

**SEXUALITY IN THE DOMINION MANDATE (GEN. 1: 26- 28) AND ITS
REFLECTION IN THE YORUBA SOCIO-CULTURAL CONTEXT**

By

**JOSHUA OLUKAYODE, ADEOGUN
MATRIC NO.: 77904**

**A Thesis in the Department of Religious Studies,
Submitted to the Faculty of Arts
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

of the

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN

JANUARY, 2022

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this thesis was carried out by JOSHUA OLUKAYODE ADEOGUN (Matric No: 77904) of the Department of Religious Studies, University of Ibadan under my supervision.

Supervisor

Prof. Adekunle O. Dada
B.A., M.A., Ph.D (Ìbàdàn)
Department of Religious Studies
University of Ibadan,
Ibadan, Nigeria.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to the Almighty God my sustainer and the source of my wisdom and strength.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I return all the glory, honour and thanks to the Lord Almighty who gives me the strength to start and complete this course. My heart is full of gratitude for security and protection for travelling mercies throughout the duration of the course.

I cannot thank my supervisor and current Head of Department enough, Prof. Adekunle O. Dada who gives his time and resources to read every sentence in this thesis. His scholastic advice and his eagle eyes on every idea on sexuality projected in this work strengthened the research. I am particularly grateful to him for the scholarly materials both hard and soft copies he supported me with contributed in no small measure to make the research possible. Without mincing word I found a bulwark of support from him.

The academic staff of the Department offered words of encouragement which served as motivation to the completion of the study. In no particular order my appreciation goes to the immediate past Head of Department, Pastor Prof. Samson Fatokun whose soothing words cannot be forgotten. Prof. Kehinde Ayantayo, who is an authority in research writing, his contributions at the Departmental Postgraduate seminar broadens horizon on the research. I thank The Rt. Rev. Dr. Bayo Obijole, who also contributed on the analysis of the text on the study. The Ven. Dr J.S. Adekoya, played a significant role encouraging me to work hard and complete the course. I thank Dr. O. O. Familusi, who offered his knowledge of ethics to make the work relevant to Yoruba context.

My appreciation radar goes to The Very Rev. Dr. Olugbenro Berekiah who had unquantifiable interest in the research. He gave me Hebrew language and syntax software, which afforded me the opportunity to type all the Hebrew texts in the Tanakh referred to in this work. He made constructive contributions, often his questions on the research widens my horizon and always leads to critical thinking which refined the work. He made sacrifices beyond my expectation. I thank The Very Rev. Dr. Honor Sewapo, the Departmental Postgraduate Coordinator for his insightful suggestions. I thank Prof. Hellen Labeodan, Dr. Mepaiyeda, Samuel Okanlawon, Dr. Samuel Olaleye, Dr. Toyin Gbadamosi, who shared the same office with The Very Rev. Dr. Olugbenro Berekiah, who tolerated me whenever I called on the latter in the office.

I am grateful to the non academic staff for their gentle disposition at the Departmental office.

I am indebted to The Very Rev. Dr. Amos Oladipo, a Minister of United Methodist in United States of America, who bought relevant books on the research for me. He also took me to some United Methodist Ministers who are in academic for discussion on the title of this research when I visited him in the states. Bro Tayo Olaniyan and The Very Rev. Dr. Simeon Osunlana who reside in the United States of America made the research possible with study materials. The role they played gave me confidence to carry out the research.

My sincere appreciation goes to Methodist Church Nigeria which gave me enabling opportunity for the programme. I thank His Eminence Dr. Samuel C. K. Uche, who when I resumed as Director of Administration having heard that I suspended the programme twice after registration as a result of responsibilities the Church gave me. He encouraged me to plan my work in spite of the daunting administrative responsibilities. The Most Rev. Dr. C. Raphael Opoko, TFG, the immediate past Secretary of Conference with whom I worked at the headquarters, when he learnt that I am on Doctor Philosophy programme advised on how I can plan my administrative work without affecting the study adversely. I sincerely appreciate his support.

I appreciate all the lecturers who worked under my leadership as Rector at Methodist Theological Institute, Sagamu, who did not cease encouraging me to embark on Doctor of Philosophy programme. I thank the Very Rev. Dr. Joseph O. Ayodele for his unquantifiable role on the research.

I thank my driver, Mr. Olayemi Ifekoya with whom I travelled in the course of this programme. My appreciation goes to Mama Ojo who arranged the Ifa Priests (Babalawo) I interviewed at Osogbo and Orunmuyi Ogunsanmi who linked me with the indigenous worshipers (*elesin a a ba laye*) which I had focused group discussion with in Lagos. In the same vein I appreciate all clergymen and laity who gave me their time for interview. I appreciate their friendly patience and mild manner.

I am indebted to my wife, Mrs Abigail Olubunmi Adeogun, who bore much burden on the research. When it seems I showed attitude of discouragement on it even without telling her she would encourage me and offered words of advice. When Diocesan responsibilities are daunting, she made time table of schedule of duties for me, just to make sure I completed it. Together with her, the children have shown me joy to the end of the course.

I will forever be grateful to YHWH for His inspiration, provision, love and the grace He bestowed on me from beginning to the end of the programme.

ABSTRACT

Sexuality, a concept which expresses different sexual and gender-related activities and features, manifests in the dominion mandate (Gen 1: 26- 28) and the Yoruba socio-cultural milieu. Previous studies on the dominion mandate focused on *imago Dei*, ecological concerns, earth stewardship, and gender discourse, with little attention paid to the issue of sexuality and its relatedness to the Yoruba. This study was, therefore, designed to examine sexuality in the dominion mandate, with a view to identifying its expressions and functions as well as its reflection within the Yoruba socio-cultural context.

Chris Manu's Inter-cultural Hermeneutics, which relates the biblical texts to African context, provided the framework. The historical-critical method was utilised in the interpretation of the pericopé. Four sessions of focus group discussion were held in Osogbo and Lagos. These cities were chosen because of their traditional nature and cosmopolitan, respectively, and where traditional worshippers and Christians interact. In-depth interviews were conducted with 16 *Ẹlẹ̀sìn abáláyé* (indigenous worshippers), five Babaláwo (Ifá priests) and 25 Christians (10 members of the clergy, 15 members of the laity) who had deep understanding of the expression and practice of sexuality. Data were subjected to exegetical and content analyses.

The dominion mandate text (Gen. 1:26 - 28) reveals three fundamental principles: fecundity, mutual relationship and exclusivity and suppressed sexuality. These characterise the foundation for the expression and practice of sexuality. Fecundity is represented as the principal instruction given to humanity on sexuality, which is expected to be achieved through heterosexual reproduction. This was corroborated in another text where *ish* (man), *yada* (mate) and *isha* (woman) procreated, which began human population (Gen.2:24-25). This indicates heterosexual conjugal relationship as a process to procreation. Mutual relationship and exclusivity is promoted through sexual expression practised in monogamous heterosexual context in which the two share their hidden divine potentials. This also leads to intimacy which engenders social cohesion. Suppressed sexuality portrayed in the text, shows the need for humanity to subdue their sexuality by restricting its expression and practice to monogamy which was established so as to instil discipline on humanity as a requisite to having dominion over other creatures. Yoruba understanding of sexuality is codified in the oral tradition and its motive is analogous to dominion mandate. Expression and practice of sexuality as reflected in the Yoruba socio-cultural milieu is a sacred phenomenon that should be done to achieve the divine goal, and should not be abused. Yoruba expression of sexuality has the focus of fecundity for the purpose of perpetuating the worship of gods and goddesses, as confirmed by all the Babaláwo in Osogbo. The purpose of sex is to promote mutual understanding and intimacy among couples. The majority of both indigenous worshippers and the Christian respondents claimed that Yoruba expression of sexuality opposes sexual perversion like homosexuality, bestiality, paedophilia and pornography.

Sexuality, as expressed in the dominion mandate and also reflected in Yoruba socio-cultural context, is a veritable avenue for the stability, sustenance of human race and development of the society.

Keywords: Dominion mandate, Sexuality in Genesis, Yorubá socio-cultural context

Word count: 492

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	i
Certification	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	vii
Table of contents	viii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background to the Study	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem	8
1.3	Purpose of the Study	10
1.4	Scope of the Study	11
1.5	Significance of the Study	11

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1	Theoretical Framework	13
2.2	Sexuality in the Old Testament	15
2.3	Sexuality and Power	28
2.4	Sexuality and Spirituality	34
2.5	Sexuality and Development	35

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1	Research Design	41
3.2	Study Area and Sample Populace	45
3.3	Sampling Technique	45
3.4	Methods of Data Collection	46
3.5	Methods of Data Analysis	46

CHAPTER FOUR: EXEGESIS AND ANALYSES OF THE DOMINION MANDATE TEXT (GEN. 1: 26 – 28) AND A CRITIQUE OF MODERN EXPRESSION OF SEXUALITY IN THE LIGHT OF THE DOMINION MANDATE TEXT AND YORUBA CONTEXT

4.0	Chapter Overview	47
4.1	Exegesis and Analyses of the Dominion Mandate Text (Gen. 1: 26 – 28)	47
4.1.1	Textual Critical Appraisal of the Dominion Mandate Text	47
4.1.2	Socio Cultural Background of the Text	49
4.1.3	The Assyrian Epic of Creation	51
4.1.4	P Account of Creation and the Babylonian Myth of Creation	54
4.1.5	P Account of Creation and the Egyptian Creation Myths	58
4.1.6	The Motif of the Cosmologies	62
4.1.7	Exegetical Import of Key Terms in the Dominion Mandate	65
4.1.8	Gender Construct in the Dominion Mandate	71
4.1.9	Form Critical Comments on the Dominion Mandate	73
4.1.10	Source Critical Appraisal on the Dominion Mandate	74
4.2	Analysis of Sexuality in the Dominion Mandate	76
4.2.1	Sexuality in Ancient Near East	76
4.2.2	Sexuality and the Image of God	82
4.2.3	Sexuality and Heterosexuality in Dominion Mandate	90
4.2.4	Sexuality and Procreation	93
4.3	A Critique of Modern Expression of Sexuality in the Light of the Dominion Mandate	99
4.3.1	Heterosexuality	99
4.3.2	Adultery	104
4.3.3	Rape	110
4.3.4	Incest	114
4.3.5	Homosexuality	116
4.3.6	Pornography	128
4.4	Sexuality in the Dominion Mandate in Yorùbá Context	131
4.4.1	Sexuality among the Yorùbá in the Pre Colonial Era	132
4.4.2	Sexuality in Colonial and Postcolonial Era	139
4.4.3	Yorùbá Oral Text on Sexuality	143
4.4.4	Convergences and Divergences between Dominion Mandate Text and the Yorùbá Text	148

4.4.5	Implication of Dominion Mandate Text for Old Testament Theology	151
-------	---	-----

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	Summary	155
5.2	Conclusion	158
5.3	Recommendations	160
5.4	Contributions to Knowledge	161
	References	163

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

The creation of humanity as explained in the *Tanakh*¹ has remained a popular and an acceptable creation story amongst diverse cultures worldwide, and among Christians of Yoruba socio-cultural background in particular. This may be attributed to its interpretation in most living languages.² This is made possible by the exegetical analysis of the passage which takes historical-grammatical issues into consideration and applies its contents to context. Wildsmith notes the reality of this when he says, “Cultural exegesis opens the Bible to all forms of cultures inasmuch as contents is applied to the people’s way of life.”³ This literature (that is, the Bible) is being used to form ethical standard in socio-political and economic life of most cultures because it is believed to be sacred and used for religious purpose. Genesis 1:26-28, also called “The Dominion Mandate”, is a very crucial part of the biblical creation account. It gives account of how humanity was created as the crown of creation, with male/female gender distinction, and given a mandate of dominion over other creatures. Male/female gender distinction calls attention to the issue of sexuality, which is also a significant element in the Yoruba sociocultural context. The dominion mandate has caught the attention of some scholars in pure sciences, social sciences and humanities. It has also become a subject of debate in scholarship. Attempts have been made by environmentalists, sociologists, ecologists, anthropologists and biblical scholars to find an appropriate interpretation of the mandate.

¹ Tanakh is an acronym for Torah, N^ebⁱm w^e K^etubⁱm, i.e. Law, Prophets and Writings representing the Hebrew Bible.

² All cultures have creation story which has been in tradition for centuries, but the advent of the Hebrew literature with its translation to many languages, being the dominant literature in Christianity, and the acceptance of this religion over many traditional religions, has made it to be one of the major religions in the world. Consequently, the Hebrew literature has been made popular, while its culture has become acceptable in many cultures. The Hebrew literature is used to form ethical values and its narratives are believed to be superior to other religious literature. Since its advent in many cultures worldwide, its creation account has been judged to be the best and the most acceptable of other cultures.

³ Andrew Wildsmith. 2002. “Cultural Exegesis: The Bible is Open to Everyone”. *Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology*, 21. 2, 200.

In his own contribution, Abogunrin examines this passage and opines that the wealth and health of humanity is hinged on sexuality⁴.

A cursory reading of the mandate focuses on ecological concerns, earth stewardship, and gender discourse. Chris Manus, in his study of this passage, submits that the Stockholm, Sweden United Nations (UN) Conference as well as the World Council of Churches (WCC) challenged the Christian faithful and the Churches to recognise the magnitude of the environmental problem and its catastrophic consequences. He avers that what the Hebrew author teaches humanity is how to responsibly handle nature so that it can be productive to support life on earth.⁵ This view is also supported by most biblical scholars. Olanisebe observes that in many Christian circles, the dominion mandate has been interpreted to mean the whole creation of the environment before the creation of humanity so that man may not be in want in the world, thus, they have to take care of nature.⁶ Kay avers that reading the mandate which God gave אָדָם ('ādām)⁷ suggests that the Tanakh's account of creation expresses explicit beliefs about the environment and human ecology. Therefore, God's mandate to אָדָם is about the conservation of the ecology. אָדָם has to be its steward for the purpose of preserving human life.⁸ Interpreting this verse, Phyllis notes that since the Bible itself is economical with self-explanation, it gives an open door for scholars to interpret the passage from the lens of their field of study. Thus, it will be difficult to judge their views wrong or right. He notes that the only way by which the earth can support human life is when it is controlled.⁹ Hall posits that the mandate is given owing to the fact that human beings cannot be separated from the environment, and, since they are the crown of creation having been created in the image

⁴ S. O. Abogunrin. 2008. "Keynote Address", C. U. Manus, (ed.) *Biblical Studies and Environmental Issues in Africa*. Ibadan: NABIS Western Zone. 5.

⁵ C. U. Manus. 2008. "Towards a Biblical Theology of the Environment: A Re-reading of Gen. 1: 27 – 28". C. U. Manus (ed.) *Biblical Studies and Environmental Issues*. NABIS, Western Zone. 21.

⁶ S. O. Olanisebe. 2008. "Revisiting Creation Accounts in Gen. 1-2 and the Dominion Theology in Relation to the Environment in Nigeria". C. U. Manus (ed.) *Biblical Studies and Environmental Issues*. Ibadan: NABIS, Western Zone. 91.

⁷ The Hebrew term אָדָם is used here to denote the generic name for humankind rather than the personal name Adam or the common masculine noun for 'man' as in the male gender.

⁸ Jeanne Kay. "Human Dominion over Nature in the Hebrew Bible". <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2563253>, accessed on 22 June, 2015. Gene M. Tucker, "Rain on a Land Where no one Lives: The Hebrew Bible on the Environment" <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3266743>, accessed on 22 June, 2015.

⁹ Phyllis A. Bird, "Male and Female He created Them: Gen 1: 27b in the context of the Priestly Account of Creation". <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1509444>, accessed on 22 June, 2015.

of God, they have to exercise authority and power over other creatures.¹⁰ These interpretations could be termed eco-biblical studies.

It cannot be disputed that the power to rule the earth and its creatures was delegated to אָדָם. However, the fact remains that the core of the dominion mandate is not primarily on environmental concern but on humanity itself and the reproduction of its kind. It is difficult for two persons to dominate ecology. The interest of most scholars in the dominion mandate which God gave to אָדָם is the second part,

Subdue it; and have predominance over the fish of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth, and the most essential part of the blessings pronounced by God is: “Be fruitful and multiply; replenish the earth...

Gene describes this notion as ecology in anthropomorphic interpretation.¹¹ Looking at the destruction and damage which the exploitative interpretation has caused the environment and the cutting short of the life span of humanity, one would have expected that scholars would have considered a careful re-reading and re-interpretation of the passage so as to do justice to the text and appropriate the text from the context. In most interpretations of this passage, humanity whom God addressed, are treated as if without them nature can thrive.

The dominion mandate commands blessing in the first instance, in the act of fecundity for humanity, an assignment given to humanity to continue the art of creation through procreation.¹² Before God gave the mandate, He had considered the potential He deposited in אָדָם that they have the ability to subdue and dominate their own nature for the purpose of preserving His image and likeness in them. The mandate given to them entails considering the potential in אָדָם and how this would be of benefit to them and the creator within the ecological setting. The mandate involves exercising authority in leadership. In leadership theory where appointment is made on merit, no one is given responsibility without considering his/her potential first. God placed in אָדָם the capability

¹⁰ W. David Hall, “Does Creation Equal Nature? Confronting the Christian Confusion about Ecology and Cosmology”. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4139920>, accessed on 22 June, 2015.

¹¹ Gene M. Tucker. “Rain on a land Where no one Lives: The Hebrew Bible on the Environment”

¹² W. Randall Garr. “God’s Creation in the Priestly Source” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4495072>, accessed on 22 June, 2015.

of subduing and dominating their very self nature, before giving them the dominion mandate. This means that before God gave this mandate to humanity, He knew that they were capable of dominating nature especially in terms of exercising control and applying it to bring the desired goal intended by Him.

The formation of both genders – male and female – inadvertently created the avenue for both sexes to have intimate mutuality in sharing their sexuality for procreation for the purpose of continuing the work of creation. Ellens observes that humanity cannot shy away from the fact that in this passage, God has not expressed sexuality as an important part of normal function of human life as the bearer of God’s image.¹³ In this sense, it begs the question of whether it is not the ecology that the dominion mandate focuses on, but humanity who bears the image of God. Anderson and Gene, commenting on the importance of the image of God in humanity note that it is a call of responsibility to act on God’s behalf, consistent with His will.¹⁴ There is need to clarify whether God’s image in humanity refers primarily to their spirituality, rationality, emotion, language proficiency or rather to their sexuality. Hall avers that we cannot deny that the dominion mandate focuses on ecology, but the motive of God in the mandate is beyond ecology. After all, the universe is invested with value and this value has to be made manifest by humanity through the act of blessing received from the creator at creation. He concludes that biblical creation account is for both ecological and comprehensive ethics.¹⁵

The comprehensive ethic is what most scholars overlook in the mandate, as they concentrate on ecology. The primary reason why scholars focus on ecology in this passage is because the readers of the *Tanakh* devote attention to what they see for the purpose of generating empirical verification to confirm their pre-meditated standpoint. Another reason is that they judge within their limited knowledge that the rights of animals, birds, fish and plants created by God need to be protected and preserved just as humanity is protecting their own fundamental human rights. Besides, the fact that the emergence of new age religions seem to derive their spiritual formation from nature,

¹³ J. Harolds Ellens. 2006. *Sex in the Bible: A New Consideration*, London: Praeger. 9.

¹⁴ Bernhard W. Anderson. 1994. *From Creation to New Creation*, Minneapolis: Fortress. 130; Gene M. Tucker. “Rain on Land Where no one Lives: The Hebrew Bible on the Environment.”

¹⁵ W. David Hall, “Does Creation Equal nature? Confronting the Christian about Ecology and Cosmology”.

while considering the misuse of ecology as inimical to the survival of their faith, bring to fore the interpretation of this passage in favour of conservation of ecology. These religions interpret this passage as a way to dissuade humanity from exploiting ecology so that the source of their spirituality will not be hampered. These are face-value interpretations of the dominion mandate and to some extent; they are anthropocentric. The reality of the dominion mandate may be deciphered by interpreting the motive of the Being who gave the mandate.

The creation account of the Tanakh shows that humanity is created as sexual beings, that is, heterosexually (male and female) imbued with the Divine blessing. This heterosexuality of humanity suggests that God created them with the capacity to express conscious libidinal sexual desire between the two sexes. The text states categorically that these sexual beings are in the image¹⁶ of God and are given the dominion mandate. The argument around humanity as God's creation constitutes a cardinal point in the doctrine of creation. The Tanakh makes it clear that, this is what differentiates humanity from the rest of creation; which implies that it creates the avenue for communication between humanity and God, and the means for humanity to reflect the identity of God on earth. However, the idea of God's image in humanity does not connote that God is sexual. Akao contends that sexual duality belongs to the sphere of creatures and not the creator.¹⁷ Cross-cultural comparison shows that the understanding of sexuality by the Israelites is in contrast to that of her Canaanite neighbours who regard the copulation and procreation of their gods as mythical pattern of creation. It needs to be ascertained that, by proclaiming that humanity was created in God's image, the text implies that God reproduced Himself only in attributive manner and gave opportunity for humanity to reproduce themselves. The blessing of God on humanity presupposes sexual constitution that is based on procreation. This indicates that the theme of sexuality is dominant in the dominion mandate because the two sexes were addressed by God.

¹⁶ Theological reflection has offered that the image of God in the Hebrew literature relates to the whole human existence which comprise spiritual, psychological, social, emotional, aesthetic which reflect in human sexuality.

¹⁷ J. O. Akao.2006. "Old Testament Concept of Sexuality", in S. O. Abogunrin, (ed.). 2006. *Biblical View of Sex and Sexuality from African Perspective*, NABIS, Number, 5, Ibadan: NABIS. 22.

The contact of the Yoruba with the West in the nineteenth century brought a change to the perception of sexual roles in the pre-colonial age with the introduction of Western culture. The culture of the people, including sexuality, is trivialized to the extent of being valueless. Before the contact of the Yoruba with the West, the practice of sexuality aligns more with the dominion mandate, because sexuality, in its practice, was strictly heterosexual, for the purpose of procreation. It was believed that the enterprise should not be for pleasure alone, but to bring the desired intention of the creator. In spite of the colonial exit of the Westerners from Yorubaland for about five decades ago, some of the instruments used (education, media, entertainment) in the propagation of Western culture have continued to influence the practice of sexuality negatively. The media¹⁸ is full of promotion of sexual perversion through pornography, and pervert sex-orientation films. The effects of this contact with the Yoruba culture are evident in the psychological, social and spiritual sphere of the people's life.

The factors that stimulate interest in this study include the perception of the Yoruba on sexuality. To the Yoruba, sexuality encompasses the total life, from the cradle to the grave. The people believe that without it, the society is devoid of peace because they regard the expression of sexuality as a sacred duty that should take place within heterosexual relationships. To this end, they do not discuss or engage in it in the open so as not to corrupt non-initiates and to maintain high moral rectitude in the society. However, this situation has changed drastically as a result of their contact with the Euro-American culture that expresses and discusses sexuality in public places. Thus, Yoruba sex culture has experienced a tremendous change that is beyond the imagination of the people. This new dimension continues to raise serious concern among sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, theologians, social sciences and other humanities-based fields.

Like every other subject, sexuality has been devoid of a one-sentence definition. Owing to its practice in every culture, scholars define it from various disciplinary perspectives.

¹⁸ In 2014 alone *The Punch* reported sixty seven cases of rape including some fathers who impregnated their daughters and some homosexuals. *The Nation* reported about twenty two cases of rape which also included some fathers who put their daughters in family way.

Mfono views sexuality as “the expression of sexual sensation and related intimacy between beings as well as the expression of identity through sex and as influenced by or based on sex.”¹⁹ Some see it as the cultural way of living out the bodily pleasures.²⁰ According to Nelson and Longfellow, sexuality can be summed up as the physical and psychological dimensions of the human person which involves minds, emotions, dreams, hopes, expectations, fears, memories, wills and self-understanding of who we are.²¹ Davidson was of the opinion that sexuality can be defined as the concepts of differentiation in human gender (the categorization of human beings into either male or female as a duality and their inter-relationships) coupled with their sexual endowment, their various biological, psychological and social dimensions.²² Paulina and Tiemoko, quoting the World Health Organization equally defined sexuality as:

The quintessence aspect of human being which an individual experiences throughout one’s life time which encompasses sex, gender identities and roles, sexual orientation, eroticism, pleasure, intimacy and reproduction. Sexuality is something that could be experienced and also expressed in thoughts, fantasies, desires, beliefs, attitudes, values, behaviours, practices, roles, and relationships²³.

The definition above is all encompassing about human sexuality. It is more than mere sexual activity; it encompasses all issues that define male and female, all that is potently shaped by cultural values, norms and tradition. But this research does not intend to treat all subjects that relate to sexuality. Hence, the focus of this work will be on sexual behaviour expressed and practiced by $\text{m}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{x}}$ to fulfill the dominion mandate assigned to them at creation. Sexuality is the sexual nature or sexual characteristic of male and female. Therefore, sexual orientation, eroticism and reproduction demands research.

¹⁹ Z. N. Mfono. 2006. “African Writer’s Exposition of African Sexuality in their Story Lines”. www.arscr.org/publication/2006.asp, accessed on 13th Oct., 2014.

²⁰ Eno Blankson. 2004. “Human sexuality in Nigeria: A Historical Perspective”. The Africa Regional Sexuality Resource Centre Seminar Series, 1.

²¹ J. B. Nelson and S. P. Longfellow, (eds.) 1994. *Sexuality and Sacred: Sources for Theological Reflection*. London: Mowbrays. xii.

²² Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson. 2.

²³ Paulina Makinwa-Adebusoye and Richmond Tiemoko. 2007. “Healthy Sexuality: Discourses in East, West North and Southern Africa”. Eleanor Maticka-Tyndale, Richmond Tiemoko & Paulina Makinwa-Adebusoye (eds.) *Human Sexuality in Africa beyond Reproduction*. Sunyside: Fanele. 1.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The dominant interpretation of Gen 1:26-28 has been hinged on two schools of thought. The first is the conservation of the environment, and earth stewardship. Scholars like Abogunrin²⁴, Manus²⁵ and Hall²⁶, in their interpretations of these verses, aver that what the Hebrew author teaches humanity is how to nature can be responsibly handled in order to be productive to support life on earth.²⁷ Olanisebe, while quoting Dyke, notes the effect of the ecological interpretation of the mandate when he writes:

Christianity did not only assert that there are two natures of human persons and reality of life in itself, but it also emphasizes that it is God's will for humans beings is for them to use nature for proper purpose. Simply because of our inability to use nature in the right way, the consequence is our continuous worsening environmental problems that we are now experiencing and until we all learn the Christian axiom that nature has no other purpose than to serve... The historical root of our environmental problems stems from the Judeo-Christian understanding of human relationship to nature²⁸.

The second interpretation of these verses which scholars have focused on is *imago Dei*, the creation of humanity in the image and likeness of God. Charry²⁹ and McGrath³⁰ assert that the thrust of the passage lies on the image of God which humanity carries. Davidson in his extensive research on sexuality in the Old Testament submits that, "this passage over the centuries has mainly focused on the meaning of human creation in the image of God."³¹

²⁴ S. O. Abogunrin. 2008. "Key Note Address". C.U. Manus, (ed.) *Biblical Studies and Environmental Studies in Africa*. Ibadan: NABIS Western Zone. 5.

²⁵ C. U. Manus. 2008. "Towards a Biblical Theology of the Environment: A Re-reading of Gen. 1: 27 – 28". C.U. Manus (ed.) *Biblical Studies and Environmental Issues*. NABIS, Western Zone. 21.

²⁶ W. David Hall. "Does Creation Equal Nature? Confronting the Christian Confusion about Ecology and Cosmology". <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4139920>. Accessed on 22 June, 2015.

²⁷ C. U. Manus. 2008. "Towards a Biblical Theology of the Environment: A Re-reading of Gen. 1: 27 – 28". C. U. Manus (ed.) *Biblical Studies and Environmental Issues*. NABIS, Western Zone. 21.

²⁸ S. O. Olanisebe. 2009. "Revisiting Creation Accounts in Gen. 1 & 2 and Dominion Theology in Relation to the Environment in Nigeria." *African Journal of Biblical Studies*, October, Vol. XXVII, Number 2. 20.

²⁹ E. T. Charry. 2005. "Human Bien, Doctrine of". Kevin J. Vanhoozer (ed.) *Dictionary of Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. London: SPCK. 311.

³⁰ A. E. McGrath. 2001. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell. 442.

³¹ R. M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson. 17.

Another sphere in which this text has been applied is in the realm of gender discourse with focus on issues like feminism, womanism, gender-equality, and the empowerment of the feminine gender. Examples of such include John S. Pobee, who casually remarked that feminism is “a movement devoted to fostering women as also bearing the *imago Dei*...”³² Another is E. Ola Adeogun, who treated the fall narrative in Genesis 3. It is noteworthy that none of these two scholars did any analysis on the Dominion Mandate.³³ Moreover, there has been a neglect of how the expression and functions of sexuality in the Dominion Mandate reflects within the Yoruba sociocultural context, despite the fact that the Tanakh has been accepted as the rule of ethics amongst Christians of Yoruba sociocultural background.

This research therefore attempts to explore aspects of the dominion mandate that relate to human sexuality, which constitutes the original intention of God as expressed in Gen. 1: 26-28. It also looks at its different expressions and functions as well as how it is reflected within the Yoruba sociocultural context. The interpretation of the Tanakh in the postmodern era makes most scholars to interpret what they read with the preconceived notion that could be termed, the dynamic interpretation of Hebrew literature in Biblical scholarship. This trend inhibits from seeing and understanding a particular passage, especially as regard human sexuality, from the author’s perspective.

In this regard, the following questions are germane: how can two persons subdue the environment when human sexuality exegetical interpretation of Gen 1: 26-28 is ignored? Can humanity restrict themselves to conservation of ecology and study of the environment when they have not created the consciousness of subduing their sexuality? Will ecology be a true source of survival for humanity when they abuse their sexuality beyond the limit of nature? Will nature not work against humanity when human sexuality is stretched beyond limit?

³² J. O. Pobee 2012. *Biblical Studies and Feminism in the African Context*. In O.A. Adewale, et.al. *Biblical Studies and Feminism in the African Context*, Ibadan, NABIS. Pg.29

³³ E. O. Adeogun. Re-Reading the ‘Fall Story’ (Gen.3) in the Context of the Power of Women in Pre-Colonial Yorubaland. In O.A. Adewale, et.al. *Biblical Studies and Feminism in the African Context*, Ibadan, NABIS. Pg.141-178.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study is situated in biblical studies, using the foundation of the narratives that tell the creation of humanity and the beginning of human sexuality, as expressed in Gen 1:26-28. Tanakh has the value of having been contextualised to all cultures as a result of its translation and interpretation into most living languages from its original language (Hebrew) and its use in religion. There is the belief that it addresses all contexts, and this has given rise to relating the Bible to context in scholarship. The purpose of this study is to attempt an exegetical study of Gen. 1: 26-28 and shows how it relates to, and addresses human sexuality.

The research investigates if, without the fulfillment of the dominion mandate of human sexuality in multiplication and fruitfulness, humanity will not have the will power to dominate or, as some ethicists would say, have stewardship of the environment. Likewise, the research attempt to examine if without the human sexuality in focus in this passage, the intention of the image of God in humanity may not manifest after all.

The study also examined how sexuality among the Yoruba took root in the pre-colonial era and how each sex carried out his/her roles to fulfill the will of deities and cultural norms without undue interference. It sought to show how Yoruba understanding of sexuality and the way it was expressed and practiced has added value to the life of the people, socially, economically, religiously and politically. How the people cherished it and passed it from one generation to another. It also interrogated how the advent of Euro-American missionaries and the interpretation of Gen. 1: 26-28 brought a dramatic change in the expression and practice of sexuality to the dismay of the Yoruba. This research further examined the changes in sexuality among the Yoruba, as a result of the interpretation of the Tanakh and its contextualisation to the Yoruba culture.

1.4 Scope of the study

This study re-examines the interpretation of Gen.1:26-28 as it relates to dominion mandate in human sexuality and the influence it has on the changes of perception of sexuality among the Yoruba. The geographical scope of this study is within the Yoruba

of South West³⁴ with Osogbo and Lagos Townships as sample populace. The Yoruba states consist of urban and sub-urban areas where the Christian Bible, which contains the English and Yoruba Versions of the Tanakh, is being applied in the expression and practice of sexuality. Globalisation which has brought urbanisation and migration of people of different ethnic groups to Yorubaland has influenced the culture of the people. As a result, the expression of modern and postmodern life in relation to the interpretation of the Tanakh has firmly taking root. Osogbo and Lagos Townships are purposefully chosen as sample populace because of their cosmopolitan nature, where traditional worshipers and Christians interact.

1.5 Significance of the study

Previous studies on the dominion mandate have paid attention to ecology and the study of the environment as a whole and human survival, but very few studies have been done on this in relation to human sexuality. This study is significant as it expresses the views of scholars on the dominion mandate in Genesis 1: 26-28 which hitherto has been limited to the study of conservation of environment and exploitation of ecology. The study further fills the lacuna created by the fact that scholars have not painstakingly considered the aspect that relates to humanity as God's image in the mandate, especially with regard to human sexuality. Sexuality gives meaning to the existence of humanity. This has contributed to the development of society in the management of ecology, but regrettably it is ignored in the discussion of the dominion mandate. The exegetical analysis of this will be significant to scholars in examining the motive of the creator in giving this order.

The study of Yoruba anthropology, with particular reference to their understanding of the dominion mandate in relation to human sexuality, will shed more light on the dignity of the image of God in humanity. The study proffers possible solutions to the tinted perspective in sexuality which has bedeviled the society and which attempt to destroy the divine potentialities

³⁴ Yoruba ethnic group in the political geographical delineation of the country covers Ekiti, Lagos, Ondo, Osun and Oyo states. This ethnic group has homogenous culture as regard understanding, expression and practice of sexuality.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Theoretical framework

This research adopted Manus³⁵ intercultural hermeneutics, which relates the biblical text to the African context. Chris Manus, doyen of intercultural biblical hermeneutics, posits that the message of the Bible will not be relevant to African context until scholars interpret it in the cultural milieu of the people. In his view it is imperative to employ alternative hermeneutics for African in the field of biblical studies with specific mode of interpretation which will make the holy writ relevant to the context of African.³⁶ It is obvious that the bible addresses various issues which are present in African cultures but limiting it studies to the traditional methods in biblical interpretation introduced by Euro-American scholars such as historical-grammatical exegesis, textual criticism, redaction criticism which have made the biblical truth hidden for a long time and hinders the socio cultural development of the people to the realities of life. Manus posits that there is need to delimit certain biblical text of which a researcher intends to give meaning to African context from its larger context for the purpose of “handy exposition.”³⁷ When a scholar engages biblical scholarship with this in focus, a breakdown into smaller unit of the text will afford the researcher give understanding exegesis because exegesis eliminates all forms of prejudices against cultural practices that exist in various cultures as expounded in the biblical text. Manus, however warned that in adopting intercultural hermeneutics “care has to be taken to isolate the emerging themes and motifs and set them aside for use in the third text.”³⁸ The intercultural hermeneutics, therefore, opens door of decoding and readdressing the new emerging situations in African context without neglecting the original message of the text. This makes the exegete to bring the biblical narrative relevant to the context of the readers.

³⁵ C. U. Manus. 2002. “Towards an African Methodology for Biblical Research”. *Orita: Ibadan Journal of Religious Studies*, XXXIV/1- 2, June & December.

³⁶ Chris U. Manus. 2002. Towards An African Methodology for Biblical Research, in *Orita: Ibadan Journal of Religious Studies*, XXXIV/ 1- 2 June & December.49.

³⁷ Chris Manus. 2002. Towards An African Methodology for Biblical Research, 53.

³⁸ Chris Manus. 2002. Towards An African Methodology for Biblical Research, 53.

Along with Manus, other scholars like Ukpong,³⁹ and Adamo⁴⁰ also employed the African model of re-reading and interpreting the Bible. Though these scholars adopted different terminologies⁴¹, their argument remained the same. This theoretical framework has been elaborated upon by other Old Testament scholars like Dada⁴² who applied it to reposition contextual biblical hermeneutics in the Africa milieu. Dada opined that without applying this to the study of the Old Testament in Africa it will be difficult to attain holistic empowerment that will make the text relevant to the context. The import of their theoretical framework is that re-reading and interpreting the Bible in Africa entails taking the culture of the people into consideration. These scholars have explored the Western paradigm for some years in Biblical scholarship and discover that it fails to address the African context, which advocate for intercultural theory in reading and interpreting the Biblical texts. They opine that it is undoubtedly true that the Bible emerged in Hebrew culture to address issues in their cultural milieu. Yet, this book is universal as it constitutes the authoritative revelation of God to humanity in their various cultural backgrounds. Therefore, its revelation would be meaningless if its reading and interpretation exclude the context of the people where it is presented. Ukpong avers that inculturation is a hermeneutic focus on Africa's anthropological empowerment and cultural identity.⁴³

The intercultural hermeneutics which this research adopted posits that intercultural interpretation will help in establishing the validity of the issues discussed in Biblical texts to make meaning to Africans. Dada posits that in intercultural hermeneutics lies inferential⁴⁴ hermeneutics. Since African experiences are quite different from those of

³⁹ Justin Ukpong coined and advocated for a new theoretical framework in African Biblical scholarship which he called inculturation Biblical hermeneutics in 1996 and since then his work has become a reference point in African Biblical scholarship.

⁴⁰ D. T. Adamo. 2005. *Explorations in African Biblical Studies*. Benin City: Justice Jeco.

⁴¹ Justin Ukpong adopted the term inculturation interpretation, Chris Manus applied intercultural interpretation while Adamo used cultural interpretation.

⁴² A. O. Dada, 2010. "Repositioning Contextual Biblical Hermeneutics in Africa Towards Holistic Empowerment" *Journal Black Theology*, vol. 8, Issue 2.

⁴³ Justin Ukpong. 2005. "Inculturation as Decolonization of Biblical Studies in Africa". S. O. Abogunrin (ed.) *Decolonization of Biblical Interpretation in Africa*. NABIS, Number 4, 35.

⁴⁴ There are a lot of hidden truths in biblical text in which inference is necessary tool to apply before making it relevant to the context of the reader.

Euro-American scholars who propounded historical-critical theory which does not take the African milieu into cognisance, it is necessary for African scholars to adopt intercultural theory which makes Biblical texts relevant to their context.⁴⁵ Applying this theoretical framework in the study of sexuality is to place value on indigenous Yoruba narratives, folk tales, and philosophical sayings that are embedded in etiological significance of what perpetuate the existence of humanity and their cultural practice, which have been indigenised in the practice of Christianity.

With the intercultural and inferential hermeneutics on which this research hinged, it was discovered that binary complementarity cannot be ignored. Binary complementarity posits that things are created in two opposite sides, each to complement one another and not to work at cross purposes. For instance, the sun and moon are principal parts of the heavenly bodies, the former gives light during the day and the latter gives light by night. In the same vein, in sexuality God created male and female for the purpose of complementing each other for the continuation of the work of creation and give meaning to the environment through development. Sexually binary complementarity apparently means Adam is both male and female. By this, there are no more than two genders among mammals including humanity. Thus, in Dominion Mandate we see intention and deliberate action of creating humanity in male and female gender. The two received injunction from the creator for fruitfulness and multiplication. The hermeneutics here indicate that the physical body and emotional attraction of each gender to one another were divinely designed to produce heterosexual behaviour for the purpose of complementing God in the work of creation and bonding with each other. Hermeneutically, binary complementarity propose that sexuality require joint action and decisions, exchange of mutuality, cooperation based on shared understanding of who they are and more importantly planning to achieve the given goal. Therefore, we can sum up that binary complementarity is fixity rather than fluidity and it is God given and not humanity's invention. Binary complementarity theory provides a solid foundation for how humanity finds meaning and purpose in relationship with one another.

⁴⁵ Chris U. Manus. 2002. "Towards an African Methodology for Biblical Research". *Orita: Ibadan Journal of Religious Studies*, XXXIV/1- 2, June & December. 53.

2.2 Sexuality in the Old Testament

The Old Testament laid the foundation of the social life that is prevalent in most cultures today since it represents the literature of the Hebrews which tells of their history and religion. It is not because the Hebrew culture supersedes other peoples' culture especially on sexuality, but because their literature is widely read and available in almost all cultures. This is made possible by its interpretation in various languages and its ethical standards in most religions and societies. The reading and interpretation of *Tanakh* is to give credence to social institutions, such as sexuality, family relationship and politics that have been designed practised for centuries. It is also being applied to modify the social practices that people think are not in consonance with the dictates of Hebrew literature. This literature has gained acceptance in most cultures to the extent that some people do not acknowledge that what they read in it, has been in their culture for ages.

For instance, in most African cultures, virginity before marriage had been the norm in sexuality before the contact with the *Tanakh*, through Euro-American missionaries, but hardly can most Africans speak about the issue of virginity in sexuality without making reference to the Hebrews' literature at the opening sentence. In the same manner, various myths that explain the origin of things are no longer given credence in other cultures, but those in the Hebrews' literature. The use of Hebrew literature to legitimise cultural practices is not peculiar to Africa as observed by some scholars like Gagnon, Smedes, Speck and Ellens⁴⁶ in their research on sexuality in some European and American communities. They conclude that the religious values placed on sexuality were derived from the culture of the people of the Ancient Near East, particularly history and religion of Israel.

The first two chapters of Genesis give the account of creation, including humanity. The *בְּרֵאשִׁית* gives the origin of human sexuality. This is to show that not only was God interested in the creation of humanity alone, but also that the social institutions that will make life meaningful for humanity and lead to purposeful development and fulfillment

⁴⁶ John Gagnon. 1977. *Human Sexuality*. Illinois: Scott Foresman; Lewis Smedes. 1988. *Sex For Christians*. Grand Rapid: Wm B. Eerdmans; Greg Speck. 1989. *Sex: It's Worth Waiting For*. Chicago: Moody; J. Harold Ellens. 2006. *Sex in the Bible: A New Consideration*. Connecticut: Praeger.

emanated from Him. Some scholars⁴⁷ have noted that the inclusion of sexuality in the creation account is necessary so as to provide the interpretive foundation for the rest of the Old Testament canon. This will form the basis upon which the principles of a theology of sexuality in the Old Testament would be laid.

Old Testament scholars agree that the earliest creation myth where sexuality was focused on was the JE account, which is the second creation account recorded in Genesis 2: 4b-25. This account was believed to have originated from the tradition of Northern and Southern kingdoms of Israel. The first creation account recorded in Gen. 1: 1-2:4a was documented by the Priests in the post exilic era. Notably, the expressions of sexuality in these two accounts do not contradict each other despite the fact that they were written in different ages as some would like us to believe. The two recorded that God created two sexes: male and female, and gave them plants, and others filling the gap that existed between the two; and as complementary visions of the deepest nature of reality.

Genesis 2:7 affirms that God crafted *אִישׁ רֶשֶׁת* from the dust of the earth and made him a living soul through His breath. The theory that the original *אִישׁ* referred to in this text was androgynous was not supported by the text, and opposed God's intention. This theory antagonises the holistic view of humanity and sexuality. Davidson asserts that the androgynous interpretation suggests that *אָדָם* the human beings, are not intrinsically sexual, a view that contradicts the anthropology of the creation account.⁴⁸ God made *אִישׁ* out of the rib of *אִישׁ* which the latter recognised as the "bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh." The beginning of sexuality started with a command for man to leave his father and his mother and be joined to his wife. This text does not refer to *אִישׁ* because he had no parents which he needed to leave for him to cleave to *אִישׁ* rather, it was made for future generations.

The origin of sexuality suggests that God placed high premium on procreation. This is revealed in making the two genders live in mutual connectedness and understanding of

⁴⁷ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*; D. M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word: Sexuality, Spirituality and The Bible*; J. A. Selling, (ed.) 2001. *Embracing Sexuality: Authority and Experience in the Catholic Church*.

⁴⁸ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*., 20.

each other and, through this, collaborate for the development of the society with their God-given potential. This indicates that erotic sexuality is not the focus of the creator, but of mutual fellowship. What the Hebrew scripture expresses about sexuality is different from other ancient creation myths among the people of Ancient Near East as they lay emphasis on procreation because they believe it is only through it that society can perpetuate the worship of gods. David Carr expresses a different view on this, as he avers that omitting the intention of procreation might not be divine but that the author of the Genesis creation accounts did not give it any attention owing to the prevalence of maternal mortality at that time. He notes that the norm of the ancient time was to pair men and women shortly before or after reaching the age of puberty. They enjoyed together but for a fairly brief period, before one partner died, often the woman in childbirth.⁴⁹ Here, the text does not suggest that humanity should sexualise all forms of relationships, nor that all life should be seen through the lens of genital sexuality. It rather offers that human intimacy can encourage appreciation of the role of passion in human life as a whole.

