

Michael Theobald

Paul and Same-Sex Sexuality

A Plea for a Sensible Approach to Scripture

In conversations about whether and how Christian churches might become a true home for people in same-sex partnerships, one regularly encounters the objection: “But Scripture says...!” And often enough, this is where the readiness to understand ends. With regard to “worldview” claims, such as the question of how the biblical creation narratives relate to scientific theories about the origin of the world, a biblicist approach to Scripture has long been obsolete; we have learned from what happened to Galileo. When it comes to ethical-anthropological controversies such as the one at hand, however, approaches to Scripture that have been painstakingly cultivated in other contexts are still not effectively applied. Yet such questions also require us to consider the cultural-historical character of the relevant texts and to look closely at which issues they address – and which they do not. For example, years ago Wolfgang Stegemann pointed out that Paul argues on the basis of an entirely different system of cultural values than that which we are accustomed to in modern Western societies, which is why his views on sexuality are also very different from ours.¹ It is reasonable to assume that Paul is not at all familiar with our problems, because our contemporary anthropological knowledge is quite different from that of his day, and therefore his views do not offer us much help. Thus it is to be expected that Scripture, once we have read it carefully, will then send us forth and expect us to develop our own ethical perspectives in the light of faith – which of course brings us back to Scripture and its wealth of encounters with God – in conversation with the human sciences, to put these perspectives to the test, and to verify them in the everyday pastoral life of the Church.

Only a few texts in the Holy Scriptures are directly relevant to our discussion here. There is no mention of “lesbian love” anywhere in the Bible – neither in the Old nor in the New Testament – a fact which hinges on the text’s androcentric perspective.² In the New Testament, same-sex sexual activity is mentioned only in the Pauline corpus, in 1 Corinthians 6:9–11 and Romans 1:26–27, and

¹ Wolfgang Stegemann, “Homosexualität – ein modernes Konzept,” *ZNT* 2 (1998): 61–68.

² For further reflections on this topic in the Old Testament, see Thomas Hieke’s contribution in this volume.

once in the pseudo-Pauline pastoral letters, in 1 Timothy 1:9–11.³ Of these three texts, the reference in the Letter to the Romans is certainly the most important, which is why in this contribution – after glancing at the other two texts – we will turn our attention primarily to Romans. I will begin with some preliminary remarks on the differences between the world of the New Testament and our world today, in terms of both culture and mindset.

1 The New Testament Texts: Witnesses to Another World

As Stegemann put it in the article I mentioned at the beginning, sexuality as we encounter it today, in the many ways in which it is perceived, is “a cultural construct of modern Western societies,”⁴ a distinct, independent “concept” in the larger context of human scientific anthropology. It is guided by “the notion of a distinct realm of personal human identity defined by sexual desires, pleasure, and acts. And from here it becomes possible to assign to each individual human being an individual sexual ‘orientation’ that defines him or her as a homosexual or heterosexual or bisexual type.”⁵

This modern “invention of sexuality as a separate area of human identity” manifests itself, for example, “in the fact that we distinguish sexual identity from gender affiliation” and “decouple types of sexual preferences from degrees of masculinity or femininity.” This concept is what makes it possible for sexuality to be “the subject of physiological and psychological analyses or therapies.”⁶

This account is supported by historical linguistic research. “The first occurrences of the terms homosexual and homosexuality can be traced to two pam-

³ William Loader (*Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* [Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013], 138) also refers to Mark 9:42, “the only other probable reference to same-sex relations,” although this is “limited to pederasty, where it makes best sense of the severe warning issued by Jesus against causing little ones to stumble, a common metaphor for sexual failing. In this case the issue is abuse of children and, while not explicitly mentioning sexual abuse, most likely has it in mind” (with reference to Mark 9:43–48 as well); see also William Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012), 334; but cf. Rudolf Pesch’s discussion in *Das Markusevangelium, II. Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20* (HThK.NT 2.2; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1977), 114 n. 3; based on a careful exegesis of Mark’s text, Pesch considers the interpretation of Proverbs as a warning against sexual sin (homosexuality, onanism) to be absurd.

⁴ Stegemann, “Homosexualität,” 62.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 62.

phlets, published anonymously in Leipzig in 1869, and probably became more widely known through their inclusion in the second edition of this book by Krafft-Ebbing” – a reference to *Psychopathia Sexualis*, published in 1887.⁷ These terms have only been in use since the time when sexuality first began to be perceived as a separate sphere of private individual existence, and they correspond to this anthropological perception. If the Greek language – and thus also Hellenistic Judaism – has no terms corresponding to “homosexuality,” which is an artificial compound word formed from a Greek and a Latin component,⁸ then this alone constitutes a sufficient warning against projecting modern perceptions of sexuality back onto ancient texts. This caution applies to the Pauline texts as well.

Stegemann goes on to say that “[o]ne of the insights M. Foucault brought to the concept is that there was no autonomous, distinct realm of ‘sexuality’ in ancient societies. Sexual desire and lust were inextricably linked to the relations of power and domination that characterized the societies of the time.”⁹ In classical Athens, for example, “sexual roles [...] were isomorphic with status and gender roles; ‘masculinity’ combines the congruent functions of penetration, activity, dominance, and social superiority, while ‘femininity’ means being penetrated, passivity, submission, and social subordination.”¹⁰ Moreover, “[f]ree men stood on one side as active sexual partners, [while] women, slaves, and boys [stood] as passive on the other.” It follows that “the issue of hetero- or homosexuality was not normative for sexual practice. The free Greek man could penetrate women, slaves (male and female), and boys, but not another free Greek man. This choice of partner was frowned upon because the other man would have had to assume the passive, subordinate, female role.”¹¹

What holds true for Greek culture – the view of sexuality as part of overarching discursive and institutional structures – also holds true analogously for the

7 Ibid., 61 (following David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* [New York: Routledge, 1990]). The author of these two pamphlets was the Austro-Hungarian writer Karl Maria Kertbeny (1824–1882).

8 Karl Hoheisel, “Art. Homosexualität,” in *RAC*, vol. 16, ed. Theodor Klauser (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1994), 289–364, esp. 299: “There are numerous Greek and Latin words that denote, are associated with, or imply homosexuality, depending on the context,” such as παιδεραστία, παιδοφιλεῖν, παιδοπίτης, καταπύγων, and εὐρύπρωκτος, and later μαλακός, ἀνδρόγυνος, and πασχητιῶν/pathicus, among others; Hoheisel also provides a general overview of the ancient sources.

9 Stegemann, “Homosexualität,” 62; cf. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 3 vols. (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 1979/1990).

10 Stegemann, “Homosexualität,” 62 (following Halperin, *Hundred Years*, 130).

11 Ibid., 62.

biblical and early Jewish tradition, for which, in addition to concepts of purity, the creation narratives provide the primary normative framework.¹² When Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 prohibit “a man from ‘using’ another man as a woman, and thus transgressing the boundaries between the sexes”¹³ which are grounded in creation, contextual evidence indicates that the prohibition is probably due to the “pressing need to produce offspring.”¹⁴ However, the way this prohibition

12 Cf. Loader, *Making Sense*, 9–31 (“In the Beginning”), 75–104 (“Sacred Space”). Loader has dealt extensively with this issue in recent years, resulting in a total of five monographs, of which his short work *Making Sense of Sex* offers a synopsis; only two of these works are mentioned here: William Loader, *Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Writings of Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011); idem, *New Testament*.

13 Following Stegemann’s paraphrase of the two regulations in “Homosexualität,” 65. The history of the impact of these verses – especially of Leviticus 20:13 – is catastrophic (beginning with Philo’s reception [see note 16 below]); Erhard S. Gerstenberger, *Das dritte Buch Mose: Leviticus* (ATD 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 271: “In the Western legal tradition, sexual acts between persons of the same sex are still criminal offenses to some extent. The biblical condemnation of homosexuality has led to merciless persecution or ostracism of those with a disposition or inclination toward same-sex sexuality in church history.” There is ongoing exegetical controversy over what exactly the directives in the book of Leviticus are directed against: (1) against forms of male cult prostitution, as Walter Kornfeld argues in *Leviticus* (NEB 6; Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1986), 71 f.; (2) against particular homosexual practices, as Stegemann argues in “Homosexualität,” 63, with reference to Saul M. Olyan, “‘And with a Male You Shall Not Lie the Lying Down of a Woman’: On the Meaning and Significance of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13,” *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 4 (1994): 179–206: “Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 obviously prohibit sexual intercourse (penetration) exclusively, while ignoring other possible sexual acts between men,” and thus “[t]he problem, then, is that a man ‘uses’ another man as a woman, thereby transgressing the boundaries between the sexes, namely the distinctions between man and woman established at creation (Gen 1:27)”; or (3) against male “homosexual” practices in general, as Gerstenberger argues in *Leviticus*, 232, 271 f. Gerstenberger is inclined to think that “the total ban on male homosexuality was a late phenomenon, i. e., a feature of the early Jewish community,” and that “[w]here the actual roots of this brutal rejection of homosexuality lie is obscure. Presumably, as in the case of many taboo regulations, they involve a fear of demons,” which admittedly “have been considered overcome for centuries and are finally being replaced by uninhibited, philanthropic attitudes in the church as well.” Thomas Hieke argues similarly in *Leviticus: Zweiter Teilband: 16–27* (HThK.AT; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2014), 688: “This categorical prohibition is singular in the Bible as well as in the ancient world.” Admittedly, he does not want to exclude a limited interpretation according to which “same-sex relations are forbidden for a man only with certain of his relatives [...] precisely by analogy to the women mentioned [in Lev 18] (i. e., with father, son, brother, grandson, stepson) [...] Homosexual relations with other men would then be permitted”; *ibid.*, 689.

