HOLY HOMOSEX?

This & That

Priscilla D.M. Turner

in association with

James I. Packer

Copyright © 2013 P.D.M. Turner

Second printing 2025

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced by any means, graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping or by any information storage retrieval system without the written permission of the author, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in academic discussions, critical articles and reviews.

ISBN-13: 9798872407768
ISBN-10: 8872407768

DOROTHEAE
Filiae dilectissimae

CONTENTS

Preface	**iii**
Relevant Biblical Texts	**1**
A Letter to Bishop Michael Ingham	**29**
An Open Letter to Bishop Michael Ingham	**35**
Questions for the Gay and Lesbian Voices	**43**
Dialogue with Hugh	**47**
Terms for Justice, Righteousness, Virtue	**105**
Yes, and Round is Square Too	**127**
A Note on Theological Ethics	**141**
A Brief to the Lambeth Commission	**147**

PREFACE

The move to reopen what was until about forty years ago a closed question, whether same-sex physical relations are good, beautiful and acceptable to God, caught both scholars and Christian people in general more or less completely off-guard. I am both a scholar and a Christian; these collected papers represent some of my contribution to modern discussion. I publish them in the hope that others may be blessed by my work, and may be enabled to think and act more consistently for Our Lord in the modern world.

It is an honour to be able to include the text of J.I. Packer's 1998 Open Letter originally co-signed by him, Donald M. Lewis and me.

For the 2017 printing I added one significant new item to the FOR REFERENCE section, Harper, Kyle '*Porneia*: The Making of a Christian Sexual Norm.' *JBL* 131/2, 2012, 363-383. It reinforces what I had concluded long ago from my original work on the Old Greek of Ezekiel 1-39. That section has now been placed more logically after the endnotes to the first paper.

It has also proved possible to solve some previously intractable problems to do with the display of Greek accents and diacriticals. Any other changes of layout are so minor as to be imperceptible.

Priscilla D.M. Turner, Vancouver, November 2025.

BIBLICAL TEXTS RELEVANT TO HOMOSEXUAL ORIENTATION AND PRACTICE

A paper prepared
for the June 1997 issue
of Christian Scholar's
Review
with additions
and emendations

Biblical Texts Relevant to Homosexual Orientation and Practice[1]: Notes on Philology and Interpretation

By ©P.D.M. Turner.

Though I firmly believe that, next to God, sexual love is the world's most interesting subject, I feel bound to preface this discussion with a couple of remarks. Firstly, my topic may seem narrow and disembodied from human and pastoral reality; but actually I have been led to it in the most personal of ways. Not only are there the many individuals whom I know and love, some of whom have died and some of whom have suffered extreme personal pain because of false doctrine and bad disciplinary practice in churches, but I myself have been involved publicly in distasteful controversy in my own city. I care to know whether the boy who goes home with a man for food and shelter puts himself, biblically speaking, outside the Kingdom, and for whom such relationships are liberating. Hence this article started life as a little paper put into circulation nationally in my own denomination.

Secondly, I am wary of a prurient interest in other people's sins; to keep me wary I sometimes think of using what used to be those precious eight letters in the PC to call this study HOMOPORN. I hope that it will be read in the same spirit.

Thirdly, I hope that, in seeking to show how exactly Scripture calls a spade a spade in at least one passage, I shall not seem to be verging on the obscene; after several decades of passionate monogamy, I myself am left cold by details of homosexual conduct, but can still be made to blush by public discussion however clinical of private heterosexual matters.

Fourthly, I have a quantity of supporting linguistic and cultural detail tucked away in footnotes; in order to keep the body of the argument lean I adduce only the bare minimum in my text. The same applies to bibliographical references: the reader should investigate the relevant literature for himself.

Has God Said ...?

We have all noticed how few are the texts in Scripture which refer to these subjects. We have probably all noticed, too, that until recently we took them for granted, assumed that their meaning was perfectly clear, and studied them little if at all. There may indeed be general agreement that whatever the Bible means is to be believed and obeyed; but there is plenty of argument about meaning. Biblical Christians have found the relatively few[2] direct references being picked off one by one by people claiming to have scholarship on their side.[3] Current opinions raise in an acute form intertwined questions about the interpretation of Scripture and the very nature of the Gospel. Marcionite arguments are resurrected, so that the whole of the Old Testament and much of the New is seen as the 'Word' of an angry, legalistic and unloving sub-Christian deity[4]; and the 'Canon within a canon' view of inspiration is invoked, so that Scripture is judged to be inspired only selectively, not in all its parts, and text may be set against text[5].

Has the Church been mistaken all this time, together with the whole older Judeo-Christian ethical tradition? The only way to tackle this is to be severely philological, as I believe most of the Fathers and the Reformers sought to be. We need the "plain sense" before we move on to theologize; if you can't get it out of the words, forget it. It is, therefore, the aim of this study to arrive at basic meaning, leaving pastoral, legal and disciplinary matters to others.

To turn, then, to the texts:–

With Friends Like That ...?

Little space need be given to the modern suggestion that in the archetypal 'Sodomite' story [Gen. 19] the verb ידע "know" means "to get acquainted with". We are looking at the prosaic, not at all mystical, sense "have physical intimacy with, have carnal knowledge of" of which there are quite a few examples in biblical Hebrew. Lot's counter-offer shows that. However much we may deplore it, in this Old Testament context it was more acceptable to offer one's own daughters than one's guests. Nor should I acquit Lot of preferring this to his own physical violation; readers will note that the male population of Sodom, thwarted of his guests, do raise that possibility. He was a good character only relatively, and quite capable of letting his virgin daughters suffer in his own place. Some concede the meaning of ידע, but want to make the main moral point the threat of a breach of hospitality. This makes a weak argument. While we are not expected to think of rape as appealing to anyone, female or male, why should homosexual gang-rape have violated hospitality, unless it were inhospitable? That Sodom was ruthlessly inhospitable in general is not in dispute; sybaritic communities probably always are cold and exploitative, not least to strangers. It does also need saying that the place is portrayed as exemplifying the universal principle that perversion is an epiphenomenon of extreme affluence.[6] This episode does show how full of wandering lust Sodom was (*cf.* the Levite's concubine in Judges 19). A subsidiary point which could be made is that the men of Sodom may have been 'situational' perverts, as nothing is said about their mental state in general.[7] However, they do not take Lot up on his daughters.

Who Among the Gods Is Like You ...?

Given that there are Old Testament passages about male cult-prostitution, one has to take rather more seriously the possibility that the double prohibition in the Holiness

Code [Lev. 18:22, 22:13] of homosexual acts is grounded in the running polemic against idolatry and occult practices. Certainly Yahweh would not be 'tamed' as a fertility-god; and the Code that was prescribed to express what it meant for Israel to belong to God can strike modern people as a curious mixture of taboo, ceremonial, hygiene, politeness, humanitarianism and ethical principle, of which not all by any means can be viewed as binding in New Testament terms. "Cult" covered the whole of life as the area of the nation's response to redeeming love. Hence the Code is an admixture of the apparently trivial and the profoundly serious. It would be a mistake, however, to dismiss any element as arbitrary or otiose. Pagan cults must have been condemned partly because of their foul practices. Purely cultic customs, and kinds of behaviour which are obviously vicious and cruel, were offered as a package deal. If Israel compromised at any point, she bought everything including the destructive elements.

In addition, the larger context shows that we are dealing with a whole catalogue of kinds of behaviour which have been universally execrated, in or out of cultic contexts.[8] If there were any sign of their being approved in the Bible, the Bible would fall below the best secular standards. They include bestiality, child sacrifice, incest and adultery.[9] These are all evil customs in any culture; to them the text applies the strongly condemnatory תועבה or "disgusting thing"[10], as highly offensive to God. It is difficult to label all תועבות as arbitrary or having no permanent connection with human good. Moreover there is every sign that the Torah as a whole was taken seriously even under the New Covenant.[11] There are New Testament principles governing the 'meaning' of the old rules: sometimes there is direct quotation, sometimes a principle is derived from them[12], sometimes we must consider how they give shape and definition to the principle of love for neighbour, which "fulfils" without necessarily abrogating them [Romans 13:8-10].

It has been left to us of the late Twentieth Century to suggest that for Jesus, Who regarded the canonical Jewish Scriptures as the authoritative Word of God, the rightness of homosexual expression or conduct was an open question. Such an opinion could be maintained only in a period where knowledge of New Testament background was at a premium. The notion is if possible more implausible than that He would have been open-minded about heterosexual relations outside marriage. There can be no doubt that the prohibition of all extramarital genital[13] contact must have held for Our Lord as it did for His society. The reaction to any teaching or living on His part which suggested compromise at this point would have been extreme; practice would have given the religious authorities grounds for a capital charge; at the very least some echo, considering the aberrations of which the Lord was accused, must have found its way into the record.[14] Given that He set up as a rabbi of sorts, if His views, let alone His practice, had been at all suspect, it is unimaginable that they would not have been made an issue. The suggestion is equally ludicrous when it comes to Paul: in that respect as in others he never ceased to be a First Century Jewish rabbi. He could, furthermore, never have risen so far so fast as a Pharisee if there had been any breath of that sort of scandal about him.[15] Jewish sensitivities in sexual matters were such that certain strict ideas about prohibited degrees were something which the Council of Jerusalem, even in the interests of settling the Great Row about the terms upon which Gentiles could belong to the people of God, could not jettison as merely cultic. Since hindrances to table-fellowship, without which you do not have one church, were in question, the issue was not core-πορνεία[16] but fringe-πορνεία. There was certainly *a fortiori* no argument between Jew and Gentile about what constituted gross sin.

All Have Sinned ...?

Because the two explicit New Testament texts, Rom. 1:26-27 and I Cor. 6:9-11[17], are Pauline, the argument is sometimes made that we have no Dominical teaching on the subject and that Jesus will have at least tolerated the conduct. I shall get to this in connection with the I Corinthians list. Of the Romans 1 text it should be said that we must be careful to read it in the context of Paul's mighty argument, which we may not short-circuit or trivialise. Some such bathetic short-circuiting is involved in any reading which makes God "abandon" women and men to nothing more striking than behaviour which is slightly *outré*[18] by societal standards. His vocabulary for "females" and "males" is of the kind which highlights biological differentiation and procreational compatibility, and echoes the Greek rendering of the parallel Hebrew pair of terms at Gen. 1:27[19]. He is speaking of the biologically bizarre as angering to the Creator of sexual difference. At the same time homosexual passion[20] and action (women are mentioned as subject to them only here) are plainly not being singled out by Paul. His indictment of sin is very comprehensive. It seems to me that he is taking a long and cosmic view, and harking right back to the Fall. He says in effect "God-shaped gap leads to substitute worship leads to degrading idols leads to abandonment by God leads to degraded living (with examples of the kind which especially appalled the more outwardly moral Jew) and a denial of what one knows of God and ethics". In the context of Creation, Fall and Redemption it is unsurprising that he should instance one manifestation of our corruption that touches the core of our being, namely that estrangement from the other sex which is more than hinted at in Gen. 3. However, he is also speaking of a homosexual condition leading to action.[21] Therefore to suggest that because New Testament Greek has no noun for "homosexuality" *per se*[22] the concept is missing is either ingenuous or disingenuous. Like Plato, Paul speaks in terms of relations which are not in accord with φύσις.

With him he must mean that the whole phenomenon is unbiological[23]; unlike him, he sees the vertical dimension of φύσις-as-Creation.

It is never fruitful to interrogate Scripture in the wrong terms. Any attempt to make a connection between τὴν ἀτιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει τὰς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες at the end of verse 27 and current diseases founders on the fact that Paul is not prophesying, but speaking in the Aorist tense of men's past finished actions. This Greek may mean a pervasive self-consciousness and defensiveness in the affected personality; or may quite as probably refer to the eventual historical judgement on Sodom. It is by no means clear that Rom. 1, or any other part of Scripture, speaks to our questions about the aetiology of the homosexual condition. Some would stress the use of μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν and suggest that it is always chosen. Others would stress παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός and argue for an origin in the Fall with its resultant idolatry. Perhaps such thinking must bow before the mystery of iniquity: there is no explanation, only a solution for all of us who have sin in our bloodstream. My personal conviction is that in Paul's mind the choice and "exchange" are Adamic, whatever particular vices we may add through our own personal mini-Fall: God have mercy on us, for we are all perverts one way or another. As St. Paul is saying, everybody knows, and nobody does. All of us, if we think at all, are haunted by the sense that "in the beginning it was not so".

Do You Not Know ...?

In the I Cor. 6 passage we find a significant term at the head of the list, one of several which recur at I Tim. 1:9-10. The πορν- group of cognates is very interesting. In extra-biblical Greek πορνεία has a limited semantic range, but in biblical Greek this is greatly extended, for reasons connected with the need in many idolatry-adultery contexts for two terms for unchastity in the

Septuagint version.[24] Professor Sir Kenneth Dover is wrong to reproach Paul with using it for all behaviour of which he disapproved, but right in his instinct that in the Greek Bible much more is wrapped up in it than the people and activities of the world's oldest profession[25]. It comes to mean all irregular genital contact except adultery and in some contexts seems to be a portmanteau for adultery too. Mt. 5, 15 and 19 are cases in point[26]: unchastity is very serious sin which defiles us inwardly, and is grounds for divorce. It is thus not tenable that the Gospel record shows Jesus making no reference to homosexual acts. πόρνοι may be masculine for common gender. This would make "sexually immoral persons" the right rendering. However, given that Paul is dealing with people's areas of freedom, the feminine cases may be intentionally excluded.[27] Most female prostitutes of any kind would have been the victims of the activities of ἀνδραποδισταί, "slavers", who figure at I Tim. 1:10, and these could not have repented of the life women were commonly sold into.[28] Males, even as chattels, were much freer. *Plus ça change* ... I am therefore strongly inclined to start off my translation of this catalogue "No men who are unchaste ...". The Greek covers practitioners of incest and child-molestation as well as those who use female prostitutes. Of course even with this extension πορνεία continues, with its cognates, to cover male commercial and ritual prostitution[29]: the word πόρνοι must, therefore, at least contain the meaning "male prostitutes" here.

Pace several modern writers, who indulge in special pleading at this point, the μαλακοί are not hard to identify. The adjective μαλακός, here used substantivally (*cf.* Eng. 'softy'), is quite unambiguously "a male performing the female role in same-sex relations". In such a context straight after the μοιχοί no-one would have read it differently. Other words with a similar range convey the same idea. Latin and Greek seem unable to generate enough semi-contemptuous expressions for the male who, de-

pending on the context, was cowardly, spoilt by soft living, ineffectual or 'female' in the technical sense. This was in the pagan world the hypocritical blame-the-victim reality. The word has to be given its full weight without tendentiousness. It is, for example, sloppy translation to run together two items in a list of ten.[30] And *NAB* tries to make commercial a category which everybody knew referred to a regular social pleasantry among the well-born (at least in the Eastern Empire). Then as now it tended to be self-perpetuating, and the penetrated often grew up unable to put his heart into marriage.[31] "Passive partner" is the right rendering.

This brings us to ἀρσενοκοίτης. These are the facts. It is a noun unattested outside our two New Testament passages, the Fathers, who show a couple of cognates to it (as you might expect in those who read the New Testament in Greek), and the Tenth Century compilation known as the Greek Anthology. It is a masculine noun in -ης, -ου. The suffix makes it an 'activity' kind of formation[32], of which the paradigm is ποιήτης, *i.e.* "one who goes in for creating". Nouns formed with this particular suffix were proliferating in the First Century. The τ has no connection with κοίτη "bed" except the coincidental one of a derivation from κεῖμαι "I lie". It is a compound, and compounds need especially careful handling; with them the grammatical relation of the parts must be sorted out before one can see daylight. Etymologizing gets one only so far, sometimes very little way. The word cannot mean "man in a bed".[33] It is an objective compound, of which one part must be a verbal noun, grammatically equivalent to a verb. It is parallel in form to παιδεράστης. It might be construed either as "one who (-ης, the suffix) lies (κοίτα-, from κεῖμαι, a verbal) with men (ἀρσενο-, a noun)", or else as an objective compound but with ἀρσενο- used verbally and κοίτα- substantivally, giving us "one who takes the male part in lying". The practical difference is slight to nil; but what on earth does it mean? The sense is not so much innocuous as vacuous, unless we say that the preceding μαλακοί desiderates

something. It would help if κεῖμαι ever had a coital connotation[34]; but it does not, even in the Fathers.

That it does not is a subtle linguistic point on which modern scholarship appears to be completely silent. The fact is that κεῖμαι *tout court* no more suggests genital relations than do English expressions such as "lie", "sleep", "go to bed", "spend the night" *tout court* (unless we count "lay" and "get laid"!). So wide is its range of other meanings, literal and figurative, that unless the verb and any derivatives are prefixed with such obvious semantic pointers as συν- and ὁμο- the suggestion is unlikely to occur to the mind at all. The coital sense is no more than a faint implication even in such words as ἀκοίτης, ἄκοιτις and παρακοίτης, which all mean "spouse". It is poignantly absent from μονοκοιτέω [Ar. *Lysistrata* 592] and παγκοίτας [Soph. *Antigone* 804, 811].[35] Apart from the necessarily obscure μητροκοίτης in a fragment attributed to the poet Hipponax (Sixth Century B.C.) the root is innocent of such a sense. So is the verb κοιτέω "I go to bed". Where then did it come from? And why from the First Century on do we find in Jewish or Christian sources a proliferation of cognates and derivatives[36] which are heavy with it? If this can be unravelled we can, I believe, sharpen considerably the reference of ἀρσενοκοίτης. This will be so whether or not we are persuaded that all the Greek Fathers who seem to know the term understood the precise nuance of both μαλακός and ἀρσενοκοίτης juxtaposed in I Cor. 6.

So, then, we have an obscure compound masculine noun, which in the present state of knowledge might well be taken as a coinage. This is the simplest explanation. The word is much illuminated when we look at the Septuagint[37] of the Leviticus texts: καὶ μετὰ ἄρσενος οὐ κοιμηθήσῃ κοίτην γυναικός (18:22); καὶ ὅς ἂν κοιμηθῇ μετὰ ἄρσενος κοίτην γυναικός ... (20:13). This is about male penetration of a male.[38] κοίτην is Hebraizing[39], but perhaps it was felt to be as good as an internal cognate accusative[40] with κοιμάομαι, a verb standard for *coitus* from Homer on. We have exactly this construction in the

Massoretic text, *i.e.* שׁכב verb-forms governing משׁכבי "intercourse with".[41] Probably, then, the compound[42], whether chosen or coined in I Corinthians, is intended to evoke the Holiness Code with its emphasis on male penetration of the male. Actually as a biblical Hellenist and Hebraist I should put it more strongly: in the absence of earlier attestation, and in view of the un-Greek semantic twist in the word, a deliberate, conscious back-reference by the Apostle is as certain as philology can make it. (He may or may not have known that he was dropping into translationese.) To be blunt, his coined compound noun means "A man who enters[43] males". He is careful to make the 'male' same-sex practitioner as culpable as the 'female': the pagan world was not so clear as the Jewish that the penetrating partner wasn't right to take all he could get, so that the order may well be significant. If it is, Paul is saying, "and the sodomite too, in case you thought that he was an exception". Fascinatingly, by avoiding the available technical term παιδεράστης[44], he sees to it that 'loving, consensual, adult[45] relations' are fully covered.

How Much Rope ...?

The clinching refutation of the argument that Paul's condemnation of both kinds of male homosexual act refers only to heathen ritual practice is that, in both the New Testament passages where we find ἀρσενοκοίτης, precisely the prostitute-inclusive word is listed separately, as we have seen. It rings almost like prophecy when, after stating in I Cor. 6:9 that those who habitually wrong others are not on the way to salvation, St. Paul issues a warning to his readers in that permissive society to be wary of deceiving themselves, or being deceived (Μὴ πλανᾶσθε). It is Christian human nature, especially when faced with a highly-developed and aggressive pagan or post-Christian selfism, to bring the baggage of that hedonistic philosophy into the new life. The ease with which we forget that "A charge to keep I have,/A God to glorify,/A

never-dying soul to save,/And fit it for the sky" is a major theme in the New Testament as a whole. We moderns may be coming to from our long post-triumphalist hangover, but we have not yet recovered the ancient sense of the sharp difference between believer and unbeliever. In the matter of Christian homosexual practice, the Fathers were unequivocal in their opposition on Scriptural grounds.[46] As for the idea that they condemned it only in the context of heathen cult-prostitution, because there were no other people who performed such acts, there is no evidence for it[47]. Even if there were evidence, the Greek Fathers would still have called the activity itself sinful. They read their Bible as a doctrinal and linguistic unity, against the background of a society which formed its obverse. They had other secular vocabulary too for the whole phenomenon, and used it. If they sometimes fell into legalism in the face of antinomianism, St. Paul did not. His teaching was that the knowledge of the old moral Law and the power to lead the new life were equally gifts of grace.

To sum up, there do not seem to be any canonical texts which express even qualified approval of homosexual conduct or expression, and Romans 1-3 represents it together with homosexual desire as a manifestation of fallen mankind's general wrongness. It is an aspect of the disordered life of a society from which one must be rescued [Gen. 18:16-19:29]; it is offensive to the God of Israel [Lev. 11-20 (or to the end of the book)]; it belongs to a category of genital sin which breaks marriage [Matt. 5:31-32, 19:3-12] and defiles me inwardly [Matt. 15:1-20]; it is one sign of my having turned away from the worship of my Creator [Rom. 1-3]; with other habitual gross sins, if chosen and persisted in it breaks community for time and eternity [I Cor. 5-6]; it defies that Law which is still binding upon the people of the New Covenant [I Tim. 1]; and last but not least, it directly contradicts all the implications of the Lord's own life and teaching about sex and marriage [*Cf.* Mk. 10:1-12]. There is no Scriptural, Apostolic or Dominical warrant for the Christian Church to baptize

it. My body with all its powers belongs, not to me, but to the Creator who made it and to the Redeemer who bought it back from slavery to sin. “You were bought at a price. Therefore honour God with your body” [I Cor. 6:20].

---

[1] I prefer this clumsy form of words to “homosexuality”. The basic reason is that I cannot find any reference in Scripture, including that in Romans 1, to the homosexual condition or inclination as such without acting-out, and only in Romans 1 is there a reference to a state of mind as well as to behaviour. For the state of mind there is otherwise only the blanket condemnation of all disordered desires as the interior root of external vices. I prefer terms that reflect Scripture and the whole Christian pastoral tradition at its best. My view is that in God’s providence Scripture reflects a reality of which we are now more aware, namely that the condition is not always chosen and that some people have no area of freedom (except in action) for which they can reasonably be held responsible. Homosexuality was institutionalised in the Greco-Roman world, hence many young men grew up corrupted. In our world and in the current debate it is not a useful term, because it is unclear whether it connotes (a) the state of mind or emotion, (b) the conduct whether or not expressing (a), or (c) the condition accompanied by expression. Moreover, the ambiguity now extends to “orientation”: is protection being sought for the right to act it out in all situations?

[2] That there are other implicit New Testament references I hope to show. There is one striking instance which the Greek Bible in effect adds in to a prophetic book. In Ezekiel chapter 16, an extended passage in which the image of the people of God as faithless wife is developed in lurid detail, by means of a tendentious mistranslation of Hebrew which plainly does not refer to anything but heterosexual misbehaviour, unbridled lust is turned into perversion (ἐξεπόρνευσας ἐπὶ τὰς θυγατέρας Ασσουρ at 16:28). The loose lady in question is a personified Jerusalem, and is stated both in Hebrew and Greek to be elder sister to Sodom. This is one indication however small that in 150-50 B.C., when this book was rendered into Greek, the connection between Sodom and same-sex immorality was maintained. On the –πορν-root see below: here it is sufficient to note that ἐκ**πορν**εύω is a Septuagintal coinage, with the prefix de-

noting excess; the form is deliberately chosen to echo the 'intensive' sense of the Hebrew verb-form, and conveys the sense of going overboard in unchastity.

[3] A recent published case of this is Daniel A. Helminiak's *What the Bible Really Says About Homosexuality.* It is so specious as to make me want call this study *What the Bible Really and Truly Says ...*

[4] Contrary to Article VII.

[5] Contrary to Article XX.

[6] This paper is perhaps not the place to draw conclusions from the fact that the "visitors" to whom the locals are so hostile turn out to be messengers of God.

