THE HOMOSEXUAL DISPUTE

TIMOTHY KLAVER

THE HOMOSEXUAL DISPUTE

What do the Scriptures teach?

TIMOTHY KLAVER

THE HOMOSEXUAL DISPUTE: What do the Scriptures teach?
© 2017 by Timothy Klaver

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the author. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Cover design and interior by Timothy Klaver.

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the New American Standard Bible®, Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked ESV are taken from The ESV® Bible (The Holy Bible, English Standard Version®), copyright © 2001 by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked NKJV are taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked NIV are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version® NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked KJV are taken from the King James Version of the Bible.

Scripture quotations marked QJV are taken from the Queen James Bible.

All emphasis in Scripture quotations has been added by the author.

ISBN-10: 1978267762
ISBN-13: 978-1978267763

Dedicated to all my brothers and sisters in Christ who are "contending earnestly for the faith" while studying "to present [themselves] approved to God as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, accurately handling the word of truth." May God bless you as you continue to "[fight] the good fight."

"I am the light of the world; he who follows Me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life."
John 8:12

"If we say that we have fellowship with Him and yet walk in the darkness, we [are liars] and do not practice the truth"
1 John 1:6

"Everyone who names the name of the Lord [must depart] from wickedness"
2 Timothy 2:19

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements 9

Introduction 11

Genesis 1 & 2 15
THE CREATION ACCOUNT VS. HOMOSEXUALITY

Genesis 19 27
WHAT THE BIBLE REALLY SAYS WERE THE SINS OF SODOM

Leviticus 18 & 22 39
RELIGIOUS PROHIBITIONS OR MORAL PROHIBITIONS?

Ezekiel 16 47
WAS SODOM'S SIN SOMETHING OTHER THAN HOMOSEXUALITY?

Romans 1 49
WHAT WAS PAUL RANTING ABOUT?

Romans 2 59
IS ROMANS 1:26-27 A MATTER OF NOT CONDEMNING EACH OTHER?

1 Corinthians 6 & 1 Timothy 1 63
DID THE BIBLICAL WORLD HAVE WORDS FOR 'HOMOSEXUALITY'?

Remaining Things 77
JUDE 1:7 AND *PAIS* (ΠΑΙΣ)

Illogical Arguments 81
YOUR 'FEELINGS' DO NOT MATTER, SO LOSE THE EMOTIONAL MANIPULATION

Temptations 89
THE TRUTH BEHIND HOMOSEXUALITY

It is ALL Homosexuality 91
ANYTHING NOT HETEROSEXUALITY IS A VARIANT FORM OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Gender & Sex 93
HOW MANY GENDERS ARE THERE? TWO OR MANY?

Mental Insanity 97
DEMANDING THAT THE REST OF THE WORLD ACCOMMODATE YOUR DISCONNECT FROM REALITY

Presumptuous Argument #1: Slavery 101
DID THE CHURCH RE-INTERPRET WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS?

Presumptuous Argument #2: Women Pastors 105
WHAT DID GOD SAY ABOUT IT, AND WHAT ROLE DID GOD GIVE WOMEN?

Conclusion 111

The Gospel 115

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my God, my Lord and Saviour Christ Jesus, for having provided me the opportunity to write this book and get it into the hands of my brothers and sisters in Christ so that they, too, may be set free by knowing the truth, for "you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). This book is written with the purposes in mind to:

1. glorify God and honour His Son (Romans 15:6; Colossians 1:18), and
2. educate the body of Christ regarding truth (2 Timothy 2:15; 3:16; Acts 17:11; 1 Corinthians 2:13).

I would also like to thank you, the reader, for picking up this book. It is by no accident that you have. I pray that you have picked it up because you are interested in learning the truth about what the Bible has to say on this very important subject, and that you are willing to obey God's Word and conform yourself to the truths revealed therein. As you read, may God open your eyes so that you can see precisely what He has written in His Word and what He has not. It is for you that I have put this book together. May God bless it for that purpose.

Thank you, one and all.

INTRODUCTION

If you are not already aware, in 2012 the homosexual community came out with their own *per*-version of the King James Bible, which they have dubbed the Queen James Bible, apparently because of the "*obvious gay link to King James, known amongst friends and courtiers as 'Queen James' because of his many gay lovers*."

The editors of this *per*-version claim they did not remove the "offending" verses, but that, "*We edited the Bible to prevent homophobic interpretations. We made changes to eight verses.*" First of all, there *are no* so-called "homophobic" interpretations; only *precise* interpretations of the *exact* words of Scripture. Second of all, the homosexual community is offended by these verses because these verses speak *the truth*. They *should be* offended. It lets them know that *they do not have the truth*. We can see evidence of this simply by reading 2 Corinthians 4:1-2:

> Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, we faint not; But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

As you will soon see, the homosexual community is guilty of breaking the things 2 Corinthians 4:1-2 says ought not to be done. While the homosexual community has been deceitfully dishonest and crafty with their

"editing" of their so-called "Bible," *all* the ancient commentaries on these eight passages interpret them as having to do with homosexuality. So how is the homosexual community going to claim "homophobic" interpretation when 2,000 years ago the *exact same* interpretation was being given?

The website for the Queen James Bible makes the false claim that homosexuality was first mentioned in the 1946 Revised Standard Version of the Bible:

> *There is no mention of or reference to homosexuality in any Bible prior to this—only interpretations have been made. Anti-LGBT Bible interpretations commonly cite only eight verses in the Bible that they interpret to mean homosexuality is a sin; Eight verses in a book of thousands!*

First of all, eight verses is *more than enough* to prove that homosexuality *is a sin*. In fact, if there were *only one* verse in all of Scripture condemning homosexuality, it would be *enough*. The Bible *only* has to say something *once* for it to be true. Second of all, these people *clearly* have not done their homework if they think no versions of the Bible prior to 1946 addressed homosexuality. The *word* "homosexual" may not have appeared in earlier versions, because it had not yet been coined, but that *does not* change a thing. In the Geneva Bibles you find the word "buggerer," which is the same as the word "somodite," which is homosexuality.

In this book, we are going to examine closely those verses handled deceitfully and re-interpreted by the Queen James Bible, as well as other verses pertinent to this issue. As Joe Dallas, a former practicing homosexual, said, "[Pro-gay theology] takes scriptures we're all familiar with, gives them an entirely new interpretation, backs its claims with the words of well-credentialed scholars, and gives birth to a new sexual ethic. Common sense may reject it, but until it's examined more closely, it's difficult to refute."[1] That is precisely what we are going to do. We are going to examine the Scripture closely by asking ourselves, "What do the Scriptures teach?" in order to uncover the truth.

Many of the arguments presented in this book come from various debates I have had with homosexuals, pro-gay theologians, or those who side with homosexuals because they have already been emotionally manipulated and brainwashed by the illogical rhetoric and actually believe there is nothing wrong with people being homosexual. We will respond to these arguments biblically, logically, and intelligently to expose them for

---

[1] Joe Dallas, *The Gay Gospel?: How Pro-Gay Advocates Misread the Bible* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2007), 172.

what they are: ridiculous and indefensible.

There is one very important point I need to stress here. *Homosexuals are not our enemies*! They are merely under a delusion, like any other sinner. As Christians, we are to love and extend grace to those struggling with the temptations of homosexuality, just as we are to love and extend grace to those struggling with the temptations of any other sin (liars, thieves, murderers, rapists, etc., etc., etc.). This *does not* mean that we accept their behaviour and make excuses for it. We *do not* condone or support their sinful behaviour and lifestyle under *any* circumstances. As much as is within us, we are to "[speak] the truth in love" (Eph. 4:15). Remember, "such *were* some of you" (1 Cor. 6:11); we too "formerly lived in the lusts of our flesh, indulging the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3). But we have "laid aside the old self with its evil practices" (Col. 3:9), "putting to death the deeds of the body" (Rom. 8:13).

I am very good at speaking the truth, but I often struggle to speak the truth in love. I have endeavoured to do so in this book, but if I have failed I ask those reading it to please forgive me. I, like many of you, have not yet attained perfection, but I strive for it as did the Apostle Paul.

Lord God, I thank You for those who have picked up this book, who have an interest in biblical and spiritual things. I do not know where they are in their lives, but I pray that You would take hold of their lives and guide them into Your truth. You have the words of eternal life. Reveal to us the idols concealed in our hearts, cause us to lay them aside, and enable us to see Your truths, believe them, and conform our lives in accordance with them. May our walk be worthy of our calling, worthy of Your name by which You have called us. Bless each individual reading this book, as they study these things themselves to come to a right understanding of Scripture and to strengthen their faith in You. May You receive all the glory from this project, Lord, for Your name's sake. In Jesus' name, Amen.

Yours because of Calvary,
Timothy Klaver

"*Not in words taught by human wisdom, but in those taught by the Spirit.*" **–1 Cor. 2:13**

"*Then He opened their minds to understand the Scriptures.*" **–Luke 24:45**

GENESIS 1 & 2

THE CREATION ACCOUNT VS. HOMOSEXUALITY

God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. God blessed them; and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply..."

GENESIS 1:27-28

In order to understand the truth about something, one must start at the very beginning. In the case of sexuality, our beginning is man's beginning, where God first created man and woman. The creation account does not say anything about homosexuality because *it does not have to*. It presents a very clear picture of God's standard and intention for *all* men and women, which is maintained and upheld throughout the *entire* Bible.

ARGUMENT:

To argue that the Creation story privileges a heterosexual view of the relations between humankind is to make one of the weakest arguments possible: the argument from silence.

RESPONSE:

This statement reveals just how blind and ignorant[2] homosexuals truly are, and just how little they know what "silence" is. They must maintain this

[2] Ignorance does not in any way, shape, or form denote or connote stupidity. The literalness of a word is its denotation; the broader associations we have with a word are its connotations. "A person can be ignorant (not knowing some fact or idea) without being stupid (incapable of learning because of a basic mental deficiency). And those who say, 'That's an ignorant idea' when they mean 'stupid idea' are expressing their own ignorance." —Paul Brians, *Common Errors in English Usage* (Wilsonville, OR: William James & Co., 2009), 118.

baseless argument because otherwise their world comes crashing down, and that is precisely what we are going to see happen.

The Bible tells us that "The man gave names to all the cattle, and to the birds of the sky, and to every beast of the field, but for Adam there was not found a helper suitable for him" (Gen. 2:20). Adam looked upon all the animals and saw that they had their suitable mate, but none of them was a suitable mate for him. The pairs of animals were of the *same* species but were *different* from each other. One was a *male* and the other was a *female*. This was important in order for them to be able to "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:22), the mandate given by God to *all* creatures.

God said, "It is not good for the man to be alone" (Gen. 2:18a). Any man. Every man. All encompassed in Adam, our head and representative. God then continued by saying, "I will make a helper suitable for him" (Gen. 2:18b). Now, if a person took two light bulbs or two sockets and tried putting them together, you would laugh at that person and call them a fool. Clearly the light bulb was designed for the socket and vice versa. If that same person took two plugs or two outlets and tried putting them together, you would again laugh at that person and call them a fool. Clearly the plug was designed for the outlet and vice versa. Likewise, the same is true of the penis and the vagina. The penis was perfectly designed to enter the vagina, and the vagina was perfectly designed to receive the penis. They were perfectly and complementarily designed for each other; *both* for pleasure *and* for procreation: "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:28).

Homosexuals think that it is an argument from silence merely because homosexuality is not mentioned. They fail to realize that *that* is the point. *Only* heterosexuality is mentioned. The lack of something mentioned is *not* the condoning thereof. Homosexuals also fail to realize that it is *their* argument which is derived from silence here. They cannot prove that Jesus condoned something just because He did not mention it, and that is what they are attempting to do with the creation account, saying that because it does not say anything about homosexuality that it must not condemn it. We have other Scriptures that *clearly* condemn it (Lev. 18:22; 20:13; Rom. 1:26-27), and we know what Jesus upheld as a standard, and that certainly was *not* homosexuality. The creation account gives a *very* clear picture—a standard—of God's intention for men and women. The *only* standard for sexual expression you will find consistently praised in *both* Testaments is that of heterosexual monogamy. Throughout the *entire* Bible, only *that* standard is upheld. Observe:

- "For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh." **Genesis 2:24**
- "Your wife shall be like a fruitful vine within your house, your children

like olive plants around your table." **Psalm 128:3**

- "Hear, my son, your father's instruction And do not forsake your mother's teaching; Indeed, they are a graceful wreath to your head And ornaments about your neck." **Proverbs 1:8-9**
- "Let your fountain be blessed, And rejoice in the wife of your youth. As a loving hind and a graceful doe, Let her breasts satisfy you at all times; Be exhilarated always with her love." **Proverbs 5:18-19**
- "My son, observe the commandment of your father And do not forsake the teaching of your mother; Bind them continually on your heart; Tie them around your neck. When you walk about, they will guide you; When you sleep, they will watch over you; And when you awake, they will talk to you. For the commandment is a lamp and the teaching is light; And reproofs for discipline are the way of life." **Proverbs 6:20-23**
- "An excellent wife, who can find? For her worth is far above jewels. The heart of her husband trusts in her, And he will have no lack of gain. She does him good and not evil All the days of her life. She looks for wool and flax And works with her hands in delight. She is like merchant ships; She brings her food from afar. She rises also while it is still night And gives food to her household And portions to her maidens. She considers a field and buys it; From her earnings she plants a vineyard. She girds herself with strength And makes her arms strong. She senses that her gain is good; Her lamp does not go out at night. She stretches out her hands to the distaff, And her hands grasp the spindle. She extends her hand to the poor, And she stretches out her hands to the needy. She is not afraid of the snow for her household, For all her household are clothed with scarlet. She makes coverings for herself; Her clothing is fine linen and purple. Her husband is known in the gates, When he sits among the elders of the land. She makes linen garments and sells them, And supplies belts to the tradesmen. Strength and dignity are her clothing, And she smiles at the future. She opens her mouth in wisdom, And the teaching of kindness is on her tongue. She looks well to the ways of her household, And does not eat the bread of idleness. Her children rise up and bless her; Her husband also, and he praises her, saying: 'Many daughters have done nobly, But you excel them all.' Charm is deceitful and beauty is vain, But a woman who fears the LORD, she shall be praised. Give her the product of her hands, And let her works praise her in the gates." **Proverbs 31:10-31**
- "This is another thing you do: you cover the altar of the LORD with tears, with weeping and with groaning, because He no longer regards the offering or accepts it with favor from your hand. Yet you say, 'For what reason?' Because the LORD has been a witness between you and the wife of your youth, against whom you have dealt treacherously, though she is your companion and your wife by covenant. But not one has done so who has a remnant of the Spirit. And what did that one do while he was seeking a godly offspring? Take heed then to your spirit, and let no one deal treacherously against the wife of your youth. For I hate divorce," says the LORD, the God of Israel, "and him who covers his garment with wrong,"

says the LORD of hosts. "So take heed to your spirit, that you do not deal treacherously." **Malachi 2:13-16**

- "And said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'?" **Matthew 19:5**
- "But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and the two shall become one flesh; so they are no longer two, but one flesh." **Mark 10:6-8**
- "Or do you not know that the one who joins himself to a prostitute is one body with her? For He says, 'The two shall become one flesh.'" **1 Corinthians 6:16**
- "But because of immoralities, each man is to have his own wife, and each woman is to have her own husband." **1 Corinthians 7:2**
- "Wives, be subject to your own husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, He Himself being the Savior of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up for her, so that He might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that He might present to Himself the church in all her glory, having no spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that she would be holy and blameless. So husbands ought also to love their own wives as their own bodies. He who loves his own wife loves himself; for no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ also does the church, because we are members of His body. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and shall be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh." **Ephesians 5:22-31**
- "In the same way, you wives, be submissive to your own husbands so that even if any of them are disobedient to the word, they may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives, as they observe your chaste and respectful behavior. Your adornment must not be merely external—braiding the hair, and wearing gold jewelry, or putting on dresses; but let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the imperishable quality of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is precious in the sight of God. ... You husbands in the same way, live with your wives in an understanding way, as with someone weaker, since she is a woman; and show her honor as a fellow heir of the grace of life, so that your prayers will not be hindered." **1 Peter 3:1-4, 7**

ARGUMENT:

But though heterosexuality may be the dominant form of sexuality, it does not follow that it is the only form of appropriate sexuality.

