

What's Christian Marriage For?

Marriage, and its Imitators

All we know of God is what God chose to reveal to us; our own ideas are of little importance. One thing God told us was that humans were intended to pair up in a thing involving one man and one woman, for the purpose of companionship, and reproducing – prolonging - humankind. We call this ‘marriage’. Anything else is purely of our own devising, and if we choose to call it ‘marriage’ (we can, after all, do what we like), it is only by imitation, or analogy.

Christians inherit this divine instruction (or should do), and are not at liberty to make up their own concepts, because the Christian church is of God's devising, not their own. The Church of England (and hence world-wide Anglicanism) from the beginning – I have argued elsewhere – claimed the legitimacy of marriage which included sexual intercourse not in any way concerned with reproduction. It is perhaps this original acceptance of such marriage (sexual relations concerned with creating and sustaining a bond between two people) which exposed Anglicanism to the possibility of accepting marriage, and its physical expression, with two people unable to reproduce (such as same-sex couples, or indeed, groups). But it is not – and in reality never could be – for the Church to decide upon the legitimacy (one might say *holiness*) of any arrangement outside of God's instruction.

It has been said that the Bible proscribes same-sex physical activity on very few occasions, and on those, with a large measure of ambiguity as to exactly *what* is being proscribed, and what is not (it is said that actor Sir Ian McKellen regularly tears the relevant pages out of Bibles he encounters). In truth, of course, it is not what the Bible proscribes that is sovereign in the homosexuality debate, but what, it tells us, God has commanded – and that, we have seen, is the perpetual union of one man and one woman. The Bible through and through and through reinforces this concept, first found at its beginning, and shows that this is not only the norm, but the *only* norm. The words of Jesus assume, and further reinforce, the legitimacy of this God-given union as *the* practice of mankind (if Sir Ian were to tear out the pages, from a Bible, which assumed or claimed this norm, he would certainly have his time cut out; and at the end, the damaged book in his hands would have very few pages left in it). And the whole of the Church's history and traditions of doctrine – and those of Judaism before it, and alongside it – have been of the same mind (that is, God's mind). It is all of this – not proscriptions of homosexuality, whatever their exact status – that shows beyond doubt that Christian marriage is, and can only be, a thing involving one man and one woman; human-devised alternatives are not so much sin as fantasy.

Much ink is spilled on the question, of course, of the exact nature of same-sex marriage (perhaps that should be “marriage”). It is often said that most male homosexuals do not want marriage – but that is marriage as it really is, and has always been understood within Western (that is, Judeo-Christian) tradition. Rather – it is argued – such people want a different kind of thing, and even, that they want *this* to be established as the norm for (all) marriage; it is often said that the important thing about gay marriage is that it goes beyond the idea of exclusivity towards some sort of more “open” thing - at least in regards its prescription of permissible sexual relations - and that the much-vaunted “committed, stable, and permanent“, that so convinces our “liberal” church leaders (mostly heterosexual males), only concerns a common domicile, but not a *sexually-exclusive* relationship; “real” gay “marriage”, it is said, has gone beyond the kind of celibacy which Christian marriage has always involved and enjoined. Not surprisingly, there are heterosexual couples who would much prefer that kind of “open” understanding of marriage; one heterosexual couple, apparently, have attempted to have their union declared as a Civil Partnership. But the political leaders (in Britain, and elsewhere), when enthusing about the same-sex marriage (or “marriage”) to which they are so committed, always seem to be *actually* thinking of something along the lines of real, traditional marriage; increasingly, with the homosexuality-promoting

political leaders, one gets the idea they have a very limited (or excessively rosy) view of real homosexuality (or no knowledge of *real* homosexual life at all). At the most concentrated centres of power, it seems, there is the most deception, and absence of reality.

The idea of post-realist marriage (as it may be called) has to be seen in the light of the mainstream media myth that orthodox Christians *hate* homosexuals. As usual with these MSM notions, the myth is the direct opposite of reality. Orthodox Christians love homosexuals (*yes, I think of men I know ...*), love them too much to want to see them destroy their bodies, and thus their lives, by way of physical practices which will inevitably have, upon them, a catastrophic effect. It is the promoters of homosexuality (particularly governments, media organisations, and education authorities) whose efforts will ensure this human destruction, a work of promotion that evidences *actual* hatred of homosexuals in all but honest admission (politicians and media people are normally driven by the demands of the promotion of ideology; ordinary individual people are often just expendable cannon-fodder in the culture wars).