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Scripture and Ethics: Core, Context, and Coherence

James T. Bretzke

Tripartite Template for Scripture and Ethics

"God hates fags! (Lev 18:22)" is a placard we see unfortunately too often today. While many educated Christians would not countenance such an inflammatory, hateful, and perverted use of scripture, still it is difficult to see how the Bible should inform our understanding of moral norms in general, and our Christian response in particular. In other words, how can we take the Bible off the shelf and bring it into ethical discussions in a way that uses the scripture in a constructive and authentic dialogical manner—in a way that may not "clinch" moral arguments from the start by closing off any subsequent debate. How can we allow the voice of scripture to be heard, engaged, and evaluated in a manner that both properly forms and informs both our character and our moral reasoning? In dealing with these questions I propose an evaluative template of three key elements: the core meaning of the biblical text, the context of the text(s) itself, and coherence (or consistency) of a given text with the rest of scripture, as well as the Christian tradition and standards of human morality.

Core refers not to the text per se, but rather points to God's definitive revelation to humankind of God's own self, namely Jesus Christ. Core reflects Vatican II's mandate that scripture be the soul of all theology (and especially moral theology). It is the progressive revelation by the Spirit, rather than any given logion or biblical verse(s), that reminds us of what has been taught by Jesus. It is the Spirit who teaches us those things we could not bear earlier (cf. John 14:16–17, 26; 16:7–15). The Spirit leads us deeper into the hierarchy of truths that express the core considerations of the Gospel message Jesus came to preach and which ongoing mission he has entrusted to the church (cf. Matt 28:19–20).

Context looks more explicitly at the text in order to illumine more clearly the core. Scripture is a text, and therefore like all texts it is neither self-evident, self-exegeting, self-interpreting, nor self-applying. Moreover, since the Bible was written not only in a different time, but also in a different language, it must first be translated. Only after scripture is translated can it be read, analyzed, understood, interpreted, and applied. These six tasks require great effort, study, and reflection. Greater attention to context can help in each of these tasks individually, as well as helping to furnish an integrative theme to hold them together.

"God hates fags" would fail the evaluative criteria of both core and context, as well as the third criterion of our template, coherence. Coherence flows naturally from a proper consideration of both core and context and works well particularly against proof-texting and/or biblical literalism by looking at how the core Gospel message functions in the various contexts to make its central points. For example, take a problematic biblical text such as Jesus' admonition to cut off any organ that causes one to sin (cf. Matt 5:29–30). While these verses may well be the ipsissima verba of the historical Jesus, we could hardly argue that literal
application of this admonition is consistent with his larger preaching and public ministry. Thus, the coherence criterion points us back to the core criterion, which would deny that this kind of injunction could be a legitimate biblical or divine command. The context criterion confirms this analysis by showing this particular logion as an example of hyperbolic discourse used to underscore the importance of the moral life, but not as a sentencing guide for infractions thereof. As a way of seeing how this tripartite template might work in interfacing the Bible with concrete moral issues, I propose a four-step process to evaluate an intriguing recent application of scripture to this issue.

**Four Steps in Using Scripture in Moral Issues**

In any application of a biblical text to a concrete moral case or ethical issue, one must obviously start with the identification of the actual case, or issue, at hand. Yet mere “identification” of an issue is rarely sufficient preparation in itself to advance to the next step of selecting the appropriate scripture text. Most concrete moral cases involve a number of related and intertwined issues and concerns, not all of which could be addressed by just a single biblical text or theme. Thus, if one takes AIDS, for example, as an important ethical concern, any number of concrete moral cases arise: effects of intravenous drug use and/or sexual promiscuity, legitimate sexual education, protection of the blood supply, acceptability of widespread mandatory HIV testing, doctor-patient confidentiality, allocation of limited health care and bio-medical research resources, job discrimination and security for the seropositive, response of the community to those infected, and so forth, to name just a few of the more obvious issues.

