



A GOOD QUESTION...

A number of years ago, I had the privilege of teaching at a school of ministry. My students were hungry for God, and I was constantly searching for ways to challenge them to fall more in love with Jesus and to become voices for revival in the Church.

I came across a quote attributed most often to Sam Pascoe. It is a short version of the history of Christianity, and it goes like this:

Christianity started in Palestine as a fellowship; it moved to Greece and became a philosophy; it moved to Italy and became an institution; it moved to Europe and became a culture; it came to America and became an enterprise.

Some of the students were only 18 or 19 years old--barely out of diapers--and I wanted them to understand and appreciate the import of the last line, so I clarified it by adding, "An enterprise. That's a business."

After a few moments Martha, the youngest student in the class, raised her hand. I could not imagine what her question might be. I thought the little vignette was self-explanatory, and that I had performed it brilliantly.

Nevertheless, I acknowledged Martha's raised hand, "Yes, Martha." She asked such a simple question, "A business? But isn't it supposed to be a body?" I could not envision where this line of questioning was going, and that the only response I could think of was, "Yes."

She continued, "But when a body becomes a business, isn't that a prostitute?"

The room went dead silent. For several seconds no one moved or spoke. We were stunned, afraid to make a

sound because the presence of God had flooded into the room, and we knew we were on holy ground.

All I could think in those sacred moments was, "Wow, I wish I'd thought of that." I didn't dare express that thought aloud. God had taken over the class.

Martha's question changed my life. For six months, I thought about her question at least once every day. "When a body becomes a business, isn't that a prostitute?"

There is only one answer to her question. The answer is "Yes."

--D. Ryser from Phillip Watkinson

Adultery Considered Morally Taboo by Most

"In light of the latest elected officials to publicly admit to having extramarital affairs, Gallup's latest Values and Beliefs update conducted last month shows that 92% of Americans say married men and women having an affair is morally wrong, garnering more disgrace than any other moral issue tested in the poll. Some of the other issues considered morally wrong by those polled were: polygamy (91%); cloning (88%); abortion (56%); gay or lesbian relations (47%); having a baby outside of marriage (45%); sex between an unmarried man and woman (40%); embryonic stem cell research (36%); divorce and death penalty, both at 30%."

--Christian News July 13th, 2009

So now we're voting on morality! If there is no God, the question is irrelevant. There are no absolutes. If evolution is true and if men are only animals, mating is natural and not sinful. Few creatures are monogamous.

But if there is a God, and if God has spoken, man has no vote! To those who say the death penalty is morally wrong, one has to be Biblically ignorant. Our thoughts are not God's thoughts..."



COMPASSION...BETTER THAN CONDEMNATION



Years ago where I ministered, there was a basketball league in which the congregation took part. There was a game between the Methodist Church and our team. The Methodist preacher

had just lost a daughter in an accident a couple of weeks before the game. The game was close and both teams of course, wanted to win.

The Methodist preacher was in earnest and in his excitement he swore and let out a curse word. Evidently it was quite loud, as everyone seemed to have heard it. When people came up to me and ask me if I had heard what the Methodist preacher said, I got the feeling they expected me to condemn him.

I put myself in his place and knew how sorry I would be if that would have happened to me. I looked at the accusers and said, "Did you just lose a daughter in an accident?" The looked at me shocked and answered, "No".

I replied, "Well remember, he did. You ought to be grieving for his loss and understand his frustration. I am sure that he regrets his sin as much as I would if it were me."

Those who heard me must have told the whole community as everywhere I went, people, even strangers, thanked me for my compassion for the minister and not taking advantage of the situation to condemn him and build myself up.

In a few days, the preacher even came by my home and thanked me for my kindness and said that until he gets a hold of himself he would refrain from playing. My heart went out to him, as I am sure he was hurting not only for the loss of his daughter, but for his burst of anger.

I just felt like Jesus was there and since I was not without sin, I never threw stones. I found out the truth of the words of Scripture, "It is a glory for a man to overlook a fault."

I never did it for glory. It was just one of those times that I do not have enough in my life, that I acted in a Christ-like spirit instead of in the flesh.

I wish I could say that I always respond like I think that Jesus would!



Dear Brother Faull,

I heard you say that Jesus was not fearful of the cross and the cup He wished not to drink was not the cross. I think you are wrong.

Answer:

It's okay to disagree with me, I've been wrong before about several things.

I wouldn't be surprised if you haven't been wrong once or twice in your life. It is not something to look upon the other as a false teacher.

Here is why I believe this prayer was not about His dying on the cross.

FIRST

Before the foundation of the earth, the cross was the plan of God and the Fathers' Will.

