

**Sources and extended quotations re
Open Letter
from Dermot O’Callaghan to the Archbishop of Canterbury
2 Dec 2016**

Wolfhart Pannenberg: “The biblical assessments of homosexual practice are unambiguous in their rejection, and all its statements on this subject agree without exception.... Here lies the boundary of a Christian church that knows itself to be bound by the authority of Scripture. Those who urge the church to change the norm of its teaching on this matter must know that they are promoting schism. If a church were to let itself be pushed to the point where it ceased to treat homosexual activity as a departure from the biblical norm, and recognized homosexual unions as a personal partnership of love equivalent to marriage, such a church would stand no longer on biblical ground but against the unequivocal witness of Scripture. A church that took this step would cease to be the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church.”

<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/1996/november11/6td035.html?start=1>

Dan Via: “The Pauline texts ... do not support this limitation of male homosexuality to pederasty ... I believe that Hays is correct in holding that *arsenokoitēs* refers to a man who engages in same-sex intercourse. The term is a compound of the words for “male” (*arsēn*) and “bed” (*koitē*) and thus could naturally be taken to mean a man who goes to bed with other men. True, the meaning of a compound word does not necessarily add up to the sum of its parts. But in this case I believe the evidence suggests that it does. In the Greek version of the two Leviticus passages that condemn male homosexuality (Lev 18:22; 20:13, a man is not to lie with a male as with a woman) each text contains both the words *arsēn* and *koitē*. First Cor 6:9-10 simply classifies homosexuality as a moral sin that finally keeps one out of the kingdom of God.”

“Professor Gagnon and I are in substantial agreement that the biblical texts that deal specifically with homosexual practice condemn it unconditionally.”

Homosexuality and the Bible: Two Views, pp. 11, 13, 93-95.

Pim Pronk: “To sum up: wherever homosexual intercourse is mentioned in Scripture, it is condemned. With reference to it, the New Testament adds no arguments to those of the Old. Rejection is a foregone conclusion.”

Against Nature? Types of Moral Arguments Regarding Homosexuality, p. 279

Walter Wink: “...efforts to twist the text to mean what it clearly does not say are deplorable. Simply put, the Bible is negative toward same-sex behavior, and there is no getting around it ...”

To Hell with Gays? Christian Century, 119:13, pp. 32-33

Bernadette Brooten: “Boswell ... argued that ... ‘The early Christian church does not appear to have opposed homosexual behavior per se.’ The sources on female homoeroticism that I present in this book run absolutely counter to [this conclusion].”

“If ... the dehumanizing aspects of pederasty motivated Paul to condemn sexual relations between males, then why did he condemn relations between females in the same sentence? ... Rom 1:27, like Lev 18:22 and 20:13, condemns all males in male-male relationships regardless of age, making it unlikely that lack of mutuality or concern for the passive boy were Paul’s central concerns ... The ancient sources, which rarely speak of sexual relations between women and girls, undermine Robin Scroggs’s theory that Paul opposed homosexuality as pederasty.”

“Paul could have believed that *tribades* [the active female partners in a female homosexual bond], the ancient *kinaidoi* [the passive male partners in a male homosexual bond], and other sexually unorthodox persons were born that way and yet still condemn them as unnatural and shameful ... I believe that Paul used the word “exchanged” [Rom. 1:26] to indicate that people knew the natural sexual order of the universe and left it behind ... I see Paul as condemning all forms of homoeroticism

as the unnatural acts of people who had turned away from God.”

Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism, pp. 11, 244, 253 n. 106, 257, 361

Willam Schoedel: “We would expect Paul to make that form of the argument more explicit if he intended it ... Paul’s wholesale attack on Greco-Roman culture makes better sense if, like Josephus and Philo, he lumps all forms of same-sex eros together as a mark of Gentile decadence.”

Same-Sex Eros: Paul and the Greco-Roman Tradition, p.67

Louis Crompton: “According to [one] interpretation, Paul’s words were not directed at ‘bona fide’ homosexuals in committed relationships. But such a reading, however well-intentioned, seems strained and unhistorical. Nowhere does Paul or any other Jewish writer of this period imply the least acceptance of same-sex relations under any circumstance. The idea that homosexuals might be redeemed by mutual devotion would have been wholly foreign to Paul or any other Jew or early Christian.”

Homosexuality and Civilization, p. 114

Luke Timothy Johnson: “*The Bible nowhere speaks positively or even neutrally about same-sex love...* The exegetical situation is straightforward: we know what the text says... I think it important to state clearly that *we do, in fact, reject the straightforward commands of Scripture*, and appeal instead to another authority when we declare that same-sex unions can be holy and good. And what exactly is that authority? We appeal explicitly to the weight of our own experience and the experience thousands of others have witnessed to, which tells us that to claim our own sexual orientation is in fact to accept the way in which God has created us. By so doing, we explicitly reject as well the premises of the scriptural statements condemning homosexuality”

Homosexuality and the Church, Commonweal Magazine, June 15, 2007

David McWhirter and Andrew Mattison: “Our culture has defined faithfulness in couples always to include or be synonymous with sexual fidelity, so it is little wonder that relationships [of gay male couples] begin with that assumption... Each man grew up feeling that being sexually exclusive was an issue of morality. In addition, they grew up believing that heterosexuality had intrinsic moral value while homosexuality was basically immoral. To arrive at the acceptance of being gay and of extrarelational sex, each of these men has had to alter his own value systems.”

The Male Couple: How Relationships Develop, pp 252, 253

See also discussions in *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*, **RAJ Gagnon**,

Royal College of Psychiatrists submission to Church of England (2007 and 2012)

[http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/pdf/RCPsych%20response%20to%20LGB%20CoE%20Listening%20Exercise%20\(2012\)%20and%20The%20Pilling%20Commission%20\(2007\).pdf](http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/pdf/RCPsych%20response%20to%20LGB%20CoE%20Listening%20Exercise%20(2012)%20and%20The%20Pilling%20Commission%20(2007).pdf)

Royal College of Psychiatrists statement on Sexual Orientation (2014)

http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/pdf/ps02_2014.pdf