

Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation in the History and Traditions of the Christian Church

Susan Gilchrist¹

SuG0729e

29 May 2016²

This paper is the fourth of a series on Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church³.

Summary

This investigation uses the results of a new neurophysiological and psychological study to examine the traditional teaching and doctrines on gender and sexual variation in the Christian Church. This is described in the introduction; where it is shown that a contradiction occurs. The influences of gender and sexual variation in the history and traditions of the Christian Church is the subject of this paper. It is demonstrated that what today is regarded as the traditional teaching of the Christian Church on gender and sexual variation has its origins in the power struggles and cultural clashes between subject and dominant societies. It is shown how the abuse of power gave permission for the abuse of sex and it is established that this was the primary reason for the biblical prohibition of male same-sex anal penetrative acts. No other proscription was placed on the expression of love between two people of the same or different genders. The development of Christian teaching is examined from this first century understanding to the present day decrees, which condemn without exception all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour as being disordered, sinful and heinous acts.

It is found that the traditional teaching of the Christian Church contradicts the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study. The current Church teaching that both sex and gender are solely determined by biology is also shown to be incorrect. From all of these standpoints this investigation demonstrates that identical criteria in relation to use and abuse should instead be applied to heterosexual and same-sex acts of sex. It is further confirmed that a moral duality is encountered which demands the welcome of cross-gender activities and same-sex relationships which are the outpourings of love and faithfulness, while condemning those that are pursued for abusive and illicit sex. It is established that in all loving and faithful relationships where the dynamics of power are not involved there should be no automatic prohibition of any cross-gender or same-sex acts of sex. There is no denigration of family life and there is no toleration of abusive sex. Instead of centuries of making homosexuality the scapegoat for all sexual abuse, it is demonstrated that the correct objective for the Christian Church should be that of combatting all forms of abusive sex.

© Susan Gilchrist 2016

sgen4144@gmail.com

¹ Personal Biography <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/SusanBiographyPapers.pdf>

² With some updates to 12 July 2016: This paper is available online at: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/220P-InfluencesChurch.pdf>

³ For the full series see Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/217P-FoundationsSexGender.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church*"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation in the History and Traditions of the Christian Church

Susan Gilchrist⁴

SuG0729e

29 May 2016⁵

This paper is the fourth of a series on Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church⁶.

Introduction to the Series

A major aim of this investigation is to conduct a neurophysiological and psychological analysis which investigates how the development of personality and self-identity takes place in early life. A further purpose of this investigation is to establish how the results of this scientific study relate to the traditional teaching of the Christian Church. A major constraint in previous studies has arisen because of the relative inability to link the internal, contagious, feed-forward and physiologically driven forces which dominate development in early life to the controlling, feed-back and externally moderated processes of cognitive development which later occur. Because of its early origins gender dysphoria is able to provide the link that is required⁷. This enables this new approach which is able to match the early physiological and identity driven leaning processes to the cognitively and reward driven ones that are present in later life.

It is observed that personality and self-identity forms in a series of stages. A rapid transformation which involves a major advancement in neural capabilities occurs at a particular point between the ages of between one and a half to three years. Before this transformation period it is demonstrated that learning and development is dominated by the physiological, internally driven and contagious feed-forward development processes which are described in the pioneering work by Gallese, Dawkins, Girard and others. This analysis takes an impartial approach⁸. After transformation the controlling, feed-back and externally moderated processes of cognitive development come into play⁹. Far from being a peaceful

⁴ Personal Biography <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/SusanBiographyPapers.pdf>

⁵ With some updates to 12 July 2016 This paper is available online at: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/220P-InfluencesChurch.pdf>

⁶ For the full series see Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/217P-FoundationsSexGender.pdf>

⁷ Gender dysphoria is a condition where a person experiences discomfort or distress because there's a mismatch between their biological sex and gender identity.

⁸ In certain respects the work of Girard and Dawkins are poles apart. Dawkins uses the results of his research to become an apostle for atheism. Girard justifies in sociological terms the human need for religious belief. For that reason Girard's work has become popular amongst some schools of theologians. The author has not found any instance where Dawkins has cited Girard's work, despite much of that work predating his own. Gallese analyses and makes use of Girard's research, but he does not generally refer to Dawkins' work. Sadly this is an area where religious and atheistic dogmas have intruded upon the independence of scientific research. This analysis is very careful to avoid making any conclusions about the correctness or otherwise of any realities presumed in religious or atheistic belief. Only the scientific aspects of this work are considered. This discipline is applied even when Church teaching, theology and history are examined.

⁹ Cognitive ability is the capacity to perform higher mental processes of reasoning, remembering, understanding, and problem solving. Cognitive brain functions require the ability to work with information in a meaningful way, to

experience the development of personality and identity is shown to be driven by intense but hidden struggles between these conflicting demands. The momentum this creates enables the highest peaks of achievement to be gained. It is further demonstrated that the physiological, neurological and psychological aspects of brain development act together to create a finely tuned system in which the maximum amount of individuality, possessiveness, intelligence and inquisitiveness, together with the minimum degree of energy expenditure is formed.

All of these aspects are examined and the results of this study are used to interrogate the traditional teaching of the Christian Church. It is demonstrated that there is a contradiction between the conclusions of the neurophysiological and psychological study and the approach which is decreed by the theology of the present day Church. The development of Christianity is investigated in the second part of this examination for the purpose of determining how and why this contradiction occurs. The results of this analysis show that the teaching of Jesus conforms to what is determined by the scientific study. This means that the source of this contradiction must come from changes in the theology of the Church. The theological, scientific and historical analyses conducted in this investigation all demonstrate that the present day teaching of the Church is incorrect: therefore the ideal sought for this investigation is to return to the teaching of Christ.

Science

At birth the parts of the brain responsible for thinking and recognition are very poorly developed. A rapid and pronounced increase in these abilities occurs broadly around the age of two years¹⁰. This transformation period is identified as the time when many distal parts of the brain interconnect and the brain can begin to work as a single unit. From that time onwards a cognitive continuum¹¹ can begin to take effect. Before this transformation, only general precursors which involve the tribal associations of babies with common purposes can be created. No personal concepts of self are formed. One precursor may link babies to a gender but it is not possible for them to identify what this means before the cognitive continuum becomes active. Only after that has happened is it possible for an awareness of the personal self to develop. Gender dysphoria is used to examine this transformation. An analogy sometimes used by the author compares an acorn to its cradle. The cradle represents the early global concepts, which identify the place of the individual in society, while the acorn represents the senses and awareness of the personal identity that later develops. The transformation from a single type of awareness into one which includes the other is delayed until the necessary neural co-ordination has developed¹². This means that a collective and tribal identity is created before any concepts which distinguish the personal self from the other can be formed.

Although the cradle supports the acorn, each component has different characteristics. In reality the acorn eventually leaves the cradle; but the acorn's characteristics depend on the

apply new information to that which has already been gained, perform preferential changes, use reasoned procedures to alter opinions, and to search for rewards.

¹⁰ Generally from one and a half years onwards

¹¹ In the cognitive continuum theory, intuition and rational analysis are defined as two modes of cognition or recognition that can be placed at the ends of a continuum, where intuition refers to rapid, unconscious processing and low control, and analysis refers to slow, rational, conscious and controlled thinking. For the latter, sufficient neural co-ordination is required. This investigation demonstrates that the early processes of development, which include intuition and possessive imitation, are physiologically rather than cognitively driven.

¹² In humans this delay is particularly long. Expert opinion disagrees but it is argued that an extended period is needed to allow the peak human potential to be created. A counter argument against this is that, the more it is delayed, the more it can go wrong.

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

sgen4144@gmail.com

type of nurture the cradle has brought. In this analogy the acorn and the cradle remain connected, however it is shown that instead of separating, these early elements may be entirely confined to the subconscious mind¹³. It is argued in this analysis that the physiology of brain development is such that these cradle based elemental global or core concepts remain fixed for the rest of life. Cognitive development may suppress or override their demands. However their constancy is shown to create a stability of personality whereby two people can continue to recognise each other even if they have spent years apart.

It is demonstrated that previous attempts to develop a scientific understanding of the early development of personality and self-identity, together with the efforts to reconcile it with the theology of the Christian Church fail or give inadequate answers, because the presumption is made that, in some measure, a cognitive continuum guides the processes of learning and development at all times of life. An extended neurophysiological and psychological analysis has been conducted. By challenging and refuting that assumption this investigation offers a radical new approach.

Contradiction

Core elements of personality, including basic concepts of gender and sexual identity are shown to form before or during the neural transformation period. This is before the cognitive processes start to become effective, and these early elements are found to be concerned with identity alone. Characteristics which originate after this transformation period have behavioural features which cognitively link desire to reward. Different types of conflict are therefore encountered. It is shown that the failure to recognise the difference between these is the physiological reason which gives rise the contradiction that exists.

In the neurophysiological and psychological analysis it is established that the features which create the core gender and sexual identities of every person are physiologically rather than behaviourally or cognitively driven. This means that as wide a range of moral attitudes, beliefs and behaviour are to be found amongst gender and sexually variant people as those which exist in society at large. It is further demonstrated that a moral duality must exist, whereby gender and sexually variant people who express their true attractions and identities in ways that conform to the highest moral standards of their own societies should be highly regarded, while those who misuse these relationships ought to be very severely condemned for their acts.

That moral duality is contradicted by the traditional teaching of the Christian Church which condemns without exception every expression of gender and sexually variant behaviour as inherently sinful: and it regards all of them as heinous acts. The current Church teaching that both sex and gender are solely determined by biology is also shown to be incorrect. Underlying this Christian doctrine is the presumption that all of these learning processes are at all times cognitively driven. Therefore the existence, and the influence, of the early physiologically driven learning processes are denied. This analysis addresses that omission. It also considers what the consequences of this have been for gender and sexually variant people, for the advancement of science, and for the Christian Church.

Theology

A major challenge to be faced is that of distinguishing the differences between the teaching of Jesus and that of the early Christian Church. That cannot be achieved by confining any examination to the teachings that the Church presents. Therefore five perspectives are

¹³ They may only come into conscious awareness when some conflict or trauma occurs.

employed. The first perspective examines the traditional Church teaching in the light of the understanding developed by this neurophysiological and psychological investigation. The second perspective works backwards within Church history and traditions in an attempt to determine what the earliest doctrines adopted by the Christian Church had been. The third independently examines the social and the cultural backgrounds of the Greek, Roman and Jewish societies in which Christianity and the early Church had first been formed. In the light of the first three perspectives, the fourth perspective seeks to ascertain the teaching of Jesus himself. The final perspective examines the relevance of these issues to present day life. The second and the third perspectives adopt reverse standpoints to examine the history and the theology of the Christian Church. By removing the armour of theological presumptions which have dominated Church teaching for the last two thousand years new insights can be gained; and this opens up unapplied interpretations of biblical texts.

The first and most obvious difference between the teaching of Jesus and that of the early Church comes from the contrasting attitudes that were taken. The Gospels show that the challenge of Jesus to the social, sexual and gender abuses of first century Jewish society was made without compromise and the strength of his attacks on the authorities led to his death on the Cross. However the Gospel message required people to work within these societies to change them rather than to destroy them. That gave the early Church a difficult choice. Early Christianity had to adapt to the demands of Roman society if it was to overcome the cultural differences between the Jewish and Roman cultures and continue to take the Gospel message to the world. This process of adaptation is clearly evident in the letters and epistles of Peter, Paul and John. It is the nature and the timing of these changes which has been the subject of much theological dispute. It is sometimes assumed that the challenging passages in these documents which refer to the imposition of gender divisions and the submission of women to men did not truly represent the Apostolic teaching, but were instead later additions which the Early Church made to the texts. That presumption is challenged both in this analysis and in the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. Perhaps surprisingly both approaches agree on this issue and the main difference between them is one of purpose and intent.

It is necessary to find out who authorised these adaptations and how and why they were made. That could have happened on an ad-hoc basis or it could be the result of a pragmatic approach. There are good reasons, including those arising from the experience of the Jews at the time of Exile and the degree of continuity with Judaism that was sought by the early Church, for believing that a pragmatic approach was taken. That is discussed in this analysis. Peter and Paul would have been fully aware of the adaptations they were making in adopting this approach.

Nevertheless if Peter and Paul were to be true to the Gospel message they must have believed that the authority to do this came from the teaching of Jesus himself. The requirement of Jesus to work within society to change it would have been one source; however there is another in the passage in Matthew 19 where Jesus discusses the issues of marriage and the place of eunuchs in the Church. This radical teaching is spread throughout the Gospels but some of the most challenging elements to first century society are presented in Matthew 19:12. That was not only because of this society's serious mistrust and condemnation of eunuchs, but also because of the attacks on social order created by the gender disruptive behaviour of the Goddess cults and their self-castrated male priests. The statement which follows this discussion: "He who is able to receive this, let him receive it" is unique in the way that it qualifies the teaching which Jesus presents. This could have been a direct comment on the abhorrence of self-castration in Jewish society, or it could have meant that Jesus was aware of the difficulties that would later be likely to occur, or it could have

been added later to deal with the changes that were required. Whatever way it is taken, it allowed the Church to move forward and gain acceptance in the Roman world.

However this was not just a statement of compromise. It was also the command for the Christian Church to express in full the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex as soon as it had the power to do so. There were several significant instances when this could have happened. One was the change in power structure that took place when Ambrose the Bishop of Milan required the emperor Theodosius to do penance for a massacre that took place. A second occurred after the Albigensian Crusade, when the military defeat of the Cathars affirmed the supreme secular authority of the Church. However, instead of returning to the radical teaching which Jesus had presented, the Church used these opportunities to enforce its own power and authority. Today this return has still not happened. If the initial compromises arose because of the needs of a powerless group in a powerful first century Roman Society, they no longer apply. Therefore it is now time to follow in full this commandment of Jesus, and restore the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex to the present day Church.

An extended analysis of the relationships between power and sex, including how these were used in the first century world is conducted. In first century societies it is demonstrated that it was the abuses of power which gave permission for the abuses of sex. It is shown that the adoption of the traditional teaching of the Christian Church on gender and sexual variation was driven by the cultural clashes and the urgent need to combat sexual abuse and gender based coercion in despotic and gender unequal societies. It has already been noted that the teaching of Jesus conforms to the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study. This outcome requires that the same criteria of use and abuse must apply equally to all heterosexual, cross-gender and same-sex acts. There is no toleration of any form of abusive or immoral sex. When the abuses of power are absent it is concluded that all people, transgender, transsexual, lesbian, gay, heterosexual and bisexual people who attempt to live their lives in ways that fulfil the love of Christ, and who seek to express their own identities within roles that are true to themselves; must be fully accepted in their own right. All behaviour is governed by the purity of intention. There is no denigration of personal relationships and family life, and there is no automatic condemnation of any cross-gender or same-sex act.

That raises significant challenges: This is why these issues are discussed in considerable length in the accompanying papers. Great emphasis is placed by GAFCON¹⁴ and others on restoring the “Godly Authority” of bible texts. It is shown that these attempts do not recover the teaching of Jesus when they are based on what is today regarded as the traditional teaching of the Church: they return instead to the compromised Christianity which was presented by the thirteenth century Church. The same is true when literal interpretations are used. If a true recovery is to be done the correct context must be applied. This is not just a matter of identity and sex. It includes restoring the role, ministry and oversight which Jesus gave to women as well. Today’s failures of Christian teaching still come from the refusal to restore the original teaching of Jesus. Instead of centuries of making homosexuality the scapegoat for all sexual abuse it is demonstrated in this analysis that the correct issue for the Christian Church should be one of combatting all forms of abusive sex.

It is important to note that the scapegoating of minority groups in society is a social phenomenon. The denial of the existence of identity driven conflicts and characteristics by the traditional teaching of the Christian Church creates the presumption that all gender and

¹⁴ The “Global Anglican Future Conference”, a group, mainly of African churches, representing the conservative elements in the Anglican Communion.

sexually variant behaviour comes from reward driven lifestyle choices, it is described as disordered and it is considered to always be in pursuit of immoral or inappropriate sex. Some sections of the Christian Church have given, and still give legitimacy and support to the secular scapegoating of gender and sexually variant people by countries and societies through their collusion with it, and in some countries extreme penalties are applied. However other sections do not; and it is shown how this has led to the schisms in the present day Christian Church. The allegation by the Christian Church that gender and sexually variant conditions are the results of reward driven lifestyle choices is refuted in this investigation, where the neurophysiological and psychological study shows that they are driven by identity instead. Accurately identifying the characteristics of the different conflict types is also very important because the correct methods of managing them are almost opposite to each other¹⁵. For centuries much harm has been done because of the medical misdiagnoses that have been made; and also because the wrong methods and approaches have been applied¹⁶.

Little change could take place for as long as these attitudes continued. However in the eyes of many, the social and cultural transformations in Western societies over the last fifty years have demolished the presumptions upon which the traditional teaching of the Christian Church on gender and sexually variant behaviour has been based¹⁷. There are many people in the world today who are honestly, faithfully and assiduously following from different viewpoints what they believe to be the correct Christian teaching, who all are concerned about what is happening in the Christian Church. Evidence for that concern is seen in the establishment of the “Shared Conversations” process in the Church of England¹⁸ and in the “Synod on the Family”¹⁹ called by Pope Francis in 2014. However preconditions were set by the Church hierarchies²⁰. These preconditions demand that there must be no change to the traditional teaching of the Church and this also means that neither the real needs nor their urgency have been addressed. The “Shared Conversations” process in the Church of England only asks that “Good Disagreement” is achieved. The final report on the “Synod on the Family” issued in 2016 advocates pastoral concern, but restates the traditional teaching of the Church²¹. If any discussions are to succeed; this is a great hurdle that has still to be overcome.

¹⁵ In the same way that treatment for depression or addiction differs from other types of treatment.

¹⁶ For full descriptions see: Gilchrist, S. (2015): “*Personality Development and Gender: Why We Should Re-think the Process*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/209P-RethinkPaperFull.pdf> and Gilchrist, S. (2016): “*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/217P-FoundationsSexGender.pdf>

¹⁷ These prohibitions can still have considerable weight in societies where gender discrimination occurs or where gender differentiation in terms of required behaviour is legally or socially enforced.

¹⁸ Shared Conversations: See: Church of England (2015) Grace and Disagreement article: Grace and Disagreement Shared Conversations on Scripture, Mission and Human Sexuality: [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <https://churchofengland.org/media/2165248/grace2.pdf> . Also: Church of England (2015) Shared Conversations Website: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.sharedconversations.org/> Gilchrist, S. (2014) *Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/018B-ControversyAndCrisis.pdf>

¹⁹ Vatican (2013): Synod on the Family: Preparatory Document: “*Pastoral Challenges To The Family In The Context Of Evangelization*” [Accessed 6/11/2015]: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20131105_iii-assemblea-sinodo-vescovi_en.html

²⁰ The Pilling Report did leave open the door to the possibility of a change, but urged great caution. Pilling Report. (2013): “*Report of the House of Bishops Working Group on Human Sexuality*” (The Pilling Report) Published: 28/11/2013: Church House Publishing ISBN-13: 9780715144374 ISBN-10: 0715144375 [Accessed 20 November 2014] http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1891063/pilling_report_gs_1929_web.pdf

²¹ Pope Francis. (2016): “*Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Amoris Lætitia Of The Holy Father Francis To Bishops, Priests And Deacons Consecrated Persons Christian Married Couples And All The Lay Faithful On Love*”

This investigation is based on the principle that the presumptions made in the traditional teaching of the Church on homosexuality and gender and sexual variation can be scientifically tested. That is acknowledged in article 2357 of the Catechism of the Catholic Church where it declares that these scientific principles are not well understood²². Even in terms of its own traditions there is no justification for any embargo which prevents a reassessment of the traditional teaching of the Church. This analysis performs that scientific test. It shows that there is a contradiction between the results of the neurophysiological and scientific study and the traditional teaching of the Church. Theology and history may be used to understand how and why this contradiction has happened but they cannot remove the contradiction itself. The concluding discussions on the “Shared Conversations” process which took place during the Church of England General Synod in July 2016 focussed on the interpretation and traditional understanding of biblical texts. Nothing relating to scientific inputs or the historical contexts, such as those which are described in this account were considered²³. The long history of opposition to the possibility of change has been documented by the author elsewhere²⁴. This continued refusal is considered by the author to be destroying the credibility; not just of the Churches, but of all Christian belief.

In a concluding statement at the end of the July 2016 General Synod the Church of England issues the following statement: “..... what has been learned through the relationships developed will inform the way the church conducts whatever further formal discussions may be necessary in the future”²⁵. No further commitments were made. Despite all current evidence many Christian Churches continue to stick rigidly to the traditional doctrines. That rigidity is shown the Apostolic Exhortation on “The Synod and the Family” released by Pope Francis in 2016. In this the total refusal to consider homosexual unions to be in any way similar or even remotely analogous to God’s plan for marriage and family is restated and enforced. This denies the moral duality that is shown by the analysis: it discounts the nature of first century Jewish relationships and it ignores the social changes in societies which demonstrate that in some respects the relationships of Adelphopoiesis had more in common with the present day understanding of marriage than any first century understanding of

In The Family: [Accessed: 18 April 2016]

https://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20160319_amoris-laetitia_en.pdf

²²Catechism of the Catholic Church: Paragraph 2357. The Second Edition English Translation of the Catechism of the Catholic Church with corrections promulgated by Pope John Paul II on 8 September 1997. “Homosexuality refers to the relations between men or between women who experience an exclusive or predominant sexual attraction toward persons of the same sex. It has taken a great variety of forms through the centuries and in different cultures. Its psychological genesis remains largely unexplained. Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity, Tradition has always declared that “Homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered.” They are contrary to the natural law. They choose the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved.”

²³ Davies, Madeleine. (2016): Synod members thanked for staying on to talk about their differences”; *Church Times*. Web Posted: 12 Jul 2016 @ 06:28

<https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2016/15-july/news/uk/synod-members-thanked-for-staying-on-to-talk-about-their-differences> See also: Anglican Mainstream (2016): “32 Synod delegates publicly express “lack of confidence” in C of E Shared Conversations process” [accessed 20 July 2016]: <http://anglicanmainstream.org/32-evangelicals-publicly-express-lack-of-confidence-in-c-of-e-shared-conversations-process/>

²⁴ Gilchrist, S. (2014): “*Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/018B-ControversyAndCrisis.pdf>. Also Gilchrist, S. (2016): “*The Perceptions of Gender and Sexual Variation in Present Day Society and in the Modern Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/221P-InfluencesToday.pdf> .

²⁵ Church of England. (2016): “*Statement following conclusion of Shared Conversations Process*”: Church of England Website [Accessed 19 July 2016]

<https://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2016/07/statement-following-conclusion-of-shared-conversations-process.aspx>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): “Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church”

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

marriage could present²⁶. These are serious concerns. The author continues to work within the Church by seeking to change it; for there is much more to Christianity than just these matters of gender and sex. The issues for the Christian Churches today should not be those of defending their own traditions and institutions. As with the command of Jesus in Matthew 19:12: they should be those of restoring the radical teaching of Jesus through its return to the Gospel of Christ.