14 See Thomas Hieke’s contribution in this volume; idem., *Leviticus*, 2:688. The actual roots of the biblical repudiation are obscure; “nevertheless, the text as a whole offers a common thread. The context makes it clear that the key to understanding is the production of progeny. On the

is formulated also reveals the underlying problem for the standard social construction of roles: in the “feminization” of a man through another man’s “lying with him as with a woman” (Lev 18:22; 20:13). This also explains why “this prohibition in the Torah applies only to men – not to women.”¹⁵

A brief survey of the writings of Philo of Alexandria – who takes up the prohibition in the Torah, expands upon it, and extends it to apply to pederasty – demonstrates the importance of both of these aspects from the Jewish perspective: the commandment to procreate (cf. Gen 1:28) and the distinction of the sexes in the sense of the creation narrative, which would preclude the “feminization” of a man. According to Philo, whoever violates this prohibition – and this applies to both the active and the (in Philo’s terminology) “feminized man (ὁ ἀνδρόγυνος)” – deserves to be put to death, and he invokes Leviticus 20:13c to support this view.¹⁶ The text does not address same-sex sexual acts between women,¹⁷ as such acts are mentioned only rarely in early Jewish tradition –

one hand, Lev 18 is concerned with preventing incestuous and illegitimate progeny [...], on the other hand, it is concerned with preventing sexual practices that do not lead to progeny; here the social dimension and function of sexuality once again becomes clear.”

15 Stegemann, “Homosexualität,” 63; Hieke, *Leviticus* 2:689: “Women’s homosexual behavior was well known but is not addressed and, since there is no semen involved and it does not concern men’s social status, was probably not considered a problem.”

16 Cf. Philo, *Spec. Laws* 3.37–42, 38–39: “And it is natural for those who obey the law to consider such persons worthy of death, since the law commands that the man-woman (τὸν ἀνδρόγυνον), who adulterates the precious coinage of his nature (τὸ φύσεως νόμισμα), shall die without redemption, not allowing him to live a single day, or even a single hour, as he is a disgrace to himself, and to his family, and to his country, and to the whole race of mankind. And let the man who is devoted to the love of boys (ὁ παιδεραστής) submit to the same punishment, since he pursues that pleasure which is contrary to nature (τὴν παρὰ φύσιν ἡδονήν), and since, as far as depends upon him, he would make the cities desolate, and void, and empty of all inhabitants, wasting his power of propagating his species”; see also *Spec. Laws* 1.325; *QG* 2.49; *Abraham* 135f.; *Contempl. Life* 59–62; and also Josephus (see note 48 below); cf. Hoheisel, “Art. Homosexualität,” 334f. As far as Leviticus 20:13c is concerned, recent exegesis judges differently: “The qualification as an ‘abomination’ marks the act as something that triggers God’s displeasure and wrath, and is therefore to be refrained from to the extent possible. This terminology itself indicates the strongly parenetic character of these texts, and therefore it is only logical to see the punitive *mot* clause not as a ‘death penalty’ to be imposed and executed by human courts, but as a warning against God’s punishment, whatever that might look like”; Hieke, *Leviticus*, 2:797, with reference to Adrian Schenker.

17 In contrast to Loader, *Making Sense*, 134: “He [Philo] reads the prohibitions in Lev 18:22 and 20:13 as targeting both pederasty and adult consensual sex, both male and female.” Loader seems to infer the latter from *Virt.* 20–21, although the text there only addresses men and women who do not dress “in keeping with nature” (19). For details on Philo, see Loader, *Philo*, 2–258.

for example, in the “didactic poem” by an unknown Hellenistic Jew from Alexandria, which has been handed down under the name of Phocylides.¹⁸ The same holds true for the Greek–Hellenistic tradition.¹⁹ Moreover, this finding is also relevant to the interpretation of Romans 1:26.

The early Jewish reception of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 also includes the reflexive move of demarcating Jewish life from the pagan way of life,²⁰ understanding sexual transgressions – such as the “exchange of the sexes” (Wisdom 14:26) – as both a symptom and a consequence of idolatry. The Book of Wisdom²¹ and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, for example, provide material that illustrates this point: “For a pit unto the soul is the sin of fornication, separating it from God, and bringing it near to idols” (Testament of Reuben 4:6; cf. Testament of Simeon 5:3; Testament of Judah 23:2).²² Thus “the nexus between perverted un-

18 Cf. Pseudo-Phocylides 190–192: “Go not beyond natural sexual unions for illicit passion; unions between males are not pleasing even to beasts. *Let not women mimic the sexual role of men at all.*” As Nikolaus Walter notes, we can assume that the didactic poem was composed in Alexandria; as for the dating, “one must think of the time between 100 BCE [at the earliest] and ca. 100 CE [at the latest]. The termination of openly Hellenistic Judaism in Alexandria soon after 100 [...] is to be regarded as the *terminus ante quem*”; see Walter, “Pseudepigraphische jüdisch-hellenistische Dichtung,” in *JSHRZ*, vol. 4.3, ed. Werner Georg Kümmel (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1983), 173–276, here 193. Further evidence from later rabbinic tradition is provided in Pieter W. van der Horst, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides. With Introduction and Commentary* (SVTP 4; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 239 f.

19 But cf. Plato, *Leg.* 636c, in which the Athenian’s speech reads: “one certainly should not fail to observe that when male unites with female for procreation (τῆ θηλείᾳ καὶ τῆ τῶν ἀρρένων φύσει εἰς κοινωνίαν ἰούση τῆ γεννήσεως) the pleasure experienced is held to be due to nature (κατὰ φύσιν), but contrary to nature (παρὰ φύσιν) when male mates with male (ἀρρένων δὲ πρὸς ἄρρενας) or female with female (θηλειῶν πρὸς θηλεία), and that those first guilty of such enormities were impelled by their slavery to pleasure.” See also note 56 below.

20 This is already programmatic in Leviticus 18:1–5: “(3) You shall not do as they do in the land of Egypt, where you lived, and you shall not do as they do in the land of Canaan, to which I am bringing you. You shall not follow their statutes. (4) My ordinances you shall observe and my statutes you shall keep, following them: I am the Lord your God.”

21 Cf. Wisdom 14:12: “For the idea of making idols was the beginning of fornication, and the invention of them was the corruption of life”; Wisdom 14:26–27: “confusion over what is good, forgetfulness of favors, defiling of souls, exchange of sexes (γενέσεως ἐναλλαγῆ), disorder in marriages, adultery, and debauchery. For the worship of idols not to be named is the beginning and cause and end of every evil.”

22 The Testament of Levi 17:11 offers a catalogue of vices of the kind that is familiar to us from the New Testament: “And in the seventh week shall become priests, (who are) idolaters, adulterers, lovers of money, proud, lawless, lascivious, abusers of children and beasts.” On the topic of same-sex sexuality in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, particularly in the Testament of Naphtali, see Hoheisel, “Art. Homosexualität,” 333 f.; Loader, *Philo*, 415–419; see also Matthias Konradt, “Fliehet die Unzucht!” (TestRub 5,5): Sexualethische Perspektiven in den Testa-

derstandings of God and perverted sexual behaviour, present in Wisdom, inspired the same connection made by Paul in Romans 1.”²³ Here as well, it becomes clear how apt the observation made at the beginning of this contribution is – namely that in antiquity, sexuality is not yet perceived as an independent anthropological sphere, but always in the context of overarching discourses, be they discourses of power, structures of domination and dependence, or – as in Paul’s corpus and in Hellenistic Judaism – discourses demarcating Israel’s true religion from pagan idolatry.

2 Where Paul’s Heart Is Not In It: The Apostle on Traditional Paths

Anyone who seeks the beating heart of Pauline ethics inevitably comes across the directive to love in the apostle’s ethical instructions and discourses: “Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law” (Rom 13:10). Or again: “For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision counts for anything; the only thing that counts is faith working through love” (Gal 5:6). This is where the apostle’s heart is! And when he indicates that he is open to other values, as in Philippians 4:8 – “Whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is pleasing, whatever is commendable, if there is any excellence and if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things!” – all of this is ultimately oriented toward concretizing and realizing *agape*. His ethos is certainly Jewish–Hellenistic in terms of both mindset and culture²⁴ – as is also confirmed by his statements on “same-sex” sexual practice – but this imprint stands under the banner of *agape*, even though his directives, rules, and parenetic remarks, which are usually situational, do not often make this explicit.

In the case of the three texts I will discuss in this contribution, this preconception is already evident in the traditional linguistic form of the catalogue of

menten der zwölf Patriarchen,” in *Anthropologie und Ethik im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. Internationales Symposium in Verbindung mit dem Projekt CJHNT, 17.–20. Mai 2012, Heidelberg*, ed. Matthias Konradt and Esther Schläpfer (WUNT 322; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 249–282; on the early Jewish texts, see also Martin Stowasser, “Homosexualität und Bibel: Exegetische und hermeneutische Überlegungen zu einem schwierigen Thema,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 503–526.

²³ Loader, *Making Sense*, 133.

²⁴ See also the contributions in the volume edited by Matthias Konradt and Esther Schläpfer (cited in note 22 above).

vices, which constitutes the setting in which the topic appears in each case (1 Cor 6:9–11; 1 Tim 1:9–11; cf. also Rom 1:28–32). This does not diminish the importance of this topic for the authors, but it does show that they are treading conventional paths here. Moreover, the discourse in Romans 1:18–32 places the topic in a subordinate position, insofar as it serves to illustrate a superordinate thesis with regard to contemporary pagan culture as the Jews perceived it. The function of this topic as a subordinate argument in a limited perspective is in itself extremely important for a reflective hermeneutical approach to the text.

