


The New Landscape

 The Bible and Homosexuality

 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

 August 5, 2015

 fbgbible.org

 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

What's the Approach?

Tonight we begin a short series of lessons titled *The Bible and Homosexuality*. The title may not encompass the total issue since it really involves the entire LGBTQ+ movement and questions of male and female that relate to gender identity. The series will not be able to encompass all the issues. Nor will it be what you expect but I've designed it the way I have for very specific reasons. I hope to present an approach that will, on one hand, convince everyone of my understanding, and on the other hand, do so by incorporating both grace and truth. I'm sure that not everyone will be convinced but at least if they can come away understanding my approach and why I think the way I do and am not belligerent then I'll have been successful. My approach of balancing grace and truth is inspired by Jesus' conversation with the woman caught in adultery where on one hand He said to the others, which of you is without sin and on the other hand to the woman, go and sin no more. This balance has to be captured or else we handle the issue in a way that is mean-spirited and sinful.

Who Needs This Series?

Everyone. Everyone needs it because homosexuality is on the rise and eventually everyone will have to deal with it on some level, either in their family, with friends, coworkers or a community member. Young people need it in particular because they are the generation caught in the crossfire. They have more immediate friends in high school or college who are coming out as gay. They are also in the stage of life when they are sorting out their way of thinking or worldview. To approach the issue with a hard-hitting series of messages will not only result in them switching the channel but it will push them farther away from the Christian worldview and further entrench the stereotype of traditional Christianity as outdated, bigoted, narrow-minded and homophobic. The younger generation needs a charitable and biblically sound message on the issues that will help them think critically through the issue(s). Middle aged and older people need it too because they increasingly have a son or daughter, grandson or granddaughter who has come out announcing they are gay. There are people in our church who have family members, friends and co-workers who are homosexual. We understand that it is

naturally fearful to interact with people who are on the other side of the issue but it becomes a necessity when it is your own family members and friends. Whether young or middle aged or older all need to know how to speak into the culture and be heard. We must never forget that the Bible teaches that we must “speak the truth in love.” This means not only speaking content that is consistent with the Christian faith but also speaking that content in a way that is consistent with the Christian faith. How Christ-like is it for Christians to engage the issue by trading political rhetoric in order to get the upper hand? Frankly, it is deplorably sinful and shallow. We need to know how to approach the issues and speak to them with both grace and truth in a way that creates less emotional heat and more cognitive thought. We need to understand that the people on the other side of the fence are also made in God’s image and are more often than not genuinely sincere about their understanding of the issue. And so our approach is to neither compromise the truth nor neglect grace. And our aim is to equip young, middle and older aged Christians to know how to approach people and discuss the issue(s) with both grace and truth.

Historical Background

Homosexuality is not a new phenomenon. Charlie Clough says, “History shows clearly that homosexuality has been a common practice for millennia everywhere outside of Judeo-Christianity.”¹ Renald Showers, among other scholars, thinks that Ham’s looking upon his father’s nakedness in Gen 9 was an act of homosexuality written against the backdrop of Canaanite distortions of sexuality in order to remind Israel about the sinfulness of homosexuality. It is well known that many Greek philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and Euripides practiced a form of homosexuality known as pederasty (man-boy sex) even though it was frowned upon. Rome tolerated it but it continued as a cultural practice. In England, King James, who authorized the production of the King James Bible, was bisexual. In our own country homosexuality has been practiced from the time of our founding, although it has always been morally condemned. Until now heterosexuality has been given the public vote of approval but now the tables have turned since the majority of the Supreme Court has decided that same-sex marriage is the law of the land.² All this to say that the issue is not new. It is an age-old debate over what is right and wrong, what the standards for ethics and values are. However, now Christians who hold to traditional interpretations of the Bible’s stance on homosexuality as sinful will now have to decide what to do.

What Can We Do?

