

# Christianity and Sexuality in the Early Modern World

Regulating Desire, Reforming  
Practice

Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks



London and New York

# CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
Introduction	1
1 Christianity to 1500	20
2 Protestantism in Europe	58
3 Catholicism and Orthodoxy in Europe	100
4 Latin America	140
5 Africa and Asia	178
6 North America	213
7 Conclusions	251
<i>Index</i>	266

# INTRODUCTION

**AS A HISTORIAN** of a period long ago, I often encounter skepticism about the relevance of my research in the contemporary world. When I began this study, I was struck by how different the responses were to the project. People I met at community meetings, soccer games, or my hair salon were extremely interested, even when I told them the book stops in 1750. I could, of course, attribute this to their “prurient” interests in anything having to do with sex, and see it as proof that the French philosopher, Michel Foucault, and the American radio host, Howard Stern, are right: modern people want to talk about sex more than anything else. But it was not merely the sex part they were interested in, it was also the connection of sex to Christianity, a connection which they saw as both self-evident and extremely relevant.

This book explores how Christian ideas and institutions shaped sexual attitudes and activities from roughly 1500 to 1750, both in Europe and in areas of the world being colonized by European powers. Though in many ways Christian treatment of sex during this period largely continued patterns and practices which had begun centuries earlier, I have chosen to highlight this period, generally termed “early modern,” for a number of reasons. The beginning point is quite traditional, and chosen for its significance in the history of Christianity: the splintering of Christianity within Europe at the same time as Christian doctrine was being spread beyond Europe through colonization. Both developments had important implications for Christian ideas about and patterns of sexuality. The ending point acknowledges the rough chronological juncture of three trends: the emergence of secular governments as more authoritative regulators of sexuality than the church in many parts of the world; the onset of a new wave of exploration and colonialism, which brought different issues and colonial powers to the fore; and the beginning of what scholars of sexuality usually call “modern sexuality.” That shift in thinking generated new ideas about the body, changes in marriage patterns, new concepts of gender differences, greater symbolic importance attached to sexuality, and new methods of controlling people’s sexual lives. Although scholars disagree about exactly when modern sexuality started and how

sharply it differed from what came before, the notion of a turning point is nonetheless very powerful. I have therefore chosen to end my study at what most scholars see as the beginning of modern sexuality.

Along with the phrase “early modern,” the other words of my title may also need some clarification. I use the term “Christianity” very broadly, for Christianity had an impact on the regulation of sexuality not only through the actions of church officials and the ideas of theologians, but also through the actions and ideas of lay people, from monarchs to ordinary individuals. If individuals or groups described their actions as Christian or held a position of authority within either a Christian denomination or a state where the official religion was Christianity, I include them here. I am not using “Christian” in a moral sense, and some of the attitudes and activities discussed here may be viewed by my contemporaries—and in fact *were* seen by some early modern people—as being antithetical to what they feel is the true message of Christianity.

“Sexuality” is a more problematic word, because no one in the centuries I am discussing used it. “Sexuality,” defined as “the constitution or life of the individual as related to sex” or “the possession or exercise of sexual functions, desires, etc.,” first appears in English only in 1800, and its use signals the beginning of “modern sexuality.” Because of its recent origin, some historians choose to avoid the word “sexuality” when discussing earlier periods. They note that people in earlier centuries did not think of themselves as having a “sexuality” or classify as sexual things that to us seem obviously to be so. They point out that ancient Greek and medieval Latin did not even have words for “sex” or “sexual.” Using a modern category such as “sexuality” to explore the past is not an unacceptable practice, however, because investigations of the past are always informed by present understandings and concerns. Thus the editors of the central journal in the field chose the title *Journal of the History of Sexuality* when it began publication in 1990. I use the word as well, and include in this study topics which the twentieth century considers related to sexuality, even if they were not perceived that way in earlier centuries.

Because exploring all aspects of the relationship between Christianity and sexuality over roughly two and a half centuries throughout the world would be impossible to do in a single book, I have chosen to focus on the ways in which people used Christian ideas and institutions to regulate and shape (or attempt to regulate and shape) sexual norms and conduct. Except for [Chapter 1](#), which traces these issues from the beginning of Christianity to about 1500, the chapters are primarily geographical: Protestant Europe, Catholic and Orthodox Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia, North America. Each of these chapters surveys learned and popular notions of sexuality, both Christian, and, in areas beyond Europe, non-Christian. They then discuss the development and operation of Christian institutions, such as law codes, courts, prisons, and marital regulations, as well as

actual changes in such areas as marriage, divorce, illegitimacy, sanctioned and unsanctioned sexual relations, witchcraft, relations between Christians and non-Christians and between different denominations of Christians, and moral crimes. Though the book is oriented toward intellectual and institutional change and its social consequences, rather than toward social change alone, it should be clear that I do not see Christianity as an abstract force or regulation or as something imposed in a vacuum. The regulated as well as the regulators shaped Christianity's intellectual and institutional structures. As Christianity split into numerous denominations and expanded beyond Europe, the dialectic between official theology and the responses of practitioners grew ever more complex.

