Take thou my love of body and of soul;
whether thou hold it dear or hold it light,
thou hast a man to love thee true and whole. (Warren, 1913, p. 126)

In turn, this is expressed in his theoretical text when he writes, “The boy-lover approaches the monk, but does not meet him... unlike the monk, he bears with him... the sensual together with the spiritual love. He and his beloved are in training, askēsis; but it is not the Christian ‘ascetic’ mortification. There is no function of the human being which is to be atrophied, while both lover and beloved are to be directly in relation with their proper ideal, the masculine. This seems to be the particular advantage of such love, the advantage which renders it indeed a philosophical passion” (Warren, 1928-30, Vol. 1, p. 79). The properly masculine plays a key role; the Philosophical Eros, which is the norm for the lovers, is “a manly spirit, as the Greeks conceived manliness, blended of strength and gentleness” (Warren, 1928-30, Vol. 1, p. 107). In his “Hymn to Love” Warren invokes this Eros:

With healing in thy wings re-arisen to bless
thou comest in Hellenic nakedness...
and I believe thee as a vision sent
to a mourner in perpetual banishment
from his own ruined hearth or home
in Greece or Rome.
I worship thee, and from thy mandate take
the conduct that will make me or unmake...
(Warren, 1913, p. 30)

But there is occasionally a more personal side which breaks through in Warren’s poetry, and it is perhaps well to end there, with his “When I am old”:

When I am old, come to me, child, and say:
‘I have tried another way,
and sweet hath been the bed whereon I have lain.
I have left thee to love again;
but take my hand today
and hear—for I will say it—what to hear
is not less just than dear,
words that are not less coveted than earned:
pleasure indeed I have learned,
have given my heart sincere,
have better loved, and found a love that now
shame were to disavow,
but not more true and perfect in the end
than thine, O perfect friend,
nor holier than thou.” (Warren, 1913, p. 100)

Before leaving this discussion of ‘paganism’ we should mention another Bostonian, whose name already arose earlier, F. Holland Day, like Woodberry and Warren influenced by Pater (Crump, 1995, p. 12), and who like W. A. Percy explored the conflicts between paganism and Christianity in his art. His Grecian themes involving boys and youths, both before, but particularly after the 1904 fire in his studio, are precise visual equivalents of our pagan literary themes here (Crump, 1995, pp. 30-32; Jussim, 1981, pp. 166-181; for examples of the former see the illustrations on p. 168 and plate 7 in the portfolio, for examples of the latter, pp. 43-59 in the portfolio). At the same time there is his struggle with his “sacred subjects” in his crucifixion series (Crump, 1995, pp. 27-30; Jussim, 1981, pp. 120-135; illustrations to that chapter and pp. 17-23 in the portfolio; see also Crump, 1994) and the implications of suffering for—and as—an ideal, which is not far removed from what obsessed Percy in his medieval dramas, or poems such as his “Ballad of St. Sebastien” (Percy, 1920, pp. 101-103).

With the phrase “O perfect friend,” we encounter a second of the themes which the Uranians saw in their Greek mirror: the model of male friendship, or its cognate comradeship. It is not totally unrelated to ‘paganism,’ for as we have seen, one of the experiences to be had within the focus on this world was that of comradeship, and further this was a paganism which had an ethic of its own, even if this was not always congruent with Christian morality. The elevated importance of friendship in ‘paganism’ is perhaps underscored by reflecting on William Johnson Cory’s magnificent and most perfectly pagan version of Callimachus’ “Heraclitus” (“They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead . . .” (Cory, 1905, p. 7)), where it is precisely the lack of any hope of afterlife where friends may meet again that gives the loss its utter poignancy.

In emerging gay scholarship thirty years ago “friendship” was regarded as just one more evasion by which 19th century homosexuals sought to hide their love—perhaps even from themselves. It is now being taken with utter seriousness and carefully contradistinguished from “the heroic warrior with his subordinate male pal or sidekick (who inevitably
dies), in addition to the patron-client model of male friendship—all the better to establish it as “another tradition that emphasizes equality, mutuality, and reciprocity in love between men” (Halperin, 2002, p. 118), albeit at the cost of “the erotic realms of difference and hierarchy” (Halperin, 2002, p. 120). “Friendship . . . by contrast, is all about sameness: sameness of rank and status, sameness of sentiment, sameness of identity. It is this very emphasis on identity, similarity, and mutuality that distances the friendship tradition, in its original social and discursive context, from the world of sexual love” (Halperin, 2002, p. 121). Yet this “tradition” as Halperin finds it is precisely what the Uranians were not advocating when they spoke of friendship; they used the term precisely for asymmetrical relationships. Again, is their problem that they had failed to perform the proper analysis, à la modern gay theorists? Or did they have another agenda in mind?

