THE RECEPTION OF JOHN BOSWELL'S *CHRISTIANITY, SOCIAL TOLERANCE, AND HOMOSEXUALITY* IN THE ACADEMIC AND PUBLIC SPHERES

By,

Jeffrey W. Cisneros

THESIS
Presented to the Faculty of the
Honors College
The University of Texas at San Antonio
In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements
For the Degree of

BACHELOR OF ARTS IN HISTORY
WITH HIGHEST HONORS IN THE HONORS COLLEGE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO
College of Liberal and Fine Arts
Department of History
July, 2012

THE RECEPTION OF JOHN BOSWELL'S *CHRISTIANITY, SOCIAL TOLERANCE, AND HOMOSEXUALITY* IN THE ACADEMIC AND PUBLIC SPHERES

PREPARED BY:

_____

Jeffrey W. Cisneros

APPROVED BY:

_____

Kolleen Guy, Ph.D., Thesis Advisor

_____

Mark Allen, Ph.D., Thesis Reader

_____

Anne Hardgrove, Ph.D., Thesis Reader

Accepted: _____

Richard Diem, Ph.D., Dean of the Honors College

Received by the Honors College:

_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Inevitably when one takes on an academic project of any consequence, it is not really a solo effort. I owe thanks to a large number of people who believed in me and supported me throughout the process. I would like to thank Dr. Ann Eisenberg, Associate Dean of the Honors College, for her belief in me. I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Kolleen Guy of History for her patience and care and my thesis readers, Dr. Mark Allen of English and Dr. Anne Hardgrove of History. I would also like to thank Dr. Bridget Drinka, the Chair of English, who also agreed to read my thesis and offer her advice.

Special thanks to Dr. Ralph Hexter, the Executive Vice Chancellor at the University of California- Davis. Dr. Hexter was John Boswell's close friend and literary executor. Without his help, I would never have been able to conduct research in Dr. Boswell's private papers. I would be remiss if I did not also thank his husband, Manfred Kollmeir for hosting me. Thanks to Dr. Toni McNaron, Dr. Mark D. Jordan, and Mr. John Lauritsen for agreeing to be interviewed for this project.

I would also like to thank Jason Trevino and Isaac Lopez for listening patiently to me when I needed to talk things out.

This thesis is dedicated to my grandparents, Mr. Francis L. Sutton and Mrs. Mary L. Sutton, who I hope would have been proud of their grandson, I love you and miss you both.

THE RECEPTION OF JOHN BOSWELL'S CHRISTIANITY, SOCIAL TOLERANCE, AND HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE ACADEMIC AND PUBLIC SPHERES

Jeffrey Cisneros, B.A. History
The University of Texas at San Antonio, 2012

Supervising Professor: Kolleen Guy, Ph.D.

This project began as a historiographic examination of *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, but became an investigation of the social and cultural turmoil of the times that contributed to the reaction to CSTH. In this investigation The methodology included reading primary and secondary source material, conducting oral history interviews, surveying book reviews and journal articles, and accessing the private papers of Dr. Boswell.

Boswell's book emerged just after the events of Stonewall and the birth of the modern gay rights movement. The emergence of what is now called the modern "culture wars" and the removal of homosexuality from the list of diagnostic mental disorders made the conditions right for a sharply divided reaction to a book about gay history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT **2**
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION **5**
CHAPTER 2: RECEPTION **13**
CHAPTER 3: INCIDENTS AND ACCIDENTS **24**
CHAPTER 4: THE RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION **32**
CHAPTER 5: OBSERVABLE EFFECTS AND CONCLUSION **42**
BIBLIOGRAPHY **48**

Chapter 1: Introduction

One of the most enduring and controversial figures in the field of History is Dr. John E. Boswell. His work on homosexuality and the history of the Christian Church was published at a key time and it profoundly impacted theological debates in numerous Christian denominations, particularly in the United States. The social turmoil and the Stonewall Riots in the late 1960's and the removal of homosexuality from the list of diagnostic mental disorders in the mid 1970's created a dynamic that not only influenced Boswell personally, but contributed to the vehement reaction to his book in 1980.

Boswell was born in Boston into a military-police family and raised as a Presbyterian; he took his undergraduate degree at the College of William and Mary, where he also converted to Roman Catholicism. In a document I found in his collection Boswell ruminated about the Church and about why he voluntarily chose to remain Roman Catholic after leaving the Presbyterian Church:

> If I joined, say, the Quakers or the Episcopalians because their theology accommodates my views better, what would I be accomplishing? Just making my life more comfortable? By remaining within the Catholic community and challenging it to rethink and reconsider its views, I do more good.[1]

Boswell admitted that it was a decision that his family was "horrified with and bitterly opposed for years."[2]

[1] John E. Boswell, "On Being a Thinking Christian in a Post-Christian World," unpublished. John Boswell Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, CT.
[2] Ibid.

Boswell earned his Ph.D. at Harvard in 1975 and was immediately hired into a tenure-track position at Yale University.[3] His first book was based on his doctoral dissertation,[4] and it displayed his gifts as a medieval philologist, working in Catalan, Aragonese, Castilian, French, and Latin with equal facility. The book investigated Muslims (*mudejeres*[5]) who did not convert to Christianity living under Christian protection prior to 1492. It received favorable reviews. Boswell was an Iberian scholar with a talent for languages, and an interest in the attendant religions of medieval Western Europe. He seemed to have the gift for insight into the challenges of being the outsider within a dominant Christian culture. All of these talents would be employed in his writing of his second monograph.

Boswell published his second monograph, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*, (hereafter CSTH) in 1980. I have used the private papers of Boswell to examine the controversy surrounding the publication of this book. This thesis examines the reception of CSTH in both the academy and general public. At first, I wanted to account for how the work became conflated with the author. The heart of the controversy centered on his contention that Christianity was not always hostile to homosexuality. This was a contention that was controversial, and as I discovered from reading his private correspondence, also poorly received by secular gay activists on the left and religious conservatives on the right. Boswell's book created a moment in time where politically odd bedfellows were forced to work together to defend outdated but cherished ideas about how Christianity historically treated homosexuals.

[3] John E. Boswell, CV, John Boswell Papers, Yale University Library, New Haven, CT.
[4] John E. Boswell, *Royal Treasure: Muslim Communities Under the Crown of Aragon in the Fourteenth Century*, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1977).
[5] After 1492 they were called *moriscos*.

Boswell wrote in the introduction to his book that his intent was to "rebut the common idea that religious belief—Christian or other—has been the cause of intolerance in regard to gay people."[6] Boswell divided his book into four sections and twelve chapters. The first two chapters handle the introduction and definitions; the exposition goes from the chapter on Rome (3) which is the foundational chapter and proceeds chronologically until the High Middle Ages (9). Boswell used the final three chapters to analyze and conclude his argument.

Boswell argued in Chapter Ten that the proscriptions against homosexuals came as a result of social change. But unlike what had been claimed previous to the publication of CSTH, Boswell argued that those legal prohibitions came as a result of a general interdiction in Europe against all groups that did not conform. What is remarkable about this argument is not that it is new, but that it reiterated an argument that medieval historians generally agree on: that restrictions on groups that did not conform were on the rise in the 12th and 13th centuries. Prior to CSTH it had not been widely acknowledged that homosexuals were caught up in this shift in sentiment in Western Europe. Boswell mentions two key events that had a profound influence on the shift: the Third Council of the Lateran (1179), and the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215). Both of these proceedings were adopted almost seamlessly into secular law and were particularly harmful to gays, Muslims and Jews.[7]

In Chapter Eleven Boswell presented an analysis of the argument put forward by scholars in the High Middle Ages that marshaled arguments against homosexuality, associating it with animal behavior. This intellectual change featured the central argument that homosexuality

[6] John E. Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 6.
[7] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 272-75.

"violated nature."[8] This natural law argument has been prevalent in Christian teaching against homosexuality since St. Thomas Aquinas successfully molded elements of Greek philosophy, late Roman law, post-classical bestiaries, and medieval medical judgments into a cohesive, but contrived argument.[9] Generally, the natural law argument takes elements of animal behavior and equates it to human behavior, making the partial assertion that since animals do not engage in same-sex couplings that it is unnatural and wrong that humans do. The problematic nature of this argument is that the natural law argument falls apart under scientific observation. There are myriad examples of same-sex coupling in the animal kingdom. Joan Roughgarden, a distinguished evolutionary biologist, has published articles that argue that same-sex pairing behavior is observable in all areas of the animal kingdom. The culmination of her primary work that began in the early 1990's is *Evolution's Rainbow*. Her monograph provided insight into how genes and hormones control this diversity in sexual selectivity and constructed a scientific refutation of natural law arguments cherished by Darwin and embraced by the Church since Aquinas.[10] Admittedly, Aquinas did not possess the sophisticated tools that Roughgarden used in the compilation of her data, but the modern Roman Church does. Roughgarden's study supported Boswell's argument from a scientific viewpoint and has done much to dispel the authority of the natural law argument that the Church cherished.

