

Questions on the Ordination of “Homosexual” Members in the Uniting Reformed Church in Southern Africa

Boitumelo Ben Senokoane

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9399-7676>

University of South Africa

senokbb@unisa.ac.za

Abstract

This article aims to engage the topic of homosexuality, with special reference to the ordination of homosexual people. This was informed by the ongoing conversation that has been happening within the Uniting Reformed Church in Southern Africa (URCSA) since their 2005 Pietermaritzburg General Synod. The church has put a moratorium on the licensing of ministry students, ordination of proponents and marriage officiation of its homosexual members until such a time that the synod makes its decision. A task team was appointed to do research and consult with congregations of the church. The aim of the article is not to provide answers but rather to ask radical theological, medical and biological questions that would assist the church in making informed decisions based on current experiences and realities. The Reformed and Creation theologies shall be used as a tool to engage and clarify questions. Questions are viewed as important to move towards finding answers and solutions to the issue of the ordination of “homosexual” ministers from the LGBTQIA+ community.

Keywords: ordination; homosexuality; LGBTQIA+ community; image of God; Reformed

Introduction

The article argues the issue of the ordination of homosexuals within the Uniting Reformed Church in Southern Africa (URCSA). As much as the emphasis shall be on homosexuality, I shall also engage bisexuality and sex change in order to clarify my argument. The point of departure is based on the Reformed understanding that homosexuals are baptised and confirmed as members of the church. URCSA continues to engage on this issue, or rather burning issue. However, it is very interesting to note



Studia Historiae Ecclesasticae
<https://unisapressjournals.co.za/index.php/SHE/index>
 Volume 49 | Number 3 | 2023 | #10652 | 13 pages

<https://doi.org/10.25159/2412-4265/10652>
 ISSN 2412-4265 (Online), ISSN 1017-0499 (Print)
 © The Author(s) 2023



Published by the Church History Society of Southern Africa and Unisa Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

and observe that the questions revolving around the ordination of “homosexuals”¹ or homosexuality seem not to be on the existence of homosexuality or homosexuals, “... both liberals and conservatives agree that homosexuality is self-evident; we all know exactly what homosexuality is and can identify it as such both in today’s milieu and throughout history” (Rudy 1997, 130). There is no denial or even an attempt by the church and society to deny the actuality and existence of homosexuality and homosexuals. No one is denying the reality of the romantic or sexual fascination or sexual action between members of the same sex or gender. These are the realities of our society, where the church was formed and exists within. The greatest shared rapports for homosexual folks are lesbians for females and gays for males; nevertheless, gay is also commonly used to denote both homosexual males and females. Thus, homosexuality is nothing new or recurring; it has always been here, and even the church has witnessed it in its life-time. The question triggered by this declaration is whether homosexuality is God-created or not, or is it a mere human design? This question will be argued further using the basic argument of Feminist and Womanist Theologies on God’s creation. Another interesting point to observe is why on all URCSA General Synod documents (agenda, minutes, ACTA/resolutions, etc.), the emphasis seems to be on homosexuality, yet ignoring questions regarding transgendered and bisexuals or the LGBTQIA+ community in general? At its General Synod meeting in Pietermaritzburg in 2005, the Uniting Reformed Church in Southern Africa took the following decision (URCSA 2002, Decision 90):

- a) Synod confirms that the Bible is the living Word of God and the primary source and norm for the moral debate about homosexuality.
- b) Synod acknowledges the diversity of positions regarding homosexuality and pleads that differences be dealt with in a spirit of love, patience, tolerance and respect.
- c) Synod confirms that homosexual people are members of the church through faith in Jesus Christ.
- d) Synod rejects homophobia and any form of discrimination against homosexual persons.
- e) Synod appeals to URCSA members to reach out with love and empathy to our homosexual brothers and sisters and embrace them as members of the body of Christ in our midst.
- f) Synod acknowledges the appropriate civil rights of homosexual persons.
- g) Synod emphasises the importance of getting clarity about the theological and moral status of homosexual marriages or covenantal unions.
- h) Synod emphasises the importance of getting clarity about the ordination of practising homosexual persons in ministry.
- i) Synod assigns the following tasks to the Moderamen:

1 I would prefer to use the concept LGBTQIA+ community but will use “homosexuals” as it is the term used in church documents. So, whenever I refer to homosexuals it should be understood in that context to clarify the argument and to respond to the discussions; moreover, to show the limitation of the concept.