### General theoretical and historiographical background

This study draws on research and analysis from many fields of history, fields that sometimes overlap or interact synergistically, yet that at other times are hostile to one another. Prime among these is the history of sexuality, which, until recently, was viewed as a questionable or at best marginal area of scholarly inquiry. Vern Bullough, one of the first investigators of medieval sexuality, reports that throughout the 1960s—that decade of the “Sexual Revolution”—his research on such topics as homosexuality, prostitution, and transvestism was rejected by historical journals as unsuitable, while books which avoided any discussion of sex, such as Edith Hamilton's *The Greek Way*, were best-sellers.<sup>1</sup> This attitude began to change in the 1970s for a number of reasons. Historians became more interested in the lives of ordinary people rather than simply political or intellectual elites, and they used methodologies from other disciplines such as anthropology and economics to create what they termed the New Social History. These changes combined with the feminist movement to create an enormous interest in women's history, of which the history of women's bodies and sexual lives was a significant part. The gay liberation movement encouraged both public discussion of sexual matters in general and the study of homosexuality in the past and present. Like women's history, it challenged the assumption that sexual attitudes and practices or gender roles were “natural” and unchanging.

The denaturalizing of sexuality and gender led some scholars to assert that the body itself has a history: that is, cultural understandings of bodily processes, including sexuality, that shape the way people experience their own bodies have changed over time. This position is often labeled “social constructionist,” and its most radical proponents argue that everything is determined by culture. They assert that because the experience of “homosexuals” or “heterosexuals” or even “men” or “women” differs so widely from culture to culture or between classes within one culture, these are simply categories that have no physical basis. What we commonly call

“biology,” from this perspective, is also a socially and historically variable construct the word “biology” itself did not appear until 1802, about the same time as “sexuality”—and those who argue for a biological or physiological basis for sexual orientation or gender difference are “essentialists.” Many historians of sexuality point out that most types of anatomical and genetic tests currently used by medical researchers to explore gender and sexual differences are not applicable for populations long dead; the exceptions are those few tests which can be performed on skeletal remains. They note that the only thing historians *can* explore about past sexuality is its social construction, its meaning, because that is what the historical record contains.

Interest in the meaning of sexuality also reflects a more general trend in historical studies over the last decade, known as the “linguistic turn” or the New Cultural History. Under the influence of literary and linguistic theory—often loosely termed “deconstruction” or “post-structuralism”—some historians focus their attention on the words of the past rather than on events, individuals, or groups. The most radical proponents of this point of view argue that the only thing we can know in history is words: that is, because historical sources always present a biased and partial picture, we can never really know what actually happened. Historical documents are “constructed,” written by particular individuals with particular interests and biases that consciously and unconsciously shape their content. They are thus no different from literary texts, and historians should simply analyze them as texts, elucidating their possible meanings. Historians should not be concerned with searching for “reality,” in this viewpoint, both because to do so demonstrates a naive “positivism,” and because the language itself determines our understanding of reality. Most historians do not take such an extreme approach, but instead treat their sources as at least partial reflections of some people’s reality. They do tend to use a wider range of sources than they did in earlier decades—literary and artistic sources are very much a part of the New Cultural History—and this has dramatically increased the array of sources available for the study of sexuality. In many eras matters relating to sex were much more likely to appear in painting, poetry, and drama than in traditional historical sources such as chronicles.

This strong emphasis on language, or what is often termed “discourse” as it incorporates visual materials such as paintings and film along with written texts, may be found in many areas of historical research at present, but especially in the study of sexuality. This is in large part due to the field’s most important theorist, the French philosopher Michel Foucault, who in 1976 began publication of a multivolume *History of Sexuality*, intended to cover the subject in the West from antiquity to the present. Though only three volumes were published before his death in 1984, the

first of these, along with Foucault's other works on prisons, insanity, and medicine, greatly influenced later historians.