RESPONSE:

As the creation story and the rest of Scripture bears out (as well as all forms of logic, common sense, science, and nature), heterosexuality *is* the

only form of appropriate sexuality. Every other form of sexuality is prohibited and condemned as immoral perversion: homosexuality, incest, pedophilia, bestiality, necrophilia, etc. All these other forms of sexuality are condemned in Leviticus 18 and 20 alongside that of homosexuality, and as we will see shortly, they had *nothing* to do with idolatrous practices of "fertility" rituals, as homosexuals suggest.

ARGUMENT:

The authors of Genesis were intent on answering the question: Where do we come from?

RESPONSE:

What homosexuals fail to see and understand from the Scriptures themselves is that the author of Genesis was *also* intent on answering the questions, "What am I here for? What is my purpose?" Man's primary purpose was to glorify God. God created male and female *for each other* and gave them the mandate to "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:28). Anything outside of this is disobedience, which is *not* glorifying God. Disobedience is sin and sin does not glorify God. Anything outside of this *cannot* obey the mandate given by God.

ARGUMENT:

While it is true that God "made them male and female," the argument against homosexuality from the Creation order is hazardous on numerous fronts. Virtually all Christians reject the notion that God created sex for procreation only despite the fact that the first man and woman were commanded to "be fruitful and multiply." An argument based on an inability to reproduce is all the more problematic to defend given the vast number of marriages that never lead to procreation. Some couples marry at ages when childbirth is no longer an option. Other couples are childless because of impotence, infertility, health restrictions, or genetic concerns. Still others opt to not have children for a variety of reasons. The lack of children doesn't invalidate these relationships nor does it devalue them.

RESPONSE:

The homosexuals' argument here is extremely problematic. They attempt to make a case based very simplistically on the fact that sex is also for pleasure, not just procreation. First of all, whether pleasure is derived from sex or not is *not* the issue, *nor* does it have anything to do with the issue. This is one of the homosexuals' Red Herring Fallacies that they so delight in using, misdirecting people to something other than the issue at hand. Sex was designed for *both* procreation *and* recreation between a

husband (*male*) and *wife* (*female*). Nothing less. Nothing more. Procreation is inevitably the end result. Second of all, homosexuals also utilize the Part-to-Whole Fallacy here in attempting to use cases where heterosexual couples are incapable of having children as support for homosexual relationships being valid. This argument is extremely simplistic and crude in its ignorance. The fact is, whether heterosexual couples have children or not is the direct result of God's will in their lives, despite what they personally might desire. If the obstacle preventing them from having children were removed by God or cured by an operation, these heterosexual couples *could* have children. However, homosexuals will *never* be able to procreate and produce progeny. *Ever*! There is *nothing* that can be done to alter this fact of reality. If homosexuals were left to themselves, they would die in their own generation without ever producing a subsequent generation. The homosexuals' argument only serves to show how little they actually know and how willfully ignorant they are.

ARGUMENT:

The creation account does not mention friendship, for example, and yet we do not assume that friendship is condemned or abnormal. It does not mention the single state and yet we know that singleness is not condemned.

RESPONSE:

Dealing with the creation account, homosexuals like to feed people another Red Herring Fallacy of theirs. They again try to make an argument from silence. They assume that because homosexuality was not mentioned, therefore it cannot be considered abnormal. But this simply is not the case. The creation account upholds the standard of heterosexuality as God's intention for human relationships. Likewise, both Jesus and Paul upheld the standard of heterosexuality. If I uphold the life of a child in the womb, I am necessarily opposed to abortion. Likewise, Scripture, Jesus, and Paul, while upholding the standard of heterosexuality, are necessarily opposed to homosexuality (and every other sexual deviation). The statement encompasses *every* man; *all* men: "For this reason *a man* [any man, every man, all men] shall leave his father and his mother, and *be joined to his wife*; and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24). Homosexuals merely want to feed people Red Herring fallacies in order to distract them from the truth. As soon as they start discovering the truth behind one of their Red Herrings, they introduce another Red Herring. There is no limit to the errors homosexuals are willing to commit in order to gain approval for homosexuality.

ARGUMENT:

Complementarity involves seeking someone matching you, someone "like-opposite" you, complementary and perceived as fascinatingly other than your own sense of self.

RESPONSE:

Interestingly enough, homosexuals self-refute and self-condemn themselves with the above argument. An examination of the Hebrew phrase "meet for" (KJV) or "suitable for" (NASB, ESV) in Genesis 2:18 reveals precisely this. The phrase "meet for" or "suitable for" in the Hebrew indicates something that is both *similar* yet *different*—like-opposite; something that was *similar* to Adam yet completely *different* from him. *This* is what was "suitable" for not only Adam but for *every* man—woman. Every animal in the animal kingdom had its suitable pair, something that was *similar* but *different*. They were of a *similar* makeup, being of the *same* species, yet they were *different* from each other, one being *male* and the other *female*. *Like* but *opposite*. They were *not* mirror images, as you find with homosexuality. Homosexuality is "like-like." There is *nothing* complementary about homosexuality. In creating the "suitable" helper for Adam (who is a picture of *every* man), God created *woman*. Woman is *similar* to Adam, being of the *same* species, but *different* from him, being a *female* (with female genitalia) as opposed to a *male* (with male genitalia), which would be a mirrored-image. This difference is key to the mandate that God gave to the two of them, which is the same mandate given to *all mankind*—"Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:28)—regardless of recreational enjoyment derived from sex.

> In God's original design, human sexual conduct was to occur within the context of marriage between one man and one woman. The first chapter of the Bible says, "God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them" (Gen. 1:27). Differentiation of the human race into two complementary sexes ("male and female") is the first fact mentioned in connection with being "in the image of God." In Genesis 2, which describes in more detail the process summarized in 1:27, God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him" (Gen. 2:18). Genesis then applies the example of Adam and Eve to all marriages: "Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24). This "one flesh" sexual union was thus established as the pattern for marriage generally, and Jesus cites Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 as the normative pattern that God expects all marriages to follow (see Matt. 19:4-6). Furthermore Paul, as a good disciple of Jesus, likewise strongly echoes Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 in his two primary texts on homosexual practice, Romans 1:23-27 and 1

> Corinthians 6:9. Jesus and Paul both assume the logic of sexual intercourse implied in Genesis: a sexual bond between a man and a woman requires two (and only two) different sexual halves ("a man" and "his wife") being brought together into a sexual whole ("one flesh").[3]

Homosexuals like to argue that, "*This is not a question of genitalia*." Glaringly in error, they fail to realize that genitalia is a *part* of the whole. They are attempting, unsuccessfully, to separate one from the other. They are attempting to remove genitalia from the picture and focus on intentions, i.e., "love." I am sorry, but no matter what your intentions are or how much you "love" your sibling or relative, incest is wrong; no matter what your intentions are or how much you "love" your dog (or whatever animal), bestiality is wrong. Your intentions and your idea of "love" do not make *wrong* actions right. Furthermore, anyone who has ever been involved with anything remotely related to homosexuality will testify that it *is* all about genitalia and sex. Wrapping it up in a pretty bow and slapping the label "love" on it *does not* change the fact their arguments are primarily and solely based on their lustful desires to have degrading sex with one another, treating each other as if they are women (in the case of homosexual men).

ARGUMENT:

The complexity of the "one-flesh" phenomenon is a union that has much more to do with two persons than with two body parts.

RESPONSE:

Yet again homosexuals are in error. Paul said, "Or do you not know that the one who joins himself to a prostitute is one body with her? For He says, 'THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH.'" (1 Cor. 6:16). The homosexuals' argument is apparently ignorant of arranged marriages where neither person really knew each other or had love for each other, but would quite possibly later grow to love one another. The union of two becoming one has to do *entirely* and *solely* with sexual intimacy. An examination of Jesus and the Samaritan woman at the well will reveal this, also.

> He said to her, "Go, call your husband and come here." The woman answered and said, "I have no husband." Jesus said to her, "You have correctly said, 'I have no husband'; for you have had five husbands, and the one whom you now have is not your husband; this you have said truly." (John 4:16-18)

Notice her response: "I have *no* husband." In other words, "I'm not

[3] *ESV Study Bible* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008), 2547.

married. I've never been married." Where am I getting that from, you ask? Let us simplify our understanding of Jesus' words to the Samaritan woman by exchanging the word "husband" for the word "coconut," making it more revealing: "*For you have had five coconuts, and the one you now have is not your coconut.*" What does she possess? Right, a coconut! A husband! Yet, not hers! "For you have had five husbands, and [the husband] you now have is not your husband; this you have said truly." The coconut, or husband, belonged to someone else. She was in an adulterous affair with a legitimately married man, making him her husband. He was another woman's husband. Before this adulterous affair, the man was a legitimately married man. Her affair was defiling another woman's legitimate husband.

The Greek word used for *have* in "the one whom you now have" is *echo* (ἔχω), and it infers possession. This same word is used for *have had* in "you have had five husbands." She had five husbands in the past and she has one now. Furthermore, we have the word "and," which carries on the same subject of the topic—another husband—which she possesses. She has had five husbands through sexual intimacy and the man she is now being sexually intimate with is her sixth husband.

Let us look at another passage dealing with marriage that illustrates well the possession of the word *have* (*echo*, ἔχω): "For Herod himself had sent and had John arrested and bound in prison on account of Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, because he had married her. For John had been saying to Herod, 'It is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife.'" (Mark 6:17-18). The law John referred to for marriage was not civil or religious, but the law of God in the sexual intimacy of a *male* and *female*: "Or do you not know that the one who joins himself to a prostitute is one body with her? For He says, 'THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH.'" (1 Cor. 6:16). Sexual intimacy is *not* just a physical encounter. It is a *permanent* marital consequence. It could have been said to Herod, "*She whom you have* (your present wife you are married to) *is not your wife.*" Herodias was Philip's wife. Herod and Herodias were living in an adulterous marriage.

ARGUMENT:

Fact is, procreation is not even mentioned as a reason why God was creating a companion for the man.

RESPONSE:

The fact *is*, procreation was the mandate, or command, given to them *upon* creation: "Be fruitful and multiply" (Genesis 1:28). Homosexuals seem to have forgotten this, or are deliberately trying to leave it out. What homosexuals seem to forget is that Genesis 2 is a more detailed account of Genesis 1:26-28. Therefore, the mandate for procreation is a part of the

creation process, as we see in regard to the creation of the animals who were given the same mandate. The most egregious thing that homosexuals attempt to argue, however, is this:

> *In antigay rhetoric, however, Jesus seems to have died so that an anatomical technicality might be tweaked. ... The self-sacrificing love that "fulfills the law" and is shown within a committed same-sex marriage is beside the point.*

With glaringly clear misconception, homosexuals have proven demonstratively that they have no clue what Paul is talking about when they say "love is the fulfillment of the law" (Rom. 13:10). In fact, homosexuals have demonstrated that they have no clue what "love thy neighbour" (Matt. 23:39) actually entails. Instead, in their perversion, they attempt to utilize both as a means for approving homosexual relationships. Furthermore, there is nothing "self-sacrificing," "loving," or "committed" about same-sex relationships. First of all, it is *not* called marriage. Marriage was created by God in the Garden of Eden and defined by God as *one man* and *one woman* for life. Second of all, homosexuals are well-known for their *many* and *fleeting* sexual encounters. Third of all, it is *not* "loving" or "self-sacrificing" to encourage someone to embrace their sin and habitually live in it. To call a relationship "loving" in the biblical sense means it is in accordance with God's will and is fulfilling His purpose, resulting in His glory. Such is not the case concerning homosexual relationships. Homosexuals clearly have a misconception of what it means to be self-sacrificing. Perhaps they might do well to study the life of Christ. Last of all, *every* individual you will ever meet is your neighbour. To "love thy neighbour" means to "treat people the same way you want them to treat you" (Matt. 7:12) and to "Do nothing from selfishness or empty conceit, but with humility of mind regard one another as more important than yourselves; do not merely look out for your own personal interests, but also for the interests of others" (Phil. 2:3-4). As Paul said, "Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law" (Rom. 13:10). This has *nothing* to do with homosexuality. Homosexuals, in their ignorance of exegesis and how to correctly and responsibly perform it, are doing exactly like the cults do here, taking a passage and trying to force support for their position.

What homosexuals also fail to grasp here and understand is that Jesus died to *free* us from slavery to sin (Rom. 6:11-14) and to *save* us from our sins (Matt. 1:21; John 1:29; 1 John 3:5). God gave us the power (2 Peter 1:3-4), through the Holy Spirit, that when temptations come our way (and they *will* come our way), to say "No" to them instead of saying "Yes" as we always did in the past, thereby committing sin (James 1:12-15; Rom. 6, 8). It

is the homosexual who is seeking to tweak what they consider an "anatomical technicality." There is no "technicality" about it. Wrong is still wrong. Woman was made specifically for man, and vice versa. When it states, "For this reason *a man* shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to *his wife*; and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24), it has moved from the specific—Adam—to the general—"*a* man"; *any* man, *every* man.