There are five papers in this series²⁷. Paper 1 provides an overall introduction. Paper 2 describes a new approach to identity and personality formation in early life. Paper 3 considers the influences of gender and sexual variation on the life and teaching of Jesus. Paper 4 (this paper) examines the influences of gender and sexual variation in the history and traditions of the Christian Church. Paper 5 investigates the perceptions of gender and sexual variation in present day society and in the modern Christian Church. Each paper may be read separately or in combined form in the compendium: "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*"²⁸.

Additional information is available in other papers^{29 30}. These include "*Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church*". This paper examines the theological issues from the Old Testament background. It includes a consideration of the approach to gender complementarity from a Judean perspective.

More detailed analyses of the neurophysiological and psychological investigations are given in the papers on: "*A Reassessment of the Traditional Christian Teaching on Homosexuality, Transsexuality and on Gender and Sexual Variation Using a New Neurophysiological and Psychological Approach*", and: "*Personality Development and Gender: Why We Should Re-think the Process*". Access to all papers is via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm> and also, where provided, through the specific links. A full personal bibliography is available on: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/bibliography.htm> .

²⁶ Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*Reform and the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/008B-ReformChristianChurchArticle.pdf> . Also Section 10 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf>

²⁷ Paper 1 is: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*An Introduction to the Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/211P-IntroFoundationsSexGender.pdf> . Paper 2 is: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*A New Approach to Identity and Personality Formation in Early Life*":

<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/218P-InfluencesPersonality.pdf> . Paper 3 is: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf> . Paper 4 is: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation in the History and Traditions of the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/220P-InfluencesChurch.pdf> . Paper 5

is: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*The Perceptions of Gender and Sexual Variation in Present Day Society and in the Modern Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/221P-InfluencesToday.pdf> . Each paper may be read separately or combined in the compendium: Gilchrist, S (2016): "*Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/217P-FoundationsSexGender.pdf>

²⁸ Gilchrist, S. (2016) *Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/217P-FoundationsSexGender.pdf>

²⁹ For a general introduction see: Gilchrist, S. (2016) Taking a Different Path": Chapter 10 in: "*This Is My Body: Hearing the Theology of Transgender Christians*", Ed: Beardsley, T. and O'Brien, M: Darton Longman and Todd. May 2016. ISBN 978-0-232-53206-7

³⁰ Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf> . Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*A Reassessment of the Traditional Christian Teaching on Homosexuality, Transsexuality and on Gender and Sexual Variation Using a New Neurophysiological and Psychological Approach*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/207P-ReassessmentPsychologyExtended.pdf> . Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Personality Development and Gender: Why We Should Re-think the Process*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/209P-RethinkPaperFull.pdf>

4:0 Introduction to the Fourth Paper

This paper examines the changes the Christian Church made in its attitudes and teaching on gender and sexually variant people and behaviour as it transformed itself from a protesting minority group in a conquered society, into the dominant religion of the Roman Empire. Earlier papers in the series have dealt with the neurophysiology and psychology underlying gender and sexually variant conditions and the teaching of Jesus himself.

The results of the neurophysiological and psychological study are reported in the second paper of this series³¹. In this it is shown that the development of the core elements of personality and development are identity driven processes. Conflicts which arise from these are identity driven conflicts. In such conflicts behaviour is not the focus and as wide a range on moral attitudes, beliefs, inclinations and responsibilities are found in these groups as those which occur in the population at large. Later developing conflicts have behavioural implications. These are considered to be reward driven, since they use cognitive abilities to relate cause to effect. The different types of conflicts have different characteristics. It is demonstrated that a moral duality is encountered which demands the welcome of cross-gender activities and same-sex relationships which are the outpourings of love and faithfulness, while condemning those that are pursued for abusive and illicit sex.

In the third paper an extended theological analysis of the teaching of Jesus is given³². New insights are gained by using the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study to remove the armour of the theological presumptions on gender and sexuality, which have dominated both Church and society for the last two thousand years. From the teaching of Jesus it is demonstrated that all gender and sexually variant behaviour is governed by the purity of intention. There is no toleration of abuse. In first century societies it is shown that it was the abuses of power which gave permission for the abuse of sex. When the abuses of power are absent it is concluded that all people, transgender, transsexual, lesbian, gay, heterosexual and bisexual people who attempt to live their lives in ways that fulfil the love of Christ, and who seek to express their own identities in roles that are true to themselves must be accepted in their own right. From both the theological and the scientific standpoints it is established that identical criteria in relation to use and abuse should be applied to heterosexual and same-sex acts of sex.

This paper considers the influences of gender and sexual variation in the history and traditions of the Christian Church. Early Christian teaching emphasised the dual nature of morality, and expressed this in terms of the "Way of Darkness" and the "Way of Light". This examination uses the same principles of duality but additional contexts are included. These involve the duality of psychology which identifies the differences in behaviour associated with identity driven and reward driven conflicts. It also identifies a moral duality which takes account of cultural differences when applying the distinction between the uses and abuses of gender and sex. Finally there is the political duality which identifies the opposing attitudes to power and social structures that divide subjugated and conquered societies from dominant and conquering ones in the first century world.

³¹ Second paper: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "A New Approach to Identity and Personality Formation in Early Life": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/218P-InfluencesPersonality.pdf>

³² Third paper: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

The relationships between power, gender and sex in first century Christianity and in the surrounding societies are examined in this analysis from three perspectives. The first considers the attitudes to power and sex in the surrounding Jewish and Greco/Roman societies. The second investigates the transformation in its attitude to these relationships which Christianity made as it moved from an oppressed minority sect belonging to a conquered society into the universal religion of a dominant one. The third examines the Jewish attitudes to the relationships between power and sex. It is shown that reasons of procreation were not a driving issue for the prohibitions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13³³ and that the condemnation of same-sex intercourse was not because of an intrinsic horror of the act.

These studies confirm that the abuses of power were the major concern in first century society, and it is this which gave permission for the abuse of sex. In the teaching of Jesus it is demonstrated that in loving, committed and faithful relationships where the dynamics of power are absent, there should be no automatic prohibition of any cross-gender or same-sex act of sex. This conclusion is in direct contrast to the present day Christian doctrines which condemn all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour through their decrees that every physical same-sex act is disordered; and always driven by the lust for sex.

These contradictions are examined. It is demonstrated that what today is considered to be the traditional teaching of the Church on homosexuality and on gender and sexual variance is built on a false foundation. It arose from the need for the Church to create and maintain its place in Greco/Roman society and is shown that it does not come from the teaching of Jesus himself. Instead of contradicting the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study it is demonstrated that the good news of Jesus, as it is presented in the Gospels, is in line with the results of the neurophysiological and psychological research.

4:1 Cultural Clashes

4:1:1 Cultural Conflicts and Misuses of Sex

During the first Century Judea and Palestine were under the control of the all-conquering Roman Empire. There were cultural clashes between subject and dominant societies, not least in relation to gender and sex. The refusal of hospitality³⁴ by the citizens of Sodom and Gomorrah expresses the horror of same-sex rape³⁵. This story has resounded throughout

³³ Intercourse was never considered to be just a baby making activity, and Judaism supported its use in supporting marital relationships when the prospect of reproduction was not involved Judaism intercourse marital relationships. The high esteem given to celibacy in Christianity also dismisses this argument.

³⁴ See section 4:2:3: "Paradigm Shifts" in this document

³⁵ It is important to note that the major concern in this passage was not the act of intercourse. This reflects the changes in outlook which are described in sections 4:2:3 and 4:4:1 of this document. Also Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf> . Lot offered women in his company in place of the men. The same situation is found in an equivalent passage describing an incident that took place at Gibeah during the period of the judges (Judges 19). Same-sex rape was seen in the context of power and domination, and the hospitality that the Israelites sought was denied by the attempts of rape. First Century Christianity had to contend with a Roman culture which saw same-sex intercourse as an expression of power and domination over subject people and societies. Today's society concentrates upon condemning this specific act but early societies were more concerned with the purpose to which it was put. See for example: Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

Jewish history, and the penetrators were condemned for their acts³⁶. Reverse concerns over power and status are found in Greco/Roman society where same-sex intercourse between two adult male citizens was strongly disparaged. However in this dominant society it is only the submissive partner who is condemned, and this is because of the debasement of citizenship his actions create. This gave permission for same-sex rape when the penetrated partner was of lesser status. Responsibility was demanded, but to women and men who were not citizens, a male Roman citizen was free to do much as he liked³⁷.

This chasm between the condemnation of the submissive partner in a conquered society and the condemnation of the active partner in the conquering one, exemplified the magnitude of the cultural clashes which occurred. For much of the first millennium the ferocity of these conflicts was to become a leading feature in the life of the Church. While Roman society applied its own condemnations entirely to the submissive citizen and none to the active one, in Jewish society the same penalty was applied to both partners. The reasons for this are discussed in more detail elsewhere but the issues of subjection and domination remain of foremost concern³⁸. In societies such as Judaism, without the powers of empire behind them, men of equal status who adopt either role in same-sex intercourse equally disrupt the good order of society; and an equal penalty may be expected to apply³⁶.

There is no condonation of sexual or gender discrimination or abuse in this analysis. The issues which are of concern are about where the boundary between acceptable and abusive behaviour should be set. In contrast to the present day perceptions it is also shown that the separation of sexual and cross-gender use from abuse in the first century was not made on a gendered basis. The distinctions were made by approving the noble pursuit of love, while condemning the carnal abuse of sex. This first century understanding conforms to the neurophysiological and psychological study and this investigation examines why that is not expressed in the present day teaching of the Christian Church³⁹.

4:1:2 Science and Theology

When science and theology are in conflict over scientific matters, it is science which should be taken to be correct. However it is found that the conclusions which are reached by the psychological and neurophysiological study have been overridden by the battles that were (and are still), encountered between power and sex. These battles are about issues of humiliation and domination in unequal societies; and it is shown that this is the reason why the prohibitions in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 are confined to male anally penetrative same-sex acts. The criminalisation and persecution of gender and sexually variant people for nearly two thousand years has prevented any evidence of the duality demanded by the neurophysiological and psychological study and the Gospel teaching being expressed. For as long as this persisted no challenge to the traditional teaching of the Church could be made. Today that duality has again been revealed in societies where same-sex relationships

³⁶ In the condemnation of same-sex intercourse in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13; the death penalty is applied equally to the penetrating and penetrated partners who engage in anal penetrative acts. Although both are condemned in equal measure, the actual wording of the prohibition attacks the perpetrator of the act: "And with a male you shall not lie the lyings of a woman". See section 3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf> and section 4:4:1 of this document.

³⁷ See section 3:1:7 of Gilchrist, S. (2016) : "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

³⁸ in section 4:4 of this document

³⁹ See also: Gilchrist, S. (2014): *Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church*: Also Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*The Perceptions of Gender and Sexual Variation in Present Day Society and in the Modern Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/221P-InfluencesToday.pdf>

have been legalised and where gender equality exists. The consequence of this is that the social, psychological and theological arguments upon which the traditional doctrines are based no longer have force, and the continued pursuit of these traditional doctrines is discrediting the Church.

4:2 First Century Perspectives

There were great differences in attitudes to sex and power in subject and dominant societies of the first century. In a dominant society, same-sex rape could be a plaything. It was also the assertion of the power of a male citizen over a non-citizen and someone of lesser status, and its use in art was a reminder of where the authority lies⁴⁰. There was no civil censure for the active partner, and no reproductive consequences were involved⁴¹. The horror and humiliation this created in subjugated societies was great. However the further one looks back in history the more important the abuses of power and hospitality seem to become, rather than the specific condemnation of the actual act⁴². The bounds of respectability were also broken when same-sex intercourse took place between two adult male citizens of the dominant society: in such cases the penetrated partner was condemned - because he had diminished the status of citizenship by his assent. In stark contrast to this the perpetrator was condemned by subjugated societies⁴³. The latter was the position taken by Judaism, Paul and the early Christian Church, although equal penalties were applied⁴⁴.

It is also of note that almost all of the discussions in dominant societies about sexual relationships in antiquity were about relationships between two men. Responsibility was expected, and this was expressed by making the distinction between the noble pursuit of love and the carnal abuse of sex. Acceptable sex was not determined on a gendered basis and men were expected to engage in both same-sex and opposite-sex behaviour at the same or at different times in their lives. The cultural differences between first century and present day societies are so great that the present day definitions of heterosexuality, homosexuality and bisexuality cannot be applied. Judgement on acceptability was instead made on the intention of the acts. This is in line with what the neurophysiological and psychological study expects. However the limitations should be noted. These moral considerations tended to be applied only to the male citizens of the dominant societies, and everyone else could be subject to their abuses of sex.

Instead of the abstract styles of Greek philosophy; Judaism adopted a collective approach. Pairs of Rabbis and students in the academies would form long-standing Chavruta partnerships to discuss and debate shared texts. That is important for a full understanding of this analysis. How these relationships were expressed in Judaism is covered in the third paper of this series where an extended discussion of first century rabbinic partnerships is given⁴⁵.

⁴⁰ See section 12 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*

⁴¹ Making it an act of religious ritual could be a way of removing these social consequences

⁴² See section 3:1:7 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

⁴³ The punishment whereby both partners are to be put to death is stated only in Leviticus 20:13. However in Jewish and in early Christian literature it is the active partner in any non-consenting relationship who is condemned.

⁴⁴ See section 3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2016) : *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

⁴⁵ See Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf> . Other analyses are given in: Gilchrist, S. (2014):

4:2:1 Gender Challenges

The first century was a time of religious upheaval in Greco/Roman society. Many of the traditional religions had become less credible and there was a search for a new meaning to life. The demand for gender fairness⁴⁶ and the protection of women meant that the male dominated patriarchal society was challenged both by Christianity and the Goddess cults. The cult of Cybele was singled out for special attack. Contrary to the Christian condemnations, Cybele's myths and doctrines embraced both sex and spirituality, they gave earlier cautions against lust and the other sins of excess, and they also demonstrated that sex and gender were less important to the soul than love⁴⁷. The cult's activities included those of nurture, birthing, care, protection and responsible sex. Positive features of the cult were later imported into the doctrines of Mariology practiced by the Christian Church⁴⁸. Many of the denunciations of sexual malpractice may be merited, others may be due to the cultural clashes between subject and dominant societies, but the intensity of the Christian condemnations of inappropriate sexual behaviour were constant and severe, and this has smothered any awareness of the positive aspects of these cults.

A different perspective on the Cults is uncovered when this investigation scrutinises the relationships between power and sex⁴⁹. In the accounts of Cybele's entry into Rome 205 B.C the absolute sexual purity demanded of the Roman matrons who welcomed the arrival of the representation of the Goddess is strongly emphasised⁵⁰. However the real reason for welcoming the Goddess, and the lavishness of her welcome, was to call on the power of the Goddess to strengthen Rome during the Punic wars, at a time when it was facing the possibility of imminent defeat⁵¹. Not only do the principal myths of the Cult, which are associated with the Goddess arriving in a chariot which is pulled by lions, together with other warlike elements, demonstrate the power to achieve a military victory, the assertion of the gender disruptive behaviour of the cult reinforces the direction of social change that their campaigning demands⁵². The Goddess cults were popular, not just with women, but with slaves and others who felt disadvantaged by society. The importation of the cult of Cybele

Christianity and Crisis: An Overview of Gender and Sexual Difference in the Early and Modern Christian Church and in Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

⁴⁶ See section 2:2:5 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁴⁷ See sections 3:1:6 to 3:1:8 of Gilchrist (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation* and Section 7 of Gilchrist (2014):

Christianity and Crisis: An Overview of Gender and Sexual Difference in the Early and Modern Christian Church

⁴⁸ See section 2:3:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁴⁹ See section 3:1:6 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁵⁰ See section 3:1:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁵¹ This is the second time this took place. Cybele was introduced into Athens for similar reasons around 412 BC. Two things had happened at this time. The Greeks had previously been at war with Persia and then with Sparta in the Peloponnesian wars. During the Sicilian expedition of 413 BC they encountered a massive defeat. The men had been called away to battle and war had decimated the male population so women became even more essential for maintaining key functions of society. See section 2:3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁵² In 395 BC, just nine years after Athens had suffered catastrophic defeat in war the comic playwright Aristophanes wrote and produced a play called *Women in the Assembly* (*Ecclesiazusae*). The plot is simple and striking. The women of Athens are fed up with the mess men have made of the city and its affairs. They infiltrate the political assembly and persuade it to hand over all power to the women. It is a comedy, and the demand for true gender equality is taken to excess. This is not long after the Greeks had previously been at war with Persia and then with Sparta in the Peloponnesian wars. Because of the decimation of the male population women had taken over significant roles in society. Beard argues from a feminist point of view that the purpose of the play was to debar and discredit women in any public role. Beard: (2014): *The Public Voice of Women*. The play reflected the social changes and the advances of the rights of women as a consequence of the reverses of the wars that had occurred. There is a resonance with the experiences after World War 1 and World War 2 in the last century, when returning men began to lay claim to the trades and professions they had previously occupied. These advances together with the perpetual need to silence the public voices of women, suggests that these were significant concerns.

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

sgen4144@gmail.com

into Rome in 205 BC and earlier into Greece in 412 BC would be expected to have the effect of bringing these people onside, when greater resources to fight these battles were required. In both cases the host societies were facing defeat, and these importations created potential challenges to the authority of a patristic male dominated society. The subjugation of a well-educated female population⁵³ and others in Greco/Roman society is almost bound to lead to power struggles and to conflict⁵⁴. These are struggles of power rather than sex and it is argued in this account that this is one of the reasons for the gender disruptive activities which were common to all of the Middle Eastern Goddess Cults⁵⁵

When it is understood that the self-castrated priests of the Goddess cults, together with their counterparts, were itinerant missionary priests who moved widely through the Roman Empire, who were known within first century Palestine, who were engaged in fortune telling, shamanic, and healing activities, who had a common mission to the disadvantaged then: both the closeness and the contest between the Cult of Cybele and Christianity can hardly be missed. In Matthew 19:12 Jesus reinforced this association with the Goddess Cults by indicating that those who followed the doctrine of the New Covenant could be accepted into the fold⁵⁶. Early Christianity and the Goddess cults both stepped outside the boundaries of a gender unequal and dictatorial society and both attacked the power structures which were essential to maintain it. As a consequence, if Christianity was to integrate itself into the mainstream of Greco/Roman society, it had to separate itself from its own early gender challenging activities and from any relationships with the Goddess cults.

4:2:2 Voices

Vast amounts of Greek and Roman literature is available which discusses sexual practice and relationships between male citizens of a dominant society. Little is said about sex with women, slaves and members of subjugated societies - from the couches of philosophers, their voices are rarely heard. The societies of antiquity strenuously sought to deny women any public voice, and their tales of oppression were drowned out by noises of sex⁵⁷.

These voices are however available, not in the form of words but in the actions of the Goddess Cults. It has already been noted that these cults were popular, not just with women but with men, slaves and other members of subjugated groups. Rome tried to tame the Cult of Cybele by creating an authorised version to which it gave high status^{58 59}. Despite these efforts a moral and a political duality always existed. The Roman establishment was never comfortable with the cult of Cybele; and the less approved sections of the cult were strongly condemned for their gender disruptive activities, ecstatic behaviour and unregulated acts⁶⁰.

⁵³ Education for many women was provided in Greco/Roman society even though the silencing of the public voice of women was made complete. Boys and girls received approximately the same level of education up to about the age of eleven years, after that major differences did occur.

⁵⁴ Van Den Bergh, R. (2000): *The Role of Education in the Social and Legal Position of Women in Roman Society*

⁵⁵ See Section 3:1:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁵⁶ See section 3:1:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>. Also sections 3:1:8 and 3:2:1 of Gilchrist (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁵⁷ Beard, M. (2014): *The Public Voice of Women*

⁵⁸ The Roman authorities directly appointed an "Archgallus" or ruling high priest to govern the activities of the Cult. This person, who was not castrated, was also a Roman citizen who could be expected to act on the establishment's behalf.

⁵⁹ See section 3:1:3 of Gilchrist (2013): *"An Unfinished Reformation"*

⁶⁰ See section 2:3:2 of Gilchrist (2013): *"An Unfinished Reformation"*

There was also a great deal of decadence and sexual immorality in first century Greco/Roman society. Christianity was totally right to condemn it and there is no doubt that the need for these condemnations applied strongly to the Goddess cults. However there is also a clear need to separate the activities of the followers of the cults from the behaviour of the fraternities of the Roman citizens of high standing who claimed to support them. The banquets organised by these fraternities became so notorious and lavish in their licentiousness and their excesses that the Roman authorities had to pass legislation to restrict them⁶¹. In contrast to these activities, the greater appeal of the cults was to those who were of lesser status. The self-castrated priests were conspicuously absent from these banquets and the same moral duality that is applied to the cults is also found in the attitudes to the self-castrated male priests⁶². Those priests who conformed to the ideals of the cults could be highly regarded but those who did not were very severely condemned for their acts⁶³. Cultural clashes were also an important issue. What was seen to be acceptable in a dominant society could be horrific in a subject one. These differences need to be considered when comparative judgements between subject and dominant societies are made.

The existence of these dualities in the Cult behaviour has been widely recognised. Roller⁶⁴ attributes this to a dualism in the cult practices where the formal public components created and maintained the social boundaries of society, while the ecstatic elements transgressed them. Borgeaud instead sets the boundary more closely in line with the traditional teachings of the Church, which identifies the unacceptable behaviour with homosexuality, cross-gender activity and the pursuit of all forms of variant sex⁶⁵. Roller, Borgeaud and others stipulate a single boundary between the reputable and disruptive behaviour. However this it is argued in analysis that both of their presumptions are incorrect and it is considered that more than one boundary must exist.

Certainly it is true that one of these boundaries must be the moral boundary which distinguishes between the use and the abuse of sex. The second is the political boundary which divides the socially conforming from the publically disruptive behaviour of the cults. The moral boundary can be imagined to act vertically across all classes of society to separate use from abuse of sex, while the political boundary works horizontally to separate those who have power from those who have not. The transgression of the political boundary enforces the social power and the political challenges of the cults. This challenge was expressed in part through the gender disruption they created⁶⁶. By supporting the secular authorities the early Christian Church sought to eliminate this political boundary without compromising its attacks on the abuses of sex.

For its own purposes Christianity has attributed the disruptive behaviour of the cults exclusively to the pursuit of the lust or sex. That attribution does not match the myths of the Cult which have been shown to be more about the wild strength of nature, culture, power

⁶¹ See section 13 of Gilchrist, S: (2013): "*Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*":
<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/015B-GenderSexualityChurch.pdf>

⁶² Self-castration was not unique to the Goddess cults. It was a widely practiced and ancient expression of religious devotion throughout the Middle East. These issues caused very real difficulties for the early church. Several early Christian encratite and ascetic movements (centred mainly in Egypt) are known to have members who were eunuchs. The cloisters of Egypt and Syria were centres of self-castration, and Coptic monasteries continued to perform castration well into the Islamic period. See Hester, J. David, (2005): *Eunuchs and the Postgender Jesus: Matthew 19:12 and Transgressive Sexualities*": See also section 11 of Gilchrist, S: (2013): "*Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*":

⁶³ See section 3:1:9 of Gilchrist (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁶⁴ Roller, L.E. (1996): *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults*.