SECOND

He came to do the Father's Will and always did do the Father's Will and He knew that the cross was His destiny.

THIRD

He repeatedly had told His disciples that He would be crucified and raised from the dead on the third day.

FOURTH

He knew that there was no other way for sin to be forgiven but by the shedding of blood of the perfect, sacrificial Lamb of God to take away the sins of the world.

He came into the world to save sinners. Therefore, it is in my judgment, ludicrous to say, He was praying to the Father to remove the cup of the death on the cross.

This questions His manhood and Deity to believe He was afraid to face the cross.

We are told in all Gospels some amazing things in:

Matthew 26:37-38, "37 And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and **began to be sorrowful and very heavy**. 38 Then saith he unto them, **My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death**: tarry ye here, and watch with me."

Mark 14:33-36, "33 And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and **began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy**; 34 And saith unto them, **My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death**: tarry ye here, and watch. 35 And he went forward a little, and fell on the

ground, and prayed that, **if it were possible, the hour might pass from him.** 36 And he said, Abba, Father, all things *are* possible unto thee; take away **this cup** from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt.”

Luke 22:41-44, “41 And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, 42 Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove **this cup** from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. 43 And there **appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.** 44 And **being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.**”

LOOK AT THESE CAREFULLY:

- He began to be sorrowful and very heavy and claimed, “My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death.”
- He began to be sore amazed and very heavy. And again, “My soul is exceedingly sorrowful unto death.”
- He asked, “This cup be taken from me, not My Will, but Thine be done.”
- An angel appeared as they did at His first great temptation and strengthened Him.
- He was in agony, great drops as of blood fell down to the ground.

QUESTIONS:

- × What caused Him to be “sore amazed” and “very heavy”?
- × Was He or was He not exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death?
- × Was it necessary for Him to be strengthened by an angel or not, in order to be able to fight His battle with Satan?
- × Was He in great agony or not, in the garden?
- × Did He drop great drops as of blood to the ground, or not?
- × Did He pray more exceedingly for the cup to pass and was His prayers heard (that is, answered)?

Read **Hebrews 5:7-8** and ask yourself if these verses do not describe the garden event.

“7 Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him **that was able to save him from death**, and was **heard in that he feared**; 8 Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered;”

QUESTION:

What was He praying for?

ANSWER:

That He may be saved from death.

QUESTION:

Was He heard?

ANSWER:

Yes. He did not die in the garden, but was saved from death.

QUESTION:

Was He saved from death on the cross?

ANSWER:

No, because that was not His concern.

He was the author and finisher of the cross plan. He faced that with joy and endured the cross and despised the shame.

Hebrews 12:2, “Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of *our* faith; **who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame**, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.”

Jesus fought in prayer for His life in the garden as Satan made a desperate attempt to stop the plan of the cross by not letting Christ get to the cross. The cup He faced was dying in the garden before He could fulfill the Father's only plan and Will to die on the cross and become a curse for us.

A perfectly healthy and emotionally stable God-man did not have an attack of fearful anxiety to what men were going to do to Him.

Many a man has sat in a jail cell and seen the gallows outside his window knowing that death would follow the next morning, and gallantly walked out to be hung or shot by a firing squad.

Jesus was no trembling coward. He was one greatly attacked by Satan, who sought His life in the garden. It was not ordinary. He sweat as if drops of blood. He was amazed and very heavy and troubled to the point of death. But Jesus overcame him and went on to die on the cross as planned of the Father.

“Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that **through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;**”

--**Hebrews 2:14**

Jesus had said these words: “But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!” **Luke 12:50**

The word “straitened” is the word *sunecho* (4912) to “hold together”.

Jesus was concerned until He would complete His assignment on the cross. He had told James and John of a baptism of suffering that they must endure.

Matthew 20:22-23, "22 But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. 23 And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father."

"The cup" is not always about the cross, for they did not endure a cross, but they did drink the cup of suffering He foretold of them.

John 12:24-27 throws further light on our subject. In verse 24, He had said the hour is come that the Son of man would be glorified. He points out that corn must fall in the ground and die or it cannot bring fruit and one must hate his own life in order to keep it.

He then demands that His servants must follow His example but "Now is my soul troubled and should I say Father, save me from this hour? Was it not for this cause I came into this hour?"

I, for one, cannot imagine that He would pray to avoid the cross when He came for this very cause. This does not mean, however, that I do not regard you as my Brother-in-Christ because you do not agree with me!

