

rency with the general public, even if its antonym *Urning* (and the English counterpart *Uranian*) were used for some decades by German authors and their British imitators. The earliest appearance of the words *gay/straight* in tandem must therefore be the term of development of the whole semantic process.

Although it has not been found in print before 1933 (when it appears in Noel Ersine's *Dictionary of Underworld Slang* as *gay cat*, "a homosexual boy"), it is safe to assume that the usage must have been circulating orally in the United States for a decade or more. (As Jack London explains in *The Road* of 1907, *gay cat* originally meant—or so he thought—an apprentice hobo, without reference to sexual orientation.) In 1955 the English journalist Peter Wildblood defined *gay* as "an American euphemism for homosexual," at the same time conceding that it had made inroads in Britain. Grammatically, the word is an adjective, and there has been some resistance to the use of *gay*, *gays* as nouns, but this opposition seems to be fading.

In the light of the semantic history outlined above, a particularly ludicrous complaint is the notion, advanced by some heterosexual writers, that the "innocent" word *gay* has been "kidnapped" by homosexuals in their insouciant willingness to subvert the canons of language as well as morals. As we have seen, the sexual penumbras of meaning were originally introduced by the mainstream society (i.e., chiefly heterosexuals), first to designate their own rakes and ramblers, and then the women these men caused to "fall." Quite apart from the quaint charge of verbal kidnapping (which ignores the fact that many words in English are polysemous in that they have two or more distinct meanings), there does exist a legitimate concern among homosexuals themselves that the aura of frivolity and promiscuity adhering to the word has not been dissolved. In that sense the comparison of the substitution of *gay* for homosexual with *black* for *Negro* is not valid, though

the two shifts were contemporary. To be sure *gay* has gained the allegiance of many well-meaning outsiders for the same reason as *black*, the assumption being that these terms are the ones preferred by the individuals they designate. Many lesbian organizations now reject the term *gay*, restricting it to men, hence the spread of such binary phrases as "gay and lesbian" and "lesbian and gay people." Such ukases notwithstanding, expressions such as "Is she gay?" are still common among lesbians.

Despite all the problems, brevity and convenience suggest that this three-letter word is here to stay. Significantly, in 1987, in the aftermath of negotiations with the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD), the *New York Times*, which had formerly banned the use of *gay* except in direct quotations, assented to its use.

Wayne R. Dynes

## GAY LIBERATION

See *Liberation, Gay*.

## GAY RIGHTS

See *Decriminalization; Movement, Gay*.

## GAY STUDIES

Gay scholarship on the subject of homosexuality has been fostered by both political and personal motives. On the political plane, it has meant the search for other cultures and societies in which the homosexual was not a criminal and an outcast, in which homosexual love was not the object of opprobrium and disgust, but both were an accepted part of the social and sexual life of the age. Above all, the homoerotic component of the glorious civilizations of the past—ancient Greece and Rome, medieval Islam and Japan—was a stimulus and a challenge to homosexual researchers seeking the roots of their own situation. At the same time they were studying themselves through the

mirror of the gay personalities and literary monuments of the past—and even the clandestine literature of the present—that shed light on their own psychological states and life situations. By demonstrating that homosexual love had enriched the cultural heritage of mankind, that homosexual experience was attested universally, gay scholars were arguing for its legitimacy and acceptance at the present day.

*Origins.* Heinrich Hoessli (1784–1864) was both the first homosexual rights advocate and the first gay scholar. His book *Eros: Die Männerliebe der Griechen* (Eros: The Male Love of the Greeks; 1836–38) was in large part an assemblage of literary materials from Ancient Greece and Medieval Islam that illustrated the phenomenon of love between males. Far more erudite than he was the jurist and polymath Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–1895) whose *Forschungen zur mann männlichen Liebe* (Researches on Love between Males), published from 1864 to 1870, ranged in an encyclopedic manner over the history, literature, and ethnography of past and present.

Driven into exile in Italy at the end of his life, Ulrichs was the first of a series of investigators who lived and published abroad to escape the intolerance of the Germanic world; and down to the 1960s many works that could not see the light of print in the English-speaking countries were issued in France, where publishing houses such as those of Charles Carrington at the end of the nineteenth century and the Olympia Press after World War II produced books for British and American tourists—who now and then managed to slip them back into their native lands.