[7] The term "situational" means that the behaviour occurs in same-sex groups, for example in prison, or in the military, where an outlet is sought *faute de mieux.* The emotions may well be heterosexual in almost all involved. Once the other sex is present again 'normality' is restored. The only homosexual phenomena observed in animals occurred in captivity when there was no mate available. I do find the Scriptural indifference to the presence or absence of fine feelings instructive; it is as though they were irrelevant casuistry.

[8] This is a very important point which can scarcely be sufficiently emphasized. However endemic the practice of homosexuality in the ancient world, I cannot find that it enjoyed unqualified approval as opposed to toleration. The long discussion of ἔρως of this type in Plato's *Symposium* seeks on some level to sublimate the feelings associated with it: Plato came to consider all physical expression less than ideal, if for reasons which would not convince those who do not hold his σῶμα σῆμα doctrine. Aristotle at *Ethics* 1148b calls a male's taking enjoyment in the 'female' act perverted; it arises from a "bad nature", and the disposition to it is either "disease-like" or "learned through violation from childhood on". διαφθορά and διαφθείρειν, which sometimes connote "destroy, seduce, corrupt", are used in Classical Greek for homosexual seduction. *Cf.*, just culled at random from recent reading of a text nearer in time to the New Testament, unfavourable references at Tacitus *Annals* XIII.17 and 30, XIV.20. In a later passage the historian

heightens his perhaps somewhat overdrawn picture of the depravity of Nero with an account of his going through a spoof homosexual marriage-ceremony dressed as a bride.

[9] The inherent link with sexuality is clear. The link with fertility rites was culturally conditioned. Breaking the latter required drastic measures; in the case of the sacrifice of the firstborn male an uniquely Yahwistic counter-cultural institution was prescribed. Detachment from the pagan environment could not have been maintained in a cultural vacuum.

[10] *Cf.* Brown-Driver-Briggs on the word.

[11] In due course we shall deal at length with a striking case of Pauline allusion to these Leviticus passages.

[12] In fact all ethical reflection that is biblically-based does this very regularly. The procedure itself needs no articulation. Probably, for instance, few modern Christians would have difficulty in excluding the lifestyle of the pimp, land speculator or drug-dealer from what is pleasing to God, though we find no texts naming them in either Testament. If we are harder on right-wing/left-wing sins than is fair, that is the effect of our cultural bias.

[13] It is perhaps too late, but it would still be good if our usage were to reflect the view that same-sex relations may be genital, but are precisely not sexual. Dover, whose book is very useful to any who know a fair amount of Greek, terms them "quasi-sexual".

[14] Suppose there were no record of the Lord's having, in the days of His flesh, spoken against sexual sin of any kind, we must still face the fact of an automatic adverse reaction to any hint or suspicion of His complaisance with, let alone indulgence in, homosex. I have no difficulty with the idea that Jesus met same-sex temptations; this appears to be implied by passages about His facing all that we face. I think it inconsistent for us to suppose that He would have been exempt from these. However, if He had yielded to them, He'd have got Himself stoned in such short order that He'd never have known what had hit Him.

[15] This is one reason why it is a virtual certainty that he had at one time been married.

[16] Dr. Gagnon has picked up the Acts 15 πορνεία argument from me in my earlier published edition of this paper; unfortunately at that stage I was still interpreting the point at issue too broadly, as ALL πορνεία rather than fringe-πορνεία. I have seen now that it cannot have been core-πορνεία (which included bestiality, incest and homosex) that was in question, because no Gentile convert would have been left in any doubt after conversion about the wrongness of that. The onus of proof is entirely and absolutely upon those who would make an exception of homosex. I shall expand on this in connection with πορνεία. Meanwhile it is sufficient to emphasize that there is no future in any interpretation of First Century Jewish conviction on the Torah which does not recognise that all of it was regarded as binding. It took the mighty act of God in bestowing the Holy Spirit on Gentiles to force re-examination of this position.

[17] The ἀρσενοκοίτης recurs in a similar list of unsavoury characters whose manner of life is inconsistent with salvation at I Tim. 1:10. Is it a portmanteau there? The meaning of the word, even if a Pauline coinage, will have been clear to anyone who knew the I Corinthians context, but perhaps ought not to be described as completely obvious when it stands alone.

[18] Some extremely convoluted suggestions have been made for what Paul intended by natural and unnatural relations, not always on the basis of much knowledge of Greek. Most of them are ruled out by Greek grammar or by the context. Syntactically τὴν φυσικήν χρῆσιν in isolation might possibly mean "relations natural to themselves", but τὴν παρὰ φύσιν within the same short context really cannot be made to mean "relations unnatural to themselves": the 'universal order' sense of the κατὰ/παρὰ φύσιν phrases is too firmly established. If Paul had intended to refer to individual "natures", he would have been bound to have used some kind of possessive pronoun or similar indicator. The definite article too is surplus to requirement unless it is of the generalising kind, which also suggests the sense "creation, creation order" for φύσις. The sense of the context would be odd even if the grammar were better, for it is unclear how any might be motivated by πάθη or "strong emotions" which were not natural to them, or alternatively how it might be "shameful" for some to behave in ways which would be acceptable in others whose emotions were more congruent. As for the idea that Paul intends some such meaning as "norm, convention", there is no need to resort to Greek which lacks the

specificity of his reference here, or to look further than the well-known passage in the later Plato [*Laws* 841b-e] which terms same-sex relations "contrary to φύσις" (actually using the expression παρὰ φύσιν!) with a view to banning them and everything extra-marital in any ideal state. It appears to be St. Paul's argument against this and all other vices that any fool can see, indeed any child can see, but for good measure Moses was agin it.

[19] This is the text which was used very early to show that sexuality, far from being a regrettable declension from the perfect will of the Creator, existed in an uncorrupt world.

[20] I Cor. 7 shows Paul's sympathetic understanding of heterosexual passion. We need to note, however, that he takes a thoroughly astringent view of it. He seems to be thinking above all of Christian usefulness and testimony, not of the presence or absence of love in the romantic sense as the governing factor. That kind of love depends on a degree of freedom which is both relatively modern and Western. Fulfilment is not a category in his thinking. At the same time we should not malign him as anti-sex or misogynist: whatever he may have had to say to Christian women in Corinth and Ephesus, dominated as they were by the cults of two powerful female deities enjoining respectively sexual enmeshment and sexual detachment, he did teach that a husband must in effect make his wife the purpose of all his earthly endeavour. This is very far removed from pagan ideals and practice.

[21] There is incidentally no sign that emotional states weigh in Paul's thinking about what is acceptable to God. They have relevance only as proximate causes: what signifies is the heart, or core of personality, and secondly the observable actions which issue from it.

[22] Even if there is no abstract noun in the New Testament this is an argument from silence; New Testament Greek is a tiny slice of Greek of the period; and in any case there are numerous nouns and adjectives for those who engage in the thing, and periphrases of various kinds. Some are more euphemistic than others, but Paul was not short of ways of specifying the activity nor of distinguishing between the 'male' or penetrative kind and the 'female' or receptive kind of act or actor. For an abstract we need look no later or further than προαίρεσις (preference),

τρόπος (inclination) in Classical sources or the ἕξις (disposition) "to play the female rôle in physical love with males" in the Aristotle passage *supra*.

[23] Plato's remarks certainly assume that procreation is a criterion of what is natural. The assumption is made quite explicit in similar and probably imitative discussions by his disciple Philo Judaeus.

[24] The broadening of the meaning of πορνεία, and the whole -πορν- group of cognates, is rooted in Hebrew, and goes back at least to the early Third Century BC. There are many examples in the Septuagint, clustered especially in the prophetic books. It is assumed by Philo and Josephus. I am therefore not enthusiastic about rendering πορνεία as 'fornication', or in more modern English as 'sexual immorality', in all biblical contexts. 'Unchastity' is sometimes more accurate. This is partly because the singular noun is sometimes abstract, as it is at the head of the list in Gal. 5. The Christian conscience will be convicted of unchastity in several spheres of modern thinking and activity, for πορνεία covers much that you and I do or think of doing. That is to say nothing of concrete behaviour such as the making, purveying and viewing of pornography. An additional reason in my mind is that autoeroticism and same-sex physical relations, two forms of πορνεία, are, as I have said, precisely not sexual. The plural means 'unchaste acts', not as Gagnon will have it in his magisterial book, 'varieties of unchastity' (one of the handful of points at which I differ from him).

That I have some small criticisms of Gagnon's writing (I have been reading Greek rather longer than he!) does not negate the overwhelming cogency of his arguments in general.

[25] There is a connection with the περν- root *i.e.* secular Greek keeps the emphasis on selling oneself, or being bought.

[26] One way of looking at the "Matthaean exception" is to say that it covers even the plight of the spouse deserted for a same-sex 'union'. Nowadays that often has high relevance, tragically. Certainly the Lord's teaching here and in the parallel Synoptic passages on marriage seems, with its emphasis on the creation order as the basis for the monogamous ideal, to lend no support to the idea that He was even tacitly in favour of same-sex relationships however 'monogamous'. Gen. 1 is cited explicitly.

A further implication is that marriage is essentially, not incidentally, between a man and a woman.

[27] It seems plausible to read the nouns in this list, all grammatically masculine, as denoting male persons only.

[28] It is surely noteworthy that Paul censures in chapter 6 the male who resorts to a πόρνη or female prostitute. He has nothing to say directly to the πόρνη herself. We should not forget that in that cold, brutal world a high proportion of people, and perhaps more in the Church, had been commodified.

[29] A modern myth is that in the ancient world same-sex relationships did not run the gamut from the 'high and holy' significant, sometimes celibate, type to the tawdry, exploitative commercial one based on brutal lust: they did. In other words we are dealing with a human propensity which is, like heterosexual ἔρως, characterized by a range of emotion and expression.

[30] At least one modern version renders [οὔ]τε μαλακοὶ [οὔ]τε ἀρσενοκοῖται "homosexual perverts".

[31] The emotional 'split' which must have resulted if romantic love was only same-sex is epitomized by "We have lady-friends (τὰς ἑταίρας) for fun, whores (τὰς παλλακάς) to see to our everyday physical needs, and wives (τὰς γυναῖκας) to bear us legitimate offspring and to be reliable housekeepers," the famous remark made by Apollodorus as plaintiff in 349/8 B.C. [(Pseudo-)Demosthenes LIX.122 (*In Neaeram*)].

[32] There are several of these in this and the I Tim. 1 list, *e.g.* the ψεύστης or "professional con-artist" and the πλεονέκτης or "acquisitor"; the form indicates a settled way of living. This seems to me significant in the context of the exclusion from all title in the Kingdom of those who live in these ways: one is excluded by one's own choice, because there is available in the Gospel transformation of our personal life (some at Corinth are stated to have experienced it), nor is one excluded because of rare and uncharacteristic lapses.

[33] This very popular modern folk-etymology entails a formation without analogy. For such a sense we should need ἀρσενοκοιτ**ήτ**ης. Our forebears, knowing on the whole more Greek, never fell into this error.

[34] The genuinely idiomatic verb is μίγνυμαι, used of either sex.

[35] The point is that, like Jephtha's daughter, none of these poor girls is going to be properly wedded, bedded, awakened and made the joyful mother of children. In the robust thinking of the pagan world, this was a fate worse than death.

[36] None of these so far as we can tell ever became idiom.

[37] We must bear in mind that Paul's Gentile converts would have been taught the Torah, because he believed that everyone was saved in order that he should in some sense keep the Law. The Torah would have been taught in its Greek dress. Greek was the *lingua franca* of the whole of the Eastern Empire. The Septuagint version of these same passages seems to me the obvious origin of the unfortunately undated ἀρσενοκοιτέω [*Sibylline Oracles* 2:71-73]: the meaning in context is plainly "I have same-sex relations with males". This is Hebraism in practice if not in the mind of the writer. In theory both words might have been coined immediately after the first hearing of the Leviticus passage in Greek early in the Third Century B.C.

[38] It is not possible to know whether Paul would have heard about intercrural 'copulation'. He is unlikely, if he did, to have thought better of it than of anal.

[39] It would indeed be an odd culture and language in which certain terms were never connected; but it remains the case that the idea of genital acts must have got into κεῖμαι words in Septuagint Greek from שׁכב words in Hebrew. Moreover κοίτη has acquired a gerundive force, so that, like מִשְׁכְּבֵי, it governs an objective genitive.

[40] *Cf.* English "to sleep the sleep of the just". A literal and somewhat crude rendering of the near-literalism in the Greek gives us "and you are not to / and whoever may sleep with a male the bedding of a woman ... ". The intransitive κεῖμαι did not serve the translator here, because he needed his Greek for "have intercourse" to govern an object.

[41] I have seen the Hebrew described as "obscure". It is perfectly ordinary. It is a standard plural-for-abstract noun in the construct state. This means that it includes what in Latin or Greek would be a genitive case of the next lexeme; here the next lexeme is functioning as an objective genitive.

[42] This would be a case of curious Greek resulting from a formulaic rendering in the Septuagint, *i.e.* the version works

with a root-for-root method. Lev. 15:16 shows a bizarre example; *cf.* the whole listing in Hatch and Redpath, Rom. 9:10. κοίτη is remarkably asexual in tone in secular Greek; I do not find the single (classical and poetic) use of it coupled with γάμος in the sense "marriage-bed" anything but a natural extension of the standard reference to a sleeping-place. We are still far from a direct reference to intercourse. Plainly derivative is the late mystical sense cited in the *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. It shows only one example of the word, and that is in an obviously pious, monkish, Hebraizing sense of "mystical union, intercourse" (Seventh Century in Maximus Mysticus). This seems to me to be a choice example of the influence of the language of (Greek) Scripture on Christian idiom. The man wanted to refer to sexual union spiritualised and figuratively, so dropped into the language of Canaan. He would never have used the word for his purpose if it had been vulgar slang in colloquial Greek for *coitus*.

[43] *I.e.* a woman cannot do it. שׁכב "I lie, sleep" has a spread of meanings, but relatively frequent is the coital. The subject is nearly always male. Passive forms with female subjects may mean "be slept with" in the coital sense. With a male subject and the prepositions עם/את "with" it amounts to "penetrate" in practice.

[44] We should take note of the fact that the first half of this compound does not mean "child" (*cf.* our English "girlfriend"), but denotes the object of ἔρως. There are numerous other compounds with the same first element and the same connotation. English "paedophile" is liable to mislead.

[45] The point is well taken that Lev. 20:13 must be about such relations, otherwise it would be unjust that both men should suffer the prescribed penalty.

[46] The Patristic view is always of central importance to Anglicans, inheritors as we are of Richard Hooker's well-known hierarchy of authorities, Scripture, Tradition and Reason. We should always think at least twice before we ignore or set aside Tradition as expressed in the Fathers in favour of our own reasoning.

[47] David F. Wright in 'Homosexuals or Prostitutes? The Meaning of ΑΡΣΕΝΟΚΟΙΤΑΙ [I Cor. 6:9, I Tim. 1:10].' [*Vigiliae Christianae* 38. 1984. 125-153] has done a solid job of demolishing John Boswell's thesis that this word only ever connoted

male prostitutes, even if he spends longer than need be on the notion that an activity noun of this type could be anything other than an objective compound. He adduces a number of κεῖμαι derivatives, some classical, some late enough to be coinages based on Septuagint or New Testament Greek, demonstrating beyond doubt that only the sense "active homosexual" is supported. However, he does not address the mystery of how these derivatives acquired a semantic twist absent from secular κεῖμαι words. Hence he does not identify the precise role of the ἀρσενοκοίτης in relation to the μαλακός.

FOR REFERENCE

Arndt, W.F. & Gingrich, F.W. tr. and ed.	*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament,* Chicago and Cambridge, 1957.
Bauer, H. & Leander, P.	*Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache*, Darmstadt, 1962.
Boswell, John.	*Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, Chicago and London, 1980.
Brock, S.P.	'Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity.' *GRBS* 20, 1979, 69-87.
Brown, F.- Driver, S.R.- Briggs, C.A.	*A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Rpt. with corrections, Oxford, 1959.
Dover, K.J.	*Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge, 1989.
Elliger, K. & Rudolph, W. edd.	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart, 1977.
Ellis, E. Earle.	*The Old Testament in Early Christianity,* Grand Rapids, 1992.
Epstein, L.M.	*Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism*, Rpt. New York, 1967.
Gagnon, Robert A.J.	*The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics,* Nashville, 2001.
Goodwin, W.W.	*A Greek Grammar*, London, 1951.

Harper, Kyle — '*Porneia*: The Making of a Christian Sexual Norm.' *JBL* 131/2, 2012, 363-383.

Hatch, E. & Redpath, H.A. — *Concordance to the Septuagint*, Oxford, 1900-6.

Hays, Richard B. — *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1996.

Helminiak, Daniel A. — *What the Bible Really Says About Homosexuality*, San Francisco, 1994.

Hooker, Morna D. — 'Interchange and suffering.' *Suffering and martyrdom in the New Testament: studies presented to G.M. Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar*, 70-83. Edd. William Horbury & Brian McNeil. Cambridge, 1981.

Jellicoe, S. — *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford, 1968.

Katz, P. — *Philo's Bible*, Cambridge, 1950.

Lampe, G.W.H. ed. — *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, 1961.

Lesky. A. — *A History of Greek Literature*, 2nd. ed. tr. London, 1966.

Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R. — *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. revised, Oxford, 1925-40.

Lisowsky,G. — *Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament*, Stuttgart, 1958.

Moulton, J.H. -Howard, W.F. -Turner, N. — *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh, 1908-75.

Nestle, E. ed. — *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart, 1953.

Norden, E. — *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, Darmstadt, Rprt. 1958.

Rahlfs, A. ed. — *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart, 1931.

Scroggs, Robin. *The New Testament and Homosexuality*, Philadelphia, 1983.

Smith, Mark D. 'Ancient Bisexuality.' *JAAR* 64.2, 1996, 223-56.

Torrance, Iain. 'Between Legalism and Liberalism: Wisdom in Christian Ethics.' *Aberdeen University 1945-81: Quincentennial Essays in the History of the University of Aberdeen*, 65-71. Edd. D.H. Hargreaves & Angela Forbes, Aberdeen, 1993.

Turner, P.D.M. (a) 'Two Septuagintalisms with ΣΤΗΡΙΖΕΙΝ.' *VT* 28, 1978, 481-2.
(b) 'ΑΝΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΕΙΝ and Intra-Septuagintal Borrowing.' *VT* 27, 1977, 492-3.
(c) 'The Translator(s) of Ezekiel revisited: idiosyncratic LXX renderings as a clue to inner history.' *Helsinki perspectives on the translation technique of the Septuagint* : proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999, 279-307, Helsinki : Göttingen : Finnish Exegetical Society, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.
(d) *The Septuagint Version of Chapters I-XXXIX of the Book of Ezekiel: The Language, the Translation Technique and the Bearing on the Hebrew Text*. A previously unpublished dissertation [Bodleian Mss. D. Phil. 1996], Vancouver, C&P Books, 2018.

Wright, David F. (a) 'Homosexuality: The Relevance of the Bible.' *EQ* 61:4, 1989, 291-300.
(b) 'Homosexuals or Prostitutes? The Meaning of ΑΡΣΕΝΟΚΟΙΤΑΙ [I Cor. 6:9, I Tim. 1:10].' *Vigiliae Christianae* 38, 1984, 125-53.

Young, James B. de *HOMOSEXUALITY, Contemporary Claims Examined in Light of the Bible and Other Ancient Literature and Law,* Grand Rapids, 2000.

A LETTER sent in 1998 by the Rector, Wardens, Parish Council and general membership of Holy Trinity Vancouver to Bishop Michael Ingham, after the first Synod vote asking him to authorise the blessing of same-sex 'unions'

Trinity III, 1998

Dear Bishop Michael,

Resolution #9 at Synod 1998

We, the undersigned members of Holy Trinity, Vancouver, wish first of all to commend you for your statesman-like action in withholding episcopal consent from the implementation of this resolution. This will help us all to heal, and will unite us in prayer for you as diocesan and for one another. We are thankful that the tone of the discussion was indeed for the most part both rational and irenical. This said, however, we must go on to express our very deep disquiet, not only that the motion was passed, but that it ever came to the vote in an Anglican diocese. In the first place, it was passed after the briefest and most superficial arguments had been heard on either side, whereas it would have been reasonable for Synod to have received detailed position papers for study beforehand, and failing that to have listened to two weighty presentations, each of at least an hour in length. In the second place, Synod ought not to have been debating a motion whose implementation would almost certainly have been illegal in Anglicanism. Yet a trained bishop and a trained lawyer permitted this flawed proceeding to take place.

That the argumentation was superficial and led to an un-Anglican conclusion may be seen from the following facts:–

i. **The meaning of the resolution was never elucidated**. One of our delegates sought an answer as to the connotation of the terms "bless" (a theological question) and "union" (a biological and legal one). An answer was promised, but no answer was forthcoming. As a result Synod lacked important factual information before the vote.

ii. **The nature and source of authority in Anglicanism, and that there is a hierarchy of our sources of authority, was not stated by anyone**

more senior than an ordinary parochial clergyman. Nobody pointed out that we grant to no bishop, not even to a majority of bishops, and to no Synod, any independent *magisterium.*[1]

iii. **The relation of the authority of experience to that of our other sources was not clearly stated by you or anyone senior**. As a result Synod spent a great deal of time listening to personal opinions based on anecdotal evidence, nor did anyone intervene to remind us that all laws make hard cases, but are not invalidated thereby.

iv. **Several speakers put forward the view that God could not have been expected to foresee our contemporary dilemmas and that we must in effect tailor the Faith and Christian ethics to our times.** This profoundly anti-supernaturalist view went uncorrected by you, though it is un-Anglican and un-Catholic.[2]

v. **The exegesis of Scripture was for the most part sloppy and unprofessional.** We may well agree that "His whole meaning is love"; but the meaning of love, the relation of one part of God's revelation to another, and in particular the meaning of love in relation to law, has been the subject of nearly 20 centuries of intelligent and reverent study in Judaism and the Church Catholic.[3] Some speakers, again uncorrected by you, confused taking the plain sense of Scripture seriously with taking it literally, nor was there any acknowledgement of the fact that literalism is sometimes appropriate.[4] Some favoured an attitude to the moral law which sets Scripture against Scripture.[5]

vi. **Naive opinions were voiced about the ancient world in general and the biblical writers in particular.** The impression was given that nothing old could possibly be new again.[6]

---

[1]Articles XX and XXI.

[2]Article VI.

[3]For a recent study see Hays, Richard B. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1996.

[4]Article VII.

[5]Article XX again.

[6]See Mark D. Smith, 'Ancient Bisexuality,' *JAAR* 64.2, 1996, 223-56; P.D.M. Turner, 'Biblical Texts Relevant to Homosexual Orientation and Practice,' *CSR* 26.4, 1997, 435-

vii. **It was assumed that the aetiology of the homosexual condition is simple and well-understood.** In fact it is highly complex even in the given individual, and is still poorly understood.[7]

viii. **It was further assumed that a supposed genetic predisposition renders the individual no longer free or responsible.** This is to infantilise the homosexual person in relation to all other mentally competent adults.[8]

ix. **A parallel was drawn with the debate over the ordination of women.** It was not pointed out that that debate was about admitting women to a kind of priesthood about which the New Testament is silent.

x. **There was an implicit doctrinal clash, connected with the argument about love, about the nature of the Christian life.** Some implied that personal fulfilment is a Christian ideal, others emphasised discipline, obedience and sacrifice. It would have been good if you as our leader had discerned the old quarrel between legalism and antinomianism behind much that was said, and that we were indeed debating a doctrinal question. Gal. 5 might have figured.

xi. **There was a failure to think in an Anglican and Catholic way about the past as well as the present.** If we are Catholic in terms of time as well as space, we will seek to honour, not discount, the struggles of those who have given up satisfactions of all kinds, legitimate or illegitimate, for Jesus Christ.

Several years before your election as bishop, the Annual Vestry of Holy Trinity Vancouver passed an unanimous motion to the effect that we were committed to what we believe to be a scriptural and Anglican position in this

---

445, a paper of which we enclose an updated and corrected copy.

[7]See especially Heather Looy, 'Taking Our Assumptions Out of the Closet,' *CSR* 26.4, 1997, 496-513.