- j) Do an extensive study on Christian faith and homosexuality while taking into consideration the abovementioned principles. (URCSA ACTA 2005)

This question triggers a follow-up question: What is the difference between the two (transgendered and bisexuality) and homosexuality to the extent that it (homosexuality) is seen as a problem, yet the other two are not? This question shall also be interrogated.

Homosexuals Created in the Image of God

Questions, complaints and mumbling on or about homosexuality have always departed from the point of view that God created males and females. Genesis 5:2 states: “He created them male and female and blessed them. And he named them ‘Mankind’ when they were created.” This has been used as the basis of understanding our creation, being and nature as Christians. The creation of male and female has been the physical marker of what is meant by man and woman in a society and in the church. Physical appeal is the grade to which a person’s bodily structures are reflected theologically, beautifully pleasing, or attractive. The reference to a corporeal marker implies sexual attractiveness or desirability but can also be distinct from either. Of course, there are other factors which influence one person’s attraction to another, with physical aspects being one of them.

Another argument on the creation of man and woman is that God had “a thinking.” This thinking has been interpreted within the gender and sexual orientation, namely that males and females are of the opposite sex but are naturally created and designed to attract and satisfy each other.

Gender and sexuality problems and ordination based on one’s gender, age, race, and so forth, are nothing new. Blacks, women and children have experienced this exclusion before. Owanikin (2005, 206) attests to this, arguing that “the controversy over the issue of the ordination of women as priests in Christian churches has been going on for a long time.” Women were and continue to be treated by men as leftovers or an afterthought of God’s creation. History exposes patriarchy as a dominant and official Christian view. It is a theology explained by Ruether (1987, 208):

Based on the notion of “male headship of the order of creation” this notion basically identifies patriarchal social order with the natural or divinely created order. Male headship is thus regarded as rooted in the intrinsic nature of things and willed by God. Any effort to upset this order by giving women autonomy or equal rights would constitute a rebellion against God and would result in moral and social chaos in human society.

It is very interesting to observe that this same argument was used and continues to be used by Whites in their justification that Blacks are less human, as prescribed by their

White Afrikaner theology on the divinely created order. The former apartheid President of South Africa, P. W. Botha,² argued:

The fact that Blacks look like human beings and act like human beings, does not necessarily make them sensible human beings. Hedgehogs are not porcupines, and lizards are not crocodiles simply because they look alike. If God wanted us to be equal to the Blacks, he would have created us all a uniform colour and intellect. But he created us differently: Whites, Blacks, Yellow, rulers and the ruled. Intellectually, we are superior to the Blacks; that has been proven beyond any reasonable doubt over the years.

The identical sense and dwelling of homosexuality in Christian records are likewise grounded on the conception of a heterosexual regime in the order of construction or “divine law.” This conception essentially recognises heterosexual societal command with the ordinary or divinely formed order. A heterosexual regime is, therefore, considered entrenched in the fundamental nature of things and desired by God. Any determination to disrupt this directive (by giving homosexuals independence or equivalent privileges) would establish an insurgence in contradiction to God, and will cause societal anarchy in anthropological civilisation—in this instance and for the purpose of our study, the Christian civilisation is named URCSA. The conception that a heterosexual regime is the command of formation, typically transmits with it the concealed or overt hypothesis that God is heterosexual or at least appropriately characterised by heterosexual codes. This opinion of a heterosexual regime transmits with it an understanding of homosexuals as the moral, ontological, and intellectual minions of heterosexuals.

