



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Reconsidering the Emergence of the Gay Novel in English and  
German

Wilper, James

Published by Purdue University Press



Wilper, James.

Reconsidering the Emergence of the Gay Novel in English and German.

Purdue University Press, 2016.

Project MUSE.[muse.jhu.edu/book/47991](https://muse.jhu.edu/book/47991).

➔ For additional information about this book

<https://muse.jhu.edu/book/47991>

## Chapter 3

### The "manly love of comrades"

The classicist and poet John Addington Symonds (1840–1893) in his *Memoirs*, which were written between 1889 and 1893, recalls his sexual awakening through the writings of Plato, by "stumb[ing] on the *Phaedrus*": "I read on and on, till I reached the end. Then I began the *Symposium*; and the sun was shining on the shrubs outside the ground-floor room in which I slept, before I shut the book up . . . Here in the *Phaedrus* and the *Symposium*—in the myth of the Soul and the speeches of Pausanias, Agathon, and Diotima—I discovered the true *liber amoris* at last, the revelation I had been waiting for, the consecration of a long-cherished idealism. It was just as though the voice of my own soul spoke to me through Plato, as though in some antenatal experience I had lived the life of a philosophical Greek lover" (*Memoirs* 99). He would go on from this point to become one of the nineteenth century's most influential Greek love theorists. It seemed to him that through the *Symposium* he "had obtained the sanction of the love which had been ruling [him] from childhood" (*Memoirs* 99). And yet, Plato did not offer young Symonds the means of expressing the physical dimensions of his love. In his case history in *Sexual Inversion* (1897), Symonds recounts to Havelock Ellis that even after his encounter with Plato he suffered under society's mandate to repress and sublimate his same-sex desire, experiencing physical manifestations of this unrest in "insomnia, obscure cerebral discomfort, stammering, chronic conjunctivitis, inability to concentrate his attention, and dejection." Only once he "began freely to follow his homosexual inclinations" did Symonds's health improve (Ellis and Symonds, *Sexual Inversion* 145). In the verse of Walt Whitman, Symonds eventually found a new means for situating male same-sex sexuality into an affirmative context. Comparable confrontations with Plato, aspects of Platonic philosophy, and the classics take place in both novels *Imre* and *Maurice*. This chapter explores these confrontations and the ways in which the authors reworked Greek love in their fiction.

Edward Prime-Stevenson's *Imre: A Memorandum* invokes the Greeks, Walt Whitman's verse, and other sources to assist in formulating a modern homosexual identity and model for homosexual relations. Although the vision of homosexual

identity and relations depicted in Prime-Stevenson's writings is in many ways similar to that theorized in England in the writings of Symonds and Edward Carpenter (1844–1929), as I explain below, there was little or no interaction between the American émigré living on the Continent and the British theorists. On the other hand, in *Maurice's* "Terminal Note," Forster acknowledges the debt he owed to Carpenter and his partner George Merrill, especially the gentle inspirational pat Merrill gave him just above the backside, in envisioning an enduring love relationship between two men (*Maurice* 215). Carpenter and Merrill's partnership is the archetype for a vision of cross-class comrade love central to the novel. Robert Martin considers this vision of love between men and contrasts it to the novel's other mode of homosexuality, charting the shift between the two types. "The novel opposes two kinds of homosexuality—one that is identified with Cambridge and Clive, and one that is identified with Alec and the open air—and uses the opinions on homosexual love expressed by Clive to indicate a stage in Maurice's development, but one that does not represent the author's concept of the final stage of development: this Maurice can achieve only through the encounter with Alec" ("Edward Carpenter and the Double Structure of *Maurice*" 35). Martin argues that the former variant of homosexuality "is dominated by Plato and, indirectly, by John Addington Symonds and the apologists for 'Greek love,'" whereas the latter "is dominated by Edward Carpenter and his translation of the ideas of Walt Whitman" and thus is a vision that represents a reorientation of conceptualizing same-sex passion (36). Martin's discussion of the double structure of the novel is an important reference point for this chapter of my study. But, despite this fact, I take issue with his identification of Symonds as merely a Greek love apologist rather than giving him credit for the role he played in developing comrade love. Rainer Guldin too, in his study of Symonds, Carpenter, and Forster, draws this line between Symonds and Carpenter. "In his novel *Maurice* of 1913–1914, Forster confronts both approaches: Symonds's idealizing, sex-negative aestheticism is repudiated in favor of Carpenter's social-critical and sex-affirmative standpoint." ("In seinem 1913–1914 geschriebenen Roman 'Maurice' [*sic*] konfrontiert er [Forster] die beiden Ansätze: Symonds' idealisierender, körperfeindlicher Ästhetizismus wird zugunsten von Carpenters sozialkritischem und körperbejahendem Standpunkt abgelehnt"; Guldin, *Verbrüderung* 15). Both viewpoints, I argue, undervalue Symonds and his writings and construct an artificial opposition between Symonds and Carpenter. That they do not recognize the link between Oxbridge Hellenism and Uranian love, embodied both literally and figuratively in Symonds, is my critique of Martin's seminal essay as well as Guldin's study. Martin concludes that Carpenter "brought an end to Forster's search for a homosexual tradition because he seemed to create his own tradition, to offer a world where the homosexual could build a new social order" (44). I certainly agree that Carpenter seemed to offer a vision for building a new social order, but this new homosexual tradition was established firmly with reference to the legacies from the ancient world. Both novels, *Imre* and *Maurice* deploy the past in order to create something new. This chapter first explores Symonds's and Carpenter's efforts at reviving Greek love, then analyzes Prime-Stevenson's novel

and the comparable uses and misuses of history and Whitman's poetry which the author worked into the text, and finally examines Forster's novel and the influence of Symonds and Carpenter in the triumph of "the manly love of comrades" over Oxbridge Hellenism.