In my estimation there are four possible things we can do. First, on one end of the spectrum we can *capitulate*. Capitulation is abandoning what the Bible teaches and adopting what the culture believes. For a Christian who has a high view of Scripture, meaning that he accepts the Bible as verbally, plenary inspired word of God, sufficient for all of life, and who wants to be a faithful Christian, capitulation to the culture when the Bible teaches otherwise is not an acceptable approach. Certain denominations like Unitarian Universalism, however,

have long ago abandoned a high view of Scripture and capitulated to the culture in a number of areas. Second, on the other end of the spectrum we can *separate*. Separationism is isolating ourselves from the surrounding culture or disengaging. Some denominations such as various Amish orders have a high view of Scripture and have disengaged from the surrounding culture. This is often desirable since we do not want to *confront* what is an *affront*. However, it is unacceptable since we are to be in the world but not of the world. Separationism only results in becoming a kind of obscure religious “ghetto,” a club of Christians who are irrelevant in the marketplace of ideas and impotent in gospel witness. Thus, separationism is not a truly viable approach for a Christian. Third, within the spectrum we can *accommodate*. Accommodation is reevaluating traditional interpretations of the Bible in order to reconcile them with what the culture believes. This may or may not be acceptable, depending on what the Scriptures actually teach. Certainly a traditional interpretation can be wrong. Long-standing traditional interpretations such as geocentrism or slavery are often put forth as examples by Christians who support same-sex relationships of how traditionalism is wrong. They think that eventually the majority of the Christian church will come around on the issue of same-sex relationships too. Many denominations have already come to this conclusion while claiming to continue to hold to a high view of Scripture. Accommodation may be a viable approach if it can be determined that is what the Scriptures actually teach. Fourth, *resonate*. *Resonating* is contributing to the discussion by speaking truth to man made in God’s image. Those who want to resonate with the culture understand that men are made for truth and are willing to speak the truth into a culture. They also realize that this may result in legal prosecution or persecution for taking a stand against what a culture accepts or has enshrined in law but, following the examples of Daniel, Paul and others, trying to speak in a way that will resonate with people made in God’s image is an acceptable approach for responding to a culture and its prevailing practices or laws when they contradict the Bible. It appears then that the only two valid things to do for Christians with a high view of Scripture are to accommodate by reevaluating certain Scriptural texts or try to resonate by appealing to God-consciousness.

A further word needs to be made with respect to separationism. Separationism is a natural response that I predict many will fall prey to. This primarily emanates from fear and disgust for the act of homosexuality. Separationists either do not understand or do not want to understand these people and their desires. In many cases it is enough for them to stay in the safety of their homes and trade political barbs via email in a show of one-ups-man-ship. To sit down and actually try to understand one another is completely out of the question. This hateful attitude is sinful and inconsistent with many Scriptural truths. First, Jesus engaged “tax collectors and sinners.” He ate and drank with them as did His disciples (Mk 2:14-17). Of course this could not occur in any context. The context was Matthew opening up his home to tax collectors and sinners. In that way Matthew could control the environment and direction of the discussion and interaction. His main interest was to introduce them to Jesus. This continues to be a tried and true approach as for example with the well-known ex-gay convert Rosaria Champagne Butterfield, then English professor at University of Syracuse. In her book *The Secret Thoughts of an Unlikely Convert* she writes that she had written an article in the paper critiquing the gender politics of the

Christian group Promise Keepers. In the midst of her hate and fan mail she found a letter from a Pastor Kenneth Smith. This letter did not attack what she wrote but asked her deep questions that challenged the underlying presuppositions of her article. She reports that she didn't know what to do with the letter and that it haunted her for weeks. She finally called Pastor Smith and he says, she asked, "Are you an evangelical? What do you believe about the Bible?"I was surprised by her questions. She was—a fact I learned later—interviewing me! The questions and dialogue on the phone continued for some time. It was a friendly interchange, and with the next question I posed this response: "Dr. Champagne, I think that question should be considered in front of our fireplace following one of my wife's good dinners. How does that sound?" She enthusiastically responded, "That sounds wonderful!" And so began a friendship which my wife and I have treasured and regarded as a gift from God. It wasn't long before Rosaria was frequenting our table, always bringing something; cheese, freshly baked bread, and always an eager mind. What great conversations we had!...much of our conversation related to the topics about which we had first spoken: the Bible theology, and worldviews. She became very dear to us."³ This, of course, was just the beginning of what resulted in her conversion to Christianity. It is nothing but an application of the age old incident of Matthew opening his home to tax collectors and sinners in order to introduce them to Jesus. When Jesus was challenged by the religious authorities for eating with sinners He responded very simply, "It is not those who are healthy who need a physician, but those who are sick; I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners." I think we might all be surprised at the people Jesus is calling to Himself that we are missing. The question is whether we are willing to follow in the footsteps of Matthew and not isolate but engage and open our homes to those who are not Christians that God puts in our path and interest in knowing something about the Bible. Second, separationism is not consistent with Jesus' command to "go into all the world and make disciples of all nations." We may not want to, we may not feel comfortable, and that is not the issue. Jonah was not comfortable either. God commanded him to go to the Ninevites. He did not want to go to the Ninevites because of their hardened intense evil. And yet all Nineveh believed, including the king himself, a fact which Jonah regretted. He wanted God to rain down wrath on them, destroy them forever. Is that our attitude toward homosexuals? When we refuse to engage or even associate with homosexuals are we not repeating Jonah's rebellious seafaring adventure? Are we not running away from what God has called us to do? Are we not rejecting His Great Commission? Are we not arrogant in keeping the gospel from them when it has so graciously been given to us? Isn't it implied when we keep the gospel from others that somehow we are worthy of the gospel and they are not? These questions may yield stinging responses in our souls but it is necessary to confront our own sinfulness first before pointing out the sinfulness of others. We could go on to show repeatedly why it is sinful and rebellious to react with separationism, and we have not even considered the negative consequences, which are legion, but what we have shown is totally sufficient to see it is not a valid response. We must learn to speak the truth in love and therefore be given the privilege of entering into the process of seeing God's redeeming grace transform someone's life.

