

---

H-France Review Vol. 16 (July 2016), No. 128

Marc-André Raffalovich. *Uranism and Unisexuality. A Study of Different Manifestations of the Sexual Instinct*. Trans. Nancy Erber and William A. Peniston; ed. Philip Healy with Frederick S. Roden. Houndmills, Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 312 pp. with index; one illustration. \$105.00 US (cl). ISBN 978-1-137-45138-5.

Review by David A. Powell, Hofstra University.

A Russian Jew born in Paris a year after his family emigrated from Odessa, Marc-André Raffalovich (1864-1934) grew up in an aristocratic family among the artistic and intellectual contacts who frequented his mother's salon. At the age of eighteen he left Paris to study at Oxford; he spent most of the remainder of his life in London and then Edinburgh. He made some attempts at being a poet.[1] He also had ambitions of hosting a literary and artistic salon like his mother. Raffalovich shared his life with John Gray (1866-1934), an English aesthetic poet and translator, often taken to be Oscar Wilde's inspiration for his character Dorian Gray. It was largely under Gray's influence that Raffalovich, at the age of thirty-two, converted to Catholicism.[2] The coincidence of his conversion and the publication of the study of uranism in 1896 is noteworthy.

Already in the mid-1890s Raffalovich began writing articles for the *Archives de l'Anthropologie criminelle*, founded by the prominent criminologist Alexandre Lacassagne. Before publishing his monumental work in 1896, several portions previously appeared in the *Archives*. [3] Soon afterward he began working on *Annales de l'unisexualité* and *Les Chroniques de l'unisexualité*, in which he planned to catalogue everything published to date on the subject of homosexuality. Despite not being able to analyze the overwhelming amount of material he amassed, these archives have long been a valuable resource for scholars. Not all of this information is included in the volume under review.

Raffalovich was a restrained admirer of the works of both Richard von Krafft-Ebing, principally the 1886 *Psychopathia Sexualis: eine Klinisch-Forensische Studie* (Sexual Psychopathy: A Clinical-Forensic Study), and Havelock Ellis' 1897 *Sexual Inversion* (co-authored with John Addington Symonds, originally published in German in 1896). In addition, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs' groundbreaking defense of homosexuality (first his 1867 defense of homosexuality before German Jurists where he demanded the repeal of anti-homosexual laws, and then the publication of *Forschungen über das Rätsel der mannmännlichen Liebe* [Studies on the Riddle of Male-Male Love], published posthumously in 1898) spurred Raffalovich to pen his own study. He later became familiar with the work of Magnus Hirschfeld, who played an important role in the Harden-Eulenburg affair.[4] Raffalovich's work displays evident familiarity with the burgeoning bibliography on issues surrounding homosexuality (inversion, uranism, sapphism, tribadism, etc.). Despite the overlap with his contemporaries on many topics, Raffalovich's contribution is important to note on two points. He insists on rejecting the notion of any psychological abnormality in homosexuality that he maintains is, on the contrary, a sexual constitution as equally natural as heterosexuality. The second major difference Raffalovich's writing brings is the insistence on the connection he perceived between pure or native inversion and Catholicism.

If *Uranism and Unisexuality* has been “utterly neglected,” as F. Roden rightly claims (p. 2), it is likely because of the substantial significance it gives to “superiority” in a select few inverts (doubtless including himself and John Gray), and to the excessive importance given to a Catholic viewpoint. Still, as it does illustrate an aspect of how homosexuality was viewed by a late nineteenth-century audience, this translation brings to the English-speaking public a worthwhile artifact.[5] The value of Raffalovich’s contribution to the discourse on homosexuality in the late 1800s is substantial; unfortunately the value of the text is not, to my mind, sufficiently underscored in the critical apparatus of the volume.

