

CONTRIBUTORS

William Loader

Megan K. DeFranza

Wesley Hill

Stephen R. Holmes

TWO
VIEWS
ON

HOMOSEXUALITY, THE BIBLE, AND THE CHURCH



Stanley N. Gundry, series editor
Preston Sprinkle, general editor

COUNTERPOINTS
► BIBLE & THEOLOGY ◀

A PDF COMPANION TO THE AUDIOBOOK

ZONDERVAN

Two Views on Homosexuality, the Bible, and the Church

Copyright © 2016 by Preston Sprinkle, William Loader, Megan K. DeFranza, Wesley Hill, Stephen R. Holmes

This title is also available as a Zondervan ebook.

Requests for information should be addressed to:

Zondervan, 3900 Sparks Dr. SE, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49546

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Sprinkle, Preston M., 1976- | Loader, William R. G., 1944- | DeFranza, Megan K., 1975- | Hill, Wesley, 1981- | Holmes, Stephen R.

Title: Two views on homosexuality, the Bible, and the church / William Loader, Megan K. DeFranza, Wesley Hill, Stephen R. Holmes; Preston M. Sprinkle, general editor; Stanley H. Gundry, series editor.

Other titles: 2 views on homosexuality, the Bible, and the church | Counterpoints. Bible & theology

Description: Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, [2016] | Series: Counterpoints: Bible and theology

Identifiers: LCCN 2016025875 | ISBN 9780310528630 (softcover)

Subjects: LCSH: Homosexuality—Religious aspects—Christianity. | Bible and homosexuality.

Classification: LCC BR115.H6 T89 2016 | DDC 261.8/35766—dc23 LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016025875>

Scripture quotations marked NIV are from The Holy Bible, New International Version®, NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 by Biblica, Inc.® Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide. www.Zondervan.com. The “NIV” and “New International Version” are trademarks registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by Biblica, Inc.®

Scripture quotations marked NRSV are from the *New Revised Standard Version Bible*. Copyright © 1989, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked KJV are from the King James Version. Public domain.

Any Internet addresses (websites, blogs, etc.) and telephone numbers in this book are offered as a resource. They are not intended in any way to be or imply an endorsement by Zondervan, nor does Zondervan vouch for the content of these sites and numbers for the life of this book.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or any other—except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Cover design: Tammy Johnson

Cover image: Ben Greenhoe

Printed in the United Kingdom

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 /CPI/ 70 69 68 67 66 65 64 63 62 61

INTRODUCTION

PRESTON M. SPRINKLE

Footnotes

1. See my book *People to Be Loved: Why Homosexuality Is Not Just an Issue* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015).
2. Ethical questions related to other sexual minorities, such as transgender persons, are just as pressing as ones related specifically to sexuality, but are beyond the scope of this volume. Therefore, I will avoid using the acronym LGBTQ+ unless appropriate.
3. John Boswell, *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, 1980).
4. See especially Richard Hays, "Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to J. Boswell's Exegesis of Rom. 1," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 14 (1986): 184–215.
5. Among the most significant are Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); William Countryman, *Dirt, Greed, and Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implications for Today* (rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); Daniel A. Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says about Homosexuality* (Estancia, NM: Alamo Square, 2000); Dale Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006); Martti Nissinen, *Homoeroticism in the Biblical World: A Historical Perspective*, trans. Kirsi Stjerna (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998).
6. Robert Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2001).
7. On the affirming side, see, e.g., James Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality: Reframing the Church's Debate on Same-Sex Relationships* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013); Robert Song, *Covenant and Calling: Toward a Theology of Same-Sex Relations* (London: SCM, 2014). On the non-affirming side, see, e.g., Kevin DeYoung, *What Does the Bible Really Teach about Homosexuality?* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2015); Sprinkle, *People to Be Loved*.
8. William Loader, *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013). Loader's other volumes include *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012); *Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Writings of Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011); *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011); *Sexuality in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 2010); *The*

Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); *Sexuality and the Jesus Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament: Case Studies on the Impact of the LXX in Philo and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

9. Preston M. Sprinkle, ed., *Four Views on Hell* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 15.

WILLIAM LOADER

Footnotes

1. See the sensitive assessment in Wesley Hill, *Spiritual Friendship* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2015), 73.
2. My book *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013) is a summary and contains a subject index for my five research volumes published by Eerdmans: *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality* (2007) (=ELJ); *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality* (2009) (=DSS); *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality* (2011) (=PS); *Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments on Sexuality* (2011) (=PJT); and *The New Testament on Sexuality* (2012) (=NTS).
3. On the Old Testament references, see *NTS* 22–31.
4. 1 Kgs 14:21–24; 15:12–14; 22:46; 2 Kgs 23:7; Job 36:13–14. Robert A. J. Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2001), 100–103.
5. On references in Jewish literature, see *NTS* 32–33.
6. On 1 Enoch and Jubilees, see *EJL*.
7. 4QD^c/4Q270 2 ii.16–18/6QD/6Q15 5 3–4.
8. 4QD^f/4Q271 3 3–4; 4QOrd^a/4Q159.
9. On the Dead Sea Scrolls, see *DSS*.
10. 4QCatena^a/4Q177 iv.10.
11. For the following writings, see *PS*.
12. Sibylline Oracles, 3:185–87.
13. *Ibid.*, 3:596–99.
14. *Ms P* 10:2.
15. Pseudo-Aristeas, 152.
16. Pseudo-Phocylides, 191.
17. *Ibid.*, 3.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*, 210–14.
20. *Wisdom of Solomon*, 13:1; 14:12, 22–31.
21. On the Testaments, see *PJT* 368–435.
22. T. Naph. 2:2–4:1.

23. Testament of Solomon, 2:2–3.
24. *Ibid.*, 4:5.
25. *Ibid.*, 6:4; Ms P; *PS* 136–41.
26. See *PJT* 2–258.
27. *Spec.* 3.37–42.
28. *Spec.* 3.37; *QG* 4.37, 39; *Contempl.* 50–52, 59; *Hypoth.* 7.1
29. *Prob.* 124.
30. *Abr.* 135; *Contempl.* 53–56.
31. *QG* 2.49; *Virt.* 20–21; *Her.* 274; implied also in the rejection of Aristophanes's myth of sexual origins in *Contempl.* 57–63.
32. *Spec.* 3.37.
33. *Ibid.*, 3.40–41.
34. *Abr.* 135.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Spec.* 3.37; *Abr.* 136; *Contempl.* 60; *Spec.* 1.325; 2.50.
37. *Virt.* 18–21.
38. *Spec.* 3.37, 39.
39. *Spec.* 3.32–33, 39; *Abr.* 135–36; *Contempl.* 62.
40. *Spec.* 3.35.
41. His main discussion is *Abr.* 133–41.
42. *Spec.* 2.170.
43. *Abr.* 135.
44. *Spec.* 3.38.
45. Plato's *Symposium*, 189–93; Philo *Contempl.* 57–63.
46. *Contempl.* 63.
47. *Ios.* 58; *Somn.* 2.184; *Ebr.* 211.
48. *Deus* 111; *Mut.* 173.
49. *Ap.* 2.199, 213; *PJT* 259–367.
50. *A.J.* 15.25, 30; *B.J.* 1.439.
51. *A.J.* 16.230.
52. *Ibid.*, 16.229.
53. *A.J.* 16.232; cf. also *B.J.* 1.488–92.
54. *Ap.* 2.199.
55. *A.J.* 3.275.
56. *Ibid.*, 4.290–91.
57. *B.J.* 4.561–62.
58. *Ap.* 2.273–75.
59. *Ibid.*, 2.269.
60. See *NTS* 74–108.
61. *Leg.* 838E–839A.
62. See Bruce S. Thornton, *Eros: The Myth of Ancient Greek Sexuality* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997), 196–99; Martha C. Nussbaum, "Eros and Ethical Norms: Philosophers Respond to a Cultural Dilemma," in *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Martha C. Nussbaum and Juha Sihvola (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 55–94.
63. *Phaedrus* 253D; *Symposium* 210–12.
64. *Lex Scatinia*.
65. See the discussion in Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 96–104; Marilyn B. Skinner, *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 199–200; Johannes N. Vorster, "The Making of Male Same-Sex in the Graeco-Roman World and Its Implications for the Interpretation of Biblical Discourses," *Scriptura* 93 (2006): 447.