Who is our Audience?

It is important to keep in mind who it is you are talking to; that is, whether they are an unbeliever or a believer. These discussions should be kept distinct, should go a different way and have a different goal. When we speak to unbelievers our ultimate aim should be the gospel, not condemning homosexuality. We are not on a moral crusade. We are not interested in reforming the sin nature. We are not interested in building a heterosexual society or do-goodism. Our ultimate interest is in getting gospel hearing because faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. This requires us to befriend unbelievers. Evangelism is relational. If you don't build relationships with unbelievers in our day and time then you cannot influence them. You are irrelevant. I gave the example earlier of Pastor Kenneth Smith engaging Rosaria Champagne and eventually inviting her into their home. Pastor Smith and his wife were willing to build a relationship with someone that was radically opposed to Christianity. This is nothing to fear because God is in control of history and he has sent us into the culture with the gospel which is His power. It is a false caricature of the homosexual community that they always harsh or abrasive. Many attest that they are one of the most helpful, kind and talented communities. Whether they cross our paths or not we need to build relationships with unbelievers if we are to ultimately give them the gospel. Many times new converts are in the best position to do this because almost all their relationships are with unbelievers. At the same time they are often the most untrained, but we should never deter them from talking to their unbelieving friends about Christ. Instead we should offer ourselves as mentors to equip them. In the end to be biblical Christians we must be willing to befriend gay people.

How Do We Speak to Unbelievers?

How do we speak to them? The most important thing we can do is ask questions. We need to do more listening and less talking. Scripture says, "He who answers a matter before he hears it, it is folly and shame to him" (Prov. 18:13)..." Asking questions rather than talking has always had several advantages over just talking. First, questions have a way of making people think. God designed us to think and there are some questions we may never have thought of. When we are asked a question it stimulates us to try and think how we might answer that question from within our own worldview. Often these questions cause us to reevaluate our worldview. Second, questions are God's preferred method for approaching us. In the Garden He did not come to Adam and say, "You're in trouble now buddy, I saw that." He said, "Where are you?" God was trying to get Adam to think about where he was relative to Himself and what caused the separation? God did the same thing with Job. He did not come to Job and say, "You've got it all wrong buddy." He said, "Who are you that darkens counsel with words without wisdom?" He was trying to get Job to remember that he was just a creature and therefore very limited. Job really was in no position to question God's allowing these things to come into his life. Jesus did the same thing with His disciples. He did not come to them and say, "Now I'm the Son of Man, get with it!" He said, "Who do you say that I am?" The question was asked to get them to reflect upon what He had taught and what He had