In contrast to most sexologists of his time, Raffalovich rejected the concept of homosexuality as being interpreted as “a female soul in a man’s body or a male soul in a female’s body”; instead he claimed that some people were simply attracted to others of the same sex, a bold claim for its time. He divided these “uranists,”[6] as he called them, into born and chosen inverts, the former being “pure” and born with the purpose of promoting the highest spiritual and mystical creations; the latter would have adopted, according to Raffalovich, a same-sex existence, partially or fully, as a result of various circumstances. In order to achieve the goal of “superior invert,” the first group would need to transcend physical desires with artistic pursuits; on the contrary, those who choose to be inverts were for Raffalovich mired in vice and perversion. He reserved the term “perverts” (*pervertis*) for this group, whom he describes as more libertine and less respectable than *born* “inverts” (*invertis nés*).[7]

Quite interesting is the notion of “superior inverts” (*invertis supérieurs*), which Raffalovich describes as “more interesting, perhaps *because* they are the only ones [presumably of all the types of unisexuality or inverts] who do not tell lies for the pleasure of lying or without being aware of it” (p. 48; my emphasis).[8] This odd and pretentious term suggests a haughtiness that emerges from the Catholic overtones of Raffalovich’s prose. He writes in a footnote: “The superior invert is less concerned with gossip or social opprobrium; and if he has charitable or noble goals, he will act on them without fear of the slurs or joking allusions that make his less independent peers shudder” (p. 55 note ix). Most revealing is the comparison with Plato: “If Plato has been accused of being dangerous it is not because of the superior invert who aspires to self-mastery and the glorification of his tastes and their purification; it is due to the weakling who lets himself be carried away, who believes that he is capable of the qualities of courage and virtue, which he does not yet have nor will ever attain” (p. 58). The quality of superiority hovers in the judgmental and largely Catholic tone throughout the book, observations of the type of invert that Raffalovich clearly prefers.

The treatise begins with an elaborate “summary table of sexualities” (divided into “ultra-virile, virile, effeminate, and passive”), which purports to lay forth the terminology of the volume. Substantial overlap of these terms, however, leads to considerable confusion, only meagerly elucidated by the editors. For example “invert” (*inverti*) and “uranist” and “unisexuality” seem to interchangeably parallel an occasional modern use of “homosexual.” Raffalovich usually uses “unisexuality” as an adjective to mean “same-sex,” but he also uses it as a noun, thus pointing to the notion of sexual identity. Elsewhere Raffalovich says that “inverts” are to be distinguished from “heterosexuals,” although they are not to be confused with “unisexuality”; no endnote clarifies or deliberates on possible unclear connotations. Despite Raffalovich’s endeavors to designate the parameters of “acquired hetero- and homosexuality” (*hétéro/homosexualité acquise*), these categories remain indistinct. Roden claims that “Raffalovich reacts against the imperative to taxonomy of his age, even as he creates his own categories of inversion” (p. 11); however, given the three pages of imprecise terms (pp. 41-43) devoted to just such taxonomy, which is used consistently, and confusedly, throughout the book, the editor’s statement is patently inaccurate. Endnotes to Roden’s introductory essay as well as a few endnotes to the general volume (apparently written jointly by Healy and Roden), attempt some clarification, although the terms remain unsettlingly puzzling throughout the book.

Raffalovich gives brief accounts of several historical people and some literary characters he deems to be uranists. In some instances he provides what he calls “historical case studies,” presumably in contrast to the clinical ones one finds in Lacassagne’s and others’ works. More interesting than these conjectures of sexual identity are his discussions on abstract categories of types of uranists, a discourse of analytic methodology. Chastity carries considerable weight in these observations: an ideal of chastity, voluntary chastity, circumstantial chastity, a predilection for chastity—not to be confused with sobriety, temperance, or tranquility. Here again he distinguishes the superior uranists from the rest.