66. Skinner, *Sexuality*, 212–13, 266.
67. *Met.* 9.728–34; Skinner, *Sexuality*, 212, 249–51; Vorster, “Making of Male Same-Sex,” 449.
68. Vorster, “Making of Male Same-Sex,” 437–38.
69. Skinner, *Sexuality*, 187–90, 253.
70. See *NTS* 334–38.
71. See, e.g., *Pss. Sol.* 16:7.
72. Daniel Helminiak, *What the Bible Really Says about Homosexuality* (Millennium Ed., updated and expanded; Estancia, NM: Alamo Square, 2000), 127–29.
73. Thomas Hanks, “Romans,” in *The Queer Bible Commentary*, eds. Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bohache (London: SCM, 2006), 582–605, at 584.
74. On this, see *NTS* 436–44.
75. E.g., J. David Hester, “Eunuchs and the Postgender Jesus: Matthew 19.12 and Transgressive Sexualities,” *JSTOT* 28 (2005): 13–40, who suggests that “this logion of Jesus questions the privileged position of a heterosexist binary paradigm of identity,” 37. See also Megan K. DeFranza, *Sex Difference in Christian Theology: Male, Female, and Intersex in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 70–83.
76. For what follows, see the detailed discussion in *NTS* 293–326.
77. See *NTS* 326–34.
78. William Countryman, *Dirt, Greed, and Sex*, 108–23; similarly, Helminiak, *Homosexuality*; Hanks, “Romans,” 586.
79. Diana M. Swancutt, “‘The Disease of Effemination’: The Charge of Effeminacy and the Verdict of God (Romans 1:18–2:16),” in *New Testament Masculinities*, eds. Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson; SemeiaSt 45 (Atlanta: SBL, 2003), 193–234, at 205–206; “Sexy Stoics and the Rereading of Romans 1.18–2.16,” in *A Feminist Companion to Paul*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine with Marianne Bickerstaff (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 42–73, at 43, 70–72.
80. James V. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality: Reframing the Church’s Debate on Same-Sex Relationships* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 157, drawing on Neil Elliott, *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 79–82.
81. Cf. John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980), 111–14; Walter Wink, “Homosexuality and the Bible,” in *Homosexuality and Christian Faith: Questions of Conscience for the Churches*, ed. Walter Wink (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 33–49, at 34–37.
82. Cf. Boswell, *Homosexuality*, 108; M. Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 255–60; Hanks, “Romans,” 594.
83. Cf. Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 99–139.
84. Cf. Robert A. J. Gagnon, “The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Key Issues” and “Response to Dan O. Via,” in Dan O. Via and Robert A. J. Gagnon, *Homosexuality and the Bible: Two Views* (Minneapolis: Fortress), 40–92, 99–105, at 81, 92; “Notes to Gagnon’s Essay in the Gagnon-Via *Two Views* Book,” accessed February 2009, <http://www.robagnon.net/2VOnlineNotes.htm>, 82, 136.
85. Cf. Dale B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 51–64, at 54, 56; Boswell, *Homosexuality*, 111–12; Brownson, *Sexuality*, 149–78.
86. Cf. Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 1996), 384–85, 388; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC 38AB; Nashville: Nelson, 1988), 62. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), writes, “The alleged echoes of the Adam stories in Genesis are simply nonexistent,” unlike those to Genesis 1, 274.

87. Brownson, *Sexuality*, 207–208; Swancutt, “Disease of Effemination,” 200, who suggests it be read as referring to “various types of intercourse ranging from adultery and sex while pregnant to ‘mutual intercourse’ and a ‘reversal of sexual roles,’” 209; similarly Swancutt, “Sexy Stoics,” 63; James E. Miller, “The Practices of Romans 1:26: Homosexual or Heterosexual?” *NovT* 37 (1995), 1–11; Hans Debel, “‘Unnatural Intercourse’ in Rom 1,26–27: Homosexual or Heterosexual?” in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle; BETL, 226 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 631–40.

88. Raymond F. Collins, *Sexual Ethics and the New Testament: Behavior and Belief* (New York: Crossroad, 2000); Robert Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 176; Bernadette J. Brooten, *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 239–53; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 284.

89. On this, see *NTS* 311–15; Gagnon, “Notes,” 82; Brooten, *Love Between Women*, 269–70; Andrie B. du Toit, “Paul, Homosexuality, and Christian Ethics,” in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honour of Peder Borgen*, ed. David E. Aune (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 92–107, at 100–101.

90. Brownson, *Sexuality*, 204–15.

91. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 59–60, 65–76.

92. Gagnon, *Bible and Homosexual Practice*, 122.

93. *Spec.* 4.89; *Contempl.* 53–56, 61.

94. Jewett, *Romans*, 179.

95. Brownson, *Sexuality*, 157.



RESPONSE TO WILLIAM LOADER

MEGAN K. DEFranza

Footnotes

1. Dale Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 52–57.
2. The Watchers were described as fallen angels who mated with human women, an ancient interpretation of the “sons of God” in Gen 6:4.
3. Megan K. DeFranza, “The Transformation of Deception: Understanding the Portrait of Eve in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, ch. 23,” *Priscilla Papers*, 23.2 (Spring 2009): 21–28.
4. Note the women Paul commends in Romans 16:1–15.
5. “12 States Still Ban Sodomy a Decade After Court Ruling,” (April 4, 2014) Associated Press, *USA Today*, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/04/21/12-states-ban-sodomy-a-decade-after-court-ruling/7981025/>.
6. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sodomy>.
7. See my chapter in this volume (p. 69) for the larger argument and supporting evidence.
8. Robert Song, *Covenant and Calling: Towards a Theology of Same-Sex Relationships* (London: SCM, 2014), xii–xiii.



RESPONSE TO WILLIAM LOADER

WESLEY HILL

Footnotes

9. To highlight only one instance, I do see “echoes of Adam” in Romans 1, who in turn prefigures Israel’s “fall” as well (Rom 7), and this affects my reading of Romans 1. Paul is not targeting specifically Gentile cultural practices but rather painting on a broad scriptural canvas and working primarily, I think, with less culturally specific references (e.g., Gaius Caligula).

10. See David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: The New Ancient World* (New York: Routledge, 1990), ch. 1; Holt N. Parker, “The Myth of the Heterosexual: Anthropology and Sexuality for Classicists,” *Arethusa* 34 (2001): 313–62.

11. American Psychological Association, “Sexual orientation, homosexuality and bisexuality,” accessed March 8, 2016, <http://www.apa.org/helpcenter/sexual-orientation.aspx>.

12. Eve Tushnet, “Order from Confusion Sprung,” eve-tushnet.blogspot.com, accessed March 8, 2016, http://eve-tushnet.blogspot.com/2010_06_01_archive.html#1921445070183139.

13. Aaron Taylor, “Can One Be Gay and Christian?” *First Things* website, accessed March 8, 2016, <http://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2013/04/can-one-be-gay-and-christian>.

14. This is the argument of a book like Frederic S. Roden, *Same-Sex Desire in Victorian Religious Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

15. Louis J. Cameli, *Catholic Teaching on Homosexuality: New Paths to Understanding* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2012), 65.

16. Eve Tushnet, “The Three False Gods of Marriage, Freedom, and Morality,” February 25, 2016, accessed March 9, 2016, <http://www.patheos.com/blogs/evetushnet/2016/02/the-three-false-gods-of-marriage-freedom-and-morality.html>.



RESPONSE TO WILLIAM LOADER

STEPHEN R. HOLMES

Footnotes

17. See particularly William J. Webb, *Slaves, Women, and Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001); Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (London: T&T Clark, 1997).

