

Significance of Theological Sources in the Homosexuality Debate

Alexander Mwita¹ and Augustin Tchamba²

¹Bugema University, Uganda

²Adventist University of Africa, Kenya

Abstract

This paper investigates the ongoing debate over homosexuality within contemporary Christianity, a subject that evokes significant division across various denominations and traditions. Despite the assumption that scriptural authority would lead to unified moral conclusions, the reality is far more complex. Differing interpretations and the prioritization of theological sources have resulted in a rich spectrum of ethical stances. The study employs descriptive, critical analysis, and evaluative approaches, in addition to the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, comprising Scripture, Tradition, Reason, and Experience as a framework to examine how these sources influence theological reflection on homosexuality. Central to this inquiry are the questions of which sources are deemed primary in ethical reasoning, the core arguments supporting both the affirmation and the condemnation of homosexual relationships, and the interpretive principles that undergird these arguments. Notably, some denominations, such as the United Methodist Church and the Episcopal Church, have embraced and formalized same-sex relationships, reflecting a shift encompassing broader cultural changes and interpretations of Scripture. Conversely, other theologians and denominations maintain a traditional stance, asserting that homosexuality remains incompatible with biblical teachings. The analysis reveals that differing emphases on theological sources contribute significantly to the unresolved debates within Christian ethics. For instance, while some traditions elevate Scripture as the sole authoritative source, others incorporate cultural experience and historical context into their ethical frameworks, leading to divergent moral conclusions. This paper ultimately argues that the complexity of the homosexuality

debate in Christianity stems not merely from isolated Scripture interpretations but from a deeper and profound engagement with theological methods. By shedding light on the foundational reasons behind these differences, this study aims to enrich the discourse surrounding homosexuality in Christian ethics and encourage thoughtful engagement among diverse theological perspectives.

Keywords: Theological sources, homosexuality, scripture, reason, tradition, experience

Introduction

The question of homosexuality remains one of the most divisive moral and theological issues in contemporary Christianity. Across denominations and traditions, differing ethical conclusions have emerged, not only because of varying interpretations of key texts but also due to the distinct ways in which theological sources are prioritized. This divergence continues to shape sharp debates over whether homosexuality should be affirmed or condemned within Christian ethics. According to Christian theology, ethics is a moral judgment of right and wrong,¹ which, in many traditions, are believed to be determined by God's will as revealed in Scripture.² Norman Geisler asserts that God gives ethical imperatives that reflect His divine moral character, calling humans to holiness within their sphere of influence.³ On the same note, Wayne Grudem comments that Christian ethics depends on God's directives on what ought to be done and what attitude should be developed by

¹ The fact assumes that ethics is for both Christians and non-Christians. McQuilkin and Copan assert that ethics does not only apply to Christians but non-Christians can also know and do good. [Robertson McQuilkin and Paul Copan, *An Introduction to Biblical Ethics: Walking in the Way of Wisdom* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 11].

² John M. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Christian Life: A Theology of Lordship* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008), 10.

³ Norman L. Geisler, *Christian ethics: contemporary issues and options 2nd Edition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010), 15

Christians.⁴ He also alludes that human character and behavior are grounded in God's moral standard, for He could not give morals that contradict His character.⁵ From this theological perspective, Scripture is not merely a spiritual resource but a foundational guide for moral reasoning. It is often assumed to be the starting point for ethical deliberation, particularly within traditions that emphasize *Sola Scriptura*. Robertson McQuilkin and Paul Copan, drawing from the creation account, argue that humans were made with a moral compass, capable of recognizing moral truths, a view that further reinforces the role of divine revelation in ethical inquiry.⁶ Admittedly, Christian teachings on ethics rely on God's directives revealed in Scripture.⁷

Yet, if humans can recognize moral truth, why does the ethical issue of homosexuality continue to generate such unresolved debate? Wayne Grudem observes that prior to the 21st century, most cultures did not recognize same-sex marriage; however, in recent decades, several have begun to legalize and affirm it.⁸ This shift is not confined to secular society but is also reflected within Christian churches, where some denominations have accepted and formalized homosexual relationships.⁹ Conversely, theologians such as Emmanuel Akande Owoeye, Mark Finley, Ekkehardt Mueller, and Preston Sprinkle maintain that homosexuality remains biblically impermissible. The Seventh-day Adventist Church, like

⁴ Wayne Grudem, *Christian Ethics: An Introduction to Biblical Moral Reasoning* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2018), 37.

⁵ Grudem, *Christian Ethics*, 78.

⁶ McQuilkin and Paul Copan, *An Introduction to Biblical Ethics*, 15.

⁷ Samuel Wells, Ben Quash, and Rebekah Eklund, *Introducing Christian Ethics* 2nd Edition (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2017), 3. The authors assert that Scripture is imperative for studying Christian ethics.

⁸ Grudem, *Christian Ethics*, 894.

⁹ David P. Gushee and Glen H. Stassen, *Kingdom Ethics: Following Jesus in Contemporary Context*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 266.

many others, has not been immune to this discussion, facing its own internal divisions over the issue.¹⁰

This paper seeks to investigate why such divergent conclusions on homosexuality persist within Christianity, particularly among those who claim allegiance to scriptural authority. It does so by exploring how different theological traditions interpret and prioritize sources such as Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience. The study aims to answer four key questions: (1) What are the primary sources used in theological reflection? (2) What are the core arguments for and against homosexuality in Christian ethics? (3) What interpretive principles support these arguments? and (4) How do differing emphases on theological sources contribute to the divergence in moral conclusions? Through descriptive, analytical, and evaluative methods, this paper aims to shed light on the foundational reasons for the persistent debate. In doing so, it highlights how the varied uses of theological sources—rather than mere disagreements over isolated texts—account for the ongoing controversy surrounding homosexuality within Christian ethics.

