

The Oxford Institute, 2007: Peter S. Forsaith  
(Eighteenth century early Methodist History working group)

Moorfields, mollies and Methodists'

The co-incidence of two divergent subcultures in eighteenth-century England.

*Synopsis*

This paper will explore some of the co-incidences between 'gay' subcultures in eighteenth century England and the emerging Methodist movement, particularly between c.1735-1760. It will be made clear that this is intended as an objective academic exploration, and not to be taken as a reference point for current attitudes or practice. However, in the context of the 2007 Institute's theme, it is offered as a contribution to the debate around the issues of Christianity and sexuality today.

In introducing the subject, the paper will outline:

- Recent research in the field of divergent sexualities, and available sources
- Terminology
- Some of the problems associated with interpreting this area today

The paper will set out a number of settings in which the early Methodist movement and individuals within it coincided with the 'molly' subcultures; geographical, social and religious. The paper will also examine what, if any, direct engagement subsisted between the two areas.

In conclusion, the paper will suggest some areas where further research and discussion might be fruitful.

-----

What insights might historians of Methodism in the eighteenth century have to contribute to debates about the place of gay people in the church today? Although that has not been the starting point for my own studies, that is the question which, broadly, this paper will seek to address. In exploring any engagement early Methodism may have had with the homosexual sub-cultures of the time I shall outline the key available sources, look at something of the relevant historic methodology and terminology before moving to examine some surviving narratives.

Communities, societies, nations all have needs to identify and define their past. Methodism is no exception and has constructed (and revised) its historical account of itself down the years. Since the decriminalisation of homosexuality in Britain forty years ago, the growing gay community has engaged with its roots and thereby 'queer history' has developed which has been part of a broader movement, with a strong transatlantic contiguity. One of the underlying issues in this paper will be how two eighteenth-century communities based, essentially, on divergence from society's norms – one by faith, the other by sexual identity – construct their histories and whether there is sufficient common ground for them to speak to each other.

The gay community tells of a hidden history; of narrative which must be deduced from fragmentary evidence – effectively an archaeological process. Sources have been used to provide a growing body of material, so a literature survey which charts some formative texts is probably the most useful starting point. Michel Foucault, in his somewhat impenetrable but massively influential *History of Sexuality*, posits that defining homosexuality as we do now is a relatively recent phenomenon, driven by the illegitimation of homosexual behaviour in the mid-nineteenth century. Before then, 'homosexual' (had the word been coined) would be an adjective, not a noun. The idea of 'orientation', he argues, is a quite recent construct.

Similarly, Boswell's seminal *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* identifies an acceptance of male homo-social/sexual relationships which had roots in classical Greece but became transferred to western Christendom as that spread initially through the Roman empire. He also holds that modes of behaviour should not be equated with models of identity. Although his study closes before the Renaissance, there are elements which usefully inform later periods<sup>1</sup> – his methodology, the difficulty of finding evidence for non-elite social groups, the question of social permission, how majority groups define and marginalize minorities, and concepts of what was conceived as 'natural' and what 'un-natural'.

Foucault's thesis is not universally accepted; Rictor Norton, whose research into eighteenth century homosexual subcultures in Britain has informed my own

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, MacCulloch references attitudes to sodomy as a key factor of Reformation society (MacCulloch, D., *Reformation, Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* [Penguin,2004].

studies, does offer evidence that homo-sexuality was understood in terms of 'natural' and 'un-natural', but argues that men were prosecuted and punished not simply because they had participated in same-sex activity, but understood themselves as being so orientated.<sup>2</sup> 'A Child of Peculiar Providence' was how one homosexual minister understood himself.<sup>3</sup>

Norton's *Mother Clap's Molly House, the Gay Subculture in England 1700-1830* tracks the ebb and flow through the eighteenth century of prosecutions and punishments particularly through the Old Bailey<sup>4</sup> records. While he has engaged with provincial court records, these seem to suggest that there were few similar 'gay' subcultures in other cities, with the possible exception of Bristol and isolated cases elsewhere. Moreover, the centralisation of newspaper publication in London further concentrates the evidence of reportage upon the capital. Then, as ever, London life is both representative and atypical of the country as a whole. Norton can be sensationalist, but his exploration of sources is valuable as he shows how much queer history must needs be constructed from court records, media accounts and gossip.