But, Thomistic arguments are not the only source of medieval antipathy towards homosexuality. Alain de Lille's *Complaint of Nature*, for example, featured the goddess *Natura* in the role of complainer-in-chief. *Natura* bemoaned the unmanly behaviors in twelfth-century

[8] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 303-10.
[9] Patrick Henry, review of CSTH, *Church History*. Vol. 51, Issue 4 (1982), 440.
[10] Joan Roughgarden, *Evolution's Rainbow: diversity gender, and sexuality in nature and people*, (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2004)

contemporary society as an example of unnatural incontinence.[11] For example, Nature rails against Man, "For the human race, derogate from its high birth, commits monstrous acts in its union of genders, and perverts the rules of love by a practice of extreme and abnormal irregularity."[12] Boswell observed in CSTH, "Alain was very much influenced by the hostility to nonconformity which was sweeping through Europe in his day, and he consciously tried to erect an intellectual structure which could support it."[13]

Thematically, Boswell argued that the rise in secular hostility was what ultimately led to church proscriptions, not the other way around. This formed the basis of argumentation against homosexuality prior to CSTH. Thus, Aquinas arrayed the above-mentioned combination of elements as a series of leading questions and proscriptive, authoritative answers in his *Summa Theologiae*. Aquinas's answers have been used as the basis for natural arguments against homosexuality all the way into the present, a period of approximately seven hundred years. CSTH, while certainly not the first salvo in the war against the natural law argument came at a time when the combination of political and social forces provided a dynamic time for Boswell's arguments to be made.

The publication of CSTH came only eleven years after the Stonewall Riots in New York on June 28, 1969, the moment in history considered as the beginning of the modern gay rights movement. The events of Stonewall occurred early in the morning and continued over the following days. It began when drag queens and a group of gay patrons were harassed in a bar and refused to cooperate with police, refused to get into paddy wagons voluntarily, and ultimately forced the outnumbered police officers and detectives to barricade themselves inside the

[11] Alan of Lille, *Complaint of Nature*, James J. Sheridan, trans. Mediaeval Sources in Translation 26. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 310.

Stonewall Inn. The initial riot ended at about four in the morning with thirteen arrests and four police officers injured. The riots and civil unrest continued over the week but the events galvanized a community that prior to Stonewall had been meek and restrained. Homosexuals had finally fought back and embarrassed the New York Police Department. But the social upheaval was not the only sign that changes to the lives of homosexual men and women were on the way, the scientific community had been pursuing answers to the question of whether homosexuality was a pathology. After years of study that started with the groundbreaking work of Alfred Kinsey and Evelyn Hooker, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its list of diagnostic mental disorders in 1973 (full ratification in 1974) and the American Psychological Association followed suit in 1975. Historically, Alfred Kinsey's groundbreaking studies in 1948 and 1953 are given credit for the beginning of the study of homosexuality; while it is true Kinsey's work revealed that many more adults than previously expected had engaged in homosexual behavior or had same-sex fantasies, Kinsey's study was quite general and was not geared to specific empirical study of homosexuality, it merely set the groundwork.[14] To give credit where it is due, the first study that directly refuted homosexuality as indicative of psychopathology was conducted by Evelyn Hooker in 1957. In brief, Hooker recruited two groups of men matched for age, IQ, and education at the time of the study. None of the men in either group was in therapy at the time of the study, and Hooker used a double-blind procedure that asked experts to rate the adjustment of the men without any prior knowledge of their sexual orientation.[15] Projective tests (Rorschach, TAT, and MAPS) were conducted; the Rorschach experts put 2/3 of the heterosexual group and 2/3 of the homosexual group in the top three categories of adjustment. When asked to classify which tests were obtained from homosexual

[14] "Facts About Homosexuality and Mental Health," Department of Psychology, University of California- Davis, accessed 04/27/2011, http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/facts_mental_health.html
[15] Ibid.

men, the experts could not distinguish sexual orientation at a level better than random chance.[16] The results for TAT and MAPS also did not differ significantly. Hooker concluded that homosexuality was not a clinical illness and that homosexuality was not associated with psychopathology. Her results have since been replicated by other researchers using a variety of research methods. Thus while Kinsey was important, Hooker's work was the true basis for why psychiatrists and psychologists altered their views.

While the medical community was clarifying and demystifying homosexuality, the Church was resisting this scientific evidence, setting the scene for Boswell to confront the traditional ecclesiastical argument. In 1976, Pope Paul VI, via the Society of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, announced the Vatican's response to the statements of the "psychological order."[17] In brief, Paul conceded that a change in pastoral care was needed to care for gay members of the Catholic community, but homosexuality was still "intrinsically disordered and in no case can be approved of."[18] The Church was invested in the continuation of the seven-hundred year old, Thomistic argument surrounding natural law that would later figure prominently in Boswell's book.

Another feature of the cultural landscape that lay behind Boswell's book was the anti-gay rhetoric that became prominent in the modern culture war. Anita Bryant became the public face of the anti-gay movement in 1977 with her "Save Our Children" campaign in Miami where she openly advocated the repeal of Miami's ordinance banning anti-gay discrimination; her attempt was successful by a margin of 69 to 31%. Bryant's campaign ultimately resulted in a law passed by the Florida legislature that absolutely banned gays from adopting children. At the same time

[16] Ibid.
[17] *Persona humana*, Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Roman Catholic Church, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19751229_persona-humana_en.html, Section VIII. The "psychological order" here refers to both APA's and their findings.
[18] Ibid.

on the other side of the country, Harvey Milk was elected as a San Francisco city-county supervisor: he was only the third openly gay U.S. politician to serve in any capacity. Milk's eventual assassination along with that of San Francisco Mayor George Moscone in 1978 by former supervisor Dan White gained nationwide attention.[19] Bryant and White epitomize two political sides at war over the issue of fundamental rights. One side was religious and socially conservative; the other side secular and socially liberal. CSTH emerged to gain the attention of the general audience and became an immediate topic of public debate that loosed a firestorm of criticism from deeply opposed political sides that agreed on nothing except that John Boswell was wrong.

[19]Randy Shilts, *The Mayor of Castro Street: The Life and Times of Harvey Milk* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982). White was ultimately acquitted on the charge of first degree murder and convicted of voluntary manslaughter. His attorney employed a novel defense claiming that White was not responsible due to a high concentration of sugar in his blood acquired from eating too many Hostess Twinkies. (Not apocryphal, this resulted in the elimination of the California "diminished capacity" law).

Chapter 2: Reception

The University of Chicago Press could have scarcely predicted the demand for CSTH. In its first year of publication, CSTH was reprinted six times and the demand for the book was greater than the publisher could supply:[20] The book is still not out of print. CSTH was reviewed in popular magazines (*Newsweek, Time*), Boswell enjoyed a measure of celebrity, and requests for speaking engagements and public appearances far exceeded his ability to fulfill them all. I reviewed a large file of such requests in his papers and discovered no less than 100 very politely worded letters where Boswell had to refuse requests to appear due to his schedule being booked as far out as two years in advance.[21] Yet Boswell's flirtation with celebrity did not result in universal acceptance of CSTH.

CSTH had (and still has) a large number of public detractors. In a review published in the *New York Times Literary Supplement*, Peter Linehan, a distinguished Fellow of St. John's College at Cambridge University whose research specialty is the medieval Church, takes Boswell to task, calling Boswell's account of St. Anselm of Canterbury "as much tendentious as misinformed…"[22] Linehan, throughout his strongly critical review, cited examples from CSTH and asserted academic bias. Linehan argued that Boswell was guilty of "claiming too much, by insistently, and at times recklessly, crowding out other considerations in its concern with the centrality of its theme."[23] Linehan frequently asked rhetorical questions within the body of the review to question Boswell's motivations and cast Boswell in a negative light. For example, in his response of Boswell's interpretation of St. Anselm, Linehan asks rhetorically, "Even if such language be allowed to be understood literally, is it safe to judge the archbishop's actions solely

[20] Undated letter from UCP Editor to John Boswell.
[21] Undated letter from John Boswell to UCP editor.
[22] Peter Linehan, "Growing hostile to gays," *London Times Literary Supplement*, January 23, 1981.
[23] Ibid.

in the light of private correspondence of twenty to forty years before? (Would a historian, or a journalist, judge those of a statesman solely in the light of his war-time, public school crushes?)."[24] These questions were combined with frequent assertions that Boswell was "too hasty."[25]

Linehan does manage to ask some interesting questions and register some legitimate concerns. He points out, for example, that St. Peter Damian's *Liber Gomorrhianus* (1051 BCE) expressed official disapproval of clerical homosexuality; indeed Damian is frequently cited as the originator of the argument against same-sex physical relations between priests. Though Boswell contends that Pope Alexander II (1061-73) suppressed the *Liber*, it seems clear that the pendulum was beginning to swing towards proscriptions and Linehan's critique of Boswell had some substance.[26]

Another one of Boswell's vocal critics was the late Louis F. Crompton. Crompton is generally regarded as one of the early fathers of what is now called Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transsexual Studies. In a mostly critical review, Crompton took issue with Boswell's contention that the Church did not always proscribe gay persons. Crompton's review dedicated the first column and a half to citing examples of executions of gay persons ranging from Emperor Justinian's *Institutions* in 538 CE to the first known execution for homosexuality in Western Europe in 1277.[27] According to Eva Cantarella, there was room for doubt that Justinian's writings had any significant effect on anything but religious law; there were no provable executions for homosexuality during Justinian's reign although there was no doubt that Justinian

[24] Peter Linehan, "Growing Hostile to Gays (review)," *London Times Literary Supplement*, January 23, 1981.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 216.
[27] Louis F. Crompton, "Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality (review)," *Commonweal*, June 5, 1981.

was hostile to same-sex physical intimacy.[28] It is after this lengthy introduction, wherein Crompton asserts that the Church was always anti-gay, that he mounts his argument against Boswell. His argument is based on Leviticus 18:22[29], from which Crompton draws a line to Corinthians I 6:9[30], and ends with Romans I, which he calls, "…the real prop of legal and moral condemnation."[31] In reading the review, Crompton states halfway through the third column, "…despite all of the scholarly exegesis, his [Boswell's] arguments left the reader unconvinced."[32] The Greek translation of the Bible in which Crompton relies for his critique also is controversial, especially that of the Greek word "*kinaidos*," which seems to mean "effeminate" but has been alternately translated to mean "homosexual" or "passive homosexual" in modern versions of the Bible.

