



CHAPTER

6 Queer Theory

Stephen D. Moore

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190213398.013.8> Pages C6–116

Published: 04 October 2019

Abstract

Since the 1990s, queer theory has been immensely influential in the humanities, and, to a lesser extent, in the social sciences, seeping into discipline after discipline, even disciplines as well insulated as biblical studies. Queer theory is most commonly understood to be the poststructuralist analysis of sex and sexuality, heterosexuality as well as homosexuality. But as queer theory developed, it frequently decoupled from sex and sexuality, its expanded object of analysis becoming normality as such, in its manifold manifestations. This essay begins with a detailed account of the origins of queer theory: its “precursors,” its “exemplars,” and its relations to queer activism. The essay then charts the queer turn in biblical studies, especially New Testament studies, which also began in the 1990s, and traces such work down to the present, commenting both appreciatively and critically on the various paths it has taken. The final section of the essay brings the tale of extrabiblical queer theory fully up to date and reflects on the largely untapped potential for biblical studies of its more recent developments.

Keywords: [queer theory](#), [queer activism](#), [queer exegesis](#), [queer temporality](#), [affect theory](#)**Subject:** [Religious Studies](#), [Religion](#)**Series:** [Oxford Handbooks](#)

Queer Origins

Even to define queer, we now think, is to limit its potential, its magical power to usher in a new age of sexual radicalism and fluid gender possibilities. How did a word with such humble origins, a word that until quite lately many decent people were reluctant even to utter, come to acquire so many portentous—weighty yet vaporous—significations?

(Halperin 2003: 339)

ON occasion, the term “queer theory,” dropped carelessly in certain classrooms, still has the capacity to trigger wide-eyed alarm in students who have not heard it before (“Did he just say *queer* theory?”) and surreptitious scoping out of the nearest exit. For all other students of a certain kind and just about all faculty of any kind, the term possesses as little intrinsic shock value as, say, “accounting theory.” But it is the neophyte student, not the jaded one, whose response to “queer theory” is the originally intended one. A recital of this saga of origins is in order (even though such tales are overly tidy plots imposed on always unruly pasts). Before reflecting on how queer theory began, however, let us consider preliminarily what it became.

Queer theory is ordinarily understood to be the poststructuralist analysis of sex and sexuality, heterosexuality as well as homosexuality. But as queer theory developed, it frequently decoupled from sex

and sexuality, its expanded object of analysis becoming normality as such, the normal being the constitutive antithesis of the queer. Since the 1990s, queer theory has been immensely influential in the humanities, and, to a lesser extent, in the social sciences, seeping into discipline after discipline, even disciplines as well insulated from such seepage as biblical studies. Queer theory is still a remarkably vibrant force in academia, despite the inevitable obituaries that repeatedly have been written on it. Yet it is not in the halls of academia that our story begins but in the streets.

p. 96 The year is 1990. In March, the activist LGBTQ organization Queer Nation is launched. In June, Queer Nation circulates 15,000 copies of a collectively authored flier titled “Queers Read This” at the New York Gay Pride Parade (Queer Nation 1990). The flier deploys the words “queer” or “queers” some sixty times. Tracing the semantic twists and turns of the term “queer” since its entry into the English language in the sixteenth century would require its own essay. Suffice it here to note a few stages on the journey. The word originally meant “odd” or “eccentric,” with no sexual connotation. Samuel Richardson’s 1742 novel, *Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded*, amusingly illustrates this usage when one of its characters exclaims, “Egad, gentlemen,... I have heard of many *queer* Pranks among my Bedfordshire neighbours; but, I bless my stars, I was in France and Italy all the time” (Richardson 1902: 133, italics original). By the close of the nineteenth century, “queer” was becoming sexualized. In an 1894 letter, John Sholto Douglas, Marquess of Queensberry, could complain that his son Lord Alfred Douglas had been sexually corrupted by certain “Snob Queers,” including Oscar Wilde. By the 1910s, some men-loving men were content, even proud, to call themselves “queer”; but by the 1950s, “gay” had replaced “queer” as the preferred insider term, while “queer” consolidated fully as an outsider’s term of contempt (Chauncy 1994: 15–16, 19).

This latter usage was the bloodstained backcloth against which the public reclamation of “queer” was staged by Queer Nation, the most prominent of the radical LGBTQ activist groups to emerge in the late 1980s and early 1990s. “Why queer?” inquired Queer Nation’s “Queers Read This” manifesto:

Couldn’t we just use “gay” instead? It’s a much brighter word. ... But when a lot of lesbians and gay men wake up in the morning we feel angry and disgusted, not gay. So we’ve chosen to call ourselves queer. Using “queer” is a way of reminding us how we are perceived by the rest of the world. ... We use queer as gay men loving lesbians and lesbians loving being queer. Queer, unlike gay, doesn’t mean male. ... [I]t’s a way of suggesting we close ranks, and forget (temporarily) our individual differences because we face a more insidious common enemy. Yeah, queer can be a rough word but it is also a sly and ironic weapon we can steal from the homophobe’s hands and use against him.

(Queer Nation 1990: 9)

Queer Nation’s dropping of the Q-bomb, then, was a resistant act of retooling and redeployment. “Queer” was a banner under which lesbians and gay men could march in unison. But the struggle that this retooled term “queer” emblemized was not for increased inclusion in straight society, the right to marry and serve in the military. Rather the struggle was antiassimilationist: “Being queer [is] not about the mainstream, profit-margins, patriotism, patriarchy or being assimilated. ... It’s about being on the margins” (1–2). Intrinsic to that elected marginality was an interrogation of the stability of sexual identity, even lesbian and gay identity, now strategically subsumed in the more fluid (anti)category of “queer.” That erosive interrogation would be taken much farther by the academic architects of queer theory, largely independently of the phenomenon that was Queer Nation, although some of them did pick up and expand on Queer Nation’s concept of “queer” and, as Erin Rand notes, “put the group’s practices in conversation with... poststructuralism and postmodernism” (2014: 5). The term “queer theory” itself, however, originated elsewhere.

p. 97

The year is still 1990. In February, a conference titled “Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities” was held at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Teresa de Lauretis, who had organized the conference, had also coined the term “queer theory.” In her introduction to the conference’s published proceedings she claimed: “My ‘queer’... had no relation to the Queer Nation group, of whose existence I was ignorant at the time. As the essays [in this collection] will show, there is in fact very little in common between Queer Nation and this queer theory” (de Lauretis 1991: xvii, n2). De Lauretis protests too much, however. Like Queer Nation, de Lauretis calls for a “common front or political alliance of gay men and lesbians,” one “made possible, and indeed necessary, in the United States today by the AIDS national emergency and the pervasive institutional backlash against queers of all sexes” (v). Also like Queer Nation, de Lauretis intends “the term ‘queer’... to

mark a certain critical distance” from the established, overly convenient formula “lesbian and gay” (iv). She concocted the term “queer theory,” she explains, to circumvent “all of these fine distinctions in our discursive protocols”—beginning with the “lesbian”/“gay” distinction itself—“not to adhere to any one of the given terms, not to assume their ideological liabilities, but instead to both transgress and transcend them—or at the very least problematize them” (v).

Yet de Lauretis’s academic manifesto for queer theory is not simply interchangeable with Queer Nation’s activist manifesto for queer protest. The “theory” in de Lauretis’s “queer theory” is, above all, the poststructuralist theory that, by then, had taken US literary studies by storm. For de Lauretis, “‘Queer Theory’ conveys a double emphasis—on the conceptual and speculative work involved in discourse production, and on the necessary critical work of deconstructing our own discourses and their constructed silences” (iv). De Lauretis’s “double emphasis” conjures up what by then had emerged as the two most influential strands of poststructuralist theory: Michel Foucault’s discourse analysis, on the one hand, “discourse,” for Foucault, being a ubiquitous rule-bound activity that determines what societies deem natural, necessary, and universal; and Jacques Derrida’s deconstruction, on the other hand, which focused on the strategic exclusions that enable texts and societies to appear coherent and self-consistent. Queer theory would bring Foucauldian, Derridean, and other modes of poststructuralist analysis to bear on the rule-bound, natural-seeming, exclusionary, incoherent domains of sex and sexuality.