ARGUMENT:

The parallel between today's debate over homosexuality and earlier debates in which the Church was eventually forced to acknowledge they had erred is striking. We've already witnessed a global shift in this debate in that those few passages often quoted to claim the moral abhorrence of same sex relationships are now being re-interpreted by steadily growing numbers of evangelicals, Bible scholars and others, just as texts have been re-interpreted in the case of slavery, the ordination of women and a host of other issues.

RESPONSE:

This is another one of homosexuals' fallacious arguments. First, homosexuals make a general assumption and then conclude that their assumption is true. Second, they base their conclusion of their position on the "*global shift*" and "*growing numbers*" of people who now support homosexuality, employing both the Appeal to the People Fallacy and the Bandwagon Fallacy, as if the numbers make their case. They are looking for acceptance and approval from the number of people who support their position rather than from the facts and evidence, which are stacked against them. Third of all, they assert that the Bible has been "re-interpreted" concerning two cases wherein it actually *has not* (except by liberals): slavery and women pastors. Both of these will be addressed later in the book. Once again, homosexuals have made assumptions without doing the actual leg-work.

GENESIS 19

WHAT THE BIBLE REALLY SAYS
WERE THE SINS OF SODOM

And they called to Lot and said to him, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may have relations with them."
GENESIS 19:5

HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY

KJV: "And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where are the men which came in to thee this night? Bring them out unto us, that we may know them."

QJV: "And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where are the men which came in to thee this night? Bring them out unto us, that we may rape and humiliate them."[4]

The words "rape and humiliate them" are *nowhere* to be found in the original Hebrew, or the Greek translation, the Septuagint. The homosexual community is eisegeting this passage, making it say what they want it to say despite the clear evidence to the contrary. The Hebrew word translated "know" is *yada* (ידע), which, amongst its various meanings, means "to know a person sexually" (Gen. 4:1; 19:5; 1 Kings 1:4). If rape was truly the issue here, then the men of Sodom would have had no problem raping the two daughters of Lot that he had offered to them instead. Rape is rape. The fact they *did not* want the women, but desired the men, informs us that homosexuality *is* in view here. The word "men" in verse 4 is the Hebrew אנוֹשׁ, which is an entirely *masculine noun* meaning man. There were *no*

[4] *The Queen James Bible* (QueenJamesBible.com, 2012), 21.

women involved here.

ARGUMENT:

Everyone is familiar with the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. At least many people think they are. The point of the story is to condemn homosexuals and homosexual behavior, right? Wrong. And contrary to the belief of some, it's not merely about a breach of the ancient sacred duty of hospitality either. Fact is, there is much to cull from the biblical text that is often missed.

RESPONSE:

Some homosexuals tend *not* to hold to the pro-gay ignorance that claims the men of Sodom merely wanted to be hospitable and friendly. However, they *still* continue to deny and re-interpret key biblical passages. Their beliefs and interpretations are a form of "collapsing context"; they believe because "everyone is doing it" that it must be true. They conclude that because there seems to be a "*global shift*" taking place in this debate, that the original writers could not have possibly had homosexual practices in mind. Our external circumstances *do not* interpret the Bible (eisegesis); it is *the Bible* that *must* shape our external circumstances (exegesis). To deny that the Bible teaches a particular truth just because the world largely does not hold to that truth *does not* negate that truth or alter that truth. Whether or not there occurs a global shift in this debate is irrelevant to the truth. The practices and acceptances of men *do not* determine truth, morality, or reality. Those standards are set *by God*!

With that being said, let us examine the passage in question:

> Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young (נצר) and old (זקן), all the people from every quarter; and they called to Lot and said to him, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may have relations with them." But Lot went out to them at the doorway, and shut the door behind him, and said, "Please, my brothers, do not act wickedly. Now behold, I have two daughters who have not had relations with man; please let me bring them out to you, and do to them whatever you like; only do nothing to these men, inasmuch as they have come under the shelter of my roof." But they said, "Stand aside." Furthermore, they said, "This one came in as an alien, and already he is acting like a judge; now we will treat you worse than them." So they pressed hard against Lot and came near to break the door. (Genesis 19:4-9)

From the underlined words, we can see how *every* argument homosexuals make is completely and utterly dismantled and destroyed.

Regarding the theory that pederasty is in view, the phrase "both young and old" rips it to shreds. Both young men and old men—from every corner of the city—wanted to have sexual relations with the *men* (not boys) being sheltered by Lot. These men are told by Lot, "do not act so wickedly," to which they accuse Lot of being their judge. A little logic and common sense goes a long way. If hospitality and friendliness were in view here, how could anyone call it wickedness, and why would the people accuse that person of being their judge? Furthermore, why would God destroy a city or nation merely for wanting to be hospitable and friendly? This theory is asinine and ludicrous. In Judges 19, these same actions are described as being foolish and vile. The fact that women were offered to these men and they declined, wanting the men instead, demonstrates *powerfully* the reality that they wanted to have sexual relations with the men. If it was merely about rape, they would have been happy to receive the women and rape them. Individuals who try and tell you otherwise are liars and they are bankrupt morally, mentally, spiritually, and intellectually.

> **19:4 the men of the city**. Ever male in Sodom, **both young and old**, was involved in the assault on the two visitors. They had become a gang seeking an orgy of rape.
> **19:5 that we may know them**. In Hebrew the verb "to know" (Hb. yada') sometimes denotes sexual intercourse (e.g., 4:1, 17, 25; 19:8; cf. Judg. 19:22). The context implies that the men of Sodom intend to have homosexual relations with the two visitors, hence the origin of the term "sodomy."
> **19:6-9** Lot's readiness to protect the two men from the mob surrounding his house is commendable. in desperation he offers his two unmarried **daughters** as substitutes--a shocking, cowardly, and inexcusable act (even if he intended this only as a bluff, or expected the offer to be rejected). The reaction of the crowd only confirms the truly evil nature of their intentions.[5]

Some homosexuals have even attempted to argue that the Hebrew word for "men" in Genesis 19:4 is inclusive of women: "*If you look at the original Hebrew text, and even early Greek translations, the word translated into English as 'men' can be inclusive of the women as well.*"[6] Therefore, they urge, the men *and women* of the city wanted to "gang rape" the two angels. However, this is false. The first flaw in their argument is with the Hebrew word אנוֹשׁ (enowsh). It is *not* inclusive of women. It is a *masculine noun* meaning man. The plural of this word often serves for the plural of אישׁ (iysh), which "does not indicate humankind but the male gender in

[5] *ESV Study Bible*, 83.
[6] Justin R. Cannon, *The Bible, Christianity, and Homosexuality* (USA, 2012), 12.

particular."[7] The second flaw in their argument is that the word used for the "men" of the city is also the same word used when demanding Lot to bring out the "men" (v.5). If it is inclusive of women, when Lot offered his daughters, why did they not take advantage of them? The third flaw in their argument is with the Greek word ανηρ in the Septuagint. It is *not* inclusive of women either. This is a *masculine noun* meaning man or husband. As you can see, these individuals are lying through their teeth, trying to forge support for their perverse behaviour.

The Bible informs us that even *after* they were all struck with blindness, the men of the city *still* continued to grope for the door, wearing themselves out—exhausting themselves. Why? When you are blind, you cannot participate in gang rape because you cannot see who it is you might be raping, and these men were after Lot's guests. You would not want to rape your best friend after all. However, if you are blind, you can *still* engage in sexual activity. *Any* sane person in their right mind immediately struck with blindness would *stop* what they were doing because the realization that they were now blind would have kicked in. God goes so far as to inform us that even *after* they were blinded, these men *did not stop*. Homosexuals today bear the same character, attacking churches and doing things to its members that no rational human being would ever do to another human being. Homosexuality makes people irrational in their thoughts and in their behaviour.

What is even more interesting about the Genesis 19 passage in the Septuagint is the usage of the word σοδομῖται in verse 4. Homosexuals insist that there is *no* Greek word for "sodomites," yet, here it is; and it is *plural masculine*. The Greek word for Sodom is Σοδομα. Σοδομῖται refers to the inhabitants of Sodom, i.e., the Sodomites. This is precisely what the word meant in biblical times. The primarily sexual meaning of the word *sodomia* for Christians did not evolve before the 6th century A.D. Roman Emperor Justinian I, in his novels no. 77 (dating 538) and no. 141 (dating 559) amended to his *Corpus iuris civilis*, declared that Sodom's sin had been specifically same-sex activities and desire for them. Nevertheless, despite this word not taking on its primarily sexual meaning until later, Christians earlier than Justinian are also seen to denounce same-sex relations. Philo of Alexandria (20 B.C. - 50 A.D.) and Methodius of Olympus (260-312 A.D.) attributed homosexual relations to Sodom, as did St. Augustine and many others. Thus, "sodomites" refers to homosexuals.

---

[7] Warren Baker, Eugene Carpenter, *The Complete Word Study Dictionary Old Testament* (Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers, 2003), 46 (see 75-76).

ARGUMENT:

Sodom is used as a symbol of evil in dozens of places in the Bible, but not in a single instance is the sin of the Sodomites specified as homosexuality.

RESPONSE:

Contradictory to these false assertions, "From Genesis, Sodom becomes an image for gross immorality in 2 Peter 2:6-8 and Jude 7; but in such contexts as Isaiah 1 and Ezekiel 16, the Sodom symbol refers rather to all injustices, including adultery and neglect of the poor. Certainly, in terms of imagery the Bible does not have the category 'homosexuality,' but rather 'homosexual behavior' or 'homosexual acts.'"[8] Homosexuality is the same as homosexual behaviour and/or homosexual acts.

ARGUMENT:

Nowhere in the 26 times where Sodom is mentioned in the Bible (18 in the OT and 8 in the NT), is the sin of the Sodomites ever specified as homosexuality.

RESPONSE:

First of all, Sodom is mentioned 47 times in the Bible—*not* 26 (38 in the OT and 9 in the NT: Gen. 10:19; 13:10; 13:12; 13:13; 14:2; 14:8; 14:10; 14:11; 14:12; 14:17; 14:21; 14:22; 18:16; 18:20; 18:22; 18:26; 19:1; 19:4; 19:24; 19:28; Deut. 29:23; 32:32; Isa. 1:9; 1:10; 3:9; 13:19; Jer. 23:14; 49:18; 50:40; Lam. 4:6; Eze. 16:46; 16:48; 16:49; 16:53; 16:55; 16:56; Amos 4:11; Zeph. 2:9; Matt. 10:15; 11:23; 11:24; Mark 6:11; Luke 10:12; 17:29; 2 Pet. 2:6; Jude 1:7; Rev. 11:8). Second of all, the sin of the Sodomites is specified as homosexuality in several of those passages (e.g., 2 Peter 2:6; Jude 7). The problem is, homosexuals are committing an Exegetical Fallacy by demanding that the Bible spell out in modern words—"h-o-m-o-s-e-x-u-a-l-i-t-y"—its condemnation of homosexuality. All any *intelligent* and *educated* reader has to do is pay attention to what Leviticus 18:22; 20:13; and Romans 1:26-27 say and they will easily and logically conclude that the Bible is condemning homosexuality. The Golden Rule of Hermeneutics states, "*If the plain sense makes common sense, seek no other sense.*" A child reading these passages would conclude that the Bible is condemning homosexuality, also. Apparently homosexuals are not as wise as a child.

The problem with this fallacious argument is that homosexuals are

[8] Leland Ryken, James C. Wilhoit, Tremper Longman III, *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1998), 396.

attempting to tell people that prior to the term "homosexual," there existed no terms to describe homosexuals; that homosexuality is a modern thing not known in previous generations. This is false, erroneous, and a lie. The old English word used long before the word "homosexual" came into existence was the word "bugger."

Canadian Oxford Dictionary:
bugger *n. slang* a person who commits buggery.
buggery *n.* **1** anal intercourse. **2** bestiality.
sodomite *n.* a person who engages in sodomy.
sodomy *n.* anal intercourse performed between two males or a male and a female.

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary:
[1]bugger *n.* sodomite.
[2]bugger *vt.* to commit sodomy with.
buggery *n.* sodomy.
sodomite *n.* one who practices sodomy.
sodomy *n.* [the homosexual proclivities of the men of the city in Gen 19:1-11] **1** copulation with a member of the same sex or with an animal. **2** anal copulation with a member of the opposite sex.

Prior to this word being used, from the 6th century A.D. onward, homosexuals were referred to as "Sodomites," because they committed the same sin that Sodom was guilty of committing. The word "Sodomites" appears in the 3rd century B.C. translation of the Hebrew manuscripts into Greek—the Septuagint. So do not let anyone try to tell you that such a word did not exist in biblical times. They would be wrong and/or lying to you.

If we examine history, we can see several individuals commenting on Genesis 19 and referring to the sin of Sodom as that which relates to "homosexual behaviour" or "homosexual acts," which is the same as homosexuality. Here are some quotes:

"The land of the Sodomites, a part of Canaan afterwards called Palestinian Syria, was brimful of innumerable iniquities, particularly such as arise from gluttony and lewdness, and multiplied and enlarged every other possible pleasure with so formidable a menace that it had at last been condemned by the Judge of All…Incapable of bearing such satiety, plunging like cattle, *they threw off from their necks the law of nature and applied themselves to…forbidden forms of intercourse*. Not only in their mad lust for women did they violate the marriages of their neighbors, *but also men mounted males without respect for the sex nature which the active partner shares with the passive*; and so when they tried to beget children they were discovered to be incapable of any but a sterile seed. Yet the discovery availed them not, so much stronger was the force of the

lust which mastered them. Then, as little by little they accustomed those who were by nature men to submit to play the part of women, they saddled them with the formidable curse of a female disease. For not only did they emasculate their bodies by luxury and voluptuousness but they worked a further degeneration in their souls and, as far as in them lay, were corrupting the whole of mankind." —**Philo**, 20 B.C. to 50 A.D. (Emphasis mine.)

"As for adultery, Moses forbade it entirely, as esteeming it a happy thing that men should be wise in the affairs of wedlock; and that it was profitable both to cities and families that children should be known to be genuine. He also abhorred men's lying with their mothers, as one of the greatest crimes; and the like for lying with the father's wife, and with aunts, and sisters, and sons' wives, as all instances of abominable wickedness. He also forbade a man to lie with his wife when she was defiled by her natural purgation: and not to come near brute beasts; *nor to approve of the lying with a male*, which was to hunt after unlawful pleasures on account of beauty. To those who were guilty of such insolent behavior, he ordained death for their punishment." —**Flavius Josephus**, 37 to 100 A.D. (Emphasis mine.)

