

WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY ON HOMOSEXUAL PRACTICE?

by Tony Higton

This booklet stands on its own but is also useful for those leading a group using our other publication *Homosexuality and the Church: A Study Guide*, a six-section course which relates to the 1991 Bishops' Statement *Issues in Human Sexuality*.

Introduction

Sexuality is created by God and is an aspect of creation which God called “very good”.ⁱ It is a pure gift of God.ⁱⁱ He intends (and commands) human beings to enjoy sexual intercourse in marriage for the purposes of fulfilment, partnership and procreation.ⁱⁱⁱ The *Song of Solomon* is a book which exults in the beauty of erotic love and shows that God intends sexual relationships to be enjoyable, not simply a means of procreation. Married couples are not to deprive each other of sexual relations except temporarily for special reasons and by mutual consent.^{iv}

However, because sexuality involves powerful emotions and may be misused, in Scripture God provides principles for sexual relationships. These principles are for the welfare of human beings. A misuse of God’s wonderful gift of sexuality leads to much human heartache: rejection, betrayal, desertion, violation, trauma, disease, unwanted pregnancy outside marriage and so on. The family (which in biblical times would normally have been the extended family) is the basic unit of human society. It is the divinely ordained and therefore most beneficial context for the nurture of children. A loving, united mother and father not only best cope with the demands of family life but they afford the children models of both male and female which is important for children of both sexes. This is not to deny that many lone parents make a very good job of bringing up children. But the norm and ideal is a family led by a loving married couple.

In Scripture we see an honest portrayal of all types of human weakness including various sexual sins. But God upholds the ideal of heterosexual marriage and views sexual relations outside heterosexual marriage as not only harming individuals but as undermining the family and therefore society. So, through OT law, Jesus and Paul, he rules them out. It is in this context, as we shall see, that there is disapproval of homosexual practice.

We look first at the Old Testament. Since the regulation of sexual relations in marriage is a creation ordinance we begin with the relevant teaching in the creation narratives.

The Old Testament

Creation Narratives

Whatever symbolism there is in the first two chapters of Genesis does not alter the fact that they are fundamental theological statements about the relationship between God and creation, between God and humanity; between humanity and creation and between human beings.

The most fundamental contradiction of the idea that homosexual practice is acceptable is found in these narratives. God creates humanity male and female. The theology of Genesis teaches that, in the area of sexuality, human beings are created by God for heterosexual relations.^v As we shall see, Paul confirms this in Romans 1 by affirming that heterosexual relations are natural, i.e. in accordance with the creation order. It also seems a clear inference from the physiological make-up of human beings that they are designed for heterosexual intercourse but not for homosexual (in the sense of anal) intercourse (see Appendix 2 on Physiology and Heterosexuality).

Immediately after God created humanity male and female^{vi} he told them to "be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth." Hence Genesis teaches that procreation is an important purpose of sexuality.

Another important purpose of sexuality is companionship. It is surely instructive that when God created a suitable companion for lonely Adam, he created woman, not another man. This may seem like a superficial debating point but it is not. Obviously we know that God was providing the possibility of procreation which would both perpetuate the race and further overcome loneliness. But the rib story surely teaches that man and woman belong together and only in joy of heterosexual intercourse is that original unity restored. The heterosexual couple become one flesh again. This is not possible for a homosexual couple, whatever emotional and sexual pleasure they experience. The full sexual complementarity which was intended for human beings was provided by God in the creation of a man and woman. The mystery of the one-flesh union is deeper than the physical sex act.

Sexual Union and Procreation

One of the fundamental purposes of sexual union is procreation:

1. God is clearly concerned with the perpetuation of creation, hence reproduction is inherent within living creatures.^{vii}
2. Central to sexual intercourse is the production and transfer of sperm, the seed of new life. Procreation can therefore not be seen as anything other than central (though not exclusively so) to sexual intercourse.
3. Genesis 1:28 is not only about dominion. Rather it is the Creator forming co-creators who preserve creation both by procreation and dominion. In this they mirror the Creator in terms of creative activity and beneficial lordship.

Speaking of the Genesis creation narratives, von Rad writes: "One must say, in fact, that in this statement [v.24] the entire narrative so far arrives at the primary purpose toward which it was oriented from the beginning. This shows what is actually intended. The story is quite aetiological, i.e., it was told to answer a quite definite question. A fact needs explanation, namely, the extremely powerful drive of the sexes to each other. Whence comes this love 'strong as death' (S. of Sol. 8.6) and stronger than the tie to one's own parents, whence this inner clinging to each other, this drive toward each other which does not rest until it again becomes one flesh in the child? It comes from the fact that God took woman from man, that they actually were originally *one* flesh. Therefore they must come together again and thus by destiny belong to each other."^{viii}

David Wright says: "The Bible ... starts with heterosexuality - and assumes it is the God-given norm throughout. The sexuality which God's Word in scripture invites us to celebrate is from first to last the distinct sexual identities of male and female created for each other. The failure to begin where the Bible begins is responsible for much of the confusion abroad today. The Bible knows nothing of an undifferentiated, indeterminate sexuality, waiting, so to speak, to fix its sense of direction, its orientation ..."^{ix}

There are other OT passages which deal explicitly with homosexuality. Some of them are more important than others but we shall examine each of them. The two most relevant and important passages are Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13

OT passages explicitly about homosexuality

[Quotations from the NIV]

The first and most famous of these is the story of Sodom. It is not, however, the most helpful or relevant passage as it is a case of attempted homosexual rape. Two angelic messengers in human form arrived at Lot's house and began to enjoy his hospitality. Later the men of the city gather outside his door with evil intent.

1. Genesis 19:5 "They called to Lot, 'Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us so that we can have sex with them.'"

The story continues with the rape of Lot's daughter and divine judgment upon the men who were also intent on homosexual rape. Clearly, the sin of Sodom was not only homosexual practice and rape. It was also a grave breach of important rules of hospitality.

Some writers, both in the ancient and modern world, do not stress the homosexual nature of Sodom's sin. Ezekiel 16:49 associates the sin of Sodom with social injustice rather than sexual perversion. "Now this was the sin of your sister Sodom: She and her daughters were arrogant, overfed and unconcerned; they did not help the poor and needy." Von Rad comments: "Sodom was always the example of greatest depravity that one could think of in Israel, but the notion about the particular nature of its sin was not always the same."^x Also R K Harrison comments: "The Talmudic authorities placed little stress on a homosexual interpretation of Genesis 19:5, preferring instead to regard the Sodomites as having violated the normal canons of hospitality and justice."^{xi} Also Rom 1:27; 1 Cor 6:9 and 1 Tim. 1:10 all condemn homosexual practice without any reference to Sodom.

