

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 "clave" 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**

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 that 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 gander" 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 "*malakoi*". 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. "effeminates" 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 perverts" 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 perverts" RSV, REB

4. "homosexual perverts" 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!**