The Greeks, with their endless list of asymmetrical male pairs, provided the Uranians with an arsenal of examples for expounding this ideal of friendship; indeed, it is a “hero and his pal,” Hercules and Iolaus, which provides Carpenter with the title under which he marshals his “Anthology of Friendship” (Carpenter, 1902). To take a selection of the examples we enumerated above, in describing that most unequal of relationships (divine/human, adult/boy) Bradford terms Ganymede “Jove’s eternal friend” (Bradford, 1913, p. 79); Erskine accepts Hercules and “Hylas the young” as the central image in his “Song of Friends” (Erskine, 1907, pp. 31-34); Hervey Allen says of the same pair, “So these two were friends forever” (Allen, 1921, p. 19); interestingly, of all our poets, however much they may emphasize love and sacrifice, McCulloch is the only one who speaks of Hadrian and Antinous in terms of friendship, using the phrase “free companionship” (McCulloch, 1902, p. 56). In a theoretical text, “Ideals of Love,” Smynonds exhaustively lists examples of what he interchangeably labels “Platonic love,” “masculine love,” “Greek love,” “friendship” and “comradeship”; Hercules and his young men, Theseus and Peirithous, Orestes and Pylades, Damon and Pythias, Cratinus and Aristodemus, Harmodius and Aristogeiton, Philolaus and Diocles, Chariton and Melanippus, Epaminondas and his comrades, Alexander and his comrades, Pindar and Sophocles, Pindar and Theoxenos, Pheidias and Pantarke. Keeping in mind the attacks of Lefroy and others, he is at pains to emphasize that it was “neither an effeminate depravity nor a sensual vice.” He recalls that in Dorian custom the lover was called the “inspirer” and the beloved the “hearer,” and that “it was the man’s duty to instruct the lad in manners, feats of arms, trials of strength and mu-
sic,” and reminds his readers that “the relation of the elder to the younger is still assumed to exist by Plato” (Symonds, 1893, pp. 61-67). In a similar inventory in his *Problem in Greek Ethics*, in the course of an argument which essentially comes down to saying that anything so common and basic in Greek civilization could not be a problem, Symonds adds still more pairs, particularly from mythology (Symonds, 1901, p. 10); at no time in either text does he suggest the relations are anything other than asymmetric. The pedagogical nature of this Eros returns in one last poetic citation, from Cecil Robert’s “Strayed Hylas”: “...Heracles loved the young boy, / he trained him to feats of endurance, he gave him the wealth of his lore...” (Roberts, 1914, p. 22).

At the same time, there is no question that for the Uranians this friendship also had an erotic dimension. The term friendship was used with, and understood in terms of, love. In his first collection of poems, Douglas Cole, later a British Labor Party economist, includes a sonnet “Friendship and Love”:

“Not lovers they, but friends,” I heard one cry;  
Shall friends not love, and lovers not be friends?...  
For this I know, that we are friends indeed,  
And that I love thee, and thy love is mine;  
Wherefore this knowledge is affection’s creed,  
That where two souls are met, as mine with thine,  
Each soul supplying all the other’s need,  
Friendship and love their willing gifts combine. (Cole, 1910, p. 48)

This by no means excluded a physical expression, as in Fabian Woodley’s *Crown of Friendship*:

More fair than He, by Hercules beloved;  
Than Ganymede, or that fond foolish boy,  
Whose image mirrored in the water proved  
A passion hopeless and a barren joy—  
You stood before me that bright summer’s morn  
Most fair and splendid of the sons of men,  
And all the grace and beauty that was Greece  
In you united and were born again!  
...I longed to hold you in my arms, to kiss  
The curve of your soft cheek; I dared not speak  
Lest from our hearts true unison might evolve
To discord that we never should resolve;
But when I thought "Must Friendship end in this?"
You suddenly raised your face—and claimed my kiss! (Woodley,
1921, pp. 34-36)

And, although the poet in question, Francis Saltus, is not to be ac-
counted among the Uranians, but a decadent, and his poem makes it
clear that the friendship in this case is not asymmetrical but between
equal adults, it is instructive to note that language of friendship between
males could get considerably more passionate than a kiss on the cheek:

Friend, fate ordains we part no more to meet . . .
You go to Cuba, draped in flower and palm . . .
While I, whose whole soul thirsts for bird and bloom . . .
Must dwell forever in the boreal gloom
Of grim Archangel’s sun-defying snows.
. . . Strange thoughts of dread
Follow and fill me with persistent power;
I fear that I shall rest when I am dead
Where ice-winds moan and awful glaciers tower . . .
Ah! Then, when freed by death, sweet spirit divine,
Though you be shadow, mirage, fire or form,
Fly through chill space to seek the soul once mine,
And clasp and cling to me till I am warm! (Saltus, 1890, pp. 173-174)

This combination of comrades and lovers is found explicitly in the
poem “Comrades and Lovers, Rest Not,” by the American Nelson
Antrim Crawford, a writer, editor, teacher and sometime publisher of
and author of introductions to collections by fellow Uranians. The refer-
ence in this case is not Greek, but a paean to Walt Whitman on the 100th
anniversary of his birth:

Oh, you genteel, conventional, uncourageous,
Bank presidents, suave, and your anaemic women,
Professional Y.M.C.A. secretaries and directors of boards of wel-
fare,
Holders of doctorates from Leipzig . . . Village newspaper men . . .
Reactionary government officials . . . Blustering Western politi-
cians . . .
when you unctuously celebrated his centenary . . .
Do you think that Walt Whitman the egoist, the unconventional, the liberal, the sincere, the frank, the healthy, the free, the light-hearted, the heroic,
The glad, the rough, the tender, the democrat, the American, the world-citizen, the friend of the worker,
Poet of the body, poet of the soul, poet of every dauntless rebel,
Would want to associate with you, or do you think you would want to associate with him?
And you, carpenters, farmers, deckhands, weavers, printers, bridge builders, pickers of cotton in the South and harvesters of wheat in the North,
Sheep herders, brakemen, brick masons, telephone operators, shop girls, wheel tappers, waiters, hired girls, workers in mines, mail carriers, whitewings, laborers skilled and unskilled,
Yes, and you lawyers, doctors, writers, engineers, manufacturers, shop-keepers,
All of you who are fair and honest and seekers of justice for all men, Walt Whitman will return to lead you on the open road of honesty, frankness, democracy.
Comrades and lovers,
Rest not! (Crawford, 1923, pp. 68-71)

Two of the words in that militant poem are worth lifting out. The first, "frankness," I noted a quarter of a century ago was something of a marker for homosexual sentiments in what I then called Calamite poems; the second, "democracy," launches us on our third and final theme that the Uranians saw in their Greek mirror.