Queer theory’s relationship to poststructuralism, however, is merely implicit in de Lauretis’s article. It is the subject of tantalizing allusion rather than explicit exploration. Derrida or even Foucault—the latter soon to become the patron saint of queer theory—do not feature in de Lauretis’s bibliography. And all that she has to hold up as examples of queer theory are the articles in the journal issue she is introducing, none of which deploy the term “queer theory.” Thus, in the early 1990s, queer theory was a signifier in search of a signified, an incipient academic movement in search of a canonical literature. ↵ But the book that soon came to be seen as the consummate expression of queer theory was, in many respects, an unlikely candidate for that role.

p. 98

Again the year is 1990, and the book is Judith Butler’s *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Not only in its subtitle but throughout, the book represents itself as a work of feminism, more precisely of feminist theory. It does use the term “queer” once in passing (1990: 166), but not the term “queer theory.” What made this forbiddingly dense book the specimen text par excellence of queer theory? The simple answer is that its last twenty pages did (128–49). There Butler famously argues that gender identity is purely performative, the product of a socially scripted set of stylized actions that manage, through sheer repetition, to create the illusion that gender is natural, an inner essence, which is “expressed” by the speech, gestures, and other behaviors that in fact engender it (see also Butler 1991). The gender that *Gender Trouble* troubles, then, is gender conceived as given, innate, or biologically based: one is born either a woman-to-be or a man-to-be, and one’s gendered existence is the progressive realization of that predetermined identity. This is the concept of gender commonly termed gender essentialism, whose opposite is gender constructivism. Famously, too, *Gender Trouble* singles out the phenomenon of drag as illustrative and exemplary of the performative nature of gender itself. Drag decouples gender from anatomical sex, and as such is emblematic, for Butler, of the unstable relations between gender and anatomy. As she would later explain, *Gender Trouble* used drag “to elucidate a structure that is at work in everyday performances of gender” (2006: 282; Butler 1993: x, 124–37).

The year 1990 also saw the appearance of what would soon come to be seen as a second queer theory “classic”—although strictly speaking Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s *Epistemology of the Closet* was another queer theory precursor. Like *Gender Trouble*, the term “queer theory” does not feature in it, and even the term “queer” only appears once (Sedgwick 1990: 203). Like *Gender Trouble*, too, “*Epistemology of the Closet* is a feminist book” (15). “So what is queer about it?” Sedgwick asks herself in her preface to its second edition, answering: “Retrospectively, I would say it’s exactly [the] resistance to treating homo/heterosexual categorization... as a done deal, a transparently empirical fact about any person” (2008: xvi). If *Gender Trouble* queers gender primarily, *Epistemology* queers sexuality primarily. Sedgwick begins with the “rather amazing fact” that, notwithstanding the dizzying variety that characterizes human sexual proclivities, “precisely one, the gender of object choice,” or “sexual orientation,” is thought to matter above all else (1990: 8). Sedgwick itemizes this variety through thirteen bullet points, the first of which reads: “Even identical genital acts mean very different things to different people” (25). So fully, indeed, does human sexuality have to do with “its excess over or potential difference from the bare choreographies of procreation” that it “is all over the experiential and conceptual map” (29). In short, sex, for Sedgwick, even

heterosex, is (implicitly if not yet explicitly) *queer*: fluid, malleable, uncontainable. As such, “the definitional narrowing-down” in the twentieth century “of sexuality as a whole to a binarized calculus of *homo-* or *heterosexuality*” is historically contingent (31). Homosexuality, no less than heterosexuality, “as we conceive of it today,” is less “a coherent definitional field... than a space of overlapping, contradictory, and conflictual definitional forces” (45).

p. 99 Sedgwick’s inspiration for much of this is the book that, with *Gender Trouble* and her own, is commonly seen as the third charter document of queer theory: the first volume of Michel Foucault’s *History of Sexuality*. Foucault aims to analyze the ways in which sex has been “put into discourse” in the West (1978: 11). He also aims to dispel the myth that the putting into discourse of sex has, since the advent of bourgeois society, been a matter of “subjugat[ing sex] at the level of language, control[ling] its free circulation in speech” (17). Rather, there was a “multiplication of discourses concerning sex” during this period, “an institutional incitement to speak about it” (18), culminating in the nineteenth-century emergence of psychology and psychiatry, which undertook to classify meticulously (“entomologize,” says Foucault) and manage every sexual practice and pleasure (41–45). The result was the discursive production of sexual subjects never before seen, not least “the homosexual,” a term first coined in 1869. The medieval “sodomite” was nothing more than the subject of “forbidden acts,” Foucault famously argues, but the modern “homosexual” was “a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood.” No facet of him was thought to be “unaffected by his sexuality.” It was imagined to be “everywhere present in him,” “at the root of all his actions,” “written immodestly on his face and body” as the “secret that always gave itself away.” Homosexuality “was transposed from the practice of sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphrodism of the soul. The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species” (43).

Together, Foucault, Butler, and Sedgwick, read retrospectively and together in the 1990s, laid down the foundational tenets of queer theory: that gender, sexuality, even sex were human constructs, whether fabricated through discourse (Foucault) or through stylized actions (Butler), and as such were inherently contradictory and eminently deconstructible (Sedgwick). “Queer” became a cipher both for what stood over against normal sex and gender to oppose and define them and for what inhered within them to subvert and pervert them. But as queer theory began to amass a canonical literature and a field-consolidating set of primers and anthologies, other innovative thinkers of sex and sexuality began to snap into focus as further precursors of queer theory.

For instance, Adrienne Rich’s “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Experience” (1980) assumed fresh significance with its argument that heterosexuality should be analyzed as a political institution rather than a sexual preference, since it is a system “imposed” on women, and “managed, organized, propagandized, and maintained by force” (648). Gayle Rubin in another celebrated essay, “Thinking Sex” (1984), also argued that “sexuality is political,” “organized into systems of power, which reward and encourage some individuals and activities, while punishing and suppressing others” (171). She called for a “radical theory of sex” that would “identify, describe, explain, and denounce erotic injustice and sexual oppression” (149). Her challenge to “the assumption that feminism is or should be the privileged site” of such a theory (169) seemed retrospectively to be a call for queer theory. The French feminist Monique Wittig, meanwhile, became known to many Anglophone readers of incipient queer theory because of her prominence in Butler’s *Gender Trouble*. Like Rich and Rubin, Wittig saw heterosexuality as a political regime, but went farther than either of them. Women come into being, Wittig argued, through a specific social and servile relationship to a man: a heterosexual relationship. Lesbians stand outside that relationship; as such, “[l]esbians are not women” (1992c: 32). They are “something else, a not-woman, a not-man” (1992b: 13).

p. 100

Queer theory gradually became enmeshed in discussions of race as the 1990s unfolded, but that trajectory too preceded queer theory proper. The African American feminist Audre Lorde, hailed retrospectively as yet another precursor of queer theory, had insisted that “racism, sexism, and homophobia are inseparable” (1984b: 110) and had taken white feminists to task for “ignor[ing] differences of race, sexual preference, class, and age” among women (1984a: 116). But it was in Cathy Cohen’s 1997 article “Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens” that queer of color critique (as it came to be called) achieved full expression within, or alongside, queer theory (see also Muñoz 1999; Ferguson 2003; Johnson and Henderson 2005; and, for New Testament application, Thomas 2018). Cohen took aim at the implicit assumption informing much queer theory and queer activism whereby “all heterosexuals are represented as dominant and controlling and all queers... as marginalized and invisible” (2005: 25). Cohen inquired how those who work with that assumption would “understand politically the lives of women (particularly women of color) on welfare.” Such women might “fit into the category of heterosexual,” but their “sexual choices are not perceived as

normal, moral or worthy of state support” (26). Further complicating the equation of heterosexuality with hegemony, for Cohen, and homosexuality with marginality was the fact that many lesbians and gays “hold other identities based on class, race, and/or gender... that provide them with membership in and the resources of dominant institutions and groups” (26). Cohen argued in consequence that “a single oppression model” (31) would not work for queer politics, just as (other) women of color had argued a decade earlier that a single oppression model would not work for feminist politics.