Yet I am not persuaded that a 'gay identity' does fit what evidence survives for the eighteenth century, when clearly many who engaged in male-male sexual activity were family men. Except for possibly a very few cases, they did not, and nor did society, define themselves by their sexual behaviour. This was more an aspect of their life in which they gave substance to a particular expression of who they were. Moreover, in the 'polite society' of the time, we know that a defining affiliation to a particular divergent group, be it political or religious, could be regarded as socially deviant.

Trumbach argues that with the eighteenth century came a significant shift in the construction and understanding of the male-male sexual subculture in Britain, especially in London. The rise of the 'molly clubs' as places of resort for men to establish social relations with other men, often leading to sexual relations, led to men developing a self-understanding of sexuality in community, and society too began to see them not as isolated deviants but having a group identity.

There is some disagreement over how real or how pronounced this shift in understanding was. What is not in dispute is that the molly clubs were active and known, as well as repressed and punished, but also surrounded by such features of the homosexual subculture as catamites and cruising – curiously enough, 'cruising' is one word which an eighteenth century molly may well have recognised. Norton estimates that there was a more thriving homosexual subculture in London that in the years prior to the decriminalising of homosexuality in Britain in 1967.

---

<sup>2</sup> Norton, 16-18

<sup>3</sup> Norton, 353ff

<sup>4</sup> The Central Courts of Criminal Justice, London.

The tide of public opinion ebbed and flowed in Britain; while there were periods of persecution and numbers of hangings for sodomy, and many more pilloried or imprisoned, there were also times when the molly houses and cruising grounds were able to exist with a degree of nodded social acquiescence.

Allied to studies of historic sexualities, but quite distinct, are gender studies. How men understood themselves historically in a wider social context has also spawned a range of literature. Jeremy Gregory's essay '*Homo religiosus*<sup>5</sup>', in which he argues that the influence of religion played a major part in notions of manliness in the eighteenth century, a theme recently re-emphasised by Will van Reyk. His Oxford University PhD thesis has researched masculine identity during the evangelical revival, challenging current secularist readings of past sexualities and emphasizing how the motif of the 'imitation of Christ' was pertinent not only among religiously-orientated men but across society much more broadly. There are implications which that may have had for sexual behaviour.

This paper deals specifically with homosexuality for one very good reason: that lesbianism was never illegal, so the primary sources are quite different and the history of lesbianism even more of a challenge to researchers than that of homosexuality. In the case of a Methodist woman, Mary Hamilton, to whom we shall return, although she had had relationships with several women, her eventual trial and punishment was under the Vagrancy Act. Moreover, the religious gender distinctions within Methodism were also well defined.

What sources lie behind the history? As already suggested, they are mainly two; court records and newspapers, supplemented by other material such as letters and journals (few and far between) or the records of the Society for the Reformation of Manners. Dealing with eighteenth century England, McCormick's *Secret Sexualities* is a useful anthology of sources. The court records are mainly for trials for sodomy, which requires some explication. While we may interpret that straightforwardly as meaning anal intercourse (equals gay sex), the reality is far from being so simple. It would not apply, for instance, to the case of Mary Price, a young woman tried at the Old Bailey in 1704 for sodomy with a dog.<sup>6</sup>

There is also ambiguity in studying trials for sodomy, for the law made no distinction between passive and active, receptor or inserter. Both were construed guilty of having participated in an 'unnatural act', so although one party might force sex on another, such as an older man on a younger male physically and socially unable to resist, there was no redress at law. Gay rape was no argument in court, and to admit to having engaged in sodomitical sex could be tantamount to putting a rope around your neck, for sodomy was a hanging offence.

---

<sup>5</sup> Hitchcock and Cohen, p85ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Proceedings of the Old Bailey*, ref t17040426-42. She was acquitted after it transpired that the accusation was brought by her mother out of spite.

This was not merely a legal position but a theological and ethical one maintained by the church, based on Romans 1.27 and often endorsed popularly by society at large, both the elite and the mob. In the case, for instance, of a Dutch sailor who in 1725 was tried on board ship for having a homosexual relationship with a boy, the chaplain argued that they should both be thrown overboard to the sharks. The ship's captain was more merciful and only the sailor was put ashore on Ascension Island with basic supplies, although he died of thirst and his body was found by a British ship the following year.<sup>7</sup> The Dutch carried on a particularly vicious anti-gay pogrom of gay men during 1730-31.<sup>8</sup>

In court much argument was often had over whether the crime committed was sodomy or merely attempted sodomy: the difference was between the gallows or (usually) the pillory, although the latter could be fatal. Penetrative sex was notoriously difficult to prove unless those involved were actually caught in the act. Court records can thus provide much hard detail evidence about the circumstances and nature of the homosexual sub-culture of the England of early Methodism.

