

**This Paper is written by Daniel Atkins**

**Course: IC603 “Doing Theology in Context”**

**Instructor: Dr. Chuck Davis**

**Assignment: Final Paper [Theology of Sexuality]**

As I approached this paper, concerning the theology of sexuality, I had to seek out how the topic ‘might’ involve me in it during my search. In that process I stumbled upon an article, on the internet, that gave me a starting point to this process; and, it helped me look in the right direction. It all begins to give me a ‘better’ understanding of the revealing images of a theology relating to sexuality, and how I might approach its definitions and its specific characterizations. I am doing theology when I am looking at how the ‘presence’ of the divine nature of God is represented in this world. God has created all things, and His imprints are in everything that was made by God (Jn. 1:1-3). Biblical theology is the measured work by his created order and likeness (Gen. ch. 1-3). Man’s creation makes things more complicated because of his division of natures (man and woman). This form of theology, which involves sexuality of mankind, as I believe, started in Genesis 1:26, with the initial making of the male child (being first), and the separate act of his partner (female) which followed him with a different set of personal instincts. One needs to be able to determine what, or how, certain terms are used in scripture.

This point that I am confronted with here is my trying to determine what God ‘really’ meant when the record stated that He was making man as male? With thought in mind we can, therefore blame God, for creating a bit of confusion and the introduction of the theology of sexuality (Gen. 1:27). “He created mankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them”. Confusing if you ask me; but, this creates a problem for most of us to determined<sup>1</sup>. This would place the blame on the Godhead’s intent to confuse matters, or purposely creating this theology of sexuality.

It is here, for some reason, man talks directly to God in his development; while Eve chooses to conversate with Satan, and she becomes the misdirected one, and blame is given to her the indirect fall; and, for misleading Adam into

---

<sup>1</sup> Clemens Sedmak, “Doing Local Theology: A Guide for Artisans of a New Humanity”, P. 13. Thesis 7: Since doing theology is natural as walking and talking, we all do theology, both as individuals and as a community. There is, however, a difference between explicit and implicit theologies, between trained and the untrained theologians.

ignoring her fault for being misled by Satan's temptation. They submitted to failing to 'trust' God's Word, and oppose it in light of the 'suggestions' of Satan, which results of the sin of disobedience, and the spiritual division between the sexes in Eden.

And, because Adam was 'not' made 'good' like other created matter, as follow: "(Gen. 1:1 heaven and earth; 1:3 light; 1:6 water; 1:7 a vault between the sky and waters/ dry land and going into the next day; 1:11 the land produces vegetation on that second day; 1:11-12 the vault in the sky to 'separate' day and night on the third day; 14-15; in 1:16 God made the sun and moon; 1:17 - 18 He named the lights of day and night; 1:20 living creatures: sea, sky; 1:21 He created large creatures of the sea, land, and sky; 1:22 God bless them and told them to be fruitful and multiply. On the fifth day, Gen. 1:24, God said the land producing animals of their own kind, livestock, creatures moving around the grounds, wild animals, and He said, in every case of His created work that His creation was 'good'". Now, when the assignment of mankind as maintenance duties is given, by God in Gen. 1:26, our biblical records said that it was good. Then, the bible says, God created mankind "in our, and in our likeness, so that 'they' may rule over" the birds, livestock, all wild animals, and all of the creatures that move over the earth. Gen. 1:27 Godhead creates mankind "in his own image; in the image of God he created male and female; he created 'them' (Gen. 1:28). In 1:28 God gave mankind the instruction to "multiply their kind, and to subdue the earth and rule over all living animals'. But, Adam's nature appeared 'only' in the male person until God saw the need for Adam's emotional partner was needed<sup>2</sup>. And, in Gen. 2:15, man was placed in the Garden to work; and, man was instructed to 'not' indulge with the tree of knowledge of good and evil or he would 'die'. Adam's helpmate was 'not' found for Adam, so God in Gen. 2:20, put Adam to sleep and

---

<sup>2</sup> Still, in his maleness Adam represent man without female as created when God created 'them' - male and female. This, to me, was a divisive move. Looking at the sense of whether this was implicit, or explicit to address intent of honoring one, of both sexes. Language, and translation may vary depending upon who is reading their intentions into the clause 'mankind'. Also, this is another example of implicit theology and explicit theology at its best when you look at the battle between the sexes (Feminist theology, is an example of this)

brought forth Eve for his companionship. Genesis 2:22 tells us that Eve was taken from Adam's rib and in 2:23 she is called Adams' "bone of bone"; and "flesh of Adam's flesh". The emotional characteristics of Eve made her an easier target for the serpent to deceive and turn God's plan array because Adam never stopped the temptation of the emotional Eve, who's desire to be 'like' God overwhelmed Adam<sup>3</sup>. God could have stopped this; but, perhaps He was trusting man to step up to his design as leader over God's creations, which even included Eve. God, 'may have been testing mankind's obligation to His headship over them and all other creation. But, because we look at things through a lense, in a society which has promoted the male dominance over females until recent days; and, here we see that Adam plays a very important part in the development of a theology of sexuality. And, this also 'helps' us to see how man participates in this role division, and dominance, of the sexes throughout history. We, then, 'naturally' read into things, from this point, that it was natural for man (or male) to dominate over his 'later' created partner female.

