

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php

TSE BULLETIN

MARCH-APRIL 1987
VOL. 10, NO. 4
\$4.50

Introducing This Issue <i>Vernon Grounds</i>	3
The Vocation of the Theologian <i>Robert K. Johnston</i>	4
From Truth to Authority to Responsibility: The Shifting Focus of Evangelical Hermeneutics, 1915-1986 (Part I) <i>Douglas Jacobsen</i>	8
An Interview With Carl F.H. Henry <i>Diana Hochstedt Butler</i>	16
The Authority and Role of Scripture (1981-1986): A Selected Bibliography <i>Donald K. McKim</i>	19
Sexuality, Hierarchy and Evangelicalism <i>Kathleen E. Corley and Karen J. Torjesen</i>	23
Carl Henry on Hierarchy	25
Japanese Christians and the Yasukuni Shrine Issue <i>Yoshiaki Yui</i>	27
The Pain of the North American Heart: Reflections on A Recent Ecumenical Student Gathering <i>Donald Persons</i>	29
The Kairos Convocation <i>Wilma Jakobsen</i>	31
Bibliography: Books on South Africa <i>Kathy O'Reilly</i>	33
The Voice of Outsiders: Is Anybody Listening? <i>William Dyrness</i>	34
Book Reviews and Comments	34

A Publication of
**THEOLOGICAL
STUDENTS
FELLOWSHIP**

relationship to man.¹⁶ This is the theological basis for his condemnation of same-sex relations. The relationship between man and woman is not an interchangeable one; they have different natures. One is created to stimulate, lead and inspire, and the other is created to respond and follow.¹⁷ Thus they cannot be who they are except in relationship to each other—male and female. Homosexuality and lesbianism therefore violate this divinely instituted hierarchical order.

As heirs of this theological tradition, many within the modern Christian community feel unable to support any theological statement which moves toward a theological acceptance of homosexuality or lesbianism.¹⁸ The official position of the Catholic hierarchy housed at the Vatican, as expressed by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, upholds the traditional condemnation of homosexual practices, and considers the current efforts to elicit the support of the clergy for legislation decriminalizing such practices as manipulative and detrimental to the common good of society. Bishops are therefore advised to keep the defense and promotion of family life as their uppermost concern when they assess proposed legislation. Moreover, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith advises that support “be withdrawn from any organizations that seek to undermine the teaching of the church.”¹⁹

Other Christian organizations try to keep the theological issues of same-sex relations separate from the civil issues. These organizations attempt to maintain a theological disapproval of the practice of same-sex love and then couple this disapproval with a call for tolerance of these practices in the public sphere in the name of human rights. This is evidenced in many official Protestant church statements on homosexuality and lesbianism, in various theological and exegetical writings, as well as in the statement of the EWCI itself.²⁰ The EWCI res-

olution was clearly an attempt to make a resolution which was limited to the issue of civil rights, to avoid the theological furor that would have arisen had the resolution made a clear bid for the theological acceptance of the practice of lesbianism. Virginia Ramey Mollenkott, on the last day of the Seventh Plenary Conference, pointed out that the organization had “not made a theological judgement concerning homosexuality.”²¹ Due to the diverse nature of the EWCI membership, the resolution was limited to a call for civil rights to allow many members to remain within the organization and continue to participate in the ongoing discussion of the theological and exegetical issues on both the local and national level. The statement itself, however, has been taken by some as an implicit acceptance of lesbianism as a valid life-style for certain Christian women, although that was not the intent of the EWCI.

Important as it is for Christian organizations to support human rights in the secular sphere, even though they are not able to offer theological justification for those rights, in light of the current abuse of Christian religious authority within the dominant society, does not the Christian church also have a moral responsibility to begin to critique and reevaluate the theological and exegetical arguments that are being used to deny civil rights to homosexual persons? As the denial of human rights for homosexual persons is based on historically religious moral precepts, can the church hope to affirm and procure the civil rights for homosexual persons without being willing to examine the theological foundation within their own tradition upon which the anti-sodomy laws are based? One could argue that no hope of a solid basis for change on the civil level can take place without any support for that change on a theological level. Although it is important that Christians

Carl Henry on Hierarchy

There are a lot of references to women in *God, Revelation and Authority*, 5 and 6. Look *women* up in the index. I think women are great. Life would be terribly monotonous without them.