Foucault argued that the history of sexuality in the West was not characterized by the increasing repression of a free biological drive, but instead by the "transformation of sex into discourse." This process began with the Christian practice of confessing one's sins to a priest, during which first acts and then thoughts and desires had to be described in language. This practice expanded after the Reformation as Catholics required more extensive and frequent confession and Protestants substituted the personal examination of conscience for oral confession to a priest. During the late eighteenth century, Foucault argued, sexuality began to be a matter of concern for authorities outside religious institutions: political authorities tried to encourage steady population growth; educational authorities worried about masturbation and children's sexuality; and medical authorities both identified and pathologized sexual "deviance" and made fertility the most significant aspect of women's lives. Foucault traced this expansion of discourses about sex into the present, when "we talk more about sex than about anything else"<sup>2</sup>, and create modern "sexuality" as we now understand the term. Before people learned to talk about sex so thoroughly, there was sex, according to Foucault, but not sexuality. Modern sexuality is closely related to power, not simply the power of authorities to define and regulate it, but also the power inherent in every sexual relationship. This power—in fact, all power, in Foucault's opinion—is intimately related to knowledge and to "the will to know," the original subtitle of the first volume of his *History of Sexuality*.

Historians of sexuality after Foucault have often elaborated on his insights by defining what is specific to modern Western sexuality (many scholars now see the sharpest break with the past as coming in the nineteenth rather than the eighteenth century, with the development of the notion of a "sexual identity"); exploring the mechanisms that define and regulate sexuality; and investigating the ways in which individuals and groups described and understood their sexual lives. Other scholars have pointed out gaps or weaknesses in Foucault's theories, and address issues that he largely ignored, among them women's sexuality, the relationship between race and European notions of sexuality, and the ways in which economic power structures shaped sexual ideas and practices. Historians of religion have gone far beyond his brief discussion of confession to explore the sexual aspects of saints' lives, heresy persecutions, and doctrinal changes.

Along with Foucault, women's studies and feminist theory have made important contributions to the new scholarship on sexuality. Many ideas central to women's studies, such as the arguments that culture shapes sexuality and that sexual relationships are power relationships (captured in the slogan "the personal is political"), not only parallel Foucault's ideas, but, in fact, predate his work on sexuality. Others do not, particularly the

emphasis in women's studies on the very different experiences of men and women in history, and on the ways in which societies create gender distinctions between men and women. Feminist analysts point out that Foucault's studies of sexuality are, in fact, studies of *male* sexuality, despite the fact that *female* sexuality has generally been of greater concern to authorities throughout history. They have thus turned their attention both to the construction of female sexuality by intellectual, religious, and political authorities (who were usually men), and to women's understanding of their own bodies and sexual lives.

The study of sexuality within feminist scholarship has produced several areas of sharp controversy. One involves the degree to which the body, sexual desire, and the experience of motherhood can be sources of power for women. Should women celebrate their bodies, the mother–daughter bond, and their sexual feelings, or do these actions overlook differences among women and reinforce the nefarious notion that “biology is destiny”? A second debate concerns pornography and sexual practices such as sado-masochism. Are these necessarily harmful to women, or can there be “feminist” pornography or sado-masochism? Does pornography limit women's civil rights, or is censorship of pornography, like any censorship, ultimately more dangerous than the material it prohibits? A third area of controversy, one which more often draws on historical and religious examples from history and religion than the others, addresses the valuation of sexual activity: Can a life of chastity and celibacy be a freeing option, or is it always an example of repression? Does our contemporary emphasis on finding and expressing one's “sexual identity” lead scholars to misrepresent the lives of women in the past? The fourth area intersects the debate about deconstruction and language: Does the emphasis on discourse in the study of sexuality contribute to the neglect of what most historians view as real events related to sex such as rape or wife-beating which are injurious to women? And finally: How are sexuality and gender related: that is, how do cultural definitions of what it means to be a man or a woman relate to such matters as sexual identity, erotic desire, and sexual activities?

The relationship between gender and sexuality is also a key issue in gay and lesbian studies, an academic discipline originating in the 1970s. At that time, historians of women pointed out that most of the work initially done in the history of homosexuality concerned men (often without stating so explicitly), while historians of homosexuality observed that most research on the history of women dealt with heterosexual women (even more often without stating so explicitly). Since then, lesbian history has developed as a field that draws from both gay and women's studies.

In the early 1990s, cultural theorists combined elements of gay and lesbian studies along with deconstruction to create queer theory. Many of the issues found in the study of sexuality or in feminism also occur in queer



theory: To what degree is sexual identity socially constructed? To what extent can sexual or gender identity (or even sex) be intentionally blurred or hidden, making it simply a “performance” rather than part of one’s essential nature? To what extent *should* sexuality or gender be blurred? Is an “identity”—or in literary and cultural studies terms a “subjectivity”—a tool of liberation or oppression? In other words, can one work to end discrimination against homosexuals, women, African-Americans or any other group, if one denies that the group has an essential identity, something that makes its members clearly homosexual or women or African-American? Why are identities so often constructed through oppositional pairs, such as men–women, homosexual–heterosexual, black–white?