⁶⁵ Borgeaud, P. (1996): *Mother of the Gods. From Cybele to the Virgin Mary*

⁶⁶ See section 3:1:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*"

and the protection of women rather than male focussed obsessions with sex. The magnitude of the gender disruptive activities and the cult's reliance on self-castrated male priests were significant affronts to the gender based power structures of a male dominated and authoritarian society. The same was true of the challenges to the social order of society in the teaching of Jesus. Its impact is seen in the disruption of the political boundaries in the ministry of Jesus and in the initially gender challenging behaviour of the early Church⁶⁷.

In the previous sections it has been shown that the dynamics of power were the dominant feature in the attitudes to same-sex relationships instead of the rectitude of the sexual acts. All voices must be heard in any discussion. Listening must not, as has happened in the Christian tradition, just be confined to the lust for sex. That is what is found in the mainstream of Christian belief. In this section it is concluded that the manipulations of power were significant matters of concern for the Greco/Roman Goddess cults. This is why the discussion that takes place in this analysis examines in detail the relationships between power and sex.

4:2:3 Paradigm Shifts

A major barrier to correct interpretation occurs because of the paradigm shifts that have taken place in the attitudes to same-sex intercourse. It has already been noted that in first century societies, sexual moralities were not primarily determined on a gendered basis. Instead the distinction was made between the noble pursuit of love and the carnal abuse of sex. Men were expected to engage in sexual relationships on the basis of responsibility: and that included involvement in same-sex and in heterosexual relationships at various times in their lives. This included same-sex intercourse in some societies. Therefore the terms homosexuality, heterosexuality and bisexuality would not have been understood in these first century cultures. There were also two reasons for the condemnation of same-sex intercourse. One came from the abuse of power in gender and socially unequal societies. The second was because of the irresponsible demands for physical exploitation and for the physical gratifications of the sexual act. Because of this freedom of expression it was not the act of same-sex intercourse that could be condemned. The only condemnations that could be applied were to this were in the context of the abuse of the act.

A further feature that must also be taken note of is how these condemnations were applied: and this is through their impact on society rather than condemnation of the sexual act. That is seen in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. Here the actual act was the intended rape of the Israelite group, or God's messengers. However in the bible the condemnation of Sodom and Gomorrah is not directly applied to this action of same-sex rape: instead it is used to condemn of the abuse of hospitality and the other alleged multitudinous abuses in that society. There are other instances of this approach being taken. Both Jesus and Peter condemned Sodom and Gomorrah for their lack of hospitality and their social immoralities rather than the act of sex⁶⁸. When the passages in the bible which are interpreted as condemning sexual depravity in surrounding societies are compared with the records from these sources it is shown that the issues were ones of abuses of power rather than abuses of sex. In this investigation the attitudes to sexual misbehaviour in the surrounding societies are separately examined and the same or similar approaches are found⁶⁹. In Rome that shift

⁶⁷ See section 3:1:8 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "An Unfinished Reformation". Also Section 7 of: Gilchrist, S. (2014): "Christianity and Crisis: An Overview of Gender and Sexual Difference in the Early and Modern Christian Church".

⁶⁸ For a discussion of these see alleged abuses see section 4:4:1 of this document.

⁶⁹ More detailed analyses of these changes are given in sections 3:2:5 and 3:5:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus":

<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf> and in Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Deuteronomy 22:5 and

has already been described, but it is also true in Canaanite religious belief. This is not a minor change and a paradigm shift is involved. Today's viewpoints tend to consider lust and sexual depravity to be a primary driving force of social immorality. However in these early societies, sexual depravity was considered to be just one of the outcomes which resulted from the abuses of power in that society. This concentration on the condemnation of the social consequences does not correspond to today's attitudes in which all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour are condemned without exception as being immoral or abusive acts.

It is shown that these transformations in outlook occurred as the Church moved from being a minority and suppressed group in society to an organisation which became the dispenser of power and authority. Carnal abuse was of course still condemned, but the act of marriage became the defining boundary between use and abuse in all sexual behaviour for the Christian Church. Instead of its earlier stance which had focussed on condemning the abuses of sexual power and behaviour by dominant peoples inside gender and socially unequal societies; it now dismissed these power elements in the doctrines it created. The doctrines of the infallibility of the Church also stopped it from acknowledging its own abuses of power in society. By restricting this first century definition of purpose and intention, sexual and gender abuse became defined by this legal act.

With these denials the purpose of all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour could only be deemed to be in pursuit of the lust for sex. Any possibility of recognising love in relationships, as well as the moral duality that is present in the teaching of Jesus was lost. For these reasons it is concluded that what today is regarded as the traditional Church teaching on homosexuality and gender and sexual variation does not conform to the Gospel message. It reflects the needs of the 13th Century Church: and it is at variance with the teaching of Christ. It is this paradigm shift which most affects the present day teaching of the Church.

For more discussion of this topic, see section 3:2:5 and 3:5:3 of this Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"* and sections 4:4:1 and 4:5:2 of this document. Another detailed analysis of these changes is given in Gilchrist, S. (2015): *"Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church"*

4:3 Christian Interactions

4:3:1 Transformation and Integration

A major challenge and achievement which was met by Christianity was its success in transferring the distinctive views of the minority Jewish religion into the dominant culture of the Greco/Roman state. This meant confronting the self-centred moralities of the culture and the sexual values which were characteristic of Greco/Roman male dominated society. That additionally meant challenging and usurping the power structures which are formed inside the powerful and dominant societies by placing the concern for the victims and the suppressed first on the religious and the social agendas of their cultures, and by embracing an all-encompassing morality which is founded on compassion, nurturing and love. The continual testimony to the place of women amongst the followers of Jesus and his own

its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

serious teaching and treatment of them was a break with tradition which has been described as being without any previous precedent in first century Judaism. His interactions with women broke many of the taboos of purity and respectability which Judaism enforced and the fairness with which he treated them is entirely appropriate for the present day world.

From his identification with the poor, women, the rejected and the outcast Jesus turned the search for authority completely on its head. His rejection of all worldly power led to his sacrifice and death as a scapegoat on the Cross. Paul accurately described the teaching of Jesus in Galatians 3:28⁷⁰ and Jesus applied this without compromise to the whole of society. The gender equalities demanded by the worship of a single universal God created the same or greater challenges for the Greco/Roman demesne, and the need to compromise on the disruptions that both of these created is encountered in the New Testament texts. The traditional approaches do not consider fully how this came about; and an examination of that is given in the following sections of this paper. The command of Jesus to work within society to change it, rather than to destroy, it forced Peter and Paul to make a difficult choice and the constant emphasis in their Epistles and Letters is one of seeking respectability for the Christian Church.

For years there has been discussion and argument over what Peter and Paul meant with their various demands for respectability in the Letters and Epistles attributed to them in the New Testament⁷¹. On the one hand there is Paul's statement in Galatians 3:28 which would find total acceptance in the present day. On the other there are the statements that Peter and Paul made which define the behaviour which women and men should adopt to obtain respect for the Church. In the early Church which was infused with the teaching of Jesus, no gender or sexual discrimination inside the Christian Community should ever take place⁷² and the equality of everyone, as Paul expressed it in Galatians 3:28 was the goal that was sought⁷³. Christianity also had to grow from small beginnings and it is demonstrated in the Letter to Philemon⁷⁴ that the early Church sought to fulfil in full the radical nature of Christ's teaching within the Christian community, while accepting the need to conform to the social structure of society outside it. However the admonitions attributed to Peter and Paul in the later Epistles and Letters meant that this separation of the Christian community from the rest of society could never be complete.

For the very early Church the return of Jesus and the end of the world was imminent. That did not happen and the longer this was delayed the greater the need there was for a pragmatic approach. That is considered in this paper. Considerations of continuity are also important. In the third paper of this series: *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the*

⁷⁰ Galatians 3:28: "There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus". NRSV

⁷¹ Perhaps the more telling way to assess their arguments is to examine the authority which the New Testament invokes. In 1 Corinthians 14:34, Paul was urging Christian women to keep silent in Church because that would be a disgrace to society, and there is no direct reference to Christ. For Peter likewise (1 Peter 3:1-16) the need for women's submission was because the esteem of the Church must be nurtured within society at large. Paul's comment in Ephesians 5:22-24 again refers to the absolute authority and control exercised by the "Pater familias" in Greco/Roman society. All of these statements reflect the need for the Church to gain respect in that society and this provided a model for the Church.

⁷² This will be later be shown to mean that all gender and sexually variant people who seek to live their lives in ways that are true to their own identities; and in relationships which fulfil the love of Christ must be accepted in their own right.

⁷³ For the first Christians the second coming of Jesus was believed to be imminent and the gender transcendence and equality which Jesus preached could be celebrated without regard to the needs of the surrounding society. That position was compromised as time progressed.

⁷⁴ See the Letter of that name in the Bible.

*Life and Teaching of Jesus*⁷⁵ it is shown how the types of relationships which were found in rabbinic partnerships were solemnised in services of Adelpopoiesis which were later conducted by the Christian Church. In the paper on Deuteronomy 22:5⁷⁶ it is shown how the Jewish attitude to gender complementarity was carried forward into the teaching of Peter and Paul and the Christian Church. The development of Paul's pragmatic approach to marriage, sex and the relative roles of men and women are reflected in the Letters and Epistles themselves. Therefore the issues of concern are those of finding out if these changes were knowingly made, and if the need to make these compromises was allowed for the teaching of Jesus himself.

Jesus did not set a political agenda beyond that which follows from his condemnation of abuses and oppression by the Jewish authorities, and the Gospel of Christian love. Despite the radical challenges contained in the teaching of Jesus, to the frustration of many; and in the tinderbox of Jewish society, he moderated his approach so that it did not seek to create an all-out physical revolt. For Jesus his Kingdom was "Not of this World", but that did not diminish the challenges it created. There are two passages in the Gospels where this moderation is most obviously applied. The first is that in Mark 12:17, where Jesus said to his questioners, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's"⁷⁷. The second passage is that on marriage and eunuchs in Matthew 19:12. Here Jesus says: "For there are eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are eunuchs, which were made eunuchs by men: and there are eunuchs, which made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it let him receive it"^{78 79 80}. This passage created major difficulties for the early Church. It is necessary

⁷⁵ Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

⁷⁶ Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

⁷⁷ There is a good precedent which urges the Apostles and the early Church to follow the rules of the secular society. In Mark 12:17 Jesus said to his questioners, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." (The passages are in Matthew 22:15-22, Mark 12:13-17 and Luke 20:20-26). The original message, coming in response to a question of whether it was lawful for Jews to pay taxes to Caesar, gives rise to multiple possible interpretations about the circumstances under which it is desirable for the Christian to submit to earthly authority. Although this passage as told in the Gospels was a clever strategy, which Jesus adopted to divert the attacks of the Pharisees and Herodians, its longer term message cannot be ignored.

⁷⁸ The close conjunction of the statements on marriage and eunuchs in Matthew 19: 3-12 further suggests that these two statements should be considered together. Both of them are included in the same sentence; the directly equivalent form of words is also used, and the Jewish Midrashim tradition of interpretation imposes a very careful structuring that demands a close reading of any biblical text. In regard to marriage, the usual interpretation which is given to this passage states that Jesus considered that marriage should be treated as a "Second best" option, and therefore the same close textural relationships between these two statements additionally implies that the people "Who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven", should be treated in the same way. Therefore this extreme action of self-castration too should be regarded as another "Second best" approach. That is only when behaviour conforms to the highest ideals of society. That must also be interpreted in accordance with the moralities of first century societies, and not those of the present day.

⁷⁹ It is important to note that is not suggested that Jesus was here advocating self-castration, although a literal interpretation was sometimes taken. However the welcome that it offers to the already self-castrated male priests of the Goddess Cults should also be noted: For a full account see Section 3:2 of Gilchrist, S .2013: "*An Unfinished Reformation*". Access at: www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm .

⁸⁰ The part of the passage which says "He that is able to receive it let him receive it" is the second passage in the New Testament where Jesus allows compromises to his teaching. (The first is the passage on "Render onto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, as described above). The statement in Matthew was a radical statement. Its impact on the behaviour on the early Church means that there is little doubt about the authenticity of the text. Christianity had to adapt if it was going to be able to survive in Roman society and to continue to take the Gospel message to the world. That meant a re-interpretation of the radical teaching which Jesus presented on gender and sex. It is shown later in this account that this passage in Matthew gave an early authorisation for the compromises that were necessary for the survival of the Church. The context also demands that Christianity

to consider this in the first century context to discover what its meaning was. For a full discussion see section 3:1:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*⁸¹. In this context it was a direct attack on the gendered security of a male dominated Roman society. That was not only because of this society's serious mistrust and condemnation of eunuchs, but also because of the attacks on social order created by the gender disruptive behaviour of the Goddess cults and their self-castrated male priests.

Because of these continuities it is concluded that the early Christians continued the Judean attitude to gender complementarity and sought to interpret the radical teaching of Jesus inside it⁸². When it is a matter of personal choice, voluntary gender complementarity can be an eminently sensible way forward, but later when it interfaces with the rules of society, social complications and gender discrimination occurs. Nevertheless its principles would have been understood by Peter and Paul. Seeking to adapt it met the immediate practical needs and it is argued that it was the subsequent institutionalisation of gender complementarity which led to the future failures of the Christian Church. How this transformation occurred is discussed in Gilchrist, S. (2015e): *"Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church"*⁸³. For all of these reasons it is considered that the statements claimed to be made by Peter and Paul on gender complementary, appropriate masculine behaviour, personal relationships with authority and the submission of women to men represented their own personal responses these needs, they were not later additions to the texts. If these statements were not made by Peter and Paul they could have been, and these presumptions form the foundations of the traditional theological approaches to gender complementarity today adopted by the Catholic Church.

By adopting a form of gender complementarity which originated from Judaism⁸⁴ and was amenable to Greco/Roman society the early Church could resolve these issues and gain the respect that it sought. Instead of continuing with its political challenges and confronting the political boundaries that authority demanded, Christianity altered its allegiance to one of endorsing the Greco/Roman establishment, by seeking respectability for the Church⁸⁵. This decision was urgent because one of the first tasks the Church had to do was to separate itself as far as possible from the gender disrupting behaviour of the Goddess cults. Christian men had to be paragons of masculine virtue for the same reasons⁸⁶. These removed the political challenges that early Christianity had presented, while leaving its moral and social

restores the radical teaching on gender and sex once it had gained a position of sufficient strength. That has had a profound effect on the development of the Church. See section 3:5:3 in Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf> and section 4:5:3 onwards in this document for an examination of the impact of this passage.

⁸¹ <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

⁸² Gilchrist, S. (2015): *"Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church"*

⁸³ <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

⁸⁴ Gilchrist, S. (2015): *"Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church"*. The description of Gender attitudes by Peter and Paul are also indicative of Judean society

⁸⁵ There is a good precedent for the compromised which urge the Apostles and the early Church to follow the rules of the secular society. In Mark 12:17 Jesus said to his questioners, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." (The passages are in Matthew 22:15-22, Mark 12:13-17 and Luke 20:20-26). The original message, coming in response to a question of whether it was lawful for Jews to pay taxes to Caesar, gives rise to multiple possible interpretations about the circumstances under which it is desirable for the Christian to submit to earthly authority. Although this passage as told in the Gospels was a clever strategy, which Jesus adopted to divert the attacks of the Pharisees and Herodians, its longer term message cannot be ignored. In Romans 13 Paul declares that Christians are obliged to obey all earthly authorities, stating that because they were introduced by God, a disobedience to them equates to disobedience to God (Romans 13:1-7).

⁸⁶ That is fully discussed in Gilchrist, S. (2015): *"Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church"*. Paul also emphasises this in his own teaching.

doctrines intact. However that required the adaptation of the radical teaching which Jesus had presented on gender and sex, and this has had a major impact on the present day Church⁸⁷. These topics are more fully discussed in the third paper of this series which examines the attitudes to gender and sexual variation in the teaching of Jesus himself⁸⁸

4:3:2 A Pragmatic Approach

For the Gospel Church the Second Coming of Jesus and the End of the World was an immediately expected occurrence. This Gospel Church did not expect an earthly future. Therefore little accommodation with the needs and customs of surrounding society was required and some of that urgency can be seen in Paul's early writings. The earliest of Paul's writing dates from around 50 AD, some 17 years after the death of Jesus, and that is a long time to wait before at least considering some sort of pragmatic approach.

However Christianity first had to gain its foothold. For this to succeed it is shown in this analysis that an initial period of true gender transcendence and equality had to exist⁸⁹. In Greco/Roman society this was also a time of crisis. There was a great deal of religious uncertainty, and the male dominated society was being put under pressure by a resurgence of the Goddess Cults. Unlike these Goddess cults which were constrained by the divinely ordained differences between men and women that were built into a polytheistic society, the gender transcendent God of Christianity could break through this barrier. That ability of Christianity to overcome it created a greater potential threat to the political structures of Greco/Roman society. This reinforced an already urgent need to seek respectability for the Church. In response and in accordance with the acceptance of Jesus⁹⁰, it has been shown that the early Church tried to neutralise these threats by adopting a form of gender complementarity which was more amenable to the Greco/Roman state.

The pragmatic approach which Peter, Paul and the early Church took was similar to the recommendations of Jeremiah at the time of the Jewish exile⁹¹. As with the Israelites at that time, it was not simply a matter of choosing right from wrong; it was about making the best available choice. This transformation was more possible because in Greco/Roman society the Gods and Goddesses had equal status. Whatever happened on earth, the equality of

⁸⁷ Many scholars argue that the passages which exhort respectability for the Church may be later additions and that they cannot be directly attributed to Peter or Paul themselves. In this document no judgement is made on that issue but the internal evidence from this analysis suggests that this is in line with what they would have been expected to write and that there is much less tampering than some scholarship suggests with the messages they present. See section 3:7:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁸⁸ Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

⁸⁹ See section 2:2:5 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁹⁰ This is a challenging statement and an explanation for it is given elsewhere in this paper. It includes references to Matthew 29:12 and Mark 12:17: In Mark, Jesus said to his audience, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Although this passage as told in Mark was a clever strategy, which Jesus adopted to divert the attacks of the Pharisees and Herodians, its longer term message cannot be ignored.

⁹¹ By doing this, Peter and Paul were also following the advice given by Jeremiah to the Israelites at the time of the exile: (Jeremiah 29:7). "But seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you into exile, and pray to the lord on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare". Jeremiah also had something to say about the compromises that were required: (Jeremiah 21:8-9): "This is what the Lord says: See; I am setting before you the way of life and the way of death. Whoever stays in the city will die by the sword, famine or plague. But whoever goes out and surrenders to the Babylonians who are besieging you will live; they will escape with their lives". Jeremiah had asked the Israelites to choose between two evils. Peter and Paul adopted a pragmatic policy in their attempts to gain the respectability that was needed to spread the Gospel message to the world. This compromise of gender complementarity sacrificed the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sexuality for the respectability of the Church. However this enabled Christianity to continue as a presence in the world.

gender was a godly ideal; and from that perspective men and women had equal esteem⁹². While the Gods and Goddesses in heaven could relax in the myths of their gender transformations, the same was not true on earth. As a voluntary way of living earthly life the practice of gender complementarity has much to recommend it, but the perils of first century life, including responsibilities for nurturing children, families, pregnancies and the dangers of childbirth could also be expected to force women into this position. When it is made compulsory severe gender discrimination almost inevitably occurs. For women this was the reality of life. In the separate paper⁹³ it is shown how Christianity transferred the type of gender complementarity expected by Judaism into Greco/Roman society, and how Deuteronomy 22:5 was used to apply the gender divisions that this created.

While men were given a public and governing role, women were excluded from it and in order to enforce this restriction, the silencing of the public voice of women was made complete⁹⁴. That was common to all Middle Eastern societies of antiquity and it was the situation that Christianity faced. Nevertheless from the perspective of Christian ideals, this form of gender complementary could still be capable of redemption. By accepting its principles, and then by seeking to change it by applying the full expression of the teaching of Jesus within it, created the opportunity that opened the gateway to the continuing presence of Christianity in the world^{95 96}.

If early Christianity had continued to apply to the social structures of Roman Society the same challenges that Jesus had made to the Jewish establishment, it would have been unlikely to survive that attack. For a marginal group existing in a dominant society the need for such compromise was essential, and this was vital for the survival of the Church. However that position was transformed when Christianity moved from a minority situation to one where it exercised control of power in society and when it became a dominant group. If

⁹² Rome was unique in having two Goddesses and one God as the members of its triad of supreme deities (Juno and Minerva plus Jupiter). The statues of the Gods and Goddesses in the Roman Forum were set out as equally balanced gender pairs. About half of the Greco/Roman Goddesses, including Cybele were virgins who gave birth by miraculous means. Any idea that a Goddess had to be penetrated by a God to give birth was intolerable because it would have been seen as an act of submission which destroyed the equal status that was given to them in Greco/Roman Society. See section 1:1:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁹³ Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

⁹⁴ Despite this restriction, and the absolute power of the male head of the household over women, women could run their own businesses; they had some independent legal and property rights and could have substantial roles. Men may often be called away for duties of war and governance of empire. Women could act as regents on their behalf and they could also control the management of large estates, with authority over many slaves and servants. Some women exerted very powerful influences, to which their husbands gave public voice. See sections 2:2:4 and 2:2:5 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "An Unfinished Reformation"

⁹⁵ Women played a key role in the ministry of Jesus. Some women also supported his ministry through their private means. Given the importance of the role of women in the Gospel church an interesting corollary which emerges in this analysis is that an initial period of complete gender equality and transcendence was essential if the breakthrough of Christianity from a minority sect to a universal religion was to occur. The feature that was required to make the breakthrough was a religion which worshipped one single gender transcendent God and which possessed a social perspective that was close to the Goddess cults. This glass ceiling and gender divide created by the polytheistic religions, which and divinely ordain the division of men and women into separate categories, is shattered by this. However this only works if the God is perceived to be truly gender transcendent. The gender discrimination practiced by the later Church restored this division. Nevertheless however short or long this early period of absolute gender transcendence was it had to be complete: it is shown that without it Christianity could never have gained the foothold which allowed it to make the transition into a world religion from a local gender defined sect: See section 5:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

⁹⁶ It is of interest to note that this approach is commended in the "Pilling Report". The Pilling Report was compiled by the Church of England House of Bishops Working Group on Human Sexuality, chaired by Sir Joseph Pilling. It was published on 28 November 2013. See Gilchrist, S. (2014) *Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church*

the Christian Church was to continue to be true to the Gospel message there was now no justification whatever for it to continue to deny the full expression of the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex which is presented in the Gospels themselves. The legitimacy and authority to make that initial compromise is given in the passage in Matthew 19:12, where Jesus says: "He that is able to receive it let him receive it". However that was not just a statement of compromise. It was also the command for the Christian Church to express in full the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex as soon as it was able to do so. Today that has still not happened. If those initial compromises were responses to needs of first century Roman Society, they no longer apply. It is now time to follow in full this commandment of Jesus, and restore the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex to the present day Church.