Footnotes

1. Intersex persons or persons with Differences of Sex Development (DSDs; historically “hermaphrodites”) have bodies with both male and female physical features. Approximately one out of every 2,500 live births is intersex. Susannah Cornwall, ed., *Intersex, Theology, and the Bible* (New York: Palgrave, 2015), 1. Intersex persons are currently differentiated from transgender persons because transgender bodies appear clearly male or female, but their gender identity does not match what appears to be their bodily sex. As urgent as it is to consider the ethics and experiences of transgender people, these remain beyond the scope of this volume. See also Megan K. DeFranza, *Sex Difference in Christian Theology: Male, Female, and Intersex in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), ch. 1.

2. Naturally born eunuchs were called “eunuchs of the sun” (*saris khama*) because from the first day the sun shone upon them, they knew these babies were different. In addition to male, female, and eunuchs, rabbis recognize *aylonith* (persons with underdeveloped genitalia which nevertheless appeared more feminine than masculine), *androgynos* (equally male and female), and *tumtum* (whose sex was unclear but thought to reveal itself in time). See John Hare, “Hermaphrodites, Eunuchs, and Intersex People: The Witness of Medical Science in Biblical Times and Today,” in *Intersex, Theology, and the Bible*, 83–87. Despite the fact that these terms have no precedent in the Old Testament, Jesus felt free to use “eunuchs from birth” and Augustine acknowledges the reality of hermaphrodites. Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, vol. 5, Loeb Classical Library, trans. Eva Matthews Sanford and William McAllen Green (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 16.8, 47. See also DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, chs. 1–2.

3. Allister McGrath, John Polkinghorne, Karen Strand Winslow, N. T. Wright, et al., “The Book of Genesis,” BioLogos Foundation (April 27, 2012), <http://biologos.org/resources/audio-visual/the-book-of-genesis>. Excerpted from “From the Dust: Conversations in Creation,” directed by Ryan Pettey (Mountain View, CA: Highway Media, 2012).

4. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 175–81.

5. The welcome of eunuchs and foreigners prophesied in Isa 56:3–8 is fulfilled in Acts 8 with the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch.

6. Sheri A. Berenbaum and Adriene M. Beltz, “Sexual Differentiation of Human Behavior: Effects of Prenatal and Pubertal Organizational Hormones,” *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology* 32 (2011): 183–200.

7. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 76–77.
8. Piotr O. Scholz, *Eunuchs and Castrati: A Cultural History*, trans. John A. Broadwin and Shelley L. Frisch (Princeton, NJ: Markus Weiner, 2001), 113–18.
9. Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 56.
10. David F. Wright, “Homosexuals or Prostitutes? The Meaning of *Arsenokoitai* (1 Cor 6:9; 1 Tim 1:10),” *VC* 38 (1984): 125–53; idem, “Translating *Arsenokoites* (1 Cor 6:9; 1 Tim 1:10),” *VC* 41 (1987): 396–98. Preston Sprinkle provides a helpful summary of this scholarly debate in chapter 7 of *People to Be Loved: Why Homosexuality Is Not Just an Issue* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 103–20.
11. Thomas E. Schmidt, *Straight and Narrow? Compassion and Clarity in the Homosexuality Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), 33–34, 95–96. Wright, “Homosexuals or Prostitutes?,” 126–29.
12. I have chosen to translate the Greek terms more literally to show that the terms differ in the Greek Old Testament (LXX). In English, the euphemism “sleep with” carries the connotation of mutuality, but “bed” more accurately reflects the ancient assumption that sex is something a man does to someone else. To bed a man was to treat him as a woman. In the Hebrew, “bed” is used in both halves of the verse.
13. Philo, *The Special Laws*, vol. 3; cited by Matthew Vines, *God and the Gay Christian* (New York: Convergent, 2014), 87.
14. Clement of Alexandria, *The Instructor (The Paedagogus)*, bk. 3; cited in Vines, *God and the Gay Christian*, 88.
15. Lev 18 and 20 do not provide a comprehensive sexual ethic for Christians. The only sexual instruction given to women is not to present themselves for sex with an animal (Lev 18:23). Many scholars point to the law prohibiting men from having sexual relations with a menstruating woman in Lev 18:19 to illustrate the fact that at least one of these Old Testament sexual prohibitions is not considered universally binding. Most Christians overlook the fact that Abraham also violated Lev 18:9 and 20:17 by marrying his half-sister, and Jacob violated 18:18 by marrying the sister of his wife. Jennifer Wright Knust, *Unprotected Texts: The Bible's Surprising Contradictions about Sex and Desire* (New York: HarperOne, 2011), 141–42.
16. Several scholars note a parallel between the list in 1 Tim 1 and the Ten Commandments: (5) honor father and mother, (6) do not murder, (7) do not commit adultery, (8) do not steal, (9) do not give false testimony. The author of 1 Tim may be illustrating how these ancient commands are being violated in the first-century context—expanding the category of adulterers (*moichoi*) to include *pornois*, *malakoi*, and *arsenokoitai*. Sprinkle, *People to Be Loved*, 117–18, n. 36, 216.
17. Dale B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 38.
18. Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 241.
19. Sprinkle, *People to Be Loved*, 116.
20. *Didache* 2.2; *The Epistle of Barnabas* 19.4; Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 252–53, 320–21. I am indebted to Roy Ciampa for directing me to these sources.
21. Sprinkle, *People to Be Loved*, 107; citing Lucan, 10.133–4.
22. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 77.
23. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 44–45.
24. *Ibid.*, 44.
25. David E. Fredrickson, “Natural and Unnatural Use in Romans 1:24–27: Paul and the Philosophic Critique of Eros,” in *Homosexuality, Science, and the “Plain Sense” of Scripture*, ed. David L. Balch (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 197, 218–21; cited in Vines, *God and the Gay Christian*, 122.

26. Cultic prostitution has also been suggested, but there is little to no historical evidence of sacred prostitution in Corinth. However, at feasts in temple districts, prostitutes were available not for religious ritual but as “part of the festivity” (Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 248–49). Ciampa and Rosner note that the connection between prostitutes and temple feasts ties together what can appear to be unrelated topics in 1 Cor 6, particularly the apostle’s concerns about food (v. 13), and the concluding exhortation: “Your bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit . . . therefore honor God with your bodies” (vv. 19–20); *ibid.*, 261.

27. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 39.

28. *Ibid.*, 41.

29. *Pornois* (masculine plural) is derived from *pornē* (“prostitute” in the feminine) and could have designated male prostitutes or the men who visit them. Over the centuries *porneia* was expanded to encompass sexual sins beyond prostitution; thus, translated “sexually immoral” or “fornicators.” Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6, trans. G. W. Bromily (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 580, 584, 587. Only a few verses later in 1 Cor 6, Paul argues that men should not “take the members of Christ and unite them with a prostitute” (v. 15). He concludes, in verse 18, “Flee *porneia*!” Most modern versions translate *porneia* as “sexual immorality,” but the nearest verses describe prostitution.

30. James V. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality: Reframing the Church’s Debate on Same-Sex Relationships* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 274.

31. Walter A. Krenkel, “Prostitution,” in M. Grant and R. Kitzinger, eds., *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean: Greece and Rome* (New York: Scribner, 1988), 2: 1296; quoted in Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 181.

32. Lynn H. Cohick, *Women in the World of the Earliest Christians: Illuminating Ancient Ways of Life* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), 281.

33. Concubinage functioned in a similar way. Cohick, *Women in the World*, 105–106.

34. Ciampa and Rosner, *First Letter to the Corinthians*, 250.

35. William Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 15–18.

36. Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation* (San Francisco: Harper, 1996), 389; Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 150–51.

37. Bernadette J. Brooten, *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 251–52.

38. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 207–208. Augustine, *Of Marriage and Concupiscence*, 2.35.

39. Brooten, *Love Between Women*, 305–308.

40. *Ibid.*, 307.

41. Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 318–19.

42. Knust, *Unprotected Texts*, 110–12. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 232–37.

43. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 166.

44. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 57; citing Dio Chrysostom 7.151–52.

45. *Ibid.*, 58.

46. *Ibid.*, 57; citing John Chrysostom, *Homily IV on Romans*.

47. *Ibid.*, 58.

48. Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 181.

49. Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, III.3.

50. Neil Elliott, *Liberating Paul* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994), 195; cited in Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 159.

51. Hays, *Moral Vision*, 389.

52. Elliott, *Liberating Paul*, 195; cited in Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 159.

53. Elliott, *Liberating Paul*, 112.

54. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 157.

55. As one might complain about Washington politicians who take advantage of interns in closets—a veiled reference to former president Bill Clinton—suggests that corruption can be found throughout the political center.

56. Suetonius, *Nero*, 26–29; cited in Elliott, *Liberating Paul*, 195.

57. Mark Achtemeier, *The Bible's Yes to Same-Sex Marriage: An Evangelical's Change of Heart* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014), 17–20.

58. David P. Gushee, *Changing Our Mind*, 2nd ed. (Canton, MI: Read the Spirit, 2015), 126–45.

59. Stanley J. Grenz, “The Social God and the Relational Self: Toward a Trinitarian Theology of the *Imago Dei*,” in *Trinitarian Soundings in Systematic Theology*, ed. Paul Louis Metzger (London and New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 87–100.

60. Stanley J. Grenz, *Sexual Ethics: An Evangelical Perspective* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990), 238. Grenz has been criticized on this point by those who argue that the traditional names of the First and Second Persons of the Trinity do not provide a basis for sex or gender difference in the Trinitarian union. Some have argued on this basis that gay or polyamorous marriages more fully reflect the Trinity. I have offered my own critique of both the sexualizing of Trinitarian relations and the assumption that sex/gender are paradigmatic of “otherness” in *Sex Difference*, chs. 5 and 4 respectively.

61. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 108–32.

62. Loader, *New Testament on Sexuality*, 17.

63. John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon in Calvin's Commentaries*, vol. 21, trans. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 68; 1 Tim 2:12.

64. One can see the tension and slow progress in Pauline literature when comparing the radically egalitarian argument that a wife has authority over her husband's body (1 Cor 7:4) with calling wives to submit to their husbands in Col 3:17—a passage without the overarching exhortation to mutual submission found in Eph 5. Similar tensions appear in the commands that slaves obey their masters (Col 3:22) and the exhortation to one particular master to receive his runaway slave as a brother (Phil 1:16). Even though Paul appears to be moving away from the radical dehumanization of women found in literature of his day, he still employs patriarchal categories when he talks about marriage.

65. On men as more fully images of God, see Frederick G. McLeod, S.J., *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 191–92.

66. It is only very recently that Christians have been shifting their interpretation of Eph 5 so that the call to “mutual submission” in verse 21 (grammatically tied to 5:22 in the Greek) is read to support egalitarian human marriage, while the ancient vision of patriarchal marriage remains an analogy for Christ and church. Churches have been changing traditional marriage vows—removing the wife's vow to obey—to underscore their evolving theology of marriage. “Church Omits ‘Obey’ from Marriage Vows to Tackle Domestic Abuse” (Oct. 3, 2006), <http://www.christiantoday.com/article/church.omits.obey.from.marriage.vows.in.efforts.to.tackle.domestic.abuse/7843.htm>.

67. Ezekiel lists other sins of Sodom as arrogance, gluttony, lack of concern for the poor and needy (16:49).

68. Hays, *Moral Vision*, 389.

69. Knust nuances this point, recalling that in Greek thought the passive male partner was not censured as long as the active partner was of higher social status. *Unprotected Texts*, 88–89.

70. For example, Jesus' stricter view on the Mosaic provision of divorce served to protect women from being discarded for “any and every reason” (Matt 19:3–9).

71. N. T. Wright, “How Can the Bible Be Authoritative,” *Vox Evangelica* 21 (1991), 7–32.

72. Eugene F. Rogers Jr., “Sanctification, Homosexuality, and God's Triune Life,” in *Theology and Sexuality: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (London: Blackwell, 2002), 225–26; J. R. Daniel Kirk, “Homosexuality and the Church Debate: Dr. Robert Gagnon vs. Dr. Daniel Kirk” October 17, 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m-Y1WpXmfso>.

73. I compare John Paul II's *Theology of the Body* to Grenz's evangelical theology of marriage in *Sex Difference*, chs. 4–5. These Anglicans note similarities between Anglican and Eastern Orthodox theologies of marriage: Deirdre J. Good, Willis J. Jenkins, Cynthia B. Kittredge, Eugene F. Rogers Jr., "A Theology of Marriage Including Same-Sex Couples: A View from the Liberals," *Anglican Theological Review*, 93:1 (Winter 2011): 51–52.

74. My translation.

75. C. S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (Orlando: Harcourt Brace, 1960, 1988), 114.

76. Rogers, "Sanctification, Homosexuality, and God's Triune Life," 223.

77. Achtemeier, *The Bible's Yes*, 51.

78. Eugene F. Rogers Jr., "Same-Sex Complementarity: A Theology of Marriage," *Christian Century* (May 11, 2011), <http://www.christiancentury.org/article/2011-04/same-sex-complementarity>. With gratitude to Wesley Hill for drawing my attention to this work in his blog post "The Future of Asceticism," <http://spiritualfriendship.org/2015/11/27/the-future-of-asceticism/#more-6202>.

79. Good, et al., "A Theology of Marriage," 70.

80. Achtemeier, *The Bible's Yes*, 58.

81. *Ibid.*, 60.

82. Augustine, *De bono coniugali. De sancta uirginitate*, ed. and trans., P. G. Walsh (Oxford: Clarendon Press: 2001), XVII, 37.

83. Gagnon argues for procreative, psychological, and anatomical complementarity. Robert A. J. Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2001), 488.

84. Dennis P. Hollinger, *The Meaning of Sex: Christian Ethics and the Moral Life* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 16.

85. For more robust discussions of gender complementarity, see Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 26–38; and DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, ch. 4.

86. Melissa Hines, *Brain Gender* (Oxford: University Press, 2004), 18–19.

87. "This personalist interpretation of genital complementarity, which sees the physical genitals as organs of the whole person, including his or her sexual orientation, allows us to expand the definition of a natural, reasonable, and therefore moral sexual act to include both homosexual and heterosexual nonreproductive sexual acts." Todd A. Salzman and Michael G. Lawler, *The Sexual Person: Toward a Renewed Catholic Anthropology* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2008), 67.

88. Augustine, *De bono coniugali*, VI, 15.

89. Ken Wilson, *A Letter to My Congregation* (Canton, MI: Read the Spirit, 2014), 94–110.

90. Wilson, *Letter*, 30–35.



RESPONSE TO MEGAN K. DEFranza

WILLIAM LOADER

Footnotes

1. Megan K. DeFranza, *Sex Difference in Christian Theology: Male, Female, and Intersex in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).
2. William Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality* (= *NTS*) (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 326–34.
3. *Ibid.*, 22–33, 293–326.
4. William Loader, *Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments on Sexuality* (= *PJT*) (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 204–17.
5. *Opif.* 151–52, 156.
6. *Spec.* 3.35.
7. *Leg.* 784E3–785A3, 783E4–7, 784B1–3.



RESPONSE TO MEGAN K. DEFranza

WESLEY HILL

Footnotes

8. At this point DeFranza adverts to N. T. Wright's five-act play model of improvisation in Christian ethics. For a fuller treatment of this way of thinking about the ethical life, see Samuel Wells, *Improvisation: The Drama of Christian Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2004).

9. Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, trans. J. H. Marks, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), 57: "The high point and goal has been reached toward which all of God's creativity from v. 1 on was directed," as evidenced by the divine self-address (1:26), the declaration after the creation of humanity that's God work is "very good" (as opposed to only "good"; 1:31), and the fact that this story is expanded in ch. 2 of Genesis, among other things.