In the same way as the development of women’s history led scholars to start exploring men’s experiences in history *as men* (rather than simply as “the history of man” without noticing that their subjects were men), gay and lesbian studies has led a few scholars to explore the historical construction of heterosexuality. Recognizing the contracted nature of heterosexuality has been just as difficult for many historians as recognizing that most history was actually “men’s history,” however. Eve Sedgwick wryly notes that “making heterosexuality historically visible is difficult because, under its institutional pseudonyms such as Inheritance, Marriage, Dynasty, Domesticity, and Population, heterosexuality has been permitted to masquerade so fully as History itself.”<sup>3</sup>

Questions of identity, subjectivity, and the cultural construction of difference have also been central areas of inquiry in colonial studies and its theoretical branch, post-colonial theory. Historical study of Europe’s colonies is not new, but until recently it tended to be regarded as separate from the study of Europe, as a kind of “overseas history” with its own trends and patterns, and as affected by, but not influencing, developments in Europe. It has become increasingly clear that the histories of Europe and its colonies—colonies and “metropole” are the common terms—must be meshed. It is also clear that imperial power is explicitly and implicitly linked with sexuality; many recent studies demonstrate how imperial powers shaped cultural constructions of masculinity and femininity and how images of colonial peoples were gendered and sexualized. This work is often interdisciplinary in nature, combining artistic and literary evidence with more traditional historical documents; its emphasis on discourse and representation frequently aligns it with the New Cultural History.

An important theme in much post-colonial theory has been the notion of hegemony, initially developed by the Italian political theorist Antonio Gramsci. Hegemony differs from domination because it involves convincing dominated groups to acquiesce to the desires and systems of the dominators through cultural as well as military and political means. Generally this was accomplished by granting special powers and privileges

to some individuals and groups from among the subordinated population, or by convincing them through education or other forms of socialization that the new system was beneficial or preferable. The notion of hegemony explains why small groups of people have been able to maintain control over much larger populations without constant rebellion and protest, though some scholars have argued that the emphasis on hegemony downplays the ability of subjugated peoples to recognize the power realities in which they are enmeshed and to shape their own history.

One group of historians, those associated with the book series *Subaltern Studies*, has been particularly influential in calling for historical research which focuses on people who have been subordinated by virtue of their race, class, culture, gender, or language. *Subaltern Studies* (the adjective is drawn from Gramsci's writings) began among South Asian historians, who investigated such topics as Indian peasant revolts and the development of Indian nationalism; it is becoming increasingly influential among historians of other parts of the formerly colonial world, such as Latin America and Africa. Historians of Europe and the United States are also applying insights drawn from *Subaltern Studies* to their own work, particularly as they investigate "subaltern" groups such as racial and ethnic minorities. They pay special attention to the language of hierarchy and domination, noting that subordinated groups often developed their own distinctive and more liberating meanings for such language in a process the Russian linguist M.M. Bakhtin calls "double-voiced discourse."<sup>4</sup> Thus in the cultural construction of difference and identity, the meanings and implications of words depend on who is using them.

### **Theory and the early modern period**

Many of the issues raised by the newer scholarship on sexuality and colonialism may seem to be quite contemporary and hence anachronistic to early modern Christianity, but they are actually central to understanding both the ways in which Christianity regulated the sexual lives of Europeans and colonial subjects, and the ways in which individual men and women, Christian and non-Christian, responded to and shaped these attempts at regulation. Though they used different terminology, theologians, lawmakers, rulers, courts, and private individuals all wrestled with issues of identity and difference in sexual matters: Should a Jew be allowed to marry a Christian, a Protestant a Catholic, a Native American a Spaniard? What were the children of such unions' ethnic, religious, or racial identities? (The answer determined their access to education, property, government positions, and marital partners.) Should everyone marry? Should hermaphrodites (those born with ambiguous genitalia) marry? What about those who vowed to God never to marry: were they holy or misguided? What sexual practices made one a sinner (a common "identity" in

Christianity)—prostitution, masturbation, homosexuality, bigamy, premarital sex, lust for one's spouse—and which were the more serious sins?

In addition to questions arising from general theories about sexuality, this study also engages with theoretical issues pertaining directly to the early modern period. One of these is the notion of social discipline, a concept which was developed originally by the German historian Gerhard Oestreich. He and others point out that almost all religious authorities in the early modern period, whether Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican (the Protestant Church in England), or Calvinist, were engaged in a process of social disciplining, by which they mean working with secular political authorities in an attempt to get people to live a proper, godly life. This process began before the Reformation especially in cities, when, as we will see in more detail in [Chapter 1](#), political leaders regulated prostitution, made sodomy a capital crime, and increased the penalties for illegitimacy. After the Reformation, religious and political leaders of all denominations expanded and sharpened their efforts at social discipline, usually combining them with an increased interest in teaching people the basics of their particular version of Christianity, a process known as confessionalization. Officials began to keep registers of marriages, births, baptisms, and deaths, and these records allowed them better to monitor the behavior and status of individuals. They restricted gambling and drinking, increased the punishments for adultery and fornication, forbade certain books and encouraged the reading of others, prohibited popular celebrations (such as Carnival and parish fairs), and preached and published pamphlets against immoral behavior. In England and New England these measures are especially associated with the Puritans, Calvinist-inspired individuals who thought the reforms instituted by the Anglican Church had not gone far enough and who wanted to “purify” the English church of any remaining Catholic practices and immorality.