"But we do not say so of that mixture that is contrary to nature, or of any unlawful practice; for such are enmity to God. *For the sin of Sodom is contrary to nature*, as is also that with brute beasts. But adultery and fornication are against the law; the one whereof is impiety, the other injustice, and, in a word, no other than a great sin. But neither sort of them is without its punishment in its own proper nature. For the practicers of one sort attempt the dissolution of the world, and endeavor to make the natural course of things to change for one that is unnatural; but those of the second son — the adulterers — are unjust by corrupting others' marriages, and dividing into two what God hath made one, rendering the children suspected, and exposing the true husband to the snares of others. And fornication is the destruction of one's own flesh, not being made use of for the procreation of children, but entirely for the sake of pleasure, which is a mark of incontinency, and not a sign of virtue. All these things are forbidden by the laws; for thus say the oracles: *Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind*. For such a one is accursed, and ye shall stone them with stones: they have wrought abomination." —**Methodius**, 260 to 312 A.D. (Emphasis mine.)

"*They who have committed sodomy with men* or brutes, murderers, wizards, adulterers, and idolaters, *have been thought worthy of the same punishment*; therefore observe the same method with these which you do with others. *We ought not to make any doubt of receiving those who have repented* thirty years for the uncleanness which they committed through ignorance; for their ignorance pleads their pardon, and their willingness in

> confessing it; therefore command them to be forthwith received, especially if they have tears to prevail on your tenderness, and have [since their lapse] led such a life as to deserve your compassion." —**St. Basil**, 329 or 330 to 379 A.D. (Emphasis mine.)

> "Can it ever, at any time or place, be unrighteous for a man to love God with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his mind; and his neighbor as himself? Similarly, *offenses against nature are everywhere and at all times to be held in detestation and should be punished*. Such offenses, for example, were those of the Sodomites; and, *even if all nations should commit them, they would all be judged guilty of the same crime by the divine law*, which *has not made men so that they should ever abuse one another in that way*. For the fellowship that should be between God and us is violated whenever *that nature of which he is the author is polluted by perverted lust*." —**St. Augustine**, 354 to 430 A.D. (Emphasis mine.)

Even the Qur'an, written around 632 A.D., clearly understood the sin of the Sodomites in Genesis 19 to be that of homosexuality.

> Surah 7:80-81 reads: "We also (sent) Lut: he said to his people: Do ye commit lewdness such as no people in creation (ever) committed before you? For ye practise your lusts on men in preference to women: ye are indeed a people transgressing beyond bounds."

> Surah 26:165-166 reads: "Of all the creatures in the world, will ye approach males, and leave those whom Allah has created for you to be your mates? Nay, ye are a people transgressing (all limits)!"

> Surah 29:28-29 reads: "And (remember) Lut: behold, he said to his people: 'Ye do commit lewdness, such as no people in Creation (ever) committed before you. Do ye indeed approach men, and cut off the highway?—and practise wickedness (even) in your councils?' But his people gave no answer but this: they said: 'Bring us the Wrath of Allah if thou tellest the truth.'"

> Surah 11:77-79 reveals their understanding of Genesis 19: "When Our Messengers came to Lut, he was grieved on their account and felt himself powerless (to protect) them. He said: 'This is a distressful day.' And his people came rushing towards him, and they had been long in the habit of practising abominations. He said: 'O my people! here are my daughters: they are purer for you (if ye marry)! Now fear Allah, and cover me not with disgrace about my guests! Is there not among you a single right-minded man?' They said: 'Well dost thou know we have no need of thy daughters: indeed thou knowest quite well what we want!'"

In an attempt to back the interpretational error of inhospitality,

homosexuals will quote from Matthew 10:14-15. However, if they would do responsible exegesis instead of ripping passages from their context, as they delight in doing, they would have compared Scripture with Scripture and found that this passage has nothing to do whatsoever with hospitality or inhospitality, but with the acceptance of the Gospel, as revealed in Matthew 11:20-24, wherein Jesus uses those same words, "I say to you that it will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment." How do we know this? Because of what was said in the verse prior: "if the miracles had occurred in Sodom which occurred in you, it would have remained to this day." Sodom would have "repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." Homosexuals demonstrate that it will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah on Judgment Day than for themselves, continuing to embrace their sin rather than repent of it.

ARGUMENT:

We should also note that during biblical times men (and the kings) of conquered tribes were often raped by the invading army as the ultimate symbol of defeat and humiliation. Male-to-male rape was a way for victors to accentuate the subjection of captive enemies and foes and a way of humiliating visitors and strangers. If we miss this, we not only miss what was going on in the Sodom and Gomorrah text, we also miss the meaning behind other passages such as 1 Samuel 31:4 and 1 Chronicles 10:4 where Saul, gravely wounded by the Philistines, instructs his armor-bearer to: "Draw your sword and thrust me through with it lest these uncircumcised come and abuse me." (1 Chronicles 10:4, NKJV)

RESPONSE:

Homosexuals need to spin a tale of marvel to try and excuse the guilt of their sin. The word translated "abuse" in 1 Samuel 31:4 and 1 Chronicles 10:4 is the Hebrew word *alal* (עלל), a word appearing 20 times in the Old Testament (Ex. 10:2; Lev. 19:10; Num. 22:29; Deut. 24:21; Judges 19:25; 20:45; 1 Sam. 6:6; 31:4; 1 Chr. 10:4; Job 16:15; Ps. 141:4; Isa. 3:12; Jer. 6:9; 38:19; Lam. 1:12; 1:22; 2:20; 3:51). Of its twenty occurrences, only *once* does it have a sexual connotation (Judges 19:25). In *every* single other occurrence, including that of 1 Samuel 31:4 and 1 Chronicles 10:4, there is *nothing* sexual about it. Homosexuals force this rare interpretation of the word onto these passages, trying to forge support for their fictional tale that the inhabitants of Sodom wanted to sexually humiliate strangers and visitors. This is nothing more than homosexual propaganda based on sloppy and dishonest scholarship. No such actions ever took place in history. If they had, word would have gotten out and *nobody* would have traveled to such cities. Those cities would have self-destructed because they would have no

merchants bringing anything to them. Moreover, if such things took place, there would be accounts of it, to which there are not. The meaning of this Hebrew word is as follows:

> I. A verb meaning to do, to deal with, to treat severely, to abuse; to glean. It basically means to treat harshly or deal severely with; to practice evil: to do evil deeds in general (Ps. 141:9); to do evil toward a person (Lam. 1:12, 22; 2:20; 3:51). It describes the Lord's dealings with Egypt to free the Israelites (Ex. 10:2; 1 Sam. 6:6). It is used of Balaam accusing his donkey of dealing treacherously with him (Num. 22:29). It describes the sexual abuse of a woman (Judg. 19:25).
> II. A verb meaning to act childishly, to play the child. It means to behave foolishly as a child without maturity or strength. It is used of the enemies of Israel to depict the hopeless state of Israel who is oppressed by children (Isa. 3:12).
> III. A verb meaning to defile. It means to make something unclean or unholy, to desecrate it. It is used figuratively of Job defiling and shaming his horn, a figurative expression of destroying his hope, character, strength (Job 16:15).
> IV. A verb meaning to thrust in, to bury, to insert. It indicates striking an object into something. In context it refers to sticking a "horn," one's hope, character, strength, into the ground, that is, giving up (Job 16:15).[9]

If we examine this passage in the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Hebrew manuscripts), the word used here is *empaizosin* (ἐμπαίξωσίν), which means "to jeer at, to deride, to mock." No homosexual-dominance boogeyman here.

ARGUMENT:

It is respectful of God's gift to us to go after his intentions and meanings before arriving at our own. Sure enough, we find that God, speaking though the prophet, spells out in striking "in your face" condemnation explicitly what Sodom's abhorrent conduct entailed.

RESPONSE:

Quoting from Ezekiel 16:48-50, homosexuals provide us with eisegesis as to what the sins of Sodom supposedly were. Unfortunately, homosexuals *never* provide us with this so-called "in-your-face" spelled-out conduct, which, if they existed, would follow after verse 50. Instead, they back-track and provide us with sloppy and dishonest eisegesis on Ezekiel 16, trying to conclude, by their faulty assumptions, that the sins of Sodom are only those related to us in this chapter. They hope to conceal the truth of what the Bible

[9] *The Complete Word Study Dictionary Old Testament*, 838-839.

really says were the sins of Sodom. However, the Bible spells it out for us on a number of occasions. Isaiah 3:9 informs us of how Sodom made shameless proclamation of their sin (the same shameless proclamation that homosexuals demonstrate today): "The expression of their faces bears witness against them, and they display their sin like Sodom; they do not even conceal it. Woe to them! For they have brought evil on themselves." 2 Peter 2:6-8 also informs us as to the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah: "and if He condemned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to destruction by reducing them to ashes, having made them an example to those who would live ungodly lives thereafter; and if He rescued righteous Lot, oppressed by the sensual conduct of unprincipled men (for by what he saw and heard that righteous man, while living among them, felt his righteous soul tormented day after day by their lawless deeds)" Likewise, so also does Jude 7: "Just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh, are exhibited as an example, in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire."

ARGUMENT:

This is not my interpretation; it is that which is given in the Bible. You and I do not get to rip passages from their context and replace them in another age for the sake of convenience. And we don't get to make things up as we go along. As always, we are stuck with the internal interpretation of the text as the primary meaning.

RESPONSE:

First of all, yes, it is the homosexual's interpretation. Their interpretation is *nowhere* to be found in the Bible or in history, as the evidence quoted above bears out. Second, the homosexual rips passages from their contexts all the time, making things up as they go along, trying to force them to correspond with other passages. This is called "collapsing context." Third, if homosexuals "*stuck with the internal interpretation of the text as our primary meaning*," they would arrive at the simple internal interpretation that homosexual behaviour is in view here, of which the entirety of history backs up.

LEVITICUS 18 & 20

RELIGIOUS PROHIBITIONS
OR MORAL PROHIBITIONS?

You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination.
LEVITICUS 18:22

If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death. Their bloodguiltiness is upon them.
LEVITICUS 20:13

HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY

KJV: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is an abomination."

QJV: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind in the temple of Molech: it is an abomination."[10]

The words "in the temple of Molech" *do not exist* anywhere in the original Hebrew, or the Greek translation, the Septuagint. The homosexual community is *adding* to the Word of God what they want to be there—*not* what is there naturally. Likewise, these words are *nowhere* to be found in the Latin Vulgate either: "*cum masculo non commisceberis coitu femineo quia abominatio est*." Notice the word "coitu"? It means "coupling"; i.e., coitus, copulation, or sexual intercourse. The description in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, *and* English (as well as *every* other language) is that of homosexuality. It does not matter *where* it is done, whether a temple, a monastery, a bedroom, or a closet, homosexuality *is* an abomination.

KJV: "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be

[10] *The Queen James Bible*, 75.

put to death; their blood shall be upon them."

QJV: "If a man also lie with mankind in the temple of Molech, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them."[11]

Once again, the words "in the temple of Molech" *do not exist* anywhere in the original Hebrew, or the Greek translation, the Septuagint. Again, the homosexual community is *adding* to the Word of God what they want to be there—*not* what is there naturally. Interestingly enough, these words are also *nowhere* to be found in the Latin Vulgate: "*qui dormierit cum masculo coitu femineo uterque operati sunt nefas morte moriantur sit sanguis eorum super eos*." Once again, we have the word "coitu," which means "sexual intercourse." But we also have the word "dormierit," which means "sleeps." The description in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, *and* English (as well as *every* other language), yet again, is that of homosexuality.

ARGUMENT:

In light of all the commotion over homosexuality, one would think the Bible has a lot to say on the subject. It does not. There are only five or six verses in the entire Bible that have been interpreted as addressing or condemning homosexuality. These verses, often referred to as the "clobber passages," because they are frequently used to clobber or censure gay men and women today, are verses taken out of their contexts to proof-text the Bible's alleged anti-homosexual stance.

RESPONSE:

First of all, the Bible *does* have a lot to say on the subject of homosexuality. Second, there are 9 passages that deal with the perversion of homosexual behaviour (Gen. 19:4-9; Lev. 18:22; 20:13; Judg. 19:22-24; Rom. 1:26-27; 1 Cor. 6:9-11; 1 Tim. 1:8-11; 2 Peter 2:6-8; Jude 7)—*not* 5 or 6. Again, homosexuals demonstrate their inability to count accurately. Five of them deal specifically with same-sex contact, but there are 9 that deal with the behaviour. Third, as demonstrated earlier in the first chapter, there are hundreds of verses that uphold heterosexuality as the standard for human relationships. So, in reality, there are far more than 9 passages that deal with homosexuality, because anything that is for heterosexuality as a standard is necessarily against homosexuality. Fourth, homosexuals call these passages the "clobber passages" in an attempt to silence their opposition. It is the

[11] Ibid, 76.

fallacy known as Poisoning the Well. Because people do not want to be known as "clobberers," they tend to back down and shut up. It is an effective strategy used by many people and groups to put their opposition in a negative light and shut down any rational discussion of the subject and the Bible. If you want to silence your opposition, name-call them. Any decent person does not want to be associated with said name-called group, or even accused of being so, so they will back down. It is sad when people fail to use logic to see false logic. Quoting Bible verses, and/or historical evidence, is *not* "clobbering."

ARGUMENT:

The Holiness Code of Leviticus prohibits these acts for RELIGIOUS reasons, not MORAL ones.

RESPONSE:

Homosexuals claim the context of these passages has to do with religious idolatry and cult prostitution. But is this a truthful assessment of the context? No, it is not. Let us observe the context.

First, let us address Leviticus 18. You, the intelligent and educated reader, are wise enough to know that the homosexual's argument is both outrageously bogus and laughably fallacious. Do homosexuals honestly expect us to believe that uncovering the nakedness of your father or your mother (18:7), of your father's wife (18:8), of your sister (18:9), of your son's daughter (18:10), of your father's wife's daughter (18:11), of your father's sister (18:12), of your mother's sister (18:13), of your father's brother (18:14), of your daughter-in-law (18:15), of your brother's wife (18:16), or any other blood relatives (18:17) has anything to do with cult prostitution? They would do well to try and retain the *context*. Do homosexuals honestly expect us to believe that having intimacy with a woman during her menstrual cycle (18:19) or having sex with your neighbour's wife (18:20) has anything to do with cult prostitution? The *only* verse that has *anything* to do with the practices of religious idolatry is verse 21, which is borne out through the entirety of Scripture. The heathen nations would sacrifice their children to their various gods. *Nothing* else in this chapter has to do with idolatrous practices, *nor* with cult prostitution. This is the homosexual reading his/her own ideas and concepts into Scripture, which is called *eisegesis*.