done and act on that. Questions have always been God's preferred method of getting people to think. And when people think they are stimulated to come to the conclusions themselves. People are much more prone to accept or change their way of thinking when they come to that conclusion by their thinking through an issue than to have them told they are wrong. Naturally we have to be convinced of something. Even God is a gentleman and wants us to be convinced of the gospel. Third, asking someone a question shows them that you have a genuine interest and respect for them as a person. You are asking them what they think. Most people are eager to tell you what they think. The bottom line here is that you cannot influence a person if they don't see that you are genuinely interested in them and respect them and asking a question opens the door. Fourth, by asking questions you start to learn how they think, you start to understand where they are coming from, their worldview. This is vital for understanding them as a person, what is important to them, what is not, what their interests are, what their frustrations are, it also helps you see that they are a person just like you and they have struggles just like you and that helps you have compassion for them. Fifth, by asking them questions and listening to their answers you start to form a relationship. Relationships are vital in 21st century evangelism. It may just be having coffee and a doughnut but you have to invest in people today or they will not see that you are authentic and if they do not see you as authentic then you are a phony and they will not let you into their lives and you will not have gospel influence on them. 99.9% of the homosexuals that come to Christ do it because a Christian invested in them in a long-term friendship and they had discussion after discussion after discussion. In fact, rule number one I would say is do not give the gospel to a gay person. Every homosexual will tell you that there are two things that every Christian tries to do right away and the entire homosexual community already has a barrier up against these two things so you are just wasting your time and pushing them away. The first thing they say a Christian will do is give them the gospel. The second thing they will do is invite them to Church. I would say, don't do either one of those. That is the only way you will show them there are different Christians. So rule number one is don't give them the gospel; that's a goal to aim for, not an introductory offer; rule number two, don't invite them to church; the last thing they want to do is surround themselves by those they perceive to be their greatest enemies. Rule number three, ask them questions and listen to their answers. You cannot learn anything about anybody while you are talking. You can only learn something about someone when you listen to what they have to say. So ask questions and listen to what they have to say. Many of these people I think you will find are not at all what you may assume they are. Many of them are very warm and kind and worth your time investing in, especially if you get to be a part of their coming to Christ.

What should our discussions revolve around?

What should be the kinds of things we talk about? There are four levels of discussion⁴ that we need to be aware of and we need to aim for the deeper levels. The first level of discussion is politics. Politics is the realm where very superficial people trade rhetoric and make stinging remarks aimed at hurting the other group while making

themselves feel better. This sinful activity should never be engaged in by Christians. All it does is bring further disdain to the name of Christ and reinforce the homosexual stereotype of Christians, that they are narrow-minded, intolerant, bigoted and homophobic. Many homosexuals attest that they completely refuse to talk about Christ because of Christians who have made stupid remarks. They only give them fodder and reason to resist. We need to stay out of the first level of discussion, politics. The second level of discussion is ethics. Ethics is the realm of more serious discussions that recognize the role of ethics and values underlying the issue. Whenever someone uses the word "ought" or "should" an ethical standard is being invoked. Whenever someone says, "that's right" or "that's wrong," an ethical standard is being applied. We need to ask why something is right and something is wrong? Why ought we to do this and not that? We need to aim for this second level of discussion, ethics, because it moves us closer to where the real issues reside and moves us away from trading political rhetoric. The third level of discussion is epistemology. Epistemology is the realm of knowing, "How do we know what we know is true?" "What is the source of the standards which underlie our ethics and values?" "How reliable is that source of standards?" How can we know? What are the presuppositions for knowing anything at all? "Are there any such things as absolutes?" We need to move into these much deeper conversations on the epistemological level. The fourth level of discussion is ontology. Ontology is the nature of being, becoming and existence. It deals with questions about who we are by nature? What are we like? Why are we the way we are? What is the meaning and purpose of life? God engages us in the three deeper levels of discussion; ethics, epistemology and ontology throughout Scripture. His way of getting us to think about these deeper issues is to ask us questions. Remember Job? When God burst on to the scene what does He do? Does He just start telling Job how it is? No. He asks Job questions after question after question. What kind of questions? Epistemological questions, what do you know Job, how do you know what you know Job; ontological questions, who are you Job, where were you? These are the deeper questions that God wants us to think about and they are instructive for the kind of conversations we need to have with unbelievers and believers. We need to discipline ourselves to get deeper, where the real issues reside and avoid the surface tension.