10. There is an analogy "between this mark of the divine being, namely, that it includes an I and a Thou, and the being of man, male and female" (Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics III/1* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1958], 196).

11. I borrow this language from Stephen Holmes's comments in an interview with Vicky Beeching, accessed March 8, 2016, <http://faithinfeminism.com/feminist-conservative-on-sexuality-2/>. In a blog post on DeFranza's book, Holmes commented similarly: "True maleness and true femaleness are, theologically considered, a memory and a hope, not a present possession. East of Eden, in our present fallen, broken state, we are all inadequately sexed," accessed March 8, 2016, <http://steverholmes.org.uk/blog/?p=7538>.

12. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *Matthew 19–28: Volume III*, ICC (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 1997, 2004), 10, n. 30.

13. Further on this, see Ellen F. Davis, "Critical Traditioning: Seeking an Inner Biblical Hermeneutic," *Anglican Theological Review* 82 (2000): 733–51.

14. Richard Bauckham, "Egalitarianism and Hierarchy in the Bible," in *God and the Crisis of Freedom* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 116–27, argues that while some biblical passages oppose hierarchy outright, it is more common to find "a strategy of relativizing and transforming hierarchy" (p. 118).

15. Francis Watson, *Agape, Eros, Gender: Towards a Pauline Sexual Ethic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 234.

16. Bauckham, "Egalitarianism and Hierarchy in the Bible," 126.



RESPONSE TO MEGAN K. DEFRANZA

STEPHEN R. HOLMES

Footnotes

17. See Lucy Peppiatt, *Women and Worship in Corinth* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015) for a helpful outline of the problems and the various proposed readings.

18. Ellen F. Davis claims the Song has been more commented on than any other biblical book save Genesis and Psalms, and notes that over a hundred commentaries were written before 1200 AD. Ellen F. Davis, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs*, Westminster Bible Companion (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 231.

19. In a survey of recent feminist readings, Robin C. McCall identifies the fact that “the relationship of the lovers in the Song is remarkably equitable” as one of the things that draws feminist interpreters to it. Robin C. McCall, “‘Most Beautiful among Women’: Feminist/Womanist Contributions to Reading the Song of Songs,” *Review & Expositor* 105 (2008): 417–33, quotation from 421.



REJOINDER

MEGAN K. DEFranza

Footnotes

1. Hill reads Adam and Eve through the lenses of Jewish philosopher Martin Buber's categories of I and Thou and Augustine's model of the Trinity which privileges the relationship of Father and Son to the marginalization of the Spirit, setting up an unhealthy vision of marriage which I explain in *Sex Difference in Christian Theology*, 230–38.

2. Hill, *Spiritual Friendship*, 2; citing Holmes, "Shadows and Broken Images: thinking theologically about maleness and femaleness" August 19, 2015, <http://steverholmes.org.uk/blog/?p=7538>.

3. Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans*, trans. Eva Matthews Sanford and William McAllen Green, Loeb Classical Library, vol. 5 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 16.8, 47.

4. Hill, "Response to DeFranza," 111.

5. Holmes's debt to Augustine seems to follow the Reformed tradition which takes a more negative view of humanity after sin than the Augustinianism of the Roman Church. Augustine's influence shows up in Holmes's argument that all sex/gender is warped "east of Eden" so as to be of little use in understanding the divine intention (Holmes, "Shadows and Broken Images"). He makes a similar case in his response to Dr. Loader, emphasizing the distorted nature of all sexual desire (Holmes, "Response to Loader," 63). In these, he appears to be trying to avoid the accusation that he views same-sex desire as more warped than heterosexuality or that the bodies of the intersexed are more fallen than those who are not intersex. I do not find his attempts convincing. Contrast his distrust of gender and sexual desire with that of John Paul II, a Western theologian who nevertheless finds in heterosexual conjugal love an icon of Trinitarian love. John Paul II, *Man and Woman He Created Them: A Theology of the Body*, trans. Michael Waldstein (Boston: Pauline, 2006), 33.

6. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 4.38. Kallistos Ware, *The Orthodox Way*, rev. ed. (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979, 1999), 50–63.

7. N. T. Wright, "How Can the Bible Be Authoritative," *Vox Evangelica* 21 (1991): 7–32. William J. Webb, *Slaves, Women & Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001). Webb unpacks "ultimate ethic" in ch. 2. Although I disagree with Webb's assessment of "homosexuality," I affirm his redemptive-movement hermeneutic and commentary on 1 Cor 7: "Pastoral moderation shapes the apostle's instructions. . . . Paul gently moves them away from the most harmful implications

of an ascetic view of sex. However, he does not come close to sketching an ultimate ethic on sexuality. . . . The Spirit of God and the human authors provide pastoral instruction for their flock, which gently moves them along in a good direction.” Webb, *Slaves, Women & Homosexuals*, 59.

8. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 181–85 and ch. 6.

Footnotes

1. Andrew Sullivan, *Love Undetectable: Notes on Friendship, Sex, and Survival* (New York: Vintage, 1998), 42.
2. Oliver O'Donovan, *Church in Crisis: The Gay Controversy and the Anglican Communion* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2008), 117.
3. The Episcopal Church Task Force on the Study of Marriage, "Report to the 78th General Convention," <https://extranet.generalconvention.org/staff/files/download/12485.pdf>.
4. Irenaeus of Lyons, *Against the Heresies*, Eng. trans. ANF 1 (1885; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 1.8.1; 1.9.4. Cf. St. Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 3.1–2; 3.27.38–3.29.40.
5. Robert W. Jenson, *Canon and Creed* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010).
6. *The Book of Common Prayer* (New York: Church Pension Fund, 1979), 184. I am drawing here from my own Anglican tradition (see Article 20 of the 39 Articles), but similar statements could be found in other traditions; for instance, in the Westminster Confession of Faith: "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself: and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly."
7. For accessible translations of the key texts, see Augustine, *Marriage and Virginity* (Hyde Park, NY: New City, 1999); Augustine, *On Genesis* (Hyde Park, NY: New City, 2004). For a useful secondary discussion, see Christopher C. Roberts, *Creation and Covenant: The Significance of Sexual Difference in the Moral Theology of Marriage* (London: T& T Clark, 2007), ch. 2.
8. This perspective is one that I share with the same-sex-marriage-"affirming" author Robert Song; see his *Covenant and Calling: Towards a Theology of Same-Sex Relationships* (London: SCM, 2014), 5–7.
9. In short, I am using Augustine as a foundational source but not, I hope, uncritically. Augustine shared many of the patriarchal assumptions of his culture which Christians today are right to repudiate. On the other hand, it must also be acknowledged that Augustine is the first patristic author to argue, on the basis of the difficult 1 Cor 11:7, that women *also*, alongside men, are created in the image of God. See further, Kari Elisabeth Børresen, "In Defence of Augustine: how femina is homo," in Bernard Bruning, et al. eds., *Collectanea Augustiniana, Melanges T. J. van Bavel* (Louvain: Institut Historique Augustinien, 1990), 263–80.
10. Song, *Covenant and Calling*, 4–5.

11. Ibid., 17.

12. According to James Brownson, Genesis is interested primarily in the ontological sameness of Adam and Eve and not also in their complementary difference (*Bible, Gender, Sexuality: Reframing the Church's Debate on Same-Sex Relationships* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013], 86–90). But as Ian Paul observes, this is wrong: “The explicit sense of the narrative is that the animals are not ‘suitable’ since they are not the *adam*’s equal. But the equally powerful, implicit sense of the narrative is that it would not be sufficient simply to form another *adam* from the ground. This ‘helper’ needed to be equal *but opposite*. . . . The twin themes of similarity and difference wind their way through the story like a double helix” (*Same-Sex Unions: The Key Biblical Texts* [Cambridge: Grove, 2014], 8).