Far broader in scope was the activity of the Wissenschaftlich-humanitäre Komitee (Scientific-Humanitarian Committee) with its journal, the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (Yearbook for Sexual Intergrades), whose 23 volumes, published between 1899 and 1923, cover almost every imaginable aspect of the

subject, with major articles on the history, biography, and psychology of homosexuality, as well as precious bibliographical lists and surveys of the literature of past and present. For the collaborators of the Committee, working under the overall supervision of Magnus Hirschfeld, their scholarship was a tool for demonstrating the position that the homosexual personality was a constant and stable type throughout human history, that it was found in all strata of society, and was therefore a biological phenomenon which could not be suppressed, but was deserving of legal and social toleration. Such scholarship was all the more needed as university curricula and standard reference works alike dishonestly omitted all reference to homosexuality, even in the lives and works of individuals who were “notorious” in their lifetimes for their proclivity to their own sex.

In England John Addington Symonds may be considered the first gay scholar, since he composed two privately printed works, *A Problem in Greek Ethics* and *A Problem in Modern Ethics*, the latter of which introduced to the English-speaking world the recent findings of continental psychiatrists and the new vision of Ulrichs and Walt Whitman. Symonds was also a major contributor to the first edition of Havelock Ellis' *Sexual Inversion* (German 1896, English 1897). At the same time the American university president Andrew Dickson White quietly inserted into his two-volume *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896) a comprehensive analysis and demolition of the Sodom legend. In the same year Marc-André Rafalovich published his *Uranisme et unisexualité* (Uranism and Unisexuality), with copious bibliographical and literary material, some from German authors of the nineteenth century, which he supplemented at intervals in a series of articles in the *Archives d'anthropologie criminelle* down to World War I. In the Netherlands L.S.A.M. von Römer, besides contributing

several major articles to the *Jahrbuch*, also published a study entitled *Het uranisch gezin* (The Homosexual's Family), which argued for the genetic determination of the condition on the basis of abnormalities in the ratio of the sexes among the siblings of male and female homosexuals. Edward Irenaeus Prime-Stevenson, writing under the pseudonym "Xavier Mayne," published in Naples a major work *The Intersexes*, which roamed the historical and sociological scenes of past and present, collecting much of the folklore of the gay subculture of early twentieth-century Europe.

In the last decades of the nineteenth century heterosexuals began to study homosexual behavior, often from the biased standpoint of the clinician observing patients in psychiatric wards or the forensic psychiatrist examining individuals arrested for sexual offenses. The writings of Krafft-Ebing, notably his *Psychopathia sexualis* (first edition 1886) were of this sort, followed by those of Albert Moll and Albert Freiherr von Schrenck-Notzing, the last of whom did, however, achieve a good critical overview of the subject in an article published in *Zeitschrift für Hypnotismus* in 1898. In Italy Carlo Mantegazza had collected anthropological materials on the subject in *Gli amori degli uomini* (The Sexual Relations of Mankind; 1885). He was followed by Iwan Bloch, who early in his career as sexologist attacked the notion of innate homosexuality in his *Beiträge zur Ätiologie der Psychopathia sexualis* (Contributions to the Etiology of Psychopathia sexualis; 1902), which had the merit of giving the phenomenon an anthropological rather than a medical dimension, but later in *Das Sexualleben unserer Zeit in seinen Beziehungen zur modernen Kultur* (The Sexual Life of Our Times in its Relations to Modern Civilization; 1907) rallied to the standpoint of the Committee. Albert Moll provided homosexual apologetics with one of its favorite themes in a book entitled *Berühmte Homosexuelle* (Famous Homosexuals; 1910).

Assisted at first by John Addington Symonds, Havelock Ellis devoted the second volume of his monumental *Studies in the Psychology of Sex to Sexual Inversion* (third edition 1915). In the book he assembled case histories that he had collected, mainly by correspondence, and an assortment of ethnographic and historical materials from his own vast reading as well as the German literature that had accumulated since the founding of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee in 1896. The editions and translations of his work made the subject part of the body of scientific knowledge accessible to the rather small public that was willing to accept it in the first half of the century.

The psychoanalytic study of homosexuality began with Freud's *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Three Contributions to the Theory of Sexuality; 1905), which rejected the static notion of innate homosexuality with the attendant therapeutic nihilism in favor of an approach that stressed the role of the dynamic unconscious in the formation of sexual orientation. Because this assumption played into the hands of the enemies of the homosexual emancipation movement, it has led to a good deal of intellectual dishonesty and hypocrisy, with even Catholic and Communist thinkers who reject psychoanalysis on philosophical grounds championing the views of depth psychologists whom they regarded as allies at least on this issue. A series of papers based mainly on psychoanalytic case histories appeared in the journals of the movement, sometimes growing into full-length books such as those of Wilhelm Stekel, who promoted the view that bisexuality was normal but that homosexuality was a "curable neurosis." These papers could also take the form of psychoanalytic biographies of famous homosexuals, a genre initiated by Freud's philologically rather weak *Eine Kindheitserinnerung des Leonardo da Vinci* (A Childhood Reminiscence of Leonardo da Vinci; 1910).