## The English Comrades

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, Symonds and Carpenter revived Greek love in their writings by drawing on Walt Whitman's "love of comrades" (*The Complete Poems* 150), which is found in his verse, especially in *Leaves of Grass* (first edition 1855). What they envision I designate in this study as "Uranian comrade love." Hellenism proved to thwart Symonds as much as it had liberated him. Whitman's "Calamus" cluster from *Leaves of Grass* offered another, for him more authentic, vision of same-sex love. "The book became for me," writes Symonds in his *Memoirs*, "a sort of Bible" (189). At the close of his book-length treatment of Whitman's verse, *Walt Whitman: A Study* (1893), he describes a transformation in himself triggered by comrade love—without explicitly broaching what he saw as its homosexual aspects. Symonds confesses how, in 1865, *Leaves of Grass* saved him body and soul. He writes that the poem that begins "Long I thought that knowledge alone would suffice me" sent "electric thrills through the very marrow of my mind" (*Walt Whitman* 158). In a letter Symonds wrote to Whitman in 1872, he explained the shift in his understanding of his attraction to other men (again, without at this point explicitly broaching homosexuality) which the poetry had catalyzed. Prior to this he had labored under "a delusion of distorted passions, a dream of the Past, a scholar's fancy," but *Leaves of Grass* allowed him to conceptualize his desire as a "strong and vital bond of man to man," a comradeship which Symonds places "on a par with the Sexual feeling for depth and strength and purity and capability of all good" (*Letters* 2: 201–02). Whitman supplants Plato: "I have pored for continuous hours over the pages of *Calamus* (as I used to pore over the pages of Plato), longing to hear you speak, *burning* for a revelation of your more developed meaning . . . Someday, perhaps—in some form, I know not what, but in your own chosen form—you will tell me more about the Love of Friends!" (201–02). Whitman's vision of comradely love surpasses Platonic philosophy. Symonds was "struggling to free himself and the English Uranians from one half of the inheritance of Oxford Hellenism while retaining the other half of its powerful ideological support" writes Linda Dowling. "Attempting to discard the crippling sexual sublimation of the Platonic eros, Symonds fights at the same time to preserve the ideal of Dorian comradeship" with "its tremendous force as a counterweight" to contemporary religious, legal, and medical discourses (*Hellenism and Homosexuality* 130). *Leaves of Grass* empowered Symonds to reconcile spiritual and physical aspects of love between men.

Edward Carpenter recounts a similar response to the writings of Whitman in his autobiography *My Days and Dreams* (1916). As was the case with Symonds,

Whitman supplanted the place reserved for Plato: "in Plato and the Greek authors there had been something wanting" (64–65). The American bard "sent shock-waves through the furtive gentility of Britain's Uranian community," writes Gregory Woods. "He transformed their nostalgia for pastoral Greece into yearning for a utopian New World of open frontiers and open-necked shirts" (*A History of Gay Literature* 177). Yet, it would be wrong to characterize this shift as an abandonment of Hellenism in favor of this interpretation of Whitman's manly "adhesiveness." Ancient Greek comrades-in-arms—Achilles and Patroclus, Harmodius and Aristogeiton, and the Sacred Band of Thebes—remained powerful images and models in the imaginations of the Uranians. Whitman was, especially for Symonds, a torchbearer in the legacy of male love. "The language of 'Calamus' . . . has a passionate glow, a warmth of emotional tone, beyond anything to which the modern world is used in the celebration of the love of friends," he writes in the essay "A Problem in Modern Ethics" (1891). "It recalls to our mind the early Greek enthusiasm—that fellowship in arms which flourished among Dorian tribes, and made a chivalry for prehistoric Hellas" (*Symonds and Homosexuality* 195). Whitman served to revitalize this heritage by stripping it of the intellectualism, effete learning, and over-refinement with which it had become encumbered in the nineteenth century (see M. Robertson, *Worshipping Walt* 140–88; Herrero-Brasas, *Walt Whitman's Mystical Ethics of Comradeship* 83–116).

There are three recurrent issues raised in these Uranian writings: (1) they do not deny the physical aspects of love between men; (2) they stress the health and manliness of Uranian men; and (3) they discuss the "democratic" nature of this love. First, an affirmation of physical love between men is a central tenet of their writings. Symonds, in "A Problem in Greek Ethics" (1873) defines Greek love as "a passionate and enthusiastic attachment subsisting between man and youth, recognized by society and protected by opinion, which, though it was not wholly free from sensuality, did not degenerate into mere licentiousness" (*Symonds and Homosexuality* 50). He is careful to emphasize the validity of the emotional bonds between two males—in the case of the Greeks "between man and youth"—while affirming, although in cautious wording, that sexuality did indeed play a potent role in these relations. Carpenter too is careful to emphasize the emotional over the physical aspects of same-sex love without completely disavowing the latter dimension. He writes in *The Intermediate Sex* that "the Uranian temperament, especially in regard to its affectional side, is not without faults," but these so-called faults are hardly what early twentieth-century guardians of morality would have leveled against them. "I think one may safely say that the defect of the male Uranian, or Urning, is not sensuality—but rather sentimentality" (13). It would be hard to fault Uranians for such a virtuous "defect." "It would be a great mistake to suppose that their attachments are necessarily sexual, or connected with sexual acts. On the contrary (as abundant evidence shows), they are often purely emotional in their character; and to confuse Uranians (as is so often done) with libertines having no law but curiosity in self-indulgence is to do them a great wrong" (26). It is with some reservations that they acknowledge physical Eros; but they deserve credit where it is due. In their writings,

Symonds and Carpenter do not deny sexual desire or argue that it should be sublimated and channeled toward supposedly purer aims.

Second, both writers stress the health, vitality, and manliness of homosexual men. In the 1891 essay, Symonds argues against "the common belief that all subjects of inverted instinct carry their lusts written in their faces; that they are pale, languid, scented, effeminate, painted, timid, oblique in expression." Symonds admits that although "A certain class of such people are undoubtedly feminine," the majority of homosexual men do not differ from "normal" men (*Symonds and Homosexuality* 134). "They are athletic, masculine in habit, frank in manner, passing through society year after year without arousing a suspicion of their inner temperament" (135). This claim was not only of importance in arguing against the stereotype of homosexual effeminacy (which would become highly visible after the Wilde trials), but in particular it countered medical discourses that hypothesized that homosexuality was a product of physical and mental degeneration. Symonds's and Carpenter's visions of homosexuality and homosexual love were that of manly men, *intragenerational* partners, bonding in a society that not only tolerates their form of affection, but values it for its contribution to the progress of civilization as a whole.