Sources for Theological Method

While theological method refers to the systematic process of doing theology, this section specifically focuses on the sources

¹⁰ Korateng Pipim reports that the rise of Adventist Scholars such as James J. C. Cox, Lawrence T. Geraty, and Fritz Guy, who challenge the Church's position against Homosexuality, "have made the issue of homosexuality a hot potato item within Adventist scholarship." In 2021, a bisexual Adventist pastor, Alicia Johnston, resigned from pastoral office due to her disagreement with SDA's teachings on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT). In 2022, she published a book, *The Bible and LGBTQ Adventists: A Theological Conversation About Same Sex-Marriage, Gender, and Identity*, arguing against Adventist rejection of Homosexuality. She opines that not all aspects of Adam's life have become the rule for humanity. She explains, "All men were not required to live under the stars or work the land like Adam. So, can we be sure all men are commanded to marry like Adam? We are inconsistent if some aspects of Adam's life become rules and others do not." In the same vein, Fritz Guy endorses Homosexuality, basing his argument on physical intimacy between David and Jonathan (1Sam 18:3) and the Roman military officer and his boy (Math 8:5-9).

employed in that process. Theology combines two Greek words, “theos-Logos,” which means studying God’s Word. Millard Erickson expands this definition by including God’s relationship to his creation.¹¹ Paul Allen stretches this idea by asserting that theology is the scientific study of God and His relation to His creation. In this regard, the subject matter in the theological task is God.¹² These sources form the foundation for theological reflection play a crucial role in shaping divergent positions on moral and doctrinal issues such as the debate on homosexuality. The Wesleyan Quadrilateral comprising Scripture, Reason, Tradition, and Experience serves as the conceptual framework for exploring these sources. According to Wesleyan thought, Scripture is primary, but theological conclusions are often enriched or challenged by the interaction with tradition, reason, and experience.

In the context of homosexuality, how theologians prioritize these sources has led to starkly different conclusions. For example, denominations like the United Methodist Church (UMC) have experienced deep divisions over same-sex marriage, largely due to contrasting views on whether Scripture or cultural experience should be the final authority. Likewise, the Episcopal Church’s acceptance of same-sex unions demonstrates the role of experience and social justice frameworks in reshaping theological stances traditionally based on Scripture.

Scripture

Within the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, Scripture is considered the primary source for theological reflection. It is regarded by many Christian traditions as the inspired and authoritative written revelation of God’s will to humanity. For these Christian traditions, Scripture provides a foundational framework through which other sources such as reason, tradition, and experience are interpreted.

¹¹ Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House Company, 1985), 21.

¹² Paul L. Allen, *Theological Method: A Guide for the Perplexed* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2012), 8.

Charles Hodge highlights its centrality by stating, “The Bible is to the theologian what nature is to the scientist. It is his store-house of facts.”¹³ The Reformation principle of *Sola Scriptura* reinforced Scripture’s role as the final arbiter in doctrinal matters, particularly in Protestant theology. Proponents of this view argue that while experience and nature may offer insight, they can also mislead without the corrective lens of biblical revelation.¹⁴

In ethical debates such as homosexuality, those who affirm Scripture’s supremacy often appeal to specific biblical texts (cf. Genesis 1:27; 2:23-24; Leviticus 18:22; Romans 1:26–27) to argue that same-sex relationships violate God’s design. However, interpretations differ widely across traditions, especially when Scripture is read in dialogue with experience or cultural context. For example, affirming denominations may reexamine these passages through historical-critical methods or place them in tension with broader scriptural themes of justice, love, and inclusion.

Reason

According to the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, reason functions in dialogue with Scripture, helping believers make sense of biblical teachings in a changing world. This does not mean that reason always dominates theological conclusions, but rather, it contributes to the discernment process. In this light, reason is seen as part of God’s gift to humanity. The process of inspiration did not eliminate the individuality of biblical authors; instead, it allowed their cultural backgrounds, personalities, and educational experiences to shape how divine messages were conveyed. This supports the idea that theological study requires intellectual engagement alongside spiritual discernment. Supporting Wesleyan view of reason, Donald K. McKim defines reason as “the ability of the human mind to

¹³ Charles Hodge, *Systematic theology* vol 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing CO., 1940), 27.

¹⁴ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 27.

think, comprehend, and make a logical judgment.”¹⁵ In the context of theological reflection, reason plays a critical role in interpreting, systematizing, and communicating theological truths. It enables theologians to analyze moral questions, assess doctrinal coherence, and engage with contemporary ethical and scientific developments

Norman Gulley comments that reason guided by the Scripture cannot be ignored in theological tasks.¹⁶ However, he also warns that reason detached from divine revelation—what he calls autonomous reason—may lead theology away from its biblical foundations. He critiques approaches that rely solely on philosophical systems without submitting to scriptural authority.¹⁷ Contrary to this view, reason has been employed autonomously in theological tasks.¹⁸ This human thinking goes beyond revelation, a claim that relies on human discoveries. Like other scientific studies, autonomous reason has been valued as an important aspect of theological inquiry. David Tracy claims this importance by asserting that “in all theological inquiry, the analysis should be characterized by those same ethical stances of autonomous judgment, critical reflection, and properly skeptical hard-mindedness that characterize analysis in other fields.”¹⁹ This view is built from the view of general revelation and Enlightenment thinking.

It is argued that since God is the creator of all, He created the human intellect and bestowed the ability to investigate the ultimate truth on them. Thus, the human intellect has been used independently

¹⁵ Donald K. McKim, *The Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*, second edition revised and expanded (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 263.

¹⁶ Norman Gulley, *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2003), 172.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Autonomous Reason is a phrase explained by Francis A. Schaeffer. He elucidates that autonomous reason is a human thinking that operates independently. It does not rely on revelation, but it is its own arbiter for truth. Francis A. Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live?* (Old Tappan, NJ.: Revell, 1996), 81.