This scholarship had to be conducted almost entirely outside the walls of the university—in physicians' consulting rooms or the private libraries of independent scholars—and published in specialized journals or in limited editions "for members of the medical and legal professions." Hence an academic tradition could not be born, much less develop within the parameters of scholarly discipline, and the field continues to attract amateurs who pass off their journalistic compositions—often produced by exploiting the talent and industry of others—as works of genuine scholarship.

The interest of geneticists in twin studies led to some papers on the sexual orientation of monozygotic and dizygotic twins, a field pioneered by Franz Kallmann. While certain issues continue to be disputed, the study of monozygotic twin pairs has revealed concordances as marked as those for intelligence and other character traits, albeit with a complexity in the developmental aspect of the personality that earlier thinkers had not fully appreciated.

*Trends in the United States.* The survey method of investigating sexual behavior had been used sporadically in the 1920s and 1930s, but only in 1938 did Alfred C. Kinsey undertake the monumental series of interview studies that provided the material for *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953), which astounded the world by stating (perhaps overstating) the frequency of homosexual experience in the American population, and enraged the psychoanalysts by disclosing the biased and statistically unreliable character of the population on which they based their often fanciful interpretations. However, his work has lasting merit in demonstrating that the homosexual was not an exhibit in a pathological waxworks museum, but a stable minority within the entire population and within all the diverse segments of the American nation.

The homosexual movement in the United States was from its outset interested in promoting the study of the phenomenon in order to prove that its followers were "like other people" as opposed to the psychiatrists who were always ready to argue that homosexuals were at least neurotic and sometimes pre-psychotic. Hence groups like the early Mattachine Society furnished the subjects for the investigations of Evelyn Hooker and others whose clinical soundings showed that homosexuals could not be distinguished from heterosexuals on the basis of the Rorschach or other standard tests. The work of the German and other continental predecessors of the American movement was used fitfully at best, and has never been fully exploited by American investigators, in some instances because they cannot even read it. A certain amount of vulgarization occurred on the pages of *Mattachine Review*, *ONE*, *The Ladder* and their counterparts *Arcadie* and *Der Kreis/Le Cercle*, which fondly revived memories of past epochs of homosexual greatness.

The new phase in the history of the American movement that began with New York's Stonewall Rebellion of June 1969 did not at first find an echo in the halls of learning, besieged as the elite institutions were by students vociferously demonstrating for the privilege of not being drafted to serve in Vietnam. But in time the gay "counter-culture" coalesced in the Gay Academic Union, whose founding conference was held at John Jay College in New York City in November 1973. A journal named *Gai Saber* was created shortly thereafter, and went through a number of issues. Only a minority of the adherents of GAU had academic motives and goals; many more were interested only in "lifestyle politics" or in causes that began to fade from public attention once the Vietnam War ended in a stalemate in 1973. A few introductory courses made their way into college curricula, chiefly in

sociology and psychology, so that the gay undergraduate could confront his identity problems with a modicum of academic guidance; but no standard textbooks or syllabi were ever produced that would compare with the advances in women's studies in the same period. Even these concessions to the radical mood of the early 1970s began to vanish as the far more conservative trend of the following decade reached the campuses.

However, it became possible for the first time to utilize and to publish vast amounts of historical and biographical material that had simply been ignored or deliberately suppressed in previous centuries. The role of homosexual experience in the lives of the great and near-great, the meanings and innuendos of obscure passages in the classics of world literature, the paths and byways of the clandestine gay subculture in the cities of Modern Europe and the United States—all these matters could now be legitimate subjects of academic concern, to be discussed as calmly as any other facet of human life, not as a subject the very mention of which demanded a profuse apology and a disclaimer of the investigator's personal involvement.

*Present Situation and Outlook.*

After World War II the accelerating pace of specialized knowledge fostered calls for synthetic perspectives in the form of "interdisciplinary" approaches. Although their existence is partly a response to political and social conditions, black studies and women's studies are by their very nature interdisciplinary. In 1976, for example, ONE Institute, the independent Los Angeles homophile education foundation, articulated the subject in the following fields: anthropology, history, psychology, sociology, education, medicine and biology, psychiatry, law and its enforcement, military, religion and ethics, biography and autobiography, literature and the arts, the homophile movement, and transvestism and transsexualism (*An Annotated Bibliography of Homosexuality*, New York, 1976). Apart from the intrinsic

unwieldiness of such a list, many scholars have clung to their own institutional bases, so that sociologists tend to see the matter chiefly in terms of contemporary social formation, literary critics are interested mainly in reflections in novels and poetry, and so forth.