The Priestly account of creation claims that God created humanity in His image and בָּרָא (created) them male and female. The creation of the two different genders has divine purpose of fulfilling the assignment of fruitfulness and multiplication, which was the first covenant God made with humanity and sealed with His blessing. The expression “be fruitful and multiply” has been interpreted by most Bible exegetes to be the procreative power with which God endowed humanity, and to distinguish the Hebrew creation account from the creation myths of others in the Ancient Near East which give attention to the sexual activities of the gods. This is also to establish the fact that Yhwh did not recognise the fertility gods. Gerhard, as quoted by Davidson, says “there is a radical separation of sexuality and divinity in the Genesis accounts of origins. God stands absolutely beyond the polarity of sex.”⁵⁰ Most Old Testament scholars believe that the Priestly account of creation originated in the post exilic era. This gives the opportunity to fill the hiatus created in the JE creation account which did not focus on procreation and having dominion over other creatures. It might be possible that the Priests had read the

⁴⁹ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 33.

⁵⁰ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 18.

earliest creation account, discovered the omission and inserted it in the second account of creation to indicate that Yhwh had keen interest in procreation. Therefore, the creation of male and female was intentional because it is fundamental to what it means to be human. In the divine agenda, to be human is to live as a sexual person.

Some scientists in the Age of Enlightenment had challenged the creation accounts in the *Tanakh* and evolved the theory of Evolution to debunk the fact that God created humanity in male and female gender. Another school of thought also interpreted אָדָם as an androgynous being which later split into two. This theory failed to prove the sex in which its assumption was split whether as the same sex or into opposite sexes. These propositions contradict the motif of God in creation because apart from this passage the duality of the sexes is still affirmed in other parts of Genesis.⁵¹

Sexuality, which has been practised in various cultures, was stamped at the emergence of the *Tanakh* with or without modification. Despite the fact that there were numerous sexual behaviours in the Old Testament, there is no particular word or proper terminology for it.⁵² The reason may be that the description of the anatomy of the human body as we understand it today was not the concern of the writers of *Tanakh*. In the discourse of sexuality, the general belief is that it should be restricted to the arena of procreation alone, and therefore, it should not be discussed publicly, so as to prevent immorality especially among the non-initiates. The Hebrew writers claimed that Yhwh entered into a covenant with humanity because of the cultural mandate “to be fruitful and multiply.” Therefore, just as the name Yahweh is too sacrosanct and so sacred to mention by an ordinary person, the genital organs is accorded the same level of honour. In view of this, the Old Testament writers made reference to the practice of sexuality and its activities in euphemistic terms. Nevertheless in the real sense, the intention of the Creator creating the sexes goes beyond erotic expression of sexuality.

⁵¹ The designation “man” is a generic term for human beings and encompasses both male and female.

⁵² J. O. Akao. 2006. “The Old Testament Concept of Sexuality”. S. O. Abogunrin (ed.) *Biblical View of Sex and Sexuality From African Perspective, Biblical Studies Series, Number 5*. Ibadan: NABIS. 24. Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 7.

The expression of sexuality started with the creation of male and female in the image of God. The purpose of creating the two sexes is to make them bring out the purpose of God, that of replenishing and multiplying human species on earth to manifest the glory of the creator. David Carr asserts that human sexuality reflects God's creative power without which His work will be limited.⁵³ This stand is against the belief in the Ancient Near East where sexual activities are divinised. The creation account assigned sexuality to the creation order and not to the divine realm. The editors of Genesis did not state the precise manner in which God created humanity in the P account of creation, but the JE account sets in detail God's personal labour of forming man from the dust of the ground and making a woman with the rib taken from the side of man. This laid the foundation upon which other sections of the Old Testament draw inspiration as their authors discuss sexuality.

The Pentateuch forms the foundation of all facets of life of the Hebrews. Its importance is shown in the reference to it as the foundation of life by the prophets up to the New Testament writers. This first section of the *Tanakh* has been described as the whole literature of the Hebrews; the two other parts; writings and prophets, are commentaries of the revelation of Yhwh through Moses. The expression of sexuality outside the garden affirms the procreation agenda of God in sexuality, which is heterosexual. The Hebrew word *יָדָע* is employed to explain sexuality especially the carnal knowledge, both heterosexual and homosexual whether consensual or rape.⁵⁴ The writer of Genesis expressed that *אָדָם* ('adam) *יָדָע* (know) Eve which is a metaphor of making love to Eve and this led to the conception and birth of Cain, and a few years later, Abel. This is believed to be the fulfillment of the command of Yhwh to humanity "be fruitful and multiply" of Gen 1: 28. Sexuality, therefore, is an activity that is strongly linked to procreation. In other accounts in the primeval history of Genesis 1-11, reference is made to the creation of humankind in dual sex and sexuality is not sacralized through cultic ritual.

⁵³ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 18.

⁵⁴ R. Laird Harris (ed.) 1980. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Chicago: Moody. 366.

The worship of gods, which was made in the image of the golden calf that Aaron made at the demand of the Hebrews in the wilderness shortly after they left Egypt and Moses was invited by Yahweh to give him the terms of the covenant, created another mode of practice of sexuality among the Canaanites, with which the Hebrews were familiar. There are two schools of thought among the Old Testament scholars as far as the interpretation of the golden calf is concerned. One is linked the narrative to *Apis*, the god of the Egyptians, and the other to bull, to which the Canaanite god *Baal* transformed himself. The popular argument favours the god of the Canaanites with the reason that since the literature of the Hebrews was compiled in the post exilic era, the golden calf was linked to the one formed by Jeroboam, the son Nebat at Bethel, and Dan after the division of the Davidic kingdom which originally started the cult of the prostitute in Israel.⁵⁵

The Canaanites had gods of fertility (*Baal* and *Asherah*), with which the Hebrews would have been familiar, since *Baal* worship was widely known at the Nile Delta at that time. The pattern by which the Canaanites engaged in immoral sexual activity in the cult of *Baal* was copied by the Israelites as they revel, played and danced and celebrated with pomp and pageantry before the golden calf. There are various interpretations of what the Israelites did at the plains of Mount Sinai both theologically and linguistically. From the perspective of theology, Black and Rowley opine that the term “rise and play” possibly is a euphemism for immoral sexual practices which was copied from the Canaanites.⁵⁶ Davis corroborates this view when he observes that the verb translated as “to play” suggests illicit and immoral sexual activity which normally accompanied fertility rites found among the Canaanites when they worshipped the god, *Baal*.⁵⁷

From the linguistic standpoint, Davidson notes that the verb הָשִׁיב denotes sexual corruption; that is, it describes corruption of the earth in the era of Noah, a situation which included sexual corruption.⁵⁸ Deem, as noted by Davidson, argues that the word

⁵⁵ J. H. Dobson. 1977. *A Guide to Exodus*. London: SPCK. 158.

⁵⁶ M. Black & H. H. Rowley (eds.) 1982. *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Workingham, Berkshire: Van Nostrand Reinhold. 238.

⁵⁷ J. Davis. 1971. *Moses and the Gods of Egypt: Studies in the Book of Exodus*. Grand Rapids: Baker. 285.

⁵⁸ Richard M. Davidson. *Flame of Yahweh*, 98.

עָנִיתָ is the intensive form of a newly discovered Hebrew verb meaning “to make love.” In the Exodus experience, there is an expression of fornication in the practice of sexuality by the Israelites. The word זָנִיתָ fornication implies that Israel who is God’s wife, fornicated with *Baal*, which is an act of unfaithfulness toward God. The act of fornication was expressed with the worship of golden calf, which indicates an act of separation and divorce from God. God frowned at the behaviour of the Hebrews and that was why He told Moses that He would destroy the nation because He could not withstand an act of fornication from His lover. The repeat of the act of sexual impurity of the Israelites occurred again probably about forty years after the first incident in the territory of Moab, when they had almost entered the Promised Land. The sexual immorality linked with the pagan fertility cult rituals formed an integral part of sin at Baal of Peor, which is a replica of what happened at the plains of Sinai with the worship of the golden calf. The incident at Moab was both carnal and spiritual harlotry.⁵⁹ The Moabite women invited the Israelite men in a seductive manner to the sacred feast of their god *Chemosh* and thereby lured the Israelite men into harlotry. The word זָנָה used in this narrative refers to the sexual activity of men and not women. It might be possible that the women were priestesses of *Chemosh* who practised cult ritual prostitution at the fertility cult. Sacred prostitution was a common feature of the Canaanite religion.

With archaeological evidence, Brown describes the nature of Canaanite religion, when he says, “hill top shrines littered the Canaanite countryside; each was the scene of corrupt and pornographic fertility ceremonies that included immoral rites, cult of prostitution and child sacrifice.”⁶⁰ The appearance of the Israelites in Moab might have attracted the attention of the women with the view that the presence of the strangers with vigour will attract the favour of the goddess *Chemosh* in the land of Moab. The narrator did not show whether the Israelites showed any resistance to the invitation of the Moabite women or not, but it seems that they accepted the offer without considering the reaction of Yahweh to such a behaviour. The narrative gives some idea of the ritual that would take place. Having dined and wined at the festive meal, the Israelites would follow the Moabite women prostrating themselves before *Chemosh* and then indulging in

⁵⁹ G. J. Wenham. 1972. *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity. 185.

⁶⁰ R. Brown. 2002. *The Message of Numbers*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity. 231.

carnal behaviour with the women. The practice in Canaanite religion was that, during festival, the priestess would approach Baal and *Asherah* naked because sexual involvement was required to obtain blessing because sex was elevated to the realm of the divine.⁶¹ They performed in ritual sexual intercourse at the high places, an act that was objectionable to Yahweh owing to the covenant relationship.

Some Bible commentators believe that the action of the sexual activity might probably be under the influence of “alcoholic” drinks taken at the festival like their forefathers at the golden calf debacle.⁶² No matter the influence under which this was done, it is obvious that Israel adopted the worship of Baal of Peor, not only at the fertility festival; they also established such a worship in the camp of Israel, thereby introducing a new form of religion and worship which was against the covenant entered into between the nation and Yhwh. The action of the Israelites mating with foreign women might seem; to some of them pleasing to Yhwh which made the son of a Simeonite leader, Zimri to bring a Midianite woman Cozbi, a daughter of a Midianite leader, into his tent and into the alcove, the inner part of the vaulted tent which was the women’s quarters to make love to her. Before then, sexual relationship between the Israelites and the foreign women had always been taking place outside the camp. Zimri, right in the presence of Moses and other people, showed his contempt for the covenant. The reaction of Yahweh indicates that he did not approve of the sexual behaviour of the Israelites, as His anger kindled against the people and led to the death of about twenty four thousand people. Phineas the priest assuaged the anger of Yhwh by killing Zimri and Cozbi with a spear.

In the testament of Moses, when he was certain that he would not lead the Israelite to the Promised Land, he foretold the sexual culture of the Canaanites which is tied to the sacred cult prostitute. He warned his people not to imitate the sexuality that is deeply rooted in sacred ritual sex in Canaanite community. The warning was necessary because of their special relationship to Yahweh. The sexual culture of the Canaanites accepts a lot of immoral practices which also degrade humanity, especially the female. Mosaic legal

⁶¹ B. W. Anderson. 1966. *The Living World of the Old Testament*. London: Longman. 108; John Rogerson. 1998. “The World-View of the Old Testament”. John Rogerson (ed.) *Beginning Old Testament Study*. London: SPCK. 63.

⁶² R. Brown. 230; R. K. Harrison. 1990. *Numbers*. Chicago: Moody. 337.

codes forbid adultery. The tradition in the Ancient Near East defines adultery as when a married woman engages in sex with another man apart from her husband.⁶³ The import of this is that the woman is considered guilty of adultery. This is considered a violation of her husband's rights on her sexuality and carries with it strict punishment for both the woman and her partner, which includes stoning the culprit to death because it is regarded as polluting the land by this evil. The land on which the crime was committed is the source of economy and human survival in general in an agrarian community. Therefore, its sacredness must be guarded jealously so that it would not attract Yahweh's wrath. This is also stipulated in the Holiness Code.

The description of the case of rape in the Pentateuch is in two categories; married and spinster. Rape involves the use of force by a man to have carnal knowledge of a woman, though it may occur by a woman initiating it. For instance, Lot had no intention to sleep with his daughters, but the latter drugged him and slept with him only for the purpose of procreation. The morality of their action is highly questionable. Parsons notes Luther's comment on this and aver that God was against the Moabites and the Ammonites, the two nations that came from the ungodly acts of Lot's daughters, because their origin came from depraved mind.⁶⁴

The episode of Joseph in Potiphar's house was an attempted rape against Joseph by Potiphar's wife while it was adultery on her part. The Mosaic legal code specifies that if rape occurs in a place where the woman was in a defenceless state, it is the incident as rape, and only the man would be stoned to death. On the other hand, if the woman has opportunity to cry for help but refused, it is admitted that it is consensual and the two of them would be stoned to death. If a spinster was raped before she is betrothed, the rape is considered as establishing a marriage; the penalty is that the man would pay a fine, which is regarded as bride price to the woman's father and he must marry her without option of divorce. Luciano and Ngewa argue that this ruling offers psychological, economic and social protection to the woman and the child which might be born as a

⁶³ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 51.

⁶⁴ M. Parsons. 2002. "Luther and Calvin on Rape: Is Crime Lost in the Agenda?" *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 74: 2, 131.

result of the rape.⁶⁵ Jones comments on the rationale that informed the laws against rape in Israel and other cultures in the Ancient Near East.

The Pentateuch has laws stipulated against the practice of homosexuality. Before the emergence of the Holiness Code, the practice of homosexuality had been in the society and it brought destruction. The account of the great deluge has been interpreted as occurring as a result of angels sleeping with women. Traditionally, Gen. 19: 4-11 has been regarded as the classic Tanakh which tells the story of homosexuality. Scholars do not generally accept this passage to be on homosexuality. Carr opines that the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is not a condemnation of same sex practice of sexuality, but a condemnation of a town that violated the rule of hospitality.⁶⁶ From the linguistic perspective, some scholars hold the view that this passage specifically relates to the practice of homosexuality in sexuality with the use of the *וְיָדָע* know which is used in sexual sense and occurred in other Yahwehistic materials.

Gagnon observes that perversion of same-sex male intercourse appears to be an integral part of the story.⁶⁷ The practice might have been prevalent in Ancient Near Eastern cultures that made the legal codes of Moses to outlaw its practice among the Israelites. The *Tanakh* is against homosexuality, either consenting or coerced. The degree of revulsion attached to the practice of homosexuality is simply detestable. In the Holiness Code, the penalty for homosexuals is death because it is considered an abomination in the sense that it contradicts the created order of God expressed in the dominion mandate where He created them male and female and gave definite instruction to the two sexes. Moses foresaw a situation where the body may be used to seek solution from economic hardship in the practice of harlotry, which is not limited to the female. This practice may not be peculiar to only female in the Ancient Near East since the cult of the prostitute consists of both male and female and sacred meal is attached to the ritual always. The code forbids the proceeds of such a practice to be presented as an avowed offering in the

⁶⁵ L. C. Chianequé & S. Ngewa. 2006. "Deuteronomy". Tokunbo Adeyemo, (ed.) *Africa Bible Commentary*, Nairobi: WordAlive. 239.

⁶⁶ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 53.

⁶⁷ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*. Abingdon: Nashville Press. 75.

tent of meeting. The code forbids all acts of sexuality that goes against the ordinances of God, such as incest and bestiality, in Israel because the people were priests to Yahweh.

In the Writings section of the Old Testament, in the historical books, sexuality was practised in a perverted manner. In Judges, the Israelite in the land of Canaan did not only backslide but also practised sexual perversion such as rape, both heterosexual and homosexual, likewise prostitution. The men of Benjamin approached a Levite who offered hospitality to a stranger. At night, the men came asking him to give the visitor so that they can rape him. The Levite later gave his concubine whom they abused to the point of death and it led to a civil war. During the period of divided monarchy, there was practice of homosexual cult prostitution. Israel's unfaithfulness to Yahweh through idolatry is likened to a wife's unfaithfulness to her husband through harlotry. The participation in idolatrous fertility cults is termed licentious practices.

The drastic change in Israel's perception of sexuality is as a result of the change in occupation from livestock rearing to agrarian practice, the occupation of the Canaanites which they thought they had no alternative to survival other than imbibing the culture of the people. The attitude of the Israelites is seen as harlotry because of her unfaithfulness to Yahweh her husband. From the time of the division of the Davidic kingdom, there was gross apostasy in the land. From the era of Jeroboam, who established the golden calf at Dan and Bethel, giving full blown practice to fertility cult in Israel, there was frequent mention of *Baal* and *Asherah*. The Biblical description of Judah's involvement with the fertility cults in the era of Rehoboam gives some indication of its permeation throughout the land. The Deuteronomists narrate how the people of Judah built for themselves high places, set up pillars, and sacred poles on every high hill and under every green tree; there were also male temple prostitutes in the land. The same scenario permeated the life of the people of the Northern kingdom. The reformation of various godly kings, such as Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah, depicts the level of depravity which Israel had gone out of the way of Yahweh in sexual immorality. The non-canonical prophets such as Elijah and Michaiah fought against the sexual immorality through the extermination of the Baal prophets in Samaria during the reign of Ahab.

The poetic parts of the Old Testament dwell much on offering pieces of advice, especially in Proverbs as well as the Song of Songs, which has been interpreted in various ways, and more importantly The writer of the book Proverbs considered sexuality from the standpoint of the two sexes, especially the woman's attempt to adorn herself to attract the attention of the opposite sex. The writer warns the male not to be enticed by the beautiful adornment of a female because it can be deceptive. The warning in Proverbs is to inculcate self-control in male and not to explore sexuality in the way it will jeopardise his future. The writer admonished young people to desist from lust in the practice of sexuality. The advice will be apt if we consider the life of Solomon who is believed to have written some parts of the book, how his sexuality was explored lustfully, which in the process made him to lose the favour of Yahweh and plunged the nation into gross apostasy, which is one of the remote causes for the division of the Davidic kingdom.

The Song of Songs exemplifies and celebrates sexuality that is established on heterosexuality and strictly monogamous in plain language. Reading the book and interpreting it literally, one may think that it teaches the reader to engage in illicit sex because of the adoration of female anatomy. One may also think that the book exemplifies infatuation between a male and a female, especially the youth. On the contrary, most Biblical scholars have interpreted the book allegorically. They opine that the book explains the love that exists between Israel and Yahweh. The Council of Jabneh that canonised the Old Testament, as Davidson quoted Akiba on his perception of the Song of Songs, "for in all the world there is nothing to equal the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel, for all the writings are Holy, but the Song of Songs is the Holy of Holies".⁶⁸ The affirmation of the Jewish Rabbi on the importance of the Song of Songs to the reality of sexuality which humanity cannot but express and practise posited a dichotomy between flesh and things of the spirit. The canonisation of the Song of Songs indicates that the practice of sexuality and spirituality do not oppose each other. Moreover, the yearning of the soul for union with God was allegorised by means of the

⁶⁸ Richard. M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 545.

erotic imagery in the Song of Songs. These poetic parts of the writings affirms the reality that sexuality can be perverted by either of the sexes.

The canonical prophets focused on the interpretation of the code of the covenant which Yhwh made with His people on Mount Sinai which was mediated by Moses. The *Tanakh* portrays Israel's God entering into covenant relationship with His people and often utilizes the imagery of a husband-wife relationship. Before the emergence of these prophets, the practice of fertility cult had been established in Israel and they believed that, without it the land would not yield bumper harvest. The prophets vehemently cried against the wayward life of the Israelites, especially how they allowed themselves to be lured away into the culture of the Canaanites. The symbolic explanation of sexuality in the prophetic writings is based on heterosexuality, though not in the sense of God making love to human beings but in terms of building and maintaining a balanced relationship. The 8th century prophets' description of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel is based on sexuality. A number of references present God as building an intimate relationship with Israel like the one expressed in the dominion mandate. Isaiah presents the parable of the vineyard, which is depicted in Divine-Human sexuality. The parable depicts a frustrated lover who determines to discipline his lover with harsh punishment. Isaiah affirms the fact that human sexuality cannot be abused, and its consequences escaped.

Hosea, whose prophetic utterance dates just a few decades before Isaiah, describes the relationship between Yhwh and Israel as the one established on sexuality. Yhwh married Israel in spite of her harlotry and, in this situation, raised a family. Jeremiah and Ezekiel describe vividly Yhwh as Israel's husband. For instance, Yahweh is depicted as the faithful "husband" while the people of Israel are depicted as the "wife." Hosea says, "I will betroth you to me forever; I will betroth you in righteousness and justice, in love and compassion. I will betroth you in faithfulness, and you will acknowledge the LORD" (Hosea 2:19-20). When the Israelites failed to be faithful to God, the Prophet Amos describes the fall of the Northern Kingdom of Israel as "Fallen is the virgin Israel never to rise again." (Amos 5:2). The imagery of husband and wife used resulted from the covenant relationship between Yhwh and Israel. Davidson notes that the word *mazeah*, a

cultic festive meal of the bourgeoisie could be an allusion to the revelry at the cultic, like the one that was practised at the golden calf and Baal Peor. Hosea's prophetic declaration centres on outrage and heartbreaking against the Israelites' sexual orgies. Israel was defiled by her adulterous way. Sexuality in the Old Testament shows that procreation is the primary purpose through which the intention of the creator such as mutuality, social cohesion and development of the society with the care of other creatures are archived. The whole idea of fruitfulness and multiplying connotes bringing about meaningful development in the world created by God by the man and the woman.

2.3 Sexuality and power

The debate of equality of the man and the woman has evoked the curiosity of scholars as to who exercises power and authority over the other. The traditional view on sexuality is that man is superior to woman and that the former exercises power and authority over the latter. This was in practice in politics, religion and social life in Israel.⁶⁹ The Age of Enlightenment brought a new dimension to the relationship of man and the woman and a lot of debate arose over who exercises power over the other. As in most cases, the Hebrew literature becomes a guide and a reference point.

There has always been the attempt to use the Old Testament paradigm to form the basis for life practice and to interpret human activities. Sexuality as a concept in Old Testament studies has been examined as who has power over the other between the two sexes created by God in the garden. However, when He created them in His own image, He made them equal. The two were blessed to bring the act of procreation, both were to subdue the earth and have co-managerial dominion over other creatures. There is no definite statement on who to take responsibility for their actions. Generally, there is the belief that both sexes are equal, a view which the Feminist theologians⁷⁰ have

⁶⁹ In ancient Israel, it was not common to have women in the forefront as priests, kings, and family leaders. The few whose names appear in the history and religion of Israel were said to be honoured by the later generation because of the role they played in the society at their time. For instance, scholars argue that the book of Ruth was not authored by her, but was named after her because of her role in the Hebrew genealogy; while the book of Esther was as a result of saving the Hebrews from ethnic cleansing in the Persian Empire.

⁷⁰ Amba Oduyoye, Musa Dube, Dorcas Akintunde are some of the notable Feminist Theologians in Africa, while Virginia Fabella is of Latin America. They have argued several times that men and women are equal and that is the way God has made the two sexes.

popularised not only in the field of religion and theology but also in other fields of study. Piper says “the tendency today is to stress the equality of men and women by minimising the unique significance of our maleness and femaleness.”⁷¹ This is evident in economic, political and social life where women rub shoulders with men and consequently both sexes perform any role assigned to them and record brilliant achievements. The trend that pervades the atmosphere is much consciousness of sexual being and not as human being. Paul Jewett examines the self-consciousness when he says:

Sexuality percolates into an individual’s being even into the depths; it regulates every aspect of human life as a person. As a self-identifier, it is always known as ‘I’, so this ‘I’ always establish the identity of itself as himself or herself. One’s personal knowledge is perpetually linked up not only to our personality but to our sexuality. At the human level, there is no ‘I and you’ *per se*, but only ‘I’ who is the man or the woman facing ‘you’, and ‘the other’ who is the man or the woman⁷².

The word power לְרִבּוֹת connotes leadership or headship, exercising authority, without which the society will be devoid of development and peace. Power is exercised within the framework of hierarchical structure of the society which has its beginning between male and female in a relationship. This phenomenon is not given attention in P account of creation. P account of creation is devoid of hierarchy between the sexes, and it creates a big gulf in the orderliness of the society made by God. The absence of hierarchy has generated much debate on who should exercise power between the two sexes since both were made equal, and both display God’s glory and image.⁷³ In Gen 1, אָדָם is generally translated as humanity or human person or man as a male person. In most cases, it is considered as a generic term. In the context of P account of creation, theologians do not dispute the equality of male and female as the two possess equal authority and power over other creatures as given by the Creator. In the view of scholars and experience in the administration of life, the P account of creation is inexhaustive and inconclusive, and has created a vacuum as regard who to be held accountable for the action of man and

⁷¹ John Piper. 2006. “A Vision of Biblical Complementarity: Manhood and Womanhood Defined According to the Bible”. John Piper & Wayne Grudem (eds.) *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books. 33.

⁷² Paul K. Jewett. 1975. *Man as Male and Female*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans. 172.

⁷³ O. J. Baab. 1962. “Sex, Sexual Behaviour”. George Arthur Buttrick (ed.) *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon. 300.

woman whether negative or positive. The pitfall in P account of creation as to who exercises power over the other between both sexes, has caused scholars to refer to JE creation account and concluded that the desideratum created in the P account is filled in JE account of creation.⁷⁴

The second account of creation is considered as a complement of the first. In JE account of creation, אָדָם was created before חַוָּה and this made the latter subject to the former. This indicates that God resides power in man and not in the woman as she was made from the rib of man, and man also gave her the name she bears. Rad postulates that name giving is an exercise of sovereignty and power which indicates having authority.⁷⁵ This suggests that without man, woman cannot exist. Some proponents of male power as a creation ordinance agree to an ontological equality between male and female, but the functional exercise of power and authority reside in man. From the Hebrew linguistic approach, the word אָדָם is translated as 'man' and חַוָּה 'woman' which suggests that woman was formed from man. This indicates that man is superior to woman, and consequently power is given to man over the woman.⁷⁶ God allowed Adam to define the woman, in keeping with Adam's headship. The liberal-critical modern theologians and Bible commentators held the view that the narrative in Gen 2 shows that, by nature, woman was created inferior to man, and thus has no divine prerogative to exercise power over man. The andocentric presentation of man as superior and the woman as inferior is made dominant in sexuality study. They favoured male headship in all facets of life and submitted that, that is the creation ordinance. In the view of the above, this school of thought to argue to twist the intention of the creator.

Again, the hierarchical interpretation of the creation narrative is espoused over the equality theory of P account. The liberal-critical theologians opine that it was the man that God addressed and not the woman; woman was formed for the sake of man as his helper, which indicates that she carries out the instruction of man. Raymond corroborates this view in his analysis of Gen 2: 18-25 when he asserts that the man bears the primary

⁷⁴ Derek & Dianne Tidball. 2012. *The Message of Women: Creation, Grace and Gender*. Nottingham: Inter-Varsity. 35; Paul K. Jewett. 1975. *Man as Male and Female*. 38.

⁷⁵ Gerad Von Rad. 1972. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster. 83.

⁷⁶ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 23.

responsibility to lead the partnership in a God glorifying direction.⁷⁷ From Hebrew linguistic analysis, עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ (a helper fit) (for him), implies the inferiority or subordinate status of woman. John Calvin posits that this phrase makes the woman an appendage to the man and a “helpmeet”⁷⁸ for the man. Clines also support the view of Calvin when he says the word עֵזֶר refers to someone in a subordinate status.⁷⁹ The fact that God gives exercise of power to man over woman was evident when Eve allowed herself to be deceived by the serpent in the garden; she was not held responsible and accountable for her action but Adam. The punishment of Adam is harsher than that of Eve. God directed that her desire would always be to her husband.

Man’s display of power in almost all facet of life such as in the area of the economy, politics, religion and socio-cultural life has set the pattern and standard for the patriarchal model of life and enquiries into the study of the Old Testament. Vaux argues that the Israelite families were undoubtedly patriarchal and that men have the right to possess their wives as masters and equally had full control over their children even in some cases that has to do with choosing between “life and death” referring to Gen. 38:24 where Judah condemned his daughter-in-law to death⁸⁰.

The Feminist theologians (and some male theologians) view the hierarchical interpretation of the Genesis 2 narrative as myopic and a deliberate bias against the woman.⁸¹ Davidson opines that the Hebrew text often uses an *inclusio* device whereby the central points of concern to a unit are placed at the beginning and the end of the unit. The record that we have in Genesis chapter 2 is a good example of an *inclusio* device whereby it places the creation of the male gender at the beginning of the story and whereas the creation of the female gender is placed at the end of the narrative and the two

⁷⁷ Raymond C. Ortlund. 2006. “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Gen. 1-3”. John Piper & Wayne Grudem (eds.) *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books. 95.

⁷⁸ John Calvin, n.d. *Commentary on Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Williams E. Eerdmans. 218.

⁷⁹ David J. A. Clines. 1990. “What Does Eve Do to Help? And Other Irredeemably Androcentric Orientations in Genesis 1-3”. David J. A. Clines (ed.) *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series*, 94. 32.

⁸⁰ De Vaux. 1961. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, translated by John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill. 20.

⁸¹ Derek & Dianne Tidball. *The Message of Women...* 36.

are corresponding story to each other in the hierarchy of importance.⁸² In their assertion, they observe that the fact that God spoke to the man and not to the woman in Gen 2 serves as a peculiar way in Hebrew literature movement from incompleteness to completeness.⁸³ From Hebrew linguistic perspective, scholars who argue against hierarchical interpretation of Gen 2 said the word עֲזָרָה# truly means helper, an assistant, a subordinate. Theologically, it connotes a relational term, describing a beneficial relationship and not position, rank or status in superiority or inferiority. Therefore, the context of helper is not a subordinate role as the hierarchical interpreter of the passage wants us to believe.

The argument that woman was formed from the rib of man is undeniable. This fact does not imply subordination, since Adam also was derived from the earth and theologians have not at any time argued that the earth exerts power over אָדָם. אָדָם ('adam) was just the raw material for the creation of Eve, just as the ground was the raw material for him. The event of life indicates that as the first woman was derived from אָדָם; but every subsequent man comes from woman, which is an expression of integration and not of subordination. The fact that man derives his life from the woman indicates that without the woman, man cannot exercise power or authority. The symbolism of the rib points to equality and not to exercise of power of man over woman. Davidson sums the argument against hierarchical interpretation of Gen 2 by quoting Bilezikian that:

It is quite obvious that there is no indication that God actually programmed it that the man should have an undue domination over the woman as far as the record found in Genesis 1-2 is concerned. Going by the enormity of such implications, if God had intended that such a structure should be part of the original design during the time of creation, God would have explained explicitly along with the other two laws of authority (God's sovereign rule governing mankind, and human governmental rule governing the whole world). For the mere fact that there is the total absence of such a rule and commission in the creation story indicates that they are not part of God's original purpose. It is only God that has the authority over Adam and Eve. Neither of them has the right to usurp divine prerogatives by assuming authority over each other.

⁸² Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 27.

⁸³ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 28.

Any doctrine that points to any other authority structure between Adam and Eve in God's creation design is to be firmly rejected since it is not founded on the biblical text⁸⁴,

In the study of creation myths of the Ancient Near East, it is only that of the Hebrews that states the creation of woman separately. This disparity is not only to give a detailed narrative of origins but to serve as a direct polemic against the mythological creation stories and to demonstrate the equality of man and woman and how the two collaborate to bring God's agenda for humanity into reality. This does not give room for hierarchical interpretation that tends to place man over woman. The Feminist theologians and their supporters point out that outside Genesis, women demonstrated a great deal of power not only over a man but over the whole nation. Reference was made to Miriam who contributed to the spirituality of the Israelites as Israelites escaped from the snares of Pharaoh. Deborah did not only Judge the nation of Israel in Palestine but led them in war against Moab. There was the prophetess Huldah. There were several royal women who exercised power over the nation of Israel.

The question is, between the man and the woman who will exercise power? Within the text of Genesis 2, no matter the direction theologians want to take the exercise of power is at the door step of man. No one disputes the fact of equality expressed by the Priestly editors. What was missing in the account was supplied by the Yahwehist and Elohist editors. The JE editors show that man was created first and God gave him command of how to live in the garden. The man exercised authority and power by giving name to other creatures including woman. God did this to forestall anarchy in the garden, should the woman want to wrest power with man and modern society takes a queue from this. God formed woman as a helpmeet for man and man has the prerogative to give direction to her as he desires the event in the garden to be organised, though this does not mean that her rights are subjugated. It is obvious that the two sexes cannot do without each other to bring order to creation.

2.4 Sexuality and spirituality

⁸⁴ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 35.

The creation of humanity has both physical and spiritual dimension. While the physical dimension consists of dust, the spiritual component is God's breath, by which humanity relates and commune with God. Hence, without God's breath in humanity, there cannot be communication between humanity and God, and humanity would only remain an empty carcass. The word spirituality is derived from the word spirit *ruach*, which means wind or breath.⁸⁵ The spirit as invisible as the maker and giver of it is equally invisible to human eyes. It is easier to have a personal experiential encounter with spirituality than to conveniently describe what it is. This makes it difficult to use a single word for it as a definition, especially since its usage is not only within religious cycle but also has shifted to other spheres of life. Nevertheless, its definition is still confined to the realm of religion because its practice is still within the scope of religion.

Spirituality refers to one's life and career on one hand and one's relationship with God and others within the community on the other hand⁸⁶. According to Kelvin, spirituality can be defined as the exploration and the practice of a perfect life before God, an observable fact or event that involves a small number of people in the strict sense of the word⁸⁷. In the words of the Members of Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians (EATWOT), they are of the opinion that spirituality is concerned with the influence of God's spirit on the life of a person that helps that individual to understand and discern God's will for their life and for the life of the people around them⁸⁸.

In discussing or writing on the theory and practice of spirituality, one is at first tempted to refer to the New Testament with a focus on the four Gospels and the Pauline epistles as the only material for the subject and ignore the relevant portions of the Old Testament which talk about the total extermination of a group of people in favour of another for the purpose of possessing their landed property. The claim of equal inspiration and value of the two canons (that is, the Old and New Testaments) is contested in the practice and study of spirituality. The popular notion is that Old Testament texts are difficult to read

⁸⁵ A. E. McGrath. 1999. *Christian Spirituality: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell. 2; Eugene H. Peterson. 2005. "Spirituality". Kevin J. Vanhoozer (ed.) *Dictionary of Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker. 766.

⁸⁶ Henry Rack. 1969. *20th Spirituality*. Epworth: Epworth Press. 2.

⁸⁷ Henry Rack. 767.

⁸⁸ EATWOT Members. 2000. "Spiritualities". Virginia Fabella & R. S. Sugirtharajah. *Dictionary of the Third World Theologies*. New York: Maryknoll. 189.

and understand, lacks hermeneutical principles, are full of unnecessary repetitions and contradictions, and the contents are opposed to the current happenings in human endeavours. It is a book that is seen as promoting war, violence, murder, rivalry and such other vices. Some even consider it as a book that goes against basic fundamental human rights especially when one considers the aspect of ethnic cleansing.

There is also a wide cultural gap between the world of the Old Testament and the contemporary world. According to Lombaard, the Old Testament is occasionally drawn from for spiritual exercise, and it continues to play a less important role in the church than its proportions in the Bible would insinuate. Even, whenever it is referred to, it is done more or less in the figurative sense than that of the exegetical or theological interpretation⁸⁹. However, it is important to note that virtually all that humanity takes pride in today: religion, economy, social life, and politics, have their foundation firmly rooted in the Old Testament. The methods and practices of human endeavours, for instance in agriculture, engineering, medicine, education, judiciary, family life, legislature including principles of fundamental human rights that social critics apply today all these are what the Old Testament characters had practiced and what the postmodern humanity still replicates. The historical scholarship of the Old Testament, on the other hand, does not in any way stand at odds with spirituality scholarship. The complexity of the Old Testament text and context is to re-emphasise issues that promote positive ideals and ideas.

2.5 Sexuality and development

The foundation of human sexuality, which the creation accounts had laid, also focuses on the development of the community inhabited by humanity. As God brought forth humanity in His likeness *imago Dei*, He gave them the command to have dominion over other creatures, both aquatic and terrestrial. These creatures are natural resources which have to be explored by humanity to their own benefit. This command is to see to the development of other creatures to the level of maturity to serve as food for humanity. In the process of serving as food, they will boost the economic power of humanity also.

⁸⁹ www.hts.org.za/index.php/HTS/article accessed on 19th March, 2014.

This command was given to the two sexes and the co-operation of the two in carrying out this responsibility adds value to humanity's quality of life. This brings to the fore the fact that the task of developing the garden was not the exclusive prerogative of man but that of the woman also. Derek and Dianne aver that both the man and the woman are made in the image of God, with a job to do on earth, and that the full meaning of humanity is to be found neither in the one nor the other but in the relationship of the two.⁹⁰ Ojo posits that the force of language in the Gen 1: 28 is an obligation to humanity to administer the created order for the purpose of enhancing development.⁹¹ The concept of development, therefore, started with God by calling the heavenly council to join hands with Him to create humanity. By creating humanity as an intelligent being like Himself and to share in His likeness and attributes, humanity cannot inhabit the garden in idleness. Thus, God engaged them with the command of having dominion over His creatures. God instructs humanity to act as His representative in creation, doing what He Himself has done both in populating the earth and bringing order to it. Myers describes this as stewardship of God's creation.⁹²

The objective of God's mandate to humanity is to provide some kind of welfarism for them an avenue for development that might lead to their prosperity, for it is by so doing that they could demonstrate their intellectual ability.⁹³ Sexuality and development is obvious in the way humanity has been domesticating animals and birds and using them for economic purposes and provision of daily bread for ages. The vitamins which human beings need for healthy bodily function, metabolism and healthy growth are mostly derived from plants, birds and animals. Myers notes that aside the purpose of tending the earth and making it productive, the creation accounts in Genesis establishes the requirement for ecology which is a type of development which the creator expects

⁹⁰ Derek & Dianne Tidball. 2012. *The Message of Women: Creation, Grace and Gender*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity. 32.

⁹¹ Anthony Ojo. 2006. "A Biblical View on Sexual Differentiation". S. O. Abogunrin (ed.) *A Biblical of Sex and Sexuality from African Perspective*. Ibadan: NABIS, Number 5. 70.

⁹² Bryant L. Myers. 2006. *Walking with the Poor: Principles and Practices of Transformational Development*. Mayknoll, New York: Orbis. 25.

⁹³ There is every probability to infer that one of the reasons why God created other living things before humanity is to find something worthwhile to engage humanity in the garden.

humanity to carry out.⁹⁴ Humanity at a time has division of labour in the development of the society. The Hebrew men were shepherds while their women were home makers. This sharing of responsibility gives opportunity of benefitting from one another's latent divine gifts and this does not in any way disrupt harmonious relationship but rather it enhances the development of the society.

When the editor(s) of Genesis attempted to explain the creation of human beings from the tradition of Ephraim and Judah, he centred it on the creation of humanity as male and female. Jewett asserts that what is stated in P account of creation in Gen 1: 27 is elaborated further in the JE account of creation to make the point of relationship in developing the earth more understandable.⁹⁵ In the second account of creation, after Yhwh had formed Adam and made him a living soul, the responsibility given to him is to keep and "till the ground". It is obvious that the first assignment God gave man was not carried out to His satisfaction owing to the absence of a helper corresponding to Adam. God realised that the task of developing the earth cannot be fully achieved by a gender, which was the very reason He created אִשָּׁה from the rib of Adam to make the two accomplish His purpose.

Carr posits that Yahweh created the woman not only as an answer to loneliness, but as a suitable helper in the garden work.⁹⁶ Thomas Schreiner notes that God does not use only men to accomplish His purpose, hence the creation of women.⁹⁷ Thus, in the two sexes Yahweh established sexuality and development, and in this their sexual life finds fulfillment. The vision of work and sexual life is from the heart of the creator and made no strict distinction between work and erotic touch. Reflecting on this story, Soile and Cloyes assert that it is obvious that Gen 2 promotes a vision of erotic relationship especially in the expression of אִשָּׁה when אִשָּׁה was brought to him. It is not limited to

⁹⁴ Bryant L. Myers. 2006. *Walking with the Poor: Principles and Practices of Transformational Development*. 25.

⁹⁵ Peter K. Jewett. 1975. *Man as Male and Female*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 38.

⁹⁶ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 35.

⁹⁷ Thomas R. Schreiner. 2006. "The Valuable Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership: A Survey of Old and New Testament Examples of Teaching". John Piper & Wayne Grudem (eds.) *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway. 209.

this, but more importantly this turned to mission in the context of a shared project of developing the garden between the two.⁹⁸

Land is a gift from Yahweh to humanity and the task of tilling it indicates that Yahweh places high value on it, and the survival of humanity depends on how it is developed. Land as a gift to humanity is irrevocable because God deposited all natural resources in and on it for the use of humanity, to make life meaningful. The maximum utilisation of the resources depends on how the two sexes cooperate to develop it. Thus, the creation of humanity to inhabit the garden is not primarily to express sexual fantasies which do not last long, but to develop the garden to achieve their God given potentials. Carr opines that the context of sharing the deepest vocation between male and female who are united together makes relationship become sacred, joyful and cemented the bond of love.⁹⁹ The two sexes made conscious effort to develop the garden which Yhwh has given them. They devised strategies to make development visible and evolved division of labour between them. We can infer that the absence of שׂוֹרֵץ at home when the serpent came to deceive הַשָּׂרֵץ in the narrative in Genesis was a result of the division of labour which they employed. שׂוֹרֵץ took the field while הַשָּׂרֵץ concentrated on the domestic aspect. The interpretation that Adam was engrossed in social activities which were unproductive and to satisfy his egocentric emotional curiosity; and that Eve was idle at home made the serpent to succeed its antics could not be true as some would want us to believe. It is clear that since they were the only two human beings in the garden, there was no one else or a group of people with which שׂוֹרֵץ can socialize apart from הַשָּׂרֵץ !. It is obvious that שׂוֹרֵץ and הַשָּׂרֵץ ! had a deep understanding that the utilisation of their God given potentials will lead to a great sense of blessedness and wholeness which will give them fulfillment socially, psychologically and spiritually. An attempt to do otherwise will cause them to lose their human dignity among the other creatures. The consequence will not be only be terrible but bring hardship to them in the garden.

⁹⁸ Daniel Soile & Shirley Cloyes. 1984. *To Work and to Love: A Theology of Creation*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 135.

⁹⁹ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word: Sexuality, Spirituality and The Bible* 36.

In analysing the role of man and woman, the model of $\psi\aleph$ and $\aleph\psi$ Eve in the garden, Meyers observe that the task of man and woman in the society overlaps in certain circumstances in their attempt to develop the society.¹⁰⁰ Some gender archaeologists¹⁰¹ refute the theory of idleness of Eve in the garden and posit that the activities of woman in development include economic, social, political and religious from the lower cadre to managerial role. Goody notes that, because woman can transform the raw materials produced by man into the cooked and produce other essential commodities, she has the ability to “work...wonders”¹⁰². The economic activities were an integral part of life in ancient Israel which had its origin in the garden. It is common to see women generally responsible for food processing, textile production and fashioning of various household implements and containers. The essence of creating them in the image of God is to bring about positive development to the created order. This what Paul Jewett describes as true partnership in life,¹⁰³ because the creator Himself continues the act of creation to bring His work to perfection.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

Exegetical and hermeneutical approaches were deployed in carrying out this research, using the tools of the historical critical methods and obtaining ethnographic data through

¹⁰⁰ Carol L. Meyers. 2013. *Rediscovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context*, New York: Oxford University Press. 104.

¹⁰¹ The works of Paloma Gonzalez-Marcen, Sandra Monton-Subias and Marina Picazo show how archaeology has identify the role of women in the household in Ancient Near East.

¹⁰² Jack Goody. 1982. *Cooking, Cuisine, and Class: A Study of Comparative Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 70.

¹⁰³ Paul K. Jewett. 1975. *Man as Male and Female*. Grand Rapids: William E. Erdmanns. 188.

focused group discussions and in-depth interviews. The exegetical approach deals with the analysis of key words in Gen. 1: 26-28, translated as rule/dominion, image and likeness, blessed, multiply and fruitful and fill in English.

26. וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֵׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְדִמְיוֹתֵנוּ וְיִדּוּ בְדִגְתַּת הַיָּם וּבְשֵׁעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל־הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל־הַרְמֵשׁ הַרְמֵשׁ עַל־הָאָרֶץ.

27. וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם א בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצַלְמֵאֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם

28. וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיִּמְרָ לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וּכְבִּשְׁהָ וּרְדוּ בְּדִגְתַּת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל־חַיַּה הַרְמֵשׁ עַל־הָאָרֶץ.

The analysis of these words are investigated to decipher the original meaning of the text in their historical and literary context.

The hermeneutical approach is the art of interpreting the narrative given within a cultural milieu.¹⁰⁴ Several African scholars¹⁰⁵ have applied this method in their quest of advocating African theology. The goal of hermeneutics is to lead to contextualising the text to bring about a change in the cultural perspective of the reader and adapting it to the Biblical text. The Tanakh speaks about issues that humanity experience daily, but its text may not be relevant to the context, that is why the selection of a preferred text cannot be ignored. In human sexuality study, the hermeneutical approach to God's injunction to דָּבָר calls for cultural interpretation of the practice of sexuality among the Yoruba. The word דָּבָר in the dominion mandate in Gen. 1: 26-28 is used for both male and female and this calls for deep reflection to decipher what the writer depicts to the reader. The discourse of sexuality in the Tanakh and oral tradition of the Yoruba were interpreted to see the convergence between the two texts.