Now that's how I propose we work with and discuss with unbelievers; our ultimate aim is the gospel and our means of getting there is by forming a relationship, being genuine, being warm and by asking the deeper questions and listening to them. Charles Clough says, "In the final analysis good results will come about only as we submit to the leading of the Holy Spirit as He clarifies wisdom principles to us--and as He providentially superintends how our listener is impacted by the exchange."⁵

How about talking with believers? This is a different conversation. Our ultimate aim is not the gospel since they have already theoretically believed the gospel. The ultimate aim is harmony on a doctrine. We want to be able to have unity. Paul said in Eph 4:3, "Make every effort to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." It is a Christian duty to strive to preserve the unity that we have in Christ positionally so that there is a bond of peace among us experientially. Separation is a last resort. Here the discussion is between Christians who maintain the traditional interpretation of the Bible, that God condemns all forms of homosexuality, and the accommodating

interpretation of the Bible, that God does not condemn homosexual relationships that are monogamous, consensual, committed and loving. The principles about befriending these believers and asking them questions to show interest, respect and stimulate thinking all remain the same as with unbelievers. Also, aiming for the deeper levels of discussion in the realm of ethics, epistemology and ontology remains the same. What will be additional will be discussion regarding the nature of the authority of the Bible and the role of the interpreter and experience. The ultimate aim should be to discover what the Bible teaches. This issue will constitute the remaining parts of this series.

What Are the Issues?

Often the issue is reduced to six or seven passages in the Old and New Testaments. For example, the editor of the Queen James Bible says, "We edited the Bible to prevent homophobic interpretations. We made changes to eight verses."⁶ The reasoning given is that these eight verses are translated in ambiguous language and so rather than simply delete the verses they decided to edit them. They say "We wanted our Bible bulletproof from the ones shooting the bullets."⁷ Matthew Vines follows the same type of approach saying, "Six passages in the Bible—Genesis 19:5; Leviticus 18:22; Leviticus 20:13; Romans 1:26-27; 1 Corinthians 6:9; and 1 Timothy 1:10—have stood in the way of countless gay people who long for acceptance from their Christian parents, friends, and churches."⁸ However, is the issue really just six or seven verses? What about the overarching theme of Scripture? I will try to show that the six or seven verse approach is committing *the error of reductionism*. This error is the practice of analyzing a complex phenomenon in oversimplified terms to conclude what is thought to be a sufficient explanation. This is a problem we will see repeatedly.

Another issue involved is that after these authors analyze the six or seven passages of the Bible they conclude that the passages do not touch on same-sex marriage as it is practiced today and therefore the modern church needs to construct its doctrine based on other positive characteristics in Scripture and experience. I intend to show that this renders the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture null and void. Watch how New Testament scholar James Brownson summarizes Gen 19, Sodom and Gomorrah, and Judg 19, the Levites concubine, "...they help to explain Scripture's negative stance toward the types of same-sex eroticism the Bible addresses, but *they do not directly address* the case of committed and loving same-sex relationships." On Lev 18 and 20, the prohibitions of a man lying with a man as with a woman, he concludes, "these prohibitions *do not speak directly to* committed and consecrated same-sex relationships." On the vice lists of 1 Cor 6 and 1 Tim 1 he summarizes, these "focus attention on the ancient practice of pederasty—the use of boy prostitutes in male-male sex. As such they also *do not address* committed and mutual same-sex relationships today." Finally he is very revealing when he says, "The issue of sexual orientation represents *new data* that the church needs to ask itself, 'Should this change the way we look at this?'"⁹ The mention of "new data" seriously undermines the sufficiency of Scripture. Matthew Vines, in his more popular treatment also undermines the sufficiency of Scripture saying, "While some parts of the Bible address cultural norms that *do not directly apply* to modern societies, all of Scripture is "useful

for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness." Vines desire is to hold on to a high view of Scripture and its value but at the same time discount that the Bible has any direct relevance for modern loving, committed same-sex relationships. If this is true then how can we say that the Scriptures are sufficient? Are we to conclude that because the Bible does not directly address an issue that it does not address it indirectly? If something is not directly in the Bible does that mean we are free to engage in it? The Bible doesn't say anything about free-basing cocaine but don't we understand that the principle related to being filled with the Spirit and not controlled by wine implies that it is sinful? The Scriptures don't directly address donating one's blood or kidney but we use wisdom principles from Scripture relative to the importance of each individual life made in God's image as well as the sacrificial love that Christ showed on the cross to conclude that there is nothing wrong with it. Nor does the Bible say anything directly about a married man who is sterile having another man's sperm put into his wife in order to get her pregnant and have a child. But we deduce from fornication and adultery texts that it is sinful. The point is that under the sufficiency of Scripture the Bible does address all of these things in one way or another and so for same-sex advocates to argue that the Bible does not give us any help in directly application to modern same-sex relationships is not only an error of reductionism but also a denial of the sufficiency of Scripture.