¹⁹ David Tracy, *Blessed Rage for Order* (New York: Seabury, 1975), 7.

to construct theological investigations. For Alfred N. Whitehead, David K. Clack, and Norman R. Gulley, the view of independent use of reason contradicts the prescriptive authority of Scripture.²⁰ Gulley unpacks this view by saying that human reason, which is “not controlled by God, cannot be in service to God in the work of theology. Such reason is critical of what God has revealed.”²¹ The use of reason in theology has therefore emerged in two broad forms: First, a theologically dependent use of reason, where logic and inquiry function within the boundaries set by Scripture.²² This approach is common in conservative or evangelical traditions, where moral teachings such as opposition to homosexuality are upheld as logical extensions of biblical authority. Second, an autonomous use of reason,²³ where philosophical frameworks such as rationalism, empiricism, existentialism, deism, and idealism inform theological arguments.²⁴ This model is more common in liberal or progressive theologies, which may affirm same-sex relationships based on ethical reasoning, human rights discourse, or psychological evidence.²⁵ For example, in affirming traditions, reason is often employed to question whether biblical prohibitions on same-sex relations reflect timeless moral principles or ancient cultural assumptions. Conversely, critics of such affirmations argue that reason must submit to Scripture, especially when conclusions appear to contradict clear biblical teachings.

²⁰ Alfred N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), 63. David K. Clack, *To Know and Love God* (Wheaton IL: Crossway, 2003), 299-302. Gulley, *Systematic Theology*. 172.

²¹ Gulley *Systematic Theology*. 172.

²² Frank Hasel argues that we are called to think in relationship with God and in harmony with His Word. Any thinking that aims at a fundamental autonomy from our creator denies our creaturely existence and is self-centered, and thus in danger of being misleading. Frank Hasel, “Elements of Biblical Hermeneutics in Harmony with Scripture’s Self-Claims” In *Biblical Hermeneutics: An Adventist Approach*, ed. Frank Hasel (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute/Review and Herald Academic, 2020), 53.

²³ Gulley, *Systematic Theology: Prolegomena*, 172

²⁴ Tracy, *Blessed Rage for Order*, 7.

²⁵ Pipim, *Born a Gay and Born Again?* 144-46.

Comparison: Reason serves as both a bridge and a point of tension between Scripture and contemporary thought. It enhances theological depth but can also produce conflict when its conclusions diverge from traditional interpretations.

Tradition

The English word tradition originates from the Latin *traditio*, meaning “a handing over.” David Wells describes it as “the process whereby one generation inducts its successor into its accumulated wisdom, lore, and values.”²⁶ Tradition can be positively termed as historical theology.²⁷ It concerns the teachings handed over from the apostolic time to the present.²⁸

Within the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, tradition serves as a valuable source in conversation with Scripture, reason, and experience. According to Gregg Allison, some of the benefits of tradition are to help the contemporary Church understand the truth from error, provide sound biblical interpretations and theological formulations, and protect the Church against individualism.²⁹ However, tradition has been defined as the dogmatic use of former church teachings without scrutiny from the Scripture. This view posits that divine authority in the canon does not demote the church or church tradition.³⁰

However, not all perspectives on tradition are positive. Critics warn against the uncritical use of past doctrines, especially when tradition is treated as an authority equal to or above Scripture. This tension is evident in debates over the source of theological authority. Kevin J. Vanhoozer presents the relationship between

²⁶ David Wells, *No Place for Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 84.

²⁷ Gregg R. Allison, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011), 23.

²⁸ Allison, *Historical Theology* 23.

²⁹ Allison, *Historical Theology*, 24, 26.

³⁰ Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 181.

Scripture and tradition through the metaphor of “script” and “performance,” suggesting that Scripture and tradition are not competing authorities but complementary. He argues that “Scripture may be self-interpreting, but it does not perform itself,” implying that tradition plays a vital role in making Scripture meaningful in new contexts such as bioethics or gender ethics.³¹

This model allows tradition to influence interpretation without displacing Scripture. However, others take a more cautious view. Fernando Canale contends that when tradition is elevated above or detached from Scripture, it can distort theological truth.³² Drawing from Matthew 15:1–16 and Colossians 2:18, he illustrates how tradition can obscure biblical meaning by imposing inherited interpretations rather than allowing the text to speak for itself. Donald Bloesch echoes this concern, asserting that tradition contains both faithful and erroneous elements and must always be tested against Scripture.

Canale proposes a process of “deconstruction,” wherein the internal logic of traditional theological positions is critically examined.”³³ If the core of a tradition is biblically grounded, it can be retained. If it rests on philosophical, cultural, or scientific assumptions rather than revelation, it should be reconsidered or rejected.³⁴

Tradition, therefore, operates in theology along a spectrum from dogmatic preservation of inherited teachings to cautious engagement shaped by critical evaluation. These different uses of tradition contribute significantly to theological diversity. For example, in debates over homosexuality, more traditionalist churches often appeal to long-standing interpretations of Scripture and tradition,

³¹ Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine*, 181.

³² Fernando Canale, *Basic Elements of Christian Theology* (North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace, 2005), 28.

³³ Donald Bloesch, *Last Things: Resurrection, Judgment, and Glory* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 172.

³⁴ Canale, *Elements of Christian Theology*, 28.

while progressive communities may reassess tradition in light of new understandings of identity, justice, and social change.³⁵

Comparison: Tradition offers theological stability and depth, but its role is contested. It can either reinforce established doctrines or, when reinterpreted, support evolving moral perspectives leading to differing conclusions within the same faith tradition.

Experience

The word experience originates from the Latin *experientia*, meaning “that which arises out of traveling through life.”³⁶ In theological discourse, it refers to the subjective dimension of human existence encompassing emotions, intuition, personal encounters, and existential reflection. Experience is not confined to theology alone; it also shapes knowledge in fields like science, history, and psychology, all of which rely on lived or observed realities. Because of its wide-ranging influence, experience plays a vital role in shaping how people understand God, morality, and community.

In the Wesleyan Quadrilateral, experience functions as both a confirmation of faith and a contextual lens through which Scripture and tradition are interpreted. It helps theologians and believers relate doctrine to everyday life and lived human realities. However, its role in theological construction has been interpreted in two major ways.

First, experience is a foundational resource for Christian theology. This view implies that human religious experience can be a basis for Christian theology.³⁷ For Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher, human experience (feelings) is a starting point

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 5th ed. (West Sussex, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers, 2011), 259.

³⁷ Ibid., 262.

for Christian theology.³⁸ According to him, feelings of absolute dependence are the source of religious devotion, and this experiential feeling must be the foundation of all doctrines.³⁹ Theological truth, in this model, arises from within the individual and community's relationship with the divine.

