Čajkovskij and the Language of Same-Sex Desire

Philip Ross Bullock*

In February 1882, Čajkovskij's publisher, Pëtr Jurgenson, wrote to pass on the latest Moscow gossip about the pianist and teacher, Nikolaj Zverev:

> He's given up and drawn in his horns, only going to the tavern out of habit. One of his hangers-on is getting married. Galli, the son of a bitch, has picked out a very pretty bride for himself and is elevating her to the rank of his spouse. I must admit that I thought he was an Urning, or at least a Dionysiac [dionizirujuščim]. The devil only knows!

Then, the following year, Jurgenson described the visit to his offices of a mysterious young man somehow linked to Čajkovskij's friend, Nikolaj Kondrat'ev, and whom he described as 'one of those passive Urnings'.[1]

Jurgenson's comments are significant in that they attest not only to his awareness of Moscow's gay subculture (both Zverev and Kondrat'ev were homosexual) and Čajkovskij's place within it, but also to his familiarity with contemporary German neologisms used to describe same-sex desire. 'Urning' had been coined as recently as the mid-1860s by the German lawyer, writer and gay rights activist, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, and was just one a growing number of terms used to describe homosexuality, itself a term dating from the same period. ('Dionysiac' may have function in a similar manner, as it evoked associations with the sensuous and erotic excesses of the Greek god, Dionysus.) Much work on the genealogy of modern homosexuality has focused on its origins in German medical and legal thought of the mid- to late-nineteenth century, so it is striking to see its vocabulary so rapidly assimilated within Russia at around the same time, especially in the slangy, non-specialist context of a personal correspondence (although it is equally interesting that this is not a language that Čajkovskij himself seems to have employed).[2]

The creation of words such as 'Urning' (or, indeed 'homosexuality' itself) is, moreover, indicative of a broader process described by Michel Foucault, who argued that the nineteenth century witnessed a shift from seeing sexuality in terms of individual acts (whether 'normal' or 'deviant'), towards a view that saw sexuality as one of a range of totalizing forms of human identity. This was particularly the case in terms of homosexuality, as Foucault notes:

> As defined by the ancient civil or canonical codes, sodomy was a category of forbidden acts; their perpetrator was nothing more than the juridical subject of them. The nineteenth-century homosexual became a personage, a past, a

* I should like to thank the participants at the symposium, 'Musik und Homosexualität – Homosexualität und Musik' at the Hochschule für Künste, Bremen, 29/30 January 2016, for their invaluable comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to the members of the 'Writing 1900' network for their feedback on an early version of some of the material included in this article at a seminar on 'Mindscapes and Bodyscapes' at the Centre for British Studies, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, 12/13 March 2015.

[1] Letters of 21 February 1882 and 29 September 1883, in Polina Vajdman (ed.): P. I. Čajkovskii–P. I. Jurgenson: perepiska, 2 vols, Moscow 2011-13, I, pp. 352 and 459-60.

[2] Robert Beachy: Gay Berlin: Birthplace of a Modern Identity, New York 2014, and Robert Deam Tobin: Peripheral Desires: The German Discovery of Sex, Philadelphia 2015.

> case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form, and a morphology, with an indiscreet anatomy and possibly a mysterious physiology.

Accordingly, Foucault gives 1870 as the date when modern homosexuality was born, citing the publication that year of Carl Westphal's article, 'Die Konträre Sexualempfindung' in the *Archiv für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*.[3] Although Foucault's claims have been vigorously debated and contested, they nonetheless provide a useful starting point for considering the question of Čajkovskij's sexuality, not only because the composer lived right through the period discussed by Foucault, but also because both his biography and creative output have frequently been interpreted as emblematic of modern same-sex desire.