Evocations of manual laborers similar to the list found here would be expected in American poets influenced by Whitman and his "frankness," and one indeed finds them, for instance in Willard Wattles's "Challenge to Youth" ("You who are young and clean and sweetened by the sun / Who have followed the binder afield until the blinding day is done. . . / Who have slept 'neath the open sky and pillowed a dusty head / On shiny saddle leather, nor wished for a better bed" (Wattles, 1916, p. 111)), and one recalls it was a young "tamer of horses on the grass-grown plains" who was Woodberry's ideal comrade. Wattles, indeed, in his "But a Great Laugher," even manages to fit Jesus into their proletariat (and sub-proletariat) company:

They do me wrong who show me sad of face,
Slender and stooped, gentle, and meek, and mild . . .
I was youth's lover, swiftest of the race,
Gay friend of beggars, brother of the wild...
Shepherd and fisher, sailor, carpenter,
I strode the hills and followed the sun,
Knew arms and bosoms and slow steady eyes,
Felt each new April through my body stir... (Wattles, 1918, p. 3)

But to whom should we attribute these lines?

... [companionship] spreads
Tents on the open road, field, ocean, camp,
Where'er in brotherhood men lay their heads,
Soldier with soldier, tramp with casual tramp... (Symonds, 1882, p. 16)

The very British John Addington Symonds! The connection of course is Edward Carpenter, with his Towards Democracy, where in a short poem entitled "A Sprig of Aristocracy" Wattles's field-laborer shakes hands with his British compatriot:

Browned by the sun, with face elate and joyous,
Pitching hay all day in the wide and fragrant hayfields,
Frank and free... O splendid boy, with many more like thee,
England might from her unclean wallowing rise again and live. (Carpenter, 1911, p. 308)

It was the concern of the Uranians to reconcile the ideal of democracy, which, as Woodberry reminded us in his Pallas Athene, was a heritage from the pagan world, and the concept of a natural aristocracy among men, the Greek ideal of the areté which could be found in a man of any station—and it was friendship, comradeship, masculine love, precisely with its asymmetrical structure and pedagogic features, which provided the instrument for accomplishing this. The equality of virtue or excellence which the two socially unequal partners shared would, in the presence of the masculine, pedagogic Eros, provide the basis for a democratizing solution that would raise the younger or socially subordinate partner to equality.

It is not surprising then that the ranks of the Uranians would supply a list of teachers at every level, from William Johnson Cory at their start, through the prolific John Gambril Nicholson, to Arnold W. Smith (Smith, 1919) and the schoolmaster and war casualty T. P. Cameron
Wilson and his touching “Mathematical Master to his Dullest Pupil” (“I came to you and caught your eagle wings / and gloomed your soul with Algebra and things, / and cast a net of pale Geometry / Wherein your laughter struggled to be free . . .” (Wilson, 1920, p. 104)). Nor should we be surprised that their poems contain a catalogue of references to working boys of various professions; Nicholson’s “Your City Cousins” provides a list in itself:

I like the boy that earns his bread;
The boy that holds my horse’s head,
The boy that tidies up the bar,
The boy that hawks the Globe and Star.
Smart-looking boys are in my line;
The lad that gives my boots a shine,
The lad that works the lift below,
The lad that’s lettered G.P.O. (Nicholson, 1911, p. 27)

Newspaper boys and bootblacks (the latter perhaps even more than the former, because they were in physical contact with the man) are particularly noticed. Bradford blends in the theme of natural aristocracy:

A little Lord, in sweet disguise,
Kneels down to black my boots . . .
A Prince, in rugged raiment cries
The names of evening papers;
And several serve in humble wise
As grocers’ boys or drapers’ (Bradford, 1918, p. 33)23

On the other side of the Atlantic, N. A. Crawford has a poem to a Greek lad in a shoe-shine parlor (Crawford, 1923, p. 55), and Walter Malone notes a Greek boy waiter:

... As I look
Upon his poor surroundings here to-night
I mutter, “Evil days have come to thee
And thine, O boy of Hellas!” But I muse
Deeply upon him, and his fine young face
Allures me more and more . . . (Malone, 1919, p. 106)