The Christian concept of a male God is based on the Old Testament account in Genesis of Yahweh’s utterances: “Let us make humankind in our own image. ... In the image of God, he created them; male and female he created them” (Gen 1:26–27). However, it is very interesting to observe the contradiction that comes with these utterances because Owanikin (2005, 212) exposes that “... the phrase ‘male and female he created them’ is still problematic since both man and woman bear the likeness and image of God.” In the context of homosexuality, the phrase continues to be problematic since homosexuals bear the likeness of the image of God in their genders (male-physique or affection; female-physique or affection) in the same person. This argument thus makes homosexuality not a choice but a natural. The point is argued by Thomas Marlo³ when stating: “I don’t think homosexuality is a choice. Society forces you to think it’s a choice, but in fact, it’s in one’s nature. The choice is whether one expresses one’s nature truthfully or spends the rest of one’s life lying about it.” And if this argument is anything to rely on as the truth of some sort, I concur with Jeanette Winterson,⁴ who states: “I think heterosexuality and homosexuality are a kind of psychosis, and the truth is

2 Botha 1985. <https://www.sites.google.com/site/nakampevillage/botha-s-plan-for-blacks>.

3 <https://www.azquotes.com/quote/293327>.

4 https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/jeanette_winterson_349444.

somewhere in the middle.” By implication, the issue of homosexuality becomes a theological and philosophical problem about the idea of a human being (man or woman).

For URCSA, the progressive and radical action to elect a woman moderator, Mary-Anne Plaatjies-Van Huffel, for the first time in history at the 2012 Namibia General Synod, seems to be in agreement with the defence of feminist/womanist theology against patriarchy. Feminist/womanist theology generally argues that women, too, are formed in the image of God. This view argues that “our position as Christian men and women is equal; our experiences in life are not. We are equal: 1) because we were both made by God (1 John 3:1 ff.; Prov. 22:2; Gen. 1:27); and 2) because we were both redeemed by Christ and made by Him (Rev. 5:9; Eph. 4:4) (Neff 1979, 165). The move by URCSA opened another door for a homosexual theology of ordination for the reason mentioned by Edet (2005, 35) that “the Christian proclamation of human liberation and the equality of men and women is indeed good news for women ...” This opens a door for both female and male.

It is also interesting to note that even those who argue that homosexuality is not biblical agree that it is not a biblical imperative. In the 1983 report of the Netherlands Reformed Church, *Verwarring en Herkenning* (Confusion and Recognition), this point was exposed as follows:

The moral standards that the Bible sets down are still valid, in consequence of which homosexuals are still valid, in consequence of which homosexual practices are condemned. For this reason, people have difficulty with admitting homosexuals to the Lord’s Table; and in our situation and circumstances, the Biblical rejection of homosexuality does not fit with the Great Commandment, and such rejection is at the cost of the wholeness of man in the light of the Gospel. (Quoted in Mader 1993, 106)

The synod resolved on this matter as expressed by Mader (1993, 106–107):

Two motions based on this report came to the floor of the synod on 10 June 1983. The first asked the synod to declare that in light of the Great Commandment; no one should be victimised by discrimination on account of their race, sex, or sexual nature, and therefore no one should be prevented from either ordination to any offices of the church, or admittance to the Lord’s Table on the basis of any of the arguments cited in the report. The second provided that, in professional evaluation, both male and female clergy to whom the service of churches had already been entrusted, and also candidates for the ministry, should be judged only upon their pastoral skills, and not on their sexual state. In a pair of votes as surprising as that a decade before, the first of these was rejected, and the second approved. The Netherlands Reformed Church had, in effect, approved the ordination of homosexuals, but not their inclusion at the Lord’s Table.

The unanswered question would be, can the ordained homosexual facilitate the Lord’s Table, as the decision left a contradiction? Moreover, in contrast to the 1983 June 10 decision (The Netherlands Reformed Church Synod), URCSA does not question or

object to the admittance of homosexuals to the Lord's Table; however, URCSA, on the other hand, had a struggle with the question regarding the ordination of homosexuals.

Homosexuality versus Bisexuality versus Sex Change

In our attempt to find answers to the issue of the ordination of homosexuals within our church, we must equally ask questions regarding bisexuality and sex change. We cannot speak about homosexuality without engaging the LGBTQIA+ community in general, but also the modern technology that includes sex reassignment and surgery. This is because there is an element of invisibility in bisexuality and sex reassignment/surgery. I am raising this point because, in the deliberations on the ordination of gays and lesbians, we have always been emphasising the “natural order” of human sexuality as prescribed by God in the creation narrative of Genesis. Physical appearance and exposure have been the markers and deciders of what it means to be a man or a woman. But this “natural order” of Genesis has been contradicted, at least in the visible sense by modern technologies. Sex reassignment and surgery have made the obvious, the physical, no longer obvious. A man can be made visibly a woman or vice versa. Sex reassignment and surgery have made it impossible to conclude that what you see is what you get, or what is given is, in fact, the case. The physical has become difficult to be the marker and decider on who is man/woman or gay/lesbian.