In order situate Čajkovskij's biography within the evolving context established by Foucault, I shall explore the specific vocabulary that the composer used to describe his sexual feelings and experiences, arguing that these reveal much about how he conceived of and understood his sexuality. Building on Jacques Lacan's widely cited dictum that, 'the subconscious is structured like a language', I argue that it is through language that an individual negotiates their relationship with society and the world. Furthermore, following post-structuralist thinkers like Foucault and Lacan, I take it as axiomatic that language is not just representative of reality, but constitutive of it too. Here, however, one must be careful, as it is all too tempting to see linguistic terms as stable markers of fixed identities and categories; throughout this essay, therefore, language will be seen as the trace of complex and evolving mental processes, as well as the tool by which these are inscribed into documentary form.

Perhaps surprisingly, there has been relatively little consideration of Čajkovskij's linguistic strategies in the relevant critical literature. Partly this stems from the censorship of crucial parts of his extensive correspondence until relatively recently. But it is also related to a widespread view of the composer as naïve, unreflective, overly emotional and even downright pathological. His language, like his musical compositions, has been treated as a symptom or a neurosis, rather than a medium of representation and self-presentation. Take, for example the following quotation taken from a 1944 biography of the composer by Gerald Abraham:

> his character offers more interesting material to the amateur psychologist than any musician from Jubal to the present day. The contrast between the outward man seen by his acquaintances (the pleasant companion, somewhat shy, but still a polished man of the world) and the real man (the neurotic, the secret drinker) is striking enough to begin with. […] And intellectually he was simple; he seems to have been completely lacking in petty affectations; he did try desperately all his life to be sincere. Yet many instances in his correspondence betray that it was his habit to say one thing to one person and something very different to someone else, and in everyday life, often in quite trivial matters, he seems never to have shrunk from a convenient lie (often naïvely confessing to it later), and it is hardly too much to say that his whole outward life was a façade carefully built up and desperately preserved, to give the world a certain impression and conceal his true nature.[4]

---

[3] Michel Foucault: The History of Sexuality, trans. Robert Hurley, 3 vols, London, 1978-86, I, 43.
[4] Gerald Abraham: Tchaïkovsky: A Short Biography, London 1944, pp. 11-12.

Here, the tone is judgmental and essentializing, and everything is read through a rigidly psychological prism that is very much in debt to mid-twentieth-century attitudes towards homosexuality. It is an account that is open to question on many fronts. Yet in positing a tension between Čajkovskij's interior and public selves, and in foregrounding the role played by correspondence (and hence language) in mediating between the two, it nonetheless offers a potentially productive model for thinking about the composer's construction of his own identity. If we replace Abrahams' inflexible binary opposition (the 'façade' versus 'his true nature') with a more finely graded continuum, then we can replace his search for the 'true' or 'authentic' image of the composer with something more contingent and dependent on social context.

Jurgenson's use of the word 'Urning' in the early 1880s attests to the extent to which new definitions of human sexuality were shaping linguistic practices in late Imperial Russia.[5] By contrast, an anthology of pornographic Russian poetry originally published in Geneva in 1879 seems to confirm Foucault's suggestion that before 1870s or so, human sexuality was perceived in terms of acts, rather than identity. Indeed, *Eros russe: Russkij erot ne dlja dam* has a direct bearing on the question of Čajkovskij's biography, as it includes a crude poem called 'The Song of the Jurists' ('Pesn' pravovedov') that circulated at the School of Jurisprudence in St Petersburg in the 1840s and 1850s – the very time when Čajkovskij was a student there:

> Venus, Venus,
> Tell me do,
> What's the best way
> To fuck?
> 'I've travelled through Europe,
> And everybody says:
> The cunt prefers people
> To take it up the arse!'
> But is there any need
> Of cunts here?
> The students fuck
> Between themselves,
> They enjoy yielding
> To each other
> And brazenly wag their arse
> At the sight of a prick![6]

Written in the spirit of the eighteenth-century erotic poet Ivan Barkov (who also influenced the bawdy verse of Mihail Lermontov and Aleksandr Puškin), this anonymous poem conceives of homosexuality as a series of playful acts carried out within the homosocial environment of a male-only educational establishment.