In fact, there is evidence that Crompton resented Boswell personally. Crompton's personal resentment was discussed in a personal letter from Dr. Mel Goldstein of the University of Hartford to Boswell himself, "You finger my apprehension precisely when you refer to Crompton's animus toward you, which may be reflected in his response to my article…Though I find myself in the role of peacemaker and hope Crompton will mellow out on some issues I wouldn't bet on it."[33]

Crompton's language was clearly judgmental: he used statements such as, "Concerned to get Christianity off the hook, Boswell is perplexed to explain the increasing intolerance of

[28] Eva Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 181-83.
[29] Leviticus 18:22 - Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.
[30] Corinthians I 6:9 - Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor catamites, nor sodomites…
[31] Louis F. Crompton, "Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality (review)," *Commonweal*, June 5, 1981.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Mel Goldstein to John Boswell, October 31, 1982.

homosexuality after the fall of Rome."[34] This sort of commentary harmed Crompton's critiques of Boswell despite Crompton's excellent academic credentials.

Equally personal, perhaps even more so, Duke Divinity School, New Testament Scholar, Richard Hays produced a critique of Boswell wherein he wrote that Boswell's interpretation of Romans I: 26-27 "has no support in the text and is a textbook case of reading into the text what one wants to find there."[35]

Hays' deployed his antipathy with politely worded phrases such as, "I am sure for the reasons above, that Boswell's exegesis of Romans I: 26-27 is in error; I am strongly suspicious that his historical construction may be equally in error…"[36] Arguments about scriptural exegesis and scholarly construction aside, Professor Hays, among others, allowed their personal feelings to influence his interpretation of the texts. As a result, I believe it weakened the scholarly credibility of their reviews.

The final example of a critical review I will use is a commentary written by Father Richard J. Neuhaus on the website First Things, a site for religious traditionalists and conservative religious scholars of all denominations. Father Neuhaus took Boswell and his work sharply to task. Neuhaus speaks about "revisionists of the Boswell school."[37] He alleged that Boswell's work was used uncritically by religious denominations to justify a more tolerant position on homosexuality, a position opposite of the Gay Academic Union. Neuhaus cited the 1993 draft position of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America as an example of this

[34]Louis F. Crompton, "Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality (review)," *Commonweal*, June 5, 1981.
[35] Richard Hays, "Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to John Boswell's Exegesis of Roman I," *Journal of Religious Ethics* Vol. 14, No. 1 (Spring 1986), 184-215.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Richard Neuhaus, "In the Case of John Boswell," *First Things*, accessed March 14, 2011, http://www.firstthings.com/article/2009/03/in-the-case-of-john-boswell-4.

uncritical acceptance.[38] Neuhaus had a long history of criticism of Boswell: in the Advent 1980 issue of *Lutheran Forum*, he sharply panned CSTH. Fourteen years later Neuhaus continued to criticize Boswell in his "First Things" column. Neuhaus concluded in his March 2009 column "despite his assiduous efforts, what Boswell's historical scavenger hunt does not produce is any evidence whatever that authoritative Christian teaching ever departed from the recognition that homosexual acts are morally wrong,"[39] as if his pronouncement was the end of the matter. I noted that Fr. Neuhaus never cited any of his own evidence, but recycled the arguments of Dr. Richard Hays and Dr. David Wright (both conservative religious scholars of the traditional mold). But over the years, criticism of Boswell has turned into a cottage industry, and Neuhaus's twenty-nine year history represents the most extreme example.

With all of the accusations that Boswell was guilty of hasty, tendentious, or faulty scholarship from both conservative religious scholars and secular progressives, it came as no surprise to me that I encountered similar sentiments in an interview with John Lauritsen; he outright accused Boswell of deliberate academic dishonesty in a conversation where Mr. Lauritsen frankly discussed his views.[40] It was Lauritsen, Boswell's self-described harshest critic, R. Wayne Dynes, and the late Warren Johansson that formed the core of the Gay Academic Union (GAU). Of these three men, only R. Wayne Dynes has a Ph.D.; Mr. Lauritsen earned an A.B. from Harvard, and Mr. Johansson was a non-degreed linguist; none were credentialed historians. It is noteworthy that Lauritsen, Dynes, and Johansson represented the political left of the gay community. In the interview Lauritsen stated that he and his fellows had been academically blacklisted for their views. At several points in the conversation, Lauritsen

[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.
[40] John Lauritsen, interview by Jeffrey Cisneros, Boston, MA, March 19, 2011. Recording in possession of this writer.

recollected being disallowed from presenting his liberal views at conferences and ascribed the blame to Boswell and other academic apologists for the Church.[41] Without the weight of evidence otherwise, it seems more likely that Mr. Lauritsen was not invited to speak at certain venues because he had only received a baccalaureate degree and was not sufficiently credentialed, or any other number of academically valid reasons, rather than because of his opinion.

But not all of the reviews of Boswell's work were negative. Professor John C. Moore of Hofstra University presents a balanced, mostly positive review of CSTH in the April 1981 issue of the *American Historical Review*; this is the journal of record for the American historical profession. Moore recommended CSTH as a "splendid piece of scholarship."[42] His main reservations concern Boswell's interpretation in Genesis of Lot where he is not entirely convinced that the sin of inhospitality was the sole crime being condemned, and the moral neutrality of the phrase "beyond nature" uttered by St. Paul.[43] I am not qualified to judge the subtle nuances of patristic Greek, and specialists like Moore (who favored Boswell) and Hays (who opposed Boswell's interpretation), have valid but opposing viewpoints. For a clearer understanding of Boswell's translations I read Appendix One in CSTH (pp. 335-353 in the Phoenix Edition, 1981) entitled, "Lexicography and St. Paul" which provided multiple interpretations from differing sources besides his own to demonstrate his diligence in interpretation. Based on this lexicography, I judge that his translations are not all that different from other reliable sources. For example, the phrase in the Masoretic text, Jeremiah 5:8, Septuagint (LCC) interprets it to read, "They became horses and mad after females," the

[41] John Lauritsen, interview by Jeffrey Cisneros, Boston, MA, March 19, 2011. Recording in possession of this writer.
[42] John C. Moore, CSTH (Review), *American Historical Review*, Vol 86, No. 2, April, 1981.
[43] Ibid.

Jerusalem Bible translates it as, "They were well-fed, lusty stallions," and the New English Bible translates it, "Like a well-fed and lusty stallion."[44] Scholars may disagree, but I am of the opinion that in service of scholarship Boswell was scrupulously honest in presenting alternate translations: whether he was correct in his translations is for better philologists than I. I am in agreement with Moore when he assesses that Boswell "argues responsibly, plausibly, and with remarkable erudition."[45] In this review, Moore compliments Boswell for a study that is "admirably dispassionate and objective" and judges CSTH fundamental for future studies of sexual attitudes in the West.[46]

I another positive response to Boswell's work, the late Professor John F. Benton presented a paper at the American Academy of Religion (AAR) in December of 1981, assessing the arguments Boswell presented about the late eleventh and the twelfth century. Benton concurred with the argument Boswell presented that indifference towards gay people began to dissipate and was replaced by two opposite approaches. In the first approach, a small, vociferous group of ascetics, revived the violent hostility of Chrysostom and claimed that homosexual acts were not only sinful, but gravely so, comparable to murder; the second approach began to assert the positive value of homosexual relations.[47] Benton viewed these arguments as a valuable corrective to the idea that St. Peter Damian's *Liber Gomorrhianus* was a "typical, rather than an eccentric product of the eleventh century reform movement and that the great twelfth-century codifiers Gratian and Peter Lombard concerned themselves with homosexuality."[48] Benton goes on to compliment Boswell, observing that despite the fact that he (Boswell) had a point of view

[44] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 336.
[45] John C. Moore, CSTH (Review), *American Historical Review*, Vol. 86, No. 2, April, 1981.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 210.
[48] John F. Benton, "Gays in the Twelfth Century," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion, December 20, 1981).

and the book, an argument, that there is a "striking commitment to following historic truth wherever it leads" by including arguments contrary to his own.[49] In the latter half of his paper, Benton offered an alternate explanation to Boswell's suggestion of a close association of urban revival and an increase in homosexual activity. Benton posits that homosexuality did not increase, but became more visible due to the development of written literature after 1050. While his argument ran counter to Boswell's "urban revival" argument, Benton provided thoughtful discussion and posited reasonable alternatives, not just a positive evaluation of CSTH.