4:3:3 Later Developments

For much of the first millennium the ferocity of the conflicts over same-sex intercourse was a leading feature in the life of the Church. The chasm between the condemnation of the submissive partner in a conquered society and the condemnation of the active partner in the conquering one; was an exemplar of the magnitude of the cultural clashes which occurred. Christianity strongly and vigorously challenged the abuse of sex between men as a means of enforcing subjection and domination in a male dominated world. This set the battle lines between Christianity and Greco/Roman society but it was not until the time of the Emperor Justinian in AD 538 that the same penalties were applied to both participants in same-sex intercourse⁹⁷. This is some 220 years after Constantine made Christianity the dominant religion of the Roman Empire⁹⁸. The same was also true for cross-gender behaviour. Roman emperors well into the Christian era continued to pleasure themselves with eunuchs, including boys who they may have had castrated, for sex^{99 100}. The Christian condemnations

⁹⁷ Emperor Justinian. (538/144): Novellas 77 of AD 538 and 141 of AD 544: See: Bailey, D.S. (1955): *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, London. See also Section 8:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): *Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*

⁹⁸ Constantine the Great converted to Christianity in or about, 312 AD. However he did little to change Roman practices. An imperial decree by the emperor Theodosius (347-395) was posted at the Roman hall of Minerva on May 14, 390 which, for the first time, seriously criminalized the sexual practices of what now would be called passive, or submissive, homosexual men. (Theodosian Code 9.7.6): "All persons who have the shameful custom of condemning a man's body, acting the part of a woman's to the sufferance of alien sex (for they appear not to be different from women), shall expiate a crime of this kind in avenging flames in the sight of the people.

⁹⁹ Constantine II (son of Constantine the Great) was born in Arles in February 316 and raised as a Christian. A historian at the time noted that the emperor was sexually devoted to his eunuchs, courtiers, and wives; while, "content with these, he was never defiled by any transverse or unjust lust." See: Sextus Aurelius Victor, (320-c390): *Epitome of the Caesars*, 12.19.

¹⁰⁰ The Christian emperor Theodosius (347-395) compelled everyone to obey the creed of the Council of Nicaea (325) as the universal norm for Christian orthodoxy, and he directed the convening of the second general council at Constantinople (381) to clarify its formula. Theodosius was a strong advocate for Christianity and interacted closely with Ambrose the Bishop of Milan who also required him to do penance for a massacre that took place. Theodosius was additionally responsible for the edict of 390 which condemned all submissive partners in same-sex intercourse to death by burning in a fire. The penetrating partner was not so condemned. Theodosius was also fond of his eunuchs. See: Tougher, S. (2009): *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society*: p 40. Eunuchs could be exempted from the penalty imposed by the edict issued by Theodosius in 390 since they were regarded not as men or women, but as members of a third sex. (See Wilson, B.E. (2015): *Unmanly Men: Refigurations of Masculinity in Luke-Acts*: p120). The prohibitions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 also state "And with a male you shall not lie the lyings of a woman" (see section 5:11 of this document). Since eunuchs were no longer male or female, it could likewise be argued that the biblical prohibition also does not apply. The same definition of maleness is also seen in attitudes to under-age sex: See section 5:11 of this document. To be a male meant that one had to have at least in theory the capacity to reproduce, and that has significant implications for the way in which the prohibitions in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 could be understood. See: Brustman, Mark: *The Historic Origins of Church Condemnation of Homosexuality*. Of major significance is that by agreeing to do penance, an

became increasingly ferocious and it is hardly surprising that this issue was the subject of the first Canon (directive) of the Great Council of Nicaea in 325¹⁰¹. This analysis shows that there is much in history to support the traditional condemnations of same-sex activity which is still contained in the teaching of the Christian church. However this ignores the duality expressed in the neurophysiological and psychological study and in the teaching of Jesus. By banning the act of same-sex intercourse rather than considering its intention is where the major failure occurs. The great sadness is that all evidence of the duality of behaviour which is demanded by the neurophysiological and psychological study; and which is also shown to be present in the teaching of Jesus, has been destroyed by these conflicts between power and sex.

Women had no power in this male controlled society: they were left out, and a trajectory towards gender discrimination was created. At the time of Augustine in the fourth century, every woman alive on earth was made to take the blame for the sins of Eve. Redemption and equality for women could only take place in heaven¹⁰² and the doctrines of gender complementary which the Church then embraced were more typical of those of first century Greco/Roman society before the coming of Christianity itself and in some respects they were worse¹⁰³. The roles of women were also written out of the history of the early Church¹⁰⁴. From a Gospel message which had given equality and a public ministry to women, the silencing of the public voice of women on earth was again made complete¹⁰⁵ and the ministry that had been given to women was denied¹⁰⁶. These changes have been built into the doctrines of the Church. Inside it all sex came to be regarded as an evil that was only made necessary by the Fall of Adam in the garden of Eden, and strict rules of celibacy were imposed on the religious and priests.

4:3:4 Changes in the Church

When the history of Christian attitudes is traced from the start of the first millennium to its end it is shown that there is a transition from the condemnations of same-sex intercourse which were applied at the start because of the sexual abuse that was driven by the social

Emperor submitted to the authority of a Bishop. The balance of power had changed, and from that point onwards the Church was more able to get its way.

¹⁰¹ See section 3:2:1 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹⁰² The idea that women had to have an instant sex change when they die in order to enter heaven as men was a common theological perception. Augustine devoted one complete chapter to the topic in his work, the "City of God". This discussion is found in Chapter 17 of book XXII – "Whether the Bodies of Women Shall Retain Their Own Sex in the Resurrection".

¹⁰³ See section 2:3:3: "The Genderisation of God" in Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹⁰⁴ Early Christianity provided an agenda for women in a society where they had not possessed any human rights. Instead of supporting any perceptions of a male superiority or the concept of an exclusively male priesthood, women occupied many prominent roles in the Gospels. They were also found in leadership roles in the early church. No limits appear to have been applied to these activities and early Christianity endorsed a level of gender fairness that would be acceptable in the present day.

¹⁰⁵ By the time of the fourth century women were told that they must wait in penance for the sins of Eve until they die and reach heaven, when freedom from gender comes. They could only redeem their lives on earth through childbirth, obedience or by renouncing all aspects of their femininity. Women were neither permitted to speak or teach. In place of the gender transcendence and equality that was first taught by Jesus, Peter and Paul, this was a return to the discriminatory practices of gender complementarity which originated from Judaism and Greco/Roman society, and the silencing of the public voice of women was again made complete. This also gave protection to the male dominated institutions of the Church. See sections: 2:2:5, 3:3:1 and 3:3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*, which examines the writings of Tertullian and the changes in the Church. In some respects the situation was made worse for women because in Greco/Roman society the Gods and Goddesses were given equal status; while in Christianity the Virgin Mary submitted to Christ. See sections 2:1:5 and 3:3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹⁰⁶ See for example the references to Tertullian in Section 2:3:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

inequalities and the power struggles between subject and dominant societies, to the attitudes from just after the end of the first millennium, when all evidence of these power struggles had disappeared¹⁰⁷. The nature of these changes is discussed in section 4:4 of this document.

A key date which may have triggered this development comes at the beginning of the fourth century. This is seen in the changes in the outlook of the Church between the Councils of Elvira in 306¹⁰⁸ and Ancyra in 314¹⁰⁹ and the first Council of Nicaea in 325. The Council of Nicaea was the event that marked the establishment of Christianity as the official religion of the state. That transformed Christianity from a constrained and sometimes persecuted sect, to the dominant religion of a governing Empire. The condemnations of same-sex intercourse contained in the Canons of the Councils of Elvira and of Ancyra reflected the earlier attitudes of sexual abuse¹¹⁰. However their main focus was the enforcement of celibacy on the priests. The first Christian condemnation of what today may be regarded as homosexuality, (by St Augustine) seems to appear not long afterwards. From the first Council of Nicaea onwards this change in outlook seems have developed¹¹¹. However Christian attitudes considered the expression of all sexual passions, including the thoughts of them¹¹² as the temptations of the devil which led to the falling from Grace, because of his deception of Eve. Although sex was accepted as being necessary for reproduction¹¹³ all participation in any type of sex was considered to be a degrading and unwelcome act.

Disputes over the correct attitudes to gender and sex continued for most of the first Millennium¹¹⁴. What today is regarded as the traditional teaching of the Christian Church on homosexuality, and by extension, all gender and sexual variation, stems in considerable measure from the work of Thomas Aquinas¹¹⁵ who reformed the institutional teaching of the Church following periods of scandals¹¹⁶ and authoritarianism which had resulted in the Cathar revolt. This lasted from 1209 to 1229. The revolt was ruthlessly put down in the Albigensian Crusades and the victory reinforced the secular authority of the Church. However the Church also recognised that it had to liberalise its teaching on sex¹¹⁷. For a Church which by this time claimed supreme authority over Kings and Empires, the original first century issues of suppression and domination were no longer its concern¹¹⁸. Because of

¹⁰⁷ There is no space for a full account in this paper. For a more complete account see: Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf>

¹⁰⁸ Council of Elvira (306): See the bibliography to access the text of the Canons.

¹⁰⁹ Council of Ancyra (314): See the bibliography to access the text of the Canons.

¹¹⁰ See section 2:2:6 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹¹¹ Augustine (354-430) is quite clear in his condemnation of what would now be regarded as homosexuality when he wrote: "You shaped the rules, either by making wrong use of the things which You allow, or by becoming inflamed with passion to make unnatural use of things which You do not allow". This appears to be the first Christian condemnation of what today may be regarded as homosexuality. There is also some evidence to suggest that Christian writers may have been slower than non-Christian writers to make the connection. All of the earlier, and often vitriolic, condemnations are set in the context of domination and abuse. See section 8:1 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): *Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*. Also: St. Augustine (354-430): *Confessions*, Book III, Chapter. 8. And Section 8:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): *Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*

¹¹² Thoughts of lust: See section 2:3:3 and 3:1:9 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹¹³ Redemption of women through childbirth: See section 2:1:5 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹¹⁴ See section 8:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*"

¹¹⁵ Aquinas was born in 1225 and died on the 7th March 1274.

¹¹⁶ See section 8:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*"

¹¹⁷ See section 8:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*"

¹¹⁸ Pope Gregory VII: (1075): "*Dictatus Pape*": According to the *Dictatus Papae* published by Pope Gregory VII in 1075, the Pope was to be judged by no one, the Roman Catholic Church had never been, and would never be,

the influence that Aquinas had, the Church has decreed that sex could be celebrated within marriage, but all forms of sexual acts outside those in marriage; (and those for the wrong purpose within it), are mortally sinful and are always driven by the lust for sex. All forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour are without exception totally condemned as heinously sinful acts¹¹⁹.

From that time onwards, not just same-sex intercourse, but all same-sex acts of sex have been condemned because they are considered to be in pursuit of lust, are disordered, and are intrinsically evil and sinful acts.

4:4 Judaism, Power and Sex

Why the Christian Church has not followed the teaching of Jesus, as described in Matthew 19:12 could be for a number of reasons. Six areas for consideration are identified. The first was the need to maintain its own respectability, power and authority by following the edicts of the gender unequal and discriminatory society which had been incorporated into the teaching of the Church. The second came from the continuation of the division of men and women into public and private roles that had been transferred from the Jewish and Greco/Roman traditions. Both of these criteria include the demand for conformity and in practice that resulted in the condemnation and scapegoating of minority groups¹²⁰. The third came through the widespread abuse of same-sex intercourse for personal gratification which came from the ability to enforce power and domination over others in gender and socially unequal societies. The fourth concerned the outlet for male heterosexual sexual passions when reproduction was not wanted. The fifth was identified with the distraction from the command for Jews to multiply and fill the world¹²¹. The sixth arose from the cultural clashes and the theological significance of Jesus to the Christian Church. In Jesus; the glory of God was personified in man. The particular nature of the love between Jesus and John is emphasised in the Gospel of John. While the early Church did not seem to have any concern about the intensity of the same-sex love that was expressed in the relationship between Jesus and John, acts of same-sex intercourse were an altogether different matter. In Judaism such activities were abhorred because of the permission which the conflicts of power gave for the abuses of sex. The condemnations were applied to the abuses that occurred, rather than the sexual act. In Greco/Roman society the importance of maintaining this prohibition was as great or could be greater than that within Judaism. In this society, same-sex intercourse would have been seen through the prism of power and domination. If Jesus and John did have same-sex intercourse, one of them would have been condemned as the submissive partner. That would have been a disaster for the continuation of Christianity and for the respectability of the Church. Constantly and repeatedly the Church emphasised the virginity, not just of Jesus but also of John, even though the same stringent demands were not applied to the rest of the disciples¹²². Many of the reasons that are described above concerned the misuse of same-sex acts of sex, and these condemnations of abuse remain just as applicable in the present day. If a better understanding of these

wrong and it declared the Pope's authority to depose emperors. See Tierney, B. ed (1892/1983), ed: "Pope Gregory VII," See also section 8:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): "Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships"

¹¹⁹ See section 9 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): *Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*

¹²⁰ See section 2:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹²¹ In any case the high esteem given to celibacy in the Christian Church negates these arguments.

¹²² See section 2:2:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "An Unfinished Reformation". Also section.4:4 of this document.

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

issues is to be obtained, it is necessary to consider in more detail the relationships between Judaism, power and sex.

4:4:1 Power and Sex in Same-Sex Acts

This section should be read in conjunction with section 3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*.

The attempt to retrieve the original teaching of Jesus is principally addressed in the third paper in this series, where first century Jewish attitudes are examined in an attempt to discover the correct nature of this teaching in relation to gender and sex¹²³. That is also discussed in section 4:2:3 of this document. There can be little doubt about the horror in Jewish society that is associated with the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. There are many references to Sodom in ancient Jewish literature, such as the Ethics of the Fathers¹²⁴, the Talmud¹²⁵ and in the Bible¹²⁶. Jesus implied in Matthew 10:14-15 and Luke 10:7-16; that the sin of the people of Sodom was to be inhospitable to strangers. 2 Peter 6-8 states that God destroyed the adults and children of Sodom because the former were ungodly, unprincipled and lawless. None of these passages say anything about loving same-sex relationships and their condemnations are about these abuses of power, misbehaviour and hospitality, rather than any sexual acts.

The account of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 19 is a story of attempted gang rape of the "outsiders." Nevertheless all of the biblical condemnations, including those of Jesus and Peter, emphasize Sodom's lack of hospitality, greed, idolatry, gluttony and other sins of excess. Jude 7 is an exception because it condemns the citizens of Sodom for fornication and going after "strange flesh". The present day interpretations which state that the story of Sodom condemns homosexuality are based entirely on the traditional teaching of the Christian Church. This blanket condemnation can only be made because the Church doctrine declares that same-sex intercourse for every purpose is always a sinful and heinous act. The issues of power, humiliation, cultural changes and the impact of the scientific

¹²³ Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹²⁴ Marcus, Y. (2015): *Ethics of the Fathers with a new commentary anthologized from the works of the classic commentators and the chassidic masters.*

¹²⁵ Rodkinson, M.L. Tr (1918): *The Babylonian Talmud Volumes 1-10 pdf*

¹²⁶ Genesis 10:19, 13:10, 12, 13, 14:2, 8, 10-11, 12, 17, 21-22, 18:16, 20, 22, 26, 19:1, 4, 24, 28; Deuteronomy 23:17, 29:23, 32:32, Ezekiel 16:46, 48-49, 53, 55-56. The entire first chapter of Isaiah is an utter condemnation of Judah which is repeatedly compared with Sodom and Gomorrah because of their evildoing and depravity. The Prophet lists many sins of the people: rebelling against God, lacking in knowledge, deserting the Lord, idolatry, engaging in meaningless religious ritual, being unjust and oppressive to others, being insensitive to the needs of widows and orphans, committing murder, accepting bribes, etc. There is no reference to any sexual activities at all. Jeremiah 23:14 also states: "...among the prophets of Jerusalem I have seen something horrible: They commit adultery and live a lie. They strengthen the hands of evildoers, so that no one turns from his wickedness. They are all like Sodom to me; the people of Jerusalem are like Gomorrah." Even though Jeremiah compares the actions of the prophets with the adultery, lying and evil of the people of Sodom; what today would be regarded as homosexual activity is not mentioned. Ezekiel 16:49-50 writes: "Now this was the sin of your sister Sodom: She and her daughters were arrogant, overfed and unconcerned; they did not help the poor and needy. They were haughty and did detestable things before me. Therefore I did away with them as you have seen." God states clearly that he destroyed Sodom's sins because of their pride, their excess of food while the poor and needy suffered; again sexual activity is not mentioned. Jude, in Chapter 4 Verse 7, disagreed with Jesus and Ezekiel; he wrote that Sodom's sins were sexual in nature. Various biblical translations of this passage in Jude describe the sin as: fornication, going after strange flesh, sexual immorality, perverted sensuality, homosexuality, lust of every kind, immoral acts and unnatural lust. However a likely interpretation is that the author of Jude was criticising the men of Sodom for wanting to engage in sexual activities with angels. This reflected a then current myth.

advances over time are ignored when this interpretation is used¹²⁷. The problem with this viewpoint is that it goes against the testimony of history, the testimony of scripture, the testimony of the neurophysiological and psychological analysis and the testimony of Jesus himself. Any attempt at a correct interpretation of this passage must properly consider the relationships between power and sex.

In many respects the first century concepts of sex and sexuality differed greatly from those of today. Leviticus contains lists of prohibitions regarding sexual intercourse. Some of these are determined by the Purity Code but others are more absolute. Earlier attitudes were very different from current perceptions. There is no prohibition of under-age sexual intercourse in the bible and what follows must be considered in the light of the cultural transformations that have occurred. According to the Talmud the prohibitions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13¹²⁸ to same-sex intercourse with boys under the age of nine years and one day were applied in a lesser way or not at all¹²⁹. This is horrific to modern attitudes but it is well written up in the Jewish Halakhic literature. The age of nine years and one day is the age at which a boy was considered to have begun puberty. Below that age a boy was considered to be “Not a male” and he could not be humiliated by being anally penetrated in a sexual act. With girls a lower age limit was applied¹³⁰. In Christianity similar exclusions were applied to eunuchs who were no longer considered male because of the incapacity that was enforced^{131 132 133}. This may

¹²⁷ The term “Sodomy” has been used to describe and condemn acts of same-sex intercourse irrespective of their intent. Homosexuality was first separated out from this blanket condemnation by Karl-Maria Kertbeny around 1870 who applied the term to describe a sexual identity where people are led to express their identities in same-sex loving acts.

¹²⁸ Leviticus 20:13 applies the death penalty to both the active and the passive partner in same-sex intercourse. There are multiple reasons for this prohibition which justify this equality of status. These are discussed in section 7:1 of this document, where it is shown that for the purpose of this analysis, the primary reason for the prohibition was that of power and control.

¹²⁹ Sanhedrin 54b: In the Rabbinic discussion it is stated that: “Rab maintains that only he who is able to engage in sexual intercourse, may, as the passive subject of pederasty throw guilt upon the active offender; whilst he who is unable to engage in sexual intercourse cannot be a passive subject of pederasty. But Samuel maintains: Scripture writes, [And thou shalt not lie with mankind] as with the lyings of a woman. It has been taught in accordance with Rab: Pederasty at the age of nine years and a day”: Thus all sexual acts before this age are not classed as pederasty: http://www.come-and-hear.com/sanhedrin/sanhedrin_54.html : http://www.come-and-hear.com/sanhedrin/sanhedrin_55a.html

¹³⁰ Sanhedrin 55a: A maiden aged three years and a day may be acquired in marriage by coition, and if her deceased husband's brother cohabits with her, she becomes his. http://www.come-and-hear.com/sanhedrin/sanhedrin_55.html

¹³¹ The identification of the prohibitions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 with domination, humiliation, power and sex is also emphasised in section 5:1 of this account. Eunuchs could be exempted from the penalty imposed by the edict issued by Theodosius in 390 since they were regarded not as men or women, but as members of a third sex. (See Wilson, B.E. (2015): *Unmanly Men: Refigurations of Masculinity in Luke-Acts*: p120). The prohibitions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 state “And with a male you shall not lie the lyings of a woman”. Eunuchs, although once male, were considered no longer male. They were excluded from direct influences on the power structures of society: they could only exercise power on behalf of others. Therefore it could be argued within Christianity at the time, that the biblical prohibitions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 did not apply, since no maleness was present. The same arguments were applied in the Jewish context of pre-pubescent sex.

¹³² To be a male meant that one had to have at least in theory the capacity to reproduce. Thus the definition of being male or female was determined, not as in the modern biological sense, but through the capacity to act. A male was defined as someone who had the ability to create babies, and a female was defined as one who had the ability to bear them. A “One Sex” concept was prevalent in first century society, where men and women existed along a continuum. Women were in essence the same as men but their reproductive organs were turned inside out. Eunuchs and pre-pubescent boys did not belong to either sex: and that has significant implications for the way in which the prohibitions in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 could be understood. The threat of being changed from a man to a woman by a malign God or Goddess was not to be dismissed. If this sex transformation was regarded with fear, due to the reduction in status, the reverse transformation from female to male was welcomed in Christianity since this is a way in which the redemption of women could be gained. In the Apocryphal Gospel of Thomas some representation of this concept is put into the mouth of Jesus himself. This Gospel cannot have

have been a legal viewpoint, and the rabbinic traditions always explore every point in every argument; however its practice would have been overwritten by the requirement for love and responsibility in any sexual act¹³⁴. These are difficult topics but one reason for examining them here is to identify the ways in which the prohibitions in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 were applied¹³⁵. What is seen as abuse is culturally determined and the Judean condemnations of the Greek practice of pederasty were vitriolic. To be identified as male or female required the capacity to fulfil the sexual expectations of each role and a “One sex” model was also adopted¹³⁶. Therefore none of the examples that have already been cited can be adequately explained unless the abuses which are being condemned are separated from the sexual act¹³⁷. At some time during the Christian era there was a transformation in attitudes to the act of same-sex intercourse from one which only condemned this intercourse when was used for domination and immoral purposes, to one which defined the act without exception as an abusive act. The nature of that transformation is examined in this analysis. All acts of abuse are utterly condemned by the moral codes of present day society, and in the author’s opinion that condemnation is totally correct. However what is most striking in both these accounts is that it is the consequences of the abuses of same-sex intercourse which are being condemned. it is not the sexual act

The same outlook, which condemned the abuses created by the improper use of same-sex intercourse instead of act itself, is found across many first century Middle Eastern societies. Almost every recorded discussion in the ancient Middle Eastern world was concerned with sexual relationships between men. This applied across most if not all of the ancient Middle Eastern societies. Present day understanding tends to consider that sexual lust is the prime motive in the biblical condemnations of sexual abuse. However it was not the sexual acts which were the prime source of the condemnation, it was the purposes to which they were put. In many societies same-sex intercourse could be expressed as part of a loving act. In these situations the only aspects that could be condemned were the challenges to male status in gender unequal societies, and to the social abuses of the act¹³⁸. In Greek culture same-sex relationships were considered to be a manifestation of the highest form of love.

been written later than 130-250 AD, but some scholars give it a much earlier date. See section 2:3:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*An Unfinished Reformation*”.