13. Ephraim Radner, “The Nuptial Mystery: The Historical Flesh of Procreation,” in Roy R. Jeal, ed., *Human Sexuality and the Nuptial Mystery* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2010), 85–115.

14. Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are taken from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV).

15. That Jesus understands marriage to involve procreation is not explicit in Matthew, but is implicit in Luke 20:34–36, since Jesus says there that when the state of resurrection renders death no longer operative in human life, then marriage will no longer feature in human sociality. Why is marriage no longer necessary if death is no more? The most likely answer is that marriage enables procreation, and procreation is the necessary response to the problem of human mortality. Once mortality is dealt with in the eschaton, procreation, and thus marriage, are no longer needed.

16. On this trajectory, see Barry Danylak, *Redeeming Singleness: How the Storyline of Scripture Affirms the Single Life* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010).

17. This should not be taken to exclude, for example, infertile couples from marriage, since “the behavioral part of the reproductive process (coitus) remains ordered to procreation even when nonbehavioral factors—like low sperm count—prevent conception” (Sherif Girgis, Ryan T. Anderson, and Robert P. George, *What Is Marriage?: Man and Woman: A Defense* [New York: Encounter, 2012], 75 and the entirety of ch. 5).

18. I have chosen to omit discussion of Gen 19 here, since whatever its interpretation, it does not condemn all forms of same-sex sexual intimacy, which is precisely the ethical question being debated in the church today. For circumspect discussion, see Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 381.

19. Contra Saul Olyan, “And with a Male You Shall Not Lie the Lying Down of a Woman”: On the Meaning and Significance of Leviticus 18.22 and 20.13,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 5/2 (1994): 179–206, the scope of this command would seem to include the actual act of penetration itself without excluding other forms of sexual intimacy.

20. This has been argued most memorably by Mary Douglas. See, e.g., *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Routledge, 1966, 2002).

21. Lev 18:2, setting the stage for what follows, implicitly describes the recipients of the commands as those who have already been delivered by God (cf. Ex 20:2).

22. L. William Countryman, *Dirt, Greed, and Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implications for Today*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 9–64.

23. Against this claim (found, e.g., in Robert A. J. Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2001], 130) is a great dearth of historical evidence, on which see Stephanie Lynn Budin, *The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

24. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, ch. 9.

25. Christopher R. Seitz, “The Ten Commandments: Positive and Natural Law and the Covenants Old and New—Christian Use of the Decalogue and Moral Law,” in Christopher R. Seitz and Carl E. Braaten, eds., *I Am the Lord Your God: Christian Reflections on the Ten Commandments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 18–39, at 31.

26. Walter Houston, *Purity and Monotheism: Clean and Unclean Animals in Biblical Law*, JSOT Sup 140 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 270, quoted in Seitz, “The Ten Commandments,” 32, n. 19.

27. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 389.
28. Contra Dale Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 52–53, the Adamic allusions in Romans 1 are widely recognized; cf. Morna D. Hooker, “Adam in Romans 1,” *NTS* 6 (1959–60): 297–306; James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 91–93. Cf. also Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*, 289–93.
29. Brownson, *Bible, Gender, Sexuality*, 228–29, 231 defends a modified version of John Boswell’s position at this point (*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, 1980], 110–12).
30. As many have noted, Paul’s use of *physis* has parallels in Jewish and Greco-Roman literature (e.g., Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3.37–42; *Abr.* 133–41; Seneca, *Moral Epistles* 122.7; Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love*, 5). In some sense, Paul believes even pagans may share his “moral logic” in condemning same-sex sexual acts (cf. Rom 1:19), but the plain sense of Romans 1 indicates indebtedness to Genesis and its creation narrative and suggests that *physis* is best interpreted primarily in that light.
31. Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark, 2015), 349.
32. Simon J. Gathercole, “Sin in God’s Economy: Agencies in Romans 1 and 7,” in John M. G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, eds., *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 158–72, at 163, 164. For a historical argument that female as well as male homosexuality is in view in Rom 1:26–27, see Bernadette Brooten, *Love Between Women: Early Christian Response to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 59–60. If Paul is in fact reflecting on Genesis, the relative rarity of female homosexuality in the ancient world matters little to his argument. His bearings are taken from Scripture, not empirical observation as such.
33. As argued in Brooten, *Love Between Women*; Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*.
34. As argued in David E. Frederickson, “Natural and Unnatural Use in Romans 1:24–27,” in David Balch, ed., *Homosexuality, Science, and the “Plain Sense” of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 197–222.
35. Francis Watson, “The Authority of the Voice: A Theological Reading of 1 Cor 11.2–16,” *NTS* 46 (2000): 520–36, at 524, n. 8: “In [same-sex] relationships, Paul may have believed, woman attempts to be ‘apart from man’ and man attempts to be ‘apart from woman.’”
36. Alistair May, *The Body for the Lord: Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5–7*, *LNTS* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), ch. 5.
37. The term could indicate anything from men who wore feminine garments, accepted castration, or were simply oversexed and lacked self-control from the perspective of the critic (see, e.g., Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 7.4.2; Plutarch, *On Moral Virtue* 447B).
38. Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 1.505–24.
39. Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 83, 108. This means, in turn, that Paul chose not to use other commonly accepted terms for same-sex coupling in the form of pederasty. Had he intended to limit his focus to that ancient institution, coining a new word would not have served his purposes.
40. See C. Kevin Rowe, “Biblical Pressure and Trinitarian Hermeneutics,” *Pro Ecclesia* 11 (2002): 295–312.
41. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* 2357, http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p3s2c2a6.htm.
42. Song, *Covenant and Calling*, x, 18.
43. I have often been struck by Eugene Rogers’s way of putting this point: “For gay and lesbian people, the right sort of otherness is unlikely to be represented by someone of the opposite sex, because only someone of the apposite, not opposite, sex will get deep enough into the relationship to expose one’s vulnerabilities and inspire the trust that healing requires” (“Sanctified Unions: An Argument for Gay Marriage,” *The Christian Century* [June 15, 2004]: 26–29, at 28).

44. It is probably too early to say whether this way of putting it will hold up in light of further psychological research. Our knowledge of the malleability of sexual desire and "orientation" is still in its relative infancy. See, e.g., Lisa M. Diamond, *Sexual Fluidity: Understanding Women's Love and Desire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

45. Jeffrey John, *Permanent, Faithful, Stable: Christian Same-Sex Marriage*, 2nd ed. (London: Dartman, Longman, and Todd, 2013).

46. Song, *Covenant and Calling*, 20, 15, 27.

47. See David Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (New York: Rutledge, 1990), 3–40; Holt N. Parker, "The Myth of the Heterosexual: Anthropology and Sexuality for Classicists," *Arethusa* 34 (2001): 313–62. Paul, at least, in Rom 1:27 seems to envision some kind of mutuality ("consumed with passion for one another"), but whether he had in mind anything like contemporary same-sex "unions" or "marriages" is doubtful (see Thomas K. Hubbard, "Peer Homosexuality," in Thomas K. Hubbard, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities* [Chichester: Blackwell, 2014], 128–49, many of whose examples [e.g., Achilles and Patroclus] may not quite fit the thesis he wishes to advance).

48. *Summa Theologiae* IIae Q.154, arts. 11–12.

49. See David F. Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

50. What Roberts, *Creation and Covenant*, 197, says about Graham Ward's arguments I would also say about Song's: "He assumes where there is [sexual] desire there must be theologically significant difference [between straight and gay people] and does not interrogate same-sex desire at any point, asking if it might be postlapsarian in origin and hence, unlike sexual difference, testifying to sin and not to ontologically significant differences. It is as if Augustine's argument against the Pelagians, to the effect that human desires must be subject to theological judgment and cannot simply be trusted for their goodness, had never been made." I would simply add that if we urge gay and lesbian Christians to interrogate their sexual identities thus (cf. Michael W. Hannon, "Against Heterosexuality," *First Things* [March 2014]: 27–34), we must ask the same of *all* Christians who self-identify as "straight," "bisexual," or whatever. Gay Christians must query their felt identities and experiences precisely because all Christians must, in light of the gospel's relativization of any identity other than "Christ."

