

## **Untangling the Web**

**By Mark Olson**

### **A look at what Scripture does and does not say about homosexual behavior**

A few years ago, the elected officials of Montgomery County, Maryland, were considering an ordinance to guarantee full civil rights to gay and lesbian people. Concerned about past practices in the county, they wanted to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation. Just because a man loves a man or a woman loves a woman, they reasoned, doesn't mean that they should have any less freedom. They should be accorded the same rights and privileges as anyone else.

But when the elected officials, in their wisdom, decided to hold public hearings on the measure, local pastors came out in force. Thumping their Bibles with vile glee, a host of Christian ministers announced their unrelenting opposition.

What, then, should we do with gay and lesbian people, asked the county board. How shall they be treated?

One minister, according to news reports I read the next day, stood solemnly, pointed to Scripture, and intoned, "Execute them."

I wish I could say that what happened in Montgomery County, Maryland, was something new. Or rare. But it's not.

For centuries, well-meaning, unthinking heterosexuals have banged homosexuals over the head with Scripture. Not only has Scripture been used to exclude gay and lesbian people from church bodies, but the gracious words of Paul have somehow given rise to hate-filled sermons about "the homosexual menace." And not only has Scripture been used

to threaten gay and lesbian people with an eternity in Hell, it's been used to suggest that they be sent there at the first opportunity.

We all misinterpret Scripture, of course. On all kinds of subjects, we misunderstand the context. We lack knowledge of the historical and cultural setting. We rely on flawed translations. And we approach God's Word with blinded eyes, seeing only what we assumed was there before we opened the book. All of us, from naive new Christian to experienced biblical scholar, make mistakes.

Yet I know of few other current issues in which Scripture is so often cited in a blind, misguided way as it is on the subject of homosexual behavior. Scholarly insights are suppressed. Gross mistranslations are accepted without question. Contexts are ignored. And all sense of balance is thrown out the window. It's as if we heterosexuals can't stand to look at Scripture objectively. I wonder if it's because we fear it will upset our world view. I wonder if it's because we fear it will call into question the viciousness of our past and present behavior toward our homosexual brothers and sisters.

Don't get me wrong. I'm not suggesting that all homosexual Christians have a perfect understanding of Scripture – or even that all homosexual Christians are willing to wrestle honestly and openly with God's revelation. They don't – and they aren't. But I *am* saying that heterosexuals have a particular appalling – sometimes downright frightening - record on this topic, one which needs to be radically turned around. The sooner the better.

We don't have the space here to examine in detail each of the passages of Scripture that refer in one way or another to homosexual behavior. But we *can* look at them briefly – in hopes of beginning to untangle the web of

misinterpretation and misunderstanding that has so often plagued them. (Excellent books are available for further reading).

Let's begin with Genesis 19, where two men, described as messengers from God ("angels"), come to visit Lot. While they're visiting, a gang of men from Sodom come to Lot's house and start a commotion. They demand that Lot send out the two foreigners so that they can "know" them. Lot refuses, offering to send out his two virgin daughters instead, suggesting that they do with his daughters as they please.

An amazing number of Christians, particularly those who haven't looked into the question, assume that the sin of Sodom (for which it was later destroyed) was homosexuality. This interpretation is based on the assumption that the word *know* in this passage is a euphemism for sexual intercourse. (The New International Version reinforces such an assumption by translating the Hebrew word for "know" here as "have sex with.")

Now, it's true the Hebrew word for "know" can refer to sexual intercourse – and clearly does in at least ten Old Testament passages. But in 933 other Old Testament passages it appears to have no sexual connotation at all. So one can hardly assume that it *has* to mean something sexual in this passage. It *might* mean a more straightforward kind of knowledge or acquaintance, as it does in most other passages.

And if the word here means something more general, then it's possible that the sin of Sodom was the sin of inhospitality. Maybe the men of Sodom, fearing aliens, wanted to abuse and attack these foreigners. Maybe they wanted to subject them to hostile and suspicious questions. Maybe they intended to kick them out of their city, denying them any gracious hospitality. If you think such a view is farfetched, don't forget

that it was while discussing with his disciples the problem of inhospitable cities that Jesus refers to the destruction of Sodom (Matthew 10: 14-15).