Sex reassignment and surgery have even become a gender issue. The term “sex change” is used for the whole process of changing one's gender role (“living as a woman” instead of living as a man, or vice versa), not limited to medical procedures. This process is often much more important to transgender people than the medical procedures themselves. Although medically induced changes and surgeries may be needed to make the change of gender role possible, both socially and legally, they can also have a significant impact on the person's well-being.⁵ The method(s) by which a transgendered person's bodily presence and the meaning of their present sexual features are transformed to look are generally related to their acknowledged gender. The sex change procedure has made the natural unnatural—or the natural has been fiddled with. In this argument regarding sex change, I am not arguing for it as natural, but rather to contend that in the presence of the invisibility thereof, a wrong conclusion might be made on the basis of the physical appearance that might have been tampered with or changed. Therefore, ordination can no longer be based on physical or sexual appearance, as those who declare their sex change will experience prejudice, while those who do not declare their sex change shall benefit from the act of ordination. Everyone is a potential woman or man; how will the church go about determining the “genuine” man or woman in this context of sex change? A man could physically be a (born) woman, and a woman could physically be a (born) man.

However, there is an alternative presentation of the natural that can be both seen and unseen, termed “bisexual.” Some bisexual individuals do not feel that they identify as

5 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sex_change

either homosexual or heterosexual; hence they have an inclination to be “unseen” in public. Records have confirmed that the “unseen” have thrived and lived in the ecclesiastical milieu for many years, and even “immoralities” devoted under the banner of the unseen have gone scot-free. The unseen is the state of a thing/theme/substance that cannot be realised. Any thing/theme/substance in this state is said to be unseen (factually, “not seen”). The concept is frequently used in belief, imaginary or science narrative, where objects/subjects/matter cannot be understood by fairy-tale or technological ways, but for our deliberations, by a corporeal or erotic acquaintance. Nevertheless, even if the “unseen” converts the “seen”; this “unseen” can be established in the material domain, mainly in physics and psychology. The unseen awareness relies on numerous visual and graphic features. For instance, it depends on the lenses of the spectators and/or the gadgets used. Consequently, a thing can be categorised as “unseen” to a person, animal, instrument, and so forth.

The unseen is frequently measured to be the ultimate formula of a smokescreen, as it does not divulge to the observer any kind of dynamic symbols, graphic properties, or slight occurrences of the divine and electromagnetic range noticeable to the human lens. Technology can be used hypothetically or practically to concentrate on actual names objects/subjects/matter of the unseen. For instance, “sex transformation” has been converted as a means of the unseen. Sex transformation is a development by which a person changes sex, that is, by which female sexual features are submitted for male ones, or vice versa. Sex change may occur naturally, as in the case of chronological hermaphroditism observed in some human beings. Usually, however, the term is used for sex relocation operations carried out on humans. The concept may also be applied to the broader process of altering gender position (“living as a woman” as an alternative to “living as a man,” or vice versa) plus, but not essentially, restricted to medical measures.

Some bisexual persons are devoted to their particular societies, ethos, and partisan arrangements. Some who classify as bisexuals may amalgamate themselves into either homosexual or heterosexual associations. Because of their “unseenness” or by being “mistaken” as heterosexuals, they tend not to be categorised and, to some degree, not interrogated or branded.