Other accounts are less explicit. The religious proscription of homosexual activity meant that this was an unmentionable offence, so has to be deduced by inference. Terms such as 'un-natural act', 'enormous crime' are generally construed as indicating sodomy given is the context, often emphasizing that it is a crime against nature. But the character of hidden histories often lies in the interpretation of surmise.

Newspaper stories illustrate the sort of muddy material from which historians must needs make bricks such as that in the London *Daily Journal* of April 25, 1722:

"Yesterday Morning about 6 of the Clock James Oglethorpe, Esq., lately chosen at Haslemere in Surrey a Representative for the new Parliament, had the misfortune to go into a Night-House of evil Reput, without Temple-Bar (being overcome with Wine), where mixing with a promiscuous Company of Hackney-Coachmen, Shoe-Blackers, and Linkmen, Mr. Oglethorpe missed a piece of Gold, and charging a Link Fellow with having taken it from him, high Words arose, and the Linkman struck Mr. Oglethorpe several Blows with his Link, who resenting such usage drew his Sword and gave the Fellow a mortal Wound in the Breast, for which he was seiz'd and carried before Mr. Justice Street, who committed him to the Gate-House."

This serves to introduce some of the methodological difficulties faced by historians, who have to ask: what is really going on here? At one level the story is quite simple, but was Oglethorpe, with some of whose subsequent history we are familiar, the innocent victim the journalist suggests?

---

<sup>7</sup> Mawson (Capt.); *The Just Vengeance of Heaven Exemplify'd...* [London:Jenkins,c.1730]

<sup>8</sup> Norton

The link-boy is the complicating factor. They were usually teenage boys who earned a living in the dangerous and unlit streets of London by lighting people their way home after the theatre, the salon, the coffee house. They also had a persistent reputation as rent-boys. In 1680 the licentious Earl of Rochester commemorated his (real or imagined) conquests of both women and men:

I'll tell of whores attacked, their lords at home,  
Bawds' quarters beaten up, and fortress won,  
Windows demolished, watches overcome,  
And handsome ills by my contrivance done.

Nor shall our love-fits, Cloris, be forgot,  
When each the well-looking link-boy strove t'enjoy,  
And the best kiss was the deciding lot:  
Whether the boy fucked you, or I the boy.<sup>9</sup>

Nearly a century later (c 1774) Joshua Reynolds painted *Cupid as link boy*<sup>10</sup>, his torch held in an unmistakably phallic position, with equally unmistakable sexual connotations.

So what was going on between Oglethorpe, who was single for much of his long life, and the link boy? Is a sexual motif detectable? Had the gold piece changed hands and if so, what for (at 6 a.m.)? As a member of the élite, an army officer and newly elected member of the Parliament, did Oglethorpe's privileged position enable him to escape prosecution and the incident not prejudice his future? Does Oglethorpe's promotion of the Georgia colony suggest a channeling of his energy into other areas?

If newspapers must be read for innuendo, personal papers may be even more secretive. Written, let alone published, accounts by active participants are very rare – leaving aside the papers left by élite individuals such as Lord Hervey or William Beckford – they were potentially hugely incriminating. To keep a journal or write a love-letter, even in code, might be to sign your own death warrant.

Another source of evidence comes from the activities of the evangelical Society for the Reformation of Manners. Formed in 1690, riding a tide of Protestant moralising which followed the Glorious Revolution, the SRM set out to suppress bawdy houses, prostitution and other social evils in London and throughout the country, in parallel to other religious societies such as the SPCK. Its strategy was to gather vigilante intelligence about people and places, collaborating with magistrates and constables, following which prosecutions were brought, its most noted case being the 1726 raid on Margaret Clap's 'molly house'.

Their techniques also involved entrapment. It gleefully trumpeted its moral victories through the publication of black-lists which offer a further source for the existence of subcultures deviant from prevailing sexual and social mores. Public weariness with the rather sanctimonious activities and attitudes of the Society led

---

<sup>9</sup> John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester (1647-80); *The Maim'd Debauchee*

<sup>10</sup> Nicholas Penny; *Reynolds* (London: The Royal Academy, 1986), p264-5.

to its decline and demise in 1738, although it was re-invented later in a less virulent form. John Wesley's charity sermon for the Society praises its opposition to vice and bawdy houses, but makes no mention of 'unnatural crimes'.