More interesting still is the section on the education or the upbringing of “ultra-virile uranians” (pp. 89ff). Raffalovich compares the nuances of effeminacy and virility and the place of sex in the lives of these individuals to those of heterosexuals, concluding that “people are born more or less uranist [...] and that] circumstances [...] can transform a heterosexual into a homosexual” (p. 89). In addition, he acknowledges in a footnote “the superiority of the invert *who controls himself* over the heterosexual man who gives into his sexuality” (p. 75; italics also in the original French). Here and throughout he displays his bias in favor of the superiority of the chaste invert, not only over other inverts but also over all heterosexuals of similarly base morals who allow sexual drive and desires to dominate reason. (Here and throughout Raffalovich speaks exclusively about men.) Of the inverts who surrender to baser instincts, he singles out soldiers who prostitute themselves and the correlative “passion that inverts have for clothes that resemble a military uniform” (p. 90). The mention of the uniform fetish leads him to an exploration of young inverts’ attraction to servants in livery and thence to the role of differences in social class in uranist attraction (with an unconvincing comparison to ancient Greek societal mores). Boarding schools naturally make their way into these observations. A concluding statement in this section may be a cause for query: “It is only by learning how to tame, scorn, or overcome sexuality and sensuality that the born invert can distance himself from heterosexuality. He adopts for his own use all the excuses for heterosexuality and he adds that homosexuality is sterile, etc. ...” (p. 95). This and other propositions scattered throughout the book—not all that different from claims made by contemporaneous doctors and detectives (e.g., Charcot, Lacassagne, Tardieu, Saint-Paul, etc.)—demonstrate that the interest of this treatise lies mostly in its representation of moral discourses of the times. Again, the editors do not problematize this assertion.

The brief section “Moral Education” introduces the notion of “the superior invert” and the frequency of them among great men. The discussion of these “sublime inverts [...] who] are sublime despite their inversion,” suggests that the group of quasi-chaste inverts—in which he clearly includes himself and John Gray—would be morally superior to others precisely because of their almost chaste existence. In contrast to his own theories and recommendations, he cites Krafft-Ebing’s “theory that each man has a right to sexual satisfaction” (p. 98); Raffalovich characterizes this sort as “invert-collectors [...] for whom the mania of ‘knowing’ the greatest possible number of lovers matters” (*ibid.*). He concludes here that “there is no line of demarcation between heterosexuals and homosexuals” (p. 99), another curious identification of homosexuals and heterosexuals. The effort to establish an even playing field between hetero- and homosexuals is not entirely consistent, nor do the editors offer any clarification. This aspect of Raffalovich’s observations deserves a painstaking analysis.

Next Raffalovich expresses his views of “effeminate,” whom he characterizes as morally inferior and vile precisely because they take on “women’s vices.” In contrast, he extolls the Greek and the latter-day German praise of “masculine virginity” (p. 101). He comments glibly on representations of inverts in Diderot and Crébillon *films*, Balzac and Zola, Huysmans and Wilde, mixed with a similarly offhand mention of historical figures (Louis XIII and Cinq-Mars, among others). He then turns to “moral hermaphroditism” (p. 111) and Platonic lovers, then to fellatio and masturbation (including an unclear distinction from onanism [pp. 122-23]), as well as masochism and sadism (pp. 129-131), and anal intercourse (pp. 131-32). The next hundred pages present statements on the various aspects of unisexuality in a broad selection of historical figures from Europe, Britain, and America.

A section “on the conclusions of Krafft-Ebing” contains Raffalovich’s repudiation of the German sexologist’s judgments, although such commentary is not restricted to this part. It is clear that his rejection of some of Krafft-Ebing’s conclusions most likely led, at least in part, to the conception of this volume. Most important is his denunciation of the notion of a man’s “feel[ing] like a woman vis-à-vis another man” (p. 173). In this refutation, Raffalovich moves between the reversal (inversion? perversion?) of the binary and his refusal of the confusion of the “effeminate uranist with a virile one” (*ibid.*). After his exploration of Krafft-Ebing’s pronouncements about man-to-man love and sex, he moves into a discussion about “Greek love,” riposting that “the Theban warriors did not feel like women vis-à-vis each other.” This, says Raffalovich, is “how Greek philosophy envisaged unisexuality” (*ibid.*). The movement from *paidierastia* (he does not use this term) to Greek philosophy is significant insofar as it lends legitimacy (despite his multiple claims elsewhere that none is needed because there is nothing illegitimate about unisexuality); this he then confusedly compares to Catholic marriage (p. 174).