This “unseenness” is imperative to engage because how we treat bisexuals divulges an excessive pact about the doctrinal and logical reliability of our position at URCSA concerning homosexuality. Zinik (1985, 8) defines bisexual as a person having “the capacity for sexual arousal by members of both sexes”; “sexual activity and sexual desire for sexual contact with both men and women”; and “self-identification as being bisexual.” This description remains equitably well-acknowledged currently. Bisexuality is one of the four groupings of sexual positioning, sideways with heterosexual, homosexual, and asexual. It is observed in numerous human civilisations and in the animal domain. Bisexuality is an assorted sexual positioning since people within the bi+ community express it in numerous ways. Some classify as bisexual, although others use

pansexual, queer, fluid, or no tag altogether to designate their charms to additional gender. I must emphasise that there are still many misperceptions about the notion of bisexuality. Numerous individuals are 100% gay or lesbian; in other words, they are sexually and passionately attracted only to buddies of the identical sex. Others are entirely heterosexual, bounding in sexual and intimate associations only with people of the alternative sex. But what about everyone else? A substantial proportion of people do not fit neatly into whichever of these groupings, because they experience sexual and emotional charms and feelings for people of dissimilar genders at some point during their lives.

The question is: What would URCSA do if a candidate for ordination specifies that he or she was bisexual? Should bisexuals be required to limit themselves to faithful sexual action with only one person of the reverse sex (or identical) sex? Would this not be a disowning of their nature? Or maybe, should bisexuals be permitted to have “faithful” sexual associations with two people (one man and one woman)? This would seem to be constant with the principle of bisexuality as God-agreed ... but then, having two partners advances an additional question on polygamy, which is, incidentally, forbidden by the Church Order of URCSA.

The proposition on indorsing or accepting bisexuality (connection with two people) recommends that sexual monogamy is insignificant in whichever homosexual or heterosexual association. Thus, any church quarrelling in contradiction with the ordination or marriage of functioning homosexuals must specify how they will resolve the questions posed by bisexuality, because the quandary of bisexuals seems inseparably connected to that of homosexuals.

What is Ordination?

Our point of departure as Christians (and Reformed in particular) is that God calls men and women to the office of Word and Sacrament. This call is regularly experienced first as the declaration of a person’s gifts for ministry by the church. An inward sense of God’s call regularly supplements such a confirmation. Confirmation occurs on two levels, by God and through the church of Christ. This is where ordination begins. Therefore, this definition becomes our point of departure and agreement. One cannot start by disassociating ordination from its meaning. It is very important to start by giving meaning and definition for me to be able to argue my point. Many of us have decided to give a particular definition of ordination that is incomplete and irrelevant, at least as per the definition around the third and early centuries. There has been an over emphasis on the allegorical or spiritual component of ordination at the expense of the theological or contextual. Bradshaw (2013, 14) argues and defines ordination in this way:

The increasing prominence given to the imposition of hands in ordination from the third century onward seems to be related to a change that took place in the interpretation of the Greek word *cheirotomia*, “the lifting up of hands,” and of its associated verb *cheirotoneo*. In classical Greek usage it had signified the act of election, voting by

raising the hand, but early Christianity extended it to designate not just the first half of the process of ministerial appointment but the whole ordination—both election and prayer with laying on of the hand. Later, however, the word came to be understood as referring to the second action rather than the first—the lifting up/laying on of the hand in prayer—thus giving that gesture greater importance and obscuring the significance given earlier to the act of election as integral to the process.

We must equally understand that in the Reformed tradition, one cannot speak of ordination outside of the doctrine of election or unconditional election, which is also known as unconditional grace. The apostle Paul in Ephesians 1:4–5, argues that:

(4) For he chose us in him before the creation of the world to be holy and blameless in his sight. In love (5) he predestined us for adoption to sonship through Jesus Christ, in accordance with pleasure and will.

Let me engage the issue of ordination from a Reformed perspective so that the matter is deliberated. John Calvin proposed that there are four offices: doctor/professor, pastor/teacher, elder, and deacon. According to Horton (2014, 1):

Pastors are trained, examined, and ordained to preach, teach, and administer sacraments. They give their time to the ministry of the Word and prayer. Over against Rome, the Reformers taught that baptism, not ordination, makes a priest. In their person, officers share with all the saints “one Lord, one faith, one baptism.” In their office, though, they are not mere facilitators or team leaders. Rather, they are Christ’s ambassadors through whom he builds and extends his own kingdom. As Calvin reminds us, Christ told the apostle that “the ministers of the Gospel are porters, so to speak, of the kingdom of heaven, because they carry its keys; and, secondly, he adds that they are invested with a power of binding and losing, which is ratified in heaven. Ministers exercise this ministerial authority by the doctrine of the gospel” in preaching and absolution and the sacraments.⁶