¹³³ Acceptance of these ideas of transformation could be taken to condone transgender experience. Nevertheless it should be remembered that transgender people seek gender reassignment to be themselves, and that need is deeper than just a change in body shape. The failure to identify transgender experiences as a search for identity rather than a search for role has caused much harm and distress.

¹³⁴ There are parallels in this viewpoint to the Greek practice of pederasty. Pederasty is a usually erotic relationship between an adult male and a pubescent or adolescent boy - hence the minimum age limit specified in the Talmud. However this Greek practice was violently condemned by Judaism. According to Plato, (424/423 – 348/347 BC, *Phaedrus*; *passim*), pederasty was a relationship and bond, whether sexual or chaste, between an adolescent boy and an adult man outside of his immediate family. It was bounded by rules to prevent its misuse. Its practice dates from the archaic period onwards in Ancient Greece. Pederasty was seen as an educational institution for the inculcation of moral and cultural values as well as a form of sexual expression.

¹³⁵ Modern society condemns sex between an adult and a child in inverse proportion to the age of the child. The younger the child is, the more serious the offence. Talmudic law worked on the reverse scale. Sex with younger children was less significant than sex with older children and in the case of intercourse with a girl the age limit was set at three years. Having intercourse with a girl of this age or above was considered to be an act of betrothal and the man was expected to take her as his wife. No crime was committed if the girl was younger than three years of age, for the sages believed that at this stage in her life the hymen would grow back. Although such acts were permitted in law the Jewish attitudes to love between two people and the other commandments in the Torah regulated the practice. This is made even more clear in Matthew 19:14 when Jesus said, “Let the little children come to me and do not hinder them, for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven.” Here Jesus emphasised the purity of the child. The requirement in Judaism that all such relationships are given and received in love is rightly used today to condemn all aspects of paedophilia, promiscuity and inappropriate sexual acts

¹³⁶ See section 4:3:3 of this document.

¹³⁷ That is also discussed in section 4:2:3 of this document.

¹³⁸ See section 4:2:3 of this document.

Gilchrist, S. (2015): “*Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church*”

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sqen4144@gmail.com

Same-sex intercourse with a junior partner could be regarded as part of the educational process: however it was surrounded by rules and regulations to ensure that issues of power and domination were not involved. This custom is described as pederasty and it was an accepted practice: however attitudes to same-sex intercourse varied greatly between Greek city-states, and across the ancient world. Roman society viewed acts of same-sex intercourse through the perspective of domination and subjection. This meant that same-sex rape was permitted if the penetrated partner was of lesser status. As Christianity spread from the Greek and Jewish world into Roman society, this was one of the first cultural clashes and transformations that it had to face. Pederasty came to be disparaged in Roman thinking because of the attitudes this culture created. Nevertheless that did not prevent this society from continuing to use its privileges of power and domination against those of lesser status in its pursuit of licentious heterosexual and same-sex acts.

Like the Greeks Judaism recognised the legitimacy of love in same-sex relationships. However inside this frequently subjugated Judean society, the horrors that came from male same-sex intercourse were strongly expressed. It has already been shown that the first century interpretation of Leviticus was used to condemn the issues of power and domination rather than the sexual act. That has previously been observed in the condemnation of Sodom and Gomorrah. The same situation is found in an equivalent passage which describes an incident that occurred at Gibeah during the period of the Judges (Judges 19). When sexual misbehaviour in first century Jewish Chavruta partnerships took place, these were likewise condemned as “A lack of respect”¹³⁹. The further back in history one goes, the greater the emphasis there is on the themes of power, domination and the abuses which their privileges allowed; and less on the issues of sex. In the book of Leviticus the Israelites are encouraged not to do as the Egyptians¹⁴⁰ and Canaanites do: (Leviticus 18:3 and 20:23). In the Baal cycle, which describes the myths of the Canaanite Gods and Goddesses, it is shown that the concern was much more about power, rather than sex¹⁴¹. In contrast to the passages in the Bible which today are interpreted as condemning the followers of the Canaanite and neighbouring Gods for sacred prostitution and vile abuses of sex, no combination of the words for prostitution and the sacred are found in any ancient Canaanite texts. All of the ancient sources which describe the cult related activities as “prostitution” are descriptions of outsiders¹⁴². Where bestiality and widespread promiscuity is alleged in the Canaanite tradition, it is found that purposes of these were instead for the protection of virginity and the fostering reproductive acts¹⁴³. In a separate paper: (Gilchrist, S. (2015): “Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church”)¹⁴⁴ it is shown how Jewish attitudes to gender complementarity connected with the earlier Ugaritic Canaanite traditions, where it is shown that the driving forces were concerned with the power of women, and not the abuses of sexual acts. As in the Canaanite tradition; all of the Goddesses who headed the major fertility cults of the ancient Middle East

¹³⁹ See section 3:3:1 Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*An Unfinished Reformation*”.

¹⁴⁰ Contrary to the present day presumptions that these comments concerned sexual depravity, by ancient standards, Egyptian society was a very egalitarian society: See: Tyldesley, Joyce: “*The Status of Women in Egyptian Society*” <https://www.library.cornell.edu/colldev/mideast/womneg.htm>

¹⁴¹ See Gilchrist, S. (2015): “Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

¹⁴² See: Kimuhu, Johnson M. (2008) “*Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions from the Perspective of Ancient Near East and Africa*” Peter Lang. ISBN 1433102005, 9781433102004. See also Greenspahn, Frederick E. (2002) “*Homosexuality and the Bible*” CCAR Journal: A Reform Jewish Quarterly: <http://saupj.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/homosexuality-bible.pdf> and Balch, David L. (1999) “Homosexuality, Science, and the Plain Sense of Scripture” Erdmans. ISBN-10: 080284698X: ISBN-13: 978-0802846983.

¹⁴³ See section 17 of Gilchrist, S: (2013): “*Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/015B-GenderSexualityChurch.pdf> and section 4:4:1 of this document.

¹⁴⁴ <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

were virgins. This was because they could not be sullied by any penetrative act¹⁴⁵. The focus of these cults was on the creation of healthy, fertile and robust offspring rather than the dalliances with sex. These viewpoints are contrary to most present day presumptions: and one purpose of this investigation is to ensure that any incorrect presumptions are removed. When cultural changes and attitudes are examined, very different perspectives are found. The mistake is to read the bible as a historical document instead of a tract which is intended to meet the needs of Judean society. Many of today's studies of ancient religion and cultures presume that the behaviour of the Goddesses cults was focussed on the lust for sex. That is perceived to be the reason for the gender disruption they create, whereas it is shown in this analysis that the primary focus was on the power and politics associated with their own societies. Christianity does this when it condemns the Greco/Roman Goddess cults as being exclusively associated with sexual depravity and licentious acts¹⁴⁶.

The same issues of power, subjection and domination are found in the first century interpretations of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13¹⁴⁷. There is little controversy in the rabbinic tradition about the meaning of these texts. They are translated in various ways but the basic meaning has always appeared quite clear: "And with a male you shall not lie the lyings of a woman, it is an abomination." A similar phrase, "The lying of a male", appears in Numbers 31:18 and this is understood to mean what women experience in intercourse, i.e. penile penetration. The lyings of a woman are plural because she may be penetrated vaginally or anally but a man, missing the vagina, is singly penetrable anally. This interpretation makes it clear that the passages in Leviticus only prohibit the act of same sex anal intercourse and they do not prohibit any other expression of same-sex desires¹⁴⁸. That was the first century understanding. This takes a very specific view but it is quoted widely in the literature, and the meaning of the text appears clear. The ancient rabbis must have had some sense of the need to emphasise this particular interpretation when they ruled nearly two thousand years ago that any same-sex sexual activity short of anal intercourse is not included in the biblical prohibition¹⁴⁹. The same understanding was reaffirmed in the Conservative Judaism's Committee on Jewish Law and Standards in America in December 2006¹⁵⁰. It is also cited by Josephus in "Against Apion"¹⁵¹; and by Philo in "Abraham"¹⁵². These latter two sources were contemporary with Jesus and Paul: That is what both would have known and that understanding would almost certainly have guided the actions of the early Christian Church. There is no biblical or rabbinic prohibition of lesbianism¹⁵³. To put it crudely, women did not matter as far as enforcing the power structures in these male dominated societies were concerned. Therefore no prohibition was required. The bible condemns sexual abuse and

¹⁴⁵ See section 3:1:9 of: Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*".

¹⁴⁶ See section 4:2 of this document.

¹⁴⁷ As with the earlier sections, this part should be read in conjunction with section 3:2 of the third paper in this series: Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁴⁸ The Jewish scriptural prohibitions in Leviticus appear in the context of laws concerning the behaviour of seven specifically named nations which the Israelites were being instructed not to emulate (Leviticus 18: 3, 22, 20: 13, 23; Deuteronomy 23: 18). That denunciation is expressed in terms of cultic rites: this examination considers these in terms of the power relationships between subject and dominant societies. The ability to abuse power gives permission for the abuse of sex.

¹⁴⁹ Maimonides, M. (1135-1204): Perush Mishnayot on Sanhedrin 54a: *Mishneh Torah*. (With analysis of the Babylonian Talmud, Yevamot 54a-56a; Sotah 26b; Niddah 13a).

¹⁵⁰ Dorff, E.N.; Nevins, D.S. and Reisner, A.I. (2006): *Homosexuality, Human Dignity & Halakhah: A Combined Responsum For The Committee On Jewish Law And Standards*. A range of options were presented.

¹⁵¹ Josephus, Flavius (37- c.100): *Against Apion* :2.199: <http://sacred-texts.com/jud/josephus/apion-1.htm>

¹⁵² Philo of Alexandria (c.25BC- 50AD): *Abraham*: 135: <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/yonge/book22.html>

¹⁵³ Maimonides, M. (1135-1204) states in the *Misneh Torah* that his own disapproval of female-female sexual relations reflects neither a biblical or rabbinical prohibition.

just this one sexual act¹⁵⁴. There is no prohibition of anal penetration in heterosexual sex. All other sexual acts are permissible in heterosexual and same-sex relationships, and these include oral sex.

4:4:2 Expression

In this investigation it is identified that, of all sexual acts, the act of anal penetration is unique in enforcing subjection and domination in gender and socially unequal societies. Sexual misbehaviour was strongly condemned, however the misuse of power has been shown to be the dominating feature and the very specific nature of the first century prohibition confirms this purpose¹⁵⁵. In place of today's denunciations, which focus on sex, the condemnations were instead applied to the abuses of power and domination which same-sex rape and intercourse enforce on people and societies^{156 157}. Judgement was made on the purpose for which the act was engaged in; and there was no prohibition of any other sexual act. In common with other first century societies, it is shown that acceptable sex in Judaism was not defined on a gendered basis¹⁵⁸. Emphasis was placed on love in relationships, marriage was almost compulsory, but men could be expected to engage in same-sex intimacies without anal penetration and in heterosexual relationships at any time in their lives¹⁵⁹. Love, care and responsibility were demanded and this was expressed by making the distinction between the noble pursuit of love and the carnal abuse of sex. In Judaism these loving and intense relationships were found in Rabbinic and Chavruta partnerships¹⁶⁰ and from an early date, relationships similar to those of the Jewish Rabbinic partnerships were solemnised in services of Adelphopoiesis in the Christian Church¹⁶¹.

A more contentious topic is concerned with how the freedom of expression should apply to same-sex anal penetrative acts. Even though the condemnations in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, when they are interpreted literally, do condemn acts of same-sex intercourse without qualification, there is no evidence of any punishment, including the prescribed death penalty, ever being applied¹⁶². The standard of evidence required for this by the sages was such that any conviction for that transgression was unlikely to be achieved. In the earlier sections of this paper it has been shown that the abhorrence of same-sex intercourse was due to issues

¹⁵⁴ For comments on masturbation see section 7:1 of this document.

¹⁵⁵ See section 3:1:7 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*. <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁵⁶ Section 4:2:3 in this document describes how the boundaries are set.

¹⁵⁷ In those societies where same-sex intercourse was endorsed as part of a loving relationship, then the only thing that could be condemned is the abuses of the act.

¹⁵⁸ Gilchrist, S. (2014): *"Christianity and Crisis: An Overview of Gender and Sexual Difference in the Early and Modern Christian Church"*.

¹⁵⁹ See section 3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*. <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁶⁰ Greenberg, Steven; (2004): *Wrestling with God and Men: Homosexuality in the Jewish Tradition*

¹⁶¹ See section 10 of: Gilchrist, S. (2011): *Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*

¹⁶² The stated punishment for the wilful violation of this prohibition is the death penalty. However minors under 13 years of age were exempt from this as from any other penalty (Sanhedrin. 54a). Even in Biblical times, it was very difficult to get a conviction that would lead to this prescribed punishment. The Jewish Oral Law states that capital punishment would only be applicable if two men were caught in the act of anal sex, if there were two witnesses to the act, and if the two witnesses warned the men involved that they committed a capital offence, and the two men, (or the willing party in case of rape), subsequently acknowledged the warning, but continued to engage in the prohibited act anyway. There is no account of capital punishment, in regards to this law in Jewish history ever being applied. In the absence of a Sanhedrin and Temple the Rabbinic traditions understand that the Torah's system of capital punishment has not been in effect for the past approximately 2,000 years. Levine, Samuel J. (1997–1998). "Capital Punishment in Jewish Law and its Application to the American Legal System: A Conceptual Overview". *St. Mary's Law Journal* 29: 1037–1051. [accessed 21 June 2016] <http://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=scholarlyworks>

of power and domination. The impact of its expression is treated with horror in Judaism but the specific nature of the first century interpretation given to Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 confirms that the abuses of power were the major concern instead of the pleasures of sex. Through ancient history the condemnations that Judaism applied to acts of same-sex intercourse were focussed entirely on to the abuses that were created. None of them focussed on a horror of the act.

It is appropriate to compare the results of this historical assessment with the conclusions of the neurophysiological and psychological analysis. The widespread expression of same-sex relationships meant that the moral duality exposed by the neurophysiological study could be observed by people in these societies. When this is moral duality accepted it is only the abuses of same-sex acts, including same-sex intercourse that can be condemned, because the condemnation has to be based on the intentions of the act. That is something which Jesus and Peter would have been expected to know, and the nature of their condemnations of Sodom and Gomorrah support this point. Therefore both sets of studies confirm that from the scientific, historical and theological points of view the only legitimate condemnations that can be made are for the abuses of these acts. These results imply that when issues of abuse, and of subjection and domination are not involved, same-sex acts of anal penetration should be treated in the same way as all other sexual acts.

From the considerations of this analysis, that is the logical point of view, but: perhaps most challengingly of all, this position appears to be supported by Jesus himself. This may best be seen in the story of the Centurion and the slave, (Luke, Chapter 7:1-10 and Matthew, Chapter 8:5-13) where the primacy of love outweighs the expectation of the act¹⁶³. This is not just an incident in one story. For a full discussion of this and the other passages see sections 3:4 and in particular, section 3:4:1 "Cross-Cultural Challenges" in Gilchrist, S. (2016): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*. In this instance Jesus is applying his own teaching on the New Covenant, where the prohibitions which were based on the letter of the law are now to be interpreted through the expectations of love and the purity of intention of the acts. If Jesus applied his own teaching on the new Covenant in this way, then perhaps that today is the approach which should be taken to all same-sex anal penetrative acts.

This is a fundamental change, for the prohibition of same-sex intercourse is no longer absolute. Its acceptability now depends on the context in which it takes place. It also alters the understanding from that of an action which Jesus and John could not do, to one that they did not do. In the paper on the *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"* it is similarly shown that the teaching of Jesus corresponds with the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study, and that this teaching contradicts the traditional teaching of the Church: that is for as long as it continues to apply the letter of the Law to these acts¹⁶⁴. Although this prohibition is no longer absolute it is unlikely that Jesus and John themselves would have broken it, and the insistence that John was a virgin is strongly emphasised in the early Church¹⁶⁵. In line with the duality which is demanded by

¹⁶³ One of the duties of the servant or slave of a Centurion was to provide sexual satisfaction when on duty in occupied countries in order to avoid compromising situations with the local population. Modern biblical Greek lexicons usually give a neutral definition of the Greek word translated as "slave" in this passage. However the particular word that is used gives an expectation of this act. For a full discussion of this passage see section 3:4:1 of Gilchrist, S. (2016e): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁶⁴ Gilchrist, S. (2016e): *"Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus"*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁶⁵ Wace, Henry. (2013): *Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature*. See under "John". See also: http://www.goarch.org/special/johntheapostle/index_html

the neurophysiological and psychological study, there is still the total condemnation of abusive sex.

4:5 Teaching and Doctrine

If this investigation takes a radical approach it is because the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study make it essential to question and examine some of the most basic teachings and doctrines of the Christian Church. It shown that transition drift and reinterpretation over a two thousand year history, have enabled these teachings to be interpreted in an exclusive manner, and in ways which now support the traditional doctrines of the Church¹⁶⁶. That process of translation drift and re-interpretation continues in the present day¹⁶⁷. Instead of the message of exclusion, this analysis offers an approach of inclusion instead. That is examined in detail in the third paper of the series¹⁶⁸. For this change to take place only one fundamental alteration is needed. It is that of altering the boundary imposed by the traditional teaching of the Christian Church, from one which condemns all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour whatever its purpose, into one which applies the same standards of morality, duty and behaviour to the full range of gender identities, sexualities, intentions and acts,

The aim is therefore to restore the moral duality that is identified in the scientific investigation, and also in the teaching of Jesus. This is only an adjustment of boundary: there is no increased toleration of inappropriate gender or sexual behaviour. Perhaps controversially, it is shown that this change affirms rather than attacks the foundations of many of the traditional understandings and teachings of the Church¹⁶⁹. That again is fully discussed in the third paper of the series, where it is shown that the acceptance of this change does not diminish the value of the traditional teaching of the Church on the sanctity of marriage and on family life¹⁷⁰. Apart from how the word “marriage” is defined, it simply requires that all people are treated alike¹⁷¹. The difficulties arise over the presumption that because marriage is sanctified, no other form of valid relationship can exist¹⁷².

¹⁶⁶ See section 3:6 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*An Unfinished Reformation*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/016B-UnfinishedReformationArticle.pdf>

¹⁶⁷ This is a problem today, particularly with the freer translations of the bible, where passages come in to line with today’s expectations. For example, in the Living Bible Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 is translated as “Homosexuality is absolutely forbidden, for it is an enormous sin”. The King James Bible instead translates Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 as “Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.” These changes in meaning have brought enormous consequences, for it means that the original and specific condemnation of the one particular act has been transformed without authority into the condemnation of every homosexual relationship and same-sex act.

¹⁶⁸ Gilchrist, S. (2016): “*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁶⁹ See section 4:5:6 of this document

¹⁷⁰ This analysis also supports the view held by GAFCON (the “Global Anglican Future Conference”, representing the conservative elements in the Church) and others that the traditional Church teaching on gender complementarity, gender and sexuality and on the silencing of the public ministry of women has Apostolic Authority. However it argues that these doctrines represent the compromises that were endorsed by Peter and Paul, which were essential to meet the requirements of Roman Society, and were needed to ensure the survival of the Church. It is shown that these were formed by the interpolation of these Jewish traditions into Roman culture. The early Church tried to express the radical teaching of Jesus within them. Thus they represent what was understood within the Jewish and Roman traditions: they do not represent the teaching of Christ. See also section 4:6:4 Resistance in this document.

¹⁷¹ Except for a question about how the word “marriage” is used.

¹⁷² For as long as homosexuality was a criminal offence no evidence of stable same-sex relationship could be found. Popular heterosexual prejudice considered that homosexual behaviour was engaged in entirely for the

Other concerns include a lack of understanding of the identity driven nature of these conditions; which in turn leads to an unfounded fear of predation¹⁷³. These fears are not surprising because sexual abuse which involved same-sex acts of sex was endemic to the first century. The imbalances in power between men and men, the pursuit of sex for its own purposes, the engagement by heterosexual men in same-sex acts of sex to release sexual passions and the abuses arising from subjection and domination in gender and socially unequal societies have all led to the virulent condemnation of all forms of gender and sexual behaviour, and to the scapegoating of these people by the Christian Church. Because of the urgency of these needs, all awareness of the moral duality in gender and sexually variant behaviour has disappeared. The need to battle against these abuses prevented the open acknowledgement of the moral duality and the identity driven characteristics in the biblical history of the early Church. The pressures that these features have created and the denial of this moral duality have led to the development of the traditional teaching of the Church. This is why the present day teaching on gender and sexually variant behaviour contradicts the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study; and it contradicts the teaching of Jesus himself.

However these were not instant adaptations. The development of Christianity during much of the first millennium is examined in a separate paper¹⁷⁴. It is shown that similar disputes continued during this period and there is evidence that Christianity continued to recognise the duality in sexual behaviour, but not in gender, for about the first three hundred years of its existence¹⁷⁵. Today, Paul's condemnations in Romans 1:18-27, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10, are used by many to condemn homosexuality and all forms of gender and sexually variant acts. That would not have been possible in these first century societies. There was a major change near the end of the first millennium from an outlook which focussed on condemning the abuses in society that are created by the abuse of same-sex intercourse, to one which focussed on condemning the sexual act. The reasons and nature of these changes are examined¹⁷⁶. Because of this it is necessary to use the results of the scientific and theological studies to examine how the original condemnations would have been understood by Paul and early Christianity; and to investigate why these have been changed into the present day teaching of the Christian Church. There are also the major fears and prejudices arising from a lack of awareness and misconceptions inside today's societies, and these must also be addressed¹⁷⁷.

gratifications of sex. Therefore loving and faithful relationships could not even be considered. However that perception has now changed. There is evidence that these same sex-relationships can be at least as long lasting as those of heterosexual marriage. See section 11 onwards of Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*":

¹⁷³ This is discussed in Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*A New Approach to Identity and Personality Formation in Early Life*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/218P-InfluencesPersonality.pdf>. It is shown that sexual identity is a core element of personality and it is about being who one is. This is fixed for life, so there is no danger of predation. However heterosexual people can also engage in abusive same-sex acts as well as abusive heterosexual acts. This is why it is so important that the duality inherent in gender and sexually variant people is recognised.

