

## **Let's *Talk* About Homosexuality**

### **Part 3: Moral and Pastoral Considerations: What the Church Teaches ... and Other Catholic Voices**

#### ***Segment 3 (Cont.): Other Catholic Voices***

---

*“Humankind looks at appearances but God looks at the heart.”*

*... 1 Samuel 16:7*

---

“In light of gay Christian experience,” writes John McNeill, “two fundamental issues of sexual morality must be re-examined. The first issue is what makes a sexual act fully human; the second is the biblical understanding of homosexual acts.”<sup>1</sup>

Traditional Catholic theologians would probably not agree with McNeill that such an examination would serve any helpful or constructive purpose. In the instance of official teaching that “lays claim to internal and respectful assent,” but does not represent an infallible proclamation, one theologian’s call for respectful dialogue can be another theologian’s claim of unwarranted efforts to undermine legitimate authority.

Nevertheless, the reality is that a tentative reappraisal is present among some progressive and moderate theologians in the United States, as well as among other scholars around the world.

In this final segment of our series, we will attempt to explore these two issues identified by McNeil in a brief and preliminary way, so interested readers might at least be aware of the on-going debate within their Church.

The first issue – what makes a sexual act fully human – is tied directly to an understanding of orientation. The question is whether the homosexual orientation has a natural end, a purpose in God’s design, a “finality,” in the language of theology.

The heterosexual orientation achieves its finality in its “openness to the transmission of life.” But what about homosexuality? It cannot be directed to a procreative end. Therefore, the Church teaches, the homosexual orientation lacks finality and must be considered “intrinsically disordered.”

Must such an orientation, then – even though it is part of the sexual identity that defines who we are, and even though it is an orientation one does not choose but discovers – must such an orientation be considered less than “humanly normative,” less than “fully human”? Should it be considered outside the divine plan – with no role to play in human society?

“The basic question gay and lesbian Catholics raise is this: Why is heterosexuality judged to be normative for full humanity and sexuality? What are the grounds for such a claim? Do we need to examine that claim and all of its sources, including biblical, psychological, and theological ones? Is heterosexuality such an intrinsic part of authentic human nature that without it the individual person is in some way lacking or inferior? Is human nature the same for all times or are we learning more and more about previous positions concerning what is normative? Do we not need to be a bit more humble about definite teachings on sexuality in the face of new information from the sciences, as [Archbishop] Rembert Weakland (1980) has suggested?”<sup>2</sup>

In discussing the positive, pastoral statements on orientation put forth in *Always Our Children*, Bishop Thomas Gumbleton acknowledged that the bishops “still need to do more. We need to face the reality that there is a basic incoherence in the Church’s teaching on homosexuality.

“This is brought out very poignantly by Andrew Sullivan [noted gay Catholic scholar and author]...He ... makes the point that, according to Church teaching, homosexuality has no finality. He puts it this way: ‘It is bizarre that something can occur naturally and have no natural end. I think it’s a unique doctrine...’ He goes on to point out that the Church concedes in the *Catechism* ‘That homosexuality...is an orientation...and is involuntary. Some people seem to be constitutively homosexual.’

“But the contradiction or incoherence of the teaching arises with the expression of the condition, when one acts on what he or she is constitutively as a human person. As he [Sullivan] puts it:

‘Yet the expression of this condition which is involuntary and therefore sinless...is always and everywhere sinful! Well, I could rack my brain for an analogy in any other Catholic doctrine that would come up with such a notion. Philosophically, it is incoherent, fundamentally incoherent....

‘Now, I have tried to understand what this doctrine is about because my life is at stake in it. I believe God thinks there is a final end for me and others that is related to our essence as images of God and as people who are called to love

ourselves and others....I think we are called to commitment and to fidelity, and I see that all around me in the gay world. I see...self-evident activity leading toward this final end, which is commitment and love: the need and desire and hunger for that. That is the *sensus fidelium* [i.e., how the faithful understand it], and there is no attempt within the church right now even to bring that sense into the teaching or into the discussion of the teaching.

‘You see it even in the [Church] documents. The documents will say, on the one hand compassion, on the other hand objective disorder. A document that can come up with the phrase *not unjust discrimination* is contorted because the church is going in two different directions at once with this doctrine. On the one hand, it is recognizing the humanity of the individual being; on the other, it is not letting that human being be fully human.’<sup>3</sup>

The practical consequences of this “basic incoherence” in teaching holds serious moral dilemmas for Catholic gay and lesbian persons. For example, consider the moral imperative of chastity.