In these discussions, Raffalovich moves between Krafft-Ebing and Ulrichs on the matter of men’s and women’s souls, bodies, genitalia and the exchange of differences that, according to Raffalovich, these two Germans assign to homosexual desires. (In this section, the term “feminine” is used. The French *féminin* is not always linked with the conventional gender identity and is quite often merely an adjective for *femme* [woman]. This is a constant problem in the translation of these terms that Erber and Peniston did not eschew.) Thus, according to Raffalovich, effeminacy comes into Krafft-Ebing’s analysis and the conclusion that inversion is “a type of functional degeneration”; Raffalovich refutes this conclusion along with what he perceives to be Krafft-Ebing’s conflation of morality and degeneration (p. 177). Raffalovich concludes this section with a repetition of his sense of the uranist’s responsibility “to re-establish a balance, to undo the damage of overpopulation and a surplus of women” (p. 178). Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia sexualis* (1886) differs substantially from Raffalovich’s treatise in that it is based on case studies. The language is scientific (for its time) whereas Raffalovich writes with a more humanist discourse. On the surface the differences are not always that striking; while Raffalovich maintains a significantly philosophical foundation, his observations and conclusions differ meaningfully from Krafft-Ebing’s. Some effort to explore these differences would have been welcome in the editorial comments in the volume.

Raffalovich’s chronicle of the Oscar Wilde trials, published a year earlier in the *Archives de l’anthropologie criminelle*, is well known. The thirty pages devoted to the details of the trials, testimonies, and reactions of the public and media, admonishments against English society, etc., correspond more or less to the usual accounts available from a variety of sources. Several comments relating his irritation at Wilde’s behavior in general and his conduct during the trials in particular, however, reveal Raffalovich’s rancor toward the Irish poet and dramatist. A few examples suggest a curious mixture of a sincere defense of Wilde and a distinct distancing from him. “The Oscar Wilde affair now belongs to science and history,” which is quickly followed by “he was a national threat [...] How is it possible that such a man was allowed, with the consent of English society, to live a life of such widely shared narcissism?” (p. 201). Raffalovich’s uncertainty in regard to his assessment of Wilde is palpable. And as if to separate himself from any possible comparison between two contemporary unisexuality, Raffalovich proclaims disapproval of “the role that [Wilde] played, the influence that he had and that he used so badly. I am concerned with the vulnerable youths’ characters that he perverted and the vices that he encouraged” (p. 200). The tone intimates perhaps something more than objective moral concerns.

Despite Raffalovich’s attempts to bring the reader back to his theories of unisexuality, he cannot refrain from a general attack on Wilde. It had been widely suggested that the character of Dorian Gray was fashioned on John Gray, who had met and associated with Wilde before meeting Raffalovich (see Healy’s biographical introduction, p. 24). Raffalovich claims “*Dorian Gray*, [to be] a novel of little originality (Wilde has never been very original [Raffalovich’s parenthetical remark]). In fact, it is artificial, superficial, and effeminate. Unisexuality plays a major role in it, but without any vigor; it is obscured by shadows, affectation, and fear” (p. 203). The attempt in the comment to bring the focus back

to the main topic of the volume resonates of jealousy rather than literary criticism; he even suggests plagiarism in *Lady Windermere's Fan* as well as a general denunciation of his effectiveness as a writer: "Wilde having neither vitality nor much talent, could only depict sexual inversion or perversion weakly, deceitfully, and languidly" (p. 204). More germane, on the surface, to the focus of the book, Raffalovich returns to a statement of disapprobation of Wilde's brand of unisexuality: "However pure his love for Lord Alfred was (and why not believe it?), Wilde surely never understood the obligations required by a love based on Plato, Shakespeare, or Michelangelo [which is more a] celebra[ti]on of] the training of one soul by another, the love that is the beginning of wisdom" (p. 219).[9]

