Homosexuality and Hegemonic Heterosexuality

Ben Webb

History 319: Sexuality and Disease in Premodern Europe

December 15, 2019

What is Homosexuality?

When *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* was first released in 1982, John Boswell introduced the field of sexuality studies, specifically homosexuality studies, into historical analysis. While his thesis was multithreaded,[1] his hypothesis that it is possible to characterize some people who lived in premodern times as "gay" or "homosexual" has since been scrutinized by historians regarding the potential anachronistic application of term.[2] R. I. Moore validated Boswell's creation of a male homosexual social identity in the context of the formation of other identities created on the basis of social exclusion.[3] Matthew Kuefler, in attempting to understand why a homosexual identity would merit that exclusion, suggested that Boswell incorrectly applied homosexual identity. Instead, he proposed that starting in the twelfth century the writers of the time began to create a space for the formation of a sexual identity through the creation of a masculine gender identity, what it means to be a man.[4] His answer omits defining what a masculine gender identity is.

---

[1] Mathew Kuefler, *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 2. Boswell had four primary hypotheses: That homosexuality is a valid field of study, sexual terminology is complex and must be used cautiously, that terms change over time, and that tolerance of homosexuality changed with urbanism.

[2] *Ibid*, 1. The primary critique of Boswell's peers are in regard to his use of the term 'gay' to describe the experience of people who lived in medieval times. At the same time, he argues this, he also explores that tolerance for homosexuality took a sharp decline in the twelfth century and urbanism but was unable to form a significant answer for why.

[3] R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250* (Malden: B. Blackwell), 99. Moore argues that the creation of named identities has historically been used for social exclusion: Manichee, Jew, leper, sodomite

[4] Kuefler, *The Boswell Thesis,* 194. Kuefler focuses on the defining traits of what it means to be a man as the beginning of the formation of a homosexual identity but asserts that it is still incorrect to think of people at this time as being 'homosexual'. He does this by exploring how the concept of male friendship changed during the twelfth century.

Using understandings of masculinity as offered by present day sociologists R. W.

Connell[5] and Michael Kimmel,[6] it is impossible to separate gender as an isolated social

practice; gender and masculinity are fundamental parts in the formation of sexual

identity. Through the formation of a masculine gender identity, homosexuality rose to

existence.

Sexual identity is not continuous experience, so much as a continuous belief

held about the criteria that are necessary for erotic desire. Heterosexuality supposes

that biologic differences are necessary components of sexual social structures and

erotic desire; it is the assertation of the biologic male over the biologic female.

Homosexuality is the lack of that difference, the lack of the gendered power

dynamic. Homosexuality naturally invalidates of the necessity for there to be a power

dynamic in sexual structure and thus threatens the validity of any power dynamic in a

sexual structure. Heterosexuality creates power over; homosexuality creates power

within. When Boswell identified urbanization as a significant factor in the rise of

---

[5] R. W. Connell, *masculinities*, (Berkley: UC Press, 2005). "We need at least a three-fold model of the structure of gender, distinguishing relations of (a) power, (b) production, and (c) cathexis (emotional attachment) … As I noted in Chapter 2, sexual desire is so often seen as natural that it is commonly excluded from social theory. Yet when we consider desire in Freudian terms, as emotional energy being attached to an object, its gendered character is clear. This is true both for heterosexual and homosexual desire. The practices that shape and realize desire are thus an aspect of the gender order… In feminist analysis of sexuality these have become sharp questions about the connection of heterosexuality with men's position of social dominance. Because gender is a way of structuring social practice in general, not a specific type of practice, it is unavoidably involved with other social structures." 74

[6] Michael Kimmel, *Privilege: A Reader*, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2003). "Homophobia is a central organizing principle of our culture definition of manhood. Homophobia is more than the irrational fear of gay men, more than the fear that we might be perceived as gay… Homophobia is the fear that other men will unmask us, emasculate us, reveal to us and the world that we do not measure up, that we are not real men." 63

intolerance of homosexuality,[7] what he really was identifying was the formation of new masculine hegemony.[8] Urbanism meant that *man* needed a new way to assert his power over *woman*. The new hegemony needed to assert power on a much more substantive level: it could not just subjugate the other as lesser, it also needed to affirm the naturalness of itself, the naturalness of heterosexuality.[9] Masculine gender identity is a hegemonic one. It is one that asserts power over another – in this case women. The man of the twelfth century is homophobic. He is incompatible with homosexuality.