But the most balanced and collegial response to Boswell's work came from Professor Marcia Colish, whose long academic history includes a 38 year career at Oberlin College as the Frederick B. Artz Professor of History and is a Fellow and past President of the Medieval Academy of America (hereafter, MAA). She is considered an expert in the Stoic intellectual tradition and Peter Lombard. Colish reviews Boswell's use of literary and philosophical sources and offers her paper not as an attempt to undermine CSTH, but strengthen it. She further notes that her remarks "will be suggestions for correction that can be found in publications that appeared too recently for Boswell to use."[50] Colish addresses Boswell's assertion that the cause of intolerance of homosexuals was a result of the shift from urban to rural life, and the rise of autocracy and decline of the nuclear family.[51] She initially concedes that Boswell uses this causative chain guardedly, although she asserts that he uses it throughout the book as a "canon of explanation."[52] Colish cites three reasons why Boswell's assertion was untenable: 1.) historians of the family agree that the extended family was normative throughout the period (its date of

[49] Benton, "Gays in the Twelfth Century."
[50] Marcia Colish, "Method and Measure: Boswell's Use of Literary and Philosophical Sources," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion, December 20, 1981).
[51] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 207-10.
[52] Colish, "Method and Measure."

emergence is generally agreed to be the 15th century). 2.) weak, decentralized and constitutionally limited rule was even more likely to coincide with ruralism rather than urbanism prior to the modern age: and 3.) many of the groups Boswell cited evidence from were not town dwellers.[53] Although there are points where Colish disagrees with Boswell, she also compliments Boswell for having "written an important and welcome book, one that brings to light a wealth of information ignored, misconstrued, or even deliberately suppressed by previous authors."[54]

In my survey of papers and reviews, I found common points among the positive reviews. These points addressed the quality of Boswell's sources and research. There was almost universal acclaim among the positive comments, papers and reviews regarding Boswell's ability to follow sources where they led him, and not pre-supposing an outcome. His uncommon erudition was a theme found in both mixed and positive reviews. The major difference between the positive and negative views was the tenor of the comments. In the papers and reviews I cited as negative, the emotional undertone tended to be truculent and dismissive. Father Neuhaus wrote at least two polemical reviews of CSTH, for example:

> Christian history is a multifarious affair, and it does not take much sniffing around to discover frequent instances of what is best described as hanky-panky. The discovery process is facilitated if one goes through history with what is aptly described as narrow-eyed prurience, interpreting every expression of intense affection between men as proof that they were 'gay.' A favored slogan of the contemporary gay movement is 'We Are Everywhere!' Boswell rummages through Christian history and triumphantly comes up with the conclusion, 'They were everywhere.'[55]

[53] Colish, "Method and Measure."
[54] Colish, "Method and Measure."
[55] "In the Case of John Boswell."

That is not to say that Neuhaus did not have valid points to make; he simply became too emotionally involved. This is apparent in his unsupported claim that Boswell's book was accepted uncritically. The same may be said of John Lauritsen, whom I found to be unfailingly polite to me in our interview, even though he effectively undercut potentially legitimate points with his personal bitterness and his unsupported assertions of outright academic dishonesty by Boswell that I found to be both mendacious and troubling.[56] One of the milder examples of his resentment follows:

> It is not surprising that Professor Boswell has been hailed enthusiastically by the gay Christians, to whom he appears as a new Savior who will rescue them not only from the queer hating religionists, but from gay liberation secularists as well, by demonstrating historically that it's alright to be a gay Christian. Well before publication of the book, Boswell was in demand as a speaker before meetings and conventions of Dignity (gay Roman Catholics) and Integrity (gay Episcopalians). In time *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* may become a fifth gospel to gay Christians, to be inserted behind the Book of the Beloved Disciple.[57]

It seems clear by simply reading the negative reviews from both political and religious sides that the controversy started early as a result of arguments, not against the book, but against Boswell himself. Jealousy occurred as part of the public adulation Boswell received, and, although I perceived little to no conflation among positive *academic* reviews, I note that conflation was concomitant with the public positive reviews. It is also seems that the celebrity

[56] John Lauritsen, interview by Jeffrey Cisneros, Boston, MA, March 19, 2011. Recording in possession of this writer.
[57] John Lauritsen, "*Culpa Ecclesiae*: Boswell's Dilemma," accessed 03/08/2011, http://pinktriangle.org.uk/lib/hic/lauritsen.html.

Boswell garnered rendered him a convenient target for public critics, and was a source of discord for some of his colleagues in the professoriate.

Chapter 3: Incidents and Accidents

No matter how diligently scholars work to be collegial, there will always be jealousies, academic rivalries, and unpleasantness attendant to the profession. I have watched scholarly arguments play out over the internet over the past two years, some of them spirited, others simply nasty. In my investigation of the reception of CSTH, I found numerous examples of comments directed towards Boswell that were merely rude up to direct accusations of academic fraud and plagiarism. I gave a great deal of thought to my decision to include and document these cases and I asked myself three questions:

1. Was I including this information to inform or merely titillate my readers?
2. What purpose would I achieve by exposing unproven accusations of plagiarism?
3. Who would be hurt most by including these incidents?

Number one was the easiest question to answer, since my thesis discusses why Boswell's work was attacked so vigorously, using this information carefully and with sensitivity could assist me in achieving my goals within the limits of my investigation. In answering number two satisfactorily I had to outline a formal goal for the use of these examples. My goal was simple: to present the information in the most objective way I could. To the best of my knowledge these events are all in the public domain, and any information I use will be from private recollections of a public event. Number three is tricky. With some of the participants deceased, I had to make careful value judgments and meticulously confirm my information by using primary source material documenting the incidents. Using only documentation from the correspondence in the record I was able to determine veracity. While the incident I include was regrettable, I believe it is instructive about academic disagreements. I include my reasoning to help establish my *modus operandi* so those who read this work clearly understand why I included academic "dirty

laundry" in my work. Bearing this in mind I present three incidents in order to help confirm just how personal this book was to some people.

The International Congress of Medieval Studies (IMC) is held annually at Western Michigan University (WMU) in Kalamazoo, Michigan. I refer back to a presentation in response to Boswell by Professor Marsha L. Dutton at the 1989 IMC, the title of which was, "Aelred of Rielvaulx and John Boswell: A Scholarly Scandal." Professor Dutton is currently Chair of the Department of English at Ohio University and is an Aelred scholar. At the time of the incident, Dr. Dutton was employed at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. In this investigation, I refer to a series of letters written by Dr. L.J. Andrew Villalon (currently employed at the University of Texas) to Boswell, Dr. Rozanne Elder of the Institute of Cistercian Studies (ICS) at WMU, and to Dr. Dutton. I also refer to the Cistercian Institute's response to Professor Villalon and Boswell's letter of complaint directed to the Director of the Medieval Institute, the late Dr. Otto Grundler. I sought a written response from Dr. Dutton and found no copy of a response to either Villalon or Boswell.

She presented her paper, "Aelred of Rievaulx and John Boswell: A Scholarly Scandal" to rebut Boswell's contention that Aelred might be gay. In this investigation I discovered personal correspondence where Boswell was angered and wounded over allegations of academic dishonesty. Dutton accused Boswell of plagiarism in his use of material from Douglas Robys' work on Aelred without citing it.[58] In fact, Boswell consulted with Robys on his book and he is included in the author's personal thanks; Robys has never accused Boswell of using his work in an unattributed manner. But Dutton continued on after Boswell's death with a paper written for *The American Benedictine Review* in 1996, where she argues, "…there is finally no way of

[58] Rozanne Elder to Andrew Villalon, May 25, 1989.

knowing the details of Aelred's life, much less his sexual experience or struggles…The question of Aelred's sexuality is the wrong question…"[59] The title of the article is, "The Invented Sexual History of Aelred of Rievaulx, A Review Article." This article takes on Boswell and Dr. Brian Patrick McGuire, author of *Brother and Lover: Aelred of Rievaulx*. Dutton makes a persuasive argument that it is difficult to prove Aelred's sexual orientation, and without the weight of clear and compelling evidence, any discussion about the possible sexual orientation of Aelred is at best, educated guesswork.