Second, the view opines that Christian theology is the sole framework by which human experience may be interpreted. In response to the first view, Jordan P. Ballard asserts, "Evangelicals can also appreciate Schleiermacher's emphasis on the importance of religious experience, though they would only seek experiences of God that match the teachings of the Bible."⁴⁰ This response informs that religious experience is subject to scrutiny from the Scripture. Gulley puts reason, tradition, and experience in one category that bears a fallen state and needs judgment of the Scripture.⁴¹ This view rejects the independent use of experiences in theological investigation.

In debates over homosexuality, these divergent approaches to experience become especially evident. Affirming churches often elevate the lived experiences of LGBTQ+ Christians testimonies of spiritual vitality, loving relationships, and exclusion from religious communities as theological evidence that traditional interpretations need to be re-evaluated. In contrast, non-affirming communities maintain that individual experience, however sincere, cannot override what they understand to be clear biblical teaching.

Global theological perspectives further illustrate this diversity. For example, in many African contexts, theology emphasizes the communal and relational dimensions of experience, valuing how

³⁸ Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube: nach den Grundsätzen der evangelische Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt*, erster Band (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1830), 4

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Jordan P. Ballard, "The Theological Method of Friedrich Schleiermacher" *Eleutheria: John W. Rawlings School of Divinity Academic Journal* 6, vol 2 (December 2022); 151.

⁴¹ Gulley, *Systematic Theology*, 172.

beliefs function within real-life social networks. Asian contextual theologies may prioritize harmony, suffering, or social duty, interpreting religious experience through cultural lenses. These approaches show that experience, while often personal, is also shaped by historical, social, and cultural forces.

Comparison: Experience provides theology with depth, empathy, and relevance. It enables faith to engage with the real world. Yet, when elevated above scriptural or doctrinal boundaries, it may lead to divergent or controversial conclusions. The tension lies in whether experience should inform theology or authorize it.

Diverging Emphases of the Sources

While the four primary theological sources, Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience offer valuable insights, theologians differ significantly in how they prioritize them. Beginning with different assumptions often leads to different theological conclusions, particularly on contested moral issues such as sexuality, gender, and justice.⁴² One of the fundamental issues in theological tasks is the lack of agreement on the starting points. Though theologians might agree on the generic, it does not mean that the emphasis on the specific sources is the same.⁴³ For some, Scripture is a normative source for theological tasks. “It is the supreme, authoritative, and infallible revelation of God’s will. It is the standard of character, the test of experience, the definitive revealer of doctrines, and the trustworthy record of God’s acts in history.”⁴⁴

Other scholars differ on this matter. John Wesley advocates a quadrilateral model for the interpretive task that prioritizes Scripture and is followed by tradition, reason, and experience,

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Allen, *Theological Method*, 208

⁴⁴ Ministerial Association of General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. *Seventh-day Adventists Believe: An Exposition of the Fundamental Beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 2018), 7.

respectively.⁴⁵ Stanley Grenz, on the other hand, finds a trilateral model appropriate. He accepts Scripture as the first source, followed by tradition and culture. Grenz removes reason and experience and replaces them with culture. For him, these three sources form a standard for the theological task.⁴⁶

Donald Bloesch proposes a unilateral authority, namely, “divine revelation.” He believes that Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience are just means of communication with divine revelation. He asserts, “It is not the Bible as such but the divine revelation that confronts us in the Bible that is the basis and source of spiritual authority.”⁴⁷ Bloesch’s view is similar to Karl Barth’s encounter revelation. For Barth, Jesus Christ is the only revelation of God, which he considers the only witness to the word of God.⁴⁸ Roman Catholics, through the office of the magisterium, have placed tradition on the same level as Scripture. In this regard, in case of misunderstanding, tradition is essential for facing a new situation in the theological task.⁴⁹ For them, tradition is used as the sole interpreter of the Scripture and is responsible for guiding the teachings of Scripture. Thus, the church is mandated to tell the Scripture what to teach. For Schleiermacher, human experience (feelings) takes the first premise in theology.⁵⁰ According to him,

⁴⁵ Donald A.D. Thorsen, *Wesleyan Quadrilateral: Scripture, Tradition, Reason & Experience as a Model of Evangelical Theology* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Light and Life Communications, 1997), 126.

⁴⁶ Stanley Grenz, *Revisioning Evangelical Theology* (Downer Grove, ILL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 87-93.

⁴⁷ Donald G. Bloesch, *A Theology of Word and Spirit: Authority Method in Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1992), 122.

⁴⁸ Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, translated from the 6th German edition (Romerbrief) by Edwyn C. Hoskyns (New York: Oxford University Press, 1933), 315.

⁴⁹ Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering, ed., *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition* (Madison Avenue, New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 4.

⁵⁰ W. A. Hofferger, “Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst,” In *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, second edition, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 1064.

feelings shape theological teachings. Based on the principle of consistency, these differences lead to divergent conclusions.

The Enlightenment Emphases

The rise of Enlightenment in the eighteenth century brought a significant theological shift. It was a time of great theological turmoil. In this period, science and reason occupied theological academia and were regarded as the source of truth. Philosophers of the time advocated the unrestricted use of reason outside of divine revelation as an authoritative means to determine the truth and understand human nature and the world. These philosophies challenged Christian beliefs in the light of pure reason. As a result, human sinful nature, miracles in the Bible, and the divinity of Christ were denied.⁵¹

Some of the philosophies that were directly attached to the theological task were the Rationalism of René Descartes (1596–1650); Empiricism of John Locke (1632–1704) and David Hume (1711–1776); Deism of Lord Herbert (1583 – 1648); Existentialism of Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855) and Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900); and Idealism of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770 - 1831).⁵² In Rationalism, Descartes promotes reason as a proper way of acquiring knowledge. His famous statement, “I think, therefore I am,” justifies his thinking. His views conclude that reason is the chief source of epistemology. His view was adopted by Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677), Gottfried Leibniz (1646–1716), and Immanuel Kant (1724–1804).