However Jude 7 does make the connection between Sodom and homosexual practice. And, according to Professor David Wright, Intertestamental Hellenistic Judaism highlighted the homosexual aspects of Sodom's sin.^{xii}

The connection is supported by the terms used in the story. "Have sex with them" is the Hebrew *yadah* ("know") which Gesenius translates as to "know a person carnally, of sexual intercourse ... man subj. and obj. (of sodomy)."^{xiii} However Derek Kidner^{xiv} refers to D Sherwin Bailey who denies that "know" in Genesis 19:5 and Judg. 19:22 has a sexual connotation.^{xv} Bailey based this view on the following:

Bailey's arguments

- a. Only 15 times in the OT does "know" have a sexual connotation. On over 900 occasions it does not.

Kidner replies: "Statistics are no substitute for contextual evidence (otherwise the rarer sense of a word would *never* seem probable), and in both passages the demand to 'know' guests is met by an offer in which the same word 'know' is used in its sexual sense (Gn.19:8 [where Lot's daughters are said not to have 'known' men] ; Jdg.19:25 [where the men 'knew', NIV 'raped' the Levite's concubine]). Even apart from this verbal conjunction it would be grotesquely inconsequent that Lot should reply to a demand for credentials by an offer of daughters."

- b. *Personal knowledge would require more than physical sexual experience.*

Kidner replies: "No-one suggests that in Judges 19:25 the men of Gibeah were gaining 'knowledge' of their victim in the sense of personal relationship, yet 'know' is the word used of them"

- c. Lot and the host in Judges 19 were sojourners. Perhaps they had exceeded their rights in receiving foreigners without their credentials being examined.

Kidner replies: Bailey "substitutes a trivial reason ('commotion...inhospitality') for a serious one, for the angels' decision. Apart from this, it is silenced by Jude 7, a pronouncement which Dr Bailey has to discount as belonging to a late stage of interpretation."

Dr Gordon Wenham concludes: "The sin of Sodom is not primarily homosexuality as such, but an assault on weak and helpless visitors who according to justice and tradition they ought rather to have protected (Ezek. 16:49). *Yet, having said this, undoubtedly the homosexual intentions of the inhabitants of Sodom adds a special piquancy to their crime.*"^{xvi}

Genesis records that "The men of Sodom were wicked and were sinning greatly against the LORD".^{xvii} "The LORD said, 'The outcry against Sodom and Gomorrah is so great and their sin so grievous'".^{xviii} So Sodom became a byword for grave sin.^{xix} It also became a byword for destructive divine judgment.^{xx}

Whatever the relevance of the Sodom story, the later Law is quite clear in its condemnation of all homosexual practice.

2. **Leviticus 18:22** "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable.

Some argue that the Leviticus passages are exclusively referring to a worship context. Canaanite worship included sacred prostitution or sexual orgies, heterosexual or homosexual. They argue that the passages are therefore irrelevant to "committed faithful homosexual relationships."

However the context does not really support this contention. True, the previous verse refers to child sacrifice in the worship of Molech.^{xxi} But the rest of the chapter is concerning unlawful sex relations in general, including adultery and incest which have no connection with worship. In the context of the whole chapter this verse is more naturally taken as a prohibition of homosexual practice in general, not only in connection with worship.

Dr David Wright comments on both this passage and Leviticus 20:13: "Although the context requires Israel to abstain from Canaanite cultic practices, nothing suggests that male homosexual intercourse was unacceptable solely because of these associations, any more than child sacrifice (Lev. 18:21) or bestiality (Lev. 20:15) would pass muster when detached from a Canaanite religious setting."^{xxii}

Others have argued that the passage refers to homosexual rape. But there is no qualification to the word "lie" (e.g. implying the use of force). Deut. 22: 22-25 shows that in heterosexual rape only the rapist would be executed. Here both parties are executed, which suggests it is referring to homosexual activity with mutual consent.

3. Leviticus 20:13 ``If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. They must be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads.

Again the context refers to child sacrifice in the worship of Molech. But, once more, the rest of the chapter is concerning unlawful sex relations in general, including adultery and incest which have no connection with worship.

R K Harrison writes: "Sacro-homosexual practices and female prostitution within the context of the cultus was probably well-established throughout the ancient Near East long before the Israelites occupied Canaan. Homosexuality of a non-religious variety is poorly documented in Mesopotamian texts; and in general Mesopotamian legislation paid little attention to any kind of homosexuality, although the Middle Assyrian laws prescribed castration for a convicted homosexual. The Hittites evidently did not prohibit homosexuality except where a man violated his son, an act which was regarded as a capital offence."

Harrison says: "Homosexuality was uniformly condemned in the Old Testament as *an abomination*, for which the punishment was death (Lv.20:13). It violated the natural order of sexual relationships, and catered to perverted lust rather than to procreation of the species."^{xxiii}

Michael Vasey, who seeks to justify committed, faithful homosexual relationships, writes about the Leviticus passages: "Attempts to treat the commands of the biblical law codes as directly applicable today ignore the fact that they have to be read through four different filters: they arose at a particular period in Israel's history and were not treated as immutable when social conditions changed [a note here refers to Lev 20:10 cf John 8:5]; they are presented to us as part of larger theological works and should not be seen simply as laws but as elements within the total message of the book; their context is a particular stage in God's unfolding dealings with people.... This law is set within a complex symbolic system that gives a clear symbolic meaning to bodily discharges and is concerned to preserve both the stability of a clan-based society and the distinctness of Israel from the surrounding nations."^{xxiv}

However, true though these contextual statements may be, they do not alter the fact that homosexual practice is condemned. The reference to the contrast between Lev 20:10 and John 8:5, presumably the best that Vasey could find, does not support his position.

Lev 20:10 states: "If a man commits adultery with another man's wife-- with the wife of his neighbour-- both the adulterer and the adulteress must be put to death." Jesus comments in John 8:5 "In the Law Moses commanded us to stone such women. Now what do you say?" Of course, Jesus does not uphold the death penalty in the case of the woman caught in adultery. But two points must be remembered:

- a. Jesus only changes the penalty, not the definition of sin. In verses 10-11, conveniently omitted by Vasey, Jesus says to the woman, "Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you?" "No one, sir," she said. "Then neither do I condemn you," Jesus declared. "Go now and leave your life of sin."

- b. Jesus has the authority to change the law's penalty.