Please Contact Us If You Desire Any of the Following:

- ➔ **Summit Theological Seminary catalog** (Free)
- ➔ **Voices of Victory (tape, CD and article) catalog** (Free)
- ➔ **Information on Annuities and Retirement**
- ➔ **Sermon Subscription:** Audio Tapes at \$12.50 or CD's at \$16.00 a month. (These are mailed out every 2 months to save on postage, making it \$25.00 every 2 months for Tapes and \$32.00 for CD's.)
- ➔ **One Year's Subscription of the Gospel Unashamed**
\$5.00 a year, which is mailed out quarterly. You will receive 4 issues a year. Or, GOSPEL UNASHAMED on the Internet for **free**. (Please send your name, contact number and email address.)

SUMMIT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
2766 Airport Road - Peru, IN 46970
(765) 472-4111
summit1@myvine.com

Dear Brother Faull,

I have grandparents who were never baptized. I know they were saved and I will see them in Heaven. The Thief on the cross was not baptized.

Answer:

Go to this website, www.summit1.edu, and listen to the sermon on "Why the Thief on the Cross was Saved". He was pardoned under the old covenant. Listen with an open mind to this sermon.

SOME QUESTIONS:

Can a person be saved without:

- × The remission of sins? **Acts 2:38**
- × The Holy Spirit? **Acts 2:38, 5:32**
- × Being saved? **Mark 16:16**
- × Their sins washed away? **Acts 22:16**
- × Being in Christ? **Galatians 3:27**
- × Being raised with Christ? **Romans 6:2-4**
- × A good conscience? **I Peter 3:21**
- × Obeying the Gospel? **II Thessalonians 1:8**
- × Being obedient from the heart to the Gospel in the dramatization of Christ's death, burial and resurrection? **Romans 6:17-18**
- × Being born of the water and the Spirit? **John 3:5, Titus 3:5**

When I get to Heaven I cannot say that I did not preach baptism is essential to salvation because I had a friend whose loved ones were not baptized and he guarantees me they were saved. I must preach what the Word says. I am not a judge. I am a faithful preacher of the things that Jesus commanded and promised. I set myself up a judge if I promise salvation to anyone who did not obey Jesus.

Those who refuse to be baptized of John were said to have "rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of John." Those who obeyed it justified God. **Luke 7:29-30**

I cannot be one of those religious leaders who judge by appearances, for many call Him Lord and do wonderful works in His name, but are not allowed in. This applies to people who have been baptized as well. It is not the hearer, but the doer. Remember **Matthew 7:21-29**.

It is impossible for God to lie. He says the words that He spoke will judge in that day. What it says now, it will say then. I have grandparents, too, who never obeyed and they have no promise of salvation.

Let God be true and every man a liar. To that I have to sorrowfully say, "Amen", even though I know it is right. My thoughts are not His thoughts.

God bless you, brother, as you think about these thoughts. I love you in the Lord.

IS HOMOSEXUALITY MORAL ACCORDING TO THE BIBLE?



"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

Proverbs 16:26

TWO UNBELIEVABLE QUOTES:

"Homosexuality is one of God's most significant gifts to humanity. To be gay or lesbian is to receive a special blessing from God. All humans receive their own special graces from their creator, but God has chosen some to be gay and lesbian in a way revealing something about God-self that heterosexuals do not. On the acceptance of this premise all authentic and successful spiritual direction with gays and lesbians starts or falls."

(James L. Empereur, SJ in "Spiritual Direction and Gay Person.")

"Being gay or lesbian is part of God's plan and a unique gift to humanity. Rather than viewing it as something to be changed or hated, properly understood within the confines of the spiritual, this orientation should be welcomed, grasped and matured with the full understanding, emotional, and intellectual, that it is good and does participate in the divine plan of creation."

(*"Outpouring of the Spirit"*, John Edward Lazar)

FIRST

IT IS ALLEGED THAT BECAUSE JESUS SAID NOTHING ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY, THAT IT IS PERMISSIBLE TO PRACTICE IT.

- A. Then these sins are permissible:
 1. Pedophilia
 2. Bestiality
 3. Necrophilia
- B. **Matthew 19:3-9** on divorce when he spoke regarding divorce. What does this show?
 1. No animals were found for man ... so no bestiality.
 2. Made them Male and Female... no homosexuality.
 3. Eve was created from man, for man to the glory of man. (Man was not made from man, for man or for his glory.)
 4. Man is not bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. Woman is not bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh. **Genesis 2:23-24**
 5. What God hath joined let not man separate (man and woman).
- C. **I Corinthians 7** to avoid fornication let each man (husband-*Aner*) have his own wife (woman-*Gune*). **I Corinthians 7:2**