By what great exegetical miracle does the homosexual expect to convince us that having sex with animals was religious idolatry (18:23)? Quoting from the *New Bible Commentary* as their sole source is hardly evidence enough to back their argument. Problem is, homosexuals continuously quote citations selectively or truncate their quotations of text in

order to find support for their position. They quote only that which agrees with their position, regardless of the poor scholarship behind it. An excellent example to demonstrate this *is* their quoting from the *New Bible Dictionary*. They quote, "*The sacrifice of children, anal intercourse between men, and both male and female intercourse with animals are all known to have been part of pagan worship in Egypt, Canaan and elsewhere*." Typical of homosexuals, they are being dishonest and deceitful with their audience. Here is the full entry:

> **18:19-23 Other prohibitions.** The sacrifice of children (21; *Molech* was the name of a god known in Canaan and elsewhere), genito-anal intercourse between men (22) and both male and female intercourse with animals (23) are all known to have been apart of pagan worship in Egypt, Canaan and elsewhere. That is probably the reason why they are grouped together here. But the additional phrases at the end of each verse indicate that a more basic immorality was involved than pagan associations alone. The actions are described respectively as *profaning the name of your God* (that is, bringing disgrace on the reputation of Yahweh among the nations), *detestable* (a term of strong disapproval in the OT, used for things which God hates or deplores), and *perversion* (lit. 'confusion'; *i.e.* the unnatural mixing of what God created and intended to be separate).[12]

Do you see how the context changes what they attempt to use as support for their position? You need to make sure they are providing their sources *and* you need to check those sources, because this kind of thing happens on a consistent basis with them.

Despite the hundreds of commentaries and theological works written that contradict their position, homosexuals quote from the rare sources that agree with their position or say something they can twist to agree with their position (like quoting half an entry in a commentary and ignoring the half that contradicts them). People were having sex with animals when God decided to flood the world, and they are doing it today without the slightest trace of religion attached to it. So the homosexuals' eisegesis is without warrant, especially considering there is nothing mentioned in the passage with regard to religious fertility rights. The passage *does not* connect it with idolatrous practice whatsoever. It condemns it *entirely*, just as it does with homosexual behaviour (18:22). Honestly, homosexuals need to go back to school and educate themselves as to what "*context*" actually is. If they paid close attention to verse 21, they would notice that "nor shall you profane the name of your God" has *nothing* to do with practices of religious idolatry.

---

[12] G. J. Wenham, J. A. Motyet, D. A. Carson and R. T. France, *New Bible Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1994), 146).

This is the third commandment reiterated. It is not connected with the first half of verse 21. Homosexuals would do well to be reminded that the chapter and verse divisions *did not* exist in the original Hebrew and Greek. They should try and remember that when considering what *context* truly is and what it consists of.

Second, let us address Leviticus 20. If homosexuals paid attention to the *context*, they would see that the verses speaking of the practices of religious idolatry *again* address *only* child sacrifice (20:2-5). *None* of the rest of this chapter has *anything* to do with religious idolatry. A person could try and argue that verse 6 does, but he/she would be in error. Do homosexuals honestly expect us to believe that cursing one's father or mother (20:9), or committing adultery with another man's wife (20:10), or lying with one's father's wife (20:11), or lying with one's daughter-in-law (20:12), or marrying a woman and her mother (20:14), or having sex with an animal (20:15-16), or discovering one's sister's nakedness (20:17), or having sex with a woman during her menstrual cycle (20:18), etc., etc., etc., has anything to do with religious idolatry? The homosexuals are reaching yet again, as *all* the evidence is against them. Let's observe further:

> Leviticus 18:22 says, "You shall not lie with a **male** as one lies with a **female**; it is an abomination."
> In the Hebrew, it reads: "תוֹעֵבָה הִוא אִשָּׁה לֹא תִשְׁכַּב מִשְׁכְּבֵי זָכָר וְאֵת"
> In the Greek Septuagint, it reads: "καὶ μετὰ **ἄρσενος** οὐ κοιμηθήσῃ κοίτην **γυναικός** βδέλυγμα γάρ ἐστιν "
> In the Latin Vulgate, it reads: "*cum masculo non commisceberis coitu femineo quia abominatio est*."
> Leviticus 20:13 says, "If there is a **man** who lies with a **male** as those who lie with a **woman**, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death. Their bloodguiltiness is upon them."
> In the Hebrew, it reads: "תּוֹעֵבָה צִשּׂוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם מוֹת יוּמָתוּ דְּמֵיהֶם בָּם וְאִישׁ אִשָּׁה אֶת יִשְׁכַּב אֲשֶׁר זָכָר וְאֵת מִשְׁכְּבֵי"
> In the Greek Septuagint, it reads: "καὶ ὃς ἂν κοιμηθῇ μετὰ **ἄρσενος** κοίτην **γυναικός** βδέλυγμα ἐποίησαν ἀμφότεροι θανατούσθωσαν ἔνοχοί εἰσιν "
> In the Latin Vulgate, it reads: "*qui dormierit cum masculo coitu femineo uterque operati sunt nefas morte moriantur sit sanguis eorum super eos*."
>
> זכר = "a male, man, mankind (as opposed to womankind)"
> אישׁ = "man, male, husband"
> אשׁה = "woman, female, wife"
> שׁכב, תּשׁכב = "a primitive root; to lie down (for rest, sexual connection, decease or any other purpose)"
> משׁכּבי = "a bed; abstractly, sleep; by euphemism, carnal intercourse"
> תּועבה, תּוֹעבה = "properly, something disgusting (morally): detestable; abomination"

ἄρσενος = “male, man, husband”
γυναικός = “female, woman, wife”
κοίτην = “a bed; spoken of the marriage bed, metaphorically for marriage (Heb. 13:4)”
κοιμηθῇ, κοιμηθήσῃ = “to sleep”
βδέλυγμα = “that which is detestable; abomination”

While we have already addressed much of this, it is important that we do so again. Notice the word "coitu" in Latin for both verses? It means "coupling"; i.e., coitus, copulation, or sexual intercourse. In Leviticus 22:13, we also have the word "dormierit," which means "sleeps." What do you call "a man who lies with a male as one lies with a woman"? What is this describing? For anyone who is honest and truthful in the least, their answer will be, "A homosexual" or "Homosexuality." The immediate surrounding context around these verses is in regard to immoralities and vile behaviours that are extremely prohibited *by God*, as we have seen earlier, and are labeled as detestable abominations. The words, grammar, and context of these passages are as crystal clear as the sun is bright. The person who denies this is not being honest with him/herself. The description in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, *and* English (as well as *every* other language) is that of homosexuality.

It does not say, "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female, unless that is your 'orientation,'" nor does it say, "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female, unless you love, support, and are committed to them." It says "You *shall not* lie with a male as one lies with a female." *Period*! It is an *absolute* prohibition against *all* forms of homosexual behaviour and/or activity.

> **18:22 You shall not lie with a male as with a woman**. This prohibited all male homosexual activity (cf. 20:13; also note on Rom. 1:26-27). In the larger picture, such activity is utterly at odds with the creation ideal (see note on Gen. 2:23-24).[13]

Now, if Leviticus 18:21-23 were prohibited for "religious" reasons and not moral reasons, homosexuals are faced with a very problematic logical conclusion. If verse 22 forbids sexual intercourse with a man as with a woman only because of its association with idolatry, then it logically stands that verses 21 and 23 are also only forbidden because of their association with idolatry. Would homosexuals care to show how infant child sacrifice and intercourse with animals are somehow morally binding today despite their association with idolatry while sexual intercourse with a man as with a

[13] *ESV Study Bible*, 241.

woman is not? What this ridiculously ludicrous argument is saying is that it is perfectly fine for someone to sacrifice their children and/or to have sex with animals. In other words, if these practices were only condemned because of their association with idolatry, that means they are morally fine to commit today. Do you see what dishonesty and eisegesis result in?

ARGUMENT:

I don't think your argument is a sound one. In the Leviticus passage's context these acts are prohibited because of their association with pagan idolatry. However, common sense also tells us that the illegitimate taking of a human life (child sacrifice/Lev 18:21) and the sexual abuse of an animal (bestiality/Lev 18:23) are additionally indisputably exploitive and abusive under ANY context or circumstance, while the same does not hold true for what we know of today as "homosexuality," which often encompasses a committed, faithful and loving monogamous partnership.

RESPONSE:

This argument is the result of homosexuals having been caught with their hand in the cookie jar. Rather than fess up to their eisegesis and perverting the context, they attempt to distract those who have caught them with their hand in the cookie jar by going, "Look over there! A flying purple people eater!"

As you can see, homosexuals are guilty of performing pretext, "an effort or strategy intended to conceal something." Their argument goes like this: Leviticus 21, 22, and 23 are prohibited for *religious* reasons while *only* verses 21 and 23 are prohibited under *any* circumstances. They are reading their own opinions and prejudices *into* the text (eisegesis). They are performing "frontloading," i.e., reading their own personal, political, and ideological beliefs *into* the text (eisegesis) and ignoring the plain sense, and the drawing out of the plain sense (exegesis), of the text. The text says what it means and means what it says.

Homosexuals argue that Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 do not apply today to "*a committed, faithful and loving monogamous partnership*" between homosexuals. What about "*committed, faithful and loving monogamous partnership[s]*" between a son and his father's wife? a brother and his sister? someone and their dog? everything else prohibited by Leviticus 18 and 20? Whether two males or two females are in "*committed, faithful and loving monogamous partnership[s]*" is irrelevant. God has declared it to be *wrong* and has called it an *abomination*! It goes against the created order and the mandate to "Be fruitful and multiple" (Gen. 2:28). Homosexuals want it to be okay and acceptable because their perverted and sinful practices call for it. But the Bible *does not*!

ARGUMENT:

Today, we know more about the Bible than any previous time in history, including even in later biblical times.

RESPONSE:

This is not true. We have more *information* available to us today that backs up the credibility of the Bible, but biblical illiteracy (knowing what the Bible teaches and what it is all about) is at an all time high (possibly greater than that of the Dark Ages). Historical, archaeological, and scientific findings that back the credibility of the Bible is *not* knowing more about the Bible. Men of history knew more about the Bible than we know today. Why? Because we are so far removed, by over 2,000 years. So, in determining what the Bible had to say and teach, it is wise for us to rely on historical commentaries and information that are closer to the times in question. This information is what homosexuals want us to ignore because it condemns and destroys their position. For centuries, we have had men gifted in the knowledge and understanding of the original biblical languages, and they have provided us with works of solid interpretation of the words and grammar of Scripture. This information, which has not changed for hundreds of years, is what homosexuals want to attempt to tell us means something completely different.

EZEKIEL 16

WAS SODOM'S SIN SOMETHING OTHER THAN HOMOSEXUALITY?

"As I live," declares the Lord GOD, "Sodom, your sister and her daughters have not done as you and your daughters have done. Behold, this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had arrogance, abundant food and careless ease, but she did not help the poor and needy. Thus they were haughty and committed abominations before Me. Therefore I removed them when I saw it."

EZEKIEL 16:48-50

Homosexuals like to argue, "*In Ezekiel chapter 16, the prophet spells out explicitly what God calls the sin of Sodom: 'As I live,' declares the Lord GOD, '...this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had arrogance, abundant food and careless ease, but she did not help the poor and needy. Thus they were haughty and committed abominations before Me. Therefore I removed them when I saw it.' (Ezekiel 16:48-50)*"

As usual, they are being deceptive and dishonest. They are begging the question and failing to address the whole context of what the prophet is saying. Homosexuals fail to notice—or choose not to address—a significant connection between Genesis 19, the two passages in Leviticus, and Ezekiel 16:48–50. Behold:

> "Ezekiel, who makes abundant use of the book of Leviticus, describes various sins of Sodom (Ezek 16:48–49), then concludes, “They were haughty and did an abomination before me. So I removed them, when I saw it” (16:50). This indicates that the “abomination” committed by Sodom led to their destruction. Ezekiel’s reference to Sodom’s “abomination” uses the singular form of the term *toevah*, and that term is used in the singular only twice in the book of Leviticus, when same-sex intercourse is called an abomination in 18:22, and when the death penalty is prescribed for it in 20:13. The four other instances of the term in Leviticus are in the plural, making it likely that Ezekiel uses the term from Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 to reference the same-sex intentions of

the men of Sodom."[14]

By the statement "committed abomination before me" (Ez. 16:50), our minds should be brought to Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, where we find the term "abomination" used to describe homosexual behaviour. The Hebrew word translated "abomination" here is *to'ebah* (תועבה), the very same term used to describe homosexual activities/relationships in the Holiness Code. *To'ebah* properly refers to something morally disgusting. Homosexuals attempt to dismiss this and sweep it under the rug, but the fact it is a viable correlation between the two can be seen in how 2 Peter 2:6-8 and Jude 7 refer to the sins of Sodom as gross immorality. Proper exegesis arrives at the conclusive fact that Genesis 19 informs us of the homosexual behaviour that the Sodomites were guilty of.

The Sodomites were guilty of *many* sins, but only *one* sin in particular lead to their destruction, as attested to by God Himself: "They were haughty and did an abomination before me. So I removed them, when I saw it" (16:50, ESV). Sodom was destroyed because of the rampant homosexuality that had enveloped and engulfed it. Make no mistake about it, homosexuality is *im*moral, *ab*normal, *un*natural, and *un*healthy. It is a perversion of *both* human *and* sexual natures; an abomination of the created order.

Homosexuals are guilty of doing precisely like the cults with this passage, running to unrelated passages in order to try and dismiss the truth derived from the passage itself. This should be no surprise because everyone who does not belong to God does the exact same thing.

[14] Albert Mohler, *God and the Gay Christian?: A Response to Matthew Vines* (Louisville, KY: SBTS Press, 2014), p.35.

ROMANS 1
WHAT WAS PAUL RANTING ABOUT?