David Atkinson writes: "It is ... to be noted that the death penalty is prescribed for homosexual offence. This penalty ... was prescribed for a range of crimes: premeditated murder, man-stealing, persistent disobedience to authorities and parents, adultery, homosexual offences, the worst forms of incest, false prophecy, profanation of the Sabbath, blasphemy, idolatry, magic and divination. Apart from incest and homosexuality, every other capital offence can be directly related to the law of the Decalogue. It would seem more than probable, therefore, that a primary factor in the seriousness with which incest and homosexual behaviour was viewed, was their contravention of the principle of the seventh commandment which upheld the sanctity of marriage."^{xxv}

The next two passages are about shrine prostitutes and rape.

4. Deuteronomy 23:17-18 "No Israelite man or woman is to become a shrine prostitute. You must not bring the earnings of a female prostitute or of a male prostitute [dog] into the house of the Lord your God to pay any vow, because the Lord your God detests them both."

"Shrine prostitute" is the Hebrew *kadesh* which Gesenius translates "temple-prostitute (man)."^{xxvi} "Male prostitute" is the Hebrew *celeb*. Gesenius translates it "dog ... applied, fig., to men, in contempt ...name given to male temple-prostitutes Dt 23:17."^{xxvii} Both the NIV and Harrison take "dog" here as male cultic prostitute. J A Thompson agrees and adds "The usage of the term *dog* is known outside the Old Testament."^{xxviii}

5. Judges 19:22 While they were enjoying themselves, some of the wicked men of the city surrounded the house. Pounding on the door, they shouted to the old man who owned the house, "Bring out the man who came to your house so we can have sex with him."

"Have sex with him" is the Hebrew *yadah* which Gesenius translates as in Gen. 19:5.^{xxix}

Some people claim there are passages in the OT where homosexual or lesbian relationships are accepted in ancient Israel, but, as we shall see, such claims are arguments from silence, examples of special pleading.

OT Passages some claim are relevant

1. Genesis 39:1ff. Some allege that Potiphar, an Egyptian official, had homosexual attraction to Joseph. R K Harrison comments: "Even the rabbinic scholars questioned the nature of the interest that Potiphar (described in Gn. 39:1 NEB as a 'eunuch') had in Joseph (*cf. Sotah 13b*)."^{xxx} However, there is no clear evidence and, even if there were, it adds nothing to the debate about Scripture's attitude towards homosexual practice.

2. Ruth. Some claim Naomi and Ruth had a lesbian relationship but there is no evidence for that.

3. David and Jonathan. Some claim David and Jonathan had a homosexual relationship, yet there is no evidence for that. The only information we have is of a strong friendship between the two men. The story does not require a homosexual interpretation. Such an interpretation is an argument from silence. What we can learn and celebrate is that it is possible for there to be very deep but non-sexual friendships between two men or two women.

Conclusion on OT Passages

The most important and helpful passages are the Creation Narratives and the relevant Levitical Law. These very clearly rule out all homosexual practice and, in the case of Leviticus, strongly condemn it. (Other passages are not so relevant in that Genesis 19 and Judges 19:22 refer to homosexual rape and Deuteronomy 23:17-18 refer to prostitution).

What do we say to those who refer us to other parts of Levitical law which are not relevant today, thereby claiming we can ignore Leviticus? They argue that OT passages on this subject were relevant to the theocracy of ancient Israel but not to us in our post-NT age. This is a strong argument and it is clear from the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pauline Epistles, for example, that the writers believed that Jesus in his person and saving work on the cross fulfilled the sacrificial law. There is also clear NT teaching that Gentile believers were not expected to keep the civil law (although there is much we can learn from it). However there is no evidence from the NT that the writers regarded the moral law as no longer relevant – rather the opposite (even though it is not a means of salvation). As an aspect of this it is quite clear from the NT that homosexual genital relationships are sinful.

The New Testament

The Gospels

There is no explicit reference to homosexual practice in the Gospels. Was Jesus silent about homosexuality? His condemnation of *πορνεία* (translated "sexual immorality") in Matt. 15:19; Mark 7:21 may have included homosexual practice. And he does refer to Sodom and Gomorrah as examples of judgment. But he makes no explicit reference to homosexuality. The explanation is probably that he was addressing a Jewish audience. Wenham comments: "Among Jews, at least after the exile, there seems to have been practically no homosexual activity by Jewish men. The later rabbis say that homosexuality is not a problem with Jews, so their rules about men associating with each other are quite relaxed compared with their ever-present worry of illicit male-female relations."^{xxxi}

When we turn to the Epistles we find clear teaching against homosexual practice.

The Epistles

One of the key passages is in Paul's introduction to his letter to the Romans.

1. Romans 1:23 "[They] exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles. 24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another ... 26 Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. 27 In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

a. Homosexual practice is a contradiction of the created order

The emphasis of this passage is that both female and male homosexual practice are contrary to nature. The context refers to creation and indicates that by the word "nature" Paul is referring to divine creation and its purpose. As Wright puts it: "'Nature' does not denote, atomistically, a particular individual's leanings or disposition but the constitutive order and function intended by God the creator for mankind and womankind."^{xxxiii} This passage can therefore hardly be limited to cultic prostitution or promiscuity. Rather it is describing the essential character of homosexual acts as contrary to nature. Similarly, condemnation of lesbianism, very unusual in ancient writers, confirms that it is homosexual activity in general which is being condemned.

As we have noted, in Romans 1 the context of Paul's remarks is creation. The verse immediately before his reference to "natural" and "unnatural" behaviour states: "They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served created things rather than the Creator-- who is forever praised. Amen."^{xxxiii} The immediate context therefore clearly indicates that his use of those words refers to the created order. The wider context confirms this.

David Atkinson writes: "...in biblical theology, 'natural' is used in a specific way. Professor O. M. T. O'Donovan rightly points out that for a Christian thinker, claims about 'nature' are not to be separated from the doctrine of Creation. To ask whether homosexuality is 'natural' is to ask whether God made it. 'While in one sense, everything that exists has been made by God, in another important sense, Christian theology distinguishes between what God created in the first instance, and what has happened subsequently' ... 'Whereas everything *created* by God is good, good without qualification, much of what he *allows*, though it serves his good ends, is in itself problematic or tragic."^{xxxiv}

I am absolutely convinced from the context that Paul is speaking of homosexual practice as contravening God's revealed creation order. But just suppose for a moment that Paul were using the word "unnatural" in a relative sense, this would not in itself justify homosexual behaviour on the part of those for whom it was (relatively) natural. After all, there are various undesirable weaknesses and behaviour patterns which are "natural" for some people, but are hardly justified morally.

b. The homosexual practice referred to includes fixed homosexual orientation

i. Not only bisexuality

David Atkinson writes: "... it would seem that within the Greek world, knowledge of an exclusively homosexual orientation (as one extreme of a spectrum of dispositions) was probable. Thus K. J. Dover refers to the Athenian court proceedings of 346 BC involving a certain Misgolas. He describes Misgolas as 'a distinguished citizen but a man of extraordinary enthusiasm for this activity (homosexual relations), who took Timarkhos home to live with him.'^{xxxv} The quotation comes from the testimony composed by Askhines for use in court for Misgolas. This would seem to indicate a very fixed disposition. Then there is the evidence of Agathon, 'an exceptionally good looking man who in his earlier years had been a paidika (the junior partner in a homosexual relationship) of Parsanias, and continued in this relationship well into adult life.' almost certainly an indication of some sort of settled homosexual partnership."