By now queer theory had not only coalesced; it had also become complex. And further important developments still lay ahead. Before reviewing them, however, let us chart the queer turn in biblical studies, especially New Testament studies, which also began in the 1990s.

Queer Scriptures

[T]he Bible is always already queer.

(Hornsby and Stone 2011a: xiii)

p. 101 Queer New Testament criticism began in earnest, and notably early, with Robert Goss’s 1993 gay and lesbian manifesto, *Jesus ACTED UP*. The book did not engage queer theory per se, although the thought of Michel Foucault permeated much of it. The book’s title played on *ACT UP*, acronym for AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power, the activist organization out of which Queer Nation had emerged, and of which Goss himself had been a member. As in the public discourse of ACT UP and Queer Nation, the term “queer” pervaded *Jesus ACTED UP*. For Goss, Christ is queer and God is queer (indeed, “God is HIV +” [1993: 135]). Goss is intent on crafting a “queer biblical hermeneutic” and a “queer christology.” In particular, Goss advocates a “queer liberation theology” in which God’s preferential option for the poor would extend to the sexually oppressed. He calls for the creation of “queer Christian base communities” on the liberation theology model but with activist tactics borrowed from ACT UP and Queer Nation. Goss’s Jesus is modeled on the socially subversive Jesus of such scholars as John Dominic Crossan and Richard Horsley, but now queers have joined the outcasts with whom this Jesus associated. Jesus’s solidarity with queers rendered him queer in turn, for Goss, as did his relationship with Lazarus (John 11:36) and the Beloved Disciple (John 13:23). It was only in and through his resurrection, however, that Jesus fully became the queer Christ (84–85; see further Goss 2002).

Goss’s ACT UP–inspired manifesto sounded notes that would echo repeatedly in queer biblical criticism in the years to come. In particular, Goss moved queer-affirmative biblical exegesis from a defensive to an offensive mode (both meanings of “offensive” apply here: Goss aimed to scandalize). It is not sufficient “to dismantle homophobic biblical interpretations,” Goss insisted; queer Christians must refuse to cede Jesus and the Bible to homophobic forces within the church (1993: 164). That refusal would come to succinct expression in the title of the essay collection that Goss would go on to coedit with Mona West: *Take Back the Word: A Queer Reading of the Bible* (Goss and West 2000).

Theodore Jennings, in his 2003 monograph *The Man Jesus Loved: Homoerotic Narratives from the New Testament*, also announced a break “with the defensive strategy of dealing primarily with passages that are alleged to support homophobia and gay bashing.” Instead of further feeding the obsession with this lethal handful of passages, Jennings would focus on what he took to be “the preponderance of the evidence: that which includes and affirms homoerotic desire and relationships” (2003: 7–8). And the preeminent item of evidence, for Jennings, was Jesus himself. Jennings investigated the Markan Jesus’s relationship with a certain unclothed youth as reflected in the Gospel of Mark (14:51–52) read through the *Secret Gospel of Mark*; the Matthean Jesus’s apparent blessing of a homoerotic relationship between a certain centurion and his *pais* (Matt 8:5–13), understood by Jennings to mean “boyfriend” (see further Jennings and Liew 2004, in which the term is translated “boy-love”); the repeated subversion of “family values” by the Synoptic Jesus in general; and, above all, the Johannine Jesus’s relationship with the Beloved Disciple. Taken all together, Jennings argued, these texts provide “evidence for the ‘dangerous memory’ of Jesus as the lover of another man and as one whose attitudes toward such relationships... are incompatible with modern heterosexism and homophobia” (ix). Jennings’s hermeneutic stood in continuity with Nancy Wilson’s strategy of “outing” biblical characters. In her 1995 book *Our Tribe*, Wilson had announced: “It is time boldly to liberate some biblical gay, lesbian, and bisexual characters and stories from ancient closets” (112; see also Wilson

2013). What of biblical characters who cannot plausibly be construed as sexually closeted? Do they resist queering? This brings us back to Goss.

p. 102 A certain strategy of queer interpretation early became a stock feature of the exegetical repertoire of the LGBTQ communities of faith. It is already evident in Goss's *Jesus ACTED UP*, and indeed in Wilson's *Our Tribe*, but it comes to more developed expression in Goss's reading of John's Gospel in *The Queer Bible Commentary* (Goss 2006a), John, for Goss, being "[b]y far... the queerest of all the Gospels" (550). "Central to John's Gospel," for Goss, "is the theme of God's coming out in Jesus" (548). "The first witness" to this queer coming out is John the Baptist (John 1:6–8), who "[f]or our queer community... is a 'hairy leather bear' in the gay sense of the word" (551; cf. Mark 1:6). Nicodemus, who comes to Jesus under cover of darkness (John 3:1–2), "is the archetypal closeted Christian" (552). After this hidden encounter, "Nicodemus fades back into the closet" (552), but later reemerges to "bury Jesus secretly" with Joseph of Arimathea, "another closeted Christian" (553; see John 19:38–40). Goss remarks: "How often has this scenario been re-enacted in closeted clergy burying gay men who died because of HIV!" (553). For Goss, the Samaritan woman may similarly be reimagined "as a lesbian who has practiced serial monogamy and is now living with her sixth lover" (553; see John 4:16–18).

Jesus's raising of Lazarus from the dead (John 11:1–44) has long been read as a coming-out story in queer communities of faith, as Goss observes (554; see also Perkins 2000; West 2003). The same is true of Jesus's own resurrection in all four Gospels. Goss recapitulates Elizabeth Stuart's interpretation of Jesus's resurrection as a metaphor for "how queer folk come out of their self-crucifixions in the closet and death of self-hatred and internalized homophobia," for how they "emerge from the closet tomb" (Goss 2006a: 564; see Stuart 1995: 50). Prior to his own interpretation of the Johannine resurrection narrative, Goss has read Jesus's farewell discourse (John 13–17) as his "instructions to his disciples on how to come out and live out in the world" (2006a: 559). And he has interpreted as follows the scene in which the dying Jesus commends his mother to the care of the Beloved Disciple: "Here in the last moments of his life, Jesus establishes a family of choice, based on his homoerotic relationship with the Beloved Disciple. Many mainline and fundamentalist Christian churches play the role of the Romans, crucifying Christ, and attempt to destroy homoerotic families of choice" (562; cf. Goss 2000: 212–13).

How is this exegetical strategy best described? It is an analogical method at base: as it was for the scandalous, beleaguered Jesus and the community of outcasts he assembled around him, so is it for queer Christians today (cf. Goss 2006a: 550). But it is also an allegorical method, or, more precisely, a neo-allegorical method, a queer appropriation of the ancient and medieval Christian allegorical tradition of biblical exegesis. Goss's neo-allegorical queer exegesis is also homiletical, as are other modes of contextual biblical hermeneutics, beginning with the classic liberation theology that inspired *Jesus ACTED UP*. Like a homily or sermon, all such work aims to harness the ancient words of the biblical texts to deliver a transformative message to a contemporary community of faith. And this is also why Goss's queer exegetical strategy would not be recognized as a legitimate method by biblical-scholarly traditionalists, the "sermonic" having been the constitutive other of the "scholarly" in the discipline since its inception.

p. 103 Neo-allegorical queer exegesis is the most distinctive feature of the New Testament essays in *The Queer Bible Commentary* (QBC; Guest et al. 2006), just as it was in the New Testament essays in QBC's precursor volume, *Take Back the Word* (Goss and West 2000; see especially Bohache 2000; Goss 2000; Martin 2000; Perkins 2000). Neo-allegory is on display not only in Goss's QBC essay on John but also in his essay on Luke (2006b), in Thomas Bohache's essay on Matthew (Bohache 2006), in Marcella Althaus-Reid's essay on Mark (Althaus-Reid 2006), and in many other essays in the commentary. Althaus-Reid's deployment of the strategy is particularly arresting. Althaus-Reid (d. 2009) was an Argentinian liberation theologian responsible for two highly provocative books in queer theology, *Indecent Theology* (2000) and *The Queer God* (2003). Althaus-Reid's queer theological tactic of "talking obscenities to theology" (2000: 87–124) spills over into her minicommentary on Mark. "They killed a faggot" are its opening words (2006: 517), and the murder of a "queer," "unemployed" man—the Markan Jesus—considered in tandem with the murder of queers everywhere and in every time is its pervasive theme. Scholarship, sermon, and activism blend in Althaus-Reid's queer redescription of Mark in a mode that by then had become a trademark of the most visible trajectory of queer biblical criticism.