In hermeneutics, there is the author centre, which focuses on the culture in which he/she was writing. It uses the text as a window through which we can picture his background

¹⁰⁴ Hermeneutics here refers to interpretation of a Biblical text which takes the culture of a people into consideration. It is also called cultural hermeneutics. This will make the research to avoid bias.

¹⁰⁵ Kwesi Dickson. 1984. *Theology in Africa*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd; John Parratt. 1995. *Reinventing Christianity: African Theology Today*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans. 25-54; John Parratt. 1987. *A Reader in African Christian Theology*. London: SPCK. 147-151; Tuesday Adamo. 1999. "African Cultural Hermeneutics". R. S. Sugirtharajah, (ed.) *Vernacular Hermeneutics*. Sheffield: Academic Press. 66-90; John Pobee. 1979. *Toward an African Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon.

and attempt to understand what it meant to him/her and to his/her recipient. On the author centre, Dodd says, “we must travel back to cross the interpretive bridge to the author’s world, to understand him and apply his teaching to our often new situation, relying on the counsel of the entire Bible.”¹⁰⁶ In thinking about sexuality, this approach indicates that the author of Genesis desired his /her world to be populated and developed through the exercise of control of human nature.

Also, in hermeneutics there is the text centre approach which looks at the construction of a phrase or sentence about a particular theme. In sexuality, there are a lot of themes that surround its practice, which has been abused owing to lack of subduing human nature. The lack of subdue of human nature has been used in the expression of human sexuality for the practice of polygamy in Hebrew and Yoruba cultures. Surgirtharajah observes that a text offers illumination to the religious and psychology of the Biblical world compared with the cultural concepts of the reader to validate beliefs about a certain age-long practice, like sexuality, and refining its deficiencies.¹⁰⁷

The ethnographic method is the primary source of information on sexuality in Yoruba sociocultural milieu in this research. This was done through Focused Group Discussions and in-depth interviews, with the data obtained subjected to qualitative content analysis. Four sessions of Focused Group Discussions were held with twenty-seven participants. There were eight participants in the first session, five participants in the second group, four participants in the third and ten participants in the last group. In-depth interviews were conducted with 16 indigenous worshipers (10 adults male and 6 adults female in Lagos) on the sexual behaviour in the past and the present, five Ifa Priests in Osogbo, and twenty-five Christians 10 clergymen and 15 lay members.

The culture of secrecy that has been on sexuality is very much in the mind of many Yoruba people. On the field, the researcher was disallowed to have audio recording of the interviews. In a place where it was attempted, a respondent said clearly that the recording tape in the pocket of the researcher has been demobilised. Owing to this, the

¹⁰⁶ B. J. Dodd. 1996. *The Problem with Paul*. Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press. 30.

¹⁰⁷ R. S. Surgirtharajah. 2002. *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 55.

researcher found it impossible to have audio or video recording of the interviews. The participants affirmed that in the past, it was a taboo to discuss sexuality in the public for the purpose of maintaining the moral standard in the society. In the past, sex and sexual behaviour were considered sacred because it is through it the continuity of human race and worship of gods and goddesses are maintained.

In view of this, caressing, kissing, and any other methods that suggest sexual interest to the opposite sex are frowned at in the public. However, due to the influence of globalization and urbanisation and the emergence of the entertainment industries, there is no more secrecy about sexual interest. Orunmuyi, a chief among these traditionalists, was of the opinion that the two foreign religions especially Christianity has done a lot of damage to the Yoruba understanding of sexuality because of its insistence on monogamy for its adherents when it is obvious that a woman may not satisfy a man's libido. He noted that a lot of male who profess to be monogamous among Christians have mistress outside their matrimonial homes. Thus, he concluded that majority of those who pervert sexuality belong to the Christianity.

Another interviewee maintained that as worse as situation was presently in sexuality behaviour, it was not common to find traditionalist as a culprit, because of the fear of the punishment of the gods and goddesses being worshipped. Moreover, the traditional religion encourage polygyny, thereby closed all avenues for a man to engage in wrong sexual behaviour. The researcher interviewed 5 Ifa priests in Osogbo on Yoruba understanding of sexuality as it contained in Ifa corpus. Ifayemi unequivocally said, "Ifa frowns at the modern expression of sexuality behaviour that is rampant in Yorubaland presently." He puts the fault at breakdown of moral teachings at home as result of western education which make the modern Yoruba male and female consider the Yoruba sexual mores inferior to that of the western world.

This same phenomenon brought migration of rural dwellers to the urban and also other ethnic groups both national and international migrated to Yorubaland and expressed their sexual behaviour without restraint. He observed that it is not common for Ifa priest to covet the wife of another Ifa priest or worshipper because anyone who breaks the mores

would bear dire consequences, which could be calamitous. Hence, people subdue their sexual expression and practice. The researcher interviewed 25 Christians even most of them were surprised that a cleric could engage them in questions on sexuality. Among these respondents, 15 agreed that sexuality in dominion mandate is monogamous. They also agree that Yoruba sexuality is rooted in polygyny. 10 of them gave reason that polygyny was practiced owing to the agricultural profession of the Yoruba. Among these 15, all of them were born and raised in polygamous family.

In examining the sexual behaviour in the past with the present, 8 of them believe that there was sexual discipline in the past than now. The reason they attributed to it is the fear of the community punishment and that of the family gods and goddesses. In the postmodern era, they agreed that it is difficult to punish sexual offenders because of the polarized nature of the society through democracy. Akapo was of the view that in the modern era sexual misbehaviour takes place frequently in offices, markets and educational institutions yet, offenders were not caught to reprimand them of their wrong behaviour, unlike in the past where people who live in the same community know each other and in most cases are blood related. On how they can relate sexuality in dominion mandate to the Yoruba sexuality, they are of the opinion that religious leaders who interpret the Tanakh have to reemphasise and focus more on its contextualisation to adherents. They affirm that they and other adherents are not unaware of the sexual behaviour recommended in the dominion mandate, but some failed to adhere to it. They agree with the view of Orunmuyi that some have mistress outside their marital home even with children. From all the respondents, we gathered that sexuality in the dominion mandate does not contradict to Yoruba expression and practice of sexuality. The change that is evident is as a result of globalisation and urbanisation.

3.2 Study area and sample populace

The geographical scope of this study falls within the boundaries of South Western Nigeria.¹⁰⁸ Osogbo and Lagos townships were selected as the sample populace. These

¹⁰⁸ Yoruba ethnic group in the political geographical delineation of the country covers Ekiti, Lagos, Ondo, Osun and Oyo states. This ethnic group has homogenous culture as regard understanding, expression and practice of sexuality.

were chosen because they are significant Yoruba townships which represent urban areas where the Christian Bible, which contains the English and Yoruba Versions of the Tanakh, is being applied in the expression and practice of sexuality. They are also cosmopolitan in nature, providing a context in which Yoruba traditional worshipers and Christians interact.

3.3 Sampling technique

The purposive sampling technique was used in selecting the sample populace as well as selection of participants in the focus group discussion and interview respondents, so as to ensure that the participants are capable of understanding and reacting to questions and discussions on the subject matter. Respondents who have reasonable knowledge of indigenous African religion and culture were purposively selected for interview in relation to Sexuality among the Yoruba, even though some of these were not literate. On the other hand, respondents who were particularly literate, and had good knowledge of the Bible, and Christian faith and practice were purposively selected to source for data on biblical practice of sexuality.

Genesis 1:26-28 was purposively chosen for the textual *pericope* for the exegesis. This *pericope* has been named “the Dominion Mandate Text” because it contained the Divine command for man to subdue and dominate the earth. It is selected for this research work because it provides the fundamental basis for human sexuality in the Bible and in Christian practice.

3.4 Methods of Data collection

Exegetical data was obtained from the chosen text through textual criticism which is an aspect of the historical critical method. This critical method was used to confirm the integrity of the Hebrew text of the dominion mandate used for the work. Also the text grammatical-lexical method was applied in the study, which serves as one of the ways by which the intention of the creator can be discovered. Data were obtained from the research populace through focus group discussion and interview.

A total of four session of focus group discussions were held in Osogbo and Lagos. Sixteen indigenous worshipers (10 adults male and 6 adults female in Lagos) and five Ifa Priests (in Osogbo), were interviewed on the sexual behaviour among the Yoruba in the past and the present. Twenty-five Christians consisting of 10 clergymen and 15 lay members were also interviewed.

3.5 Methods of data analysis

The data sourced from the text, in form of various key terms and catch-phrases were subjected to exegetical analysis using other aspects of the historical critical method including source critical appraisal. The historical critical methods were very apt in teasing out an understanding of the historical context of the Dominion Mandate Text.

The data sourced through focused group discussion and interviews were subjected to content analyses, with a view to discern the perspective of the participants in the focused group discussion and the in-depth interview respondents on the practice of sexuality among the Yoruba.

CHAPTER FOUR

EXEGESIS AND ANALYSES OF THE DOMINION MANDATE TEXT (GEN. 1: 26 – 28) AND A CRITIQUE OF MODERN EXPRESSION OF SEXUALITY IN THE LIGHT OF THE DOMINION MANDATE TEXT AND YORUBA CONTEXT

4.0 Chapter Overview

This chapter examines the integrity of the text, its sociocultural context and the exegetical import of its key terms, pre-literary form, and literary source. The Leningrad Coded (L) presented in the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia would be used as the working text.

4.1 Exegesis and Analyses of the Dominion Mandate Text (Gen. 1: 26 – 28)

4.1.1 Textual Critical Appraisal of the Dominion Mandate Text

The Masoretic Text as preserved in the Leningrad Codex is presented below and translated.

26 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ וַיְרִדּוּ בְדִגְתַּת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם
וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל-הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל-הַרֹמֵשׂ הָרֶמֶשׂ עַל-הָאָרֶץ:
וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצַלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם:
27

וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ וּכְבִשְׁתֶּהּ
28
וַיְרִדּוּ בְדִגְתַּת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל-חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ עַל-הָאָרֶץ:

26. And God said, ‘let us make man (humankind) in our image according to our likeness (to be like us) and let them rule (reign) (govern) (have dominion) over (the) fish of the sea (ocean) and over (the) birds of the heavens and over the cattle and over all (animals) on the earth and over all the creeping things that creeps on the earth.’

27. Then, God created the man (humankind) in His image in the image of God (He) created him, male and female (He) created them.

28. And (therefore) God blessed them and God said to them be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue (have dominion) on it and rule (reign) (govern) over the

fish of the sea and over the birds of heavens and over all living things that creeps on the earth.

A text-critical appraisal of the text was carried out using the text critical apparatus of the BHS. It confirms that the integrity has been well preserved, and there had been negligible textual variants in the manuscript of the Leningrad Codex used for this work. The few textual variations are as follows:

In verse 26, as indicated by the critical note (a), the LXX and the Latin Vulgate agree with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and inserts the ו conjunction on the word פְּדָמוֹתָנוּ giving the reading וּפְדָמוֹתָנוּ which translates as follows:

“...let us make man in our image and according to our likeness...”

Samaritan Pentateuch

“...Let us make man according to our image and likeness...” LXX. L.

i.e the Leningrad Codex does not retain the ו conjunction.

The second critical note (b), in verse 26 indicates that the Syriac version adds תַּיִת giving the reading וּבְכָל־תַּיִת הָאָרֶץ which translates as “...and over all the earth which indicates **beasts of the earth**, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.” Instead of “...and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and **over all the earth**, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.” This reading gives a different hue to the sphere of dominion. It replaces the subject of dominion with “the beasts of the earth” instead of “the earth” itself as indicated in L.

In verse 27, the Critical Note (a) indicates that the word בְּצַלְמוֹ (in his image) is missing in the original Greek manuscripts of the LXX. This would give the reading:

“...So God created man, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them.”

Instead of “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him, male and female he created them” found in L. It was perhaps deleted sometimes during transmission. This reading removes the dialectic between the phrase “...created man in His image,” ... and “... male and female he created them.” but creates a different impression, tending towards the opinion that only the male was created in the image of God.

In verse 28, the critical note (a) indicates that the LXX added a phrase “καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς ” while the Syriac also suggests a vorlage that had inserted “...וּבְרֵהֶמָה” making a similar reading as found in verse 26. This translates as follows:

...God said to them be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of heavens and over all the cattle and all creeping that creep on the earth.

Syriac Vorlage “...Increase and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the seas and flying creatures of heaven, and all the cattle and all the earth, and all the reptiles that creep on the earth.” – LXX

The second critical (b) note on verse 28 indicates that the Samaritan Pentateuch simply added the definite article to the word הַיָּרֵק in the last phrase of the verse giving the translation:

“... and all **the** creeping creatures on the earth” instead of “...and all living creatures that creep on the earth”.”

In spite of the variations observed, it can still be affirmed that the text has retained its integrity over the years of manual transmission. It is notable that a manual comparison with the Scroll 4Q2 Genesis^b of the Dead Sea Scrolls¹⁰⁹ shows no divergence from Leningrad Codex.

4.1.2 Socio cultural background of the text

The dominion mandate text is part of the Torah, which is composed of traditions that originated in the ancient Near Eastern socio cultural context. These people shared some cultural practices such as language, literature, and technology in common. The Deteronomic historian reported that the Southern part of Israel was taken captive to

¹⁰⁹ Genesis 1:1-28 is well preserved in 4Q2 Genesis; which is part of the manuscripts retrieved from Qumran Cave 4 Dated to about 30 - 68 A.D. Other contents of the manuscript include Genesis 2:14-19; 4:2-11; 5:13. The fragments have been assembled and translated to English, and this translation is available at <http://dssenglishbible.com/chapterview.htm>. The Scanned infrared pictures of the Dead Sea Scroll manuscripts plates are available at the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scroll Digital Library. The 4Q2 Genesis manuscripts retrievable online from https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/manuscript/4Q2-1?locale=en_US. The English translation of 4Q2 Genesis is available at <http://dssenglishbible.com/chapterview.htm>. Genesis.

Babylon and the Judeans lived there for about 70 years.¹¹⁰ During this period the Judeans must have been well acquainted with the Babylonia myths of creation being recited publicly at the New Year festival. It was believed that P who authored Genesis 1: 1 – 2:4a compared and contrasted the creation myth of the Israelites with that of Babylon and used the opportunity to rewrite the creation myth and placed it theologically above that of Babylon. It was argued further that P might have had the knowledge of other creation myths in Mesopotamia since the region was the centre of world power at the time owing the conquest of other nations and expansion of commerce. In view of this there is indisputable intertextuality in the creation myths. These myths expressed the creation of the universe in diverse forms, though they have some correlations. Terje Oestigaard says “There are cosmogonies that describe creation from nothing (*ex nihilo*), creation from chaos, creation of cosmic egg, creation from world parents, emergent creation and creation through the intercession of an earthdiver.”¹¹¹ This assertion is true of creation myths in Mesopotamia and makes intertextuality unavoidable among them. Kenton Sparks corroborates this that there is a general agreement among theorists that all texts are intertextual, that written words always draw on the precedent of earlier discourse.¹¹² For instance, in Mesopotamia there is Atrahasis epic, Gilgamesh epic and *Enuma Elish*, all of these have in one form or the other the creation myth of various regions and have some connections. Some of the expressions in these myths are evident in the P account of creation in Genesis 1: 1- 2: 4a. The similarities in expression make some scholars to conclude that P who was a stranger in Babylon made use of the ancient materials to write the Israelites’ creation story without studying the narratives critically.

The socio cultural context did not only reveal intertextuality but also the concept of God or gods and the phenomenon of life which surrounds them. It shows the anthropomorphic outlook of the author. It also creates avenue for the text to be contextualised within the context of current scholars. The next section discusses the creation narrative of P in

¹¹⁰ John Rogerson. 1998. Old Testament History and History of Israel, John Rogerson (ed.). *Beginning Old Testament Study*, London: SPCK, 54, Paul Joyce. 1998. The Individual and the Community, John Rogerson (ed.). *Beginning Old Testament Study*, 90.

¹¹¹ Terje Oestigaard. 2011. Cosmogony, in Timothy Insoll (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 76.

¹¹² Kenton L. Sparks. 2007. “Enuma Elish” and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism, *The Society For Biblical Literature*, Vol. 126. No. 4, 627.

Genesis 1: 1-2: 4a with reference to creation of humanity and compare and contrast it with the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian myths of creation.

4.1.3 The Assyrian epic of creation

The Assyrian creation epic was in the 7 tablets discovered in the royal library of Nineveh. The tablets were written in old Akkadian language. The epic is very similar in content to the Babylonian *Enuma Elish* but with different names of gods who created the universe after a fierce struggle. While Babylonian epic had Marduk as the principal pantheon which conquered the Tiamat, Bel/Merodach was the name of the principal god who fought the dragon and conquered in Assyrian epic of creation.¹¹³ Tiamat in the *Enuma Elish* was the Dragon in Assyrian epic who Bel/Merodach, the divine demiurge slew before creating the universe. It was suggested that the Babylonian legend of the fight between Marduk and Tiamat was retold in the Assyrian Epic of Creation, substituting Bel and the Dragon for Marduk and Tiamat in the part of Mesopotamia where the Assyrians reside, hence the similarity in this account. The creation shares similarities with the creation account contained in Genesis 1 in that it was described as consisting of a series of successive acts. The world in the Assyrian belief had been created out of water, and it had been preceded by an earlier imperfect creation.

The opening expression in the tablet, “before the beginning of time”,¹¹⁴ answers to the expression of *בְּרֵאשִׁית* of Genesis. At the time in reference, it was only watery chaos that existed; the heavens and earth had not been created. Then there was a movement in the waters and the deities as well as the created world were brought forth out of the bosom of this chaos. The father of the gods was Apsu while Dragon was their mother. The first primeval divinities born were Lakhmu and Lakhamu, and then An-sar and Ki-sar, "the upper" and "lower firmament."¹¹⁵ Last of all were born the three supreme gods of the Assyrian faith, Anu the sky-god, Bel, the lord of the ghost-world, and Ea the god of the river and sea. Thus the gods established in power and in glory. Apsu and Dragon were fed up with the ill behaviour of their offspring and Apsu took counsel from Mummu, his

¹¹³ The Assyrian Epic of Creation mentioned Bel and the Dragon, but these were not the major deities, their character and roles were secondary. See further <https://www.mesopotamiangods.com/the-assyrian-epic-of-the-creation/> and <https://www.ancient.eu/Mesopotamia>, accessed 29th October, 2018.

¹¹⁴ <http://www.sacred-texts.com/ane/rp/rp201/rp20130.htm>, accessed 29th October, 2018.

¹¹⁵ <http://www.sacred-texts.com/ane/rp/rp201/rp20130.htm>, accessed 29th October, 2018.

beloved son. Mummu counselled Apsu to contact the Dragon and tell her his intention concerning the behaviour of the gods and what he intended to do. The Dragon was enraged having heard the misbehaviour of her children and agreed with Apsu to destroy them¹¹⁶.

The second tablet is used in the record of the preparations made to ensure that the victory of light overcame darkness and order over chaos. For the young gods to find a suitable home for themselves, it is imperative for them to destroy the Dragon, the god of chaos and all its monstrous children. This herculean task was performed by the sun-god Bel/Merodach, son of Ea, An-sar, who promised him victory, and by the other gods who gave him his arms. Ea, the wise god averted the destruction of the gods by using incantations and by capturing Apsu and Mummu. The capture of Apsu and Mummu angered the Dragon and she summoned Kingu as his commander to fight other gods. All the high gods rose up and went to Anshar, where they had festivity. They ate and drank sesame juice until they were drunk. Inside Anshar's chambers, they empowered Bel/Merodach to fight the Dragon. After that, the gods put down a garment in front of Bel/Merodach and instructed him by saying to him: “now open your mouth with authority, speak with power so that this garment might be destroyed; command again with authority so that the garment would be restored”. Bel/Merodach obeyed their instruction and immediately, the garment vanished; he thereafter spoke with power and authority again and the garment was restored. Instantly, the gods shouted for joy, they all prostrated and pronounced that Bel/Merodach be made their king forthwith¹¹⁷. He was given irresistible weapon with which to conquer the Dragon. Bel/Merodach brought forth seven winds: these winds were evil; they were uncontrollable winds, the tempest, the whirlwind, the four winds, the seven-fold winds that has no equal. He fought against the Dragon and he defeated it.

The triumph of the god of light over the Dragon's allies is delineated in the third tablet. The Dragon was destroyed by bringing up of light into the world. The Dragon was

¹¹⁶ www.gutenberg/ebooks/16653, accessed 29th October, 2018.

¹¹⁷ www.gutenberg/ebooks/16653, accessed 29th October, 2018.

murdered and its accomplices were captured and the books of destiny which originally was in the possession of the ancient gods were relinquished to the younger deities of the new world. Whereas, in the fourth tablet, what we have there has to do with the description of the battle and it was composed in a poetry form in honour of Bel/Merodach. As far as the visible heaven is concerned, it was created from the skin of the Dragon and became the symbol of An-sar and the habitation of Anu, Bel, and Ea, while the disorderly waters of the dragon became the dominion sea being ruled over by Ea. What we have in the fifth tablet is the description of the creation of the heavens and how it was furnished with mansions for the sun, moon, and stars. It equally describes how the heavenly bodies are intertwined with precise rules so as to be able to regulate the calendars that determine the years. As far as the sixth tablet is concerned, it describes and explains how the earth was formed, as well as how the plants, birds, and fishes were created. In the seventh tablet, it has the record of how the creation which had earlier been possessed by the ancient gods was later transferred to the younger gods of the new world comprising the wild animals and reptiles, as well as that of human beings¹¹⁸. Dragon is the Assyrian equivalent of the Hebrew תְהוֹם (the deep), upon whose face, according to Gen. 1. 2, darkness had rested before the universe was created.

It can be noted that in the Assyrian myth of creation, there is the evident that it has a striking resemblance to that of the creation story that was recorded in the book of Genesis chapter 1:1-2:4a. In each case, the creation story was divided into seven successive stages. According to the story, it was revealed that this present world was preceded by a watery chaos¹¹⁹. In both the Biblical and Assyrian accounts תְהוֹם (the deep) in P account, the Dragon in the Epic of Creation of the Assyrian is used to represent chaos; what only makes the difference is that “the deep” as we have it in the Assyrian account of creation has become a mythological personage, who happens to be the mother of a chaotic brood. Moreover, the order of creation is in agreement with the two accounts; first the light, then the creation of the firmament of heaven, then the selection of the celestial bodies for signs

¹¹⁸ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Ashur-Mesopotamia.deity> , accessed 29th October, 2018

¹¹⁹ Cyrus H. Gordon and Gary A Rendsburg. 1997. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 4th Edition, New York: W. W. Norton, 17.

and for times seasons that will determine days and years, and again, the creation of beasts and all reptiles.

Despite the similarities in these two records, one can still take note that there are some observable differences between them. An example of such differences that has been noted is the fact that there is no corresponding statement with what we have in the book of Genesis where it was recorded that: “the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters”. In the creation myth of the Assyrian, it seems that the earth was not created until after the appointment of heavenly bodies, whereas in the account in Genesis it was created before the appointment. The creation of humanity was not clearly expressed in the Assyrian epic, whereas in Genesis humanity was made in the image and likeness of God and depicted their sexuality. The Assyrian epic did not recognise human sexuality though the gods were said to be created male and female and through their union other gods were born. But this was not expressed as regards human beings. The epic suggests that humanity was created as a hermaphrodite, being which is in contrast with P’s phrase “male and female created He them” in Gen.1:27. The seventh day is a day of work instead of rest. Nevertheless, the interpolation of the struggle between Merodach and the powers of evil (which erupted as a result of the introduction of light into the universe) as against the creation of the firmament of the heavens remains a striking difference between the two narratives. Also, while the Assyrian epic was mythological and polytheistic, Genesis is sternly monotheistic, presenting the Creator as omnipotent who needs not to struggle with any other power before creating the universe. Thus, an impassable gulf obviously exists between Bel/Merodach and the Hebrew God.

4.1.4 P account of creation and the Babylonian myth of creation

There has been continuous debate among Old Testament scholars concerning P creation account in Genesis 1: 1-2: 4a and its relation to the Babylonian creation epic called *Enuma Elish*. Some Old Testament scholars aver that there is high possibility that the author adapted it to write Hebrew creation story owing to some parallels discovered in the two. Though scholars cannot dispute the similarities, some who prefer to maintain the uniqueness of the Tanakh argued that Genesis narratives were written first and the Babylonian myth borrowed from it. For instance, Arvid Kapelrud posits that in the

community of P before Babylonian captivity, there was a creation story which was in oral form. He adds that the Babylonian creation accounts could have entered the stream of biblical tradition in the latter half of the second millennium.¹²⁰ The present concern in this study however is the expression and practice of sexuality in the P account of Creation.

The Babylonian creation epic was related in 7 baked clay tablets in poetic form, which suggests that it was written in the 12th century B. C.¹²¹ According to historians, they were found in the middle of 19th century in the ruins of the palace of Ashurbanipal in Nineveh.¹²² The clay tablets were written in Akkadian, an old Babylonian dialect; and features Marduk, the principal deity as the creator.¹²³ It has also been recorded that there was an earlier similar version in ancient Sumerian which has Anu, Enil and Ninurta as the heroes of creation of the universe.¹²⁴ However, the version of the tablets which scholars interpreted and believed to have discussed creation was the Akkadian.

The Babylonian creation myth opens with a theogony, the descent of the gods. The myth states that before anything was created, Tiamat the god of the sea and Apsu the god of fresh water and male fertility produced a series of pairs of gods as they were husband and wife.¹²⁵ In the tablet 1, it was stated that the offspring of Apsu and Tiamat made so much commotion and ill-behaved, probably struggling for power over who would be in control of the universe. This divine conflict was called theomachy.¹²⁶ Their behaviour became overbearing on their parents (Tiamat and Apsu). Apsu, their father, decided to kill all of

¹²⁰ Arvid S. Kapelrud. 1974. The Mythological Features in Genesis Chapter 1 and the Author's Intentions, *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 24, Fasc. 2, 179.

¹²¹ David Adams Leeming. 2010. *Creation Myths of the World: An Encyclopedia*, 2nd Edition, Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 56.

¹²² Bernhard W. Anderson. 1966. *The Living World of the Old Testament*, second edition, London: Longman Press, 321.

¹²³ Benjamin R. Foster. 1996. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, second Edition, Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 389.

¹²⁴ David Adams Leeming. 2010. *Creation Myths of the World: An Encyclopedia*, 2nd Edition, 56.

¹²⁵ Kenton L. Sparks. 2007. "Enuma Elish" and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol 126, No 4, 629.

¹²⁶ John H. Walton. 2008. Creation in Genesis 1: 1- 2: 3 and the Ancient Near East: Order out of Disorder after *Chaoskampf*, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 43, 49.

them.¹²⁷ Before he could carry out his decision, he was killed by Ea, the wise god who made the watery domain his home with his wife Damkina. We were told that thereafter Ea and Damkina gave birth to Marduk, who later happened to be the god of spring symbolizing the light of the sun and the lightning in the storm and rain¹²⁸. Tiamat was enraged at the murder of her husband, Apsu, and vows to revenge. She had some monsters who were ready to fight her course under the command of Kingu, her second husband. Tiamat represented the forces of disorder and chaos in the world. The tablets related a fierce struggle that happened between Marduk and Tiamat, the sea dragon. These two gods fought a war where Marduk defeated Tiamat. Marduk divided her corpse he used half to create the earth and the other half to create the sky.¹²⁹ Just as the sky was preparing for a massive thunderstorm, Marduk stretched forth his skin across the sky so as to prevent water from escaping. He carefully put in place the assemblage of the stars. He did it in such a way that at least three stars were assigned to each month, he created his own planet, he made the moon to be visible, and caused the sun to govern the day and the moon to dominate the night. From different parts of Tiamat, he created the clouds, the wind, the fog, the mountains and the earth. From the myth, he was highly exalted above all other gods and he became the chief pantheon and was given fifty names.

By the time Marduk decided to create human beings, he was faced with the challenge of getting blood and bone which was needed to fashion them. According to the tablet, Marduk using his power and authority commanded that: “Let blood be put together, and let bones be formed too. Let a primeval man be created: Man shall be his name. Let me create a primeval man and it happened as he had declared”¹³⁰. He became a creator with name Marruka.¹³¹ Ea, his father advised him that one of the gods should die to provide the materials for creation. It was then resolved that the god who plotted the revenge with Tiamat would be the victim. Marduk inquired from the assembly of gods to identify the

¹²⁷ Benjamin R. Foster. 1996. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, second Edition, 354.

¹²⁸ Stephanie Dalley. 1989. *Enuma Elish, Tablet 1: Myths from Mesopotamia, Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh and Others*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 231 – 233.

¹²⁹ Benjamin R. Foster. 1966. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, Vol 1, Second Edition, Bethesda, Maryland: CDL, 388.

¹³⁰ Benjamin R. Foster, 1966. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, Vol 1, 388.

¹³¹ Benjamin R. Foster. 1966. *Before the Muses*, Vol 1, 388.

god who incited Tiamat's rebellion, and they pointed to Kingu, her second husband. Ea killed Kingu and used his blood to fashion humankind. The purpose for the creation of humanity was to serve gods as worshippers and to bring sacrifice from which the gods would have their daily meal.

From the *Enuma Elish*, it is discovered that the earth had not been created before the gods were operating. The gods were paired in male and female for the purpose of expressing and practising sexuality. Through this, they procreated to produce the number of gods. There is confusion in the narrative of the creation of humanity and the purpose for which they were created. The narrative reveals that the creation of humanity was conceived by Marduk as expressed in tablet 6. The same tablet shows confusion in the creation of humanity where it states "out of his blood they fashioned mankind." The confusion here is who are the "they" who fashioned mankind? In the same tablet, it was stated that Ea, the wise god created humanity. Another god, Nudimmud, was also mentioned as the creator of humanity. This indicates that the Babylonian creation myth did not apportion the creation of humanity to a particular god. The theology of the myth was polytheistic. The myth did not specify the sex in which humanity were created so as to reflect gender and human sexuality. The sum of this myth shows that creation took place out of preexistent materials.

P starts the narrative of the creation with בְּרֵאשִׁית (in the beginning), which indicates the commencement of creation; at a time that nothing was yet in existence, before the creation of heavens and the earth. God, אֱלֹהִים (God) created order out of disorder by the word "let there be" and it came forth. He created light and other things *ex nihilo*¹³² culminating in the creation of man (humanity) in his own image and likeness as the crown of creation. P's narrative shows that God created all things systematically one day allotted to one creation. The purpose for which God created man was to have dominion and to be fruitful and multiply. It should be called to mind that the final redaction of the Pentateuch came from the hands of P. Sexuality of humanity was consciously expressed in P. He created them male and female.

¹³² Victor P. Hamilton. 1990. *The Book of Genesis, 2 Vols, 1*, Grand Rapid: Eerdmans, 110 – 111; Gordon J. Wenham, 1994. *Genesis, 2 Vols, 1*, Waco: Word, 8.

There are similarities in expression in both *Enuma Elish* and P narrative. The two narratives were introduced by a clause. In *Enuma Elish* “when on high” while P in it is “in the beginning.” Marduk defeated Tiamat the water dragon; P has God tamed the *t’hom*, the deep, in the sense that He made dry land to appear, thereby bringing order out of the disorderly chaos. In both, this victory happened before creation took place. The way in which an ordered place is assigned to each created thing closely related to Marduk’s fixing the destinies of each element in creation. In *Enuma Elish*, the creation of heaven and earth was followed by the creation of the heavenly bodies and humanity, the same counts for P account. In *Enuma Elish*, there was intention to create to either by Ea or Marduk, but the tablets did not state how and when humanity was created. The tablets stated that the gods wanted to create but never did, while P said humanity was created in the image of God.

Owing to some seemingly similarities enumerated above between P narrative and *Enuma Elish*, some scholars submit that P knew *Enuma Elish* and adapted it to create myth of Israel’s creation. For instance, Mathew Black and H. H. Rowley opine that the setting of P narrative is Mesopotamian.¹³³ To this end, it has been expressed that P presumably collected and edited the traditions of Israel after the Babylonian exile.

4.1.5 P account of creation and the Egyptian creation myths

During the period when the critical approach to the study of the Old Testament was at its peak, scholars do not only described the correlation between the P creation account in Genesis 1: 1-2: 4a to the Babylonian myth of creation, but also with that of the Egyptian origin of cosmogonies. Some scholars suggest that the creation myth in the P account was just a replica and the adaptation of Egyptian myths. These scholars suggest that Moses must have written the Pentateuch, which was based on Moses’ Egyptian background with the culture and tradition of the people on one hand, and the original audience of the text

¹³³ Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley. (eds.), 1982. *Peake’s Commentary on the Bible*, 178.

on the other hand. Invariably, some conclude that Israel's creation myth contains "crass plagiarism"¹³⁴. Friedrich Delitzsch corroborating this says,

the Hebrew scribes, whom I presume knew what they were doing, copycatted the famous myths/ epics of ancient Egypt and Sumer, in what could be world's first and yet the biggest copyright the Jewish scribes, who I think they know what they were doing, replicated the famous myths/legends of the ancient Egypt and Sumer, which of course could be taken as the first world's biggest and greatest copyright infringement included in their Bibles¹³⁵.

The questions that arise are: to what extent has the Egyptian cosmologies influenced Genesis 1: 1-2: 4a creation narrative? How strong do the parallels indicate borrowing? What are the key similarities and differences between the Hebraic and Egyptian creation myths? This section will examine these questions.

The Pyramid Texts, the Coffin Texts, The Book of the Dead, The Theology of Memphite, as well as various hymns, Wisdom texts and bas-reliefs on the walls are some of the various sources in which the concepts of the creation is perceived and understood in ancient Egypt¹³⁶. These sources show that Egyptian cosmology is both uniform and diverse. Although there are nearly one dozen Egyptian creation myths, the three from the cultic sites of Heliopolis, Memphis and Hermopolis were the most dominant. These three were unified by key three themes: deification of nature, a primordial hill and a primordial ocean. These three cosmogonies specifically narrate how the gods created the universe but did not pay attention to the creation of humanity. Rather, there is a separate Egyptian tradition from Khnum, the potter god, that explains the creation of humans and animals.

In the traditional Egyptian culture, there prime belief concerning the creation is that the earth was created out of darkness and turbulent chaos. There are ample reports from the ancient historians who claimed that during the primeval era, there was nothing but dark water which was without form or purpose. Existing within this void was Heka (god of

¹³⁴ James K. Hoffmeir. 1983. Some Thoughts on Genesis 1&2 and Egyptina Cosmology *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*, 15, 37.

¹³⁵ <https://ashraf62.wordpress.com> Asraf Ezzat, Hebrew Bible: Plagiarized Mythology and Defaced Monotheism PYRAMIDON, accessed 27th October, 2018.

¹³⁶ James P. Allen. 1997. Cosmologies. *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions From Biblical World, 3 Vols. 1, William W. Hallo (ed.)*, New York: Brill, 7.

magic) who equally awaited the moment of creation¹³⁷. It was from this watery silence known as (Nu) that the primordial hill which is known as the Ben-Ben emanated from, who later stood upon the great god known as Atum (or, in some versions of the myth, Ptah)¹³⁸. It was this Atum that looked upon the nothingness and identified his loneliness and through the agency of magic, he copulated with his own shadow in order to give birth to two gods, Shu, god of air; and Tefnut goddess of moisture. Shu gave to the early world the principles of life while Tefnut contributed the principles of order. Leaving their father on the Ben-Ben, they set out to establish the world. Atum became concerned of the many years of the absence of his children (Shu and Tefnut) who went on a journey and did not return. Atum sat alone on the hill in the midst of chaos and contemplated eternity. Shu and Tefnut returned with the eye of Atum (later associated with the Udjat eye, the Eye of Ra, or the All-Seeing Eye) and their father, grateful for their safe return, shed tears of joy. The tears dropping from his eyes into the dark, fertile earth of the Ben-Ben brought forth human beings.

Shu and Tefnut mated and gave birth to Geb (the earth) and Nut (the sky). Geb and Nut, though brother and sister, fell deeply in love and were inseparable. Atum found their behaviour unacceptable and pushed Nut away from Geb, high up into the heavens. The two lovers were forever able to see each other but were no longer able to touch. Nut who was already pregnant (sequel to the mating between her and Geb) eventually gave birth to Osiris, Isis, Set, Nephthys, and Horus. These five constituted the Egyptian's most often recognized gods as the earliest or, at least, the most familiar representations of older god-figures. Osiris showed himself a thoughtful and judicious god and was given rule of the world by Atum who then went off to attend to his own affairs.

Though the creation of humans and animals receives little attention in the main cosmogonies, Egyptian evidence concerning the creation of man is not lacking. As noted by Cyrus Gordon, one of the most familiar scenes in Egyptian art is Khnum, the ram-headed god, who created human beings and animals on his potter's wheel using the silt of

¹³⁷ Barbara Watterson. 1996. *Gods of Ancient Egypt*, Godalming, Surrey: Bramley Books Limited, 189.

¹³⁸ Barbara Watterson. 1996. *Gods of Ancient Egypt*, 189.

the Nile, that is, clay..¹³⁹ The narrative has it that, after he fashioned a person, his consort Heket offers the “breath of life,” (symbolised by the *ankh*) to the nose of the clay figure. The breath, thus, animates the clay effigy and the person receives an allotted life-span, personified as Shay, meaning “That-which-is-ordained.”¹⁴⁰ In the Temple of Deir el Bahari, Hatshepsut had a relief carved on one of the walls depicting Khnum fashioning her and her *ka* out of clay on his potter’s turntable.

Certainly, P account of creation and Egyptian myth of creation have some things in common. The two expressed that the world was created out of darkness and swirling chaos. The expression *b^ere’shit* and its analogous Egyptian expression both denote a specific time when the world was created. The beginning in Egyptian myth refers to the time when the Primordial Waters were disturbed, causing the self-recognition of Nun, after which Athum the supernatural light came into being. In genesis *b^ere’shit* refers to the time when the uncreated God created the supernatural light. These similarities could be unavoidable since the Hebrews lived in Egypt for four and half centuries and were informed about the cultural practices of the Egyptian. Gordon Wenham and other Old Testament scholars submit that the use of the Egyptian ideas in Genesis creation account should not be surprising since Moses, author of the Pentateuch was educated in the courts of Egypt.¹⁴¹

Despite the obvious similarities identified in the P creation account and the Egyptian myths of creation, there are undisputable variations that differentiate the P account from the ancient Egyptian mythology. For example, a critical look at the Pyramid and the Coffin Texts, showed that the sequence of creation has structural parallelism with that of Genesis to a large extent. Human beings were created from the tears of Athum unknowingly. In Genesis, humanity was created intentionally to rule the world in his image. Furthermore, the P account shows an uncompromising monotheistic creation of the world, while that of the Egyptian myths was a polytheistic one. The creation of man

¹³⁹ Cyrus H. Gordon. 1982. Khnum and El, *Scripta Hierosolymitana: Egyptological Studies*, Vol. 28, Sarah Isrelit-Groll, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 203.

¹⁴⁰ Barbara Watterson. 1996. *Gods of Ancient Egypt*, 189.

¹⁴¹ Gordon J. Wenham. 1987. Genesis 1 – 15, *Vol 1, Word Biblical Commentary*, David A. Hubbard & Glen W. Barker, (Eds.), Waco: Word Books, xlvii, James K. Hoffmeier. 1996. *Israel in Egypt: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Exodus Tradition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 144.

has the purpose of multiplication and fruitfulness and to have dominion over other creature, while the Egyptian creation myth did not specify the reason why human beings were created. The sexuality of humanity was not expressed in Egyptian creation myth, whereas in P man was created male and female to express and practice sexuality.

P creation account emanate from inspiration of the spirit of God. Using familiar symbols and themes does not indicate reproduction of Egyptian myths. The theological framework of the two are post apart while one stress monotheism the other shows polytheism. P applied literary methods to assert that the Creator is transcendent and sovereign over all creatures.

4.1.6 The motif of the cosmologies

The discovery of ancient tablets in the 19th century created a new dimension in the study of Tanakh, especially the Pentateuch which contained the Priestly account of creation. This discovery has served as the motivating factor scholars to commence the comparative study of ancient documents for the purpose of investigating which one among them that was first written. As a result, comparative studies have forced Biblical anthropologists and historians to look beyond the traditional account of creation of Genesis 1: 1–2: 4a, and then critically investigate further so as to determine which of them is the oldest. Some scholars rushed into the conclusion that the creation story of the P tradition is much later and that the author only modified what was in other cultures to reproduce or replicate the creation story of Israel. However, before one can agree or do otherwise of such assertion, that the Genesis account of creation is a just a modified account of other cosmologies, it is highly imperative to carefully examine the authors' motifs of the authors of these cosmologies and their theologies. According to the assertion of W.G. Lambert, who opines that one would be biased if one failed to apply critical analysis of the relationship between biblical creation accounts and those of others in the ancient Near East before concluding and judging who made use of the another's materials because the stories presented are distinct, though they may have some things in common in their expressions¹⁴². Consequently, reading these texts side by side with one another will

¹⁴² W. G. Lambert. 2013. *Creation Accounts: Enuma Elish, The Memphis theology and Genesis 1-2: Mesopotamia Civilization 16*, Winona Lake IN: Eisenbraun, 61.

automatically draw one's attention to the fact that each of them has its own uniqueness. The stories are distinct and their distinctiveness raises the questions: who is the creator? What is the motive of the creator in creation particularly the creation of humankind?

A careful reading from all these myths of cosmology theories, one will observe that there is a very sharp difference in the motives of the authors from one to the other. The focus here is not to fully examine the motives of each author and then ascertain to what extent does each aspect of the items discussed in the creation stories relates to one another and then pay much attention to the issue of the creation of humanity and their sexuality. The *Enuma Elish* and Egyptian myths have both shown considerably that humanity was created from pre-existing materials; whereas, the former holds that humanity was created out of Kingu's blood of Kingu and the latter indicates that humanity was created from the spittle of Athum. However, both narratives failed to state the sex in which humans were created them. The Genesis account of creation says that God created man and woman in his own image. In Genesis, there is cooperation among the council of heaven when it comes to the creation of humanity; which was not expressed in the other creation myths in the ancient Near East. This point of divergence makes Tsumura to say:

the background of the Genesis creation story has nothing to do with the Mesopotamian, as preserved in the Babylonian creation myth *Enuma Elish*. In Genesis 1 there is no struggle among gods on who expressed desire to create humanity as it is expressed in *Enuma Elish* between Marduk and Ea¹⁴³.

W. G. Lambert corroborates this when he notes that the theological ideas of P is not a rejoinder to a specific text, but a polemic response to the cultural pressure of the author's imperial surrounding.¹⁴⁴ Therefore, it is an over statement to conclude that P account of creation is a commentary on a specific composition.

The creation myth of the ancient Near East is quite different from that of the Genesis account regarding the purpose for which humanity was created. *Enuma Elish* believed that humanity was created to worship gods, which consisted of offering regular sacrifices

¹⁴³ D. Tsumura. 2005. *Creation and Destruction*, Winona, Lake Ind: Eisenbrauns, 143.

¹⁴⁴ W. G. Lambert. 2013. *Creation Accounts: Enuma Elish, The Memphis theology and Genesis 1-2: Mesopotamia Civilization* 16, 69.

in the temple to the gods. This is also reflected in the epic of Atrahasis of Assyria wherein mankind had to accept the work that the gods had to do. Egyptian myth does not state the motif of Athum creating humanity with his spittle, but the motif will not be different from that of *Enuma Elish* since it also projects polytheism. This position diminishes humanity as the eternal slave of the gods. The Genesis account of creation highlights the unique connection between Elohim and humanity. Human beings are to act as God's representative on earth. This shows that after Elohim created the world, He continued to take care of and sustain it through the actions of the human beings who settled there. The implication of this is that creation continues in the humanities in its sexuality, unlike natural legends in other cultures that its creator left the world after creation. The selfless motive of God (אֱלֹהִים 'Elohim) is revealed in the Genesis account. God (אֱלֹהִים 'Elohim) empowered humanity by giving him dominion over other creatures. Elohim offers the blessing of multiplication and fruitfulness to humanity that will occur in expression and in sexual relationships. This reason does not exist in other myths. The only one who served as a representative of the gods on earth was the Apostle Mesopotamia.¹⁴⁵

The primordial beings in other cultures have genealogies as against the Genesis, where the creator has no beginning. In *Enuma Elish* and Egyptian myths the motive of the authors was concerned on the gods and how they run the cosmos more than in the physical properties of the world. As we place Genesis 1: 1-2: 4a side by side with *Enuma Elish* and Egyptian creation myth it is necessary to investigate the language of presentation of the creation of the world. The Hebrew verb בָּרָא *bara'* which placed God (אֱלֹהִים 'Elohim) as the subject is meant to bring something into existence functionally and not only materially. It is noted that the verb is not accompanied by an identification of materials used in creation, which underscores the author's motive in show that creation of the world was out of nothing *ex nihilo*. John Goldingay asserts that the verb בָּרָא has no special link with beginning of things. It is used without reference to raw material.¹⁴⁶ It will be difficult to apply the term to Babylonian gods. *Enuma Elish* used physical verbs

¹⁴⁵ For example, Marduk delegates rule of Babylon to Hammurabi, while Pharaoh represents Ptah in Memphis.

