

Boy Meets Girl

Joshua Harris

I read this book when it first came out—I liked it way better than Josh’s first book (I HATED “I Kissed Dating Goodbye”) and was interested in hearing more about how not dating could result in marriage. I was 18 the first time I read it and was terrified of becoming an old maid within the next couple years (and while that sounds sarcastic, I really wasn’t being sarcastic...in purity culture you were encouraged to get married very young and heading into your mid-20’s was considered “getting up there” in age.)

As I re-read the book I was reminded, again, of just how prescriptive (and damaging) it was. Though the author does offer some wiggle room with some things (which is actually quite UNCOMMON in most other purity culture books I’ve read), there is still very clear rules regarding dating/courtship, how to live, the roles of men and women, engaging in any sort of physical or sexual activity, etc. It was in the pages of this book (and a couple others) that I found the origins of many of the rules I “chose” to live by during my 15+ years in purity culture.

A couple quick notes before we begin:

- This is a used copy (I couldn’t find my original), so any markings in the book other than the dark, black ink pen are from previous owners of the book.
- There have been many editions of this book; I read the original version, published in the year 2000. The page numbers listed below are reflected of this first edition; if you have a different edition, the page numbers may be different.
- These are my own interpretations and critiques of this book and I am not suggesting that you MUST believe them! Grab a copy and read for your self and come to your own conclusions! Also, I think there is a critique I could make about every page of this book...however, that’s long and exhausting so I have picked out points that explain what the author is saying as well as specific teachings and ideologies that seem to represent purity culture as a whole OR the particularly damaging and abusive teachings that many people who believe that “purity culture is just about no sex before marriage” wouldn’t have any clue about . The hope is to bring light to some really awful stuff so that we can heal that stuff.
- As many people are aware, Josh Harris splashed back into the headlines a few years ago for various reasons having to do with walking back purity culture teachings, talking to those harmed/negatively impacted by purity culture and his own faith deconstruction. I think it’s important to note this because to my knowledge, Josh is one of the only “major players” in purity culture who has since come out and recognized the damage these teachings can do. He has received a lot of pushback from that community (and the

survivor community...for different reasons), however, this did not stop him from asking his publishers to discontinue printing “I Kissed Dating Goodbye” and this book, “Boy Meets Girl”. I want to make it clear that the criticisms I have of this book are in regard to the content and the messages that Josh was promoting THEN and not who he is TODAY. And I think that is important to recognize because as humans many of us might cringe at the things we did back then (whenever “then” was) that are not reflective of who we are today. That does not absolve us from consequences or impact (both of with Josh is keenly aware of) but it does, hopefully, allow us space to offer compassion and kindness to ourselves and others—for when we know better, we do better (Maya Angelou).

- As usual, some of what I am about to share may feel incredibly triggering, angering, upsetting, or shocking. The goal in doing these purity culture book reviews is to shed light on what has been taught in the purity culture and the damage that it can cause, even after walking away. Please use the caution you read through

Page 22

The concept of being “equally yoked” is very prevalent throughout purity culture (though it is a bit unequal in the sense that as long as the man is the spiritually stronger one, there is room for relationship. If the woman is the spiritually stronger one the implication is that the relationship will not work). However, it went beyond mere “levels” of spirituality and instead also took into account how someone grew up, if they had christian parents, divorced parents, etc. Even though the author “got over” the fact that his wife was from a divorced home (and was a “baby” christian) there is still extreme judgmentalism in this line of thinking. There are still many churches today that teach various iterations of “if your parents were divorced, you are not marriage material”—with various reasons, backed by the bible, for why this is.

For me personally, this meant an extreme amount of judgmentalism. In part, this was a coping mechanism. One of the reasons I was blacklisted in the church I went to (which I’ll talk more about at other points in the book review) was because I was more spiritually advanced than the person I was courting. I was told by many people, in no uncertain terms, that because of this I would act and speak manipulatively, that I would bulldoze and disrespect him and I would be living in sin because I would be the spiritual head of our home if we were to marry.

Page 24

This is, ultimately, the crux of purity culture...don’t date; court. And do not court until you are ready to get married. While the author doesn’t say it in the book, this teaching was interpreted in various ways, most commonly that you essentially need to know if you are going to marry that person before you ask the person to court you (for the man) or respond with a “yes” to this request (for the woman. Obviously this is completely unnecessary and overwhelming pressure—however, this was done under the guise of “guarding your/someone else’s heart”—meaning that we can skirt around deep hurt and pain from relationships if we pursue romantic relationships in this particular way.

Page 33

One of the biggest foundational issues with purity culture is that most of the teachings and applications of it are not actually biblical. While there are specific, cherry-picked verses that are used to back up specific rules or to show overarching principles, the bible actually has relatively little to say about relationships and sex (and even then, what the bible, in its original language and context, says is VERY different than how its interpreted today...seriously, y'all should do some study around that!) This passage here implies then that in order to have the right kind of romantic relationships you have to have the right kind of relationship with god (which this book then dissects). Interestingly, throughout this book and others there is this notion where the authors will say things like “we aren’t legalistic”—which is just another way of saying fundamentalist, patriarchal, controlling—and then go on to outline very specific rules that need to be followed IF you want these great rewards that god promises...usually a great marriage and out-of-this-world sex life.

Page 35

Purity culture talks a lot about sexual immorality—and trying to flee from it. Interestingly, though, when we look at the original language and context of the bible, ‘sexual immorality’ is used to describe sexual acts that are harmful and non-consensual (and almost always have dynamics of power and control attached to them). Purity culture uses these verses to teach us why homosexuality is a sin, or sex outside of marriage is a sin, when in reality, according to everything that I’ve read, what is being condemned is people engaging in a sexual act in order to exert power over someone else. It’s not talking about consensual sexual relationships (regardless of gender or sexuality).

Page 37

We see in this book also the promotion of the necessity of involving other people in the relationship to act as advisors—most notably parents (but only if the parents are christians). This is seen especially with women/individuals socialized to be women, as the notion of women needing to be protected is a constant theme throughout purity culture. And while protection certainly is nice, and a basic human need, “protection” in this context is very different. It’s protection in the form of viewing women as weaker, more vulnerable and incapable of making her own decisions/choices. If humans are not to trust themselves (because our hearts are evil) then this is true, even more, for women.

Interestingly, for me, this led to me feeling constantly UN-protected. There were men “willing” to protect me so long as I stayed in the tiny box that was prescribed for me. I could do it for a little while (stay in the box) but the moment I stretched my legs and arms to try and be a little bit less confined, the protection was also revoked. ...and it would be used against me in order to get me back in line with whatever the man/men in my life had determined for my life.

Page 46 - part 1

Here we see this notion of parental intervention which goes hand-in-hand with the idea of both inviting other people into your love life and needing protection (like I discussed on the previous slide). In purity culture if the parents were Christians there was a sort of ‘carte blanche’ that they were allowed to intervene in any way they saw necessary. I certainly do not want to undermine how important it can be to have external support, including from our family if we want them to be involved. However, this went far beyond that and gave parents permission to intervene however necessary AND have the Bible as their backing and justification for whatever they did (because...”children obey your parents”).

Personal story: In my early 20’s I was courting someone that the church leaders did not approve of. My parents did not particularly care for the relationship either (because he was younger than me). The leaders of the church (who were allowed to intervene because I also worked at the church) began turning everyone against me, asked people to spy and report back information about me, and warned people about me—including all of my friends and family. Believing that it was their role to do so, my parents also intervened in various ways (by mild threats to the guy I was courting and by reporting back to church leaders private conversations, suspicions and my comings/goings). This concept truly ruined my life...and yet, after all the dust settled (and I quit my job and broke things off), I was still blamed, gaslit, manipulated, coerced (into repenting, giving more time/energy/money to the church) and even told, years later, that this sin of mine was so grave that it was possible I would never find a man who would want to marry me. There is, of course, more to this story and I realize that this might seem like an extreme example of parental/spiritual authority intervention...but it’s not. I hear stories like this (and worse than this) all the time. I remember being told by several pastors, while this was happening, that this was for my own good and that someday I would look back on it and laugh about it—it’s been over 15 years and I’ve never laughed about it or seen the good that has come from it (well, except exiting purity culture and religion altogether).

Page 46 - part 2

The notion of “giving away your heart” was a big deal in purity culture...the teachings went something like: if you become emotionally or physically involved with someone who is not your spouse (and prior to marriage) you will be giving away parts of your heart that you can never get back. It assumed that your heart (e.g. emotions) and love were finite as well as teaching that if you give “parts of your heart” away, your marriage will suffer because you haven’t saved the most special parts of you for the most special person in your life.

Personal Story: Even after leaving purity culture and religion, even after having sexual relationships...this concept haunted me—I never felt guilt about being physically involved with others but the emotional piece felt different for me. I had become so good at filtering myself and guarding my heart that I wouldn’t let myself express any emotion or tell anyone I loved them. I was actually terrified to say it to the first person I said it too—I figured it was the only thing I had left to give to my future husband (don’t you love how those purity culture teachings are so ingrained?!?)

Page 53

Like many other PC books, the villainizing of feelings and emotions is prevalent. This is the foundation for the belief that you cannot trust yourself or your feelings as well as the notion that acting on feelings is either sinful or will certainly lead to sin. The book states “the way of sin is to separate feelings from commitment”. Essentially what this says is that if your feelings can’t lead to commitment (aka marriage) then you are engaging in a sinful relationship. This is also why dating is considered evil—because you develop feelings for various and/or many people without an expressed desire or intent for commitment. If you aren’t ready to engage in a relationship headed towards marriage, then you just shouldn’t be in a relationship at all.

Page 66

Since there is a foundation of relationships needing to result in commitment and specific things that need to happen to indicate you are ready for commitment, called “ducks in a row” in this book, the author lays out seven factors that are necessary in terms of how to know if you are ready to be married. One quick note here is that most of this is geared towards men. Men are to always be the initiators of these relationships and women must sit idly by and wait for the pieces to fall into place. Also, it’s important to note that each of these “steps” is not only subjective but it is affirmed by external sources telling you if you have, in fact, “mastered” the step. Again, this is the requirement for the man. The flip side of this is that if all of these ducks are in a row and all the external supports are affirming the man and his desire for a relationship with a specific woman, it makes it VERY difficult for the woman to have any sort of autonomy or choice in the matter. If every person who is supporting, protecting and has spiritual (or other) authority is over her is approving of a specific relationship then something will be wrong with HER if she doesn’t want to engage in the relationship.

Page 68

The term “leading someone on” in purity culture ups the ante as to how it is typically thought of in non-purity culture circles. In this case “leading someone on” could be as simple as engaging in conversations, being friends, initiating any sort of contact. Anything can be leading someone on. However, typically in the PC when men strive to not lead someone on they are considered even more godly and ready for marriage; when women attempt this same thing they are often accused of being cold, unfriendly and unkind.

Personal Story: I’ve experienced this multiple times...where my genuine friendship (e.g. calling a man to congratulate him on his last day of work at a job he hated and starting his dream job the next day) was called manipulative or misleading—I received many “scoldings” from men (or from my friends whom these men had “reported” me to) that I was stepping outside the lines in terms of how a woman should act in a relationship. I remember one time where a guy who had been CLEARLY leading me on made a passing comment about being “just friends” so I pulled way back (so as to protect myself). Because I was no longer paying attention to him at the same level he got upset and “told on me” to some church leaders who then admonished me for the way I was treating him. Even when I let them know what was actually happening, their understanding

(of me) increased only slightly and I was told I needed to put my feelings aside and treat him like a brother in christ.

Page 69

Purity culture teaches about this elusive line about desiring something versus making an idol out of it. Interestingly, so many of these PC books elevate marriage to the point where it seems to be the pinnacle of our existence and simultaneously tells us to not want it so much that it becomes an idol in our lives. Theologian John Calvin (founder of Calvinism/Reformed Theology) taught this as well...that if we want something too much, god will not give it to us. This was often used as a spiritually bypassing reason for why someone wasn't married "well maybe you want it too much and aren't satisfied in god enough". And yet, we were mandated to continue developing habits and lifestyles that would make us a more desirable husband or wife.

Page 76

Ahhhh, the romanticized version of the spouse. We were told to dream of an pray for our future spouse, to describe them (remember the "Shopping list for HIM!" that Dannah Gresh promoted in her book, "And the Bride Wore White" that I reviewed a few weeks ago!?) and not settle for less. AND we were told that god doesn't actually care what we want, he gives us what we need...and because we can't trust ourselves and what we want, we can almost always assume that the opposite of what we want is what we will get. I want to be clear that I am not suggesting that we can't change what we want or need in a partner...I think about the type of partner I would have wanted when I was 20 as compared to today and they are night and day difference! What PC teaches though is that your needs/desires/wants/preferences come second (or third, or fourth) to what god wants. For many people this looked like a very deeply held belief that they would be "forced" to marry someone that they were not attracted to—and that god would use their "unattractive spouse" to teach them more about him.