First, what is our question? Christ is the head of the church. Second, in New Testament times we have the universal priesthood of believers, male and female. Women are priests no less in that universal priests are all believers. So Paul is surely not a male chauvinist and anti-feminist when he says that the exclusive male priesthood of the Hebrew theocracy is gone forever. Christ has destroyed it. Next, prophecy in New Testament times, which is not prophecy in the Old Testament understanding but nevertheless prophecy, is the proclamation of Christ and belongs to women no less than to men in the New Testament era by the work of the Holy Spirit. “I shall pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and they shall prophesy.” And Peter says that in a sense, Pentecost is the beginning of this. That doesn’t mean inspired teaching but testimony of Christ in the New Testament. And certainly the New Testament says there is a service ministry from women, deaconesses, they’re in the New Testament. Service ministry as I understand it can be temporary or it can be permanent. I have no problem with deaconesses in the Lutheran churches as a life vocation and that sort of thing.

What that doesn’t settle is the question of women in the role of pastoral leadership in the churches, whether they should be ordained or not. Well, first the New Testament does not stipulate ordination; it does not mandate ordination for anybody. The cases of ordination are rather simple and they represent a recognition on the part of the church that the Holy

Spirit has set aside a person for a particular work. I don’t see any necessity in the New Testament for ordaining. You don’t have the same mandate—as you do in the great commission—for ordaining men who are called to ministry in the modern sense. That whole question of ordination in those universal terms is something that needs to be squared with the New Testament.

But in any case, I have read Paul many times and reread him within the last few years because I was on the committee of the Southern Baptist Convention when this issue of women’s ordination came on the floor. I cannot get around the fact that Paul seems to say that there is a basis in the order of creation and in the order of redemption for restricting the role of pastoral leadership in the church to the male or at least excluding the woman from that realm. And it is quite possible to get around this by saying this is a cultural accommodation. But if you do, I think there is a hermeneutical shift and I don’t think those who do it on the basis of an hermeneutical shift have clearly worked out the implications of what this implies for apostolic teaching generally. I might wish it were not so. I know gifted women and certainly have no objection to them teaching Sunday School classes. I know that the bottom would fall out of the mission field if it weren’t for the women who go, bless their hearts. I know many gals, even from the earlier years, seminarians and collegians who went out. They were as interested in marriage as we were. They just put it all onto the cross. So there I am. I’ve sort of wrestled with that in volume 5, I think in *God, Revelation and Authority*.

Taken from a conversation with Carl F.H. Henry by Diana Hochstedt Butler for TSF Bulletin.

continue to support the separation of moral and legal issues, it could be that in the case of homosexuality, the theological disapproval of homosexual and lesbian behavior based on unexamined interpretation of the few biblical texts which discuss it would weaken an intent to support rights for homosexual individuals. Even though certain evangelical organizations like the EWCI may not be able to resolve the theological problems surrounding homosexuality for many years to come, surely discussion can take place in church governmental bodies, as it has in such denominations as the Presbyterian Church (USA) and the UCC. The open discussion of homosexuality and lesbianism on the local and congregational level would also do much to alleviate the unfounded fears and prejudices that many Christians have for those with a homosexual orientation. The EWCI attempts to allow for such discussion and diversity of opinion by offering numerous workshops in its plenary sessions, and by encouraging discussion in local EWC chapters throughout the country.

Where does such a reappraisal begin? First, it must begin with careful consideration of those biblical texts which proscribe homosexuality and lesbianism, particularly since the traditional interpretations of these texts and their significance for the modern church have come under question in the past few decades.²² Although an article of this scope cannot hope to discuss or settle such complicated issues as the relevance of the Holiness Code and its purity laws for the Christian Church (Lev. 18:22) or the lexical problems surrounding the translation of *malakos* and *arsenokoites* in I Cor. 6:9-10 and I Tim. 1:9-10, we would like to discuss briefly the one clear prohibition of lesbianism by Paul in Romans 1:26-27, as it is often this text which leads even the most compassionate of Christian theologians, biblical scholars and ethicists to conclude that homosexuality and lesbianism are "unnatural." Why does Paul call same-sex relations "unnatural?" That is a question all Christians must ask, biblical feminists in particular. Lewis B. Smedes, in his sensitive discussion of homosexuality in his well known book, *Sex for Christians*, while affirming that Paul must be right in his rejection of same-sex relations, also comments, "I do wish we had a clearer grasp of why homosexuality is unnatural," and points out that Paul also calls long hair on men "unnatural" (I Cor. 11:14). "Nature does not speak as clearly to me about long hair as it did to Paul," Smedes writes, "but long hair and homosexuality are hardly in the same category."²³ What has hairstyles to do with homosexuality? More importantly for biblical feminists, what has hairstyles to do with a rejection of same-sex relations between women?