[8]See Stanton L. Jones and Mark A. Yarhouse, 'Science and the Ecclesiastical Homosexuality Debates,' *CSR* 26.4, 1997, 446-477; Mark A. Yarhouse and Stanton L. Jones, 'A Critique of Materialist Assumptions in Interpretations of Research on Homosexuality,' *CSR* 26.4, 1997, 478-495.

matter, in accordance with the ’79 episcopal guidelines. Old or new, we are striving to believe and behave as classical Anglicans here. To sum up the position of this parish, we are not prepared to move in the direction of Resolution #9. It seems to us that that same Scripture, and that same Lord, that call us to love our neighbours by just conduct, call us to love our neighbours by sexual restraint and purity. We oppose the pretence that same-sex ‘union’ exists, let alone is capable of being blessed by Anglicanism in the name of our Creator and Redeemer. Homosexual persons who press for blessing on their relationships have at bottom a quarrel, not with church and society, but with the Author both of our biology and of heterosexual passion and response as the Great Metaphor for His love and ours. If we involved ourselves in that, we could not hold our people, still less grow. We think it more consistent that the Diocese should institute a Day of Celebration, to uphold those who seek to live, often at great personal cost, in accordance with what we believe to be Christian sex-ethics in this sphere.

Yours in Christ,

Copy: His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

AN OPEN LETTER to the Bishop of New Westminster, the Rt. Revd. Michael Ingham and the members of his Council of Advice

From

The Revd. James I. Packer, D.Phil.
Priscilla D. M. Turner, D.Phil.
Donald M. Lewis, D.Phil.

10 September 1998

An Open Letter to the Bishop of New Westminster, The Rt. Revd. Michael Ingham and the members of his Council of Advice.

On May 9, 1998, under the Bishop's chairmanship, the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster passed a motion that "asks the Bishop to authorise clergy in this diocese to bless covenanted same-sex unions, subject to such conditions as the Bishop deems appropriate." The voting was 179 (approximately 52%) in favour and 170 (approximately 48%) against: a very narrow margin of approval.

Since then, the Lambeth Conference has affirmed, by a vote of 526 to 70, with 45 abstentions, that the homosexual lifestyle is incompatible with biblical teaching. In the light of this, were the New Westminster Synod to vote again on this motion, the result could be expected to be different.

In introducing the Synod's discussion, Bishop Ingham appeared to say that in his opinion what was being voted on was a proposed gesture of goodwill in which no doctrinal issue was directly involved. It appeared that the only doctrinal issue that the Bishop thought might have been involved was the doctrine of marriage.

We believe that this estimate was mistaken and misleading, and the purpose of this letter is to lay before you our reasons for thinking so.

To clarify our point, three matters must be raised at the outset.

First, what are the "covenanted same-sex unions" that the clergy would bless? They are more than committed life-long friendships as such; they are relationships that are expected to involve arousing and gratifying sexual desire by physical action, as in Christian marriage.

Second, what would it mean to "bless" such a relationship? It would mean declaring it good and right in itself, and asking God to enable the partners to get the best out of it – that is, to manage it in a way that enables them to realise all the values inherent in it, for their own good, for the good of others, and ultimately for the glory, honour, and praise of God the Creator.

Third, what is a "doctrinal issue"? "Doctrine" means "teaching" – affirmation and instruction, viewed from the standpoint of its content. A doctrinal issue in the Church is thus a question about what the Church should teach as God's health-giving truth.

The synodical motion involved several major doctrinal issues.

First and fundamentally, it raised a general question about **biblical authority**. Should the Church be subject to, and bound by, the Bible's explicit teaching? The catholic Christian answer, only ever challenged in the Church by an academic minority, is **yes**. Our Bible consists of the scriptures Christ knew, honoured, and fulfilled (the Old Testament), plus the apostolic witness to Christ (the New Testament). The two collections dovetail as a unity: demonstrably, they tell one story, announce one salvation, and teach one set of behavioural ideals – of which, as the Church has always acknowledged, same-sex unions form no part. (The physical element in such unions is explicitly ruled out in Leviticus 18:22, 20:13, Romans 1:27, I Corinthians 6:9, I Timothy 1:10.) The Bible is the book

of the Church, and the Church must ever be the people of the book.

The idea that the Church should not be bound in this matter by biblical teaching was formulated in an interview by Frank Griswold, Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church of the USA, as follows: "Broadly speaking, the Episcopal Church is in conflict with scripture (on sexual morality). The only way to justify this is to say that Jesus talks about the Spirit guiding the Church and guiding be-lievers and bringing to their awareness things they cannot deal with yet. So one would have to say that the mind of Christ operative over time has led the Church to, in effect, contradict the words of the Gospel (on sexual matters)." Whatever be thought of this view, it is undoubtedly doctrine – Griswold's doctrine – and as such serves to highlight the fact that biblical authority is a doctrinal issue.

The truer doctrine here is that for the Church to sit loose to the authority of scripture – that is, to the authority of God in the teaching of scripture – must mean a forfeiting of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit through whose agency the Bible was given and was and is discerned to be canonical, and who now gives Christian people understanding of it as they reverently study it. That is the catholic Christian contention on this basic doctrinal issue. For any part of the Anglican Church to bless same-sex unions would be to fly in the face of the historic Christian consensus on biblical authority, and to tell the world that that is what we choose to do.

Also, the motion raised particular doctrinal questions. **Creation** and **sin** are doctrines directly involved. May we claim, as some do, that God has created same-sex physical tendencies in the same way as he has created heterosexual mating instincts, so that acting out both sets of desires within a covenanted relationship will equally please God? Or should we say, as the Church has historically done, that our sexual powers are to be kept

within the limits God specifies, and that the homosexual orientation, however derived and wherever found, is one aspect of the racial disorder that stems from sin as a racial fact, and that acting it out can only displease God? The question here is inescapably doctrinal.

Redemption and **sanctification** are doctrines also involved. Both belong to the gospel of salvation from sin, through the combined action of our triune God. Through Christ's life, death, resurrection and heavenly ministry we are saved from sin's condemnation, and through the on-going work of the Holy Spirit we are saved from sin's power. In light of God's explicit negativity about homosexual connections, it would seem that God's redemptive purpose must be to empower those inclined to them to refrain from them, as one dimension of their life of holiness. This, too, is a doctrinal matter.

The unavoidable conclusion is that it was a real, if unwitting, mistake to treat the motion as not involving doctrine.

A letter that the Bishop wrote on December 15, 1994 states: "I do not believe weekend conferences have the competence or authority to define orthodoxy in Christian faith." Exactly so; and the same is true of diocesan synods. But the effect of this vote, if made a basis for action, would be, really if inadvertently, to change the contours of orthodoxy on all the matters mentioned.

It is right that the Church should reach out in loving and accepting ministry to all who, like ourselves, need God's grace, gay people included. For any part of the Church to express approval of active homosexual behaviour would, however, be something quite different, and totally wrong. We ask that in your deliberations and in any future diocesan discussions of homosexual-

ity this distinction be frankly faced and not obscured. We also ask that, in view of the considerations set out above, the synodical vote of May 9, 1998 not be regarded as in any way decisive.

Signed,

The Revd. James I. Packer, D.Phil.

Priscilla D. M. Turner, D.Phil.

Donald M. Lewis, D.Phil.

Copies: The Primate, the Most Reverend Michael Peers
The House of Bishops
Topic
The Anglican Journal
The Internet
Christian Week
B.C. Christian Info
B.C. Report

QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO THE GAY AND LESBIAN VOICES

QUESTIONS COMPOSED ON BEHALF OF HOLY TRINITY VANCOUVER DURING THE NEW WESTMINSTER DIALOGUE PROCESS FOR THE GAY AND LESBIAN VOICES TO ANSWER:

1. How do you deal with the Scriptural position? the basic Scriptural texts?

2. Are there limits to our acting on our feelings?

3. Do you suppose that Jesus could possibly have taught or exemplified homosexual practice?

4. At what age do you consider same-sex relations to be legitimate?

5. What precisely differentiates a 'same-sex union' from a warm, deep, long-lasting and faithful Christian friendship?

6. Is there any sin that is against God alone?

7. The case for the blessing of 'same-sex unions' seems to us to be basically humanistic; what are the specifically Christian grounds for it?

8. If feelings validate same-sex relations, do they validate other kinds of sexual activity?

9. If you were persuaded that the Bible is clearly adverse to homosexual practice, would you obey it?

10. Is it not a normal part of growing up to develop one or more passionate attachments to someone of the same sex?

11. If homosexual practice enjoyed the unequivocal approval of church and society, would conscience say anything to you about it?

12. Do you draw any conclusions from the fact that through same-sex relations no woman will ever be sexually awakened or conceive a child?

13. Must the Church validate every lifestyle of those who hold, or aspire to hold, paying positions in it?

DIALOGUE WITH HUGH

A Little Exercise for a Young Christian Ethicist

AN EDITED VERSION OF A LONG AND MUCH-SEGMENTED PUBLIC CONVERSATION BETWEEN THE LATE HUGH DEMPSTER AND PRISCILLA TURNER. IT WAS BASICALLY ABOUT THE BLESSING OF SAME-SEX UNIONS.

It took place over a period of months, between the 1998 and 2001 synod votes in the Diocese of New Westminster. The diocese was concurrently engaged in the aforesaid official 'dialogue' process.[9]

After some unsystematic exchanges which were not recorded, it became clear that a significant discussion was developing. Hugh wrote:

First of all, Prisca, thanks for a response that actually paid some attention to what I had said. I was anxious in that comment to respond quickly, yet reasonably briefly, to the question of a biblical basis for this dialogue. I therefore borrowed a few bits from a longer piece I've been working on, and probably didn't connect them well enough to make my reasoning clear.

In my ongoing conversation with you, I want you to face the issue in a different way.

Prisca replied:

Yes, I too am glad to get down to some real Scriptural argument, and recognise that this little window is not easy to fit everything into, especially as some of us type quite slowly.

There is indeed a biblical basis that (in my opinion) compels (good word!) such a dialogue as ours in this Diocese on blessing same-sex unions and other matters about the

---

[9] In this edition the initiatives are in Plain, the responses in Italics, and the two interlocutors are differentiated by font.

treatment of homosexuals. Let me give two references (out of many):–

Luke 10:25-37: The Good Samaritan story is given to define "neighbour" in the summary of the law – "Love God, and love your neighbour." What we often don't notice here is that Jesus' example of a neighbour, who loves and is to be loved, is a person despised and vilified by those in his audience, as one who does not keep all of God's laws. Indeed, for that community, a "good" Samaritan is an oxymoron! Surely that is the intended message in this parable. (I sometimes imagine that, were Jesus telling the parable in our culture, it would have become "the Good Homosexual"!)

With all due respect, Hugh, your reasoning here is a bit off-beam.

First a little New Testament background. To ask a self-styled Rabbi to define the 'whole duty of man' was to test his claim to be a real Rabbi; the Greek says that the 'lawyer' was trying to see what Jesus was made of. Dramatically enough, the Lord refuses to be examined in this way, and makes the questioner look foolish by causing him to answer his own question, thus demonstrating that his theory at least is quite sound. When he tries to 'justify' himself, he is shown to be insincere, for he was not wanting to know: he knows what he should be doing, but he wants to wriggle out of it in practice. I haven't heard many sermons which bring out this personal drama, or emphasise the words "DO this, and you will live", but myself tried to do this in my article called '... And Your Neighbour as Yourself', published in CRUX *as long ago as 1969. There is far more going on here than the enunciation however pointed of a moral platitude. Was the Lord seriously suggesting that we are any of us capable of going out and simply keeping either of the two great commandments just because we know we ought to? Not in the mind of any sinner who really knows himself!*

Nobody was thinking of the Samaritan as someone who, whether as active or passive 'neighbour', was wanting to overturn any part of the ethical demands of the Law.

The contempt was inspired by a conviction that that community read the Law in a debased copy, and worshipped in the wrong place. The 'lawyer' will have been quite clear that HIS copy was a perfect one; so Jesus shows him a fictional Samaritan whose reading of his debased copy was good enough to make him a better Jew than some Jews. EVERYONE would have known the answer to the question "Is it right to have same-sex relations in any context at all?", and it would have taken the form, if we want to use this passage in the matter, "What is written in the Law? How do you read it?"

It is not possible to leap from the obligation to treat everyone as a human being with basic needs to an obligation to baptize all forms of behaviour in which people may wish to indulge. We may not neglect, starve or torture the likes of Clifford Olsen for his sexual orientation or the way it has manifested itself, but equally we owe him, and them, no praise, petting or public recognition. Not all our wants are good and beautiful, and not all of them are real needs. Our faith has never agreed that all human beings are owed even legitimate forms of sexual happiness, for example. The Good Samaritan supplied the victim with rescue, antibiotic, emollient, bandages, ambulance service, food, lodging and a worry-free convalescence; he did not leave money behind saying, "And when he's recovered sufficiently to be thinking about his sexual orientation again, here's enough cash to call the right kind of escort service to suit him!"

Matt. 25:31-46: In this parable of the last judgement, Jesus identifies himself with all the hurting people we have encountered – the hungry and thirsty, the sick, the prisoner (and the homosexual?) – and our fate hangs on the way we respond. "What you did (or did not do) to the least of these my brethren, you did (or did not do) to me."

This is a very common modern misunderstanding of the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats. Last year I sat through a whole Synod that was based on it. Our Lord

simply cannot be addressing us, or anyone who has actually read this parable, about OUR OWN judgement. That is not to say, of course, that we should not bother with works of mercy; but certainly we should not be anxious if we are not perfect in them, for "Who then shall be saved?"

However, even if the modern popular view is right, where in this catalogue is the expression of my sex-drive? It is all about basic human needs that are of the esse*, not necessarily of the superadded* bene esse*, of our lives. Wrestling with the difference between wants and real needs is perhaps never so painful as in matters of the heart, but all my single friends have to do it, and when widowed I shall have to do it again. Why should people with homosexual desires alone be exempt from the struggle?*

And how have gays and lesbians been treated, over the past centuries, by our Christian society? Despised, rejected, condemned, shunned, excluded from community, murdered, driven to suicide – just for being what they are. We have in fact made life so miserable for them that (until fairly recently) most have felt it essential to conceal their identity as gay or lesbian – to live their whole lives "in the closet." Is this the way we would choose to treat Jesus?

What is honestly your authority for this opinion?

I submit that there is a very strong biblical basis for dialogue (and action!) on radical changes in the way Christians have traditionally thought about and treated their homosexual brothers and sisters.

The point is the same with the Sheep and Goats: "what you do to the least of these ..." – *i.e.*, no one is so insignificant as not to merit your loving care. (Is this a "modern misunderstanding"? I don't know what you mean by that. I haven't been able to read your file – don't think I can handle the languages.

The amount of ancient language is small, the argument pretty clear without it. I supply a translation; most people I believe could make it all out. Anyhow, the main contention in this paper is that there is nothing whatsoever in the passage about Christian conduct or how we who are in Christ are going to be judged. It is about the judgement of those who have never had the chance to embrace the Cross. Since I wrote it it has occurred to me that it may even go so far as to say that ONE SINGLE work of mercy would suffice to save such a person. Certainly there is nothing there about a perfect record of such works, nor can it legitimately be used to beat good works out of Christian people.

The "loving care" again has nothing whatever to do with many of our felt wants, everything to do with basic need.

And again, there is nothing here explicitly about sexual orientation.

Precisely so. There is nothing implicit either. What does that say about its significance? It says among other things that our life, for time and eternity, is infinitely more complex than our genital urges: I am far far more than my heterosexuality, which except insofar as I use it responsibly and in accordance with God's will, or not, has no lasting significance at all.

The other side of my argument is the observation that (to say the least) homosexuals have not been treated kindly in our society. You need my authority for that opinion? I would have thought it is pretty well known these days. I read newspapers. I listen to gays and lesbians. I read what some of them have written about their lives. And I use my imagination. (Surely the "closet" option is familiar? What if the world were reversed, and we heterosexuals were the closeted ones? If I daren't go to church, or anywhere public, with my wife – in fact, daren't let anyone suspect I have a wife, on penalty of maybe losing my job, my welcome in church, perhaps even being beaten up on the street? It doesn't sound like a life anyone would

choose.) If you really want specifics, I do have a few files of clippings and other documents which I can dig out (they're not very well organized).

I admit that I had thought that you were referring in part to history, including late Roman and medieval history. The sources are frequently misread.

None of us can be in favour of cruelty to anyone; but it is important to get this particular case into proportion. Is objection to particular types of behaviour unkind? How many people are genuinely badly treated for simply being homosexual, i.e. *having a set of desires and/or temptations not shared by the majority? All you men, of any orientation, should try being a person housed in a female body in most times and places where the Gospel has never taken firm root!*

As for us heterosexuals, there was an experiment done by medieval Christendom which lasted several centuries (Rome is a bit hungover from it still!) whereby a big enough closet was made to stuff into it ALL, priest or lay, who experienced ANY form of sexual desire.

I conclude that the way gays and lesbians have been treated in our society – and especially by Christians, ostensibly in obedience to God's law – is pretty clearly in violation of the law to "love your neighbour," especially considering the spin Jesus puts on it in those two passages. (This is the part glossed over too quickly in my earlier posting.) That is to say: the traditional interpretation of those Bible passages which explicitly condemn homosexual behaviour has led to a world in which a smallish group of people (gays and lesbians) don't count as "neighbours," deserving of our love. This is the fruit borne from that tradition. "By their fruits you shall know them," Jesus said in another context (about false prophets). If the fruit does not meet the law of love, then I conclude that there is something wrong, something false, in that tradition.

It is frequently said nowadays that Christian teaching has produced this evil fruit. Given that no society has ever

thought homosexual desire and behaviour to be unequivocally good, and that without even one biblical text contra *observation shows them to be biologically bizarre, that is extremely doubtful. Societies always look, left to themselves, for some visible enemy: the unregenerate heart must after all have someone to hate. Sometimes, though by no means always, the object to hand may be homosexuals. It is no part of New Testament ethics to hate or harm anyone. That applies to those who persecute me for any cause: I must still treat them well: the whole Christian ethical tradition has always said so. The tradition is not to blame, but sinful people are, if individuals are abused. The musical score is wonderful, the performers are usually imperfect.*

It is in that sense that I claim a biblical basis for re-examination of that tradition – which is what this dialogue is all about. (And another little insight, as I reread that sentence: I have been trying to formulate a basis for change in that tradition – and realize that what I have given here is incomplete for that. But it is, perhaps, a basis for re-examination of tradition – a basis for dialogue, as Gerry had put it in the beginning.)

Again, we are not discussing the necessity for kindness to anyone, nor do we usually think that there must be special indulgence to anyone to make up for harshness in the past.

Is my reasoning still off-beam? I hope I have made myself clearer than I did in my first try. And I do welcome criticism, as long as it can lead toward truth.

In the Good Samaritan story, my interest was not in the "personal drama" between Jesus and his questioner, nor in "the enunciation ... of a moral platitude," but in the story's cast of characters. Why did Jesus make his hero a Samaritan? It seems to me he must have been deliberately making a point: in the story, the "good" guys acted badly, the "bad" guy did it right. *I.e.*, we, and those whose status we respect, are not necessarily "better" than someone we consider "inferior". (This theme turns up often in

the gospels – *e.g.*, passages in which Jesus is criticized for associating with "tax collectors and sinners.")

I was not actually implying that you, Hugh, had failed to get the point, but attempting to set the scene a bit. The Lord is sparring with someone who assumes his own superiority over this upstart would-be Rabbi. Jesus had never been to Rabbinical School to be taught the Law or how to teach it. The note that the 'good neighbour' was a Samaritan (two Temple officers having already evaded their duty) will indeed have brought a gasp from the audience. The "cast of characters" is an integral part of the drama.

I am not sure I completely understood all of your comments, but they didn't seem to quarrel with this interpretation. (Of course, I am not suggesting any direct connection with homosexuality. The link is simply that our culture regards homosexuals as "inferior," somewhat as New Testament culture did Samaritans.) I am contending that there is a biblical basis for reconsidering the church's attitude to homosexuals. The two examples I have put forward were the parables of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) and the last judgement (Sheep and Goats, Matt. 25:31-46).

The Parable of the Sheep and the Goats in Matt. 25 probably needs to be left out of it, as referring to the judgement of the heathen. In any case, whoever is ministering or not ministering to whom in the Parable, the ministry itself as in the Good Samaritan story is described in terms of serious and central needs of the needy.

It seems to me, Prisca, that you haven't been thinking, as you express your public opposition to the blessing of same-sex unions, about Jesus' attitude to the Samaritan in the Parable in Luke 10. He criticized the religious people, but showed the social outcast as doing the will of God. Shouldn't we similarly side with the homosexual,

who is the outcast in our society? I am concerned about the humane treatment of such people.

In that parable, as the setting shows, the Lord is dealing with, not ordinary Synagogue members, but prominent and powerful clerics, for whom He reserved His severest strictures. It is therefore legitimate, if it is legitimate to try to bring the Good Samaritan up-to-date in our Diocesan situation, to ask about the attitudes of our ecclesiastical equivalents to, say, those conscientiously unable to endorse same-sex acts. Our Chinese Christians got behind the mike at our climactic Synod literally in tears, at the prospect of the ruin of their testimony and usefulness in their own culture. Are they and others being treated humanely?

I too noticed the strong role played by our Chinese members on Resolution 9. My "attitude" to them (and to all those holding the same position), begins with a question – Why?

Why Such a Reaction to Homosexual Acts?

Why not? Not only does opposition to same-sex acts chime with the united witness of the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Septuagint version (which adds an allusion in Ez. 16), the Intertestamental literature, the Fathers, the Reformers and all Jewish and Christian ethicists until perhaps thirty years ago, it encompasses very large numbers of ordinary people in the pew (and outside all pews). It is not possible to attempt to put a whole three-thousand-year-old culture and tradition suddenly on the defensive and to cherish the illusion that there will be no reaction.

This takes me back a decade or more to the time when the homosexual issue began to emerge as a public debate (about the time the Gay Games came to Vancouver). Up to then, I might describe myself as "unable to endorse homosexual acts" – more accurately, unwilling to endorse, condemn, talk or even think about them at all. The Gay

Games triggered a spate of protest in forums (such as letters to the editor) which I couldn't help noticing. What struck me most was the strength of feeling expressed in these protests: the energy, the emotion, the anger, the depth of concern, even a suspicion of fear.

I too was very greatly affected in my thinking by the holding of the Gay Games in our fair city. I was in the position of leading the Council of Christian Churches of Greater Vancouver through a time when there was a violent public clash between secular indifference on the one hand and an hysterical 'Christian' reaction (expressed in a full-page ad. in the papers) on the other. We (and I, under siege from the media as a prominent Anglican because of the holding of a 'Service of Welcome' in my cathedral) had to produce a measured yet principled response in a real hurry. We then had, not many months later, because of our constitutional commitment to "Biblical and Traditional Christian Ethics", to ask the member United Church presbyteries about their eligibility for membership in the Council.

Up to then, my position was simply that I had not particularly studied any texts about the matter; but I took it for granted that there were some, for it would be curious indeed if the God of all creation had had nothing explicit to say about behaviour which was so plainly unbiological. Perhaps as an emotionally mature wife and mother (by 1987 I had been married 25 years) the 'wrongness' was plainer to me than it could be to any man: I cannot remember a time in my adult life when I have not known that if there was anything worthwhile for men in same-sex acts, there was certainly nothing for the female of the species, whose sexual maturity and satisfaction depends on a specifically feminine experience unattainable in such acts. (This was in my thinking and feeling quite independent of any desire for children, which was completely absent from my conscious mind when I was married.) This instinct may go far to account for the fact that there always seem to be an even smaller number of females than males at all interested in lifetime same-sex relations, and

that where there are no children lesbian 'unions' are even less stable. I still believe, or have come round to believing again, that we have no need of any texts at all to know from observation that same-sex acts are biologically bizarre, and that this is so quite apart from the fact that they cannot lead directly to offspring. I believe, and have gone into scholarly print to this effect, that half of the Pauline argument in Rom. 1 has to do with the 'biologically bizarre' aspect of the thing, but that of course Paul sees no conflict between what the late Chief Rabbi of Great Britain called some years ago "the law of God" and that of "nature" in genital relations.

Out of my formulation in the press and in a letter to City Hall (we did not quote Scripture or say anything about sin against God in this context) came the beginning of my own study of the explicit biblical references. Hence my eventual published paper, which circulated for some years with an introduction which I attach as a Word file. Some Christian people in this city thought us compromised, but we did not want to spoil our case by appeal to Biblical authority and spiritual standards with people for whom these were of no account. We thought, and said to City Hall, that one more Indian boy on the street with Aids after the Gay Games was one too many.

I suppose that no-one would claim that homosexuality is really natural. Ostensibly, however, this strong feeling was based on the Biblical condemnation of homosexual activity.