Personal Story: At barely 20 years old there was a man who wanted to pursue me through courtship. He did it the "correct" way and got the appropriate approvals before he asked me to begin spending focused time with him. He was quite the "catch" on paper—exactly the type of guy I should have been elated to be pursued by. But I was not physically attracted to him. At all. I begged god to make me attracted to him...and, nothing. I berated myself for how superficial I was that it was merely my lack of physical attraction that was the reason for breaking things off...and yet no matter how much I begged god to change my heart, that attraction never came. And despite being deeply entrenched in the PC there was just something in me that would not let me move forward with the relationship...so I ended it. Y'all...I took some MAJOR heat for that—not only from him but from the pastors and other people in the church who began questioning my commitment to god if I was really going to "let someone go" for such a fickle reason.

Page 89

This book spends a lot of time focusing on the roles of men and women in relationships—though the primary focus is men in relationships. I suppose this is due in part because the author is a male and in part because there is such a focus in PC on male leadership/headship and the woman being the follower and submissive one. Men being the initiator of every part of the relationship is not just recommended, it's required. Alternately, if women initiate these aspects of the relationship (e.g. romance, communication, deeper conversation) this is evidence of a role-reversal and at the very least one is to be very wary of these dynamics. If a woman does not let a man lead, there are big issues.

Page 98

This book has an underlying theme that basically everything is sin. Role-reversal between the man and woman? Sin. Miscommunication? Sin. Kissing before marriage? Sin. (We'll get into that one later). The author suggests that anything except absolute perfection is sin (which is in line with his reformed theology)—so anything that is less than ideal in a relationship is either sin, the result of sin, or a consequence of sin. Even things like the way you respond, feel, attach, communicate as a result of your upbringing is considered sin with the remedy of repentance and asking god to guide you. There is no mention of actually examining the root of what has happened to us or understanding how different relational dynamics (especially early on) impacts us. It's just sin. There are many problems with this line of thinking, but the one that comes to mind is the amount of blame and shame that someone takes on for things they had no control over and the ensuing impact is considered to be their fault (because, sin) versus understanding the impact, taking responsibility if/where necessary and moving towards change.

Page 112

Generally speaking, in PC (and fundamentalism) men are to be the head of the relationship/initiators and women are to submit and follow. While the bible really only talks about submission to christ and your husband (which the author also acknowledges), most PC rhetoric encourages men and women to begin practicing these roles far before marriage (which the author does promote). These teachings were used against me all the time—I was told that the best way to show that I could be a submissive wife was to practice submission to any man in leadership or who had any sort of authority over me. In one ministry setting where I was a leader, I had a male counterpart who was at the same level of leadership I was but FAR under-qualified in terms of experience, personality, motivation, creativity, etc. BUT, because he was male, it was my job to submit to him, defer to him, honor, respect, and support him because that was my role as a woman. Practically speaking, it usually meant that I did all of the work and he took the credit for it. While this is not everyone's circumstance, this idea of women needing to submit to the men/male authority and men needing to practice leadership/headship constantly definitely wreaks havoc on trying to have any sort of equality in a relationship.

Page 117

One of the things that is often used as a basis for which to teach women that they need to defer to male leadership is the story of original sin—where Eve eats the fruit and therefore all of humanity is cursed. Because Adam was also present in this situation and for whatever reason didn't stop Eve, this suggests that men tend to be more passive and women are interested in control—especially controlling men. Because of this women are to be constantly looking out for the ways they try to control situations or usurp the role of men. This can, of course, happen in relationships in the case of initiating any sort of conversation, deepening of the relationship, etc. Here we see that women *can* initiate but not too much. Women don't have to submit to every man but they do need to be supportive and respectfully responding to male leadership. It's a total mind-f*ck and constantly keeps women from being able to act with any sort of equality or autonomy.

Page 132

There is very little research on religious trauma or the negative impacts of religion...I suspect there will be in the coming decade, but for not, there just isn't. Interestingly, there IS growing research on purity culture...both it's teachings and the negative impacts. One of the main angles of research is how purity culture mirrors rape culture in many ways...which is both sad and terrifying. This section of the book is a great example. The author talks about the prevalence of dangerous men (towards women). However, instead of focusing on what causes men to be this way or how we can promote equality, consent, equality, etc., the focus is on how women simply need protection. I'm not suggesting that women being protected is a negative! I am suggesting that we are barking up the wrong tree. Unless we actually begin to look at the reasons WHY men think it's ok to violate women (or any human to violate any other human) we will only be trying to stop the bleeding of a giant wound with a bandaid. R*pe, sexual assault and abuse don't stop when a father or brother protects their daughter or sister more or better. It stops when we deal with how these ideals of violation are taught in the first place.