Third, a facet of this contribution to progress would take the form of the breaking down of inequitable power structures of social hierarchy. Symonds writes that "the blending of Social Strata in masculine love seems to me one of its most pronounced and socially hopeful features" (*Letters* 3: 808), and Carpenter posits that Eros can bridge "the most estranged ranks of society." "Eros is a great leveler. Perhaps the true Democracy rests, more firmly than anywhere else, on a sentiment which easily passes the bounds of class and caste, and unites in the closest affection the most estranged ranks of society. It is noticeable how often Uranians of good position and breeding are drawn to rougher types, as of manual workers, and frequently very permanent alliances grow up in this way, which although not publicly acknowledged have a decided influence on social institutions, customs and political tendencies" (*The Intermediate Sex* 114–15). The Uranians drew their conclusions about future society from the ancient world, but seem to ignore the aspects of Greek society that conflicted with their visions. Matt Cook highlights that "Athenian life was neither so stable nor so democratic as many in the later nineteenth century chose to believe" (*London and the Culture of Homosexuality* 126). James Davidson concurs, writing that same-sex relations in ancient Greece represented a reinforcement of social hierarchies, not a challenge to them (*The Greeks and Greek Love* 96–98).

It is also important to notice that this form of comradeship, as D. H. Mader notes, "was not defined in terms of sameness" ("The Greek Mirror" 378); instead, Uranian love theorizes sexual difference in terms of class difference. In these relations both partners are adult, if not coevals; thus sexual difference was not determined by age, as it had been for the Greeks and was the case for the *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen* in Germany. Carpenter and Symonds searched for a philosophic underpinning for their attraction to "rougher types" and they find it in Whitman's democratic and egalitarian love of comrades (M. Robertson, *Worshipping Walt* 151–58,

175–81). For the Uranians, this difference took the form of cross-class liaisons and alliances. Symonds, on the one hand, always maintained the position of benefactor in his relations. Cook describes how, for Symonds, any shame incurred by a visit to a London male brothel could be alleviated by becoming acquainted with and befriending his bedfellows. Comradeship, even the barest pretence at such, would allow him to reframe the liaison as "a more laudable and 'respectable' fraternity" within the philosophy of comrade love (131). Carpenter, on the other hand, went to greater lengths to realize his ideals. The longest-lasting of his relationships was with George Merrill, a young working-class man whom Carpenter met in 1891. The two began living together at Millthorpe, Carpenter's farm/commune in rural Derbyshire, in 1898 and remained together until Merrill's death in 1928 (Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter* 179, 242, 435–36).

Whitman's verse enabled Symonds and Carpenter to formulate a vision of love between men that was egalitarian, masculine, and enduring, but making this vision work in reality proved to be a challenge. They were undoubtedly aware that their cross-class comradeships could be viewed as sexual exploitation of members of the working class. There may have been tension between the stated aims of the Uranian comrades and the relations which many conducted in actuality. Jeffrey Weeks writes that there were "complex patterns recurring": "On the one hand was a form of sexual colonialism, a view of the lower classes as a source of 'trade.' On the other were an often sentimental rejection of one's own class values and a belief in reconciliation through sexual contact. . . . In the rarefied atmosphere of the 'Uranian' poets, money would change hands but ideology minimized its significance" ("Inverts, Perverts, and Mary-Annes" 203–04; see also Sedgwick, *Between Men* 210; Weeks, *Coming Out* 44; Cook 129–33; M. Robertson 153). Be that as it may, Symonds and Carpenter went beyond the bounds of Greek love, thereby catalyzing a departure from dependence on this discourse for their imitators and inheritors. They salvaged some core values and ideals from the past, revived these images with Whitman's love of comrades, drew upon liberationist theories of same-sex sexuality from the leading German researchers in the field, and incorporated their efforts into larger social reform movements.

## The (Mis)uses of History

In Prime-Stevenson's *Imre: A Memorandum*, in contrast to Forster's *Maurice*, there was undoubtedly little or no influence from John Addington Symonds or Edward Carpenter. If both writers had been influenced by the British Uranians, this would provide a convenient explanation for the many similarities between the two novels in terms of the homosexual identities and relations depicted. But as no such influence can be substantiated, the similarities are all the more remarkable for this fact. There is little evidence to connect the US-American, who lived on the Continent from around 1900 until his death in 1942, to Symonds and Carpenter. It is likely that Prime-Stevenson had read Symonds's essay "A Problem in Greek Ethics," which

was included, as the first appendix, to *Sexual Inversion* (1897), the medical textbook on homosexuality produced in collaboration between Symonds and the physician Havelock Ellis. In a letter to his friend and literary executor, Paul Elmer More, which was written in 1906, Prime-Stevenson mentions Ellis and Symonds's work ("Letter to Paul Elmer More" 135). Considering that in the letter Prime-Stevenson regarded *Sexual Inversion* as "dealing with pathologic conditions, with only limited 'typic' aspects, and [is] too much from and for exclusively a professional-psychiatric standpoint" (135), I doubt that he had read the German translation of the book which appeared in 1896, although he was especially well versed in German sexological writings (as is discussed in greater depth in chapter 5). Titled *Das konträre Geschlechtsgefühl*, the German translation was closer to Symonds's conception than the English edition published the following year (Crozier, "Introduction" 57–58).

Particularly interesting are the similarities between Prime-Stevenson's and Carpenter's writings, especially between the former's *The Intersexes: A History of Similisexuality as Problem in Social Life* and the latter's *The Intermediate Sex*, both of which were published in 1908. It would seem then that Prime-Stevenson had read Carpenter's *Homogenic Love and Its Place in a Free Society*, the forerunner to the 1908 work, which was first published privately in 1894. This is perhaps why James Gifford writes that the novel's defense of masculine homosexuality is "inspired both by antiquity and by the philosophy of Edward Carpenter" (*Dayneford's Library* 113). Yet, Carpenter's explicitly homosexual writings would have been difficult to come by. *Homogenic Love* was not available to those outside Carpenter's circle until its publication as a chapter in *Love's Coming of Age* in 1906 (Brady, *Masculinity and Male Homosexuality in Britain* 202). Thus, although Carpenter had read *Imre* and quotes it in the appendix of his study (*The Intermediate Sex* 167–69), it is unlikely that Prime-Stevenson had read Carpenter. Perhaps, then, it was the other way around; perhaps Prime-Stevenson influenced Carpenter. More likely, though, is that any similarity between the visions of homosexual love and relations theorized by the two writers is due to them drawing from the same well of inspiration—German sexology, Greek love, Walt Whitman's verse—and coming to comparable conclusions. Prime-Stevenson depicts in his work of fiction homosexual identities and love relations which seem to mirror those theorized at the same time in England. Similar to the writings of Symonds and Carpenter and Forster's novel, Greek love discourse and Whitman's poetry play decisive roles in shaping the visions of homosexual identities and love relations. The novel draws upon the past, but ultimately utilizes it to create something new. Oswald fashions a cultural-historical narrative of love between men which speaks of this impulse in association with creative accomplishments, philosophy, bravery, and martial valor, thereby challenging contemporary society's condemnation of him as sinful, criminal, diseased, and effeminate.