Empiricism attests to sensory experience as the primary source of truth. Locke disagreed with the concept of rationalism, instead, he came up with the view of empiricism. He held that knowledge

⁵¹ John Woodbridge, *The Rise of Biblical Criticism in the Enlightenment*. <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/essay/the-rise-of-biblical-criticism-in-the-enlightenment>.

⁵² Justo L. González, *The Story of Christianity Vol II: Reformation to the present day*, Revised and Updated (New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc., 2010), 183, 226–231,

is derived from inner and outer experiences.⁵³ He concluded that faith is experienced from the knowledge gained from revelation, not reason.⁵⁴ On the same thread, Frederich Schleiermacher (1768 – 1834) argued against rationalism, asserting that religion is not an intellectual enterprise but is moral by nature and, therefore, introduced a religion of human feelings. For him, Christian theology is not grounded in theological and ethical norms but is informed by human emotions. This means that human feelings determine what is true. In reaction to Schleiermacher's views, Fernando Canale reports that Schleiermacher bases his theology on cognitive or scientific zone of human experience. He categorically says "Schleiermacher boldly contended that Christian theology is ultimately based on human feeling."⁵⁵

Existentialism is the study of human existence. From a philosophical point of view, it focuses on explaining life and how people live in the world. It posits that individuals must make independent life choices that break the chains that society's rules place on them. This philosophical thinking promotes people's independence and choices that elevate self-experience above society's rules. Existentialists such as Jean-Paul Sartre, Karl Jasper, Martin Heidegger, and Gabriel Marcel emphasize individuals' immediate and real-life experiences.⁵⁶

Deism, on the other side, emphasized pluralism. Herbert was a great proponent of deism and held that true religion should focus on the instincts of all human beings. In this view, revelation and religious historical events are of no value; instead, it asserts that empirical reason and observation of the natural world have sole authority in determining the divine.⁵⁷ In addition, the Idealism of

⁵³ González, *The Story of Christianity*, 229.

⁵⁴ González, *The Story of Christianity*, 229.

⁵⁵ Fernando Canale, *The Cognitive Principle of Christian Theology: A Hermeneutical Study of the Revelation and Inspiration of the Bible* (North Charleston: CreateSpace, 2005), 156.

⁵⁶ McGrath, *Christian Theology* 261.

⁵⁷ González, *The Story of Christianity*, 231.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel suggests that truth exists in the pure concept. For him, the medium of religion is mental imagery, meaning that the truth is absolute from the mind's interpretation. Therefore, the mind interprets what is real and not according to internal pictures.⁵⁸

These philosophies reveal that the emphasis on using sources changed with time. The Enlightenment period marked a great shift from the authority of Scripture. This period declared that science and pure reason were the appropriate sources of the truth. From this view, philosophies such as rationalism, empiricism, dualism, and idealism were added to the theological method. Therefore, Scripture lost its identity as the normative document for theology.

Debate over Homosexuality

The debate over homosexuality within Christian theology is longstanding and deeply rooted in divergent interpretations of Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience. While some theological perspectives firmly oppose same-sex relationships based on biblical texts and historical doctrines,⁵⁹ others advocate for their acceptance by reinterpreting Scripture and highlighting evolving understandings of human sexuality, dignity, and justice. To clarify the core tensions, this section organizes the debate into two major positions: the traditionalist (non-affirming) view and the affirming view, with attention to their theological rationale, scriptural interpretations, and underlying assumptions.

⁵⁸ Lloyd Spencer and Andrzej Krauze, *Introducing Hegel* (North Road, London: Icon Books Ltd, 2012), 112.

⁵⁹ Daniel Bediako explains that the foundational basis for sexuality is provided in Gen 1:26–28; 2:18–25). The passages elaborate that God created different genders, male and female. Adam being a man and Eve being a woman elaborates that sexual difference was an act of God since the beginning. The difference is definite in the usage of the Hebrew phrase *‘ezer kenegdo* literally means “a help(er) like opposite him.” The phrase justifies gender distinction, equality, complementarity, and communion. Thus, Eve was intentionally built as Adam’s “opposite.” Daniel Kwame Bediako, “Sexual Identity: A Reflection” *The Official Newsletter of the Biblical Research Institute*, Reflection no. 88 (October-December 2024), 3.

1. The Traditionalist (Non-Affirming) Position

This perspective holds that homosexuality is inconsistent with God's design for human sexuality. It draws heavily from Scripture to ground its moral and theological stance. For them Scripture is a uniquely normative source for theological enquiry.⁶⁰ Employing the view Scripture as the normative source, Richard Davidson asserts that creating humans in the image of God *imago dei* is directly connected to the male and female relationship as humankind. He affirms that the sexual distinction between males and females is fundamental to being human.⁶¹ His argument is built on the theology of marriage and family, of which he asserts that "Human sexuality according to the Edenic divine paradigm finds expression in a heterosexual marital form."⁶² He further notes that the permanency of heterosexual relation to all future relationships is based on the introductory 'al-ken' "therefore" at the beginning of Genesis 2:24. Accordingly, Commenting on the same verse, Clinton Wahlen argues that "The verse looks ahead, way beyond Eden because Adam and Eve had not yet become parents. Its general terminology and outlook define what marriage is to be going forward: a man leaves "his father and mother" (heterosexual, monogamous marriage) and is "joined to his wife" (another heterosexual, monogamous marriage)."⁶³

On the same premise, Norman L. Geissler builds his argument against Homosexuality from the creation account. He asserts that "God ordained heterosexuality, not homosexuality." he argues that the book of Hebrews appeals to all that marriage should be honored and be kept pure by all humanity for God will judge those who act

⁶⁰ John C. Peckham, "The Prophetic Gift and Sola Scriptura" In *Biblical Hermeneutics: An Adventist Approach*, ed. Frank Hasel (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute/Review and Herald Academic, 2020), 378.

