lier times in the West and in other societies the equation of the two was not generally recognized, and it may be that at some future point research and public opinion will concur in effecting a separation. For present purposes, however, consideration of male homosexuality and lesbianism together seems to offer better prospects of attaining understanding, in particular of the social context of homosexuality.

One of the vexing problems with the homosexual concept is its ambiguity with regard to exclusivity of **orientation**: does it include **bisexuality** and **situational homosexuality**?

Another question is whether homosexuality should include deep **friendships** that are not genitally expressed: male bonding and female bonding. Some scholars place these phenomena under the general umbrella term of **homosociality**.

The Greeks and Romans focused on the phenomenon of **pederasty**, that is to say, age-graded relations between males governed by strong cultural tradition. Rarely did they attempt a synoptic view of the whole realm of same-sex relations. The modern Western world, by contrast, recognizes other types of age-graded relations (such as **ephebophilia**, the attraction to maturing youths, and **pedophilia**, the attraction to children) but then assimilates all male same-sex relations to ones between adults (**androphilia**), which are regarded as the norm.

The **Middle Ages** gave birth to the problematic concept of **sodomy**. While the abstract noun sodomy could cover almost the whole range of illicit sexual acts, the noun of agent, sodomite, tended to be restricted to the male homosexual. Sodomite then, allowing for significant cultural changes, foreshadows the modern term *homosexual*.

This expression arose out of an intense phase of discussion in the second half of the nineteenth century in Central Europe. Rival terms, such as **uranianism**, contrary sexual feeling, and **inversion**, were coined and canvased, but in the end the word homosexual won out.

See also **Typology**.

Homosexuality (Origins of the Modern Concept)

The German term *Homosexualität*, the original form of the word, points to a concept of homosexuality that crystalized in Central Europe in the sixties and seventies of the nineteenth century. With some changes, this concept is the immediate predecessor of the mainstream of present-day Western thinking about same-sex **orientation**. Familiarity has made the model seem simple and straightforward, almost a given of nature. It is none of these things. The notion that modern society has adopted is a hybrid that owes its existence to the interaction and fusion of three remarkable semantic innovations stemming from historically distinct cultural epochs, two of great antiquity and one of recent origin.

Three Conceptual Sources. First, there was the Judaic law (Leviticus 20:13) that treated the union of two individuals having male genitalia as a single offense. Other civilizations of antiquity had accepted as a matter of course a dichotomy between the **active and passive** sexual partners. The consolidation effected by the Judaic legislation boldly disregarded this tradition. Second, there was the equation of male–male and female–female relationships in the more abstract thinking of the Greeks. By contrast, the ancient Near Eastern mind had never identified the two, and—as shown by the Babylonian myth reported by Berossus and echoed in **Plato**'s *Symposium*—had traced male–male and female–female attraction to separate origins. But the Greek drive toward logical parallelism made it possible to regard **pederasty** and **tribadism** as two aspects of a single entity. Third, modern Europe—specifically nineteenth-century Ger-

many—attempted a quantification of psychic phenomena.

The German Forensics. The acceptance of a mathematical continuum (0 to 100) made it possible to distinguish individuals in whom sexual attraction to others of the opposite sex was completely absent [the zero degree of heterosexuality = H1] from those who merely experienced an attraction to their own sex that did not exclude the opposite one [H2]. The recognition of exclusively same-sex oriented individuals [H1]—known to the ancients but denied by Christian theology and Christian society for centuries—was crucial to the emergence of the concept of sexual **inversion in psychiatry** with the classic papers of Karl Friedrich Otto Westphal (1869), Richard von **Krafft-Ebing** (1877), and Arrigo Tamassia (1878).

The investigators—being forensic psychiatrists—did not limit themselves to a descriptive analysis, but also entered the realm of the prescriptive and judgmental. They concluded that those who were incapable of feeling any attraction to the opposite sex [H1] could not, by virtue of the involuntary and exclusive character of their orientation, be held legally responsible for their sexual conduct, but that the others who, though primarily attracted to their own sex, could nonetheless function on occasion with the other sex [H2] were by comparison morally blameworthy and legally responsible.