2.1 He Will Not Inherit the Kingdom of God: Observations on the Catalogue of Vices in 1 Corinthians 6:9–11

1 Corinthians 6:9–11 offers a traditional catalogue of vices framed by references to the “heir of the kingdom of God” (1 Cor 6:9b, 10e). Paul did not “invent” this reference either, but adopted it as a discourse formula (cf. 1 Cor 15:50; Eph 5:5; James 2:5; cf. also Mark 10:17). While the term βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is not typical of Paul’s texts, his catalogue follows well-trodden ground. With this expression he concludes his treatment of a specific incident in Corinth, which he sums up as follows: “When any of you has a grievance against another, do you dare to take it to court before the unrighteous, instead of taking it before the saints?” (1 Cor 6:1). “Law and its renunciation in the Christian community” is the theme here.²⁵ At the end, in 1 Corinthians 6:11, he assures his addressees that they have been “sanctified,” even “justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Within the guidelines set by these concepts – “justified” versus “unrighteous” – the catalogue fleshes out the ethical consequences of the addressees’ new status before God. If we include the framing device, the text reads:

- 9 a Or do you not know
 b *that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God?*
 c Do not deceive yourselves!
 d Neither the sexually licentious, nor idolators,
 e nor adulterers,
 nor the effeminate (μαλακοί), nor those who sleep/lie with men (ἀρσενοκοῖται),²⁶

²⁵ Andreas Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9.1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 133; see also Michael Theobald, “Vom Werden des Rechts in der Kirche: Beobachtungen zur Sprachform von Weisungen im Corpus Pastorale und bei Paulus,” *ZNW* 106 (2015): 65–95.

²⁶ The NRSV/CE version has “male prostitutes” and “sodomites,” and thus transports massive value judgments into the text. It is in urgent need of revision.

- 10 a nor thieves, nor those who covet,
 b not drunkards,
 c not blasphemers,
 d not scoundrels
 e *Shall inherit the kingdom of God.*
- 11 a And such were some of you!

“The unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God!” To illustrate what “unrighteous” (ἀδικία) means concretely, the catalogue offers ten examples – vices that are “consistently considered reprehensible, also according to Hellenistic–Roman moral standards.”²⁷

At issue is the translation of the phrase in verse 9d, which is of interest here: μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται. Whereas μαλακός occurs often in extra-biblical Greek, albeit with quite different meanings,²⁸ ἀρσενοκοίτης is not attested prior to Paul’s use of the term. It is a neologism based on Leviticus 20:13 in the Septuagint: “And whoever lies with a man (ἄρσενος) sexual intercourse (as) with a woman (κοίτην γυναικός), both have committed an abomination” (we find the same terminology in Lev 18:22). In extra-biblical Greek, the expression first occurs in the imperial period.²⁹ If the term μαλακός denotes the passive role in homoerotic sexual practice, then ἀρσενοκοίτης denotes the active role. However, it is unclear whether this is a reference specifically to pederasty (boy love),³⁰ or whether such a limitation of the restriction is not intended. The fact

27 Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 140: “including the sphere of homoeroticism” (with reference to Hans Herter, “Art. Effeminatus,” in *RAC*, vol. 4, 620–642); but there are also “critical statements” about homosexual practices in Greek literature, as an example of which Lindemann refers to *Anthologia Graeca* IX 686: “The wanderer who comes to Thessalonica reads in a gate inscription that it is a well-governed city (βάρβαρον οὐ τρομέεις, οὐκ ἄρρενας ἀρσενοκοίτας) and need fear neither barbarians nor men who espouse men.” See also note 54 below.

28 See the discussion in note 8 above; μαλακός = soft. In extra-biblical Greek, the word refers to men who act like women; in Latin: *effeminatus*.

29 Cf. Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 1,1–6,11)* (EKK 7.1; Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1991), 430–432.

30 Jacob Kremer, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (RNT; Regensburg: Pustet, 1997), 116: The terms μαλακοὶ and ἀρσενοκοῖται both, “according to most interpreters, denote those men–women are never mentioned in this context – who passively (invitingly) or actively engage in same-sex intercourse. The widespread translation of μαλακοὶ and ἀρσενοκοῖται as ‘catamites’ and ‘pederasts’ rightly assumes that these are ‘merely’ references to offenses with adolescents (pederasty, the love of boys, was very common in the pagan environment and often praised as the ideal). (On the other hand, only Rom 1:27 [cf. Lev 18:22; 20:13] speaks unequivocally of ‘men with men’); Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 133 has: “neither effeminates nor pederasts.” In fact, pederasty was the dominant form of homosexual contact in antiquity; see Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 29–62.

that this neologism is grounded in the directives in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 speaks in favor of the second hypothesis.³¹

Verse 11a is a remarkable conclusion to this list, demonstrating that Paul is looking at “the behavior, not at the underlying predisposition. Otherwise he could not say: ‘And such were some of you!’”³²

2.2 The Torah Is for the Lawless: Observations on the Catalogue of Vices in 1 Timothy 1:8–11

Closely related to 1 Corinthians 6:9–11 is 1 Timothy 1:8–11, where once again we find the term ἀρσενικοίτης in the context of a traditional catalogue of vices, with a total of fourteen vices or perverse attitudes. As the parallel columns in the following synopsis illustrate, there is some evidence to suggest that Pseudo-Paul arranged the vices – some of which occur in pairs, and some individually – in accordance with the Decalogue. The fact that verses 9f–10c refer to commandments five through ten is undisputed, but the theory that verses 9c–e refer to the first four commandments is not. “Direct terminological echoes of the Decalogue” are not present in either case.³³ While the wider context concerns the proper use of the Torah (cf. v. 8c) – a question about which our author is in dispute with his opponents (cf. 1 Tim 1:3–7 immediately prior to the passage we are considering here) – verses 9–10 make clear that he ascribes to the Torah an ordering function for moral life, with a particular focus on the Decalogue. The idea that he un-

31 Dieter Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 217: “Attempts to restrict the Pauline statements to prostitution or pederasty fail on the basis of the general expression ἀρσενικοίται, which is oriented to the OT, and which in the parallel in Rom 1:26f. is also extended to same-sex intercourse among women.” I agree with the first part of this statement, but not with the second (see below on Rom 1:26–27). See Loader, *New Testament*, 331, which asserts that it is “certainly not limited to the latter (= pederasty)”; see also William L. Petersen, “Can ARSENIKOITAI be translated by ‘Homosexuals’? (1 Cor 6.9; 1 Tim 1.10),” *VigChr* 40 (1986): 187–191.

32 See Zeller, *1 Kor*, 218. He continues: “Thus [Paul] does not do justice to the complex biological, psychological, and social conditions of homosexuality.” See also Kremer (*1 Cor*, 116), who argues: “The widespread designation ‘homosexuals’ is in any case unsuitable in this instance, especially since this term, according to the modern view, includes not only perpetrators [*sic!*], but also those predisposed [*sic!*] to it.”

33 Jürgen Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKK 15; Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1988), 75f: “Lists of vices that paralleled the commandments on the second tablet of the Decalogue were widespread in Judaism.”

derstands the Decalogue “as a normative codification of the divine law,” however, cannot be inferred from the text.³⁴

1 Timothy 1:8–11

References to the Decalogue

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>8 a Now we know
 b that <i>the law</i> is good,
 c if one uses it legitimately.</p> <p>9 a This means understanding
 b that <i>the law</i> is laid down not for the innocent
 c but for the lawless and disobedient,
 d for the godless and sinful,
 e for the unholy and profane,
 f for those who kill their father or mother,
 g for murderers,</p> <p>10 a for those who sleep with males (ἀρσενικοῖται),
 b slave traders,
 c liars, perjurers,
 d and whatever else is contrary to the sound teaching</p> <p>11 a that conforms to the <i>glorious gospel</i> of the blessed God,
 b which he entrusted to me.</p> | <p>Offenses against the realm of the divine (first four commandments?)
 Fifth commandment
 Sixth commandment
 Seventh commandment
 Eighth commandment
 Ninth commandment</p> |
|---|--|

The question of translation, which is pernicious in 1 Corinthians 6:9, also arises in 1 Timothy 1:10a. Again, the fact that the neologism ἀρσενικοῖτης is a reference to Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 speaks against the widespread understanding in the sense of pederasty,³⁵ as was also the case with 1 Corinthians 6:9 above. This is particularly clear here because the term occurs in a(nother) vice catalogue and stands under the banner of the Torah. It is also noteworthy that the author indi-

34 Ibid., 75 f.: “What speaks against this assumption [that the text also refers to the first tablet, and hence to the Decalogue as a whole], besides the fact that neither Jewish–Hellenistic nor NT catalogues take up the first tablet of the Decalogue, is the observation that nowhere in the NT is there an attempt to introduce the Decalogue into the paraenesis as a normative factor. There is only a reception of the Ten Commandments ‘in the context of central theological statements’ [H. Hübner], but not for the sake of the Decalogue itself. Thus here as well, the Ten Commandments seem to serve little more than a merely heuristic function. They are not yet understood as the sum total of God’s enduring law.”

35 Roloff (1 Tim 60) translates this as: “Knabenschänder.” Here we also note that many English translations render this phrase with the term “sodomites” or “homosexuals.” The King James Version translates the phrase as: “them that defile themselves with mankind,” while the New International Version has: “those practicing homosexuality.” See also Philip H. Towner (*The Letters to Timothy and Titus*, NICNT [Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006], 122), who renders the phrase: “for those practicing homosexuality.” The term “homosexuality” in translations should be avoided at all costs because it introduces modern concepts into the ancient texts.

rectly connects Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 to the seventh commandment in the Decalogue, thus giving high priority to the directives of the “Torah of Holiness.”