As Alexander Poznansky has suggested, Čajkovskij's education at the School of Jurisprudence may have had an effect on his subsequent emotional development (and Modest Čajkovskij describes his brother's youthful infatuation with Sergej

---

[5] Brian James Baer: Translating Sexology in Late-Tsarist and Early-Soviet Russia: Politics, Literature, and the Science of Sex, in Heike Bauer (ed.): Sexology and Translation: Cultural and Scientific Encounters Across the Modern World, Philadelphia 2015, pp. 115-34.

[6] Eros russe: Russkij erot ne dlja dam, 3rd edition, Oakland 1995, p. 89.

Kireev at the same time as 'the strongest, most durable and purest amorous infatuations of his entire life');[7] this slight poem may be one clue as to the erotic atmosphere that prevailed at the school at that time. Čajkovskij's own attitude is harder to ascertain, although the recent publication of his complete uncensored correspondence to Jurgenson suggests he had a far more scabrous sense of humour than has often been appreciated. However, letters written in the 1870s do offer more concrete evidence about the composer's linguistic strategies for describing, if not defining, his sexual preferences. Take for instance, a letter he wrote to his brother, Modest, in late September 1876, in which he talked about his plans to marry:

> I should like by my marriage, or in general an open affair with a woman, to hush the mouth of various contemptible creature whose opinion I don't value in the least, but who can cause pain to the people close to me. In any event, do not be frightened for me, dear Modia. The realization of my plans is not at all as close as you think. I am so set in my habits and tastes that it is not possible to cast them aside all at once, like an old glove. And besides, I am far from possessing an iron will by any means, and […] I have already given in to the force of my natural inclinations about three times. Would you imagine! One day I even went to *Bulatov's* country estate, and his house is nothing but a homosexual bordello. As if it were not enough that I had been there, I *fell in love* like a cat with his coachman!!![8]

Here, Čajkovskij describes his sexuality in terms of 'habits', 'tastes' and even 'inclinations', but the most striking word here would appear to be 'homosexual'. But the use of the word 'homosexual' is misleading, and certainly historically inappropriate. 'Homosexual' is a modern term, dating from the late 1860s and not popularized until at least the 1880s or so; it suggests an identity that Čajkovskij himself might not have recognized and is certainly belongs to a lexicon with which he could not have been familiar. His own term is, in fact, 'pederastičeskaja bardel'',[9] with 'pederastic' serving as the then current Russian slang for 'gay' (much as it still does in some Russian-speaking circles).

The contrast between the original Russian and its modern English translation is revealing. 'Homosexual' is a quasi-scientific neologism used to describe a fixed psychological or physiological identity that has often seen as going against the social norm. 'Pederastic', by contrast, refers to the relationship in Ancient Greece between an older man and his younger male lover; the relationship may have been sexual, but it was also pedagogic, and was certainly socially legitimated (the older man was

---

[7] Alexander Poznansky: Tchaikovsky: The Quest for the Inner Man, New York 1991, pp. 18-30. For Modest's account of his brother's infatuation with Sergey Kireev, see Alexander Poznansky (ed.): Tchaikovsky through Others' Eyes, Bloomington and Indianapolis 1999, p. 23.

[8] Alexander Poznansky: Unknown Tchaikovsky: A Reconstruction of Previously Censored Letters to His Brothers (1875-1879), in Leslie Kearney (ed.): Tchaikovsky and His World, Princeton 1998, pp. 55-96, here pp. 65-6.