> *For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.*
>
> ROMANS 1:26-27

HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY

> **KJV:** "For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against their nature."
>
> **QJV:** "_____ Their women did change their natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, left of the natural use of the woman, burned in ritual lust, one toward another."[15]

The blank area at the beginning of the verse indicates something that is missing from this verse, something key to the context and exegetical interpretation thereof. The underlined text *does not* belong to verse 26; it belongs to verse 27. Furthermore, there is *no word* for "ritual" in the original Greek passage. The word for "lust" is the Greek *orexis* (ὀρέξις), which means "the excitement of the mind; desire." It is always the reaching out after an object with the purpose of drawing it to oneself and appropriating it. Anyone who reads these two verses (26-27) in *any* Bible translation (Wycliffe to King James, Revised Standard to English Standard, or *any other* language) will come to the simple, logical, and exegetical conclusion

[15] *The Queen James Bible*, 545.

that it is speaking about female and male homosexuality. The language and description cannot get any clearer.

> **KJV:** "And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet."
>
> **QJV:** "_____ Men with men working that which is pagan and unseemly. For this cause God gave the idolators up unto vile affections, receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet."[16]

Once again, the blank area at the beginning of the verse indicates something that is missing from this verse. The underlined text *does not* belong to verse 27; it belongs to verse 26. However, the word "idolators" *does not appear* in the original Greek for verse 26. Furthermore, the words "pagan and" *are not* in the original Greek passage. The homosexual community has attempted to re-construct these verses in an effort to get rid of the crystal clear condemnation of homosexual practice that is described therein. Again, anyone who reads these two verses (26-27) in *any* Bible translation (Wycliffe to King James, Revised Standard to English Standard, or *any other* language) will come to the simple, logical, and exegetical conclusion that it is speaking about female and male homosexuality. The language and description cannot get any clearer.

ARGUMENT:

Doesn't all this sound like what Paul had in mind in the beginning of his letter to the Romans with an attack on pagan idolatry when he wrote: "Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way, the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty [e.g., castration] for their perversion." (Romans 1:27) Doesn't this better describe these pagan cultic rites of Paul's day than it does the mutual love and support in the everyday domestic life of committed gay Christian couples today?

RESPONSE:

The fact is, *no*, it does not because that is *not* what Paul said *nor* what he was writing about. Homosexuals, quoting from Catherine Kroeger and B. Z.

---

[16] Ibid, 545.

Goldberg, who are writing about pagan cultic rites (which have nothing to do with the biblical text and its context), attempt the Bait and Switch Fallacy here. They are attempting to persuade people that so-called "*mutual love and support...of committed gay...couples*" (because their is *no such thing* as gay "Christian" couples) is somehow different from every other form of homosexuality. Homosexuality is homosexuality, regardless of the brush you choose to paint it with: A male raping another male is *homosexuality*; a male dominating another male sexually is *homosexuality*; a male prostituting himself out to other males is *homosexuality*; an older male having sexual relations with a younger male is *homosexuality*; two males who choose to be in a "*committed, faithful and loving monogamous partnership*" is *homosexuality*. Whether there is an age gap or not, whether it is for casual sex or a so-called "committed" relationship, homosexuality is homosexuality is homosexuality. The intentions *do not* change anything. Remember, Leviticus 18:22 *does not* say, "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female, unless that is your 'orientation,'" nor does it say, "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female, unless you love, support, and are committed to them." It says "You *shall not* lie with a male as one lies with a female." Period. It is an *absolute* prohibition against *all* forms of homosexual behaviour and/or activity. Likewise, so we find here, too, in regard to Romans 1:26-27.

Some homosexuals claim that Paul was condemning pederasty. However, he was, in fact, condemning *all* forms of homosexual behaviour. Bernadette Brooten (a lesbian New Testament scholar who taught at Harvard Divinity School) wrote:

> "If . . . the dehumanizing aspects of pederasty motivated Paul to condemn sexual relations between males, then why did he condemn relations between females in the same sentence? . . . Rom 1:27, like Lev 18:22 and 20:13, condemns all males in male-male relationships regardless of age, making it unlikely that lack of mutuality or concern for the passive boy were Paul's central concerns. . . . The ancient sources, which rarely speak of sexual relations between women and girls, undermine Robin Scroggs's theory that Paul opposed homosexuality as pederasty."[17]

William Hendriksen points out the same:

> "It is not clear why homosexual relations between females (lesbianism) is condemned before illicit relations between males. The only explanation that has any merit, as far as I can see, is the one according to which the

[17] Bernadette J. Brooten, *Love Between Women: Early Christian Responses to Female Homoeroticism* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 253.

> apostle wanted to place special emphasis on the male-with-male perversion; hence, kept the condemnation of this vice for the close of the sentence, so that he would then be able to enlarge on it, since, of the two homosexual sins it was probably the most prevalent."[18]

Now, there is a glaring problem with the quotes homosexuals provide for us and what Paul actually writes. Homosexuals are attempting to rip Paul's words from their context and twist them to refer to pagan "sex reversal," wherein a particular sex pretends to be the other sex or hides their own sex for the sake of their pagan god. This argument condemns each and every transvestite and transsexual because that is precisely what *they* are doing, regardless of whether they are doing it to appease some god or not. However, you will notice that Paul *does not* say that "women exchanged natural sex/gender for opposite sex/gender in order to appease their god" or that "men abandoned natural sex/gender." No, Paul says they "exchanged natural *use/function*" and "abandoned natural *use/function* with women." The word translated "use/function" is *chresin* (χρῆσιν), which refers to sexual intercourse as an employment or occupation of the body. So, the passage would be more accurate if rendered:

> Because of this God gave them over to dishonorable passions, for even their females exchanged natural sexual intercourse for that which is against nature. Likewise also the males, having abandoned natural sexual intercourse of the woman, burned in their lustful desires toward one another, males with males, committing shamefully indecent acts and receiving in themselves the retribution for their perversion.

Cult prostitution is *not* in view here, and females were hardly well-known for engaging in same-sex perversions the way males were. It was practically unheard of. The description spells out in *clear* in-your-face finality the behaviour, acts, and lifestyle of homosexuality. Paul condemns *both* female-on-female and male-on-male behavioural engagements. To see this as a fact, let us examine the internal interpretation of the passage.

> Romans 1:26-27 says, "For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and in the same way also the **men** abandoned the natural function of the **woman** and burned in their desire toward one another, **men with men** committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error."

---

[18] William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary: Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 78-79.

> In the Greek, it reads: "Διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας αἵ τε γὰρ **θήλειαι** αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν ὁμοίως τε καὶ οἱ **ἄρσενες** ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς **θηλείας** ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους **ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν** τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι καὶ τὴν ἀντιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες."
>
> θήλειαι = "female, woman"
> ἄρσενες, ἄρσεσιν = "male, man"
> χρῆσιν = "employment, i.e. (specially), sexual intercourse (as an occupation of the body)"
> ὀρέξει = "excitement of the mind, i.e. longing after: lust"
> ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν = "men with men, i.e. homosexuals"
> ἀσχημοσύνην = "an indecency; by implication, the pudenda: shame"

Χρῆσιν clearly delineates sexual intercourse. "Women [exchanging] the natural function" speaks of women abandoning natural sexual intercourse for woman-on-woman perversion. This fact can be seen from three evidences: (1) "in the same way" or "likewise," this lets us know there is a comparison taking place; (2) "natural function of the woman," this lets us know that the former was speaking of women abandoning the natural function of the man; and (3) "men with men," this lets us know that women with women is in view. It clearly states these "men abandoned the natural function" of sexual intercourse, "[burning] in their [lust] toward one another." Lust (ὀρέξει) is sexual desire of the mind. The fact it states ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσιν puts the nail in the coffin on the fact it is speaking of man-on-man perversion.

Now, the context is quite clear. "Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, that their bodies might be dishonored among them" (Rom. 1:24). Then we receive the description of how they were dishonouring their bodies amongst themselves in their lusts (Rom. 1:26-27), which ends stating the fact that they "[receive] in their own persons the due penalty of their error". The Golden Rule of Hermeneutics states, "*If the plain sense makes common sense, seek no other sense.*" The Direct Statement Principle of Hermeneutics states, "*God says what He means and means what He says.*" What are the words *saying*? What are the words *describing*? For anyone who is honest and truthful in the least, their answer will be, "Homosexuality."

> **1:26-27** Not only homosexual acts but also such **passions** or desires are said to be **dishonorable** before God. Just as idolatry is unnatural (contrary to what God intended when he made human beings), so too homosexuality is **contrary to nature** in that it does not represent what God intended when he made men and women with physical bodies that

> have a "natural" way of interacting with each other and "natural" desires for each other. Paul follows the OT and Jewish tradition in seeing all homosexual relationships as sinful. The creation account in Genesis 1-2 reveals the divine paradigm for human beings, indicating that God's will is for man and woman to be joined in marriage. **Consumed** (or "inflamed") gives a strong image of a powerful but destructive inward desire. The sin in view is not pederasty (homosexual conduct of men with boys) but **men** engaging in sin **with men**. There is no justification here for the view that Paul condemns only abusive homosexual relationships. **Due penalty** could refer to the sin of homosexuality itself as the penalty for idolatry. Or, the "and" in **and receiving** may indicate some additional negative consequences received **in themselves**, that is, some form of spiritual, emotional, or physical blight. The "due" penalty refers to a penalty that is appropriate to the wrong committed.[19]

In his commentary on Romans 1:26-27, St. John Chrysostom (347 to 407 A.D.) wrote:

> "ALL these affections then were vile, but *chiefly the mad lust after males*; for the soul is more the sufferer in sins, and more dishonored, than the body in diseases. But behold how here too, as in the case of the doctrines, he deprives them of excuse, by saying of the women, that "they changed the natural use." For no one, he means, can say that it was by being hindered of *legitimate intercourse* that they came to this pass, or that it was from having no means to fulfill their desire that they were driven into this monstrous insaneness. For the changing implies possession. Which also when discoursing upon the doctrines he said, "They changed the truth of God for a lie." And with regard to the men again, he shows the same thing by saying, "Leaving the natural use of the woman." …*For genuine pleasure is that which is according to nature*. But when God hath left one, then all things are turned upside down. And thus not only was their doctrine Satanical, but their life too was diabolical." (Emphasis mine.)

ARGUMENT:

Notably, Paul also applied the very same Greek term "para physin" to God's action in Romans 11:24, when God engrafted Gentiles onto the Jewish olive tree — and there "para physin" was an appreciation, not a reproach. So, if same-sex coupling is, in Paul's terms "unnatural", so too is your salvation.

RESPONSE:

Looking at one of the words translated "natural" in this passage,

[19] *ESV Study Bible*, 2159.

homosexuals perform what is called "collapsing context" by trying to relate the passage to Romans 11:24 merely because they share a similar word. By doing so, they make an argument that if homosexuality is unnatural, so, too, is our salvation. Their argument is both right (unknowingly) and wrong, as we shall discover. Let us examine both passages:

> "For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural [aj5446; phusikos, φυσικος] function for that which is unnatural [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις], and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural [aj5446; phusikos, φυσικος] function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error." (Romans 1:26-27)

> "For if you were cut off from what is by nature [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] a wild olive tree, and were grafted contrary to nature [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] into a cultivated olive tree, how much more will these who are the natural [pre2596; kata/an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] branches be grafted into their own olive tree?" (Romans 11:24)

ARGUMENT:

We know from linguistic studies that in Paul's day the terms "natural" and "unnatural" referred simply to what was, or was not, expected.

RESPONSE:

This definition is a Linguistic Fallacy. Try and apply the homosexuals' definition to Ephesians 2:3—"and were by nature [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] children of wrath." Remember, their definition of "nature" is "*what was, or was not, expected*." But is their definition accurate? I submit to you that, *no*, it is not.

> 5446 phusikos, φυσικος; *adjective*. Natural, as established by God in nature.
> 5449 phusis, φυσις; *anarthrous noun*. Nature, natural birth or condition; natural disposition.

> φυσις is everything which by its origin or by observation of its constitution seems to be a given. To call it "given" φυσις is already to go beyond the sphere of naive description and implies a judgment on its actual constitution or true nature.[20]

[20] Gerhard Kittel., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co, 1974), 9:253.

In response to these accurate definitions, homosexuals tend to respond with, "*We can't do responsible exegesis by simply camping out with our Bible and a Greek dictionary*." Why do they say this? Because they know nothing of the Greek language and are intimidated when someone actually uses it correctly. As such, they turn around and say that we need to "*analyze its use in as many different contexts as possible*," which is fine. However, as soon as you do this, they once again try to deny one's accurate handling of the issue. You see, the word "*phusikos*" is only found three times in the New Testament. Twice in Romans 1:26-27, and once in 2 Peter 2:12. "Phusis," on the other hand, is found 14 times: Romans 1:26; 2:14; 2:27; 11:21, 24; 1 Corinthians 11:14; Galatians 2:15; 4:8; Ephesians 2:3; James 3:7; and 2 Peter 1:4. Homosexuals argue that the phrase παρὰ φύσιν means "*what was, or was not, expected*." If we look outside the Bible, like in the Stoics, for example, we find that "for Zeno it is παρὰ φύσιν to live with a woman who is legally married to another and thereby to disrupt his house."[21] If homosexuals bothered to "*analyze its use in as many different contexts as possible*," they would have seen that they are once again *wrong*, for Gerhard Kittel deals thoroughly and extensively with the word and its use throughout a vast collection of Greek literature on pages 251 to 277 of volume 9 of the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.

We will have to excuse the homosexuals' ignorance and their typical assumptions and conclusions drawn from assumptions. As we have already established, homosexuals argue that if homosexuality is unnatural, so too is our salvation. These homosexuals were right about one thing (although unwittingly so), and that was that our salvation is *not* natural to us. It is not in accordance to our birth condition and natural disposition. We are born in sin and are deservedly heading toward Hell. We do not deserve salvation.

> Homosexuality *is* unnatural [aj5446; phusikos, φυσικος] because it exchanges what was established by God in nature [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] for that which is *against* [pre3844] nature [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις]. Notice that salvation is *not* unnatural [aj5446; phusikos, φυσικος], but is *not* our natural [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] disposition. We are by nature [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] children of wrath (Eph. 2:3), just as every man and woman are by nature [an,nn5449; phusis, φυσις] heterosexual. They choose to be homosexual and act out homosexual activities.

For the record, homosexuality is *not* something you *are*, it is something you *do*. You do not commit the act of homosexuality because you are a homosexual, you are a homosexual when you commit the act of

[21] Ibid, 9:265.

homosexuality. You do not commit the act of murder because you are a murderer, you are a murderer when you commit the act of murder. You do not commit the act of rape because you are a rapist, you are a rapist when you commit the act of rape. You do not commit the act of theft because you are a thief, you are a thief when you commit the act of theft. You do not commit the act of lying because you are a liar, you are a liar when you commit the act of lying. If you never tell a lie or steal something, even though you might think about doing such, it is rather impossible to call you a thief and a liar. Thoughts, feelings, and temptations mean bupkis. (That is the technical term.)

