrothed. It was reasoned, apparently, that young women could practice these sentiments on each other so that when they were ready for marriage they would have perfected themselves in those areas. It is