On May 11, 1989, Villalon wrote a letter to Boswell recounting the above-mentioned panel presentation by Dr. Dutton wherein he reported, "I found the overall tone of her talk both insulting and patronizing, not only to you, but to gay history as well."[60] This panel was also attended by Dr. Ruth Mazo Karras, one of Boswell's former graduate students. Karras's defense of Boswell was terminated in mid-sentence and no opportunity was given for a complete rebuttal. Dr. Boswell (who was at the IMC, but did not attend the panel) wrote a letter to the panel organizer expressing his concern, I present his remarks in part, "I am told Marsha Dutton accused me of falsification and fraud…a responsible institution would not allow a participant in a session of this sort to attack by name a living scholar without making sure he had the opportunity to respond."[61] Boswell closed his letter as follows, "…only two persons spoke on my behalf, and Ms. Dutton interrupted and terminated the rebuttal offered by Professor Karras. I hope this does not mean that you consider Ms. Dutton's remarks or behavior appropriate."[62] I sought out a letter to Dutton from Boswell in Boswell's papers and found none. Villalon

[59] Marsha Dutton, "The Invented Sexual History of Aelred of Rievaulx: A Review Article," *American Benedictine Review* 47 (1996), 432.
[60] Andrew Villalon to John Boswell, May 11, 1989.
[61] John Boswell to Otto Grundler, May 11, 1989.
[62] Ibid.

describes the event in his letter to Dutton, "As you are well aware, the discussion of your paper was cut off rather abruptly (with a totally inadequate quip about continuing it at the happy hour), and never taken up again."[63]

Villalon carefully marshaled his concerns. His first objection was to the title of the paper, which he asserted was quite rude. Initially, he considered the title as some sort of inside reference, but after attending the session he came to a different conclusion. Villalon also defended Boswell against a charge that "permeated" Dutton's paper, "that in order to 'prove his thesis' he purposely slanted or omitted evidence to deceive his audience."[64] He offered a corrective to Dutton, suggesting that perhaps it might have been better to issue an invitation to Boswell, provide him with a copy of the paper for a response, and the time to present a rebuttal.[65]

Villalon's letter to Dr. Rozanne Elder of the ICS offered the same corrective, and took the ICS to task for not seeing through their responsibility in the process.[66] In reply, Elder took full responsibility for the lack of oversight for the paper and even though Elder offered a brief scholarly defense of Dutton's paper, she admitted that she was "quite unprepared for the rather different thesis and for the tenor of Professor Dutton's paper. And I must admit that, as a scholar and as a sponsor, I was discomfited by it." Simply put, she defended the scholarship of the paper, but was quite upset with the tenor of the actual paper.[67]

The best I can say is that based upon what I have read, and what I now know about the incident, Dutton did indeed act in a rude manner at the Congress. She was taken to task for it by Villalon and Karras. I am not privy to any correspondence between Elder and Dutton, Elder and

[63] Andrew Villalon to Marsha Dutton, May 11, 1989.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Andrew Villalon to Rozanne Elder, May 21, 1989.
[67] Rozanne Elder to Andrew Villalon, May 25, 1989.

Boswell, and Dutton and Boswell; none was to be found in the papers although I searched diligently. I can only speculate perhaps in the zeal of her responding to Boswell, Marsha Dutton forgot her academic good manners. Her major error was to accuse Boswell of falsification and fraud both in public and *in absentia*. Dr. Elder admitted embarrassment at the incident, and while I rather doubt Dutton and Boswell were on each other's Christmas card lists, there is no further hint of Dutton ever publicly accusing Boswell of academic dishonesty after 1989. It is important to note that in the future I hope to speak to Dr. Dutton about this incident, but the pressure of the academic deadline prevents my pursuing that line of research to its logical conclusion at this time. Until such time, I can only record the incident and offer a *qualified* judgment.

Another incident that stands out was the public attempt by the Gay Academic Union to discredit Boswell. GAU possessed an unremitting belief that Christianity had always treated homosexuals intolerantly and, moreover, that this intolerance had included a consistent application of punitive measures against homosexuals. When Boswell, a self-identified gay man of faith, produced a study that countered their belief, it was not surprising that they would react defensively and lash out. John Lauritsen was the spokesperson and self-proclaimed critic of Boswell.

During my interview with him, he asserted that the reception of scholars to CSTH was "highly critical;"[68] However, based on the evidence available, the reaction among scholars was mixed, a fact that can be confirmed by Dr. Paul B. Halsall who maintains a collection of reviews of Boswell's work.[69] In my interview with Mr. Lauritsen he overstated his case against Boswell on more than one occasion; for example, later in the interview Lauritsen said "to me it is

[68] John Lauritsen, interviewed by Jeffrey Cisneros, Boston, March 19, 2011. Recording in possession of this writer.
[69] Paul Halsall, ed., "People with a History," Fordham Jesuit University, accessed 04/02/2011, http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/index-bos.asp

dishonest to do what Boswell did, to pretend that there was no homophobia in the Christian religion."[70] This statement was factually inaccurate; Boswell acknowledged in the introduction of CSTH that religious beliefs may indeed cloak intolerance.[71] Boswell's argument stems from the difference between "conscientious application of religious ethics and the use of religious precepts to justify oppression…"[72] Lauritsen's assertions were also contradicted by Father Richard Neuhaus, a conservative religious scholar, theologian, and critic of Boswell, who argued in his online column, "First Things," that Boswell's work was received uncritically.[73] Boswell's work discomfited both sides of the argument; in response both sides attacked and overextended their arguments in the attempt to discredit him instead. Was the overextension deliberate or a classic case of passions overriding common sense? In my investigation I discovered that most of Boswell's academic critics exhibited courtesy and fair play when taking him to task. Unfortunately, this was not always the case, which brings me to the next incident.

The late Dr. David F. Wright of the University of Edinburgh, who was the Professor of Patristic and Reformation Christianity, wrote articles and scholarly papers that attempted to discredit Boswell. In much the same manner as Richard Neuhaus, Wright was a very conservative evangelical who was uncomfortable with homosexuality, according to Dr. Paul Halsall, then a graduate student and witness to some of Wright's speaking engagements on the topic. Over the years, Dr. Wright published at least four papers that specifically invoked Boswell and his work, and specifically in his entry for the *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, in the definition of "Homosexuality" Wright placed the following statement, "The conclusion must be

[70] John Lauritsen, interviewed by Jeffrey Cisneros, Boston, March 19, 2011. Recording in possession of this writer.
[71] John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 6-7.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Richard Neuhaus, "In the Case of John Boswell," *First Things*, http://www.firstthings.com/print/article/2009/03/in-the-case-of-john-boswell-4?keepThis=true&TB_iframe=true&height=500&width=700.

that for all the interest and stimulus Boswell's book provides in the end of the day there is not one piece of evidence that the teaching mind of the early Church countenanced homosexual activity,"[74] a statement that is debatable considering the fact that scholars are still divided on the issue years after Boswell's death. Nevertheless, Wright critiques the book by employing a philological argument about specific words in Attic Greek uttered by St. Paul mean specific things (*malakoi* and *arsenokoitai*) without acknowledging that scholars have debated the patristic use of those words for well over a century and no definitive answer is forthcoming.[75] In fact, William L. Petersen in *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989) criticizes both Boswell and Wright for their translations of *arsenokoitai*. Wright on four occasions wrote papers disagreeing with Boswell's translation of *arsenokoitai* as "male prostitutes." With this academic debate currently unresolved, and the definition of the Greek terms murky at best, any evidence Wright presented in his attempted refutation of Boswell is inadmissible. Whether he was correct or not, Dr. Boswell properly presented evidence and discussed the reasoning for his definition in Appendix One of CSTH.[76]

Each incident mentioned in this chapter involves a person who accused (or is still accusing) Boswell of academic dishonesty, plagiarism, falsification, fraud, or deliberate deception. I will note that in over thirty years not one of these charges has ever been confirmed as accurate and I view such charges as spurious. Each of these people hails from very different political and academic backgrounds (John Lauritsen is politically active on the extreme gay left, Marsha Dutton is a medieval academic of indeterminate political and religious status, and the

[74] David C.F. Wright, "Homosexuality," *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, et al. (New York: Garland Pub, 1990).
[75] E.g. Boswell argues that *arsenokoita*i might mean "male prostitute" and Wright contends it actually means "homosexual." For the specialist reader I recommend A.W.H. Adkins, *Moral Values and Political Behavior in Ancient Greece* (London, 1972) and Andre Pellicer, *Natura: etude semantique et historique du mot latin* (Paris, 1966), pp 17-35.
[76] John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 346-353.

late David Wright was a conservative, evangelical Patristic scholar). The only thing they have in common is how they reacted to Boswell. But does this point to a conflation of the man and his work?

Boswell's work threatened firmly entrenched political arguments from both sides of the political spectrum. In the case of the GAU, their arguments assume that the Church and religious community are completely hostile to the homosexual community. Any well-researched work that undermined their arguments would logically be defended at all costs. In the case of conservative religious community, Boswell's book and his personal popularity calls into question over six-hundred years of the majority interpretation that homosexuality is a mortal sin, and punishable by being denied a place in heaven (at the very least). The Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) was the blueprint for secular law in Western Europe and St. Thomas Aquinas gave his answers in Part II of the second part of the *Summa Theologiae* (1265-74). The various Christian reformation movements did not formally set aside the answers of Aquinas and, until the period just prior to the publication of CSTH, did not embrace same-sex intimate behavior.

It is evident that both sides of this were invested heavily in their arguments. Boswell's book threatened both sides, so they went after the threat.

Chapter 4: The Religious Discussion

From the Stonewall Riots in 1969 to the removal of homosexuality from the list of diagnostic mental disorders by the American Psychiatric and Psychological Associations in 1975/76, organized religions have felt compelled to justify their theological positions. The publication of CSTH added an important historical dimension to these theological debates. It helped to change the terms of the discussion from if and how the individual homosexual could be saved to a discussion about the historical place of homosexuals within Christianity. Prior to CSTH it was simple enough for a religious denomination to state or publish a position based on scripture outside of historical context, but with the publication and major success of CSTH, churches were put into the unusual position of having to respond to a detailed academic argument that also had the merit of being a mainstream publishing success. The research simply could not be ignored or dismissed out of hand.