That the prohibition of same-sex love in Rom. 1:26-27 is related to the question of hairstyles in I Cor. 11 has not escaped the notice of certain scholars.²⁴ Just how the two are related, however, has been somewhat unclear. A recent study of I Cor. 11 by Jerome Murphy O'Conner, however, has argued that it is possibly same-sex love and gender distinction that is at issue in Paul's concern for hairstyles, and that the Corinthians' disregard for gender distinction in their dress reflects an interpretation of Gal. 3:28.²⁵ Bernadette J. Brooten, in her recent article on Rom. 1:26, has clarified the relationship between Rom. 1:26 and I Cor. 11 by indicating Paul's hierarchical world view inherent in both passages.²⁶ What is "unnatural" about same-sex relations between women and gender differentiation in appearance is that both reflect an upsetting of the hierarchical ordering of creation. Brooten writes:

The discussion of headress and hairstyle is quite reminiscent of the ancient discussions of same-sex love. For the man, the fear is that by looking like a woman a man loses his masculinity and can sink to the level of a woman.

Short hair on a woman is one of the signs of her becoming like, or trying to become like a man . . . A woman cannot sink to the level of a man. She can only make ridiculous, yet nevertheless threatening, attempts to rise to that level.²⁷

The ancient sources Brooten cites object to women either dressing like or behaving like men, especially when they attempt to imitate the aggressive sexual role usually assigned to males in the order of creation. It is therefore Paul's hierarchical definition of maleness and femaleness which leads him to reject same-sex relations between women, a hierarchical definition which he shared with the Greco-Roman writers around him who objected to women overstepping the passive sexual role assigned to them in Greco-Roman culture.

Discussions of homosexual behavior in antiquity do not parallel discussions of lesbianism in antiquity. Although there is a relationship between discussions of same-sex relations of men and women in that such behavior in both cases calls into question the order of society, the practice of homosexuality is not uniformly objected to in Greco-Roman sources as is lesbianism. On the contrary, although the common argument against homosexuality is that it is also "contrary to nature" or "unnatural,"²⁸ there are many positive arguments for it, even to the extent that it is considered by some to be more "according to nature" than heterosexuality. Robin Scroggs argues that this is precisely because it avoids any movement towards the female, and is therefore a more masculine activity which indicates a superior nature.²⁹ Scroggs also argues that the dominant form of homosexual relationships in antiquity were primarily that of an adult male and a boy or youth (i.e. pederasty).³⁰ Another view is that of John Boswell, who does not conclude that the apparent prevalence of homosexual relationships between adults and boys is truly indicative of reality in the ancient world.³¹ Neither of these authors, however, sufficiently differentiates between male and female homoeroticism in their analysis of same-sex relationships in antiquity. This discrepancy between ancient views on lesbianism and homosexuality should warn us away from subsuming discussions of lesbianism under discussions of homosexuality.

Paul's rejection of lesbianism reflects the rejection of female homoeroticism found within the literature of the Greco-Roman world. Although Paul allowed celibacy for women, which would have circumvented the male headship of a spouse (I Cor. 7:8-9, 25-35, 39-40), and although Paul recognizes the work of women in their ministry to the church (Rom. 16:1-16; Phil. 4:2-3) and permits them to prophesy in the assembly (I Cor. 11:5), "What he could not accept was women experiencing their power through the erotic in a way that challenged the hierarchical ladder: God, Christ, man, woman."³²

It would appear then that in Paul issues of sexuality are theologically related to hierarchy, and therefore the issues of biblical feminism and lesbianism are irrefutably intertwined. For biblical feminists, how one deals with the issue of hierarchy is central. Some argue that the New Testament does not support a strictly hierarchical pattern for relations between the sexes. Others argue that even if the New Testament does reflect a hierarchical world view, as that world view is not specifically Christian, there is no reason to inflict such world view on the modern church. The opinions on the significance of hierarchy for both church structure and ordination as well as sexual relations are diverse. Many denominations have in effect dismissed possible biblical mandates for a hierarchical church structure which place women under the authority of men (such as I Tim. 2:11ff) by their ordination of women to positions in which they will have spiritual authority over men in the congregation. Even the assertion that wives should sub-

mit to their husbands found in the household codes (Eph. 5:21ff; Col. 3:18), which is also based on a hierarchy which makes the husband the head of the wife (Eph. 5:23), has been called into question by certain interpreters, particularly those who wish to emphasize the notion of "mutual submission" within marital relationships.³³ Clearly, the larger evangelical community needs to reach a consensus on whether or not the maintenance of hierarchy between the sexes is important within either sexual relationships or church structures. A determination of the significance of a hierarchical world view for the Evangelical churches becomes central, particularly if it will help us in our struggle over the issues of homosexuality and lesbianism.