As I have said above, the Christian reaction was quite varied, and based on varied grounds. (I am glad that you accept that homosexuality is unnatural.)

But my immediate reaction to this was, and continues to be, one of disbelief. I find it simply not credible that a few obscure texts from Leviticus and elsewhere had moved people so strongly. The Bible, after all, has a lot to say about sins of many kinds (most of which receive a great

deal more Biblical attention than this one), and even more about doing what is right. Issues of justice and love, for example, of fair sharing of wealth, and of care and concern for the disadvantaged, are far more prominent in the Bible, but do they draw the same kind of emotional attention? Hardly. A telling comparison is with usury, condemned in about as many Biblical passages as homosexual behaviour. How is it that the same protesters seem content to live in an economy whose very basis is the earning of maximum rates of return on one's invested wealth? Where are the energetic, emotional protests against banks and the stock market?

I intend to split off some of my reply to this point into a new posting: See Shades of Marcion*. Here I shall take up the matter of usury. The medieval church condemned usury in all its forms on the basis of "a few obscure texts". The ban on taking money at usury was maintained for at least a millennium, in a Christian culture which had at least as well-thought-out and articulated a theology of the Just Wage, the Just Price, the Just War and so forth as ours. We have absolutely no monopoly on Christian consistency in this or any other sphere. The people would not soil their hands with it, leaving all money-lending (which developed societies have always used and needed) to Jewry (ironically enough). There was a tremendous amount of "emotional attention" paid to all such economic matters, very much less to personal and relational ones.*

The justification, or rationalisation, for our modern practice is a distinction between usury and interest (though that distinction seems to be to have broken down briefly in our economy in the early Eighties!). The "Are we talking about the same phenomenon?" argument really is relevant here. Usury in the Bible was indeed usurious, the rates being so crippling that personal slavery for debt was often the rapid result. And this was at times when inflation was so low that it took centuries for any to be discernible. The modern argument would be that that kind of lending is what is forbidden. For ourselves,

isn't the principle behind the prohibition that we may not enslave anyone in any way for our own profit? That is a far more far-reaching demand, it seems to me, than a disapproval of lending at interest. It may be doubted whether you, Hugh, or any of us, could move an inch in modern life without using our present financial system. We do it every time we shop, put money into the bank, or draw a salary or pension.

A much better parallel might be contraception, with its strong personal and relational component. Until a few decades ago the whole Judaeo-Christian tradition condemned it: the problem had always been to keep the population up, and it was assumed that Scripture said the same. Meanwhile as TB of the ovaries vanished from the Western world, ethicists were forced to rethink the ban. It could be said, and still is said in one very significant Christian denomination, that the fact that there is nowadays not a peep out of anyone about its use in Christian marriage is simply a measure of how wickedly self-indulgent we all are. Except that God in His wisdom said nothing at all about it, but rather instructed married people to meet each other's needs lest worse befall them. And yes, sundry methods, including intrauterine devices, were known to the ancient world.

The Early Fathers, always required reading for Anglicans (they were what Hooker primarily meant by Tradition), were eloquent against contraception on the ostensible basis of two Old Testament texts. They were eloquent against same-sex relations on the explicit basis of the Leviticus and other texts. They were also eloquent against abortion, about which there are strictly speaking no texts at all: they said that it was murder, involving the destruction of a person made in the image of God; it was not far from their minds that it was nearly always fatal to the mother, who was in the same category. The need to keep the population up was not a minor consideration to them in any of these judgements; but they can be shown to have been unbiblical in only the first case.

I can only conclude that the emotional reaction against homosexuality is triggered by more than the Biblical texts. By what, then? I suspect that the driving force for anti-homosexual feeling and protest is something much more visceral than intellectual or even moral;

There is another possible kind of reaction to reckon with, and that is one rooted in a deep spiritual conviction.

… that the energy flows from a "gut" sense of discomfort, even revulsion, at the very thought of physical intimacy with a partner of one's own sex. I find at least some hints of such feeling in my own experience – my initial reluctance to deal with the issue, for example.

Yes, I agree with you that there is a visceral reaction on the part of most of us, and that we have to be careful that we are not blinded by this to any facts. Some even react pathologically to the idea of heterosexual relations! In the late Eighties I knew less detail than I do now, and as I learnt more had to discipline myself to peel off, as it were, my emotions from my thinking in this as in other spheres. The more we know about the nature of the same-sex 'act of love' (which, when all's said and done, in the male case involves entering an exit) the more careful we have to be about simple disgust. At the same time, isn't it reasonable that people who are not disembodied spirits, but who only ever know one another in this life in bodies which are of one sex or the other, should experience a reaction which is tinged with emotion? Some people have an entirely principled objection to a situation in which their growing children may be encouraged to think of this kind of relating as being on all fours with heterosexual relations, or to come to their local parish church and be 'turned' by their friendly neighbourhood Anglican priest. Nor do we think an emotional reaction of disgust and horror peculiar in a victim of sexual abuse.

I think that there are circles where more information about the physical facts would not come amiss: probably

not apocryphal is the tale of the dear old lady who couldn't understand what all the fuss was about in connection with gay men's living together; it turned out that her definition of 'gay' was 'unable to beget children'...

Another possible factor is cultural: what have people learned from the way others in their society think about and treat homosexuals? From long ago, I remember just one line of a song, I think from "South Pacific". Children, the song said, don't naturally dislike those of another race – "They have to be carefully taught!" When I see the Chinese members of our Synod, and the Africans of Lambeth, more strongly opposed than others to some accommodation with homosexuality, I wonder whether their culture has taught this lesson more strongly than ours. This is something I haven't yet discovered, and would be interested to learn.

As far as I can see the main cultural factor is that homosexual expression is an epiphenomenon of extreme affluence, and always has been. Third World bishops, for instance (not to mention a majority of First World ones) cannot see why the Church should be rent asunder over what they view as the emotional problem of a tiny minority in the affluent West. In many places Christian people are not only accorded far less tolerance than active homosexuals in our societies, they are liable to get lynched all the more certainly if there is any suggestion that they are promoting any form of vice.

As for children, they surely do not need to learn cruelty and hatred of visible difference from anyone. They need to unlearn them and learn Christ, like parents. They are no more noble than savages are.

So my attitude to others with whom I disagree is to seek the reason why, in the expectation that one side has something to learn from the other. The biblical arguments (that I expect to be offered) do not satisfy me, for at least two reasons: the one given above, that other biblical teachings are not pursued so eagerly, and the one I have been putting forward in the rest of this conversation, that

this particular teaching seems to produce results that violate other, more certain, biblical teachings.

This encapsulates another point which I shall take up in detail under separate cover, as it were.

Why Such a Reaction to Homosexual Acts? Contd.

Hugh Dempster writes:

Oh dear! Here was I, thinking that over the Christmas "lull" I'd be able to put together a response to earlier comments from Barclay, and now it's now, with that still undone and the flood-gates opening again. Well, I've known all along that there are many facets to this subject, and that a simple discussion of one topic would perforce branch out before long into a bunch of other tracks. Let me start with a few brief quibbles on Prisca's last posting. Yes, I too am all behind ...

Prisca had asked about my attitude to the Chinese members of our Synod, who spoke strongly against Resolution 9.

Actually I did not mean yours or that of any ordinary person in the pew, but rather church leaders such as are in conflict with our Lord in the context of the Parable of the Good Samaritan. Our Chinese members were particularly distressed, and said so.

I began by wondering why they took that position, and Prisca responded:

Why not? ... It is not possible to attempt to put a whole three-thousand-year-old culture and tradition suddenly on the defensive and to cherish the illusion that there will be no reaction.

I am moving here to the reasonableness of such a reaction not merely on their part, but on that of any church person. Hence my title.

I don't expect "no reaction," but the rest of Synod was about equally divided pro and con;

Synod had not really had any time to think about Resolution 9, particularly as it was amended just before it came before us. The 'debate' was extraordinarily superficial.

I was asking why the Chinese reacted so differently. If the "three-thousand-year-old culture and tradition" you speak of is the Judeo-Christian teaching, then both groups presumably have been exposed to that (the Chinese, perhaps, not for so long), and it would not seem to explain the difference. (If you meant instead the Chinese ethnic culture, that's another story. In that case, you would seem to be accepting that their position (and yours?) is based primarily in culture, not the Bible.)

I think that the Chinese position is grounded in reason first, their own pagan culture second, and the Bible has reinforced these for them only very recently. They cannot commend the Gospel in Chinese culture with sex-ethics like that, they are saying. I strongly suspect that even tolerance for all such differences is the fruit of a long exposure to the Gospel with its revolutionary concept of the value of every human being. The reaction grounded in culture is to be found everywhere and at all periods, quite independently of any Bible.

When I previously made the suggestion that culture might be a factor (and that children aren't naturally racist, but must be so taught), Prisca replied:

As far as I can see the main cultural factor is that homosexual expression is an epiphenomenon of extreme affluence, and always has been. I am taking a long and broad view, having studied the thing historically as well as geographically. It has been an upper-crust and affluent thing always and everywhere. Third World bishops, for instance … cannot see why the Church should be rent asunder over

what they view as the emotional problem of a tiny minority in the affluent West. ...

This was overwhelmingly the majority view of ALL the bishops at Lambeth.

As for children, they surely do not need to learn cruelty and hatred of visible difference from anyone.

I should perhaps have said, soon after they cease to be toddlers and abandon parallel play.

I question both of these assertions, and the Third World bishops! It may well be that only in "the affluent West" has it become relatively safe for homosexuals to "come out" and live openly as what they are, but they exist in both Asia and Africa, and probably everywhere. I can understand that they may be relatively invisible to, say, the African bishops, when I see (*New Internationalist* 328, Oct. 2000, pp. 18-19) that in over half the African countries homosexual acts are illegal, with penalties ranging up to death.

The premiss here is that there is something inherent in some human beings called "being homosexual". Where do we suppose it to be located? In the genes, the chromosomes, the psyche? Are we supposing that there has been a major psychological shift in the makeup of human beings?

It would be good (I plead again) if we could be clear that what we are talking about is the acceptance of a particular kind of behaviour as feasibly pleasing to God in Christian people, not some state of mind or emotion which does not manifest itself in action.

I have no data at hand about children and racism, but have certainly read accounts of small children playing happily with others of different race, and, if questions arose ("Mommy, why is Bobby's skin so black?"), being satisfied with very simple answers. Maybe the answer is that children must be taught either way – to accept, or to hate.

I think that I want to assert that children are sinful too.

Where do their parents get wickedness from, to pass it along to them? But this is another hare to be set running: call it the Perfectibility question, if you like.

Finally, on usury (which I had put forward as a parallel to homosexuality – not that the issues are similar, but simply that both are uniformly condemned by scripture, in about as many passages), Prisca's response noted changes in attitude through history and gave some reasons for these – and seemed to accept the result. But hold on! If we switch back to sexuality, shouldn't those be my lines, which she would be opposing? Why should a historical change in attitude away from the Biblical position be acceptable in one case and not in the other? Again, this would suggest (as I have come to suppose) that the Church's traditional view on sexuality is indeed based on something more than the Biblical texts themselves.

I am saying that the phenomenon is NOT the same as what is condemned in the Old Testament but unmentioned in the much more urban setting of the New (significantly interest-earning is accepted by Our Lord in the Parable of the Talents, if one wants to be exact!). Hugh, you have not taken me up about your own involvement in the system, but you are not telling me that you live detached from it? Have you taken all your pension money, turned it into gold and stuffed it into a sock under the bed? Would you not give someone who needs it a mortgage? Tell me how, and I will gladly yield to your scruples if I could thereby get you to think more tenderly of mine!

I have a whole string of topics pending: I hope that you agree that we have to make this discussion less unwieldy?

More later!

Shades of Marcion, or Is Scripture Divisible or Unclear?

Early in the Second Century there arose a theologian called Marcion. He thought that there were two Gods in the Bible, a punitive, angry, legalist God, and the

Christian God. On this basis he 'outed' all of the Old Testament, most of the Epistles and large parts of the Gospels as sub-Christian, leaving as Scripture really only the 'Gentle Jesus meek and mild' parts of the Gospels. His view was rejected as aberrant before he died, but never died with him, for it has been popping up again at intervals ever since. It is actually in modern terms a variant of anti-Semitism, for it flourished among the 'German Christians' during the Third Reich. Article VII was written to contradict the Marcionite heresy. It states among other things that in the New Covenant we are still to obey "those commandments which are called moral".

Why was Marcion mistaken? First and foremost, one cannot disentangle two ideas of God from one another in revelation: they are completely interwoven, the idea of His love and the idea that out of love He gives us standards and is angry when they are broken. Marcion ignored the teaching of Jesus Himself, that His Bible was one, and that the apostolic witness too was to be inspired and one with it. He ignored the position that is Dominical, Pauline and that of the writer to the Hebrews, that Christian people are obliged to 'fulfil' all of the Law which remains unfulfilled in the Person and Work of Christ, and in the power of the Holy Spirit to follow His example of a perfect obedience to its demands. He went in for 'DIY' integration, or non-integration, of Scripture; the Church said that the broad method of approaching the diversity within Scripture was already contained within Scripture: Jesus was the supreme authority over the whole, the interpretation of the Old Testament was to be governed by that of the New, and the meaning of the whole caboodle, whatever that was reverently found to be, was to be believed and obeyed.

Furthermore, Article VI states, again in accordance with catholic doctrine, that Scripture contains perspicuously all that everyone needs to know about salvation (which as we all know includes sanctification and glorification in the New Testament view). Article XX says that the Church has no right "so to expound" one passage of

Scripture "as to be repugnant to another". It adds that the Church has no authority to require anyone to believe 'extras' (*e.g.* the necessity of baptizing sinful behaviour as a part of being 'loving') which are not demonstrable from Scripture.

It is in accordance with the catholic view of Scripture that as great a New Testament scholar as the still-living C.F.D. Moule said in my hearing when lecturing on Romans, "The Jew attempted to keep the Law in order that he might be saved; we are saved in order that we may keep the Law."

But my immediate reaction to this was, and continues to be, one of disbelief. I find it simply not credible that a few obscure texts from Leviticus and elsewhere had moved people so strongly.

To comment first on "a few": why should the number of texts matter? The First Great Commandment rests on fewer passages still. Is it therefore to be taken less seriously? Does the plethora of passages uncomplimentary to adultery make adultery 'worse' than my idolatry of self?

"... obscure": the Hebrew texts, like most of the Torah, are linguistically completely straightforward; no ancient or modern version has any difficulty with them, and all versions are wholly serviceable for those whose Hebrew is growing rusty. The Early Fathers, reading their Bible in Greek or a version of that, knew that they were about consensual penetration of the male by the male.

"... from Leviticus": the Two Great Commandments have as their source that book and Deuteronomy, from which the Lord quoted them as part of His Bible and authoritative for us all.

"... and elsewhere": the "elsewhere" is with one exception Apostolic, and the Apostolic references contain back-reference to parts of the Torah. They too are clear to

good Hellenists, if not always well translated in the modern English versions.

The Bible, after all, has a lot to say about sins of many kinds (most of which receive a great deal more Biblical attention than this one), and even more about doing what is right. Issues of justice and love, for example, of fair sharing of wealth, and of care and concern for the disadvantaged, are far more prominent in the Bible, but do they draw the same kind of emotional attention?

This is an interesting distinction, but not a Biblical one. Exercising sexual restraint and purity is not separate from "doing what is right", but a vital aspect of it. Sexual and other standards are held together, indeed fused, throughout biblical ethics. What is this "justice and love" which does not encompass all of life? We started out in this discussion with a passage which makes love, for God and man, the all-embracing category. Has it now become a small thing?

As for the "emotional attention", it depends where you are. Certain concerns are a preoccupation in left-liberal circles. These, because we are human and find it hard to get our minds round so much material (plus the fact that biblical ethics condemn us all!), bleat about them all the time, but are silent in the face of our modern epidemic of unchastity, it seems to me.

Biblical ethics are very even-handed, it seems to me, on the Left and the Right.

I have just done a search of the New Testament terms for just/unjust and cognates. Those prepared to look at the results, perhaps with a good translation to hand, will see that there is no vital distinction within them between justice, goodness, righteousness etc. and their opposite negative equivalents.

So my attitude to others with whom I disagree is to seek the reason why, in the expectation that one side has something to learn from the other. The biblical arguments (that I expect to be offered) do not satisfy me.

Shouldn't we all be expecting to learn more from Scripture all our days? Particularly if we are open to having our assumptions challenged by what we find there?

… for at least two reasons: the one given above, that other biblical teachings are not pursued so eagerly …

I am open to hearing in what way my life and thinking need correction. I go to church partly for this.

… and the one I have been putting forward in the rest of this conversation, that this particular teaching seems to produce results that violate other, more certain, biblical teachings.

This brings us smack up against the question of what love for neighbour is, and how it relates to the revealed will of God.

That needs a new discussion.

Is There an Analogy with the Good Samaritan?

Hugh wrote:

Continuing my conversation with Prisca … By way of reprise, this started with my claim (against a denial) that there is a biblical basis for reconsidering the church's attitude to homosexuals (as we are trying to do in this dialogue). The chief theme I have in mind is Jesus' frequent alignment with "inferior" people, the poor, the outcast, the foreigner, the despised. (In effect, I guess, the "preferential option for the poor" of Latin-American theologians.) Homosexuals, in today's society, surely fit in that category – and this, I claim, needs to be considered over against those scripture passages which condemn homosexual behaviour. The two examples I put forward were the parables of the Good Samaritan and the last judgement.

First, about the Good Samaritan.

The note that the 'good neighbour' was a Samaritan (two Temple officers having already evaded their duty) will indeed have brought a gasp from the audience. The "cast of characters" is an integral part of the drama. The Lord is also dealing with, not ordinary Synagogue members, but prominent and powerful clerics, for whom He reserved His severest strictures.

So far we agree.

It is therefore legitimate, if it is legitimate to try to bring this up-to-date in our Diocesan situation, to ask about the attitudes of our ecclesiastical equivalents to, say, those conscientiously unable to endorse same-sex acts ...

I've been trying to understand this sentence as raising a question about the parallel I draw between the parable and our situation, but can't make it come out to any question I believe you would ask. The end part, about attitudes (perhaps mine?) to those "unable to endorse same-sex acts," I can respond to, but not really in the context of the parable. (In that context, it would translate into attitudes to those unable to endorse Samaritans – perhaps the "prominent and powerful clerics" you mentioned as targets of Jesus' severest strictures.) I'll therefore make that a separate response message.

I was trying to say that the connection with homosexuality in general and our Diocesan situation in particular is so tenuous as to be nugatory. We are asking whether a particular lifestyle is one which God can 'bless'.

Were not Samaritans then and homosexuals now similarly despised? That's essentially the connection. I agree with that last sentence as a fair statement of the question we are addressing (except perhaps for the unfortunate word "lifestyle"). But then you go on to make characterizations which, it seems to me, beg that very question.

Our Lord's ideal Samaritan is of course to be assumed to be exemplary in his life in general: his 'inferiority' is a religious/ethnic thing not tied to something universally agreed to be sinful. In the episode of the Woman at the Well, the Lord was prepared to challenge a real-life Samaritan about sex-ethics where these were the issue. But they or any other form of ungodliness are not even remotely the issue in Lk. 10.

To make this comparison does not, I think, "leap ... to baptize all forms of behaviour." And it means that your "cash to call the right kind of escort service" is actually attached to the wrong player in this little drama – your presumed homosexual should be playing the part of Samaritan, not victim. :-)

When you say "tied to something universally agreed to be sinful" or "any other form of ungodliness" in arguing against my linking of the Good Samaritan story with homosexuality, are you not by implication assuming that same-sex relations in particular cannot be blessed by God? I am not sure about the specific issues separating Jews and Samaritans (they worshipped on different mountains, for one?), but would not Jesus' hearers assume that the "Samaritan lifestyle" could not be blessed by God? And would we perhaps (in the light of this parable) disagree with that? Again, you say that the Samaritan of the story "is of course to be assumed to be exemplary in his life in general." Would not the opposite be assumed by those hearers? Would they not consider the label "good Samaritan" an oxymoron? Wasn't that likely Jesus' point in casting his story as he did?

I am saying that the teaching of the Parable has everything to do with the meeting of fundamental human need, and absolutely nothing to do with any messing about in bed of any variety! (Yes, there is an oscillation, within the Parable and in our thinking about it, between the active and passive senses of "neighbour". I am primarily concerned at this point to emphasise that certain kinds of satisfaction are quite distinct from basic human needs, and the duty to meet them, which together create human rights.)

Yes (if you must put it that way), but it also includes a striking warning against denigrating (or excluding from your "neighbour-hood") certain others just because you think God can't bless them. As I indicated before, I set this story alongside other passages in which Jesus aligns himself with people "beyond the pale" – most often "tax collectors and sinners" – and is criticized for so doing. My argument supposes only that many Christians today treat homosexuals in much the way Jews of Jesus' time treated Samaritans. Is that not a legitimate analogy?

I think that a number of points need to be made. Your remarks are in inverted commas.

1. *You state "this started with my claim (against a denial) that there is a biblical basis for reconsidering the church's attitude to homosexuals (as we are trying to do in this dialogue)."*
2. *Actually we are not doing that, as you later admit: we are asking whether same-sex relations are a possible Christian behaviour which God can 'bless'. We are not talking about anybody's 'orientation' as such. (Sometimes this may be at odds with actual behaviour, or prove to be so in the long run.)*
3. *"The chief theme I have in mind is Jesus' frequent alignment with 'inferior' people, the poor, the outcast, the foreigner, the despised. (In effect, I guess, the 'preferential option for the poor' of Latin-American theologians.) Homosexuals, in today's society, surely fit in that category – and this, I claim, needs to be considered over against those scripture passages which condemn homosexual behaviour."*
4. *Even if it were granted that our society really oppresses homosexuals, it is not homosexuals as such, or our society, which are in question in our Diocesan situation. Isn't it clear, furthermore, that, for example, wife-beating is generally disapproved? We do not*

conclude that wife-beaters are thereby rendered fine fellows subject to cruelty and gross misunderstanding, and that the Good Samaritan is analogous to them. By this far-fetched method, absolutely any behaviour could be smuggled into our reasoning as admirable, or at least venial.

5. *"I've been trying to understand this sentence (about the Lord's reserving His severest strictures for religious leaders) as raising a question about the parallel I draw between the parable and our situation, but can't make it come out to any question I believe you would ask. The end part, about attitudes (perhaps mine?) to those 'unable to endorse same-sex acts,' I can respond to, but not really in the context of the parable."*

*The Samaritan in the parable is shown to be exemplary by contrast with two highly-educated religious professionals, who signally failed to obey the Law which Jesus' interlocutor has just established as representing the whole (horizontal) will of God for mankind. To get these people even more into context, we need to understand that these were individuals who were really in earnest about their religion. No doubt we are meant to understand that there was a purely selfish, ordinarily human, motive for their neglect (*i.e. *the brigands who notoriously lurked in the caves and boulders above the Jericho road might want a piece of them too!); but they were also coping with an equally human conflict of genuine duties. The victim looked dead. To establish that he could still be helped involved touching him. Whether the two functionaries were coming or going from their service to God is unclear from the Greek; but either way they would have been rendered ritually unclean for many days, and thus unable to serve, by reason of their contact with a corpse. Their love for God was expressed, in their minds, even supremely expressed, in their Temple service to Him. Someone else, they would have reasoned, was more freed up to look after*

the mess on the roadside. The real point of the Parable is that when push comes to shove, love for God does not ignore the visible object, or it is unreal. Precisely the same point is being made in the well-known long passage at I John 3-4. It is teaching about Theological Ethics, to use the technical term: how do we hold together the two Great Commandments?

I want to say that if there is a current and local parallel to these religious officials, it is much more plausibly with the attitude which ignores the obvious distress of ordinary church members, in favour of a doctrinaire insistence that because I am high up in the Church I know better what God wants done. I do not refer to you, Hugh, or to ordinary members of Synod…

3. *"When you say 'tied to something universally agreed to be sinful' or 'any other form of ungodliness' in arguing against my linking of the Good Samaritan story with homosexuality, are you not by implication assuming that same-sex relations in particular cannot be blessed by God? I am not sure about the specific issues separating Jews and Samaritans (they worshipped on different mountains, for one?), but would not Jesus' hearers assume that the 'Samaritan lifestyle' could not be blessed by God?… Again, you say that the Samaritan of the story 'is of course to be assumed to be exemplary in his life in general.' Would not the opposite be assumed by those hearers? Would they not consider the label 'good Samaritan' an oxymoron? Wasn't that likely Jesus' point in casting his story as he did?"*

Actually my reference is to an assumption which would most certainly have been shared by absolutely everyone at the time of the telling of the Parable. We need to be completely clear that neither the Lord Himself, nor any of His contemporaries who were in any kind of position of authority, whether Jew or Samaritan, could possibly have countenanced, let alone practised, same-sex relations.