Events leading up to the publication of CSTH indicated the beginnings of a fundamental shift in how churches and their parent denominations would address the question of homosexuality during these debates.

On December 29, 1975, the Catholic Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (SCDF) issued a "Declaration on Certain Questions Concerning Sexual Ethics." Published within the Papal Decree, *Persona Humana*, this extraordinary document, in part, directly addressed the Vatican's position on homosexuality and reserved an entire section to its reasoning. The fact that the Vatican felt compelled to reissue pastoral guidance on homosexuality is extraordinary enough, but to do so in response to pressures within its own congregation was remarkable. Not only was this document issued in response to social changes that permeated western society, it also addressed the judgment of secular authority about sexual orientation.

The first paragraph of Section 8 of *Persona Humana* observes,

> "At the present time there are those who, basing themselves on the observations in the psychological order,[77] have begun to judge indulgently, and even excuse completely, homosexual relations between certain people. This they do in opposition to the constant teachings of the Magisterium and to the moral sense of the Christian people."[78]

This opening statement is followed by a restatement of the actions of church opinion, "…homosexuals whose tendency comes from a false education, from a lack of normal sexual development, from habit, from bad example, or from other similar causes, and is transitory, or at least not incurable…"[79] It seems quite clear by the statement of the SCDF that the Church responded to the judgment of the American Psychiatric Association and the American Psychological Association; in fact the section concludes with the following, "In Sacred Scripture they [homosexual relations] are condemned as a serious depravity and even presented as a sad consequence of rejecting God…Scripture does not of course merit us to conclude that all those that suffer from this anomaly are personally responsible for it…homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered and can in no case be approved of."[80]

This statement attempted two things, first, to diminish or not recognize the judgment of medical professionals in the eyes of the worldwide congregation, and second, to confirm a hierarchical order that emphasized the religious order over the secular world. It was remarkable that this pastoral instruction, for the first time, softened the language in its instructions in regard

[77] In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association declassified homosexuality as a mental disorder, the American Psychological Association Council of Representatives followed suit in 1975.
[78] "*Persona humana*," Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Roman Catholic Church, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19751229_persona-humana_en.html, Section VIII .
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid.

to homosexual orientation. Yet, in both instances the Church was only partially successful. Lesbian and gay American Catholics started to splinter off from the main church and leave communion with Rome concerned about their place in the Catholic community [81] A group of openly gay Catholics called Dignity (founded in 1973) responded to the SCDF in their February 1976 newsletter condemning the statement and asking the Church to "appoint a committee of theologians, social scientists, and gay persons to more adequately study the question of homosexuality (and) its implications for Church and society."[82] Moreover, the Roman Catholic Church was not the only body interested in responding to the decision of psychiatrists and psychologists.

The United Methodist Council on Youth Ministry released a report less than a week after the SCDF that formally called for a church-wide study on human sexuality in anticipation of a three year period of mandatory education within the United Methodist body. Along with other biblical scholars, Boswell participated in a public forum on December 29, 1976, that strongly affected the outcome of the report. As one observer noted, "Dr. Boswell's presentation offered what may well be new and persuasive evidence in this arena to challenge the church's traditional injunctions against the practice of homosexuality."[83] The progress of the United Methodist denomination has been incremental over a period of decades and perhaps some of the incremental progress is owed to Boswell and other social scientists who conducted studies that attempted to bring to light the hidden history of gays and lesbians within Christianity. While the current policy as determined by the quadrennial meeting of United Methodist delegates (called

[81] Mark D. Jordan, *Silence of Sodom: Homosexuality in Modern Catholicism*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2000), 238.
[82] National Office of Dignity, "The Vatican's Statement on Sexual Ethics," *Dignity* Newsletter Volume VII, no. 2 (Feb. 1976).
[83] United Methodist Council of Youth Ministry. Bill Barney, ed. Press Release, January 3, 1976.

the General Conference) has evolved over the decades, the United Methodist denomination has called for gays and lesbians to serve openly in the armed forces of the United States, relaxed prosecutions of ministers blessing of same-sex unions (although such blessings are still not legal), and called for equality in pastoral care for every person since 2001.[84]

Despite the statement of the SCDF, elements of the Roman Catholic Church reacted favorably to the publication of Boswell's work. In a review of CSTH, Father Paul K. Thomas, who worked for the Catholic Archbishop of Baltimore, wrote in the *Catholic Review*, "Today's Christian ministers can reduce or eradicate the suffering associated with intolerance by being responsive toward well-founded interpretations of scripture and tradition, by becoming cognizant of new theological perspectives, and by remaining open to modern scholarly research."[85] The Bishops Committee for Pastoral Research and Practices (hereafter CPRP) invited Boswell to send comments on a proposed pastoral statement that would; "articulate more clearly the gospel principles that underlie the Church's teaching on sexual morality, elaborate on some of the new positive developments in sexual morality, while still affirming the Church's teaching of moral norms, (and) contrast the difference between the high standards of Christian morality and those of a secular society such as ours."[86]

The chair of the CPRP and Bishop of Savannah, Raymond W. Lessard, and Boswell communicated, and while Boswell's input was taken into account, nothing fresh emerged from the Bishops Committee. In fact, a more aggressive policy of silencing dissident voices in the Church emerged at the diocesan and archdiocesan levels. One of the most prominent voices for

[84] Homosexuality Backgrounder. United Methodist Church, accessed 03/01/2011, http://archives.umc.org/umns/backgrounders.asp?mid=905&story=FA58780B-1C10-491A-938E-E242A5D47186.
[85] Paul K. Thomas, "Researching gay Christians of the past: A 'valuable contribution' in context of faith, *Catholic Review*, May 22, 1981.
[86] Raymond Lessard to John Boswell. February 4, 1982.

Catholic social justice was Fr. John J. McNeill, S.J.: he was officially silenced and prohibited from speaking on the matter of homosexuality in 1979. McNeill has a long history with DIGNITY, and even gave the keynote address at the first U.S. convention of DIGNITY in California in 1973. The keynote reads in part, "All too often in the past the Church and its moral theologians have made *a priori* statements concerning the morality and lifestyle of homosexuals without any serious effort at dialogue."[87] McNeill published his first book, *The Church and the Homosexual* (Beacon, 1976) and received *imprimi potest*[88] only to have it retroactively taken away two years after publication. McNeill's comments would prove controversial and would set him on the road that eventually led to his expulsion from the Society of Jesus in 1988 by order of Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger who was then in charge of the SCDF and later became the current Pope, Benedict XVI.

McNeill refused to remain silent after his expulsion from the Jesuit Order in 1987 and has published a number of books in addition to *The Church and the Homosexual*. This list includes *Taking a Chance on God* (Beacon, 1993), *Freedom, Glorious Freedom* (Beacon, 1995), and his autobiography, *Both Feet Planted Firmly in Midair* (Westminster Press, 1998). Boswell was active in DIGNITY and while his work owes more to Canon Derrick Sherwin Bailey's *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1955) than to McNeill's *The Church and the Homosexual* (Beacon, 1976), it is clear that Boswell admired McNeill's work and frequently quoted from it in CSTH.[89] Boswell owed his work to those who came before him and some who would survive him among gay people of faith. While

[87] John J. McNeill, S.J., Keynote speech First National DIGNITY Convention, Hollywood, CA (Labor Day Weekend, 1973).
[88] Latin- formal permission to print from the Vatican.
[89] Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 406.

the conservative elements of religious academia mostly panned Boswell's work, there were also some positive reviews posted in academic religious journals.

First I turn to the *Bulletin de Theologie, Ancienne et Medievale*[90], an important annual journal of ancient and medieval theology that compiles studies on the Church from New Testament to early 17th century. The journal is based in the *Abbaye du Mont Cesar* in Louvain, Belgium. The anonymous reviewer gives a positive review of CSTH, referring back to the statement of the SCDF in 1975 as a starting point in reappraising pastoral care of homosexuals in the Church.[91] The reviewer asserts that "A major reappraisal of the theological, moral, and social implications is currently underway within the Church: there can be no doubt but that the future tenor of the moral debate will be greatly influenced by B's brilliant study…"[92] The reviewer agrees with him throughout, once again demonstrating a remarkable tendency of reviewers to either fully embrace Boswell's work or reject it utterly. I will not call it a phenomenon, but in my small survey of reviews I found remarkably little middle ground. The reviewer speaks of Boswell closing his work at the fourteenth century, not as a dividing line, but a natural end point. The reviewer's assertion is that Church policy did not change significantly over a seven hundred year period due to St. Thomas of Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*.[93] I cannot recall a single point of disagreement with Boswell. I must admit when I read this review, I was taken aback by the effusiveness: it was almost off-putting.

[90] Bulletin of Ancient and Medieval Theology (Fr.)
[91] *Persona humana*. Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Roman Catholic Church, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19751229_persona-humana_en.html, Section VIII .
[92] *Bulletin de Theologie, Ancienne et Medievale*, Review of CSTH, Jan-Dec (sic) (1984).
[93] Ibid.