The gay or lesbian person, along with the heterosexual person, is called by the Church to live a chaste life. “The homosexual orientation is not held to be a sinful condition; as with heterosexuality, it represents the situation in which one finds oneself, the starting point for one’s response to Christ’s call to perfection. Responding to this call entails living out the demands of chastity within that orientation.”<sup>4</sup>

And what are we to understand by the “demands of chastity”? Chances are that most of us were taught in our youth to equate chastity with the idea of not thinking or acting in certain sexual or erotic ways – especially before marriage. But such a narrow view misses the point of the virtue of chastity.

In *Always Our Children*, the U.S. Bishops write:

“With the help of God’s grace, everyone is called to practice the virtue of chastity in relationships. Chastity means integrating one’s thoughts, feelings and actions, in the area of human sexuality, in a way that values and respects one’s own dignity and that of others. It is ‘the spiritual power which frees love from selfishness and aggression.’ (Pontifical Council for the Family, *The Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality*, 1996, no. 16)”

With a relational perspective that focuses on human values and dignity, on respect for the person and on unselfish consideration for others -- the bishops call us all, whatever our life status might be, to live chastely within our God-given sexual identity.

To some, the bishops’ understanding of chastity might serve as the ideal for a committed, loving and life-giving same-sex union as easily as it does for a loving heterosexual marriage. But the bishops did not intend this. A few paragraphs later, they write: “To live and love chastely is to understand that only within marriage does sexual

intercourse fully symbolize the Creator's dual design, as an act of covenant love, with the potential of co-creating new human life.”

For the gay or lesbian person, then, chastity necessarily becomes synonymous with celibacy. And this causes some questions among Catholic scholars – not to mention gay and lesbian Catholics and many of their parents and family members.

Celibacy was held in the highest esteem in both the pre-Christian age and the early Church. It was solemnly recognized as a gift from God. But how, it may be asked, can celibacy be both a gift and, at the same time, mandatory? John McNeill writes:

“According to Catholic tradition, celibacy is a special gift of God given to a certain few for the sake of the kingdom. The occasional homosexual who receives this gift is, indeed, blessed. Clergy choose a celibate lifestyle voluntarily, but lay [gay] people are given no choice; they're told they must live celibate lives. But there is no reason to believe that God grants this gift to everyone who is lesbian or homosexual.”<sup>5</sup>

Theologian Joseph Selling notes that “...celibacy is viewed [by Church councils] not as a denial of one's sexual being but as a mode of living out one's human sexuality. [However] one could rightly ask how this could ever be the case if ... the only way to fulfill the end purpose of human sexuality is to achieve or to be “open to” procreation. Clearly it could not.”<sup>6</sup>

Bishop Thomas Gumbleton acknowledges the problem:

“Gay and lesbian persons must struggle to learn how to love also. They too must learn how to integrate their sexuality into genuine intimacy with another person. How to do this, when one has no call to celibacy, is something that moral theology has not grappled with to any extent. We do know what God wants for all of us. God wills that each one of us becomes a fully human person, fully developed as a human person and, therefore, a person who is at peace within oneself, one who develops the talents and skills that one is given. This will happen through our loving relationships. And for most people it will happen through a special relationship with another person in a very loving and nurturing way.”<sup>7</sup>

The second “fundamental” issue needing re-examination in McNeill's view is the biblical understanding of homosexual acts.

In searching for God's meaning in the writings of Sacred Scripture, scholars refer to the word *hermeneutics*, i.e., “the correct reading and use of Sacred Scripture, or the way we view Sacred Scripture in dealing with contemporary moral questions.” This “correct reading” is a task assigned to the theologians, biblical scholars and historians of

the Church. On the issue of homosexuality, not surprisingly, these experts are not always in perfect harmony.

The 1986 *Letter to the Bishops* cites as gravely erroneous “a new exegesis of Sacred Scripture which claims variously that Scripture has nothing to say on the subject of homosexuality, or that it somehow tacitly approves of it, or that all of its moral injunctions are so culture-bound that they are no longer applicable to contemporary life.”<sup>8</sup>

Gerald Coleman, a noted Catholic theologian, writes, “While individual biblical texts must be interpreted carefully and contextually, there is no doubt that both the Old Testament and the New Testament prohibit homosexual conduct. Even the absence of any explicit teaching from Jesus does not counteract this point.”<sup>9</sup>

Theologians and scholars seeking a re-examination of official teaching agree with Fr. Coleman that same-sex behavior is clearly condemned in the Bible. They question, though, how this behavior was understood in the minds of the ancient writers.