Over the history of this world we have viewed our feminine partner 'only' as male's 'supporting' partner; and, 'not' having females being equal in our male oriented society. In biblical record, when the Godhead's intent of having: "Adam being made in God's own likeness", and no mentioning of his emotions. I believe that the emotional qualities of females cause a difference in emotions, and desires, to be greater than male posture would allow. Here is where, I believe, that the challenge of sexual 'identity' that mankind experienced and the greatest action where division erupted between the sexes. Confused about who each other 'sexually' meant that there were two different stories about mankind clashing. And, so the story of men and women, throughout history, have dealt with these same issues which developed to divide them forever. Adam, possessing the characteristics, and influences of the divine nature of God; and, Eve's, now under

---

<sup>3</sup> Clemens Sedmak, *Doing Local Theology: A Guide for Artisans of a New Humanity*, P. 77. Thesis 28: "A way to unveil biases or trace hidden values and implicit theologies is through the use of stories that present ambiguous situations with actors who act on the basis of different value systems. These "value stories" are a useful theological tool when we ask which actors in the story are justified in acting the way they do.

the influence of a slippery voice of the serpent. Two different natures now existed between the two humans occupying the Garden. One nature with a command, and the other nature being lure to a certain greatest by the 'suggestion' that one could be like God if one could eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. Thus, a divided nature, and a great division of sexual personhood began in the garden and a theology of sexuality was fostered and their 'nakedness' became notable to Adam his later act of guilt caused him to 'hide' from his responsibilities from God (3:10) caused them both to experience open shame forever (3:12)<sup>4</sup>. One moment in time has caused this theology of sexuality; and, its remedy by the creator, was to force them out of the Garden because they have experienced a touch of sinful nature through the act of disobedience. This pleased satan, as his directive corrupted man's future because of the existing 'lustful' suggestion given to Eve would hurt God<sup>5</sup>. Even though Eve sinned, God 'saves' mankind through 'another' male model (or, 2nd Adam) after the first Adam dies in the disobedience of God's order. And, the act by the second Adam, dying on another tree, is meant to cover the sins of all mankind through eternity and redeem the previous act of sinful man.

God, later, creates a future history for the sinful man to return to Him in the future. This promise would be resolved through the coming of a baby born in a manger. God's solution to that act is the reason we have the gospel story instead of all things ending up with eternal damnation for mankind (Jn. 1:14; 3:16).

There are two sciences that we use to examine the nature of God, and our biblical records. They are 'General' Revelations, and Special Revelations.

General Revelation deals with natural revelation of God's nature, which includes

---

<sup>4</sup> Davidson (chapter 2) Fall.pdf-Google (Sexuality and the fall; Genesis 3) P.57 - The idea that a conscious of sex came only after the fall seems to be based mainly on a misunderstanding of the meaning of Gen. 3:7 relationship to 2:25. It is argued that since Adam and Eve knew that they were naked after the fall, then 2:25 must mean that they were not aware of their nakedness \*or sexuality) in the beginning.

<sup>5</sup> Debra Hirsch, "Redeeming Sex: Naked, Conversation About Sex" [Sexuality Meets Spirituality] P. 23, 24 (23) I believe that within both the desire and the pleasure of sex are found in deeper human longing for the eternal connection and ecstasy. There is, in other words, something deeply 'spiritual' about sex. (24) Orgasms offer us "fleeting experiences of transcendence, a way of losing ourselves, a mechanism to find and experience the 'other'.

His spiritual presence in the world which we live in; and is visible to us in the world as created matter which is visible to us, and the physical universe around us. Some examples of this are: Ps. 19:1-4; weather, land, water, etc.

Special Revelations, on the other hand, will show up to us through different means. This is where God ‘shows up’ to us through dreams, visions, angels, through His prophets, and in several other mystical apparatus, and ways, which He chooses to show up to us in. Scripture examples of this are as follows, in Gen. 3:8; 18:1; Exod. 3:1-4; 34:5-7, He shows up through dreams. The angels in Dan. 2; 1 Kings 3:5; Luke 2:10-11); 2 Tim. 3:16; through His ‘inspired’ Word from the past time (Heb. 1:1-2; and, also, He shows up in His recorded word of our Bible in Rom. 3:16-17. An article, on the internet, “What is Your Theology of Sexuality?” 5 Questions: by David Fitch<sup>6</sup> brought out some very good, and

---

<sup>6</sup> Uncategorized - **What is Your Theology of Sexuality? 5 Questions:** by David Fitch, on December 3, 2013 - What is your theology of sexuality? Most of us do not think theologically about sexual questions. I’m constantly forced to because I teach sexual ethics in a **seminary**. Most of us do not sort out the implications of our sexual discernments for the way they make space for God to work in and through our lives and other people’s lives. We do not sort out the assumptions by which we engage our own sexual formation. What do we do with desire? What does it mean that I am attracted sexually to this or that person, this or that object? What if I’m married and attracted to someone else? etc. etc. etc. In society at large, there is an unconscious belief in the merits of self expressionism as the basis of moral action. Pursue sexual self expression as an authentic part of your self as long as you don’t hurt anyone else. It is left at that. In the midst of this, the sexual guidance and formation that our churches have given us has been brutal. The resulting confusion has been ubiquitous. And so, I offer some questions I ask in the midst of the many discussions that are provoked by sexual crises in a person’s life or the life of the church. These questions, admittedly are at the level of a theologian/philosopher of culture. They are the questions that ferret out issues in the midst of church discernments. But they might be helpful in person to person conversations if they could be translated (maybe you can help me with this?). Yet I find these questions really important as the church seeks to navigate sexual formation from within its communal processes in the current culture. When someone presents to me “I believe such and such” about a sexual issue he or she is confronted with, these are the questions I find myself asking (often internally). I find these questions in particular often missing in the ensuing discussions. So here are 5 sets of questions that make explicit one’s theology of sexuality: **Sanctification:** What doctrine of sanctification is implied by your position? How do you believe God in Christ transforms/heals human beings and human life? What then does this mean for all people with sexual issues of any kind in their lives? What hope do you offer (from within your own discernment) for people with issues that need healing, renewal, change, transformation? **Chastity:** All sexuality, heterosexual, gay, lesbian, other assumes a form of chastity, the ordering our sexual desires towards a given end. For instance, gay marriage infers that a gay man shall guide and chasten his desires toward one male in one monogamous marriage. In your own discernment, how are the ends towards which we chasten our sexual drives determined in your views of sexuality? **Subjectivity:** Subjectivity after the postmodern matrix, within post structuralism, after Foucault, Derrida, Zizek, Butkler, sees the human subject as the product of cultural formation, “the Big Other.” Part of this (if not the main part) is that desire is not simply given but shaped by these forces. How does this change the way we view sexuality and the formation of desire? Do you take this into account? Why or why not? **Antagonism as Source of Sexual Life:** In what ways is our sexual expression/identity formed in antagonism versus healing? What ways have we pointed out faults in others to better secure and avoid examining our own sexual identity and lives. **The Limits on Self Expression:** If self expression is the source of one’s sexual ethic, i.e. what

