

Romans 1 and the moral logic implicit . The only passage referring to the sexual experience of women. Although the first 300 years until Augustine it was women engaging in non-procreative sex with men and not as lesbian sex.

Why is it gentile sinfulness?

4 kinds of moral logic

1. Language of purity and impurity
2. Language of lust and passion
3. Language Of honor and shame
4. Language of nature

Purity and impurity

“God gave them up to impurity”

Paul often puts sexual misconduct with impurity even though, with the inclusion of gentiles
In NT - there was a move to define impurity as internal (the motives) not the external actions.

Lust and Passion

Mind driven by lust and passion.

People in ANE looked at lust - to let something or someone else determine your behavior. In the ANE it was not you determining the actions - it was someone else. very different from how we think today.

Jewish authors - Philo of Alexandria made the same conclusion. On Sodom - excess in Sodom led to glutton and forbidden forms of intercourse. And behavior that caused them to eventually have only a sterile seed

DioChrysostom - insatiable lust - too easy to get women's love and so they turn to males, believing it is harder to obtain. It is a type of addiction where you need more and more.

Exhibit A was Gaius Caligula - in office 25 years prior to Romans being written. He was sexual pervert, abused women. Was killed by officer he had abused sexually - killed by stabbing through the genitals - was this receiving in their own person the penalty?

Nothing about sexual orientation or committed long term gay relationships-more about excessive greed that motivates Caligula

Honor and Shame

(Degrading - dishonorable) -it was a honor and shame culture. In Greek - honor and money are the same word. Honor means you have capital to spend. The public court of reputation.

Depends on what people think about you. You have shame if people do not honor you. All cultures have this, but some have greater emphasis - such as Asian cultures and gangs in contemporary urban cultures.

Shame - includes failure to act in accordance with ones' gender. I.e. the long hair from 1 Cor 11:14

the behaviors violated the established social expectations regarding gender. For women - any behavior outside of marriage. For men - be passive, be penetrated. (This can be the penalty)

This is self-evident. No argument needed from God. This honor/shame has been taught from an early age.

Language of Nature

This is central for many non-affirming. Tie it back to the creation narrative in Genesis. The will of God as revealed in Genesis. But Romans 1 is focused on Gentiles and they have no access to Genesis. So we cant restrict ourselves to Genesis. Word for nature (phusis) never occurs in OT in Septuagint. Not even a category in the Hebrew Bible. Stoic philosophers use it and then Gentile philosophers.

This is sinfulness, apart from the Law.

3 basic meanings to the notion of nature

1. Nature as one's own disposition (doing what comes naturally)
 1. John Boswell - saying that heterosexuals were acting like homosexuals and against their "bent"? Check with his text.
2. Communal well being - what everyone knows to be natural
 1. Cicero says by nature we are to safeguard and protect other humans
 2. It violates normal social conventions. Jack Rogers - unnatural is synonymous with unconventional like 1 Cor 11:14 - nature tells you that long hair on men is degrading but a glory to women
 3. Victor Paul Furnish - an appeal to social convention. Self-evidently proper behavior
3. Nature as conformity to biological and material universe
 1. Richard Hays - sexual identity as revealed in Genesis. Procreation was the key focus
 2. Philo - men devoted to the love of boys is contrary to nature - would make cities empty since there could be no propagation of the species

No ANE text has anything about the fittedness of male and female genitals. The unnatural is non-procreative, not because the plumbing doesn't fit.

Stoic Vision of Nature

Individual disposition - is sexual orientation a new aspect of this?

Social flourishing - changing notions of gender alters our conception of natural social order

Procreation - hasn't contraception changed the centrality of procreation for the meaning of sexuality.

Sanctified Imagination

Deep intent - sex can't be driven by lust and passion. Sex can't degrade participants. Must be where people are authentic. Sexual relationships must serve toward enduring relationships. Chapter 1 shows failure to fulfill the goals of sex.

Single most important question

"Do you know, love and care about someone who is LGBTQ? If answer is no - it will be a different sort of conversation"

Reason is - it takes a lot of work to read the Biblical text.

Unless you know someone, you have no reason to work on things.

Kevin says

Must "**Move from literalist to contextualist reading of the text**".

Teaching of NT

1st goal - read text as its first intended readers would have read it

Why you use Greek lexicon - the meaning of words in the first century

You can never violate the meaning that the first intended readers would have had.

You can move beyond that - but never violate it.

In the flow of Romans - readers are expecting Paul to nail the Gentiles... and then it gets to the Jewish Christians

Something to consider -

How is the contemporary experience of LGBTQ similar to and different from what Paul is talking about?

James Brownson on Romans 1

Matthew 19 From the beginning, God put man and woman. The question of divorce is a breaking of kinship tie. Jesus brings up man and woman, because the question is about marriage. Questions of normative and what is normal.

Non-affirming speakers often go Back to the creation order being the best design. Even if we can interpret it differently....what they see is (traditional)

Creation Order is complicated. We all pick and choose what we like and what we don't like. Lots of polygamy in OT. And then it is not seen in NT and it is 1 man and 1 woman. This was not the consistent case of scripture.

Men run the show; women submit - yet there are plenty of examples counter to this that are in scripture.

We must be honest that we are all “picking and choosing”

Like polygamy “God might allow it, but it is not God’s best”. Non-affirming say - God offered grace at that time -but it was not his plan.