On the other hand, from a hermeneutical point of view, we should bear in mind that in Paul’s teaching – including here in 1 Timothy – the “law” is also brought into relationship with the “gospel” (v. 11). As Jürgen Roloff points out:

the pastoral epistles have tried to hold on to the Pauline heritage, insofar as they proclaimed – with Paul – believers’ fundamental freedom from the law. [...] Their answer to the inevitable question of where the law, if its salvific function is rejected, finds a place as a regulatory function for Christians, is that the sound doctrine that originates from the gospel fulfills this regulatory function. This does not happen in the law’s manner of coercion and threat, but in that the gospel creates a new possibility of salvific, communal life for believers, namely *love*. The gospel points to the existing orders of the world and society, not by threatening, and still less by establishing a meritorious principle of achievement, but by bestowing and enabling.³⁶

These remarks are based on 1 Timothy 1:5, immediately prior to our passage, in which Pseudo-Paul programmatically declares with respect to the law: “But the aim of all such instruction (τῆς παραγγελίας) is love that comes from a pure heart, a good conscience, and sincere faith.”

These rather general hermeneutical considerations are important in addressing the catalogue of vices in 1 Timothy. If the Torah in general or the Decalogue in particular displays a rather defensive, negative character – “the law is laid down not for the innocent but for the lawless and disobedient” (v. 9b–c) – then love prevails positively, as the power of salvation. Love is the fundamental principle that governs the moral conduct of the just. Individual norms must be subordinated to and measured by this principle.

2.3 “Against Nature”: On the Argumentation in Romans 1:26–27

In the case of Rom 1:26–27 – which the most important passage in relation to our topic, along with Leviticus 18:22 and 20:3 – the context in which the verse is placed is crucial, which is why we must turn to this issue first.³⁷

³⁶ Roloff, *1 Tim*, 81 (emphasis in the original).

³⁷ Hardly any other passage in Romans has been the subject of so many studies in recent years as Romans 1:26–27; see Michael Theobald, *Der Römerbrief* (EdF 294; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000), 142–145, namely the excursus on “Das Argument ‘contra naturam’ und die Homosexualität (1,26f.). Zur ethischen Normativität der Schöpfungsordnung”

It is striking that Paul does not address the topic in the parenetic, moral-exhortatory part of his letter (Rom 12–15:13), but in the argumentative, introductory part. Same-sex sexual practices do not seem to have been a “pastoral problem” among the letter’s addressees. Moreover, when we consider the argumentation in Romans 1:16–31, the topic ranks quite low in terms of the logic employed. Let us therefore take a closer look at the structure of this argumentation.

Romans 1:26–27 form part of a kind of prophetic judgment speech in which Paul exposes humankind’s sinful, fallen nature: in Romans 1:18–32 that of the ἔθνη, the the nations,³⁸ and in Romans 2 that of his own people, the Jews. Why does Paul attach such importance to demonstrating the sinful depravity of all humankind? We find the answer in the letter’s main theme, formulated in the central thesis in Romans 1:16–17: only the gospel of Jesus Christ can save people – whether Jew or Gentile – from the calamity of the world. This gospel is justification and life. However, this means that all people – and, according to Paul, especially the Jews – are entangled in the calamities of this world, or as it says toward the end of the prophetic judgment speech in Romans 3:9: “all are

(with references); as well as the list in Michael Wolter, *Der Brief an die Römer (Teilband 1: Röm 1–8)* (EKK 6.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie/Patmos, 2014), 133f.; see also Loader, *New Testament* 293–326; Diana M. Swancutt, “‘The Disease of Effemination’: The Charge of Effeminacy and the Verdict of God (Romans 1:18–2:16),” in *New Testament Masculinities*, ed. Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson (SBL Semeia Studies 45; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 193–233; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 172–181; Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 217–219, 229f.; David J. Murphy, “More Evidence Pertaining to ‘Their Females’ in Romans 1:26,” *JBL* 138 (2019): 221–240; Martin Ebner, “Verbietet das Neue Testament ‘Homosexualität’? Neutestamentliche Grundlagen zu einer aktuellen Streitfrage,” *Lebendige Seelsorge* 70 (2019): 55–60; Ansgar Wucherpfennig, *Sexualität bei Paulus* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2020).

38 In Romans 1:18, however, which constitutes the “heading” of the whole argument in 1:19–3:20, Paul avoids the word ἔθνη and instead speaks *in principle* of “men.” On the one hand, this can be ascribed to the function of this verse as a “heading”; on the other hand, it is a clever rhetorical device, because this speech – which is peculiarly detached and addresses men’s transgressions and their just consequences in the third person – is intended for an interlocutor who has been steeped in *Jewish* thought. This interlocutor can only agree with the remarks in 1:18–32, since Paul, in accordance with his own religious background, presents humankind’s situation from an entirely Jewish perspective, as the hopeless situation of *others* – that is, the Gentiles. The attentive reader will have already recognized that Paul is up to something here by the fact that he turns the tables in 2:1, so that the one who has already applauded this prophetic judgment speech is afflicted with his own guilt, and thus has already pronounced judgment on himself. In contrast to Jewish apocalyptic literature, Paul refuses to divide humankind into the pious and the godless: “There is *no one* who is righteous, *not even one*,” he declares in Romans 3:10, taking up Ecclesiastes 7:20 LXX.

under the power of sin.” Paul defines sin (ἡ ἀμαρτία) in the introduction to the whole judgment speech in Romans 1:18, namely “ungodliness and wickedness” – the refusal to acknowledge God as God, and thus also the rejection of his will, which demands justice in human coexistence. According to Paul’s thesis in Romans 1:18, such doubly determinate behavior – negating the creator as well as the fellow human being – has always been subject to God’s wrath: that is, to the threat of his judgment. Paul explicates this point in what follows. On the one hand, he declares that anyone who denies the creator is culpable, and he justifies this assertion on the grounds that people always had the chance to recognize him through his works (Rom 1:19–20).³⁹ On the other hand, he shows this denial of the creator – for which the offender is culpable – leads to punishment, which consists in the fact that God “gives them up” to the depths of their impure hearts (Rom 1:24, 26, 28), so that the punishment takes the form of new offenses against his will. Three times Paul expounds on this connection between guilt and punishment with great rhetorical force (Rom 1:21–24, 25–27, 28–31).⁴⁰ Paul’s description of their guilt becomes shorter and shorter, while his description of their punishment becomes longer and longer. The reader is left with the impression of a cycle of sin in which people are inexcusably (Rom 1:20) but also inescapably involved. The second description in verses 25–27 is of particular interest for our purposes here:

- 25 a because they [the people] *exchanged* the truth about God for a lie
 b and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator,
 c who is blessed forever! Amen.
- 26 a *For this reason* (διὰ τοῦτο) God gave them [the people] up to degrading passions.
 b *Then* (γάρ) *their females* exchanged *natural* [use] (τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν) for *unnatural* (παρὰ φύσιν),
- 27 a in the same way (ὁμοίως) also *the males*, giving up the *natural* use of femaleness (τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας),
 b were consumed with passion for one another.
 c *Males* committed shameless acts with *males* (ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν)
 d and received in their own persons the due penalty for their error.

The text evinces a stereotypical manner of speech and thought. The fact that people “exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – as stated in the preceding verse 25a–b, which the *berakha* “who is blessed forever” further underscores rhetorically –

39 In his summary of this argument in verse 21a–c: “for though they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him (ἠὺχαρίστησαν)” (cf. verse 25), he also hints at human-kind’s basic sin, which amounts to “not wanting to thank the Creator.”

40 Cf. the diagram with details of the respective parallel formulations in Wolter, *Röm I*, 135.

takes aim at pagan idolatry as the worship of creation (cf. Rom 1:23). Thus this verse reproduces the familiar Jewish prejudice against pagan depravity. Those in the Greek tradition who sought God – such as Socrates and Plato, to name just a few – are left out, without this becoming a problem in any way.

The subsequent presentation of God’s punishment in verses 26–27 is also stereotypical: the perversion of sexuality as a consequence of idolatry,⁴¹ which also establishes a linguistic correspondence between the “exchange” of “natural intercourse” for intercourse that is “unnatural”⁴² and the previous “exchange” through which the creature is worshipped in place of the Creator.⁴³

It is important for the logic of the argument and the significance of the passage that Paul once again formulates a kind of subheading in verse 26a, which he then explains in verses 26b–27, indicated by a justificatory γάρ: “For this reason God gave them [the people] up to degrading passions.” As all-encompassing as this heading sounds, the explanation that follows is equally all-encompassing, for it was probably not true of all pagans that “*their females exchanged natural* [use] (τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν) for *unnatural* (παρὰ φύσιν)” (v. 26c), and likewise that all “*the males*” gave up the “*natural use of femaleness* (τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας).” The terminology here is significant. By using the substantive adjectives αἱ θήλειαι (“the females”) and οἱ ἄρσενες (“the males”) here, rather than the standard nouns αἱ γυναῖκες (“the women”) and οἱ ἄνδρες (“the men”), Paul signals that he is concerned with “biological gender identity” (sex) and that “social gender identity” (gender) takes a back seat. “Even where the sexual practices of men and women are negotiated in terms of their conformity with or deviation from “nature” outside the New Testament, these adjectives are generally used.”⁴⁴ This alone indicates the distance between this text and the modern concept of homosexuality as an aspect of personal identity. The meaning of the first statement about “the females” in verse 26b is controversial. How are we to interpret this?