New Testament Professor Victor Paul Furnish writes:

“It was only toward the end of the nineteenth century that medical and psychological investigators began to advance theories about the origins and formation of sexual identity. Until then, no distinction between ‘heterosexual’ and ‘homosexual’ orientation was possible. Although even today we understand very little about how sexual identity develops, at least we know that the process is highly complex and involves many different factors. Neither the biblical writers nor the ancient world in general had any notion of this. Therefore, no ancient language, including Hebrew and Greek, had any specific words for ‘sexuality,’ ‘heterosexuality’ or ‘homosexuality.’ ”<sup>10</sup>

The Bible says nothing about homosexuality as a sexual orientation, condition or (as the U.S. Bishops define it) “deep-seated dimension of one’s personality.” In six often-cited passages, however, Scripture does seem to refer to genital intercourse between people of the same gender. These passages have traditionally formed the basis for the Church’s teaching from Scripture that homosexual activity is morally wrong.

However, using methods of scripture interpretation approved by Pope Pius XII (*Divino Afflante Spiritu*, 1943) and by the Second Vatican Council (*Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*, 1965), a number of contemporary Catholic theologians, Bible scholars and historians have raised questions about the traditional interpretation of these passages. In a piece from his work *What the Bible Really Says about Homosexuality*, Catholic theologian Daniel Helminiak, Phd. writes:<sup>11</sup>

“Church documents have claimed that, from the book of Genesis to the end of the Christian Testament, there is constant opposition to homogenital acts. However, contemporary Bible scholars raise many questions about the matter. Read within

the context of their own historical and cultural backgrounds, the Bible texts do not address adult, loving homosexual relations as we understand them today.”

For a better awareness of these differing perspectives, we might compare and contrast interpretations “outlined briefly” in the 1986 CDF Letter *On the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons* with summaries presented by Helminiak as representing a consensus interpretation proposed by some contemporary biblical scholars.<sup>12</sup> We consider the six pertinent texts:

### **Genesis 1-3**

**CDF Letter:** “God, in his infinite 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 self to the other. In Genesis 3, we find that this truth about persons being an image of God has been obscured by original sin. There inevitably follows a loss of awareness of the covenantal character of the union these persons had with God and with each other. The human body retains its ‘spousal significance’ but this is now clouded by sin.”

**Contemporary Proposal:** “Genesis 1-3 shows Adam and Eve created for mutual companionship and procreation. These accounts use the most standard of human relationships to teach a religious lesson. The point is the love and wisdom of God, who made all things good and wills us no evil. Nothing suggests the biblical authors intended a lesson on sexual orientation.”

### **Genesis 19**

**CDF Letter:** “In Genesis 19:1-11, the deterioration due to sin continues in the story of the men of Sodom. There can be no doubt of the moral judgment made there against homosexual relations.”

**Contemporary Proposal:** “The story of Sodom in Genesis 19 is about offense against the sacred duty of hospitality. That is how Ezekiel 16:48-49 and Wisdom 9:13-14 interpret this text. The attempted male rape only heightens the atrocity of this offense [of in-hospitality].

### **Romans 1**

**CDF Letter:** “In Romans 1:18-32, still building on the moral traditions of his forebears, but in the new context of the confrontation between Christianity and the pagan society of his day, Paul uses homosexual behavior as an example of the blindness which has overcome humankind. Instead of the original harmony

between Creator and creatures, the acute distortion of idolatry has led to all kinds of moral excess. Paul is at a loss to find a clearer example of this disharmony than homosexual relations.”

Contemporary Proposal: “Romans 1:27 mentions men having relations with men. But the terms used to describe them are ‘dishonorable’ and ‘shameless.’ These refer deliberately to social disapproval, not to ethical condemnation. Moreover, according to Paul’s usage, different from the prevalent Stoic philosophy of the day, *para physin* (‘unnatural’) would best be translated ‘atypical’ or ‘beyond the ordinary.’ So it bears no reference to natural law. And it can imply no ethical condemnation because in Romans 11:24, God is said to act *para physin*. Paul sees gay sex as an impurity (see Rm. 1:24), just like un-circumcision or eating forbidden foods. He mentions it to make the main point of his letter, that the purity requirements of the Jewish Law are not relevant in Christ Jesus.”