Not only could He not, for logical reasons already stated, have been thinking about vindicating Samaritans, as opposed to rebuking Jews. (For a really telling 'exemplary neighbour although' he could have chosen a much more spectacularly despised Gentile, after all. The Jews really did think of the Gentiles as a bunch of immoralists.) This teaching is much deeper than our typical modern sociological, horizontally-human, concern. He chose as a lay-figure for a story about love for neighbour someone who stood for an hereditary religious/ethnic enmity going back at least five centuries, because the Law was held in common: and reading it in an inferior copy, not to mention worshipping in the wrong place, are shown in the story to be no bar to pleasing God. 'How do you read it?' is a very pointed question!!! There was mutual contempt and institutionalised avoidance between two old communities, into which people were born and out of which there was no exit. They occupied different lands and had two separate Temples. Both priest and Levite were professionally concerned with the accurate understanding of the Law and with ceremonial correctness. Jesus cannot possibly have been saying anything like 'The Samaritan is a superb pastry-cook (admirable but irrelevant) and here showed himself to be an excellent neighbour too', or 'The Samaritan is a keen entomologist (morally neutral but irrelevant) and was a wonderful neighbour to a wounded Jew', let alone 'He beats his wife regularly every Sabbath, and is exemplary in his love for neighbour' ... !

Perhaps it would help our discussion to put same-sex relations into their Biblical context. They keep company with child sacrifice, bestiality, incest, adultery, murder (Leviticus); (as an aspect of sexual immorality in general) with wicked schemes, murder, adultery, theft, false testimony and defamation (Mt. 15); with every kind of vice, violence and wickedness in Rom. 2; with general unchastity, idolatry, adultery, theft, ruthless acquisitiveness, intoxication, defamation, and swindling (I Cor. 6); with parricide, matricide, murder, adultery, slaving, fraud and

perjury (I Tim. 1); and by implication with all the other 'works of the flesh' in Gal. 5. They would certainly not have been attributable, or attributed, to a Samaritan qua *Samaritan by the most hostile Jew.*

4. *"[The parable] also includes a striking warning against denigrating (or excluding from your 'neigh-bour-hood') certain others just because you think God can't bless them. As I indicated before, I set this story alongside other passages in which Jesus aligns himself with people 'beyond the pale' – most often 'tax collectors and sinners' – and is criticized for so doing."*

I really don't know anyone in my church who denigrates, excludes socially or thinks of as 'unblessable' homosexual or any other persons.

Didn't the Lord, in his mostly private but occasionally documented chats with the Quislings and Street People actually always get them to align themselves with Himself? His love, reflecting the love of God, was never a soft thing. Repentance and faith with power for amendment of life were part of the offer, without which there was no ultimate blessing. There was no question of what Bonhoeffer called "cheap grace".

5. *"My argument supposes only that many Christians today treat homosexuals in much the way Jews of Jesus' time treated Samaritans. Is that not a legitimate analogy?"*

Even if the premiss be granted, no, except in the most remote and subsidiary way. I have tried really hard, but find the analogy really too convoluted.

Is Sex-experience a Basic Human Need?

About the Sheep and Goats:

We have already agreed that whoever is ministering or not ministering to whom in the Parable, the ministry itself as in the Good Samaritan story is described in terms of serious and central needs of the needy.

The "loving care" again has nothing whatever to do with many of our felt wants, everything to do with basic need.

Yes and no. It isn't about satisfying greed, but our bodies have a way of making us "feel want" whenever we suffer a "basic need." Hunger and thirst (which are mentioned in the parable) are felt wants, signalling our basic needs of food and drink. Companionship may be both a want and a need (for, say, the sick or prisoner). And of course, what about our sexual drives? They are surely a basic need for our species, and (probably therefore) are given to us as fairly urgent wants. So I think that distinction may not be quite as clean as you suggest.

Yes, the visiting of people in their sickness or imprisonment does look like a care for them as social beings. Certainly, to reiterate my earlier distinction, human contact and the sense of being cared for by other people is of the bene esse*, if not of the* esse*, of most people's lives most of the time. For the very young or otherwise vulnerable it may make the difference between life and death in particular cases. However, we need to remember that the infirmary and other place of sickness, let alone prison, have been and still are by no means necessarily places where one got fed, or cared for in other basic ways, unless someone cared enough to visit there. So I do not think that those parts of the Parable can be used to argue for the basic nature of the need for companionship. Absolutely essential in the action of the Good Samaritan was the brave and sacrificial act of physical rescue: this is why the*

Parable is sometimes expounded (however methodologically unsoundly!) as an allegory of Christ's rescue of the sinner, who is mortally wounded and powerless to help himself.

Our whole tradition teaches that for companionship, affirmation and personhood we always can, and sometimes must, do with God only.

That we have been programmed to desire sexual union so as to propagate the race is clear. It is incidentally clear that same-sex 'union' is an exceedingly roundabout method of arriving at the same result. The Creation Mandate to 'fill up the earth' used to be regarded as justification for the view that, to quote Humanae Vitae, *"Every marriage-act must be open to life." We cannot conclude that all without exception are called to do their bit, nor outside the Roman obedience do we nowadays make the command mean that all the married have a duty to have as many babies as they possibly can in the time.*

If we are talking about our longing for sex-experience or any aspect of it, it may be so overwhelmingly strong (in many women the desire for awakening comes before the desire for children, and conceivably the second is always qualitatively different in the two sexes) that the little difficulty that nobody has offered us marriage is experienced as terrible deprivation by individuals. I have many younger friends who live with very much pain because of this. The short-term, or sometimes lifelong, pain is the greater for believers because they do not feel free to assuage it in unworthy ways. They are quite clear what they want, and tell the Lord about it frequently and with tears, but must like all of us accept that when the answer is still "No" or "Not Yet" what they are feeling is a want not a need. I have never known any rational Christian to die under this particular deprivation, or to consider that God, the Church or society have failed to grant them some sort of abstract 'right' to sexual enjoyment.

There is a Christian virtue called Acceptance which enters into all our deep frustrations. When one has gone through this sort of dark experience, whether because of

sexual desire or something else, one can and does discover the Lord in a new way. One discovers that grace and forgiveness, as the Lord's Prayer indicates, are indeed among our basic needs, and are always forthcoming when we ask for them. Suffering borne with and for Christ is less heavy, and has some very beneficial fruits of the kind that do last longer than the pain.

I know whereof I speak.

Our life, for time and eternity, is infinitely more complex than our genital urges: I am far far more than my heterosexuality, which except insofar as I use it responsibly and in accordance with God's will, or not, has no lasting significance at all.

Yes, but! We are very complex beings. Each one of us is certainly far more than our sexuality, yet our sexuality is a very important part of our being. Without it, we would not be what we are. It is surely not a thing to be lightly ignored. Christianity, remember, does not teach immortality of the soul, but resurrection of the body – so I wouldn't be so sure that sexuality "has no lasting significance."

We have it on the very best authority that there is no marriage in the heavenly life.

It was, I believe, Aquinas who postulated SEVEN sexes, each capable of complete interpenetration. His grounds were that what is coming has to be at least as full of joy, colour and passion as what we have here. That is surely a right approach. What we cannot conclude is that we are sexual in our souls, except of course in so far as the FEMININITY of all people before God is a very important Christian idea. It is hard for me to imagine a life for me which is not passionately heterosexual, but I have absolutely no grounds for expecting that I am going to get simply more of the same later!

Besides, if you think sexuality so unimportant, why are you determined to impose a different set of rules on some

people just because their sexuality happens to be of the wrong kind?

I don't, and I am not. If, however, you put to me the question, "Have you stopped denying your husband yet?", I cannot answer it in any way creditable to myself...

Do you know of any way in which, in my thinking or living, I am harder on others than on myself?

… Again, we are not discussing the necessity for kindness to anyone, nor do we usually think that there must be special indulgence to anyone to make up for harshness in the past.

I am discussing the necessity for kindness to everyone (regardless of sexual orientation), and I am not asking for "special indulgence" for anyone, but rather, for gays and lesbians, the same "indulgence" the rest of us take for granted, to put an end to "harshness" in the present.

I meant to say that the necessity of kindness to everyone was not up for grabs, but a 'given'. What does need defining is what kindness is. Is it kind to promise what is not and what God cannot bless? This is how I think of same-sex 'unions'.

None of us can be in favour of cruelty to anyone; but it is important to get this particular case into proportion. Is objection to particular types of behaviour unkind?

Objection to hurtful behaviour is proper. But yes, it is unkind to make a person's life miserable by objection to behaviour that harms no-one else, and is the only possible behaviour for that person. And I think the proper "proportion" for this case is far greater than you seem willing to admit.

That gets us into the very important question of whether there must be visible harm before we must say that something is inconsistent with Christian ethics. That is yet another discussion.

Must Sin Involve Visible Harm?

Hugh has said:

"Objection to hurtful behaviour is proper. But yes, it is unkind to make a person's life miserable by objection to behaviour that harms no-one else, and is the only possible behaviour for that person. And I think the proper 'proportion' for this case is far greater than you seem willing to admit."

Plenty could be said about whether it is right to bring into the public arena details of one's own bedroom habits which most of us regard as private, and then claim that one's life is being made miserable because the reaction is adverse. I write as someone who remains quite incurious when I learn that two unrelated men, or women, live in one dwelling. What they do in their bedrooms is not at all my business until they want to tell me all about it.

As for "the only possible behaviour", when did we arrive at the point in our thinking where we accept that one segment of rational, adult Christian society, with all the Lord's resources of grace available, cannot help acting on its affections and passions? None of the rest of us are infantilised in that way, surely, or wish to be? I emphasise again that we are not in this Dialogue, or when we vote at Synod, dealing with society in general, but with professing Christian adults.

The "harms no-one else" part of this argument is, however, what I wish to address in this slot. Pace *my friend Gerry*[10]*, the more lurid medical aspects (in respect of which the figures for lesbians tend to be very low, about the same as for nuns!) are not quite the point. I should buy the "no harm" claim only in any case where there were no concomitant betrayed spouses, deserted children, confused adolescents, enemies of God caused to blaspheme, violated Christian consciences, dead-ended lives, broken-*

---

[10] Gerry Hunter of this Diocese, who had recently posted some very alarming statistics about illnesses among homosexually active males.

hearted lovers, eager never-married maidens or men, where emotional coldness and ruthless selfishness were not reinforced, where there was no failure to labour and sacrifice so that children might be born to serve God and the world. Then and then only could it fairly be claimed that there was no visible or palpable harm. (In practice, the very least harm that is done consists in the deepening of emotional neediness, not its healing, and a sense of alienation from the Creator of one's body, which frequently manifests itself in the demand that the Church 'bless' and so whitewash what the individual knows to be deeply wrong.)

My point is a point of principle: must human reason be satisfied that the consequences of disobedience are obviously harmful before we will obey? Is not all sin fundamentally against God? Is there not sin which is against God only? Do I know better what love is than the Author of love, who loves me and all the others more than any of us can conceive?

Did Someone Say Something about the Plight of Homosexuals?

How many people are genuinely badly treated for simply being homosexual, *i.e.* having a set of desires and/or temptations not shared by the majority?

All you men, of any orientation, should try being a person housed in a female body in most times and places where the Gospel has never taken firm root!

Hmm. And in some places where the Gospel has taken root! I find it interesting that some of the traditionalists determined not to allow equal status for homosexuals are also determined not to allow the same for women.

I hold absolutely no brief for those who would deny my equality as a woman, in or out of church. Coming as I do out of the oppressing (!) classes of British society, with a

powerful sense of noblesse oblige *ever since I can remember, to extend privilege to all women has been a major concern of mine all my adult life. It probably helps me that thanks to deeply Christian parents I have always been 'equal': education in the very best places, and a sense that that privilege demanded piles of work from me by way of return, have seen to that. I do not find any compelling rationale for my equality anywhere but in the fact that those who treated me so well believed that Jesus had hung on His Cross for me, as for my brothers. Where else do we find any dynamic for change, any sense that the might of the male is not right? Our very critique of Western society for its continuing shortcomings comes out of the Gospel. What other source has it?*

Catholic Christianity has never held that it was sinful in principle to be a woman, 'practising' or not. I have been equal since Pentecost, as the Old Testament texts cited by Peter show. The New Testament echoes with the Great Row about whether a gentile can be a Christian: that a woman, never able to be a full Jew, can be a Christian, is absolutely taken for granted. Women were the first frontier the Gospel crossed, before even the Samaritan one.

I do not think that I or anyone has a 'right' to ordination or a salary as a cleric, a 'right' to a marriage or to be deeply loved by any human being, nor have I at nearly 63 any 'right' to bear more children; I never did have any 'right' to beget any!

I should expect that "a person housed in a female body" might be more sensitive than others to the plight of homosexuals in our society – yet for the second time you express some reservation about the truth of the facts I have mentioned.

All over the world, as a woman, I may be denied adequate food, medical care in spite of my more complicated physiology, all educational opportunity, civil rights, freedom to choose my marriage partner or my friends; I may be subject to routine genital mutilation, punished for my own

rape, imprisoned first in my father's, then in my husband's house, traded for money, forced into a harem with other 'wives', valued and eventually devalued on the basis of my physical charms if any, battered and discarded as worthless. Have I said enough?

I am still waiting for the privileged professional victims of the West to get their eyes up off themselves and to lift one finger for women who suffer like this!!! This is the kind of identification which would commend itself to me, not an attempt to use the truly oppressed as a stalking-horse for homosexual or other vice.

I think it not inappropriate to mention that for good measure my ancestry on my mother's side (the side that counts in this context!) is Jewish. Now the Jewish Holocaust really was persecution for what one was and could not help: Christian people and atheists of Jewish origin perished equally in the gas chambers.

Will it help if I remind you of one, concrete, local example? On March 11, 2000 Hamed Nastoh, 14, honour roll Grade 9 student from Surrey, jumped to his death from Patullo Bridge. He left a note saying he was doing it to escape endless tormenting and name-calling from fellow students, who called him gay, faggot, geek, uncool, over and over and over again. (One student said some children were still calling him a faggot after his death.) He was not gay. [Source: The Province*, March 16, 2000, pages 1, 3.]*

Of course, that's only one (and maybe he doesn't count because he wasn't really gay).

How could anyone tell either way? To have some homosexual feelings, even a major 'crush' on someone of the same sex, is part of growing up for nearly everyone. I ask again, where is 'gayness' located? Would an autopsy have revealed it?

I'd say that's one too many – and even so, it is just one of many more. Was Christian teaching on homosexuality responsible for Hamed's death? I would guess it's a pretty

significant contributing factor. The bullies in his school learned somewhere that "gay" was not a nice thing to be. (Wasn't it Surrey school parents that made a fuss about gay-friendly teaching? Ignorantly afraid, apparently, that it might make their children gay!) Christian teaching doesn't create bullies – but it may "give them permission" to target gays, or perhaps to use "gay" as a put-down taunt.

I really don't know what was at work there, except the aforesaid natural bloody-mindedness of adolescent children. Any insult would probably have done as well. Girls get tormented for late physical development, or being virtuous, for instance. In the over-sexualised culture of the High School it is perhaps assumed that virginal students have something the matter with them. But certainly sheer IGNORANCE of Christianity is quite as likely to have been a factor, isn't it?

I really do not think that it is profitable to ignore the obvious: the acting out of homosexual impulses is biologically bizarre, and this fact is plain to all with half an eye. Parents do not want their children recruited in the schools, or the churches, and most children are aware of the biological facts, perhaps all too aware. No, I do not consider heterosexual promiscuity 'normal' either.

I think that we have to be careful not to make deductions from Scripture about what the Lord "would have said if ..." when what he DID say, about sexual sin in general and the normative nature of heterosexual monogamy in particular, is quite clear. If there is no explicit account of what must have been His convictions about same-sex relations, it can only be because then as now the vast majority were subject to temptations to heterosexual aberrations from the norm. He did not admit the rightness of anything but heterosexual monogamy, or call anything else 'union'. He is our authority about love for neighbour, and our authority about sex-ethics too.

We have to let God Himself define what love is, rather than bring our conception of it to Him and ask Him to rubberstamp it.

It seems to me He did just that in the two parables we have been discussing, and went out of His way in the process to make clear that it is owed also to those neighbours we (for some reason) dislike.

I say it again: Yes, love is owed to all, but 'love' is not to be identified with the commendation of vice.

Visible Harm contd.

Prisca writes:

Plenty could be said about whether it is right to bring into the public arena details of one's own bedroom habits which most of us regard as private, and then claim that one's life is being made miserable because the reaction is adverse. I write as someone who remains quite incurious when I learn that two unrelated men, or women, live in one dwelling. What they do in their bedrooms is not at all my business until they want to tell me all about it.

As for "the only possible behaviour", when did we arrive at the point in our thinking where we accept that one segment of rational, adult Christian society, with all the Lord's resources of grace available, cannot help acting on its affections and passions? None of the rest of us are infantilised in that way, surely, or wish to be? I emphasise again that we are not in this Dialogue, or when we vote at Synod, dealing with society in general, but with professing Christian adults.

I am jumping the queue to respond to this message because I disagree so strongly with these two comments – not so much in what they say, but in what they take for granted. I find both of them quite mischievous.

First, the lives of gay and lesbian people are made miserable, not by adverse reaction to publication of their "bedroom habits" but by "adverse reaction" to the (known or assumed) "habits" themselves. In the situations that matter (that is, those in which harm results), the "publication" (true or fictional) is often made not by themselves but by others – with the deliberate intent to stimulate "adverse reaction." I agree with your suggestion that this is not right.

Before you question what I just said, let me cite a real example, that of the Rev. Jim Ferry (already public knowledge since his book, "In the Courts of the Lord," tells the story). He was not the one to "bring into the public arena" certain details of his life (in fact, he took some care not to do so); that was done (whether one thinks it appropriate or not) by the Church, in the persons of a snoopy parishioner and his bishop. And you are right, that action certainly produced an adverse reaction, and made Jim's life (I would think) fairly miserable.

I may be mistaken, but wasn't there an undertaking made to his Diocesan which was broken? But be that as it may, we are not talking about a matter of clerical discipline some time ago in another Diocese.

Or take Hamed Nastoh, whom I mentioned earlier. He published nothing. Others created and "published" such details (probably fictional) with the deliberate intent of making his life miserable by their own "adverse reactions" – and they succeeded to such an extent that he took his own life.

Nor are we talking about a young man who was not asking for his 'union' to be 'blessed' in a diocese of the church of my birth and baptism.

Your comment implies (without actually stating – that might be too obviously fallacious) that the whole problem is a desire of gays and lesbians to bring "bedroom habits" into "the public arena." A specific response to that must depend on what you really mean by "the public arena." If you mean Gay Pride parades, then you are talking about

people sufficiently lacking in fear that they are prepared to defy and mock the "adverse reaction." If you mean a simple wish to acknowledge publicly one's sexual partner, then you and I are equally guilty: we do that all the time. Why don't you have a problem with this desire on the part of heterosexuals? Why doesn't it make our lives miserable by "adverse reaction"?

I am talking about individuals who have obtruded such personal matters on us in this Diocese through a Synod resolution. The difficulty is that in the case of same-sex 'partners' the wish is by no means "simple", in its nature or its consequences. Some of us would argue that it is not merely a request that the Church pronounce God's blessing on something both unbiological and contrary to His revealed will, but that there is no sex in any meaningful sense between same-sex people. I believe that there is no 'union' possible in such relationships, so that those who want such 'unions' 'blessed' are wanting what is not to be had, and twice over.

There are indeed ways of heterosexual relating which, if I indulged in them and told everyone about it, I should expect to attract some very sharp adverse reactions, in any Church setting which claimed to be catholic.

(And you can't answer "Because heterosexual sex is not sinful, same-sex sex is," because that is, more or less, the question we're debating. To assert it as an argument in the debate is begging the question.)

Really, Hugh! You write as though I had conceived some innovative idea about Christian sex-ethics and were trying to put it over on everybody else. Hasn't it crossed your mind that the onus of proof is on those who wish to change Christianity at this point?

I am STILL waiting to hear the case for the inherent goodness and beauty of homosexual acts. It is not established by an assertion, however often repeated, that perhaps they are not sinful after all.

As good a case, if not better, could be made for "loving, consensual" father-daughter incest. I cannot see that any conduct is improved or rendered acceptable by an undertaking to engage in it exclusively or for a lifetime.

As to your second comment, the issue is not whether people can avoid acting on their passions – that's a red herring.

Actually it is pivotal.

*Celibacy is an option for anyone; most do not desire or choose that option. Our branch of the Church decided long ago that it should be considered a calling, not a requirement for anyone, even clergy. What do you mean by suggesting that the great majority of us who choose the other (*i.e.*, non-celibate) option are "infantilised"? (The word doesn't usually mean "one who acquires an infant"! :-)*

In practical terms, indefinite celibacy is both calling and requirement for all Christian people who are not led into marriage. We are expected to abstain apart from marriage. This may come to be part of the cost of discipleship, and a major part of our Christian testimony. Not, of course, that Christian married people are having a non-stop riot either…

I was speaking of homosexuals as being infantilised by the suggestion that they, and they only, of rational adults with access to all the grace that is poured out on us all daily, cannot keep the Christian standard. That is so contemptuous! As well as being factually inaccurate in very large numbers of cases.

So when I say "only possible behaviour" I am not talking about "behaviour" in relation to the celibacy option, but rather the choice of partner for a loving, pleasurable, non-celibate life. If you still think "hetero-behaviour" is a genuine option for homosexuals, try to imagine exploring "homo-behaviour" yourself, or read (as I did) the story of

a gay evangelical Christian who tried conventional marriage – and finally realized he was living a lie.

There will always be anecdotes, but we all know that one swallow does not make a summer. Alcoholism is very hard to break when the underlying neediness remains unaddressed. I have myself never known well any homosexually-inclined person free of such deep neediness. The neediness is treatable, and often the homosexual desires will die away when treatment has been accepted.

Perhaps, for all any of you know, I do not need to "imagine" such explorations.

"Homo-behaviour" is something which strikes me as tragically boring and frustrating, especially for me as a woman: the male of the species may get up a back-passage, the female gets nowhere fast. To be stuck in immature, superficial titillations, without penetration, awakening, impregnation, always travelling and never arriving, when there are such gorgeous creatures as men in the world, is a deeply sad missing of God's best for us.

As for "the choice of partner for a loving, pleasurable, non-celibate life", what are we saying about our rights here? As we have asked before, are there rights when there are felt wants rather than actual needs? How does this kind of attitude differ from "If it feels good, do it"?

I think it not unsuitable to append in this connection a pair of quotations from Lewis on Love:–

> Sexuality may operate without Eros or as part of Eros. Let me hasten to add that I make the distinction simply in order to limit our inquiry and without any moral implications. I am not at all subscribing to the popular idea that it is the absence or presence of Eros which makes the sexual act "impure" or "pure", degraded or fine, unlawful or lawful. If all who lay together without being in the state of Eros were abominable, we all come of tainted stock. The times and places in which marriage depends on Eros are in a small minority. Most of our

ancestors were married off in early youth to partners chosen by their parents on grounds that had nothing to do with Eros. They went to the act with no other "fuel", so to speak, than plain animal desire. And they did right; honest Christian husbands and wives, obeying their fathers and mothers, discharging to one another their "marriage debt", and bringing up families in the fear of the Lord. Conversely, this act, done under the influence of a soaring and iridescent Eros which reduces the role of the senses to a minor consideration, may yet be plain adultery, may involve breaking a wife's heart, deceiving a husband, betraying a friend, polluting hospitality and deserting your children. It has not pleased God that the distinction between a sin and a duty should turn on fine feelings. This act, like any other, is justified (or not) by far more prosaic and definable criteria; by the keeping and breaking of promises, by justice or injustice, by charity or selfishness, by obedience or disobedience …

… Thus God, admitted to the human heart, transforms not only Gift-love but Need-love; not only our Need-love of Him, but our Need-love of one another. This is of course not the only thing that can happen. He may come on what seems to us a more dreadful mission and demand that a natural love be totally renounced ... Eros, directed to a forbidden object, may have to be sacrificed. In such instances, the process, though hard to endure, is easy to understand.