The Normalization of Heterosexual Desire

> Those whom God had joined in the concord of one spirit and in love in live, so in death he did not want them to be separated... There were made therefore two churches... and the remains of their bodies were buried, the one here, the other there. In the morning however, and done according to divine disposition, the body of Amelius was found with his sarcophagus next to the sarcophagus of Amicus in the king's church. What an admirable association of these two friends, what ineffable love between them., which not even in death deserves separation![10]

---

[7] John Boswell, *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), chap. 8, "The Urban Revival".

[8] Connell, *masculinities*, "I stress that hegemonic masculinity embodies a 'currently accepted' strategy. When conditions for the defense of the patriarchy change, the bases for the dominance of a particular type of masculinity are eroded. New groups may challenge old solutions and construct a new hegemony. The dominance of *any* group of men may be challenged by women. Hegemony, then, is a historically mobile relation. Its ebb and flow is a key element in the picture of masculinity" 77. Connell here points out that the only static part of hegemony is hegemony itself. The ways in which hegemony are achieved are always in flux.

[9] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*. (New York: First Vintage Books, 1980), "What was formed was a political ordering of life, not through an enslavement of others, but through an affirmation of self" 123.

[10] Anon, *Vita Amici et Amelii carissimorum* (M. Kuefler, trans.), *cix-cx*.

It befell one night, as Sir Amis lay asleep, that he thought a bright angel from heaven stood before his bed, and said to him …slay his two children, and with the blood anoint his brother, by God's grace Amiloun's sickness would be taken away… "I have brought thee my children's blood; and I hope it may heal thee as the angel hath said!" … they went both to Sir Amiloun and found that he was awake; and by God's grace, all his foulness was gone, and he was once more as fair as a man as he had been sith he was born. Then were they all so blithe that they might not tell their joy, and gave thanks to God; and presently they went to the chamber where the children lay, and found them whole and sound, without hurt, and playing together in bed… They both died on the same day, and were laid in one grave.[11]

The folktale of Amelius and Amicus is highly similar to the tale of Ami and Amiloun. They are based upon one another, with the tale of Amelius and Amicus originating before the latter. Yet the differences between the two show a change in the values at the time. In Amelius and Amicus, God's divine intervention occurred solely to unite Amelius and Amicus after their death – both of them died before returning to their families. In Amis and Amiloun, divine intervention occurred to reunite Amis' family, one that he had destroyed for the sake of Amiloun. The new version of this story instead emphasizes God's intervention for the heterosocial structure instead of a homosocial structure. This story includes women, in a passive role, in the asserting naturalness of heterogender relations.

The two men are united in death but are done so by the will of the people not by the will of God. This change emphasizes that homosocial interactions were not chastised entirely, instead heterosocial interactions took precedence in the eyes of God. God viewed the relationship between man and woman as more important than the relationship between man and man. God's intervention confers the naturalness of

---

[11] Anon, *Amis and Amiloun* (E. Rickert, trans.), 27-31.

heterosocial structures over homosocial structures. The change seen here marks a divergence in twelfth century writing: male-male relationships were important, but they were less important than male-female relationships. This does not necessarily mean that the value of a homosocial relationship was degraded – Amis and Amiloun were still buried together. Homosocial male relationships were important but became homophobic, important but never more important than a heterosocial relationship.

All four of these men had the experience of knighthood. It was unacceptable for a knight to be feminized, but knights, unlike the clergy and other political elite had other ways of demonstrating their manhood – namely the use of violence. This allowed for them to not necessarily participate in *compulsory heterosexuality.*[12] Part of the significance of naturalizing heterosexuality was the ease at which sodomy could be accused and masculinity removed. The more ways which men could establish their dominance during the twelfth century, the more stable his masculinity was.

> O Romeo, Romeo! wherefore art thou Romeo?
> Deny thy father and refuse thy name;
> Or, if thou wilt not, be but sworn my love,
> And I'll no longer be a Capulet.
> …
> What's in a name? That which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet[13]

Juliet's lament to Romeo, about Romeo in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet demonstrates the apparent futility of common sense in contrast with love.[14] Juliet is

---

[12] Ruth Karras, *Knighthood, Compulsory Heterosexuality, and Sodomy,* in Kuefler, *The Boswell Thesis,* 273-274.