In the end, it would seem that if the church is going to deal with the issues of sexuality it is also going to have to deal with hierarchy. We need to grapple with the possibility that our conflicts over the appropriate use of human sexuality may rather be conflicts rooted in a need to legitimate the traditional social structure which assigns men and women specific and unequal positions. Could it be that the continued affirmation of the primacy of heterosexual marriage is possibly also the affirmation of the necessity for the sexes to remain in a hierarchically structured relationship? Is the threat to the "sanctity of marriage" really a threat to hierarchy? Is that what makes same-sex relations so threatening, so frightening? Certain theologians and ethicists have begun to ask these questions.³⁴ Evangelical Christians need to begin to question their unexamined positions on sexuality and hierarchy, particularly if they wish to have a voice in the call for equality for all men and women, not just a few.

¹ For a discussion of the proceedings of the Seventh Plenary Conference of the EWCI, see *Update: Newsletter of the EWC* 10 (Fall 1986) as well as Anne Eggebroten, "Handling Power: Unchristian, Unfeminine, Unkind?" *The Other Side* 22 (Dec. 1986), pp. 20-25.

² Quoted by William O'Brian, "Handling Conflict: The Fallout from Fresno," *The Other Side* 22 (Dec. 1986), pp. 25, 41.

³ Brief of petitioner Michael J. Bowers, Attorney General, on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit; Dec. 19, 1985; Bowers vs. Hardwick, no. 85-140, pp. 20-21.

⁴ Brief of the Amicus Curiae, American Psychological Association, American Public Health Association, p. 8ff.

⁵ Augustine, *The City of God* XIII, 13; XIV, 19.

⁶ Augustine, *On Marriage and Concupiscence* I, 6, 7.

⁷ Augustine, *On the Good of Marriage* II.

⁸ Augustine, *Confessions* Bk. VIII, XI.

⁹ Augustine, *On Marriage and Concupiscence* I, 4, 5.

¹⁰ Augustine, *On the Good of Marriage* XIII, 15.

¹¹ *Summa Theologica*, Pt. II, Ques. 154, art. 11.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Summa Theologica*, Pt. II, Ques. 154, art. 12.

¹⁴ Luther, *Sermon on the Estate of Marriage*, 1519.

¹⁵ Luther, *Commentary on Genesis* 1:26, 27; Calvin, *Commentary on Genesis* 1:26, 27.

¹⁶ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. III, pt. 4, p. 166.

¹⁷ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, vol. III, pt. 4, p. 170.

¹⁸ Karl Barth, "Church Dogmatics," in *Homosexuality and Ethics*, Edward Batchelor, Jr., ed. (New York, NY: The Pilgrim Press, 1980), pp. 48-51; Don Williams, *The Bond that Breaks: Will Homosexuality Split the Church?* (Los Angeles, CA: BIM, Inc., 1978); David Atkinson, *Homosexuals in the Christian Fellowship* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979); Lewis B. Smedes, *Sex for Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), pp. 62-75; "Scripture and Homosexuality," in *Homosexuality and the Church: A Report of the Assembly Committee on Homosexuality and the Church*, Gordon S. Dicker, ed. (Melbourne, Australia: Uniting Church Press, 1985), pp. 40-53.

¹⁹ Letter of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith entitled "The Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons," printed in *Origins*, 16:22 (Nov. 13, 1986), pp. 377-382; par. 16. This Letter is originally dated Oct. 1, 1986, but was released Oct. 30, 1986. It was signed by Cardinal Ratzinger and approved by Pope John Paul II and is therefore an accurate representation of the opinion of the church hierarchy of the Vatican.