Another example is the July, 1985, issue of *St. Luke's Journal of Theology*. This is a much more restrained review, but is still quite positive. It is written by Stanley Hauerwas of the Duke Divinity School and it is interesting to see how much Hauerwas and Richard Hays disagree on the topic of Boswell's book.[94] Hauerwas qualifies his review of Boswell's book at the outset, and sets the terms of his review carefully, "…the reader must be warned that Boswell's book is not morally significant because it is about a subject most assume involves moral questions. The book more importantly takes the form of a moral argument that depends for its cogency on the historical analysis."[95] It was Hauerwas' contention that Boswell challenged the assumption that an issue "…like homosexuality can be determined by formal or abstract philosophical and theological considerations."[96] It is in this review that Hauerwas gets to the very heart of why Boswell was so intensely polarizing; for so many people Boswell's book challenged comfortable stereotypes and theological positions that had allegedly been settled for over seven-hundred years. This very fact brings into focus why some gays of the secular left attacked Boswell; his work attacked the settled notion that gays could not realistically be people of faith because in their notion of history the Church had always been intolerant of gays. According to Mark Jordan, only a gay historian of faith, determined to reset the record could have done this work.[97] There was the danger that Boswell could have gone too far, wrote what his heart wanted to say rather than go to the heart of matter and seek out the truth, no matter how bad it might have hurt.

[94] Richard Hays, "Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to John Boswell's Exegesis of Roman I," Journal of Religious Ethics Vol. 14, No. 1 (Spring 1986), 184-215.
[95] Stanley Hauerwas, Review of CSTH, *St. Luke's Journal of Theology*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (July 1985).
[96] Ibid.
[97] Mark D. Jordan, interviewed by Jeffrey Cisneros, Boston, March 18, 2011. Recording in possession of this writer.

Stanley Hauerwas also perceived that Boswell was not writing a "value-neutral" history.[98] Boswell had a point of view and he argued it. The general opinion of the effectiveness of the argumentation varies from person to person and academic to academic, as we have seen all too often in discussions about controversial topics. Singled out for special notice by Hauerwas is chapter six of CSTH, where Boswell discussed moral and theological rationales, and specifically the assertion during the third to the sixth centuries where animal behavior is used to "…justify the attitude toward homosexuals…"[99] Hauerwas goes on to assert that the assumptions of theologians was "simply bizarre"[100] and that what is now commonly referred to as the "Natural Law" argument of that period was not sufficient to turn the tide of opinion against homosexuals. Hauerwas pointed out that Aquinas argued that "homosexuality is against nature but that 'nature' cannot refer to the act itself since nocturnal emission is natural"[101] We see only carefully selected elements of the natural law argument deployed in Thomism. Since the argument was selective it did not have the same weight as the secular argument for punishing non-conformity by various groups. In this period the fear of "the other" had been firmly established in both the secular and religious communities. Muslims, Jews, and heretics were noteworthy victims of this attitude. It did not take much effort to demonize and whip up fears of the homosexual as also being other. Thomas codified and justified by "natural law" this othering, but only by making tortured and qualified religious assumptions about the rationality of animal behavior.[102] It seems that conservative religious scholars felt threatened by Boswell and also attacked him, for the same reasons I outlined above with the secular left. Boswell disturbed long settled theological

[98] Stanley Hauerwas, Review of CSTH, *St. Luke's Journal of Theology*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (July 1985).
[99] Ibid.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid.

questions, and expressed a rational argument about Thomas that no self-protective Catholic theologian would make.

Hauerwas closes his review complimenting Boswell for "…putting the issue in the right context."[103] He also makes a plea, "…we must return to the fundamental vision of community characteristic of the early church. It is the gospel imperative that must determine the issue, not concentration on particular Scriptural passages and/or arguments about how homosexuality is or is not natural."[104] It is a powerful plea and one I find myself in agreement with.

In *Church History*, the journal of record for the American Society of Church History, Dr. Patrick Henry of Swarthmore College wrote a positive review of CSTH in which he noted "Like all good historical argument, Boswell's case is orderly, but not easy to summarize"[105] but hones in on Boswell's surprising historical judgment that "it would be misleading to characterize Christianity as somehow peculiarly liable to antigay feelings or doctrines."[106] Henry argues that the answer is historical, and in agreement with Boswell that in the latter half of the thirteenth century homosexuality passed from being "completely legal in most of Europe to incurring the death penalty in all but a few contemporary legal compilations."[107] At this juncture one must ask, why was this the case? Interestingly, Henry clarified Boswell's argument with Aquinas:

> "The natural law which underlies Saint Thomas's teaching on homosexuality, which for centuries has been the grounding of *the* (sic) Christian teaching on the subject of homosexuality, is shown to be a hodge-podge of Greek philosophy, medieval bestiaries,

[103] Hauerwas, Review of CSTH, St. Luke's Journal of Theology, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (July 1985).
[104] Ibid.
[105] Patrick Henry, review of CSTH, *Church History* 51 (1982), 440.
[106] John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 127-128.
[107] John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 293.

social convention, and Roman law."[108]

Aquinas is addressing the social and sexual issues of the day in the best way he knew how. I wonder sometimes why such extraordinary gyrations occurred. Prior to Boswell, all a Christian religious denomination had to do was to either quote Aquinas or quote biblical scripture out of context and leave it at that. Boswell changed the modern landscape by being a religious, gay academic that used the intellectual gifts at his disposal to challenge the conventional wisdom; but Boswell also was a witty, charming man who used his charm to bolster his argument.

[108] Patrick Henry, review of CSTH, Church History 51 (1982), 440.

Chapter 5: Observable Effects and Conclusion

In the process of researching the reception of Boswell's work I discovered that CSTH had a significant effect on the study of male homosexuality; on the other hand, the book had little to no impact on the study of female homosexuality. While the book sparked an explosion in the study of homosexuality in all fields, it inadvertently contributed to theoretical differences in how homosexuality was to be studied.

With higher visibility for work in the history of homosexuality, parallel work was coming to fruition in the field of literary analysis. While Boswell's book gained the lion's share of public attention, literary analysis had gone almost unnoticed until prominent theorists started promulgating "queer theory." One of the founders of this approach was the late Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, the Newman Ivy White Professor of English at Duke University and later Distinguished Professor of English at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Always controversial, Sedgwick published essays and books that span the period from 1985 until her early death in 2009 from breast cancer, including two of the founding monographs of Queer Theory, *Between Men* (Columbia University Press, 1985) and *The Epistemology of the Closet* (University of California Press, 1990). Queer Theory builds upon the work of Michel Foucault and structural theorists that attempted to destabilize simple conceptions of gay or lesbian identity. This was a departure from the essentialist theory of historians who maintained that certain phenomena are natural, inevitable, universal, and biologically determined. For example, Boswell and essentialists maintain the argument that homosexuality is determined genetically, an argument that is still prominent today. Structuralists argued that biology is only one of a number of factors that determine sexual orientation. Structuralism does not deny that biology is a significant factor, but it allows for the elements of nurture and choice in its arguments.

When I embarked upon this study over two years ago, my vision of it was different than it is now. The focus was historiographical; now after two years in Boswell's private papers I have a clearer picture of the political and social landscape. In that process a question emerged; why was Boswell conflated with his book? Certainly the ground was comfortable and much more black and white than it is today. Society was much more comfortable with a clear cut "good versus evil" fight, and less readily accepting of the shades of gray that emerge from research that indicates that both the political left and religious right were not entirely correct. For instance, the arguments presented by patristic scholars relied on a specific definition of the word *kinaidos*[109] as "homosexual," when the definition is dependent upon context. The word may indeed mean "homosexual," but alternatively it may also mean "male prostitute." Conversely, liberal gay academics relied on Leviticus 18:22 to demonstrate and justify their interpretation that Christianity has always persecuted same-sex physical love. There is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate the veracity of either argument.

Why would Boswell expose himself to critics on both sides that were demonstrably offended by his arguments and conclusion? A partial answer was provided by Boswell himself in his private musings -"it's a question of conviction, but what sort of conviction if I sometimes find myself in substantial disagreement with the church I adhere to?" He later clarifies this in relation to being part of a Catholic community, "I am as much the church as anyone else; it's not me disagreeing with 'them' (the hierarchy, theologians, Rome, more conservative Catholics); it's 'us' disagreeing among ourselves."[110]

[109] Greek- May refer to homosexual or prostitute of the male gender, dependent upon context and translator. Disputed. C.D. Younge translated this word originally as "effeminate" in *An English-Greek Lexicon* in 1870.
[110] John Boswell, "On Being a Thinking Christian in a Post Christian World," unpublished.