While these issues are all related to the AIDS tragedy in some way or another, the individual moral cases are often rather disparate. Sexual education concerns differ from the issues connected with doctor-patient confidentiality, and therefore the precise ethical issue must be clearly specified and demarcated before either further moral evaluation or the employment of biblical material can be attempted. Step One requires an initial identification and specification of the actual moral case. Often a practical aid in the precision of the concrete moral case connected with some broader ethical issue will be the identification of the audience to be addressed. Thus, a medical convention, a school board, a parish council, or even a Sunday homily might each provide a legitimate forum in which some aspect of the AIDS crisis would be faced. Each of these different potential audiences, however, would focus on a different facet of this complex issue. Obviously then the biblical input would likely vary as well.

This first step, if done carefully and well, will often “suggest” an appropriate scriptural text or theme that might shed some additional light on how either the individual or community might respond. Step Two moves on to the actual selection of the biblical text and/or theme. Here we must recall the basic hermeneutical principle that no text is “self-interpreting” and yet at the same time strive to avoid the problematic of the hermeneutical circle in such a way that we merely bring our agenda to the Bible for confirmation. Here the crucial hermeneutical problem becomes precisely which images, themes, and so forth are appropriate to guide our moral theology or ethical reflection on this or that particular question. A related issue concerns the “working definitions” that we have given for moral theology and scripture: do our understandings of moral theology and revelation allow for scripture to inform Christian ethics in a substantive and practical way? Furthermore, what criteria are best suited to guide our selection from the wide variety of moral discourse found in the Bible?

Addressing this question, William Spohn presents five central criteria distilled from the work of H. Richard Niebuhr.
First, Spohn points out that the appropriate biblical images should be central to the canon of scripture. Second, those guiding biblical images chosen should convey, or be in harmony with, a theologically sound image of God, for example, the Exodus view of God as Redeemer and Deliverer of captives. Third, these governing images themselves must be consistent with the definitive revelation of God's own self in the person of Jesus Christ, which may require jettisoning “negative” biblical images, such as the “Crusading Warrior” of the Holy War, which are fundamentally inconsistent with the New Testament character portrait of Jesus. The fourth criterion is methodologically obvious: The selected images should be appropriate to the moral situation under reflection, and shed light (rather than heat) upon it. The fifth, final criterion states that the biblical images employed should not suggest any action that would be opposed to the common standards of ordinary human morality; Deus impossibile non iubet is an important manualist maxim to retain. Since God does not command the impossible, physically or morally, believers cannot be called by God to any type of activity that would be clearly injurious to themselves or others. This criterion reflects the integral harmony the church has always taught exists between the natural law and divine revelation, and is well-expressed in Jesus’ own statements of his mission (cf. Luke 4:16–20; John 10:7–10). To Spohn’s and Niebuhr’s five criteria I would suggest adding a sixth. While it is impossible to take into consideration every possible biblical text for each moral issue, nevertheless we have to avoid the very natural tendency to create a “canon-within-the-canonical,” whereby we systematically exclude from our reflection some significant section of biblical material. Thus, it is important to practice a lectio continua whereby we engage ourselves in a process of reading the whole of scripture on a regular extended basis such as the practice the church follows in the three-year lectionary cycle. This could be any habit of reading the Bible in a progressive manner, from start to finish, or in any other manner, so long as regular exposure is had to the whole of the Word of God.

Once the moral case has been specified, and some possible biblical texts selected that might seem to speak to the issue, we move to Step Three, which involves the arduous but necessary task of careful exegesis of the scriptural text chosen. Two general guidelines of exegesis have particular relevance for our method. First, care should be taken to choose a passage that is of sufficient length and that represents an entire scriptural unit, and therefore is not taken out of its context. This guideline will militate against the deleterious effects of proof-texting. Second, greater attention might be given to those parts of scripture that contain more of the ethical material and/or have enjoyed a certain tradition of moral interpretation, such as the Sermon on the Mount. Only after the identification of the concrete moral issue and the selection and exegesis of the relevant biblical material can we move to the most crucial and difficult Step Four, which brings us to an interpretation of the scriptural passage(s) and the application to the ethical concern under reflection.