¹⁴⁶ John Goldingay. 2003. Old Testament Theology, Vol. 1, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 77.

such as tore open, slit, bound, threw down, smashed and severed in projecting Marduk who killed Tiamat in a battle. Marduk negotiated and bargained with other gods before the world was created. This indicates that creation of the world in Babylonian epic was out of chaos, an indication that the world will continue to be governed in chaos. In Genesis 1 God (אלהים 'Elohim) spoke and things happen. It is creation by divine fiat.¹⁴⁷ Thereby the myth shows the motive of the author is to demonstrate which of the gods is most powerful.

The theological motif of P is monotheistic contrary to the polytheistic motif of others in the ancient Near East. P was not interested in how should be practice and the survival of God. Elohim is placed above daily provision by humanity, rather the creation of vegetation and other living creatures are to serve as food for humanity. God (אלהים 'Elohim) stands above sharing with humanity of the daily bread. The motive of the creation myths in other culture is to demonstrate how the gods would be placated probably to assuage their anger against humanity, hence they have to be worshipped through offering regular sacrifice.

The *Enuma Elish* and the Egyptian creation myth are focused on a certain locale as they ascribe the universal dominion to their creator. Marduk rules from his house in Babylon and Ptah from his house in Memphis. From the account in Genesis 1 the vision of God's habitation is not bound by a geographical location. He is both transcendent and immanent.

4.1.7 Exegetical import of key terms in the Dominion Mandate

i. אָדָם Man

The Hebrew word אָדָם ('adam) is used as a compound word in the dominion mandate. It is used to refer to the man God created in His own image. The word is used for both genders. This indicates that the nature of the two is a connection in two of which one cannot function perfectly without the other. The word אָדָם is also used to refer to colour,

¹⁴⁷ Walter Brueggeman. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute Advocacy*, Chicago: Moody Press, 146.

“to be red or ruddy”¹⁴⁸. It describes the attribute of the creator in human beings. Considering that אָדָם is part of nature as described in the JE account of creation is contrary to P account of creation. It can be argued that אָדָם was created by the divine council from a non-material. It can also be conjectured that they were probably created like other creatures by the command of God ('elohim) from the earth (הָאָדָמָה). He is the heir of אֱלֹהִים which makes him take the position of envy in the measure of creation. It has been awarded the highest position in the world among other creatures. P does not see אָדָם as a copy of the handy work of any other god as described in the other texts in the Old Testament.

The motif of P is that the creation of אָדָם transcends understanding of אָדָם himself. The verb בָּרָא is a function that is clearly restricted to אֱלֹהִים and its direct object is nonmaterial. Some translators and interpreters of the text posit that the term בָּרָא does not follow with the identification of the material used and conclude that בָּרָא means creating a material object *ex nihilo*¹⁴⁹. This is contrary to the verb עָשָׂה where the creator or inventor has to make use of a material to create an image, such as the analogy of a potter who uses clay to make a pot in the prophetic literature or creation story of JE in Gen 2: 4b - 25 and a phenomenon expressed in the creation myth of other cultures in the ancient Near East. The non-material creation of אָדָם made R. Martins posit that the creation of man in Genesis 1:26 is beyond the postulation and analysis of current scientific theory and knowledge.¹⁵⁰ It would be an exercise in futility to impose the current paradigm in the study of material ontology on the ancient text which its motif and context differs from perception of the modern age. P considered אָדָם as an embodiment of אֱלֹהִים for the purpose of his immanence in the universe. This indicates that in אֱלֹהִים אָדָם is in the world. This allows אֱלֹהִים to confer power and authority to אָדָם than any other creature. The word אָדָם without the definite article הָ in v. 26 undoubtedly refers to humanity as specific being different from other creatures. This further buttresses with the use of the singular word הוּאָ the third person plural qal complete jussive in double the kingdom. On the other hand

¹⁴⁸ Robert B. Girdlestone. 1956. *Synonyms of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans, 45.

¹⁴⁹ John H. Walton. 2008. Creation in Genesis 1: 1 – 2:3 and the Ancient Near East: Order of Disorder after Chaos. *Calvin Theological Journal*, 43, 58.

¹⁵⁰ R. P. Martins. 1982. Creation, *New Bible Dictionary*, D. W. R. Wood, (ed.), Nottingham: Inter Varsity, 239.

is v. 27 P shows the ancestral meaning of אָדָם using the definite article הַ which refers to “the man” as a body instead of a human being. This is emphasized by the use of the same word אָתוּ. However, some Old Testament scholars opine that the pronominal reference of both singular pronoun אָתוּ and the plural אֹתָם give the same interpretation to the reference of אָדָם in v. 27. The P theology is to describe and present the creation of אָדָם in the image of אֱלֹהִים wherein in v. 27 fulfills what God said in v. 26.

ii. בְּצַלְמִנוּ In the Image

According to the Genesis account of creation, it was reported that אֱלֹהִים created אָדָם in His own image. The implication of this is that there is a physical representation of God's image in human form. What the author actually did was to employ the use of anthropomorphic language so as to represent God. From the P account, it shows אֱלֹהִים as someone that has the same senses as human beings (especially the five senses), such as having the ability to speak, taste, see, think, touch and feel. These anthropomorphic expressions must have been the reason why some scholars arrived at the conclusion that P account actually copied from the myths of creation that was already invoke in the ancient Near Eastern culture to document about the deficiencies discovered in Israel's creation story account. He understood that אֱלֹהִים in the Hebrews thought and theology had no physical form. From this account, it means that when God concluded the creation of Israel as a nation, he then instructed them in the Ethical Decalogue that they should not imitate His image. This indicates that He is distinct from other gods in the ancient Near East who carved the images of their gods with wood, clay, metal or stone. The use of artistic imagery term by P is to bring a clear understanding of אֱלֹהִים to his audience, also to show that all humans has the inner qualities of אֱלֹהִים. Since אֱלֹהִים would make them His representative in the world among other creatures, the authority to exercise control is to create him in His image. Literally אֱלֹהִים not pictured. He is incorporeal. He created all things according to His own will and purpose while He Himself is self existence

The author was so careful not make any theological blunder by saying that אֱלֹהִים has an image because theological reflection should be situated in a culture. The prevailing culture in which the author is well known to reflects the subject of creation and worship in images. He then used those words to convey to his audience the creator of humanity in

Hebrew concept. It is also a way to show to other cultures that the creator God of Israel, has intimate relationship with humans, which is better than any other deity in the mythology of creation in the ancient Near East. Karl Peters posit that the nature of humanity in terms of the image of God in Genesis should ultimately be understood his relationship with אֱלֹהֵי. The image gives humanity the sense of sanctity of life, knowing, doing, acceptance and rejection of good and evil.¹⁵¹ The concept of image allows human beings to respond to אֱלֹהֵי direction as He wants the world to be ruled. In agreement with this assertion, some current Old Testament scholars have interpreted the image variously. Some of its meanings include ways of human incomparable power, such as wisdom, moral righteousness or the ability to invent and love. Some see the image as a functional identity with אֱלֹהֵי to exercise control over creation. Image commentary is important for the purpose of communication which is embedded in the religious tradition and rituals especially in prayer.¹⁵² The Hebrew concept of the image is that God made it so that humans could imitate Him by making the earth a livable place. The purpose of the celestial council in creating man in the image of God is to create the doctrine of cooperation among human beings for the purpose of achieving the will of God. John Goldingay opines that what gives humanity rational, religious, emotional, and the ability to relate to one another is being created in the image of God.¹⁵³ The concept of image is therefore that of the inner qualities of a human being rather than of the external and makes them different from other creatures.

iii. דְּבַר רִדָּה Dominion and מְשָׁל Rule

The Hebrew word דְּבַר רִדָּה is translated “to have dominion” from the root רִדָּה which means to dominate, rule or govern. The word dominion is mentioned twice: v. 26 and v. 28. In v. 26, it is presented as a concept of what the creator wants to make of אָדָם, while in v. 28 it stands as an instruction to אָדָם, who He created. In v. 28, it stands as giving effect to the intention contained in v. 26. Dominion has been interpreted from allegorical and literal stance by scholars. The allegorical interpretation consider it in the first instance, as an instruction to אָדָם to exercise self-control over his “natural” and his “bestial” instinct

¹⁵¹ Karl E. Peter. 2007. Theology and the Image of God: Transversal Reflection of Unitarian-Universalist with Christian Theologian, *American Journal of Theology & Philosophy*, Vol. 28, No 3, 382.

¹⁵² Karl E. Peter. 2007. Theology and the Image, 382.

¹⁵³ John Goldingay. 2003. *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. 1, Illinois: Inter Varsity Press, 102.

which is his sexuality.¹⁵⁴ The pronouncement of fecundity has been made prior to the instruction of dominion which indicates that their dominion would depend on their expression and sexual practice. This shows that the allegorical interpretation focuses on the inner life of אָדָם (male and female). The creator desires an intelligent human soul to dominate and rule the earthly body and natural senses. David Jobling notes that the allegorical interpretation of the dominion mandate reflects the question of direct behavioral pattern of the individual which ends in allowing reason to rule passion.¹⁵⁵ Darek Isaacs affirmed this view when he opines that in order for humans to rule over the animal kingdom, it is necessary to exercise dominion over their “combinations of values” and “abilities.”¹⁵⁶ The premise of the allegorical interpretation is that the inner power of humanity rules the external. In other words, before assessing the expression and sexual behavior in an individual it is necessary to take his or her actions into consideration.

Another dominant view on dominion is in the literal interpretation. This school of thought considers dominion instruction as assignment of earth stewardship (plants, aquatic creatures and animals) which is the beginning of agriculture especially the livestock. The creation account says that אֱלֹהִים created the aquatic creatures and the birds; He blessed them for multiplication and fruitfulness. He created all kinds of animals. It means that the blessing of multiplication and fruitfulness mentioned earlier on other creatures also apply to animals. Ecological hermeneutics favours literal interpretation of the text and do not consider it more than an anthropocentric theory. In as much as God’s pronouncement of multiplication and fruitfulness of fish, birds and animals only two person will not be able to dominate unless they procreate.

The root word מָשַׁל translate as rule in Genesis 1:17 & 18 which applies to the heavenly bodies connotes dominion.¹⁵⁷ This obviously means that during the day when the sun gives its light human does not need much of any other kind of light. Its dominion is

¹⁵⁴ Tony Ballantyne . 2011. Gen. 1: 28 and the Language of Colonial Improvement in Victorian New Zealand, *Victorian Review*, Vol. 37, No 2, 10.

¹⁵⁵ David Jobling. 1977. “And Have Dominion!: The Interpretation of Genesis 1: 28 in Philo Judaeus, *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, Vol. 8, No 1, 64.

¹⁵⁶ Darek Isaacs. 2013. Is there Dominion Mandate?, *Answers Research Journals* 6, 2.

¹⁵⁷ Robert D. Culver. 1981. *Mashal, III, Theological wordbook of the Old Testament, Vol. 1*, R. Laird Harris, (ed.), Chicago: Moody Press, 534.

powerful to the extent where אָדָם generate solar energy. The word רָדָה in Genesis 1:26 & 28 with root רדה is used for אָדָם only. רָדָה is a verb “to rule” while its noun cognate root מרדה is dominate which is limited to אָדָם rather than divine dominion. This involves the exercise of authority and power.¹⁵⁸ The term dominion is stronger than rule or governs in the instruction with the use of the word וְכַבְּשָׁה (subdue) which refers to taking total control. God commissioned אָדָם to dominate the world. The meaning of dominating the animal kingdom does not imply their destruction, but to care for them. John Goldingay observes that the mystery of dominion over other creatures is that אָדָם is created lower than אֱלֹהִים but created higher than the animal world.¹⁵⁹ Regardless of the hermeneutic position taken by scholars, the standpoint of dominion mandate is that אָדָם has the ability to dominate their sensual and sexuality for the purpose of achieving אֱלֹהִים instruction.

iv. בָּרַךְ Blessing, פָּרָה Fruitful and רָבָה Multiply

P in the account of creation says that “God blessed them”. In the Old Testament concept it means to be with endued with power for success, prosperity, fecundity, security and longevity.¹⁶⁰ This shows that אֱלֹהִים spoken word is life giving. The purpose of God's blessing is to authorize אָדָם for multiplication and fruitfulness. Generally, blessing in Hebrew culture often convey a formular, but this uttered by אֱלֹהִים is beyond a formular because it is self generated. The blessing of the dominion mandate cannot be altered. The dominion blessing is conferred on אָדָם for fecundity. Thus, the blessing is not an ordinary utterance but bestowal of new life. It is an action by which the power to give life is monopolized by אֱלֹהִים and this was transferred to אָדָם. With אֱלֹהִים blessing of fecundity, it suggests that אֱלֹהִים abdicate the power of creation and gives it אָדָם. But it should be noted that אֱלֹהִים did not relinquish the work of creation as אָדָם understand that he could achieve fecundity without His power. The view of P in v. 28 is to show that אֱלֹהִים should not be equated with the gods of other cultures who created man exiting material or who depended on filling the earth based on the rationale of the fertility cult. P distance the thought of his audience from gods who created man out of chaos. The ability to create

¹⁵⁸ William White. 1981. Radah, I, *Theological Workbook of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2, R. Laird Harris (ed.), 833.

¹⁵⁹ John Goldingay. 2003. *Old Testament*, 111.

¹⁶⁰ John N. Oswalt. 1981. Bereka, *Theological Workbook of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1, R. Laird Harris, 132.

and maintain the universe belongs to אֱלֹהִים alone who incorporates the means of perpetuity into the universal design.¹⁶¹

There is no doubt that the blessing which אֱלֹהִים uttered is meant for procreation. The questions however, remain: how can אָדָם achieve procreation when אֱלֹהִים has not approved it? Does P think אָדָם knows how to carry out the order of fecundity? Did P intentionally conceal אֱלֹהִים command for אָדָם? It does not documented in any part of the canon of the Old Testament where אָדָם was taught the practice of making a desire for procreation. We may infer that since אֱלֹהִים created אָדָם male and female gender, inwardly אֱלֹהִים imbued in them a way of procreation. Thus, it is in sexuality that the concept of reproduction is manifested in the dominion mandate. It is not disputed in the postmodern era that science and technology has developed assisted means of reproduction without copulation of male and female. As popular as this may be, the long lasting reproduction is the through the natural method.

Gender construct

The creation of humanity in Hebrew cosmology is not androgynous but זָכָר and נְקִיבָה P used אָהֶם to indicate that God has two genders in his creation project to show the primordial unity between the two as expressed in v. 28. Paul Jewett observes in biblical creation the two genders are intertwined which is impossible to discuss one in the absence of the other.¹⁶² Volf emphasized the point further when he notes that the cooperation established by the heavenly council in the creation of אָדָם was demonstrated in two genders. He states that “to be a woman means to have relationship with fellow human being who is 'not without a man'; to be a man means to relate with others who is not ‘without the opposite sex’.”¹⁶³ The fact that אָדָם is male and female does not mean that אֱלֹהִים is definitely feminine or masculine. Old Testament scholars and theologians generally believed that אֱלֹהִים is not a male or female, but that the responsibilities assigned to אָדָם for both.

¹⁶¹ Phyllis A. Bird. 1981. Male and Female He Created Them : Gen. 1: 27b in the Context of the Priestly Account of Creation, *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 74, No 2, 147.

¹⁶² Paul K. Jewett. 1975. *Man as Male and Female: A Study of Sexual Relationships from Theological Point of View*, Grand Rapids: Wm Eerdmans, 149.

¹⁶³ Miroslav Volf. 1991. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness and Reconciliation*, Nashville: Abingdon, 187.

4.1.8 Gender construct in the Dominion Mandate

Gender construct is always present in the culture and customs of a people. It is available both orally and in writing. To understand the meaning of masculinity and femininity in ancient Israel, this study is based on the written tradition in the creation text. In this case, it is necessary to rely on the account of P who gave the order of creation in Gen. 1: 1 – 2: 4a. Hebrew theology indicates that P has no material ontology but functional ontology. John Walton notes that in natural history the whole concept of ontology is to explain why human being, a god or an object was created. He goes on to point out that the Genesis account of creation in the first chapter of the bible says that it is important for modern-day scholars to see and hear the same thing as the ancient Israelites did¹⁶⁴. It may be necessary to accept this view because when discussing sexuality of the ancient world, no one is to be interviewed or observed and the evidence to be relied upon is being testified as true in the canon of the Old Testament. From a philological point of view, the verb *בָּרָא* suggests an act of creation that determines the roles within a functional ontology. *בָּרָא* refers to bringing people or something into existence for a purpose. P shows that God created fish, birds and animals to be for human survival. To this end, the work for gender writing in v. 28 is for male and female to cooperate for fruit and multiplication.

The understanding of gender creation as discussed in this work is related to the difference between gender roles in achieving the divine mission of fecundity. This study agrees with Gilary Lipka which shows that sexual reproduction is a network of social definitions in the form of forms, definitions, practices, interpretations, prohibitions and representations of members of a particular culture created, maintained and apply to sexual effects and sexual interactions.¹⁶⁵ The principle laid down by P in the dominion mandate that *אֱלֹהִים* form sexuality between the two genders and it is applied to judge, compare and differentiate sexual relations in other cultures. Some scholars suggest that in view of the cultural diversity of the ancient Near East, where the Israelites were, it would be much better to hinge research on sexuality on gender constructs rather than gender construct.

¹⁶⁴ John H. Walton. 2008. Creation in Genesis 1: 1- 2: 3 and the Ancient Near East: Order out of Disorder After *Chaoskampf*, *Calvin Theological Journal* 43, 56.

¹⁶⁵ Gilary Lipka. 2006. *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible*, Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2.

But a keen study of dominion mandate in P account this is contrary to the established norm in that אֱלֹהִים created them male and female in His image. Some of the trends in the ancient Near adopt sexuality in the reproductive group that is evident in the expression and practice of pornography, homosexual and pedophilia. For this reason, some anthropologists, theologians, and biblical scholars have accepted the P account in Gen. 1: 26-28 as the norm in the expression and practice of sexuality. This is not limited to current scholars but others who write biblical texts. In all versions of the Old Testament canon, bestiality, prostitution, pedophilia, adultery, and incest are forbidden in Israel based on the interpretation of P account of the creation of אָדָם (male and female). Gilary Lipka observes that the evidence for sexual orientation in ancient Israel is found in the literary works, which are translated from one generation to the other and are used to understand the sexual nature of אָדָם.¹⁶⁶

In the modern day Israel it is indisputable seen artifacts that depict feminine figures, some with hands carved pointing to their sexuality. This is not to the approval of P in the dominion mandate which intend the expression and practice to secretly done between the genders. It is obvious that there is extra-biblical literary evidence that refers to moral and sexual construction, which can be compared with P account of dominion mandate to determine the approved moral and sexual meaning. It is necessary for current scholars to rely on a specific scripture to assert the sexuality that is right to give sexual construct. David Biale opine that narrative texts is reliable than the artifacts in the study of sexuality in ancient Israel because the latter can be misinterpreted and can mislead.¹⁶⁷ more literal sense of sexuality than ornaments that evoke a sense of inconsistency.

From the text of the dominion mandate we note that P is not explicit on gender construct but suffice to say he has established the biological distinction between male and female in observing the ontological function which is fecundity. Both have different anatomy, but they are created in the image of God. The creator created both at the same time, indicating that they are equal partners. The equality of both is to be a creator with God.

¹⁶⁶ Gilary Lipka. 2006. *Sexual Transgression*, 11.

¹⁶⁷ David Baile. 1992. *Eros and the Jews: From Biblical Israel to Contemporary America*, New York: Basic Books, 11.

4.1.9 Form critical comments on the Dominion Mandate

Genesis, as it stands in canon, is expressed in an informational form that introduces itself to the reader as a kind of narrative. However, some facts are also clear: (a) the story is from a variety of sources; (b) the literature used, characters, cases and events in chapters 1 to 11 belong to a different category than those canonized in chapters 12 to 50; and (c) both sections do not have the same historical or historical values as other biblical histories such as chapters 11-25 of second Kings. Based on these observations, scholars have divided Gen. 1-11 as myth or primeval history, while Gen. 12 - 50 is classified as saga. The main concern in this section is to examine the genre of the creation account in Genesis chapter 1, and how this affects its meaning. We can argue that the principles of eternal history are in Gen. 1: 1-2: 4a has been fully redefined by a strict monotheist legend whose original forms are difficult to identify. However, the fact is that the treatise cannot be classified as history in the modern sense of the word for obvious reasons. The plot and its content are characters, events and issues that go far beyond the scope of human history. Certainly not from a witness account; also cannot be classified as saga or legend. It is based on its specific characteristics that are classified as the origin of the myth. Scholars agree that it is a literary tradition that has circulated for centuries as oral form before reaching a fixed form in writing. It has been suggested that his real life plan is in liturgical usage during the New Year celebrations.¹⁶⁸

In view of the above, since the author see the short life span of humanity, it is necessary for the multiplication of their type through expression and practice of sexual act for the continuation of the memory of the New Year celebrations. In this case, it would be a matter of rhetoric to treat this matter as a scientific or ordinary historical account of the origin of the universe. Liturgical texts are in no doubt since New Year's celebrations are meant to preserve the religious belief of the worship community. Patricia Tull has also called attention to the poetic characteristics of this pericope.¹⁶⁹ This is noticeable in the refrains "... God said 'let there be... and there was' ...and God saw that it was good" "...there was evening, and there was morning... day..."

¹⁶⁸ Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley, (eds). 1982. *Peake's Commentary*, 91.

¹⁶⁹ Patricia K. Tull. 2013. *Inhabiting Eden: Christians, The Bible and the Ecological Crisis*, Louisville: Westminster: John Knox, 21.

4.1.10 Source critical appraisal on the Dominion Mandate

The studies based on dominion mandate generally believed that it originated from the Levites, who had authority over religious activities in Israel both pre and post exilic era. This is called P in the Old Testament scholarship. The writings of P re-present the worshipping community of ancient Israel. The writer views the acts of אֱלֹהִים as pre-arranged events, designed to show the readers that He existed before all other things were created and that all things come from him. Old Testament scholars are of the view that the Jahwhistic-Elohistic source of the Old Testament accounts including the second creation account in Gen 2: 4b - 25 preceded P account. Despite the P knowledge of JE account of creation he documented a new creation account under the inspiration of אֱלֹהִים to show its theological supremacy over JE and of other creation myths. Bernhard Anderson opine that P account of creation is used in worship in the Temple, where was solemnly chanted before it reached its present form of liturgical prose. He further notes that the story was not written until the time of the exile, but it has a long history behind it and has strong religious significance over the course of many generations.¹⁷⁰ It is possible that the patriarchs told a myth about the creation of Mesopotamia from one generation to another and the development of civilization made it possible to be incorporated into the religious history of Genesis.

Many Old Testament scholars believe that P account of creation was written either in Babylon or shortly after the return from captivity. Mathew Black and H. H. Rowley postulate that that the book of law brought by Ezra from Babylon was probably has a record of creation and since he was a Levite, P account of creation which has dominion mandate was included. It is also said that the writings of P are part of the songs that are sung or recited at the New Year celebrations where they celebrate the victory of אֱלֹהִים over the forces of evil and chaos.¹⁷¹ It might possible that this creation account had being in Israel before the Babylonian exile and its final form when the people of Judah became familiar with the Babylonian (*Enuma Elish*) myth, often read on the New Year Day. *Enuma Elish* presents the chaos, in which the gods struggle among themselves on the creation of the human being and eventually Marduk killed Tiamat. Therefore, P indicates

¹⁷⁰ Bernhard W. Anderson. 1971. *The Living Word of the Old Testament*, London: Longman, 384.

¹⁷¹ Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley, (eds.). 1981. *Peake's Commentary*, 178.

the pre-existing God and through Him the earth was created by His word with man in two sexes. He created אָדָם in his own image and likeness, hence the responsibility to reproduce and multiply is given to them through expression and practice of sexuality. With this, the source of sexuality is traced to P.

4.2 Analysis of sexuality in the Dominion mandate

The Dominion mandate was given to humanity for the purpose of making them replicate what God Himself had created and ensure the continuity of creation continue. Durkheim asserts that the main factor for God giving the Dominion mandate is to make humanity cover the expanse of land which he has created along with other creatures. Humanity is made up of rational and moral beings, who are finite, but their creator, infinite. The Dominion mandate made humanity to possess a greater degree of elements of personality similar to God. In view of this, humanity has been granted unlimited ability to act on behalf of God. Although the mandate was given to Adam and documented in the Hebrew literature, this does not mean it is limited to the Hebrews. God used Adam and Eve as example for the whole human race. Dominion indicates having control over a place or a person or to be the most important person or thing. Within Dominion mandate, there is need for scholars to examine the intention of God in achieving the mandate. We consider that within the Dominion Mandate is sexuality through which fruitfulness and multiplication will be achieved.

4.2.1 Sexuality in Ancient Near East

Biblical historians, theologians and anthropologists attributed most of the events recorded in the *Tanakh*, to ancient Near East.¹⁷² This area share border with ancient Israel which originally was inhabited by the Canaanites. The nations of the ancient world, such as Assyria and Babylon, were also part of the ancient Near East. The ancient Near East was the location of the earliest organized cultures¹⁷³ which include sexuality. The *Tanakh* contains has some similarities with other texts in the ancient Near East such as the Sumerian cuneiform, which played an important role in the establishment of its cultural

¹⁷² Ancient Near East is often described as the cradle of western civilization which is known as modern day Iraq, Kuwait and parts of Turkey.

¹⁷³ Culture refers to a society's customary beliefs, social forms, thought, speech, action, norm and tradition and material traits.

beliefs. Daniel Boyarin avers that Israel's culture including its cultic institutions and literature draws on sources common to its environment.¹⁷⁴ From its specific cultural heritage the priests and prophets developed an acceptable form of life that later became the basic belief that many cultures used as a standard.

The ancient Near Eastern nations can be described as extended families because in one way or the other, they are blood related. Abraham left Ur of the Chaldeans in Mesopotamia and through it his ancestors founded other nations such as Edom, Moab and Amalek. However, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל covenant did not apply to all, but only to Israel. Though they were extended family structure there are some cultural practices in common while there are some divergences in some. Owing to these divergences, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל instructed the Israelites not to intermarry with them so as not to corrupt the covenant relationship. The reason why other nations in ancient Near East aside from reproduction engage in sexual acts is economic because it is attached to the fertility cult. When we study the ancient culture, no one to interrogate observe, the evidence we rely on is artifacts and perhaps scanty literary works. In a few artifacts and literary works, scholars note that the expression and practice of sexuality in ancient Near East was heterosexual. Scholars identified three ways in which information about sexual expression and sexuality is obtained. The first method of information is through the discovery of the archaeologists discovered in artefacts such as paintings on the walls of ancient houses, weapons, pottery and art works. These buried objects were brought as a result of inter and intra tribal wars that led to the migration of people from one place to another and the invasion of land and the subjugation of people.

Bullough notes that the first migration among the people of Ancient Near East was that of the Semitic Akkadians who seized the hegemony of Sumer and established an empire stretching westwards Mediterranean. He observes further that the period ended in chaos as the Northern mountainous tribes known as Gutti descended on the fertile plain, and for some time controlled it. The Gutti was also conquered and the situation continued till around first century AD.¹⁷⁵ The consequence of conquering, invasion and migration was

¹⁷⁴ Daniel Boyarin. 1995. "Are There Any Jews in The history of Sexuality"?, *Journal of History of Sexuality*, Vol. 5, No 3, (January), 334.

¹⁷⁵ Vern L. Bullough. 1971. "Attitudes Towards Deviant Sex in Ancient Mesopotamia"... 185.

absorption and assimilation of cultural practices, custom and tradition. The application of this method is dependent on interpretation of the unknown from the known as expressed by Gudbergsen in his examination of images in the ANE images. He argues that they only represent a copy of the original, but they are true manifestation of what they represent in the imagination of the artist of which the reader may comprehend through his/her life experience in sexuality.¹⁷⁶

From the artefacts, there were drawings of male and female holding each other face to face, likewise walking together side by side. There were signs of caressing each other in expression of love making. There was also pictorial sign of kissing. There was pictorial sign of sitting opposite each other which depicts a form of dialogue between the opposite sexes. There were love poems inscribed on wall in Sumerian language which indicate a form of telepathy expressed between two lovers. One of such poems recorded by Bullough and translated to English was:

Let a horse [make love]
[Let his male organ be stick of *martu-wood*]
[Let it strike the woman...]¹⁷⁷

There are also pictorial representations of clay models of female sexual parts and stone models of erect male organ which are found in the temple dedicated to Ishtar. In the study of Summerian artefacts by Kramer¹⁷⁸ as noted by Bullough, there were numerous pictorial representations of couples making love in fulfilment of the command of god and goddess. A number of *terra cotta* model beds exist, showing a couple making love while other representations show a couple, the woman standing bent over drinking from a vessel through a tube, while the man held her at the back. Davidson, in his study of Mesopotamian arts said, “the Mesopotamian religions abound with both male and female deities and their myths often described creation and continuing fertility as occurring by means of sex among these deities.”¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶ Thomas Gudbergsen. 2012. “God Consists of both Male and Female Genders: A Short Note on Gen. 1: 27”. *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 62, Fasc 2. 450.

¹⁷⁷ Vern L. Bullough. 1971. “Attitudes towards Deviant Sex in Ancient Mesopotamia”... 191.

¹⁷⁸ Vern L. Bullough. 1971. “Attitudes towards Deviant Sex in Ancient Mesopotamia”... 189.

¹⁷⁹ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahwh*, 85.

The earliest literary document about the life of the people of Ancient Near East was contained in the myths written in Sumerian and Akkadian languages. This was followed by Hittite and Ugaritic (Canaanite) writings.¹⁸⁰ It was believed by scholars that these literary works predate the record of Genesis and that there are few materials borrowed by the writer of Genesis from Sumerian, Akkadian and Ugaritic texts. Apart from Israel whose theology hinged on monotheism, expression and practice of sexuality among other people in the Ancient Near East was divinised and sacralised as deities engaged in sexual activity. Pantheons were personified in male and female figures, and they had tremendous influence on nature including the agrarian life. For instance, in the Sumerian mythology, there was a whole pantheon of gods and goddesses, often paired male and female partners because the fertility of the land is dependent on sexual action especially by the annual sacred marriage rite between vegetation god Dumuzi and his consort Inanna Queen of heaven.¹⁸¹

In spite the fact that civilisation began in the Ancient Near East, the main profession of the people was farming both arable and animal husbandry. The belief of the people was that bumper harvest can only be attained when god and goddess engage in sexual act and the frequency of it will determine the productivity of crops and herds. Owing to this, the sexual act was a symbol of fertility and the New Year's festival ritual was the love making between the king who ritually represent god Dumuzi and a priestess representing the goddess Inanna. The song at the New Year festival is also composed to reflect act of sexuality. Davidson quoted one of the songs translated by Thorkild Jacobsen thus:

The king goes with (eagerly) lifted head to the holy loins,
Goes with (eagerly) lifted head to the loins of Inanna.
Ama-ushumgal-anna goes to bed with her:
"O my holy loins! O my holy Inanna!"
After he on the bed, in the holy loins, has made the queen rejoice,
After he on the bed, in the holy loins has made holy Inanna rejoice,
She in turn soothes the heart for him there on the bed;
Iddin-Dagan, you are verily my beloved!¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ Vern L. Bullough. 1971. "Attitudes towards Deviant Sex in Ancient Mesopotamia"... 190.

¹⁸¹ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*, 86

¹⁸² Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*, 87

This rite was portrayed on the a few cylinder seal. Scholars attest to the fact that ritual sex covered the whole area of ancient Mesopotamia apart from the annual sacred marriage rite. This also includes cult prostitution as shown in cuneiform texts and ancient Near East iconography.¹⁸³ In order to prevent any obstacle on sexuality, there were remedies prescribed in incantations and rituals which will be applied on both sexes. In some instances, from the Akkadian and Sumerian texts, it was discovered that incantation can be employed for man to have erection. At times, he can use special oil for anointing the body, which is called *puru*, to have special performance on a woman. This shows that at times, love making was not based on natural affection but through the application of external substance, which can be likened to the use of sexual drug enhancer in the modern time.

The literary document of Sumerian and Akkadian revealed that the expression and practice of sexuality in the ANE was not limited to the terrestrial life, particularly among humans, but it extended to the celestial as demonstrated from an astrological text of the New Babylonian period 6th century B. C. Archaeologists aver that the document can be traced back to early Sumerian times. Sexuality was practice as phenomenon to add value to life generally. In view of this, the discovery of the writing and the interpretation of Sumerian and Akkadian literature on sexuality might have spread the belief in horoscope as regard the influence of the destiny of the opposite sex one will have relationship with. The Sumerian term for the document is SA.ZI.GA which could be literally translated as “rising of the heart”, and generally implies sexual potency. The document was studied and interpreted by Briggs. The text indicates the effect of stars on potency and love making and is expressed in the following signs:

Love of a man for a woman: region of Libra.
Love of a woman for a man: region of Pieces.
To make love with a woman: region of Aries.¹⁸⁴

In the Ugaritic pantheon, *Ashtoreth* (goddess) is the consort of *Baal* (god). The land is fertilised by the sperm of *Baal* which is achieved through the copulation of god and

¹⁸³ Wilfried G. Lambert. 1957-1958. “Morals in Ancient Mesopotamia”. *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap (Genootschap) Ex oriente lux*, 15. 195.

¹⁸⁴ Robert Biggs d. S. A. Z. G. A. “Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations”. *Texts from Cuneiform Sources*, 2.

goddess. When is then that The land will release its fruitfulness on when the divine sex activity is emulated on the high place on the earthly. Thus, there appeared the cult offices of the 'holy man' and 'holy woman' male and female personalities who among other functions, engage in ritual sex. Worshippers were encouraged to engage in ritual intercourse with shrine devotees in order to emulate and stimulate the sex activities of the gods. Davidson while quoting Jackie Naude notes that, "many thought the processes of nature were controlled by the relations between gods and goddesses; by engaging in sexual intercourse with the devotees of the shrine to achieve the desire for the increase in herds and fields as well as in his own family."¹⁸⁵ The historical books of the Hebrew literature explained this phenomenon, which the Israelites copied but the Hebrew prophets vehemently opposed its practice. The record of Genesis 1 which is the focus of this research is a document which originated in ancient Near East, and verses 26-28 which this research hinged on expressed that sexuality is heterosexual. The document also profoundly epitomises blessing of fruitfulness and multiplication.

As expressed in Sumerian and Akkadian artefacts and literary works that the expression and practice of sexuality has the purpose of adding value to the God's creature, the creation account in Hebrew literature also affirmed that the expression and practice of sexuality is for the multiplication of humankind to have dominion over other creatures. Thus, sexuality is not a phenomenon that is only being engaged for pleasure, but a phenomenon to add value to creation because it is by this that Elohim's work will be meaningful and purposeful.

In the Sumerian, Akkadian and Ugaritic literature, gods and goddesses are representatives of the Creator, and their copulation fulfils a command and adds value to life. In the same vein, Adam (male and female) in Genesis record are representatives of Elohim. They express and practice sexuality in fulfilment of His command "be fruitful and multiply." The point of divergence between Genesis record and other literature in the ancient Near East is that Elohim does not exist in dual gender, but He is capable to manifest Himself in different ways to achieve His goal in nature. The command of Elohim as regards expression and practice of sexuality is not related to the fertility of

¹⁸⁵ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament...* 94.

ground, fecundity of herds and bumper harvest of arable crops. The attachment of sexuality to fertility of land is one of the factors why Elohim command that Israel should not have marital relationship with the neighbouring nations. In the Deuteronomic law, there are regulations, taboos and curse against male and female who act contrary to God's sexual command.

4.2.2 Sexuality and the image of God

Genesis presents a sharp shift from the way God has been creating other creatures from that of man. Hamilton points out that there is a shift from jussive verb "let there be" to a cohortative "let us make". The verb choice here underscores the reader's anticipation of something momentous.¹⁸⁶ The animals that precede Adam are created according to their own kinds, likewise the sea creatures, birds of the air. They are thus different from the way man were created because "God created humanity in his image, male and female he created them." Humanity is made after God's own kind and given dominion over other creatures that preceded him. In order to have an understanding of the text, we shall examine it from theological, syntactic and gender perspective.

A difficulty which the text poses is that God is presented in plural form in his existence, **בְּצִלְמֵנוּ** "In our image" and **כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ** "our likeness." The question is: who are the "our?" In the real sense in Yahwism, polytheism is far from the belief of the Hebrews. The author's understanding is that the creation of humans originates from the Divine Council in the Trinitarian entity of God and this does not connote plural existence of God. In the patristic period, Berkhof notes that Ireneaus and Tertullian argued that **צֶלֶם** is different from **דְּמוּת** They attempted to make a distinction between **צֶלֶם** and **דְּמוּת** that the former connotes the bodily image of humans that cannot be lost, while the latter refers to the spiritual entity that relates only to God which can be lost in the process of disobeying his command.¹⁸⁷ The view of these Church fathers is that **אָשָׁף*** have two compartments: physical body which is tangible and the spiritual which is intangible. Friedrich Horst and Maxwell Miller consider the term **צֶלֶם** and **תְּמוּנָה** from Hebrew language explain that **תְּמוּנָה** carries the sense of a hewn or carved statue such as an idol or sculpture which

¹⁸⁶ Victor Hamilton. 1990. *The Book of Genesis Chapters 1-17*. NICOT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 134.

¹⁸⁷ Louis Berkhof. 2005. *Systematic Theology*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust. 203.

signifies in every case a manufactured work in contrast to its maker. They submit that צֶלֶם describes humanity as in its physical denotation without the spiritual side.¹⁸⁸

Miller's comment in relation to the connection between the two terminologies in Genesis 1:26 is “when the words are combined together as they appear in this verse, צֶלֶם it seems to explain the ambiguity and the meaning of תְּוִמֵּד by explaining that the similarities exist between God and the human beings which he is referring to has something to do with their physical and corporeal appearance”.¹⁸⁹ Humbert and Westermann's views are not different from those of Miller and Horst as cited in the work of Gordon Wenham when they assert that the corporeal understanding of the image of God is further reinforced by the term תְּוִמֵּד as it denotes a copy used in connection with visual similarities and often carries the connotation of “has the appearance of.”¹⁹⁰ This notion opposed the thought of the author of Genesis who sees humanity as one entity rather than two. Gen. 1: 26-27 show that *adam* is holistic and it is both male and female. The text of Gen. 1: 26- 27 is distorted when attempt is made to separate the male and female's spiritual nature from their physical existence. Clines succinctly clear in his quotation cited by Mueller thus:

אָדָם according to the Old Testament is psychosomatic unity; it is therefore the corporeal animated man that is the צֶלֶם of God. The body cannot be left out of the meaning צֶלֶם ; אָדָם is a totality, and his ‘solid flesh’ is as much as the צֶלֶם of God as his spiritual capacity, creativeness, or personality, since none of these ‘higher’ aspects of the human being can exist in isolation from the body. The body is not a mere dwelling-place for the soul, nor is it the prison-house of the soul. Inasmuch as man is a body and bodiless man is not man, the body is the צֶלֶם of God. אָדָם is the flesh-and-blood image of the invisible God. This is not to say that it is the body as opposed to something else, e.g. the spirit, that is the רוּחַ of God. For the body is not “opposed” to the spirit; indeed as far as the image is concerned at least, what the body is the spirit is.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ Friedrich Horst. 1950. “Face To Face: The Biblical Doctrine of the Image of God”. *Interpretation* (July), 260; J. Maxwell Miller. 1972. “In the ‘Image’ and ‘Likeness’ of God”. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 91, 291.

¹⁸⁹ J. Maxwell Miller. 1972. “In the ‘Image’ and ‘Likeness’ of God”. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 91, 294.

¹⁹⁰ Gordon J. Wenham. 1987. *Genesis 1-15*. Waco: Word. 30.

¹⁹¹ Chris Mueller. “What it means to be created in the Image of God”. <http://core.ac.uk>. Accessed on 26th July, 2018.

The *צֶלֶם* and *דְמוּת* have the same connotation since the creation of humans is the work of Godhead and are not compartmentalised, then humans cannot be said to consist of two separate entity. The human body and spirit complement each other; one cannot function without the other. Muller posits that Gen. 1: 26 is concerned neither with the corporeal nor with the spiritual qualities of people; it is concerned with the person as a whole.¹⁹² The two words *צֶלֶם* and *דְמוּת* are used interchangeably in the text and this does not connote compartmentalisation. The thought of the writer is that human being is the corporeal image of the incorporeal God. Berkhof sums it up thus, “the image of God in humans can only be a certain receptivity for the divine, a capacity to answer to the divine ideal.”¹⁹³ Carr, McGrawth and Peters align with this as they assert that the image of God in humans is rationality, a moral will, original righteousness, a spiritual nature, the capacity for a special relationship with God.¹⁹⁴

This indicates that the image of God is understood to be the human rational faculty which mirrors the wisdom of God. It is this that distinguishes humans from other creatures though they may have some things in common. In essence, there is no distinction between the image and likeness as patristic fathers want us to believe. The indivisible of the body and soul as expressed in Genesis 1: 26-27, the image of God in humans mark the status of divinely appointed rulers of the earth which is exhibited in human sexuality through which they demonstrate the creative power. Barth sums up the point in Gen 1: 26 by explaining that there is no mention or idea of form or appearance, rather, the author’s perception is about quasi-humans members of God as a reference to His wills, knowledge, words and deeds to provide proofs to the fact that He is indeed the sovereign and the supreme God¹⁹⁵. Genesis 1: 26-27 does not focus on the human body but on the soul, the mind and the spiritual nature of human beings. Placing the human condition as a definitive uniqueness of humanity is an overdrawn conclusion limiting the

¹⁹² Chris Mueller. “What it means to be created in the Image of God”...

¹⁹³ Louis Berkhof. 2005. *Systematic Theology*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust. 203.

¹⁹⁴ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 17; Alister E. McGrawth. 2001. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*. Third Edition. Oxford: Blackwell. 441; Karl E. Peters. 2007. “Theology and the Image of God: Transversal Reflections of a Unitarian Universalist with a Christian Theologian”. *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy*, Vol. 28, No 3 (September). 384.

¹⁹⁵ Karl Barth. 1958. *Church Dogmatics*, trans. J. W. Edwards, O. Bussey & Harold Knight, Vol. 3, No. 1. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 185.

image of God to personality, intellect or emotional capacities. Clines avers that the idea of man being created in the image of God does not imply any similarity between him and God because there is צלם of God on the pattern of which man could have been made.¹⁹⁶ The use of צלם and דמות in Gen. 1: 26 is to give clarification that human being is a resemblance of God, rather than literal bodily replication. Barr states that דמות is used to “define and limit” the meaning of צלם, so that the uniqueness of God will be guarded.¹⁹⁷

The theological approach on the צלם of God lies on the dominion mandate which is given to אָדָם. Scholars examine the notion of image from the text of other literature in the ancient Near East and the life of the kings. In the Ancient Near East where the author of Genesis originated the text, Semitic kings considered themselves as the image of the chief deity of the pantheon.¹⁹⁸ The king could be divinised, and become a representation of a god. On the contrary, the theology of Hebrew creation account differs from the conception of other literature in ancient Near East, which says all men and all women were created in the image of God. The idea of a king being the incarnation of God is foreign to Hebrew thought.

There is no doubt that human beings are functional images of God through dominion and as God’s royal representative on earth. Mueller notes that in the Old Testament, wherever humanity is, God is proclaimed. It is the nature of an image to allow what it represents to appear, so that where humanity appears, God also appears.¹⁹⁹ The male and female are not physical representation of God, but rather God’s representatives to creation through their sexuality. Mueller posits that male and female distinction in Gen. 1: 27 is to clarify the sexual intimacy that will be expressed for the purpose of procreation which is unique to man.²⁰⁰ The point of sexuality is displayed through the emphasis placed on the plural pronoun אֲנָחְם at the end of Gen. 1: 27, contrasting the singular אָדָם* and אִתּוֹ earlier in the verse.

¹⁹⁶ D. J. A. Clines. 1968. “The Image of God in Man”. *Tyndale Bulletin*, 19. 90.

¹⁹⁷ James Barr. 1968-69. “The Image of God in the Book of Genesis: A Study of Terminology”. *BJRL*, 51. 24.

¹⁹⁸ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 18; Phylis Bird. 1981. “Male and Female He Created Them”. *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (April). 135; Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh* 128.

¹⁹⁹ Chris Mueller. “What it Means to be Created in the Image of God”.

²⁰⁰ Chris Mueller. “What it Means to be Created in the Image of God”...

The actual knowledge and interpretation of אֱלֹהִים being created in the אֱלֹהִים of God which is imposed on the *Tanakh* is from the Greek philosophical concept. The Greeks had contact with the *Tanakh* more than any other people because of the commerce and religious persecution in Jerusalem. This contact enabled the Greeks to translate *Tanakh* into LXX. This led to interpreting *Tanakh* in Greek thought. On this, Boer says, “within the empire the most important spiritual influence came not from the Romans but from the Greeks. Roman power and Roman law governed military, political, social and economic life; Greek thought pervaded the thinking of the people.”²⁰¹ Greek philosophers argued that true God had no tangible body which can be touched or felt. He cannot be thought as a Being who possesses the five senses like humans. They portray God as a incorporeal principle or force. The thought of Greek interpreters differs from the Israelites in some respects, as the latter had no confusion imagining God having humanlike body. The Hebrew reflect the way God communicated with the Israelites in the wilderness, pre-exilic and exilic era giving directive in all life ventures such commander of the army of Israel, provider of bread and water, just as a human father would do to his children. This could not make them doubt the reality of God’s existence in human form, even though He is invisible. They believe that man can die if he sees God face to face, and it is forbidden to portray Him in the image in artistic work.