### ***Leviticus 18, 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy***

CDF Letter: “In Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, in the course of describing the conditions necessary for belonging to the Chosen People, the author excludes from the People of God those who behave in a homosexual fashion. Against the background of this exposition of theocratic law, an eschatological perspective is developed by St. Paul when, in 1 Cor. 6:9, he proposes the same doctrine and lists those who behave in a homosexual fashion among those who shall not enter the Kingdom of God...Finally, 1 Tim.1, in full continuity with the Biblical position, singles out those who spread wrong doctrine and in v. 10 explicitly names as sinners those who engage in homosexual acts.”

Contemporary Proposal: “Leviticus 18:22 does forbid male-male sex as an ‘abomination.’ But the word simply means an impurity or a religious taboo – like eating pork. As in the case of Catholics who used to be forbidden under pain of mortal sin to eat meat on Friday, the offense was not in the act itself, but in the betrayal of one’s religion. The ancient Jews were to avoid practices common among the unclean Gentiles.

“1 Corinthians 6:9-10 and 1 Timothy 1:8-10 list *arsenokoitai* among those who will be excluded from the Reign of God. This obscure term has been translated ‘homosexuals’ but its exact meaning is debated. It certainly does not include women but only some kind of male sexual offenders. It must be interpreted in light of the abuse and licentiousness commonly associated with male-male sex in the Roman Empire. (See Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality*.)”

Catholic scholar William H. Shannon refers to a principle of biblical interpretation cited in the 1986 Bishops’ Letter from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. This principle, Shannon says, “states clearly that thought patterns and modes

of expression in the Bible differ from one period of biblical history to another and also between the biblical period and contemporary times.”<sup>13</sup>

Referencing this principle, Shannon claims, “... one cannot assume that a consistent understanding of the meaning of ‘homosexuality’ and an unequivocal use of the word homosexual would have persisted through the various periods of the writing of the Bible and the different ages of the Church’s history.” He concludes:<sup>14</sup>

“The biblical writers saw homosexuality at times in the context of male temple prostitution, at other times (Gen. 19, perhaps?) in the context of gang rape, at still other times as *unnatural* behavior on the part of *heterosexuals*. Thus it seems quite plausible to suggest that the homosexual behavior that Paul so clearly condemns in Romans 1:27 involved men who were heterosexual or at least thought to be so by Paul. For the biblical authors knew nothing of a homosexual condition that was not ‘chosen,’ but ‘given.’ They certainly would have had no notion of homosexuality as a way of relating humanly to another person in the context of love, fidelity and mutuality.

“I am not in any sense addressing the question as to whether such a way of relating is morally justifiable or not. I simply intend to say that this is what homosexual people mean today when they speak of responsible homosexual behavior, and, further, to say that this way of understanding homosexuality would have been beyond the ken of the biblical writers. We may judge that what some people call ‘responsible homosexual behavior’ is not responsible at all and needs to be condemned. But our condemnation would have to be based on our particular understanding of sexuality, not on a hermeneutic [i.e., interpretation] that would ask biblical writers to condemn something they could never even have thought of.”

Catholic theologian John McNeill poses the question – and its importance – this way:

“Can one merely accept what is referred to in English translations of the Bible as homosexuality as representing in the mind of the biblical authors what we refer to today by the same term?... It is important for the moralist to keep the distinction between homosexual activity and the homosexual condition clearly in mind. For there is an important difference in the moral judgment to be passed on a heterosexual indulging in homosexual activity and a true homosexual indulging in the same behavior as an expression of his or her love.”<sup>15</sup>

And so, the biblical debate goes on – providing grist for scholars, sound bites for politicians, questions of faith for those most directly impacted and, unfortunately too often, more heat than light.

Theologian Richard Gaillardetz discusses the “state of the debate” in his paper *Christianity and Homosexuality: The State of the Question in Contemporary Biblical and*

*Theological Studies*. Gaillardetz is the Murray Bacik Professor of Catholic Studies at the University of Toledo. He writes:

“In the midst of this controversy, the debates have too often been limited to a polarized ‘for or against’ mentality that played into ready-made liberal-conservative stereotypes. Often lost in all this was the serious scholarly reflection that has taken place within many different Christian traditions. I believe that the debate over homosexuality is one of the most important to be addressed in the churches in the last century, and it is not being served by the ideological polarization and demonizing rhetoric that has substituted for learned and thoughtful dialogue among and within the churches.”