Nature and Implications of the German Concept. The nineteenth-century conceptual innovation did not arise spontaneously, as a direct product of psychiatric insight or of the interrogation of homosexual patients. The new formulation was the outcome of a dialogue between the psychiatric profession and the spokesmen for the inchoate homophile movement, Karl Heinrich **Ulrichs** and Károly Mária **Kertbeny**. The word homosexual was invented by the litterateur Kertbeny and not by the psychiatrists, so that contrary to the almost universal assumption within today's gay community it did *not* originate as a **medical** term, though it was subsequently used as such. Rather the new concept was dialectical in origin and stemmed (in the case of the **homophile** apologists) from the polemic need to combat the deeply rooted theological-forensic tradition of the Christian world that stigmatized and penalized sexual activity between individuals having the genital organs of the same sex, and to exonerate those whom public opinion execrated as guilty of "unconditional self-surrender to the immoral." Only in this way could the burden of centuries of obloquy begin to be lifted. Yet few developments in human thought are completely new, and in this instance the new distinction was superimposed upon the two long-standing equations noted at the beginning of this article, the Levitical assimilation of the active and passive partners, and the Greek conflation of male–male and female–female attraction. The emergent concept was thus an "old wine in a new bottle," or perhaps more correctly a cocktail blended from three different vintages. The two older strata had abolished two antinomies (active vs. passive; male vs. female) to create the theological notion of "crime against nature by reason of sex"; conversely, the modern stratum created a new antinomy: exclusive [H1] vs. elective [H2], yielding the psychiatric notions of "homosexual" vs. "**bisexual.**" The fact that the popular mind lumped both of the latter behavioral types together under the term "homosexuality" does not efface the historical reality that the concept arose out of the perception of duality.

The two authors of the concept themselves disagreed in that Ulrichs was more the spokesman for the [H1] category, while Kertbeny was concerned more with the rights of the [H2] group, since their behavior was equally culpable in the eyes of the law, yet he argued that they had the right to choose the same rather than the opposite sex for purposes of erotic gratification. In fact, to limit the application of the law to the [H2] category in practice

would mean that the prosecution would have to prove that on other occasions the defendant engaged in heterosexual behavior which was perfectly legal—a logical impossibility from the standpoint of the law.

Problems. As the outcome of its complex pedigree, the new concept was fraught with ambivalence and ambiguity: a century of medical and biological investigation has failed to discover any common denominator among the individuals labeled homosexual. Success in such a quest was precluded from the start since H1 and H2 are typically treated as if they were one: the problem of the occurrence of homosexual attraction is not identical with the problem of the absence of heterosexual attraction. Yet until a relatively recent date many researchers wrote of "the homosexual" in the singular, as if they were describing a discrete species. Though this linguistic habit is not common now, its long prevalence served to reinforce the misapprehension that a single phenomenon was under study. To the extent that the researchers did follow more attentively the nineteenth-century model, which focused on this single psychological trait of ability or nonability to respond to heterosexual stimuli, they perforce neglected the tremendous range of variation in constitutional and personality type found within both H1 and H2. Of course, it cannot be excluded that at some future time a genetic basis for the absence of heterosexual desire or response will be discovered, but thus far biology has furnished no evidence for this.

It is not surprising that in its perplexity the general public wavers on the issue, unable to secure any authoritative guidance from the experts. On the one hand, homosexuality is thought to be exclusive and innate [H1], so that fathering or giving birth to a child is regarded as indisputable proof that the parent is *not* homosexual—a "true" homosexual could not manage such a fundamental shift. On the other hand, when homosexuals are exhorted to enter therapy in order to change their orientation, by a sleight of hand the conceptualization moves over to pigeonhole H2, taken to imply that individuals who have been functioning homosexually should function heterosexually. In this way a claim is made that the first assumption had categorically denied.