In this final step attention to hermeneutics is crucial. While interpretation and application are difficult and risky, they obviously must be undertaken if our moral theology, and the scripture, are to exert a positive and practical influence on our world of human activity.

It is hard to give abstract rules for what constitutes a legitimate interpretation and application of scripture to an ethical issue, so let me consider one biblical theologian who tries to keep the Bible from being put away “on the shelf,” as so often happens when we run into moral problems for which the various scriptural texts seem to give confusing, contradictory, or even “inhuman” answers (e.g., “If your hand causes you to sin, cut it off,” Matt 18:8–9).
How to Decide?
Homosexual Christians and the Bible

Jeffrey Siker, who has worked widely in the area of scripture and ethics,7 wrestles with how to bring the Bible to bear on the issues of homosexuality. For Siker the concrete issue that sparked his reflection was whether he could vote in favor of ordaining active gays and lesbians, and though initially personally opposed to this move, he saw the need to reflect more deeply in the light of scripture. While he never advocated a simplistic sola scriptura use of the Bible to answer this question, Siker did feel the scriptural warrants against homosexual behavior were clear and would seem to preclude the ordination of gay men and women for ministry in the church. Probing a bit more deeply, however, Siker came to realize that differing theological views on homosexuality inevitably frame both the discussion and the resulting conclusions:

Those who argue that homosexual expression goes against God’s intentions for humanity conclude that the homosexual orientation is one symbol among many of the distorted relationship between humans and God. It is a consequence of the fall, and while not sinful in and of itself, it is one expression among many of human rebellion against God. (Many would argue that this position can be derived from Paul’s argument in Romans 1).8

Siker also noted that others would counter “that homosexual expression does not necessarily counter God’s intentions for humanity [and] conclude that the homosexual orientation is simply one among various sexual orientations with which people are naturally born.”9 If this is so, the argument continues, then the homosexual orientation is God-given and thus natural. If sin is connected with this orientation, it comes not from homosexual expression in a stable, committed relationship, but rather sin raises its ugly head in “the heterosexism and homophobia of people (heterosexuals and homosexuals alike) who, out of ignorance, fear, and moral blindness, perpetually refuse to recognize the God-given legitimacy of the homosexual orientation and loving homosexual relationships.... Why should we condemn what God condones? This is the argument of many gay and lesbian Christians.”10

Before turning directly to what might be considered the critical passages dealing with “homosexuality” in the Bible, Siker steps back and observes that the differing views of the nature of homosexuality can be viewed as contrasting analogies. The first Siker calls the “analogy of alcoholism.” Just as an alcoholic should refrain from drink to protect his or her own well-being and that of family, friends, and the larger community, so “the argument goes, to allow Christians of homosexual orientation to engage in active homosexual practice would be to allow, and even to invite, the destructive consequences of such practice into the body of Christ, the church.”11 Siker questions, however, whether the analogy holds: “while the damaging effects of active alcoholism are readily apparent, such is not the case for persons with a homosexual orientation who engage in homosexual activity.”12 While recovering alcoholics readily admit the destructiveness that continued drinking brings, most persons who are homosexual do not see their sexual orientation as anything from which they need to recover. Rather, contrary to the alcoholism analogy, they would argue that abstaining from homosexual activity itself is what is potentially most debilitating, because to do so is to deny a significant expression of their identity as human beings who seek out intimate and committed relationships with other persons, just as heterosexual people do.13

Before offering his counter-analogy, Siker turns his attention to the specific biblical texts and contexts that (seem to) deal
with “homosexuality,” noting that the biblical passages that purport to deal with homosexuality “are often used to ‘prove’ that heterosexuality is God’s exclusive intention for human sexuality, and that homosexuality is an abomination before God.” Siker outlines a number of exegetical difficulties with both the usage of the individual scriptural texts and the conclusions putatively “proven.” For example,

to use the creation stories to argue for heterosexuality as the exclusive norm is largely an argument from silence, since nothing there is said about homosexuality....As for the Sodom and Gomorrah story, one can certainly conclude that homosexual rape (just like heterosexual rape...) is an abomination before God, but it does not follow from this that all expressions of homosexuality are prohibited. (David’s sin of adultery with Bathsheba does not make all heterosexual expressions sinful!).