A final issue to be thought about is how these authors consistently refer to past traditional interpretations as wrong and then couch this issue in the same category. For example, Matthew Vines says, "For the first sixteen hundred years of church history, every major Christian leader and theologian believed that the earth stood at the center of the universe." They based this geocentric view of the solar system on taking passages like Ecclesiastes 1:5 overly literal. "The sun rises and the sun sets; and hastening to its place it rises there again," was interpreted as meaning that the sun literally revolved around the earth. Yet now we know from our experience with Galileo's telescope that this is phenomenological language. It's true that this language is phenomenological, it's speaking from our point of view. And from our point of view it appears that way. We still use this language today, even scientists use this language and everyone knows that this is not a scientific statement. And yet the biggest problem is that's not what the verse is about. The verse is just saying that life seems to be the same thing over and over. And while you might be able to use this argument to say that we need to reevaluate what the Bible says about homosexuality you can't use this as an argument to say that we need to change our views of homosexuality. What Vines and Brownson and other authors are talking about is the necessity of bringing our modern experience into this situation since the Bible alone is insufficient. When we evaluate the evidence of mental strain that the traditional view is putting on gay Christians we conclude that this could not be wrong; there has to be a place for Christian same-sex relationships. It is a heart strings argument. What is never asked as far as I can tell is, "Why is this an increasing phenomenon?" The stated assumption throughout their writings is that gay people are born gay and they can't change being gay and so God must have made them gay...This means that God must be making more and more gay people and therefore it can't

be sinful and so our interpretations of the Bible must fit this paradigm. To accomplish this we limit the discussion to the six or seven texts, the error of reductionism. This is a faulty approach.

In conclusion, what's our approach? Grace and truth. We must honor Christ in our handling of this issue. Who needs this series? Everybody. It's an increasing phenomena and we will all have to face it on one level or another. We all need to be equipped. What's the historical background? It's not a new issue. It's been around for a long time. What is new is that it is now considered the law of the land. What can we do? We can't capitulate because then we become like the world and we can't separate because Jesus didn't separate and Jesus commanded us to go into all the world. We may accommodate if that is what the Scriptures truly teach. At least it's a valid possibility. We can try to resonate the traditional view into culture if that is what the Scriptures teach. Who is our audience? If an unbeliever, our ultimate aim is the gospel and our means of getting there is by forming a relationship, being genuine, being warm and asking the deeper questions and listening to them. If believers are the audience our ultimate goal is doctrinal agreement and our means of getting there is by forming a relationship, being genuine and dealing with the deeper questions as we work our way through the Scriptures. What are the issues? Ultimately the issue is what is the overarching teaching of Scripture? Normally accommodationists reduce the issue to six or seven verses. This is the error of reductionism. Often they conclude that the Bible does not touch on the issue of modern same-sex relationships that are loving and committed. This is the error of denying the sufficiency of Scripture. Finally they equate this issue with other issues like geocentrism when they are not really the same issue.

Alright, that's enough for tonight. What I'll be doing in the following weeks is showing that it's a much bigger issue than seven or eight verses and it gets ultimately back to who God is in the Trinity and how God's image is male and female together in complementarity marriage with the primary function of procreation and how that structure is necessary for the population growth of the human race that is abundantly testified to in Scripture.

What questions do you have?

¹ Charles Clough, *Essays on Same-Sex Marriage*.

² Though many rightly argue that the Constitution is the law of the land, many consider the Constitution a living document and therefore the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution as the law of the land. This is a debate within legal and hermeneutical circles that devolves to the issue of whether meaning is determined by the author or the reader.

³ Rosaria Champagne Butterfield, *The Secret Thoughts of an Unlikely Convert*, p ix.

⁴ The following scheme of the four layers of conversation is borrowed from Charles Clough, *Essays on Same Sex Marriage*.

⁵ Charles Clough, *Essays on Same-Sex Marriage*.

⁶ http://www.amazon.com/The-Queen-James-Bible/dp/0615724531#reader_0615724531 p 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p 3.

⁸ Matthew Vines, *God and the Gay Christian*, p 11.

⁹ <http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2014/06/03/christianity-catholic-church-gay-homosexuals-column/9926489/>