Boswell was engaged in two worlds, that of an academic and that of a man of deep, personal faith; his sexual orientation was an integral part of both worlds. His convictions drove him, his sense of duty as a "thinking Christian," and his academic duty to answering the questions he found along the way. In the study of history we often bandy about the word "objectivity" as the chief goal of all historical inquiry; I suggest that this "objectivity" may stifle genuine inquiry by placing a false expectation upon the historian. Peter Novick states that the principle assumptions of objectivity for the profession of history:

> include a commitment to the reality of the past, and to truth as correspondence to that reality; a sharp separation between knower and known, between fact and value, and above all, between history and fiction. Historical facts are seen as prior to and independent of interpretation: the value of an interpretation is judged by how well it accounts for the facts; if contradicted by the facts, it must be abandoned. Truth is one, not perspectival.[111]

Why do we as historians find these aims desirable? Novick argued that:

> the foundation of an historical profession--a community of the historically competent-was...an indispensable prerequisite for the establishment, identification, and legitimation of objective historical truth.[112]

[111] Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 1-2.
[112] Peter Novick, 52.

Judy Hensley argues that elements of the discipline of History "were tangled with assumptions about science and the nature of professional consensus and comity."[113] It seems that some in the profession of History tend to treat the discipline as a hard science; under the circumstances, that sets up problematic and unrealistic expectations that historians should divorce themselves from their point of view.

Was Boswell trying to fulfill a "secret" agenda? Did he play it fast and loose with the facts to arrive at a pre-determined outcome? Did he "make-up" history as Dr. Marsha Dutton suggested on at least two occasions? I am as confident that the answer to all of these questions is no. I had unfettered access to his personal papers, the recollections of his best friend, the recollection of his harshest critic, *et al.* There were no indications that would lead me to suspect this was the case. Boswell's study was placed in a time where the circumstances were right; social, cultural, and religious forces had already deployed along sharply divided lines; if the study had not been a commercial success in both academia and the general public the reaction would have been less sharp.

Boswell's chief critics from the right were social and religious conservatives that deployed the argument that homosexuality was a violation of natural law. This argument was articulated by Aquinas and had been adopted by conservative Christian denominations alongside the Roman Catholic Church. Boswell's refutation of natural law and his establishment of a "History of gay persons" alarmed them. Boswell's detractors from the left were convinced that Christianity has always sought to demonize and punish gay persons; this "cult of victimhood," while not around as long as the right's natural law argument, still pervaded the secular gay left.

[113] Judy Hensley, "The Philosophical and Historical Understandings of Objectivity," Gustavus Adolphus College, accessed 10/07/2011, https://gustavus.edu/philosophy/judy.html.

Both sides saw Boswell's challenge of their cherished notions, and lashed out. I found this was borne out in reviews of CSTH in non-academic sources and the oral histories.

Finally, the split in academia between essentialist historians and queer theorists represented a shift in how the study of sexual history and identity would continue to play out after Boswell's early death; these theoretical differences made it difficult for inter-disciplinary conversations. Boswell and Foucault were friendly with each other but Boswell adamantly opposed social constructivist views presented by Foucault as a reemergence of medieval nominalism. Boswell penned a review of David Couzens Hoy's *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, where Boswell's equal measure of affection and frustration with Foucault was evident. Even though the review was ostensibly about Hoy's book, it turned into rumination about Foucault's *The Care of the Self*. At times critical and other times admiring, Boswell observes:

> Two explanations occur to me. By canonizing these texts as a kind of "patristics" (both a sacred literature and a statement of the authority conferred by age and gender) of human sexuality, Foucault may have been making a wry comment on truth as a scholarly artifact; or the vastness and complexity of sexuality in Rome may have seemed to him not reducible to comprehensive treatment, so he simply excerpted and selected texts to make the points he considered important without even trying to explain their context. The two are not incompatible, and either or both would constitute a worthy epistemological riddle from the author of so many previous challenges to the way we understand thought, language, history and their interaction.[114]

[114] John Boswell, "Good Sex at Home in Ancient Rome." *The New York Times Review of Books*, January 18, 1987. http://www.nytimes.com/books/00/12/17/specials/foucault-care.html. Accessed 03/25/2012.

This disagreement remains even though the men responsible for beginning it have passed on; I suspect, as in most disagreements, the truth lies somewhere in between the two sides.

Boswell's work was groundbreaking and important because of the debate it opened in both academia and the general public. As with all historical works, it is the responsibility of historians to reexamine, refine, and build upon the work that preceded theirs. By way of closing, Boswell expressed this hope in chapter one of CSTH:

> Once the terrain has been better mapped, it will be possible to improve initial surveys very substantially; early studies may appear in retrospect absurdly roundabout or totally useless. To this ineluctable hazard of early research is added the difficulty in the case at issue that a great many people believe they already know where the trails *ought* to lead, and they will blame the investigator not only for the errors of first explorations but also for the extent to which his results…do not accord with their preconceptions on the subject. Of such critics the writer can only ask that before condemning too harshly the placement of his signposts they first experience for themselves the difficulty of the terrain.[115]

[115] John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 39.

Bibliography

Books

Alain of Lille. *Complaint of Nature.*

Bartsch, Shadi. *Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Boswell, John E. *The Royal Treasure: Muslim Communities Under the Crown of Aragon in the Fourteenth Century*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1977.

Boswell, John E. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Cantarella, Eva. *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Davidson, James. *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Bold New Exploration of the Ancient World*. New York: Random House, 2007.

Elliot, Dyan. *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages.* Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1999.

Everitt, Anthony. *Hadrian and the Triumph of Rome*. New York: Random House, 2009.

Jordan, Mark D. *The Invention of Sodomy in Christian Theology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Jordan, Mark D. *Silence of Sodom: Homosexuality in Modern Catholicism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Hubbard, Thomas K. ed. *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Karras, Ruth Mazo. *Sexuality in Medieval Europe: Doing Unto Others*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Mattingly, David J. *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Nirenberg, David. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity" Question and the American Historical Profession*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Ormand, Kirk. *Controlling Desires: Sexuality in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2009.

Plato. *The Symposium*. trans. Christopher Gill, New York: Penguin Classics, 1999.

Roughgarden, Joan. *Evolution's Rainbow: Diversity, Gender, and Sexuality in Nature and People*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Shilts, Randy. *The Mayor of Castro Street: The Life and Times of Harvey Milk*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.

Williams, Craig A. *Roman Homosexuality (2nd Edition)*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999, 2010.

Verstraete, Beert C. and Vernon Provencal, eds. *Same-Sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press, 2005.

Journal Articles

Bulletin de Theologie, Ancienne et Medievale. Review of CSTH. Annual 1984.

Hauerwas, Stanley. *St. Luke's Journal of Theology*. Review of CSTH. Volume XXVIII, No. 3 (July 1985).

Hays, Richard. "Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to John Boswell's Exegesis of Romans I." *Journal of Religious Ethics*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Spring 1986).

Henry, Patrick. Review of CSTH. *Church History*. Vol. 51, Issue 4 (1982).

Moore, John C. Review of CSTH. *American Historical Review*. April 1981.

Magazine Articles

Crompton, Louis F. “Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality (Review).” *Commonweal*. June 5, 1981.

Dutton, Marsha. “The Invented Sexual History of Aelred of Rievaulx: A Review Article.” *American Benedictine Review*. Vol. 47, No. 4 (1996).

Thomas, Paul K. “Researching Gay Christians of the Past: A ‘Valuable Contribution’ in Context of Faith.” *Catholic Review*. May 22, 1981.

Newspaper Articles

Boswell, John E. “Good Sex at Home in Ancient Rome.” *New York Times Review of Books*. January 18, 1987.

Linehan, Peter. “Growing Hostile to Gays.” *London Times Literary Supplement*. January 23, 1981.

Other Published Works

Wright, David C.F. “Homosexuality” (entry). *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Everett Ferguson, ed., *et al*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1990.

Unpublished Sources

Benton, John F. “Gays in the Twelfth Century.” Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion, San Francisco, CA, December 20, 1981.

Boswell, John E., The Boswell Papers. Archives and Manuscripts. Yale University Library. New Haven, CT.

Colish, Marcia. “Method and Measure: Boswell’s Use of Literary and Philosophical Sources.”

Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion, San Francisco, CA, December 20, 1981.

McNeill, John J. Keynote Speech to the First Biennial Dignity Convention, Los Angeles, CA, August 31, 1973.

Electronic Resources

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. *Persona Humana*. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19751229_persona_humana_en.html.

Halsall, Paul. "People With a History." www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/index-bos.asp.

Hensley, Judy. "The Philosophical Understandings of Objectivity." https://www.gustavus.edu/philosophy/judy.html.

Lauritsen, John. "Culpa Ecclesiae: Boswell's Dilemma." http://www.pinktriangle.org.uk/lib hic/lauritsen.html.

Neuhaus, Richard. "In the Case of John Boswell." http://www.firstthings.com/article/2009/03/In_the_case_of_john_boswell_4.

United Methodist Church. Homosexuality Backgrounder. http://archives.umc.org/umns/backgrounders.asp?mid905=905&story=FA58780B-1C10-491A-938E-E242A5D47186.

Oral History Interviews

Jordan, Mark D. interview by author, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, MA, 03/17/2011. Transcripts in possession of author and Department of History, University of Texas at San Antonio.

McNaron, Toni A.H. interview by author via telephone from UTSA office of Dr. Kolleen Guy, 09/22/2010. San Antonio, TX. Transcripts in possession of author and Department of History, University of Texas at San Antonio.

Lauritsen, John. interview by author, Boston, MA, 03/18/2011. Transcripts in possession of author and Department of History, University of Texas at San Antonio.