With the Leviticus Holiness Code the central problem “is how one decides which texts have authority and which texts do not. The prohibitions in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 are clear enough, but then so are the prohibitions of crossbreeding animals, sowing two kinds of seed in one field, wearing garments made of two different materials, rounding off the hair on one’s temples, marring the edge of one’s beard, and receiving a tattoo (Lev 19:19, 27–28; 21:5).” Siker poses this key interpretative question: “Do we blithely adopt first-century (or ancient Israelite) social constructions of human sexuality and sexual relations and apply them to today? As far as I can tell, for the most part we do not.”

Since Siker judges that the biblical evidence itself regarding homosexuality is not as clear-cut black-and-white as so many others hold, then what does one do? Just give up turning to the Bible at all? Decide according to one’s own predilections, or follow some other “magisterium” of the crowd, political correctness, or church authority? Problems with the very lack of clear-cut determinative scriptural answers to concrete moral issues lead many to put the Bible back on the shelf and choose to follow some other path of moral discernment. Echoing the criteria suggested by our tripartite template of core, context, and coherence, Siker poses a counter-analogy that he judges “more appropriate than the alcoholism analogy,...to view homosexual
Christians today in the same way the earliest (that is, Jewish) Christians approached the issue of including Gentile Christians within the community.\textsuperscript{21}

While admitting that at first glance this analogy may seem incongruous, Siker claims that the central issues are very similar, and while the particular contexts differ, if we attend properly to the core values in a coherent manner, then the analogy does fit. Look first at the context of the Jewish world of New Testament times:

To be a Gentile was, in the eyes of Jews and Jewish Christians alike, the same as being a sinner, since the Gentiles did not have the law, since they were by definition unclean, polluted, and idolatrous. They first had to repent of being Gentiles and adopt the purifying and transforming practices of God’s covenant people, the Jews, before they could become Christians.\textsuperscript{22}

Siker realized that “just as Peter’s experience of Cornelius in Acts 10 led him to realize that even Gentiles were receiving God’s Spirit, so my experience of various gay and lesbian Christians has led me to realize that these Christians have received God’s Spirit as gays and lesbians and that the reception of the Spirit has nothing to do with sexual orientation.”\textsuperscript{23}

Siker admits that his preferred analogy has its own limitations, though he really does not spell these out. He stresses, however, that the inclusion analogy is more appropriate “than the destructive alcoholic Christian/homosexual Christian analogy.”\textsuperscript{24} Siker admits that honest exegetes come to conclusions different from his (he uses Richard Hays as an example\textsuperscript{25}) but he continues to hold that “law-based” arguments against homosexual inclusion are “exactly what the law-observant Jewish Christian opponents of Paul said when dealing with the question of Gentile inclusion.”\textsuperscript{26}

Siker hardly pretends that his Gentile inclusion analogy “proves” that homosexual activity is biblically condoned, nor that the scriptures “give us clear guidance regarding inclusion of gays and lesbians in the Christian community, but it does give us clear guidance regarding the inclusion of those who, even to our surprise, have received the Spirit of God and join us in our Christian confession.”\textsuperscript{27} For Siker the Gentile inclusion analogy’s primary benefit is that it opens up the question of inclusion of active homosexuals into the Christian community in a way that might allow the Spirit to suggest new and different “answers” than had traditionally been countenanced. Just as the Spirit led to a radical shift of what the Jewish Christians considered to be “right” and “wrong” in regard to the possible inclusion of Gentiles, so perhaps the Spirit might be challenging the Christian community to revisit its notions of what constitutes “sin” and “sinfulness” and/or whether such activity bars one from full inclusion in the community. For Siker the New Testament core message is one of inclusion, and the coherence criterion, as he sees it, in moving from the Judeo-Hellenistic context to the present, would call for a non-exclusionary acceptance of homosexual men and women into all areas of the church community, including ordained ministry.