[From C.S. Lewis *The Four Loves*]

The main "harms no-one else" body of your message I find hard to respond to in any meaningful way, since it seems so far from relevant. Your long list of "harms" seems to belong mostly to the heterosexual world, and again contains what I perceive as false assumptions.

I think that in order to be plainer I must paraphrase and make less impersonal my catalogue of 'visible harms'. Persons who seek or are involved in same-sex 'unions' will have sinned against other human beings in at least one, frequently more, of the following ways: they will have betrayed a spouse, deserted offspring, confused adolescents going through the normal ambivalence of their time of life, blotched the Christian witness in society, violated the Christian consciences of all aware of their behaviour, permanently dead-ended their own and often another's life, broken the heart of a heterosexual lover, failed to give marriage to some man or maiden, reinforced their own emotional coldness and ruthless selfishness, failed to labour and sacrifice so that children might be born to serve God and the world. These are all visible or palpable harms. At the very least, they will have harmed themselves by deepening instead of seeking healing for their emotional neediness, which is observably present in many such persons, and is arguably in most cases the root of which homosexual desire is the fruit; and harmed themselves by putting themselves by biologically bizarre behaviour into a position where it is natural to feel a sense of alienation from the Creator of one's body.

None of these harms is inherent in heterosexual Christian marriage.

Thus you speak of "the demand that the Church 'bless' and so whitewash what the individual knows to be deeply wrong." But surely those who seek such a blessing are exactly those who neither know nor believe their union to be "deeply wrong," but rather consider it a thing they wish to offer before God. (Perhaps, if you think God won't accept that offering, you should step aside and let Her deal with it?? :-) Once again, aren't you begging the question by taking for granted that the subject of our discussion is sin?

Are you sure that the whole push for public blessings is not a symptom of guilt denied?

The closest any of us has ever come to knowing the mind of God about anything is the teaching and example of Jesus Christ. All of us need to "step aside" for Him, and we need to do that not only in respect of those aspects of ethics, e.g. *justice, which appeal more to us than others do. Hands up all those who genuinely believe that He could have endorsed, tolerated or practised same-sex relations. Let's have it right out in the open in this debate.*

More seriously (for me), you seem again to be trivializing or evading (without saying so explicitly) the very real, genuine, deep harm that results from the sin (as I would say) of homophobia. (I guess it is time to name the evil that has all along driven me into this debate.) Curiously, this present exchange is the result of my simple 3-line answer to a question you had asked (way back on Dec. 6), in the course of one of those evasions: "None of us can be in favour of cruelty to anyone," you said (conceding an inch), "but it is important to get this particular case into proportion. Is objection to particular types of behaviour unkind?"

I answered, in effect, "Yes, sometimes," and tried to characterize those times in a few words. I wonder whether this simple idea has been in any way clarified by your response "Must Sin Involve Visible Harm?" and my present rebuttal. Certainly our debate is proceeding at a rather glacial pace. I've a few minutes to finish this before plunging into the Jubilee conference – which will occupy me for the full weekend. After that I'll try to think of a more direct approach than all this back-and-forthing about small (even if important) details. But I must add a word about your title. I did not suggest that sin must involve "visible harm," nor, I suspect, would you. Perhaps a better question might be the other way around: "Must visible harm involve sin?" Certainly I would be inclined to say that going out of one's way (or not) to cause (or even fail to prevent) harm (visible or not) to another IS sin. And my main theme in the current debate is that, directly or indirectly, the Church's traditional teaching about homosexuality has done just that to gay and lesbian people.

Which begs the question indeed.

Actually I was trying to get down to brass tacks with my new topic. Is sin a merely sociological category? Are we answerable only to other people? If so why give it a theological name or drag God into it at all? Unless parts of the Christian revelation (perish the thought!) are merely useful as a handy stick to beat certain actions and attitudes out of devout people? And other parts are disposable?

The classic statement of the nature of sin is in Ps. 51. After a series of very destructive offences against human beings, the guilty writer says, with Hebraic hyperbole, that his sin was against God only. As surely all our unrealised evil imaginings are.

Love as Glop

When I was young, there was suet pudding. It was thought to be useful if not essential to the diet of growing children.

When I was young, there were necessary medicines which came in the form of huge round pills or bitter powders.

When I was young, a woman in England slowly murdered her unwanted husband with cumulative doses of arsenic.

When I was young, there was Golden Syrup. It rendered the tasteless interesting, the unpalatable acceptable and the poisonous apparently harmless. Thus was born Treacle Pudding.

Is the Love of God, or our Christian love, Golden Syrup, which if poured out in sufficient quantity renders even what is noxious sweet and good? If so, then "Come let us sin, that grace may abound!" [Rom. 6:1] Dietrich Bonhoeffer had a term for that: *Billige Gnade*, or Cheap Grace. In Anglispeak that is "Confess, communicate and carry on". I will not be found supporting, let alone subsidising in the Rectory, any such thing in my Church.

[I've finally "decoded" this last of Prisca's burst of messages back in January and February (I'm afraid I'd forgotten there was one more that hadn't yet been printed). It annoys me so much that I'll respond right away, and then (I hope) find time to go back and give a more organized reply to some other points.]

Prisca writes:

Did Someone Say Something about the Plight of Homosexuals?

Why, YES, Prisca – I believe I did! Several times, in fact. With a few specific examples.

In fact, THAT'S THE MAIN THING I'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT IN THIS WHOLE CONVERSATION, FROM THE START!!

Excuse me for shouting. But, Prisca, your replies have given me every reason to believe that (on this topic at least) you suffer very seriously from hardness of hearing.

Each time I have made such a comment, you have questioned it, doubted it, ignored it, trivialized it, or said "We aren't talking about that." To which my response is YES WE ARE, and it's about time you acknowledged that it is a reality, and one that we Christians have to take some responsibility for!

For example, in the exchange prior to the message I am now replying to, you had said "How many people are genuinely badly treated for simply being homosexual?" (aren't **any** too many?) – and then went on to note the difficulties of being female. Fair enough; that's a similar problem (not our topic here), but it doesn't negate the problem we ARE talking about! I didn't quarrel with you, but did note that "some of the traditionalists determined not to allow equal status for homosexuals are also determined not to allow the same for women," (referring to dissidents in the U.S. Episcopal Church who seem to reject both homosexual and female priests). You replied:

I hold absolutely no brief for those who would deny my equality as a woman, in or out of church.

and continued with a sermonette on equality for women. (You needn't say that to me! Perhaps you should direct it to some of those on **your** side of the current sexuality debate!)

In the earlier exchange I had added my expectation that you, a female, (just exactly because of the history you cite) "might be more sensitive than others to the plight of homosexuals in our society" – to which your response was a graphic rant about the sufferings of women in various of the world's societies, ending with

... Have I said enough?

I am still waiting for the privileged professional victims of the West to get their eyes up off themselves and to lift one finger for women who suffer like this!!! This is the kind of identification which would commend itself to me, not an attempt to use the truly oppressed as a stalking-horse for homosexual or other vice.

-- still, it seems, demeaning the very real suffering of homosexuals!

Then you add:

I think it not inappropriate to mention that for good measure my ancestry on my mother's side (the side that counts in this context!) is Jewish. Now the Jewish Holocaust really was persecution for what one was and could not help: Christian people and atheists of Jewish origin perished equally in the gas chambers.

So, I remind you, did homosexuals!!!

What does it take, Prisca, to get you to admit, and express some concern for, the pretty obvious truth that homosexuals in our own society have been a persecuted group? I had tried to make the abstract issue concrete and real and human by naming for you one recent, local victim – Hamed Nastoh (the 14-year old so tormented at school by being called gay, though he probably wasn't, that he killed himself just over a year ago by jumping off Patullo Bridge)

– ending, a bit sarcastically, “Of course, that’s only one (and maybe he doesn’t count because he wasn’t really gay).” Your only response:

How could anyone tell either way? ... I ask again, where is ‘gayness’ located? Would an autopsy have revealed it?

Prisca, what does it matter whether he was really gay? He was treated as such, so badly that he could not bear to live. HE’S DEAD, Prisca; his family still mourn him. DON’T YOU CARE? Does your treatment as a woman make that seem trivial? Is he, to you, only a “privileged professional victim”?

I had then raised the question whether Christian teaching had some responsibility for Hamed’s death, suggesting that “Christian teaching doesn’t create bullies, but it may ‘give them permission’ to target gays, or perhaps to use ‘gay’ as a put-down taunt.” Your response (in part):

I really don’t know what was at work there, except the aforesaid natural bloody-mindedness of adolescent children. ... But certainly sheer IGNORANCE of Christianity is quite as likely to have been a factor, isn’t it?

Both my wife and my teen-aged granddaughter were rather shocked by your characterization of adolescents. I do not know whether the bullies who drove Hamed to suicide were Christian or not. What **was** reported (later) was that some caring teachers proposed the formation of “gay-straight alliance clubs” as a means through which students could face these issues, perhaps learn a little more, and come to realize that none of them are monsters – in the hope of preventing future events of this kind. The opposition to this idea (which I thought very creative) was sharp and public – and came principally from avowedly Christian parents!!

I think I need to use the word I have been avoiding, to be clear what I am really talking about. Homophobia is a very real and widely present factor in our society and culture (and perhaps even more so in other cultures). Lit-

erally of course, the word means “fear” of the homosexual, but I think the fear comes associated (in varying degrees) with disgust and hatred. Certainly the common use of the word conjures more the sense of hatred than of fear. It is homophobia that has created the persecution and misery of homosexual people. That is a reality – whether Prisca will admit it or not!

My principle argument from the beginning of this conversation can then be stated very concisely:

homophobia is incompatible with love;

the “traditional” biblically-based teaching about homosexual behaviour supports homophobia;

and (therefore) that teaching violates the law of love, and needs to be challenged.

Hugh,

What I believe you undertook to do was to provide a Scriptural and theological argument for the acceptability, and thus the Churchly blessing, of “same-sex unions”. What your argument amounts to, however, as you say, is that homosexuals, whether real, reputed or lyingly identified as such, have been persecuted. This is illogical, as you will soon see if you substitute for homosexual practice any behaviour generally recognised as wrong – homophobic persecution, for example. Your argument would then read: homophobic[11] persecution is acceptable because homophobes are treated badly nowadays. Or paedophilia is fine because the other day two vigilantes apparently took and murdered an alleged violent paedophile. Or damned annoying behaviour on the part of a wife is good, because some men are given to beating up their spouses …

Actually, I have consistently had both ears cocked, listening hard for a half-cogent argument from you for the acceptability of same-sex relations as an Anglican Christian behaviour. That argument has not yet been

[11] Which actually etymologises as “to do with fear/horror of the identical”, but it’s probably too late to amend this modern use.

made, in my view, and I do not know anyone who thinks that it has. Sometimes nothing is heard, not because of deafness, but because no sound is being emitted. You are really going to have to try harder, and you haven't many days to do it in. I have taken your argument piece by piece and line by line, grain by grain I have sifted and shaken it, factually, logically, philosophically and theologically, without resort to emotion or personal abuse of anyone. I have uncovered, I think to everyone, all the assumptions which underlie it. It has been weighed most thoroughly in the balance, and found wanting. If you cannot do better, your case, even if won at Synod, will remain empty of all consistency.

Recently you used a very revealing expression, when you referred to the attitudes of "the moral guardians of society" (or some such phrase) and implicitly or explicitly associated the Church with them. Clearly you think of God's people in this place as powerful and capable of exercising some kind of tyranny over others. Where is this powerful Church? There is no such entity here and nowadays: our Diocese, or at least that part of it which is opposed to Motion 9, is pleading in the face of a powerful secularist lobby for the freedom to live its own life, begging for Jubilee from enslavement to worldly oppression. Ostensibly in the name of love, some, it seems to me, are showing an active, destructive hatred for the Church. Who will stand with her?

Christ's Obedience and Ours

As I meditate this week on Our Lord's perfect obedience, and on why He was able to say, "It is accomplished", I have been realising again how sophisticated is the New Testament's interpretation of the Old, in this as in other matters. None of the authors, apart from a less advanced technology, was in any sense a primitive (as indeed none of the Old Testament writers were either). The provisions of the Mosaic Law are shown in the New Testament to be

firstly religious and ceremonial, secondly civil and criminal, lastly moral. Our Lord fulfilled the whole caboodle, as Substitute, as Representative and/or as Exemplar.

For about nineteen centuries it has been held that sex-ethics were part of that third area of the Torah, and that in that area Christian disciples are obliged to seek to follow His example, as an essential part of their obedience. Enabling us to do this is one aspect of what He accomplished.

Can Same-Sex Persons Unite?

My query about unions is much more "of the earth, earthy": I want to know how between people of the same sex any union is established in bed. Sexually unconsummated marriages are not marriages in the sight of God or the State, however fine the relationships may be in other respects. They are, or may be, annulled, as never having been in existence. I'm not here talking Roman doctrine of intentionality (Rome as is well known will annul for a price even after 20 children), but Anglican and scriptural doctrine about the one-flesh union. That union is our "outward and visible sign", and the couple minister the sacrament to one another.

If this Dialogue can't call a spade a spade, I don't know where to go for guidance. I may have to resort to asking my crude question, the one which was never answered, again next year at Synod. That'll make it three years I've been waiting ...

As for the bisexuals, I don't think that they are asking for their relationships to be baptized in our church: what kind of 'union' they might be wanting must depend on whether there's an 'r' in the month, or something!

Ron may want to censor out that last remark, at least. In my family, though, we sometimes used a little mirth to our siblings if they were being really silly.

The "Jesus Said Nothing" Argument

If anyone purporting to provide serious, professional study materials has genuinely asserted that Our Lord had nothing to say about same-sex relations, the process is fatally vitiated.

It cannot be stated too strongly that His teaching about sin includes at least one term for sexual sin the Aramaic original of which must, in His mind and in the mind of all His hearers, have covered that perversion too. If He had not meant to imply that, he was unqualified to teach in that time and place; if He actually involved Himself in that or any other cruelty or vice (and most vices are cruel to somebody!) He was not the person the Church has always believed Him to be.

A GREEK NEW TESTAMENT SEARCH OF COGNATE TERMS FOR JUSTICE, RIGHTEOUS-NESS, VIRTUE ETC.

A GREEK NEW TESTAMENT SEARCH OF COGNATE TERMS FOR JUSTICE, RIGHTEOUSNESS, VIRTUE ETC. AND THEIR OPPOSITES.

Mt. 1:19 Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, ***δίκαιος*** ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι, ἐβουλήθη λάθρᾳ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν.
Mt. 3:15 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· ἄφες ἄρτι, οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν ***δικαιοσύνην***. τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν.
Mt. 5:6 μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν ***δικαιοσύνην***, ὅτι αὐτοὶ χορτασθήσονται.
Mt. 5:10 μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν ***δικαιοσύνης,*** ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.
Mt. 5:20 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ ***δικαιοσύνη*** πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων καὶ φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.
Mt. 5:45 ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ ***δικαίους*** καὶ ***ἀδίκους.***
Mt. 6:1 προσέχετε [δὲ] τὴν ***δικαιοσύνην*** ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔξετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
Mt. 6:33 ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν [τοῦ θεοῦ] καὶ τὴν ***δικαιοσύνην*** αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προτεθήσεται ὑμῖν.
Mt. 9:13 πορευθέντες δὲ μάθετε τί ἐστιν· ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν· οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι ***δικαίους*** ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.
Mt. 10:41 ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου μισθὸν προφήτου λήμψεται, καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος ***δίκαιον*** εἰς ὄνομα ***δικαίου*** μισθὸν ***δικαίου*** λήμψεται.
Mt. 11:19 ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν· ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ

οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. καὶ ***ἐδικαιώθη*** ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς.
Mt. 12:37 ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου ***δικαιωθήσῃ***, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ.
Mt. 13:17 ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ ***δίκαιοι*** ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.
Mt. 13:43 τότε οἱ ***δίκαιοι*** ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκουέτω.
Mt. 13:49 οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος· ἐξελεύσονται οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀφοριοῦσιν τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου τῶν ***δικαίων***
Mt. 20:4 καὶ ἐκείνοις εἶπεν· ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ ***δίκαιον*** δώσω ὑμῖν.
Mt. 20:13 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ἑνὶ αὐτῶν εἶπεν· ἑταῖρε, οὐκ ***ἀδικῶ*** σε· οὐχὶ δηναρίου συνεφώνησάς μοι;
Mt. 21:32 ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ ***δικαιοσύνης,*** καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ, οἱ δὲ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες οὐδὲ μετεμελήθητε ὕστερον τοῦ πιστεῦσαι αὐτῷ.
Mt. 23:28 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνεσθε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ***δίκαιοι***, ἔσωθεν δέ ἐστε μεστοὶ ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας.
Mt. 23:29 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τοὺς τάφους τῶν προφητῶν καὶ κομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν ***δικαίων***,
Mt. 23:35 ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα ***δίκαιον*** ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ ***δικαίου*** ἕως τοῦ αἵματος ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ βαραχίου, ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.
Mt. 25:37 τότε ἀποκριθήσονται αὐτῷ οἱ ***δίκαιοι*** λέγοντες· κύριε, πότε σε εἴδομεν πεινῶντα καὶ ἐθρέψαμεν, ἢ διψῶντα καὶ ἐποτίσαμεν;
Mt. 25:46 καὶ ἀπελεύσονται οὗτοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ ***δίκαιοι*** εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
Mt. 27:19 καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ λέγουσα· μηδὲν σοὶ καὶ τῷ ***δικαίῳ*** ἐκείνῳ· πολλὰ γὰρ ἔπαθον σήμερον κατ᾽ ὄναρ δι᾽ αὐτόν.
Mk. 2:17 καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς [ὅτι] οὐ

χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλ᾽ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι ***δικαίους*** ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς.
Mk. 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα ***δίκαιον*** καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, και ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν.
Lk. 1:6 ἦσαν δὲ ***δίκαιοι*** ἀμφότεροι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ ***δικαιώμασιν*** τοῦ κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι.
Lk. 1:17 καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει ἡλίου, ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει ***δικαίων***, ἑτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον.
Lk. 1:75 ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν.
Lk. 2:25 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ ᾧ ὄνομα συμεὼν καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ***δίκαιος*** καὶ εὐλαβὴς προδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν·
Lk. 5:32 οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι ***δικαίους*** ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν.
Lk. 7:29 καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ***ἐδικαίωσαν*** τὸν θεὸν βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου·
Lk. 7:35 καὶ ***ἐδικαιώθη*** ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.
Lk. 10:19 ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ***ἀδικήσῃ***.
Lk. 10:29 ὁ δὲ θέλων ***δικαιῶσαι*** ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον;
Lk. 12:57 τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ ***δίκαιον***;
Lk. 13:27 καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα [ὑμᾶς] πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ πάντες ἐργάται ***ἀδικίας.***
Lk. 14:14 καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί σοι, ἀνταποδοθήσεται γάρ σοι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν ***δικαίων***.
Lk. 15:7 λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ***δικαίοις*** οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας.

Lk. 16:8 καὶ ἐπῄνεσεν ὁ κύριος τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ***ἀδικίας*** ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν· ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσιν.
Lk. 16:9 καὶ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ***ἀδικίας,*** ἵνα ὅταν ἐκλίπῃ δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς.
Lk. 16:10 ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστιν, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ***ἄδικος*** καὶ ἐν πολλῷ ***ἄδικός*** ἐστιν.
Lk. 16:11 εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ***ἀδίκῳ*** μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει;
Lk. 16:15 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ ***δικαιοῦντες*** ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ δὲ θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν· ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλὸν βδέλυγμα ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.
Lk. 18:6 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος· ἀκούσατε τί ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ***ἀδικίας*** λέγει·
Lk. 18:9 εἶπεν δὲ καὶ πρός τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶν ***δίκαιοι*** καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντας τοὺς λοιποὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην·
Lk. 18:11 ὁ φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα προηύχετο· ὁ θεός, εὔχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ὥσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἅρπαγες, ***ἄδικοι***, μοιχοί, ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης·
Lk. 18:14 λέγω ὑμῖν, κατέβη οὗτος ***δεδικαιωμένος*** εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ᾽ ἐκεῖνον· ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.
Lk. 20:20 καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς ***δικαίους*** εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὥστε παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος.
Lk. 23:41 καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν ***δικαίως,*** ἄξια γὰρ ὧν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν· οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξεν.
Lk. 23:47 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὸ γενόμενον ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν λέγων· ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ***δίκαιος*** ἦν.
Lk. 23:50 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσὴφ βουλευτὴς ὑπάρχων [καὶ] ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ***δίκαιος***
Jn. 5:30 οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν· καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω, καὶ ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ***δικαία*** ἐστίν,

ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.
Jn. 7:18 ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ· ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν οὗτος ἀληθής ἐστιν καὶ ***ἀδικία*** ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν.
Jn. 7:24 μὴ κρίνετε κατ' ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ***δικαίαν*** κρίσιν κρίνετε.
Jn. 16:8 καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ***δικαιοσύνης*** καὶ περὶ κρίσεως·
Jn. 16:10 περὶ ***δικαιοσύνης*** δέ, ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με·
Jn. 17:25 πάτερ ***δίκαιε***, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων, καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας·
Acts 1:18 οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτήσατο χωρίον ἐκ μισθοῦ τῆς ***ἀδικίας*** καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμενος ἐλάκησεν μέσος καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ·
Acts 3:14 ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ ***δίκαιον*** ἠρνήσασθε καὶ ᾐτήσασθε ἄνδρα φονέα χαρισθῆναι ὑμῖν,
Acts 4:19 ὁ δὲ πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον πρὸς αὐτούς· εἰ ***δίκαιόν*** ἐστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν ἀκούειν μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ, κρίνατε·
Acts 7:24 καὶ ἰδών τινα ***ἀδικούμενον*** ἠμύνατο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν τῷ καταπονουμένῳ πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον.
Acts 7:26 τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις καὶ συνήλλασσεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην εἰπών· ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε· ἱνατί ***ἀδικεῖτε*** ἀλλήλους;
Acts 7:27 ὁ δὲ ***ἀδικῶν*** τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπών· τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ ***δικαστὴν*** ἐφ' ἡμῶν;
Acts 7:35 τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες· τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ ***δικαστήν***, τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς [καὶ] ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν σὺν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάτῳ.
Acts 7:52 τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν; καὶ ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγείλαντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ ***δικαίου***, οὗ νῦν ὑμεῖς προδόται καὶ φονεῖς ἐγένεσθε,
Acts 8:23 εἰς γὰρ χολὴν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ***ἀδικίας*** ὁρῶ σε ὄντα.