1. Homosexuals need to explain why God never gave a means for them to avoid fornication.
- D. The difference between fornication and adultery is (generic and specific) that one has a covenant and the other does not. **Hebrews 13:4**
- E. The apostles are Christ's ambassadors. They received the Holy Spirit and led them into all truth. Reject you, they reject me. Reject me, reject Him that sent me.
- F. They do speak of homosexuality. My lawyers speak for me as well as I speak for myself. Only those who have not yet learned this great truth would believe that only what Jesus said was relative to us today.
- G. Those who say the purpose of marriage is only companionship, not having children, are ludicrous. God created the world to be inhabited. (**Isaiah 45:18**). This could not be done by Adam and Steve.
- H. **Malachi 2:14-15** – Made a woman for companionship, covenant relationship, and children.

"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

SECOND

IT IS ALLEGED THAT THE SIN OF SODOM WAS INHOSPITALITY RATHER THAN HOMOSEXUALITY.

- A. The verse they quote: **Ezekiel 16:49**.
But read the next verse: **Ezekiel 16:50**.
- B. They deny that "that we may know them" has a sexual connotation. Many said it just means "to know" or "to be acquainted with".
- C. What is the abomination that they committed....not inviting strangers into their home???
- D. Isaiah says this of them.... Declare their sin like Sodom. **Isaiah 3:9**
- E. Is **Genesis 18:20** really inhospitality? Let's see. **Genesis 19:1-5**
 1. Lot pressed the angels not to lodge in the streets.... Why, because no one would invite them home?
 2. "They pressed to have them come out to know them"...does that mean get acquainted with them? Seems friendly enough. So did Lot mean, do not so wickedly as to get acquainted with them?
 3. Lot would not bring them out and was careful to shut the door.
 4. He offered his two virgins daughters who had never known a man. Had they never been acquainted with a man?
 5. "Know" means "sex" **Genesis 4:1, 25; Genesis 38:26**
 6. These men of Sodom were dying to meet these fellows and tried to break down the door after struck blind.
 7. Angels had to defend Lot from these "friendly folk" and strike them blind and then destroy them for not being hospitable!!!!

8. They only needed 10 righteous people and found only four. So He only needed 3 consensual, loving faithful partners.
9. Imagine, in the whole Sodom and Gomorrah area, there were not even six homosexuals (who supposedly were born that way) who were living righteously. That would only be 3 gay couples!
10. Some even quote Jesus and abuse the text in **Matthew 10:14-15** as proof that their sin was inhospitality. The reason Sodom and Gomorrah will stand and testify against the Jews of Jesus' day is not just because they would not receive the apostles into their homes, but because they would not hear the words of the apostles.
11. What does Jude say was their sin? **Jude 1:7**, "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." No mention of inhospitality.
12. See the same sin and circumstance in **Judges 19:22-28**. What does the inspired Scripture call the homosexuals in verse 22? Sons of Belial (worthless, wicked, evil men). See Strong's #01100

"There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

THIRD

IT IS ALLEGED THAT SOME OF THE GREATEST BIBLE CHARACTERS WERE HOMOSEXUAL LOVERS.

A. Some allege this of Ruth and Naomi.

× **Genesis 2:24**

× **Ruth 1:14**

THEIR ARGUMENT:

The same Hebrew word used in **Genesis 2:24** describes how Adam felt about Eve (and how spouses are supposed to feel toward each other) is used in **Ruth 1:14** to describe how Ruth felt about Naomi. Her feelings are celebrated, not condemned. Also, Ruth's beautiful words to Naomi illustrated the nature of a marriage covenant and are read at church weddings. The fact that they are the words of a woman to a woman tells us a lot about how God feels about same gender relationships.

ANSWER:

No, the above tells us something about the person who can grasp at such straws to defend their sin. Such persons are one of two things: deceitfully wicked or woefully ignorant.

1. The Hebrew word in **Genesis 2:24** and **Ruth 1:14** is *dabaq* (cleave). Because this word is used it is foolishly alleged that there is a basis for people of the same sex to be partners. This is pure foolishness.