Interference of Related Concepts. The ultimate source of the confusion lies in the fact that the new term was superimposed upon the already emotion-laden semantic fields of "pederasty/tribadism" and "**sodomy**," neglecting the crucial element of the exclusive and involuntary character of H1, which had so impressed the rational minds of the pioneering nineteenth-century investigators. This lingering afterglow of the older attitude of condemnation hindered the progress of the movement for gay rights for many decades. By confounding exclusive homosexual attraction [H1] with elective homosexual attraction [H2] it played into the hands of an opposition that clung to the notion that "homosexuality is only a new name for an old vice," insisting that "homosexuality is a disease" that can be cured if the homosexual will only "renounce his way of life." To be sure, the disease concept of homosexuality represents a modernization of the religious notion of sin. But the conversion from sin to sickness was made possible by the initial belief in the statistical rarity of H1, which suggests that homosexuality is a human variant outside the normal range: a biological anomaly. And yet the opposing H2 model underlies the notion of change of orientation through therapy. Thus at the present day one half of the inherited nineteenth-century concept is invoked to diagnose disease, the other half to insist on the possibility of cure.

Kinsey. In 1948 Alfred **Kinsey** and his associates were to retain the category of same-sex exclusives [H1] in the 6 of their 0–6 scale, but because of their approach as evolutionary biologists they stressed a spectrum of sexual response and attached no significance to the crucial line

of demarcation that had so impressed the European forensic psychiatrists. The Kinsey "rainbow" has had considerable influence on the academic discussion of homosexuality, but comparatively little impact on the popular mind.

Conclusion. The intricacies of the formation of the concept of homosexuality illustrate the general principle in intellectual history that key ideas are not forged through a simple conjunction taking place at a single moment in history. That moment represents at most a phase of crystalization, not of creation ex novo. Moreover, concepts are not simply the product of an impartial evaluation of data, but rather take shape in human minds already equipped with semantic grids. As Blaise Pascal observed, "Chance smiles only on minds that are prepared." In the realm of thinking about sexuality the theories are almost inevitably contaminated with ideology, the strivings of interested parties, and the wish to preserve an existing value system or replace it with a new one. The world still awaits a conceptual system that overcomes the serious flaws of the one inherited from the nineteenth century.

See also **Typology.**

Warren Johansson

HOMOSOCIALITY

A neutral term, homosociality designates the patterns and relationships arising from gender-specific gatherings of all sorts. When men or women participate affectively in homosocial situations, one may speak also of male bonding and female bonding.

Basic Features. In the field of lesbian and gay studies, homosociality has become a methodological tool. In 1975 Carroll Smith-Rosenberg ("The Female World of Love and Ritual," *Signs*, 1 [1975]), and then Michel Foucault (interview in *Masques* [13], Spring 1982), outlined the concept of homosociality as a way of broadening the terrain of gay and lesbian studies. At the international conference "Among Men, Among Women" (Amsterdam 1983) it was stated thus: [With the concept of homosocial arrangements] "we hope to achieve several results at the same time. In the first instance, it can be illuminating to relate sexual relations between members of the same sex to other forms of homosociality, instead of continuing to compare them with sexual relations between men and women. Secondly, it can be a methodological improvement to use the notion of the 'recognitions of masculine and feminine relations' and avoid falling back on the stereotyped notion of 'homosexuality.' Our attempt here is to open perspectives on the enormous diversity in (and types of) masculine and feminine relations which have developed in the past 200 years alone. Thirdly, the study of the relations between members of the same sex can contribute to historical and sociological theory on the development of homosexual arrangements in particular, and homosocial arrangements and their relation to heterosocial arrangements in general."

Homosociality can exist at three levels. First, one finds it at the level of societies, e.g., when social life is sex-segregated with men operating in public and women in private spheres. In this sense, Western society of some centuries ago and many non-Western societies today can be described as strongly homosocial. Secondly, homosociality can exist at the level of institutions—the **military, prisons, monasteries,** merchant marine (*see* **Seafaring**), schools, **athletic** teams and clubs, scouting. Formerly most public bodies in western countries were organized along homosocial lines (law, politics, industry). Thirdly, personal relations can be homosocial, as in friendships, **circles,** or cliques.

Female Homosociality. The second and third forms have been thoroughly examined in lesbian and women's studies, because of the general interest in the separate spheres of women outside the realm of male dominance, and also because of the