Such are some of the sources for the study of queer history. Methodism, by way of contrast, has generally constructed its history from an abundance, perhaps even a surfeit, of mostly internal documentary material, both published and manuscript, which because it was privileged within the tradition has had a high survival rate. Moreover it is top-heavy. A local history of some Methodist chapel in a remote village in Britain will typically open with an account of when Mr Wesley or one of his preachers visited (using Wesley's published Journal and Letters) and lean heavily for its early accounts on the 'Minutes of Conference' or the Methodist Magazine.

Further, Methodist history has generally been studied and analysed by Methodists; with the result that commerce with other historical disciplines has become uneasy, in both directions. Such a centralised, hegemonic and internalised construct of history, with concomitant advantages and disadvantages, was criticized by Mark Pattison in the nineteenth century. It has proved extraordinarily resistant to modification, although it may be argued that queer history has equally been contained within a ghetto.

Alongside a different methodology sits a contrasting terminology. Something of the definition of homosexual activity, in terms of 'sodomy' has already been explored, as has its public anonymity, but the vocabulary of the 'mollies' does not always readily translate into today's gay-speak. 'Gay' and 'queer' were centuries from becoming slang, nor had 'homosexual' entered the dictionary.<sup>11</sup> On the religious front, we should also bear in mind that 'evangelical', 'chapel' and 'methodist' are also words with changed meanings. The currency of language needs careful handling.

In 1755, for instance, a case of sodomy was brought against Charles Bradbury, a 'methodist preacher'. The plaintiff was an apprentice who alleged that Bradbury had committed sodomy with him a number of times, in the chapel where he preached and elsewhere. Bradbury was eventually found not guilty largely (one suspects) because the evidence of a mere apprentice was discounted against that of a respectable master and preacher. Yet who was this 'methodist preacher'? He was probably not one of Wesley's local preachers; the location and circumstances suggest he was possibly a Dissenter. Thus 'methodist' does not always mean 'Methodist'.

The church in general was not immune from homosexual activity. The most celebrated case, in the closing years of Georgian England, was that of the Bishop of Clogher who in 1822 was caught *in flagrante delecto* with a handsome

---

<sup>11</sup> OED records the first use of 'homosexual' as 1892.

young Guardsman in the back room of a London tavern.<sup>12</sup> More relevant to Methodism is the case of John Church, a Whitefieldite preacher and protégé of Jeremiah Garrett (an evangelical minister with links to Wesley, who had been in the Lock Hospital for treatment for STD, later a member of Lady Huntingdon's Connexion, and, according to Norton, a 'notorious Sodomite'). Church became minister of an Independent Chapel in Banbury where his sexual reputation risked the very survival of the meeting house and his pastorate was terminated. He then ministered at the Obelisk Chapel in south London where he was a popular preacher although his dalliances with younger men were evidently an open secret. He also apparently 'officiated' at molly marriages. In 1817 he was imprisoned for attempted sodomy, although members of his congregation ensured he was cared for in prison and he returned in some triumph to his pulpit.

But is there solid evidence at all of homosexuality among Wesley's Methodists? It is little and fragmentary, but it does exist. Late in the century several Methodist preachers left under circumstances which may or may not have been homosexual misdemeanours. James Perfect left the ministry in 1785 for 'repeated acts of immodesty such as I could not name to a woman'<sup>13</sup>; Andrew Inglis was expelled in 1793 for a 'shocking crime'<sup>14</sup> and William Dieuaide in 1797 for 'reprehensible acts'.<sup>15</sup> Clearest is the case of Nathaniel Ward who left Wesley in 1784/5 ostensibly over financial irregularities, probably jumping before he was pushed, to join Lady Huntingdon's Connexion. However, the Countess later instigated enquiries and was told:

He has in Time past, too near approached a Line of Conduct, unnatural in itself and too indelicate to mention. Rom.1.27. ... Mr Ward had been very acceptable, and much respected, in Mr W-'s Connection. But being suspected in a certain Particular, he had been admonish'd; acknowledg'd his Error; and promis'd future Amendment. In this, however, he fail'd; the consequence of which was, he was dismissed the Connection.<sup>16</sup>

Norton cites the case of a Mary Hamilton, born c.1721, although this has some problems. In her teens she was converted to both Methodism and lesbianism by her neighbour Anne Johnson, with whom she went to live in Bristol. Cross-dressed as a man, she subsequently courted and married first a widow in Dublin (where 'she became a Methodist teacher'), then a young lady in Devon and another in Somerset. Eventually brought to trial, revelling in her notoriety, she was prosecuted under the vagrancy act for 'false and deceitful practices', it being difficult to find a charge otherwise which covered her case.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Norton 372ff.