"Likewise Philo refers to those who 'habituate themselves' to the practice of homosexual acts, [*De Specialibus Legibus* 3.37-42, cf. also *De Vita Contemplativa* 59-63] so also Josephus indicates that homosexual behaviour had become a fixed habit for some. [cf. *Against Apion* 2.273-275] Clement of Alexandria, (3rd century) refers to the interpretation of Basildes on Jesus' words in Matt. 19:12 concerning those 'eunuchs who have been so from birth', that 'some men, from birth, have a natural aversion to a woman; and indeed those who are naturally so constituted do well not to marry.'^{xxxvi}

“It is likely therefore that Paul and his readers were not unaware of the fact that there were some people for whom homosexual intercourse was not simply a freely chosen alternative but a fixed preference or settled lifestyle.”^{xxxvii} All this militates against the suggestion that Paul merely condemned bisexuality.

ii. Not only pederasty

The NT does not support those who claim that the NT only condemns the predominant Greek form of homosexuality, namely pederasty.

a. It is noteworthy that Paul condemns lesbianism in Romans 1 and there is no parallel to pederasty in lesbianism. This strengthens the case for holding that he condemns homosexual practice in general, not just pederasty.

b. A further point is that Paul does not use any of the various Greek words referring to pederasty. In 1 Cor. 6:9 (cf. 1 Tim. 1:8-11) he uses *αρσενοκοιτης* a very general word for homosexuals. He avoids the use of more specific terms such as *παιδεραστης* (‘lover of boys’), *παιδοφθορος* (‘corrupter of boys’) or *αρρενομανης* (‘mad after males’).

iii. Not only promiscuity

Some claim that Rom. 1:27 may only be referring to “promiscuous, hedonistic homosexual abandonment” by its use of the phrase “inflamed with lust” (NIV). This is to read too much into the words. The word translated “lust” in the NIV, *orexei*, is translated by Bauer, Arndt & Gingrich as “desire” or “longing”. Even if one maintains the translation “lust” this need not merely refer to “promiscuous, hedonistic homosexual abandonment”. It could just as easily refer to strong sexual desire in any wrong context, including a committed, faithful homosexual relationship. The use of *orexei* therefore does not help the pro-homosexual case. [It is interesting that in 1 Cor. 7:8-9 Paul writes of the unmarried: “if they do not have self-control, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to be inflamed (*πυρρυσθαι*).” It seems unclear whether this means lust or merely a strong attraction. Either way the context is heterosexual and does not necessarily refer to promiscuity, but could refer to fornication].

iv. Linked to idolatry

Michael Vasey writes: “An approach to biblical interpretation called rhetorical criticism notes that the meaning of a passage often lies less in its content as ‘simply statement of truths’ and more in the role that it plays within a persuasive argument. Behind the argument of Romans 1:18-23 lies a conventional Jewish critique of Gentile society that sees sexual disorder as the outcome of idolatry.”^{xxxviii} It is true that this connection is often made and is indeed made in this passage, but that does not mean that the sexual act outside of marriage is only condemned when linked with idolatry. That is to misunderstand the logic of the passage. It is true that wrong behaviour is linked to wrong belief as a cause, but that does not imply that the same behaviour if linked to right belief is thereby vindicated.

Vasey continues, referring to Paul: “There is certainly an argument to be made that the man we know from his letters might be more at home today in gay rather than non-gay society. He shared Jesus’ non-familial emphasis and lifestyle (1 Cor 7:25-35, 9). He treated no person as inherently unclean. His letters show a quality of tenderness, open emotion and gentleness (cf. 2 Cor 10:1) that is far removed from the heterosexual masculinity of our culture. He was happy to use feminine imagery of his relationship with others (1 Thess 2:7-8). He had strong non-sexual relationships with women (Philippians 4:2; Rom 16). He had strongly emotional relationships with younger men (2 Tim 1:1-8; 2 Cor 2:13). One might add that he experienced ostracism and desertion by the church (2 Tim 1:15).”^{xxxix} My only comment on this is that for anyone to think that the man who wrote Romans chapter 1 could be at home in a gay society must be a case of special pleading.

2. 1 Corinthians 6:9 Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders .. will inherit the kingdom of God."

The NIV translates as "male prostitutes" the Greek word *μαλακος*. Arndt and Gingrich translate it as "soft, effeminate", esp. of catamites, men and boys who allow themselves to be misused homosexually.^{xl} Abbott Smith translates it as "soft, effeminate: 1 Co 6:9 (prob. in obscene sense)".^{xli}

The NIV translates as "homosexual offenders" the Greek word *αρσενοκοιταις*. The word is a combination of *αρσεν* = "male" and *κοιτης* = "bed" or, euphemistically, "sexual intercourse". Arndt and

Gingrich translate ἀρσενοκοιτίας as "a male homosexual, pederast, sodomite".^{xlii} Abbott Smith translates "sodomite".^{xliii}

Prof. F W Grosheide translates the end of v.9 "effeminate men and abusers of themselves with men" and adds that the terms "designate passive and active homosexuals respectively".^{xliv}

This is the earliest known usage of ἀρσενοκοιτίας.^{xlv} Wenham comments: "Paul does not use the common Greek words for homosexuals or pederasts, which might have suggested he was opposed to certain types of homosexual practice. Rather he uses a word, which like the OT, covers all types of male homosexual intercourse."^{xlvi} Wright says: Paul's choice of this term suggests that this condemnation has a broader scope than Greek pederasty. It specifies the maleness of the sexual partner, not merely his youthfulness. We are justified in seeing in it a declaration that all male same-sex erotic relationships are sinful.^{xlvii}

3. 1 Timothy 1:10 The law is "for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers- and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine."

The word translated "perverts" is ἀρσενοκοιτίας which the RSV translates "sodomites".

4. Jude 1:7 "In a similar way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding towns gave themselves up to sexual immorality and perversion. They serve as an example of those who suffer the punishment of eternal fire."