Acts 10:22 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Κορνήλιος ἑκατοντάρχης, ἀνὴρ ***δίκαιος*** καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐχρηματίσθη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου ἁγίου μεταπέμψασθαί σε εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ῥήματα παρὰ σοῦ.
Acts 10:35 ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ φοβούμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος ***δικαιοσύνην*** δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστιν.
Acts 13:10 εἶπεν· ὦ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥᾳδιουργίας, υἱὲ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης ***δικαιοσύνης,*** οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας;
Acts 13:38 γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὅτι διὰ τούτου ὑμῖν ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν καταγγέλλεται, [καὶ] ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως ***δικαιωθῆναι***,
Acts 13:39 ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ***δικαιοῦται***.
Acts 17:31 καθότι ἔστησεν ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν ***δικαιοσύνῃ***, ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὥρισεν, πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.
Acts 18:14 μέλλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα εἶπεν ὁ γαλλίων πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· εἰ μὲν ἦν ***ἀδίκημά*** τι ἢ ῥᾳδιούργημα πονηρόν, ὦ Ἰουδαῖοι, κατὰ λόγον ἂν ἀνεσχόμην ὑμῶν,
Acts 22:14 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατό σε γνῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν ***δίκαιον*** καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ,
Acts 24:15 ἐλπίδα ἔχων εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προδέχονται, ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι ***δικαίων*** τε καὶ ***ἀδίκων***.
Acts 24:20 ἢ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι εἰπάτωσαν τί εὗρον ***ἀδίκημα*** στάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου,
Acts 24:25 διαλεγομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ ***δικαιοσύνης*** καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλοντος, ἔμφοβος γενόμενος ὁ φῆλιξ ἀπεκρίθη· τὸ νῦν ἔχον πορεύου, καιρὸν δὲ μεταλαβὼν μετακαλέσομαί σε,
Acts 25:10 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Παῦλος· ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρος ἐστώς εἰμι, οὗ με δεῖ κρίνεσθαι. Ἰουδαίους οὐδὲν ***ἠδίκησα*** ὡς καὶ σὺ κάλλιον ἐπιγινώσκεις.
Acts 25:11 εἰ μὲν οὖν ***ἀδικῶ*** καὶ ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραχά τι, οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν· εἰ δὲ

οὐδέν ἐστιν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγοροῦσίν μου, οὐδείς με δύναται αὐτοῖς χαρίσασθαι· Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι.
Acts 28:4 ὡς δὲ εἶδον οἱ βάρβαροι κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔλεγον· πάντως φονεύς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ὃν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ***δίκη*** ζῆν οὐκ εἴασεν.
Rom. 1:17 ***δικαιοσύνη*** γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὁ δὲ ***δίκαιος*** ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.
Rom. 1:18 ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ***ἀδικίαν*** ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ***ἀδικίᾳ*** κατεχόντων,
Rom. 1:29 πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ***ἀδικίᾳ*** πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ, μεστοὺς φθόνου φόνου ἔριδος δόλου κακοηθείας, ψιθυριστάς
Rom. 1:32 οἵτινες τὸ ***δικαίωμα*** τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν.
Rom. 2:5 κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ***δικαιοκρισίας*** τοῦ θεοῦ
Rom. 2:8 τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ***ἀδικίᾳ*** ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός.
Rom. 2:13 οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου ***δίκαιοι*** παρὰ [τῷ] θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου ***δικαιωθήσονται***.
Rom. 2:26 ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ ***δικαιώματα*** τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσῃ, οὐχ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται;
Rom. 3:4 μὴ γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς γέγραπται· ὅπως ἂν ***δικαιωθῇς*** ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσεις ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε.
Rom. 3:5 εἰ δὲ ἡ ***ἀδικία*** ἡμῶν θεοῦ ***δικαιοσύνην*** συνίστησιν, τί ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ***ἄδικος*** ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω.
Rom. 3:10 καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ***δίκαιος*** οὐδὲ εἷς,
Rom. 3:20 διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ ***δικαιωθήσεται*** πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.
Rom. 3:21 νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου ***δικαιοσύνη*** θεοῦ

πεφανέρωται μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν,
Rom. 3:22 ***δικαιοσύνη*** δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολή,
Rom. 3:24 ***δικαιούμενοι*** δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ·
Rom. 3:25 ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων
Rom. 3:26 ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ***δίκαιον*** καὶ ***δικαιοῦντα*** τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.
Rom. 3:28 λογιζόμεθα γὰρ ***δικαιοῦσθαι*** πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου.
Rom. 3:30 εἴπερ εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὃς ***δικαιώσει*** περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως.
Rom. 4:2 εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ***ἐδικαιώθη***, ἔχει καύχημα, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πρὸς θεόν.
Rom. 4:3 τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην***.
Rom. 4:5 τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ***δικαιοῦντα*** τὸν ἀσεβῆ λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην***·
Rom. 4:6 καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται ***δικαιοσύνην*** χωρὶς ἔργων·
Rom. 4:9 ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γάρ· ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ πίστις εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην***.
Rom. 4:11 καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς σφραγῖδα τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι᾽ ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι [καὶ] αὐτοῖς [τὴν] ***δικαιοσύνην***,
Rom. 4:13 οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ ***δικαιοσύνης*** πίστεως.
Rom. 4:22 διὸ [καὶ] ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην***.
Rom. 4:25 ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν ***δικαίωσιν*** ἡμῶν.
Rom. 5:1 ***δικαιωθέντες*** οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην

ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
Rom. 5:7 μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ ***δικαίου*** τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν·
Rom. 5:9 πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον ***δικαιωθέντες*** νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς.
Rom. 5:16 καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς ***δικαίωμα***.
Rom. 5:17 εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Rom. 5:18 Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς ***δικαιώματος*** εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς ***δικαίωσιν*** ζωῆς·
Rom. 5:19 ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ***δίκαιοι*** κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.
Rom. 5:21 ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ ***δικαιοσύνης*** εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
Rom. 6:7 ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν ***δεδικαίωται*** ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.
Rom. 6:13 μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ***ἀδικίας*** τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ***δικαιοσύνης*** τῷ θεῷ.
Rom. 6:16 οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἤτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην***;
Rom. 6:18 ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ ***δικαιοσύνῃ***.
Rom. 6:19 ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν. Ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν

ἀνομίαν, οὕτως νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** εἰς ἁγιασμόν.
Rom. 6:20 ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ ***δικαιοσύνῃ***.
Rom. 7:12 ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ ***δικαία*** καὶ ἀγαθή.
Rom. 8:4 ἵνα τὸ ***δικαίωμα*** τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα.
Rom. 8:10 εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ ***δικαιοσύνην***.
Rom. 8:30 οὓς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ***ἐδικαίωσεν***· οὓς δὲ ***ἐδικαίωσεν***, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν.
Rom. 8:33 τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; θεὸς ὁ ***δικαιῶν***·
Rom. 9:14 τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ***ἀδικία*** παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; μὴ γένοιτο.
Rom. 9:30 τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὅτι ἔθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα ***δικαιοσύνην*** κατέλαβεν ***δικαιοσύνην***, ***δικαιοσύνην*** δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως,
Rom. 9:31 Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον ***δικαιοσύνης*** εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν.
Rom. 10:3 ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ***δικαιοσύνην*** καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν [***δικαιοσύνῃ***] ζητοῦντες στῆσαι, τῇ ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν.
Rom. 10:4 τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην*** παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι.
Rom. 10:5 Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν ***δικαιοσύνην*** τὴν ἐκ [τοῦ] νόμου ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.
Rom. 10:6 ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως ***δικαιοσύνη*** οὕτως λέγει· μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν·
Rom. 10:10 καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην***, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν.
Rom. 14:17 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις ἀλλὰ ***δικαιοσύνη*** καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ·
I Cor. 1:30 ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ, ***δικαιοσύνη*** τε καὶ

ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις,
I Cor. 4:4 οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ ***δεδικαίωμαι***, ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με κύριός ἐστιν.
I Cor. 6:1 τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν πρᾶγμα ἔχων πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον κρίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ***ἀδίκων*** καὶ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων;
I Cor. 6:7 ἤδη μὲν [οὖν] ὅλως ἥττημα ὑμῖν ἐστιν ὅτι κρίματα ἔχετε μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν. διὰ τί οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ***ἀδικεῖσθε***; διὰ τί οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἀποτερεῖσθε;
I Cor. 6:8 ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς ***ἀδικεῖτε*** καὶ ἀποτερεῖτε, καὶ τοῦτο ἀδελφούς.
I Cor. 6:9 ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ***ἄδικοι*** θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; μὴ πλανᾶσθε· οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε εἰδωλολάτραι οὔτε μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται
I Cor. 6:11 καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ***ἐδικαιώθητε*** ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.
I Cor. 13:6 οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ***ἀδικίᾳ***, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ·
I Cor. 15:34 ἐκνήψατε ***δικαίως*** καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε, ἀγνωσίαν γὰρ θεοῦ τινες ἔχουσιν, πρὸς ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λαλῶ.
II Cor. 3:9 εἰ γὰρ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον περισσεύει ἡ διακονία τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** δόξῃ.
II Cor. 5:21 τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα ***δικαιοσύνη*** θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.
II Cor. 6:7 ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ· διὰ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν,
II Cor. 6:14 μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις· τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** καὶ ἀνομίᾳ, ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος;
II Cor. 7:2 χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς· οὐδένα ***ἠδικήσαμεν***, οὐδένα ἐφθείραμεν, οὐδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν.
II Cor. 7:12 ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, οὐχ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ***ἀδικήσαντος*** οὐδὲ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ***ἀδικηθέντος*** ἀλλ᾽ ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.
II Cor. 9:9 καθὼς γέγραπται· ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκεν

τοῖς πένησιν, ἡ ***δικαιοσύνη*** αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
II Cor. 9:10 ὁ δὲ ἐπιχορηγῶν σπόρον τῷ σπείροντι καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν χορηγήσει καὶ πληθυνεῖ τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν καὶ αὐξήσει τὰ γενήματα τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** ὑμῶν.
II Cor. 11:15 οὐ μέγα οὖν εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μετασχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι ***δικαιοσύνης·*** ὧν τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν.
II Cor. 12:13 τί γάρ ἐστιν ὃ ἡσσώθητε ὑπὲρ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας, εἰ μὴ ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν; χαρίσασθέ μοι τὴν ***ἀδικίαν*** ταύτην.
Gal. 2:16 εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ ***δικαιοῦται*** ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, και ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα ***δικαιωθῶμεν*** ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ ***δικαιωθήσεται*** πᾶσα σάρξ.
Gal. 2:17 εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες ***δικαιωθῆναι*** ἐν Χριστῷ εὑρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἆρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; μὴ γένοιτο.
Gal. 2:21 οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ***δικαιοσύνη***, ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν.
Gal. 3:6 καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην·***
Gal. 3:8 προιδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως ***δικαιοῖ*** τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεὸς, προευηγγελίσατο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὅτι ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη·
Gal. 3:11 ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς ***δικαιοῦται*** παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον, ὅτι ὁ ***δίκαιος*** ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται·
Gal. 3:21 ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν [τοῦ θεοῦ]; μὴ γένοιτο· εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζῳοποιῆσαι, ὄντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ ***δικαιοσύνη***.
Gal. 3:24 ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως ***δικαιωθῶμεν·***
Gal. 4:12 γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν. οὐδέν με ***ἠδικήσατε·***
Gal. 5:4 κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ ***δικαιοῦσθε***, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε.
Gal. 5:5 ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα ***δικαιοσύνης*** ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.

Eph. 4:24 καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.
Eph. 5:9 – ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ καὶ ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** καὶ ἀληθείᾳ –
Eph. 6:1 τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν [ἐν κυρίῳ]· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ***δίκαιον***.
Eph. 6:14 στῆτε οὖν περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης***
Phil. 1:7 καθώς ἐστιν ***δίκαιον*** ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς, ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου συγκοινωνούς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας.
Phil. 1:11 πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν ***δικαιοσύνης*** τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ.
Phil. 3:6 κατὰ ζῆλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατὰ ***δικαιοσύνην*** τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος.
Phil. 3:9 καὶ εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ, μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν ***δικαιοσύνην*** τὴν ἐκ νόμου ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ***δικαιοσύνην*** ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει,
Phil. 4:8 τὸ λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα ***δίκαια***, ὅσα ἁγνά, ὅσα προφιλῆ, ὅσα εὐφημα, εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, ταῦτα λογίζεσθε·
Col. 3:25 ὁ γὰρ ***ἀδικῶν*** κομίσεται ὃ ***ἠδίκησεν***, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολημψία.
Col. 4:1 οἱ κύριοι, τὸ ***δίκαιον*** καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε κύριον ἐν οὐρανῷ.
I Thess. 2:10 ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ θεός, ὡς ὁσίως καὶ ***δικαίως*** καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν,
II Thess. 1:5 ἔνδειγμα τῆς ***δικαίας*** κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε,
II Thess. 1:6 εἴπερ ***δίκαιον*** παρὰ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλῖψιν
II Thess. 1:9 οἵτινες ***δίκην*** τίσουσιν ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ,
II Thess. 2:10 καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ***ἀδικίας*** τοῖς

ἀπολλυμένοις, ἀνθ’ ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτούς.
II Thess. 2:12 ἵνα κριθῶσιν πάντες οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἀλλὰ εὐδοκήσαντες τῇ ***ἀδικίᾳ***.
I Tim. 1:9 εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι ***δικαίῳ*** νόμος οὐ κεῖται, ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις, ἀσεβέσι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς, ἀνοσίοις καὶ βεβήλοις, πατρολῴαις καὶ μητρολῴαις, ἀνδροφόνοις
I Tim. 3:16 καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ***ἐδικαιώθη*** ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.
I Tim. 6:11 σὺ δέ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε θεοῦ, ταῦτα φεῦγε· δίωκε δὲ ***δικαιοσύνην*** εὐσέβειαν πίστιν, ἀγάπην ὑπομονὴν πραϋπαθίαν.
II Tim. 2:19 ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ θεοῦ ἕστηκεν, ἔχων τὴν σφραγῖδα ταύτην· ἔγνω κύριος τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ, καί· ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ***ἀδικίας*** πᾶς ὁ ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου.
II Tim. 2:22 τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεῦγε, δίωκε δὲ ***δικαιοσύνην*** πίστιν ἀγάπην εἰρήνην μετὰ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν κύριον ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας.
II Tim. 3:16 πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἐλεγμόν, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν ***δικαιοσύνῃ***,
II Tim. 4:8 λοιπὸν ἀπόκειταί μοι ὁ τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ κύριος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὁ ***δίκαιος*** κριτής, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐμοὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ.
Titus 1:8 ἀλλὰ φιλόξενον φιλάγαθον σώφρονα ***δίκαιον*** ὅσιον ἐγκρατῆ,
Titus 2:12 παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας σωφρόνως καὶ ***δικαίως*** καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι,
Titus 3:5 οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου,
Titus 3:7 ἵνα ***δικαιωθέντες*** τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν κατ’ ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

Philem. 1:18 εἰ δέ τι ***ἠδίκησέν*** σε ἢ ὀφείλει, τοῦτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγα.
Heb. 1:9 ἠγάπησας ***δικαιοσύνην*** καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέν σε ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.
Heb. 5:13 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ἄπειρος λόγου ***δικαιοσύνης,*** νήπιος γάρ ἐστιν·
Heb. 6:10 οὐ γὰρ ***ἄδικος*** ὁ θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες.
Heb. 7:2 ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ, πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς ***δικαιοσύνης*** ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστιν βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης,
Heb. 8:12 ὅτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ***ἀδικίαις*** αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι.
Heb. 9:1 εἶχε μὲν οὖν [καὶ] ἡ πρώτη ***δικαιώματα*** λατρείας τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν.
Heb. 9:10 μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν καὶ πόμασιν καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, ***δικαιώματα*** σαρκὸς μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα.
Heb. 10:38 ὁ δὲ ***δίκαιός*** μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται, καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ.
Heb. 11:4 πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ Καϊν προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ, δι᾽ ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι ***δίκαιος,*** μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ δι᾽ αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ.
Heb. 11:7 πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων, εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασεν κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ δι᾽ ἧς κατέκρινεν τὸν κόσμον, καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν ***δικαιοσύνης*** ἐγένετο κληρονόμος.
Heb. 11:33 οἳ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας, εἰργάσαντο ***δικαιοσύνην***, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν, ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων,
Heb. 12:11 πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπης, ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι᾽ αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσιν ***δικαιοσύνης.***
Heb. 12:23 καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων καὶ πνεύμασι ***δικαίων*** τετελειωμένων

Jas. 1:20 ὀργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς ***δικαιοσύνην*** θεοῦ οὐκ ἐργάζεται.
Jas. 2:21 Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ***ἐδικαιώθη*** ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον;
Jas. 2:23 καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα· ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς ***δικαιοσύνην*** καὶ φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη.
Jas. 2:24 ὁρᾶτε ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων ***δικαιοῦται*** ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.
Jas. 2:25 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ***ἐδικαιώθη*** ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα;
Jas. 3:6 καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ· ὁ κόσμος τῆς ***ἀδικίας*** ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης.
Jas. 3:18 καρπὸς δὲ ***δικαιοσύνης*** ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην.
Jas. 5:6 κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν ***δίκαιον***, οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν.
Jas. 5:16 ἐξομολογεῖσθε οὖν ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ εὔχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων ὅπως ἰαθῆτε. πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις ***δικαίου*** ἐνεργουμένη.
I Pet. 2:19 τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις εἰ διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχων ***ἀδίκως.***
I Pet. 2:23 ὃς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει, πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι ***δικαίως·***
I Pet. 2:24 ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** ζήσωμεν, οὗ τῷ μώλωπι ἰάθητε.
I Pet. 3:12 ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ ***δικαίους*** καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά.
I Pet. 3:14 ἀλλ᾽ εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ ***δικαιοσύνην***, μακάριοι. τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε,
I Pet. 3:18 ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν, ***δίκαιος*** ὑπὲρ ***ἀδίκων***, ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζῳοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι·

I Pet. 4:18 καὶ εἰ ὁ ***δίκαιος*** μόλις σῴζεται, ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται;
II Pet. 1:1 συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
II Pet. 1:13 ***δίκαιον*** δε ἡγοῦμαι, ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει,
II Pet. 2:5 καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὄγδοον Νῶε ***δικαιοσύνης*** κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας,
II Pet. 2:7 καὶ ***δίκαιον*** Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρρύσατο·
II Pet. 2:8 βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκῇ ὁ ***δίκαιος*** ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν ***δικαίαν*** ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν·
II Pet. 2:9 οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, ***ἀδίκους*** δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν,
II Pet. 2:13 ***ἀδικούμενοι*** μισθὸν ***ἀδικίας,*** ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν,
II Pet. 2:15 καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ βοσόρ, ὃς μισθὸν ***ἀδικίας*** ἠγάπησεν
II Pet. 2:21 κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ***δικαιοσύνης*** ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς.
II Pet. 3:13 καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς ***δικαιοσύνη*** κατοικεῖ.
I Jn. 1:9 ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ ***δίκαιος,*** ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ***ἀδικίας.***
I Jn. 2:1 Τεκνία μου, ταῦτα γράφω ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ ἁμάρτητε. καὶ ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ, παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ***δίκαιον·***
I Jn. 2:29 ἐὰν εἰδῆτε ὅτι ***δίκαιός*** ἐστιν, γινώσκετε ὅτι καὶ πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ***δικαιοσύνην*** ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται.
I Jn. 3:7 Τεκνία, μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς· ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ***δικαιοσύνην δίκαιός*** ἐστιν, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος ***δίκαιός***

ἐστιν·
I Jn. 3:10 ἐν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστιν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου· πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιῶν ***δικαιοσύνην*** οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.
I Jn. 3:12 οὐ καθὼς Καϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν καὶ ἔσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τίνος ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν; ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ***δίκαια***.
I Jn. 5:17 πᾶσα ***ἀδικία*** ἁμαρτία ἐστίν, καὶ ἔστιν ἁμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον.
Jude 1:7 ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, πρόκειται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου ***δίκην*** ὑπέχουσαι.
Rev. 2:11 ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ὁ νικῶν οὐ μὴ ***ἀδικηθῇ*** ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ δευτέρου.
Rev. 6:6 καὶ ἤκουσα ὡς φωνὴν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν τεσσάρων ζῴων λέγουσαν· χοῖνιξ σίτου δηναρίου καὶ τρεῖς χοίνικες κριθῶν δηναρίου, καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὸν οἶνον μὴ ***ἀδικήσῃς.***
Rev. 7:2 καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου ἔχοντα σφραγῖδα θεοῦ ζῶντος, καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ***ἀδικῆσαι*** τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν
Rev. 7:3 λέγων· μὴ ***ἀδικήσητε*** τὴν γῆν μήτε τὴν θάλασσαν μήτε τὰ δένδρα, ἄχρι σφραγίσωμεν τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν.
Rev. 9:4 καὶ ἐρρέθη αὐταῖς ἵνα μὴ ***ἀδικήσουσιν*** τὸν χόρτον τῆς γῆς οὐδὲ πᾶν χλωρὸν οὐδὲ πᾶν δένδρον, εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οἵτινες οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων.
Rev. 9:10 καὶ ἔχουσιν οὐρὰς ὁμοίας σκορπίοις καὶ κέντρα, καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ***ἀδικῆσαι*** τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μῆνας πέντε,
Rev. 9:19 ἡ γὰρ ἐξουσία τῶν ἵππων ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν ἐστιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν, αἱ γὰρ οὐραὶ αὐτῶν ὅμοιαι ὄφεσιν, ἔχουσαι κεφαλὰς καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ***ἀδικοῦσιν***.
Rev. 11:5 καὶ εἴ τις αὐτοὺς θέλει ***ἀδικῆσαι*** πῦρ ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ κατεσθίει τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν· καὶ εἴ τις θελήσῃ αὐτοὺς

ἀδικῆσαι, οὕτως δεῖ αὐτὸν ἀποκτανθῆναι.
Rev. 15:3 καὶ ᾄδουσιν τὴν ᾠδὴν Μωϋσέως τοῦ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ᾠδὴν τοῦ ἀρνίου λέγοντες· μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ· ***δίκαιαι*** καὶ ἀληθιναὶ αἱ ὁδοί σου, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν·
Rev. 15:4 τίς οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇ, κύριε, καὶ δοξάσει τὸ ὄνομά σου; ὅτι μόνος ὅσιος, ὅτι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἥξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου, ὅτι τὰ ***δικαιώματά*** σου ἐφανερώθησαν.
Rev. 16:5 καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ ἀγγέλου τῶν ὑδάτων λέγοντος· ***δίκαιος*** εἶ, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν, ὁ ὅσιος, ὅτι ταῦτα ἔκρινας,
Rev. 16:7 καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος· ναὶ κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ἀληθιναὶ καὶ ***δίκαιαι*** αἱ κρίσεις σου.
Rev. 18:5 ὅτι ἐκολλήθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ***ἀδικήματα*** αὐτῆς.
Rev. 19:2 ὅτι ἀληθιναὶ καὶ ***δίκαιαι*** αἱ κρίσεις αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἔκρινεν τὴν πόρνην τὴν μεγάλην ἥτις ἔφθειρεν τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐξεδίκησεν τὸ αἷμα τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῆς.
Rev. 19:8 καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ἵνα περιβάληται βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρόν· τὸ γὰρ βύσσινον τὰ ***δικαιώματα*** τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν.
Rev. 19:11 καὶ εἶδον τὸν οὐρανὸν ἠνεῳγμένον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος λευκός καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν [καλούμενος] πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, καὶ ἐν ***δικαιοσύνῃ*** κρίνει καὶ πολεμεῖ.
Rev. 22:11 ὁ ***ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω*** ἔτι καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ***δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην*** ποιησάτω ἔτι καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.

YES, AND ROUND IS SQUARE TOO:

A Diatribe on 'The Sacrament of Homosexual Marriage'

YES, AND ROUND IS SQUARE TOO: A Diatribe on 'The Sacrament of Homosexual Marriage'.

"Matilda told such awful lies/It made one gasp and stretch one's eyes ..." According to a recent posting on NWNet, Robert Warren Cromey's brother Edwin asked him *'if I believed the marriage of same sex partners was the same as the sacrament of marriage between opposite sex couples. I'll start off by saying yes they are the same. The articles of faith in the 1978 Book of Common Prayer, P. 857, says, "The sacraments are the outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace, given by Christ as sure and certain means by which we receive that grace."*

- *'The outward and visible signs in marriage are two people.'* No. If we get the doctrine right, we shall get the rest right. In marriage the "sign" is sexual consummation. This is by definition between a man and a woman, in accordance with the Lord's own word. Sex itself (from Latin *sexus*, the physiological difference) involves two sexes not one. No amount (to be blunt) of messing about with genitals makes an act into sexual consummation or intercourse, which is the irreducible reality without which there is no marriage, in the sight of God or in the legal sense. That is why for non-consummation one may ask for and obtain an annulment, not a divorce. Marriage, however complex and interesting it may become as a phenomenon of Christian civilisation, remains irreducibly sexual.
- *'The inward and spiritual grace is the couple's vows and the assurance of God's blessing on the couple ...'* No again. The "inward and spiritual grace" in marriage is much less ethereal: it is God's gift of married sexual love: that it is present is signified by consummation, that it grows and flourishes is ensured by sexual belonging.
- *'Marriage conveys what it signifies. Marriage conveys vows of fidelity, life long union and love. One doesn't have to be of the opposite sex to convey the significance of marriage.'* No again: marriage does not convey vows,

the vows convey consent to, and the intention of, being married. To use the terms "union" and "marriage" in this connection is to beg the question. Same-sex people may well wish to promise to be one another's best friend for the rest of their lives, even to mess around with one another's genitals exclusively, but neither deep spiritual friendship nor messing around etc. is of the essence of marriage. It is surely not coincidental that very many languages cannot even express the idea of same-sex persons' marrying one another: sometimes, as in ancient Greek, different forms of the verb are used for the man and the woman, sometimes, as in modern Russian, the actual verbs differ.