Missing from the mix, however, was queer theory. All in all, queer biblical criticism, most of all queer New Testament criticism, has made extraordinarily little use of queer theory. *The Queer Bible Commentary*, at 877 pages the most conspicuous product of queer biblical criticism to date, is entirely representative in that

regard. Michel Foucault (who featured so prominently in *Jesus ACTED UP*) and Eve Sedgwick are each mentioned once in passing in the New Testament essays in *QBC*, while Judith Butler, extraordinarily, is not mentioned even once. A work of this magnitude in literary or cultural studies with the word “queer” in its title and the iconic queer theorists all but absent from its pages (not to mention the legions of other theorists and critics who have built on or alongside their work) would be all but unimaginable.

This is not to say that there has been no significant engagement with queer theory in New Testament studies, only that there has been far less of it than one might expect. My own *God’s Beauty Parlor* engaged head-on with queer theory in its introduction (Moore 2001: 7–18), but that petered out in the book’s exegetical chapters, which, while they are deeply informed by queer theory, do not, for the most part, rely on specific works of queer theory to perform their readings. In New Testament studies, indeed, one can point to relatively little in the way of robust engagement with queer theory prior to the edited collection, *Bible Trouble: Queer Reading at the Boundaries of Biblical Scholarship* (Hornsby and Stone 2011b; see also Hornsby 2006; Townsley 2006; Runions 2008; Liew 2009; Moore 2009; Marchal 2011b).

The nine New Testament essays that, together with a response essay, make up the second part of *Bible Trouble* demonstrate the degree to which queer biblical criticism, even or especially when it draws on queer theory, is not a singular method so much as a spectrum of interrelated and eclectic reading strategies. What unifies this spectrum is a common approach to gender, sex, and sexuality as motile and mercurial categories. Queer theory has tended to deal deconstructively with concepts of sexual identity, even gay and lesbian identity. Most if not all of the Bible-troubling team might agree with Sean Burke when he states: “While identification with a particular identity category may function strategically as a means of resistance”—in particular, “as a basis for movements of liberation”—“the naturalization and normalization of identities—that is, the insistence that identities be recognized as natural, stable, fixed, and unitary—ultimately function in ways that oppress people” (2011: 176). Such a position fits more comfortably in *Bible Trouble* than in *QBC*.

Yet it would be a mistake to draw too sharp a line between *Bible Trouble* and *QBC*. At least two of the New Testament essays in *Bible Trouble*, those of Jione Havea and Manuel Villalobos, emerge smoothly out of the trajectory of queer biblical criticism most palpably rooted in liberation hermeneutics (see also Menéndez-Antuña 2018), and would sit very comfortably beside Marcella Althaus-Reid’s essay on Mark in *QBC*, say, even as her essay would sit very comfortably beside theirs in *Bible Trouble*. Havea’s “Lazarus Troubles” (2011) distils several months of working with a group of Pacific Islander prison inmates in New South Wales to queer John 11, to read it as graphically reincarnated “in their tattooed, knifed, scarred, shot, pierced, and penetrated bodies” (158). Villalobos, meanwhile, in “Bodies *Del Otro Lado* Finding Life and Hope in the Borderland” (2011) approaches the Ethiopian eunuch of Acts 8 (see also Burke 2011, 2013) from his own dislocated social location as a *Mexicano del otro lado*, a (queer) Mexican “from the other side” (see further Villalobos Mendoza 2012).

Havea does not really engage with queer theory per se, while Villalobos, in effect, expands the queer theory “canon.” He reads the “borderlands” theory of Gloria Anzaldúa (2007) as (also) queer theory, and it is in Anzaldúa’s borderlands that Villalobos and the Ethiopian eunuch meet. Gillian Townsley expands the queer theory canon in another direction in “*The Straight Mind* in Corinth” (2011; see now also Townsley 2017)—or, rather, steps back behind it. *The Straight Mind* of her title is the essay collection of queer theory “precursor” Monique Wittig (1992a), whom we encountered earlier. Refocused through Wittig’s theory, the overlooked Corinthian men of 1 Corinthians 11 become “lesbian men” on Townsley’s reading.

Several of the other New Testament essays in *Bible Trouble* are catalyzed by intertexts of other kinds. Joseph Marchal, whose “Corinthian Women Prophets and Trans Activism” (2011a) probably engages most fully with queer theory, stages an encounter between the women prophets of 1 Corinthians 11 and contemporary trans people, both of them groups that embrace queer identities not amenable “to the models offered by the dominant scripts” (239). Lynn Huber’s “Gazing at the Whore” (2011) takes as its jumping-off point a stylized portrait of the pop icon Madonna as Revelation’s “Great Whore.” That image catalyzes an extended queering of the gaze to which the woman Babylon is subjected in Revelation; a confession on Huber’s part that, “as a queer woman,” she finds Babylon “at least somewhat desirable” (307); and a nuanced challenge to the position (exemplified by Pippin and Clark 2006) “that Revelation has little or nothing to offer queer readers” (302; see also Huber 2013: 117–26).

Jeremy Punt’s “Queer Theory, Postcolonial Theory, and Biblical Interpretation” (2011), finally, as its title implies, is an exercise in theoretical intersectionality of a sort that has long been common in queer

theory (the terms “transnational” or “global” sometimes displacing the term “postcolonial”), but rare in queer biblical criticism (see also Punt 2007, 2010; Moore 2009; Runions 2014; Menéndez-Antuña 2018). Postcolonial queer criticism has, however, considerable potential in New Testament studies, particularly in texts in which sex and empire interweave. The most obvious text of this sort is Revelation, in which Rome is represented as a sexually insatiable woman (14:8; 17:1–2; 18:3; 19:2), meaning that Roman imperial military might, implicitly hypermasculine, is being decked out parodically and queerly in drag as a depraved prostitute destined to be sexually humiliated and violently obliterated (see Moore 2014: 144–49). Also, in all four Gospels, Jesus’s crucifixion on a colonial cross for counterimperial activities becomes a sexualized event when focused through ancient hegemonic gender scripts, Jesus’s pinioned helplessness, forced nakedness, and perforated flesh all potentially feminizing him and shaming him sexually, as many gender critics of the Gospels have remarked. But queer theory fused with postcolonial theory would offer further conceptual resources for depth analysis of this epochal spectacle.

Queer Futures

[I]f queerness is to have any value whatsoever, it must be viewed as being visible only in the horizon.

(Muñoz 2009: 11)

What else does queer theory have to offer New Testament studies or biblical studies in general? This question returns us to the tale of queer theory’s emergence and development with which we began. The continued saga of queer theory past the point at which we left off may be narrated in terms of three “turns,” each of which had its beginnings in the 1990s, each of which has been formative for subsequent queer theory, and each of which has had little impact as yet on queer biblical criticism: the antinormative turn, the temporal turn, and the affective turn.