This process of social disciplining has been linked to, or seen as part of, a more general social change that is often called the “reform of popular culture” or “the reformation of manners.” The English historian Peter Burke has described the process of social discipline as a “triumph of Lent,” in which popular culture was restricted by moral and clerical reformers bent on making people's behavior more pious, somber, and sober.

While Burke concentrates on external agents of control, the German sociologist Norbert Elias focuses on internal agents: that is, on the ways people internalized more controlled social behavior and habits which they learned from their parents or superiors or from reading books of manners and conduct. Elias traces long-term changes in habits of eating, washing, blowing one's nose, and urinating from the fourteenth century through the nineteenth. He notes that these natural functions were increasingly regarded as inappropriate in public, and that polished manners came to be

regarded as a sign both of civility and of civilization. He links this “civilizing process” to changes in the structures of power and state formation in Europe; to Elias, it explains why Europeans by the nineteenth century could view themselves as “civilized” and superior to the “savages” in areas being colonized. Elias’s supporters stress that he was critical of such value judgments. A few of his opponents, most prominently the German sociologist Hans Peter Duerr, argue on the contrary that the civilizing process itself is a “myth,” that reticence about the public display of nakedness and bodily functions can be found around the world. They point out that taboos about certain behaviors have existed throughout history, and cite the work of Mary Douglas and other cultural anthropologists to support their position.

Elias’s main concern is Europe, and, with the exception of research on the New England Puritans, theories about social discipline, the reform of popular culture, and the civilizing process are drawn entirely from studies of Europe. Several theories developed by scholars working in non-European areas during the early modern period have also had an impact on the material treated in this book. Prime among these is the concept that relations between Europeans and non-Europeans were primarily “encounters” rather than discoveries or conquests, with cross-cultural exchanges in terms of material goods and intellectual concepts in both directions. An emphasis on encounters has been particularly prominent in recent scholarship on the Americas, which explores the ways in which indigenous peoples not only reacted to and fought against European ideas and practices, but also transformed them for themselves and for the colonial powers. Because the Americas were colonized at a point when Christian beliefs and institutions were more powerful than they would be later in Europe’s history, historians of American colonization pay greater attention to religious ideas and structures than do those studying the British Empire outside North America, and view religion as a central force in the creation of hegemony.

Scholars of cross-cultural encounters during the early modern period increasingly point out that such contacts not only occurred between Europeans and nonEuropeans, but also happened between Chinese and South-east Asians or Arabs and Indonesians, for example. In most encounters, people confronted others of different ethnicity, race, language, and religion, and they had to develop ways of understanding this alterity. In no instance was that understanding based simply on actual encounters; it was also shaped by preconceptions about other peoples and about themselves. Some scholars describe this process as “creating the Other” or “constructing the Other” or sometimes even “Othering.”

Though confronting or constructing the Other occurred throughout the world and was a many-sided process, European responses to non-Europeans have received the most scholarly attention. The greater

availability of source materials from Europeans partly accounts for this emphasis. Europe was also establishing political and economic hegemony over much of the world at this time, so that scholars consider this line of encounter to be the most significant. Some argue, as well, that Europeans both created and utilized more radical distinctions between self and other than other people did.

Studies of European constructions or inventions of the Other include encounters with both the East and the West. Those which focus on European ideas about Asia, such as the works of Edward Said, tend to concentrate on the period since the eighteenth century, whereas those which focus on the New World start, for obvious reasons, with Columbus. European response to the New World was first analyzed by the Mexican historian and philosopher Edmundo O’Gorman, who coined the phrase the “invention of America” to describe the ways in which Columbus’s cultural assumptions shaped both his own and subsequent commentators’ descriptions of his voyages and the New World. More recently, European writings about the New World have been a central topic for literary critics and historians influenced by theories of the centrality of language. These scholars assert that colonial discourse is so shaped by preconceptions that it can reveal little about the people described; the proper—indeed the only possible—focus of study is simply the discourse itself. Others (myself included) find this approach limiting and unsatisfying, and consider European observations, imperfect and biased as they are, as nonetheless valuable for analyzing other cultures.