The word "perversion" means literally "going away after other flesh". Professor Bigg comments on this phrase: "Jude ... by adding *heteras* ["other"] has made it refer to the sin connected with the name of Sodom - a sin which though horribly common in heathen Greece and Rome, was never alleged against teachers who could in any sense be called Christians."^{xlviii}

5. Revelation 22:15 "Outside are the dogs ..."

Harrison thinks this could refer to male homosexual cultic prostitutes or homosexuals generally.

R. H. Charles comments on the word "dogs": "Anciently the word was used to denounce the moral impurities of heathen worship: cf. Deut. xxiii. 18 ... Here 'dog' is the technical term for a *kadesh*, or male prostitute, according to the inscription in the temple of Astarte at Larnaka. It was likewise employed by the Jews of the 1st century AD. to designate the heathen: cf. Matt. xv. 22 sq. In Phil. iii. 2 St. Paul applies it to the Judaizing faction in the Christian Church ..."^{xlix}

Conclusion on NT Passages

There is no explicit reference to homosexual practice in the Gospels. This is explained by the fact that it was not an issue in Jewish society at that time because it appears hardly any Jewish men were involved in it. Jesus however clearly disapproved of sex outside marriage.

Paul strongly condemns homosexual practice in Romans 1 as contrary to the revealed creation order and uses terms which indicate he was referring to all homosexual practice (including lesbianism). In 1 Corinthians 6:9 he states that those who persist in such behaviour (amongst other sins) will not inherit the kingdom of God. 1 Timothy 1 is in harmony with this view. (Jude 7 is referring back to Sodom which is a case of homosexual rape and Revelation 22:15 may refer to prostitution, so they are not particularly helpful to our concern in this paper).

General Conclusion on the Biblical Passages

It seems quite clear that whenever Scripture refers to homosexual practice it condemns it as contrary to the divine order of creation. It seems equally clear that it rules out all homosexual practice, not just bisexuality or the extremes of pederasty or rape or cultic prostitution. The question is whether the biblical teaching on the subject is still relevant today.

Is the biblical teaching relevant today?

Is it possible that homosexual behaviour could be right in circumstances unforeseen by biblical writers?

Is Scripture referring to committed faithful consensual relationship?

We have already argued that Scripture condemns all homosexual relationships, whatever their context. The argument that behaviour which is morally condemned in Scripture might be right and good in circumstances unforeseen by biblical writers is dubious. The context of the Levitical condemnation of homosexual practice forbids adultery and incest, both of which can happen in the context of loving committed relationships. Are we to argue, with exactly the same arguments as for homosexual monogamous relationships, that these are morally right and good?

The answer surely is no and this clearly implies that committed, faithful homosexual relationships would also be condemned.

Were the ancient writers unaware of inverted homosexuals?

The argument is that if they were unaware of people who have never known any other orientation, then maybe their condemnation was only of "perverts" i.e. those who chose homosexual behaviour. However the ancient world was quite aware of such people. Some claim that Jesus teaches about this when he refers to three types of "eunuch" in Matt. 19:12. "Some are eunuchs because they were born that way." However, this seems to refer to some physical incapacity, rather than homosexuality.

K J Dover affirms that the ancient Greeks were aware that some men were "naturally" inclined to homosexuality.¹

Aristotle in the fourth century BC distinguished between congenital and conditioned homosexuality. In the *Ethics* he says that some people are homosexual by nature. Similarly Clement of Alexandria, writing in the third century AD, says that "some men from their birth, have a natural sense of repulsion from a woman: and those who are naturally so constituted do well not to marry."

Homosexuality in the Ancient World

Dr Gordon Wenham writes: "The ancient Near East was a world in which the practice of male homosexuality was well-known. It was an integral part of temple life at least in parts of Mesopotamia, and no blame appears to have attached to its practice outside of worship. Those who regularly played the passive role in intercourse were despised for being effeminate, and certain relationships such as father-son or pederasty were regarded as wrong but otherwise it was regarded as quite respectable."^{li}

Homosexual practice was common in the Greek world. A Barnes outlines this in his commentary on Romans^{lii} as does William Barclay.^{liii} Virgil writes, without criticism, of the relationship between Corydon and Alexis. Maximus Tyrius^{liv} says it was common in the time of Socrates but that Socrates himself was an exception. However Barclay writes that Socrates did in fact practise homosexuality.^{lv}

Cicero writes: "Dicearchus had accused Plato of it and probably not unjustly."^{lvi} He also says that Greek poets and philosophers gloried in homosexuality. Xenophon wrote: "the unnatural love of boys is so common, that in many places it is established by public laws." He referred particularly to Sparta.^{lvii} Dr David Wright comments that in Sparta homosexuality was virtually a formalised part of education, and in Athens too, in the philosophical circles around Plato and Socrates, for example.^{lviii}

Barclay writes: "Plato's dialogue *The Symposium* is always said to be one of the greatest works on love in the world, but its subject is not natural but unnatural love."^{lix} Plato says the Cretans justified homosexuality by referring to the example of Jupiter and Ganymede.^{lx} Aristotle writes that the Cretans legalised homosexual practice.^{lxi}

Plutarch says the practice was justified in Thebes and Elis. In his *Life of Solon* he writes that Solon, the great law-giver of Athens, "was not proof against beautiful boys, and had not courage to resist the force of love." The Stoic Zeno was a practising homosexual according to Diogenes Laertius.

Cicero writes, without any criticism, that Cotta justified his homosexual practice by referring to the ancient philosophers.^{lxii} Seneca recorded that the practice was openly accepted in Rome. Boys of different races and nationalities were trained up for it.^{lxiii} Fourteen out of the first fifteen Roman emperors were practising homosexuals. Nero had a boy called Sporus castrated, married him publicly and took him home to live with him as his wife. Nero had previously married a man called Pythagoras and called him husband. When Otho took the throne he took possession of Sporus. The Emperor Hadrian lived with a Bithynian youth called Antinous.

It is therefore extremely unlikely that the New Testament writers in particular were unaware of homosexuality in all its forms, including inversion.

Should the church now favour the liberation of homosexuals as a parallel to its attitude to slavery?

This argument is based on the apparent support of Scripture for the oppression of slaves. The church now believes that to be wrong. Similarly, the argument goes, Scripture upholds the oppression of homosexuals and the church should now treat that as wrong too.

Actually, Scripture has a relatively compassionate approach to slavery and in NT times the conditions of slaves were generally being improved throughout the ancient world. The parables of Jesus illustrate that slaves were employed more as administrators with labour being recruited casually.