- a. The word is used of fighting as well as loving. **Judges 20:42** speaks of overtaking (*dabaq*) and destroying enemies.
- b. Lot was afraid some evil would take me (*dabaq*) and I die. **Genesis 19:19**
- c. God warned the Israelites not to let any of the cursed things (spoils of war) cleave (*dabaq*) to their hands. (Like Achan did – **Deuteronomy 13:17**)
- d. In the same book Ruth kept fast (*dabaq*) to Boaz's young men. Wow! **Ruth 2:21** What an inference by their definition of the word.
- e. Ruth kept fast (*dabaq*) also to Boaz's maidens. Wow! **Ruth 2:23** Is she bisexual?
- f. The Philistines followed hard (*dabaq*) after their enemies and Saul in battle. **I Samuel 14:22, 31, II Samuel 1:6**
- g. The man of Judah cleave (*dabaq*) after their king. **II Samuel 20:2**
- h. David clung (*dabaq*) to his sword until his hand was weary. **II Samuel 23:10**
- i. Some cleave (*dabaq*) to their sins. **II Kings 3:3**
- j. Naaman's leprosy cleave (*dabaq*) to the servant of the prophet for lying. **II Kings 8:27**

On and on we find the word in Scriptures used of things "cleaving". Such as:

- ✓ Skin to bones.
- ✓ Scales to fish.
- ✓ Tongues to the roof of the mouth.
- ✓ Soul to dust.
- ✓ Cleaving to the Lord.

To say because Ruth "cleave" to Naomi defends homosexuals "cleaving" to one another is as ridiculous as saying Sarah raped (*anah*) Hagar in **Genesis 16:6** because that is the same word used in **Judges 20:5** of the sodomites raping the concubine all night.

a. **Genesis 16:6**

b. **Judges 20:5**

c. Almost any teaching could be validated if merely using the same word is the basis of the proposition.

2. If Ruth and Naomi were lovers, they were guilty of incest.
3. To argue that because Ruth's beautiful words to Naomi make a beautiful wedding vow for a marriage between a man and his wife would justify wedding vows between two lesbians today is absurd. Ruth's vows were not a wedding vow. It was a vow of a single woman to her mother-in-law and no sexual overtones exist in the words. **Ruth 1:16-17** Naomi looked at her as a daughter – **Ruth 2:2** and is the one who helped secure a husband for Ruth. She had mourned she had no more sons to give her for a husband **1:13** and she was too old to have a husband **1:12**. To get a romantic relationship **3:4, 18** out of this requires a sick mind.

4. They say she helped Ruth to seduce Boaz to a marriage contract so he would support their security together. This is slander.
5. They also claim that the word “daughter-in-law” in **Ruth 4:15** can be translated, “bride”, inferring that they were married. Of course, its meaning here is your son’s bride is better than ten sons. See **I Chronicles 2:4** of Judah and his son’s bride, Tamar. Again, such dishonesty proves the weakness of their argument.
6. To turn Ruth’s promise of the dedication to her dead husband’s mother into a vow like unto marriage and justify a lesbian relationship is a wicked assumption.
7. She did cleave (*dabaq*) to Naomi but she also cleaved to Boaz’s young men and his maidens. There was no romantic relationship with any of these. She was not a bisexual woman. She was simply a faithful wife to her first husband and his mother and later to her new husband, Boaz. Oh, how it vexes my spirit to see how men pervert the Words of the Lord. We do not resent two Christian women agreeing to live together and helping out the other but to defend a lesbian relationship based on one Hebrew word is nothing short of ludicrous. I heard of one lesbian who attended a wedding who upon hearing Ruth’s vow to Naomi, used of a man and woman, “I now have fantasies of interrupting poor unsuspecting heterosexuals at their wedding with ‘STOP, IN THE NAME OF RUTH AND NAOMI, STOP STEALING OUR STORIES WHILE MAKING OUR RELATIONSHIPS ILLEGAL OR CHARACTERIZING THEM AS IMMORAL.’”

It appears to me if Ruth was giving a commitment with sexual overtones to Naomi, she was not true to her vow because she married Naomi’s near kinsman. All this makes Ruth a bisexual, promiscuous, lesbian who was also guilty of incest. Poor Ruth!!! She is slandered after 33 centuries by gay preachers professing to be faithful to God. It is almost too much for us to bear!

- B. Some allege that Jonathan and David were homosexual lovers.

THEIR ARGUMENT:

At Jonathan’s funeral, David declared that he loved Jonathan more than any woman. This is just one of several Bible passages that describe and celebrate an intense love between these men that went well beyond friendship.

1. **I Samuel 18:1-4** – They say this is love at first sight on Jonathan’s part.
2. **I Samuel 20:30** – They see this is a father angry at a son for not giving up a gay relationship.
3. **I Samuel 2:41-42** – They see this as a homosexual pact since their homosexual love was doomed by death.

4. **II Samuel 1:23, 26-27** – They think this is David’s love song concerning Jonathan that he taught all Israel to sing. They say, “Here it is in black and white.” David states the love he shared with Jonathan was greater than which he had experienced with woman. In this story we have a direct Biblical answer to the question, “Can two people of the same sex live in a loving committed relationship with God’s favor? The answer is yes! Because Jonathan or David did and the Bible celebrates their relationship. They ask, “Have you ever heard of a heterosexual man say he loved his male friend more than his wife?” What do I think of their conclusion?