It seems, however, that three main constellations or domains of research may be identified. (1) The empirical-synchronic domain studies the behavior and attitudes of living subjects, using primarily questionnaires and interviews. This great realm comprises **sociology**, social and individual **psychology**, public opinion research, **medicine**, and **law enforcement** (including **police studies**). The advantage inherent in this range of disciplines is direct access to the groups of human beings that are being studied. Yet problems arise from researcher bias, the difficulty of obtaining adequate samples from a still largely closeted population, and (in sociology) a neglect of the biological and historical substrates. (2) The historical-comparative domain includes **history**, **biography**, and **anthropology**, together with the historical aspects of the disciplines discussed in the first category. The advantage of this method is that it permits one to view present arrangements as but one set of possibilities in a larger conspectus of documented human behavior and attitudes. Dangers arise from an anachronistic project which elides differences, seeing "gay" people everywhere. Regrettably, the attempt of the **social construction** approach to correct such present-mindedness errs on the side of an overemphasis on difference and distinction, claiming (in a few extreme examples) that there were no homosexuals before 1869. In anthropology there is a continuing temptation to "ethnoromanticism," that is overidealizing the exotic culture one is studying, viewing it as "natural," "nonrepressive," "organic," and so forth. (3) The final domain is that of cultural representation, and it studies the appearance of homosexual themes and characters in novels, poetry, the visual arts, film,

and radio and television. Here one can see, in gay-authored works, the ways in which homosexuals have sought to image themselves, while in "straight" works the stereotypes, as well as the rare instances of honest effort toward understanding, are available for inspection. In researching this third domain one cannot neglect the constraints of publishers, producers and other cultural "gatekeepers" in shaping the material.

Apart from this suggested articulation of research in three main domains, some general desiderata should be mentioned. Narrow parochialism should yield to horizons that are as broad as the subject demands. For example, a study of the gay subculture in early twentieth-century New York City should show an awareness not only of other places in America, but also of the European setting, from which so many immigrants came. Moreover, a study of causal factors should be polythematic, considering a variety of conditioning factors, and not reducing them, say, to a mere matter of the socioeconomic base (historical materialism) or conversely the downward trickle of learned notions (the history of ideas approach). Researchers must be alert to lingering biases in their own makeup, as from Christianity or secular belief systems such as Marxism. Unexpected differentiations must always be watched for: for example with male transvestites there are at least three distinct varieties, none of which is assimilable to the model of the "gay person." Finally, there is an urgent need for the acquisition of auxiliary sciences; in this field that means first and foremost foreign languages—the standard academic languages of German and French to assimilate the older literature, plus Latin, Greek, Arabic, Persian, Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and the like according to one's particular research interest.

Having been relegated to the margin of academia for so long, it is perhaps understandable that the field developed somewhat idiosyncratic standards,

not exempt from advocacy scholarship and apologetics. Now that these studies are receiving serious academic attention, it is essential that accepted canons of evidence and exposition be observed. In this way gay studies will not only find its proper place in the constellation of knowledge, but in so doing replace homosexual behavior in its proper context as part of the mainstream of history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Wayne R. Dynes, *Homosexuality: A Research Guide*, New York: Garland, 1987.

Wayne R. Dynes and  
Warren Johansson

## GENDER

In current social science usage gender denotes consciousness of sexual dimorphism that may or may not be congruent with actual genital sex in human beings. The expression *gender role* was introduced by John Money in 1955, as a relatively new use of a term that has a long history in English in other senses. In a relatively short time, however, it found acceptance in both scientific and political usage as a needed complement to the older term *sex*.

*Origins in Linguistics.* The concept of gender originated in linguistics, where it designates a specific grammatical category of the noun that can find expression morphosyntactically. In this function it bonds with adjectives ("agreement") and verbs and with particular suffixes limited to a single gender. There is also a syntactic aspect, expressed through combination with appropriate forms of the article and the pronoun. For the speaker of English, in which these relationships have been lost, they may be somewhat hard to understand. And indeed gender based upon analogy with the natural sex of animate beings is not universal; it is limited to the Indo-European and Semito-Hamitic families. However, of the six classical languages of the world, five have the category of sex gender: Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit