

## Editor's Notes

Human sexuality is such a difficult thing for Christians to talk about, even though it has been a central topic in North American Christianity and North American Anglicanism for well over thirty years. Many of our perennial questions about the relationship of human persons to God have to do with incarnation: the relation of body and spirit/mind/soul, of consciousness and will and desire, of the transitory and the enduring. And the thorniness and urgency of these questions seems to come to the fore particularly in matters of sexuality. Or, perhaps more accurately, *sexualities*. Particularly pressing in our American Anglican context is the matter of whether and how committed relations among persons, particularly those of the same biological sex, are related to holiness of daily life. Whether we call committed same-sex relationships unions, marriages, or something else, what we have to say about them has implications for what we say about relationships among persons of different biological sexes, including Christian marriage. And what we say about how daily life ought to be lived connects directly to how we understand God's call to us and to the church as the body of Christ in the world. No wonder we spend so much time talking about sex.

In 2008, the Theology Committee of the House of Bishops appointed a task force of theologians to prepare and exchange position papers on the issues associated with same-sex relationships and to present the papers to the House of Bishops. It is the *Anglican Theological Review's* privilege to publish these papers in this issue. Professor Ellen Charry of Princeton Theological Seminary, who chaired the task force, introduces the papers and gives an overview of the process that generated them. I greatly appreciate her care and attentiveness to this work, and to bringing these papers to publication in this issue of the *ATR*. I hope our readers will find this exchange of views helpful and suggestive, not just in its content but in its process. Person to person, group to group, human beings are bound to disagree, simply because we are actually different, one from another. The challenge to us is not disagreement as such—that is a given—but how we maintain real if imperfect communion with each other in the midst of disagreements

that threaten to be divisive.<sup>1</sup> The work of this task force and of the Theology Committee may give an example of how communication may be fostered even in painful circumstances.



I also want to express my heartfelt thanks, and that of the *ATR* Board and staff, to the many donors who support this journal's work. The donors' pages at the end of this issue list the dioceses, parishes, and individuals whose generosity makes it possible for us to produce the *Anglican Theological Review* and distribute it to individuals, libraries, and institutions in North America. Just as important is the fact that these gifts make it possible to send the *ATR* to theological schools throughout the Communion (through the Seminaries Abroad Gift Program) and to persons who might otherwise not have access (through the Overseas Gift Fund). We have also begun a new program, Bishop to Bishop, through which bishops of the Anglican Church of Canada and the Episcopal Church can continue the Indaba process by providing an *ATR* subscription to their conversation partners around the world. Many thanks to each and all of you for supporting the mission of the *Anglican Theological Review*.

ELLEN K. WONDRA  
*Editor in Chief*

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas E. Breidenthal, "Disagreement as Communion," *Gays and the Future of Anglicanism: Responses to the Windsor Report*, ed. Andrew Linzey and Richard Kirker (Winchester, UK: O Books, 2005), 188–198.