ANSWER:

It is a biased assumption looking through the colored homosexual glasses. They can only think of the term “love” with sexual connotations.

1. These men ignore the fact that Jonathan was a married man. Any sexual involvement would be adultery on his part. (They always ignore this and contrary to all their talk of a monogamous homosexual marriage they are always trying to show it is moral even when it is between married people or family members.)
2. Later, David marries Jonathan’s sister. So a sexual relationship between Jonathan and David would be incestuous and adultery on David’s part. What kind of cad has an affair with his wife’s brother???
3. Jonathan was a great warrior himself in the preceding chapters. Jonathan’s soul was knit to David for his bravery and courage. Upon hearing the talk between David and Saul, he identified with him and loved him as his own soul. This is an expression for a good friend.

Deuteronomy 13:6 (Notice, not a friend of thy bosom.) He delighted in David and over time, as David stayed at the palace of Saul, they became good friends. To say they lived together as lovers is ludicrous. Jonathan loved David so much that Jonathan gave him his Royal robe and garments, girdle, bow and even his sword (only Saul and Jonathan had one). **I Samuel 13:19-22** In giving all these things to David, he surrendered his right to be king. This makes the people accept the person of David. Jonathan risked his life for David. His father’s anger was not about a homosexual relationship between the two. He was angry because Jonathan was refusing the Kingdom and keeping alive the dynasty of Saul since he was recognizing David as Israel’s next king. Saul called Jonathan a rebellious son for

insisting that Jonathan did not have the right to be Saul's successor as King, shaming his mother. Jonathan had told David, "And he said unto him, Fear not: for the hand of Saul my father shall not find thee; and thou shalt be king over Israel, and I shall be next unto thee; and that also Saul my father knoweth." **I Samuel 23:17** Later, Saul said in **I Samuel 24:20-21** So Saul knew God had taken the kingdom from him and David was to be his successor. Saul and Jonathan both knew it. Jonathan approved of God's plan. He loved David as his own soul and was willing to be second to him as David was such a friend that he loved him as his own soul.

4. Jonathan and David made a covenant to protect one another and their seed. Often when a man became king he would kill anybody who might usurp their throne. David kept his covenant with Jonathan when he became King and looked for any of Jonathan's descendants to bless. He did so for Mephibosheth. **II Samuel 9:6-13** It should be remembered that Saul, Jonathan, Abigail and Abiathar all knew David would be king. Jonathan wanted it so because he loved David and complied with the Will of God, unlike his father, Saul. When Saul and Jonathan were killed, David's beautiful eulogy praises not only Jonathan but Saul. Both were called lovely and pleasant in their lives. David was deeply grieved. Note his words concerning Jonathan, "I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me: **thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women.**"

Here the homosexual bias takes over and is clearly seen. There is no hint of sexual love. David says that Jonathan's love was "more wonderful toward him than that of a love of a woman". A woman's love is known to be strong towards those she loves. **It does not say David's love for Jonathan surpassed his love for women but Jonathan's love for him surpassed a woman's love for him.** The sexual connotation that they always put on the word "love" is not the aim of David's praise. What a foolish thing for their idea would be for David to have sung, "The love (sex) he gave was better than that which a woman gives" or "My love for him was greater than that for any woman." What absurd songs to teach a nation in song. What man in his right mind would give either song?

David had a lot of women to compare the genuine, unselfish, love of Jonathan to a man's love. Friend's love can be fickle. Jonathan's love was genuine. It surpassed in its genuineness the love of a woman for her husband, children or family. That's a long way from homosexual love. One writer tries to prey on his reader's ignorance and points out that the love David and Jonathan

shared was expressed in the same word for "love" in sexual passages of the Song of Solomon's. He fails to mention the same word is used often of God's love for Israel - **II Chronicles 2:11, 9:8, Jeremiah 31:3.**

The Proverb is true "A little knowledge is dangerous." David was not a cheating bisexual, incestuous, brother-in-law. He was a faithful man of God. They slander both men. Unfortunately the two friends are not here to defend their integrity against such evil allegations. Many men's souls are knit together, yet sexual thoughts never 'enter their mind'. The assumptions of those who make them gay lovers tells more about the one assuming than it does about David and Jonathan.

- C. Some allege that Jesus and John were homosexual lovers.