In other Hebrew texts aside Genesis, there are assumptions that God has a humanlike bodily form with all senses, hence such phrases like the hand of God, the finger of God, the eye of God in abstract form. The thought that God exists in bodily form is not peculiar to Israel, Carr notes the 3,000-year-old statue of Hadadyisi, king of Sikan, an ancient city in the upper reaches of Mesopotamia. Hahadayisi constructed the statue to stand in the sanctuary before his god, Hadad, when Hadadyisi would not be around. He further notes that the inscription on it says, “the likeness of the governor/king Hadadyisi which he set up before the god Hadad of the city Sikan.”²⁰² He observes that king Hadadyisi uses the Aramaic words, for image and likeness the same words used in Gen

²⁰¹ Harry R. Boer. 1976. *A short History of the Early Church*, Ibadan: Day Star, 7.

²⁰² David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 20.

1: 27.²⁰³ But the difference between Israel and others in the Ancient Near East is that it is forbidden to make statue of God. In Genesis 1: 26-27, the words *צֶלֶם* and *דְמוּת*, “Then God said, Let us make humankind in our *צֶלֶם* image, according to our *דְמוּת* likeness so God created humankind in his *צֶלֶם* (image), in the *צֶלֶם* (image) of God he created them; male and female he created them”, were used four times. The author employs these terms for material image to claim a bodily resemblance between humans and God. The thought of the author in this text does not specifically lie on the bodily image of God, but that men and women are embodiment of the divine image. Thus, just as the images in the ancient world represent those whose images they bore, *אֱלֹהִים** represents God in the world. *אֱלֹהִים* is the vizier of God.²⁰⁴ The text states clearly the purpose for which God created humans in his image:

26 וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים וַעֲשֵׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ וַיְרִדוּ בְדִגְתַּת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם
 וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל־הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל־הַרְמֵשׁ הָרֹמֵשׁ עַל־הָאָרֶץ:
 And God said, “Let us make Adam (humankind) in our image, according to our likeness and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over cattle, and over the wild animals of the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on earth.” (Gen. 1: 26).

The aim of the author in this text is to show that God exists in plural form and that humanity is created in godlike form for the purpose of having the dominion mandate which he (male and female) have to express in their sexuality. This text suggests that God made humanity as miniature godlike replicas to roam over the earth. This shows that the image of God in humans is the mark of divine status appointed to rule the earth. Creating humans in his image make male and female possess creative power and this is inherent in sexuality. The notion of the divine image serves here to validate and explain the special status and role of *אֱלֹהִים* among other creatures. In *כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ* connotes that God desire male and female in projecting his image has to be done in a cooperative manner as the Divine Council created *אֱלֹהִים**. In God’s rational the cooperative nature of male and female will give a better and lasting result than assigning the creative power to an

²⁰³ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 20.

²⁰⁴ John M. Frame. 2006. “Men and Women in the Image of God”. John Piper & Wayne Grudem (eds.) *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*. Wheaton: Illinois: Crossway. 230; Thomas Gudbergsen. 2012. “God Consists of both Male and Female Gengers: A Short Note on Gen. 1: 27”. *Vetus Testamentum*, 62. 450.

individual. Frame opines that when we examine the living condition of humanity, we discover that things that have added value to them and improved the living standard in economy, politics, social and religious are issues that are taken and done corporately between male and female.²⁰⁵

From the outset some theological thoughts have interpreted the body nature of humanity as a phenomenon that is opposed to the will of God. This school of thought was influenced by the anti-sexual elements of the Greek tradition. In the 6th century, the Greek Pythagorean philosophic movement had praised keeping the body pure from sex. Some of the writings of Plato argue that the only way a soul can gain freedom from the chaos of the temporary pleasures like sex is to direct its desire to higher goods like beauty and truth. The Stoic movement also encouraged the cultivation of *apatheia*, the freedom from being moved by passion.²⁰⁶ The thought of the philosophers spread wide and many relegate human sexuality to the background.

The second approach which image of God in ׀ִאָ* has been examined is from the philological perspective. The reason for this approach is because a critical study of Priestly account of creation shows that it is not detailed enough. Some English translations arranged verse 27 in poetic form to show synonymous parallelism typical of Hebrew literature.²⁰⁷ From syntactic analysis, scholars like Barth, Gudgergsen and Bird²⁰⁸ divided verse 27 in poetic form:

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ
בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ
זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם:

And God created the man in His own image
In the image of God He created him
Male and female (He) created them

²⁰⁵ John M. Frame. 2006. "Men and Women in the Image of God". John Piper & Wayne Grudem (eds.) *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood...* 230.

²⁰⁶ Daniel H. Garrison. 2000. *Sexual Culture in Ancient Greece*. Normal: University of Oklaoma. 246- 269.

²⁰⁷ New Revised Standard Version and New International Version arranged verse 27 in poetic form.

²⁰⁸ Thomas Gudbergsen. 2012. "God Consists of both Male and Female Genders: A Short Note on Gen. 1: 27". *Vetus Testamentum*, 62. 450. Phyllis Bird. 1981. "Male and Female He Created Them". *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 74, No. 2 (April). 135.

In this verse, philologists argue that there is parallel construction in lines 2 and 3 “in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them”. It is observed that line 2 sheds light on line 1 with reference to meaning without necessarily using the same word. As it appears in this text, the author(s) is economical with words in the description of the creation of humans because his aim is to emphasize the dependence of all creation on God and to describe the order established within creation. Thus, lines 1 and 2 may sound as repetition but it is to show that all creation depend on God including human beings which He created in His image.

In syntactic analysis of verse 27, Barth opines that the Hebrew syntax probably would not have used the conjunction “and” but instead use “or” since every human being is either male or female and with this gender differentiation they express and practice their sexuality. He argues further that each gender do not have some things in common including the genitals.²⁰⁹ But his argument did not gain popular acceptance in Old Testament anthropology and theology. The philologists did not see the rationale to substitute “or” for “and” as contained in the original text as this will tantamount to distortion of the thought of the author as he conceived God’s creation.

The third aspect in which created in the image of God has been considered in this text is from the gender standpoint. The text says God created זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה * male and female in his image he created them, the import of this statement is that God exist in sexual form. Scholars, who interpret this text in ordinary male and female sexual relationship, compared other accounts in the Ancient Near East from where Genesis also originated. In other cultures in ANE, the creator exists in gods and goddesses who express and practice sexual relationship before humans can receive god’s benevolence. But the author of Genesis does not describe life being created through the sky god’s impregnation of the earth goddess with rain. This thought is no where expressed whether in the primary creation account in Genesis and/or elsewhere in the Hebrew literature. The idea projected in the Hebrew literature is that God is beyond the polarity of sexuality, even though sexuality is part of the structure of creation. God is not presented

²⁰⁹ Karl Barth. 1958. *Church Dogmatics*, Translated by J. W. Edwards, *et.al.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 184ff.

as a male god with a female consort like the fertility cult in the Ancient Near East. The God of Genesis is not sexually erotic like the gods of Egypt, Mesopotamia and the Canaanites.

The gender school of thought also argue that the text of Genesis project God has earth as female consort as expressed in Gen 1: 12 וַתֵּצֵא הָאֲרֶזֶן דְּשֵׂא עֵשֶׂב and the earth תֵּצֵא “bore”, “bring forth” tender sprout (plant), the same word used in the creation of animals in Gen. 1: 24. They argued further that the Hebrew word אֲרֶזֶן earth is feminine noun which suggest that earth is God’s wife. Other creation myths in the ancient Near East also feature a female earth goddess as the source of life. To show that God is above the polarity of sexuality in the text and the context of Genesis differ from creation myth of other Ancient Near East cultures is that God does not create humans alone but through the Divine council and in their image and likeness he created them. Also, the text depicts that God created everything with word of decree including the earth. The fact that God created humans sexually erotic cannot be disputed and he demonstrates this in the pronouncement of blessing פְּרוּ be fruitful and וּרְבוּ multiply. The image of God in humans includes sexuality through which the blessing of God is fulfilled. Peters asserts that the image of God is not only a descriptive concept but the means by which humans should be and act in the world to fulfil the desire of God in their creation.²¹⁰

4.2.3 Sexuality and heterosexuality in Dominion Mandate

Old Testament scholars have expressed some difficulties situating heterosexuality in the Hebrew literature, because the idea of sexual orientation and behaviour did not exist when the literature was written. The difficulty is further compounded in the sense that the word “heterosexual” was not one of the vocabularies that was used in religious, social or political life of the Israelites. What we understand is that humanity had been engaging in some practices for centuries which have added value to human life and creation in general before they gained attention of scholars in various fields of study and were given terminology. Thus, it has been argued that cultural, social and religious

²¹⁰ Karl E. Peters. 2007. “Theology and the Image of God: Transversal Reflections of a Unitarian Universalist with a Christian Theologian”. *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy*, Vol. 28, No. 3, (Sept.). 382.

practices had been in existence before their history was documented, as a result event created history. This assertion is true of heterosexuality. Ever before the emergence of the term heterosexual and heterosexuality, humanity had been making love between the two sexes, marrying, procreating, building families, and populating the society but they were categorically not aware that they were heterosexuals because creation of sexual orientation and behaviour did not occurred to them. The notion of humanity is that the sexual practice they engaged in is normal with the way the creator had created them. This affirms the claim of anthropologists that sexuality is a natural construct which humanity had been practicing before its real terminology.²¹¹

The Hebrew literature the history of religio-political and social life that are explained in it, though some terminologies that have become subject of debate in scholarship do not emanate from it. Historians, anthropologists and sociologists have observed that prior to May 6, 1868, there was no term as heterosexual or heterosexuality.²¹² Most documentations on human history have reflected love as being romantic or platonic, brotherly or maternal, *eros* or *agape*; it was definitively not heterosexual. It was in the mid-nineteenth century that the West began to think and differentiate human beings by the kinds of sexual desire they express and practise.

The emergence of the knowledge of biological science with Darwin's theory of evolution on natural selection disputed P creation account especially the creation of <d*a*. The theory was applied to the interpretation of the Hebrew literature especially the creation of <d*a*. Biologists interpreted <d*a*h* in Genesis 1: 27 to mean androgynous or hermaphroditic being which they believe split into two sexes, and not that God created humanity male and female.²¹³ This gained attention of some scholars and they bought into the interpretation. For instance, Tribble and Kawashima argue that <d*a*h* is

²¹¹ Wayne A. Grudem. 2004. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than One Hundred Disputed Questions*. Sisters, Ore: Multnomah, 111-113.

²¹² Hanne Blank. 2012. *Straight: The Surprisingly Short History of Heterosexuality*. Boston: Beacon Press. 9.

²¹³ Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution claims that all creatures including humans were species which undergo the process of natural selection that when reproductive isolation occurs new species will form negating the procreation through sexual activities.

basically androgynous: one creature incorporating two sexes.²¹⁴ The text and context of Genesis 1: 27, however, oppose this notion. The authors say, אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֶת זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָא, אֱלֹהִים God created them male and female. The plural word; אֱלֹהִים) in v. 27 is intentionally contrasted with singular At=ao, and this negates the proposition of biological science of androgynous or hermaphrodite theory. This is further stressed in Gen.1: 28, where God blessed “them” to be fruitful and multiply. This command can only be fulfilled through heterosexual form of sexuality. The sexual distinction of male and female is fundamental to what it means to be human. To be human is to live a sexual person. Richard Davidson quoting Karl Barth says, “we cannot say man without having to say male and female. Man exists in this differentiation, in this duality.”²¹⁵ There no doubt that heterosexuality as terminology is recent. However, the expression and practice of sexuality through it has been since creation of humanity. This point is further buttressed in J account of creation where vya!! exclaimed that hv*a! is bone of his bone, flesh of his flesh when she was brought to him!

The origin of ‘heterosexual’ is traceable to medical profession. It was one of the types of sexual orientation named by a physician, Richard von Krafft-Ebing.²¹⁶ He had the consciousness to coin these terminologies as a result of Prussian legal code of April 14, 1851 in Germany which stipulated a punishment of five years with hard labour for anyone convicted of “unnatural fornication.”²¹⁷ Unnatural fornication in the context of the code includes human having sex with animals or sex between persons of the same sex. Richard von Krafft-Ebing named sexual orientations to include heterosexual, homosexual, monosexual (which is known today as masturbation) and heterogenit (which is termed bestiality). The rationale for these terminologies was to assist law enforcement agents and the Judiciary in the implementation of the law and punishing the offenders in the right manner. Also, the population explosion spurred by industrialisation and urbanisation in the late 1860s further necessitated differentiation of sexual

²¹⁴ Phyllis Trible. 1973. “Depatriarchializing in Biblical Interpretation”. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (March). 35; Robert S. Kawashima. 2006. “A Revisionist Reading: On the Creation of Adam and Then Eve”. *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 56, Fasc. 1 (January). 46.

²¹⁵ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 20-21.

²¹⁶ Jonathan Ned Kart. 1995. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 21.

²¹⁷ Hanne Blank. 2012. *Straight*, 16.

orientations by which people could be identified. Thus, they serve as representatives of generic forms distinguished on the basis of their tendencies to behave sexually in particular ways. Also, industrialisation and urbanisation led to scientific and philosophical approach to natural creation particularly humanity, and the attendant increase in urban population brought all kinds of unorthodox sexual activities. These sexual activities brought the consciousness to have terms for the type of sexual behaviours expressed and practiced by male and female. About two decades later he published this in his book titled *Psychopathia Sexualis* 1886.²¹⁸ His proposition did not widely spread until a Hungarian journalist, Karl Maria Kertbeny, used the term “heterosexual” in a chapter of a book arguing for the decriminalisation of homosexuality that the term came into the public knowledge.²¹⁹ Then heterosexuality became a subject of debate in scholarship.

4.2.4 Sexuality and procreation

The emergence of inter disciplinary approach to the study of Hebrew literature has brought the debate on the purpose for which God has created זָכָר male and female and blessed them to ‘be fruitful and multiply’ among scholars. Bird notes that in the history of biblical interpretation, Gen 1: 26- 28 has produced a lot of exegetical and theological reflections and there is no sign of ceasing or abating.²²⁰ On the same point, Akao opines that, “extending over a period of some one thousand years, the Old Testament as a document of the history of a people and their religious evolution, contains a variety of theologies, opinions and attitudes regarding sexuality.”²²¹ The reason for the fascination of the passage lies in the nature and limits of the text. Bird affirms that the statement in this passage is limited in contents, guarded in its expression and complex in its structure.²²² The area where scholars argue is that the blessing of God is not limited to humanity because before the creation of humanity God has declared terrestrial and

²¹⁸ Hanne Blank. 2012. *Straight*, 41.

²¹⁹ Jonathan Ned Katz. 1995. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*, 21

²²⁰ Phylis Bird. “Male and Female He Created Them”: Gen. 27b in the Context of the Priestly Account of Creation. Accessed on 18th May, 2018.

²²¹ J. O. Akao. 2006. “The Old Testament Concept of Sexuality”. S. O. Abogunrin (ed.) *Biblical View of Sex and Sexuality from African Perspective*. Ibadan: NABIS. No. 5. 15.

²²² Phylis Bird. “Male and Female He Created Them”: Gen. 27b in the Context of the Priestly Account of Creation...

aquatic creatures to bring forth their kind without reference to sexual activity (Gen. 1: 22). Before the pronouncement of blessing, there is strong emphasis from the text that God created humanity in sexual differentiation (male and female) which is distinct from the divine order. The sexual distinction between male and female is fundamental to what it means to be human and to be human is to live as a sexual being.

Moreover, scholars have expressed concerns as to whether or not the blessing refers specifically to procreation or to the care of creation for their wellbeing and survival. Apart from pleasure which humanity derive in the expression and practice of sexuality, another goal of it is procreation. Procreation is what adds value to the world which God has created and made humanity the crown of it. Procreation, as indicated in פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ is the primary purpose of sexuality, and it emphasises the divine design for human sexuality. Shapiro posits that the אֱלֹהִים commanded אָדָם to be fruitful and multiply with the intention of preserving the human species.²²³ Also, as interpreted by Davidson, what is implied in Gen 1: 28 by בְּרַב־כֹּחַ is the power to accomplish the task which God has set forth in the blessing. Davidson further argues that humanity are expected to take the seriously and act upon it freely and responsibly in the power that attends God's blessing.²²⁴

However, how humanity is to achieve God's desire of procreation is not explained in the blessing, thereby leaving a vacuum. This vacuum has led to the emergence of the rational man with the development of reproductive technology such as In Vitro Fertilisation (IVF) to undermine the role of sexual intercourse. The advocate of this does not take into consideration that IVF is of recent discovery. From time immemorial, humanity has been engaging in sexual intercourse with focus on procreation.

Sexuality in the dominion mandate includes the act of sexual intercourse between male and female which is restricted only within the marital relationship. The creation of humanity in male and female sex negates the notion of homoerotic which some are

²²³ Davis S. Shapiro. "Be Fruitful and Multiply". *A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought*. traditional archive.org/news/article accessed on 4th Aug. 2018.

²²⁴ Richard M. Davidson. "The Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning 1-2". http://faculty.gordon.edu/hu/hu/bi/ted_hilebrandt/ote.source01/genesis. Accessed 4th August, 2018.

advocating in sexuality phenomenon. Holis observes that sex is not a sinful aberration or a regrettable necessity as it has often been regarded in the history and pagan thought. Rather, human sexuality as both ontological state and relational experience is divinely inaugurated.²²⁵ The blessing of God is fruitfulness and multiplication, the Hebrew word for multiply הַרְבֵּה indicates many, numerous and populous. This indicates that God (Elohim) expects man to procreate so that the dominion assignment given them will be carried in proportionate number of terrestrial and aquatic creatures. The Hebrew word to fill, מִלֵּא* gives the idea of replenishing the earth with human beings to populate the earth through procreation. God (Elohim) shares his power with humanity to join him the art of creation.

The text of Gen. 1: 28 originated out of a living a community and people who are bonded together by a cultural practice. In ancient Israel, procreation is seen as an obligation that must be fulfilled by a couple because it is the only means of keeping family posterity. Chianeque and Ngewa note that the way by which the Israelites conceive immortality is through their sons, who would continue the family line and ensure that their names were not blotted out of history.²²⁶ As regard procreation, both male and female are necessary to reproduce. In ancient Israel, men were believed to be fonts of fertility to create new life, and were strongly believed to have been created complete without any form of infertility. The role of female is to receive the new life from male to incubate, nourish and nurture the seed received from male and bring forth new life through child birth. In view of this, women in ancient Israel were valued first and foremost for their reproductive capacity. It was the greatest role a woman has to fulfil for her to be considered normal in the family and society at large. Female throughout antiquity have been interpreted as symbols of fecundity and maternity.²²⁷ A woman who is barren has no integrity. In ancient Israel, the cause of infertility is placed on the woman and she is considered to be under the curse of Yhwh.

²²⁵ Harry Hollis, Jr. 1975. *Thank God for Sex: A Christian Model for Sexual Understanding and Behaviour*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 58.

²²⁶ Luciano Chianeque and Sameul Ngewa. 2006. "Deuteronomy". Tokunbo Adeyemo. *Africa Bible Commentary*. Nairobi: World Alive. 243.

²²⁷ Stephanie Lynn Budin. 2014. "Fertility and Gender in the Ancient Near East. Mark Masterson". Nancy S. Rabinowitz & James Robson (eds.) *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*. London: Routledge. 30.

Procreation in sexuality is held in high esteem to the extent that the Hebrew literature gives no consideration to any form of control of fertility or a deliberate action to inhibit multiplication of human such as the practice of abortion, the use of contraceptives and other forms invented by modern science such as condom for male and female. The perception of the author of Genesis is that of pro-life, as against termination of life in any form. Abortion is a deliberate action of thwarting the birth of a child which is considered wrong, as it is termed to be murder and shedding of human blood. There had been debates for and against it both by the religious group which is championed by the Roman Catholic. The religious group argued against it in the practice of sexuality. *Adam* is the image of God on earth and deciding deliberately not to reproduce oneself the person deprives the world of the quality of Divinity, which reflects itself in each new life. David Shapiro arguing against abortion says, “whoever aborts s/he refrains from propagating his or her kind, s/he derogates, if one might say so, from the general form which all individual forms comprehended, and cause the river to cease its flow and impairs the holy covenant, on all sides.”²²⁸ The commandment of procreation, like any other commandment, brings its influence to bear on all dimensions of existence, both earthly and heavenly. The argument does not take into consideration the health implication of the mother or the foetus as modern science would have done. Religious argument is, therefore that sexuality is created as the creator’s world works for procreative act.

The use artificial contraceptives which modern science invented as a method of birth control is another word the author of Genesis does not make reference to. Some scientists believe not only that sexual activity goes beyond reproduction, that sex indeed is meant to give pleasure by itself. Oomman asserts that the sexual organ of male and female are created to give a sense of pleasure, bonding and create relationship that will make life worth living for the two. He submits that the idea that procreativity as the end of result of sexuality should not be placed above pleasure.²²⁹ It is undeniable that sex provides pleasure and it is natural phenomenon. Benagiano and some researchers in obstetrics

²²⁸ D. S. Shapiro. 1973. Be Fruitful and Multiply, *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Thought*, Vol 13, No 4. 45.

²²⁹ Nandini Oomman. 1998. Sexuality: Not Just a Reproductive Health Matter. *Reproductive Health Matters*. Vol. 6, No. 12. <http://www.jstor.org/stable>. Accessed on 20th June, 2018.

after reviewing evidence from physiology, psychology and cultural values concluded that it is undeniable that pleasure originally developed in order to promote procreation, it is not an irrelevant by-product of the drive to procreate.²³⁰ Jackson, in support of this view, opines that sexuality is a form of living out the human body in pleasurable manner which is shared by strengthening individual emotional and psychological well-being which culminates in social cohesion.²³¹ Sexual pleasure that emanates from the sense of natural fantasy usually ends up in procreation. Ikpe also observes that pleasurable sex is not alien to humanity as the creator made it to bring about harmonious relationship between a man and woman, which climaxes in satisfying each other sexual experience.²³² Pleasurable sex engenders exchange of trust and companionship because it is a means of feeling alive and virile. Oluwole notes that there is difference between pleasurable sex and practicing sex for fun or enjoyment. She observes that it is natural for humanity to express their sexuality and this first of all creates sense of pleasure but the end result may be reproduction purposes.²³³

On the other hand, the pleasurable dimension to sexuality through the use of contraceptives is believed to corrupt public morality by aiding prostitution and sexual diseases. The use of contraceptives in expression and practice of sexuality tend towards individualistic and auto-focused which contradict the intension of the creator in dominion mandate. Owing to the moral depravity which the invention of contraceptives will inject into the society, the Lambeth Conference of Bishops in the Anglican Church issued statements condemning contraception:

We issue a stern warning against using unnatural means to avoid getting pregnant, as well as serious threats - physical, moral and religious - as a result, and against the misconduct of stretching which the extension of such use threatens the human race. Contrary to the teaching which, under the name

²³⁰ Guiseppe Benaggio, Sabina Carrara, & Valentina Filippi. 2010. "Sex and Reproduction: An Evolving Relationship". *Human Reproduction Update*, Vol. 16, No. 1. <http://academic.oup.com/humupd/article-abstract>. Accessed on 4th Aug. 2018.

²³¹ Stevi Jackson. 2003. "Heterosexuality, Heteronormativity and Gender Hierarchy: Some Reflections on Debates". Jeffer Weeks, *et. al* (eds.) *Sexualities and Society*. Cambridge: Blackwell. 73.

²³² Eno Blankson Ikpe. "Culture and Pleasurable Sexuality in South Eastern Nigeria". *Sexuality in Africa Magazine*, Vol. 3, Issue 3, 8.

²³³ Sophie Oluwole. "Public Health and Individual Right to Sexual Pleasure and Choice". *Sexuality in Africa Magazine*, 6.

of science and religion, encourages couples to deliberately cultivate sexual intercourse as an end in itself, we strongly support what must always be regarded as governing consideration of Christian marriage. One is the main purpose of marriage, namely the continuation of the race through the gifts and inheritance of children; the second is the most important thing in a prudent and self-controlled marriage²³⁴.

On the nature of sex, there exists the Roman Catholic argument which is hinged on the teaching of Augustine and Aquinas. The teaching holds that sex is inherently procreative and the use of artificial contraception is condemned on the ground that it gives room for pre-marital and extra marital sex, it is opposed to sexuality created in the dominion mandate, and it is detrimental to societal and marriage stability. Justin Allen opines that to focus attention on sex and engage in it other than to procreate is to do injury to the nature.²³⁵

Thus, the sexuality in Genesis excludes the practice of abortion the use of artificial contraception. Then, how can *Adam* understand the blessing of multiplication. To what extent can they procreate? How many children can they procreate that God would have been satisfied that they have obeyed his command? In what way will they control birth so as to prevent over population and secure food security? Scholars who are opposed artificial contraception note that since God can created all other creatures both plants and animals for the wellbeing of *Adam* and they are given authority to have dominion over them, he has created natural contraceptive among the plants which *Adam* can use for birth control. Raquel Lopez expressed among the people of Ancient Near East archaeologists found papyrus leaves with recipes instructing women to use certain herbs and natural substances as contraception; even removal of the ovaries.²³⁶ He further argued that nature has made the body of a woman that during the period of *postpartum*, she will be prevented from getting pregnant no matter the number of times she had sex; as a result there is no need to employ the use of artificial contraceptive and abortion in procreation.

²³⁴ Dennis P. Hollinger. 2013. *The Ethics of Contraception*. 684.

²³⁵ Justin Allen. 1998. Birth Control and the Catholic Church. *Undergraduate Review*, Vol. 11, Issue 1, Article 7. 52.

²³⁶ Raquel Lopez. 2012. "Perspectives on Abortion: Pro-Choice, Pro-Life, and What Lies Between". *European Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No. 4. 511.

4.3 A critique of modern expression of sexuality in the light of the Dominion Mandate

Sexuality is part of creation, and to be human is to be sexually active. The creator does not prescribe the form of sexual orientation which אָדָם has to express and practice because he is beyond the polarity of erotic sex. David Carr maintains that, “the God of Genesis 1 is not sexually erotic like the gods of Egypt, Mesopotamia and other cultures near Israel.”²³⁷ Since God created אָדָם in his image and likeness, he gives freedom to them to fashion out the form of sexual orientation they will adopt to fulfil the dominion mandate. The absence of a particular form of sexual orientation, which אָדָם has to express and practice leads to various forms of sexuality that have gained the attention of scholars.

4.3.1 Heterosexuality

Heterosexuality is defined as coitus relationship between the opposite sexes. This form of sexuality is as old as creation. Though there was initial negative perception to it, but owing to increase in knowledge, this perception changed, and as a consequence, it was considered normal way of expression and practice of sexuality and up till now it is regarded hetero-normativity by majority of scholars. It is expected that humanity will engage in it with dignity and sense of responsibility. Since this form of sexuality has been in practice, it is believed to be natural because God created only two genders and this causes scholars not to be inquisitive about its origin. Whatever most scholars think and discuss about heterosexuality, the fact remains that a male is erotically attracted to female(s) and vice versa. In most cultures, people are made to believe and act their sexuality in this manner. Without doubt, the expression and practice of heterosexuality is what has kept humanity on the planet earth because it is through it that recreation and procreation occur. Halperin asserts that without heterosexuality human species would not have survived this long.²³⁸

The Tanakh which informs this research approves heterosexual practice, with the condition under which it has to be done. In the first instance, God created אָדָם (male and

²³⁷ David M. Carr. 2003. *The Erotic Word*, 24.

²³⁸ www.bbc.com/future/story/the-invention-of-heterosexuality. Accessed 15th May, 2018.

female) and made them to live together. In the course of time, God gives law to regulate the heterosexual practice as stated in the Holiness Code. With the introduction of these laws, Moses was instructed to tell the Israelites not to emulate the sexual practice of the Egyptians where they sojourned for about four and half centuries and the sexual culture of Canaanites with whom they would inhabit as expressed in Lev. 18: 1-5.

- 1 וַיִּדְבֹר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר:
 דַּבֵּל אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה
 2 אֱלֹהֵיכֶם;
 3 כִּמְעַשֵׂה אַרְצ־מִצְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁבְּתֶם־בָּהּ לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ וְכִמְעַשֵׂה אַרְצ־כְּנָעַן אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מְבִי
 אֶתְכֶם שָׁמָּה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ וּבַחֲקֻתֵיהֶם לֹא תִהְיוּ:
 4 אֶת־מִשְׁפָּטֵי תַעֲשׂוּ וְאֶת־חֻקֹּתַי תִּשְׁמְרוּ לִלְכֹת בְּהֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם:
 5 וְשִׁמְרֶתֶם אֶת־חֻקֹּתַי וְאֶת־מִשְׁפָּטַי אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם הָאָדָם רָחִי בְהֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה:

The law forbids incest Lev. 18: 6

6. אִישׁ אִישׁ אֶל־כָּל־שֹׂאֵל בְּשָׂרוֹ לֹא תִקְרַבוּ לְגִלוֹת עֶרְוַת אֲנִי יְהוָה:

A man shall not draw near to uncover the nakedness of his flesh (relative) who is a woman I am Jehovah.

Adultery Lev. 18: 20

20. וְאֶל־אִשְׁתּוֹ עִמִּיתָהּ לֹא־תִתֵּן שִׁבְבֶתָהּ לְזָרָע לְטַמְאָהָּ־בָּהּ:

And the wife of your neighbour you shall not give your semen by lying with her for (it is) unclean with her.

These laws are also repeated in the Deuteronomic code. For instance, fornication i.e. violation of chastity law (Deut. 22: 13-21); adultery (Deut. 22: 22-24); rape (Deut. 22: 25-27). Stulma posits that legal materials in the Tanakh are symbolic attempts to work out in the concrete terms the behavioural pattern in the life of the covenant people, the principles which have to be deeply held for the purpose of adding value to the community.²³⁹

²³⁹ Louis Stulman. 1992. "Sex and Familial Crimes in the D Code: A Witness to Mores in Transition". *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. Issue 53. 47.

Barclay submits that every civilisation is established and consolidated by observing strict moral code which regulates sexual relationship between a man and a woman.²⁴⁰ As there are legal codes that regulate sexual relationships in ancient Israel, equally in African culture, there are taboos and superstitions which society evolve and use to guide humanity in the act of making love. For instance, in Africa, it is a taboo to commit incest, bestiality and adultery, anyone who acts contrary to the mores of the society will face dire consequences. Familusi opines that it is forbidden for a man to have sexual intercourse with his wife's sister or any of her relations. It is believed that any person that violates the taboo of incest will be punished with sickness.²⁴¹ Also, there are taboos and superstitions on when and where sex should be done. For instance, among the Yoruba it is a taboo for a man and woman to have sex during the day. It is believed that if a couple breaks it, if the woman gets pregnant she will give birth to an albino. The Yoruba taboo forbids having sex in the farm, which is the source of economy and food production; to do so leads to desecration of land.

In spite of the law, taboos and superstitions that guide sexual activities, זנות* is still found guilty of heterosexual perversion, the sexual behaviour which society condemns and considered inimical to human health and has negative psychological effects. Anthropologists and sociologists have identified three factors that usually lead to heterosexual perversion which are: religious feasts, prostitution and pleasure. The origin of heterosexual perversion has been traced to celebration of religious feasts in various cultures. Religious feasts are a time of merry making when excess food and intoxicating drinks of various kinds are supplied and are available to all categories of people free of cost. It is generally believed that during religious feasts, people drink to the point of being intoxicated and the tendency to behave inappropriately is high. Tanakh presents Israelite festivals as occasions where one could eat and drink one's fill, with song and dance contributing to the festive mood. Toorn posits that in the circumstances of eating and drinking in excess, one could easily lose one's sense of propriety and momentarily

²⁴⁰ William Barclay. 1973. *The Ten Commandments for Today*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans. 164.

²⁴¹ Olusesan O. Familusi. "Human Sexuality in Africa Thought and the HIV/AIDS Scourge". luminati.hnu.ph/articles/c17/familusi. Accessed 14th January, 2018.

indulge in a type of behaviour that would otherwise be deemed inadmissible.²⁴² An example of this is the incident at yearly feast of the Lord at Shiloh when the Benjaminites were advised to use the occasion to take women when they come out to dance as wives by force and elope with them to their city.

In the Babylonian Talmud, it is expressed that on the fifteenth day of the month of *Ab*, and on *Yom Kippur*, the Israelite girls would dress in white apparel, dance in the vineyard, and in the process make boys to be attracted to them; and in the end make their choice among them.²⁴³ In the same Talmud, it is also expressed that in the spirit of ecstasy, ladies would invite the young men to raise their eyes and see whom each one of them would choose.²⁴⁴ During religious festivals, there are renditions of sensual songs and poems. These usually stimulate sex instincts in both sexes. The dancing steps of females also attract males to them. This indicates that sexual excesses were part of the expected ritualised behaviour at festivals and belonged to the popular culture of the time. This might be the reason why Hosea denounced cultic parties in his prophecy in the pre-exilic period when he referred to the event at Baal-Peor in the land of Moab. The ban of transvestism in Deuteronomy has been suggested that it is to prevent religious orgies. In this modern day, social ceremonies such as birthday party, wedding party, and burial party coupled with establishment of social centres heterosexual excesses are on the increase.

In ancient Israel and most modern day cultural practices, heterosexual perversion is evident in the practice of prostitution. It is difficult to trace the origin of prostitution, but it is believed that it has been in existence from time immemorial. William Domeris notes that prostitutes are found in most ancient societies regardless of the religion practised.²⁴⁵ The Tanakh mentioned Tamar the daughter in-law of Judah, who dressed like a prostitute so as to seduce and trick him for failing to provide a husband for her.

²⁴² Karel Van Der Toorn. 1989. "Female Prostitution in the Payment of Vows in Ancient Israel". *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 108, No. 2. 202.

²⁴³ Karel Van Der Toorn. 1989. "Female Prostitution in the Payment of Vows in Ancient Israel"... 203.

²⁴⁴ William Barclay. 1973. *The Ten Commandments for Today*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans. 112.

²⁴⁵ William Domeris. "Prostitution in the Context of Christianity". <http://www.researchgate.net/publication/265667965>, accessed 28th Aug., 2018.

There is also the story of Rehab, the harlot who saved the Israelite spies in Jericho. Toorn avers that prostitution has been with humanity as a form of trade to rake strangers of their booty. He describes it “the oldest profession in the world”²⁴⁶. This indicates that prostitution is considered as an extension of the concept of reciprocity, whereby certain women become public property out of self-volition, and offer their sexuality to a large number of men. As regards prostitution as a form of heterosexual perversion, women are the initiator while men are the executor. The pleasure which $\square\eta\aleph$ attaches and derives from heterosexuality has brought immoral sex behaviour in the practice of prostitution in the society.

In ancient Near East to which the Israelites also belong, there are priestesses in the Temple of the gods who were sacred prostitutes and men have liberty to coition with them. This is regarded as act of worship. The Deuteronomist records that during the era of confederacy and monarchy, the Israelites copied the culture of the Canaanites and they established cult of the prostitute in high places for the purpose of human and animal fecundity and bumper harvest of arable farming.²⁴⁷ It is also argued that during the captivity of the people of Judah in Babylon, there was practice of sacred prostitution. Toorn notes that in the Neo-Babylonian records from the Ishtar temple of Uruk, certain female members of lower class were hired out as concubines to private citizens.²⁴⁸ It is undoubted that the relation between these men and women indicate nothing than to have pleasurable sex. Some Old Testament scholars believe that the Israelites copied the practice of Temple prostitution when they returned to Jerusalem.²⁴⁹ Economic survival played a principal role in the practice of prostitution. In the ancient time, it was linked to fertility cult and hence, it has been defined as sacred prostitution. It has been said that when a woman is in the sacred cult of fertility, she makes a vow to the god of fertility which she has to fulfil. Since there was no other means for her to pay her vows she has to

²⁴⁶ Karel Van Der Toorn. 1989. “Female Prostitution in the Payment of Vows in Ancient Israel”... 201.

²⁴⁷ Bernhard W. Anderson. 1966. *The Living World of the Old Testament*. Second Edition, London: Longman. 212; T. N. O. Quarcoopome. 1986. *History and Religion of Israel*. Ibadan: African Universities Press. 92.

²⁴⁸ Karel Van Der Toorn. 1989. “Female Prostitution in the Payment of Vows in Ancient Israel”. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 108, No 2. 204.

²⁴⁹ G. Fohrer. 1972. *History of Israelite Religion*. Nashville: Abingdon. 59.

resort to prostitution. It has been suggested that the payment of vows was used to maintain the temple of gods and goddesses. More importantly, it has been argued that since the Israelites were in the same community with the Canaanites, they might have practised the cult of sacred prostitution. But it is clear that this practice was repudiated in the Mosaic laws for the Israelites in Deuteronomy 23: 17-18, of which it is expected that they would obey it.

17 עִמָּךְ יֵשֵׁב בְּקִרְבְּךָ בַּמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר־יִבְתֵּר בְּאַתְדִּשְׁעֶיךָ בְּטוֹב לְוֹ לֹא תוֹנְנוּ: ס
18 לֹא־תִהְיֶה קְדֻשָּׁה מִבְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה קְדָשׁ מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

17. There shall be no harlot among the daughters of Israel, nor shall there be a homosexual among the sons of Israel.

18. You shall not bring the hire of a harlot, or the price of a dog, into the house of Jehovah your God for any vow for even both of these are an abomination to Jehovah your God.

Heterosexual excesses are born out of the notion that sex is not only meant for biological purposes alone but to satisfy human passion. In view of this, humanity seeks for sex as a means of pleasure or a means to satisfy an appetite. It is argued that post modernity has changed the whole significance of the sex act in such a way that it is no longer necessary to confine it within the dominion mandate. Barclay avers that in the past, when dominion mandate was considered a rule which should not be violated, the expression and practice of sexuality was dominated by three fears: “the fear of conception, infection and detection”.²⁵⁰ All these have been assuaged by the scientific invention of contraceptive drugs and condoms. Even if conception occurs, the foetus can be aborted. There are drugs to cure sexually transmitted diseases, which considerably solves the problem of detection. This phenomenon has opened a wide door to engage in heterosexual relation for pleasurable satisfaction. The belief that heterosexual instinct is given for procreation is fast becoming primitive and out model.

4.3.2 Adultery

The sexuality expressed in the dominion mandate is sexual relationship between a man and a woman who are bound together legally. In the Hebrew community, there is practice of polygamy and concubinage and it is not condemned probably because it prevents men

²⁵⁰ William Barclay. 1973. *The Ten Commandments for Today*. 161.

against adulterous practices. Adultery is defined as sexual intercourse of a married man or woman with another man or woman than his wife or her husband.²⁵¹ It is also called extra marital sex.²⁵² This kind of expression and practice of sexuality is religiously and socially disapproved. Adultery in the eyes of the Hebrews is a crime against the matrimony. Adultery has been in practice among other nations which the Israelites will cohabit with in Canaan and there is possibility that culture assimilation will take place. Hence, in the Mosaic laws, the seventh commandment forbids the practice of adultery in the form of apodictic law. The law states:

לא תנאף

You shall not commit adultery

This law is further reiterated in the Holiness Code prescribing the penalty for the offenders. Lev. 18: 20; & 20: 10 says:

20. וְאֶל-אִשְׁתּוֹ עֲמִיתוֹ לֹא-תִתֶּן שְׂכָבְתְּךָ לְזָרַע לְטַמְּאָהּ-בָּהּ:

20. And the wife of your neighbour you shall not give your semen by lying with her for (it is) unclean with her.

10. וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִנְאֹף אֶת-אִשְׁתּוֹ אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִנְאֹף אֶת-אִשְׁתּוֹ רְעוּהוּ מִוַּת-יְיֹמֵת הַנְּאֹף וְהַנְּאֹפֶת:

10. And a man who commits adultery with another man's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death.

The penalty is reemphasised in Deuteronomy 22: 22

כ. יִימָצָא אִישׁ שֹׁכֵב עִם-אִשְׁתּוֹ בְּעֵלְתוֹ וְנָשָׂא בְּעֵלְתוֹ וְנָשָׂא עִם-הָאִשָּׁה וְהָאִשָּׁה וּבְעֵרְתָּ הָרָע מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל:

22. If a man is caught lying with a married woman both of them shall die and you shall put away the evil from the land of Israel.

The purpose of reemphasising on the law in the Holiness Code and in the second law is because adultery transgresses the socio-theological boundaries and threatens the foundation upon which family which is the nucleus of the society was built. In this case, it is a violation of divine law, and therefore, an abomination.

²⁵¹ William Barclay. 1973. *The Ten Commandments for Today*, 104.

²⁵² Judith K. Balswick and Jack O. Balswick. 2008. *Authentic Human Sexuality: An Integrated Christian Approach*, Second Edition. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity. 200.

Prior to the legal code that forbids adultery, there had been traces of the practice of it in the patriarchal narratives. On two occasions, Abraham deceived Pharaoh and Abimelech, king of Egypt and Gerar, respectively, by telling them that Sarah was his sister and not his wife, so that he could save his life. The two narratives show divine disapproval of adultery because God would have visited Pharaoh and his subjects with plagues, just as He threatened Abimelech with capital punishment, a situation which would have caused the nation greatly.

In Ancient Near Eastern culture where Israel also belongs, there is legislation against adultery and anyone who acts contrary will not evade punishment which ranges from castration, banishment to capital punishment, because it is considered as sin against the gods.²⁵³ The study of the laws of other nations in the ancient Near East and Israel however shows that there is a difference in the punishment of an adulterer. Other nations have option of fine, mutilation of the body either facial or sex organ or total forgiveness if the husband of the woman chooses. By contrast, in Israel, there is no option of punishment than death because adultery is regarded primarily a moral crime against God and not merely a civil offence. Phillip explains that this situation could only have arisen because Israel entered into a covenant with Yahweh which made her peculiar among other nations.²⁵⁴ It is undisputed that Israel was corporately bound by the Decalogue at Mount Sinai and any breach of its provisions could be regarded as act of unfaithfulness and breach of trust against Yahweh. Therefore, death penalty is to serve as deterrent to others and to purge evil from the land. Another reason death penalty is unavoidable for an adulterer is that if pregnancy should occur through adulterous relationship, it will disrupt the patrilineal system upon which the family inheritance was based. Barclay avers that if adultery is not criminalised, the whole institution of family would be radically altered. The very essence of the family is that in it two persons, a male and a female, marry each other for life time. It is this exclusive relationship which gives marriage its security.²⁵⁵

²⁵³ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 342.

²⁵⁴ Anthony Phillip. 1981. "Another Look at Adultery". *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, No. 20. 19.

²⁵⁵ William Barclay. 1973. *The Ten Commandments for Today*. 162.

Thus, adultery which threatens the security of family and the society has to be penalized, in this case, it is prohibited for both male and female.

Criminalisation of adultery also exists in other cultures, particularly in Africa. African culture denounces adultery vehemently, and takes stern measures to punish the offenders. For instance, among the Yoruba, it is forbidden for men and women to engage in adultery. If a man is caught in adultery, it is said that *o je eewo* (he eats taboo) because it is forbidden to sleep with the wife of another man. A person, *je'ewo* by committing adultery.²⁵⁶ The punishment for committing adultery for both sexes varies from one community to another. Generally, Yoruba communities use *magun* (literally meaning “do not climb”) to punish an adulterer. If a man suspects infidelity on the part of his wife, he can lay *magun* on her to trap the man. *Magun* is of various types and it is deadly. There is the type that kills immediately an adulterer who has sex with an adulterous woman. There is the type that will defer its action till when an adulterer eats a particular food, fruit, drink or perform a particular action like crossing a gutter, or road which would activate the potency of the *juju* and kills him afterward. This type of *magun* is like a timed bomb waiting to explode. *Magun* works on both man and woman. If *magun* is on a woman and had no sex with a man it will still affect her negatively. The woman will emaciate and die eventually.

The Tanakh on which this research is hinged does not tell why $\square\uparrow\aleph$ engages in adultery. Notwithstanding, from various narratives of attempted adultery and practice of adultery one may deduce that lust is the principal reason for the practice of adultery. Barclay avers that sexual intercourse with a woman other than one's wife originates from an incitement of lust after the adornment of the woman that brings out her beauty.²⁵⁷ When Abraham migrated to Egypt from Canaan on an account of famine having realised the beauty of Sarah, his wife, he had a premonition that Egyptian would lust after her. What he had in mind was true as Pharaoh lusted after Sarah and took her into his palace. The same happened in the land of Gerar when Abimelech, out of lust, took Sarah to his harem.

²⁵⁶ Bolaji Idowu. 1996. *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief*. Revised and Enlarged. Ibadan: Longman. 156.

²⁵⁷ William Barclay. 1973. *The Ten Commandments for Today...* 105.