revealing, points to my understanding. This article helped me to ‘continue’ to look closer at this theology of sexuality. It helped point me in the right direction as I sought to understand this theology of sexuality, as it is seen in the secular community. Several interesting topics under their definitions were as follows: Sanctification, Chastity, Subjectivity, Source of Sexual Life, Antagonism, and the Limits of Self Expression. These are, per Davis Fitch, the primary components of what he eludes to as being the properties of this Theology of Sexuality. But, looking at his theological view, and how these, mostly, secular definitions might apply to the biblical theme of Theology of Sexuality I see that they share some truths in definitions.

*I believe that if we look at the division of the sexes, it is important how we approach the fact that guilt might, also, be applied to man’s responsibility to being guilty, neglectful, and responsible for his part of the act for not watching his partners’ actions; and, start accepting his role in the fall of mankind. In the Garden God speaks to Adam; and, later, Satan tempts Eve to ‘divide’ the two. Eve, like some other women in the bible, yields to Satan's negative challenges to undermine God’s work throughout history. Lot’s wife turning back to a salty solution, Queen Jezebel (who’s name throughout history has given a woman a ‘bad’ image) turned on her husband Ahab, the idol worshippers; Job’s wife attack on Job’s faithfulness to God; Deliah (the seductive person of Sampson; Herodias; Maacah; Potiphor’s wife, Rahab, who understood the spies real promise and their God: and a few more to speak of.*

Women, throughout the history of the world have been seen as being playing second fiddle to men, or a nonfactor altogether, in the development of some theological history of God’s divine purpose for man. Though this is true, I

---

you feel, desire should be fulfilled because it is given by God, what if any limits do you put on that expression and why? What is the source of that limiting ethic? For those theologically minded people, what do you think of these questions for church conversations? Are there others that are more important? Do you find any of these questions helpful? offensive? Herein reveals much about our theology of sexuality. Why are they helpful? offensive? How would you rephrase them? I’m not looking to define the answers here for Christian orthodoxy. Instead I’m looking for the right questions that need to be asked and the ones, given our current culture, that often get missed. In this regard, do these questions help and why or why not?

am reminded that there are some great women that have played major roles in the development of the history of mankind. They are, in the likes of, to begin with, Mary, mother of Jesus; Rahab, who help save the spies; Ruth, and her faith; Mary Magdalene, Rachel, Hannah, Deborah, Esthee, Miriam, Sarah, Elizabeth, Priscilla, Mary of Bethany, Martha, Mary (Martha's sister), and few more that were mention. The interpretations of the records, and the language matters much towards interpretation of the records to ensure the truth of record<sup>7</sup>. Here, in

---

<sup>7</sup> A Thesis Submitted By: Justin Marc Smith: "To The Faculty Of Divinity In Candidacy For The Degree Of Doctor Of Philosophy ST Andrews, Scotland, January 31, 2010 Without some generic comprehension, either conscious or subconscious, the reader will be unable to unpack fully, if at all, the communicative efforts of the author. However, before one can engage the subject of genre formation and function, one first has to tackle the issue of genre itself. **What is Genre? Some Ancient and Contemporary Approaches:** Freedman and Medway have argued that, 'traditional definitions of genre focused on textual regularities. In traditional literary studies the genres – sonnet, tragedy, ode, etc. – were defined by conventions of form and content.' 10 Thus, genres were defined rigidly according to organization and subject matter. Indeed, this desire for conformity dominates the discussions of antiquarian literary critics of differing eras (Pl. *Rep.*, 392d; Arist. *Poet.*, 1447a-1448a; and Cic. *Orat.*, 70-75) where an adherence to 'types' is of great importance. 11 However, there are two important provisos to be considered when attempting to construct or reconstruct systems of generic theory in antiquity. First, the definition of genre itself runs the risk of being reduced to futility if all the subdivisions 27 themselves. 12 While ancient literary critics were well acquainted with genre and genre distinctions, this does not imply that these distinctions were universally followed, which brings us to the second proviso. 13 While generic and aesthetic distinctions were recognized in antiquity neither the critics nor authors adhered to the rules of genre consistently. Often writers, critics and authors alike, would acknowledge the principles of generic construction and would ignore them just as frequently in their own compositions. Philosophical reasons aside, the existence of texts that do not conform to the rules of *decorum* would provide an impetus for literary critics to take up the pen in defense of aesthetic sensibility. It has been suggested that the ancient classifications of genre are unclear, especially regarding biography, and as a result, the employment of modern literary theory may be of some use. 14 Yet, it is fundamental to remember that the application of modern theory to ancient texts is done with the aim of providing a useful and helpful way of organizing and understanding the material. What is to be avoided is the act of infusing ancient texts with anachronistic views and expectations, thus doing violence to the texts and *Weltanschauung*. With this in mind, we would like to adopt the working definition of genre as put forth by Depew and Obbink which defines genre as 'a conceptual orienting device that suggests to a hearer the sort of receptional conditions in which a fictive discourse might have been delivered.' 15 Communication, written or otherwise, is in effect always a discourse, actualized or fictive. As a result, genre enables the 28 hearer/reader to understand the conditions and expectations of the discourse. This definition is advantageous for the following reasons: 1) it imagines genre as an integral part of discourse and thereby acknowledges the roles of the deliverer and receiver in this process; 2) it is not confined to literary transmission as the sole representation of generic output and as such, it allows for a wider discussion of generic features including orality, oral transmission and oral performance; and 3) it allows for a greater measure of flexibility as it posits genre to be a conceptual device and it is not an attempt to couch genre in specific structural or thematic terms. 16 This definition is broad enough to cover the development of a particular genre over a period of time as well as being specific enough to locate genre within a communicative matrix. 17 Whereas in antiquity, literary critics regarded a genre as a static set of rules and expectations for how literature was to be produced, with a heavy emphasis on aesthetic concerns, modern conceptualizations of genre emphasize its role in communication, apart from artistic value.

believing that Eve earned her reputation as being the ‘weaker’ sex is wrong if we understand the value of her position; and, this might possibly proved why God chose Adam to lead instead of Eve in a different context. Again, this is where, as I believe, the theology of sexuality is supported by Eve’s presence, and she can be understood as being a very important part of the Eden story, in her role.