[13] William *Shakespeare, Romeo And Juliet, 1597,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), Act 2, Scene 2.

[14] The storyline of *Romeo and Juliet* follows hopeless lovers from opposite worlds. Their two families, the Montagues and the Capulets are sworn enemies. Common sense tells them that it is impossible for the two of them to form a union.

asking Romeo what is more natural: the love between them or the identities they

hold. Emotions, especially ones like love are impossible to fully describe; names, on

the other hand, are simple.[15] They know that because of their families they should

feel a particular way about each other, yet Juliet cannot help but ignore what she

knows because of what she feels. Their love is forbidden because love is a permanent

alliance, in their case, an alliance between sworn enemies.[16] Romeo and Juliet is

written in English, but a significant number of other historical writings were written

in other languagues. During the translation, the implications of love change based on

the translator's interpretation.[17] By implicating emotion in unionship, Juliet finds

herself stuck between everything she has ever known and everything she wants to

know. Love is not something that either of them chose, it is not something they had

autonomy over: it occurred in spite of labels.

Shakespeare released this work much later than the time period that Boswell

was exploring. Romeo and Juliet do not assert the validity of heterosocial interactions

over homosocial interactions, instead their story asserts the naturalness of

---

[15] Emotions, experiences and the terms we use to describe them fall into a chicken and the egg situation: which came first? For instance, William Gladstone noticed that in the epic's written by Homer, the description of color is far from accurate. Homer continually described the ocean with the term οἶνοψ πόντος. The literal translation for this is wine-dark sea. This does not mean that in antiquity the Mediterranean Sea was a different color than it is now. It does mean that the ability to describe a phenomenon can come after the existence of the phenomena.

[16] Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. (New York: First Vintage Books, 1980), "I am speaking of the *deployment of sexuality*: like the *deployment of alliance*, it connects up with the circuit of sexual partners, but in a completely different way. The two terms can be contrasted term by term. The deployment of alliance is built around a system of rules delimiting the permitted and the forbidden, the licit and the illicit, whereas the deployment of sexuality operates according to mobile, polymorphous, and contingent techniques of power." 106

[17] John Boswell, *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe*, (New York: Villard Books, 1994), 3-9.

heterosexual structures through love. If the experience of love or erotic desire was not also a social structure and alliance, there would be no tension, they would just experience their desire for one another. Love is not something that they have control over – their alliance to each other is more natural than the identities they hold separately. It would be an anachronistic imposition to say that Romeo and Juliet were *heterosexual lovers* despite their clear love for a member of the opposite sex. However, it is not an imposition to say that Romeo and Juliet experienced heterolove and heteroalliance. Their experience of heterolove is natural, the label is imposed.

Had Romeo and Juliet been the same gender, the tension would be different. The natural experience of love is a social structure. They would not be experiencing their natural emotions as intense of manifestations of social structure. The Capulets and Montague's would not be intertwined in a genealogy: they would not have as permanent of an alliance. Their erotic desire for one another would still be an alliance, however temporary; their love would be just as real. Love is the orientation for a person, whereas sexuality is an orientation for a gender.[18] The same emotion of love is experienced for different genders with different consequences – consequences that are directly related with the gender identity of the participants. If they were able to, they would not desire an alliance with each other. If they had been experiencing homolove, the implications of their alliance would be lesser. The heterolove that they were experiencing was so natural and powerful that it encouraged them break the significant implications of a heteroalliance. The resolute

---

[18] Franco Mormando, *The Preachers Demons* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999), "The term sodomy ecompassed more than the sum of specific behaviors... there was no understanding of homosexuality as an involuntary, psychologically constituted, perhaps genetically determined orientation" 111.

use of love in heterosexual relations and heterosexual power structures show how strong this alliance is.

Asserting the naturalness of heterosexuality was a key component in the creation of masculinity as a power structure.[19] It is explicitly the normalization and naturalization of a power structure that maintains a power structure.[20] The naturalizing of the relationship between a man and a woman over one between a man and a man is the heterosexual identity. The experience of erotic desire can be the same regardless of the identity between the two people, love is love is love is love. Heterosociality is asserted both as innately natural and as more natural than homosociality which implicitly places heterosexuality and homosexuality in the same ordination. The progression of a masculine gender identity did develop, and it did so by defining itself in sexual identity, in sexual desire. Sexuality is a gender performance; the social implications of erotic desire are sexuality.

