

“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 The prohibitions in Lev 18:22 and 20:13: Outdated purity legislation?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 |

A Response to Myers and Scanzoni, What God Has Joined Together? Robert a. j. gagnon. Why is the debate in the church about homosexual practice so difficult to talk about, to do scholarship about, and, for some, to decide about? Why have we reached a seeming impasse? To make this point, we will examine the attempt to circumvent the biblical witness in the 2005 book by David G. Myers and Letha Dawson Scanzoni, What God Has Joined Together? A Christian Case for Gay Marriage.¹ Before we do that, however, we will explore how proponents and opponents of homosexual unions have different hermeneutical "eograduated scales," or ranked interests, for their views. I. Inverted Hermeneutical Scales². This has been interpreted as a reference to homosexuality by some and to the sexual lust of mortals after angels by others.^[5] Jewish writers Philo (d. A.D. 50) and Josephus (37 " c. 100) were the first reported individuals to assert unambiguously that homosexuality was among the sins of Sodom.^[10] By the end of the 1st century A.D., Jews commonly identified the sin of Sodom with homosexual practices.^[12] Scholars, noting that Romans 1:18"32 represents an exception in the book of Romans as a whole and uses vocabulary elsewhere not seen in Paul's letters, have for decades puzzled over the passage.^{[24][25]} homosexual activity.^[41] Particulars of Boswell's arguments are rejected by several Therefore what God has joined together, let no one separate." Homosexuals will say that they are born the way they are, that it is a genetic orientation, and since they didn't choose it, it cannot be wrong. If that is the case, then why do identical twins, with identical genetics, not have uniformity of sexual orientation? This proves it is not just genetic.⁵ But let's not stop there. If not, then why the double standard? Would it then be okay for such a person to want laws passed to protect his "homosexuality aversion orientation"? Or, is only the homosexual orientation worthy of protection? What should be the Christian's response to the Homosexual? Just because someone is a homosexual, does not mean that we persecute them, call them names, sue them for not agreeing with us, or get laws passed to silence them.