In fact, as it turns out, *no* biblical reference to the destruction of Sodom specifically labels the sin of Sodom as homosexuality. Often the sin of Sodom is described as pride – as it is in the ancient books of Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. Similarly, Ezekiel 16:48-49 states that the sin of Sodom was pride, coupled with a failure to “strengthen the hand of the poor and the needy.” (The next verse adds that Sodom was “haughty” and did abominable things – but what those things might be is not specified.)

So if you take the Bible at face value (avoiding translations of Genesis 19 that impose their own interpretation), you can hardly say that Sodom was punished solely – or even primarily – for a general practice of homosexuality.

Of course, Lot’s offering of his virgin daughters to the men of the city does at least *imply* a possible sexual interest on the part of the men. So it seems possible, even likely, that Sodom’s sins was a horrible propensity for rape – even brutal gang rape (homosexual in this case).

Such behavior, whether homosexual or heterosexual, deserves God’s wrath. But that doesn’t mean the story of Sodom should be taken as a general condemnation of all forms of sexual activity, whether homosexual or heterosexual. And in that sense, Genesis 19 tells us nothing about the validity or non-validity of loving sexual relationships, homosexual or heterosexual.

Nevertheless, two verses in the Old Testament *do* explicitly condemn *male* homosexual activity. (Lesbianism is never mentioned). Both of these verses appear in Leviticus, and although the wording in Hebrew is a bit strange, the meaning is clear. “If a man lies with a male as with a woman,

both of them have committed an abomination,” says Leviticus 20:13. “They shall be put to death; their blood is upon them.” (A similar command is given in Leviticus 18:22. No punishment is specified.)

But for the followers of Jesus, the levitical code is no longer applicable in any literal sense. Paul reminds us that we live not under law but grace. Jesus said he came not to destroy the law but to bring it to completion. And in the transfiguration story, when the disciples try to accord equal status to Jesus and representatives of the Old Testament Law and Prophets, a voice from heaven warns them to listen to Jesus. He and he alone is the Word made flesh.

Of course, many provisions of the Old Testament code were valuable and important – especially to a struggling, once nomadic people trying to reproduce and establish itself on God’s promised land. But that doesn’t mean those rules and regulations still necessarily reflect God’s will for us in any absolute, ongoing sense.

Some Christians claim we ought to uphold the Old Testament “moral law” while abandoning the “ceremonial law.” But since the Old Testament itself makes no such distinction (and Old Testament Jews would find the notion impossible), that’s difficult to do. In what category do you put the command to stone disobedient children? Or the command for a husband and wife to abstain from sexual relations except during a woman’s most fertile period? What about the command not to harvest the grain around the edge of a field – must we keep that in a literal fashion as well?

The levitical law, though valuable and instructive, is from a time past. By themselves, the two verses that condemn male homosexual relations – like those that govern the mixing of cloths and restrict the harvesting of fruit from trees – shed little or no light on what God wants for us today.

So then, as Christians, we look primarily to the New Testament – and especially to Jesus – for insight into how we should live. It is here that we sense God speaking to us most clearly about the faith, hope, and love that should mark our lives.

And as we look to the New Testament for advice on homosexual behavior, the first thing we're struck with is the complete silence of Jesus on the subject. Jesus addressed many issues. He pointed through our human follies. He poked holes in our false gods. He got devastatingly specific in calling God's people to lives of love not hate. But he never, in the Gospel record, addressed the question of homosexual behavior.

So when we look at Jesus on this question, we get many important general principles about righteous living. But we get no specific answers. Either homosexual behavior was not an issue for Jesus or he (and the Gospel writers) deliberately chose not to address it. And that's something we must not lose sight of as we examine other New Testament passages.

The only New Testament references to homosexual behavior come in three brief, passing remarks of Paul. All three appear in letters addressed to the churches in the Greco-Roman world. And all three, as we shall see, are often misinterpreted and mistranslated.

The earliest of these references comes in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10. "Do you not know," Paul writes, that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither the immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor *malaroi* nor *arsenoroitai*, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the kingdom of God."

Check a variety of Bibles and you're likely to find an equal number of different translations of the Greek words *malaroi* and *arsenoroitai*. Sometimes, as in the Revised Standard Version, they're even lumped together as one word. Literally, *malaroi* means "soft."