²⁰ Lutheran Church in America, American Lutheran Church, United Methodist Church, in "Appendix B" of Brief of Amici Curiae, The Presbyterian Church (USA), The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, The American Friends Service Committee, The Unitarian Universalist Association, Office for Church and Society of the UCC, The Right Rev. Paul Moore, Jr., on Writ of Certiorari to the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals, Bowers vs. Hardwick, no. 84-140, in the Supreme Court of the US, Oct. Term, 1985. See also Brief of the Amicus Curiae, American Jewish Conference. For an enumeration of recent church discussions of homosexuality, see Robin Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality: Contextual Background for Contemporary Debate* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), pp. 1-16. Various scholars who call for a legal tolerance of homosexuality while maintaining a theological disapproval are William Muehl, "Some Words of Caution," in *Homosexuality and Ethics*, pp. 71-78; H. Kimball Jones, "Toward a Christian Understanding of the Homosexual," in *Homosexuality and Ethics*, pp. 105-113; Atkinson, *Homosexuals in the Christian Fellowship*, pp. 120-121. A few ethicists, while maintaining a clear disapproval of homosexual practice for Christians, feel that celibacy is not possible for certain homosexuals, nor is change to a heterosexual orientation. They advocate an "optimum homosexual morality." See Smedes, *Sex for Christians*, p. 73; H. Kimball Jones, "Toward a Christian Understanding of the Homosexual," in *Homosexuality and Ethics*, p. 109ff.

²¹ Quoted by Joanne Ross Feldmeth, "Fresno '86 Conference: Surviving Our Adolescence," *Update* 10 (Fall 1986), pp. 15.

²² Letha Scanzoni and Virginia Ramey Mollenkott, *Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), pp. 54-72; Norman Pittenger, *Time for Consent: A Christian's Approach to Homosexuality* (London: SCM Press, 1976), pp. 81-87; Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality*, pp. 99-129; "Perspectives on Biblical Passages Dealing with Homosexuality," *Homosexuality and the Church*, pp. 29-39. For an overview of recent literature, see "Study Report of the Assembly Committee on Homosexuality and the Church," *Homosexuality and the Church*, pp. 9-28; Atkinson, *Homosexuals in the Christian Fellowship*, pp. 4-28.

²³ Smedes, *Sex for Christians*, p. 67.

²⁴ Smedes, *Sex for Christians*, p. 67; Helmut Thielicke, "The Theological Aspect of Homosexuality," *Homosexuality and Ethics*, pp. 96-104.

²⁵ Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "Sex and Logic in I Cor. 11:2-16," *CBQ* 42 (1980), pp. 482-500.

²⁶ Bernadette J. Brooten, "Paul's Views on the Nature of Women," in *Immaculate and Powerful: The Female in Sacred Image and Social Reality*, Clarissa W. Atkinson, Constance H. Buchanan, Margaret R. Miles, eds. (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1985), pp. 61-87.

²⁷ Brooten, "Paul's Views," pp. 76-77.

²⁸ Scroggs, *The New Testament and Homosexuality*, p. 59.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

³¹ John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 28ff.

³² Brooten, "Paul's Views," p. 78.

³³ See Don Williams, *The Apostle Paul and Women in the Church* (Van Nuys, CA: BIM, 1977), pp. 88ff. Scott Bartchy is also a key proponent of this view. His paper entitled "Patriarchy and Submission in Ephesians 5?" was the topic of a panel discussion of the Women in the Biblical World Section of the SBL chaired by Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Susan B. Thistlethwaite at the recent Annual Meetings of the AAR and SBL in Atlanta, GA, Nov. 22-25, 1986. Other panelists included David Balch and Katie Cannon. The session drew a crowd of over 100 scholars, which is evidence of the keen interest in the topic of hierarchy in religious academic circles.

³⁴ Tom F. Driver, "The Contemporary and Christian Contexts," pp. 14-21; Gregory Baum, "Catholic Homosexuals," pp. 22-27; Rosemary Radford Ruether, "From Machismo to Mutuality," pp. 28-32, all in *Homosexuality and Ethics*.

Japanese Christians and the Yasukuni Shrine Issue

Introduction

Regardless of the social and cultural matrix within which a given Christian community may find itself, sooner or later it will inevitably be forced to grapple with the problem of competing demands for allegiance.

Since its inception in the 16th century, the Christian church in Japan has been acutely aware of the conflicting demands of Christ and Caesar for loyalty. And although the post-World War II Constitution guarantees complete freedom of religion, there has been recently an increase in activity linked to attempts to provide official government sanction of religious values and traditions closely associated with Shintoism, Japan's major indigenous religion.

The focus of the current controversy is the Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo, which was established in 1869 to venerate those who had died in battle in service of the Emperor. Those killed in action were automatically enshrined as kami (divine). Over 2.4 million persons have been enshrined there, including the group of A-class war criminals from World War II headed by General Tojo. There have been repeated attempts to place the Shrine under official government sponsorship, but so far without success. However, the Christian community is alarmed by increasing support for such a move, and has been actively opposing it for several reasons. Not only would this be a clear violation of the constitutional principle of separation of religion and state, but it would have disastrous consequences for Christian evangelism in Japan. Throughout its