Slavery is undermined by 1 Cor 7:22 “For he who was a slave when he was called by the Lord is the Lord's freedman; similarly, he who was a free man when he was called is Christ's slave.” and Gal 3:28 “There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”

Paul encourages slaves to gain their freedom: “Were you a slave when you were called? Don't let it trouble you-- although if you can gain your freedom, do so.”^{lxiv}

He commands masters to treat slaves well: “Masters, treat your slaves in the same way. Do not threaten them, since you know that he who is both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no favouritism with him.”^{lxv} “Masters, provide your slaves with what is right and fair, because you know that you also have a Master in heaven.”^{lxvi}

Paul's attitude to Onesimus, the runaway slave, illustrates how fundamentally Christianity undermines slavery. He writes to Onesimus' master: “I appeal to you for my son Onesimus, who became my son while I was in chains. Formerly he was useless to you, but now he has become useful both to you and to me. I am sending *him-- who is my very heart--* back to you. I would have liked to keep him with me so that he could take your place in helping me while I am in chains for the gospel. But I did not want to do anything without your consent, so that any favour you do will be spontaneous and not forced. Perhaps the reason he was separated from you for a little while was that *you might have him back for good-- no longer as a slave, but better than a slave, as a dear brother. He is very dear to me but even dearer to you, both as a man and as a brother in the Lord.* So if you consider me a partner, welcome him as you would welcome me. If he has done you any wrong or owes you anything, charge it to me. I, Paul, am writing this with my own hand. I will pay it back-- not to mention that you owe me your very self. I do wish, brother, that I may have some benefit from you in the Lord; refresh my heart in Christ. Confident of your obedience, I write to you, knowing that you will do even more than I ask.”^{lxvii}

However slaves are to respect their masters: “Slaves, obey your earthly masters in everything; and do it, not only when their eye is on you and to win their favour, but with sincerity of heart and reverence for the Lord.”^{lxviii} “All who are under the yoke of slavery should consider their masters worthy of full respect, so that God's name and our teaching may not be slandered. *Those who have believing masters are not to show less respect for them because they are brothers.* Instead, they are to serve them even better, because those who benefit from their service are believers, and dear to them. These are the things you are to teach and urge on them.”^{lxix}

So slaves should serve their masters as they would the Lord, but, given the opportunity, take their freedom. Masters are to treat them in a way which is right and fair, without threatening them. Paul urges Philemon to receive Onesimus (Paul's “very heart” who is “very dear”) as a brother rather than a slave.

Conclusion on slavery

In its historical context, the OT was compassionate towards slaves. NT teaching clearly set the seeds of slavery's downfall: there is neither slave nor free in Christ; Onesimus, the runaway slave, is Paul's “very heart”, he is “very dear”, Philemon, his master, should regard him as a brother not a slave. The abolition of slavery is a clear implication from New Testament teaching. There is no parallel with homosexuals. Both the Old and New Testament strongly condemn homosexual practice and give no hint that this view could change.

Had the New Testament writers unintentionally incited slaves to rebel this could have led to widespread reprisals and bloodshed. I believe the Holy Spirit restrained the writers at that time from going further on this issue, lest it led to such a widespread rebellion that the cause of the gospel itself would have been overshadowed or even hindered at that time. This would not have been the case in the Greek world had the New Testament liberated homosexuals, because the Greek world accepted homosexuality. Yet there is no hint of homosexual liberation in the New Testament.

The unavoidable conclusion is that there is no parallel between Scripture's acceptance of slavery and its condemnation of homosexual practice. Consequently the church would not be justified in liberating homosexuals, in the sense of accepting homosexual practice.

Although the cry: "Justice for oppressed minorities – including homosexuals" is a very powerful one, especially when articulated by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the apparent parallel between this cause which he has taken up and the cause of the liberation of black South Africans is in fact mistaken. The NT makes it very clear that all men and women are equal before God. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus."^{lxx} But nowhere does it declare that variants on sexual practice are on a level in God's sight.

General conclusion on the relevance of biblical teaching

Scripture rules out *all* homosexual practice, including committed, faithful, consensual relationships. It was also aware of inverted homosexuals and therefore condemned their behaviour too. There is no parallel with slavery which would justify the church "liberating" homosexuals by accepting homosexual practice. There is therefore no ground for rejecting the relevance of the biblical condemnation of all homosexual practice to our modern situation.

The Equally Important Question of Attitudes

Scripture makes it quite clear the second great commandment is to love your neighbour as yourself. In this paper we have argued that Scripture condemns all homosexual practice. However, if we do not love our homosexual or lesbian neighbour we are equally sinful. Paul makes it quite clear in 1 Corinthians 13:1-3

"If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am only a resounding gong or a clanging cymbal. If I have the gift of prophecy and can fathom all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have a faith that can move mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. If I give all I possess to the poor and surrender my body to the flames, but have not love, I gain nothing."

The plain fact is that many homosexual and lesbian people do not feel loved by their fellow Christians. To love them does not, of course, mean accepting homosexual genital behaviour. But it does mean accepting them as people. Jesus exemplified this attitude in responding to the woman caught in the act of adultery in John 8:11. He said to her, "Neither do I condemn you ... go and leave your life of sin." Sadly, many homosexuals regard it as so unloving not to accept their behaviour that they will continue to regard the church as unloving. Rather it is unloving to disobey or encourage disobedience to the moral guidelines in Scripture which are for our welfare.

We should however make it clear that forgiveness and strength to overcome temptation are readily available to the penitent.

Sexuality inevitably raises powerful emotions. Christians have often dealt badly with the subject. They are threatened by it, even in our "liberated" age. We must avoid a fixation on sexual sin as if it were more serious than other sins the New Testament links with it. 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 lists "idolaters, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, slanderers and swindlers" with "the sexually immoral, adulterers, male prostitutes and homosexual offenders" who will not inherit the kingdom of God." Judging by the way that Christians slander each other in negative gossip in the average church, that passage should be rather worrying to many churchmembers, not just those who have sinned sexually.

It follows that we should treat homosexual sinners in the same way as we treat other sinners. They should be made welcome to attend church. Any "gut reaction" of homophobia (an irrational rejection of or even hatred towards homosexuals) which some Christians have towards homosexuals should, in itself, be treated as a temptation to sin and resisted firmly. A homosexual ought to know he can reveal his orientation

within our churches without risk of rejection or being kept at arms length. No-one should avoid showing the same affection to him or her as to everyone else, including a hug, if that is part of the culture of the church concerned.

Many churches have driven homosexuals into the clutches of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement because of the lack of warmth, welcome and affection shown to them in those churches. Like Jesus with the woman caught in adultery, we must distinguish the sinner from the sin. As we have seen, he warmly affirmed her, then told her to go and sin no more. The hypocritical and vindictive holy joes around him would have criticised him for being soft on adultery!