The range of approaches informing this book may seem quite dizzying, and it may be tempting here at the outset to try to link all of these various theories, or to claim that they are simply different words to describe the same processes: Is not social discipline really cultural hegemony by another name? Were not prostitutes and homosexuals, like Native Americans and Asians, constructed as the Other? Were not popular beliefs and practices in regard to sexual matters restricted similarly throughout the world? The temptation is especially great because the geographical scope of my study is so large, and the precedent for grand theories regarding sex is so well established; it includes not only Foucault, Aristotle, and Sigmund Freud, but also the latest pop psychology books on gender differences.

I want to resist that temptation, or at least hold my discussion of unifying themes until the conclusion. A stress on commonalities does help to avoid what Edward Said has termed “orientalizing,” (making other cultures appear overly exotic and bizarre), but it also risks creating an artificial sameness that renders every other culture more or less like “us.” Because most theory about sexuality has been developed in reference to Europe (actually only a small part of Europe, England and France) there is a risk of importing west European theory into areas where it is not appropriate. Thus the chapters which follow each address the same topics—

ideas, institutions, effects—but the material they present may be even more dizzying in its variety than the theories discussed in this introduction. I hope this variety reinforces rather than negates the expectations of my friends and neighbors, and that it strengthens their assumptions about the continued importance of connections between Christianity and sex.

### Notes

- 1 Vern Bullough, “Sex in History: A Redux,” in Jacqueline Murray and Konrad Eisenbichler, eds, *Desire and Discipline: Sex and Sexuality in the Premodern West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 4; Edith Hamilton, *The Greek Way* (New York: Norton, 1942 and many reprints).
- 2 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Random House, 1990), 33 (orig. *L’Histoire de la sexualité 1: La Volonté de savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976)).
- 3 Eve Sedgwick, “Gender Criticism,” in Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn, eds, *Redrawing the Boundaries* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1992), 293.
- 4 M.M.Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 324.

### Selected further reading

This book is designed for students and general readers as well as more specialized scholars. Because of its audience, and because the materials for a broad study such as this are so numerous, I have included only English-language works in this and subsequent chapter reading lists. Most of the more specialized works included here will lead interested readers to the appropriate primary and secondary materials in other languages.

A good place to begin for overviews of sexual issues is the work of Vern Bullough, including *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: John Wiley, 1976) and Vern Bullough and Bonnie Bullough, *Sexual Attitudes: Myths and Realities* (New York: Prometheus, 1995). (There are several very dated books titled *Sex in History* which are no longer viewed as authoritative.) For surveys of modern Western sexuality, see Carolyn Dean, *Sexuality and Modern Western Culture* (New York: Twayne, 1996); Jeffrey Weeks, *Sex, Politics, and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800* (London: Longmans, 1981); John C.Fout, ed., *Forbidden History: The State, Society, and the Regulation of Sexuality in Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Catherine Gallagher and Thomas Laqueur, eds, *The Making of the Modern Body: Sexuality and Society in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987). The notion of a divide between modern sexuality and earlier ideas

can be seen also in the increasing use of the term “premodern” in new collections on sexuality, such as that edited by Murray and Eisenbichler in note 1 above, or Louise Fradenburg and Carla Freccero, eds, *Premodern Sexualities* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

There are countless books which explore issues of Christianity and sexuality in contemporary society, written to provide guidance and advice for clergy and lay people or to address contentious issues such as homosexuality, abortion, or divorce. One of the more academic of these, which does explore historical developments along with contemporary concerns, is Elizabeth Stuart and Adrian Thatcher, eds, *Christian Perspectives on Sexuality and Gender* (Leominster: Gracewing/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996). Many of the materials included in the section titled “Sexuality, Spirituality, and Power,” from Eugenia C. DeLamotte, Natania Meeker, and Jean F.O’Barr, eds, *Women Imagine Change: A Global Anthology of Women’s Resistance from 600 BCE to the Present* (New York: Routledge, 1997) are from Christian authors, and the section as a whole provides a good comparison of links between sexuality and spirituality in many religious traditions.

There is an excellent survey of the development of the history of sexuality in the introduction to Domna Stanton, ed., *The Discourses of Sexuality: From Aristotle to AIDS* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), and a briefer one in Lawrence Stone, *The Past and the Present Revisited* (London: Routledge, 1987), pp. 344–382. A summary of the new history of the body may be found in the chapter by Roy Porter in Peter Burke, ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (London: Polity Press, 1991); this book also contains a survey of women’s history by Joan Scott. Several other useful essay collections are: Sherry B.Ortner and Harriet Whitehead, *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Pat Caplan, ed., *The Cultural Construction of Sexuality* (London: Tavistock, 1987); Kathy Peiss and Christina Simmons, eds, *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989).