41 See above, notes 21 and 22.

42 See the Testament of Naphtali 3:4–5: “But ye shall not be so, my children, recognizing in the firmament, in the earth, and in the sea, and in all created things, the Lord who made all things, that ye become not as Sodom, which *changed the order of nature* (ἐνήλλαξεν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς).” Order (τάξις) is a key word in the Testament of Naphtali; see 2:8, 9; 3:2, 4; 8:9, 10.

43 Behind this correspondence between deed and punishment is the Jewish principle of appropriate retribution, in accordance with the link between what one does and who one becomes.

44 Wolter, *Röm I*, 149 (with references).

The idea that Paul had lesbian relationships in mind here – which is the common interpretation⁴⁵ – is not convincing, because early Judaism hardly considers such relationships worth mentioning, and the Old Testament does not address them anywhere.⁴⁶ The primary weakness of this interpretation is that it interprets verse 26b along the same lines as the subsequent verse, but there is no formulation in 26b which corresponds to verse 27c – that is, whereas 27c has “male with male,” there is nothing in 26b about “female with female.” So what does Paul mean by “natural” and “unnatural” here? If he does not have lesbian relationships in mind, then the most plausible of the interpretations offered seems to be the idea that women exchanged their natural sexual practice for an “unnatural” one in which they practice heterosexual but non-coital sexual intercourse for contraceptive purposes.⁴⁷ In this case, the natural practice of female sexuality is determined by the Jewish conviction (which also partly overlaps with Greek–Hellenistic ideas⁴⁸) that the “natural” purpose of sexual union is procreation – in line with the exhortation in Genesis 1:28: “Be fruitful and multiply.”⁴⁹ This interpretation is supported by the fact that Romans 1:18–32 is measured against the order of creation in other respects,⁵⁰ and also

45 Zeller, *1 Kor.* 217; see more recently Loader, *Making Sense*, 137 f.; and Jewett, *Romans* 176. Wucherpfennig (*Sexualität* 124) does not exclude this interpretation.

46 See notes 15, 18, and also 19 above.

47 See also James E. Miller, “The Practices of Romans 1:26: Homosexual or Heterosexual?,” *NT* 37 (1995): 1–11; Roy Bowen Ward, “Why Unnatural? The Tradition behind Romans 1:26–27,” *HThR* 90 (1997): 263–284; Murphy, “More Evidence” (with illuminating references to patristic exegesis), 221: “Although it is the interpretation attested first in the church, AO [= the view that the females took up anal and/or oral sex with men] has been revived only recently.”

48 Cf. Ward, “Why Unnatural,” 269–277 (on Philo and Pseudo-Phocylides); cf. also Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.199: “But, then, what are our laws about marriage? That law owns no other mixture of sexes but that *which nature hath appointed* (κατὰ φύσιν), of a man with his wife, and that this be used only for the procreation of children (εἰ μέλλοι τέκνων ἕνεκα γίνεσθαι). But it abhors the mixture of a male with a male (τὴν δὲ πρὸς ἄρρενας ἀρρένων); and if any one do that, death is its punishment”; see also 2.273–275.

49 Ward (“Why Unnatural,” 264–267) points out that the κατὰ (παρὰ) φύσιν terminology is taken from the Timaeus creation myth: “Femaleness is defined by procreation in which the female of the species is the passive receptor of the male seed. The active/passive dichotomy, representing male citizens and women respectively, was already the cultural norm in Plato’s time, yet he did offer an innovative rationale for this dichotomy and gave it normative value *in the order of creation* as κατὰ φύσιν” (267, my emphasis). See also note 19 above, as well as the example in Plato, *Leg.* 836c, where he describes intercourse among males as “unnatural” (τὸ μὴ φύσει τοῦτο εἶναι).

50 See verses 19, 23, and 25. See also Stowasser, “Homosexualität,” 518: “The formulation of Romans 1:23 is largely inspired by the order of creatin in Genesis 1:26–7, which is in any case rounded off in Genesis 1:28 with the mandate to multiply. The theme of creation is also present

by the specific terminology I have already mentioned – “the female” and “the male” – which unilaterally emphasizes biological sex and accentuates procreation and childbearing.⁵¹

This interpretation of verse 26b suits the subsequent verse 27 quite well. There is a good reason why the word ὁμοίως (meaning “just the same”) is used to link these two verses: “just as” “the females” violate the exclusively procreative purpose of sexuality by “using” their sexuality as described in the text,⁵² “the males” do the same when they turn to same-sex sexual practices.

An orientation around the traditional purpose of marriage – namely procreation – thus connects the two statements about women and men. Both are sweeping statements, and while the one about women lacks any specificity, the one about men has “little or nothing” to do with the circumstances obtaining in the non-Jewish sphere. It was not the case that

“the” – i. e., all – men abandoned “normal” heterosexual sexual intercourse, nor were heterosexual and homosexual relationships mutually exclusive. Moreover, Paul’s presentation of inter-male sexual practice in v. 27b–c as a relationship characterized by reciprocal egalitarianism [they “were consumed with passion for one another”; “males with males”] does not correspond to reality in such a sweeping way, because like every sexual relationship,

in Romans 1:25; the designation of wrongdoing as παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα even created a linguistic approximation to that of 1:26: παρὰ φύσιν”; and similarly Loader, *New Testament*, 313–315. One must also keep in mind that Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 are to be understood in terms of the guiding principle of procreation; see note 14 above.

51 Cf. Genesis 1:27, 5:2 LXX; Mark 10:6 = Matthew 19:4; Galatians 3:28. The same terminology is also found in Plato (cf. Ward, “Why Unnatural,” 264–267: “θῆλυ differs from γυνή inasmuch as the former denotes one who bears and nurses offspring, whether human or animal, while γυνή refers to any human woman.” Wucherpfennig (*Sexualität*, 108) denies this connection, though without compelling reasons: “The idea that sexual activity acquires its natural legitimacy only through the production of offspring is not to be found in him [Paul].” Evaluating the conclusion that a condemnation of lesbian relations in Jewish literature is first attested in Pseudo-Phocylides (see note 18 above), Klaus Haacker (*Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* [ThHK 6; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999]) argues that “the generally held formulation in v. 26 is very difficult to explain as an allusion to a tradition presumed to be known and recognized. [...] I therefore understand it as incorporating the warning against sexual intercourse with animals which immediately follows the condemnation of intercourse between men in Lev 18:23, and which expressly includes women.” But why then does Paul allude to Leviticus 18:23 and 24 in reverse order? Thus we see that Haacker’s alternative interpretation is also too narrow.

52 This is also true of intercourse which takes place between “females,” but Paul does not address this in v. 26b (see above).

such relationships was also based on the distinction between active and passive roles, and thereby mapped social hierarchies.⁵³

Thus Paul declares that which was forbidden by the Jewish moral law according to Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 – namely same-sex sexual relations between men – to be a behavior typical of ἔθνη, the people of the nations.⁵⁴ Here he uses this Jewish anti-pagan stereotype to illustrate the fact that all people, concretely the “Gentiles,” are entangled in the calamity burdening the world – thus operating on the lowest level of his argumentation, so to speak, by reproducing this cliché for rhetorical effect, exploiting his readers’ expected consent. Both of these factors prevent us from placing Romans 1:26–27 at the center of Paul’s ethics.

3 On the Need to Reform the Catechism of the Catholic Church

Are the Pauline statements on same-sex sexual practice – especially in Romans 1:26–27 – still applicable to contemporary discussions of the topic? As is well known, the 1993 Catechism of the Catholic Church (revised in 1997) answers this question in the affirmative, referring to Paul – and specifically to Romans 1:26–27 – as the basis for the teaching “that homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered” and “are contrary to the natural law” because “they close the sexual

⁵³ Wolter, *Röm I*, 152; with reference to verse 26b, Wolter abstains from any further interpretation: “Paul merely says that there are women who exchange ‘natural’ sexual intercourse for the ‘unnatural’ – he leaves open what it is they do.”

⁵⁴ The *Letter of Aristeus* puts it as follows: “For most of the rest of humankind defile themselves when they have associations, committing great injustice [...] For not only do they procure males, but also they defile mothers and even still daughters. We, however, have been kept apart from these things” (*Let. Aris.* 152–153). We should note, with Roloff, that same-sex love in the Greek world was “by no means universally morally accepted, despite its prevalence”; Roloff, *1 Tim*, 77, with reference to Hans Licht, *Die Homoerotik in der griechischen Literatur* (Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Sexualforschung 3.3; Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1921). According to Swancutt (“Disease”), Paul has Stoic philosophers in mind in Romans 1:18–32. Wucherpfennig (*Sexualität*) adopts this view and states with reference to 1:27: “It means that Stoic teachers humiliated their students through homosexual activity” (125). But there is no indication that this sweeping statement should be limited in this way; moreover, Romans 2:1 (about which Wucherpfennig claims: “Here Paul overturns the socially dominant philosophy with a caricature of the self-righteous Stoic sage”) does not permit such a specification, since Paul says: “Therefore you have no excuse, whoever you are, when you judge others.”

act to the gift of life” (no. 2357). The corresponding note on this text also includes Genesis 19, thus transmitting an uncritical moral disqualification of “homosexual acts” as sodomy.⁵⁵ As for Romans 1:26–27, the Catechism uses these verses indiscriminately to develop its own doctrine of natural law, ignoring their context and disregarding their rhetorical character. There are three main arguments against such a use of Scripture.