For one Uranian thinker, comradeship in the setting of the boys’ club occupies a special role in this constellation. William Paine, a lecturer on
social issues and one-time president of a Working Boy’s Athletic Club, produced a whole treatise on the programmatic role of ‘love’ (along with other elements like athletics) in discovering the natural excellence of working-class boys and youth, overcoming class antagonism, and bringing about what he, in the title of his book, termed The New Aristocracy of Comradeship—‘a new aristocracy whose watchword is comradeship and whose archetype the friend’ (Paine, 1920, p. 5). Once again, we must be clear that this friendship involves a sexual dimension: ‘Friendship is not something dissimilar from love. Friendship is one of the manifestations of love... The regular channels through which love manifests itself are comradeship (spiritual love) and sexual passion (physical love). If these two channels are kept open, and free from all impediments and all impurities, spiritual love reacts upon physical love, and vice versa, to the advantage of both...’ (Paine, 1920, p. 51). After some facile Marxist analysis, Paine proclaims that the object of this ideal of comradeship ‘is entirely to overthrow the existing form of society and build up a new society in its place’ (Paine, 1920, p. 52). This will be accomplished by ‘the spiritualisation of the relationship of the man and the boy’ (Paine, 1920, p. 63). Explaining what he means by this in a footnote, Paine calls upon the Greeks: ‘The idea of protective love is not peculiar to Christian ethics, in which it is softened down to a sentiment of pity or tenderness for the young. It dates back to the earliest times, and is co-eval with the heroic consciousness of mankind. In its origin it was the instinct and practice of the warrior to ensure the preservation of his tribe. The warrior took a boy or youth with him into battle to teach him the use of arms, and, while he sought to set him an example of valour, shielded the youth from harm with his own life. In that way there grew up between the protected and protector a tie that was stronger even than the tie of a blood relationship, for it was constantly being reaffirmed in the presence of danger and death’ (Paine, 1920, p. 167, note 3). The working-class boys’ club is the seedbed for such heroics today. Paine hypothesizes that ‘every boy is born an aristocrat, by which I mean he is born to the pursuit of an ideal of character which modern conditions make it almost impossible for him to realise. ... But all are born aristocrats. We have to keep them so’ (Paine, 1920, p. 65). The working-class boy comes to this naturally: ‘Almost as soon as he can walk the London working-class boy feels that the hand of society is against him, and prepares to resist it by an instinctive loyalty to his brother... He is saturated with this feeling. It is his religion. All he wants to make it immediately heroic is a leader, and if he fancies ever so little that you are the leader he is looking for, he will instantly tender his
affections to you provocatively, that you may declare yourself for what you are, and start with him on the great adventure of friendship, which adventure is to destroy the old order of things and create a new order in its place” (Paine, 1920, p. 117). Paine then provides pages of examples from his own experiences in reaching ‘hard cases’ through his friendship, guiding them particularly through sports such as boxing and wrestling, and swimming. His ultimate proposal is that these young natural aristocrats should be brought in contact with middle-class and upper class boys, at camps in nature and athletic competitions between working-boys’ clubs and public schools, so that the boys of the higher classes will be won over by the comradeship with them, and “we stop the middle-class boy from becoming pretentious, the lesser middle-class boy from becoming invertebrate, the aristocratic boy from becoming stiff-necked” (Paine, 1920, p. 66).

But we must equally recognize that those of the Uranians who were interested in age-consistent relationships express no less of an asymmetry in their lists of those who fascinate them. Horatio Brown, in his Drift, writes, among others, “To a Great-Western Broadgauge Engine and Its Stoker,” “Drive on! . . . Blow back the curly, close-cropped hair. /Ah! Western lad, would I might be / a partner in that ecstasy” (Brown, 1900, p. 5), to a 23-year-old guardsman (Brown, 1900, p. 8) and, in a humorous description of a visit to a concert with friends, “Bored at a London Music,” of a footman: “[I] heard the whole laborious din, / Piano, ’cello, violin; / And so, perhaps, they hardly guessed / I liked their footman, John, the best” (Brown, 1900, p. 105). Edward Carpenter also found enginemen attractive (Carpenter, 1911, pp. 140-141), and bricklayers as well: “The thick-thighed hot coarse-fleshed young bricklayer with the strap around his waist. . . . The bricklayer shall lay me: he shall tap me into place with the handle of his trowel; / And to him I will utter the word which with my lips I have not spoken” (Carpenter, 1911, pp. 69, 73). As we saw before, in his handling of the Greek allusions, Roden Noel exhibits greater depth in his work, in a posthumously published elegy to a “comrade,” J. H., obviously of lower social rank:

Comrade, my comrade, they are calling names
Of epoch-making men about the town
Who died but now; and these are nought to me,
Who mourn my brother, lowly, poor, unknown,
Died with them in thy manhood’s flower; thee Death
Took using all thy strength to wrest a friend
From his cold clutch; but he would take you both.
No famous man hath ended better; God
Approveth, and thy comrade honours thee... (Noel, 1902, p. 487)

It remains to note that for a fair number of the Uranians whose biographies we do possess, neither their political commitment to a basic democratization of society, nor their involvement with asymmetrical relations was just a matter of words. Aside from a curious olio of documents which tells us far more about its compiler than its subject (Heath, 1998), we have very little personal information about Roden Noel, son of the Earl of Gainsborough and later Groom of the Privy Chamber to Queen Victoria, whose duties, Rupert Croft-Cooke remarks, “interfered with the habits he had already formed of association with service men and good-looking manual workers, associations which in that kindly undiscerning age gave him no worse than a reputation for socialism, in spite of his effeminate appearance” (Croft-Cooke, 1968, p. 123). Noel’s second volume of poetry was tellingly entitled The Red Flag. In his introduction to a scarce selection of Noel’s verse which he edited, the Uranian poet Percy Addleshaw refers to Noel’s interest in “the toiling masses and above all in the children” as being one of “the chief concerns of his life” (reprinted in Heath, 1998, p. 60), and (in a line which has apparently disappeared into one the ellipses that stud Heath’s reprint, but is quoted by Croft-Cooke) to how “he had long laboured among the children of the lower classes and bidden successfully for their love”—which Croft-Cooke somewhat venomously proceeds to assure us Addleshaw did not mean tongue-in-cheek (Croft-Cooke, 1968, p. 124), for it is clear from J. A. Symonds’s papers that along with his political and humanitarian interests, and whatever lovers he may have had, Noel did engage in purely pecuniary relations with young guardsmen and other working class youth. Carpenter’s socialism, and his lifelong relationship with George Merrill, whose background in the slums contrasted sharply with Carpenter’s upper-middle class and Cambridge background, is too well known to require documentation here.