¹⁷⁴ Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*":

<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf>

¹⁷⁵ See section 8:2 "The First Millennium" of Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*":

¹⁷⁶ See section 4:2:3 of this document

¹⁷⁷ History and tradition has played an important part by reinforcing the stereotypes that have been created. In the face of the universal condemnations which Church doctrines have imposed on all types of gender and sexually variant people the natural action of the LGBTI community is to band together in a single common response. Another consequence of this is the creation of a culture which is opposite to what the condemning organisation expects. A many-partnered (but not necessarily promiscuous) lifestyle within the lesbian and gay community is encountered. The criminalisation of homosexual behaviour has also had a major effect in preventing long term same-sex relationships being formed. Each side creates stereotypical images of the other

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church*"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

4:5:1 Paul and Deuteronomy

For a correct assessment of these issues a full consideration of the background is required. Therefore Paul's condemnations of same-sex activities are examined in the light of the moral and psychological dualities identified by the neurophysiological and psychological study, the abyss in perceptions of sexual moralities between the Jewish and Roman cultures, the enforcement of power between subject and dominant societies and the first-century interpretation of these texts. There are additional key features which must also be considered. The first is that attitudes to sexual moralities were not primarily determined on a gendered basis: the distinction was made between the noble pursuit of love and the carnal abuse of sex. Same-sex intercourse was regarded with horror in Judaism and Christianity in the first century: however the condemnation was made on the consequences and the purposes to which the act was put and not on the horror of the act. Paul also placed his condemnations in the context of sexual abuse: what is most striking in the accounts of these first century and earlier societies is that it is the consequences of the abuses of same-sex intercourse which are being condemned: it is not the sexual act. It is shown that the cultural clashes, and the exercise of power and domination by Roman society and its citizens over subject ones, such as Judaism gave permission for the Roman abuses of sex. This meant that same-sex rape of others by members of the dominant society was endorsed, provided the citizen was the penetrating partner in the act. In addition to this Paul used an unusual; and probably his own invented word "Arsenokoitai" in his condemnations¹⁷⁸. There are arguments about what Paul actually meant by this word, but it is frequently believed that he was using it to refer to the first century interpretation of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13¹⁷⁹. That viewpoint is supported in this analysis. Paul was very careful about the meaning he gave to it and his denunciations are set in the context of the abuse of same-sex acts. This means that Paul's own condemnations are bounded by what this first century interpretation of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 meant.

However one question that should be asked is about why there should be any scope for argument or discussion about these passages at all? It is shown earlier that an absolute rule of celibacy in any relationship between Jesus and John had to be maintained if the Church was to obtain respectability in Greco/Roman society¹⁸⁰. Therefore an unambiguous declaration, which could be clearly understood by the Greek and Roman people, would be the ideal statement to make. However Paul did not do this. Without providing a statement requiring total rejection, and by referring back to Leviticus, Paul was testing the acceptability of the Church.

and these reinforce the prejudices and polarisation that is found. This exists on both sides. The breaking down of these stereotypes is a painful process. It also requires significant adjustments within the LGBTI communities, as it must within the Christian Church.. One should not expect the results to be mirror images of each other. The need is for the duality inherent in gender and sexually variant behaviour to be fully accepted and recognised within the LGBTI community. This must be carried out on its own terms, and not on any imposition that others direct. Some of the difficulties involved in this are discussed in a separate account .See:

¹⁷⁸ This word is translated in various ways and there is disagreement about what it means. A common translation of it is "Abusers of themselves with mankind". Arsenokoitai is a compound word: arseno is the word for "a male," and koitai is the word for "mat" or "bed." Put the two halves together, and the word means "a male bed" - that is, a person who makes use of a "male-only bed" or a "bed for males". In this context the word meaning "bed" has been given a sexual connotation - the Greek word koitai is the source of the English word coitus (referring to sexual intercourse) or literally "bed wetting" sex. Interestingly the word itself does not signify abuse. The condemnation of abuse comes from the context in which it is placed. .

¹⁷⁹ See also section 3:1:8 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*":
<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/016B-UnfinishedReformationArticle.pdf>

¹⁸⁰ See section 3:3:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

Many people will argue that Jesus could never have condoned same-sex intercourse because Paul so thoroughly condemned it. However both Paul and Jesus were approaching the same issues from different perspectives. In the story about the Centurion and his slave Jesus was emphasising the power of love and faithfulness. In doing this, and because of the way in which this story is worded, he also was also condoning the same type of relationship between all Centurions and their slaves. In these relationships, same-sex intercourse was a normal expectation¹⁸¹. However Jesus also made it clear that this condonation only applied when the dynamics of power were absent; and when it was the outcome of a loving relationship. Paul was reacting against the sexual abuses which were promoted and enforced through the power and domination of Roman society. Thus Paul's purpose was to condemn same-sex intercourse when that was the outcome of the sexual abuses, exploitations and immoralities which occurred. Both of these approaches are entirely in line with the first century interpretation of Leviticus which prohibited same-sex intercourse when it was the product of abuse, and not because of an intrinsic horror of the act. Both approaches likewise conformed to the first century attitudes to sexual morality, which were not determined on a gendered basis but instead made the distinction between the noble pursuit of love and the carnal abuse of sex. By doing this Paul's teaching was also in line with that of Jesus. For both of them the same distinctions were made between accepting same-sex intercourse given in love, together with severe condemnations of those who pursued it for abusive or antisocial purposes. That reaches a crunch point in this analysis which reflects on how much has changed in the history of the Church.

4:5:2 Continuity, Power and Sex

One feature of this study is an examination of the continuity with Judaism and the compromises that were made by the early Church. That continuity is shown in the way that the first century Jewish interpretation of Leviticus was maintained. It is also demonstrated in the manner that the relationships similar to those expected in first century rabbinic partnerships were carried over and solemnised in services of Adelpopoiesis conducted by the Christian Church. It is further established that an important use of Deuteronomy 22:5 was to enforce social differentiation in gender divided and discriminatory societies and it is shown how these divisions were transferred into the Christian Church¹⁸². No purely literal interpretation of this Deuteronomy passage was ever applied. In addition it is demonstrated how the early Church tried to maintain this continuity with Judaism and express the radical teaching of Jesus within it. However it is clear from the record of the Epistles and Letters of Peter, Paul, John and other writers in the New Testament that compromises had to be made to ensure the survival of the Church, and its ability to take the Gospel message to the World. This analysis investigates the compromises and the processes of transition. Instead of this taking place in an ad-hoc and unplanned matter; it is shown in this account that they were the results of a pragmatic approach.

Establishing the relationships between power and sex has been a key feature of this analysis. For Peter, Paul and the early Church, respectability was sought through the examples of the exemplary lives led by the early Christians, their care for everyone, their moral purity, their good deeds and their preservation of social order within society. However

¹⁸¹ See section 3:4:1 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁸² It is additionally strongly attested from first century and earlier Jewish and Christian sources that the prohibition of cross-dressing in Deuteronomy 22:5 applied only to its use for abusive purposes, as codes for war, and to condemn the gender disruptive behaviour of the Goddess cults. See Gilchrist, S. (2015): "*Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

respectability transforms into authority when it is backed by the power of the state. By the time of the eleventh century the Christian Church claimed to have the power to depose emperors, and in the name of Christianity it had become the holder of supreme secular power over the Christian world¹⁸³. However disgust over the scandals of sexual abuse; its corruption and the abuse of its secular power, most notably by its priesthood, together with the inability of the Church, to live up to the standards that should be expected of a Christian organisation were important elements which promoted the Cathar revolt¹⁸⁴. This revolt was ruthlessly crushed in the Albigensian Crusade¹⁸⁵. Although the defeat was totally complete, one consequence of these disturbances was the recognition by the Church that it needed to liberalise its teaching on gender and sex.

The Dominican Order was set up by St Dominic inside the Catholic Church as an order of preaching to deal with these abuses and to counter what the Church regarded as the heresies of the rebellion¹⁸⁶. One of the motivations for St Dominic himself was his own concerns about the abuses and the failures of the Church¹⁸⁷. However; after the Cathars were defeated, the order was also involved in the task of restoring the power and authority of the Catholic Church. Drawing on the teachings of Aristotle and the Greek philosophers, the Dominican, Thomas Aquinas used the principles of Natural Law¹⁸⁸ for this purpose. He also argued that Natural Law was subject to and had to be interpreted in accordance with Divine Law, which was determined by the theology of the Church. This meant that when natural law was leading to a contrary conclusion, it could be trumped by the theology of the Church¹⁸⁹.

¹⁸³ Pope Gregory VII: (1075): "*Dictatus Papae*": According to the *Dictatus Papae*, the Pope was to be judged by no one. This stated that the Roman Church had never been, and would never be, wrong and it declared the Pope's authority to depose emperors. (See:

<http://faculty.cua.edu/pennington/churchhistory220/topicfive/dictatuspapae.htm>)

¹⁸⁴ Gilchrist, S. 2011: "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*".

¹⁸⁵ Cathar Revolt: See Section 8:4 of Gilchrist, S. 2011: "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*".

¹⁸⁶ The Cathars adopted theological positions directly opposed to Roman Catholic doctrine, at least partly on the grounds that enforcing these doctrines did nothing to exorcise the scandals inside what they perceived was the corrupt organisation of the Church. Thomas Aquinas was a member of the Dominican Order, and this was the background to his work. One of the reforms Aquinas introduced was to increase the freedom of sexual expression within marriage, while at the same time vehemently denying all sexual relationships outside it. To do this Aquinas combined the principles of Natural Law which were developed by Plato, Aristotle and others with the then current theology of the Church. This work by Aquinas has become the foundation of present day teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. However instead of being a teaching that just reflected the Church traditions, it was needed to enforce the control of the Church. It was also built on the Augustinian doctrines and the traditional views of the Roman Catholic Church.

¹⁸⁷ St Dominic met and debated with the Cathars in 1203 during his mission to the Languedoc. He concluded that only preachers who displayed real sanctity, humility and asceticism could win over convinced Cathar believers. He believed that the institutional Church as a general rule failed to meet these requirements. In 1208 St Dominic encountered the papal legates attempting to subdue the Cathar revolt returning in pomp to Rome. To them Dominic administered his famous rebuke: "It is not by the display of power and pomp, cavalcades of retainers, and richly-housed palfreys, or by gorgeous apparel, that the heretics win proselytes; it is by zealous preaching, by apostolic humility, by austerity, by seeming, it is true, but by seeming holiness. Zeal must be met by zeal, humility by humility, false sanctity by real sanctity, preaching falsehood by preaching truth." (See: <http://dictionary.editime.com/Dominicans>). His concerns led eventually to the establishment of the Dominican Order in 1216.

¹⁸⁸ See section: 9:0 in Gilchrist, S. (2011): "*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf> . Also sections 2:1:6 and 3:7:1 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/016B-UnfinishedReformationArticle.pdf>

¹⁸⁹ Aquinas brings up a very striking exception. Any act, which includes fornication, adultery or even rape is not considered a sin at all if it is performed under the command of God. See: *Summa Theologica* I-II, question 94. Article 5, reply to objection 2. "All men alike, both guilty and innocent, die the death of nature: which death of nature is inflicted by the power of God on account of original sin, according to 1 Samuel 2:6: "The Lord killeth and maketh alive." Consequently, by the command of God, death can be inflicted on any man, guilty or innocent, without any injustice whatever. In like manner adultery is intercourse with another's wife; who is allotted to him by

Aquinas based his condemnations on the grounds that all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour were always motivated by lustful desire and in pursuit of what he called the venereal act. This has led to the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church which is described in paragraph 2357 of the Catechism of the Catholic Church, where it states: *“Tradition has always declared that “Homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered.” They are contrary to the natural law. They choose the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved”*¹⁹⁰. This teaching does not reflect any of the concerns about the relationships between power and sex which were a feature of the first millennium and in the early Church. Nor does it reflect the nature of the prohibitions that were applied. Because of these omissions, a compromised version of Christianity is presented to the world. This is one reason why an aim of this investigation is to try to recover the first century understanding of the teaching of Jesus and the Gospel Church

4:5:3 Transformations in the Church

If early Christianity had continued to apply to the social structures of first century Roman Society the same challenges that Jesus had made to the Jewish establishment, it would have been unlikely to survive that attack. For a marginal group existing in a dominant society the need for such compromise was essential: it was vital for the survival of the Church.

It is shown that the legitimacy and authority to make that initial compromise is given in the passage in Matthew 19:12, where Jesus says: “He that is able to receive it let him receive it”. However that status was transformed when Christianity moved from a minority role to one where it exercised the control of power in society; and when it became a dominant group. There was now no justification whatever for it to continue to deny the full expression of the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex. The statement in Matthew 19:12 was not just a statement of compromise, it was also the command for the Christian Church to express in full this radical teaching of Jesus as soon as it was able to do so. By this time, Christianity had achieved domination over kings, empires and secular societies. If Christianity was to continue to be true to the Gospel message, this is a point where, in accordance with the statement Jesus made in this passage, it should have been able to receive, restore and express in full, the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex. That did not happen. If Christianity was to challenge the abuses of power in society it also had to be able to acknowledge its own abuses. However that self-acknowledgement was made impossible by the establishment of Christian doctrines which declared the infallibility of the Church¹⁹¹.

the law emanating from God. Consequently intercourse with any woman, by the command of God, is neither adultery nor fornication. The same applies to theft, which is the taking of another's property. For whatever is taken by the command of God, to Whom all things belong, is not taken against the will of its owner, whereas it is in this that theft consists. Nor is it only in human things, that whatever is commanded by God is right; but also in natural things, whatever is done by God, is, in some way, natural”....

¹⁹⁰Catechism of the Catholic Church: Paragraph 2357. The Second Edition English Translation of the Catechism of the Catholic Church with corrections promulgated by Pope John Paul II on 8 September 1997. “Homosexuality refers to the relations between men or between women who experience an exclusive or predominant sexual attraction toward persons of the same sex. It has taken a great variety of forms through the centuries and in different cultures. Its psychological genesis remains largely unexplained. Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity, Tradition has always declared that “Homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered.” They are contrary to the natural law. They choose the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved.”

¹⁹¹ See section 8:0 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): *“Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships”*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): “Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church”

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

Christianity was now working from a position of secular power in the world. Instead of the attitude of the early Church which was a challenger of authority, it had by this time become the instrument of authority instead. The original necessity for compromise was forgotten, and the doctrines of gender complementarity, which included the silencing of the public voice of women, were written into the theology of the Church¹⁹². These changes meant that the first century interpretation of Leviticus could no longer be used. The challenges which gender and sexually variant behaviour imposed on the religious and secular structures of society had also to be suppressed; and this has given the excuse for the scapegoating of all gender and sexually variant people by the Christian Church.

In the interpretation which the Church now applies to Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 all references to power and domination are absent, the duality that is found in the teaching of Jesus and in the neurophysiological and psychological study is also not recognised. All forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour, whatever their intention and purpose are condemned by this Church teaching as acts of grave depravity, which are intrinsically disordered, that are contrary to the natural law, and which are stated to choose the sexual act to the gift of life. There is a further failure in this teaching because it presumes that the pursuit of these activities is a lifestyle choice, is reward driven and is entirely in pursuit of the lust for sex. Therefore it ignores the identity driven processes through which gender and sexually variant identities are created. There is the total rejection that any of these activities could legitimately be an expression of the outpouring of love.

4:5:4 Contradictions

This approach should be compared to the developments in Christian teaching during the first millennium and to the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study. Earlier in this investigation it has been shown that the specific nature of the first century interpretation of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 demonstrated that the abuses of power were the major concern. What is most striking in the accounts is that it is the social consequences of the abuses of same-sex intercourse which are the focus of condemnation; not the sexual acts. A description of the neurophysiological and psychological study is given in the second paper of the series¹⁹³. In the third paper of the series it is demonstrated that the teaching of Jesus is in line with those results¹⁹⁴. There it is shown on scientific grounds that the features which create the core gender and sexual identities of every person are physiologically rather than behaviourally or cognitively driven. This means that as wide a range of moral attitudes, beliefs and behaviour are to be found amongst gender and sexually variant people as those which exist in society at large. It is further demonstrated that a moral duality must exist, whereby gender and sexually variant people who express their true attractions and identities in ways that conform to the highest moral standards of their own societies should be highly regarded, while those who misuse these relationships must expect to be very severely condemned for their acts.

If the correct understanding is to be recovered it is necessary to return to the early teaching of the Church. It is therefore concluded that what today is regarded as the traditional teaching of the Christian Church on homosexuality and gender and sexually variant behaviour arises from the needs and requirements of the 11th century Church. It does not

¹⁹² See section 2:3:3 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): "*An Unfinished Reformation*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/016B-UnfinishedReformationArticle.pdf>

¹⁹³ Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*A New Approach to Identity and Personality Formation in Early Life*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/218P-InfluencesPersonality.pdf>

¹⁹⁴ Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

represent the Gospel teaching. Furthermore it contradicts the teaching of Jesus himself, and it presents a compromised version of Christianity to the world.

In this analysis the prohibitions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 are examined from the perspectives of the teaching of Jesus, the neurophysiological and psychological study, the doctrines of the New Covenant and the Jewish Midrashim traditions¹⁹⁵. It is confirmed that the abuses of power were the major concern instead of the pleasures of sex. In line with the duality demonstrated in the neurophysiological and psychological study there is total condemnation of abusive sex. It is also shown that in loving, faithful and committed relationships where the dynamics of power are not involved, there should be no prohibition of anal penetration, and the same rules apply equally to heterosexual and same-sex acts¹⁹⁶.

4:5:5 Teaching

Paul summarises the teaching of Jesus in Galatians 3:26-28 when he states: "So in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith, for all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus"¹⁹⁷.

This statement can be tested both from the scientific and the theological perspectives and that is undertaken in this analysis. The neurophysiological and psychological study demonstrates that as wide a range of moral attitudes exist among gender and sexually variant people as there are in the population at large. From the theological point of view, Jesus makes exactly the same distinction in his teaching in the Gospels and the New Covenant, where the prohibitions that were previously based on the letter of the Law are now to be interpreted in the context of love and on the intention of the acts. Therefore, judged from both the psychological and the religious criteria the traditional teaching of the Church on homosexuality and gender and sexual variation is without foundation. From the arguments presented in this document, and from the more detailed considerations which are presented in the additional papers¹⁹⁸, it is demonstrated that in the teaching of Jesus, all transgendered, transsexual, lesbian, gay, heterosexual and bisexual people who attempt to live their lives in ways that fulfil the love of Christ, and who seek to express their own identities in roles that are true to themselves; must be accepted in their own right. The traditional Church teaching which enforces gender complementarity is repudiated. All sexual behaviour is governed by purity of intention and there is no automatic condemnation of any same-sex act.

4:5:6 Accuracy

An unexpected result of this investigation derives from the extent to which it continues to support the traditional teaching of the Christian Church¹⁹⁹. It is shown that the traditional

¹⁹⁵ Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

¹⁹⁶ In heterosexual relationships the bible does not prohibit anal penetrative acts. What this statement is saying is that in loving, faithful and committed same-sex relationships, the same principles should also be applied.

¹⁹⁷ See sections 7 and 8 of: Gilchrist, S. (2015): *Personality Development and Gender: Why We Should Re-think the Process*. Other analyses are given in: Gilchrist, S. (2014): *Christianity and Crisis: An Overview of Gender and Sexual Difference in the Early and Modern Christian Church* and Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹⁹⁸ See for example sections 3:2 to 3:4 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*.

¹⁹⁹ The full discussion of this is contained in section 3:4:2 of the third paper in this series. Gilchrist, S. (2016): "*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

teaching on marriage and family life remains largely intact²⁰⁰. This analysis also supports the views held by GAFCON (the “Global Anglican Future Conference”, representing the conservative elements in the Church) and others that the traditional Church teaching on gender complementarity, gender and sexuality and on the silencing of the public ministry of women has Apostolic Authority. However, contrary to the GAFCON viewpoint, this analysis argues that these doctrines represent the compromises that were endorsed by Peter and Paul, which were essential to meet the requirements of Roman Society, and which were needed to ensure the survival of the Church. It is shown in this account that these were formed by a prompt interpolation of the Jewish traditions into Roman culture. The early Church tried to express the radical teaching of Jesus within them. Therefore they represent what was understood within the Jewish and Roman traditions: they do not represent the teaching of Christ²⁰¹.

The results of the study also demonstrate the extent of the continuity between first century Judaism and the early Christian Church. This is indicated in the way that the first century Jewish interpretation of Leviticus was maintained, in the continued application of Judean expectations of gender complementarity within Roman society and the manner in which relationships similar to those expected in first century rabbinic partnerships were carried over and were solemnised in services of Adelpopoiesis conducted by the Christian Church²⁰². It is demonstrated how the early Church tried to maintain this continuity with Judaism, and at the same time express the radical teaching of Jesus within it. However the need to gain acceptance in first century Roman society meant that this could not be complete. A description of this is provided in section 4:3:2 of this document which examines how the necessary transformations and their compromises were enacted; and it is shown how this would have taken place in the context of a pragmatic approach.

The Gospel of John makes it clear that John was the beloved disciple of Jesus, and the special nature of that love is freely described. There are strong indications uncovered in this analysis that Jesus and John may themselves have formed a chavruta partnership. Although the disciples of John may have been the author of John’s Gospel, the existence of such a chavruta partnership would give a far greater depth and credence to the teaching of Jesus which is presented in the Gospel of John, than it would be possible for any other relationship to provide. The failure of the Christian Church to express in full the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex once it had gained the power to do so, has also brought a compromised version of Christianity to the present day world.

A presumption made by this doctrine is that, because marriage between a man and a woman is a sanctified relationship, all other forms of relationships are inherently sinful and no other form of valid relationship which is based on love could exist. This is shown to create a Christian doctrine which contradicts the results of the neurophysiological and psychological

²⁰⁰ See also section 3:4:2 of Gilchrist, S. (2016): “*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

²⁰¹ See also section 4:7:3 of this document.

²⁰² See section 10 of: Gilchrist, S. (2011): “*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*”, Also Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*Reform and the Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/008B-ReformChristianChurchArticle.pdf>. Relationships in first century rabbinic partnerships are examined in section 3:3:2 of the third paper. Gilchrist, S. (2016): “*Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>. These partnerships demanded that the relationships were between two equals and it is shown that same-sex partnerships conforming to the same requirements were solemnised in services of Adelpopoiesis by the Christian Church. Although surviving liturgies for the solemnisation of these partnerships contain elements that were common to those of marriage, these were quite definitely not regarded as marriages. However the paradox is that they had more in common with the present day definitions of marriage than any first century marriage could present

study that underpins this work. The teaching of Jesus and the early Church is examined against the first century background. In the third paper of this series it is shown how translation drift and re-interpretation of key passages have been used to deny the moral duality inherent in gender and sexually variant behaviour and to reinforce what are currently considered to be the traditional doctrines of the Church.

The consequences of translation drift and re-interpretation are investigated with the aim of separating the teaching of Jesus from the adaptations that occurred. The moral duality that is inherent in gender and sexually variant behaviour would also have been known to Jesus, John, Paul and the others because of their encounters with first century societies where same-sex relationships were widely expressed. It is shown that the message of Jesus agrees with the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study; and that the same moral duality is encountered in the teaching he presents.