Through this Special Revelation of His written word we have been established as His people, and responsible to live an errorless lifestyle, based upon our confession (Rom. 10:8 -10). And, along with this, we have become responsible to share it with others (2 Tim. 3:16).

Sexuality tends to bring many difficult areas of concern to the table; and, when looking at theology I am forced to look at it in several different ways because there are a few different directions in which the process of study might be focused on. Some of the classifications of theology are as follows. We have contemporary theology; political theology, Christian theology, black theology, liberal theology, covenant theology, biblical theology, systematic theology, implicit and explicit theology, and many more types of studies of theology. And, for this paper, we include today’s study of the Theology of Sexuality (even though sexuality is a fragile area of study, and one needs to be carefully studied. Here, as we look at theology, we start to, also, look at the nature of the divine in different theological viewpoints. In the desired designs, and assigned duties of mankind, on earth, as partners, and friends, to the God’s community containing his imprint as part (or, His DNA (Ps. 19:1- 4; Rom. 1:19-20).

I believe, has helped mankind to shift their attentions to those those which have been designed to help transformed our society, and thoughts towards his design God purposed principles to the sexes<sup>8</sup>. It has been set in stone that the

---

<sup>8</sup> R.R. Reno, “EARLY-MORNING MUSINGS ON THE SACRED”: R. R. Reno takes up Gilbert Meilaender; St. Augustinian themes. Theologians participated in this de-consolidation, formulating theories about the intrinsically secularizing and disenchanting significance of Christianity. That consensus has been all too successful, and now it is time to build up. This building up will produce idols of pride if we imagine it as flowing from our creativity or the calculations of utility. Let it be, rather, that we warm to the loves to which we are called, purifying them with our reason and ordering them to God by receiving them as providential gifts, sacred in the sense of coming from the mysterious purposes of the divine. For Americans, this means loyalty to our liberal traditions. But let us not be

practice of practical male dominance has been a standard. But, when man fell into sin of disobedience), he was out of touch with God; but, God was able to rescue mankind from himself by placing His planned redemptive work in place through His son's dHis Son's appearance on the earth (Gen. 3:15). This is the 'full' theme of the Christian Bible.

As I continued to look at this topic on the theology of sexuality I am asking myself this question: "why did the Godhead create Adam first?". Does this still mean that Adam's early appearance gave him the right, or preeminence, over Eve's status as being the weaker sex? Sarah Coakley, in her approach to the divine<sup>9</sup>. In Eugene F. Rogers Jr.'s book "Theology and Sexuality: Classic and

---

deceived by the spirit of disenchantment so dominant today. This loyalty to our national heritage is transcendent, because its intensity--the bonds it creates and the duties it imposes--are, happily, greater than anything we can justify by political theories, liberal or otherwise. today ceaseless labor to be safe; nor dissipation and enslavement to self-destructive vices, suggests movement. Both conditions train our souls to remain neutral, never engaging the gears of love that draw us out of ourselves to work in solidarity toward ends greater than our private goods. Trained to stay self-enclosed, we domesticate the call of Christ and delay our departure. For all things there is a season. There is a time to break down, and a time to build up. As I argue in Return of the Strong Gods, after 1945 the dominant consensus urged breaking down the solidarity that unites men, especially the solidarity of the nation. Theologians participated in this de-consolidation, formulating theories about the intrinsically secularizing and disenchanting significance of Christianity. That consensus has been all too successful, and now it is time to build up. This building up will produce idols of pride if we imagine it as flowing from our creativity or the calculations of utility. Let it be, rather, that we warm to the loves to which we are called, purifying them with our reason and ordering them to God by receiving them as providential gifts, sacred in the sense of coming from the mysterious purposes of the divine. For Americans, this means loyalty to our liberal traditions. But let us not be deceived by the spirit of disenchantment so dominant today. This loyalty to our national heritage is transcendent, because its intensity--the bonds it creates and the duties it imposes--are, happily, greater than anything we can justify by political theories, liberal or otherwise. today, ceaseless labor to be &quot; nor dissipation and enslavement to self-destructive vices, suggests movement. Both conditions train our souls to remain in neutral, never engaging the gears of love that draw us out of ourselves to work in solidarity toward ends greater than our private goods. Trained to stay self-enclosed, we domesticate the call of Christ and delay our departure. For all things there is a season. There is a time to break down, and a time to build up. As I argue in Return of the Strong Gods, after 1945 the dominant consensus urged breaking down the solidarity that unites men, especially the solidarity of the nation. Theologians participated in this de-consolidation, formulating theories about the intrinsically secularizing and disenchanting significance of Christianity. That consensus has been all too successful, and now it is time to build up. This building up will produce idols of pride if we imagine it as flowing from our creativity or the calculations of utility. Let it be, rather, that we warm to the loves to which we are called, purifying them with our reason and ordering them to God by receiving them as providential gifts, sacred in the sense of coming from the mysterious purposes of the divine. For Americans, this means loyalty to our liberal traditions. But let us not be deceived by the spirit of disenchantment so dominant today. This loyalty to our national heritage is transcendent, because its intensity--the bonds it creates and the duties it imposes--are, happily, greater than anything we can justify by political theories, liberal or otherwise.