Among the Americans, Woodberry’s letters during World War I reporting the exploits of his “Italian boys” (Woodberry, 1933, pp. 153, 171-172, 176, 179, 181, 197) and a touching later note, in the last months of his life, to a correspondent who would be passing through Taormina—

Try to find Princuzio Sciaccia, who is employed at a small pension there to meet trains, and may be useful to you, if you tell him you
are my friend. I haven’t seen him since he was twelve years old, or less, but he is a devoted friend of mine, and has a boy of four who is my namesake, Giorgio. He is also the boy of the ‘Ho! The Springtime!’ poem, and of the sonnet ‘On the Italian Front, 1916’. I haven’t seen him since he was twelve, and I suppose he is all grown up, but he wrote me letters all through the war, and ever since very frequently. He knows a little French, and is divotissimo to his old ‘Signore’... (Woodberry, 1930, pp. 264-265; on the same individual, see also pp. 272-273)

—tell something of his long relationships with these boys who inspired his poems. F. Holland Day, whom we mentioned as a visual parallel to the Uranians, was noted for his charity work, including personal involvement as a tutor among the children of the Boston slums, and in particular for his discovery and encouragement of an immigrant boy from those slums, Kahlil Gibran, of whom he produced several stunning portraits (Jussim, 1981, pp. 114-117; Gibran, 1974, pp. 51-68). Another of Day’s models was the Italian immigrant boy Nicola Giancola, who was a shoe-shine boy when discovered by Day, and became a successful commercial artist. A recent critic has noted that there appears to be “a more complicit understanding in these photographs between photographer and subject than in any others of Day’s repertoire” (Roberts, 2000, p. 26), and another of the essayists in the collection edited by Roberts notes that Giancola’s letters to Day “document the stormy relationship between an arrogant teenager maturing into adulthood and Day, a surrogate father figure. Giancola remained unthinkingly grateful to him, long after participating in Day’s photographic projects, and credited Day’s mentoring for his own financial success and personal fulfillment as a landscape painter” (Curtis, 2000, p. 49; the texts of some of these, and a further discussion of their relationship, are to be found in Curtis 1998). Curtis wishes to insist the relation between Day and Giancola was not homoerotic; Jussim, who got the rest of the relationship wrong, as she did not have access to all the letters, is however likely right in her assessment that it “bordered on the homoerotic, even if it was never consummated” (Jussim, 1981, pp. 176-178). In addition to these philanthropic and sexually charged relationships with immigrant boys, Day is also noted for another liberal—even, given the times, radical—social stand, namely his racial views, as expressed in his several series of photographs of black models (Jussim, 1981, pp. 106-109; Crump, 1995, pp. 23-25, 137, note 86; see also Michaels, 1994); Crump underscores both the political rhetoric of Day’s work, and the role of homoerotic desire in shaping this stance.24
Perhaps the most radical of all in his making the personal political was William Alexander Percy. Various of his humanitarian and, for his time and place, radical activities were known—his volunteer service with the Belgian Relief Commission before the American entry into World War I (Percy, 1941, pp. 156-168), his stand against the Ku Klux Klan (Percy, 1941, pp. 225-241), organizing flood relief in the Mississippi delta after the 1927 floods (Percy, 1941, pp. 249-269), the profit-sharing plan under which he operated his Trail Lake plantation, which became a subject for study as an economic model (Percy, 1941, pp. 278-80). Although a discerning eye could detect a certain amount in the chapter of his autobiography which deals with his chauffeur Fode (Percy, 1941, pp. 285-297), it remained for his great-nephew to confirm that in addition to a white “boyfriend” whose deathbed he could not attend because of social censure, but whom he had buried in the Percy family plot (Percy 1997, p. 85; see also Percy, 1941, p. 346: were there others?), Percy had a series of interracial homosexual relationships with black teenagers, including Fode, who were taken on as employees, for whom he would provide education and, as they grew older, a start in business or a trade (Percy, 1997, pp. 80-82).

**DISCUSSION**

To summarize: the Uranians, in their use of specific Greek allusions and in elaborating general themes that concerned them which they saw reflected in the Greek heritage as they perceived it, developed three interrelated notions. The first was of ‘paganism’ which comprehended a critique of their own materialistic, industrializing, bourgeois Christian society, and in its place emphasized direct experience of nature and beauty, incorporating Platonic idealism with this. The second was a discovery of ‘friendship’ or ‘comradeship’ as a manner by which males could relate to one another, constructing these concepts on models from Greek mythology and historiography; this friendship was specifically conceived as asymmetrical. It was precisely this asymmetry which allowed the Uranians to develop the third of their concerns, a reconciliation of their notions of democracy and aristocracy, namely by idealizing and attempting to create democratizing male relationships in which, beginning with the excellence inherent in both partners and subjecting it to the operation of a pedagogical Eros, the younger or otherwise socially subordinate partner was to be lifted to equality. Their social vision was
thus essentially progressive and humane, and at least in some cases we know they united the personal and the political.