Paul's point is *not* about idolatry—worshiping false gods—or prostitution, but about homosexual behaviour and homosexual acts. Homosexuality among women was not that prevalent, so when Paul condemns it first and then expands on it with his condemnation of homosexuality among men, you know precisely what he is describing. Homosexuals are looking for any excuse to let them off the hook. Whatever sounds like the best argument at the time, that is what they will spew at you in order to try and make their behaviour and actions acceptable. Homosexuality, like every other sin, will *never* be acceptable—not in the eyes of God at least. Regardless of what public opinion is today, homosexuality is an unnatural perversion of *both* human *and* sexual nature. It is an abomination. Truth is *not* a consensus, and consensus is *not* truth. Consensus is invoked only in situations where the theology is not solid enough.

The penis was perfectly designed for and made to enter the vagina, and the vagina was perfectly designed for and made to receive the penis. Anything beyond this is *not natural*! Homosexuals can concoct all the emotional arguments they want in order to try and confuse people by lying to them about the truth of the issue, but in the end it will not change anything. When they stand before God on Judgment Day, they will, each and every one of them, be condemned for embracing and habitually practicing their sins of perversion, just like every other sinner. Only those who have repented of and forsaken their sins will be admitted into the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:9-10; 1 Tim. 1:8-11). Homosexuals and homosexual advocates would do well to believe the Bible instead of trying to twist it to make room for their depraved lusts.

ROMANS 2

IS ROMANS 1:26-27 A MATTER OF NOT CONDEMNING EACH OTHER?

Therefore you have no excuse, everyone of you who passes judgment, for in that which you judge another, you condemn yourself; for you who judge practice the same things.

ROMANS 2:1

ARGUMENT:

Paul wants us all to know we are not to condemn each other.

RESPONSE:

Some homosexuals will attempts to rip Romans 2:1 out of context and apply it to Romans 1:26-27. Romans 2 falls hot on the heels of Romans 1:28-32. Verse 32 concludes by saying, "and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them." Romans 2:1 then says, "Therefore you have no excuse, everyone of you who passes judgment, for in that which you judge another, you condemn yourself; for you who judge practice the same things." Whenever you see the word "therefore," you need to ask, "What is it there for?" It means "as a result of everything just said." What Paul is getting at in Romans 2 is that if we condemn another person for committing a sin that we ourselves are guilty of committing, we also condemn ourselves. We see this in verse 3: "But do you suppose this, O man, when you pass judgment on those who practice such things and do the same yourself, that you will escape the judgment of God?" Paul is not finished though. In verse 4 he goes on to say, "Or do you think lightly of the riches of His kindness and tolerance and patience, not knowing that the kindness of God *leads you to repentance*?" Who is Paul talking to this entire time? The unrepentant.

Observe verse 5: "But because of your *stubbornness* and *unrepentant* heart you are storing up wrath for yourself in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." This is the state of every sinner, including those who commit homosexuality.

ARGUMENT:

Those Paul speaks of had refused to acknowledge and worship God and for this reason were abandoned by God to their lustful depravity.

RESPONSE:

Homosexuals have it backwards here. They would do well to read the actual words and pay attention to what is happening (i.e., the context). Romans 1:24 says, "Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them." Again, when you see the word "therefore," you need to ask, "What is it there for?" In light of everything Paul said previously, God then gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity. In other words, they desired it so much that God gave them over to it. In verse 26 we read, "For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions." For what reason? Read the rest of verse 26 and on into verse 27: "*For this reason* God gave them over to degrading passions; *for* their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error." Why did God give them over to degrading passions? Because both genders had abandoned the natural use of sexual intercourse and were engaging in sexual activities with those of their same sex. Verse 25 is *not* a part of verses 26 and 27; it is the finality to verses 18 through 24. It ends with "Amen."

> "The most important imagery for homosexual acts is the language in Romans 1 of 'exchanging' God's purposes and of God letting go. Some dishonored God by substituting idols for God; therefore, God 'gave them up' to their own lusts (Rom. 1:18-25). Others God 'gave up' to their depravities, such as envy, gossip and arrogance. Romans 1:26-27 declare that God gave over to their degrading passions both women and men who 'exchanged' natural functions for unnatural. These three image sets are examples of warning, for Romans 2:1 insists that everyone is without excuse since all practice such rebellion against God."[22]

[22] *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*, 396.

ARGUMENT:

The Christian gay people I know have not rejected God at all; they love God and thank Him for his grace and His gifts. How then could they have been abandoned to homosexuality as a punishment for refusing to acknowledge God?

RESPONSE:

Yet another attempt at a fallacious, erroneous, and egregious argument. You *cannot* know any "Christian gay people" because *there are none*. That is equivalent to saying you know "Christian rapists" or "Christian murderers." You might know a Christian who committed rape or murder in the past, but if they are committing it presently they demonstrate that Christ is not in them. Based on 1 Corinthians 6:11 and like passages (Rom. 11:30; 1 Cor. 12:2; Eph. 2:2; Col. 3:5-7; Titus 3:3-7), Christians *were* guilty of these sorts of things in the past before they were saved; but *no longer*. They have been renewed, which in the Greek means to be renovated. The god that homosexuals have not rejected is a god made in *their* image, one they can worship without guilt and condemnation (although their conscience still condemns them). What they are guilty of is idolatry, creating a god to suit their own desires. If they worshiped the God of the Bible, they would know that "everyone who names the name of the Lord [must] depart from iniquity" (2 Tim. 2:19, ESV). The Bible informs us that "The Lord knows those who are His" (v. 19), which we see clearly from Matthew 7:21-23 and other passages. Homosexuals think that just because a person *claims* to know Jesus that that makes him/her a Christian. *It does not*. It does not matter if you know who Jesus is, it matters whether or not He knows you. Many people claim to know Christ Jesus but the demonstrations of their life reveal the opposite, to which they will hear those fateful words, "I *never* knew you; depart from me, you who practice lawlessness" (Matt. 7:23).

Concerning Romans 2, homosexuals will attempt to take everything Paul says and turn it into "Do not judge so that you will not be judged" (Matt. 7:1). While this is not only contextually inaccurate, it is also a glaring ignorance used vastly by Christians and non-Christians alike. First of all, in the Greek, there are two words translated as "judge": *krino* (κρινω) and *anakrino* (ανακρινω). *Krino* means "to pronounce judgment, to condemn in a legal sense." This is the word Jesus used when he said, "Do not judge so that you will not be judged." *Anakrino* means "to scrutinize, to question, to investigate, to discern, to determine, to examine, to judge, to search." This word is used in 1 Corinthians 2:14-15. Second of all, even in the English language the word "judge" has more than one meaning, yet people ignorantly try to tie a single definition to the word. Do people not realize that when they are accusing you of judging others, and telling you, "Judge

not, lest ye be judged," that they themselves are guilty of judging you?

However, homosexuals fail to catch what Paul says in 1 Corinthians 5:11-13:

> But actually, I wrote to you *not* to associate with any *so-called brother* if he is an *immoral person*, or covetous, or an *idolater*, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or a swindler--*not even to eat with such a one*. [This would include homosexuals professing to be "brothers" in the faith.] For what have I to do with judging (κρίνειν) *outsiders*? Do you not judge (κρίνετε) those who are *within the church*? But those who are *outside*, God judges (κρίνει). REMOVE THE WICKED MAN FROM AMONG YOURSELVES.

Christians are called to judge those inside the church who call themselves Christians but who do not bear the fruit or evidence of a genuine born-again Christian. But not only that, Paul even says in 1 Corinthians 6:2-3:

> Or do you not know that the saints will judge (κρινοῦσι) the world? If the world is judged (κρίνεται) by you, are you not competent to constitute the smallest law courts? Do you not know that we will judge (κριτηρίων) angels? How much more matters of this life?

Just so homosexuals do not try and pervert this to mean something else, let us see what else Paul said: "For I...have already judged (κέκρικα) him who has so committed this, as though I were present" (1 Cor. 5:3). So clearly, from "*analyz[ing] its use in as many different contexts as possible*," there is a wrong time/way to judge/condemn and a right time/way to judge/condemn. If you are doing the same things as the one you are judging/condemning, then you are in the wrong and you self-condemn yourself. This is also the point Jesus was making.

What Paul is getting at in Romans 2 is those who condemn (*krino*) the sins of others while deliberately overlooking or excusing their own sins of the same nature. What Paul was *not* getting at, which is what homosexuals are trying to turn into Paul's case, is those who judge (*anakrino*) correctly in order to judge (*krino*). To point out that homosexuality is a sin and those who commit it and habitually practice it are in danger of the Lake of Fire, is not a self-righteous condemnation. It is an accurate discernment. A person can judge (*anakrino*) without judging (*krino*), but they can also judge (*anakrino*) in order to judge (*krino*) correctly. Unfortunately, most people, including homosexuals, fail to grasp this simple concept.

1 CORINTHIANS 6 & 1 TIMOTHY 1

DID THE BIBLICAL WORLD HAVE WORDS FOR 'HOMOSEXUALITY'?

> *Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, not thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God.*
> 1 CORINTHIANS 6:9-10

HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY

> **KJV:** "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind."
>
> **QJV:** "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor morally weak, nor promiscuous."[23]

Neither the term "morally weak" nor the term "promiscuous" are accurate translations of the Greek words μαλακοί and ἀρσενοκοῖται (although homosexuals could be accurately described as "morally weak," since their actions go against all morality).

> **KJV:** "For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine."
>
> **QJV:** "For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves _____,

[23] *The Queen James Bible*, 554.

> for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine."[24]

As you can see, the homosexual community has deliberately removed the words "with mankind" that complete the description derived from the Greek word used, which we find in the 1530 Tyndale Bible, the 1537 Matthew's Bible, and the 1611 King James Version. The 1380 Wycliffe Bible has "they that do lechery with men." Letchery is offensive sexual desire; lustfulness. The 1560 and 1599 Geneva Bibles have it rendered more accurately and correctly with "buggerers," which, of course, means Sodomites, which means homosexuals. Kenneth Wuest in his *The New Testament: An Expanded Translation* renders this word "sodomites."

> We know that the Law is good, if one uses it lawfully, realizing the fact that law is not made for a righteous person, but for those who are lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers and immoral men and homosexuals (ἀρσενοκοῖταις) and kidnappers and liars and perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound teaching, according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God. (1 Timothy 1:8-11)

> Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate (οὔτε μαλακοί), nor homosexuals (οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται), nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God. (1 Corinthians 6:9-10)

Figuratively, μαλακοί means "effeminate," having feminine qualities untypical of a man, such as transvestites (men who dress up like women), transsexual women (men who make themselves out to be women, even going so far as to have sex changes), or a person who allows himself to be sexually abused contrary to nature (the passive partner in homosexual acts). There are those who argue that μαλακοί means "soft" (Matt. 11:8; Luke 7:25), but this is without warrant or justification. The former verses join μαλακοῖς to the word ἱματίοις (clothing) in order to modify it. In 1 Corinthians 6:9, the phrase appears as οὔτε μαλακοί. The word μαλακοί is not joined to any other word, which is what would be required in order to translate it as "soft." The question would arise, "Soft what?" Ergo, we must translate it according to its other meanings and usages:

1. soft, soft to the touch

[24] Ibid, 575.

2. metaph. in a bad sense
    a. effeminate
        i. of a catamite
        ii. of a boy kept for homosexual relations with a man
        iii. of a male who submits his body to unnatural lewdness
        iv. of a male prostitute

The compound Greek word ἀρσενοκοῖται comes from its root or stem words, αρσεν (a male) and κοιτε (a bed), and means "a male bed partner" or "a man who lies in bed with another male," i.e., a homosexual, a Sodomite, one who defiles himself with men. Interestingly enough, Leviticus 20:13 in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, uses these root words side-by-side: ἄρσενος κοίτην.

Borrowing an argument from Dale Martin, homosexuals will argue that we cannot translate ἀρσενοκοῖται based upon the combined meanings of its root words because "*the English word 'understand' has nothing to do with either standing or being under*." They also provide other words such as "butterfly" or "honeymoon" or "mandate" in an attempt to provide false proof to their Linguistic and Etymological Fallacies. This argument is the height of ignorance concerning English language, grammar, and structure. It is illogical and lacks any common sense or knowledge of linguistics. In the English language, its compound words largely have *nothing* to do with their individual root words. However, for words taken directly from other languages, such as amuse, agnostic, atheist, amillennial, etc., they *do*. "A" is a negative prefix, meaning "no, not, or without." "Muse" means "to think." Ergo, "a-muse" means "not to think," although in our day and age it is used ignorantly and incorrectly as a positive term meaning "funny or entertaining." Amusements clearly involve the lack of active thought. So if fun and entertainment is "amusing," it is without thought. Hence why the television is referred to as an "idiot box."

Homosexuals choose these words because they lend support to their Straw Man Fallacy arguments. However, what about the *hundreds* of other English words they *deliberately* ignore that contradict their argument?

circumnavigate = circum (around) + navigate
acrophobia = acro (high) + phobia (fear)
egomaniac = ego (I, self) + maniac
egocentric = ego (I, self) + centric
biology = bio (life) + logos (study, word)
biography = bio (life) + graph (write, record)
biohazard = bio (life) + hazard
agnostic = a (no, not, without) + gnostic (knowledge)

atheist = a (no, not, without) + theist (god)
amillennial = a (no, not, without) + millenial (thousand years)
amuse = a (no, not, without) + muse (to think)
anti_____ = anti (against) + whatever word you want to insert
neo_____ = neo (new) + whatever word you want to insert
theocracy = theo (God) + cracy (rule)
geography = geo (earth) + graphy (write, record)
geology = geo (earth) + logos (study, word)
telephone = tele (distance) + phone
Some others are bicycle, microscope, telescope, asymmetrical, etc.