But in sexual contexts during the time of Paul, it almost always referred in a negative, pejorative way to a widely despised group of people who functioned as effeminate “call-boys.” These were boys or young men who sold their services as prostitutes. As they grew older, they sometimes even resorted to plucking their facial hair, dressing and perfuming themselves like women. Apparently the more feminine they looked, the more successful they were in selling their services.

Recent research by New Testament scholar Robin Scroggs, and others has shown that pederasty – in the literal sense of men having sex with boys – was an open and common practice in many Hellenistic cities during the time of Paul.

Sometimes it would take the form of men buying sex with young prostitutes. At other times, men would take a specific boy as their long-term lover, using them as a sexual partner throughout adolescence, shepherding them towards manhood almost as would a father. For some people, this latter kind of pederasty almost had a “noble” aura about it. It was apparently practiced by many government leaders and military heroes. A third form of pederasty involved slavery. A cordial host would apparently supply boy-slaves as involuntary objects of sexual activity for adult male guests. In some circles, this was considered a suitable use for slaves.

By the way, *pederasty* these days is sometimes used as a synonym for “anal intercourse” – devoid of its original indication of sex between a man and a boy. This more general definition is not what Scroggs intends, especially since sexual activities between men and boys during this period took many forms. Sometimes they involved anal intercourse. But they didn’t have to – and often didn’t.

In any case, great debates raged in Paul's day, even in secular culture over the legitimacy of these practices. In these debates, no form of pederasty was more roundly condemned than the selling of one's sexual services as a *malaros*. It's likely then, that Paul, in his "vice list," was denigrating that which many of his readers would also denigrate, namely, the practice of children selling themselves as sexual partners to adults of the same sex. Such behavior was universally considered the lowest form of pederasty.

The other key word in Paul's vice list is *arsenoroites*. Literally, it's a combination of two Greek words, *arsen* ("male"), and *roite* ("bed," "marriage bed," or "sexual intercourse"). In such combinations, the second half of the Greek word often takes on a verbal force. But exactly what Paul meant by the term is hard to say. No one has found any written use of the word in any Greek literature prior to the writing of 1 Corinthians. So we can't examine other contexts of the period to learn more precisely what Paul meant by it.

Historian John Boswell argues that the "male" half of the word is the subject not the object. This view is supported by some later uses of the word by early church theologians. And if this is true, then the word refers to male prostitutes – not necessarily homosexual. (Boswell also cites evidence that *malaros* was sometimes used to refer in a general way to someone who was merely "wanting in self-control.") If Boswell is right, 1 Corinthians 6 doesn't necessarily refer to homosexuality at all.

Robin Scroggs, however, takes another view. Scroggs suspects that *arsenoroites* doesn't appear elsewhere in Greek literature because it's a translation of an established Hebrew phrase, *misrav zarur*, which means "lying with a male." The word doesn't appear elsewhere because only a Greek-speaking Jew would think to use it.

If Scroggs is correct, then “male” is the object not the subject of the word. And in this context it most likely refers to those pederastic men who bought the services of the *malaroi* or “call-boys.” This would fit with the usual discussions of pederastic prostitution in secular literature. In such literature, it was common to condemn both the seller and the *buyer* of such services.

In either case, it appears that the vice list Paul uses in 1 Corinthians 6, illustrating a point about Christian purity, says little or nothing about homosexuality in general or about faithful, mutual relationships in particular. If Scroggs is right, it *does* condemn the buying and selling of sex between men and boys. But the other, more culturally respected forms of pederasty (which I mentioned earlier) aren’t even included in this judgment.

All our present knowledge could be wrong or misguided. But it certainly appears that those who use 1 Corinthians to write all homosexual people out of God’s kingdom are going far beyond what Paul had in mind.

Chronologically, the next New Testament reference to homosexuality comes in Romans 1:26-27. These two verses come in the midst of a major theological argument by Paul about the universality of sin and justice and mercy of Christ.

Paul begins by discussing the senseless idolatry of the Gentiles and the fallen behavior such idolatry promotes. In chapter 2 he shows that Jews, too, are part of that fall, though they often fail to acknowledge it. (You are “doing the very same things,” he tells his readers.)