In its own time this was critiqued by Lefroy and others as possibly leading to sexual dissipation—or more precisely, to homosexual practices. By 1970, the critique was no longer on the grounds of Christian morality, but psychology. D’Arch Smith, in drawing his study to a close, offers his critique of the Uranians. After proposing that “the Uranians’ need to form alliances with working-class boys may well have arisen from an inferiority complex forbidding them to stand up to the rigours and responsibilities of a love affair with an intellectual equal,” he then goes on to suggest, “At the same time such boys could indulge their lovers with a brief, exciting sexual encounter after which they could be shaken off if they became too demanding, without the lover’s feeling too guilty about discarding persons whom he had once encouraged” (D’Arch Smith, 1970, pp. 191-192). It should be noted that while D’Arch Smith is writing here of age-discrepant relationships, all that he says could be applied—and was applied, in Croft-Cooke’s stricures on Roden Noel— to relations between adults in which the asymmetry ran across class lines. Nonetheless, the critique is essentially psychological and individualized: “There is, of course, a natural physical and mental inferiority inherent in every paederastic relationship; apart from his receptiveness to adult influences which encourages the man to believe he may be of help, the boy’s only strength lies in his sexual attraction. His natural homosexual phase may for a time allow the relationship to proceed on an equal footing, but unless he inherit some of the man’s mental maturity the friendship is surely doomed to failure as the years go by” (D’Arch Smith, 1970, p. 192). “Unless”? Of course it was not D’Arch Smith’s purpose to investigate the lives and relationships of his authors—little enough is known of them now, and still less was known in 1970—but one somehow has the feeling that even in the face of evidence of enduring relationships, or evidence of continued devotion by the younger or originally subordinate partner such as was presented here for Uranians such as Woodberry or Day, whose lives are better researched, this view would be little altered. Reports by the “superordinate” partner would represent self-deception or justification; testimony such as the letters of Nicola Giancola could be symptomatic of a failure on the part of the witness to recognize the damage done to them, or of their identification as a ‘victim’ with their ‘abuser’; if all else fails, and the success of the relation has to be acknowledged, it is deemed statistically insignificant. At least D’Arch Smith concedes that the Uranians probably meant well.
Thirty years have passed; not even the possibility of D'Arch Smith's "unless" and his concession is left. All erotic relationships between adults and minors are "abuse"; relations which cross class or racial lines are regarded as deeply suspect or rejected, socially if not by law, not because of the inequalities of the individuals involved, but because they are prisoners of social structures. A new paradigm, essentially political and not psychological, is in place, an ideal standard of equality, mutuality and reciprocity (Halperin, 2002, p. 118), which looks not to the dynamics of the relationship, but to the circumstances surrounding it. Halperin's critique of DeVries is exemplary here, and could apply just as well to the Uranians: "Again and again, DeVries insists that pæderastic relations between classical Athenian men and boys were, to quote his favorite adjectives, 'warm,' 'loving,' 'affectionate,' and 'tender'; he emphasizes the 'closeness,' 'intimacy,' 'love,' 'affection,' 'warm feelings,' and even 'responsiveness' that could characterize such relations. In all of this he is surely right. But what exactly does it prove? What kind of objection is it to say, against the view that pæderastic relations were asymmetrical, hierarchical, and generally non-reciprocal in their distribution of sexual pleasure, that men and boys really loved each other? . . . The point at issue here is not the emotional temperature of personal relationships but the social structuration of erotic life" (Halperin, 2002, p. 153). A social consensus has been reached that--no matter how much we may recognize that difference (and, as S&M at an extreme reminds us, that includes difference in power) is the basis of eroticism--too much difference is simply not acceptable. This has been the result of a century of sexual politics: the recognition that 'love' was no answer to the inequalities in relations between men and women, which only a (still not entirely complete) equalization of social and legal structures could cure. Once this idea that sexual and social relations must be between equals was widely enough accepted, it became a tool for the acceptance of socially 'reciprocal' homosexual relationships too, and at the same time for the reclassification of age-structured sexual or erotic relations from merely being 'immorality' to being exploitation and 'abuse.' Relations now must be 'democratic'--between equals--and not, as the Uranians argued, democratizing. When we look at our Greek mirror, we see our concern: abuse.27

What sort of argument, Halperin asks, is it to say that men and boys (or men of radically different social power and status) love each other? A very strong one, it seems to me. With the arguments of the Uranians in the background, let me be so bold as to turn Halperin's question around: what kind of objection is it to say, against the views of those
who are themselves engaged in such concrete relationships that these relationships are loving, satisfying, potentially even empowering, that the social context is too asymmetrical and hierarchical, insufficiently reciprocal for our prevailing ideology? What sort of paternalization and patronization does that represent? Acknowledging that social structuration of erotic life has its importance—something the Uranians acknowledged too—why should that be privileged to the exclusion of the emotional temperature experienced by those who are after all the participants? Why should reciprocity be narrowed down to a question of social power, and become a precondition rather than an outcome? Why 'democratic' rather than 'democratizing'? Pace Halperin, a relationship need not be equal to be mutual, and even, depending on how one defines the term, reciprocal. The Uranians and their art may have something to say to us yet.