A mere three years after the term “queer theory” was coined, Eve Sedgwick could already report, “[R]ecent work around ‘queer’ spins the term outward along dimensions that can’t be subsumed under gender and sexuality at all” (1993: 9), while Michael Warner, introducing *Fear of a Queer Planet*, could write: “In different ways queer politics might... have implications for any area of social life” (1993: vii). It was becoming particularly apparent that queer theory could be extended, elasticized, so as to wrap around normality—or “normativity,” as one learned to say—in any of its myriad forms (not just the sexually normal), and subject them to destabilizing analysis. This desexualization of the queer prompted much self-probing. “What’s Queer about Queer Studies Now?” inquired a thematic double issue of the journal *Social Text* (Eng et al. 2005). A retrospective volume on queer theory, with a who’s who list of contributors, was titled *After Sex?* (Halley and Parker 2011a), and its introduction began, “What has queer theory become...? What, if anything, does it not include within its purview?” (Halley and Parker 2011b: 1). More pointedly: “Can work be regarded as queer if it’s not explicitly ‘about’ sexuality?” (2).

The decoupling of queer theory and sexuality, however, enabled much significant work. A single example will have to suffice. Robert McRuer, introducing his book *Crip Theory* (2006), quoted from Michael Warner’s queer theory milestone, *The Trouble with Normal* (1999), adding: “A critique of normalcy has similarly been central to the disability rights movement and to disability studies” (7). McRuer, building on the work of Alison Kafer (2003), developed a concept of “compulsory able-bodiedness” in counterpoint to Adrienne Rich’s proto-queer-theoretical concept of “compulsory heterosexuality” (2; cf. Rich 1980), noting that “[a]ble-bodiedness, even more than heterosexuality, still largely masquerades as a nonidentity, as the natural order of things,” as the very face and form of the normal (McRuer 2006: 1; see also McRuer and Mollow 2012; Kafer 2013).

All of this is potentially relevant to queer New Testament studies. If life in contemporary Western culture—especially, but not only, sexual life—is regulated by regimes of the *normal*, life in ancient Mediterranean culture—especially, but not only, sexual life—was regulated by regimes of the *natural*, and queer theory in its denormalizing, denaturalizing forms offers resources for tackling the nonsexual “natural” in New Testament texts, “their” natural being one of the primary progenitors of “our” normal. Extrasexual queer theory is an especially apt analytic tool for a collection of ancient texts that, first of all, seldom mention sex, and second, while having explicit recourse to the concept of “the natural” (*ho physikos*) only twice in relation to sexual behavior (Rom 1:26–27), have implicit recourse to the concept numerous times in relation

to nonsexual behavior and states of being. One area in which implicit recourse to “the natural” comes into play is in relation to disability (see especially Henning 2011). The Gospels and Acts are thickly populated with physically and mentally disabled characters. Increasingly scholars have begun to engage them from disability studies perspectives, but crip theory, that norm–destabilizing fusion of disability studies and queer theory, would add further dimensions to such work.

The turn to temporality in queer theory is related to the turn to antinormativity to the extent that it is a further deployment of the “queer” in spheres that are not simply coextensive with the sexual or the gendered. This temporal turn in queer theory has taken several interrelated forms, one of which is an extension of the interrogation of normativity to reimaginings of normal or straight time: time marked by such life experiences as marriage, reproduction, and child rearing. “Queer subcultures,” as Judith Halberstam observes, “produce alternative temporalities by allowing their participants to believe that their futures can be imagined according to logics that lie outside of those paradigmatic markers of life experience—namely, birth, marriage, reproduction, and death” (2005: 2). Elizabeth Freeman, extending such analysis of straight time, has coined the term *chrononormativity*: “the use of time to organize individual human bodies toward maximum productivity” (2010: 3; for New Testament application, see Hoke 2018). Sexuality is both teleologically regulated by, and assimilated to, economics under capitalism, argues Freeman. “In the eyes of the state, [the] sequence of socioeconomically ‘productive’ moments is what it means to have a life at all” (4–5).

Much of this applies *mutatis mutandis* to the ancient Mediterranean world and the place of Jesus and his movement, as represented in the Synoptic Gospels in particular, within that world, as I have argued briefly elsewhere (Moore 2013: 67–68). If “queer time ... is ... about the potentiality of a life unscripted by the conventions of family, inheritance, and child rearing” (Halberstam 2005: 2), then the Matthean Jesus, say, seems to embody one realization of that potential. His life, offered as a model to his disciples, is unscripted by the ancient Mediterranean institutions of marriage, biological progeny, conventional labor, or material inheritance. His conception and birth occur outside the conventional structures of marriage (Matt 1:18–25; cf. Bohache 2006: 496). As an adult, he himself eschews marriage, even sex, and hence biological sons and heirs. He seduces his male disciples into abandoning their own marriages (4:18–22; 8:14; 19:27–29; cf. 10:35–37) and holds eunuchhood up to them as an ultimate model for emulation (19:10–12; cf. 5:27–30; Hester 2005; Bohache 2006: 507–11). The movement inaugurated by the Matthean Jesus, then, may be reimagined as a queer subculture productive of an alternative temporality that is profoundly anti-imperial, entailing as it does a present and a future structured according to logics that lie outside the paradigmatic markers of Roman life experience. The Matthean Jesus and his movement do not run on Roman time.

And neither does Paul, least of all in 1 Corinthians 7, declaring “it is well for a man not to touch a woman” (7:1); “to the unmarried and the widows I say that it is well for them to remain unmarried as I am” (7:8); “concerning virgins ... I think that, in view of the impending [eschatological] crisis, it is well for you to remain as you are” (7:25–26), and other such things. These ascetic injunctions might be queerly reimagined as dismissals of what another queer theorist of time, Lee Edelman, would call “reproductive futurism”: the heteronormative ideology in which “the Child”—“not to be confused with ... any historical children” but rather a “fantasmatic” figure—embodies “the telos of the social order” (2004: 11). Yet Paul cannot simply be assimilated with the queer in its most radical theoretical forms. Side by side in 1 Corinthians with queer subversions of reproductive futurism are boot-camp denunciations of nonhegemonic masculinities. Among those whom Paul consigns to perdition are *malakoi*—literally, “soft males,” penetrable girlymen (6:9; see also Rom 1:27)—and he urges the Corinthian males in general, *andrize the*, “man up,” “stand erect” (1 Cor 16:13).

The concept of queer temporality also entails ambitious rethinking of historical time and historiographical assumptions (see Goldberg and Menon 2005; Traub 2013). This should hardly surprise us. The earliest “precursor” text of queer theory, and the most influential, was, after all, a work of historiography, Foucault’s *History of Sexuality* (1978, 1985, 1986). But the queer turn within historiography is more commonly linked with Louise Fradenburg and Carla Freccero’s introduction to *Premodern Sexualities* (1996), with Carolyn Dinshaw’s *Getting Medieval* (1999), and with Freccero’s *Queer/Early/Modern* (2006; see also Dinshaw et al. 2007; Dinshaw 2012). Emerging from such work is a historiographical distinction between “alteritism,” on the one hand—simply put, the conviction that the past is truly another country, altogether alien to “ours,” structured by cultural assumptions utterly different from ours—and “continuism,” on the other hand—the countervailing conviction that profound cultural continuities bridge past and present (see Fradenburg and Freccero 1996: xv, xix).

Dinshaw and Freccero would trouble that dichotomy. “[O]ur choices as queer historians,” insists Dinshaw, “are not limited simply to mimetic identification with the past or blanket alteritism” (1999: 34; see also Freccero 2006: 4–5). Yet the alteritism/continuism polarity provides an illuminating spectrum on which to place different varieties of biblical work that engage with homoeroticism (cf. Marchal 2012: 214–17).