THEIR ARGUMENT:

John only described himself as "The one whom Jesus loved." The sexuality of Jesus was not mentioned so conclusions on that subject are pure speculation. However, John did call attention to the special affection Jesus had toward him personally. In **John 13:23**, John is shown laying his head on Jesus' bosom. It is clear that John understood Jesus to have a unique affection for him, an affection that must be described as same gender.

ANSWER:

This demonstrates the prejudice, the assumptions, and jumping to asinine conclusions that are the typical foundation of the Gay community arguments to sustain gay sex. It never seems to dawn on people that John was being humble and simply identified himself as "the disciple Jesus loved." He was not boasting of a special relationship with Jesus, especially a homosexual one. He was being humble by not mentioning his name.

It is used in:

1. **John 13:23**
2. **John 19:26**
3. **John 20:2**
4. **John 21:7, 20**

Here is a lesson for the spiritual minded that is missed by the carnally minded:

When one is humbling himself as John did by not mentioning his own name, he has caused people to exalt him by assuming he was the most beloved of Jesus. However, John could not know he was the most beloved of the Lord but he did feel the love of Christ. If the Lord had told him he

was the most beloved then we could know it was true. John humbled himself and so he is exalted.

As for resting his head on Jesus' bosom – the ignorance of those who want to make this significant is easily seen. When eating, the Jews reclined, resting their head upon their left arm. This means that each of the disciple's heads was resting on the bosom of the man next to him. Someone would have had their head laying on John's bosom. Was he two-timing Jesus? Most of all the disciples' head was on someone's bosom. Perhaps DaVinci should have studied the Jews' eating habits before showing the Last Supper with men dining at a table. Speaking of DaVinci, The DaVinci Code tries to make a romantic connection between Jesus and Mary Magdalene. The DaVinci Code fails to establish such a relationship between them. Everyone seems to have an agenda to make Jesus a sexual partner with someone. The one assumption is as ridiculous as the other. Both attempt to make Jesus like them and both fall short of their goal.

- D. Some allege Jesus affirmed the Roman Centurion and a boy-lover.

PAIS = *CHILD, SERVANT*

THEIR ARGUMENT:

Jesus affirmed this homosexual couple, for the servant is called a "*pais*". He is his "boy lover", not just an ordinary servant of the Centurion. He was very dear to him. **Matthew 8:5-13**

ANSWER:

The word "*Pais*" (child) used of:

A Girl

× **Luke 8:54**

A Boy

× **Luke 9:42**

× **Matthew 17:18**

Menservants or Servants

× **Matthew 14:2**

× **Luke 12:45**

× **Luke 15:26**

A man's own child

× **John 4:51**

Jesus

× **Acts 3:13, 26**

× **Acts 4:27, 30**

× **Luke 2:43**

× **Acts 3:26**

× **Matthew 12:18**

David

× **Luke 1:69**

Young man who fell out of the window.

× **Acts 20:12**

Infants of babes at Bethlehem

× **Matthew 2:16**

Crowd of children

× **Matthew 21:15**

× **Matthew 2:18**

Nation of Israel

× **Luke 1:54**

This word is used of the child servant that was dear to this Gentile Centurion. He was not a "Boy-lover" because he is called "*PAIS*" that was dear to him. This is reading into the text, eisegesis, not exegesis. It is definitely "exit Jesus". Try translating the darkened words "boy lovers" in each instance. Note these facts:

1. The word is never used as a boy lover anywhere in the New Testament.
2. It is used of Jesus more than anyone else!!!
3. It is not used exclusively of boys.
4. It is used of ones "own" son – did Jesus affirm incest?
5. Does this not "confirm" pedophilia as much as it does homosexuality?
6. What proves too much proves nothing.

This is handling the Word of God deceitfully. **II Corinthians 4:2** It is twisting the Scriptures to one's own damnation. **II Peter 3:16**

- E. Some allege the Ethiopian Eunuch was a homosexual.

THEIR ARGUMENT:

The eunuch was a homosexual for a eunuch does not have to be a castrated male.

ANSWER:

This is true of the Hebrew word for "*eunuch*" but Strong's Concordance of the Greek word, *eunouchos* says: "from *eune* (a bed) and 2192; a castrated person (such being employed in Oriental bed-chambers); by extension an impotent or unmarried man; by implication, a chamberlain (state-officer)--eunuch." **Acts 8:27, 38**

But what does the contention prove if we grant this black man was a homosexual? This would be the case of a homosexual becoming a Christian, not a Christian becoming a homosexual. What proves too much proves nothing. Of course God's grace and salvation is available to a repentant homosexual. We pray often for our homosexual friends. Jesus mentioned eunuchs in a definite context of sexuality. **Matthew 19:9-12**

If Jesus is speaking of homosexuals rather than ordinary eunuchs, it goes against those who say that

all homosexuals are born homosexuals? If these are homosexuals, we do not understand how men could make men homosexual. How would being homosexual benefit the Kingdom of God? Who can believe that Jesus is speaking of homosexuals in this passage? Is He not saying that some are born unable to have sex (hermaphrodite), some are made eunuchs by castration, and that some choose not to be married for the Kingdom of God's sake?