NOTES

1. The first use of the term "Calamities" appears to have been by Algernon Swinburne, as the editor of Men and Boys correctly observes in his note introducing John Addington Symonds's poetry there (Slocum, 1924/1978, p. 42)—an indication of this editor's familiarity with the British scene. Swinburne intended it as a mocking characterization, meant to both refer to Whitman's title and to pun on the word "calamities." In a typical minority strategy of salvaging derogatory terms and using them as positive designations, Breen here reclaims it for this group. For an assessment of Breen's role in homosexual liberation and scholarship, see Mader (2002).

2. As well as D'Arche Smith's appendix on Chubb being reprinted (D'Arche Smith, 1991), Chubb has been the subject of several separate studies (Rahman, 1991 and Reid, 1970; see also Cave, 2001). A recent contribution in Dutch (Mader, 2003) attempts to give a more balanced view of Chubb.

3. The most accessible biographical information on Warren is presently to be found in Sox (1991).

4. Other than this Anthology, the only American book listed in the poetry section of the Catalogue is Wilbur D. Nesbit's The Trail to Boyland and Other Poems (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1904), a production not dissimilar to James Whitcomb Riley's earlier Armauzindy (Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill, 1894) or Burges Johnson's later Youngsters: Collected Poems of Childhood (New York: Dutton, 1921).

5. The fact that one of the seven or eight copies then known to exist bore a preliminary page—excised from the others—announcing it was produced by a group calling itself the American Society for the Study of Sex Psychology should have been a further clue (Slocum, 1924/1978, p. xlv).

6. Circumstantial evidence would indicate his co-editor was Willard Wattles, a peripatetic professor of literature at that time teaching at Connecticut Agricultural College (now University of Connecticut) in Storrs, CT, whose poetry is also included in the "Present-day Poets" section (Slocum, 1975/1924, p. xlv).
7. Offered by the American book dealer Priapean Tomes in their Winter, 2001, catalog; present whereabouts unknown.


9. Still another author turned up by research is “Michael Strange,” actually the pseudonym of the actress, poet, suffragette, and socialist Blanche Marie Louise Oelrichs, whose later marriages included those to the actor John Barrymore (1920-1928) and to the noted lawyer Harrison Tweed (1929-1950). Writing in the male voice, she produced Uranian poems to adolescents, and effusions to Walt Whitman (Strange, 1919, pp. 149, 158). For the rest, this study will not concern itself with possible female Uranians.

10. The curious case of “Laurence Hope”—the pseudonym of Adela F. Nicolson, née Cory, is instructive here. In her *Stars of the Desert* she published passionate poems to adolescent (and even younger) Arab and North African boys, such as her “Song of the Eufila River” (“In Memory of Abdullah, drowned at 16 . . .”) (Nicolson, 1913, pp. 9-11); evidently it was regarded as more acceptable to sing to boys as a man, at least with the cover of the East (and particularly if the boys were safely dead) than for a Victorian lady to express such erotic sentiments under any circumstances.

11. Outside our language area, it might be noted that the Dutch homophile poet Willem de Merode also exploits the image of the medieval master/page relationship in his “De Page” I and II (Merode, 1919, pp. 65, 66). For an analysis of “De Page II” see Mader (1998, pp. 86-88).

12. Stoddard dedicates his *Poems* to Taylor, “Who I admire as a poet and love as a man,” and adds a further sonnet to Taylor (“Let us join our hands and knit our souls in friendship’s bands” (Stoddard, 1852, p. 121)), and has a further, more restrained sonnet for Taylor in his *Book of the East*, followed by another to Stedman, accompanying a copy of Shakespeare’s *Sonnets* ("Fancies like these, where love and friendship blend") (Stoddard, 1871, pp. 177, 178), while Stedman in turn dedicates his *Blameless Prince* to Stoddard, and it contains a sonnet to Taylor (Stedman, 1869, p. 145). The poetic implications of this triangle are addressed in Martin (1979, pp. 97-109). It is interesting to note that later Stedman is closely linked in various editing projects with George Edward Woodberry.

13. D’Arch Smith silently corrects his information regarding the authorship of this book (D’Arch Smith, 1970, pp. 132-133) in D’Arch Smith. 1998 (pp. 27 and 30 n. 8), where he offers his evidence for adding Charlton—and notes that Lomer and Charlton were the older gentlemen who “befriended” a young Noel Coward in his days as a boy actor.

14. This list could be extended beyond the Uranian period, with for instance Tom Meyer’s *Uranian Roses* (Scarborough, Ont.: Catalyst, 1977), or Jim Eggeling’s hip versions, including his own of the Garland Weaver (Leyland, 1977, pp. 64-65). Moving out of our era in another direction, it should also be noted that several Romans—especially Martial—were also favored for translation. Although his two collections of translations of Martial were not published until the 1970s (*Ganymede in Rome*, London: Palatine Press, 1971, and *An Eye for Ganymede*, London: Palatine Press, 1972), by virtue of his poems published just after World War I Brian Hill must be counted among the Uranians. Perhaps one must also mention Kenneth Hopkins’s original “ver-
sions' of Martial (The Dead Slave and other Poems of Martial, Scarborough, Ont.: Catalyst, 1977); Hopkins can, at least, claim to have reinvented himself as a Uranian in his To the Uranian Muse: A Cycle of Sonnets by Vincent Holmes (pseud.), Toronto: A-Z Chapbooks, 2000).

15. It remained for Eggeling to be thoroughly irreverent about the image in his "The Ganymede Equation" (Leyland, 1977, p. 66).