- *'We also know that the ministers in the marriage are not the clergy but the couple.'* Yes, and they are a "couple" because, by virtue of their differentiation by *la petite différence*, they will be able to copulate. To accept less is to accept something short of a full marriage. *'This means that the sacrament of marriage happens with or without the clergy and the church. It happens when the couple choose to enter into the covenant of marriage. They may go to the church and ask the assistance of the clergy for counsel, prayer and in the American church sign some legal documents. These have nothing to do with the sacramental nature of the marriage.'* Yes, but we go to church for weddings for another reason, even if the church wedding is itself a legal form (which in many places it is not): we are proclaiming our willingness to obey God's call to this marriage. Our commitment is made publicly, our friends and family witness it, and they stand ready to support our marriage in the future with prayer and counsel. God Himself is in the sacrament; if He were not, it would be a form of magical mumbo-jumbo which we do to one another.

- *'The church is ready to assist straight people but not gays and lesbians.'* If the sacrament happens anyhow, what is lost to such "couples", except of course a colourful ceremony? Why not a City Hall ceremony (if City Hall could be induced to attach any meaning to it in the case of

a pair of people of the same sex)? But seriously, a Christian church cannot celebrate what is not, or treat people as called to what is not. If I want to complain that all my life I have been excluded from the pleasure and privilege of begetting children I can go right ahead, but I need to be fair and blame the Management alone for my exclusion.

- *'The articles of faith in the Book of Common Prayer continue P. 861. "Holy Matrimony is Christian marriage, in which the woman and man enter into a life-long union, make their vows before God" and the articles of faith in the Book of Common Prayer continue P. 861. "Holy Matrimony is Christian marriage, in which woman and man enter into a life-long union, make their vows before God and the Church, and receive the grace and blessing of God to help them fulfill their vows."*

I believe that same sex couples enter marriage and holy matrimony when they "enter into a life-long union, make their vows before God and the Church, and receive the grace and blessing of God to help them fulfill their vows."' What union? As a legal concept this does not exist, as a biological reality it is impracticable. It is incidentally thoroughly sexist as a term: the plain facts are that the male gets up a back passage, a female gets nowhere fast. Because both the sex-act and sexual love work differently in each sex, women suffer a different, and arguably a much severer, kind of deprivation in same-sex relations. And I'm not meaning children here, but the specifically feminine experience of awakening in which most women are, initially at least, a lot more interested than in progeny.

- *'It is clear that some same sex couples in my experience desire to "enter into a life-long union." That is their wish, desire and intent. I as a priest must simply take their word for their motivation and intention. They "make their vows before God and the church." In the ceremonies I have conducted and witnessed, same sex couples make vows of faithful, life-long union before God and in church.*

I believe they "receive grace and blessing of God to help them fulfill their vows." As celebrant and witness to such blessings I ask God to give grace and bless the couple. I assume God does that. I am not willing to limit God's grace and blessing in any matter. I assume God graces and blesses same sex couples as He does opposite sex couples just because they ask for God's blessing and grace. We have no proof that God provides those gifts, we accept on faith that He does - for opposite sex as well as same sex couples.' This will work when one can put together a long grey nose, four large hooves, a stringy tail and an unwieldy body and hope for a live elephant out of it. God has not granted it to us to make our own elephants, still less bring them to church for some impersonal substance called "grace and blessing" to be poured out upon them.

- *'Paul's words are that marriage is the sign of the mystical union between Christ and His church. The personal and sexual intimacy between the couples speaks of a deep connection, unity and bonding. That intimacy is a sign of our oneness with God and all creatures. The exhilaration of sexual and orgasmic union reflects the creative, intimate, and explosive character of divine energy available to all human beings. That intimacy happens to same sex couples as well as opposite sex couples. It is not dependent on procreation. It is dependent on robust sexual connection, trust, love and joy.'* It is an idea, before one tries to get anything out of any passage of Scripture, to have read it recently and attempted to submit one's mind to it. These remarks bear virtually no relation to the words of the text. First, in Eph. 5 Paul is addressing men *qua* husbands, women *qua* wives. Second, he is addressing people who in most cases were in arranged marriages. Third, he must have assumed sexual connection with all its possible joys, but he has nothing explicit to say of the nature or quality of anybody's orgasms or the degree of personal intimacy enjoyed. That the ideal of a romantic and intimate love between husband and wife would

eventually come out of his teaching might well have surprised him (but not of course the Holy Spirit). Fourth, he is speaking of an asymmetrical relation between one who gives up his life for another, woos and pursues, enters, awakens and makes fruitful, and one who is at first empty, then turns and responds, receives, is changed and matured, conceives and produces. I do not wish to be crude, but he is saying, as the whole Old Testament is, that the facts of sex are a God-given metaphor for an eternal relation. Fifth, marriage is not Paul's topic except incidentally: his subject is the archetypal truth, which he applies to actual marriages. He is not getting a picture of the relationship of Christ and the Church out of natural human marriage, whether or not orgasmic or intimate, but trying to get Christian marriages to function as little acted parables of that supreme love-relationship. In it all the getting comes through giving, just as we are happiest in sex when we forget ourselves entirely. In it all of us His people are feminine, and His passion and our response are made visible in fruitfulness. Heterosexual relations are the metaphor, Christ and His bride are the reality to which in Paul's mind actual marriages are to bear witness. As the black Episcopalian preacher whom I heard in NYC recently put it so vividly, "Jesus wants to open you up and climb right down inside of you." In practical spiritual terms he is telling me that if I am in a Christian marriage, the wishes of my husband, or the needs of my wife, dictate the shape of my obedience to Christ. This has tremendous healing implications for, among other things, the greedy claims of careers, ecclesiastical or secular, or of children. It was almost certainly incidental to his aim that his prescription works for falling in love in an arranged marriage, and for climbing back into love when we fall out of it, that it is uniquely counter-cultural, contradicting equally male mother-fixation and female smother-love, that obeying it makes men grown up and women fulfilled, and that the happiness produced by it is perhaps "the best bliss that earth imparts". After several decades of passionate monogamy I am still discovering new wonders and riches

in this passage; but what has it to do with same-sex relations, or even chaste same-sex friendships? Absolutely nothing: there is enough teaching in the rest of the New Testament on all other relationships to keep us occupied for a lifetime. One might as well look to this passage for guidance on kindness to animals.

- *'Some say the purpose of marriage is procreation. The Book of Common Prayer indicates three purposes of marriage. "The union of husband and wife in heart, body and mind is intended by God for their mutual joy: for the help and comfort given one another in prosperity and adversity; and, when it is God's will for the procreation of children ..."'* The ECUSA's BCP is not quite Scripture, but it's Scriptural all right, if a little coy on the first purpose.
- *'While same sex couples cannot have children biologically, they are quite capable of having children by adoption, in vitro fertilization, and foster care. The church allows straight couples to be married who are too old to have children, who are not physically able to have children or just plain don't want children. Procreation is not a necessary requirement for marriage. Same sex couples can pledge each other mutual joy, help and comfort in prosperity and adversity without the expectation of procreation.'* Same-sex couples will always be dependent for children on the coming together in one way or another of spermatozoon and ovum, in other words two sexes are necessary for procreation. To have children is the predictable, regular and typical (dare I say normal?) result of physical union between people who are biologically compatible (*cf.* Latin *parens,* pl. *parentes* 'one who brings forth'), the contrived, incidental or artificial result of same-sex relations. The people who enter a same-sex relationship with a view to having a family must be almost as rare as those who regret that they are heterosexual. And (speaking as a mother), I cannot subtract from the joys of marital relations the joy of anticipating the offspring that were to come that way when we were young, and the memory now that we are much older of the people who have now come that way. I speak as someone who, when

I entered upon matrimony (a denominative Latin noun from *mater* "mother"), did not desire children, just believed that to have a couple was probably my Christian duty.

- *'I also believe that God enters human history and brings about change in the social order. Saul and David were permitted many wives. Jesus said a man should not divorce his wife. We know now that men could divorce wives but women could not divorce husbands.'* "We know now" is an interestingly contemptuous way of putting it, but scarcely right. The Jewish situation has always been known to the interpreters of the relevant passages. Roman wives divorced husbands quite a lot. *'Jesus<'> proscription of divorce was to protect women and not marriage. Even the idea of faithful, life-long monogamy was a development within the Jewish people of God from a society that permitted polygamy.'* The protection of women and men is a real effect of the monogamous ideal: but why, unless Jesus was dead stupid (He spoke or read at least one more language than most clergy in the ECUSA for starters), must we assume that He was incapable of holding more than one idea in His head at a time? Suppose He was after several things, above all glorifying His Father by reversing the Fall and destroying the works of the devil at the point where human beings sin most cruelly against one another? Jesus was at the very least recalling the people to God's intention in making mankind sexually differentiated, and it wasn't so that we should all get the mostest for the leastest.

- *'We know that slavery in many varied forms was permitted in Jewish and Christian societies. Heroes like Wilberforce in England and the abolitionists in the United States felt called by God to abolish the institution of slavery. I believe God acted in and through these prophets to change existing religious notions and bring freedom to people in bondage and offer them full humanity.'* It seems to be implied here that the abolition of slavery represented an advance on New Testament teaching. Wilberforce & Co. would be astonished. So would Paul, who "accepted"

slavery only when it could not be changed. When a convert found himself caught in a situation which could not be changed, the trick was (and is) to live in Christian freedom within those limits. The alternative was to wait for some time which would never come before starting to live for Christ. The writer seems not to have noticed that some form of slavery has always been the lot of most people, because it is the privilege of very few to choose their domicile, occupation or status.

- *'The church had it that the ordination to the priesthood was reserved for men. God acted in and through the church to bring about change and justice so that women are ordained priest and bishop. We know that all Christians do not agree with this change. But the church, her rules, theology and liturgics are always changing and developing.'* There are three implications here to all of which I object most strenuously. The first is that ordination is some kind of a human right. NO!!! I have no such right. If God calls me, or I think He has, there need to be fair means of determining that this is so, and of doing something about it, that's all. But the justice argument is the worst and weakest. Secondly, while I am not currently contemplating or seeking ordination, if I were to do so I should find it insulting to be regarded as someone who needs to persuade the authorities of my fitness in spite of my sex. Mainstream Christianity, whatever we may hear these days, has never thought it regrettable to be a woman, even one who has been "sexually active" with one man for more than half her life. My ordination is not of the same order as that of someone whose *mores* would until 30 years ago have been condemned in any Christian church. I had better in this context stop at that before I boil over onto the Net. Thirdly, not everything is up for grabs in the Church. The Apostles must have all worn sandals and robes, and thought them good: we needn't. They may have considered women ritually unclean and so unfit for presiding over the Eucharist, but they don't seem to have said so. We need to distinguish between Apostolic custom and Apostolic teaching.

- *'Cuthbert Simpson's old book* Revelation and Response *indicated God reveals himself in human history and we, God's people, respond, change and develop, as did the ancient prophets and people of Israel.'* Biblically God interprets His acts to His people in words and acted parables. The stock view of the prophets as initiating a whole new set of ideas is based on misunderstanding. Much truer to the record is that Moses represented God's Statement and the prophets His Reminder. In any case God is not captive to events and in flux like them.
- *'Jesus indicated the law was made for man, not man for the law.'* Not exactly. What are my body and sexuality made for? *'The sacraments are made for man, not man for the sacraments. The laws and sacraments of the church now say marriage is only for heterosexuals. I believe God reveals to us today a new creation, a new being, a new phenomenon. We live in a time when some same sex couples want to enter life-long faithful relationships.'* How do we test the spirits? What if some of us sometimes have little urges which are not quite right? Must God the Grandfather baptize it all?
- *'Some homosexuals, not all by any means, want to vow to be with each other "to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, until we are parted by death." They want to make a solemn vow. The writers of Leviticus didn't face this.'* Not in so many words, for chronological reasons. *Paul never heard of such a thing.* Not precisely in Judaism or the Church, but there's no knowing what may have gone on in fringe groups. He will, however, certainly have heard of the pagan equivalent. Tarsus where he was a student was a big city with all the vices. '*The ancient fathers, the theologians, the reformers, the writers of Prayer Books and liturgies never faced a situation where same sex couples came to the church asking for a blessing, a marriage, a wedding ceremony, or a nuptial mass.'* Homosexual "marriage" motivated as in modern times was known in pagan antiquity. At least one ancient bishop taught the

rightness of male homosexual conduct. But by and large the reaction to such a request before Process Theology was so wholly predictable that nobody tried it. '*Homosexuality in the past was seen only as fun for the initiated and perversity* (Note: He means "perversion". The perversity is elsewhere.) *and abomination and immorality by the church at large.'* This does small justice to negative pagan views of the activity, or to the Christian tradition of distinguishing desire from action. '*We are in a new world now. God is revealing new things through our homosexual brothers and sisters. They are not going away. They will always be with us no <matter how> badly we treat them.'* We have been in a new world since the Ascension. Is all modern change for the better? What precisely, apart from the loss of a sense of shame, is new about it anyhow? Our Third World brethren would term this change an epiphenomenon of extreme affluence: given a short course of austerity, it will vanish away like the dew i' the morn. Historically speaking they would be right. The real mistreatment is the cruelty of promising that what is not to be had is there for the asking.

- *'God's law on social custom is not immutable. It has always changed and will continue to do so. The sacrament of marriage is nowhere near the doctrine of the Incarnation, the Trinity and Eucharist in power and strength. Even in those we know there is a wide variety of interpretation about those great statements of belief. The doctrine of Christian marriage must be expanded to include the marriage of same sex persons if it is their desire to seek the blessing of God through the church.'* I need to hear some scriptural and theological argument for this, instead of a flimsy appeal to sociology and the winds of societal change. Hands up all those who are better and wiser than the Lord Jesus, who have matured out of a perfect love for all their neighbours, a perfect forgiveness and constant intercession for all who have injured them, and a perfect self-giving to (all) their wives, and long to move on from these primitive little rules to higher things ...!!!

- *'Neither the church nor the sacrament of marriage need protection.'* Right enough. These great realities will endure when this whole discussion is sunk without trace. *'They are large enough in heart and compassion to expand even further to include the new being of homosexual love and marriage.'* This seems to me to be sentimentality cloaked in theological cliché. Whatever next?

A NOTE ON THEOLOGICAL ETHICS

This was my contribution to a 1996 e-mail discussion on the N(ew)W(estminster)Net.

Far be it from me to chip in on an existing dialogue, or to pretend to some kind of Olympian detachment. But it does strike me that when two earnest Christians disagree on the subject of how the canonical Scriptures are to be interpreted and applied, there is almost certainly an underlying clash of theological assumptions. I think that I can claim to be pretty objective in the homosexuality debate. I have recently done and am publishing some pioneering work on the relevant texts. This is grounded in forty years' immersion in the study of the ancient world, and nearly as long an acquaintance with both Testaments in the original text (or as near as we can get to it!). I started my investigation with an attempt at an entirely open mind about What the Bible Says on this topic, and worked as a philologist. I hope that what I say now will sound and be quite independent of what I am sexually or erotically, whether I am "liberal" or "conservative" in theology.

The discussion seems to be (a) theological, *i.e.* about the relation of God's love to His justice and how we proclaim and exemplify these, and (b) ethical, *i.e.* about the relation of (Judaeo-)Christian love to (Judaeo-)Christian law/rules. To save time I will lump these two categories together. These are what I believe to be biblical positions (I give no references because we all know them):–

(1) There is no opposition between God's love and His justice. There is not really a distinction even, for justice is simply love viewed from a particular angle. The two Testaments are united on this point. Marcion got nowhere in the early Church with the opposite opinion. Love includes God's doing justice to and for us, and His expecting us to imitate Him out of gratitude for His redeeming/liberating love. Love so understood, His for us, ours

for Him, and ours for one another, is the great all-inclusive (Judaeo-)Christian gospel truth, and represents the whole of life and the whole duty of man.

(2) The God of love defines what love is, as opposed to our using our idea of love to delimit God in some way.

(3) We are converted into a life of love, or we are not converted at all. There is no holiness which is not loving. Persons and relationships are bigger than anything else; they alone are eternal.

(4) While God is all men's Father, as seen and experienced in the Life, Death and Resurrection of Christ, I am not His child unless I respond to, and live responsively in, His love.

(5) The opposite of love is sin. All sin is primarily against God. There is sin which is against God only. Because He is both God and a God Who loves people, to sin against our fellow is both to dishonour and to displease Him. Thus a loving God is "angry with sinners every day".

(6) There is no opposition between love for brother/neighbour and obedience to the moral law. The moral law comes to us from a loving God, and our obedience to it is an aspect of love. Love "fulfils" not by abrogating, but by igniting and motivating. The rules function rather like the jelly to the mould, providing shape and definition: certainly we can't eat the mould, but without it we are unlikely to get any jelly.

(7) Both a legalistic exaltation of the rules (usually for others) and an antinomian contempt for them (usually in my own favour) are fundamentally sub-Christian.

(9) We of the (Judaeo-)Christian tradition have learned a universally-known and binding ethic in the matrix of our faith. But everyone has it, and a sense of obligation to it,

as part of common grace. Our danger may sometimes be that we fall below, rather than rise above, the world's best standards, whether in sex-ethics or elsewhere.

I find it absolutely fascinating that all of this chimes with Articles VI, VII and XX.

That's perhaps about enough to be going on with, except that I want to make two remarks and tack on a letter to the Anglican Journal (whether it gets printed depends I suspect on whether they are interested in moving the discussion on towards a livable resolution).

(a) Close study of the language for righteousness, justice, justification, doing right and for unrighteousness, sin, wronging one's fellow etc. shows that we are looking at one complex of ideas. Greek cognates and derivatives with -δικ- pervade the text *e.g.* of Rom. 1-3 and I Cor. 6.

A very good new book is Richard B. Hays' *The Moral Vision of the New Testament* (Edinburgh 1996).

(b) I am by no means convinced that modern homosexual relationships do not, as ancient ones did, run the gamut from the lasting-and-loving kind to the exploitative and hedonistic. For the ancient evidence (with a couple of minor faults in his Greek) see a fine article by Mark Smith in *JAAR* 1996 64.2 pp. 223-56.

"TO THE *ANGLICAN JOURNAL*

Dear Editor,

As a biblical Hellenist and Hebraist, I have to say that those who believe that the canonical scriptures contain nothing about modern homosexual orientation and practice are going to have to make and publish their own version of them, along the lines of the Jehovah's Witnesses' New World Bible, for such a tendentious notion will never get past the vast majority of qualified scholarly opinion.

For full documentation of this, I refer readers to my article entitled 'Biblical Texts Relevant to Homosexual Orientation and Practice' in the forthcoming special summer issue of *Christian Scholar's Review.*

As for the suggestion that we have no recorded Dominical teaching on these subjects, it is a falsehood based on a failure to reckon with the wide scope of the Greek term πορνεία and the -πορν- root as it is used in the Bible. Our Lord has things to say about it in Mt. 5, 15 and 19. There is incidentally an extra Greek-biblical reference imported by the translator at Ezekiel 16:28 (discussed on p. 178 of my Oxford dissertation on the Septuagint Version of Ezekiel). Even if we had no record, First Century Judaism was so solid against conduct which was thought of as contrary to the Law of God and of nature, that any aberrant teaching or behaviour on the Lord's part or that of St. Paul would have excited remark, to put it mildly.

As a theologian and simple believer, I wait patiently as I have for thirty years for my church to start thinking spiritually. We have God the Schoolmarm (Touch not, taste not/keep-the-rules-or-else legalism), God the Grandfather (Come let us sin,/anything-goes antinomianism), but where is the Lord, the Giver of Life (Against such there is no law/living-in-the-Spirit Christian freedom)? If we had more of the real God we should see the back of the current sterile clash between Left and Right in ethical discussion.

Dr. P.D.M. Turner."

A BRIEF TO THE LAMBETH COMMISSION ON COMMUNION

established by the Archbishop of Canterbury in October 2003, following the special Primates' Meeting called that month in Lambeth Palace to discuss developments in the Anglican Episcopal churches of North America

A Brief to the Lambeth Commission addressing the Key Questions 1(b) and 2(b), *i.e.* the theological implications of the consecration of Gene Robinson in New Hampshire and the blessing of same-sex unions in New Westminster.

It is never wrong to love another human being; but we all know that particular expressions of that love may be wrong, and that the wrongness is independent of the depth, intensity and permanence of love. That some kinds of genital expression, for instance between parent and child, two siblings, close friends of the same or different sex, are displeasing to God is the united witness of the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Old Greek version (which adds an allusion to lesbian relations in Ez. 16), the Intertestamental literature, the Fathers, the Reformers and all Jewish and Christian ethicists until perhaps thirty years ago. The *differentium* of same-sex 'unions' and of Gene Robinson's relationship with his close friend is a case in point. In biblical Greek and language derived from it (for instance in Philo) such kinds of physical expression are frequently called *porneia* (rendered "fornication" in older English versions): at least twice in the Lord's teaching according to Matthew, in I Cor. 6-7 and in Gal. 5 (where it stands at the head of the list of the 'Works of the Flesh') it is made clear that *porneia* in all its forms is gross sin, persistence in which has transcendental and eternal consequences. Abstention from mild forms of it, probably transgressions of stricter Jewish conceptions of prohibited degrees, was at issue at the Council of Jerusalem; incest at Corinth provoked the strongest possible apostolic reaction. No argument for the goodness and beauty of same-sex physical relations can be made on Scriptural grounds which does not apply equally to, say, child-molestation, incest, adultery and so forth.

Absolutely pivotal are Our Lord's own teaching and example. That the Lord both taught and lived fully within the Old Testament sexual ethic is certain. We may indeed know His attitude to same-sex genital relations. No case can be made for the modern notion that there was or could have been any Dominical silence or ambiguity about them. His attitude is actually quite plain from the *porneia* references in Matthew, where His teaching is represented by the Evangelist as Jesus-Torah, and Himself as the new Moses. It is certain that if anyone in His time and place had had the temerity to produce a challenge to Him as teacher along the lines of that about divorce, He would most certainly have replied, "What is written in the Law? How do you read it?" By analogy, He would if anything have sharpened the moral demand for His disciples. There would have been no qualifications at all, no mention of pastoral provision for failure, there being none in Leviticus or elsewhere. This was a closed question: it is not open to us to attribute to Him historically impossible attitudes.

Not only is the language unambiguous, we must also come to terms with Jesus as our pattern, here as elsewhere. Any compromise on His part would have produced an immediate challenge to the validity of His ministry, and that challenge must have left some trace in the record. Some want to ignore Him as example of perfect First Century Jewish sex-ethics, while using Him as a stick to beat the rest of us into other more fashionable attitudes. The idea of Him as the best of husbands and fathers, even (just about) as the best of wives and mothers, is possible; but not the idea of Him curled up in bed with John the Beloved Disciple at any stage. The man in Melbourne who has just got a PhD for arguing that case deserves at least one for ingenuity, but none at all for scholarship.

Many things may be Christian but not Anglican. But unless something may be Anglican which is not Christian,

we must understand that to call right what the Lord Himself called wrong, and to do what appalled Him, is to part company with essential Anglicanism, endangering not only the souls of those who teach this untruth and wickedness, but in many cases the very lives of little children, young girls, young men, women and all the sexually weak and vulnerable wherever they may be, now and for the foreseeable future. It is to say that the right to the physical expression of love trumps all the obedience we may owe to the one we call Lord. As ethicists we know that there is no human right to orgasm at any cost. We need to hold onto the subtler truth, that there is no Christian right to redefine love in the face of the God Who commands and supplies it.

Grant, O Lord, that as we are baptized into the death of thy blessed Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, so by continually mortifying our corrupt affections we may be buried with him; and that, through the grave, and gate of death, we may pass to our joyful resurrection; for his merits, who died, and was buried, and rose again for us, thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. AMEN.