Foucault’s impact on the history of the body is explored in several of the essays in Colin Jones and Roy Porter, eds, *Reassessing Foucault: Power, Medicine and the Body* (London: Routledge, 1994), which also contains a select bibliography of recent works on Foucault. Porter also debates Foucault’s usefulness in Nikki R.Keddie, ed., *Debating Gender, Debating Sexuality* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 247–273. Several of the essays in Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989) discuss the impact of Foucault’s thought on history more generally; this collection is also a very helpful introduction to the field of cultural history as a whole. An excellent summary of Foucault’s thought is Alan Sheridan, *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth* (London: Routledge, 1990) and a good collection of his

writings is David Couzens Hoy, ed., *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986). An insightful discussion of the intersections between Foucault and colonial studies is Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995).

Discussions of the relationship between Foucault and feminism have been largely in the form of collections of articles, such as Irene Diamond and Lee Quinby, eds, *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1988); Caroline Ramazanoglu, ed., *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Susan Hekman, ed., *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault* (University Park, Pa.: Penn State University Press, 1996). Lois McNay provides a longer analysis in *Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993).

Theoretical discussions of the constructed nature of gender and sexual identity include Teresa de Lauretis, *Technologies of Gender* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987); Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990) and *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Donna Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991). Two key articles which discuss the use of gender in historical analysis are: Joan Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986): 1053–1075 and Gisela Bock, "Women's History and Gender History: Aspects of an International Debate," *Gender and History* 1 (1989):7–30. The debate within feminism about pornography and sado-masochism is discussed in Carol Vance, ed., *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1984) and reviewed in B.Ruby Rich, "Feminism and Sexuality in the 1980s," *Feminist Studies* 12 (1986):525–561.

Important studies of homosexuality over a long period include: David Greenburg, *The Construction of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988) which takes a strongly social constructionist position and has a bibliography of more than 100 pages; Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey, Jr., eds, *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (London: Meridian, 1989); Jonathon Dollimore, *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991). Edward Stein, ed., *Forms of Desire: Sexual Orientation and the Social Constructionist Controversy* (New York: Garland, 1990) traces the whole social constructionist debate, and Scott Bravman, *Queer Fictions of the Past: History, Culture and Difference* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997) looks at the current state of gay and lesbian studies, especially history. The bibliographies which



follow each chapter contain additional works on homosexuality relevant to the chapter's focus. On the lack of a discussion of lesbians in a wide range of scholarship see Judith Roof, *A Lure of Knowledge: Lesbian Sexuality and Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), and in historical studies in particular see the introduction to Duberman, et al., *Hidden From History*.

The basic works in queer theory include: Eve Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Julia Epstein and Kristina Straub, eds, *Body Guards: The Cultural Politics of Gender Ambiguity* (New York: Routledge, 1991); a special issue on "Queer Theory: Gay and Lesbian Sexualities," *differences* 3/2 (Summer 1991); Michael Warner, ed., *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (New York: Routledge, 1993). For a recent overview designed for students, see, Annamarie Jagose, *Queer Theory: An Introduction* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), and for essays linking feminist and queer theory, see Elizabeth Weed and Naomi Schor, eds, *Feminism Meets Queer Theory* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997).

Two articles are especially helpful for understanding links between gender and race, and have been widely reprinted in various collections: Tessie Liu, "Teaching the Differences Among Women from a Historical Perspective: Rethinking Race and Gender as Social Categories," *Women's Studies International Forum* 14 (1991):265-276 and Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race," *Signs* 17 (1992):251-274.

Some of the central works in the theory of race and colonialism are: Henry Louis Gates, Jr., "Race," *Writing, and Difference* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); George Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution: A History of European Racism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978) and *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993).

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin provide a good introductory survey of the main ideas in post-colonial theory in *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures* (London: Routledge, 1989); the same three scholars have also edited a large anthology of articles by many major post-colonial scholars, *The Post-colonial Studies Reader* (London: Routledge, 1995). Two works which bring together feminist and post-colonial analysis are Trin T.Minhha, *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989) and Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, eds, *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991).

The work of the Subaltern Studies group may best be seen in its ongoing series of essay collections, *Subaltern Studies*, which began publication in 1982 in Delhi. Two additional important theoretical works by Indian scholars associated with Subaltern Studies are Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (London: Zed, 1986) and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (London and New York: Methuen, 1987). Debates about issues raised by Subaltern Studies may be found in a series of articles by Gyan Prakash, Florencia Mallon, and Frederick Cooper in *The American Historical Review* 99 (1994):1475–1545 and by Patricia Seed, Hernan Vidal, Walter D. Mignolo, and Roleno Adorno in *Latin American Research Review* 26 (1991):181–200 and 28 (1993):113–152.