The centrality of Greek love is flagged early in the narrative by the epigraph attributed to "Magyarbol": "Is there really now, as ages ago, a sexual aristocracy of the male? A mystic and Hellenic Brotherhood, a sort of super-virile man? A race with hearts never to be kindled by any woman; though, if once aglow, their strange

fires can burn not less ardently and purer than ours? An élite passion, conscious of a superior knowledge of Love, initiated into the finer joys and pains than ours?—that looks down with pity and contempt on the millions of men wandering in the valleys of the sexual commonplace?" (34). "Magyarbol," Gifford writes, is one of Prime-Stevenson's personae, a name which translates as "from the Hungarian" (34, note 1). This epigraph would seem to suggest that the standard nineteenth century Greek love apologetics, comparable to the one Clive voices to Maurice (*Maurice* 73), holds sway in the novel. The fact that these are not the words of another person, but of the author himself, would reinforce this assumption. Theirs is "An élite passion, conscious of a superior knowledge of Love." When Oswald describes to Imre the means through which he forged his identity, the first discourse he accesses is Greek love, which allows him to develop an understanding of his desire as "the Love-Friendship of Hellas" (84). The sources Oswald invokes do not stop with ancient Greece, which would seem to indicate that this work draws on a broader range of sources in shaping the identities depicted. "Between man and man could exist the sexual-psychic love. That was still possible! I knew that now! I had read it in the verses or the prose of the Greek and Latin and Oriental authors who have written out every shade of its beauty or unloveliness, its worth or debasements—from Theokritos to Martial, or Abu-Nuwas, to Platen, Michelangelo, Shakespeare. I had learned it from the statues of sculptors . . . [and] had half-divined it in the music of a Beethoven and a Tchaikovsky" (84). He identifies an affinity between himself and great men from diverse epochs and civilizations: this affinity that spans time, place, and culture is same-sex desire. "Tens of thousands of men, in all epochs, of noblest natures, of most brilliant minds and gifts, of intensest energies . . . scores of pure spirits, deep philosophers, bravest soldiers, highest poets and artists, had been such as myself" (86). Counter to the taboos and moral strictures of his day, he recognizes that among many of history's greats, love and desire between men was a vital force in their philosophies, works, and lives. He confidently asserts to Imre "that they belonged to Us" (88).

Despite the essential role played by history, the novel makes significant departures from these classical and postclassical sources and models. *Imre* depicts love between adult men, not love for a teenage boy. Tariq Rahman draws a useful distinction between androphilia, attraction to "manly as opposed to boyish physical features," and ephhebophilia, attraction to beautiful pubescent boys and youths ("Ephhebophilia" 126). Thus the manly Uranian love depicted in Prime-Stevenson's novel, although a mode of same-sex desire, is fundamentally different to the "ephebophilia" celebrated in the works of many of the writers Oswald invokes (for instance Plato, the Greek and Roman poets, Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Platen). Indeed, the protagonist repudiates the desire described and depicted in Greek philosophic dialogues and poetry as well as in Roman, Arabian, and Renaissance writings. These men are "the cynical debauchers of little boys; the pederastic perverters of clean-minded lads in their teens" (87). Prime-Stevenson's study *The Intersexes* provides insight into the author's understanding of male same-sex relations in his-

tory. He writes that there were "three distinctions in Hellenic love" (49). The first was "merely spiritual passion and bond, untouched by physical desires" and thus "was not love, but friendship, at its highest throb." The second was "the similesexual physical love" which included "high idealism, intellectual companionship . . . along with the physical passion for him, and its natural satisfaction." This mode of same-sex passion is not boy-love, but is intragenerational. "This is a sort of similesexual passion and love-sentiment in which the friends are relatively of equal and fairly matures ages." And the third, which he credits for sapping the "Greek military spirit," is the "mere physical possession of a youth" which "we know today under the phases of Pederasty, or boy-love" (49). It is a fast-and-loose reading of history as well as of the literary sources, but one from which Oswald derives a sense of homosexual selfhood. Against the fierce opprobrium of his day, it is an incredibly potent resource to tap.

When he shares this discourse with Imre, it may be that he projects his understanding of his sexuality, a product of cultural forces specific to his own era, to figures from the past, assigning an early-twentieth century conception of homosexual subjectivity onto earlier generations who understood and expressed their sexual drives differently. This is an endeavor which is now recognized as anachronistic. And yet, this possible misuse of history represents a positive force for the characters as well as for readers of the novel, having the potential to open avenues toward self-awareness. Such "list[s] of great queens of history," writes Rictor Norton, are "compiled by queers in order to find a place for themselves in a historical tradition, to celebrate that they are part of a cultural unity." A narrative like the one Oswald weaves "celebrates the fact not so much that queers are great, or even that they are creative, or even that they are good, but that queers are part of history" (*The Myth of the Modern Homosexual* 223). Oswald asserts that his love does exist, contrary to charges of its unnaturalness. He is not mistaken in recognizing that love between men transcends its contemporary condemnation; thus his endeavor is less about applying terms and notions anachronistically onto figures from the past, and more about deploying a historical narrative to turn the tables on the argument made by moral, legal, and some medical authorities, to contend that it is the condemnation of love between men which in fact is unnatural. Oswald sees the possibility the past offers for forging identities in the present and constructs a narrative of queer history, finding a place for himself within this cultural legacy (see also Wilper, "Sexology, Homosexual History, and Walt Whitman" 52–68).

It is clear that this effort is twofold in its purpose. On the one hand, this is the means through which the protagonist builds his identity. On the other, it incorporates a defensive and justificatory strategy (somewhat awkwardly from an artistic standpoint) into the novel. I am inclined to agree with James Levin that "the use of such lists in fiction is awkward" (*The Gay Novel* 18–19). The stratagem he mobilizes was by no means new or untested. By 1906, the year of the novel's first publication, Oscar Wilde had defended himself, his writings, and "the Love that dare not speak its name"; Symonds had penned two essays that were influential in developing Uranian

love; Elisar von Kupffer, in *Lieblingminne und Freundesliebe in der Weltliteratur*, and Carpenter, in *Ioläus: An Anthology of Friendship* (1902), had anthologized many of the same authors referenced by Oswald in their respective literary compilations; and Friedländer had argued in *Renaissance des Eros Uranios* that the persecution of same-sex desire was unnatural and harmful to society. Wilde's speech and these texts historicize love between men, arguing for its cultural legitimacy, insisting that this impulse is natural and healthy, and that its recognition would benefit society. *Imre: A Memorandum* is a voice in a movement of Greek love apologia which defended same-sex love. It demanded that the existence of this form of love be acknowledged and that its worth be recognized and valued.