Evaluation and Conclusion

Clearly the contrast between the positions of Siker and those who find a strong condemnation of any homosexuality in the Bible could hardly be more pronounced, yet both views would claim to ground their approach not only in the biblical texts but in an authentic understanding of God and God’s purposes for humanity as well. Confronted by such strongly divergent “readings” of the Bible, some might be tempted to put the
Bible back on the shelf and leave it there. I think, however, that if we bring the template of core, context, and coherence to an analysis of how scripture is used in this debate, we can gain some important insights. While “God Hates Fags” is not found quite so baldly put in the academy, there are numerous scholarly presentations with positions that might be summarized in this sort of syllogism in which the major premise is that sin in the Bible is punished by God, the minor premise is that homosexual activity is sin, and the conclusion is that homosexual activity should be punished by God, Q.E.D. (quod erat demonstrandum, “that which was to be demonstrated,” which is often appended to mathematical or logical proofs to indicate successful conclusion of the proof of the initial hypothesis).

Siker would counter, however, that the rules of logic demand that before we accept the Q.E.D., both the major and the minor premise have to be true, and the resulting conclusion has to follow from them both. Rather than Q.E.D., Siker’s exegesis suggests a judgment of non liquet (not yet proven). Attention to core, context, and coherence challenges the formulation of both premises of this syllogism. This syllogism does demonstrate, however, how crucial it is to engage fully the complex issues of exegesis and interpretation, and Siker further shows how incomplete or incorrect attention to the context of the biblical text may often lead to judgments that are skewed, at best, and contrary, at worst, to the intent of the scriptural message.

It does seem that the position condemning homosexuality appears supportive of foundational core considerations, such as upholding a strong moral order and calling upon all to follow God’s will, yet the overall image of God remains troubling, especially in the strong notion of retributive justice expressed in divine wrath. Ethics has always recognized retributive justice, but it is contextualized and tempered by the communitarian themes of distributive and social justice. Both the Old Testament and the New Testament consistently show us a God who does not condemn us for our violations against God and neighbor, but calls us to a conversion so that we might have life to the full (John 10:10). Thus, this “God” ultimately seems to fail the coherence criterion: Ultimately the Bible does not reveal us to be simply and solely sinners in the hands of an angry God.

Siker’s portrayal seems more consistent with the New Testament themes of non-condemnation, openness to the Spirit, and God’s mercy and compassion. There seems, at first glance, to be a clear identification of the core message (openness, compassion, and inclusion), which, moving from the original New Testament context to the contemporary situation, would suggest as a “coherent” conclusion that the Spirit is calling the church to accept the modern analogue of the Gentiles into full communion. Yet Siker’s argument may also fail to convince, as it does seem to leave out of the biblical equation a critical feature of the counter-position, namely, are there moral behaviors that are not consistent with God’s creative will as expressed in our true human nature? In short, Siker’s approach will not settle definitively one of the basic questions of moral normativeness, for example, are certain actions right and/or wrong in themselves? Certainly we should not easily exclude or excommunicate any individual or group of people, but Paul and the subsequent Tradition of the church’s history are replete with good examples of behaviors that cannot be tolerated if the Christian community is to thrive and remain faithful to its mission.

Siker’s use of contrasting analogies is initially compelling, yet analogies, like syllogisms, are tricky to get just right. At first glance, the “alcoholic analogy” may seem cogent, but upon closer examination we can agree that it does not hold since it lacks sets of terms that truly correspond. Alcoholism and the alcoholic are not necessarily analogous to homosexuality and the homosexual: A is to B (alcoholic to alcoholism) and C is to
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D (homosexual to homosexual behavior), but the relation between the two pairs does not necessarily follow, that is, that the relation of a homosexual to living out his or her orientation (including homosexual behavior) is equivalent to the relation of an alcoholic to the disease of alcoholism exacerbated by drinking. For the analogy to hold there would have to be equivalence between orientation and disease, and that is what seems ultimately unpersuasive in analogical terms.

