As the initial enthusiasm cooled, however, it was perceived that, applied to present day society, the androgynous ideal might lead to a disregard of the inherent strengths of male and female, whether these be culturally or biologically determined. Thus some feminist thinkers today emphasize nurturing and cooperative behavior as distinctive and desirable female traits. Despite some exaggerations, recent discussions have had the merit of helping bring into question earlier popular negative dismissals of androgyny, promoting a more supple concept of the relation between sex roles and gender.


Wayne R. Dynes

ANDROPHILIA
This rarely used term serves to focus attention on those homosexuals who are exclusively interested in adult partners rather than adolescents and children. In our society such a focus would seem self-explanatory, inherent in the definition of homosexuality itself. Yet in other societies, such as ancient Greece, China, and Islam, and in many tribal groups, age-graded differences were or are the norm in same-sex conduct in contradistinction with androphilia, which is most familiar to us. Because of the prevalence of androphilia in modern Western culture, its assumptions are sometimes unwittingly or deliberately imported into other settings; some discussions of homosexual behavior in ancient Greece, for example, tend to gloss over the fact that it was predominantly pederastic (though not pedophile in the narrow sense of attraction to prepubertal boys).

In the early years of the present century, the great German sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld offered a three-fold classification of homosexuals: [1] ephebophiles, who prefer partners from puberty to the early twenties (in current usage, from about 17 to about 20); [2] androphiles, who love men from that age into the fifties; and [3] gerontophiles, who seek out old men.

Contemplating this scheme from the standpoint of an individual of, say, thirty years of age, it is evident that the first and third categories of sex object constitute differentiation, the second relative similarity.

The shift to dominance of androphilia, in which the two partners are of comparable age, occurs only with the rise of industrial society in Europe and North America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; in Mediterranean countries the shift remains incomplete, and in much of the world has barely begun or has not occurred at all.

Attempts at explaining the new homosexual pattern include keying it to a change in heterosexual marriage, which led the way by becoming more companionate and less asymmetrical; to the rise of the democratic ideal; to demographic changes such as increased life expectancies; and to changes in the social treatment of youth which made the young less available as sexual partners. Nevertheless, the dynamics behind this fundamental transition remain historically mysterious, a major challenge to any attempt to draw up a reasonably comprehensive history of homosexuality.
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ANGLICANISM
Anglicanism, or Episcopalianism as it is also termed, is a worldwide Christian religious fellowship, stemming from
the state-supported Church of England. Generally regarded as a form of Protestantism, Anglicanism (especially in its High Church variety) may also claim to represent a third path between Catholicism and Protestantism in the strict sense.

The Church of England and homosexuality began on an antagonistic footing, stemming not only from the inherited homophobia of Christianity as a whole, but from the reformers' polemical critique of Catholic monasteries as dens of corruption and sexual indulgence. It has also been argued, though the matter is disputed, that Henry VIII's law of 1533 on buggery was linked to his "smear campaign" against the monasteries. In ensuing centuries it was a commonplace of English antihomosexual propaganda to attribute the presence of sodomy to the complaisant customs of Catholic Europe, whence the infection is supposed to have spread to the otherwise untainted British Isles. Several notable scandals, including those of John Atherton, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore (1640), Reverend John Fenwick (1797), Reverend V. P. Littlehales (1812) and Percy Jocelyn, bishop of Clogher (1822), show that members of the Anglican clergy were by no means exempt from the "vice."

In the latter decades of the nineteenth century a more comfortable relationship developed, at least de facto, between homosexuals and the Church of England. This rapprochement was due to the High Church or Oxford movement, which favored an aesthetic approach to religious ceremonial. This atmosphere appealed to homosexual aesthetes, who were welcomed, as long as discretion was observed, to the churches practicing the High Church liturgy. Conversely, adherents of the opposing faction, the Broad Church, were tempted to pillory their ritualist opponents as sissies or worse.