Oswald draws upon the past, the Greek, Roman, Arabian, and postclassical Western authors and artists whose diverse works celebrate male beauty and love between men, thus enabling him to conceptualize his sexuality and himself positively (84–88). But these works of art do not seem, in and of themselves, to possess the discursive authority to challenge Judeo-Christian condemnation of the sex act between men directly. "And I had recognized what it all meant to most people today, from the disgust, scorn and laughter of my fellow-men when such an emotion was hinted at! I understood perfectly that a man must wear the Mask. . . . Love between two men, however absorbing, however passionate, must not be . . . a sexual love, a physical impulse and bond" (84). Crossing this line between spiritual love and the physical act makes this noble desire "a nameless horror—a thing against all civilization, sanity, sex, Nature, God!" (84). Oswald in time learns with the assistance of progressive sexology that this notion was a fallacy, eventually rejecting a conception of love that demands the sublimation of its physical expression. He casts off many of the anxieties about relations between males embedded in the source texts and their later invocations, specifically rejecting the ideals that insist love between men must remain a chaste "romantic friendship" (46). Nevertheless, in the narrative he must learn this lesson again.

While he still believes that Imre is heterosexual, he is willing to sublimate his desire in order to remain close to the man he loves. He resigns himself to forming a Platonic bond with him. The relationship model that the text seems to develop for the two is one of nonsexual love between comrades. Oswald's confession takes place under a monument "To the Unforgettable Memory of Z. Lorand, and Z. Egon," a memorial to brotherly love and self-sacrifice, which James Gifford notes is a Hungarian recasting of the Greek story of Damon and Pythias (Introduction 18). Lorand and Egon appear to figure as the patron saints of Oswald and Imre's passion, but later in the narrative when the two share a moment of intimate physical contact—Imre buries his head in Oswald's chest while he searches for the words to confess his homosexuality and the love he reciprocates—Oswald becomes visibly sexually aroused, or as he puts it, "the Sex-Demon brought his storm upon my traitorous nature, in fire and lava" (115). "Oh, this cursed outbreak and revelation of my sensual weakness! this inevitable physical appeal of Imre to me! This damned and inextricable ingredient in the chemistry of what ought to be wholly

a spiritual drawing toward him, but which meant that I desired my friend for his gracious, virile beauty—as well as loved him for his fair soul! Oh, the shame of it all, the uselessness of my newest resolve to be more as the normal man, not so utterly the Uranian" (115). The scientific language Oswald employs emphasizes the essential nature of homosexual passion: physical desire is an "inextricable ingredient in the chemistry" of their relationship. Sexual desire is like a law of nature, an "inevitable physical appeal." Oswald laments to Imre that "I have tried to change myself, to care for you only with my soul. But I cannot change" (116). The imagery employed in this passage suggests more than a mere obvious erection; "in fire and lava" is certainly a metaphor for orgasm. *Der Puppenjunge* also employs nature as a metaphor for sex—in that case it is a release of atmospheric tension in a sudden summer storm (*Hustler* 178; *Puppenjunge* 208). These images communicate a sense that sexual desire is a force that transcends human efforts to rein it in, a force of nature that is eventually victorious. Imre then confesses that he too is "wholly homosexual" and that he loves Oswald (117). After Imre narrates his life story to Oswald, which Oswald, as the narrator, summarizes for the reader (119–26), the novel winds down with a speedy denouement, concluding with the suggestion that the two finally consummate their love: "Come then, O friend! O brother, to our rest! Thy heart on mine, thy soul with mine!" (127). Thus the novel deploys history to build affirmative identities and structure relationships between men, but it does so in a way that avoids being constrained by these discourses. The novel invokes the past and evokes its ideals and virtues, but, like the English comrades, does not see emotional and physical love as mutually exclusive. And, like the comrades, the novel takes cues, particularly for how to structure relations between males, from a more modern source, interpreting them from the verse of Walt Whitman.

The cultural-historical narrative which the novel draws upon and consequently promotes emphasizes the sterling qualities of homosexual men and thus fosters a vision of love between men colored in shades of superiority; Oswald rhetorically asks Imre: "Are we not the extreme of the male? its supreme phase, its outermost phalanx—its climax of the aristocratic, the All-Man?" (86). The novel stresses the manliness of homosexual men to counter charges of enfeeblement and effeminacy, derangement and disease, and a key influence in this discourse of Uranian manliness is Whitman. Although his name is listed with other writers, such as Shakespeare, Marlowe, Byron, and Platen (87), his full impact upon the novel only becomes explicit when read in light of the author's treatment of the poet in *The Intersexes*. Prime-Stevenson deems Whitman "one of the prophets and priests of homosexuality" whose verse is pervaded with a homoerotic atmosphere springing from "the neo-hellenic, platonic democracy of Whitman's philosophic muse" (377). In many of "Whitman's philosophico-political poems," writes Prime-Stevenson, "he accents the idea of the importance of masculine ties on lines of the old hellenic sort—the Sacred Band—as vital to the State, in the restoration of the true democracy" (380). *The Intersexes* constructs a homosexual literary heritage which situates Whitman's poetry as the most recent apotheosis of a cultural legacy of male love traceable from Plato,

through Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Platen: in Whitman's verse "is to be heard a new voice, if with an accent classically old, in its philosophic message of conviction as to the purity, the naturalness of true uranian love and its high mission to the individual and toward nations" (381). The study's glowing account of Whitman's place within the homosexual literary canon indicates the role played in the novel by the American poet's paeans to manly comrade "adhesiveness," which, I posit, is the basis of the relationship between Oswald and Imre.