At or near the alteritism pole we might set work like that of Dale Martin on the Pauline terms *malakos* and *arsenokoitēs* (1 Cor 6:9; cf. 1 Tim 1:10), erroneously assimilated to modern concepts of homosexuality, according to Martin (2006: 37–50), or my own reading of Romans 1:26–27, which likewise decouples it from modern homosexuality and submerges it instead in ancient sex and gender scripts (Moore 2001: 133–72; see also Martin 1995; further discussion in Dunning, “Same-Sex Relations” in this volume). The alteritist impulse also finds expression in William Loader’s *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* (2013; see also Loader 2012), which regularly “remind[s] the reader” of the “distinctiveness” of ancient sexual assumptions and their “difference from our own” (2013: 8), and in other similar books and articles too numerous to name.

At or near the continuism pole, meanwhile, we might set John Boswell’s *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (1980), which as its subtitle indicates, purports to trace the submerged history of “gay people” from the first century CE (see 91–168) to the fourteenth, as well as Bernadette Brooten’s *Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (1996), which, although more nuanced than Boswell’s study, nonetheless posits a lesbian identity in antiquity. Also continuist in inclination is the trajectory of queer biblical criticism epitomized by *Take Back the Word* (Goss and West 2000) and *QBC* (Guest et al. 2006), with its characteristic gesture of presenting the contemporary queer Christian with a parade of queer biblical forebears whose existence validates the former’s sexual identity and whose behavior provides models for his or her own behavior.

How else might queer historiography, or queer criticism, in biblical studies proceed? How might they navigate between “blanket alteritism” (Dinshaw 1999: 34), on the one hand, and blanket continuism, on the other? Dinshaw calls for “partial, affective connection, for community, for even a touch across time” (21). Dinshaw’s “touch across time” is a recurrent metaphor in her *Getting Medieval* (“this book turns out to be in many ways about touch” [39]), and one that has seized the imaginations of many scholars, including at least two scholars of New Testament and early Christianity (Castelli 2001; Marchal 2011b, 2018).

But with Dinshaw, we have also arrived at—or, more accurately, encounter as already underway—the affective turn in queer theory; for her “touch across time” is an “affective connection” with individuals and communities long dead (1999: 21; see also 35, 38, 137), in particular “between marginalized people now and then” (Dinshaw et al. 2007: 178). Just as queer theory’s involvement with temporality and historiography was already implicit in the catalyzing work of Foucault, so also was its involvement with affect—emotions, but also bodily sensations. Foucault wrote of the psychiatric medicalization of the sexual in the nineteenth century as productive of “intense sensations.” The power that “took charge of sexuality” then and made itself scrupulously attentive to it, “monitor[ing]” and “palpat[ing]” it incessantly, effected an unprecedented “sexual saturation” of the body (1978: 44–45). Queer affect would also be taken up by Eve Sedgwick, and her essay “Shame in the Cybernetic Fold,” coauthored with Adam Frank (1995), would become a foundational text for affect theory (see also Sedgwick 2003), which in the first decade of the current century would emerge as the preeminent new development in critical theory (see Clough and Halley 2007; Gregg and Seigworth 2010; for biblical applications, see Kotrosits 2012, 2015; Koosed and Moore 2014; Moore 2017: 15–59). Affect theory entailed a swerve from the poststructuralist obsession with language, which in queer theory took the form of a conception of sex and sexuality as discursive constructs, to a preoccupation with emotion and other associated states.

Dinshaw, then, was calling for, and modeling, a queer historiography that would entail an “affective connection,” a “touch across time,” with its temporally distant subjects. But it was Carla Freccero, arguably, who developed most fully a model for a queer affective historiography. The historical analyses contained in her book *Queer/Early/Modern* “proceed otherwise than according to... a presumed logic of the ‘done-ness’ of the past, since queer time is haunted by the persistence of affect and ethical imperatives in and across time” (2006: 5; see also Freccero 2007; and, for New Testament application, Moore 2017: 93–106). In a subsequent essay, Freccero notes, “what most resist[s] queering” in her own field of Renaissance studies is a certain “version of historicism” (2011: 17–18). If anything, this is even truer of biblical studies. Freccero’s challenge to her field (20–24), then, is also a challenge to ours. She calls us to recognize that our historiographical investments in the world(s) of earliest Christianity and the first Christian or proto-

Christian communities are inevitably infused with intense affective attachments and identifications, queer desires and fantasies; and rather than imagining that such nonrational elements can be exorcised from our historiographical practices, to acknowledge them instead, to allow ourselves to be openly haunted by them and by the long dead subjects who continue to make spectral and ethical claims on us from beyond the grave. Such a historiography might be styled a knowing continuism, a continuism strategically transgressive of the alteritist protocols of traditional historiographical propriety.

Such a historiography also comes to partial expression in biblical studies in Benjamin Dunning's *Specters of Paul* (2011), cannily continuist in its leanings (see especially 3–5). It comes to more thoroughgoing expression in Maia Kotrosits's *Rethinking Early Christian Identity* (2015), an altogether affective, frequently queer (see especially 47–83) experiment in historiography (see also Kotrosits 2012, 2014, 2018), as well as in Joseph Marchal's "'Making History' Queerly" (2011b), "Female Masculinity in Corinth?" (2014), and "How Soon Is (This Apocalypse) Now?" (2018), all of which refocus Pauline texts, especially 1 Corinthians 11, through the theories of queer temporality we have been considering. The reflections with which my essay concludes are my own improvisation on certain of Marchal's themes (see also Marchal in this volume).

Coda: Queer Pasts

Spectrality is, in part, a mode of historicity: it describes the way... the past or the future presses upon us with a kind of insistence or demand, a demand to which we must somehow respond.

(Freccero 2006: 70)

Marchal refuses either to forget or let go of the Corinthian women prophets (1 Cor 11:2–16), despite repeated insistence from Pauline historical critics that Paul is the only reconstructable person in the Corinthian correspondence, the only human remains that can be raised, reenfleshed, touched across time—all of which has the effect of turning the Corinthian women prophets into unresurrectable remains, even an apophatic (non)entity. Who or what do we touch, who or what do we know, when we reach out across the vast temporal gulf that separates us from the Corinthian women prophets, a gulf filled to overflowing with decomposed human remains?

We do touch someone or something. The Corinthian women prophets, although situated in the dim, distant past and ostensibly dead—buried in Paul's letter, entombed within it—refuse obliteration, refuse to be forgotten, refuse even to lie still. "There is no male and female" (Gal 3:28; cf. 1 Cor 12:13), they intone queerly, silently, and insistently through a gestural language that has them removing their veils repeatedly so as to shave their heads (1 Cor 11:5–6) while Paul looks on in horror. These long dead and otherwise forgotten women haunt Paul's letter.

But Paul is also haunted by another specter. This is the unexorcisable ghost of a certain condemned criminal who was executed gruesomely in the past and is now, through a queer spatiotemporal paradox, somehow returning to Paul and the Corinthians from the future with tremendous velocity: he is coming back, he is almost here. "Our Lord, come!" exclaims Paul (1 Cor 16:22), trembling with ecstatic anticipation. But this spectral savior has already been here even since he left. He appeared to Peter, to James, to the twelve, to the five hundred. "Last of all," claims Paul, "as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me" (15:8). The hauntology that is both Pauline theology and Pauline historiography: Jesus haunts Paul, Jesus and Paul haunt us, we haunt Paul, those of us who do, skulking obsessively in his letters, their hidden alleyways more than their public thoroughfares, seeking to catch glimpses of the apostle as he goes about his business, to put flesh on his still insubstantial form by becoming disembodied witnesses of his world. For queer historiographic hauntology is reciprocal: it entails "a willingness both to be haunted and to become ghostly" (Freccero 2011: 21). We commune with the dead by becoming like the dead, and we resurrect the dead as we do so.

Althaus-Reid, Marcella. 2000. *Indecent Theology: Theological Perversions in Sex, Gender, and Politics*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Althaus-Reid, Marcella. 2003. *The Queer God*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Althaus-Reid, Marcella. 2006. "Mark." In Guest et al., *The Queer Bible Commentary*, 517–525.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 2007. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Spinster/Aunt Lute.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Bohache, Thomas. 2000. "'To Cut or Not to Cut': Is Compulsory Heterosexuality a Prerequisite for Christianity?" In Goss and West, *Take Back the Word*, 227–239.