This portion of Romans, then, is not meant as ethical admonition. It’s theological argument. And as a part of that argument, Paul seeks to show that sin is not only universal, but that its effects are equally widespread in the individual. So he talks about God giving us up to the desires of our

*hearts and bodies*, God giving us up to the corruption of our *passions*, God giving us up to unfit *minds*. (Note the amazingly parallel structure in vv. 24-28). Not only have all of us sinned, but the effects of our sin can be seen in all parts of our living and being. We have sunk into a false reality, relied on false wisdom, and the prospects – apart from God – are hopeless.

Although Paul offers no illustrations of sins manifested by the desires of the heart and body, he illustrates dishonorable passions with a two-verse discussion of homosexuality. And then, building to a climax with his usual rhetorical skill, he illustrates the errors of an unfit mind with the longest, most vigorous vice catalog you'll find anywhere in his letters.

It's this brief discussion of homosexuality, of course, and not the vice list or the overall theological argument that concerns us here. We want to know what Paul is saying about homosexuality - and why. What does it mean for us?

Remembering then that these verses are incidental to a larger theological point, let's look at what Paul says about homosexuality. "Therefore," reads Romans 1:26-27, "God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For not only did their females exchange natural intercourse for that which is against nature, but also males, leaving natural intercourse with females, lusted in their desire for one another, males working shame with males and receiving the punishment within themselves which their falsehood necessitated" (translation by Robin Scroggs). Some heterosexuals, perhaps influenced by a latent homophobia, are inclined to read these verses as a flat-out condemnation of *all* homosexual activity. But let's not blame it all on homophobia. If you read these verses superficially, neither examining the Greek text nor investigating the historical-cultural context, they surely appear, at first glance, to cast aspersions on *all* homosexual activity.

Other interpretations are possible, of course. For example, some people look at the passage and focus on the word *natural*. They conclude that Paul is talking about *heterosexuals* who choose to have homosexual relations, violating that which is *natural to them*. This interpretation fits nicely with the context, in which Paul is talking about the dangers of living falsely. And it fits with the fact that many men and boys who participated for a time in pederasty later married and lived normal heterosexual lives.

Obviously, if this interpretation is correct, then Paul's comments have no bearing on true homosexual people. If anything, the implication would be that true homosexual people should do what is natural to them. And that would mean having intercourse with people of the same sex.

This is possible. But Paul is talking about people who "lust in their desires" for one another. And as I understand it, that's normally not the case when heterosexuals (as opposed to homosexuals) engage in same-sex relations. On the other hand, in speaking of lustful desires, Paul *could* have been speaking figuratively. If so, maybe we shouldn't put so much weight on his reference to sexual passion.

It's also unlikely, of course, that Paul had any understanding of the fact that some people are "naturally" attracted to people of the same sex. So precise language isn't likely to have characterized his writing on the subject, especially when he's merely illustrating a larger, more important theological point.

Others focus on the immediate context of the passage and realize that Paul's larger subject here is idolatry. That leads them to believe that Paul may be discussing the kind of sexual activity that took place in some pagan temples. That's plausible. Certainly temple prostitutes were prevalent at many times in history, and Paul is likely to have known this.

Such activity would have been especially repugnant to anyone of Jewish background. So it's possible this is what Paul had in mind.

On the other hand, it does seem strange – or significant - that he mentions only homosexual activity. Temple sex was both heterosexual and homosexual. Why would he have made a big deal out of the homosexual nature of this activity? We can't know for sure, but it *seems* as if both homosexual *and* heterosexual temple prostitution would have been equally abhorrent in Paul's mind. And that raises some serious questions about this interpretation.

Because of our distance from the writing of this epistle – and our limited knowledge of the times – it's hard to know which interpretation comes closest to the truth. As always, we need to maintain a great deal of humility in our approach to Scripture. Yet one interpretation, offered by Robin Scroggs in his excellent book, *The New Testament and Homosexuality*, is especially compelling.

Scroggs argues that once again (as in 1 Corinthians), it is primarily pederasty that Paul has in mind. Pederasty was the only form of male homosexual behavior openly and widely practised in the Hellenistic world at that time. And it was practised in some especially vile and abusive ways. So it's not surprising that Paul would mention it as an example of the false passions that arise as a result of the sin in us all.

Supporting this view is the fact that the Greek phrase that Paul uses for “male lying with male” is the same Greek phrase used by Philo, a Hellenistic Jewish philosopher, to describe pederasty. Indeed, whenever Philo uses the phrase, he is talking about pederasty.