<sup>9</sup> Radu Bordeianu, "Triadologie Totale: An Orthodox Reflection on Sarah Coakley's Spirit-Centered, Iconographical Perspective In her most recent book, Sarah Coakley proposes a new—or

Contemporary Readings”, points out that “a man’s focus on his lust for things have become his downfall because as he has turned away from the presentation of women as the proponent of his lust, and that man has refocused his attentions on other things in that place”<sup>10</sup>. We have ‘even’ seen the forbidden biblical model of this being enforced in the adversed nature of gathering of our church’s collective today without the total regards to what the true gospel represents today<sup>11</sup>. In

---

renewed— approach to the Trinity from the perspective of *théologie totale*, understood as “a new form of systematic theology that attempts to incorporate insights from every level of society and to integrate intellectual, affective, and imaginative approaches to doctrine and practice” (352). For political and sexual reasons, beginning with patristic times and up to today, this type of approach has been pushed to the margins. The primary task of *théologie totale* is to expose the sexual, political, and ecclesiastical presuppositions and implications that mark all human discourse on the Trinity and to submit them to critical evaluation.

<sup>10</sup> ROGERS Jr, Eugene F. (ed.), *Theology and Sexuality: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Blackwell Readings in Modern Theology; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. xxii + 422, There are two keys for understanding Rogers' organization of his essays: one revealed and the other hidden. The explicit key is given in the first two readings of Part I, from Susan A. Harvey and George P. Schnier. Their essays tell us how and how not to think about the body in theology. The body is to be understood as a site for reflecting the glory of God, thereby constructing the body liturgically — and only then doctrinally and ethically. The body should not be reduced to sex, or to functions of sex, but understood as a social presence that can, as a communal body, signify the Kingdom of God. While the Christian tradition is replete with denials, repressions and abuses of the individual body, it also provides resources for rescuing the body from contemporary functional utilitarianism. When car adverts are explicitly rendered in terms of sexual desire, so that lust, envy and jealousy are activated through sight of the car's body, rather than that of a woman, we have a clear measure of modernity's telos. Through his Reader, Rogers offers a convincing and richly ecumenical account of strategies for an alternative understanding of the body, in which wonder and joy, fidelity and patient covenanted relations, construe embodied community.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. The fifth part of the Reader ('Nuptial Hermeneutics, Or What Marriage Means') contains some very fine pieces which perhaps best embody the basic themes underlying Rogers' project. Rather than have a separate section on homosexuality, Rogers here provides essays that view same-sex relations under the rubric of marriage — a strategy that is rarely questioned in the collection. This section includes two exceptionally good essays by David Matzo McCarthy and Rogers himself. McCarthy's essay shows how virtue ethics can render same-sex relationships as virtuous practices through viewing such relationships as 'anomalous' in the context of nuptial theology. Rogers' essay is a superb compression of the argument of his book, *Sexuality and the Christian Body* (reviewed by Gareth Moore in issue 15 of *Theology and Sexuality*), in which he advocates the legitimacy of same-sex relationships within a Christian nuptial theology. Both essays show how traditional forms of theology, such as natural law and nuptial body symbolism, can be recovered and used to highlight and endorse what they have often been thought to reject. The essay by the Orthodox theologian

Paul Evdokimov is one of the great classics and strangely evokes certain forms of radical French feminism, even if some of its assumptions will offend some modern readers. Rogers' prefatory remarks, as always, help to disarm prejudices, so that more 'traditional' materials, like Evdokimov's, can be properly valued.

addition to this point she demonstrates that we have to look at the presence of God in a very ‘different’ manner<sup>12</sup>.

As I, again, continue to look at the topic ‘theology of sexuality’, I see role-playing has become a very important factor in society today. We are now in an age of ‘change’ from the days of old. Both men, and women, lead by example as role models. Occupational leadership, everywhere, have experienced this change. No longer do women become limited to kitchen duties, the nursery, doing the shopping, cooking, and other limited duties as part of the old domesticated scene. Women, as well as men, lead in many positions in the workplace and churches today. And, in our churches they also lead as senior pastors, ordained clergy, elders, deacons, trustees, and more. This includes musicians, dancers, ushers, and more. No longer can it be said that any one position in the church is a so-called female or male position. God calls everyone to His service as a servant of the most high. We no longer label positions as women or men accept for the sexual classification. In fact, this particular situation has lend itself to the sexual revolution in the church totalitarian movement from heterosexual, in many cases, to persons of homosexuality taking over in positions of leadership in the present church structure today.

Part of this has evolved from the feminist movement which has allow women to take their places in leadership roles in some churches. Along, with this, they have even adopted the feminist version of the bible to undergird their movement, and have alter the language in accordance to what we see after their new teachings. As I look at our current situation concerning sexual freedom I have come to understand that mankind has created a major problem for God, and themselves. Everywhere you look you can find a ‘modern’ household, and ‘modern’ family comprised of partnerships of the same sex unions. In fact, today

---

<sup>12</sup> I bid, We need to be willing to let the life of God change our views of the Trinity and our interactions. Coakley turns Freud on his head: rather than regarding religion as being about sexuality, she looks at sexuality as ultimately being about our relationship with God, and thus as the Christological transformation of earthly, physical love

it is legal to co-exist in this new form of nuclear family. This is one view of the sexual revolution, and a part of the theology of sexuality.

Faces and places changing to show that women are, now taking their place where men once ruled. But, at the same time there are still a few disturbing looks to this in our era of change. Arrangements like a household having two moms; or, two dads have become acceptable in today's world to form a new meaning of nuclear (moder) family. I believe that mankind, in this new fashion, is saying that God made a mistake when He created a single gender of man for the gender of women; and woman for man. We call this new companionship 'civil union' which is another sinful 'compromise' of mankind. This society doesn't follow the prescribed path of marriage in the heterosexual manner which consists of one man and one woman with the man being head of household<sup>13</sup>. Homosexuality, today, is being 'boldly' flaunted in the public as a norm, thus shunning God's way for man to live (Rom. 8:5-9).