Page 148- part 1

Just a quick note to make it very clear that you don't get cancer or have pre-cancer from having multiple or too many sexual partners.

Page 148 - part 2

Interestingly, god's forgiveness is a theme of this book—there is an entire chapter on it later on. However, time and time again it is implied and overtly stated that sexual sin is different and has both life long and eternal consequences (see the next slide for an overt example). Also, it's not lost on me that the person they are talking about in this passage is King David who supposedly was punished for his sin of sex with a woman who was not his wife (and subsequently having her husband killed when he found out she was pregnant)...let's be very clear that David r*ped the woman (because...dynamics of power and control...he was the king, she could have been killed for saying no). Beyond that though fundamentalism and PC teaches that all sin is “equal at the

foot of the cross”, there is a lot of teaching in this and other books that sexual sin(s) has a very special trajectory that will impact you in this life and the afterlife.

Page 150

Ok, so here we go. Plain as day. In black and white. The teaching that sexual sin leads to death (both on earth and eternal conscious torment in Hell). I cannot think of any other sin that is taught to have this consequence. This is super abusive and downright terrifying. This is why, even after leaving PC, so many people have visceral responses to sex outside of marriage...why they often live in fear and terror that they have ruined their lives—not because they consciously believe it but because their bodies believe that they have just done something so damaging and dangerous that they are going to die. (Which also means it makes sense that our bodies would do whatever it takes and try to get our attention through obvious or subtle physical complications that would make it difficult or detrimental to have sex outside of marriage).

We also see here the acknowledgement that we are sexual beings, though it is framed under the guise of sexual temptation. Later on we see that the reason we have these desires but are not supposed to act on them is so that there will be a reward later on. But this, like so many other fundamentalist teachings, is complete gaslighting. Essentially, god created us, our sexuality, our sexual desires. He GAVE us these things and then put all these rules around them so that, if you don't follow them and instead act out in the way that you were inherently made, you will be punished. Gross.

Page 154

The book lays out all sorts of long term consequences for sexual sin...though there is literally no evidence to support this. These are giant assumptions that are made. In this part of the book we see that two people had sex before they are married and two years into the marriage they are having sexual issues. The assumed reason? Premarital sex (aka sexual sin). At the very least we should consider the shame they felt from having premarital sex as a reason why their sexual relationship is strained—imagine the shame and fear you would feel if you believed this thing you did was going to not only bring you death but all sorts of other negative consequences throughout your life.

Personal Story: This is a common sentiment among people coming out of these types of religions and systems. I have friends and family and clients who have lamented over parts of their life being a struggle or not going as desired and they truly believe (or have believed) that it is a result of premarital sex. I believed this for a long time too...I believed that the reason my body was gaining massive amounts of weight or that I was having money problems or that I couldn't seem to make a romantic relationship stick was because I had premarital sex. While I do not believe this anymore (also, hello trauma responses!) it took a long time for my body to recognize that I was not going to hell, nor did I need to suffer on earth, for having sex.

Page 160 AND Page 163

While the author is clear that each person and couple has to take the time to develop their own personal physical boundaries and rules about physical intimacy in a relationship, he makes a strong case that even kissing before marriage could be sinful. PC teaches that our bodies are designed to go from “A to Z” in regard to physical intimacy...kissing always leads to more. So if we engage in kissing, we are setting ourselves up to want more which would be sinful if we acted on it AND sinful if we are desiring it.

Further, we see that even beyond our actual actions we have to have a pure thought life, pure motivations and constantly keep ourselves in check. And since we have sinful hearts (aka emotions are sinful), when the author asks “is my sinful heart deceiving me?” (in terms of trying to decide if kissing is ok for me/us) the answer would be almost unequivocally yes. This is where PC really does a lot of damage. Despite having nearly no biblical backing, the way these authors use other parts of the bible combined with their own interpretation of how this should be applied leads to rules and consequences determined by various people and removes all autonomy and ability to trust yourself.