The translation by Nancy Erber and William A. Peniston gives an adequate representation of late nineteenth-century French pseudo-scientific prose.[10] At times the syntax is turgid, which, while befittingly representing Raffalovich's French, results in a somewhat incommodious twenty-first-century English version. Given the author's grandiose and imprecise (and sometimes confusing) terminology--not anomalous among the positivist and naturalist writers in late nineteenth-century France--this version is reliable, though it requires historical and linguistic parsing, sadly lacking in this volume. A few notable mistranslations should be mentioned. For instance, for Raffalovich's quote from Diderot, talking about male inverts who "se sentent femmes, voudraient être femmes, adorent les bonbons, les mensonges, les parfums, les boudoirs, les *cancans*, l'attirail féminin, les vêtements de femme" (my emphasis; p. 44 in French edition), *les cancans* nonsensically becomes "the cancan" (p. 68) instead of the obvious sense of "gossiping." *Éducation* is regularly translated as "education," whereas quite often it is "upbringing" or "breeding" that is called for. Similarly, *enfant naturel* is alternately translated as "natural" or "illegitimate" child without obvious indication of a distinction that Raffalovich is not making. Two other worrisome cases risk miscomprehension: *continence* is translated as "continence" (p. 171) instead of "abstinence"; and *effémation*, a verbal noun meaning to render effeminate or to encourage effeminacy, is translated as "effeminacy" (p. 101), which does not allow for the appreciation of the verbal aspect of the original French. Apart from these few exceptions, the quality of the translation is satisfactory.

It should be noted that in 1895 Charles Judson Herrick published the translation of a synopsis of Raffalovich's theories under the title "Uranism, Congenital Sexual Inversion, Observations and Recommendations." [11] Some passages in this contemporaneous publication are identical to those in the translation under review; others, however, reveal subtle but significant differences in degrees of objectivity and faithfulness to the original. I do not undertake here a comparative analysis of Herrick's and Erber/Peniston's translations; however, a variety of subtle differences does indicate a somewhat less objective tendency in the version at hand.

The text of *Uranism and Unisexuality* is preceded by two essays: "Introduction" by Frederick S. Roden, and "André Raffalovich (1864-1934): A Biographical Note," by Philip Healy. Professor Roden has published extensively on Raffalovich. His overview of Raffalovich's work is thorough and well informed; his expertise is apparent. Among other components, Roden identifies Raffalovich's insistence on the normative masculinity of the invert and his defense of inversion as well as his "powerful call for gay rights" (p. 17), citing his claim that "inverts have more to contribute to society than heterosexual men" (p. 10). Similarly, Roden underscores Raffalovich's goal to depathologize the invert, separating sexuality from identity (*ibid.*). He also offers a useful comparison of Raffalovich to his contemporaries' writings on sexology (p. 4). Roden also rightly captions Raffalovich's reactions to the problems of the Wilde trials as well as marking the influence on Raffalovich of the Dreyfus affair and its effects on French Jews. Roden admits that his "approach is a 'philo-Raffalovichian' position" (p. 7); his apologetic style pervades the essay, much as Raffalovich's insistent comparisons to Catholicism do his book.[12]

Although his introduction lacks a desirable degree of objectivity, it does offer a helpful review of Raffalovich's insights into the ethos of the period. In the beginning he repeatedly refers to Raffalovich as "the man"; at times the expression causes confusion and at others it suggests something analogous to

idolatry. Roden persuasively articulates the “ethical-moral argument that is uniquely [Raffalovich’s, thus illustrating] ‘the philosophy, morality, and poetry of sexual inversion’” (p. 9). The religious aspect of Raffalovich’s work does remain at the center of Roden’s introduction; he proposes that in the superior invert homosexual behavior is all but abolished so as to give way to an elevation to some higher sphere, as “transubstantiation” (p. 15). Moreover, with somewhat less than objective inflection, he explains Raffalovich’s rhetorical consideration of the (homo)sexuality of historical figures as “rhetoric [that] not only justifies the acceptable range of same-sex desire but also excuses his readers from recrimination if they remember such common experiences in their own lives” (p. 12). Roden grapples with Raffalovich’s admittedly confused blame on society for a failure to privilege “the cultivation of an art of unisexual love” in favor of “quick physical release.” Notwithstanding Raffalovich’s convoluted attempt to explain, account for, and/or justify same-sex behavior, Roden’s desultory paragraph (p. 13) does little to elucidate it. Roden is right to point out Raffalovich’s rejection of the hypothesis of unisexuality being related to hereditary illnesses (p. 13), of the notion that the unisexual is a “new creature [...] an invention like the telephone” (p. 14), and of the “disjunction between the truth ... and the social conventions that deny” (*ibid.*). However in another attempt to metaphorize Raffalovich’s theories, Roden compares them to the “twenty-first-century concern about greening our footprint” (p. 16). Despite these incursions of anachronism, maintenance of disjointedness, and veneration, Roden’s introduction provides more than ample bibliographical information.