So, even as we look at the changing tide in the world, and in the church, we are beginning to see a wave of homosexuals expressing their freedom to assemble, and influence, our future generations with their openness. Based upon scripture, I believe that God has called all of His creation into service; and, this would include women as leaders of His people and within the house of God. Some examples of this are, as follow: in Judges 4, and 5 (Deborah); Exodus 15:20, and Micah 6:4 (Miriam); 2 Kings 22 (Huldah, the prophetess); Luke 8:1-3 (Mary of Bethany); John 20:14 (Mary Magdalene); Acts 16:40 (Lydia); Romans 16:1 (Phoebe); Acts 18:26 (Priscilla); and, Joel 2:28 announces that "God would pour His Spirit on 'all' flesh", this, then, allows women to minister as well as men were qualified to do the same. This transcendent view has changed this day's modern work among the church, as it adapts to modern day society. Sexual classification should not limit any person who should qualify for ministry in the

---

<sup>13</sup> Giddens.ch.9\_ Sexuality, Repression, Civilization \_ (1).pdf Pgs. 162-163. Modern society is Patriarchal and its emphasis upon monogamous marriage serves to develop authoritarian traits of character, thereby supporting an exploitative social system. Behind this phenomenon stands a crucial transition in early history, from a matriarchal society in which the repressive of infantile and adolescent sexuality was unknown.

church. But, sadly, as it might be said to be there are a few places where this practice of segregation is still being practiced. Freedom of worship, and especially in the position to lead the church, should be open to all who qualify by experience. Our churches, today, have moved past the old standards of having only women in ‘seeking’ those female positions; and, men seeking those so-called men positions in leadership roles<sup>14</sup>. Leadership, of many of our churches today, are being led by female clergy which have proven just as qualified as the men that have preceded them.

The people in my local church, like many other churches, don’t look to make sure that their leaders are men or women. They, in most parts, just want to be fed by someone who really knows what God is saying for their lives. The politics of sex, as far as leadership, has been placed aside today. And, since God’s Words have made it possible for women, as well as men, to lead I see no problem in having them lead in ministry regardless of the previous trends of local doctrines that have kept them out of the pulpit, due to the misunderstanding of scripture (1 Tim. 2), since their place was considered Eve’s was the second creation ‘behind’ Adam. Sex, among our current generation, have taken a turn for the adverse situations of the past to just disappear because its acceptance has been ‘liberally’ accepted by many due to the fact that so many persons in attendance have become participants of this dual-sexual climate<sup>15</sup>. But, because human nature has allowed

---

<sup>14</sup> ROGERS Jr, Eugene F. (ed.), *Theology and Sexuality: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Blackwell Readings in Modern Theology; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. xxii + 422, There are two keys for understanding Rogers' organization of his essays: one revealed and the other hidden. The explicit key is given in the first two readings of Part I, from Susan A. Harvey and George P. Schner. Their essays tell us how and how not to think about the body in theology. The body is to be understood as a site for reflecting the glory of God, thereby constructing the body liturgically — and only then doctrinally and ethically. The body should not be reduced to sex, or to functions of sex, but understood as a social presence that can, as a communal body, signify the Kingdom of God.

<sup>15</sup> Wesley Hill: “*Washed and Still Waiting: An Evangelical Approach To Homosexuality*” Pgs. 323-324. Many in the church—more so in the mainline denominations than the evangelical ones, though that could soon change—tell stories of “homosexual holiness.” The authors of these narratives profess a deep faith in Christ and claim a powerful experience of the Holy Spirit precisely in and through their homosexual practice. According to these Christians, their homosexuality is an expression of holiness, a symbol and conduit of God’s grace in their lives. My own story, by contrast, is a story of feeling spiritually hindered, rather than helped, by my homosexuality. Another way to say it would be to say that my story testifies to the truth of the position the Christian church has held with almost total unanimity throughout the centuries—namely, that homosexuality was not God’s original creative intention for

homosexuality to exist within it shows that human nature has become the overruling factor in today's church. Yet, this dilemma has made it an open gate to personal delight and been here for many ways to become 'justified' under the banner of the same church that once ignored their claim to belonging to the status quo that believes that the old ways is the only way<sup>16</sup>. In fact, I have seen that the power of singleness has become a dominant theme today because many have embrace it as gospel, and practice for church acceptance<sup>17</sup>.

But, even with this there is, 'still', a place for living a life of celibacy, holiness, living by following the rules of having sexual relationships 'outside of marriage and living by the example set by Jesus' (living in celibacy) with His position of holiness<sup>18</sup>. In fact according to John M. Comer, of Bridgetown Church

---

humanity, that it is, on the contrary, a tragic sign of human nature and relationships being fractured by sin, and therefore that homosexual practice goes against God's express will for all human beings, especially those who trust in Christ.

<sup>16</sup> Wesley Hill: *Washed and Still Waiting: An Evangelical Approach To Homosexuality* P. 325. I did my best to describe in precise terms the shape of such a life—how it involved experiences of loneliness, doubt and questioning, ongoing battles with shame and guilt, and a pursuit of community, friendship, and ecclesial service. I wrote about these things in order that other same-sex-attracted Christians might be able to identify with and derive some comfort from my narrative, and in order that pastors and other Christian leaders might be able to learn from my experience how better to minister to gay and lesbian believers in their churches. My shorthand description for this place of tension I was (and am) seeking to occupy is “washed and waiting”: forgiven and cleansed in the waters of baptism, per Paul's description in 1 Corinthians 6, and eagerly awaiting the redemption of the body, with the final sanctification and transformation of a fallen sexuality, per Paul's hopeful words in Romans 8. In terms of the “already but not yet” of the NT's inaugurated eschatology, I wanted for myself and for other gay and lesbian believers the identity of being washed in the blood of the Lamb and waiting with endurance for the consummation of the kingdom of God.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid: P. 326 ” I did my best to describe in precise terms the shape of such a life—how it involved experiences of loneliness, doubt and questioning, ongoing battles with shame and guilt, and a pursuit of community, friendship, and ecclesial service. I wrote about these things in order that other same-sex-attracted Christians might be able to identify with and derive some comfort from my narrative, and in order that pastors and other Christian **leaders might be able to** learn from my experience how better to minister to gay and lesbian believers in their churches. My shorthand description for this place of tension I was (and, am) seeking to occupy is “washed and waiting”: forgiven and cleansed in the waters of baptism, per Paul's description in 1 Corinthians 6, and eagerly awaiting the redemption of the body, with the final sanctification and transformation of a fallen sexuality, per Paul's hopeful words in Romans 8. In terms of the “already but not yet” of the NT's inaugurated eschatology, I wanted for myself and for other gay and lesbian believers the identity of being washed in the blood of the Lamb and waiting with endurance for the consummation of the kingdom of God.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. P. 327 In the face of these cultural norms, Jesus chooses to practice celibacy himself and commend it to others as a radical sign of the “turning of the ages.” In Matthew 19, his commendation of the voluntarily chosen life of a eunuch is said to depend on the kingdom—the newly in breaking reign—of God (v. 12). As most scholars now recognize, Jesus's practice and encouragement of some of his followers to choose celibacy is not a timeless asceticism but rather an eschatologically charged symbol of the lateness of the hour and the significance of his advent.