⁶¹ Richard Davidson, "Homosexuality and the Bible: What is at Stake in the Current Debate. *Dialogue* 24 (2012); 7.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Clinton Wahlen, Review of *The Bible & LGBTQ Adventists: A Theological Conversation About Same-Sex Marriage, Gender, and Identity*, by Alicia Johnston (N.P.: Affirmation Collective, 2022), 15.

contrary (Heb. 13:4). For him, passages such as Genesis 1:27-28; 2:24; Heb 13:1; and Exo20:14,17 declare that ordained sexuality rests in heterosexual principles.⁶⁴ Mueller concurs that “the creation account does not only point to the beginning of marriage but also portrays the ideal for human sexual relations.”⁶⁵ Mueller further rejects the view of Homosexuality that asserts that “overpopulation demands the same sex orientation because it sounds ecological.”⁶⁶ On the contrary, he argues that;

Heterosexual relationships are reduced to the function of procreation only. Gen 1 and 2 do not portray this idea. Man and woman are created in the image of God. It appears likely that the image of God has to do with humanity, being God’s representative on earth, and standing in an intimate relationship with God. In addition, Gen 5:1-3 may also suggest that the image of God included a resemblance of human faculties and the entire human being with the Lord of the universe.⁶⁷

In the same vein, the SDA statement against Homosexuality argues that sexual intimacy belongs only within the marital relationship of a man and a woman. This was the design established by God at creation. The statement informs that Jesus reaffirmed heterosexuality by referring to its foundation during creation (Mat 19:4-6).⁶⁸ Thus, SDA reaffirms heterosexuality in following the Lord’s instruction and example. Tallying to that argument, Andrews University Theological Seminary gives its position

⁶⁴ Geissler, *Christian Ethics: Contemporary Issues and Options* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academics, 2010), 289. (Incomplete?)

⁶⁵ Mueller, *Homosexuality and Scripture*, 36.

⁶⁶ Walter Wink, “Homosexuality and the Bible,” in *Homosexuality and Christian Faith: Questions of Conscience for the Churches* ed. Walter Wink (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 4.

⁶⁷ Mueller, *Homosexuality and Scripture*, 36.

⁶⁸ The statement was voted during the Annual Council of the General Conference Executive Committee, October 3, 1999 in Silver Spring, Maryland. Revised by the General Conference Executive Committee, October 17, 2012. <https://gc.adventist.org/official-statements/homosexuality/>

against Homosexuality for several reasons. First, the sexual distinction between male and female at creation and marriage is a key feature of humanity (Gen 1:27; 2:23-24). Second, Scripture strongly condemns homosexual activities (Lev 18:22; 20:13). It is argued that the meaning of this term *zakar* is male, denoting that men should not lie with all members of this gender regardless of age. Likewise, the argument is based on the Hebrew clause *lo' tishkab*, which literally negates Homosexuality and makes it a permanent sanction in all ages.

Third, the story of Sodom informs that Homosexuality was one of the sins that brought destruction to the city. Though defenders of Homosexuality disqualify the word “*yada*,” which is used for sexual intercourse, their argument loses its validity since the same word, “*yada*,” is referred to in connection to sexual intercourse between Lot's daughters and men.

Fourth, based on *analogia scriptura*, the apostle Paul agrees with the Old Testament prohibition of Homosexuality, and he emphatically denounces homosexual lusts and practices (Rom 1:24–27; 1 Cor 6:9–11; 1 Tim 1:10). These passages inform that those who practice Homosexuality displease God and will be punished. Other New Testament passages, such as Jude 6-7 and 2 Peter 2: 6-8, allude to homosexual practice from the historical reference of Sodom and Gomorrah and conclude that continual doing such will lead to divine judgment.⁶⁹ In the same vein, Bediako argues that Homosexuality is contrary to sound doctrine (1 Tim 1:10), for it is a wicked action. He alludes that Homosexuality is referred to as worthlessness (Jud 19:22–25).⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, “An Understanding of the Biblical View on Homosexual Practice and Pastoral Care: Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary Position Paper” (2015). *Books*. 27. <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/sem-books/27>

⁷⁰ Bediako, *Sexual Identity*, 4.

2. The Affirming Position

Following the arguments against Homosexuality, the second group is those who concur with Homosexuality. The group asserts that God permits gays and lesbians to enter into a covenantal-marital relationship.⁷¹ Professors Judith K. Balswick and Jack O. Balswick of Fuller Theological Seminary suggest that those who decide on monogamous homosexual union believing that it is the best form for them should be acknowledged.⁷²

Doubtingly, the House of Bishops of the Church of England is unable to commend Homosexuality and concurrently does not reject those associated with it. In this case, their response to Homosexuality is ambivalent. They concur with homosexuals who argue that their way of life is faithful in itself and reflects God's purpose as in heterosexual relationships.⁷³ Other arguments for Homosexuality come from empirical studies and behavioristic philosophy.⁷⁴ An empirical study done in San Francisco concluded that homosexuals were found to be the happiest and healthiest people among the group studied and, therefore, encouraged not to attempt heterosexual relations.⁷⁵ Argument from behavioristic philosophy asserts that Homosexuality is natural because homosexuals are born Gay, therefore, anything natural is not morally wrong.⁷⁶

⁷¹ Gushee and Glen H. Stassen *Kingdom Ethics*, 266.

⁷² Judith K. Balswick and Jack O. Balswick, *Authentic Human Sexuality: An Integrated Christian Approach*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 136.

⁷³ Michael Banner, *Christian Ethics and Contemporary Moral Problems* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 252.

⁷⁴ Pipim, *Born a Gay and Born Again?* 144-46.

⁷⁵ David R. Larson, "Sexuality and Christian Ethics," *Spectrum* 15 (May 1984):16. See also Judith Reisman and Edward W. Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex, and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People* (Lafayette, La.: Lochinvar-Huntington House, 1990).

⁷⁶ Chris Blake, "Redeeming Our Sad Gay Situation," *Insight*, (December, 1992); 6, 7, 11.