An interpretation of the homoerotic aesthetic of Whitman's verse, which especially marks the "Calamus" poems, is an essential point of reference for the Uranian subjectivity portrayed in the novel and provides the essential model for love relations between men. The manly "lifelong love of comrades" embodies an ideal, a model, and a vision of masculine, egalitarian, and enduring love between men (see Herrero-Brasas, *Walt Whitman's Mystical Ethics of Comradeship* 83–116). The author's emancipatory and didactic undertaking with the novel is parallel to the program formed by the writings of Symonds and Carpenter. Like the English comrades, in Prime-Stevenson's interpretation, comrade love is primarily a minority affair and denotes love between adult men rather than that of an adult man for an adolescent boy—androphilia instead of ephebophilia, in Rahman's terms ("Ephebophilia" 126). This is in distinct contrast to the ways which the American poet's ideals were understood in Germany by writers associated with Adolf Brand's journal *Der Eigene* or by André Gide in France. *Imre* is a meditation in novel form upon a vision of homosexuality and homosexual relations which owes an immense debt to Whitman.

*Imre: A Memorandum* draws upon the past in order to create something new. The greatest difference between *Imre*, on the one hand, and Forster's novel, on the other, is how sexual difference is theorized. In both novels, the partners are adult, and high value is placed upon their manliness. Whereas Forster formulates difference around cross-class outreach, difference takes shape in terms of "race," or rather nationality, in *Imre*. Both Imre and Oswald are aristocrats; the former belongs to an ancient, yet impoverished, noble family (37), and the latter is a leisure-class English gentleman who commands the pecuniary resources to live comfortably in exile in Europe. Both are educated, both are interested in art and music. Whereas neither Maurice nor Alec cares for art and culture, for the characters of *Imre*, it is their shared interests in art and music which initially draw them together. Through Oswald's exposition of Imre, in the first part of the novel, it becomes evident that Imre's "race" is a source of keen attraction, situating him as the "other." Oswald romanticizes the "Oriental quality, ever in the Magyar" to the point of fetishization. He admits to Imre that interest in his nationality plays a significant role in his attraction to him: "the mysterious affinity between myself and your race and nation; of my sensitiveness, ever since I was a child, to the chord which Magyarország and the Magyar sound in my heart. . . . Thy land, thy people, Imre, are they not almost my land, my people?" (103). Thus theirs is not a relationship based upon sameness; instead it is one based upon difference too, but in the form of nationality.

## Comrade Love over Hellenism

In *Maurice*, Hellenism is represented by Clive Durham and the relationship he frames for himself and Maurice. In this portion of the novel, conflict is cast in terms of opposition between Judeo-Christian doctrine and Hellenism. For Clive, study of the classics opens new avenues toward self-awareness. In his youth, he believed that he was "damned," in possession of a "tainted soul," and "punished" with the desire of Sodom (55)—classical philosophy liberates him from the constraining forces of religion. Clive swaps the Bible for Plato. "Never could he forget his emotion at first reading the *Phaedrus*. He saw there his malady described exquisitely, calmly, as a passion which we can direct, like any other, toward good or bad" (55–56). The church's interpretation of same-sex desire being at odds with his nature, Clive throws off Christianity: "he could not find any rest for his soul in [the church] without crippling it, and withdrew higher into the classics yearly" (56). Clive initiates Maurice into this discourse. Plato's *Symposium* provides a conduit through which Clive can broach the subject of homosexuality with Maurice. "The Greeks, or most of them," Clive assures him, "were that way inclined, and to omit it is to omit the mainstay of Athenian society" (38). It is not that at this point Maurice does not understand what Clive drives at—he has read an unexpurgated edition of the poetry of Martial—but "He hadn't known it could be mentioned, and when Durham did so in the middle of the sunlit court a breath of liberty touched him" (38). Nevertheless, religion still presents an obstacle to their coming together. Maurice does not read the *Symposium* during the vacation, and so when Clive confesses his love, Maurice is "scandalized," "horrified," and shocked to the "bottom of his suburban soul": "it's the only subject absolutely beyond limit as you know, it's the worst crime in the calendar, and you must never mention it again" (44). Maurice's slow nature eventually senses his blunder. He sees that from boyhood he has "been fed upon lies," meaning conventional morality, Judeo-Christian norms, values, and strictures. "He loved men and always had loved them," he finally realizes. "He longed to embrace them and mingle his being with theirs" (47). He adopts Hellenism to understand and voice his sexual nature: "I have always been like the Greeks and didn't know" (50).

Through the means of classical philosophy, the two build a relationship: "by linking their love to the past [Clive] linked it to the present" (58). Maurice and Clive shared the "love that Socrates bore Phaedo," a love both passionate and temperate. Clive "led the beloved up a narrow and beautiful path, high above either abyss . . . He educated Maurice, or rather his spirit educated Maurice's spirit, for they themselves became equal" (80). Their relationship is structured along similar philosophical lines to the one Aschenbach imagines between himself and Tadzio. The same models, Socrates and Phaedrus, are referenced. Furthermore, the relations are justified by way of their intellectual and pedagogic basis. A notable difference is that whereas Greek love is a shared discourse in the case of Clive and Maurice, which helps them mutually to understand and structure their relationship, in *Der Tod in Venedig* only Aschenbach has access to this discourse. And the most evident

difference is that whereas approximately thirty-nine years separate Aschenbach and Tadzio, only one year separates Clive and Maurice. The former relationship is (or rather would be) intergenerational, and thus nearer to Greek practices in this sense, and the latter relationship is intragenerational. Nevertheless, despite the nearness of their ages, Clive is very much the active partner—perhaps not in the sexual sense, as their relationship is never consummated, but definitely in "carv[ing] a channel for" their love, setting boundaries, in leading and "educat[ing] Maurice," in spite of the assertion that "they themselves became equal" (80). Owing to the intellectual and pedagogic bent and the fact that these relations are conducted between men, who allegedly experience emotion more deeply, Clive characterizes this love as higher and purer: "I feel to you as Pippa to her fiancé, only far more nobly, far more deeply, body and soul, no starved medievalism of course, only a—a particular harmony of body and soul that I don't think women have even guessed" (73). Theirs is a textbook example of Oxford or Cambridge Greek love.