First, for Paul, same-sex sexual practices would connote a deliberate turning away from “natural intercourse with women,” which is why he also understands such practices as sin – irrespective of the overriding idea that they are also a vehicle for God’s punishment. In the Greek tradition, we occasionally encounter voices that are aware of the possibility of same-sex sexual practice based on a predisposition,⁵⁶ but in the case of Paul’s Jewish perspective, such a concept

55 Here the Catechism aligns itself with a long tradition stretching back to antiquity; cf. Hoheisel, “Art. Homosexualität,” 329f. The 1986 “letter” to the bishops from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (*Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons* [Rome: Vatican, 1986], no. 6, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19861001_homosexual-persons_en.html [accessed April 21, 2021]), is even more explicit: “Thus, in Genesis 19:1–11, the deterioration due to sin [since the fall] continues in the story of the men of Sodom. There can be no doubt of the moral judgment made there against homosexual relations.” The “letter” also gives an account of the underlying hermeneutics. Number 5 acknowledges that “it is quite true that the Biblical literature owes to the different epochs in which it was written a good deal of its varied patterns of thought and expression (*Dei Verbum* 12),” but it counters this by noting “a clear consistency within the Scriptures themselves on the moral issue of homosexual behaviour,” which it adopts as “the solid foundation of a constant Biblical testimony” on which Church tradition, unbroken to this day, “is thus based.” Moreover, “it is likewise essential to recognize that the Scriptures are not properly understood when they are interpreted in a way which contradicts the Church’s living Tradition.”

56 Aristotle, for example, speaks of pederasty as a behavior which arises “in some cases from natural disposition, and in others from habit, as with those who have been abused from childhood”; *Nicomachean Ethics* 7.5, 1148b. See also Plato, *Symp.* 191d–193d: “Thus, each of us is the matching half of a human being, since we have been severed like a flatfish, two coming from one, and each part is always seeking its other half [...] Those women who are split from a woman, however, have no interest at all in men, but rather are oriented toward women [...] Those who are split from the male (ἄρρενας) pursue males (τὰ ἄρρενα). While they are boys, since they are a slice of a male, they are fond of men and enjoy lying with men and becoming entwined with them. These are the best of the boys and young men, and at the same time they are the most manly in nature (φύσει). Anyone who says they are shameless is mistaken, for they do this, not from shamelessness, but from courage, manliness, and masculinity, welcoming what is like themselves. There is a definite proof of this: Only men of this sort are completely successful in the affairs of the city. When they become men, they are lovers of boys and by nature (φύσει) are not interested in marriage and having children, though they are forced into it by cus-

is not even a distant possibility.⁵⁷ But if contemporary human sciences substantiate the existence of permanent same-sex sexual orientations or predispositions, due to whatever factors, then the Pauline texts can no longer be used as an argumentative authority for a serious theological anthropology that is in conversation with the human sciences. With Stegemann and others, I argue that it is anachronistic to read the biblical texts along the hermeneutical lines of what we understand as “homosexuality” today.⁵⁸

Second, in the context of his Jewish tradition, Paul only speaks of same-sex sexual practices;⁵⁹ he is not able to conceive of them as an expression of person-

tom (ὕπὸ τοῦ νόμου). They would be satisfied to live all the time with one another without marrying.” Cf. Hoheisel, “Art. Homosexualität,” 310 f.; see also Zeller, *1 Kor*, 218 n. 140.

57 In contrast, Haacker (*Brief des Paulus*, 54) observes: “It is widely overlooked [...] that Paul, under the auspice of παρέδωκεν αὐτούς, alludes to an irresistible, fateful homosexual inclination, which he interprets theologically, while other ancient sources explain the phenomenon astrologically. Thus one cannot solve the hermeneutical problem of the relevant biblical texts by claiming that antiquity did not yet recognize the phenomenon of ‘constitutional’ homoerotic inclinations.” On the other hand, it must be said that the wording in Romans 1 does not intend to abrogate a person’s responsibility for their actions. Otherwise the speech, which seeks to hold its readers responsible for their actions, would lose its argumentative force (see note 39 above). See also Jewett (*Romans*, 173), who argues: “In contrast to traditional moralizing based on this passage, sexual perversion is, in Paul’s view, ‘the result of God’s wrath, not the reason for it’ (Käsemann).”

58 See section 1 above. It is precisely such an anachronistic reading that characterizes the Catholic Church’s documents. The Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany is more advanced than the Catechism in this area and has issued a much more nuanced document on the subject: *Mit Spannungen leben: Eine Orientierungshilfe des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland zum Thema ‘Homosexualität’* (Living with Tension: The Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany’s Guide to the Topic of “Homosexuality”), EKD 57 (February 26, 1996), <https://archiv.ekd.de/EKD-Texte/44736.html> (accessed December 15, 2020). Concerning the biblical evidence (in chapter 2), on the one hand this “guide” states: “The thesis that there is no (explicit) mention of predispositional, premeditated homosexuality in the Bible is true, but says nothing about whether and to what extent such a view of homosexuality would modify or correct the respective biblical statements”; see 2.3. But can this really be a matter of modification or correction, and not rather a dismissal of the biblical passages in question? On the other hand, after appraising Jesus’s ethos, for example, the document arrives at the following assessment of the issue, which admittedly still seems fractured: “based on the overall testimony of the Bible, it must be said that in forming a homosexual relationship (as with any other interpersonal relationship), the decisive factor is whether it is lived out in love for God and for humankind, which also means: whether it encompasses a readiness to accept the burdens of a relationship. The tension between the biblical opposition to homosexual practice as such and the affirmation of its ethical formation according to the will of God does not therefore disappear, but can be understood and endured on this basis.” Obviously the principle of *sola scriptura* plays an obstructive role here.

59 Cf. note 44 above.

al identity. In our contemporary context, however, the issue in many ways is one of personal dignity and the rights of people in same-sex partnerships,⁶⁰ on the basis of which we must draw the conclusion that Paul is simply not an appropriate discussion partner for us today – at least as far as Romans 1:26–27 is concerned.

Third, while Paul orients himself in Romans 1 as a Jewish theologian concerned with the order of creation, exegetical analysis also demonstrates that the way in which he sets the “natural” in opposition to the “unnatural” is at the same time part of a “rhetorical strategy” that is “solely intended to discredit behaviors that contradict (one’s own) cultural conventions.”⁶¹ However, his theological classification of the topic under the order of creation does not simply dissolve into rhetoric, which is why this passage calls for a theological hermeneutics. What Catholic doctrine describes as an immutable “law of nature” must be rethought from the perspective of a historically oriented theological anthropology.⁶² Sexuality is always also a social construct.⁶³ Therefore the question is

60 When the Catechism of the Catholic Church states that “homosexual persons are called to chastity” (no. 2359), it demonstrates its inability to consider the issue from the position of holistic personhood. This is also demonstrated in the revealing statement on “homosexual acts” (no. 2357): “They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity.” The Catechism considers the immutability of the Church’s moral teaching more important than addressing the real-life circumstances of same-sex oriented people who demand answers from the faith. Thus it states: “tradition has always declared that ‘homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered’” (no. 2357). This *topos* of a constant, unchanging church doctrine which determines all church documents could become a snare for us today.

61 Wolter, *Röm I*, 153. He continues: “What has always been considered ‘natural’ is what the majority does, while deviation from the norm has been devalued as ‘unnatural.’ Such argumentation is always solely concerned with marginalizing people who deviate from the socially prevailing norm. What people deem ‘natural’ and ‘unnatural’ is therefore in reality nothing more than a cultural construct.” Moreover, because “people’s sexual practice [...] is always embedded (in) culturally mediated and learned patterns of perception and behavior,” from this perspective it is also “impossible to distinguish between ‘natural’ and ‘unnatural’ approaches to human sexuality.” See also Jewett, *Romans*, 177: “Paul is raising a cultural norm to the level of a ‘natural’ and thus biological principle, which would probably have to be formulated differently today.” Longenecker (*Romans*, 230) takes a different approach. In a major scholarly commentary (with Charles Talbert) in 2016, under the heading “Contextualization for Today,” he succinctly declares: “if homosexual acts are wrong, those committing them are sinners, like the rest of us, who are in need of a Savior. So Christians are called to show Christ’s love to them, not a radical intolerance.”

62 The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith’s *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church* (see note 55), however, pulls the rug out from under this possibility by starting from a doctrine of creation interpreted in terms of natural law: “Providing a basic plan for understanding this entire discussion of homosexuality is the theology of creation we find in Genesis. God, in his in-

whether theological anthropology, in conversation with the human sciences, should perhaps come to consider homosexual and heterosexual predispositions as variants of sexuality and as a gift – as a sign of the diversity of God’s good creation. This would require an approach that places the human person, with all of their characteristics and possibilities, at the center of theological discourse.

As the author of Romans 1:26–27 (as well as 1 Cor 6:9), for the three reasons mentioned above, Paul may no longer be an authoritative interlocutor for us today. Nevertheless, he offers important insights elsewhere that support us in our question regarding the theological grounds on which we might situate the Church as a true home for gay and lesbian people. In particular, Galatians 3:28 is a text to which we must turn our attention as we conclude.

4 The Significance of Galatians 3:28 for an Ecclesiastical Accommodation of Different Personal Identities and Orientations

As we have seen in our discussion above, Romans 1:26–27 certainly does not stand at the center of the gospel. The maxim in Galatians 3:28, however, is of the utmost importance for Pauline ecclesiology, as demonstrated not only by its high significance in the overall argumentation of the Letter to the Galatians, but also by the fact that it is reiterated in 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Colossians 3:11. It is possible that Paul did not formulate it himself, but learned it – along with other gospel principles – from the church in Antioch and subsequently adopted it. It reads:

finite wisdom and love, brings into existence all of reality as a reflection of his goodness. He fashions mankind, male and female, in his own image and likeness. Human beings, therefore, are nothing less than the work of God himself; and in the complementarity of the sexes, they are called to reflect the inner unity of the Creator. They do this in a striking way in their cooperation with him in the transmission of life by a mutual donation of the self to the other”; see no. 6. The proposition derived from this, which is also decisive for other moral-theological questions currently being debated, therefore reads as follows: “It is only in the marital relationship that the use of the sexual faculty can be morally good”; see no. 7. It follows that “[a] person engaging in homosexual behaviour therefore acts immorally.” The same applies to a second marriage: according to this logic, if the first marriage was a sacramental one, then the second can only be considered an extramarital and therefore immoral “use of the sexual faculty.” These issues are interrelated and together call for the further development of church teaching.