Additionally, scientific evidence has been used to defend Homosexuality.⁷⁷ This evidence from biology, psychiatry, and sociology claims that Homosexuality is a natural phenomenon in many societies. Consequently, “It is a type of sexual orientation within the human population, and it is normal to have between 5% to 10% of homosexuals in any society.”⁷⁸ Accordingly, it is incorrect to refer to a normal phenomenon as sinful. Johnston uses cultural arguments to defend Homosexuality. She argues that marriage is a social institution that has expanded and matured beyond the Edenic ideal; it is an adaptive quality that allows room for exceptions while retaining its core meaning.⁷⁹

Other philosophical arguments conclude that 1) sex difference is described, not prescribed, in Scripture; 2) the union that brings one flesh’ does not imply sex difference; 3) Romans 1 condemns excessive lust, not same-sex love; 4) Biblical writers did not know about sexual orientation; 5) the word homosexual was added to the Bible in 1946; 6) Biblical writers wrote this topic from their homophobic and patriarchal cultural setting; 7) Jesus never mentioned Homosexuality.⁸⁰ These arguments have been employed in the United States, Asia, and other European countries to legalize same-sex relationships. Moreover, homosexual supporters argue that the biblical texts which condemn Homosexuality should be re-interpreted. They opine that reading these texts should consider views from other readers because texts may not have a final meaning.⁸¹ Generally, those who uphold Homosexuality re-interpret the texts and assert that Scripture does not condemn the practice. Some of the re-interpreted texts are;

⁷⁷ Ángel Manuel Rodríguez, “Adventists and Homosexuality: The Central Issue in the Debate” *Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of SDA Church*. n.d. 1

⁷⁸ Ibid. See also Joe Dallas, *A Strong Delusion: Confronting the “Gay Christian” Movement* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1996), 107-131.

⁷⁹ Johnston, *The Bible and LGBTQ Adventists*, 118-124

⁸⁰ Sprinkle, *Does the Bible Support Same-Sex Marriage* 20-214.

⁸¹ Rodríguez, *Adventists and Homosexuality*, 1.

1. Lev 18:22, which condemns Homosexuality, was associated with dietary ceremonial law, which was done away with by Mark 7:19 and Acts 10:15
2. The Bible condemns only Homosexuality, which is associated with idolatry (Deut. 23:17; 1 King. 14:24).
3. Pauline's condemnation of Homosexuality recorded in 1 Cor 6:9 was his personal opinion (1 Cor. 7:25).
4. Quoting Isaiah 56:3-5 homosexual asserts that homosexuals have a place in the kingdom of God.
5. Homosexuals presuppose that David and Jonathan were homosexuals (1 Sam. 18-20).

Conclusively, in light of the arguments above, the debate between those who reject Homosexuality and those who defend it is ongoing with no end in sight. While those who reject Homosexuality claim that the biblical distinction between male and female is a fundamental principle for sexuality, those who support it claim that marriage has matured beyond the Edenic ideal that allows some exceptions. The following section attempts to find the root cause of the ongoing debate.

Key Points of Disagreement: A Comparative Overview

Issue	Traditionalist View	Affirming View
Source Emphasis	Scripture (as infallible authority), Tradition	Experience, Reason, Reinterpreted Scripture
Creation Account	Heterosexual complementarity reflects divine image (Gen 1–2)	Gen 1–2 describes but does not prescribe exclusive heterosexuality
Jesus' Teaching	Reaffirms heterosexual marriage (Matt 19:4–6)	Silent on homosexuality; emphasizes love and inclusion
Pauline Texts	Denounce same-sex acts as sinful (Rom 1; 1 Cor 6)	Condemn lust, not loving same-sex unions; culturally contextualized

Moral Argument	Homosexuality is against God’s design and moral order	Covenant love and mutual commitment reflect divine values
Scientific and Cultural Insights	De-emphasized or seen as subordinate to Scripture	Used to affirm dignity and inclusion of LGBTQ+ individuals

Homosexuality and the Ongoing Debate

The ongoing theological debate over homosexuality is shaped by fundamentally different hermeneutical and moral frameworks. While both affirming and non-affirming theologians engage with Scripture, their interpretations and ethical conclusions differ due to the sources they prioritize and the values that guide their theological tasks. This section presents a comparative analysis organized around three dimensions: hermeneutical shapes, moral frameworks, and resulting theological conclusions.

Hermeneutical Shapes

Non-affirming theologians typically adopt a historical-grammatical method of interpretation. This approach seeks the original meaning of the biblical text as intended by its authors, taking into account grammar, historical context, and canonical coherence. Under this model, Genesis 1–2 is seen as establishing the normative heterosexual union, and texts such as Leviticus 18:22 and Romans 1:26-27 are understood as timeless prohibitions against same-sex acts.

In contrast, affirming theologians often employ contextual and reader-response hermeneutics. These interpretive approaches emphasize how biblical texts are received, reinterpreted, and made meaningful in different cultural settings. For example, Paul’s condemnations in Romans are read as addressing specific historical practices like pederasty or exploitative relationships, rather than consensual same-sex unions. Galatians 3:28 and Isaiah 56:3–5 are used to highlight themes of inclusion and covenantal belonging.

A key factor in this shift is the influence of contemporary biblical scholarship. As Pipim observes, “Under the influence of contemporary higher criticism, the Bible’s sole authority is being replaced by other sources: reason, tradition, and experience.”⁸² This development reflects a broader trend in modern theology toward incorporating additional sources into the interpretive process, often resulting in more fluid and evolving understandings of biblical texts.

Moral Frameworks

Non-affirming positions are grounded in divine command ethics, where moral truth is derived from God’s revealed will as expressed in Scripture. Holiness, obedience, and sexual purity are central moral values. Same-sex behavior is considered a violation of God’s design and moral order, regardless of individual intention or relational quality. This framework affirms that Scripture is not only authoritative but also sufficient for moral guidance across all cultures and eras. On the contrary, affirming theologians often draw from moral philosophies that emphasize autonomy, dignity, relational ethics, and justice. These include:

- i. Rationalism, which prioritizes human reason in questioning inherited norms and interpreting Scripture in light of logical consistency.
- ii. Empiricism, which uses psychological and sociological research to understand sexuality as a natural and non-pathological human variation.
- iii. Existentialism, which affirms the primacy of lived experience and authentic selfhood over imposed theological norms.
- iv. Idealism, which interprets divine will as manifested through internal moral principles such as love, commitment, and equality rather than through fixed legal codes.