<sup>13</sup> JW Letters viii, 275.

<sup>14</sup> Pawson Letters i, 149,152n.

<sup>15</sup> JW Letters viii, 68, Lelievre 394. Both Inglis and Dieuaide had sons who remained at Kingswood School.

<sup>16</sup> Thomas Young to Lady Huntingdon, 11 April 1791 [Cheshunt Archive].

<sup>17</sup> Norton, pp407-412.

This case illustrates further complexities. The dates are difficult to reconcile with the chronology of Methodist development but, again, the term 'methodist' is elastic and may refer to dissenters or simply be used as a term of popular abuse. The narrative is dependent on a pamphlet by Henry Fielding, who may well have embroidered the story he heard.

John Fletcher's protégé James Glazebrook also wrote of the case of a former Trevecca College student, commenting on:

..poor Ellis's besetting evil before he came to College. The point is too delicate for me to touch upon. However,... 4 years experience in the world has not cured him...<sup>18</sup>  
Schlenter, in his biography of Lady Huntingdon, *Queen of the Methodists* [sic!], notes both cases. The Countess was not inclined to be lenient, although possibly Mr W. was more so.

The key question is – what is to be made of such narratives? What of the American Methodist preacher, Jeremiah Minter, who was expelled for having undergone voluntary castration to be a eunuch for the sake of the kingdom?<sup>19</sup> Why did he take Matthew 19.12 so literally? The narrative cannot be simply brushed aside; as historians we need at least to attempt to account for it. It seems capable of interpretation as being a remedy for sexual urges or deviancy, homosexual inclinations being one possibility

I have so far generally avoided direct mention of John Wesley, in part at least because part of my argument is that a non-hegemonic, de-centralised construction of Methodist history, parallel to the queer history model, as opposed to the Wesley-centric model, can offer variant insights into Methodism's roots.

John Wesley did encounter the issue while at Oxford when in 1732 he took up the case of a Mr Blair in the Bocardo prison, charged with sodomy and who was being persecuted by his fellow prisoners. On Thursday 14 December 1732 Wesley spoke with the Vice-Chancellor and recorded raising Blair's case. Although as we have seen, 'sodomy' is not necessarily active homosexuality, the public reaction suggests that this was the case, for the Wesleys and their friends reaped the whirlwind from town and gown for 'countenancing a man whom the whole town think guilty of such an enormous crime', although they were not pleading for clemency for Blair, but simply for humane treatment in prison.

Such a hostile reaction was predictable in any event. But to compound matters, earlier in 1732 the chaplain of Merton College of 40 years standing had been forced to resign following a complaint by a Commoner

whom he had got into his chamber, and after urging him to drink, would have offered some very indecent things to him. He has been long suspected of Sodomistical practices, but could never be fairly convicted of them<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> James Glazebrook to Lady Huntingdon, 12 August 1772 [Cheshunt Archive].

<sup>19</sup> See Ruth, Lester; *Early Methodist Life and Spirituality* [Nasville:Kingswood,2005], p283.

<sup>20</sup> quoted Midgley, pp88-9.

It was elsewhere commented that

He has been guilty of this abominable vice many years ... but this and other Vices are become so common in England ... that they are not by many looked upon as sins<sup>21</sup>

A few years later the Warden of Wadham College departed in not dissimilar circumstances, giving Oxonian rhymesters 'Wadham/sodom' for years to come. It was written of Oxford in 1715 that

among the chief men in some of the colleges sodomy is very usual and ...it is dangerous sending a young man that is beautiful to Oxford.<sup>22</sup>

So John Wesley could hardly have been ignorant of the mollies and it is arguable that where he encountered homosexual activity he showed a degree of tolerance, such as allowing a preacher to depart quietly, which others might not have done. If Wesley had some personal experience of the homosexual sub-culture, the Methodist societies in London are likely not to have been in ignorance of them as Wesley's headquarters at the Foundery was on the edge of the capital's main cruising area:

...in London, one area was so popular with the mollies that it became virtually synonymous with homosexuality: Moorfields... By the early eighteenth century a path in Upper-Moorfields, by the side of the Wall that separated the Upper-field from the Middle-field, acquired the name 'The Sodomites Walk'.<sup>23</sup>