Another reason that gives rise to adultery is power. In Hebrew's thought, a husband has power over his wife. Women generally are regarded as part of the property of men which men can treat or discard as they like. Under the Jewish law, a woman has no legal rights to initiate divorce proceedings against her husband, even if her husband is caught in adultery. Whereas, a man can divorce his wife on the offence of adultery and on any minor issue. Aside the power of a husband over his wife, there is exercise of royal power as in the case of Pharaoh, Abimelech in the patriarchal narratives and that of David who took Bathsheba and killed her husband. In most patriarchal cultures, undue power of men over women is a factor which makes men not to respect their marital vows. Adultery is easier for men than for women, because they have more freedom than women. They often have access to both single and married women. In this manner, the consequences of adultery are more on women than on men. For instance, if pregnancy occurs in an adulterous relationship, the sense of shame and guilt is usually heavier on the woman than the man as the case of Bathsheba and David.

In the modern time, factors that lead to adultery include premarital sex, which a spouse may find it difficult to detach himself or herself after marriage. Another is marital sex dissatisfaction. Some spouses, particularly men, are not satisfied with one sex partner. Some may be as a result of foreign religious teaching which goes against the practice of polygamy that makes them engage in adultery. This also can be a result of women interest in sex changes because of life cycle. In some cases such as prostitution, economic imbalance, mostly on the part of women, leads some into adultery wherein they sell their sexuality. There is also the reason of low spirituality whereby a spouse does not see anything wrong in having extra marital sex. High libido and lack of self-control can lead to adultery. Ojo submits that men are likely to commit adultery because of their natural preference for promiscuity.²⁵⁸

Also, adultery is possible in the situation of seeking for greener pasture, where spouses live apart and far away to each other and for some years do not have opportunity to see each other let alone sleeping together. Judith Balwick and Jack Balswick observe that

²⁵⁸ Matthias Olufemi D. Ojo. 2013. "Magun: The Traditional Juju for the Punishment of Adultery among the Yoruba Natives". *Antropologija* 13, Sv 3, 133.

sexuality is an integral part of humanity as they interact with opposite gender outside of their marriage. This may bring about sharing of life experiences of one's family with a third party and this has both positive and negative sides. They submit that in most cases frequent close contact with the opposite sex may lead to adultery.²⁵⁹

There is connection between working class and extramarital sex for women. It is also suggested that as more women join the labour force as against being home makers, the opportunity for adultery opens and increases, because there are more eligible men around. The need for new sexual excitement as a result of sexual boredom is another factor. Mass media and social media have given the opportunity to the majority of people to watch different sex techniques. Coupled with this is the entertainment industry like cinemas and film houses and the production of home videos where a lot of sex techniques are displayed unhindered. Sexual dysfunction owing to an ailment of a partner can cause adultery which may bring inability to achieve orgasm. In a research, John Gagnon reports that women revealed that they have higher proportion of orgasm in extramarital sex than in marital sex.²⁶⁰ It has been observed that women committing adultery is usually based on the idea of a woman at home whose husband has declining sexual interest in her probably owing to wrong perception of her by the husband or unresolved differences.

Another factor for adultery is affluence and influence in the society especially on the part of men. The more wealth and personal resources a person has, especially the man, the more he has the wherewithal to finance extramarital affairs. Affluence can also pay for the consequences of his action both at the home front and with his adulterous partners. Gagnon posits that middle class men can afford to allocate more resources to non-marital pursuits, because of their position and sometimes, affluence and power which make them more attractive later in life.²⁶¹ The sense of financial and vocational autonomy for both men and women can lead to a heightened sense of right of sexual choice. Psychologists and sociologists submit that it is difficult to have an end to adultery because most people find their extramarital relationships highly exciting, especially in the early stages. This is

²⁵⁹ Judith K. Balswick and Jack O. Balswick. 2008. *Authentic Human Sexuality*. 214.

²⁶⁰ John H. Gagnon. 1977. *Human Sexualities*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foreman. 219.

²⁶¹ John H. Gagnon. 1977. *Human Sexualities*, 218.

as a result of psychological compression; the two partners are very passionate about each other for the number of hours they meet, a situation which is absent in most marital relationships. Another reason for its persistence is that they always see each other well dressed, looking attractive and well behaved, not when feeling tired and grubby.

The punishment for adultery in the postmodern age is not as harsh as it was in the Old Testament era. The Old Testament legislation gives no option than death penalty. It may be unheard of to kill because of adultery. In the postmodern era, the constitution of some countries has abolished capital punishment. Even in Africa where *juju* is applied to punish adultery, there are remedies to render the *juju* impotent. The reason for this is that consequences of adultery today are more personal than communal. Also, the society today is multi religious as against the monolithic practice of the Israelites. The present generation is heterogeneous which gives room for inter marriage contrary to homogenous nature of the Israelites. In view of this, the penalty for adultery cannot be the same, no matter the way the present generation applies the Tanakh for ethical norms. The spouses affected in adultery can only seek for counsel from a religious functionary, take the step for separation and at worse seek divorce legally.

4.3.3 Rape

Within the expression and practice of heterosexuality in the dominion mandate, humanity has evolved rape in it. The Tanakh does not have a direct equivalent word to denote the English word rape, like adultery but it mentions seduction which is done in violent ways. This violent sex in the Old Testament which Pentateuch legislated against is what modern scholars call rape. The word rape has its origin from Latin which indicates “to seize”²⁶² by force. The practice of rape within the context of sexuality in the dominion mandate is perpetuated by man while woman is the victim. In rape, the perpetrator seizes the victim by force and engages in sexual activity without her consent. This concept makes it to be broadly defined as any sex act in which one participant mostly woman has not given informed consent.²⁶³ Lipka defines it as the violation of another physically, psychologically and emotionally through the commission of a non-consensual sexual act

²⁶² Samuel W. Kunhiyop. 2008. *African Christian Ethics*. Nairobi: WordAlive. 273.

²⁶³ Judith K. Balswick & Jack O. Balswick. 2008. *Authentic Human Sexuality*: 261.

that is imposed by the use of domination, force and or violence.²⁶⁴ Laws and attitudes regarding rape vary widely from culture to culture; in some societies, it is a heinous criminal offense second only to murder, while in others, it is considered an offense only insofar as the rapist has violated another man's property. The cultures that lack written record evolved taboos against rape and its contravention always attracts penalty.

In Hebrew community rape is considered a crime. The fact that there is law which stipulates stiff penalty against rape is not to hinder the freedom which the God has given אדם but to make them act responsibly and sensibly. Hilary Lipka notes that law against rape is to prevent and control the sexual expression that poses a threat either for the wellbeing of individuals within the community and the cohesiveness of the community.²⁶⁵ Without the law, sexual drive is capable of inciting individuals to perform reckless actions which can threaten the cooperative relationships among members of the community upon which social life depends. Rape has been in existence before the legal code, but not approved and those that occur after the existence of the written code were condemned.

The passage that deals with rape is in the second law. Rape offences are in three parts. The first part is Deut. 22: 23- 24 which concerns a betrothed lady who is raped in the city.

23. כי יִהְיֶה נַעֲרָה בְּתוּלָהּ מֵאִרְשֵׁהּ לְאִישׁ וּמִצָּאָהּ אִישׁ בְּעִיר וְשָׁכַב עִמָּהּ:

24. וְהוֹצֵאתֶם אֹתָם-שְׁנֵיהֶם אֶל-שַׁעַר הָעִיר הַהוּא וְסָקַלְתֶּם אֹתָם בְּאֲבָנִים וּמָתוּ אֶת-הַנַּעֲרָה עַל-דִּבְלֵהּ אֲשֶׁר לֹא-צִעֲקָה בְּעִיר

וְאֶת-הָאִישׁ עַל-דִּבְרֵי אֲשֶׁר-עָשָׂה אֶת-אִשְׁתּוֹ רְעוּהוּ וּבִעֲרַת הָרַע מִקִּרְבֶּךָ:

23. If a virgin girl that is betrothed to man and a man finds her in the city and lies with her.

24. You shall then bring the man and the girl out to the gate of that city and you shall stone them to death, because the girl did not cry out and because the man has disgraced the wife of his neighbour. You put away evil from the land.

The second is that of a woman raped in the country side Deut. 22: 25-27.

²⁶⁴ Hilary Lipka. 2006. *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Phoenix. 21.

²⁶⁵ Hilary Lipka. 2006. *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible...* 21.

וְאִם-בִּשְׂדֵה מְצָא הָאִישׁ אֶת-הַנְּעוּלָה הַמְאֲרָשָׁה וְהִחְזִיק-בָּהּ הָאִישׁ וְשָׁכַב עִמָּה וַיִּמַּת הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר-שָׁכַב עִמָּהּ לְבִדּוֹ:
. 25

וְלִנְעוּר לֹא-תַעֲשֶׂה דָבָר אֵין לְנְעוּר חֲטָא מְוֹת כִּי כַּאֲשֶׁר יָקוּם אִישׁ עַל-רַעְיוֹ וּרְצִחוֹ נָפֵשׁ כִּין הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה:
. 26

כִּי בִשְׂדֵה מְצָאָהּ נְעוּר בְּתוּלָה צָעָקָה הַנְּעוּר הַמְאֲרָשָׁה וְאֵין מוֹשִׁיעַ לָּהּ:
. 27

25. But if a man finds a betrothed girl in the field, and the man seizes her and lies with her then only the man that lay with her shall die.

26. And you shall do nothing to the girl; (because) the girl has no sin that is worthy (commensurate) of death; for it is like when a man rises against his neighbour and murders him, even so this matter.

27. For he found her in the field (and) the betrothed girl cried out, but there could be no one to save her.

The third is a virgin who has been betrothed Deut. 22: 28-29.

כִּי-יִמְצָא אִישׁ נְעוּרָה בְּתוּלָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא-אֲרָשָׁה וְתַפְשָׁהּ וְשָׁכַב עִמָּהּ וְנִמְצָאוּ:
. 28

וְנָתַן הָאִישׁ הַשָּׁכֵב עִמָּהּ לְאָבִי הַנְּעוּר חֲמִשִּׁים כֶּסֶף וְלִזְוִתֶיהָ לְאִשָּׁה תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר עָנָה לֹא-יִוָּכַל שְׁלִחָהּ כָּל-יָמָיו:
. 29

28. If a man finds a virgin (girl) that has not been betrothed and rapes her and he is caught

29. The man shall give the girl's father fifty pieces of silver and he shall marry her because he has defiled her. He shall not put her away all his days.

The first law presents the case of illegal and violent sexual intercourse between a betrothed virgin and a man in the city. The penalty stipulated by the law is that if they are caught, both of them are to be stoned to death because their offence desecrates the land upon which economic life depend. The mention of 'the city' indicates that the sexual intercourse occurs in a busy place where people are around and nearby, which gives the girl opportunity to cry out for help. Thus, the man's successful intercourse with her implies that she gives consent to the act. This act of rape transgressed against religious and communal boundaries and it threatens to cause a breach in the societal fabric by destroying the bonds that are necessary for mutual cooperation within the community.²⁶⁶

²⁶⁶ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 346 - 347.

As observed by Lipka, sexual practices that inhibit the cohesiveness of the community among its members include rape and other forms of sexual assault.²⁶⁷

The second phase of rape presented above is different from the first in that the intercourse takes place in the countryside, where there are few passers-by. In such a secluded area if the woman cries for help, there would be no one to hear her cry. The girl is presumed and proclaimed innocent, but the man shall be stoned to death. Therefore, she is presumed to have been physically coerced into the illegal sex. Alexander Abasili points out that whenever *hiphil* of *qzx* is preceded by the proposition *b* it always denotes ‘to seize’, ‘lay hold’, ‘constrain.’ Hence, this presents a clear case of the use of physical power against the betrothed virgin.²⁶⁸ The third aspect of the law made it compulsory for the man to marry the girl after paying the penalty specified by the law. This is necessary in that if pregnancy occurs it is an abomination for a girl in ancient Israel to give birth to baby out of wedlock. Moreover, if this is not applied the lady may not have a man to marry her, because of the value placed on virginity of a girl before marriage in ancient Israel.

In the analysis of these laws, some Old Testament scholars argued that these verses are more of seduction than of rape. Comparing v. 25 with v. 29 a different word is used when signifying rape, namely *חָזַק chazaq*. If the inspired author wanted to imply that the woman in vv. 28-29 was being raped, he could have used this same word *חָזַק chazaq*; especially since this is the word he used in the preceding verses to refer to an actual rape incident. The fact that he did not use it should further caution us from reading rape into vv. 28-29. The Hebrew word *יָנַח inah* (“humble, afflict,”) emphasised above used in Deuteronomy 22:29 can sometimes be used for forcing a woman as indicated in other passages (Gen. 34:2; Jud. 20:5; 2 Sam. 13:12), which is clear from the Deuteronomy passage itself in verse 24. This word can simply mean to dishonour, mistreat, afflict, and violate.²⁶⁹ Joseph Smith submits that there is clear evidence of “outright rape” of an

²⁶⁷ Hilary Lipka. 2006. *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible...* 23.

²⁶⁸ Alexander Izuchukwu Abasili. 2011. “Was it Rape? The David and Bathsheba Pericope Re-Examined”. *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 61, Fasc. 1. 6.

²⁶⁹ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament...* 359; Joseph W. Smith. 2014. *Sex & Violence in the Bible: A Survey of Explicit Content in the Holy Book*. New Jersey: P& R Publishing Company. 113.

unbetrothed woman.²⁷⁰ The penalty for this rape is for the man to compensate the father of the woman of fifty shekel, with the added codify is that the man not only must marry the woman but also must not be permitted to divorce her. Lipka explains that the sexual transgression against the woman is legally conceived of a violation of the rights of her father rather than a crime against the woman, and the trauma experienced by the victim is often not a consideration when determining the damages owed to the father.²⁷¹

4.3.4 Incest

Incest is defined as act of making love to close relative which include one's biological father, mother, stepmother, sister, half-sister, step-sister, granddaughter, aunt, uncle, uncle's wife, daughter in-law and sister in-law. Incest as practised in ancient Hebrew community did not cover all the description above. This description is designated as primary kin that is sexual relationship between first-degree relatives²⁷², which the ancient Hebrews practised. The Tanakh suggests that in pre Mosaic era, incest was not condemned because it was a cultural practice as evidenced during the time of the patriarchs. Waltke and Freddicks assert that the reason for this might have been as a result of nomadic society which the patriarchs find themselves and it is necessary to have regular close contact with the opposite sex who are related.²⁷³ In the ancient time, endogamous sexual relationship was permitted among the Hebrews. For instance, Abraham married his half-sister, Sarah; Isaac married Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel, Abraham's nephew. Jacob married the daughters of Laban, his maternal uncle; his wives were his cousins. Moses was born of a union between nephew and aunt. This indicates that the nation of Israel originated from incestuous relationships. As noted in ancient Hebrew community, this sexual relationship was not condemned and it was forbidden for the eldest daughter to marry outside the family.²⁷⁴ It has been said that prior to the Holiness Code, a Noachid was prohibited only the natural degrees of incest which are union with mother, father's wife, married woman and maternal sister.²⁷⁵ This law did not

²⁷⁰ Joseph W. Smith. 2014. *Sex & Violence in the Bible: A Survey of Explicit Content in the Holy Book...* 34.

²⁷¹ Hilary Lipka. 2006. *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible...* 28.

²⁷² Johanna Stiebert. 2016. *Incest in the Hebrew Bible: Sex in the Family*. Bloomsbury: T&T Clark. 33 - 34

²⁷³ Bruce K. Waltke & Cathi J. Freddicks. 2001. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapid: Zondervan. 149.

²⁷⁴ Jewish Encyclopedia.com, accessed on 21st September, 2018.

²⁷⁵ Jewish Encyclopedia.com, accessed on 21st September, 2018.

affect Abraham who married his paternal sister, and Jacob who married two sisters because these cases were not contrary to the natural law.

After the formation of Israel as a nation through the Sinaitic covenant, incest was prohibited and then it labelled a perversion of heterosexuality. The apodictic laws in the Holiness code list fifteen sexual relationships among close relatives which are prohibited (Lev. 18: 6- 18). Though every culture has taboos that legislate against incest, it is the written code that makes the modern societies to enact laws against incest and prescribe penalty for an offender. Hebrew literature does not inform us as to the rationale for the prohibition against incest. However, one can decipher primary and secondary reasons for it. The main reason is that Israel is a peculiar nation to Yahweh among other nations. The practice of incest is common among the neighbouring nations of Israel, but she has to be different to them. Another reason is that the principle behind the laws concerning incest is that Israel should be holy. Lockshin comments that the main thrust of Leviticus is holiness (the code is called holiness code). This indicates that Israel who is the recipient of the law has to be holy.²⁷⁶ Coupled with this is the reason that Yahweh regards sex and marriage as sacred and he has a purpose for giving אִיִּם the sex instinct and it should be directed to achieve the intended purpose. He sees that the practice of incest runs counter to the intention.

It cannot be denied that there will be sensuality among family members. Some sociologists argue that incestuous fantasies are necessary for children to grow into healthy sexual adults. Though these fantasies may be important, it is essential that they be controlled. Therefore, the holiness code forbids sexual conduct with those women who are regularly in a man's vicinity. In other words, in order to cut down as much as possible on sexual activity, the holiness code forbids sexual conduct between a man and all the women most easily accessible to him. This law is to protect the women who are always vulnerable in the patriarchal culture. Moreover, the law against incest is to increase serenity, tranquility and reduce evil, jealousy among humanity. Accordingly, the Torah forbids a sexual relation with a woman that might lead to arguments. For example, the Torah forbids sexual relations between a woman and her daughter, and sexual union with

²⁷⁶ <https://thetorah.com>, why-the-torah-prohibits-incest, accessed 22nd September, 2018.

two sisters. These women are likely to be jealous of each other since jealousy is more intense among relatives, male or female, than among strangers.

Possibly the reason why incestuous relations were prohibited is that people in the nation who are not related become closer to each other. Besides, the application of these laws would be more felt during the period when the Israelites settle in Canaan where topography prevented the tribes to have easy access to one another. As difficult as topography may be the man who wants to marry will struggle to locate another to have a woman to marry outside his immediate tribe. It makes the nation united. This will also keep away animosity; intertribal war and feuds among the tribes. In addition, in Israel, virginity is held in high esteem. If there is no evidence of being a virgin when a woman married she is a disgrace to herself and to her family. Then, if there is no law against incest, there will be frequent copulation among relations. It means there is no woman who would ever leave her father's home a virgin, as her father, her brother, and her grandfather who brings her up, would lie with her. This indicates that incest could endanger any possibility of a secure marriage, home and family. In the same way a son would be lying with his mother and his aunt.

The law is given to ultimately prevent the negative effects of inbreeding. It has been observed by scientists that each family has a particular defect or health problem and if incest is not legislated against, it will increase the risk of infectious diseases. In endogenous relationships, there is bound to be passing family health imbalance from one generation to another; if the relationship is exogenous it will be at a minimal level. The ultimate effect of inbreeding will decrease the frequency of defective genes in the population. Furthermore, there is need to strengthen social solidarity which can only be achieved when sexual relationship is established with unrelated tribe.

4.3.5 Homosexuality

In academic discourse, it has been asserted that homosexuality as a terminology originated at the same time with heterosexuality.²⁷⁷ It is a form of expression of sexuality which its origin is difficult to trace in history. It has been expressed that this form of

²⁷⁷ Jonathan N. Karl, 1995. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*. 92.

sexual expression existed in most cultures before *Tanakh* was written. Before its emergence, literature of other cultures had been in existence and was already being used in socio-religious affairs. Some of the writings on sexuality as a whole and homosexuality in particular in Ancient Near East are expressed in laws, magical texts, myths and rituals and in the Gilgamesh Epic.²⁷⁸ Richard Davidson also corroborates this.²⁷⁹ Two Middle Assyrian laws from the Second Century B. C., Tablet 19 and 20, refer explicitly to homosexual relations as follows:

If a person [or: a seignor; that is, a magnate] crookedly spreads gossips about his neighbour [or: comrade], saying: "Everyone practices homosexuality" [or: "that people have copulated with him consistently"), or should someone says it in the public that: "people have had sex with you" [or: that people have consistently had sex with you), and that I can show the evidences," But unfortunately, could not proof the allegation beyond reasonable doubt, such a person should be beating with a staff fifty times: such a person should also serve the king with community service for one full month, such a person's hair should be cut off [better: such a person should be castrated] and he shall pay one talent of lead.

If a person [or: a seignor] had sexual intercourse [or: lay] with his neighbour [or: comrade] and such an allegation is proved beyond any reasonable doubt against him and he is found guilty, they shall have sex [or: lie] with him and they shall turn him into a eunuch.²⁸⁰

In the law 19 cited above, it is noted that it is possible to allege the expression and practice of homosexuality against someone publicly with the motive for the community to punish the person. But if the charges are proved to be untrue then, the penalty for homosexual libel receive 50 stroke of canes, a limited period of forced labour which is in form of community service, hair shaving, castration risk and payment of fine of one talent of lead. As shown in legal code 20, we note that if a man had sex with his comrade and

²⁷⁸ Ronald A. Veenker. 1999-2000. "Forbidden Fruit: Ancient Near Eastern Sexual Metaphors". *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. 70/71 <http://jstor.org/stable>. Accessed 18th May, 2018; Stephanie Lynn Budin. 2014. "Fertility and Gender in the Ancient near East". Mark Masterson, et.al. (eds.), *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*. <http://www.routledgehanbooks.com>. Accessed 2nd Aug. 2018.

²⁷⁹ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*, 134.

²⁸⁰ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*. Nashville: Abingdon. 45.

the community prove the charges against him and find him guilty, the penalty is castration. In the case of the two laws, it is clear that expression and practice of homosexuality is regarded as degrading and shameful either in rape form or consensual.

In the Babylonian omen text, *Summan alu*, it was discovered that about five out of thirty eight omens are involved in homosexual intercourse. As cited by Gagnon in the works of Matti Nissinen, two out of these cases are positive omens as he quoted “if any man is found to have copulated with a man like himself from the rear, such a man becomes the leader among his peers and brothers”; and if any man is discovered to have copulated with a male cult prostitute (*assinnu*), such a man’s hard destiny (or: care, trouble) will leave him.”²⁸¹ In the first omen text, it is established that the man actually penetrated a male in his social circle lowered the latter’s status in relation to himself. In the second omens text, it means that the society in a way actually accepts the practice of homosexuality or at least tolerated it in one way or the other: sex with a male cult prostitute. A third omen, involving sex with a courtier (*gerseqqu*), seems to be moderately negative (“as it indicates that terror will possess such a person for a whole year or leave him”). Two other omens foretell “hard destiny”: a man in prison who desire to mate with men “like a male cult prostitute” and a man who copulates with his house born slave.²⁸² From the last two omens we can note that homosexuality is borne out of confinement of the people of the same gender and the society justifies the practice.

In the myth and ritual practice, the ANE culture accepts the male cult prostitute as norm where homosexuality can be expressed and practised because it is directly and indirectly linked with the fertility cult. De Young asserts that homosexuality existed in the practice of Temple prostitution which is called *קְדֻשִׁים* *kedeshim* male prostitutes and *קְדֻשֹׁת* *kedeshot*, female prostitutes for the purpose to please the fertility gods.²⁸³ Gagnon corroborates this assertion that male cult prostitutes were closely connected with the goddess Inanna (Sumerian) or Ishtar (Assyrian).²⁸⁴ This was identified with Venus (masculine as the morning star and feminine as the evening star), hence a goddess

²⁸¹ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice...* 47.

²⁸² Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice...* 48.

²⁸³ James B. De Young. 1991. “The Contributions of the Septuagint to Biblical Sanctions against Homosexuality”. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, Vol. 34, No. 2. 166.

²⁸⁴ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice...* 48.

possessing androgynous features and traits. The expression and practice of homosexuality is hinged on the belief that it empowers the person to be delivered from sickness and other life threatening troubles and bring success in life ventures and gives victory over the power of the enemies. According to Gagnon “ideally, a man who had intercourse with an *assinnu* did so as a means of accessing the power of the goddess herself.”²⁸⁵ This indicates that one of the motives to engage in homosexuality is to be empowered in extraordinary way. In the Gilgamesh epic, it was narrated that Gilgamesh and Enkidu got entangled to each other as sexual partners. Greenberg opines that Enkidu became a female prostitute though a male god to Gilgamesh as noted by Gagnon.²⁸⁶ In ancient Egypt, there is an account of Pharaoh Pepi II making regular secret nocturnal visits to an unmarried general, Sisene, for homosexual relationship. According to Greenberg and Wold, as noted by Gagnon, it is undoubtedly that during the reign of Pepi II moral corruption was the order of the day and it made Egyptians of the time to give approval to the practice of same-sex behaviour.²⁸⁷ He notes further that in a few dynasties at least, small number of Pharaohs and court officials engaged in homosexual practice.²⁸⁸

Sexuality in P creation account makes no reference to homosexual practice because it unequivocally states that God created two different genders. The author records general understanding of human sexuality which set within the broader context of God’s grand purposes of creating Adam in his image and likeness. In the discourse of homosexual practice in this research, we will look beyond the P creation account, though the discourse will commence with Genesis account to show that the beginning of human sexuality has its foundation in the Torah.

The first mention of an idea of homosexual practice is the account of Ham Noah’s son (Gen. 9: 20 – 25). The account states that Ham saw the nakedness of his father and exuberantly related it to his brothers. The precise act of Ham has been a subject of debate among scholars. It was suggested that Ham entertained lewd thought when he saw the nakedness of his father, and it is interpreted to mean homosexual rape. Seeing the

²⁸⁵ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*... 49.

²⁸⁶ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*... 51.

²⁸⁷ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*... 52.

²⁸⁸ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*... 53.

nakedness of his father is the same as uncovering the nakedness, a term used in the Holiness Code to condemn immoral behaviour which is euphemism for sexual intercourse. Also, for Noah to have cursed the descendants of Ham, he saw the action of his son as immoral.²⁸⁹ Richardson interprets uncovering and seeing the nakedness as sexual intercourse as expressed in the holiness codes as an abomination.²⁹⁰ Aside the homosexual act of Ham, his action also depicts motivation for power with the intention to usurp the authority of his father and elder brothers, establishing his right to succeed his father as patriarch. In the ANE, one of the motives for the practice of homosexuality is the lust for power.

The second mention of the practice of homosexuality in *פְּרַאֲשִׁית* a term which traditionally has been regarded as Hebrew classic of same-sex is Gen. 19. In the theological parlance the account is that of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19: 4 – 11). The term “sodomy” which has become a common reference to male homosexuality is derived from this account. Just like the account of Ham, the account does not directly deal with consensual homosexual relationship, but homosexual rape. However, scholars do not perceive this account with the same view. Davidson, while making reference to the research of John Boswell, postulates that Lot, as a resident alien of Sodom, whether in ignorance or in defiance to the extant rules of Sodom and Gomorrah, he went beyond the authority of an alien resident in the city by accepting and entertaining two foreigners whose motives might be hostile, and whose identity had not been properly screened²⁹¹. Bailey opposes the view of homosexuality when he asserts that much of the prejudice against expression and practice of homosexuality in the account of Sodom and Gomorrah is as a result of misunderstanding and misinterpretation. He argues that men of Sodom were anxious to interrogate the strangers to find out if they were spies who intend to survey their land before waging a war against them since the era was rife with inter-tribal wars. The demand “to know” the men from Lot meant nothing than their desire to get acquainted

²⁸⁹ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh...* 142; Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice...* 64.

²⁹⁰ Alan Richardson. 1953. *Genesis 1 – 11*. London: SCM. 114.

²⁹¹ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh...* 146.

with them as regards their mission.²⁹² Lot's decision to give his daughters in place of the foreigners is explained by Bailey as "the most tempting bribe that Lot could offer on the spur of the moment to appease the hostile crowd"²⁹³ and not an offer of heterosexual in lieu of homosexual tendency. Bailey buttresses his point when he states:

According to the Bible, there are records of how the Eastern people lay much emphasis on the importance of Oriental hospitality and the gravity and seriousness doing otherwise. Apparently, it is observed that the people in most cases if necessary, would not mind that their daughters be abused sexually in order to protect their visitors. The sexual aspect of the story is the only the vehicle that carries the subject of the desired hospitality. It is well described in Ezekiel 16; 49 Behold, this was the judgment of thy brother Sodom: she and her daughters had pride, surfeit of food, and prosperous ease, but did not aid the poor and the needy²⁹⁴.

The argument of Bailey did not gain wide acceptance among scholars because the word יָדָע (to know) appears over 943 times in the Old Testament and only 12 times does it mean "to have intercourse with." Bailey and others who shared his view posit that intercourse as a means of personal knowledge is more than copulation. But it is clear that the context in the account wherein Lot offered his daughters indicates undoubtedly sexual intercourse and the men of Sodom did not hide their intention. Ukleja avers that Lot who had long lived in the city knows that the practice of homosexuality is not strange.²⁹⁵ Therefore, to suggest that the account does not mention homosexuality and that it is usually being practiced with the consent and rape is wrong and it is an aberration. Davidson argues that many modern translators now acknowledge that homosexuality and xenophobia are defined in Genesis 19 and he insisted that sexual matter is that of rape or incest²⁹⁶. The specific actions of the Sodomites included homosexuality and rape. So, it is possible that the sin actually committed by the people of Sodom was simply a lack of

²⁹² D. Sherwin Bailey. 1975. *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*. London: Hamden, Connecticut. 3.

²⁹³ D. Sherwin Bailey. 1975. *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*... 6.

²⁹⁴ D. Sherwin Bailey. 1975. *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*. 4.

²⁹⁵ Michael Ukleja. 1983. "Homosexuality and the Old Testament". *Bibliothecae Sacrae*, Vol. 140, July – Sept. No. 559. 260.

²⁹⁶ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*... 147.

hospitality or even attempted rape of a guest but rather attempted rape of male stranger. Davidson puts it succinctly, "what makes the example of this lack of hospitality so barbaric, what makes the name 'Sodom' a derogatory word for the mistreatment of visitors in the Jewish period and of Christians race, is the specific form which the inhospitality manifests itself: homosexual rape"²⁹⁷.

In addition to the biblical text, Schmidt points out general homosexual acts of Sodom taken from early literature:

According to the second-century BC Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sodomites were labeled as a people that are "sexually perverted" (Testimony of Benjamin 9:1) and it equally refers to "Sodom as a city which departed from the order of nature" (Testament of Nephtali 3:4). During the same period of time, the Jubilees specified that the Sodomites were "people that polluted themselves by fornicating in their flesh" (16:5, compare 20:5-6). Both Philo and Josephus plainly name same-sex relations as the characteristic view of Sodom²⁹⁸.

The Mosaic Law against all acts of homosexual activity both in its behaviour and orientation occur in the context of a larger block of laws Lev. 17- 26 that scholars refer to as Holiness Code. The law code which is binding on all Israelites not only the priests. The code is to keep the land unpolluted through total obedience. The law in Lev. 18:22 states:

וְאִשְׁת־זָכָר לֹא תִשְׁכַּב מִשְׁכַּבִּי אִשָּׁה תוֹעֵבָה הוּא:

You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination.

This is expanded in Lev. 20: 13

וְאִישׁ אִשָּׁר יִשְׁכַּב אֶת־זָכָב מִשְׁכַּבִּי אִשָּׁה תוֹעֵבָה צָשׂוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם מוֹת יוּמָתוּ דְמֵיהֶם בָּם

Whenever a man lies with a male as if it is with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall be put to death, their blood will be upon them.

These passages are set in the context of God's judgment on homosexuality and an expansion of the seventh commandment with deals with adultery. Moses was not establishing a new code on sexuality rather God inspired him to deal with certain gross

²⁹⁷ Richard M. Davidson. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh*... 148.

²⁹⁸ Thomas E. Schmidt. 1995. *Straight and Narrow? Compassion and Clarity in the Homosexual Debate*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity. 191.

offenses that were common in the nation surrounding Israel at the time. We shall attempt the hermeneutic of these verses for a better understanding of what the author offer on homosexuality. It has been said above regulation against homosexuality occurs in a larger context of forbidden sexual relations. The word זָכָר male indicates that all members of this gender regardless of age and status are forbidden to engage in sexual activity with one another. The prohibition applies not only to Israelites but to the foreigners who live among them. The degree of repugnance associated with homosexual act is with the word תּוֹעֵבָה abomination. Gagnon posits three reasons why homosexuality is abominable to God. First, it dehumanizes both the penetrated and penetrator. Second, it is contrary to his intention for creating sexuality in humanity. Third, it contaminates the land which he created to be flowing with milk and honey.²⁹⁹ In the eye of Holiness Code, it is not expected of any male regardless of status who is an Israelite which God covenanted with to contemplate of practicing homosexuality let alone engaging in it. Gagnon avers that in the entire priestly corpus of the Tetrateuch, the only forbidden act to which the designation abomination is specifically attached is homosexual intercourse.³⁰⁰ This is because God regards the Israelites as his covenanted people whose ways of life have to be distinct from other nations around them. The penalty for the offender of this law is stated in Lev. 18: 29

כִּי כָל-אִשָּׁר יַעֲשֶׂה מִכֹּל חַטּוֹעֵבוֹת הָאֵלֶּה וְנִכְרְתוּ הַנְּפֹשׁוֹת הַעֹשֵׂת מִקִּרְבֵּי עַמָּם

For whoever shall do any of these abominations, the persons that do them shall be cut off from among their people.

The phrase כָּרַת “cut” where “cutting off” is derived has the same connotation with cutting a covenant, which is a prerogative of God calling Israel to have a special relationship with him. In the same vein, in cutting off as a punishment on whoever practices homosexuality, God alone will execute the judgment. The execution of the judgment may include excommunication from the commonwealth of Israel, spiritual and physical death, or rendering the offender impotent so that he will not become an heir to inherit his landed property. Aside regarding the expression and practice of homosexuality

²⁹⁹ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*... 118.

³⁰⁰ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*... 113.

as an abomination, the expanded law on it in Lev. 20: 13, and the penalty for males found guilty of the offence of homosexuality, is capital punishment because they have committed an act of abomination. This suggests that the act involved mutual consent. Stulman in his comment on legal codes says, “capital punishment whether actual or idealized is reserved for acts seen to be thoroughly disruptive to the symbolic arrangements of the cosmos”³⁰¹. Lev. 18: 22 and 20:13 condemn both males involved in a consensual act of anal intercourse. In view of this, the community is called to join God in executing the judgment. The death penalty here may be done by stoning the offender to death. God also can cause his premature death or blot out the name of the offender by terminating the family line or disallowing the offender to join his ancestors in the afterlife. Death penalty is aimed at exterminating evil from the land. It serves as deterrent to others who may want to engage in it. The offence put the community in grave danger, as a result, it demands communal action in order to protect the wellbeing of the inhabitants. If the community fails to carry out the penalty as stipulated in the law it would be to the destruction of the whole community.

As it is with other legislations in the Tanakhe that have generated debate among scholars, the law and penalty against the expression and practice of homosexuality has attention of scholars. The argument is on the legality and illegality of homosexuality as it is between the traditionalists and the revisionists. Both sides turn to the Tanakh particularly the Holiness Code which addresses same-sex intercourse directly, and unconditionally criminalizes it to argue their view points. The contention between these two schools of thought is about whether the prohibitions in Lev. 18: 22 and Lev. 20: 13 are against same-sex intercourse though considering the fact that those rules or moral authority are no longer relevant in the present. The Hebrew philologists consider the phrase זָכַר מִשְׁכָּבִי “lie with a male” in Lev. 18: 22 cannot be interpreted other than “penetration of a male by a male”, and it has direct reference to anal intercourse. Walsh on Levitical laws says, “the Levitical material has in view sexual (anal) penetration of one man by another on the

³⁰¹ Louis Stulman. 1992. “Sex Familial Crimes in the D Code: A Witness to Mores in Transition”. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Issue 53. 48.

analogy of sexual (virginal) penetration of a woman by a man.”³⁰² In other words, the code implies that ‘a man shall not have sexual intercourse with another male anally.’ The legislation addresses both the homosexual rape and consensual as made explicit in Lev. 20: 13. Also, Wenham explains that Levitical laws depict a sexuality that “marks Israel off from its neighbours as God’s special people.”³⁰³ While, the traditionalists hold tenaciously to the view of the inviolability of the Holiness Code. On this Gagnon submits:

It would be a mistake to regard the statutes in the Holiness Code as consisting of largely irrelevant purity regulations. Indeed, most of Leviticus 18 – 20 can be thought of as an expanded commentary on the Ten Commandments... Ritual and moral eternal and contingent, are combined in the profile of holiness developed in Leviticus 17 – 26.³⁰⁴

The standpoint of traditionalists is that when God calls something unholy, no man no matter the level of knowledge he may acquire cannot make it holy. The pronouncement of God on all matters is final.

The revisionists who are also called pro-homosexual reject the traditional interpretation on the grounds that the Hebrew literature has been misinterpreted and misunderstood on the issue of sexuality in general and homosexuality in particular. They are quick to note that Hebrew language with which the Tanakh was written does not have a word for homosexuality and that the term does not appear in the English translation until the publication of Revised Standard Version in 1946.³⁰⁵ Those who proffer this hermeneutic claim that the continual interpretation of these texts in the traditional sense, i.e. as condemning homosexuality, is misguided as it continues to provide the basis for discriminating against some group of people. They claim that one’s sexual behaviour and orientation should be respected and acknowledged as a gift from God requiring neither shame nor repentance, inasmuch as God has granted every human being freedom. The hermeneutic stance of the revisionists is that those parts of the Tanakh that appear to

³⁰² Jerome T. Walsh. 2001. “Leviticus 18: 22 and 20: 13: Who is Doing What to Whom?” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 210/2. 202.

³⁰³ G. J. Wenham. 1991. “The Old Testament Attitude to Homosexuality”. *Expository Times*. 102. 362.

³⁰⁴ Robert A. J. Gagnon. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*... 121.

³⁰⁵ Lesleigh Cushing Stahlberg. 2008. “Modern Day Moabites: The Bible and the Debate about Same-Sex Marriage”. *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches*, Vol. Xvi, No 5, 450.

condemn same-sex sexual behaviour should be read and interpreted mythologically or metaphorically by understanding them to be finite (and time bound) rather than applying them to be universal and eternal.

Stahlberg, while quoting Jacob Migrom, unequivocally says, “The laws in Leviticus are not universal in their reach, they address a particular actor and a particular act.”³⁰⁶ The context of these prohibitions is not directed towards homosexuals but towards the cult prostitution practiced by the neighbouring Canaanites who worshipped *Baal* and *Asherah*. They argue further that those who have been created by God with homosexual orientations should be embraced and as such should not be made targets for discrimination. The revisionists posit that these legal codes are religious prohibitions rather than moral injunctions and are applied only to the ancient Israel who journeyed in the wilderness. In view of the revisionists, the hermeneutic underpinning of these texts is that they refer to a pagan practice of temple prostitution and thus condemn idolatry, not sexual perversion. In recontextualizing תועבה “abomination” in Levitical proscription, it is interpreted as sex that demonstrates power, conquest, shoring up of *ego*, for the perverse pleasure of demeaning another man, all these lack love of one’s neighbour. Boswell argues that תועבה does not signify something intrinsically evil like rape, robbery or murder but something that is ritually unclean for the Hebrews like eating pork meat, wearing cloth of different fabrics or engaging in sexual intercourse with a woman during menstruation.³⁰⁷ They opine that priests who are believed to be the authors of the texts focus more on ritual purity as against the moral preaching of the prophets, of which they did not mention homosexuality. They argue further that much injury has been done to the texts by isolating only laws against homosexuality among other laws which in the texts humanity violate and are not condemned. Blair, a protagonist of homosexuality sees the traditionalists as being partial, not objective and untruthful to their conscience in the application of the Old Testament laws as quoted by Ukleja thus:

It is appalling to note how the evangelicals have taken with levity the issues of other proscriptions that are embedded in

³⁰⁶ Lesleigh Cushing Stahlberg. 2008. “Modern Day Moabites: The Bible and the Debate about Same-Sex Marriage”... 456.

³⁰⁷ John Boswell. 2005. *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. 100.

the same Old Testament Code, such as: The Rules against consumption of rabbit (Lev. 11: 26), oyster, clams, shrimp and lobster (Lev. 11: 10ff), and rare steaks. It is disturbing to note that we now eat pork and ham without feeling guilty, we now wear clothing materials that were made from interwoven linen and wool as against what we have in Deut. 22: 11, and yet, we are not bothered at all. Evangelicals are not saying that in accordance with these cultic purification laws as we have it in Lev. 20: 13, those that were found guilty of practicing homosexual activity should be executed as prescribed by the text... or that the people should be cut off among the society as demanded by this same Code. They are not saying anything on the judgement against those who have sexual intercourse with women during menstruation (Lev. 20: 18), and those who marry women who have been divorced (Lev. 21: 14). Evangelicals do not keep out those who are visually handicapped or lame or those with a limb too long (Lev. 21: 18ff).³⁰⁸

The claim of Blair in the above quotation is that the attitude of the evangelicals can be interpreted to mean that many things that were considered abominations in ancient Israel, are at present ruled out. Not everything we read in the Tanakh that should be taken hook line and sinker in the postmodern era. Then homosexuality should not be labelled an abomination. At some point on this debate, some revisionists denied the Tanakh as the word of God. However, applying it for ethical issues is an aberration. Berlinerblau, a proponent of homosexuality asserts that, “the Hebrew Bible is an assembled, not authored document. It is a pasting together of disparate texts or fragments of text by countless unknown authors or redactors or reciters over an indeterminable amount of time.”³⁰⁹ In this regard, the Tanakh has unintentional meanings.

The debate on homosexual behaviour and orientation will be unending, as long as the Tanakh is opened to different interpretations based on the understanding and different cultural practices of humanity. But it is undisputable that Levitical texts proffer death penalty for same-sex sex establishing that homosexuality falls under moral law. The interpretation of what and how capital punishment should be depends on the modern

³⁰⁸ P. Michael Ukleja. 1983. “Homosexuality and the Old Testament”... 264.

³⁰⁹ Jacques Berlinerblau. 2005. *The Secular Bible: Why Nonbelievers Must Take Religion Seriously*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 47.

scholars. Homosexuality has been said to be common to certain areas in Africa and it is linked to a particular adherents of a religion.³¹⁰ This indicates that it was imported to Africa. Among the Yoruba, homosexuality is abhorred. In this case those who practice it whether as strangers or indigenes always keep it secret.

4.3.6 Pornography

Human sexuality is inborn and it has its origin in the dominion mandate. Its expression and practice has reached a greater dimension than what $\square\tau\aleph$ can also explain as a result of inquisitive mind. The Tanakh mentioned heterosexuality which is regarded as normal way of practicing sexuality. It denounces homosexuality, adultery, rape and fornication. It did not envisage that $\square\tau\aleph$ would ever practice pornography. Hence, it did not catch the attention of the writers. Pornography is now a form of expression and practice of sexuality by the modern $\square\tau\aleph$ and no culture is exempted from it. It has been argued that sculptures, paintings and other artistic works suggest the presence of pornography from the ancient time.³¹¹ Owing to the fact that cultures have works of arts in paintings that show the human genitals, scholars do not agree on one definition of pornography. It is worthy to note that in all attempted definitions, there is connotation or expression of erotic sexuality. Pornography is photographs, films, books, or other material depicting erotic or sexual acts designed to cause sexual arousal without the constraints of everyday reality, social norms and conventional morality.³¹²

The sculptures and paintings that have been in existence in various cultures of the ancient people did not create extreme sensations that lead to anti-social behaviour or elicit maladaptive behaviour. People consider the paintings and sculptures regardless of revealing human genitals as a way to project their history, their aspirations and rich culture. Kenny buttresses this point in his view that “those who would truly understand the spirit of another age have to study not only its history, but also its literature and

³¹⁰ Oyinloye Abogunrin (ed.) 2006. “Introduction”. *Biblical View of Sex and Sexuality from African Perspective, A Publication of NABIS*. Ibadan: NABIS. 12.

³¹¹ <https://www.britanica.com/topic/pornography>

³¹² M. C. Anluorah. 1989. “Pornography: Its Scope in Nigeria”. D. C. E. Ugwuegbu & B. U. Eke (eds.) *Youth and Pornography*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Information and Culture. 5.

artefacts.”³¹³ Pornography in the expression and practice of sexuality is made popular with the advent of mass media. Initially, pornography is only within the reach of the literates who come across it in newspapers, books, magazines and periodicals. In some of these print materials there is hard core pornography which are capable of eliciting auto erotic fantasies wherein the reader entertains himself/herself with sexual feelings.

Formal education which makes these literatures available to the young adults makes them to be inquisitive about sexual organs and its performance. Reading some of these literatures create the inquisitive mind of young adults who want to know about penis size, orgasm and what constitute sexual desires. The gradual popularity of pornography started with the advent of the consumer society which brought advertisement and marketing. In cities and towns it is common to see on bill boards erotic and sexual depictions as a way to attract consumers. The dimension of its exponential popularity which has gone out of control in the modern era is the use of the electronic media. Radio stations air programmes where suggestive sexual matters are discussed in various local languages, which promote pornography. These radio stations also play music that are erotic and incite sexual practice. The television channels with the invention of cable television with proliferation of channels have made pornography to be at the reach of everyone without limitation. Television has the primary aim of bringing motion pictures with audio to the public. In most cases, attention is drawn to motions that catch the attention of young adults; often these are negative.