Ministry “we can live a life of holiness as we learn to lie by the creator’s design”. “Sexuality”, he goes on to say, “is not only about anthropology; but, it is ‘also’ about theology and as we learn more about God’s design for our bodies, in its human design, we can appreciate and come to know better about the role of sex as it was given to us”. *In fact, having gone to the stage of the incarnational we have seen many become ‘transformed’ by the understanding that mankind has come to live in the shadows of sexuality and the reclaimed emphasis on how it might help me conform to His image in celibacy.*

Today we, as previously mentioned, have seen that the role of sex having less bearing on positions in the church as it has been in the past, concerning leadership roles. We are now living in the age where women hold down the same responsibilities as men. Women, in fact, are the breadwinners as much as men were in the past. And, we have a record, in scripture, to help us follow the right way ordained of God. He has given us a road map to follow His way of purity and holiness.

The following group of scripture are here to help remind us of the guidelines created to help us from falling into sinful lust. They are, as follows: 1) Genesis 1--3: God’s creative order, with man being made first and women following. Then, in chapter Adam ‘names’ Eve, and her position (now) is the mother of all living. Her title gives her a major role in the future development of mankind even though she was deceived by satan. 2) Proverb 5:15--19: The beauty of God’s provisions are noticed in these lines: God hasn’t created mankind without making proper provisions for his existence. In fact, His mercies have been extended for mankind to survive the time of reckoning. We have to look to God for ‘everything’ that He has intended to sustain us with. 3) Song of Songs 7:6--12: In the midst of our creation His love has been ingrained in us; and, there is an ever growing love affair going on between God and His creation. 4) I Corinthians 6:12--20: Because of the price Christ ‘paid’ for us our bodies belong to Him. So,

---

## Theology of Sexuality

we cannot do what we please for that reason. These bodies are to ‘remain’ holy, and acceptable to Christ as a member of His earthly presence. 5) I Corinthians 7:1--7 [don’t miss implications of v. 7; read the rest of the chapter if it is not clear].

In a godly marriage there is a mutual consent to marital bonding, with each as equal partners belonging to one another. This is under the marital obligations to one another the marital arrangement is holy, and acceptable, to God’s law.

The marital arrangement is a holy one by the nature of holy joining through scripture. 6) Hebrews 13:4: Marriage should be kept holy because God is the judge

of all activity within its existence. 7) I Corinthians 5:1, 9--11. Any sexual immorality act is ‘totally’ forbidden within that marriage agreement in any form.

The theology of sexuality has so many different components to it because God has blessed the union of man and woman from the start. And, Obey God’s rule

concerning holiness; and, do not associate yourself with those of the world at all. Nor, like the rest of the world, become like those who disobey God’s laws. And, Finally, we have 8) in I Thessalonians 4:3--7, we must remember that sexual immorality, no matter what type, is not acceptable because God has not called us to

this impure state of mind or being. We are a holy nation, and have been acceptable

to His calling.

So, we are not to partake of anything that is ‘not’ in the Will of God; and, if we adhere to these scripture verses we will be able to follow the path of righteousness for His name sake. And, because there is a true theological aspect dealing with sexual behavior I am convinced that many people

have come to understand this theology of sexuality much better than I might imagine, and, I believe that it started in the /garden of Eden.

### Appendix

Uncategorized Archives (missio alliance.org) - What is Your Theology of Sexuality? 5  
Questions: by David Fitch, on December 3, 2013 (article - Internet)

Clemens Sedmak (Forewords by Robery J. Schreiter, “Doing Local Theology; A Guide of a New Humanity,” Orbis Books, Maryknoll, New York 2002 [RSV Bible Version]

Radu Bordeianu, “Triadologie Totale: An Orthodox Reflection on Sarah Coakley's Spirit-Centered, Iconographical Perspective Modern Theology, 2014, Publication Date: 2014, Publication Name: Modern Theology <https://duq.academia.edu/RaduBordeianu>

Coakley, Sarah, “Response to My Critics in the Journal of Pentecostal Theology”. Journal of Pentecostal Theology, Year: 2017, Volume 26(1), Page: 23-29. Abstract: In this response article, Coakley replies to the three Pentecostal theologians who, in this issue of the Journal of Pentecostal Theology, dialogue with her book 'God, Sexuality and the Self: An Essay 'On the Trinity' (Cambridge University Press, 2013). She suggests ways in which her future work will attempt to reflect their insights.