In addition, note that Paul's argument from nature is linked neither to theories of “natural law” (a concept which developed later) nor to the Genesis creation stories. What it *is* linked to - at least linguistically – is

the common Greek argument against pederasty. According to Scroggs, the Greek phrase which Paul uses, *para phusin* (“that which is against nature”), is identical to the Greek phrase that regularly appears in secular Greek critiques of pederasty. Even Paul’s reference to shame (*asremosome*) is linguistically identical to typical secular judgments on pederasty of this period.

If this is true, it seems strange that Paul begins with a brief reference to women. Pederasty, by definition, involves only men. And not only does the Old Testament never prohibit female homosexual activity, but secular Greco-Roman literature hardly even acknowledges its existence. If there were some kinds of female homosexual activity at this time, they were not well known and almost never discussed. Given present resources, it’s almost impossible to know what kind of female homosexual activity Paul had in mind.

But when you think of Paul’s theological argument – about the universality of sin – it’s clear why he would need to include women as well. His whole point is that *all* are fallen – Jew as well as Gentile, women as well as men, slave as well as free. And in Christ *all* are brought to newness of life.

And when you look at the larger context, it’s clear that Paul was sometimes speaking in a rather general or figurative fashion. For example, in chapter one, he outlines all kinds of gross Gentile sins, including idolatry and (probably) pederastic prostitution. And then in chapter two he turns to his Jewish readers and declares that they are doing “the very same things” (Romans 2:1). Obviously, very few Jewish readers of Romans were worshipping carved idols or engaging in any kind of homosexual activity (since such activities seem almost unknown in Jewish culture). Yet Paul’s Jewish readers *were* in an important theological sense guilty of the same fallenness.

It's plausible, then, that Paul was speaking in a similar general, theological way about women. Note that in Romans 1 Paul spends most of his time talking about the men; they're the focus of the linguistic force. While women are dealt with in a few simple words, Paul piles on the adjectives and phrases in denouncing the pederastic activities of men. It's as if they're what's really on his mind. (On the other hand, he *might* have had some specific behavior in mind, something unmentioned in other literature of the period. If so, we may never know what it is.)

In any case, it's clear that, given his theological purpose, Paul couldn't let anyone off the hook. All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God (Romans 3:23).

I don't know if Scroggs is right about all this. Maybe he's missed something. Or maybe conflicting data will be unearthed someday. But at this point, he's compiled some impressive evidence. It ought not be taken lightly.

Chronologically, the final New Testament reference to homosexuality comes in 1 Timothy 1:9-10. In this pastoral epistle we find another vice list, a catalog of behaviors "contrary to sound doctrine" and not in accord with "the glorious gospel."

The examples in this vice list seem to fall into five groups. First, the text talks of the lawless and rebellious. Then it talks of the impious, the sinner, the unholy, and the profane. Next it talks of patricide, matricide, and murder. And finally it talks of the liar and the perjurer.

But just before the liar and the perjurer comes a group of vices that we should look at more closely. In Greek the words here are *pornoi*, *arsenoroitai*, and *andrapodistai*.

In some translations, *arsenoroitai* is translated as “homosexual” or “sodomite.” But it is not as simple as that. *Arsenoroites* is one of those same words we found in 1 Corinthians 6. And as I said before, it’s a rare word – with no record of use prior to these two passages in the Pauline epistles. However, as I pointed out in reference to 1 Corinthians 6, it may be a transliteration of a Hebrew word that refers to the adult male in a pederastic relationship, specifically a person who buys sex with a boy prostitute.

As for the other words grouped with it here, the first is  *pornos*. In the most straight forward sense,  *pornos* means a male prostitute or a slave in a brothel house. But in much literature of the New Testament era, it seems to have taken on broader meaning, referring to sexual offences in general. And to determine whether it’s being used in its narrow or broad sense, one must look at the context.

In this passage,  *pornos* is linked with  *arsenoroites*. And to Scroggs that suggests that it is being used here in its more narrow sense, probably referring to those boys whose sexual services were sold to adult men. (In this sense,  *pornos* is parallel to the  *malaros* of 1 Corinthians.)