Philip Healy’s biographical note (pp. 22-31) briefly lays out the events of Raffalovich’s life followed by a concise mention of his publications as well as his tumultuous relationship with Oscar Wilde. Information on John Gray, while succinct, is also pertinent to the goals of the volume. Raffalovich’s publication history under Lacassagne’s tutelage, again concise, provides valuable bibliography as well as details regarding his links to Catholicism. These components include at once mystical and symbolic elements as well as material on Gray’s conversion and its influence on Raffalovich’s. A mention of Raffalovich’s connections with queer and Catholic writers and artists provides a useful cultural context of the period in which Raffalovich composed his treatise on uranism. Healy includes a select bibliography as well as a recommended reading list. In all, Healy’s “notes” present an appropriate introduction to Raffalovich and his world.

The endnotes supply a bounty of information both bibliographic and biographical. Nearly 500 notes explain Raffalovich’s allusions to a variety of people and concepts as well as several historical annotations. While the volume is clearly meant for wide readership, some of the notes identifying universally known personalities (for example Racine, Corneille, Balzac, Zola, and Michelangelo) are probably unnecessary. A rare judgment or oddly worded comment in a few of the notes detracts from the otherwise scholarly presentation. For example, Sainte-Beuve is identified as “the most famous literary critic in France during the nineteenth century” (p. 278, note 14); well known, respected and even revered as he was, there were several other esteemed critics, literary and other, during the nineteenth century.

*Uranism and Unisexuality. A Study of Different Manifestations of the Sexual Instinct* is certainly of intellectual interest and an English translation is thus welcome. While the translation is adequate, the supporting apparatus of the edition is not well suited for scholarly use: introductory editorial material is scanty and many of the technical terms go without adequate explanation or exploration. In addition, a lack of rigorous comparison with other sexology writings of the same decade is disappointing; perhaps the publication of this translation will lead to such studies.

## NOTES

[1] Banal in subject and in form, his poetry never led to distinguished literary renown. Wilde is reported to have said that Raffalovich’s poetry questioned the would-be poet’s familiarity with English

prosody and culture. Robert Browning is also said to have observed that the sex of the object of desire was often obfuscated in Raffalovich's poetry, thus encouraging a same-sex reading.

[2] Upon joining the Dominican Order he tellingly adopted the sobriquet Brother Sebastian.

[3] The following articles, published in *Annales de l'unisexualité*, reflect various sections of the volume under review here: *Quelques observations sur l'inversion* (n. 50, IX 1894, pp. 216–218); *L'éducation des invertis* (n. 54, IX 1894, pp. 738–740); *L'uranisme. Inversion sexuelle congénitale. Observations et conseils* (n. X 1895, pp. 99–127); *John Addington Symonds* (n. X 1895, pp. 241–244); *L'inversion sexuelle* (n. X 1895, pp. 325–332); *À propos du 'Roman d'un inverti' et de quelques travaux récents sur l'inversion sexuelle* (n. X 1895, pp. 333–336); *L'affaire Oscar Wilde* (n. X 1895, pp. 445–477); *Homosexualité et hétérosexualité, trois confessions* (n. X 1895, pp. 748–758); and *Unisexualité anglaise* (n. XI 1896, pp. 429–431). For a thorough study of how Raffalovich's work fits into sexology studies of the late nineteenth century, see Patrick Cardon's *Discours littéraires et scientifiques fin-de-siècle. Autour de Marc-André Raffalovich* (Paris: Orizons/L'Harmattan, 2008). Despite its sometimes indulgent methodology, this meticulous essay provides an exceptional compendium of contemporaneous documentation ancillary to Raffalovich's work. Roden mentions the study in a note (p. 20 note 32), but Cardon's name does not figure in the index nor, unfortunately, is there any evidence that it has contributed to the critical apparatus of the volume.