It is affirmed that Paul correctly summarises the teaching of Jesus when he states in Galatians 3:26-29: *“For in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith. As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus. And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s offspring, heirs according to the promise”*. It is additionally demonstrated in this investigation that the recovery of this teaching of Jesus can be achieved by altering the boundary imposed by the traditional teaching of the Christian Church: from one which condemns all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour whatever its purpose, into one which applies the same standards of morality and duty to the full range of gender identities, sexualities, intentions and acts. In accordance with the teaching of Jesus in the New Covenant, there is no condemnation of any heterosexual, cross-gender and same-sex behaviour or acts of sex when these are governed by the love, the purity of intention, the commitment and the faithfulness which the Gospel message expects.

There are only two situations in the New Testament where Jesus allowed compromise to his teaching. One of these is Matthew 19:12, where he says: “He that is able to receive it let him receive it”. Some initial compromise was essential if the Church was to survive in first century Roman society and to take the Gospel message to the world. It is shown that this passage gave the authority for the compromises to be made²⁰³. However that was not just a statement of compromise. It was also the command for the Christian Church to express in full the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex as soon as it had the power to do so. Today that has still not happened. If those initial compromises were responses to needs of first century Roman Society: they no longer apply. Therefore it is now time to follow in full this commandment of Jesus, and restore the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex to the present day Church.

In this investigation a continuous pattern of development is set out, which traces the history of the Christian Church from its beginning to the present day. Unlike other attempts at analysis, there is little need for the interpolations, insertions, adaptations and changes to the original New Testament texts that are alleged to have been anonymously made by later writers in the early Church. It can be assumed that the writers of the Gospel of John remained true to John’s message. It is also shown that this applies in the Letters and Epistles of Peter Paul and John, when their authorship is in doubt.

²⁰³ See section 3:5:3 in Gilchrist, S. (2016): *“Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus”*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

This is not a neutral analysis because it uses the results of the neurophysiological study to conduct a critique of the Christian Church. The danger of this approach is that it can create its own agenda. Therefore its success or failure depends upon whether it brings a greater or lesser understanding to the development of the Christian tradition and to the teaching of Jesus himself. New insights are gained by using the results of the neurophysiological and psychological study to remove the armour of the theological presumptions on gender and sexuality, which have dominated both Church and society during the last two thousand years. In the author's view, this investigation has succeeded in bringing deeper insights into the history and development of Christianity, a greater understanding to the meaning of the Gospel Message, and greater insights into the life and teaching of Christ.

4:6 Implications

4:6:1 Science and Theology

This investigation combines theology and science in a study on how personality and self-identity, including gender and sexual variant forms, is created and how these affect people in everyday life. In terms of understanding the origins and characteristic of these conditions theology is unimportant because it cannot abrogate scientific results. On the other hand theology is very important because of the horrors that can be created through ignorance or the incorrect interpretation of those results. This analysis also shows that a contradiction occurs between the conclusions of the scientific investigation and the theology of the Church. In the second paper of the series it is demonstrated that the application of this theology results in the wrong medical diagnoses being made. The management methods that are required are almost opposite to one another and great psychological and medical harm has been done because the wrong techniques have been applied.

4:6:2 Gender Complementarity

Far from any capitulation the adoption of gender complementary was of great advantage to the Church, who could better fulfil its mission of transferring the distinctive views of the minority Jewish religion into the dominant culture of the Greco/Roman state. This meant confronting the self-centred moralities of the culture and the sexual values which were characteristic of Greco/Roman male dominated society. It additionally meant challenging and usurping the power structures which are formed inside the powerful and dominant societies by placing the concern for the victims and the suppressed first on the religious and the social agendas of their cultures, and by embracing an all-encompassing morality which is founded on compassion, nurturing and love. By endorsing the framework of Greco/Roman society, Christianity could now work within it to challenge all abuses of power and sex. For Jesus and for the Christian Church the Gospel of Christian Love did, and does, apply to all people and all aspects of life. In a world today obsessed by sex, it is too easy to forget the successes this brought. The author continues to work within the Church of England to change it rather than disrupt it for there is much more to Christianity than these issues of gender and sex.

A major feature of gender complementarity comes from the way it separates the male from the female roles. Any form of gender and sexually variant behaviour, for any purpose challenges this distinction and it may be seen as a danger to the social order. Peter and Paul reflected these concerns by declaring that in public women should submit to men. Therefore every departure from the stereotypical behaviour expected of men and women becomes a challenge to the respectability sought by the Church. The more severe gender discrimination

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

sgen4144@gmail.com

becomes the greater is the threat that this creates. Contraventions of the social order can therefore be called “disordered acts”²⁰⁴. By adopting this policy Christianity had changed its allegiance. Instead of challenging the orthodoxies of gender complementarity Christianity became an enforcer of them. As a consequence a strong and stereotypical masculine orthodoxy was demanded²⁰⁵ and this transformation has led to what is accepted today as the traditional teaching of the Church. Contrary to the Gospel teaching, the total condemnation of all expression of gender and sexually variant behaviour, for any purpose, became and still continues to be the official teaching of the Church.²⁰⁶

4:6:3 Scapegoating and Discrimination

It is important to note that discrimination against gender and sexually variant people is a socially led phenomenon and it would be a mistake to identify its cause with religious belief. The transformation needed to gain acceptability in the Greco/Roman culture brought the Church to collude with these secular demands of society rather than to challenge them. Not only has this consent reinforced the secular prejudices of such discriminatory societies; it gave and it still gives religious legitimacy to them, it reinforces the severity of the penalties that are encountered and it contradicts the results which the neurophysiological and psychological analysis presents. Instead of recognising the moral duality which is inherent in gender and sexual behaviour, without exception all of these people have been made the scapegoats for abusive sex. Harm has been done by the medical misdiagnoses that have been and are being made. The persecution and slaughter of gender and sexually variant people, not only in Christianity but in Islam, Judaism and all other religions, states and cultures which have drawn their teachings from this has been enormous, and repentance is needed for these acts.

4:7 Current Issues

Material for this section is extracted from the fifth paper in this series: Gilchrist, S. (2016): “*The Perceptions of Gender and Sexual Variation in Present Day Society and in the Modern Christian Church*”²⁰⁷.

4:7:1 Social Changes

The results of this analysis have demonstrated that the knowledge and acceptance of this moral duality in gender and sexually variant behaviour is present in the ministry of Jesus, and that it was also understood by first century society. In this investigation it is also shown how and why this awareness has been lost, and how subsequent centuries of criminalisation and condemnation have prevented any awareness of this moral duality being restored.

²⁰⁴ See sections 4:2 and 4:3:2 of this document.

²⁰⁵ Paul’s own condemnation of “Soft Men” should be noted (1 Cor. 6:9-10). In the *Paedagogus* (the Instructor) Clement of Alexandria; writing in the second century, gives an extensive discussion which defines the appropriate standards for Christian clothing and behaviour. It is clear from this that orthodoxy is expected. (Clement of Alexandria (ca 195): *The Paedagogus* (The Instructor) Book III. Also: Bercot, David W. Ed: (1998): *Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs*: p. 445.)

²⁰⁶ This was reaffirmed on the 24th October 2015 at the closing of the meeting of the October 2015 meeting of the Synod on the Family: Pullella, P (2015): *Pope, Ending Synod excoriates Bishops with Closed Hearts*: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/10/25/us-pope-synod-idUSKCN0SH2O620151025>

²⁰⁷ <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/221P-InfluencesToday.pdf>

Little change could take place for as long as these attitudes continued, however the social and cultural transformations in Western societies over the last fifty years have demolished the presumptions upon which the traditional teaching of the Christian Church on gender and sexually variant behaviour has been based. Freedom of expression has again revealed the moral duality which is inherent in gender and sexually variant behaviour and people can now find out for themselves what this involves. Nevertheless in gender discriminatory societies of the present day these condemnations can still have considerable force. Instead of exploring this new situation many Christians have taken refuge in the traditional doctrines of the Church. It is argued in this analysis that the authority and credibility of Christianity and the Church is today being destroyed by a fervent reliance on disproved traditional demands. The reasons that are given for maintaining the traditional viewpoints are founded on the “Godly Authority” of bible texts, and this is why a critical analysis of these texts has been made.

4:7:2 Conflict and Dissent

There are many people in the world today who are honestly, faithfully and assiduously following from different viewpoints what they believe to be the correct Christian teaching, who all are concerned about what is happening in the Christian Church. Evidence for that concern is seen in the establishment of the “Shared Conversations” process in the Church of England²⁰⁸ and in the “Synod on the Family”²⁰⁹ called by Pope Francis in 2014. However preconditions were set by the Church hierarchies²¹⁰. These preconditions, which still apply, demand that there must be no change to the traditional teaching of the Church. If any discussions are to succeed; that is a great hurdle which has still to be overcome. The long history of opposition to the possibility of change has been documented by the author elsewhere²¹¹; and the continued refusal is considered to be destroying the credibility, not just of the Churches, but of all Christian belief.

Nevertheless some positive changes have occurred. In the “Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation on the Synod on the Family” released in 2016 by Pope Francis²¹², the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church on homosexuality and same-sex relationships is reaffirmed. However there are no condemnations, no use of the of language of “intrinsic disorder”, there is also a nuance applied to use of language like same-sex attraction, and an actual recognition of homosexual orientation, which is very significant in a document of this type²¹³.

²⁰⁸ Shared Conversations: See: Church of England (2015) Grace and Disagreement article: Grace and Disagreement Shared Conversations on Scripture, Mission and Human Sexuality: [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <https://churchofengland.org/media/2165248/grace2.pdf> . Also: Church of England (2015) Shared Conversations Website: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.sharedconversations.org/>

Gilchrist, S. (2014) *Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/018B-ControversoryAndCrisis.pdf>

²⁰⁹ Vatican (2013): Synod on the Family: Preparatory Document: *Pastoral Challenges To The Family In The Context Of Evangelization*

²¹⁰ The Pilling Report did leave open the door to the possibility of a change, but urged great caution

²¹¹ Gilchrist, S. (2014) *Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church*: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/018B-ControversoryAndCrisis.pdf>

²¹² Pope Francis. (2016): “*Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Amoris Laetitia Of The Holy Father Francis To Bishops, Priests And Deacons Consecrated Persons Christian Married Couples And All The Lay Faithful On Love In The Family*”: [Accessed: 18 April 2016] https://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20160319_amoris-laetitia_en.pdf

²¹³ Cornwell, Megan (2016): “Amoris Laetitia: Reaction From The Catholic Community”; The Tablet 08 April 2016: <http://www.thetablet.co.uk/news/5397/0/amoris-laetitia-reaction-from-the-catholic-community>

4:7:3 Resistance and Condemnation

There is much to be welcomed in the increasing pastoral concern being expressed for gender and sexually variant people. However that is not enough. In those societies which have outlawed gender discrimination the continued pursuit of these traditional doctrines will increasingly undermine the credibility and the moral authority of the Church. In societies which institutionalise the division in gender role, the continuing pursuit of these doctrines will result in its collusion with society to scapegoat all gender and sexually variant people as purveyors of abusive sex. That is at the heart of the present schism in the Anglican Communion where some provinces are trying to find ways to endorse same-sex marriages while other provinces are supporting long prison sentences for all people who engage in any form of same-sex act of sex. Death sentences or life imprisonment are being proposed in some countries²¹⁴. In the United States, the legalisation of same-sex marriage by the Federal Government has resulted in a rash of mainly Southern states seeking to scapegoat transsexual people by legally enforcing them only to use toilets and bathroom facilities which correspond to the genitalia they were born with. This is irrespective of their gender identities and the transformations that they make. That position was supported by Cardinal Robert Sarah, Archbishop emeritus of Conakry (Guinea) and Prefect of the Congregation of Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments in the Catholic Church, during the address he gave to the, 12th Annual National Catholic Prayer Breakfast held on Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Washington DC. The Cardinal's address can be seen on the link provided²¹⁵. Not only did the Cardinal support the movement to impose the bathroom ban, he also declared that gender identity and sexual orientation are defined by the biology of sex. That not only contradicts the results of this investigation, it contradicts much of the current medical and psychological understanding, and it disregards the physiological fact that external appearance is only one of the many factors which are involved in determining an individual's biological sex²¹⁶.

From a pastoral point of view there are changes which can be strongly welcomed²¹⁷. However there is still the refusal to consider any changes in the doctrines of the Church. In Paragraph 251 of the "Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation on the Synod on the Family"; the

²¹⁴ In Mauritania, Sudan and northern Nigeria, homosexuality is punishable by death. In Uganda, Tanzania, and Sierra Leone, offenders can receive life imprisonment for homosexual acts. In addition to criminalizing homosexuality, Nigeria has enacted legislation that would make it illegal for straight family members, allies and friends of the LGBT to be supportive. According to Nigerian law, a straight ally "who administers, witnesses, abets or aids" any form of gender non-conforming and homosexual activity could receive a 10-year jail sentence. South Africa has the most liberal attitudes toward gays and lesbians, with a constitution which guarantees gay and lesbian rights and legal same-sex marriage (Wikipedia).

²¹⁵ Address given by Cardinal Robert Sarah, Archbishop emeritus of Conakry (Guinea) and Prefect of the Congregation of Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments in the Catholic Church to the 12th Annual National Catholic Prayer Breakfast Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Washington DC. [accessed 14 June 2016]: <https://catholicprayerbreakfast.com/2016-video/>

²¹⁶ Biological sex markers See: Ainsworth, Claire. (2015): "Sex redefined" The idea of two sexes is simplistic. Biologists now think there is a wider spectrum than that": *Nature* 518, 288–291:19 February 2015 doi:10.1038/518288a <http://www.nature.com/news/sex-redefined-1.16943> . Also: Gooren, Louis. (2006): "The biology of human psychosexual differentiation". *Hormones and Behavior* 50 (2006) 589–601. [Accessed 21 June 2016] <http://www.eulabs.eu/Downloads/gooren06.pdf>

²¹⁷ In the Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation on the Synod on the Family, Pope Francis urged the church to "reaffirm that every person, regardless of sexual orientation, ought to be respected in his or her dignity and treated with consideration", while "every sign of unjust discrimination" is to be carefully avoided, particularly any form of aggression or violence. But the pope stopped short of pushing for a change in church doctrine. "De facto or same-sex unions, for example, may not simply be equated with marriage". However the church's traditional definition of same-sex relationships as "intrinsically disordered" is notably absent from the exhortation. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/apr/08/pope-francis-urges-compassion-for-all-in-landmark-statement-on-family-values-catholic-church>

Synod Fathers observed that, “as for proposals to place unions between homosexual persons on the same level as marriage, there are absolutely no grounds for considering homosexual unions to be in any way similar or even remotely analogous to God’s plan for marriage and family”. The continued refusal to make any change in the traditional Church doctrines was again confirmed, although the statement that homosexuality is intrinsically disordered no longer appears²¹⁸.

In the Anglican Communion, the Primates meeting in January 2016 in Canterbury censured The Episcopal Church of America for proceeding without authority on the issue of same-sex marriage²¹⁹. However it managed to avoid a complete schism in the Communion. A period of grace of three years for further study was allowed, but there was little coming together of minds. This was followed by a meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in Lusaka, Zambia between 8-19th of April 2016. After that meeting, the Primates Council of GAFCON (the “Global Anglican Future Conference”, representing the conservative elements in the Church) met in Kenya on the 22nd of April and issued a Communiqué²²⁰. It contained the attached appendix referring to the recent meeting of the Consultative Council²²¹. From this appendix, it is clear that their condemnation of the other churches in the Anglican Communion is based entirely on the authority of scripture as they traditionally interpret it and upon the “Godly Order” expected within the Church: their demand is for the repentance of the rest of the Church. What that means is challenged by this analysis. If this

²¹⁸ Pope Francis. (2016): “*Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Amoris Lætitia Of The Holy Father Francis To Bishops, Priests And Deacons Consecrated Persons Christian Married Couples And All The Lay Faithful On Love In The Family*”. Paragraph 251: “In discussing the dignity and mission of the family, the Synod Fathers observed that, “as for proposals to place unions between homosexual persons on the same level as marriage, there are absolutely no grounds for considering homosexual unions to be in any way similar or even remotely analogous to God’s plan for marriage and family”. It is unacceptable “that local Churches should be subjected to pressure in this matter and that international bodies should make” financial aid to poor countries dependent on the introduction of laws to establish ‘marriage’ between persons of the same sex”. [Accessed: 18 April 2016] https://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20160319_amoris-laetitia_en.pdf

²¹⁹ Anglican Communion: (2016) Communiqué from the Primates of the Anglican Communion: 15 Jan 2016: “Walking Together in the Service of God in the World” <http://www.primates2016.org/articles/2016/01/15/communique-primates/>

²²⁰ GAFCON Nairobi Communiqué 2016: <http://gafcon.org/2016/04/22/nairobi-communique-2016/>

²²¹ Appendix to the GAFCON Nairobi Communiqué 2016 : *From Canterbury to Lusaka*

“Last January, we spent time together at the Primates Gathering contending for a restoration of godly order within the Anglican Communion. The sanctions passed at that meeting were not in themselves capable of restoring order, but they were a potential first step.

At that meeting, we acknowledged the reality of the “significant distance” between us and “expressed a desire to walk together” if possible. This distance was created when The Episcopal Church walked away from the Anglican Communion’s doctrine on sexuality and the plain teaching of Scripture.

Within hours of the meeting’s end the public responses from many bishops, clergy, and lay people of The Episcopal Church made it clear that they did not desire to share the same journey. The biblical call to repentance is a call to make a 180 degree turn. It grieves us that many in The Episcopal Church have again rejected this call. While we desire to walk together, until there is true repentance, the reality is that they are deliberately walking away from the Anglican Communion and the authority of Scripture at a distance that continues to increase.

The recent meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in Lusaka, Zambia has again highlighted the inability of the current instruments to uphold godly order within the Communion. Delegates from the Episcopal Church, by their own admission, voted on matters that pertained to polity and doctrine, in defiance of the Primates. This action has damaged the standing of the Anglican Consultative Council as an instrument of unity, increased levels of distrust, and further torn the fabric of the Communion.

Nonetheless, we give thanks that these events have brought further clarity, and drawn GAFCON closer together in the mission of the Gospel. We are of one mind that the future of the Anglican Communion does not lie with manipulations, compromises, legal loopholes, or the presentation of half-truths; the future of our Communion lies in humble obedience to the truth of the Word of God written. What others have failed to do, GAFCON is doing: enabling global fellowship and godly order, united by biblical faithfulness. This unity has provided us with great energy to continue to work for the renewal of the Anglican Communion”.

Gilchrist, S. (2015): “Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church”

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

sgen4144@gmail.com

“Godly Order” means an absolute return to the traditional teaching of the Church, then it means a return to the compromised teaching of the 11th Century Church. The question is who should repent? Is it those who enforce this traditional Church teaching? Or is it those who seek to recover the radical teaching of Jesus himself?

Some years previously the Church of England report of the House of Bishops Working Group on Human Sexuality, or the Pilling Report²²², which was commissioned in January 2012, acknowledged that there could be the possibility of change in the traditional teaching of the Church on gender and sexual variation, but it urged that great caution be exercised before adopting it. The recent pronouncements by GAFCON and others deny even the possibility of such change. That resistance is not new and there is a long history behind it. That is discussed in the fifth paper in this series and it has also been documented by the author elsewhere²²³. The refusal to engage in these issues still continues. The condemnations by Cardinal Robert Sarah, the bathroom ban in the southern United States, the activities of GAFCON, the support by the Church for criminalisation of homosexual behaviour and its endorsement of the extreme penalties that are imposed in some countries demonstrate that the scapegoating of gender and sexually variant people remains alive and well in the Christian Church.

Despite all of the evidence that is available many Christian Churches, continue to stick rigidly to the traditional doctrines. That rigidity is shown the Apostolic Exhortation released by Pope Francis in 2016, where the total refusal to consider homosexual unions to be in any way similar or even remotely analogous to God’s plan for marriage and family denies the moral duality that is shown by the analysis: it discounts the nature of first century Jewish relationships and it ignores the social changes in societies which demonstrate that in some respects the relationships of Adelphopoiesis had more in common with the present day understanding of marriage than any first century understanding of marriage could present²²⁴. The traditional Church teaching defines marriage as a: “Lifelong union between a man and a woman”. The author would have no problem with this if corresponding same-sex unions were fully recognised with a different word. However that has not happened. In the eyes of society outside it, and in the view of the author, this continuing intransigence is destroying the moral authority of the Church. It is now society which is determining what the word marriage means: it is not the Church.

The public attitudes to the same-sex behaviour which is openly experienced in many societies at the present time would also have been known to Jesus, John, Paul, and to all others in a first century society where these same-sex relationships were widely expressed. By condemning all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour the traditional teaching of the Church has diverted its concerns away from the real issues of the practice by all men of illicit, abusive and promiscuous sex. That universal condemnation has enabled the Church to make all gender and sexually variant people the scapegoats for abusive sex, and the present day changes in society have exposed the failures of the Church. Today it is the clashes between what is seen by society as the common sense values, and the fervent reliance by the Church on its traditional doctrines, which is destroying the credibility of

²²² Report of the House of Bishops Working Group on Human Sexuality (The Pilling Report) Published: 28/11/2013: Church House Publishing ISBN-13: 9780715144374 ISBN-10: 0715144375
http://www.churchofengland.org/media/1891063/pilling_report_gs_1929_web.pdf

²²³ Gilchrist, S. (2014): “*Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/018B-ControversoryAndCrisis.pdf>

²²⁴ Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*Reform and the Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/008B-ReformChristianChurchArticle.pdf> . Also Section 10 of Gilchrist, S. (2011): “*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf>

Christianity in the eyes of the world. Change is urgently required, but it is not change which departs from the Gospel message, it is change which returns to the Gospel texts.

4:8 Conclusions

There are two elements to this analysis. One is the neurophysiological and psychological investigation into the formation of personality and self-identity in early life. The second is a theological investigation which uses the results of the scientific study to conduct a critique of the Christian Church. It is concluded that there is a contradiction between the results of the scientific investigation and the current theological approach. Social attitudes and Christian theology have largely hidden this contradiction. Because of this great harm has been done, and is still being done, by the medical misdiagnoses that are made.

The purpose of the theological analysis is to find out why this contradiction occurs. An extended theological analysis has been conducted which examines the cultural values of the surrounding first century and earlier societies; and compares these with the teaching of the Church. From all of these standpoints it is demonstrated that a moral duality is encountered in gender and sexually variant behaviour is encountered, which demands the welcome of cross-gender activities and same-sex relationships which are the outpourings of love and faithfulness, while condemning those that are pursued for abusive and illicit sex. It is also established that identical criteria in relation to use and abuse should be applied to heterosexual and same-sex acts of sex. There is no diminution of moral standards and no condonation of abusive sex.