Homosexuality in Creating Power

Homosexuality was accepted when it began to look like masculinity, when it achieved power. Homosexuality and homosociality are able to achieve power, it is just that power is not in the contextual subversion of another – it is not masculinity. Generally, men have had power, and the connections that they formed amongst

---

[19] John Boswell, *Revolutions, Universals, and Sexual Categories*, (1982), "Left to their own devices, without such processes of socialization, people would simply be sexual. The category 'heterosexuality,' in other words, does not so much describe a pattern of behavior inherent in human beings as it creates and establishes it" 91.

[20] Özlem Sensoy, *Is Everyone Really Equal: An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice Education,* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2012), "No individual member of the dominant group has to do anything to oppress a member of the minoritized group; the prejudice and discrimination is built into society as a whole and becomes automatic, normalized and taken for granted" 62.

themselves elevated each other. Hegemony and heterosexuality demand the execution of power over something; homosexuality does not mandate the *othering* in the goal of achieving power or erotic satisfaction. Sodomy was not a deviant behavior in Florence, one law even went as far as to say, "It is evident how much sodomy is presently practiced in this city."[21] Homosociality was a fundamental part of Florentine culture. Connections and a network were made, in the same conceptual erotic alliance that Romeo and Juliet found themselves in. This all occurred in spite of sodomy remaining a crime. Homosociality and homosexuality were prevalent both in the experience of erotic desire and in the experience of societal structures. The connections that were made supported the existence of men pursuing an erotic desire.

> Twenty-year old Paolo was simply vilified as a *bardassuloa* who "indecently and shamefully lets himself be fucked" even by four or six men at a time, "just like a bitch" ... But especially significant is a remark by Paolo's accuser in 1496 that described his father, Bernardo, as openly tolerant of his family's homosexual relations, for utilitarian motives. The informer said that Bernardo had been reproached many times for his son's sexual activity, but "he doesn't trouble himself over it He knows about their behavior and that of other family members," he intriguingly explained, *"because it is useful for the family."*[22]

The homosexual relations that took place in Florence during the fifteenth century created power despite the loss of masculine power. Bernardo was tolerant of his son's actions because they also resulted in connections with other men, powerful men. The sexual act did not create power by asserting the dominance of *man* over the

---

[21] Provvisioni, Registri 150, 199v. found in Michael Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 113

[22] Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships,* 177.

other, instead it was the social connection that a homosexual interaction created that gave the Paolo and his family power. Despite being against the action, the informer was aware enough of the benefits homosexual interactions that he could describe and rationalize Bernardo's stance. The benefit however was limited to just Bernardo's family and detracted from the masculine assertion of power in sexual relationships, so it was reported. It is possible this happened more often than in the case of Bernardo and his family. If homosexual actions indeed did benefit a finite group of people, the knowledge of these events would stay in the shadows of that group so as to not unmask the power that was being generated. Men are allies in achieving mutual power of man, any group is allies in achieving power.

The informer here demonstrates something interesting: Paolo was valid in achieving power but was invalid in achieving power in a way that benefit all men. Tolerance only exists for those who it benefits. Bernardo was tolerant of homosexuality not necessarily because he thought of the action as valid and natural, but because the action granted him power. Homosexuality and homosociality can create power: they do create power, but they do not create power in a way that is compatible with heterosexual hegemony or masculinity.

Homosexuality in Denying Hegemony

> I turn from laughter to tears, from joy to grief, from merriment to lament, from jests to wailing, when I see the decrees of Nature fall silent, when a shipwrecked multitude perishes by a monster of Venus, when Venus fighting with Venus makes 'hes' into 'shes,' and when she unmans men [*devirare vires*]

with magic art… A man [*vir*] is made female [*femina*]. He blackens the honor of his sex… He denies being a man [*vir*].[23]

With these words, Alain de Lillie, like his peers at the time,[24] attacks the sodomite as he defines what it means to be a man. To be a man is to have a woman, it is to have power over a woman, it is to be valid in having power over a woman. If a man does not feel valid having power over a woman, then he may as well forgo his masculinity. The requirement for a man to seek power over another is how a man becomes a man. Alain's stance demonstrates how fragile the masculine identity is, a single action can revoke the entirety of the identity. If having sexual relations with a woman was a way of achieving hegemony, having sexual relations with a man undermines the validity of that same hegemony.