The invention of home video and Digital Versatile Disk (DVD) machines and cassettes coupled with the development of entertainment has promoted pornography. The invention of communication devices with the advent of social media have made pornography to be at the reach of all categories of people regardless of age, sex, status and religion. Electronic and communication devices are veritable tools of soft pornography. Pornography has been tearing apart the very fabric of cultural values and norms, but the problem has been made much worse with pornography’s proliferation through the Internet. Studies show that a large percentage of people of different age range

³¹³ Joseph Kenny. 1989. “A Comparative Assessment of Pornography: Christian and Islamic Perspective”. D. C. E. Ugwuegbu & B. U. Eke (eds.) *Youth and Pornography*. 52.

of both sexes regularly visit Internet pornography sites either at home, office or at educational institutions. With Internet, pornography has become ubiquitous. The negative impact which pornography is having on the cultural values and norms are alarming. It has made some to drift from sexuality in the dominion mandate. It has created unbridled exaltation of sex. It is giving rise to increase in sexual crime such as rape and other sexual immorality. It debases human dignity in sexuality.

Psychologists and sociologists have argued that pornography has its positive side on the society. They posit that beyond the veneer of pornographic presentation lies a deeper seated mine of didactic material of greater importance than the regular teachings.³¹⁴ The magazines, novels and periodicals when read and the main thrust well understood, project self-control, moral uprightness, avoiding the pitfalls of the negative side of the stories or characters related especially in relationship with the opposite sex. The main objective of fiction or real life experience expressed in novels, magazines and periodicals is to curtail promiscuity, sexually transmitted diseases and to prevent anti-social sex behaviour. There are gold mines of positive teaching hidden in the stories. Another positive side of pornography noted by the psychologists and physicians is that blue films, pornographic magazines and pictures are priceless materials for therapists for the treatment of people suffering from heterosexual phobia. They maintain that it has helped couples to have normal sex arousal and healed negative teachings that have been taught about heterosexuality. It can be a source of healing people with low *libido*. Besides this, pornography serves as a means by which couples can revitalise their sexual life by having variety of sexual techniques to heal sexual boredom.³¹⁵ In this case, it has contributed to decrease broken homes. The expression and practice of pornography should be seen as a means to an end and not an end in itself.

In summary, we have examined forms which sexuality is expressed and practiced. We discovered that different perceptions and interpretations has been evolved by *Adam* which are contrary to dominion mandate. We note also that out of all the forms it is only

³¹⁴ M. C. Anuorah. 1989. "Pornography: Its Scope in Nigeria". D. C. E. Ugwuegbu & B. U. Eke (eds.) *Youth and Pornography*. 11

³¹⁵ J. A. Disu. 1989. "The Place of Pornography in Human Sexual Development: A Philosophical Reflections". D. C. E. Ugwuegbu & B. U. Eke (eds.) *Youth and Pornography*... 64.

heterosexuality that conform to the dominion mandate though not without wrong attitude to it. On the whole heterosexuality seem to be the chief cornerstone as moral authority is shifting from religion to the human depraved philosophy and ideology which attempt to shake the family institution the fabric upon which the society stand, it endorse the old orthodoxies a new and vibrant lease of life. Blank says, science had pronounced heterosexuality natural, inevitable and innate without which the society would go in extinction.³¹⁶

4.4 Sexuality in the dominion mandate in Yorùbá context

There is no society without a culture that expresses its sexuality. In other words, every society has a culture which can be understood as a unified system. The Yorùbá history and culture existed in oral tradition. The oral tradition that was recorded by scholars largely informs us about the theogony and cosmogony of the people. The first written record about the culture of the Yorùbá originated from the European scholars who documented what they gathered with the thought pattern of European culture. As a result, there is a dearth of some facts about the life of the Yorùbá. It is unlike the Hebrew's which has a well-articulated literature and spread to various cultures through its interpretation to various languages. The Yorùbá mythology does not tell us how the first male and first female was created, but we understand that things existed in binary form. In the mythology of the Yorùbá, it is only *Olódùmarè*, the Supreme Being, who is not sexual. He does not procreate through love making. All other created being including the divinities and deities are sexual and through their sexual intercourse the world was and still being populated.

The myth reveals that the creator created the world in binary forms including the deities in male and female sexes. In some instances, these deities were said to be husband and wife. For instance, *Obàtálá* or *Òrìsà Ñlá* the creator of physical parts of human being in Yorùbá creation myth was said to be the husband of *Yemoja* a riverine goddess and that their union produced two daughters, *Ojúńromí* and *Odòjé*. *Òrúnmilà* the god of wisdom married *Ojúńromí* the daughter of *Òrìsà Ñlá*. *Şàńgó*, god of thunder and lightning was

³¹⁶ Hanne Blank. 2012. *Satriaght: The Surprisingly Short History of Heterosexuality*, xv.

said to be the husband of *Oya*, the god of tornadoes and whirl wind and *Ọṣun* the riverine goddess of prosperity. *Ẓàṅgó*, operates mostly during the raining season and it is rain that brings water to fill the river where *Oya* and *Ọṣun* his two wives reign. From the life of some Yorùbá deities, sexuality is expressed and practised in polygynous manner. In Yorùbá, sexuality polygyny is the culture of the people and the practice of it is strictly heterosexual with the primary purpose of procreation. It is based on this expression in the mythology that we will examine the practice of sexuality among the Yorùbá.

4.4.1 Sexuality among the Yorùbá in the Pre Colonial Era

The expression and practice of sexuality in pre-colonial Yorùbá is shrouded in secrecy and strictly a private affair. Familusi notes that in traditional African society of which Yorùbá is a part, it is considered a taboo to talk about sex.³¹⁷ When it comes to discussion on sexual matters and organs, the dictum of the Yorùbá is *a kíl fì gbogbo ẹnu sòrò* meaning we do not talk anyhow. Sexuality is not to be discussed in the public and sexual organs are not to be called their direct name. Anyone who does would be labelled as immoral, uncultured, indisciplined, indecent, vulgar and obscene. Fákéyẹ puts this succinctly:

In the Yorùbá culture there is a way of referring to some things not the way they should be called. We must not call them their real names that we've known them for, except we use another word. It is a taboo for saying it whosoever breaks the taboo concerning those words will be regarded as a novice and vulgar person... among such words that we use euphemism for are the words pertaining to male and female private organs.³¹⁸

The sexual organs are regarded as sacred and they are to be treated specially among other parts of the body. They are given relevance to the extent that they have to be treated with high level of hygiene. If other parts of the body are naked, it is uncommon to have the sexual organs uncovered in Yorùbáland. When the artist draws or carves the image of a human being, he restrains himself as to drawing or caring for the sexual organs. The special regard given to the sexual organs extends to the fact that they are not to be called

³¹⁷ Lumina.hnu.edu.ph/articles/(17)/familusi. Accessed 15th October, 2018.

³¹⁸ Morenikeji Funmilola Fakeye. 2003. *Sex and Sexuality in the Poetry of Olatubosun Oladapo*. Master of Arts Thesis, Department of Linguistics and African Languages, University of Ibadan. 29-30.

their real name, but mentioned in euphemisms. The group that has immunity to mention the sexual organs and would not be reprimanded are the cultural oral poets who have sense of humour who could mention it for entertainment purpose. However, this is limited only to the festival periods and social celebrations.³¹⁹ In some instances, the oral poets who have the license to say what they desire to say without being rebuked even exercise some restraint in calling sexual organs their real name. In the pre literate era, male and female biologically related people are not allowed to sleep together to prevent incest though they can work together in the farm or play together at moon light under the watchful eye of the elders. From time to time, young people are told moon light tales to inculcate sexual moral, family ethos and societal values in them.

The way by which male and female are made to be conscious of their sexuality and maturity for sexual practice is a rite of passage. The puberty initiation rite is done for the age grade collectively. It is done in the community with males separated from females. The male undergo penis circumcision and are taught about sexual intercourse and the responsibility of fatherhood. On the side of the female, they undergo circumcision of the cutting of the tip of the clitoris which is in modern day regarded as Female Genital Mutilation (FGM). The Yorùbá believe that any female whose clitoris is not reduced by circumcision would be promiscuous. It is also expressed that the tip of the clitoris should not touch the head of a new born baby; if it does, the baby would die. Thus, a circumcised woman earns dignity in the community.

Rites of passage provide the foundation for male and female to be conscious of their sexual identity. Sexual identity and the roles of gender identity are enshrined in the rites of passage. The males are prepared for their responsibilities in the family and the community at large, and the females are prepared for their responsibilities of motherhood and as home makers. This is done without confusion. The process and details of initiation include songs, dance, masks, various tests and tattooing for females.³²⁰ This usually takes place between age of 12 and 15 years.

³¹⁹ Morenikeji Funmilola Fakeye. 2003. *Sex and Sexuality in the Poetry of Olatubosun Oladapo...* 9.

³²⁰ J. Omosade Awolalu and P. Adelumo Dopamu. 1979. *West African Traditional Religion*. Ibadan: Onibonoje. 178.

As expressed among the deities, sexuality is practiced in polygynous way. This is also followed by the worshippers of these deities. In the pre-literate era it is considered abnormal for a man to be monogamous, such a man would be regarded as lazy and irresponsible. In some instances, women of this era count it as unfortunate if their husbands did not have junior wife or wives in the house probably to help in domestic chores and farm produce marketing. In some case, they help their husbands to search for new wife and go to the extent to raise bride price and other requirements for the marriage consummation. The Yorùbá maxim of this era was, *ká rìn ká pò, yí yẹ níí yẹ ni* meaning to go together in life befits humans as creatures. Àlàbá notes a song which corroborates the adage above, it runs thus:

Olórun má jẹ n sàdá nì kan gbélé o
Olórun má jẹ n sàdá nì kan gbélé o
Àdá nì kan jẹ
Àdá nì kan mu
Àdá nì kan gbé núu-pálò-bí-eranko
Olórun má jẹ n sàdá nì kan gbélé o

God forbid it that I live alone in my house
 God forbid it that I live alone in my house
 Eating alone
 Drinking alone
 Living alone in my living room like an animal
 God, forbid it that I live alone in my house.³²¹

The sexual life usually begins in the teen age for both male and female after they have undergone the puberty rite which is between the age of 12 or 15. The society placed value on virginity for both male and female but emphasis is usually laid on the female. According to Fádípè, “in every division of Yorùbáland great importance was attached to a bride being found *virgo intacta* and this was the rule for both high and low alike.³²² A woman who loses her virginity before marriage is considered a disgrace to herself, her parents and the community where she was raised. On the other hand, a woman found *virgo intacta* was a cause for celebration for herself, her husband, and more importantly,

³²¹ Olugboyega Alaba. 2004. “Understanding Sexuality in the Yoruba Culture”. *Sexuality in Africa Magazine*. Lagos: Africa Regional Sexuality Resource Centre. 3.

³²² N. A. Fadipe. 1970. *The Sociology of the Yoruba*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press. 83.

she is a pride of her parents and the community where she was raised. Virginity is respected both in marriage and the religion of the Yorùbá. The worship of gods and goddesses demand sexual purity. In the case where female priestess is required, the woman has to be a virgin who has not compromised her sanctity. It is believed that she will attract the blessing of gods and goddesses to the community.

Owing to the social approval of polygyny, it is uncommon to see a woman of age of 18 and a man of age of 20 who are not betrothed. In most cases, in the preliterate era a female child would have been betrothed even before birth because the population of female is very low compared to that of male, and such male would have been engaged to a female at childhood age. Polygyny gives opportunity to a man of 40 years to marry woman of 18 years. A Juju maestro in a song said *àwa òkùnrin lè láya méfà kò burú, òkùnrin kanṣoṣo l'Òba Olúwa yàn f'òbìnrin* meaning we men each can marry six wives, it is not bad, it is only one man that God has assigned for a woman.³²³ It is a taboo to practice polyandry in Yorùbá sexuality, because the society is patriarchal.

Sexuality practised in Yorùbá land is exogamous relationship. In the preliterate era, the people who lived in the same community are close relatives called extended family so it is difficult for endogamy sexual relationship to take place. In this case, sexuality among the Yorùbá abhors incest. Exogamy allowed for the expansion of families and gives opportunity for wider connection. Yorùbá sexuality and other African ethnic groups never recognised homosexuality. It is considered as a taboo.³²⁴ It has been argued that since male population in this era outnumber that of female, that the male have no any other means of expressing their sexual fantasies than among themselves. Those who argue in this line thought submit that it is because of the culture of silence on Yorùbá sexuality that hides the practice of homosexuality. This thought is far from the truth, because the type of back breaking job they do would not allow them to give thought to same sex. Also, it has been expressed that travesty and cross dressing found among the Yorùbá suggest that same sex was practiced in the past. The form of cross dressing

³²³ Ebenezer Obey Fabiyi: An album.

³²⁴ S. K. Adekunle. 2013. "Homosexuality and African Christianity: A Critical Assessment from Biblical Perspective". Samson A. Fatokun (ed.) *Christianity and African Society: A Festschrift In Honour of Gabriel Oladele Olutola @80*. Ibadan: Book Wright. 556.

among the Yorùbá is restricted to certain categories of religious devotees such as *Ṣàṅgó* priest. Matory attests to this fact when he describes the feminine character of *Ṣàṅgó* priest who has many wives and children, but found no evidence that he engage in sexual intercourse with other men.³²⁵ Essien and Aderinto also note another religious devotee in Ibadan hill deity, *àbòkè 'Bàdàn* who biologically is a male but always wears female hairstyles (*ṣùkú, òpálàṅgbé, kolobá*) and cross dresses as a female during the annual festival of the deity. As a spirit medium of a female deity (*àtàgé olómù oru*), it is incumbent on him to cross dress not only during the annual festival, but also when occasionally he is in the midst of other priests and traditional chiefs of the town. They conclude that the cross dressing of *àbòkè* does not show that he engage in same-sex.³²⁶ There were no traces of the practice of homosexuality in the ancient time among the Yorùbá.

The fact that polygyny is practised in Yorùbáland sexuality without reprimand may suggest there is adultery in the society but it is not approved. This is not peculiar to the Yorùbá as noted by Joe Kapolyo who said “adultery is a common act in every human society”.³²⁷ Though it is in every society, it is a taboo against the moral values of the community and religious ethics.³²⁸ It is both male and female that commit adultery regardless of the form of marriage contracted. Ward avers that monogamy is far from being a criterion for female marital fidelity and being a polygynist does not prevent a man from committing adultery.³²⁹ The excessive power of male over female in the community is a major factor for adultery. This allows man to dominate his wife or wives and even dominates her in area of marital infidelity where she has no right to challenge his action.

³²⁵ J. L. Matory. 1994. “Sex and the Empire that is No More: Gender and the Politics of Metaphor Cutting the Head of the Roaring Monster in Africa”. *Oyo Yoruba Religion*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. 207.

³²⁶ Kwame Essien & Saheed Aderinto. 2009. “Cutting the Head of the Roaring Monster”: Homosexuality and Reference in Africa. *African Study Monograph*, 30(3). 125.

³²⁷ Joe Kapolyo. 2005. “The Human Condition: Christian Perspective through African Eyes”. *Urban Theology*, Vol. 3, No. 2. 35.

³²⁸ E. Bolaji Idowu. 1996. *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief*. Revised and Enlarged. Ibadan: Longman. 154.

³²⁹ Edward Ward. 1937. *Marriage among the Yoruba*. Washington: Catholic University of America. 40.

The occurrence of adultery would not be unconnected to man's natural preference for promiscuity. In most cases, when it is the woman who commits adultery, it is due to lack of sexual or emotional satisfaction in the primary relationship. This usually happens when a man neglects the older wife or wives for the new wife and it may be a situation where the new wife is not satisfied with the sexual performance of the man. In most cases, it is the older wives who need support outside their marriage. If a man discovers that his wife is unfaithful in the relationship, he will report her to the family head and warn her sternly. If she persists, the man can lay her with *mágùn*, a dreadful juju for the punishment of adultery among the Yorùbá. *Mágùn* can kill the male partner instantly or by installment or render him impotent. If there is no man who has sexual intercourse with the woman, the woman would become emaciated till she dies unless the husband gives her the remedy. The motive behind *mágùn* is a fight against property right rather than sexual morality because women are regarded as property of the man as a result of the huge amount of bride price paid coupled with labour in the father-in-law's farm. Adultery is frowned at and offenders are severely punished.

The reason for the practice of polygyny is for economic expansion. In the pre literate era, a man would have large expanse of land would find it difficult to cultivate alone. Thus, he would need to invest in many women in his harem who would work on the household land and be later join by the children and after his demise taken over by the children especially the male. The bride wealth received on female children serves a source of relief for a man and it expands his connection with other families who become his in-laws. Caldwell, Orubusoye and Caldwell aver that a larger family with more widespread alliances, an impressive number of children sired, and more housing, farmed land all constituted the 'big' man with great prestige.³³⁰ The social advantage of polygyny is that the pre-colonial era is bedevilled with communicable diseases which make child mortality rate high. The couples did not have the means to know their blood group and genotype, a situation that made SS to marry SS or AS and the woman gives birth to children with sickle cell anaemia which results to infant mortality. If a man marries three or four wives all of them would not have the same blood group and it would make him to

³³⁰ John C. Caldwell, I. O. Orubuloye and Pat Caldwell. 1991. "The Destabilization of the Traditional Yoruba Sexual System". *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2. 235.

have children of both sexes as he desired. In the pre-colonial era, there were inter-ethnic and ethnic wars. Since there was no organised army, the male children are enrolled into the local military for defensive and offensive wars. This would make a man or community to prevent the enemy to take their farm land forcefully, plunder their crops and even render them homeless. In the face of wars, if a man is not a polygynist without many children, it is likely for him to go to grave childless. This is the political advantage of polygyny.

Religion forms the foundation and the governing principle of Yorùbá life. Bólájí Ìdòwú describes the life of the people as, “in all things... religious.”³³¹ He further explains that the religion of the people is the worship of gods and goddesses and their practice of sexuality is strongly attached to their faith. “The real key of the life of the Yorùbá is neither in their noble ancestry nor in the past deeds of their heroes. The key note of their life is their religion.”³³² The worship of the family gods and or goddesses are passed from one generation to another. Every man expects his children to continue the worship of the gods or goddesses hence polygyny is a must for most men. It is the gods or goddesses that would make life worth living for the children after the demise of the father. Therefore, a man must have many women in his harem for religious purpose. Additional reason for the practice of polygyny is that the traditional society did not approve a man to have sex with his wife during pregnancy and during the wife’s postpartum and it is difficult for him to abstain from sex for such a long period. The merit of this practice is that it prevents extra marital relationship. In the pre literate age, there were no commercial sex workers where a man can satisfy his sexual urge. Therefore, it is imperative for him to have many women in his harem. Olaniyan notes that often adult males do achieve sexual gratification independent of love and commitment rating sexual intercourse above everything else, until he releases the pressure of the testosterone.³³³

Polygyny may not provide sexual satisfaction for all women especially where the age gap between the man and the woman is as wide as 10 or 20 years’ difference. Aside the lack

³³¹ E. Bolaji Idowu. 1996. *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief...* 1.

³³² E. Bolaji Idowu. 1996. *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief...* 5.

³³³ Gabriel O. Olaniyan. 2016. “Spiritual Content of Yoruba Concept of Sexuality and Sustenance of Family Values through Eko- Ile (Home Training)”. *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol. 7, No. 24. 30.

of sexual satisfaction owing to age difference, there is also the problem of emotional ties between spouses. Women in this age might encounter the problem of support in raising very young children where the husband is too old to farm and older children have secured independence by marrying and raising their own children. Wande Abimbola notes in a Yorùbá folklore that women represented two opposite poles of emotional involvement. They are symbols of love, care, devotion, tenderness and beauty. At the same time, they are symbols of wickedness, callousness, deceit and disloyalty.³³⁴ The negative side of polygyny is that it may manifest in bewitching each other when there is uneven treatment among them by the man or when the children of one are being treated special. The unsatisfactory sexual relationship may lead a woman to meet her sexual desire with another man within the family or a mature male child of her husband from an elderly wife.

4.4.2 Sexuality in Colonial and Postcolonial Era

The Yorùbá were proud of their sexuality before their contact with Euro American culture and passed this from one generation to another. The contact of the European with the people brought a twist to all they cherished including sexuality. The Europeans who discovered Africa saw the people as backward, powerless and concluded that they needed a new way of life for them to realise the purpose for their creation. As a result of this, they colonised the continent, destabilised traditional mode of governance, and introduced a new form of economy and social life. The Europeans who conquered Africa for the purpose of political and economic expansion gave no thought to study the culture of Africans, but in a sweeping manner condemned everything particularly the polygynous sexuality culture. As the Europeans set up a new system of government, it enacted law which took away power from the community leaders; likewise, their interest in commerce brought economic change.

Moreover, the Missionaries used the teaching of the new religion to condemn the culture in its totality and left the people in a state of confusion. The two powerful weapons they

³³⁴ Wande Abimbola. 1975. "Iwa Pele: The Concept of Good Character in Ifa Literary Corpus". Wande Abimbola (ed.) *Yoruba Oral Tradition*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press. 400; Olukayode Adeogun. 2013. "Christianity and Family Life in Africa". Samson Fatokun (ed.) *Christianity and African Society, A Festschrift in Honour of Pastor (Dr.) Gabriel Oladele @ 80*. Ibadan: Book Wright. 241.

employed to destroy sexuality of the Yorùbá were formal education and religion. Fádípè notes that rapid changes in customs and practices have been steadily taken place since the establishment of British rule not only among the Yorùbá, but across the length and breadth of the country.³³⁵ The first debacle that destabilised sexuality among the Yorùbá was the establishment of customary courts which is a product of new form of government. Fádípè reports that a girl betrothed in infancy has the freedom to approach the colonial administrator for divorce if her new boyfriend was ready to pay the amount her earlier boyfriend paid her parents either directly and indirectly.³³⁶ The colonial administrators were interested in divorce of not the betrothed girls but also of married women. They believed it was a way of freeing women from polygyny. Any married woman who found new love and the man was ready to pay her former husband the bride price she would be allowed to divorce. By this, husbands find it difficult to control the actions of their wives. This is because young men in the colonial period have numerous opportunities to get quick money to afford bride price. For instance, the construction of rail line in core commercial centres of Yorùbáland essentially linked the region to the North thereby facilitating easy movement of farm produce particularly kola nut and cocoa. Another factor which boosts men's economy was availability of paid employment on cocoa farms and those employed by the administrators were paid salary. This gave young men greater independence from their parents. Consequently, they had opportunity of self-decision making, and were economically viable to pay bride price and raise family. Men and women had the freedom to engage in sex, there was little or no fear because they were protected by the law. Caldwell, Orubuloye and Caldwell, in a research conducted in Èkìtì, report that the effect of colonial administration weakened sexual discipline among the Yorùbá.³³⁷ This situation reduced the authority of fathers on their daughters and also reduced the expected income through bride price.

The Missionaries opposed the practice of polygyny with the notion that it promotes sexual promiscuity and reduces woman dignity. The Missionaries introduced marriage by ordinance which forbade a man who married under the law from marrying another

³³⁵ N. A. Fadipe. 1970. *The Sociology of the Yoruba*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press. 90.

³³⁶ N. A. Fadipe. 1970. *The Sociology of the Yoruba*. 91.

³³⁷ John C. Cadwell, I. O. Orubuloye & Pat Caldwell. 1991. "The Destabilisation of the Traditional Yoruba Sexual System". *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2. 254.

woman. The Missionaries were ready to convert women in polygynous marriages, but not their husbands. One of the measures applied by the Missionaries was that men who have more than one wife were disallowed to participate in the Holy Communion whereas women in polygynous relationships were administered Holy Communion. The non-admittance of polygynous men at Holy Communion gave rise to some Churches that were funded and led by the Yorùbá such as United African Methodist Church (*Eléja*), African Church and a host of African Initiated Churches. As they were denied to take Holy Communion, they were also denied the position of leadership in the Church.

The main instrument that destabilizes Yorùbá sexuality is Western education. This was entrenched in Yorùbáland through the establishment of schools and emphasis was laid on religious education with the interpretation of Hebrew literature on sexuality and gender relationship. The Hebrew literature became the yardstick with which the Yorùbá sexual practice was measured and judged combined with European cultural milieu. Western education judged Yorùbá sexual culture archaic, oppressive, primitive, out model, obnoxious, degrading, and retrogressive. They concluded that it is unacceptable to the standard which God gave in the Hebrew literature. The Missionary teachers sent arsenals through students to the parents to have a quick rethink and embrace the new sexual culture which they introduced. Aside the teachings in schools, the Missionaries engaged the married men and women in Bible studies in Churches which they termed religious education. In a subtle manner, they used the Hebrew literature on dominion mandate to condemn polygyny. The Missionaries collaborated with the colonial administrators to enforce the law on divorce so that any woman who decided to leave her polygynous husband after finding a new one should be granted the permission since the new husband would pay the bride price which the old husband had paid. Men who also desired to divorce in line with the new faith were encouraged to divorce their wives and remain with only one. This is not peculiar to the Yorùbá as Kunhiyop reported that when Kasagama, the Omukama king of Toro kingdom in Uganda got converted to Christianity he had to divorce eleven of his wives out of twelve he had.³³⁸ The text books which students read especially in introductory science have pictures of both sexes exposing the

³³⁸ Samuel W. Kunhiyop. 2008. *African Christian Ethics*. Nairobi: World Alive. 225.

sexual organs. Sexual organs were called their real name without restraint which is opposed to informal education the children had received. The process of copulation was demonstrated graphically. To the Missionary teachers, it is a way to make the students have a better understanding of human anatomy, but in reality it exposes Yorùbá male and female to quick understanding of sex and creates the inquisitive mind to want to experiment it with the opposite sex.

Another way by which Hebrew literature on dominion mandate was interpreted to demean Yorùbá sexuality is that male and female were equal. The Missionaries interpreted Biblical account of creation and show that male and female were created the same time and thereby were equal. They interpreted this passage that without the two sexes, the society is not complete and none is subordinate to the other. They emphasised the fact that a male cannot do without a female. This negates the patriarchal culture of the Yorùbá where women were only to be seen and not to be heard. They used the Biblical account of creation to condemn polygyny and point out that it is against God's design for humanity to practice sexuality. The World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910 labelled polygyny as one of the gross evils of heathen society which like habitual murder or slavery must at all cost be ended.³³⁹ The missionaries considered polygyny as a state of adultery that run contrary to both natural and divine law. The Yorùbá rated their sexuality decent, full of self-respect, self-worth, and gives confidence. They see it that it made family life vibrant especially in the inheritance of landed property for the sustainability of economy and protect female from subjugation. The sexuality that was rated high by the Yorùbá, the Euro-American missionaries rendered it valueless through the interpretation of the dominion mandate. They made male and female who are from polygynous relationship have negative attitude against their father and created sense of self condemnation in them to have originated from a relationship that fall below God's standard.

Western education has gone further to say that practising sexuality is not necessarily for procreation, a teaching that negates the practice of sexuality among the Yorùbá. The Hebrew literature was used to reduce sexuality to the level of expression emotion and

³³⁹ Samuel W. Kunhiyop. 2008. *African Christian Ethics*. Nairobi: World Alive 225.

pleasure. The blessing in dominion mandate was neglected in their interpretation. They attempted to destroy Yorùbá sexuality that was tailored towards prosperity and abundance. They made some Yorùbá to consider sex and sexuality as a means to fulfil all righteousness. This makes a number of Yorùbá men and women to place career above procreation in sexuality in the present age. The reaction of the Yorùbá to the teaching of the colonial and Missionaries was reported by Fádípè that in 1937, at the first conference of Yorùbá Chief, one of the main agenda of the conference was the codification of the customs and practices relating to marriage by introducing uniformity into the divergent practices of various ethnic groups. They also discussed the issue of rampant divorce on the part of women.³⁴⁰

The instrument which the colonial masters and missionaries used, which were school and Churches continue to reverberate and do further damage to Yorùbá sexuality. The trained teachers and indigenous priests who take over schools and Churches reinforced the Euro American paradigm and further destroy Yorùbá form of sexuality. In the post-colonial era, sexuality was polarised through hypocritical lifestyle. In the name of modernity, some men and women cohabit without being husband and wife legally. Some men who profess to be monogamous have mistresses outside the matrimonial home not only to seek sexual pleasure, but to the extent of having children out of wedlock.

4.4.3 Yorùbá oral text on sexuality

The Yorùbá, from time immemorial, have oral tradition which explained everything about the world around them and how their response to visible and invisible things was passed from one generation to another. From the oral tradition, they developed societal values which they cherish from time to time. The advent of western education opened door for indigenous scholars in linguistics, history, sociology, religion and anthropology to have the oral tradition in writing both in poetry and prose form.

³⁴⁰ N. A. Fadipe. 1970. *The Sociology of the Yoruba*. 91.

The religion and social life of the Yorùbá is contained in *Ifá*³⁴¹ corpus which is written in poetic form. *Ifá* corpus is the sacred book of the Yorùbá, just as the *Tanakh*³⁴² is to the Hebrews. *Ifá* poems are highly valued because it is regarded as guardian of the mores of the society, the wisdom of the divinities and the ancestors. Some of the sexuality issues discussed in *Ifá* corpus have been waxed in records for entertainment purposes and posterity. The written and waxed records have the aim to entrench morality in the expression and practice of sexuality. *Ifá* corpus is in the form of *Enuma Elish*, Gilgamesh Epic, Atrahasis and other forms of epics and mythologies in the ancient Near East because it is written in poetic form. In some cases, the content and themes are disjointed. In some *odu*, some lines are lost and some words cannot be translated into English language directly. Abimbola notes in an *odu* which discussed women that several poems were joined together such that on critical study of it, it reveals unrelated themes.³⁴³

As it has been expressed earlier in this chapter, Yorùbá sexuality is deeply rooted in polygyny, but does not condemn monogamy. According to Yorùbá mythology, some divinities who are the guardians of the morality in Yorùbá culture were polygynist. This indicates that the worshippers are encouraged to be polygynist. *Ifá* corpus, however, recommends monogamy as the way to express and practice sexuality. Unfortunately, minority are those who have the knowledge of the recommendation of *Ifá* corpus, just as only few Hebrews may be able to interpret the demand of Elohim on sexuality. According to Abimbola, *Ifá* poem that discusses sexuality in Yorùbá social life is *Ifá ÑláÑlá* in *Ògúndáméjì*.³⁴⁴ The discussion on sexuality opens with virtues that are inherent in the relationship of one male and female. The poem does not say that *Olódùmarè* created only one male and one female as it is in P account. But it explains the problems that portend polygyny. *Ifá* corpus encourages the practice of monogamy but does not condemn polygyny. The *Odu* that discusses sexuality states:

³⁴¹ *Ifa* provides useful information on the religion, social, economy and political life of the Yoruba. It is also called *odu*, it has sixteen great poems which explain the genesis and end of a matter including sexuality. *Ifa* stands for guidance in the choice of career, relationship between the two genders and other life ventures.

³⁴² The Old Testament (OT) is a term used among the Jews for the Hebrew Bible. It is divided into three parts: The Law, The Prophets and The Writings.

³⁴³ Wande Abimbola. 1975. *Great Poems of Ifa*. Paris: UNESCO. 105.

³⁴⁴ Wande Abimbola. 1975. *Great Poems of Ifa...* 105.

*Omọ olúoko
Ọràn bí òyì bí òyì
A díá fún akéréponjú
Omọ agẹmọ bá wọn lóhun gbogbo lóhun gbogbo
Ọkan soṣo poro lobìnrin dùn mọ lówó ọkọ.*

*Bí wọn bá di méjì
Wọn á dòjòwú
Bí wọn bá di méta,
Wọn á dẹta òtúlé
Bí wọn bá di mẹrin,*

*Wọn di iwọ lo rìn mí, ni mo rìn o.
Bí wọn bá di márùn,
Wọn á di lágbájá
Ni orun ọkọ o wá tán lóhun susuusu.
Bí wọn bá di mẹfà*

*Wọn á dikà
Bí wọn bá di méje,
Wọn a dàjẹ
Bí wọn bá di méjo
Wọn di iyá alátàrí bàmbà*

*Ló ti kó irú èyí ṣe ọkọ wa lówó
Bí wọn bá di mèsàn-án,
Wọn á di iyálé wa ò níṣé kan
Kò lábò kan
Bó bá ti jí*

*Aṣọ ọkọ wa ní máa sán kiri.
Bí wọn bá di mẹwàá
Wọn di ilé lẹkọ wa jóko,
Ní wọn níwá ọkọ wa wá.
Ìgbà tó di léèkíní,*

*Mo lọ bá wọn janpata lóde Aró.
Wọn níké janpata janpata mọ mi.
Wọn níké olóyè olóyè mọ mi.
Mo ní kìn lẹ ñṣe lóde Aró?
Wọn ní iyàwó làwọn ñgbé.
Mo ní ẹ epèlẹ o.
Ìyàwó agbélé
Omọ àbílù
Omọ agbóge lóri oge
Ìyàwó ò boòsàn*

Ìyàwó ò boòòrò
Ìyàwó ò gbóogbóo Olúyèyèntuyè,
Ìyàwó ò gbóogbóo Olúyèyèntuyè,
Ìyàwó ò gbóogbó Olúorógbó;
Èyí tó gbó gbòò gbò³⁴⁵

Offspring of the king of farmland.
Matters that seem always unstable.
Ifá divination was performed for *akéréponjú*,
The son of chameleon who always shares out of everything.
It is one and only wife that brings pleasure to any man.

When there are two wives,
They become rivals.
When they increase to three,
They destroy the home.
When they increase to four,

They laugh one another to scorn.
When they increase to five,
They will accuse someone among them
Of monopolising their husband's property.
When they increase to six,

They become wicked people.
When they increase to seven,
They become witches.
When they increase to eight,
They will say that the fat-headed favourite.

Has taught their husband his evil ways.
When they increase to nine,
They will say that the favourite wife has no other work,
No other occupation,
Except to wake up in the morning,

And wrap herself with their husband's cloth.
When they increase to ten,
They will say that even when their husband stays at home
Women come in to visit him.
On the first occasion,

I went to engage in a contest in the city of Arò
The people of Arò were shouting at me.
They were yelling at me.

³⁴⁵ Wande Abimbola, 1975. *Sixteen Great Poems of Ifa*, 113-116.

I asked, “What are you doing in the city of Arò?”
They told me that they were marrying a wife.

Then I said, “Accept my greetings.
You will marry more wives.
You will bear many more children.
You will bear many children.
You will marry more and more maidens.
The wife will deliver female children.

She will deliver male children.
The wife will live to become old like *Olúyèyèntuyè*
The wife will be as old as *Olúyèyèntuyè*.
She will be old as *Olúorógbó*
Who was old.³⁴⁶

The import of this *Ifá* poem is that, in the expression and practice of sexuality, it is only the relationship of a male and a female that brings pleasure. The Yorùbá traditional sexuality is polygynous, but it has a lot of pitfalls such as rivalry, fighting, wickedness and witchcraft as expressed in this poem which does not only affect the women and the man but also the products of the relationship. The *Ifá* corpus expresses that the goal of sexuality among the Yorùbá is procreation. We wonder that since the Yorùbá sacred book gives a great deal of demits of polygyny, why it is still practiced without restrains in the past. We may suggest that not many of the Yorùbá have the knowledge of the sacred book, especially as there are numerous divinities which they worship and the demand of each is not the same. Another reason might be as a result of culture of silence on sex and sexuality might lead to lack of information on the recommendation of *Ifá* corpus.

In Yorùbá culture, there are other ways by which morals are impacted into the society. One of such ways is Yorùbá oral poetry. Most of the poets are entertainers. A poet is expected to have a full and clear knowledge of the cultural practices through which he has liberty to discuss any point of his interest without harassment. Among the Yorùbá, the value placed on sexuality makes it to be a secret and private affair. Hence, one of the wisdom sayings of the people is, *a kílì fì gbogbo ẹnu sòrò* meaning one does not talk anyhow. Therefore, it is not permitted to mention male or female reproductive organs

³⁴⁶ Wande Abimbola. 1975. *Sixteen Great Poems of Ifa*... 113-116.

directly, and anyone who does that is regarded as indecent, immoral and vulgar, except for a poet who enjoys the poetic license. Fákéyẹ quoting Ọlátéjú says:

*Nínú àṣà Yorùbá àwọn ǹnkan kan wà
Tó ní bí a ṣe gbòdò pè wón tàbí sọ wón.
A kò gbòdò la orúkọ tí a mọ ǹnkan yẹn sí mọ ọn lóri
Àfì kí a dà á pè
Èèwò ni láti dárúkọ ǹnkan bẹ̀ẹ̀,
Eni tó bá déjàá àwọn èèwò bẹ̀ẹ̀ aláìmòkan
Tàbí onísokúṣọ ni wón máa ka ẹnì nàà sí...
Lára àwọn ọ̀rọ̀ tí a máa ǹ dà pè ni ọ̀rọ̀ tó bá jẹ́
Mọ̀ ibi ipamọ̀ ara ọ̀kùnrin
Tàbí obìnrin³⁴⁷*

In the Yorùbá culture, there is a way of referring
To some things or the way they should be called.
We must not call them their real names that we've known
Them for, except we use another word.
It is a taboo for saying it,
Whoever breaks the taboo
Concerning those words will be regarded as a novice
And vulgar person...
Among such words that we
Use euphemism for are the words pertaining to the male
And female organs.

When a poet entertains, he/she wants his/her audience to visualise the male and female copulation. Faleyẹ posits that nothing should inhibit a Yorùbá poet, because he/she stands as agent of not only impacting morality but creating a sense of humour.³⁴⁸ The discussion of sexuality by Yorùbá poets is in the choice of euphemism, and any time a poet entertains people on the issue of sexuality, he attracts a great deal of attention. He/she leaves the audience to interpret his euphemistic language.

4.4.4 Convergences and divergences between Dominion Mandate text and the Yorùbá Text

This research is on two ethnic groups who are not on the same continent but who have some things in common especially on sexuality. The two applied their sacred texts on their cultural values. The dominion mandate in the Hebrew literature which expressed

³⁴⁷ Morenikeji Funmilola Fakeye. 2003. *Sex and Sexuality in the Poetry of Olatubosun Oladapo*. A Master Thesis, Department of Linguistics and African Languages, University of Ibadan. 29.

³⁴⁸ Morenikeji Funmilola Fakeye, 2003. *Sex and Sexuality in the Poetry of Olatubosun Oladapo*... 18.

sexuality is believed to have been authored by the Priests, while the *Ifá* corpus of the Yorùbá originated from the oral tradition of the people documented with the advent of western education. A close study of the cultural practices of the Yorùbá in relation to the record of the Hebrew literature one could say that it in the time immemorial, they cohabit the same environment and share the same culture. For instance, the two abhor having sexual intercourse with a woman during her menstrual period. At the same time, bride price is a common practice between the two. The priests are regarded as the custodian of morals in the society. The two ethnic groups placed value on male children above female. As regard expression and practice of sexuality, P account in the dominion mandate claim that Elohim created a male and a female in the image of Elohim. The notion of creating male and female is to establish the concept of gender study and to show that development of the society depend on the collaboration of the two. In the dominion mandate there is no division of labour giving to the two, but it is assumed that the two though created equally but possess different potentials. The combination of their potentials will make the world worth living for them. The two were given instructed to have dominion over other creatures. The main occupation of the Yorùbá is farming where the male and the female collaborate to make it thrive. The male is to cultivate the land while the female process and market the farm produce. For instance, it is the duty of man to harvest palm nuts and the woman is to process it into palm oil and market it. The development of economy depends on the two genders. The dominion mandate text also express that humanity has to express and practice sexuality in heterosexuality, hence their creation in male and female gender. This is also hinged on monogamy. Other sections of the Hebrew literature leverage on this text condemn bestiality, incest and adultery.

In *Ifá* corpus, the ideal relationship recommended is monogamy and heterosexuality. This is not to show it as the ideal practice, but to expose the inherent pitfalls in it such as the evil jealousy expressed in Jacob's harem both among his wives and children. The two texts express fecundity as one of the goals of sexuality. The dominion mandate text said "God blessed them, said, Be fruitful and multiply and the fill the earth" (Gen. 1: 28a). This portends procreation which is cherished in the union of a male and female among the Hebrews. Procreation is valued to the extent that the culture allows a woman to have

children through surrogacy, a situation recorded in the life of Sarah, Abraham's wife, who gave her maid to her husband for the purpose of having children through her. Rachael, the wife of Jacob, did the same thing. Sexuality is not regarded as being favour by the gods until it produces children among the Yorùbá. If there is delay for a couple to have a child, a great effort is made by offering series of sacrifice to appease the gods, while a lot of herbs will be prepared for the couple especially the woman to make sure that she conceives. The emphasis on procreation in the two texts is for the continuity of human species on earth to give worship to God.

The sacred book of the Hebrews is the Old Testament. The dominion mandate text is part of the book, in the first chapter of בְּרֵאשִׁית. This text is widely spread and it is applied in several cultures to measure the standard of cultural practice in sexuality. However, it is mainly for Judaism and Christianity. The two religions especially Christianity spread to all continents and countries. Owing to this, Hebrew literature of which dominion text is a part is translated to living languages. This makes it enjoys universal acceptance. Conversely, the Yorùbá sacred text is *Ifá* corpus. It has sixteen great poems. The text is known and read only among the Yorùbá. The percentage which has the knowledge of it is not large. As a result of this, most Yorùbá do not know its contents, let alone apply it to the practice of sexuality. The dominion mandate text is translated to several languages including Yorùbá, and it is interpreted to form sexual mores. It will not be out of place to say that majority of the Yorùbá who have the knowledge of sexuality in the dominion text do not know what *Ifá* corpus says about sexuality. The reason for this is that Hebrew sacred text is giving attention in western education while Yorùbá sacred text gains little or no attention. The trained personnel in Hebrew literature far outnumber that of *Ifá* corpus. However, majority of the Yorùbá who have the knowledge of *Ifá* corpus are illiterate. This makes the dominion mandate text more popular and acceptable than that of the Yorùbá text in *Ifá* corpus.

Procreation is an instruction in the dominion mandate from the creator to the male and female. The creator blessed them and said they should be fruitful and multiply. In Yorùbá text, procreation is assumed not an instruction. The notion of equality in sexuality is expressed in the dominion mandate text. The understanding which P gives is that God

created humanity male and female the same day and at the time, an indication of no class status between them. In Yorùbá text, the idea of equality in sexuality is not expressed. There is no record when male or female were created in Yorùbá mythology. The Yorùbá myth of creation is similar to the second creation account in the Hebrew literature Gen 2: 4b – 25 where a man was formed from the dust and the creator breathed into the image and it became a living being (Gen 2: 7). The Yorùbá myth expresses that *Òrìsà Nlá* or *Obàtálá* moulded the physical form of human beings and *Olódùmarè* breathe into the image and it became a living being.³⁴⁹ Sexuality in the dominion mandate text can be said to be divinely created while that of the Yorùbá is humanly created. This point of divergence shows that gender equality is not in the *Ifá* corpus. As matter of fact in Yorùbá culture male is considered superior to female. Hence, male child is more valued than female. The purpose of procreation in the two texts differs. Sexuality in the dominion mandate text emphasise on humanity to rule over other creatures. This indicates that as Elohim made provision for the survival and wellbeing. This is completely absent in Yorùbá text. The Yorùbá procreation is focus on the worship of gods. One of songs at the annual festival of *Obàtálá* says:

*Èni sojú semú,
Òrìsà ni mà á sìn-ín,
Èni dá ni wáyé,
Òrìsà ni mà á sìn-ín.*

The creator of eyes and nostrils
He I will worship
He who brings one to earth
I will worship.

4.4.5 Implication of Dominion Mandate text for Old Testament theology

The genesis of theology in all its branches starts from P creation narrative. P seeks theological insight as pertains to God and God's relationship with creation. The main theme in the Old Testament theology is found to be God initiating relationship with humanity. Indisputably, dominion mandate text pre date science. Since the emergence of science however, it has put the text to test because its base its assumption on empirical

³⁴⁹ E. Bolaji Idowu. 1996. *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief*. 19; J. Omosade Awolalu & P. Ade Dopamu. 1979. *West African Traditional Religion*. Ibadan: Onibonoje. 56; Geoffrey Parrinder. 1978. *West African Traditional Religion*. London: Epworth Press. 20; T. N. O. Quarcoopome. 1987. *West African Traditional Religion*. Ibadan: African University Press. 56.

verification, while the text is based on faith. The dominion mandate text and science seek to establish the truth to validate of their claim. Hall notes the view of Nelson and Galio that to attain the truth both in religion and science, there should be a dialogical interaction between biblical hermeneutics and scientific explanation for the purpose of integrating religion and science.³⁵⁰ As plausible as this view is, it is impossible to ascertain the truth about creation by depending on empirical verification. Although the biblical narrative and science exist on the same epistemological footing as both are interpretation of facts, the facts of the Old Testament is more valid than that of science. For instance, science especially Darwin's theory of evolution argues that the idea of androgynous being which later split into two sexes cannot be sustained from the text. Davidson, quoting Von Rad said, "the plural in v. 27 'he created them' is intentionally contrasted with the singular 'him' and prevents one from assuming the creation of an originally androgynous man"³⁵¹.