It is shown that this contradiction is absent in the Gospel message, and that the teaching of Jesus agrees with the conclusions of the neurophysiological and physiological study. Paul summarises that teaching in Galatians 3:26-28 when he states: *“So in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith, for all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus”*. It is demonstrated that all transgender people, transsexual lesbian, gay, heterosexual and bisexual people who attempt to live their lives in ways that fulfil the love of Christ, and who seek to express their own identities in roles that are true to themselves; must be accepted in their own right. All sexual behaviour is governed by the purity of intention and there is no automatic condemnation of any same-sex act.

That contradicts what today is regarded as the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church on homosexual practices, and by implication on all gender and sexual variant behaviour. This teaching decrees that without exception, all gender and sexually variant behaviour is disordered, it is always in pursuit of lust, it denies the gift of life and it concentrates entirely on the sexual act. It also considered to be a lifestyle choice in which any form of expression of this behaviour is a mortally sinful act. The changes in doctrine and in society are examined in this investigation. It is concluded that what today is considered to be the traditional doctrines of the Christian Church on sexual and gender variance rest on a false foundation. They come from the need to gain respectability in Roman society. They do not come from the teaching of Jesus himself. For its survival and to enable it to take the Gospel message to the world, Christianity adopted a form of gender complementarity which was

Gilchrist, S. (2015): “Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church”

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Access via: <http://www.tqdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

sqen4144@gmail.com

amenable to Roman culture. The failures of this would lead to major misuses in the later Church²²⁵.

It is shown that these transformations in outlook occurred as the Church moved from being a minority and suppressed group in society to an organisation which became the dispenser of power and authority. Instead of its earlier stance which had focussed on condemning the abuses of sexual power and behaviour by dominant peoples inside gender and socially unequal societies; it now dismissed these power elements in the doctrines it created²²⁶. With this denial the purpose of all forms of gender and sexually variant behaviour could only be deemed to be in pursuit of the lust for sex. Any possibility of recognising love in relationships and the moral duality that is present in the teaching of Jesus was lost. The universal nature of this condemnation has allowed sections of the Church to collude with the scapegoating of all gender and sexually variant people by secular society and to endorse the criminalisation of their acts. With the support of the Christian Church extreme penalties are today being applied for engagement in gender and sexually variant behaviour in many parts of the world.

It is therefore concluded that an urgent priority must be that of bringing back the radical teaching of Jesus on gender and sex to the Christian Church. That can be achieved by changing the boundary between unacceptable and acceptable behaviour from the traditional condemnation of all gender and sexually variant behaviour into one which expresses the moral duality which has been identified in the teaching of Jesus, and discovered in the neurophysiological and psychological study. From all of these standpoints this investigation demonstrates that identical criteria in relation to use and abuse should be applied to all forms of gender and sexual behaviour, including all heterosexual and same-sex acts of sex. In line with the teaching which Jesus presents in the New Covenant, all moral decisions should only be made on the pureness of the love, responsibility and intentions that are involved in these acts. Changing the boundary also exposes the true challenges that should be faced. The fundamental need is for the Church to tackle the major issues of promiscuity, prostitution, sexual slavery and abuse which are endemic in many areas of the world, irrespective of sexual orientation, gender differences, and how these arise. Instead of centuries of making homosexuality the scapegoat for sexual abuse, the real issue is one of combatting all forms of abusive sex. That is an issue which everyone should be able to agree on, churches in Africa, liberal and conservative churches in the West, Orthodox Churches and many gender and sexually variant people themselves.

The early Christian Church described the moral duality which was identified in this analysis in terms of "The Way of Darkness" and "The Way of Light". The same early Church set out to be a beacon of light, shining out to the hostile and discriminatory society around it. However the Gospel message which demanded true equality and fairness for all people did not last. One might argue that this light began to be extinguished for sexually and gender variant people by the transformation of the Gospel message into doctrines which looked for respectability, authority and continuity inside the gender discriminatory and socially unequal societies that surrounded the Church. In a Christian Church which lives true to the vision of the New Covenant; all behaviour should be governed by purity of intention, and all people must be accepted in their own right. This analysis does not diminish in any form the rightful condemnation of the way of darkness. There is no condonation of abusive acts. Instead it identifies the way of light for all gender and sexually variant people who seek to live their lives in ways that are true to their own identities in the Love of Christ. That light will shine most strongly in places where there are discriminatory societies around it. Whatever the cost

²²⁵ See section 2:2:5 of Gilchrist, S. (2013): *An Unfinished Reformation*

²²⁶ The doctrines of the infallibility of the Church stopped it from acknowledging its own abuses of power in society.

to the organisation may be, surely the mission of every Church today must be to rekindle this beacon of light.

Despite the urgency of these matters the unwillingness to change and engage seriously in these discussions still continues. Opportunities for discussion and resolution were made available during the Anglican Primates meeting in January 2016 and at a later Anglican Consultative Council meeting. However subsequent statements have emphasised the divisions that exist. The “Shared Conversations” discussions in the Church of England were intended to promote a process of reconciliation. The stated objective of these is to obtain “Good Disagreement”. The results of the “Shared Conversations” process are due to be discussed in the Church of England General Synod in July 2016, but a recent statement made by David Porter, the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Chief of Staff, and formerly Director of Reconciliation, indicates that he expects that schism may be unavoidable²²⁷. The tensions between GAFCON and the more liberal wings of the Anglican Communion are increasing. This investigation uses the results of a scientific investigation to conduct a critique of the Christian Church. These arguments are not just about theology. Regrettably the use of theology in defiance of science is not a new feature in the history of the Church.

© Susan Gilchrist 2016: All Rights Reserved. Permission is granted to reproduce this work for personal and educational use only. Commercial copying, hiring and lending are prohibited. Other reproduction and onward transmission in any form without written permission is prohibited.

²²⁷ Farley, Harry. (2016): “Church of England split over gay marriage may be unavoidable, admits Welby’s chief of staff”: Christian Today 7 June 2016 [accessed 20 June 2016]
<http://www.christiantoday.com/article/church.of.england.split.over.gay.marriage.may.be.unavoidable.admits.welby.s.chief.of.staff/88625.htm>

4:9 Select Bibliography

This paper is available online at: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/220P-InfluencesChurch.pdf>

Notes for this paper are posted on: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/notes212P>

4:9:1 Personal Articles

Gilchrist, S. (2016): "The Perceptions of Gender and Sexual Variation in Present Day Society and in the Modern Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/221P-InfluencesToday.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation in the History and Traditions of the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/220P-InfluencesChurch.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Influences of Gender and Sexual Variation on the Life and Teaching of Jesus": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/219P-InfluencesJesus.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2016): "A New Approach to Identity and Personality Formation in Early Life": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/218P-InfluencesPersonality.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/217P-FoundationsSexGender.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2016): "Taking a Different Path": Chapter 10 in: "This Is My Body: Hearing the Theology of Transgender Christians", Ed: Beardsley, T. and O'Brien, M: Darton Longman and Todd. May 2016 ISBN 978-0-232-53206-7 Notes for this chapter are available on: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/sourcesA/index.htm>

Gilchrist, S. (2016): "An Introduction to the Foundations of Science, Sex and Gender Variation in the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/211P-IntroFoundationsSexGender.pdf> *

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Deuteronomy 22:5 and its Impact on Gender and Sexual Variation in the Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/022B-Deuteronomy22-5.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Living with Difference": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/208P-LivingWithDifferenceFinal.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Personality Development and Gender: Why We Should Re-think the Process": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/209P-RethinkPaperFull.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2014): Articles Offered to The Church of England for use in its Process of Shared Discussions on LGBTI Matters: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/020B-OfferedPapersIntroduction.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2014): "Controversy and Challenge: Issues of Gender and Sexuality in the Present Day Christian Church": <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/018B-ControversyAndCrisis.pdf>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): "Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church"

First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016

Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55

Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

sgen4144@gmail.com

- Gilchrist, S. (2014): “*Christianity and Crisis: An Overview of Gender and Sexual Difference in the Early and Modern Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/017B-ChristianityAndCrisisOverview.pdf>
- Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*Gender, Sexuality and the Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/015B-GenderSexualityChurch.pdf>
- Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*From Gender Transcendence to Gender Complementarity: the Development of Attitudes to Gender and Sexuality in the Early and the Modern Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/007B-FromGndrTranscToGndrComp.pdf> *
- Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*Personality Development and LGB&T People: A New Approach*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/201P-PersonalityDevelopmentAndLGBTPeople.pdf> *
- Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*A Reassessment of the Traditional Christian Teaching on Homosexuality, Transsexuality and on Gender and Sexual Variation Using a New Neurophysiological and Psychological Approach*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/207P-ReassessmentPsychologyExtended.pdf>
- Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*Reform and the Christian Church*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/008B-ReformChristianChurchArticle.pdf>
- Gilchrist, S. (2013): “*An Unfinished Reformation*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/016B-UnfinishedReformationArticle.pdf>
- Gilchrist, S. (2011): “*Issues on the Sanctity of Same-Sex Relationships*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/014B-IssuesOnTheSanctityOfSame-SexRelationships.pdf>
- Gilchrist, S. (2011): “*LGB and T People: Labels and Faith*”: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/002B-LabelsFaithText.pdf>
- Gilchrist, S. (Ed) (2010): “*Proceedings of a conference on Sexuality and Human Flourishing*”, Stirchley, Birmingham, 6 February 2010: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/documents/001B-Proceedings2SexualityAndHumanFlourishing.pdf>

All of these documents are, or will be available through the website:
<http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm>

Refer to the website for current status

4:9:2 Additional Papers

- Ainsworth, Claire. (2015): “Sex redefined” The idea of two sexes is simplistic. Biologists now think there is a wider spectrum than that”: *Nature* 518, 288–291:19 February 2015
doi:10.1038/518288a <http://www.nature.com/news/sex-redefined-1.16943>
- Anglican Communion. (2016): Communiqué from the Primates of the Anglican Communion: 15 Jan 2016: “*Walking Together in the Service of God in the World*”
<http://www.primates2016.org/articles/2016/01/15/communique-primates/>

Gilchrist, S. (2015): “Gender and Sexual Variation in History and Traditions of the Christian Church”
First Issued: 29 May 2016. Last update: 29 July 2016 Printed: 10/04/2017 11:55
Access via: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/articles/index.htm> sgen4144@gmail.com

- Aquinas, Thomas (1225-1274): *Summa Theologica*: Second Part of the Second Part: Answers to Question 154: [Accessed 19/12/2015].
http://www.logicmuseum.com/wiki/Authors/Thomas_Aquinas/Summa_Theologiae/Part_IIb/Q154#q154a12co
- Aquinas, Thomas (1225-1274): *Summa Theologica* I-II, question 94. Article 5, reply to objection 2.
- Archbishop of Canterbury Website (2015): Archbishop of Canterbury calls for Primates' Gathering: <http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/5613/archbishop-of-canterbury-calls-for-primates-gathering->
- St. Augustine (354-430): *Confessions, Book III*, chap. 8 [Accessed 15/11/2015]:
<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/110103.htm>
- St. Augustine (354-430): *City of God, Chapter 17 of book XXII* - Whether the Bodies of Women Shall Retain Their Own Sex in the Resurrection. [Accessed 19/12/2012].
<http://www.tertullian.org/fathers2/NPNF1-02/npnf1-02-28.htm>
- Bailey, D.S. (1955): *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, London, 1955, pp. 73-74.
- BBC (2015): News report on the Synod on the Family, see: Catholic bishops end divisive synod on family: BBC News: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]:
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-34629539> .
- Balch, David L. (1999) "Homosexuality, Science, and the Plain Sense of Scripture" Erdmans. ISBN-10: 080284698X: ISBN-13: 978-0802846983.
- Beard, Mary (2014): The Public Voice of Women. *London Review of Books*: Vol. 36 No. 6 · 20 March 2014: pp 11-14: [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v36/n06/mary-beard/the-public-voice-of-women>
- Bercot, David W. Ed. (1998) "*Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs*". p 445. Hendrickson ISBN-10: 1565633571 ISBN-13: 978-1565633575 ISBN 1-56563-357-1
- Besser, M., Carr, S., Cohen-Kettenis, P.T., Connolly, P., De Sutter, P., Diamond, M., Di Ceglie, D. (Ch and Adol.), Higashi, Y., Jones, L., Kruijver, F.P.M., Martin, J., Playdon, Z-J., Ralph, D., Reed, T., Reid, R., Reiner, W.G., Swaab, D., Terry, T., Wilson, P. and Wylie, K. (2006) 'Atypical Gender Development – A Review', *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 9(1):29-44, [Accessed 15/10/2015]:
<http://www.gires.org.uk/assets/Research-Assets/atypical-gender-development.pdf>
- Borgeaud, Philippe. (1996). *Mother of the Gods. From Cybele to the Virgin Mary*. Originally published as *La Mère des dieux: De Cybele à la Vierge Marie*. Éditions de Seuil, Collection "La Librairie du XXe siècle", 1996. Translated from the French by Lysa Hochroth. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004. ISBN 0-8018-7985-X.
- Brustman, Mark. *The Historic Origins of Church Condemnation of Homosexuality*. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.well.com/~aquarius/rome.htm>.
- Catechism (1997) *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Homebush, NSW, Strathfield: Pauline Books

- Church of England (2013). *The Pilling Report*, compiled by the House of Bishops Working Group on Human Sexuality and chaired by Sir Joseph Pilling, was published on 28 November 2013. <https://www.churchofengland.org/our-views/marriage,-family-and-sexuality-issues/human-sexuality/pilling-report.aspx>
- Church of England (2014) Church of England House of Bishops Pastoral Guidance Document on Same Sex Marriage. This can be found on: <https://www.churchofengland.org/media-centre/news/2014/02/house-of-bishops-pastoral-guidance-on-same-sex-marriage.aspx>. A comment by the LGBTI Anglican Coalition can also be found on: <http://www.lgbtac.org.uk/statements/SuE0221a-CoalitionStatementOn%20BishopsPastoralLetter.pdf> [Accessed 15/12/2015]
- Church of England (2015) Grace and Disagreement article: Grace and Disagreement Shared Conversations on Scripture, Mission and Human Sexuality: [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <https://churchofengland.org/media/2165248/grace2.pdf>
- Church of England (2015) Shared Conversations Website: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.sharedconversations.org/>
- Clement of Alexandria (ca 195): *The Paedagogus (The Instructor)* Book III: Translated by William Wilson. From Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.1885.) Also available [Accessed: 27 November 2012] at: <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/02093.htm>
- Cornwell, Megan (2016): "Amoris Laetitia: Reaction From The Catholic Community"; The Tablet 08 April 2016: <http://www.thetablet.co.uk/news/5397/0/amoris-laetitia-reaction-from-the-catholic-community>
- Council of Ancyra (314): For the text of the Canons see: http://www.synaxis.org/canon/ECF37THE_COUNCIL_OF_ANCYRA_HISTORICAL.htm [Accessed 26 November 2012]
- Council of Elvira (306): For the text of the Canons see: <http://faculty.cua.edu/pennington/Canon%20Law/ElviraCanons.htm> [accessed 26 November 2012].
- Dorff, E.N.; Nevins, D.S. and Reisner, A.I. (2006): *Homosexuality, Human Dignity & Halakhah: A Combined Responsum For The Committee On Jewish Law And Standards*: [Accessed 15/10/2015]: http://www.rabbinicalassembly.org/sites/default/files/public/halakhah/teshuvot/20052010/dorff_nevins_reisner_dignity.pdf
- Farley, Harry. (2016): "Church of England split over gay marriage may be unavoidable, admits Welby's chief of staff": Christian Today 7 June 2016 [accessed 20 June 2016] <http://www.christiantoday.com/article/church.of.england.split.over.gay.marriage.may.be.unavoidable.admits.welbys.chief.of.staff/88625.htm>
- Pope Francis. (2016): "*Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Amoris Lætitia Of The Holy Father Francis To Bishops, Priests And Deacons Consecrated Persons Christian Married Couples And All The Lay Faithful On Love In The Family*": [Accessed: 18 April 2016] https://w2.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20160319_amoris-laetitia_en.pdf

- GAFCON. (2016): Nairobi Communiqué 2016: <http://gafcon.org/2016/04/22/nairobi-communication-2016/>
- Gilchrist (2015) *Article Notes* [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.tgdr.co.uk/notes212P>
- Girard, R. (1965/1961) *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel: Self and Other in Literary Structure*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Girard, R. (1977/1972) *Violence and the Sacred*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Girard, R., Oughourlian, J.-M. and Lefort, G. (1987) *Things Hidden since the Foundation of the World*, Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gledhill, R. (2015): Archbishop of Canterbury moves to heal Anglican divide: Christianity Today: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.christiantoday.com/article/archbishop.of.canterbury.moves.to.heal.anglican.divide/64966.htm>
- Global Network of Rainbow Catholics (2015): Media Release 26 October 2015: "A new era for inclusive pastoral care of LGBT people is going to start after the Synod:" examines positive and negative aspects of the Synod's report.
- Gooren, Louis. (2006): "The biology of human psychosexual differentiation". *Hormones and Behavior* 50 (2006) 589–601. [Accessed 21 June 2016] <http://www.eulabs.eu/Downloads/gooren06.pdf>
- Greenberg, Steven; (2004): *Wrestling with God and Men: Homosexuality in the Jewish Tradition*: The University of Wisconsin Press, ISBN 10: 0-299-19094-3
- Greenspahn, Frederick E. (2002) "Homosexuality and the Bible" CCAR Journal: A Reform Jewish Quarterly: <http://saupj.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/homosexuality-bible.pdf>
- Pope Gregory VII: (1075): "Dictatus Pape" See also Tierney, B : <http://faculty.cua.edu/pennington/churchhistory220/topicfive/dictatuspapae.htm>
- Hoad, N.W. (2007) *African Intimacies: Race, Homosexuality, and Globalization*. Chapter 3 Neoliberalism and the Church: p65 University of Minnesota Press: ISBN 978-0-8166-4916-7 ISBN 978-0-8166-4915-0
- Hester, J. David, (2005) "Eunuchs and the Postgender Jesus: Matthew 19:12 and Transgressive Sexualities" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*: September 2005 28: 13-40, Interfakultäres Zentrum für Ethik in den Wissenschaften, Tübingen Centre for Hermeneutics and Rhetorics, California. [Accessed 23/7/2012] www.spirituality.org.za/files/Eunuch.pdf
- Josephus, Flavius (37- c.100): *Against Apion* :2.199: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015] <http://sacred-texts.com/jud/josephus/apion-1.htm>
- Kimuhu, Johnson M. (2008) "Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions from the Perspective of Ancient Near East and Africa" Peter Lang. ISBN 1433102005, 9781433102004.

- Levine, Samuel J. (1997–1998). "Capital Punishment in Jewish Law and its Application to the American Legal System: A Conceptual Overview". *St. Mary's Law Journal* 29: 1037–1051. [accessed 21june2016]
<http://digitalcommons.tourolaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=scholarlyworks>
- Maimonides, M. (1135-1204): Perush L'Mishnayot on Sanhedrin 54a: *Mishneh Torah* (See also Babylonian Talmud, Yevamot 54a-56a; Sotah 26b; Niddah 13a). [Accessed 15/10/2015]: http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/682956/jewish/Mishneh-Torah.htm
- Marcus, Y. (2015): *Ethics of the Fathers with a new commentary anthologized from the works of the classic commentators and the chassidic masters*: Kehot Publication Society: Translated Text: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]:
http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/5708/jewish/Translated-Text.htm
- Oliva, Adriano. (2015): *Amour (Love)*: Collection Theologies: Les editions du Cerf. ISBN: 9782204106795
- Perry, M.P. (2015): *Sex, Sense and Non-Sense for Anglicans*: The Very Revd Professor Martyn Percy, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. Vice President of Modern Church [accessed 16/12/2015: <http://modernchurch.org.uk/downloads/finish/818-articles/756-sex-sense-and-non-sense-for-anglicans> [Accessed 18/12/2015]
- Philo of Alexandria (c.25BC- 50AD): *Abraham*: 135: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]:
<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/yonge/book22.html>
- Plato: (424/423 – 348/347 BC): *Phaedrus*; *passim* [Accessed 15/10/2015]:
<http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/phaedrus.html>
- Pullella, P (2015): Pope, Ending Synod excoriates Bishops with Closed Hearts: [Accessed 6/11/2015]: <http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/10/25/us-pope-synod-idUSKCN0SH2O620151025>
- Rodkinson, M.L. Tr (1918): *The Babylonian Talmud Volumes 1-10* [Accessed 15/10/2015]:<https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Judaism/FullTalmud.pdf>
- Roller, Lynn E. (1996). In Lane Eugene N (ed.) (1996), *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults: Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaseren. Religions in the Greco-Roman World*, 131. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996. ISBN 90-04-10196-9.
- Sanhedrin 54b: [Accessed 15/10/2015]: http://www.come-and-hear.com/sanhedrin/sanhedrin_54.html
- Sanhedrin 55a: [Accessed 15/10/2015]: http://www.come-and-hear.com/sanhedrin/sanhedrin_55a.html
- Sarah, Cardinal Robert. (2016): Address given by Cardinal Robert Sarah, Archbishop emeritus of Conakry (Guinea) and Prefect of the Congregation of Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments in the Catholic Church to the 12th Annual National Catholic Prayer Breakfast Tuesday, May 17th, 2016 at the Marriott Marquis Hotel in Washington DC. [accessed14June 2016]: <https://catholicprayerbreakfast.com/2016-video/>

- Sextus Aurelius Victor (320 – c 390), *Epitome of the Caesars*, 12.19. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://www.roman-emperors.org/epitome.htm>.
- Tierney, B. ed (1892/1983), ed: "Pope Gregory VII," See E. F. Henderson, ed. in *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages* (London: George Bell, 1892), pp. 366-367, 365. Reprinted in Brian Tierney, ed., *The Middle Ages, Vol. I: Sources of Medieval History*, 4th ed., (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983) pp. 142-143. [Accessed 30 October 2011] at <http://www.thenagain.info/classes/sources/dictatuspapae.html>
- Tougher, S. (2009) *The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society*. p 40: Taylor and Francis. Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies. ISBN: 9781135235710
- Van Den Bergh, R. (2000): The Role of Education in the Social and Legal Position of Women in Roman Society; *Revue Internationale des droits de l'Antiquité XLVII* (2000) pp 351-364: [Online]. [Accessed 15/10/2015]: <http://local.droit.ulg.ac.be/sa/rida/file/2000/vandenbergh.pdf>
- Vatican (2013): Synod on the Family: Preparatory Document: Pastoral Challenges To The Family In The Context Of Evangelization [Accessed 6/11/2015]: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20131105_iii-assemblea-sinodo-vescovi_en.html
- Vatican: Synod of Bishops (2015): Final Report of the 2015 Synod of Bishops on The Vocation and Mission of the Family in the Church and in the Contemporary World. [Accessed 6/11/2015] http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_doc_20141209_lineamenta-xiv-assembly_en.html
- Wace, Henry. (2013): *Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature*. Delmarva Publications, Inc
- Wilson, B.E. (2015): *Unmanly Men: Refigurations of Masculinity in Luke-Acts* p120: Oxford University Press, ISBN 0199325006, 9780199325009