51. Roberts, *Creation and Covenant*, 227.

52. Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *Cherishing Life* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 2004), 111, emphasis mine.

53. Kathryn Greene-McCreight, "The Logic of the Interpretation of Scripture and the Church's Debate over Sexual Ethics," in David L. Balch, ed., *Homosexuality, Science, and the "Plain Sense" of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 242–60, at 259.

54. I have written at length about this in *Spiritual Friendship: Finding Love in the Church as a Celibate Gay Christian* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2015).

55. On Aelred as "gay," see Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 222–23. Compare also, though, the discussion in Brian Patrick McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350–1250* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988, 2010), 302–304 which critiques Boswell for greater confidence in his interpretation than Aelred's texts warrant. In the end, however, McGuire agrees that Aelred experienced same-sex attraction: "Insofar as Aelred indicated that he had to cope with a sexual desire for other men, Boswell's interpretation captures one aspect of the special quality of the earlier part of the twelfth century," 303.

56. Aelred of Rievaulx, *De speculo caritatis*, as quoted in Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, 225.

57. Sheldon Vanauken, *A Severe Mercy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 147.



RESPONSE TO WESLEY HILL

WILLIAM LOADER

Footnotes

1. William Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012) (=NTS), 22–33.
2. NTS, 326–34.
3. NTS 453–67.
4. Wesley Hill, *Spiritual Friendship* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2015).



RESPONSE TO WESLEY HILL

MEGAN K. DEFranza

Footnotes

5. For the longer version of this argument, see my *Sex Difference in Christian Theology: Male, Female, and Intersex in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), especially chs. 1, 2, 4.

6. Augustine, *De bono coniugali*, *De sancta uirginitate*, ed. P. G. Walsh (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), XVII, 37; VI, 15.

7. Dale B. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Lexington, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 52. In rabbinic sources, idolatry is traced to Kenan, the generation of Enosh, or the influence of the Watchers. Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 53.

8. *Ibid.*, 54.

9. *Ibid.*, 55.

10. See my comments on Romans 1 in my chapter in this volume, pp. 134–37.

11. C. S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1960, 1988), 57–58. See also DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, ch. 5.

12. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 213–38.

13. Lewis, *Four Loves*, 73.

14. *Ibid.*, 133–34.

15. Rowan Williams, “The Body’s Grace,” in *Theology and Sexuality: Classic and Contemporary Readings*, ed. Eugene F. Rodgers Jr. (London: Blackwell, 2002), 309–21.



RESPONSE TO WESLEY HILL

STEPHEN R. HOLMES

Footnotes

16. Eve Tushnet, *Gay and Catholic: Accepting My Sexuality, Finding Community, Living My Faith* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2014).



REJOINDER

WESLEY HILL

Footnotes

1. Compare her fuller argument in her *Sex Difference in Christian Theology: Male, Female, and Intersex in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 177.
2. Cornelius Plantinga Jr., *Not the Way It's Supposed to Be: A Breviary of Sin* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996).
3. A point made recently and powerfully by Sarah Coakley, *The New Asceticism: Sexuality, Gender, and the Quest for God* (London: Bloomsbury/Continuum, 2015).
4. John Piper, "Warfield's Supernatural Patience," *Desiring God*, June 11, 2008, accessed April 12, 2016, <http://www.desiringgod.org/articles/warfields-supernatural-patience>.
5. Eugene F. Rogers Jr., "Same-Sex Complementarity," *The Christian Century*, May 11, 2011, accessed April 12, 2016, <http://www.christiancentury.org/article/2011-04/same-sex-complementarity>.

LISTENING TO THE PAST AND REFLECTING ON THE PRESENT

STEPHEN R. HOLMES

Footnotes

1. I am conscious that “same-sex sexual relationship” is a clumsy phrase; I do not wish to use “homosexual” as it is considered offensive by some, at least in the UK, where I live and work. I will use gay and lesbian to refer to contemporary Western patterns of relationship, but not all sexual activity between two men or two women fits these contemporary patterns, and so a broader term is necessary.

2. Robert Song has recently drawn attention to this theme in *Covenant and Calling*, citing John Chrysostom. The idea is held very generally, however, the phrase going back at least to Tertullian, and the point being made by (at least) Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Jerome, and Ambrose (see Josiah Trenham, *Marriage and Virginity according to St John Chrysostom* (Durham theses), Durham University, available at Durham E-Theses Online, <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1259/>) p.89, n. 102). It is striking that the post-Marxist sociologist Zygmunt Bauman rediscovers this link in his meditations on mortality, *Mortality, Immortality, and Other Life Strategies* (Cambridge: Polity, 1992); see especially 29.

3. This account may be maintained regardless of the position one takes on the presently contentious issue of the extent to which Eph 5 and other texts demand a gendered specifying of this mutual self-giving with language of “submission” and “headship.” I take the symmetrical mutuality of 1 Cor 7 to be normative and do not find it hard to read Eph 5 in those terms.

4. Roman Catholic theology traditionally divides sins into “venial” and “mortal,” the former being less serious than the latter.

5. Karl Bath, *Church Dogmatics* III.4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1961), 166.

6. Nikki Sullivan, *A Critical Introduction to Queer Theory* (New York: New York University Press, 2003), 2–4.

7. See Craig A. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (Oxford: OUP, 2010) for extensive evidence.

8. Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 279–86 surveys some of the evidence.

9. See, e.g., Alan Wilson, *More Perfect Union: Understanding Same-Sex Marriage* (London: DLT, 2014), ch. 8.

10. Jenell Williams Paris, *The End of Sexual Identity: Why Sex Is Too Important to Define Who We Are* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2011), 62–69. Stephen O. Murray’s classic *Homosexualities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000) uses three of the four same categories to

structure his extensive data (Murray regards “profession-based” relationships as a subset of “gender-structured” ones).

11. See Murray’s chapter on “Premodern Egalitarian Homosexualities,” in *Homosexualities*, 359–81, for extensive examples.

12. The recently retired Anglican archbishop of Uganda, Henry Orombi, described a narrative like this as part of the reason he cannot imagine giving any space to gay and lesbian relationships. Male same-sex intercourse, he suggests, was historically a mode of imposing and demonstrating control of social inferiors. When in June 1886 a number of page boys of the king of Buganda refused to submit to his sexual advances because of their new-found Christian faith, they were killed. (See, e.g., Orombi’s influential essay “What Is Anglicanism?” *First Things*, Aug/Sept 2007, <http://www.firstthings.com/article/2007/07/001-what-is-anglicanism-50>.)

13. Consider, for example, two popular Singaporean books: Li-Ann Thio is a lawyer who has served in the Singaporean parliament and holds degrees from Oxford, Cambridge, and Harvard. Nonetheless, her *Prophecy, Pansexuality, and Pandemonium: The Political Arm of the Spirit of Lawlessness in the Acharit-Hayamim* (Singapore: Genesis, 2013) is every bit as extreme to a Western reader as the title suggests. The National Council of Churches’ *A Christian Response to Homosexuality* (Singapore: Genesis, 2004) is more measured in tone, but still regards “Should a homosexual be baptised?” (p. 93) as a valid question to ask.

14. Hanne Blank, *Straight: The Surprisingly Short History of Heterosexuality* (Boston: Beacon, 2012), 15–21.

15. “Queer theory” is a recent academic approach to the study of sexuality which denies the existence of any norms. See Sullivan, *Critical Introduction*.

16. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: The Care of the Self*, vol. 3 (trans. ed., New York: Random House, 1986), and Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

17. See Sullivan, *Critical Introduction*, *passim*.

18. Given the space constraints of these essays, I am merely gesturing at areas of evidence here, trusting that the point will be fairly self-evident once made. For a fuller argument, see Foucault, *History*, vol. 1, 155–57.