The fiercest prosecution and punishment of sodomy happened by the Council of Ten in Venice during the fifteenth century. The term sodomy is inclusive of any actions that are unnatural with women: anything other than vaginal intercourse with a female.[25] The term sodomy is the closest label to describe homosexual interactions. Sodomy could happen with a woman, and it did: sodomy with a wife, sodomy with a prostitute, and sodomy with a female servant. In 1497, the Ten passed a regulation:

> To eliminate the vice of Sodomy from this our city is worth every concern and as there are many women who consent to this vice and are broken in the rear parts and also many boys are so broken and all these are treated, yet still none

---

[23] Alain of Lille, *De planctu naturae*, (d. 1202) found in *The Angle-Latin Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the Twelfth Century*, translated by J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1980), 1.1

[24] Kuefler, *The Boswell Thesis,* "As modern scholars have pointed out, to love a woman became such a central focus of male identity beginning in the twelfth century that not to love a woman brought into quest a man's right to call himself a man" 191.

[25] Guido Ruggiero, *The Boundaries of Eros: Sex Crime and Sexuality in Renaissance Venice* (New York: Oxford University Press), 114.

are accused and their deeds go unpunished; therefore, because it is wise to honor God, just as blows with weapons are denounced to the Signori di Notte, so too those who are broken in those parts be they boys or women are to be denounced… whoever treats any woman or boy with a break in the rear parts caused by a member… must give notice to the Lord of Heads of the Ten.[26]

The verbiage used in here suggests that the Ten sought to deter sodomy equally as it occurred both to men and women. The enactment of this policy was much more focused on the protection of their own power and the power of men. The Ten were comprised of members from the most important and powerful families in Venice. They began only began to involve themselves with prosecuting sodomy in 1406 when a case of homosexual activity involving fifteen nobles was unearthed.[27] Sodomy was an active threat only when it posed a threat to the validity of those in power. For the Ten to maintain their hegemony over the rest of Venice, they themselves needed to first adhere to the standards that they were putting in place.

All homosexual actions that occurred between men were sodomy. Starting in 1440, Venice began to differentiate between the active and passive partner in cases of sodomy. It was the active partner that received the harsher punishment for the crime.[28] Ruggiero offers two answers for why: the first is that the passive partner was generally much younger. 90% of the passive documented in Florence were under the age of 18.[29] The second was that the active partner was initiating the action whereas the passive partner was just complicit. This is different than gendered ideals where

---

[26] Ruggiero, *Boundaries of Eros,* 117-118.

[27] Ruggiero, *Boundaries of Eros,* 127.

[28] Ruggiero, *Boundaries of Eros*, 121.

[29] Ufficiali di note e conservatori dei monaster, 19-35; Catasto (1480). found in Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships,* 243.

the passive partner is the one losing his masculinity.[30] The explicit action of homosexual actions are natural, the passive partner was accepted despite taking the feminine role; the normalization of a male taking the feminine role, and seeking and perpetuating a male taking the feminine role was the crime. If the passive partner was the chastised one, it would reinforce the fundamental difference between men and women. It was the active partner, the one who still was a *man*, that was punished. He was punished for emasculating another man; he was punished not as an individual, but as a part of a system.

The prosecution of sodomy by the Ten neglected to equally enforce female sodomy. Between the years 1326 and 1500, of the 514 prosecuted cases of sodomy in Venice, only 34 involved females.[31] Heterosexual sodomy was common, it was known, but it did not challenge gendered sexual power dynamics of sexual relationships. A law only exists to the extent that it is enforced – a sodomite is not a homosexual, but a homosexual is a sodomite: he is the sodomite. By grouping all sodomites together, there was no ability to identify homosexual identity. The lack of a homosexual identity prevented a discourse regarding the validity of the hegemony of men[32] – the existence of that discourse would challenge male dominance on the premise of erotic desire without gendered power dynamics.

---

[30] Kuefler, *The Boswell Thesis,* "Sodomy was not a question or sexual orientation or preference as much as it was a matter of gender inversion" 274.