If you would like to explore further the subject of Scripture and homosexuality, please see the Appendix for a bibliography suggesting books by authors on both sides of the question.

The two issues cited by McNeill – i.e., the question of finality in the sexual act and the biblical understanding of homosexual acts – are certainly key to Church teaching. In addition, though, in its official writings, the Church also clearly condemns homosexual acts on the basis of other magisterial teachings. These include the living tradition of the Church, the argument from natural law and the understanding of “complementarity” as an essential requirement for sexual behavior. While these considerations are not addressed in this series, there is considerable current discussion in the literature and in the pews on these topics as well.

If the reader is interested in learning more about the theological and historical aspects of the Church’s teachings – as well as the current questions being raised in light of these teachings – the listing of “related readings” at the end of this series may help.

---

And so, as we “*Talk About Homosexuality*,” the complexities are apparent. There are lots of questions:

“Does our experience now support or challenge the assumption that homosexuality is, simply and without exception, an ‘offense against nature’? Leviticus and Paul considered homosexuality a vice because they assumed it was a deliberate choice that ‘suppressed the truth about God.’ Is that a fair assessment of homosexuality as we have come to understand it? It is, of course, grossly distorting to even talk of ‘homosexuality’ as though one clearly definable thing were meant. But many of us who have gay and lesbian friends and relatives have arrived with them at the opposite conclusion: for many persons, the acceptance of

their homosexuality *is* an acceptance of creation as it applies to them. It is emphatically *not* a vice that is chosen. If this conclusion is correct, what is the hermeneutical implication?

“Another order of questions concerns the connection of homosexuality to *porneia* [any form of sexual immorality]. The church, it is clear, cannot accept *porneia*. But what is the essence of ‘sexual immorality’? Is the moral quality of sexual behavior defined biologically in terms of the use of certain body parts, or is it defined in terms of personal commitment and attitudes? Is not *porneia* essentially sexual activity that ruptures covenant, just as *castitas* is sexual virtue within or outside marriage because it is sexuality in service to covenant?

“If sexual virtue and vice are defined covenantally rather than biologically, then it is possible to place homosexual and heterosexual activity in the same context.”<sup>16</sup>

So can the Church accept gay and lesbian persons in all their humanity?

Bishop Kenneth Untener says that one of the hallmarks of Catholicism is the fact that we are an “extraordinarily inclusive church.”

“When we were youngsters, my dad took us to ball games at Tiger Stadium (back then it was called Briggs Stadium) and we always sat in the center field bleachers. The bleacher crowd is different from the crowd in the box seats or even the reserved seats. It occurred to me years later after I had studied ecclesiology, that the bleacher crowd is a good image for what the Church ought to be. That is where you have all of humanity. That is the image I think of when I read the gospels and imagine the people who complained about Jesus and the kind of people who seemed to walk with him. From our foundation by this person who walked with sinners, ate with them, and was accused of being a drunkard and a glutton, we have always been a remarkably inclusive Church...

“Catholics are the ones who drink, gamble, swear and smoke. Perhaps we should examine some of this behavior. But I find it interesting that of all the major Christian denominations, it seems more characteristic of Catholics to have a certain earthiness. We are also the ones who bury gangsters!

“While we can be proud of the inclusivity of the Church, we have never been perfect. It was a paradox that, while we were burying gangsters, we would not bury divorced people. Although we have been far from, and will never, be perfectly inclusive, there is no mistaking the fact that we are at the core, a very inclusive Church.”<sup>17</sup>

And how will this inclusivity for gay and lesbian people occur? Luke Timothy Johnson, professor of New Testament and Christian Origins at Candler School of Theology, offers an analogy:

“The issue here is analogous to the one facing earliest Christianity after Gentiles started being converted. Granted that they had been given the Holy Spirit, could they be accepted into the people of God just as they were, or must they first ‘become Jewish’ by being circumcised and obeying all the ritual demands of Torah [the five books of Moses]?”

“Remember, please, the stakes: the Gentiles were ‘by nature’ unclean, and were ‘by practice’ polluted by idolatry. We are obsessed by the sexual dimensions of the body. The first-century Mediterranean world was obsessed by the social implications of food and table-fellowship. The decision to let the Gentiles in ‘as is’ and to establish a more inclusive form of table-fellowship, we should note, came into direct conflict with the accepted interpretation of Torah and what God wanted of humans.