63 See section 1 above.

- a There is no longer Jew or (οὐδέ) Greek,
- b there is no longer slave or (οὐδέ) free,
- c there is no longer male and female (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ; cf. Gen 1:27 LXX);
- d for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.

The immediate context of the maxim in Galatians 3:26–27 signals its “Sitz im Leben” and thus also the experiential background against which it should be understood: “For in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith. As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.” The experience of conversion culminates in the convert’s baptism and first Eucharistic meal with their new community⁶⁴ – an experience in which the new believer leaves behind the former world, with all of its faults, hierarchies, and discord: “So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation: everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!” (2 Cor 5:17).

People who are as different as the polar opposites described in this maxim come together, practice table fellowship, accept one another, and are freed from the constraint of having to assert themselves over against one another. They put their religious (v. 28a), social (v. 28b), and cultural identities (v. 28c) to rest in view of the fact that in Christ Jesus, they can each conceive of themselves as holding an equal position before God: Jews and Greeks (i.e., the people of the nations), slaves and free persons, men and women.

It is not only the first, but also the third dyad that is formulated from a Jewish perspective, specifically on the basis of Genesis 1:27, which says: “So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; *male and female* (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ) he created them.”⁶⁵ Particularly the first creation narrative, of which Genesis 1:27 is part – in contrast to the second, Genesis 2:4b–3:24, with its hierarchical sequence (first Adam, then Eve⁶⁶) – contains an emancipatory potential, which has also repeatedly been brought to bear in the text’s reception history.⁶⁷ Galatians 3:28 also makes use of this potential, although Joel 2:28–29, a significant text for the early church, may also play into it.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ Hans-Ulrich Weidemann, *Taufe und Mahlgemeinschaft. Studien zur Vorgeschichte der altkirchlichen Taufucharistie* (WUNT 338; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

⁶⁵ The contrast between the οὐδέ in Paul’s first two pairings and the καὶ in his third pairing permits us to speak of a clear allusion to Genesis 1:27.

⁶⁶ Cf. 1 Tim 2:11–14: “Let a woman learn in silence with full submission. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed *first, then* Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.”

⁶⁷ Valuable information on the reception of this text in the early church can be found in Gerhard Dautzenberg, “‘Da ist nicht männlich und weiblich’. Zur Interpretation von Gal 3,28,” in *Studien zur paulinischen Theologie und zur frühchristlichen Rezeption des Alten Testaments*, ed. Gerhard Dautzenberg and Dieter Sänger (Gießen: Selbstverlag des Fachbereichs, Evangelische

From a contemporary perspective, this maxim might also have consequences for the determination of the range of seemingly temporally remote but undoubtedly culturally shaped arguments from “nature,” since Paul employs them along the lines of traditional anthropology in Romans 1:26–27. He ascribes decisive – though admittedly, as I have shown above, argumentatively subordinate – importance to the “proper” classification of the two sexes, from the perspective of the reproduction of humankind, in terms of their relationship to God, when he lists deviations from this classification under the category of “sin” and as a consequence of “God’s wrath.” According to Galatians 3:28, however, this does not apply, which is why the two texts stand in tension with one another: “Rom 1:26 f. stands in tension with Gal 3:28: in Rom 1:26 f. maleness and femaleness are of ultimate significance, whereas in Gal 3:28 they are of no significance.”⁶⁹ This is also linked to the fact that Romans 1:26–27 is formulated from a creation-theological perspective, while Galatians 3:28 takes an eschatological view. Paul himself – unmarried and, in view of the (supposed) dawn of the end times, “anxious about the affairs of the Lord” (1 Cor 7:32) above all else⁷⁰ – speaks from a worldview in which marriage and the associated task of raising offspring are no longer the top priority, because “the present form of this world is passing away” (1 Cor 7:31), and “the ends of the ages have come” upon us (1 Cor 10:11). Thus Paul is completely consumed with the wish that “all were as I myself am” (1 Cor 7:7) – that is, unmarried!⁷¹

Theologie und Katholische Theologie und deren Didaktik der Justus-Liebig-Universität, 1999), 69–99.

68 Joel 2:28–29: “Then afterward I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; *your sons and your daughters* shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions. Even on *the male and female slaves*, in those days, I will pour out my spirit.” Cf. Acts 2:16–21.

69 Bernadette J. Brooten, *Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 265.

70 Solely because – from his personal perspective – he raises contrasts such as the following: “I want you to be free from anxieties. The unmarried man is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, how to please the Lord; but the married man is anxious about the affairs of the world, how to please his wife, and his interests are divided” (1 Cor 7:32–34).

71 Cf. Michael Theobald, “Die Ehetheologie des Epheserbriefs (Eph 5,21–33). Literarhistorischer Kontext und kanontheologische Relevanz,” in *Ehe und Familie: Wege zum Gelingen aus katholischer Perspektive*, ed. George Augustin and Ingo Proft (Theologie im Dialog 13; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2014), 121–147, here 124–134 on 1 Corinthians 7 (see “Paulus – Patron der Enkratiten,” among others). Although the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith’s *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church* (see note 55), no. 6, states: “Against the background of this exposition of theocratic law [in Lev 18:22 and 20:13], an *eschatological* perspective is developed by St. Paul when, in I Cor 6:9, he proposes the same doctrine and lists those who behave in a

Yet Galatians 3:28 does not simply declare that the factual differences between “Jews and Greeks,” “slaves and free,” or men and women do not exist; rather, it strips them of their soteriological relevance, which has concrete consequences for the effort to live together “in Christ”: Jews should still be able to adhere to their traditions in the ecclesia – for example, to have their sons circumcised – but they must not and can no longer make this the *casus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* and seek to impose it on others. Furthermore, slaves are not promised a revolt against their contemporary slaveholding society, but their masters are taken to task and told that social relations in the *oikos* must be determined by Christian love (see the Letter to Philemon). Likewise, relations between the sexes – their differences and classifications as Paul sees them, and indeed as large parts of society at that time saw them – are still valid, but they should not and must no longer play a role in the ecclesia: man and woman are equal, and the “charisms” (including κυβέρνησις or “forms of leadership” in the church; see 1 Cor 12:28) are solely the free gifts of the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 12; Rom 12) and are thus independent of characteristics such as age, sex, or origin.⁷² Admittedly Paul occasionally finds these topics difficult, and his various statements on the subject do not always fit together seamlessly.⁷³

Thus it should be all the more important to take the maxim in Galatians 3:28, which Paul himself declares to be a high priority in his Letter to the Galatians, theologically seriously.⁷⁴ On this basis, according to our contemporary hermeneut-

homosexual fashion among those who shall not enter the Kingdom of God,” the letter nevertheless leaves it to the reader to discern what is meant by “eschatological perspective.”

72 The pastoral letters, however, are different; they are orientated toward the second creation narrative (cf. note 65 above), and they reverse not only the emancipatory tendencies of the first churches Paul planted, but also the breadth of his doctrine of charisms to a significant extent.

73 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 remains a difficult text; it is by no means seamlessly argued, and it evinces a strong pragmatic orientation, since Paul seeks to use this letter to counter those emancipatory tendencies in Corinth which he finds unpleasant. Cf. Hans-Josef Klauck, *1. Korintherbrief* (NEB 7; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984), 77–80; Klauck speaks of the “theological weaknesses of these speculations” (referring to v. 10), which Paul would be aware of and which he attempts to “correct” in v. 11–12 (see p. 79).

74 In the *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church: Lumen Gentium* (Rome: Vatican, 1964), no. 32, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html (accessed April 21, 2021), the Second Vatican Council pays particular attention to Galatians 3:28: “There is, therefore, in Christ and in the Church no inequality on the basis of race or nationality, social condition or sex, because ‘there is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all “one” in Christ Jesus’ (Gal 3:28; cf. Col 3:11). Therefore, from divine choice the laity have Christ for their brothers who though He is the Lord of all, came not to be served but to serve

ical premises, one would then conclude that different personal identities and orientations are also irrelevant when it comes to sex.⁷⁵ As Romans 1:26–27 insinuates, under no circumstances may one ascribe to a certain anthropological view of sexual classification a relevance that impacts upon one’s relationship with God (the keyword here is “sin”). As Michael Wolter explains in his recent commentary on Romans:

Gal 3:28 is relevant for the different sexual identities, insofar as cultural identity attributions play no role in this world of meaning which, for those who believe in Christ, constitutes God’s “new creation” (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15). When Paul writes: “for you are all one in Christ Jesus,” this applies not only to the everyday worldly differences between “Jew and Greek,” “slave and free,” “male and female,” but also to the difference between “homosexual” and “heterosexual.”⁷⁶

“Welcome one another, therefore, just as Christ has welcomed you, for the glory of God” – so the apostle writes in Romans 15:7, with an eye to the cultural and religious imprinting of the various house churches in Rome, thus formulating his “ecclesiological constitution.”⁷⁷ When gay and lesbian partnerships are welcomed into the Church without prejudice, it is precisely this “ecclesiological constitution” – according to which others are accepted with all of their differences – that is at stake. Where else should it be possible to experience God’s unconditional acceptance of every human being, if not first and foremost in the congregations that invoke on the name of Jesus?