We have to admit, however, that Siker’s preferred analogy based on Gentile exclusion does not follow ineluctably either. Can we argue, analogously, that because the Spirit led the early Jewish Christians to include Gentile converts that the contemporary Christian community is necessarily (i.e., in the normative sense) being called to accept active homosexuals in the same way? Would anyone be excluded justifiably from communion in the church? Is there some behavior that clearly is contrary to our basic Christian identity? Paul obviously said “yes,” and Siker’s treatment does seem to sidestep this question, or at least does not engage it critically enough. To be fair, I suspect that Siker himself does not intend his analogy normatively, but perhaps heuristically, for example, to prod a rethinking of an issue, opening the possibility that a genuine discernment of the Spirit may shift a few established paradigms.

Each of us comes to both scripture and any given moral issue with a certain set of convictions and predispositions, or perhaps even a governing “analogy,” firmly in place. If we look to the Bible simply to validate or confirm these convictions, then while the effort may initially seem rewarding, upon closer examination we recognize that we are not being open to the triple role of the Spirit as Advocate and Spirit of Truth (John 14:16–17), Teacher (John 14:26), and Progressive Revealer (John 16:7–15). The role of the Holy Spirit as Paraclete is precisely to help us “recall” what we have forgotten and “teach” us what we could not earlier bear.

Scripture and Ethics: Core, Context, and Coherence

Therefore meditation on scripture is key for the moral life of both the individual and the community, as well as for ongoing moral dialogue, to discern where the Spirit is blowing.

One of the best recent books that deals with these larger issues of the relationship of the Christian community to scripture as a canonical text and to Jesus as God’s definitive revelation of God’s moral will is William Spohn’s Go and Do Likewise: Jesus and Ethics. Spohn uses the concept of analogy extensively in his work and notes that in any coherent biblical analogy there are four basic terms: “(a) the biblical text in relation to (b) its world and (c) today’s Christian community in relation to (d) its world.”* Analogy is perhaps the most appropriate way to engage ourselves with scripture, since it opens us up to seeing and responding to our world in new ways. This is the dynamic of the discernment of the Spirit that Siker argued for, and Spohn further suggests that the governing term of our analogical imagination be to look on Jesus as the concrete universal, not in the simplistic sense of the popular “WWJD” (“What Would Jesus Do?”) bumper sticker, but in the “doing likewise” Jesus showed in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:31–37), told in response to the lawyer’s question about just who was his “neighbor”:

Jesus does not tell the lawyer what to do as an active, outgoing neighbor. Rather, that is left up to the analogical imagination. The “likewise” is up to each person to figure out in different situations. Anyone who can use her analogical imagination to stand in the place of the lawyer has a new model for looking at others. It instructs the imagination, goads our sympathy beyond its usual parochial limits and calls us to acknowledge that we too have received undeserved mercy from others and God.*

As a means of helping create and maintain this openness to the Spirit, analogy is an appropriate way to engage ourselves with scripture, since it opens us up to seeing and responding to
our world in new ways. This is the dynamic of the discernment of the Spirit that Siker argued for, and that Spohn has developed as looking on Jesus as the “concrete universal” in the construction and application of our analogical imagination. It is in first “imagining” both what the going and the doing of the “likewise” means for us that the Bible can play a crucial role; yet this role is by nature flexible, for the Bible is neither a rule book nor a technical manual of the moral life. Attention to core, context, and coherence can help us to remain open to the Spirit of God that continues to speak to us through both the scriptures and in the various signs of our times. Just as both exegesis and hermeneutics are ongoing processes, and not once-and-for-all established results, so too the Christian community’s ethical use of scripture must be somewhat open-ended. It is part of our Christian hope that we grow in our understanding and living of the Christian vocation—both individually and communally. As Lumen Gentium stressed, we are a pilgrim church—on the way to be sure, but still with some way to go. It is my hope that my tripartite template might function somewhat as a rough map that can help take the Bible off the shelf so that we can use it in navigating this journey.
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