Patrick McCormick, “Moral Theology 2000: Four Signs and Shifts”, September-October 1993, From: The Catholic World (Vol. 236, Issue 1415) Publisher: Paulist Press, Document Type: Article; Length: 2,823 words

R.R. Reno, "EARLY-MORNING MUSINGS ON THE SACRED": R. R. Reno takes up Gilbert Meilaender's St. Augustinian themes, Date: Mar. 2020, From: First Things: A Monthly Journal of Religion and Public Life (Issue 301), Publisher: Institute on Religion and Public Life (Document Type: Article - Length: 2,299 words) Lexile Measure: 1240L

Gilson, Rachel "I NEVER BECAME STRAIGHT: GOD HASN'T REMOVED MY ATTRACTION TO WOMEN. PERHAPS THAT WAS NEVER HIS GOAL IN THE FIRST PLACE", Source: Christianity Today, 61 no 8 Oct 2017, p 51-54, ISSN: 0009-5753; eISSN: 1551-1855, Publication Year: 2017 Language: English [Subjects: Homosexuality -- Religious aspects - Sexual orientation, Christian life] Contents: Link to Constituent Parts, Publication Type: Article, Issued by ATLA: 12/11/2019 Availability: <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/archives/> (Subscriber access) Accession Number: ATLAiGEV1710300

Hill, Wesley 1981- "*WASHED AND STILL WAITING: AN EVANGELICAL APPROACH TO HOMOSEXUALITY*", Source: Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 59 no 2 Jun 2016, p 323-338, Peer Reviewed: Yes ISSN: 0360-8808, Publication Year: 2016, Language: English [Subjects: Homosexuality -- Religious aspects] Celibacy, Vocation, Friendship, Contents: Link to Constituent Parts, Publication Type: Article Issued by ATLA: 11/21/2019 Availability: <http://www.etsjets.org/> (Publisher's URL:) Accession Number:

Rebecca M. M. Voelkel, "Carnal Knowledge of God: Embodied Love and the Movement for Justice" Published by: Augsburg Fortress, Publishers, Copyright Date: 2017, DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt1ggjnhm, [Article: 3 Colonization and Sin (pp. 31-42) DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt1ggjnhm.8] Pages: 144 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1ggjnhm>

WESLEY HILL: "*WASHED AND STILL WAITING: AN EVANGELICAL APPROACH TO HOMOSEXUALITY*": JETS 59/2 (2016): 323-38

UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS ST MARY'S COLLEGE Why Bioj Bioj Bioj Bioj?: On the Relationship Between Gospel Genre and Implied Audience A THESIS SUBMITTED BY: Justin Marc Smith TO THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY ST ANDREWS, SCOTLAND January 31, 2010 [A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Ph.d. at the University of St. Andrews; 2011; Full Metedata for this item is available in Research@STAndrews:FullText at: <http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>: Please use this identifier to cite of link this item: <http://hdl.handle./10023/2112/> This item is protected by original copyright This item is licensed under a Creative Common License

ROGERS Jr, Eugene F. (ed.), *Theology and Sexuality: Classic and Contemporary Readings* (Blackwell Readings in Modern Theology; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), pp. xxii + 422, £16.99 pbk. [T&S 9.1 (2002) 118-124] ISSN 1355-8358

Doc #8 Local Theology of Sexuality

## Theology of Sexuality

Doc #7 Interpretation of Bible and Historical Commentaries (Davidson, Hollinger, Listen to Mark Comer, Hollinger, Contemporary Theologies on Sexuality, John's afterwards, 6-12 statements Theology of Bible (from bible), and 6-12 The Gospel on Flourishing).

Doc #6 Biblical Text.pdf

Doc #5 Cultural Analysis.pdf

Doc #4 Cultural Liturgies (Heralds\_of\_good\_news

Doc #3 The Cultural Good News Story.pdf

Doc #2 The Gospel (1).pdf

Doc #1 The Model.pdf

Feminist Ethics and the Catholic Moral Tradition: Readings in Moral Theology, No. 9 Author: James M. Gustafson Date: Oct. 18, 1997 From: America (Vol. 177, Issue 11) Publisher: America Press, Inc. Document Type: Book review Length: 1,455 words

Davidson, "Sexuality in the Beginning: Genesis 1-2" ch. 1 in Flame of Yahweh, pp.15-54 [PDF provided] Note: pp.15-34

Robert J. Davidson "Yahweh, Sexuality in the Old Testament, Hendrickson Publishers, 2007, Peabody, Mass. (chapter 2) Sexuality in the Beginning; Gen. 1-2 Pgs. 15-54; (Ch.2) Sexuality and the Fall, Pg. 55- Fall.pdf-Google - Sexuality and the Fall; (Genesis 3) P.57 -

Feminist\_Ethics\_and\_the\_Cathol.pdf

Giddens, ch.2\_Foucault and Sexuality\_.pdf.

Giddens .ch 9\_Sexuality, Repression, Civilization\_(1).pdf Pgs. 162-163

Listen to JohnMark Comer's opening message in the Bridgetown Church series "God and Sexuality." Note especially the theological description added to your developing biblical theology [this is a part of the seat time requirement, please send an email message to [chuckdavis@globallead.org](mailto:chuckdavis@globallead.org) to confirm fulfillment]

<https://bridgetown.church/teaching/god-sexuality/god-sexuality/>

Dennis P. Hollinger, "Christian Worldviews and Sex," ch. 2 "The Meaning of Sex", pp.43-68 Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, Mich. [PDF provided]

Hollinger, "The Christian Worldview and Sex," ch. 3 in The Meaning of Sex, pp.69-92 [PDF provided] Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Debra Hirsch, "Oh My God Sexuality Meets Spirituality," Ch. 1 in Redeeming Sex: Naker Conversation about Sexuality and Spirituality", pp.21-32; Ch. 4, "Eight Fundamentals of Sex-article: Lilian Cole Bager, Pg. 65-86. 2015 IVP Books - [PDF provided] - ch.4\_The Eight fundamentals of sex.pdf.]

Jones, Afterward, in the Embrace of Eros.pdf

1 Sexual Formation.mp3 (audio)

Theology\_meeting\_amplifies\_worn.pdf



Dear [Customer Name],  
We could not have done it without  
you. We appreciate your business

Dear [Customer Name],  
We could not have done it without  
you. We appreciate your business