Most studies of the links between sexuality and empire focus on the British experience in the modern period, including: Ronald Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990); Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire, and the Imaging of Masculinity* (London: Routledge, 1994); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (London: Routledge, 1995); Felicity Nussbaum, *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality and Empire in Eighteenth-century English Narratives* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995); Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: The “Manly Englishman” and the “Effeminate Bengali” in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995); Revathi Krishnaswamy, *Effeminism: The Economy of Colonial Desire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998). Gyan Prakash, ed., *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), Lenore Masterson and Margaret Jolly, eds, *Sites of Desire, Economies of Pleasure: Sexualities in Asia and the Pacific* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997) and Ruth Roach Pierson and Nupur Chaudhuri, eds, *Nation, Empire, Colony: Historicizing Gender and Race* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998) include some essays which discuss other colonial powers. See below and the bibliographical essays which follow Chapters 4 and 5 for readings about the colonial Americas.

A good introduction to Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony is Joseph V. Femia, *Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness and the Revolutionary Process* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981) or Gramsci's own work, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (New York: International Publishers, 1971). Steve Stern, *Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982) discusses hegemony in a colonial Latin American context.

The concept of “social disciplining” was first discussed by the German historian Gerhard Oestreich, and his major work has now been translated

into English: *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). Most of the studies of specific areas are in German, to which there is a good bibliography in R.Po-Chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550–1750* (London: Routledge, 1989); this book also provides a good overview of the whole issue.

The concept of a reform of popular culture was set out most influentially by Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London: Temple Smith, 1978) and Robert Muchembled, *Popular Culture and Elite Culture in France, 1400–1750* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1985). Norbert Elias's major work, *The Civilizing Process*, was originally published in German in 1939, but the first English translation of the first volume on manners was not published until 1978 (New York: Urizen Books). A good introduction to his thought is Norbert Elias, *On Civilization, Power, and Knowledge*, eds Stephen Mennell and Johan Goussblom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). His harshest (and longest-standing) critic is Hans-Peter Duerr, who has now completed four volumes of a planned five-volume work entitled *Der Mythos vom Zivilisationsprozeß [The Myth of the Civilization Process]* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988–1997). This work concentrates on nakedness, intimacy, rape, and the female breast and has not been translated into English. The classic study of taboos cross-culturally is Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Praeger, 1966).

The many works of James Axtell have been especially influential in developing the notion of “encounters” as central to colonial history in North America. See, for example, his *Beyond 1492: Encounters in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) and *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985). Colin G. Calloway also has a number of significant books, most recently *New Worlds for All: Indians, Europeans and the Remaking of Early America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997). Both Axtell and Calloway, along with other scholars, use the word “Indians” rather than “Amerindians,” “Native Americans,” or “First Peoples” when discussing the indigenous residents of the Americas. This usage is also favored by native scholars in their writing and teaching, and I have adopted it here.

Edmundo O’Gorman’s pioneering study of European colonial discourse was published in Spanish as *La invención de América; El universalismo de la Cultura del Occidente* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1958); an expanded and modified version appeared in English as *The Invention of America: An Inquiry into the Historical Nature of the New World and the Meaning of its History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1961). In the last several decades, it has been joined by numerous

others: Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Harper and Row, 1984); Peter Hulnie, *Colonial Encounters: Europe and the Native Caribbean, 1492–1797* (London: Methuen, 1986); Urs Bitterli, *Cultures in Conflict: Encounters Between European and Non-European Cultures, 1492–1800*, trans. Ritchie Robertson (New York: Polity Press, 1989); Peter Mason, *Deconstructing America: Representations of the Other* (London: Routledge, 1990); Stephen Greenblatt, *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Anthony Pagden, *European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism* (New Haven: Yale, 1993); O.R.Dathorne, *Imagining the World: Mythical Belief versus Reality in Global Encounters* (Westport, Conn.: Bergin and Garvey, 1994) and *Asian Voyages: Two Thousand Years of Constructing the Other* (Westport, Conn.: Bergin and Garvey, 1996); John F.Moffitt and Santiago Sebastián, *O Brave New People: The European Invention of the American Indian* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996). Encounters with and representations of Africans have been the focus of fewer studies; the best introduction to this issue from a European perspective is Kim F.Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995) and from an American perspective Winthrop D.Jordan's classic *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968).

There are numerous essay collections dealing with colonial encounters, some of which do not include discussion of issues of gender and/or sexuality; a sample of those which do: Francisco Javier Cevallos-Candau, et al., eds, *Coded Encounters: Writing, Gender, and Ethnicity in Colonial Latin America* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994); Stuart Schwarz, ed., *Implicit Understandings: Observing, Reporting and Reflecting on the Encounters between Europeans and Other Peoples in the Early Modern Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Kenneth J. Adrien and Rolena Adorno, eds, *Transatlantic Encounters: Europeans and Andeans in the Sixteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).