It does no good to quote that many Gentile eunuchs were homosexual rather than castrated because they were still the lovers of men, rather than women. Most eunuchs were castrated males. Only gays with a need for a proof text for their lifestyle would assume the Ethiopian eunuch was gay. Could he have been? Possibly! Was he? Believing such an assumption as a basis for the justification for their homosexual lifestyle is like playing Russian Roulette with your soul. Again, if the Ethiopian eunuch was a homosexual, it would only be an example of a homosexual becoming a Christian, not a Christian becoming a homosexual or staying one. **I Corinthians 6:9-11** shows those homosexuals that did become Christian did not stay practicing ones. There is forgiveness for repentant homosexuals.

“There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.”

IV. SOME ALLEGE THAT THE LEVITICAL PASSAGES ARE ONLY FOR THOSE ENGAGED IN CULTIC PROSTITUTION AND IDOLATRY.

Leviticus 18:22

Leviticus 20:13, 16

Well what else is in that so-called cultic chapter? **Verses 15-16** condemns bestiality. Does that only condemn cultic bestiality? Why may only homosexuals be allowed to engage in sexual activity but not heterosexuals? Why wouldn't we say, "What is good for the goose and the goose" and "the gander and the gander" is not good for "the goose and the gander?" Homosexuals always want privileges that normal people do not have. We suggest you go to <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NejRd5ByZLA> and listen to this song, "Come on Down to the Farm".

V. SOME ALLEGE THAT THE ROMANS 1:26-32 PASSAGE AND THE I CORINTHIANS 6:9-11 PASSAGES AND I TIMOTHY 1:9-10 ARE WRITTEN FOR ONLY THOSE WHO ARE NOT NATURALLY HOMOSEXUALS AND GIVEN OVER TO IDOLATRY, NOT A LOVING, CONSENSUAL, FAITHFUL AND LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIP.

I Corinthians 6:9

A. The Greek word for "effeminate" (NAS) is "*malako*". It means: "soft, soft to the touch...not simply of a male who practices forms of lewdness, but persons in general who are guilty

of addiction to sins of the flesh, voluptuous" (Vine, page 195).

"men and boys who allow themselves to be misused homosexually" (Arndt-Gingrich, page 488)

Other translations:

1. "effeminate" KJV, ASV, Estes, Phillips
 2. "male prostitutes" NIV, NRSV, New Century
- B. The Greek word for "homosexuals" (NAS), "homosexual offenders" (NAS) is "*arsenkoita*". It means:

"a male who practices homosexuality, pederast, sodomite" Arndt-Gingrich, page 109.

"from #730 and #2845, a sodomite: abuser of (that defiles) self with mankind" Strong #733, p. 16.

"abusers of themselves with mankind" is all one word in Greek. It is compound of (arsen) 'male' and (koite) 'bed' and so means, "one who lies with a male as with a female, a Sodomite." *Word Meanings in the New Testament*, Ralph Earle, pages 226-227.

Other translations:

1. "sexual pervers" McCord
 2. "homosexuals" Simply English, New Century
 3. "sodomites" NRSV, Jerusalem, Cassirer
- C. The above two words BOTH refer to homosexual practice. F. F. Bruce says the words "denote the passive and active roles (of homosexual behavior) respectively" (Commentary, page 61; also see Grosheide, p. 140; Barrett, p. 140). For that reason several translations simply COMBINE the two words, as follows:
1. "partakers in homosexuality" New Berkeley
 2. "men who sin sexually with other men" Beck
 3. "sexual pervers" RSV, REB
 4. "homosexual pervers" TEV
 5. "homosexual perversion, NEB

VI. SOME ALLEGE THAT IT IS A MATTER OF OPINION.

- A. This is absurd. The Church has understood the truth of this for 1900 years of history.
- B. These pseudo intellectuals preying on peoples' ignorance of the Bible and pretending a knowledge of Greek words that confirm their view, foster the misunderstanding of unstable souls. They give professional help to those looking for an excuse to continue in their sins.

“There is a way that seemeth right unto a man but the end thereof is the way of death.”

**PRACTICE DIVERSITY
MARRY THE OPPOSITE SEX!**