Forster was certainly treating familiar material because, by the time he arrived at Cambridge in 1897, this manner of Platonic love was well established among undergraduates (Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* 3). It was a means to conceptualize and express love and desire between men as a form of "sexless devotion" (Jenkyns, *The Victorians and Ancient Greece* 280–97; see also Richards, "Passing the Love of Women" 92–121; Bowden, "Education, Ideology, and the Ruling Class" 161–86). Thus despite the challenge Hellenism offers Christianity, the latter is not entirely vanquished. Sex between men in this form of Hellenism is disavowed while the purity and nobility of the sentiment is touted in order to prove that the practitioners are not breaking the Christian prohibition against "lying" with another man as well as legal sanctions against acts of "gross indecency." Clive's Hellenism at first appears to free Maurice, but as the narrative wears on it proves to trap him in another cage. Forster writes in the terminal note that Clive "believed in platonic restraint and induced Maurice to acquiesce, which does not seem to me at all unlikely. Maurice at this stage is humble and inexperienced and adoring, he is the soul released from prison, and if asked by his deliverer to remain chaste he obeys. Consequently, the relationship lasts for three years—precarious, idealistic, and peculiarly English, what Italian boy could have put up with it?" (217). In some ways this relationship is "peculiarly English," and in other ways not. In contrast to the German-language works of fiction, *Maurice* presents a Greek love relationship between two characters of similar ages. In this regard the relationship can be regarded as somewhat particular to the British context, especially to the elite universities of Cambridge and Oxford. But, as for invoking the ancients to justify and structure male-male relations, Clive's Platonism is not unique. At points in both German works of fiction (more so in Mann's novella), as well as to some extent in Prime-Stevenson's *Imre*, Greece is invoked not only to justify love between males, but also to offer a philosophic framework for these relations. And comparable to both German texts, as well as to *Imre*, reliance on discourses of nineteenth-century Hellenism, with the accompanying ideal that these relations must be chaste, impedes Clive and Maurice's love. "Classi-

cal studies may awaken a person's homosexuality," writes Robert Aldrich, "but too much book-learning can stifle sex" (*Seduction of the Mediterranean* 99). Debrah Raschke explains that a paradox exists in Clive's philosophy: "Platonism gives voice to homoerotic expression, but because it situates truth away from the body, it thwarts the physical fulfillment of this alternative expression; it, in effect, becomes a site of struggle for characters who fall under its influence" ("Breaking the Engagement with Philosophy" 153). *Maurice* shows the deficiencies of a relationship that supposedly enriches the spirit but makes no provision for bodily manifestations of love. Maurice begins to understand the shortcomings of this mode of expression in the course of the narrative. "His interest in the classics had been slight and obscene, and had vanished when he loved Clive. The stories of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, of Phaedrus, of the Theban Band were well enough for those whose hearts were empty, but no substitute for life. That Clive should occasionally prefer them puzzled him" (91). Clive's insistence on Hellenic philosophy set the boundaries of the relationship which Maurice eventually recognizes as entirely contrived. He bitterly recalls that "The less you had the more it was supposed to be—that was Clive's teaching" (159). And, at the close of the novel, Maurice confronts Clive and his philosophy that places the spirit above the body: "I'm not here to get advice, nor to talk about thoughts and ideas either. I'm flesh and blood, if you'll condescend to such low things—" (212). The novel shows the dangers inherent in the sublimation of the needs of the body not only with the relationship's dead end, but also in rendering the decline of Clive's physical appearance and the impending dereliction of his estate: "both house and estate were marked, not indeed with decay, but with the immobility that precedes it" (69). These represent vivid metaphors of what one risks in ignoring the body's needs and unambiguously symbolize the author's rejection of the Platonic sublimation of physical Eros ingrained in Cambridge or Oxford Hellenism.

The alternative vision of homosexual relations, which also springs from the Greek love tradition, is embodied in Alec Scudder. Although Maurice is older than Alec, the relationship is intragenerational. This is, writes Tariq Rahman, certainly the influence of Carpenter, who "was among the pioneering poets of adult homosexuality—Walt Whitman and John Addington Symonds were others—defined as a phenomenon distinct both from love of pretty boys and youths (paedophilia and ephrophilia) and platonic friendship." In contrast to other contemporary Victorian writers, Carpenter's "distinction was to have articulated the desire of men for young men with *manly* rather than *boyish* good-looks and vice versa" ("Edward Carpenter and E. M. Forster" 51). This novel, as well as *Imre: A Memorandum*, were among the first to depict relations that would become the norm in modern gay novels.

In *Maurice*, the basis of this form of Carpenter-inspired comrade love appears early in the narrative, long before Maurice and Alec meet. Young Maurice first feels this manner of bond for the garden boy, George. After he left the Hall's employ, his memory "stirred [something] in the unfathomable depths of [Maurice's] heart" (10). And later, in a dream, young Maurice is confronted with "his friend," an encounter that "filled him with beauty and taught him tenderness. He could die for such a

friend, he would allow such a friend to die for him; they would make any sacrifice for each other, and count the world nothing, neither death nor distance nor crossness could part them" (12). Maurice attempts to understand this image of his "friend" in religious as well as Hellenic terms, but neither notion fits. Maurice "tried to persuade himself that the friend must be Christ. But Christ has a mangy beard. Was he a Greek god, such as illustrates the classical dictionary? More probable, but most probably he was just a man" (12). Forster wrote to an early reader of the novel that he believed he had "created something absolutely new, even to the Greeks" (qtd. in Furbank, *E. M. Forster* 2: 14). That it is asserted that Maurice's friend was neither Christ nor a Greek god suggests this intent.

Nonetheless, the ancient world still has a strong bearing on Carpenter's new tradition, social order, and consequently Forster's novel. For the Uranian comrades, Doric virtues and manliness were highly prized and emulated, and the examples of ancient heroes and fighting forces, such as the Sacred Band of Thebes, provided powerful images. Young Maurice's dream of his friend which would evolve into the outlaws-of-the-greenwood vision has its basis in ancient Greece, as is reflected in the *Symposium*, where Phaedrus envisions a state or army consisting entirely of lovers and their beloveds: "If there was any mechanism for producing a city or army consisting of lovers and boyfriends, there could be no better form of social organization than this: they would hold back from anything disgraceful and compete for honour in each other's eyes. If even small numbers of such men fought side by side, they could defeat virtually the whole human race" (Plato 11). This cohesive bond described by Phaedrus also lay behind the valor of the Theban Band, which greatly influenced Carpenter's ideals of homosexual relations and the future role of the Uranian in society. *Maurice* fuses the Theban Band with English folklore to recreate this type of union but in a native setting. The result is a homosexual Robin Hood fantasy for which Maurice eventually sacrifices his career and position in society. "He was an outlaw in disguise. Perhaps among those who took to the greenwood in old times there had been two men like himself—two. At times he entertained the dream. Two men can defy the world" (114). Maurice's vision is a clear reference to Phaedrus's assertion, but the character does not invoke the *Symposium* to justify this belief. This would prove cumbersome, like the artificial restrictions that complicated Clive's Hellenism. Instead, Maurice's outlaw vision develops organically. Later in the narrative, he speaks of the fantasy to the hypnotist. "On the other hand, they could get away. England wasn't all built over and policed. Men of my sort could take to the greenwood. . . . It strikes me there may have been more about the Greeks—Theban Band—and the rest of it. Well, this wasn't unlike. I don't see how they could have kept together otherwise—especially when they came from such different classes" (183). The situations are not "unlike," but neither are they exactly the same. Maurice and Alec's greenwood is an English haven, different to a classically inspired exile in Italy or Greece.