In Reformed Theology, baptism is a sacrament signifying the baptised person’s union with Christ or becoming part of Christ and being treated as if they had done everything Christ had. Sacraments, along with the preaching of God’s word, are means of grace through which God offers Christ to people. Sacraments are believed to have their effects through the Holy Spirit, but these effects are only believed to be beneficial to those who have faith in Christ.⁷

By implication, homosexuals born into a Reformed Church would have been baptised as part of the Christian family. In “How to use ‘the sacraments in a sentence’,” the following is argued:

In the sacraments, God graciously condescends to use common material objects to communicate divine promises to people. The grace promised consists not only in

6 <https://www.crossway.org/articles/john-calvin-on-the-role-of-the-pastor/>.

7 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reformed_baptismal_theology.

benefits which God bestows on people, but Christ's person himself, to whom God unites the believer. Sacraments confirm or ratify the promises communicated in preaching. Both preaching and the sacraments are not merely symbolic and representative of the reality to which they refer, but actually create the reality of saving grace. The sacraments are made efficacious by the Holy Spirit in actually bringing into effect the promises signified in the sacraments. The efficacy is only beneficial, however, for those who have faith. The sacrament remains efficacious regardless of the recipient's response. Its effect is negative, resulting in judgment for the faithless; while it confers Christ and his benefits for the faithful.⁸

John Calvin (1975, IV Ch. XV) argued that: "Baptism is the sign of the initiation by which we are received into the society of the church, in order that, engrafted to Christ, we may be reckoned among God's children." For Calvin, baptism is not simply a mark. It is not something man does to confess his faith before others; as he clearly states in the identical chapter, "they who regard baptism as nothing but a token and a mark by which we confess our religion before men ... have not weighed what the chief point of baptism was. It is to receive the baptism with this promise. 'He who believes and is baptised will be saved'" (Mark 16:16).

Calvin contended that God, by the benefit of his autonomous will, prearranged to save some, whom he named the "elect," but convicted others—the "non-elect." In his renowned work, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, the reformer inscribed: "No one who wishes to be thought religious dares outright to deny predestination, by which God chooses some for the hope of life, and condemns others to eternal death" (Calvin 1975, III. xxi). The Swiss reformer supposed that anthropological "free will" was ruined by man's "original sin"; consequently, the essential power to produce to the will of God was misplaced continually. Later, this philosophy was fused into the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1643). Note the next (Article III):

God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass. ... By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death. (Bettenson 1947, 347)

A distinction must also be made between the Reformed and Catholic views on what ordination means. Torrance (1993, XV) makes this distinction arguing that:

The English word "priest", of course, derives from "presbyter" and is not a translation of "sacerdos", and was regularly used in the sense of presbyter, not in the sense of a sacrificing priest. It is particularly at the celebration of the Eucharist, as well as in the ministry of the Word, that the true nature of the ordination to the priesthood and its Christlike functioning in the Church became apparent, for, as St Thomas Aquinas rightly used to point out, "ordination is in order to the Eucharist." This ordained ministry or priesthood is in no sense an extension of the priestly ministry of Christ or a prolongation

8 <https://writebetter.io/examples/the+sacraments/>.

of his vicarious work. That is the view that gives rise to the very wrong notion of eucharistic sacrifice as an extension or repetition of Christ's own priestly sacrifice, and to wrong notions of priesthood as the prolongation of Christ's Priesthood.