19. The most accessible sustained argument for this proposition is now J. K. A. Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009), but it is also the point that almost all of Hauerwas’s writings make one way or another.

20. To forestall a common criticism, I am not here comparing gay relationships to polyamorous relationships. I am testing an argument used to justify gay relationships by inserting an entirely different reality—polyamory—into the argument to see where it leads. I could do the same thing with gun owning, prayer, or baseball-card collecting, except that these examples would not yield useful data (as far as I can see).

21. Eugene F. Rogers, *Sexuality and the Christian Body: Their Way into the Triune God* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999).

22. Robert Song, whom I will consider in the following section, is the only other example that comes to mind, at least among book-length treatments.

23. “The trouble with most conservative accounts is not that in denying same-sex couples the rite of marriage they would deny them true self-satisfaction . . . [but] that they would deny them true self-denial.” Rogers, *Sexuality*, 70.

24. The best book exploring this area remains Christopher Roberts, *Creation and Covenant: The Significance of Sexual Difference in the Moral Theology of Marriage* (New York: Continuum, 1997). See also Beth Felker Jones, *Marks of His Wounds: Gender, Politics, and Bodily Resurrection* (Oxford: OUP, 2007).

25. Robert Song, *Covenant and Calling: Towards a Theology of Same-Sex Relationships* (London: SCM, 2014).

26. For both these points, see Anna Poulson, *An Examination of the Ethics of Contraception with Reference to Recent Protestant and Roman Catholic Thought*, PhD thesis, King’s College London, 2006, <https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/theses/an-examination-of-the>

-ethics-of-contraception-with-reference-to-recent-protestant-and-roman-catholic-thought
%28f20ad0c1-2706-416f-bf6f-b95f901e888c%29.html.

27. I made this argument in general terms, not focusing on marriage, in my *Listening to the Past: The Place of Tradition in Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003), particularly chs. 1, 2, 10.



RESPONSE TO STEPHEN R. HOLMES

WILLIAM LOADER

Footnotes

1. On celibacy, see the discussion in William Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012) (=NTS), 430–90.
2. NTS 182–222.



RESPONSE TO STEPHEN R. HOLMES

MEGAN K. DEFranza

Footnotes

3. Craig Williams, *Roman Homosexuality*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: University Press, 2010), appendix 2, 280–81.
4. Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 220.
5. See my *Sex Difference in Christian Theology: Male, Female, and Intersex in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), especially ch. 5.
6. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, especially chs. 3 and 4.
7. Melissa Hines, *Brain Gender* (Oxford: University Press, 2004), 18–19. See also Mary E. Frandsen, “*Eunuchi conjugium*”: The Marriage of a Castrato in Early Modern Germany,” *Early Music History* 24 (2005): 53–124.
8. Anne Fausto-Sterling, *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality* (New York: Basic, 2000), 36.
9. Mark Brustman, “The Ancient Roman and Talmudic Definition of Natural Eunuchs,” a paper presented at a conference on “*Eunuchs in Antiquity and Beyond*,” Cardiff University, July 27, 1999, <http://www.well.com/user/aquarius/cardiff.htm>.
10. See Alfred Cohen, “Tumtum and Androgynous,” *Journal of Halacha and Contemporary Society* 38 (1999): 62–85. John Hare, “Hermaphrodites, Eunuchs, and Intersex People: The Witness of Medical Science in Biblical Times and Today,” in *Intersex, Theology, and the Bible: Troubling Bodies in Church, Text, and Society*, Susannah Cornwall, ed. (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015), 86.
11. Augustine, *De bono coniugali*, *De sancta uirginitate*, ed. P. G. Walsh (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), XVII; 37.
12. John Paul II, *Man and Woman He Create Them: A Theology of the Body*, trans. and ed. Michael Waldstein (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006), 163, homily 9:3, 427, 77:2. See also John Paul II, “Commitment to Promoting Women’s Dignity,” (general audience, Nov. 24, 1999), in *The Trinity’s Embrace: God’s Saving Plan, a Catechesis on Salvation History* (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2002), 289.

13. David Matzko McCarthy, *Sex and Love in the Home: A Theology of the Household*, 2nd. ed. (London: SCM, 2004), 4–5. Despite these improvements, McCarthy worries that the personalist account of conjugal love goes too far when using this lens as the primary pattern of divine and Christian love. For my analysis of these developments in Roman Catholic and evangelical theology, see especially DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, ch. 4.

14. Stanley J. Grenz, *Sexual Ethics: An Evangelical Perspective* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1990), 87–89.

15. Ibid., 149.



RESPONSE TO STEPHEN R. HOLMES

WESLEY HILL

Footnotes

16. John Bauerschmidt, Zachary Guiliano, Wesley Hill, and Jordan Hylden, "Marriage in Creation and Covenant: A Response to the Task Force on the Study of Marriage," *Anglican Theological Review*, accessed March 9, 2016, <http://www.anglicantheologicalreview.org/static/pdf/conversations/MarriageInCreationAndCovenant.pdf>.

17. I acknowledge my indebtedness to Brevard Childs, among other so-called "canonical critics," at this point.

18. What I am suggesting is that it is actually the historical development within the canon that leads to Augustine's theology of marriage. Most likely Ephesians itself intends to supplement or adapt the views expressed in 1 Cor for a slightly later moment in early Christian history. On this, compare John M. G. Barclay, "Ordinary But Different: Colossians and Hidden Moral Identity," in *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews*, WUNT 275 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 237–55. What the later Pauline letters intend is "to interpret household relations within the framework of allegiance to the Lord" (p. 247).

19. Wesley Hill, *Spiritual Friendship: Finding Love in the Church as a Celibate Gay Christian* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2015).

20. Casey Pick, "Friends Without Benefits," accessed March 9, 2016, <http://www.believeoutloud.com/latest/friends-without-benefits>.

21. Personal correspondence, August 25, 2013. Used with correspondent's permission.

22. Matthew Loftus, "Material Dimensions of Spiritual Friendship," accessed March 9, 2016, <http://mereorthodoxy.com/material-dimensions-spiritual-friendship/>.

23. I owe this way of putting things to Eve Tushnet, who has stressed this point in many contexts over the years. See her *Gay and Catholic: Accepting My Sexuality, Finding Community, Living My Faith* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria, 2014), 168–69.



REJOINDER

STEPHEN R. HOLMES

Footnotes

1. From Yeats, "The Circus Animals' Desertion."

HOMOSEXUALITY, THE BIBLE, AND THE CHURCH

PRESTON M. SPRINKLE

Footnotes

1. Most notably, Louis Crompton (*Homosexuality and Civilization* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006]) and Bernadette Brooten (*Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* [Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998]).

2. Paul mentions children in Eph 6:1–4, of course, but this doesn't in itself mean that such children intrinsically validate the sexual relationship between the husband and wife in 5:22–33 any more than slaves (6:5–9) justify a legitimate household. In Paul's discussion, household codes are organized the way they are probably to reflect the typical way they were discussed in Greco-Roman society and not to make, or assume, an argument for procreation.

3. See Loader, *Sexuality*, 37–41.

4. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 119.

5. Ibid, 120–21.

6. On the Trinity, 7.7.10–12.

7. DeFranza, *Sex Difference*, 125.

8. Christopher Roberts, *Creation and Covenant: The Significance of Sexual Difference in the Moral Theology of Marriage* (New York: Continuum, 1997).

9. It seems to me, however, that when Jesus brings up the eunuch in Matt 19, he does so *not* to expand the definition of marriage, but argues that some people are called to radical discipleship *outside* of marriage. The eunuch, according to Jesus, doesn't marry.

10. Some people argue that the early church's revision of old covenant dietary and circumcision laws (e.g., Acts 15) shows that accommodation is necessary and, indeed, biblical. However, these first-century discussions had to do with the place of old covenant law in the life of the new covenant believer. The question facing the church today is about the teaching of the New Testament itself and not about whether certain laws given to Israel are for the church.