Page 165

Like other PC books, the author addresses the “what if we are sexually compatible?” argument that people use (obviously because they are trying to sin and want to have premarital sex!)...he goes beyond what some other authors say (if you’ve never had sex before then you have nothing to compare it to!) and suggests that sexual incompatibility comes only from sin and selfishness. It’s important to note that this is CATEGORICALLY FALSE. Sexual compatibility can happen for a number of reasons (different preferences/interests, different desires around frequency, past trauma, sickness, injury, etc.) that have nothing to do with sin or selfishness.

Also, to promote this idea can bring a lot of shame and people who force them to do/engage with things they are not comfortable doing/engaging with. If we believe sexual incompatibility is due to sin or selfishness, I will be inclined to believe that it is MY sin or selfishness. Therefore, rather than listening to my body or even talking to my partner about it, I would be more likely to push through, override internal cues and even divorce myself from my body during these sexual encounters rather than having to deal with fear, shame, and terror that any incompatibility means something about my own sinfulness.

(And while this author certainly does NOT say this, there are other authors and preachers that go so far as to say that if there is something that your partner wants you to do and you don’t want to it’s not only incompatibility, it’s sin...that you need to repent of and then push through and just “do it” in order to honor and respect your partner).

Page 172

This is an excerpt from the chapter on how to deal with past sexual sin. The entire book up until this point has promoted overtly and covertly that sexual sin has long lasting consequences on

earth and after you die. Unlike any other thing considered sin, sexual sin is something that seems to be the root of why anything else in your life isn't going as you wish. Here we see someone say they fear that they are still single because of past sexual sin. Why wouldn't this person think this when this is literally what they have been taught?

Personal Story: After I ended things with the man I was courting (the one that the leaders of my church absolutely destroyed me over) I experienced a long period of singleness. Though I had repented, sought counsel and really did have my “ducks in a row”, literally no one took interest in me—in fact, the opposite. I would often receive reprimand from others about how my genuine friendliness and kindness towards everyone, including men, was evidence of me trying to usurp men's roles in relationships. After 3-4 years of singleness I confided in my best friend—I let her know how terrified I was that my singleness was god's punishment for being with this other man whom the church leaders had been so opposed to (one quick side note: by “being with another man” I do not mean sexually, at all. I mean merely courting him. The furthest we went sexually was him kissing my hand. The sin was not sexual in nature, in terms of a physical act, but that I had remained in this romantic relationship despite what the leaders wanted for me). After explaining my fears to her (which ended with me sobbing), she, with zero compassion, responded with “I mean honestly, you're probably right. You messed up big time and I wouldn't be surprised if this is punishment for it.” I wasn't even mad at her...it hurt to hear those words—because they affirmed this great fear I had. But I wasn't mad at her for saying them...because I honestly believed this was the case.

Page 176

Here is one of the most manipulative teachings at the crux of purity culture: you need to stay pure because Jesus died on the cross for your sins...YOU did these things to him so you owe it to him to live according to his rules. For MANY reasons this is problematic...not the least of which is the recognition that not only did we not ask Jesus to die for us, he died for us for doing the thing he created us to do (narcissistic much?) This teaching hinges on the theological principles that we were created to be sinners—from the very first breath we take, we are sinners. There is nothing good in us, this is woven into our DNA, it's how we were born. So god created us and then punishes us for the way he created us. I believe this would be the definition of gaslighting. And then we see this grow into all these other areas. God creates us as sexual beings, but unless we do things in a very prescribed way (which is prescribed by people and not outlined in the bible at all) we will be punished, again, for the thing he has created us to do and be. It may seem obvious how harmful this teaching is on the outside, but when you are in it, the amount of guilt and shame and absolute terror it brings when you engage in various sinful acts is debilitating.

Page 177

And to end this review...let's just reiterate very clearly that this statement right here affirms that purity culture is not just “don't have sex before you are married”...it's so much more. Look at the provocative and fear-based language that is used. To sin sexually is committing TREASON against god, it is ABUSING our bodies, it is DESERVING of hell...so you better be glad that Jesus died for you. Wow.

PFinal Recap

Well, there you have it! It's ok if you feel like you need to take a shower or use your punching bag after reading these through. In fact, I would encourage it. Notice how your body feels as you read these passages from the book and see how problematic they are. Notice if your body feels like you need to DO anything—perhaps even doing the thing that you never got to do. Many times as I read this book I found myself needing to re-focus on my breath (as I was panic-breathing), yell out profanities or even connect to my younger self to remind her that this was not just false but that it was dangerous and abusive teachings and that we were safe to push against it now.

I would love to know your thoughts after reading this review...what did you learn, see for the first time, what were you shocked or dismayed by?