[9] V. S. Sokolov: Ot 'pamjatnika' k čeloveku': Izbrannye pis'ma P. I. Čajkovskogo bez kupjur, in P. E. Vajdman (ed.), Neizvestnyj Čajkovskij, Moscow 2009, pp. 209-99, here p. 256. In Poznansky's defence, it should be noted that other translations are equally problematic – to retain 'pederastic' would be to use a word that has offensive connotations. Moreover, Poznansky's ground-breaking study was the first to challenge both Soviet traditions of silence and a Western tendency to psychopathology when it came to the treatment of Čajkovskij's sexuality; thus, to employ 'homosexual' constitutes an important gesture of normalisation and acceptance.

almost invariably married, and the younger one would subsequently expect to marry too). To be sure, the extent to which this philological distinction was understood in everyday usage in nineteenth-century Russia is hard to gauge. It is also the case that the classical model of pederasty was frequently invoked by gay rights activists to defend their cause.[10] Nonetheless, Čajkovskij's use of the term illustrates not just the slipperiness of nineteenth-century vocabulary, but also the instability of sexual identities at the time too.

Something of this same problem can be seen in a letter that Čajkovskij wrote to Modest's twin brother, Anatolij, in early 1875:

> I am very, very lonely here, and if it were not for working constantly I should simply give myself over to melancholy. It is also true that my damned homosexuality creates an unbridgeable chasm between me and most people. It imparts to my character an estrangement, a fear of people, immoderate timidity, mistrustfulness, in short, a thousand qualities whereby I am growing more and more unsociable.[11]

Once again, a published English translation gives a misleading sense of Čajkovskij's own vocabulary. Here, 'homosexuality' is used to render a Russian word with a very different set of associations: 'bugromanija'.[12] Redolent of the private argot of Moscow's gay subculture in the mid-nineteenth century, it carries connotations of the physical act of sodomy ('buggery') rather than with homosexual identity per se. However, it is also linked to questions of psychology and even pathology ('mania'), and thus alludes to the medicalization of sexuality that was such a characteristic feature of scientific discourse in the second half of the nineteenth century. As Foucault notes, this discourse was often punitive or discriminatory in nature; 'mania' suggests an illness to be cured. Yet as Foucault also argues, it could have a paradoxically emancipatory potential:

> The appearance in nineteenth-century psychiatry, jurisprudence, and literature of a whole series of discourses on the species and subspecies of homosexuality, inversion, pederasty, and 'psychic hermaphroditism' made possible a strong advance of social controls into this area of 'perversity'; but it also made possible the formation of a 'reverse' discourse: homosexuality began to speak in its own behalf, to demand that its legitimacy or 'naturality' be acknowledged, often in the same vocabulary, using the same categories by which it was medically disqualified.[13]

'Bugromanija' is, then, not just an instance of pejorative language, albeit employed by its own subject. In naming, however, disparagingly, a form of contrary sexual desire, medical and legal vocabularies established a discursive space where such an identity could exist and even flourish. Moreover, by appropriating this vocabulary for himself (much as some modern LGBTI communities have adopted the term 'queer'),

---

[10] Stefano Evangelista: Platonic Dons, Adolescent Bodies: Benjamin Jowett, John Addington Symonds, Walter Pater, in George Rousseau (ed.): Children and Sexuality: From the Greeks to the Great War, Basingstoke 2007, pp. 206-30.
[11] Poznansky: Unknown Tchaikovsky (see fn. 8), pp. 60-61.
[12] Letter of 9 January 1875, cited in Aleksandr Poznanskij: Čajkovskij', Moscow 2010, p. 204.
[13] Foucault: The History of Sexuality (see fn. 3), I, p. 101.

Čajkovskij contributes to a process whereby the language of perversity is transformed into a powerful tool for potential self-assertion.