It is only when attitudes are sorted out that the church can begin to help with the emotional and moral problem. Otherwise any approach will seem judgmental and hard. *Ultimately*, anyone who persists impenitently in a sinful lifestyle must face proper godly church discipline. But patience and mercy are primary considerations.

As for “curing” homosexuals. I am sure that counselling and prayer for emotional healing is important. And I don’t deny that deliverance may have its place in certain cases. But anyone who thinks a quick-fix will happen in all, or even most cases, is mistaken. The problem is more complex, and great damage can be caused by a simplistic quick-fix approach. A number of Christian ministries specialise in a long-term approach.

There is no substitute for on-going pastoral support and for discipling (in the best sense of the term). Something along the lines of a Christian version of the Twelve Steps to Recovery of Alcoholics Anonymous needs to be adapted to help practising homosexuals who are penitent. We also need to learn more about teaching a minority how to live a chaste or celibate lifestyle. After all, many single women had to learn such a lifestyle in a church where they were, and are, often outnumbered 2:1 and they did not want to marry an unbeliever.

Above all, like the rest of us, those with a homosexual orientation need to be loved as people.

Appendix 1: Homosexuality and Society

The purpose of God’s Law is the welfare of humanity. The biblical condemnation of homosexual genital acts is no exception. Our society, let alone the church, will do well to maintain the biblical disapproval of this behaviour. There are various questions to be faced.

a. Does society have the right to regulate or ban homosexual practice?

Sexual behaviour has always been regulated by society: it has never been purely a matter of private conscience. Adultery has been seen by society in the past as sufficient cause for divorce. The age of consent is governed by society. Incest and paedophilia are ruled out by society. The reason for these sanctions is that sexual relations have a profound effect for good or ill on individual citizens and their relationships with the rest of society. It is right therefore that homosexual practice should be regulated and should not be placed on a par with right heterosexual practice.

b. What harm does accepting homosexual practice do?

In Appendix 2 we point out the damage done to the human body by anal intercourse. But there are other areas of damage:

- i. It normalises abnormality in society.
- ii. It causes gender confusion in children and teens.
- iii. It confronts adolescents (who not infrequently go through a brief homophile phase) with a choice which could confirm them unnecessarily in a homosexual or bisexual lifestyle.
- iv. It encourages people into a lifestyle in which, even in stable relationships, many people experience a deep sense of guilt. This guilt is acknowledged by the homosexual lobby.^{lxxi}
- v. It encourages promiscuity and sexual licence. The much-proclaimed “committed, faithful homosexual relationships” are few and far between. Promiscuity is the norm in homosexual circles. Even the Christian homosexual lobby don’t want a full scale parallel

to heterosexual marriage: life-long exclusive commitment; legal sanction; the necessity of a legal divorce procedure. Instead they want a blessing on an equivalent, at best, of cohabitation, with freedom to change partners. The unhelpful Osborne Report (commissioned by the House of Bishops but never published) acknowledged that:

"Not all gay people are celibate or living in committed relationships. Some are exploring other lifestyles which some gay Christians find acceptable. Some gay Christians are experimenting in sharing homes and building small communities. these experiments in community living need to be distinguished from uncommitted and casual lifestyles. Patterns of life which have traditionally been regarded as sinful and unacceptable to Christian conscience are now being affirmed as fully acceptable to Christian people, and experienced as satisfying and fulfilling ways to live."^{lxxii}

To encourage promiscuity and sexual licence in one area of society inevitably encourages it throughout society and will undermine marriage still further. It will also further venereal disease and psychological damage (human beings are not designed physically or psychologically for promiscuity).

- vi. If officially tolerated by the church it would lead to destabilisation of the marriage commitment. One could not legislate for a life-long marriage for heterosexuals on the one hand and for shorter term homosexual relationships on the other. That would be seen as a double standard. The latter would undermine the former.

Appendix 2: Physiology and Heterosexuality

The above-mentioned paper makes it clear that:

- a. Physiologically the primary purpose of sexual union is to achieve procreation.
- b. Anal intercourse (widespread in homosexual relationships):
 - normally damages the body, and
 - even where it doesn't damage the body, as an unsanitary act it can transmit viral infection directly into the blood stream (quite apart from venereal disease and AIDS). Given reasonable hygiene (impossible with anal intercourse), this danger is not present in heterosexual intercourse.

Medical experts say: "From a purely biological perspective sodomy, even apart from the transmission of AIDS, is an intrinsically unsanitary and pathological act."^{lxxiii} Obviously many practising homosexuals seek to overcome the risks by the use of the condom. Although this helps to overcome the risk of transmission of disease, this was not a possibility open to humanity until recently and as a manufactured device does not negate inference from basic physiology.

© Tony Higton: see conditions for copying on the [Home Page](#)

Scriptures taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version® NIV®. Copyright© 1973, 1978, 1984 by Biblica, Inc.™ . Used by permission. All rights reserved worldwide.

ⁱ Gen. 1:31

ⁱⁱ Heb 13:4

ⁱⁱⁱ Gen 1:28; 2:24-25

^{iv} 1 Cor. 7:1-5

^v This is clearly the meaning of the Genesis. Von Rad comments:

“Whoever expounds Gen., ch. 1, must understand one thing: this chapter is Priestly doctrine – indeed, it contains the essence of Priestly knowledge in its most concentrated form ... nothing is here by chance; everything must be considered carefully, deliberately and precisely. It is false, therefore, to reckon here even occasionally with archaic and half-mythological rudiments, which one considers venerable, to be sure, but theologically and conceptually less binding. What is said is intended to hold true entirely and exactly as it stands. Nowhere at all is the text only allusive, ‘symbolic’, or figuratively poetic.... These sentences cannot be easily overinterpreted theologically! Indeed, to us the danger appears greater that the expositor will fall short of discovering the concentrated doctrinal content.” (Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis*, SCM Old Testament Library, London 1963, p. 45f)

Commenting on Gen. 1:27 he adds: “Sexual distinction is also created. The plural in v. 27 (‘he created them’) is intentionally contrasted with the singular (‘him’) and prevents one from assuming the creation of an originally androgynous man. By God’s will, man was not created alone but designated for the ‘thou’ of the other sex.” (Ibid., p. 58)

A modern scientific approach to Genesis 1 will, of course, raise numerous questions about a literal interpretation of the chapter. An evolutionary approach will, for example, argue that the species are not totally distinct and inviolable, in that one evolved into another. It will argue that the distinction between animals and man is not absolute in that man evolved from animals. According to this approach therefore, in literal terms, the distinctions and inviolabilities of the early chapters of Genesis may not be born out in literal fact and it may be argued that this undermines the consequent sanctions (e.g. against homosexual genital relations) implied in these chapters.