[4] Hirschfeld founded the Scientific Humanitarian Committee (Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee) in 1897, a group that undertook, among other things, research to defend the rights of homosexuals and to repeal Paragraph 175 of the German penal code, which criminalized any homosexual act. He also founded the Institute for Sexual Science (Institut für Sexualwissenschaft) in 1919, which ended with the rise of the Nazi regime. In addition Hirschfeld was directly involved in the Eulenburg-Harden sexual scandal: Maximilian Harden, a journalist, published claims that General von Moltke had had a homosexual affair with Prince von Eulenburg, a close friend of Kaiser Wilhelm II. Hirschfeld was called in as an expert witness and declared Eulenburg to be homosexual. As Hirschfeld was Jewish and Eulenburg an anti-Semite, the 1906–09 discourse linked homosexual behavior to Jewish identity; possible influence from the aftermath of the Dreyfus affair in France cannot be overlooked.

[5] Roden claims this is the first republication of the text as well as being the first English translation of Raffalovich's book (p. 3). As this is a translation, it is not a "republication" of the original French text. Moreover, there is an English translation, which Roden references (p. 6 and p. 20n34), albeit just a summary of Raffalovich's theories, translated by Charles Judson Herrick: "Uranism, Congenital Inversion," and published in *The Journal of Comparative Neurology* vol. 5.1(1895):33-63. See below for further commentary on this translation.

[6] "Uranian" is a nineteenth-century term referring to a person of a so-called third sex. It is believed to be an English adaptation of the German word *Urning*, coined by activist Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, who developed his terminology before the first public use of the term "homosexual", which appeared in an 1869 pamphlet published anonymously by Karl-Maria Kertbeny (originally Benkert). Ulrichs derived the word *Urning* from the Greek goddess Urania, daughter of Zeus and Mnemosyne; she is said to have been created out of Uranus's testicles, thus reflecting a homosexual gender. Adopted by English-language advocates of homosexual emancipation in the Victorian era, such as Edward Carpenter and John Addington Symonds, the term "Uranian" also gained currency among a group of Classicists from the 1870s to the 1930s. It has long since fallen into disuse. The term lacks a clear explanation in the critical apparatus of the volume under review here.

[7] P. 49; p. 16 in original French edition (Lyon: A. Storck and Paris : Masson & Cie., 1896). As the oft-disputed terminology of sexology was, and still is, changing, I include direct quotes from the original French edition for clarity. The terms "acquired" and "congenital" homosexuality are found in significant

frequency in Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia sexualis*. Much of Raffalovich's rhetoric mimics Krafft-Ebing's language, from which Raffalovich attempts, not always convincingly, to distance himself.

[8] The original French does not claim a cause-and-effect logic, which this translation adds (hence my emphasis on "because"). Herrick's translation of 1895 does not impute any cause here, staying true to the original (p. 35). The term "superior invert" also appears in Havelock Ellis's *The Study of Sexual Inversion*. Raffalovich makes no mention of Ellis; while it is wholly possible given the coincidence of the publication of both books that Raffalovich had not yet read Ellis, it is surprising that the editors have made no mention of Ellis.

[9] In his *Discours littéraires et scientifiques fin-de-siècles* (Paris: Orizons/L'Harmattan, 2008), Patrick Cardon goes into great detail on Raffalovich's assesment of the Oscar Wilde affaire (chapter four, 125-134).

[10] Note also their translation and annotated edition of *Bougres de vies: huit homosexuels du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle se racontent. Queer Lives: Men's Autobiographies from Nineteenth-Century France* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007).

[11] *Journal of Comparative Neurology* 5.1(1895):33-65. See Roden, p. 6.

[12] Roden cogently reviews critics' observations on the Catholic homosexual ethics angle of Raffalovich's treatise (pp. 5-11).

David A. Powell  
Hofstra University  
[david.a.powell@hofstra.edu](mailto:david.a.powell@hofstra.edu)

Copyright © 2016 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for edistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/ republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172