The text of the dominion mandate shows that the creation narrative and more importantly about sexuality is beyond guess work. The emergence of science has attempted to claim that human beings can be reproduced through scientific methods such as cloning whereby a cell in the body of an individual will be used to replicate the person. This is guesswork because scientists have not been able to produce a human being through that process. At the same time, the suggestion of scientists has received criticisms by scholars that if it is possible to do, it will create moral and ethical problem for the society.

God's mandate to man is not exploitation of ecology as environmentalists want us to believe. Domination of the environment, an assignment which the creator gives humanity, is to offer helping hand to other creatures to develop and prevent them from preying over one another. For instance, if humanity does not have dominion over the animal, wild animals would not allow other kind of animals to exist. It is a fact that God created animal and humanity the same day and the two share some things in common, but between the two creatures the rationale being is humanity. If humanity is not given power to dominate animal kingdom, the wild animals such lion, leopard, cheetah will prey on

³⁵⁰ W. David Hall. 2005. "Does Creation Equal Nature? Confronting the Christian Confusion about Ecology and Cosmology". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 73, No. 3. 796.

³⁵¹ Richard M. Davidson. 1988. "The Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning: Genesis 1-2". *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 1. 7.

goat, dog and others. The creation of אָדָם as presented by P is different from other living beings. Other beings were created by means of the word *let there be* whereas man was created with the cooperation of the divine council in the image of God. This indicates that the creation of man was different from and independent of the description of creation as a whole. P unequivocally asserts that man was created in the image of God to show him distinct from all other creatures. The image of God in man gives dignity and worth to him above other living beings and this makes him superior to them. The image of God thus symbolises an ambivalent human nature.

Taking a critical look at the clause in the creation account where it was recorded concerning man as being created male and female in the first instance, is indeed an aberration and a flagrant display of sexual differentiation being presented as creation by God, could not have been part of the divine order itself. One could note that this emphasis on the creation of sexual distinction appears to form a subtle but strong polemic mindset against the divinization of sex expressed in the creation myth of Israel's neighbouring nations. This is further observed that in the myths of the people in ancient Near East, there is ample sexual activities of the gods which usually form a dominant motif. In most cases, the fertility cults are usually given prominence, most especially in Mesopotamia and Palestine. To this end, in the fertility cults, creation, specifically procreation was ascribed to the sexual activities of their male and female deities. Looking at the P account of creation, one could observe that there is a sharp contrast between it and that of the mythological views on divine procreation in the sense that the P account presented a radical demarcation between sexuality and divinity. God is a sovereign God and He is absolutely beyond the polarity of sex. That might be the reason why there is a clear difference in the sexual distinctions that are presented as creation by God, making it not part of the divine order.

In the dominion mandate text, human sexuality stems from the equal pairing of male and female in parallel with *and* in v. 27. There is no expression of ontological or functional superiority or inferiority between the genders. In the wider context of the passage, both are given the same dominion over other living creatures. The two genders have the image of God and received the blessing and responsibility of procreation. The

import of equality expressed by P indicates that personhood and sexuality are placed on the same level. The two are created to enrich and enhance each other in the fullest way possible. The complementarity of the two brings about development in the world. Thus, sexuality projects intra and interpersonal relationship. The theological insight of equality negates the distinction placed by culture on the genders. Cosgrave avers that the actual differences between male and female in cultures are not necessarily innate or immutable. They are due partly to social and cultural conditioning where strength, logical reasoning, ability to initiate and create are attributed to male, and sensitivity, submissiveness are attributed to female.³⁵² In the true sense of the matter, there is no reason why man should not seek to develop the so called feminine characteristics and woman develops masculine characteristics. It is obvious from the text that one of the primary purposes of creating sexuality is procreation. Procreation assignment gives humanity an opportunity to participate in the act of creation. This gives continuity and permanence to the immanence of God on earth. This indicates that God deliberately designed the perpetuation of human species. Sexuality is life-giving. Shapiro posits that in oral tradition procreation can be a religious duty, an imperative placed on man by the Divine Law because the earth is sustained by worship of the Divine and if there is no procreation, it will lead to extinction of human race, consequently bring an end to worship.³⁵³

As theological import of dominion mandate shows anatomical and physiological details and differences as expressed above, likewise theology reveals psychological and spiritual connotation of sexuality. Psychologically, theology reveals that sexuality has no meaning to male or female in isolation, but in mutual relationship. Barth, as noted by Davidson, maintains that “I-Thou” relationship of male and female correlates to the image of God.³⁵⁴ Cosgrave opines that sexuality is a powerful antidote to loneliness.³⁵⁵ Sexuality encompasses all aspects of humanity.

³⁵² William Cosgrave. 1979. “Christian Understanding of Sexuality”. *The Furrow*, Vol. 30, No. 6. 362.

³⁵³ David S. Shapiro. 1973. “Be Fruitful and Multiply”. *A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought*, Spring-Summer, Issue 13.4 & 14.1.

³⁵⁴ Richard M. Davidson. 1988. “The Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning: Genesis 1-2”... 8.

³⁵⁵ William Cosgrave. 1979. “Christian Understanding of Sexuality”... 364.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 SUMMARY

The foundation of theological, social, economic and political life of humanity has their beginning in the P account of creation in Genesis Chapter One. As a result, discussion on sexuality has no other root than in the dominion mandate which is a very significant pericope within the P account of creation. In chapter one which is the general introduction we note that dominion mandate gives the origin of sexuality which is rooted in heterosexuality. Chapter two deals with theoretical framework and review of extant literature on sexuality in the dominion mandate. The theoretical framework of the research was based on relating text to context. This also brings about inferential hermeneutics in the dominion mandate. The text originated from the רַבְּנָה אֱלֹהִים and this affords it to address various contexts without contradictions. Unarguably the text in its origin has no readily identifiable context, but the window of critical reflection which it offers, makes this research discover that it addresses Yoruba expression and practice of sexuality. For the eternal truth of the text, grammatical-lexical method was applied in the study, which serves as one of the ways by which the intention of the creator as represented in the text, can be discovered. This is necessary so that the assertion can convey indisputable meaning. To this end, the research notes that the dominion mandate is not an informal or ordinary statement but instruction which humanity has to carry out for the purpose of partnering with the creator in populating the earth. Owing to this dictum some scholars refer to the text as “the cultural mandate”.³⁵⁶ One may not appreciate the text without scrutinising the expression and practice of sexuality that are opposed to the dominion mandate. The destructive tendencies in the social life of sexually pervert people with the occurrence of bestiality, paedophilia, homosexuality, has their root in the misuse of the human freewill and the outright rejection of the

³⁵⁶ Jeremy Cohen, 1989. “*Be Fruitful and Increase, Fill the Earth and Master It*” *The Ancient and Medieval Career of a Biblical Text*, Ithaca: Cornell University, 2.

dominion mandate. This study gives an exegetical analysis of man, dominion, subdue, blessing and gender construct in the dominion mandate. It is indisputable that the text and Yoruba sexual practice agree on the fulfilment of the intention of the creator. Therefore, sexuality gives the opportunity for אָדָם to share in the parentage nature of God. David Carr observes that אָדָם being created in the likeness of God is a reflection of God's power to give life.³⁵⁷ The parentage concept in the dominion mandate reveals the relationship that אָדָם has with אֱלֹהִים and with each other.

Chapter four of this research discussed elaborately on the צלם and דמות of אֱלֹהִים that two are inter woven and cannot be disconnected as it discovered in the texts of other cultures in the ancient Near East. The concept of creator in P resides in the divine council which is one and not in plural. The word אֱלֹהִים appears in plural form in Hebrew word for God this does not indicate that He has several forms but His acts are in several forms which cannot be numbered. When we place side by side and apply critical analysis to the expression and practice of sexuality in all the ancient Near Eastern culture without any iota of prejudice we discovered that אָדָם did not originate from spontaneous evolution as claimed by some biologists or from fierce struggle between gods as indicated by anthropologists in Enuma Elish, Athrahaïs Epic or the pyramid texts. It is unequivocally stated that אָדָם was a created being in the image and likeness of God. When other text did state clearly how genders was created P account of the origin of אָדָם indicates that everything on earth originated from the creator and nothing came to existence by chance. P argues that אָדָם has a distinct purpose and plan from the creator different from other creatures and the pronouncement of blessing of fruitfulness and multiplication in the dominion mandate prove this assertion. In this case, we note functional ontology in sexuality in the dominion mandate as against material ontology in others. Functional ontology denounce the practice homosexuality, adultery, beatilaity, prostitution, pedophilia and bestiality which material ontology advocate for.

³⁵⁷ David M. Carr, 2003. *The Erotic Word: Sexuality, Spirituality and the Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 36.

The dominion mandate reveal that אָדָם was created in צֶלֶם and דְמוּת of אֱלֹהִים which is an indication of the physical presence of God on earth. It has been noted earlier that God is beyond the polarity of sex, He cannot be placed on the same level with אָדָם yet he possesses the power to create אָדָם in His own צֶלֶם and דְמוּת. The concept of צֶלֶם and דְמוּת in Hebrew signify similarity not in the physical sense but in nature as opined by Crouch.³⁵⁸ Most Old Testament scholars avoid the interpretation of צֶלֶם in terms of physical resemblance and physically identity because God has no physical form. Von Rad explains that the Priestly writer used the term דְמוּת to elucidate on the meaning of צֶלֶם, and that the use of these terms by P is beyond the Aramaic צֶלְמָא which is interpreted to mean idol or statue.³⁵⁹ The image of God is the power of the soul wherein lies the intellect and will of man. God in His wisdom endows אָדָם to share from his nature.

This brought about the parental metaphor which other sections of the Old Testament used to represent the relationship between YHWH and Israel. The concept of parentage in dominion mandate becomes explicit in the blessing of God on אָדָם for fruitfulness and multiplication. This is a constant assignment which man has to do for God for the continuation of his image and likeness on earth. P did not explain how the assignment would be achieved. It is in the absence of this explanation that scholars conclude that there is no other means by which אָדָם will carry out God's instruction except through expression and practice of sexuality which is restricted to heterosexual relationships.

This study has examined sexuality in the dominion mandate since it has not been given due attention in Old Testament scholarship. It is found that the *Tanakh* is not focused on a particular context in the mind of the author, but it addresses all contexts. The biblical narrative of the creation of humanity and the pronouncement of the creator to be fruitful and multiply; and its reflection on the Yoruba sociocultural context (Gen. 1: 26-28) is the concern of this study. The fact that the *Tanakh* is translated to various living languages makes it to be contextualised in varying contexts. The reflection of the

³⁵⁸ C. L. Crouch, 2010. Genesis 1: 26-7 As a Statement of Humanity's Divine Parentage, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 61, NO 1, 4.

³⁵⁹ G. Von Rad, 1962. *The Theology of Israel's Historical Tradition*, Vol. 1, London: Oliver & Boyd, 145.

expression and practice of sexuality is obvious in the exegetical study of the text. The research examined the hypothesis that if humanity failed to accomplish sexuality in the dominion mandate with the aim of multiplication and fruitfulness, there will not be the will power to subdue or, as some ethicists would say, have stewardship of the environment. Likewise, the research discovered that without the human sexuality in focus in the text, the motive of creating humanity in the image and likeness God may not be achieved.

The study also examined how sexuality among the Yoruba took root in the cultural context of the people and the purpose for which the creator created two different genders. The research discovered how Yoruba understanding of sexuality and the way it is expressed and practiced has added value to the life of the people, socially, economically, religiously and politically which is found to be in tandem with the *Tanakh*. The people cherished it and passed it from one generation to another. This research further examined the changes in the practice of sexuality among the Yoruba as a result of their contact with the European and American missionaries who introduced the *Tanakh* and its interpretation for the purpose of contextualization to the sociocultural context of the Yoruba.

The didactic intention of P is wide. It is undisputable that he emphasizes that אָדָם should have dominion over other creatures. But he did not tell what אָדָם needs to do to themselves to carry out this assignment. It is necessary for אָדָם to have dominion over their “personalities and potentials” which are embedded in the image and likeness of God he carries. The intellect and will of man lies in this image and the likeness. It is worthwhile to note that God endows man with His nature but it can be misused or mismanaged and this reflects in sexual perversion. Sexuality in the dominion mandate reveals that sexual perversions such as paedophilia, homosexuality, bestiality, rape, pornography which are basis of sexual harassment and violence at workplace, academic environment and even at social clubs do not originate from God. Thus unequivocally P

denounce these vices in the text. Judith Balswick and Jack Balswick describe these sexual perversions as inauthentic sexuality.³⁶⁰ The text denotes moral dominion.

In the past, research and discussion on this text mainly focused on the image of God *imago Dei*, ecological concern and earth stewardship neglecting the aspect of creating the “male and female” and the blessing on them to be “fruitful and multiply.” These statements in the passage cause the inquisitive mind to seek for the reason why the two genders were created. We see the idea of human gender unfolding in the dominion mandate. This has created gender studies and has generated a lot of debates on inequality between the two genders in socio-economic, religious and political life worldwide. This text shows that the creator created ♂ and ♀ male and female equally. The two were blessed for fruitfulness and multiplication. God assigned them the responsibility of fecundity and to have dominion over other creatures. With this, the study shows that each gender has a role to fulfill in the dominion mandate. Nature assigns the role of making new life to male while the female receive the new life, form and nourish it. Stephanie Budin expressed this point in this way that “male created seed progeny, children, whereas female incubated, nourished and nurture the seed given by male.”³⁶¹ It is worth noting that sexuality is undisputable in the dominion mandate, wherein one gender cannot do without the other. Michael and Auriel Schluter aver that the notion of the creator creating male and female is not to make them separate or compete with each other but to cooperate and to be interdependent.³⁶² The dominion mandate establishes the fact of genesis of family formation with the agenda of fruitfulness and multiplication which is explicit in the passage. The postmodern idea that two males or two females can procreate and form a family is contrary to the original design of formation of family.

5.2 CONCLUSION

³⁶⁰ Judith K. Balswick & Jack O. Balswick, 2008. *Authentic Human Sexuality: An Integrated Christian Approach*, 2nd Ed. Downer Groove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 222.

³⁶¹ Stephanie Lynn Budin, 2014, Fertility and Gender in the Ancient Near East, Mark Masterson, Nancy Sorkin & James Robson, *Sex in the Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, London: Rotledge, 31.

³⁶² Michael and Auriel Schluter, 2003. Gender Co-operation: Some Implications of God’s Design for Society *Biblical Thinking For Public Life*, Vol 12, No 2, 1.

Sexuality is a core element of our being human which encompasses the interpretation of the text of the *Tanakh* especially the dominion mandate, which is a text in P creation account in Gen. 1: 26 – 28 and its reflection of the Yoruba concept of sexuality. The introduction of *Tanakh* to the Yoruba through the Euro-American missionaries shows two different ethnics who had the same view of sexuality. The contact which brought formal education made the Yoruba to realize that sexuality that has been expressed and practiced is confirmed in the dominion mandate text. The primary aim of Yoruba expression and practice of sexuality is procreation. In the same vein Gen. 1: 26 – 28 has the agenda of procreation in the blessing of אָדָם by אֱלֹהִים. We see that in the two cultures sexuality reflects humanity's ability to interact with one another of different genders. This brings about self disclosure which creates avenue to make use of ones potentials to achieve the goal of the creator.

There is hidden truth in the creation of humanity especially in the pronouncement of blessing 'be fruitful and multiply'. This indicates that dominion mandate text is germane to the concept of sexuality which is hinged on procreation. Interpreting the text and its reflection in the Yoruba socio-cultural context reveals that what is being done everyday life and given it no recognition is recorded in the Holy writ. The reciporetory of Yoruba wisdom which is hidden in the oral tradition has embedded in Ifa oracle frwns at perversion of sexuality as being expressed and practiced in the modern age. The reflection on the contexts in the religious books shows that the perversion of sexuality which globalization brought into the cultural expression and practice of sexuality is aberrant to the intention of the creator both in Hebrew and Yoruba. *Tanakh* mentioned these modern forms of the expression and practice of sexuality such as homosexuality, pedophilia, bestiality, incest, adultery and described them as abomination. In several texts God instructed the people not to engage in them to forestall severe punishment. Likewise the Yoruba frowned at them and consider anyone who engages in any of these as an accursed person. On the whole sexuality is not to be expressed and practiced for pleasure, economic gain, they are considered as unnatural and against the intention of the creator. The real motive of the creator is fecundity.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the banes of social imbalance which has bedeviled various cultures is as a result of deliberate neglect of the cultural values which are passed from one generation to another. This is more evident in the expression and practice of sexuality. Sexuality is the bed rock of the moral life of the society, when it is jettisoned the society is bound to experience moral degeneracy. We recommend the need to re-examine and institute the teaching on sexuality as entrenched in the dominion mandate and Yoruba context.

It is obvious that globalization has taken a toll on the psyche of humanity especially the youth. The negative aspect of the globalization is what attracts them most and this is opposed to the dominion mandate and Yoruba culture of sexuality. Globalization itself cannot be stopped since the only thing that is permanent in life is change. But making humanity to realize that there are certain established norms which globalization should not be allowed to erode if social cohesion will be achieved, one of which is sexuality. It is necessary to pin point the fact that the entertainment industry should embrace the good of other cultures and not its negative traits which some young persons tend to adopt. Sexuality as given in the dominion mandate and as expressed and practiced in the Yoruba context remain the way to make the world peaceful.

It has been argued that modern age is at the stage of transition as far as sexuality is concerned owing to the introduction of perversion of sexuality in term of lesbianism, gay, bisexual and transgender. The emergence of these are aberrations to the intention of the creator who created humanity male and female for the purpose of creating intimacy and to be co-creator with God. The emergence of this perversion and high level of advocacy given to them cannot change the purpose of God in sexuality. It is our candid opinion that these perversions should not be allowed to hold sway in the society. We recommend that it is necessary to increase public awareness of the negative impact of the media on the society as regards sexuality.

Sexuality as expressed in the dominion mandate and Yoruba context is both a penetrative and an emotional expression. It encompasses the exploration of both inner and outer parts

between the two genders. This requires the openness and broad mind of the two partners for the purpose of cooperation so that dominating the rest of creation will not be an uphill task. Openness and being broad minded engender understanding of one another, cooperation and achieving the desired goal of the creator for their creation. In this case, we recommend that sexuality should not be limited to sexual pleasure only.

The only appropriate context for sexual relations is that of committed intimacy which can be found in relationship of the $\text{m}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{s}}$ created in the image of God. Therefore, to stem the tide of sexual violence is to embrace dominion mandate text and old Yoruba concept of sexuality. It is this that can promote harmony and peace because the principle laid concerning sexuality cannot be out dated. The principle teaches humanity to dominate their sexuality which is controlled through self discipline.

5.4 CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE

The primary aim of research is to contribute to knowledge regardless of several works on a particular subject because each scholar looks at a subject from different perspective more so that this work is base on the record of the Holy Writ on creation account of $\text{m}\bar{\text{t}}\bar{\text{s}}$. One thing that germane in biblical scholarship is interpretation of text and relating it to context. A cursory reading of Gen. 1: 26 – 28 one will not notice that sexuality is embedded in the pronouncement of God. But given a careful reading and reflection on the text one will decipher through interpretation that there is a subject of sexuality in it. This work is an aspect of theological reflection on the root of what we engage in within the context of our everyday life and what constitute what we term as unnatural in sexuality based on what we read and interpret in the dominion mandate text and the expression and practice of sexuality in Yoruba context. The exegetical analysis of the dominion mandate text reveals hidden truth about the intention of the creator for humanity which is procreation. Therefore, this work contributes to interpretative biblical theology.

The dominion mandate reveals that the nucleus of the society is embedded in sexuality which is the bed rock of technological development that make life meaningful for humanity. Without humanity discovering their sexuality as pronounced by God, humanity

may not realize and maximize their potentials to bring about the desired goal of the creator. The research shows that the assumption and belief in patriarchal culture which place man above woman is not in the agenda of the creator. The study however, has disproved the theory of inequality between male and female. What some scholars hinged on to claim that man is above woman is as a result of different roles played in procreation. Different roles is normal in sexuality because in the process of procreation it is divinely ordained that male has to give and the female has to receive. The process of giving and receiving makes them to fulfill the purpose of their creation. There are reproductive technologies but this work has shown that there is none of these technologies that can erode the procreation in the dominion mandate. The relationship between the two genders as established in the dominion mandate is the best method of achieving basic productive, economic and educative unit of the society because it fosters harmonious relationship and promote peaceful co-existence in the society.

REFERENCES

- Abasili, A.I. 2011. Was it rape? The David and Bathsheba Pericope Re-Examined. *Vetus Testamentum* 61 Fasc 1, 6. (1 - 15).
- Abimbola, Wande. 1975. Iwa Pele: The Concept of good Character in Ifa Literary Corpus, Wande Abimbola, ed. *Yoruba Oral Tradition*, Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Abogunrin, S. Oyinloye. 2008. Keynote Address, C. U. Manus, (ed.) *Biblical Studies and Environmental Issues in Africa*, Ibadan: NABIS Western Zone. (2 - 12).
- Ackerman, Susan. 2014. I have Hired You With My Son's Mandrakes: Women's Reproductive Magis in Ancient Israel, Mark Masterson, Nancy S. Rabinowitz & James Ronson, (eds), *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, London: Routledge, (15 - 29).
- Adamo, Tuesday. 1999. African Cultural Hermeneutics in R. S. Sugirtharajah, (ed.), *Vernacular hermeneutics*, Sheffield: Academic Press.
- Adekunle, S. K. 2013. Homosexuality and African Christianity: A Assessment From Biblical Perspective, Samson A Fatokun, ed. *Christianity and African Society: A Festschrift In Honour of Gabriel Oladele Olutola @80*, Ibadan: BookWright. (554 - 559).
- Adeogun, E. O. 2012. Re-Reading the 'Fall Story' (Gen.3) in the Context of the Power of Women in Pre-Colonial Yorubaland. In O.A. Adewale, et.al. *Biblical Studies and Feminism in the African Context*, Ibadan, NABIS.
- Adeogun, Olukayode. 2013. Christianity and Family Life in Africa, Samson Fatokun, (ed.) *Christianity and African Society, A Festschrift in Honour of Pastor(Dr.) Gabriel Oladele @80*, Ibadan: BookWright, (235 - 243).
- Ahlstrom, G. W. 1984. *An Archeological Picture of Iron Age Religions in Ancient Palestine*, StudOr 55, Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- Akao, J. O. 2006. The Old Testament Concept of Sexuality in *Biblical View of Sex and Sexuality From African Perspective*, *Biblical Studies Series Number 5*, S. O. Abogunrin, (ed.), Ibadan: NABIS, (15 - 27).
- Alaba, Olugboyega. 2004. Understanding Sexuality in the Yoruba Culture, *Sexuality in Africa Magazine*, Lagos: Africa Regional Sexuality Resource Centre, (2 - 13).
- Alan Richardson. 1953. *Genesis 1 – 11*, London: SCM.
- Allen, James P. 1997. *Cosmologies. The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions From Biblical World, 3 Vols. 1*, William W. Hallo (ed.), New York: Brill.
- Allen, Justin. 1998. Birth Control and the Catholic Church, *Undergraduate Review*, vol. 11, Iss 1 Article, 7, (40 – 66).
- Anderson, Bernhard W. 1994. *From Creation to New Creation*, Minneapolis: Fortress, _____, 1966. *The Living World of the Old Testament*, second edition, London: Longman Press.

- Anthony, Phillip, 1981. Another Look at Adultery, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, No 20, (3 – 25).
- Anwuluorah, M. C. 1989. Pornography: Its Scope in Nigeria, *Youth and Pornography*, D. C. E. Ugwuegbu & B. U. Eke, eds., Lagos: Federal Ministry of Information and Culture, (3- 13)..
- Assotho, Barnabe & Ngewa, Samuel. 2006. Genesis, Tokunbo Adeyemo, (Ed), *Africa Bible Commentary*, Nairobi: WorldAlive.
- Athalya, Brenner. 1997. *The Intercourse of Knowledge: On Gendering Desire and Sexuality in the Hebrew Bible*, Biblical Interpretation Series, 26, Leiden: Brill..
- Awolalu, Omosade J. and Dopamu, Adelumo P. 1979. *West African Traditional Religion*, Ibadan: Onibonoje,.
- Baile, David. 1992. *Eros and the Jews: From Biblical Israel to Contemporary America*, New York: Basic Books.
- Ballantyne, Tony. 2011. Gen. 1: 28 and the Language of Colonial Improvement in Victorian New Zealand, *Victorian Review* Vo. 37, No 2,.
- Balswick, Judith K. and Balswick, Jack O. 2008. *Authentic Human Sexuality: An Integrated Christian Approach*, second Edition, Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity.
- Barclay, William. 1973.. *The Ten Commandments for Today*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans.
- Barlinerblau, Jacques. 2005. *The Secular Bible: Why Nonbelievers Must Take Religion Seriously*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Barr, James. 1968-69. The Image of God in the book of Genesis: A study of Terminology, *BJRL*, 51, (11- 26).
- Barth, Karl. 1958. *Church Dogmatics*, trans. J. W. Edwards, O. Bussey & Harold Knight, Vol.3:1,, Edingburgh: T& T Clark.
- Benaggio, Guiseppe, Carrara, Sabina & Filippi, Valentina. 2010. Sex and Reproduction : An Evolving Relationship, *Human Reproduction Up date*, vol. 16, No. 1, <http://academic.oup.com/humupd/article-abstract>, accessed on 4th Aug. 2018.
- Benjamin R. Foster. 1966. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, Vol 1, Second Edition, Bethesda, Maryland: CDL,.
- Berkhof, Louis. 2005. *Systematic Theology*, Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust.
- Biggs, Robert D. S. A. Z. G. A.: Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations, Texts from Cunneiform Sources,
- Bird, Phylis. 1981. Male and Female He Created Them, *the Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 74, No 2 April (129 – 159).
- Black, M. & H. H. Rowley (eds.). 1982. *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, Workingham, Berkshire: Van Notrand Reinhold.

- Blank, Hanne. 2012. *Straight: The Surprisingly Short History of Heterosexuality*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Boer, Harry R. 1976. *A Short History of the Early Church*, Ibadan: Daystar.
- Boswell, John. 2005. *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Boyarin, Daniel. 1995. Are There Any Jews in “The History of Sexuality”, *Journal of History of Sexuality*, Vol. 5, No3, Jan. (333 – 355).
- _____, 1993. *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*, Berkeley: University of California.
- Brown, R. 2002. *The Message of Numbers*, Leicester: Inter-Varsity.
- Bruce, K. Waltke & Cathi, J. Freddicks. 2001. *Genesis: A Commentary*, Grand Rapid: Zondervan,
- Brueggeman, Walter. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute Advocacy*, Chicago: Moody Press.
- Budin, Stephanie Lynn. 2014. Fertility and Gender in the Ancient Near East, Mark Masterson, Nancy S. Rabinowitz & James Robson, (eds), *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, London: Routledge..
- Budin, Stephanie Lynn. 2014 . Fertility and Gender in the Ancient near East, Mark Masterson, et.al. (eds), *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, <http://www.routledgehanbooks.com>. Accessed 2nd Aug. 2018.
- Bullough, Vern L., Attitudes Toward Deviant Sex in Ancient Mesopotamia, *The Journal of Sex Research*, (184 – 203).
- Buttrick, George Arthur. 1962. *The Interpreter Bible Dictionary*, in four Volumes, Vol. 4, New York: Abingdon.
- Caldwell, John C. Orubuloye, I. O. and Caldwell, Pat. 1991. The Destabilization of the Traditional Yoruba Sexual System, *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 17, No 2, (229 – 262).
- Carr, David M. 2003. *The Erotic Word: Sexuality, Spirituality and The Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press,.
- Charry, E. T. Human Bien, Doctrine of’ in Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Ed.), *Dictionary of Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, London: SPCK, 2005.
- Chianeque, Luciano and Ngewa, Samuel. 2006. Deuteronomy in Tokunbo Adeyemo, *Africa Bible Commentary*, Nairobi: World Alive.
- Clines, D. J. A. 1968. The Image of God in Man, *Tyndale Bulletin*, 19.
- Culver, Robert D. 1981. *Mashal, III, Theological Workbook of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1, R. Laird Harris, (ed.), Chicago: Moody Press.
- Cyrus H. Gordon and Gary A Rendsburg. 1997. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 4th Edition, New York: W. W. Norton, 17.

- Dalley, Stephanie. 1989. *Enuma Elish, Tablet 1: Myths from Mesopotamia, Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh and Others*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Darek Isaacs. 2013. Is there a Dominion Mandate?, *Answers Research Journal* 6, (1 – 16).
- Davidson, Richard M. 2007. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- _____, The Theology of Sexuality in the Beginning 1-2, http://faculty.gordon.edu/hu/hu/bi/ted_hilebrandt/ote.source01/genesis. accessed 4th Aug. 2018.
- Davis, J. 1971. *Moses and the Gods of Egypt: Studies in the Book of Exodus*, Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Disu, J. A. 1989. The Place of Pornography in Human Sexual Development: A philosophical Reflections, *Youth and Pornography*, D. C. E. Ugwuegbu & B. U. Eke, eds., Lagos: Federal Ministry of Information and Culture, (61- 68).
- Dobson, J. H. 1977. *A guide to Exodus*, London: SPCK.
- Dodd, B. J. 1996. *The Problem with Paul*, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Ellens, Harolds J. 2006. *Sex in the Bible: A New Consideration*, London: Praeger.
- Ellington, John. 1979. Man and Adam in Genesis 1-5, *The Bible Translator*. Vol. 30, No 2, Chicago: United Bible Societies, (201 – 205).
- Essien, Kwame, & Aderinto, Saheed, 2009 . Cutting the Head of the Roaring Monster: Homosexuality and Reference in Africa, *African Study Monograph* 30, 3, (121 – 135).
- Fabiyi, Ebenezer Obey, An Album.
- Fadipe, N. A. 1970. *The Sociology of the Yoruba*, Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Fakeye, Morenikeji Funmilola. 2003. *Sex and Sexuality in the Poetry of Olatubosun Oladapo*, Master of Arts Thesis, Submitted to the Department of Linguistics and African Languages, University of Ibadan.
- Familusi, O. O. Human Sexuality in Africa Thought and the HIV/AIDS Scourge, [luminati.hnu. ph/articles/c17/familusi](http://luminati.hnu.ph/articles/c17/familusi).accessed 14th Jan.2018.
- Fohrer, G. 1972. *History of Israelite Religion*, Nashville: Abingdon.
- Frame, John M. 2006. Men and Women in the image of God, in John Piper & Wayne Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, Wheaton , Illinois: Crossway, (225 – 232).
- Gagnon, Robert A. J. 2001. *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*, Nashville: Abingdon,
- Garrison, Daniel H. 2000. *Sexual Culture in Ancient Greece*, Normal: University of Oklaoma,

- Goldingay, John. 2003. *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Gospel*, Vol. 1, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Gordon, Cyrus H., Khnum and El. 1982. *Scripta Hierosolymitana: Egyptological Studies*, Vol. 28, Sarah Isrelit-Groll, Jerusalem: Magmes Press.
- Grudem, Wayne A. 2004. *Evangelical Feminism and Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than One Hundred Disputed Questions*, Sisters, Ore: Multnomah.
- Gudbergesen, Thomas. 2012. God consists of both Male and Female Genders: A short note on Gen. 1: 27 *Vetus Testamentum* 62, (450 – 453).
- Hall, David W., Does Creation Equal Nature? Confronting the Christian Confusion about Ecology and Cosmology <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4139920>, accessed on 22 June, 2015.
- Hamilton, Victor P. 1997. *Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis* 5 vols, Willem A. VanGemeren, (ed.) Vol. 1.
- Hamilton, Victor P. 1990. *The Book of Genesis, 2 Vols, 1*, Grand Rapid: Eerdmans.
- Harris, R. Laird (ed). 1981. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, Chicago: Mood Press.
- Harrison, R. K. 1990. *Numbers*, Chicago: Moody.
- _____, 1963. *Archaeology of the Old Testament*, London: The English Universities Press.
- Hoffmeir, James K. 1983. Some Thoughts on Genesis 1&2 and Egyptian Cosmology *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*, 15, 37.
- Hoffmeir, James K. 1996. *Israel in Egypt: The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Exodus Tradition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hollinger, Dennis P. 2013. The Ethics of Contraception: A Theological Assessment, *JETS* 56/ 4.
- Hollis, Harry Jr. 1975. *Thank God for Sex: A Christian Model for Sexual Understanding and Behavior*, Nashville Tennis.
- Hornby, A. S. 2006. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University.
- Horst, F. 1950. Face to face: The Biblical doctrine of the Image of God *Interpretation* 4. 3. 259 – 270.
- Idowu, Bolaji. 1996. *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief*, Revised and Enlarged, Ibadan: Longman,
- Ikpe, Blankson, Eno. 2004. Human sexuality in Nigeria: A Historical Perspective, in *The Africa Regional Sexuality Resource Centre Seminar series*, No 2, (1 -33).
- Jackson, Stevi. 2003. Heterosexuality, Heteronormativity and Gender Hierarchy: Some Reflections on Debates, Jeffer Weeks, et.al , *Sexualities and Society*, Cambridge: Blackwell,.

- Jewett, Paul K. 1975. *Man as Male and Female A Study of Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View*, Grand Rapids: Wm Eerdmans.
- Jewish Enclopedia.com, accessed on 21st September, 2018.
- Jobbing, David. 1997. And Have Dominion!: The interpretation of Genesis 1, 28 in Philo Judaeus, *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, Vol8, No 1, (50 – 82).
- Jones, Jake, “Pre-Biblical and Old Testament Rape Law Parallels: Recurring Andocentric Themes in Historical Biblical Text” [www. ://mals.camden Rutgers.edu/files/jake –Jones-capstone](http://www.mals.camden.rutgers.edu/files/jake-Jones-capstone). Accessed on 6th April, 2016.
- Joyce, Paul. 1998. The Individual and the Community, John Rogerson (ed.). *Beginning Old Testament Study*, London: SPCK.
- Kalpoyo, Joe. 2005. The Human Condition: Christian Perspectives Through African Eyes, *Urban Theology*, Vol. 3, No 2.
- Kapelrud, Arvid, S. 1974. The Mythological Features in Genesis Chapter 1 and the Author’s Intentions, *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 24, Fasc. 2, (178 – 186).
- Karl, E. Peters. 2007. Theology and the Image of God: Transversal Reflections of a Unitarian Universalist with a Christian Theologian *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy*, Vol 28 No 3, Sept. (378 – 392).
- Karras, Ruth Mazo. 1990. Holy Harlots: Prostitute Saints in Medieval Legend, *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, Vol. 1, No 1,.
- Kart, Jonathan Ned. 1995. *The Invention of Heterosexuality*, Chicago: The University of Chicago. Press.
- Kawashima, Robert S. 2006. A Revisionist Reading: on the creation of Adam and Then Eve, *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 56, Fasc. 1, Jan. (46 – 57).
- Kay, Jeanne, “Human Dominion over Nature in the Hebrew Bible” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2563253>, accessed on 22 June, 2015. Gene M. Tucker, “Rain on a Land Where no one Lives: The Hebrew Bible on the Environment” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3266743>, accessed on 22 June, 2015.
- Kenny, Joseph. 1989. A Comparative Assessment of Pornography: Christian and Islamic Perspective, *Youth and Pornography*, D. C. E. Ugwuegbu & B. U. Eke, eds., Lagos: Federal Ministry of Information and Culture, (47 – 60).
- Kunhiyop, Samuel W. 2008. *African Christian Ethics*, Nairobi: WorldAlive.
- Kwesi, Dickson. 1984. *Theology in Africa*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd,
- Lambert, W. G. 2013. *Creation Accounts: Enuma Elish, The Memphis theology and Genesis 1-2: Mesopotamian Civilization 16*, Winona Lake IN: Eisenbraun..
- Lambert, Wilfried G. 1957-1958. Morals in Ancient Mesopotamia, *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziati-Egyptisch Gelzeschap (Genootschap) Ex oriente lux* 15.
- Leeming, David Adams. 2010. *Creation Myths of the World: An Encyclopedia*, 2nd Edition, Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

- Lipka, Hilary B. 2006. *Sexual Transgression in the Hebrew Bible*, Sheffield: Phoenix.
- Lopez, Raquel. 2012. Perspectives on Abortion: Pro-Choice, Pro-Life, and What Lies in Between, *European Journal of Social Science*, Vol. 27, No 4, (511- 517).
- Makinwa-Adebusoye, Paulina and Tiemoko, Richmond. 2007. "Healthy Sexuality: Discourses in East, West North and Southern Africa" Eleanor Maticka-Tyndale, Richmond Tiemoko & Paulina Makinwa-Adebusoye, (eds). *Human Sexuality in Africa Beyond Reproduction*, Sunyside: Fanele, (1 -8).
- Manus, C. U. 2008. Towards a Biblical Theology of the Environment: A Re-reading of Gen. 1: 27 – 28 C. U. Manus (ed.), *Biblical Studies and Environmental Issues*, NABIS, Western Zone.
- Martins, R. P. Creation. 1982. *New Bible Dictionary*, D. W. R. Wood, (ed.) Nottingham InterVarsity,
- Matory, J. L. 1994, Sex and the Empire that is No More: Gender and the Politics of Metaphor Cutting the Head of the Roaring Monster in Africa, *Oyo Yoruba Religion*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Maxwell, Miller J. 1972. In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91, No 3, , (289- 304).
- McGrawth, Alister E. 2001. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, Third Edition, Oxford: Blackwell,
- Mfono, Z. N. 2006. "African Writer's Exposition of African Sexuality in their Story Lines". www.arscr.org/publication/2006.asp, accessed on 13th Oct., 2014.
- Miller, J. Maxwell. 1972. In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 91.
- Mueller, Chris, "What it means to be Created in the Image of God" <http://core.ac.uk> accessed on 26th July, 2018.
- Nagel, Thomas. 1969. Sexual Perversion, *The Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 66, No 1..
- Nelson, J. B. and Longfellow S. P., (eds.). 1994. *Sexuality and Sacred: Sources for Theological Reflection*, London: Mowbrays.
- Oestigaard, Terje, Cosmogony, in Timothy Insoll (ed.). 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ojo, Matthias Olufemi D. 2013. Magun: The Traditional Juju for the Punishment of Adultery Among the Yoruba Natives, *Antropologija* 13, Sv 3, (131 – 141).
- Olanisebe, S. O. 2009.. Revisiting Creation Accounts in Gen. 1&2 and Dominion Theology in Relation to the Environment in Nigeria, *African Journal of Biblical Studies*, Vol. XXVII, Number 2.
- Olaniyan, Gabriel O. 2016. Spiritual Content of Yoruba Concept of Sexuality and Sustenance of Family Values through Eko-Ile (Home Training), *Journal of Education and Practice*, Vol. 7, No 24, (27 – 32).

- Oluwole, Sophie , Public Health and Individual Right to Sexual Pleasure and Choice, *Sexuality in Africa Magazine*, Vol 3, Issue 2 (6 – 8).
- Oomman, Nandini, Sexuality: Not Just a Reproductive Health Matter, *Reproductive Health Matters*, Vol. 6, No 12, 1998, <http://www.jstor.org/stable>, accessed on 20th June, 2018.
- Oswalt, John N. 1981. bereka, *Theological Workbook of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1, R. Laird Harris,
- Parratt, John. 1995. *Reinventing Christianity: African Theology Today*, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- _____,1987. *A Reader in African Christian Theology*, London: SPCK.
- Parsons, M. 2002. Luther and Calvin on Rape: Is Crime Lost in the Agenda?, *The Evangelical Quarterly*, (123- 142).
- Peters, Karl E. 2007. Theology and the Image of God: Transversal Reflection of Unitarian-Universalist with a Christian Theologian, *American Journal of Theology & Philosophy*, Vol. 28, No 3.
- Pobee, John. 1979. *Toward an African Theology*, Nashville: Abingdon.
- _____, 2012. Biblical Studies and Feminism in the African Context. In O.A. Adewale, et.al. *Biblical Studies and Feminism in the African Context*, Ibadan, NABIS. Pg.21-30
- Quarcoopome, T. N. O. 1986. *History and Religion of Israel*, Ibadan: African Universities Press.
- Randall, Garr W. “God’s Creation in the Priestly Source” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4495072>, accessed on 22 June, 2015.
- Rogerson, John. 1998. The World-View of the Old Testament, in John Rogerson (ed.), *Beginning Old Testament Study*, London: SPCK.
- _____, 1998. Old Testament History and History of Israel, John Rogerson (ed.). *Beginning Old Testament Study*, London: SPCK..
- Schmidt, Thomas E. 1995. *Straight and Narrow? Compassion and Clarity in the Homosexual Debate*,
- Shapiro, Davis S. Be Fruitful and Multiply A *Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought*, traditional archive .org/news/article accessed on 4th Aug. 2018.
- Shelling, J. A. (ed). 2001. *Embracing Sexuality: Authority and Experience in the Catholic Church*
- Sherwin, Bailey D. 1975. *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, London: Hamden, Connecticut.
- Smedes, Lewis. 1988. *Sex For Christians*, Grand Rapid: Wm B. Eerdmans.
- Smith, Joseph W. 2014. *Sex & Violence in the Bible: A Survey of Explicit Content in the Holy Book*, New Jersey, P& R Publishing Company.

- Sonnenberg, Roher. 1998. *Human Sexuality: A Christian Perspective*, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House.
- Sparks, Kenton L. 2007. "Enuma Elish" and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 126, No 4, (625 – 648)..
- Speck, Greg. 1989. *Sex: It's Worth Waiting For*, Chicago: Moody.
- Stahlberg, Lesleigh Cushing. 2008. Modern Day Moabites: The Bible and the Debate About Same-Sex Marriage, *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches*, Vol Xvi, No 5, (442- 475).
- Stiebert, Johanna. 2016. *Incest in the Hebrew Bible: Sex in the Family*, Bloomsbury: T&T Clark.
- Stulman, Louis. 1992. Sex and Familial Crimes in the D Code: A Witness to Mores in Transition, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*. (46 – 63).
- Surgirtharajah, R. S. 2002. *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toorn, Karel Van Der. 1989. Female Prostitution in the Payment of Vows in Ancient Israel, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 108, No 2, (192- 205).
- Trible, Phyllis. 1973. Depatriarchializing in Biblical Interpretation, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 41, No 1, Mar (30 – 48).
- Tucker, Gene M. 1997. Rain on a Land Where no one Lives: The Hebrew Bible on the Environment, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 116, No 1 (13- 17).
- Tull, Patricia K. 2013. *Inhabiting Eden: Christians, The Bible, and the Ecological Crisis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Ukleja, Michael. 1983. Homosexuality and the Old Testament, *Bibliotheca Sacra* Vol. 140, July – Sept. N0 559, (259 – 266).
- Veenker, Ronald A., Forbidden Fruit: Ancient Near Eastern Sexual Metaphors, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. 70/71, 1999-2000, <http://jstor.org/stable>, accessed 18th May, 2018;
- Volf, Miroslav. 1991. *Exclusion & Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*, Nashville :Abingdon.
- Walsh, Jerome T. 2001. Leviticus 18: 22 and 20: 13: Who is Doing What to Whom?, *Journal of Biblical Literature* (201 – 209).
- Walton, John H. 2008. Creation in Genesis 1: 1- 2: 3 and the Ancient Near East: Order out of Disorder after *Chaoskampf*, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 43, (48- 63).
- Ward, Edward, *Marriage Among the Yoruba*, Washington: Catholic University of America, 1937.
- Watterson, Barbara. 1996. *Gods of Ancient Egypt*, Godalming, Surrey: Bramley books Limited.
- Weeks, Jeffrey Janet Holland & Matthew Waites, (eds). 2003. *Sexualities and Society: A Reader*, Oxford Blackwell.

- Wenham, G. J. 1991. The Old Testament Attitude to Homosexuality, *Expository Times*, 102.9, 259 – 363).
- Wenham, Gordon J. 1987. Genesis 1 – 15, *Vol 1, Word Biblical Commentary*, David A. Hubbard & Glen W. Barker, (Eds.), Waco: Word Books.
- Wenham, Gordon J. 1994. *Genesis, 2 Vols, 1*, Waco: Word.
- Wenham, Gordon. J. 1972. *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary*, Leicester: Inter-Varsity,
- Wildsmith, Andrew. 2002. Cultural Exegesis: The Bible is Open to Everyone, *Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology*, 21. (1- 11).
- <http://www.sacred-texts.com/ane/rp/rp201/rp20130.htm>, accessed 29th October, 2018.
- <https://ashraf62.wordpress.com> Asraf Ezzat, Hebrew Bible: Plagiarized Mythology and Defaced Monotheism PYRAMIDON, accessed 27th October, 2018.
- <https://thetorah.com>, why-the-torah-prohibits-incest, accessed 22nd September, 2018.
- <https://www.ancient.eu/Mesopotamia>, accessed 29th October, 2018.
- <https://www.britanica.com/topic/pornography>
- <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Ashur-Mesopotamia.deity> , accessed 29th October, 2018
- [www.//jemiriye.org/yorubasexuality.htm](http://www.jemiriye.org/yorubasexuality.htm) , accessed 8th September, 2018.
- www.bbc.com/future/story/the-invention-of-heterosexuality. accessed 15th May, 2018.
- www.gutenberg/ebooks/16653, accessed 29th October, 2018.
- www.gutenberg/ebooks/16653, accessed 29th October, 2018.