⁸² Pipim, *Born a Gay and Born Again?* 144.

- v. Deism, which supports the idea that moral truths are accessible through universal human reason and conscience rather than through specific scriptural commands.

Affirming moral reasoning places, a strong emphasis on values such as consent, mutual respect, and the inherent worth of individuals. Theological conclusions are shaped not only by how Scripture is read, but also by how human experience is integrated into moral discernment.

Resulting Theological Conclusions

The two theological frameworks arrive at opposing conclusions. For non-affirming theologians, same-sex relationships contradict divine intent and biblical authority. Homosexuality is seen as morally wrong, not simply because of cultural discomfort, but because of explicit biblical teaching that reflects God's unchanging standards.

Affirming theologians conclude that same-sex unions, when marked by fidelity and covenantal love, can reflect Christian virtues. Scripture, when read through the lens of justice, compassion, and human dignity, is seen to support inclusion. While affirming perspectives do not dismiss Scripture, they challenge traditional readings and argue for theological models that evolve with deeper understandings of human identity and relationality.

Ultimately, both groups engage the same sacred texts but arrive at opposing conclusions due to their underlying hermeneutical assumptions and ethical frameworks. The disagreement is not merely about individual verses but about what theological sources carry the most weight, how texts are to be interpreted, and what constitutes moral truth in Christian life.

Evaluation of how Sources bring Divergence Conclusions on Homosexuality

The divergent theological conclusions on homosexuality are deeply rooted in how different Christian traditions prioritize and interpret theological sources. The source one begins with whether

Scripture alone or Scripture in dialogue with reason, tradition, and experience often determines the trajectory of interpretation. However, the issue is not simply which sources are used, but how they are interpreted and integrated into theological reasoning.

For theologians who uphold *Sola Scriptura* such as Pipim, Rodríguez, Mueller, and Finley, Scripture is viewed as the final, infallible authority on moral issues. Through a historical-grammatical method, they interpret passages such as Leviticus 18:22 and Romans 1:26–27 as timeless moral prohibitions. These texts are understood literally and universally, with no distinction between ancient context and modern application. As a result, same-sex relationships are seen as inherently immoral because they contradict God's revealed design for human sexuality.

By contrast, many affirming theologians also affirm the authority of Scripture, but employ alternative hermeneutical approaches, including historical-critical, narrative, and reader-response methods. These theologians such as the Balswicks, Johnston, and Geraty, contend that the biblical texts must be understood within their cultural and literary context. For example, Romans 1 is interpreted not as a condemnation of consensual same-sex love but as a critique of exploitative sexual behavior tied to idolatry in the Greco-Roman world. Similarly, Leviticus 18 is seen as part of an ancient purity code tied to Israelite distinctiveness, not a universal moral law. Thus, biblical passages on homosexuality need to be reviewed in light of modern discoveries, including psychological, sociological, and ethical developments that were not available to ancient communities.

The hermeneutical divide is further illustrated by the treatment of texts like Galatians 3:28. While non-affirming theologians argue that this passage addresses spiritual unity and not sexuality, affirming theologians view it as a theological foundation for radical inclusion, where categories of gender and social status are transcended in Christ. These interpretive differences are not arbitrary; they reflect broader commitments to how Scripture is read in relation to culture, human dignity, and theological development.

While it is true that many affirming theologians also engage reason, empirical research, and contemporary cultural insights, this does not equate to a rejection of biblical authority. Rather, their approach reflects a more dialogical model, in which Scripture is read alongside other sources to respond faithfully to changing human realities. Veeneman gives an insightful comment on the sources; she argues, “While there is not complete agreement on how we should go about doing theology either historically across the tradition of today, there is some broad agreement on what sources we should generally consider.”⁸³ It is the priority, interaction, and interpretation of those sources that lead to divergent outcomes.

Thus, the debate over homosexuality is not simply a clash between biblical fidelity and secular reasoning, but a complex theological disagreement about which sources to trust, how to interpret them, and how to apply them in a modern ethical context.⁸⁴ Even within *Sola Scriptura* traditions, variations in emphasis and textual focus can lead to nuanced differences in moral theology.

The persistence of disagreement highlights the significance of hermeneutical methods in theological ethics. It also calls for humility and continued engagement between traditions that may disagree profoundly but share a commitment to serious theological inquiry. The ongoing conversation reflects not a failure of theology, but its complexity and the enduring challenge of interpreting Scripture faithfully in a changing world.

Conclusion

This paper aimed to find out reasons for the ongoing debate over Homosexuality among Christians. The paper argues that the scientific nature of theology mandates a theological method to

⁸³ Mary M. Veeneman, *Introducing Theological Method* (Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 2017), 10.

⁸⁴ Sheila Greeve Davaney, *Historicism: The Once and Future Challenge for Theology, Guides to Theological Inquiry* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006), 160-164. See also James B. DeYoung, *Homosexuality: Contemporary Claims Examined in the Light of the Bible and Other Ancient Literature and Law* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2000), 11.

reach its conclusion. Several sources were available to accomplish this task: Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience. However, as a moral being, God revealed His will in Scripture on the morality of Homosexuality. Consequently, the hermeneutical principles revealed in Scripture are the source at the genesis of the theological task. From this view, homosexuality is thus immoral because Scripture is against it, as we have established based on the principles outlined earlier.

Conversely, during the Enlightenment, philosophical thinking was added to Scripture, reason, tradition, and experience as sources at the genesis of the theological task. The hermeneutical principles derived from these sources were applied to the moral issue of Homosexuality and resulted in Homosexuality being deemed an acceptable way of life. Based on the divergent emphasis on the sources, this paper concludes that the debate on the morality of Homosexuality is endless and ongoing. On the one hand, using Scripture as the normative source leads to the conclusion that Homosexuality is morally wrong. In contrast, adding philosophical principles such as reason, tradition, and experience on the same level with Scripture leads to the conclusion that Homosexuality is morally acceptable. We can safely conclude that the lack of consensus on the normative sources for the theological methods accentuates the endless debate over Homosexuality among Christians.