

“Why the Disagreement over the Biblical Witness on Homosexual Practice? A Response to Myers and Scanzoni, *What God Has Joined Together?*”

by Robert A. J. Gagnon

Associate Professor of New Testament, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA 15206-2596

in

***Reformed Review* 59.1 (Autumn 2005): 19-130**

Available online at <http://www.westernsem.edu/Brix?pageID=17236>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Inverted Hermeneutical Scales	19
II. The Difficulty in Neutralizing Scripture for a Pro-Homosex Agenda	25
A. Ignoring Opposing Arguments and Writings	26
B. The Nature Argument	30
1. A misrepresentation of my argument	30
2. Articulating the nature argument	34
3. The effect of sexual sameness on male homosexual promiscuity	35
4. Counterarguments by Myers and Scanzoni against the nature argument	40
a. Denigration of singleness?	40
b. No linkage with other forms of sexual immorality	41
(1) Polyamory	41
(2) Incest	44
(3) Dismissing formal criteria	45
(4) Which is the more foundational violation?	45
c. Misogyny as the underlying motivation?	45
C. The Scripture Argument: The Old Testament Witness	46
1. Sodom: Only indicting rape?	46
a. Five reasons for seeing an indictment of male-male intercourse	47
(1) The ancient Near Eastern context	47
(2) Texts by the same narrator	47
(a) The story of the creation of woman in Gen 2:21-24	47
(b) The story of Ham’s act in Gen 9:20-27	47
(3) The Deuteronomistic parallel in context	48
(4) Other ancient Israelite texts	49

(5) History of interpretation	
(a) Ezekiel	49
(b) Jude 7 and 2 Peter 2:6-7, 10	49
b. What's orientation got to do with it?	50
2. The prohibitions in Lev 18:22 and 20:13: Outdated purity legislation?	50
a. Seven reasons for their contemporary relevance	51
(1) Part of an interconnected Old Testament witness	51
(2) Grouped with incest, adultery, bestiality	51
(3) A first-tier sexual offense	51
(4) Framed absolutely	52
(5) Contains the marks of moral impurity	52
(6) Adopts a creation/nature model	52
(7) Appropriated by the New Testament	53
b. Bad analogies for irrelevance	53
(1) Cloth mixtures	53
(2) Intercourse with a menstruant	53
D. The Scripture Argument: The New Testament Witness	54
1. A consensus view of the New Testament	54
2. Jesus' view: Silence as approval or indifference?	56
a. Did Jesus not pick up on sexual differentiation in Gen 1:27 and 2:24?	56
b. Ten reasons for assuming Jesus' opposition to homosexual practice	57
[Sayings of Jesus]	
(1) Jesus' interpretation of Gen 1:27 and 2:24	57
(2) Defilement from desires for various kinds of <i>porneia</i>	57
(3) The adultery commandment as heading for other sex laws	57
(4) Singling out Sodom	57
(5) Not giving "what is holy to the dogs"	58
[Contextual factors]	
(6) Jesus' general view of the law of Moses	58
(7) Jesus' approach to sexual ethics	58
(8) Jesus and John the Baptist	58
(9) The univocal stance of early Judaism	58
(10) The univocal stance of the early church	59
c. Problems with the silence/love argument	59
(1) The hermeneutical significance of Jesus' "silence," in context	59
(2) Jesus and judgment	60
(3) Jesus and the love commandment	60
(4) Loving outreach as recovery for obedience	61

3. Paul <i>versus</i> the “new knowledge” arguments	62
a. Trends in the use of new knowledge arguments	64
b. Tension between two or more new knowledge arguments	65
c. The case against the exploitation argument	65
(1) Intertextual echoes to the creation texts in Rom 1:23-27 and 1 Cor 6:9-20	65
(2) The nature argument in Rom 1:26-27	67
(3) Exchange, mutuality, and lesbianism in Rom 1:26-27	70
(4) “Soft men” and “men who lie with a male” (1 Cor 6:9) in context	72
(5) Caring homosexuality and universal critiques in Greece and Rome	73
Conclusion	75
d. The case against the orientation argument	77
(1) Ancient sexual orientation theories	77
(2) Evidence from Paul’s letters in context	77
(3) Paul’s compatible understanding of sin	78
(4) The disconnection between orientation and morality in ancient context	78
e. The case against the misogyny argument	80
(1) Ignoring concerns for structural compatibility	80
(2) Greco-Roman structural congruity arguments	80
(3) Absoluteness and the priority of gender over status	80
(4) Women’s liberation as a stimulus for opposing all male homosexual unions	81
(5) An absurd corollary: Jesus and scripture authors as the biggest misogynists	81
f. Addendum: Does Paul reject judgment of homosexual practice?	83
E. Is Homosexual Practice the Diet and Circumcision Issue of Today?	86
1. Romans 14:1-15:13: A matter of indifference like diet?	86
2. Acts 10, circumcision, and the Gentile inclusion analogy	88
a. Ignores creation grounding	88
b. Confuses a Jewish ritual prescription . . . with a universal sexual proscription. . .	88
c. Confuses persons and behaviors	89
d. Confuses very different degrees of scriptural support	89
e. Overlooks limitations of a Spirit-possession/fruit-bearing test	89
f. Sidesteps the reason for the proscription	90
g. Confuses ethnicity and “sexual orientation”	90

F. The Use of Other Analogies	90
1. Slavery	92
2. Women in ministry	93
3. Divorce and remarriage	94
a. Violation of structural prerequisites as greater offenses	94
b. Why remarriages are not like homosexual practice	94
c. Working to end the cycle of both divorce/remarriage and homosexual practice	95
4. Other attempted marriage analogies	95
5. Better analogies: “Responsible” incest, polyamory, and pedosexuality	98
III. Concluding Observations	101
A. Conclusions from the Scripture Argument	101
B. Manipulative Rhetoric?	103
1. Assuring readers of their faithfulness on “the big-ticket items”	104
2. Repeated calls to humility regarding appeals to Scripture	106
3. This book “is not about winning arguments”	109
4. Claiming a “third way” that “bridges the divide” and is “win-win”	110
Conclusion	113
C. The Science Side	114
1. The shape of Myers’ discussion of science	114
2. What if Myers and Scanzoni got everything they want from science?	116
3. Can culture affect the incidence of homosexuality in a population?	120
a. Social and demographic variables	120
b. Early childhood experiences	121
c. Studies of identical twins	122
d. No change in rates?	123
e. Adoption	123
f. The example of New Guinea tribes	124
4. Why “gay marriage” is not good for society	125
a. Overlooking the core structural problem	125
b. Misunderstanding the root cause for measurable harm	126
c. Eroding resistance to other sexually deviant behaviors	127
d. Misunderstanding the data to date	127
e. Encouraging an increase in homosexuality	129
f. Encouraging civil and religious intolerance	129
Conclusion	130