However the *theology* of the early chapters of Genesis is clear. It teaches, amongst other things, that, in the area of sexuality, human beings are created by God for heterosexual relations. This is confirmed by the subsequent teaching of both the OT and NT, not least in that it consistently condemns homosexual genital relationships, as we shall see. Theologically, the heterosexual nature of humanity is taught by Genesis as fundamental – part of the creation order. To seek to weaken or argue against this interpretation, as some do, because of the incidence of human sex change, homosexuality and bisexuality (let alone bisexuality, asexuality, etc., in other creatures) is special pleading.

^{vi} Gen. 1:27

^{vii} Gen. 1:11, 22, 28; 9:1, 7

^{viii} Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis*, SCM, London 1963, p. 82f

^{ix} *The Christian Faith and Homosexuality*, Rutherford House, Edinburgh 1994, p.12

^x Von Rad, op. cit., p. 212f

^{xi} *Leviticus*, Tyndale OT Commentaries, IVP, Leicester, 1980, p.192, quoting *Sanhed. 19a; Bab. Bath. 12b, 59a*

^{xii} David Wright, *Homosexuality in the Early Church*, paper in *Sexuality and The Church*, ed. Tony Higton, Action for Biblical Witness to our Nation, Essex 1987, p. 40.

^{xiii} William Gesenius, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, transl. Edward Robinson, edited by Brown, Driver and Briggs, Oxford, 1906, p.394

^{xiv} *Genesis*, Tyndale OT Commentaries, IVP, London, 1967, p. 136f

^{xv} D Sherwin Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (Longmans, 1955)

^{xvi} Gordon Wenham *Homosexuality in the Bible* in *Sexuality and the Church*, edited by Tony Higton, Action for Biblical Witness to our Nation, Essex, 1987, p.29 (emphasis ours)

^{xvii} Genesis 13:13

^{xviii} Genesis 18:20

^{xix} Deuteronomy 32:32; Isaiah 3:9; Jeremiah 23:14; Revelation 11:8

^{xx} Deuteronomy 29:23; Isaiah 1:9; 13:19; Jeremiah 49:18; 50:40; Lamentations 4:6; Amos 4:11; Zephaniah 2:9; Matthew 10:15; 11:23; Luke 10:12; Romans 9:29; 2 Peter 2:6; Jude 1:7

^{xxi} Although Snaith makes an interesting comment that it “is generally interpreted as referring to a ceremony whereby children were passed through fire, possibly burning them as whole-offerings. But it is curious that the prohibition here occurs among sexual matters. The ancient versions have ‘cause to serve’ (Sam.), ‘serve’ (LXX), ‘cause to lie down for sexual intercourse’ (Syr.), whilst other Greek Versions have ‘compel by force’. MT has *Molech*, intended to be the name of a false god. Possibly the reference is to dedicating children to a Canaanite god or in a mixed Canaanite-Yahweh cult for the purposes of temple prostitution.” See N H Snaith on Leviticus in Peake’s *Commentary on the Bible*, ed. Matthew Black and H H Rowley, Nelson, London 1962, p. 249.

^{xxii} Wright, op. cit., p. 40

^{xxiii} Harrison, op.cit., p. 191f

^{xxiv} *Strangers and Friends*, Hodder, London 1995, p. 126

^{xxv} David J. Atkinson, *Homosexuals in the Christian Fellowship*, Latimer House, Oxford 1979, p.86

^{xxvi} Gesenius, op. cit., p.873

^{xxvii} Gesenius, op.cit., p.477

-
- xxviii Deuteronomy, Tyndale OT Commentaries, IVP, Leicester, 1974, p.242. See also G Henton Davies on Deuteronomy in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, ed. Matthew Black and H H Rowley, Nelson, London 1962, p. 279.
- xxix Gesenius, *op.cit.*, p.394
- xxx Harrison, *op.cit.*, p.192
- xxxi Wenham, *op.cit.*, p.33
- xxxii Wright, *op.cit.*, p.42
- xxxiii Rom 1:25
- xxxiv O.M.T. O'Donovan, *Is It A Natural Alternative? 'Insight'*, Wycliffe College, Toronto, June 1978, p. 6f; quoted in David J. Atkinson, *op. cit.*, p.60
- xxxv K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, Duckworth 1978, p.22
- xxxvi *Miscellanies* 3.1; this and the last four references all quoted in D J Atkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 93
- xxxvii Atkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 93
- xxxviii Vasey, *op. cit.*, p. 130
- xxxix Vasey, *op. cit.*, p. 133
- xl *A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT*, University of Chicago, Cambridge University Press, 1957, p.489
- xli *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the NT*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1960, p.277
- xlii Arndt & Gingrich, *op.cit.*, p.109
- xliii Abbott Smith, *op.cit.*, p.61
- xliv *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., London, 1954, p.140
- xlv Wright, *op.cit.*, p.41 (emphasis ours)
- xlvi Wenham, *op.cit.*, p.34. (emphasis ours)
- xlvii Wright, *op.cit.*, p.41 (emphasis ours)
- xlviii Prof. Charles Bigg, *Epistles of St Peter and St Jude*, International Critical Commentary, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1969, p. 329f
- xlix R H Charles, *The Revelation of St John*, International Critical Commentary, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1989, vol. 2, p.178
- l K J Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, Duckworth, 1978, referred to in Wenham, *op.cit.*, p.37
- li Wenham, *op.cit.*, p.28
- lii *Notes on the NT*, Blackie & Son, London, 1835, Vol. 4, p. 42f.
- liii *The Letters to the Corinthians*, Daily Study Bible, St. Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1975, p. 53f
- liv *Diss.10*
- lv Barclay, *op.cit.*, p.53
- lvi *Tuscul. Ques.* 4:34
- lvii *Ibid.*, 4:33
- lviii Wright, *op.cit.*, p.39
- lix Barclay, *op.cit.* p.53
- lx Plato, *Book of Laws* 1
- lxi Aristotle, *Politic.* b, 2: chap. 10
- lxii *De Natura Deorum*, b, 1: chap. 28
- lxiii *Epis.* 95
- lxiv 1 Cor. 7:21
- lxv Eph. 6:9
- lxvi Col. 4:1
- lxvii Philemon 1:10-21
- lxviii Col 3:22
- lxix 1 Tim 6:1-2
- lxx Gal 3:28
- lxxi For example, *The Joy of Gay Sex* Silverstone and White, Pocket Books (an explicitly pro-homosexual book) pp 92-95
- lxxii Osborne report paras 102-103
- lxxiii Pearl Ma and Donald Armstrong, *op. cit.*, p.100; quoted in Green, *op. cit.*, p.102