

## “Inclusive language” What are people calling for?

The Bible uses ‘relationships’ that the people understood at the time.  
Like Father/son; Bride/Bridegroom; Master/Servant; Son/Slave.

In particular, the ‘Father’ / ‘First-born Son’ relationship which held an inheritance entitlement by law.

Scripture tells us that we are all adopted children of God and all share in the same inheritance with God’s ‘First-born Son’, Jesus, without distinction. Where **race**, **social status** and **gender** are **NOT** a consideration.

You can’t get more **inclusive** than that. There are **no** second-class ‘first-born’ sons.

Successive bible ‘translation’ are in many instances, not translations at all, but modifications to suit the prevailing ‘political correctness’ of the time.

The original meaning of biblical text, (Old Testament- Hebrew or New Testament-Greek), does not change with time.

A typical example of political correctness is ROMANS 8:29.  
In the New Revised Standard Version Bible.

*“For those whom he foreknew, he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son, in order that he might be the **first-born within a large family**”.*

*“.....**first- born within a large family**”.* This means absolutely nothing with regard to one’s “status” or “position” or “standing” before God the Father.

We must go back to the original Hebrew & Greek text to establish its meaning at the time it was written. The meaning then, must be held as the meaning for all time. Since we believe the scriptures are the word of God.

**Dei Verbum** the Second Vatican Council's **Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation**, affirms the saying of **Augustine** that *“the New Testament is hidden in the Old, and that the Old Testament is manifest in the New”* (DV 16).

### **Peter’s Confession of Christ..... Matthew 16**

**13**Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, He was asking His disciples, “Who do people say that the Son of Man is?” **14**And they said, “Some say John the Baptist; and others, Elijah; but still others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.” **15**He said to them, “But who do you say that I am?” **16**Simon Peter answered, “You are **the** Christ, the Son of the living God.” **17**And Jesus said to him, “Blessed are you, Simon Barjona, because flesh and blood did not reveal this to you, but My Father who is in heaven.

When Jesus asks **us**, “Who do **you** say that I am”? What will be our reply?

In the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians 4:1-7, he writes: - *“My point is this: heirs, as long as they are minors, are no better than slaves, though they are the owners of all the property; but they remain under guardians and trustees until the date set by the father. So with us; while we were minors, we were enslaved to the elemental spirits of the world. But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, in order to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children. And because you are children, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, “Abba! Father!” So, you are no longer a slave but a child, and if a child then also an heir, through God”.*

The important teaching here, is that all adopted children of The Father are **heirs**, regardless of gender.

To make the point that God, the creator of all things, is a personal loving God, Jesus uses the term “Abba”, that is Daddy, when addressing His Father. (Mark 14:36).

There are of course many who may not have had a loving father but can surely speculate on the benefits of having one.

There are also many cultures where the status of woman is second-class, in relation to their fathers.

Since the adopted children of The loving Father, with the status of ‘first-born sons’, everyone is **included** and have an **equal** inheritance.

We have the opportunity to accept Jesus as our Lord and Saviour, and to develop a personal relationship with Him.

All first-born sons of God The Father are entitled to receive the sacrament of “Holy Orders”

**Little Flower Parish bulletin 21 July 2019.** *It’s time for the Church to take some strong symbolic and practical steps to defend the leadership of women within our own Catholic community. For example, Church teaching does not stand in the way of re-admitting lay people, and this time lay women, into the College of Cardinals; women could continue to assume high profile positions in each Diocese and also leadership roles within the Roman Curia, starting with those that deal with instructions and directions that directly affect them; and the Church could welcome the ordination of women as Deacons.*

(Richard Leonard S J).

Consider one mind-stretching example: the Vatican Secretary of State is one of the church’s highest-ranking offices, sometimes compared to the role of a national prime minister. The incumbent, Cardinal Pietro Parolin, told reporters that he could imagine a woman assuming his lofty role, “in the sense that the role of the Secretary of State is evidently not bound to the sacraments or the priesthood.” (Chris Lowney: “Everyone leads” page 165).

If the Vatican Secretary of State can imagine a woman playing his role, how many more possibilities might emerge if we all think expansively?

One will also note that Lowney uses the ‘naked’ name **Jesus** throughout the book. The reluctance of Catholics to use the ‘naked’ name **Jesus** is covered in Sherry Weddel’s book “Forming Intentional Disciples”.

The exclusion of women from the priesthood has no foundation in scripture. In a comprehensive analysis of scripture, the Pontifical Biblical Commission found no theological evidence which would preclude women from being ordained a priest. (ref. “Getting back on Mission” page 132).

**Peter Jones, Brisbane**  
**7 July 2022**

.  
File Peter’s Letters: - “Inclusive Language”