[31] Consiglio dei Dieci, *Deliberazione Miste,* Registers 8-28 (1392-1500), found in Ruggiero, *Boundaries of Eros,* 128.

[32] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality,* "Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but it also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. In like manner, silence and secrecy are a shelter for power, anchoring its prohibitions" 101.

Homosexual identity denies the masculine identity. If sexual actions were truly viewed as isolated action not an identity,[33] then how can a single action deny an entire identity? It is explicitly the lack of homosexual identity during this time period that necessitates the acknowledgement of a homosexual identity. This homosexual identity is different than the conception of the current views of homosexual identity. The homosexual identity is what threatens masculine identity; the suppression of the identity does not mean the absence of the identity -- it means the power of the identity.

What is Homosexuality?

Homosexuality based on the current understanding of sexual identity did not exist prior to the nineteenth century. Certainly, no person bore the homosexual identity in the same way it exists today, the identity exists in the eyes of others. The lack of its existence lies in is in the incorrect conception of sexuality not a lack of homosexuality. Homosexuality and Heterosexuality as a normative gender practice and placement have existed since at least the twelfth century. This *homosexuality* was the idea that erotic interest exists in absence of biologic and gender differences. Toxic masculinity is the belief that because of biology, men are able – or unable to be something. Masculinity is at the core of the formation of a heterosexual identity.

Urbanization meant that men could no longer rely on their physical dominance to establish themselves over women. Through the ritualization and enforcement of sexual practices, men found another way to assert themselves above women: heterosexuality. The sexual reformation was one that that the elite tried on

---

[33] Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships*, 124.

themselves to maintain their hegemony,[34] it was one that men tried on themselves to maintain their hegemony. The power of sexual hegemony is that the subordinate member of the relationship still feels significant emotional investment in the relationship. Heterosexual relationships are the ultimate alliance,[35] they are the a near perfect consolidation of power protected by emotional implication.

The understanding can be helped by going back to one of Boswell's other hypotheses, that "sexual terminology had to be carefully taken into consideration, since assumptions about language might obscure as easily as they might clarify historical relationships."[36] His caution applies both to current conceptions as well as historical understandings of these terms and ideas. Is just as correct to apply a term to current society as it does to societies of the past. The lack of a name for an idea does not fundamentally change the experience: a rose is still a rose. What changes is the discourse that can be had surrounding the dynamics of the identities.

Homosexuality was valid when it provided power, to those it provided power for. The experience of homoerotic desire is the same as heteroerotic desire, the identities and implications are vastly different. Heterosexuality is homophobia; it places intimacy with the opposite, it prevents men from threatening masculinity. The creation of a masculine identity cannot happen without the conceptual threat of a

---

[34] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, "It seems that the deployment of sexuality was not established as a principle of limitation of the pleasures of others by what have traditionally been called the "ruling class." Rather it appears to me that they first tried it on themselves" 122.

[35] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, "For the aristocracy had also asserted the special character of its body, but this was in the form of *blood*, that is, in the form of the antiquity of its ancestry and the value of alliances...The concern with genealogy became a preoccupation with heredity" 124.

[36] Kuefler, *The Boswell Thesis*, 2.

homosexual identity, masculinity defines itself in contrast to homosexuality. Through

the focused subversion of a masculine identity that does not mandate or desire

gendered power dynamics, the homosexual identity was formed. Power may seem like

hegemony, but they are different. Heterosexuality is hegemony; homosexuality is

power.

Bibliography

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

Boswell, John. "IV: Towards the Long View Revolutions, Universals and Sexual Categories." Salmagundi no. 58/59 (1982): 89-113

Boswell, John. *Same-Sex Unions in Premodern Europe*. New York: Villiard Books, 1994.

Connell, Raewyn. *masculinities*. Second ed. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 2005.

Deutscher, Guy. *Through the Language Glass: Why the World Looks Different in Other Languages*. First ed. New York: Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt and Co, 2010.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. First Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1980.

Halperin, David M. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Kimmel, Michael S. and Abby L. Ferber. *Privilege: A Reader*. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press, 2003.

Kuefler, Mathew. *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Moore, R. I. *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250*. Second ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Rocke, Michael. *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence*. New ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996; 1998;.

Ruggiero, Guido. *The Boundaries of Eros: Sex Crime and Sexuality in Renaissance Venice*. Reprint. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 1989.