Bohache, Thomas. 2006. "Matthew." In Guest et al., *The Queer Bible Commentary*, 487–516.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Boswell, John. 1980. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Brooten, Bernadette J. 1996. *Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Burke, Sean D. 2011. "Queering Early Christian Discourse: The Ethiopian Eunuch." In Hornsby and Stone, *Bible Trouble*, 175–190.

Burke, Sean D. 2013. *Queering the Ethiopian Eunuch: Strategies of Ambiguity in Acts*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Butler, Judith. 1991. "Imitation and Gender Insubordination." In *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories*, edited by Diana Fuss, 13–31. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. 2004. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Butler, Judith. 2006. "Afterword." In *Bodily Citations: Religion and Judith Butler*, edited by Ellen T. Armour and Susan M. St. Ville, 276–291. New York: Columbia University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Castelli, Elizabeth A., ed. 2001. "History's Queer Touch: A Forum on Carolyn Dinshaw's *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern*." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10: 165–212.

Chauncy, George. 1994. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890–1940*. New York: Basic Books.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Clough, Patricia Ticineto, with Jean Halley, eds. 2007. *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Cohen, Cathy J. 1997. "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?" *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 3: 437–465. Reprinted in Johnson and Henderson 2005: 21–51.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

De Lauretis, Teresa. 1991. "Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities: An Introduction." *differences* 3: iii–xviii.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Dinshaw, Carolyn. 1999. *Getting Medieval: Sexualities and Communities, Pre- and Postmodern*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Dinshaw, Carolyn. 2012. *How Soon Is Now? Medieval Texts, Amateur Readers, and the Queerness of Time*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

- p. 112 Dinshaw, Carolyn, Lee Edelman, Roderick A. Ferguson, Carla Freccero, Elizabeth Freeman, Judith Halberstam, et al. 2007. "Theorizing Queer Temporalities: A Roundtable Discussion." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 13: 177–195.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Dunning, Benjamin H. 2011. *Specters of Paul: Sexual Difference in Early Christian Thought*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Edelman, Lee. 2004. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Eng, David L., Judith Halberstam, and José Esteban Muñoz, eds. 2005. "What's Queer about Queer Studies Now?" *Social Text* 23, nos. 3–4.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Ferguson, Roderick A. 2003. *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality, Volume One: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books. French original 1976.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Foucault, Michel. 1985. *The History of Sexuality, Volume Two: The Use of Pleasure*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books. French original 1984.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Foucault, Michel. 1986. *The History of Sexuality, Volume Three: The Care of the Self*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books. French original 1984.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Fradenburg, Louise, and Carla Freccero. 1996. "Introduction: Caxton, Foucault, and the Pleasures of History." In *Premodern Sexualities*, edited by Louise Fradenburg and Carla Freccero, xiii–xxiv. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Freccero, Carla. 2006. *Queer/Early/Modern*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Freccero, Carla. 2007. "Queer Spectrality: Haunting the Past." In *A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies*, edited by George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry, 194–213. Oxford: Blackwell.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Freccero, Carla. 2011. "Queer Times." In Halley and Parker, *After Sex?*, 17–26.

Freeman, Elizabeth. 2010. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goldberg, Jonathan, and Madhavi Menon. 2005. "Queering History." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 120: 1608–1617.

Goss, Robert E. 1993. *Jesus ACTED UP: A Gay and Lesbian Manifesto*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goss, Robert E. 2000. "The Beloved Disciple: A Queer Bereavement Narrative in a Time of AIDS." In Goss and West, *Take Back the Word*, 206–218.

Goss, Robert E. 2002. *Queering Christ: Beyond Jesus Acted Up*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goss, Robert E. 2006a. "John." In Guest et al., *The Queer Bible Commentary*, 548–565.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goss, Robert E. 2006b. "Luke." In Guest et al., *The Queer Bible Commentary*, 526–547.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Goss, Robert E., and Mona West, eds. 2000. *Take Back the Word: A Queer Reading of the Bible*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Gregg, Melissa, and Gregory J. Seigworth, eds. 2010. *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Guest, Deryn, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bohache, eds. 2006. *The Queer Bible Commentary*. London: SCM Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Halberstam, Judith. 2005. *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives*. New York: New York University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Halley, Janet, and Andrew Parker, eds. 2011a. *After Sex? On Writing since Queer Theory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Halley, Janet, and Andrew Parker. 2011b. "Introduction." In Halley and Parker, *After Sex?*, 1–14.

p. 113 Halperin, David M. 2003. "The Normalization of Queer Theory." *Journal of Homosexuality* 45: 339–343.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Havea, Jione. 2011. "Lazarus Troubles." In Hornsby and Stone, *Bible Trouble*, 157–174.

Henning, Meghan. 2011. "In Sickness and in Health: Ancient 'Rituals of Truth' in the Greco-Roman World and 1 Peter." In *Disability Studies and Biblical Literature*, edited by Jeremy Schipper and Candida R. Moss, 185–204. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hester, J. David. 2005. "Eunuchs and the Post-Gender Jesus: Matthew 19.12 and Transgressive Sexualities." *JSNT* 28: 13–40.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Hoke, James N. 2018. "Unbinding Imperial Time: Chrononormativity and Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *Sexual Disorientations: Queer Temporalities, Affects, Theologies*, edited by Kent L. Brintnall, Joseph A. Marchal, and Stephen D. Moore, 68–89. New York: Fordham University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hornsby, Teresa J. 2006. "The Annoying Woman: Biblical Scholarship after Judith Butler." In *Bodily Citations: Religion and Judith Butler*, edited by Ellen T. Armour and Susan M. St. Ville, 71–89. New York: Columbia University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hornsby, Teresa J., and Ken Stone. 2011a. "Already Queer: A Preface." In Hornsby and Stone, *Bible Trouble*, ix–xiv.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Hornsby, Teresa J., and Ken Stone, eds. 2011b. *Bible Trouble: Queer Reading at the Boundaries of Biblical Scholarship*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Huber, Lynn R. 2013. *Thinking and Seeing with Women in Revelation*. New York: Bloomsbury.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Jennings, Theodore W., Jr. 2003. *The Man Jesus Loved: Homoerotic Narratives from the New Testament*. Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Jennings, Theodore W., Jr., and Tat-siong Benny Liew. 2004. "Mistaken Identities but Model Faith: Rereading the Centurion, the Chap, and the Christ." *JBL* 123: 467–494.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Johnson, E. Patrick, and Mae G. Henderson, eds. 2005. *Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Kafer, Alison. 2003. "Compulsory Bodies: Reflections on Heterosexuality and Able-Bodiedness." *Journal of Women's History* 15: 77–89.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Kafer, Alison. 2013. *Feminist Queer Crip*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Koosed, Jennifer L., and Stephen D. Moore, eds. 2014. "Affect Theory and the Bible." *BibInt* 22, nos. 4–5.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Kotrosits, Maia. 2012. "Romance and Danger at Nag Hammadi." *The Bible and Critical Theory* 8: 29–52.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Kotrosits, Maia. 2014. "The Queer Life of Christian Exceptionalism." *Culture and Religion* 15: 158–165.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Kotrosits, Maia. 2015. *Rethinking Early Christian Identity: Affect, Violence, and Belonging*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Kotrosits, Maia. 2018. "Queer Persistence: On Death, History, and Longing for Endings." In *Sexual Disorientations: Queer Temporalities, Affects, Theologies*, edited by Kent L. Brintnall, Joseph A. Marchal, and Stephen D. Moore, 133–144. New York: Fordham University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Liew, Tat-siong Benny. 2009. "Queering Closets and Perverting Desires: Cross-Examining John's Engendering and Transgendering Word across Different Worlds." In *They Were All Together in One Place? Toward Minority Biblical Criticism*, edited by Randall C. Bailey, Tat-siong Benny Liew, and Fernando F. Segovia, 251–288. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Loader, William. 2012. *The New Testament on Sexuality*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

p. 114 Loader, William. 2013. *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Lorde, Audre. 1984a. "Age, Race, Class, and Sex: Women Redefining Difference." In *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, 114–123. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Lorde, Audre. 1984b. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." In *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, 110–113. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Marchal, Joseph A. 2011a. "The Corinthian Women Prophets and Trans Activism: Rethinking Canonical Gender Claims." In Hornsby and Stone, *Bible Trouble*, 223–246.