The area of 'moorland' north of the city had long been a dumping ground for the city's detritus, including the stone from Old St Pauls after the Great Fire. Moorfields, 'that Coney Island of the eighteenth century'<sup>24</sup> was too a gathering space for other groups existing on the margins of society (such as Grub Street); the 'Sodomites' Walk' was situated between the Upper and Lower Moor-Fields (present day Finsbury Square).<sup>25</sup> Here there is a geographic context for the interface between early Methodism and homosexual subculture. Being marginalized, stigmatized groups, they led a more or less covert existence on the outskirts of society. In the early days of Methodism, members or preachers were liable to be at best shunned or lampooned, at worst prosecuted, mobbed or press-ganged. At the time of the '45 Wesley needed to distance himself publicly from Jacobitism but the suspicion of Methodists being Jesuit fifth-columnists was not so quickly dispelled.

Further, homosexuality was also, perhaps because of the habits of classical Greece, viewed as a southern European characteristic, so the mollies were somehow also identified as comprising part of the Catholic threat to England, and their persecution further justified. So Methodists and mollies were also driven to

---

<sup>21</sup> quoted Midgley, p88.

<sup>22</sup> Hitchcock, 64

<sup>23</sup> Norton, 125

<sup>24</sup> Lubbock, Halford E., Hutchinson, Paul; *The Story of Methodism* (New York, Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1926), p3.

<sup>25</sup> John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, was known as 'the Moor-Fields author' for his 1684 'Sodom, or the Quitnessence of Debauchery' [quoted Norton, 127].

subsist geographically in the twilight areas and in rubbing shoulders had to co-exist in some measure.

In Bristol, too, in the 1730s there was an active molly culture around the St James' and Horsefair area, the focus of Methodist settlement. This proximity to the areas of molly activity may signal no more than that these low areas of town functioned both as the seat of the vices against which the Methodists were urging people to flee from the wrath to come, and also as a sanctuary for the ecclesiastically dispossessed. How improbable is it that there was no social exchange between the two?

By way of conclusion, there are some, though few, surviving narratives to suggest that there was an incidence of an interface between the early Methodists (and the evangelical revival more generally) and the homosexual sub-cultures in England in London and elsewhere, whether of Methodists who engaged in homosexual activity, or mollies who turned from their ways to embrace the life of faith. Such narratives need to be investigated more closely and set into their context. But they suggest that homosexuality was not entirely unknown among early Methodists, and possibly there was a level, albeit a low level, of tolerance.

But the main point to be made is to note that the 'mollies' and the Methodists occupied adjacent social space. That is, as groups who were distanced from the mainstream of society and regarded as divergent if not deviant they suffered disadvantage which extended to experiencing punitive measures. In engaging with debates about the place of gay people, it would be well to recognize that there is an element of common history.

Finally, if such history is to contribute to the ongoing 'gay debates' in the church, it needs to be recognized that there are several debates, and that they take place beyond the church as well. How adequately can Methodist history and queer history engage fruitfully with each other? The dialogue is complicated by methodological distinctions and terminological differences but perhaps Methodist history could benefit from hearing voices from the margins. It has to be a two-way process.

So more pressing, perhaps, is a need for those who research and interpret queer history to recognize that the influence and impact of religion on their past has had its effects and needs to be incorporated into the narrative if all are to gain from understanding the influence of religion upon their story.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boswell, John; *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* [Chicago, London:University of Chicago Press,1981]
- Foucault, Michel; *The History of Sexuality* [xx] in 3 vols, vol 1, 1976, vols 2 & 3,1984.
- Green, Vivian; *The Young Mr Wesley* [London: Edward Arnold, 1961]
- Hitchcock, Tim; *English Sexualities 1700-1800* [Basingstoke, Longmans. 1997]
- Midgley, Graham; *University Life in Eighteenth Century Oxford* [New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1996]
- Norton, Rictor; *Mother Clap's Molly House* [Stroud: Chalford Press, 2006 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)]
- Trumbach, Randolph; *Sex and the Gender Revolution* (volume 1: 'Heterosexuality and the Third Gender in Enlightenment London ') [Chicago:University of Chicago Press, 1998]
- ; 'London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the 18th Century' in *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Autumn, 1977), pp. 1-33
- Schlenker, Boyd; *Queen of the Methodists* [Durham: Durham Academic Press,1997]