The issue of social class arises as a concern. Maurice is a middle-class stockbroker and Alec is a gamekeeper and the son of a butcher. At first class differences present a boundary to their relationship. Their first sexual encounter was impetuous,

a force of nature that refused to be denied, but in the morning social division drove a wedge between them, "Class was calling, the crack in the floor must open at sunrise" (171). The "primitive abandonment" of their coming together gave rise to suspicion and fear. Alec "held out his hand. Maurice took it, and they knew at that moment the greatest triumph ordinary man can win. Physical love means reaction, being panic in essence, and Maurice saw now how natural it was that their primitive abandonment at Penge should have led to peril. They knew too little about each other—and too much. Hence fear. Hence cruelty" (196). At this point they "give over talking" and, in clasping hands, they come together as comrades. This is an example of the imperative "Only connect . . .," the epigraph from *Howards End* (1910). Nor is this manner of men coming together a one-off in Forster's oeuvre: for instance, in *A Passage to India* (1924) there is Dr. Aziz and Cyril Fielding's friendship that transgresses strict racial boundaries in colonial India. In *Maurice*, the titular character gives up his family, career, and social position, and Alec turns his back on opportunities for a better life in Argentina. Class is a limit whose transgression is a source of pleasure and possibility. Inspired by Carpenter and Merrill—and in contrast to Oswald and Imre—Maurice and Alec "must live outside class, without relations or money" (207); they live outside the social order as outlaws of the greenwood.

It is worth pointing out that the novel swaps one form of philosophy to order and justify the male-male relationship for another. Relations without a set of structuring ideals are also portrayed in a negative light. There are three instances of this in *Maurice*. The first of these is Maurice's attraction to Dickie Barry. Maurice peers into the young man's bedroom as he "lay unashamed, embraced and penetrated by the sun" (124). The use of the word "penetrated" here is suggestive as Maurice's gaze penetrates into the guest room of his mother's house where Dickie sleeps. The young man's "lips were parted, the down on the upper was touched with gold, the hair broken into countless glories, the body was a delicate amber" (124). Again, the parted lips and bare chest are blatantly sexual. Maurice is nearly predatory in his pursuit of Dickie. "This episode nearly burst Maurice's life to pieces": "His feeling for Dickie required a very primitive name. He would have sentimentalised once and called it adoration, but the habit of honesty had grown strong. What a stoat he had been! Poor little Dickie! He saw the boy leaping from his embrace, to smash through the window and break his limbs, or yelling like a maniac until help came. He saw the police—" (127). He realises that no high-minded idealism or talk of Platonic love could disguise that the primitive urge termed "lust" was what he had felt for the young man. He looks at himself in the mirror and notes the incongruity between his respectable middle-class appearance and his inner life: "Was it conceivable that on Sunday last he had nearly assaulted a boy?" (130). Lytton Strachey, who read the novel in 1915, quite rightly criticized the portrayal in this scene, finding nothing unusual in the protagonist's desire for the boy and certainly not warranting such a harsh portrayal (Furbank 2: 15). The second instance is Maurice's attraction to the young working-class men who attend his boxing lessons. After Dickie, he vows "to keep away from boys and young men" (127) and comes to recognize his actual mo-

tivations underlying his volunteer work in the East End. "The feeling that can impel a gentleman towards a person of lower class," he reasons, "stands self-condemned" (128). Hence the text seems to repudiate sexual exploitation of the lower classes and the hypocrisy which supports a system of prostitution sanctified by intellectualism or pedagogy, à la Oscar Wilde, or even Symonds. Although he finds happiness with a member of the working class, the two men have declassed themselves and come together as comrades. With the young men of his boxing class, Maurice would have stood above as a patron; with Alec, he stands alongside as an equal. But this was not always the case. The third instance of the negative portrayal of male-male relations without philosophy is Maurice and Alec's "primitive abandonment" at Penge.

Therefore the novel demonstrates its reliance upon some form of philosophy. When Hellenism fails, Maurice is left to grope about until he can fashion for himself a model for conducting relations with another man. Maurice leaves behind the crippling aspects of Clive's Hellenism, and he and Alec are free to express the physical dimension of their love. And yet history is not rejected. It still represents a source of strength for the present and future. By appropriating Greek love and employing it in new ways, Carpenter offered a powerfully affirmative homosexual identity and model for relations which reverberate in Forster's text. The physical expression of love was a source of angst for many of the inheritors of Greek love, and thus is a concern in all four literary texts considered here. In the relationship Maurice forms with Alec, physical desire is no longer repressed, sublimated, or disavowed. However, sex and sexual desire outside of a philosophical framework is threatening in *Maurice*.

## Conclusion

Forster's *Maurice* and Prime-Stevenson's *Imre* are indebted to Greek love and share a great deal in common in regards to the Whitmanian visions of same-sex identity and relations they portray and advocate. In contrast to the German works of fiction that I discussed above, which portray intergenerational love of men for teenage boys, the English examples depict intragenerational love, in other words, love between adult males. This physical attraction is, or may be, in the German texts one-sided. This is certainly the case in *Der Puppenjunge*, where the young man is only interested in the monetary exchange, but it is less clear in *Der Tod in Venedig*, in which mute Tadzio's feelings about Aschenbach's adoration are intimated at points in the narrative, but are never voiced. On the other hand, in the English novels, desire is mutual, although still based on a form of sexual difference, and is organized in life-long partnerships, rather than transient mentorships. Thus, the English novels do not depict Greek pederasty, instead, the mode of desire which has become the prevailing norm in gay subcultures and in gay literature. This chapter demonstrates that the texts position themselves in relation to Greek love in ways that initiate an expansion of this discourse. The result is a broader space in which to discuss and depict love and desire between males.