'Bugromanija' is revealing for other reasons too, as it both a calque and possibly also a neologism for a condition that had not yet formed as a recognizable sexual identity. The root of 'bugromanija' is clearly the French word *bougre*, which crops up a number of times in Čajkovskij's correspondence, as well as in that of other gay man at the time. Suggesting both same-sex activity ('sodomy'), and homosexual identity ('a sodomite'), its foreignness is a feature that can be seen elsewhere in Čajkovskij's correspondence. Early in 1879, for instance, he found himself in Paris, working on his opera, *Orleanskaja deva*. Rather incongruously perhaps, given the subject matter of the opera, he found himself involved with a Parisian hustler. His detailed description of the events of the evening (included in a letter to Modest) is funny, relaxed, knowing and ironic:

> I decided that I had to spend some time in *pleasures*. I dined quickly and went to search for *Luisa*. For some time my search was unsuccessful until suddenly: it was she! I was unimaginably glad for she really was quite attractive to me. We immediately turned into a deserted street and had an explanation. It turned out that she had not come to the *rendez-vous* that time because she had had a very unpleasant accident. […] She suggested we go to her place. She lives immeasurably far away. We walked for a long time, then took an omnibus, then walked some more; moreover I spent the whole time engrossed in her chatter, as if it were the most wonderful music, and in general felt quite in love. Finally we reached *rue de Maine*. That is an area of petty tradesmen. On this and the following street, *de la Goite* [sic. *de la Gaité*], there was a mass of revellers, bar after bar, dancing halls with open windows from which music thundered. In order to get to his *mansarde* it was necessary to enter an *assomoir*, drink *une mante* [sic. *menthe*?] *avec de l'eau frappé*, slip through a small door, then climb up a narrow and dark staircase leading to a tiny room with slanted ceiling and a window not in the wall, but in the ceiling!!! All that the room contained was a bed, a sorry trunk, a dirty table with candle-stub, several pairs of holey trousers and shirts hanging on nails, an enormous crystal glass won in the lottery. And nonetheless at that moment I felt that this miserable room was the focus of all human happiness. He (I can't use the feminine pronoun talking about that dear person) immediately showed me his passport and diplomas, which fully proved the truth of all he had told me about himself. Then there were various *calinerie* [sic. *câlineries*], as he put it, and then I became possessed with amorous happiness and the most improbable pleasure was experienced. […] I shall tell you at our meeting many charming details bearing witness to his naiveté combined with debauchery. […] Show Tolia [Anatolij] this letter. I ask his forgiveness that he will have to read of my amorous adventures.[14]

Čajkovskij's account of his encounter with 'Luisa' is a fascinating document that sheds much light on the linguistics codes of nineteenth-century homosexuality. His use of French (*rendez-vous*, *mansarde*, *assomoir*, *une mante avec de l'eau frappé*, *calinerie*) is, of course, dictated by his being in Paris, as well as by the Russian gentry's fluency in that language in the nineteenth century.

---

[14] Poznansky: Unknown Tchaikovsky (see fn. 8), pp. 89-91.

But the persistence of French also functions as a marker of sexual intimacy. Both France and French represented for Čajkovskij a form of escape from Russian society and a greater opportunity to explore his inner emotional world, and his use of the word *câlineries* (tender words, sweet nothings, caresses) give a sense of the evident pleasure that he derived from this particular encounter. Čajkovskij's letter also functions as a guide to the gay sites of Paris in the mid-nineteenth century; then, as now, Rue de Maine and [rue] de la de la Gaité, were at the heart of the entertainment and prostitution district just behind the Montparnasse station.[15] If French serves as a kind of code exchanged between initiates, something similar might be said about the gender play that characterizes this letter. To begin with, Čajkovskij refers to his companion as 'Luisa' and employs the appropriate feminine pronouns. This is something that can be observed in other letters too, where Čajkovskij employs feminine pronouns to mask the gender of his sexual partners.[16] About half way through the cited passage, however, he abandons this ruse, reverting to the grammatically correct gender and revealing the truth about his partner's identity. Admittedly, it is hardly a difficult code to crack, and it may reveal more about Čajkovskij's indebtedness to nineteenth-century discourses on homosexuality which saw it in terms of effeminacy and inversion.

