

Thursday, January 31
Session #4
Paul on Homosexual Practice

Dr. Robert A. J. Gagnon, Associate Professor of New Testament,
Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburg, PA

I. Romans 1:24-27: Opposed to Some, or All, Forms of Homosexual Practice?

- A. Three main arguments made to discount Romans 1:24-27
- B. The plot structure of Romans 1:18-32
- C. Intertextual echoes to Genesis 1:26-27
- D. The argument from nature
- E. The mention of lesbian intercourse in Romans 1:26
- F. The mention of mutual gratification in Romans 1:27
- G. The conception and practice of caring homosexual relationships in antiquity
- H. Absolute nature arguments in the Greco-Roman world
- I. Why Paul is not saying, “Don’t judge homosexual practice”
- J. What even scholars supportive of homosexual unions admit

II. 1 Corinthians 6:9 (& 1 Tim 1:10): Opposed to some, or all, forms of male-male intercourse?

- A. Meaning of *malakoi*, “soft men”
- B. Meaning of *arsenokoitai*, “men who lie with a male”

III. The Bible’s alleged ignorance of sexual orientation

- A. Greco-Roman theories of a congenital basis for some homoerotic attraction
- B. Differences with contemporary theories are beside the point
- C. Did Paul get “nature” confused?
- D. What even scholars supportive of homosexual unions affirm

IV. The Bible's Alleged Misogynistic Bias against Homoerotic Unions

- A. Ignoring concerns for structural complementarity in ancient texts
- B. Absoluteness of Bible's prohibition suggests priority of gender over status
- C. Women's liberation as a stimulus for opposing all male homosexual unions
- D. An absurd corollary
- E. View of women in the Bible fares well relative to its cultural environment