16. Taylor also manages to smuggle a reference to Hylas (as well as one to Ganymede) into one of his oriental poems, the "Nilotic Drinking Song" (Taylor, 1855, pp. 92-94).

17. A curious sidelight can be gained here from an early 20th century study, J. F. C. Gutteling's 1920 doctoral thesis (written in English) at the University of Amsterdam, Hellenic Influence on the English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century. Although only one of the poets she deals with was active into the last quarter of the century (Swinburne), and she avoids any discussion of sexual issues, it is nonetheless of interest for revealing what an academic contemporary of the Uranians saw in the Greeks. She defines the "Hellenic spirit" under six heads—"beauty, love of freedom, directness of apprehension that avoided sentiment and applied reason and common sense, rationalism, sanity, and many-sidedness" (Gutteling, 1920, pp. 3-7), several of these recur here in various forms. In discussing Swinburne she also speaks of "the sensuous beauty of paganism" and "a joyful, sensuous paganism" that contrasted with what for him was the "Christian religion of pain," leading to his rejection of the latter (pp. 39-40).

18. Their view is confirmed in historical hindsight by Linda Dowling's assessment of the Uranians: "Uranian poetry was able to voice to a counterdiscourse of spiritual procreancy underwritten by the authority of Oxford Hellenism to precisely the degree it was able to represent itself as superior to the blind urgencies of merely animal sexuality..." (Dowling, 1996, pp. 114-116). For the rest, her delineation of "Uranian poetry," being based on D'Arch Smith, is much narrower than that being used here; while her assertion applies to many of the British poets, and Americans such as Woodberry who appealed to the Greeks, it should be noted that another idealism than the Platonic—namely Whitman's ideal of democratic comradeship—performed the same function for other Uranians.

19. Further insight into the influence of Pater at Harvard, albeit in the following decade, and on F. Holland Day's being introduced to Pater's thought there, is to be found in Crump (1995, p. 12).

20. For those interested in the calculations, the key is to be found in Woodberry's essay "The Ride," in his Heart of Man, recording a philosophical conversation which he and a former student—obviously the same person referred to in "Comrades," having died before the time the essay in the 1890s and the poem circa 1910—engage in during a journey on one of Woodberry's returns to the mid-west; in introducing the incident Woodberry tells us there was five years' difference in their ages (Woodberry, 1899, pp. 268-269). Knowing Woodberry went to Nebraska in 1877, determining their ages is easy. It remains for John Erskine, a later student of Woodberry's, to put a name to this friend—Eugene Montgomery, to whom Heart of Man is dedicated (Erskine, 1948, p. 202). Heart of Man also contains an essay characteristically celebrating Taormina, once part of Magna Graecia, as a humble, enduring repository for the ideals of civilization. For the rest, note the allusion to II Samuel 1:26.

21. John Erskine attributes the departure from Columbia to power-plays in the faculty, and the departure to Europe to Woodberry's deep disappointment (Erskine, 1947, pp. 148-159, 242; 1948, pp. 104-105). It is not impossible this was merely a faculty
quarrel, but one is left wondering if there are not other reasons relating to his sexuality to account for such a radical removal from the scene.

22. See, for instance, his plaint to Harry Harkness Flagler in a 1906 letter from Sorrento, about "hearing the old wolf coming up to scratch at the door," and his longer and more melancholy complaint on the same theme in a 1910 letter from Naples to Merideth Nicholson (Woodberry, 1933, pp. 48, 81-82). Flagler, son of an American railroad tycoon and philanthropist, was possibly homosexual; regarding his links to E. I. Prince-Stevenson/Xavier Mayne, who dedicated one of his books to him, see Hafkamp (1988, p. 128).

23. The iconography of the working boy, as developed particularly by the British-born New York painter of street boys J. G. Brown, is discussed in Mader (1999). Further sources on Brown can be found there. The newsboy of course had his apotheosis in the work of Horatio Alger, whose dismissal as a clergyman for sexual relations with boys was well-hidden during his lifetime, and many years after (see Chapter 1 of Edwin P. Hoyt’s Horatio’s Boys: The Life and Works of Horatio Alger, Jr. (Radnor, PA: Chilton, 1974)).

24. It is interesting to note that one of the few other figures in American art in that period to also positively portray Afro-Americans was J. G. Brown (Mader, 1999).

25. The connection here is admittedly slim, but this is an opportunity to mention an interesting contribution to the debate about masculinity and homosexuality in America in the first decades of the 20th century which others have missed, Charles Hanson Towne’s poem “Young Rupert”: Rupert, the very picture of the pansy (“His hair was golden as a girl’s, his cheeks were pink and white...”) who responds to the call of duty (“But when they needed youngsters, those early days in France! Young Rupert packed his grip and went to drive an ambulance”) leaving behind the he-men who laughed at him to their empty boasting in dingy bars (Towne, 1919, pp. 87-88).

26. The reception of James Gardiner’s A Class Apart: The Private Pictures of Montague Glover (New York/London: Serpent’s Tail, 1993) is informative in this regard: while widely proclaimed as proof of stable, long-lasting gay relationships, almost no reviewer noted—despite the clear allusion in the title—that this was the visual history of precisely the sort of cross-class relationship which is suspect, and the age difference at the time Glover and Hall met was totally consigned to silence.

27. To those who think this generalization is irresponsible: the Library of Congress catalogues Félix Buñol’s Eros adolescens, La pédiastrie dans la Grèce antique under “Child sexual abuse—Greece”; http://catalog.loc.gov and perform a subject search under that heading!
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