Accounts like this one point not just to questions of language and location, but to issues of class too. Indeed, a historically sensitive understanding of Čajkovskij's sexuality needs to take into account issues of class distinction and privilege, as these were often central to the operation of sexual relations in nineteenth-century Europe, when companionable relations between social equals were comparatively rare. Čajkovskij's sexual encounters often took place in European cities – not just Paris, but also Vienna, Berlin, Rome and Florence – and they often seem to have involved younger working-class men and entailed possible financial reward (his involvement with a Viennese hustler the summer of 1876, described in a letter to Modest, appears to have led him to buy the young man a new set of clothes).[17] This was equally true in Moscow and St Petersburg too, where gay men could interact with networks of working-class sex workers, predominantly coachman and bath-house attendants. In Moscow in September 1878, Čajkovskij allowed himself to be introduced to a peasant by Nikolaj Bočekarkov, one of the denizens of the city's gay demi-monde; although the encounter was unconsummated, the composer was charmed by the young man's face and body, which he described to Modest as '"un rêve", the embodiment of a sweet dream.'[18] Once again, language, class and venue interact in often surprising ways and this interaction constitutes one means through which Čajkovskij's sexual make-up can be imaginatively reconstituted on the basis of the available textual evidence, rather than on rumour and supposition.

Reading Čajkovskij's linguistic practices attentively can reveal much about how he understood both his inner psychological make-up and its relationship to external factors. Yet in their search for evidence of Čajkovskij's underlying 'homosexuality' (as opposed to corroboration of the details of his personal life), such readings often risk overinterpreting or even completely misinterpreting the available evidence. One particularly telling example comes in a letter written just after his

---

[15] William A. Peniston: Pederasts and Others: Urban Culture and Sexual Identity in Nineteenth-Century Paris, New York, London and Oxford 2004, and Régis Revenin: Homosexualité et prostitution masculines à Paris: 1870-1918, Paris 2005.

[16] Poznansky: Tchaikovsky (see fn. 7), pp. 131-50.

[17] Poznansky: Unknown Tchaikovsky (see fn. 8), pp. 61-3.

[18] Poznansky: Unknown Tchaikovsky (see fn. 8), p. 85.

failed marriage in early 1878, in which the composer seems to express a clear sense of self-acceptance as a gay man: 'Only now, especially after the story of my marriage, have I finally begun to understand that there is nothing more fruitless than wanting to be anything other than what I am by nature.'[19] Certainly Čajkovskij would express himself in a less intensely anxious way about his erotic encounters and emotional entanglements in the letters he wrote after the failure of his marriage. Yet read in its full context, the statement cited above forms part of a very different story; that of a cautionary tale about the perils of vanity and ambition. As the letter goes on:

> I wanted to be not only Russia's first composer, but in the whole world too; I wanted to be only a composer, but also a first-class *Kapellmeister*; I wanted to be an *unusually* clever and colossally learned person; and I also wanted to be elegant and worldly and able to shine in salons; I wanted all of this so very much. Only little by little, at the price of a whole series of unbearable sorrows, did I come to understand my own true worth. […] It's amusing for me to recall, for instance, how much I suffered because I was unable to break into high society and be a society figure. […] How much time did it take me to realize that I was not a stupid person, but that I was certainly not one of those people with an outstanding mind. How many years did it take me to understand that even as a composer, I was simply a talented individual, and not some exceptional phenomenon.[20]

If there is a 'coming-out' narrative to be found in Čajkovskij's life, it is that of his self-realization as a creative artist in mid-nineteenth-century Russia, rather than of an essentialist coming to terms with his own homosexuality.