Marchal, Joseph A. 2011b. "'Making History' Queerly: Touches across Time through a Biblical Behind." *BibInt* 19: 373–395.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Marchal, Joseph A. 2012. "Queer Approaches: Improper Relations with Pauline Letters." In *Studying Paul's Letters: Contemporary Perspectives and Methods*, edited by Joseph A. Marchal, 209–228. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Marchal, Joseph A. 2014. "Female Masculinity in Corinth? Bodily Citations and the Drag of History." *Neot* 48: 93–113.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Marchal, Joseph A. 2018. "How Soon Is (This Apocalypse) Now? Queer Velocities after a Corinthian Already and a Pauline Not Yet." In *Sexual Disorientations: Queer Temporalities, Affects, Theologies*, edited by Kent L. Brintnall, Joseph A. Marchal, and Stephen D. Moore, 45–67. New York: Fordham University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Martin, Dale B. 1995. "Heterosexism and the Interpretation of Romans 1:18–32." *BibInt* 3: 332–355. Reprinted in Martin 2006: 51–64.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Martin, Dale B. 2006. *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Martin, James. 2000. "'And Then He Kissed Me': An Easter Love Story." In Goss and West, *Take Back the Word*, 219–226.

McRuer, Robert. 2006. *Crip Theory: Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability*. New York: New York University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

McRuer, Robert, and Anna Mollow, eds. 2012. *Sex and Disability*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Menéndez-Antuña, Luis. 2018. *Thinking Sex with the Great Whore: Deviant Sexualities and Empire in the Book of Revelation*. New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Moore, Stephen D. 2001. *God's Beauty Parlor: And Other Queer Spaces in and around the Bible*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Moore, Stephen D. 2009. "Metonymies of Empire: Sexual Humiliation and Gender Masquerade in the Book of Revelation." In *Postcolonial Interventions: Essays in Honor of R. S. Sugirtharajah*, edited by Tat-siong Benny Liew, 71–97. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Moore, Stephen D. 2013. "The Dog-Woman of Canaan, and Other Animal Tales in the Gospel of Matthew." In *Soundings in Cultural Criticism: Perspectives and Methods in Culture, Power, and Identity in New Testament Interpretation*, edited by Francisco Lozada Jr. and Greg Carey, 57–71. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Moore, Stephen D. 2014. *Untold Tales from the Book of Revelation: Sex and Gender, Empire and Ecology*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Moore, Stephen D. 2017. *Gospel Jesuses and Other Nonhumans: Biblical Criticism Post-Poststructuralism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Muñoz, José Esteban. 1999. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

- p. 115 Perkins, Benjamin. 2000. "Coming Out, Lazarus's and Our Own: Queer Reflections of a Psychospiritual, Political Journey." In Goss and West, *Take Back the Word*, 196–205.

Pippin, Tina, and J. Michael Clark. 2006. "Revelation/Apocalypse." In Guest et al., *The Queer Bible Commentary*, 753–768.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Punt, Jeremy. 2007. "Sex and Gender, and Liminality in Biblical Texts: Venturing into Postcolonial, Queer Biblical Interpretation." *Neot* 41: 382–398.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Punt, Jeremy. 2010. "Power and Liminality, Sex and Gender, and Gal 3:28: A Postcolonial, Queer Reading of an Influential Text." *Neot* 44: 140–66.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Punt, Jeremy. 2011. "Queer Theory, Postcolonial Theory, and Biblical Interpretation: A Preliminary Exploration of Some Intersections." In Hornsby and Stone, *Bible Trouble*, 321–342.

Queer Nation. 1990. "Queers Read This." <http://www.qrd.org/qrd/misc/text/queers.read.this>.

[WorldCat](#)

Rand, Erin J. 2014. *Reclaiming Queer: Activist and Academic Rhetorics of Resistance*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Rich, Adrienne. 1980. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Experience." *Signs* 5: 631–660.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Richardson, Samuel. 1902. *Pamela; or Virtue Rewarded*. London: Chapman and Hall. Originally published 1742.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Rubin, Gayle S. 1984. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality." In *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, edited by Carole S. Vance, 267–319. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Runions, Erin. 2008. "Queering the Beast: The Antichrist's Gay Wedding." In *Queering the Non-Human*, edited by Noreen Giffney and Myra Hird, 97–110. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Runions, Erin. 2014. *The Babylon Complex: Theopolitical Fantasies of War, Sex, and Sovereignty*. New York: Fordham University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1990. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1993. *Tendencies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 2003. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 2008. "Preface to the 2008 Edition." In *Epistemology of the Closet*, 2nd ed., xiii–xviii. Berkeley: University of California Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky, and Adam Frank. 1995. "Shame in the Cybernetic Fold: Reading Silvan Tomkins." In *Shame and Its Sisters: A Silvan Tomkins Reader*, edited by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Adam Frank, 1–28. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. Reprinted in Sedgwick 2003: 93–122.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Stuart, Elizabeth. 1995. *Just Good Friends: Towards a Lesbian and Gay Theology of Relationships*. New York: Mowbray.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Thomas, Eric A. 2018. "The Futures Outside: Apocalyptic Epilogue Unveiled as Africana Queer Prologue." In *Sexual Disorientations: Queer Temporalities, Affects, Theologies*, edited by Kent L. Brintnall, Joseph A. Marchal, and Stephen D. Moore, 90–112. New York: Fordham University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Townsley, Gillian. 2006. "Gender Trouble in Corinth: Que(e)rying Constructs of Gender in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16." *The Bible and Critical Theory* 2: 17.1–17.14.

Townsley, Gillian. 2011. "The Straight Mind in Corinth: Problematizing Categories and Ideologies of Gender in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16." In Hornsby and Stone, *Bible Trouble*, 247–282.

Townsley, Gillian. 2017. *The Straight Mind in Corinth: Queer Readings across 1 Corinthians 11:2–16*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

p. 116 Traub, Valerie. 2013. "The New Unhistoricism in Queer Studies." *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 128: 21–39.

[Google Scholar](#) [WorldCat](#)

Villalobos, Manuel. 2011. "Bodies *Del Otro Lado* Finding Life and Hope in the Borderland: Gloria Anzaldúa, the Ethiopian Eunuch of Acts 8:26–40, y Yo." In Hornsby and Stone, *Bible Trouble*, 191–222.

Villalobos Mendoza, Manuel. 2012. *Abject Bodies in the Gospel of Mark*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Warner, Michael. 1993. "Introduction." In *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, edited by Michael Warner, vii–xxxi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Warner, Michael. 1999. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

West, Mona. 2003. "The Raising of Lazarus: A Lesbian Coming Out Story." In *A Feminist Companion to John*, Vol. 1, edited by Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Blickenstaff, 143–158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wilson, Nancy L. 1995. *Our Tribe: Queer Folks, God, Jesus, and the Bible*. New York: HarperCollins.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wilson, Nancy L. 2013. *Outing the Bible: Queer Folks, God, Jesus, and the Christian Scriptures*. Indianapolis, IN: LifeJourney Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wittig, Monique. 1992a. *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*. Boston: Beacon Press.

[Google Scholar](#) [Google Preview](#) [WorldCat](#) [COPAC](#)

Wittig, Monique. 1992b. "One Is Not Born a Woman." In Wittig, *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*, 9–20. Originally published 1981.

Wittig, Monique. 1992c. "The Straight Mind." In Wittig, *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*, 21–32. Originally published 1980.