In 1955 Canon D. S. Bailey's book *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* appeared, influencing both secular and ecclesiastical thinking. Bailey was a member of the Church of England's Moral Welfare Council, the predecessor of the Board for Social Responsibility. This work of these bodies was part of the background of the successful decriminalization of male homosexuality in Britain and Wales in 1967, a legal change strongly supported by the archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey. At the pastoral level, Anglican clergy offered counseling and support to British gay people. In 1979 a Board for Social Responsibility working party, chaired by the bishop of Gloucester, produced *Homosexual Relationships*, a report that acknowledged the possibility of permanent gay relationships. The appearance of the report was indicative of a new atmosphere in which many homosexuals in the church felt free to proclaim their identity.

Yet counterforces were gathering. A new breed of militant evangelicalism regarded homosexual behavior as a corrupting influence. This kind of religious intolerance accorded with the rise of Margaret Thatcher within the Conservative Party and the growth of New Right economic and political ideas. Local councils in Britain's cities that were seeking to promote positive images of gay people came under heavy attack from the right and from the tabloid press. In this context the 1987 General Synod was presented with a motion by Tony Higton, leader of the Alliance for Biblical Witness to Our Nation, calling in effect for the removal of "practicing" gay clergy. Although the resolution was rejected in favor of a compromise one, no serious theological debate took place. The popular press seized the occasion to run stories under such headlines as "Holy Homos Escape Ban" and "Pulpit Poofs Can Stay." Under these circumstances Anglican gay clergy felt intimidated. Then in May of 1988 the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement was evicted from its home in St. Botolph's church in London, where it had been located since 1976.
Gay Anglicans have fared better in the United States. In the era of gay liberation, the lay Episcopal group Integrity was formed, encountering the benevolent support of many Anglican clerics. In 1976 the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. passed a resolution stating that “homosexual persons are children of God, who have a full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love, acceptance, and pastoral concern and care of the Church.” Reverend Paul Moore, bishop of New York, has been outspoken in his defence of gay people, whom he has also ordained. To be sure, his positive attitude is not universally shared among American Episcopalians, but on the whole their church has borne the stress of the age of AIDS with calmness and compassion.
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ANGLO-SAXONS

Our information about homosexual behavior in Anglo-Saxon England is chiefly linguistic. The word baedling, a diminutive of baeddel, occurs in an Old English glossary as the equivalent of the Latin terms effeminatus and mollis, designating the effeminate homosexual. A synonym is the word waepenwifstere [approximately: “male wife”]. Evidently, these words reflect an Anglo-Saxon stereotype of the homosexual as an unwarlike, womanish type. In all likelihood, this negative concept derives in part from a common Germanic archetype, attested by a passage in Germania (12) by the Roman historian Tacitus—where death by drowning is stipulated for such individuals—but probably modified in the early Middle Ages by Mediterranean-Christian influences.

Similar in form to baedling is deorling, the source of the modern English darling. While the Old English word had a general sense of a beloved person or thing, it was also used more specifically to label a minion, a youth favored because of his sexual attractiveness.

At the present stage of research further data about homosexual behavior in Anglo-Saxon times (that is, from ca. 500 to 1066) remains elusive. For its part, however, the word baeddel survived, turning eventually—through a process of semantic expansion—into the general English adjective of pejoration, “bad.” The word also forms part of two place names in England: Baddesmere (“baeddel’s lake”) in Kent and Baddlinghame (“the home of the baedlings”) in Cambridgeshire.

The broadening of the meaning of the word baeddel in the direction of general desparagement (“bad”) has several historical parallels. The first, from another Germanic sphere, is the shift from old Scandinavian argr, cowardly, effeminate, to modern German arg, bad, wicked. Then early medieval France seems to have witnessed the creation of feloffelonis, evil person [the etymon of our legal term felon] from Latin fellare, to fellate. It is also possible that Russian plokhoi, bad, is cognate with Greek malakos [with change of the initial labial from m to p], as the Polish plochy has the meaning of “timid, fearful,” another of the nuances of argr.

ANIMAL HOMOSEXUALITY

A body of evidence has accumulated showing homosexual behavior among many species of animals—behavior that has been observed both in the wild and in captivity. While this evidence suffices to dispel the old belief that homosexuality is unknown among animals, more extended comparisons with human homosexual behavior remain problematic.

Examples and Characteristic Features. In the 1970s the well-publicized reports of the German ethologist Konrad Lorenz drew attention to male–male pair