The tendency to prioritize Čajkovskij's sexuality over his professionalism is a widespread one in much biographical and critical literature, and has specific historical roots. From around 1900 onwards, Čajkovskij's biography was increasingly instrumentalized by individuals seeking to comment on and even justify modern forms of sexual identity.[21] E. M. Foster's novel *Maurice*, written just before World War I, but unpublished until 1971, deals with the means by which a young man, Maurice Hall, at first realizes and then accepts his homosexuality. As an undergraduate at Cambridge, he first turns to Greek classical literature in order to fathom the nature of his sexual desires. He then turns to medicine, seeking advice from his family doctor as well as treatment from a hypnotherapist. Yet it is Čajkovskij's life and music that eventually liberates him. He first hears the *Pathétique* as a student, and later hears it properly at an orchestral concert in London. Alerted to the work's supposed subtext, as well as the composer's unorthodox personal life, by an acquaintance, he borrows a biography from the library and his life is transformed:

> The episode of the composer's marriage conveys little to the normal reader, who vaguely assumes incompatibility, but it thrilled Maurice. He knew what

---

[19] Poznansky: Tchaikovsky (see fn. 7), p. 271.

[20] Letter of 13 February 1878, in Pëtr Il'ich Čajkovskij: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: literaturnye proizvedenija i perepiska, Moscow 1953-81, VII, p. 115.

[21] Judith A. Peraino : *Listening to the Sirens: Musical Technologies of Queer Identity from Homer to Hedwig*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 2005, pp. 77-92, and Philip Ross Bullock: Are You Musical? Sexuality and Social Utopianism in the Reception of Russian Music in Late-Victorian and Edwardian Britain, in: Inga Mai Groote/Stefan Keym (eds): Russische Musik in Westeuropa, 1867-1917: Ideen – Funktionen – Transfers (forthcoming).

> the disaster meant and how near Dr Barry had dragged him to it. Reading on, he made the acquaintance of 'Bob', the wonderful nephew to whom Tchaikovsky turned after the breakdown, and in whom is his spiritual and musical resurrection. The book blew off the gathering dust and he respected it as the one literary work that had ever helped him.[22]

The account painted by Forster is, by and large, an accurate one. In Edwardian England, Čajkovskij's music very often served as a code for homosexuality, even if this could only be hinted at through euphemism and implication.

Others were more explicit, however. The pioneering sexologist, Edward Carpenter included Čajkovskij in his discussion of the close, even causal relationship between homosexuality and artistic genius.[23] Another turn-of-the-century scholar of human sexual identity, Havelock Ellis, was yet more categorical: 'It has been extravagantly said that all musicians are inverts; it is certain that various famous musicians, among the dead and the living, have been homosexual.'[24] And there was discussion of the relationship between music – especially that of Čajkovskij and Wagner – and same-sex desire on the continent too. Magnus Hirschfeld's *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* considered the emotional susceptibility of homosexual subjects to particular musical repertoires,[25] and in 1896, the French poet, Marc-André Raffalovich, revealed just how close the association had become: 'In certain circles the word *musical*, like the word *artistic*, seems to have become a synonym for *pederast*'.[26]

We are back, then, where we started; with the evolution of linguistic codes to describe changing sexual identities from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards. Foucault has bequeathed to scholarship a model in which modern categories of human sexual identity are primarily linked to developments in the law and medicine. Yet it is equally the case that the arts, and especially music, not only reflected, but also shaped these identities in ways that continue to influence our own understanding of same-sex desire. The study of Čajkovskij's linguistic practices can thus be seen as a contribution to biographical practice, inasmuch as it sheds new light on his inner life. It is also represents an invitation to historians of sexuality to incorporate more fully the subjective experience of creative artists and their audiences into narratives that have so far been dominated by the frequently repressive discourses of medicine and the law.

University of Oxford

[22] E. M. Forster, *Maurice*, London 1971, p. 149.
[23] Edward Carpenter: The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women, London 1908, p. 111.
[24] Havelock Ellis: Sexual Inversion, Philadelphia 1924, p. 295.
[25] Magnus Hirschfeld: Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes, Berlin 1914.
[26] André Raffalovich: Uranisme et unisexualité: étude sur différentes manifestations de l'instinct sexuel, Lyon and Paris 1896, p. 188.