This view is further supported by the last word in this vice cluster,  *andropodistes*, a word which appears nowhere else in the New Testament. Literally, it means “kidnapper” or “slave dealer.” These two meanings were almost synonymous in first-century Hellenistic culture. People became kidnappers not to collect ransoms but to sell people into slavery.

When attractive boys and girls were kidnapped, they were often sold as slaves to wealthy individuals or brothel houses – for sexual purposes. Thus these three words –  *pornos*,  *arsenoroites*, and  *andropodistes* – are closely linked together. And in this passage, then, we have a

condemnation of prostitutes (especially young boys), the men who buy such services, and those who kidnap and sell children into sexual slavery.

One can hardly think of crimes more contrary to “the glorious gospel” than these. Such behavior contradicts all that Jesus taught. We are to relate to each other with love, service, and grace. The destructive and abusive behavior described in this passage can never be reconciled with the loving spirit to which we’ve been called.

Although 1 Timothy is sometimes translated in a way that makes it sound as if it is referring to homosexuality in general, that doesn’t seem to be the case. This seems to have been understood by many early church theologians. Historian John Boswell points out that early Christian thinkers, when they discussed the larger question of homosexuality, never cited this text as having any bearing on the subject!

So where does this leave us? In the Old Testament we have a story about a proud, selfish city that God destroyed. At one point, it manifested its wickedness by seeking to subject visitors to homosexual gang rape. We know from general biblical principles that such behavior is unconscionable.

We also have in the Old Testament two one-sentence prohibitions of male homosexual activity. But we know from the New Testament that the old levitical law is no longer operative. It was given in a specific time and place – but that time and place has passed. So these two verses are no longer applicable.

In the New Testament, we have two vice lists in Pauline epistles. Each refers in a derogatory way to prostitution, especially prostitution that involved pederasty – exploitive sex between men and boys. 1 Timothy also condemns those who would sell children into such settings.

These are abominable practices, clearly contrary to the spirit of Jesus. It's not surprising to see them condemned.

Finally, we have in Romans a theological illustration that focuses most strongly on pederasty (though other interpretations are possible). Pederasty was a major concern of Hellenistic culture, both Christian and non-Christian. (Even Josephus, the Jewish historian, reminds his readers that it was for pride that Sodom was destroyed. But given the details of the story, he then launches into an attack on the practice of pederasty, suggesting that the angels were probably beautiful young men.) Again, this is wholly consistent with other larger biblical principles.

Nowhere, then, except for two non-applicable verses in Leviticus, does the Bible address the question of homosexual behavior in general. Never do the Gospel writers mention any reference of Jesus to the topic.

Legitimate questions can be raised concerning Paul's illustration in Romans 1. Though it appears to focus on pederasty, it might have larger implications. The problem is, if you apply it to faithful, loving homosexual relationships, you're moving onto shaky ground. It's hard to see how such relationships, in and of themselves, would violate the teachings of Jesus or any larger biblical principle.

Certainly the Bible assumes heterosexual relationships are the norm. They're the most common. But nowhere are we taught any general principle that denies the validity of committed, caring homosexual relationships between people who find themselves drawn in love toward others of the same sex.

I know of some gay and lesbian people who, in seeking to be open to Scripture and God's Spirit, have felt called to celibacy. They affirm and acknowledge their homosexual orientation but choose not to practice it. Over the centuries, many heterosexuals have felt genuinely called to

celibacy as well. I respect that decision. It's an option for all of us; we need to support and encourage those who choose it. I suspect it can be liberating.

On the other hand, I have seen God blessing and using homosexual Christians who have united with each other in loving sexual relationships. In faithful, committed relationships, gay and lesbian Christians find God at work. We must not be so attached to a few verses of Scripture – or our own interpretations of them – that we miss this witness of God's Spirit.

God is still speaking. God's Word is still ringing out. With humility and openness we must listen as God continues to lead us in the way of grace, in the way of life, in the way of love.

*Mark Olson is the editor of THE OTHER SIDE. For more detailed reading on the texts discussed in this article, try Robin Scrogg's THE NEW TESTAMENT AND HOMOSEXUALITY, John Boswell's CHRISTIANITY, SOCIAL TOLERANCE, AND HOMOSEXUALITY and the "Postscript" to Hendrik Hart's SETTING OUR SIGHTS BY THE MORNING STAR.*