Conclusion

As much as I do not possess the answers to the questions that I have provoked, my intention is to open a conversation that ought to assist us in finding a way forward and answers to the questions. This matter has been outstanding for many years without a proper solution and resolution, except for an escape clause of the Pietermaritzburg Synod of 2005 that the church has hidden behind itself. The Shakespearean question remains relevant for our conversation: "To be, or not to be: that is the question." Every Tom, Dick, and Harry has questions about God and the substances of life. Once we enquire those questions, we are enquiring about theology. Questions contribute to making well-versed and suitable verdicts. Some conclusions will be so repetitive that you style them exclusively by giving them considerable thought. However, problematic or thought-provoking conclusions petition more reflection. These are the kinds of choices that include ambiguity, complication, extraordinary jeopardy, substitutes, and interactive matters. Hesitation is mainly caused as many of the facts may be unknown. Intricacy is instigated because there can be numerous, consistent aspects to contemplate. High-risk penalties confront us because the influence of the choice may be noteworthy. There may be numerous substitutes, each with its particular set of doubts and penalties. Interactive matters need to forecast how dissimilar people will respond. A question is an etymological expression used to make an appeal for data, or the appeal made using such an appearance. The data demanded is given in the form of a response. It ought to be emphasised that questions have advanced a variety of usages that go beyond the modest producing of data from alternative parties. Oratorical questions, for instance, are used to make an argument and are not anticipated to elicit a response. In the systematic technique, a question frequently formulates the foundation of the examination and can be well-thought-out. Theology and philosophy deal with questions that result when people mirror their domain. Questions support us to involve the topics that are antagonising us, and it is by these questions and through them that we try to get explanations or responses.

As Judy Carter⁹ points out: "It's a lot easier being Black than gay. At least if you're Black, you don't have to tell your parents."

References

Bradshaw, Paul F. 2013. *Rites of Ordination: Their History and Theology*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

9 <http://www.quotehd.com/quotes/judy-carter-quote-its-a-lot-easier-being-black-than-gay-at-least-if-youre-black>.

- Bettenson, Henry. 1947. *Documents of the Christian Church*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Botha, P. W. 1985. Speech made by former South African President P.W. Botha to his Cabinet. Reprint written by David G. Mailu for the *Sunday Times*, a South African newspaper, dated August 18, 1985. Accessed July 14, 2022. <https://www.sites.google.com/site/nakampevillage/botha-s-plan-for-blacks>.
- Calvin, John (Ed.). 1975. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- “Carter, Judy.” Accessed July 14, 2022. <http://www.quotehd.com/quotes/judy-carter-quote-its-a-lot-easier-being-black-than-gay-at-least-if-youre-black>.
- Edet, Rosemary N. 2005. “Christianity and African Women’s Ritual.” In *The Will to Arise: Women, Tradition, and Church in Africa*, edited by M. A. Oduyoye and M. R. A. Kanyoro, 25–29. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.
- Mader, Donald. 1993. “Exclusion, Toleration, Acceptance, Integration: The Experience of Dutch Reformed Churches with Homosexuality and Homosexuals in the Church.” *Journal of Homosexuality* 25 (4): 101–120. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v25n04_07.
- Horton, Michael. 2014. “John Calvin on the Role of the Pastor,” October 24, 2014. Accessed July 18, 2022. <https://www.crossway.org/articles/john-calvin-on-the-role-of-the-pastor/>.
- “How to use ‘the sacraments’ in a sentence.” Accessed July 21, 2022. <https://writebetter.io/examples/the+sacraments/>.
- Neff, Miriam. 1979. *Discover Your Worth*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.
- Owanikin, R. Modupe. 2005. “The Priesthood of Church Women in the Nigerian Context.” In *The Will to Arise: Women, Tradition, and Church in Africa*, edited by M. A. Oduyoye and M. R. A. Kanyoro, 206–220. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.
- “Reformed Theology.” Accessed July 21, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reformed_baptismal_theology.
- Rudy, Kathy. 1997. “The Social Construction of Sexual Identity and the Ordination of Practicing Homosexuals.” *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 25 (1): 127–146.
- Ruether, Radford R. 1987. “Christianity.” In *Women in World Religions*, edited by Arvind Sharma, 207–234. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- “Thomas, Marlo.” Accessed July 18, 2022. <https://www.azquotes.com/quote/293327>.
- Torrance, Thomas F. 1993. *Royal Priesthood: A Theology of Ordained Ministry*. London: Continuum T&T Clark. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780567690852>.
- URCSA General Synod ACTA. 2005.

“Sex Change.” Accessed July 14, 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sex_change.

“Winterson, Jeanette.” Accessed July 18, 2022.
https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/jeanette_winterson_349444.

Zinik, Gary. 1985. “Identity of Conflict or Adaptive Flexibility.” *Journal of Homosexuality* 11 (1–2): 7–19. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v11n01_02.