However, simply invoking this principle in Church practice remains insufficient if it is not simultaneously accompanied by Church doctrine that also breaks

(cf. 2 Pet 1:1).” In the *Decree on Ecumenism: Unitatis Redintegratio*, no. 2, the second occurrence of this passage in the conciliar textual corpus (this verse is encountered nowhere else), the quotation from Galatians 3:28 is shortened, and these concrete oppositions are left out; see http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html (accessed April 21, 2021).

⁷⁵ See Peter von der Osten-Sacken, “Paulinisches Evangelium und Homosexualität,” in *Evangelium und Tora: Aufsätze zu Paulus*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken (TB 77; Munich: Kaiser, 1987), 210–236, esp. 236.

⁷⁶ Wolter, *Röm I*, 153f.

⁷⁷ It constitutes an ecclesiological constitution because it concerns the mutual acceptance of those in the church who think differently, here in concrete terms: that is, Jewish–Christian and Gentile–Christian church members. Moreover, the structure of the sentence is indicative and imperative, the latter grounded in the former (καθώς has a justificatory sense: cf. John 13:15, 34; and also Matt 18:33 [ὡς καὶ ὧ;]). The indicative itself fully circumscribes the christological salvific event according to its soteriological as well as its theocentric aspects (εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ), whereas the imperative draws from this the appropriate ecclesiological conclusion: mutual acceptance.

new ground. We need a profound revision of the “Catechism of the Catholic Church,”⁷⁸ and until this takes place, the problem will continue to smolder.⁷⁹ Fundamentalist appeals to Scripture contradict the very essence of the Catholic hermeneutic. So let us approach Scripture sensibly and listen to what it truly calls us to do – for the sake of our salvation!

Bibliography

- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Vol. 19. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 73. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Brooten, Bernadette J. *Love between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons*. Rome: Vatican, 1986. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19861001_homosexual-persons_en.html. Accessed April 21, 2021.
- Dautzenberg, Gerhard. “‘Da ist nicht männlich und weiblich’: Zur Interpretation von Gal 3,28.” In *Studien zur paulinischen Theologie und zur frühchristlichen Rezeption des Alten Testaments*, ed. Gerhard Dautzenberg and Dieter Sänger, 69–99. Gießen: Selbstverlag des Fachbereichs, Evangelische Theologie und Katholische Theologie und deren Didaktik der Justus-Liebig-Universität, 1999.
- Ebner, Martin. “Verbietet das Neue Testament ‘Homosexualität’? Neutestamentliche Grundlagen zu einer aktuellen Streitfrage.” *Lebendige Seelsorge* 70 (2019): 55–60.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. 3 vols. London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 1979/1990.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard S. *Das dritte Buch Mose: Leviticus*. ATD 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Haacker, Klaus. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. ThHK 6. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999.
- Halperin, David M. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Herter, Hans. “Art. Effeminatus.” In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 4, ed. Theodor Klauser, 620–642. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1959.

78 Over against this, of course, stands an antiquated fundamental-theological concept of church “doctrine” that seeks to present it as rigid, unchanging, and unshakable (cf. note 60 above), out of fear that Church authority could be damaged if doctrinal “changes” occur. In the process, one must close one’s eyes to the alarming, repeatedly statistically verified fact that the *diastasis* of “doctrine” and “practice,” as well as the tendency of the faithful to reject the Church’s decisions, has been eroding Rome’s authority for quite some time. The days when Karl Rahner spoke of the necessity of dogmatic-historical doctrinal development have been forgotten.

79 See Hansjürgen Verweyen, *Der Weltkatechismus: Therapie oder Symptom einer kranken Kirche?* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1993).

- Hieke, Thomas. *Levitikus: Zweiter Teilband: 16–27*. HThK.AT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2014.
- Hoheisel, Karl. “Art. Homosexualität.” In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 16, ed. Theodor Klauser, 289–364. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1994.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Josephus. *The Works of Flavius Josephus*. Translated by William Whiston. London: George Routledge, 1892.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *1. Korintherbrief*. NEB 7. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1984.
- Konradt, Matthias, and Esther Schläpfer, eds. *Anthropologie und Ethik im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. Internationales Symposium in Verbindung mit dem Projekt CJHNT, 17.–20. Mai 2012, Heidelberg*. WUNT 322. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Konradt, Matthias. “‘Fliehet die Unzucht!’ (TestRub 5,5): Sexualethische Perspektiven in den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen.” In *Anthropologie und Ethik im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen. Internationales Symposium in Verbindung mit dem Projekt CJHNT, 17.–20. Mai 2012, Heidelberg*, ed. Matthias Konradt and Esther Schläpfer, 249–282. WUNT 322. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Kornfeld, Walter. *Leviticus*. NEB 6. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1986.
- Kraus, Wolfgang, and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.
- Kremer, Jacob. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. RNT. Regensburg: Pustet, 1997.
- Licht, Hans. *Die Homoerotik in der griechischen Literatur*. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Sexualforschung 3.3. Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1921.
- Lindemann, Andreas. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. HNT 9.1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Loader, William. *Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Writings of Philo, Josephus, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Loader, William. *The New Testament on Sexuality*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Loader, William. *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Miller, James E. “The Practices of Romans 1:26: Homosexual or Heterosexual?” *NT 37* (1995): 1–11.
- Murphy, David J. “More Evidence pertaining to ‘Their Females’ in Romans 1:26.” *JBL 138* (2019): 221–240.
- Olyan, Saul M. “‘And with a Male You Shall Not Lie the Lying Down of a Woman’: On the Meaning and Significance of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13.” *Journal of the History of Sexuality 4* (1994): 179–206.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. “Paulinisches Evangelium und Homosexualität.” In *Evangelium und Tora: Aufsätze zu Paulus*, ed. Peter von der Osten-Sacken, 210–236. TB 77. Munich: Kaiser, 1987.
- Pesch, Rudolf. *Das Markusevangelium, II. Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20*. HThK.NT 2.2. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1977.
- Petersen, William L. “Can ARSENOKOITAI be translated by ‘Homosexuals’? (1 Cor 6.9; 1 Tim 1.10).” *VigChr 40* (1986): 187–191.

- Philo. *On the Special Laws, On the Virtues, On Rewards and Punishments*. Vol. 8. Loeb Classical Library 341. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Plato. *Laws*. 2 vols. Translated by R. G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library 187/192. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Plato. *The Symposium and the Phaedrus: Plato's Erotic Dialogues*. Translated by William S. Cobb. Albany: SUNY Press, 1993.
- Rat der evangelischen Kirche. *Mit Spannungen leben: Eine Orientierungshilfe des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland zum Thema 'Homosexualität'* (26.2.1996). EKD 57. <https://archiv.ekd.de/EKD-Texte/44736.html>. Accessed December 15, 2020.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*. EKK 15. Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1988.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 1,1–6,11)*. EKK 7.1. Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchener, 1991.
- Scroggs, Robin. *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Second Vatican Council. *Decree on Ecumenism: Unitatis Redintegratio*. Rome: Vatican, 1964. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_unitatis-redintegratio_en.html. Accessed April 21, 2021.
- Second Vatican Council. *Dogmatic Constitution of the Church: Lumen Gentium*. Rome: Vatican, 1964. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html. Accessed April 21, 2021.
- Stegemann, Wolfgang. "Homosexualität – ein modernes Konzept." *ZNT* 2 (1998): 61–68.
- Stowasser, Martin. "Homosexualität und Bibel: Exegetische und hermeneutische Überlegungen zu einem schwierigen Thema." *NTS* 43 (1997): 503–526.
- Swancutt, Diana M. "'The Disease of Effemination': The Charge of Effeminacy and the Verdict of God (Romans 1:18–2:16)." In *New Testament Masculinities*, ed. Stephen D. Moore and Janice Capel Anderson, 193–233. SBL Semeia Studies 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Translated by R. H. Charles. London: Wentworth Press, 1907/2019.
- Theobald, Michael. *Der Römerbrief*. EdF 294. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000.
- Theobald, Michael. "Die Ehetheologie des Epheserbriefs (Eph 5,21–33): Literarhistorischer Kontext und kanontheologische Relevanz." In *Ehe und Familie: Wege zum Gelingen aus katholischer Perspektive*, ed. George Augustin and Ingo Proft, 121–147. Theologie im Dialog 13. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2014.
- Theobald, Michael. "Vom Werden des Rechts in der Kirche: Beobachtungen zur Sprachform von Weisungen im Corpus Pastorale und bei Paulus." *ZNW* 106 (2015): 65–95.
- Towner, Philip H. *The Letters to Timothy and Titus*. NICNT. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Van der Horst, Pieter W. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides: With Introduction and Commentary*. SVTP 4. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Verweyen, Hansjürgen. *Der Weltkatechismus: Therapie oder Symptom einer kranken Kirche?* Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1993.
- Walter, Nikolaus. "Pseudepigraphische jüdisch-hellenistische Dichtung." In *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, vol. 4.3, ed. Werner Georg Kümmel, 173–276. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1983.

- Ward, Roy Bowen. "Why Unnatural? The Tradition behind Romans 1:26–27." *HThR* 90 (1997): 263–284.
- Weidemann, Hans-Ulrich. *Taufe und Mahlgemeinschaft: Studien zur Vorgeschichte der altkirchlichen Taufeucharistie*. WUNT 338. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Wilson, Walter T. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2005.
- Wolter, Michael. *Der Brief an die Römer (Teilband 1: Röm 1–8)*. EKK 6.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie/Patmos, 2014.
- Wright, Benjamin G. *The Letter of Aristeas: "Aristeas to Philocrates" or "On the Translation of the Law of the Jews."* Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Wucherpennig, Ansgar. *Sexualität bei Paulus*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2020.
- Zeller, Dieter. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEK 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.