“The decision, furthermore, was not easy to reach. Paul’s Letter to the Galatians suggests some of the conflict it generated. Even the irenic Luke devotes five full chapters of Acts (10-15) to the account of how the community was caught up with God’s intentions, stumbling every step of the way through confusion, doubt, challenge, disagreements, divisions and debate. Much suffering had to be endured before the implications of Peter’s question, ‘If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that could withstand God,’ (Acts 11:17) could be fully answered: ‘We believe that we [Jews] shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they [Gentiles] will.’ (Acts 15:11)

“The grounds of the church’s decision then was the work that God was doing among the Gentiles, bringing them to salvation through faith. On the basis of this experience of God’s work, the church made bold to reinterpret Torah, finding there unexpected legitimacy for its fidelity to God’s surprising ways. (Acts 15:15-18) How was that work of God made known to the church? Through the narratives of faith related by Paul and Barnabas and Peter, their personal testimony of how ‘signs and wonders’ had been worked among the Gentiles. (Acts 15:4, 6-11, 12-13)

“Such witness is what the church now needs from homosexual Christians. Are homosexuality and holiness of life compatible? Is homosexual covenantal love according to ‘the mind of Christ,’ an authentic realization of that Christian identity authored by the Holy Spirit, and therefore ‘authored’ as well by the Scripture despite the ‘authorities’ speaking against it?”

“The church can discern this only on the basis of faithful witness. The burden of proof required to overturn scriptural precedents is heavy, but it is a burden that has been borne before. The church cannot, should not, define itself in response to political pressure or popularity polls. But it is called to discern the work of God in human lives and adapt its self-understanding in response to the work of God.

Inclusivity must follow from evidence of holiness; are there narratives of homosexual holiness to which we must begin to listen?”<sup>18</sup>

## Notes

### Part 3: Segment 3 (cont.): Other Catholic Voices

---

<sup>1</sup> John J. McNeill. “Homosexuality: Challenging the Church to Grow,” from Homosexuality in the Church, ed., Jeffrey S. Siker, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press), p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Nugent. “Theological Contributions of the U.S. Church,” from Building Bridges: Gay & Lesbian Reality and the Catholic Church, 3<sup>rd</sup> printing, Robert Nugent and Jeannine Gramick, (Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications), p.154.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas J. Gumbleton. “A Call to Listen: The Church’s Pastoral and Theological Response to Gays and Lesbians,” from Sexual Diversity and Catholicism: Toward the Development of Moral Theology, eds., Patricia Beattie Jung, with Joseph Andrew Coray, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001).

<sup>4</sup> “Ministry and Homosexuality in the Archdiocese of San Francisco,” issued as an Archdiocesan Pastoral Plan by the San Francisco Senate of Priests, from Voices of Hope, eds., Jeannine Gramick and Robert Nugent (New York: Center for Homophobia Education, 1995), p.109.

<sup>5</sup> McNeill, p. 51.

<sup>6</sup> Joseph Selling. “The Development of Catholic Tradition and Sexual Morality,” from Embracing Sexuality: Authority and Experience in the Catholic Church, ed., Joseph Selling, (Aldershot, Hampshire, England: Ashgate, 2001).

<sup>7</sup> Gumbleton, op. cit.

<sup>8</sup> “Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons,” issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1986.

<sup>9</sup> “Homosexuality: Catholic Teaching and Practice,” (New York: Paulist Press, 1995), see chapter on *Biblical Documentation*, pp.56-72.

<sup>10</sup> Victor Paul Furnish. “What Does Scripture Say? How Shall We Listen? The Bible and Homosexuality,” from *Open Hands*, summer, 1993.

<sup>11</sup> Daniel Helminiak, from *Catholicism, Homosexuality and Dignity*, 1996.

<sup>12</sup> The positions stated are taken from the 1986 CDF Letter and from the Helminiak source referenced above.

<sup>13</sup> William H. Shannon. “A Response to Archbishop Quinn,” from The Vatican and Homosexuality, (New York: Crossroad Press, 1988), eds., Jeannine Gramick and Pat Furey, pp. 20-27.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> McNeill, pp 38 and 39.

<sup>16</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson. “Disputed Questions: Debate and Discernment, Scripture and the Spirit,” *Commonweal*, January 28, 1994.

<sup>17</sup> Kenneth E. Untener. “Hallmarks of the Church,” an address delivered at a New Ways Ministry Symposium, March 28, 1992.

<sup>18</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson. Op cit.