Homosexuals are trying to convince us of their perverse beliefs by use of fallacious arguments. Their first error I have just exposed above. Their second error is in attempting to force English grammar and structure upon the grammar and structure of other languages. Regarding the majority of other languages around the world, their compound words *do* have something to do with their individual root words. Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish quite frequently have compound words that mean *precisely* and *exactly* the combination of their individual root words. The same is true of Greek, as noted:

paralambano = para (near) + lambano (to receive) = to receive near
paiderastia = pais (boy) + erastos (lover) = lover of boys (adolescence)
aperchomai = apo (off) + erchomai (to go) = to go off (depart)
suneiserchomai = sun (with, together) + eiserchomai (to enter into) = to enter in company with
eiserchomai = eis (to, into) erchomai (to go) = to go into, to enter into

The Greek word παραλαμβνω means "to receive near." Its root words are παρα (near) and λαμβνω (to take, obtain, receive). Ergo, when the root words are combined, the compound word means "to receive near." This can be demonstrated with *hundreds* more Greek compound words. Ἀρσενοκοῖται is no different. It means:

1. one who lies with a male as with a female (male bed partners), bugger, sodomite, homosexual

Some have said, "Αρσενοκοιται has been understood as referring to male-male sexual activity for a long time. 'Homosexual' is a (perhaps unhelpful) attempt to render that in contemporary English." How do you figure? Homosexuality, by definition, is "a sexual attraction to (or sexual relations with) persons of the same sex." A homosexual, by definition, is

"someone who is sexually attracted to (or sexually active with) people of their own sex." Male-male sexual activity *is* homosexuality. Furthermore, here is what ἀρσενοκοῖται means according to Greek dictionaries:

- ἀρσενοκοίτης arsenokoítēs; gen. arsenokoítou, masc. noun, from ársēn (730), a male, and koítē (2845), a bed. A man who lies in bed with another male, a homosexual (1 Cor. 6:9; 1 Tim. 1:10 [cf. Lev. 18:22; Rom. 1:27]). (*The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament*)
- 88.280 ἀρσενοκοίτης, ου m: a male partner in homosexual intercourse—'homosexual.' οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι … οὔτε μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται … βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν 'don't you know that … no adulterers or homosexuals … will receive the kingdom of God' 1 Cor 6:9–10. It is possible that ἀρσενοκοίτης in certain contexts refers to the active male partner in homosexual intercourse in contrast with μαλακός[b], the passive male partner (88.281). (*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*)
- ἀρσενοκοίτης (arsenokoitēs), ου (ou), ὁ (ho): n.masc.; ≡ Str 733—LN 88.280 male homosexual, one who takes the active male role in homosexual intercourse (1Co 6:9), specifically interpreted as male homosexual paedophilia (nab footnote); possibly a more generic term in first Timothy; sodomites (rsv, nrsv, nkjv), perverts (niv, neb, reb), practicing homosexuals (nab), homosexual (njb), (1Ti 1:10+), note: translations possibly use certain specific terms to infer or allow certain theologies. (*Dictionary of Biblical Languages*)
- ἀρσενοκοίτης, ου, ὁ an adult male who practices sexual intercourse with another adult male or a boy homosexual, sodomite, pederast (*Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*)

The most pathetic argument I have ever heard in this debate is the claim that all these verses are prohibiting heterosexual men from engaging in homosexual activities. Whoa! Let's stop and *think* for a moment here. That argument is completely and utterly *illogical*, lacking *all* common sense. A heterosexual male engaging in homosexual activity, thereby committing homosexuality, is, by definition, a homosexual. Heterosexuals and homosexuals are either *male* or *female*. There are *only two* genders of humanity: *male* and *female*. "Heterosexual" and "homosexual" are adjectives; they describe the character and behaviour of the individual. They only become nouns when the adjective is habitually true of the individual's life practices. Hence, you are *born* a heterosexual, at some point *choose* to be a homosexual (whether or not you remember having made that choice is irrelevant; you *still* made it), and, when you are either saved by the Lord Jesus or your conscience and common sense kick in, *revert* to a heterosexual once more. How about we throw out these terms, meant to obscure reality and truth, and deal with the words and descriptions contained therein.

ARGUMENT:

The word 'homosexual' did not appear in any translation of the Christian Bible until 1946.

RESPONSE:

"But, we have to acknowledge that you don't translate a word from Hebrew and Greek into the English if there is no English equivalent. So, using the term "homosexual" in the English Bible could not have occurred until after the word had entered the English vocabulary."[25] Regardless of when this word came into existence, it does not negate the fact that *every* translation, past or present, describes or directly names homosexuality. See my comparison of 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 from a wide variety of translations for this fact (10 English translations, a Latin translation, 5 German translations, 5 Spanish translations, 3 French translations, and 2 Russian translations):

THE WYCLIFF BIBLE (1380):

Whether ye witen not, that wickid men schulen not welde the kyngdom of God? Nyle ye erre; nethir letchours, nether men that seruen mawmetis, nether auouteris, nether letchouris ayen kynde, nether thei that doon letcheri with men, nether theues, nether auerouse men, nethir `ful of drunkenesse, nether curseris, nether rauenours, schulen welde the kyngdom of God.

MODERN ENGLISH:

Whether ye know not, that wicked men shall not wield the kingdom of God? Do not ye err; neither lechers, neither men that serve maumets [neither men serving to idols], neither adulterers, neither lechers against kind, neither they that do lechery with men, neither thieves, neither avaricious men [neither covetous men, or niggards], neither men full of drunkenness, neither cursers, neither raveners, shall wield the kingdom of God.

Letchery: offensive sexual desire; lustfulness

THE TYNDALE BIBLE (1530):

Do ye not remember how that the vnrighteous shall not inheret the kyngdome of God? Be not deceaved. For nether fornicators nether worshyppers of ymages nether whormongers nether weaklinges nether abusars of them selves with the mankynde, nether theves nether the coveteous nether dronkardes nether cursed speakers nether pillers shall inheret the kyngdome of God.

[25] http://carm.org/word-homosexual-english-bible-1946.

THE MATTHEWS BIBLE (1537):
Do ye not remember how that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived. For neither fornicators, neither worshippers of images, neither whoremongers, neither weaklings, neither abusers of themselves with mankind, neither thieves, neither the covetous, neither drunkards, neither cursed speakers, neither pillers, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

GENEVA BIBLE (1560):
Knowe ye not that the vnrighteous shal not inherite the kingdome of God? Be not deceiued: nether fornicatours, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor watons, nor bouggerers, nor theues, nor couetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extorcioners, shal inherite the kingdome of God.

GENEVA BIBLE (1599):
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor (♣) wantons, nor (♠) buggerers, Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God.

(♣) Immoral or unchaste, lewd.
(♠) Someone who engages in anal copulation (especially a male who engages in anal copulation with another male.)

KJV (1611):
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

NASB (1971):
Or do you not know that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor [the] covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

NIV (1978):
Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

NKJV (1979):
Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God.

ESV (2001):
Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor men who practice homosexuality (*), nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

> (*) The two Greek terms translated by this phrase refer to the passive and active partners in consensual homosexual acts

LATIN BIBLE (VULGATE):
an nescitis quia iniqui regnum Dei non possidebunt nolite errare neque fornicarii neque idolis servientes neque adulteri neque molles neque masculorum concubitores neque fures neque avari neque ebriosi neque maledici neque rapaces regnum Dei possidebunt
TRANSLATION:
Do ye not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God is not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor liers with mankind nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God

GERMAN BIBLE (Luther 1534):
Wisset ihr nicht, daß die Ungerechten das Reich Gottes nicht ererben werden? Lasset euch nicht verführen! Weder die Hurer noch die Abgöttischen noch die Ehebrecher noch die Weichlinge noch die Knabenschänder noch die Diebe noch die Geizigen noch die Trunkenbolde noch die Lästerer noch die Räuber werden das Reich Gottes ererben.
TRANSLATION:
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Let not seduce you! Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers [of themselves with mankind], nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor are revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

GERMAN BIBLE (Schlachter 1951):
Wisset ihr denn nicht, daß Ungerechte das Reich Gottes nicht ererben werden? Irret euch nicht: Weder Unzüchtige noch Götzendiener, weder Ehebrecher noch Weichlinge, noch Knabenschänder, weder Diebe noch

Habsüchtige, noch Trunkenbolde, noch Lästerer, noch Räuber werden das Reich Gottes ererben.

TRANSLATION:

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

GERMAN BIBLE (Schlachter 2000):

Wisst ihr denn nicht, dass Ungerechte das Reich Gottes nicht erben werden? Irrt euch nicht: Weder Unzüchtige noch Götzendiener, weder Ehebrecher noch Weichlinge, noch Knabenschänder, weder Diebe noch Habsüchtige, noch Trunkenbolde, noch Lästerer, noch Räuber werden das Reich Gottes erben.

TRANSLATION:

Do you not know that the unrighteous will inherit the kingdom of God is not to be? Do not be deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

GERMAN BIBLE (NGU):

Muss ich euch daran erinnern, dass die, die Unrecht tun, keinen Anteil am Reich Gottes bekommen werden, dem Erbe, das Gott für uns bereithält? Macht euch nichts vor: Keiner, der ein unmoralisches Leben führt, Götzen anbetet, die Ehe bricht, homosexuelle Beziehungen eingeht, stiehlt, geldgierig ist, trinkt, Verleumdungen verbreitet oder andere beraubt, wird an Gottes Reich teilhaben.

TRANSLATION:

Must I remind you that those who do wrong, no share in the kingdom of God will receive, the inheritance that God has for us? Never mind before: No one who leads an immoral life, idol worship, adultery, arrives homosexual relationships, stealing, being greedy, drinking, or other spreads slander is robbed, participate in God's kingdom.

GERMAN BIBLE (HOF):

Habt ihr vergessen, dass für Menschen, die Unrecht tun, in Gottes neuer Welt kein Platz sein wird? Täuscht euch nicht: Wer verbotene sexuelle Beziehungen eingeht, andere Götter anbetet, die Ehe bricht, wer sich von seinen Begierden treiben lässt und homosexuell verkehrt, wird nicht in Gottes neue Welt kommen; auch kein Dieb, kein Ausbeuter, kein Trinker, kein Gotteslästerer oder Räuber.

TRANSLATION:

Did you forget that for people who do wrong will be no place in God's new world? Do not be deceived: those who take illicit sexual relationships, worshiping other gods, adultery, who can be driven by his

desires and perverted homosexual will not come into God's new world, nor a thief, not a sweatshop, not a drinker, not a blasphemer or robbers.

SPANISH BIBLE (RVR 1960):
¿No sabéis que los injustos no heredarán el reino de Dios? No erréis; ni los fornicarios, ni los idólatras, ni los adúlteros, ni los afeminados, ni los que se echan con varones, ni los ladrones, ni los avaros, ni los borrachos, ni los maldicientes, ni los estafadores, heredarán el reino de Dios.
TRANSLATION:
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom God.

SPANISH BIBLE (RVR 1995):
¿No sabéis que los injustos no heredarán el reino de Dios? No os engañéis: ni los fornicarios, ni los idólatras, ni los adúlteros, ni los afeminados, ni los homosexuales, ni los ladrones, ni los avaros, ni los borrachos, ni los maldicientes, ni los estafadores, heredarán el reino de Dios.
TRANSLATION:
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

SPANISH BIBLE (RVA):
¿No sabéis que los injustos no poseerán el reino de Dios? No erréis, que ni los fornicarios, ni los idólatras, ni los adúlteros, ni los afeminados, ni los que se echan con varones, Ni los ladrones, ni los avaros, ni los borrachos, ni los maldicientes, ni los robadores, heredarán el reino de Dios.
TRANSLATION:
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

SPANISH BIBLE (RVC):
¿Acaso no saben que los injustos no heredarán el reino de Dios? No se equivoquen: ni los fornicarios, ni los idólatras, ni los adúlteros, ni los afeminados, ni los que se acuestan con hombres, ni los ladrones, ni los avaros, ni los borrachos, ni los malhablados, ni los estafadores,

heredarán el reino de Dios.

TRANSLATION:

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Make no mistake: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor those who lie with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor foul-mouthed, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

SPANISH BIBLE (Traducción en lenguaje actual):

No se dejen engañar. Ustedes bien saben que los que hacen lo malo no participarán en el reino de Dios. Me refiero a los que tienen relaciones sexuales prohibidas, a los que adoran a los ídolos, a los que son infieles en el matrimonio, a los afeminados, a los hombres que tienen relaciones sexuales con otros hombres, a los ladrones, a los que siempre quieren más de lo que tienen, a los borrachos, a los que hablan mal de los demás, y a los tramposos. Ninguno de ellos participará del reino de Dios.

TRANSLATION:

Do not be fooled. You well know that wrongdoers will not participate in the kingdom of God. I mean those who have sex prohibited, those who worship idols, who are unfaithful in marriage, to effeminate, to men who have sex with men, to thieves, who always want more than they have, to drunkards, to those who speak ill of others, and to cheats. Neither of them will participate in the kingdom of God.

FRENCH BIBLE (LOUIS SEGOND):

Ne savez-vous pas que les injustes n'hériteront point le royaume de Dieu? Ne vous y trompez pas: ni les impudiques, ni les idolâtres, ni les adultères, ni les efféminés, ni les infâmes, ni les voleurs, ni les cupides, ni les ivrognes, ni les outrageux, ni les ravisseurs, n'hériteront le royaume de Dieu.

TRANSLATION:

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

FRENCH BIBLE (La Bible du Semeur):

Ne savez-vous pas que ceux qui pratiquent l'injustice n'auront aucune part au *royaume de Dieu? Ne vous y trompez pas: il n'y aura point de part dans l'héritage de ce royaume pour les débauchés, les idolâtres, les adultères, les pervers ou les homosexuels, ni pour les voleurs, les avares, pas plus que pour les ivrognes, les calomniateurs ou les malhonnêtes.

TRANSLATION:

Do you not know that those who practice injustice will have no part in

the kingdom of God? Make no mistake: there will be no share in the inheritance of the kingdom for fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, perverts or homosexuals, nor thieves, covetous, nor for drunkards, slanderers or dishonest.

FRENCH BIBLE (SEGOND 21):
Ne savez-vous pas que les injustes n'hériteront pas du royaume de Dieu? Ne vous y trompez pas: ni ceux qui vivent dans l'immoralité sexuelle, ni les idolâtres, ni les adultères, ni les travestis, ni les homosexuels, ni les voleurs, ni les hommes toujours désireux de posséder plus, ni les ivrognes, ni les calomniateurs, ni les exploiteurs n'hériteront du royaume de Dieu.
TRANSLATION:
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither those who live in sexual immorality, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor transvestites, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the men still want to have more, nor drunkards, nor slanderers nor exploiters will not inherit the kingdom of God.

RUSSIAN BIBLE:
Или не знаете, что неправедные Царства Божия не наследуют? Не обманывайтесь: ни блудники, ни идолослужители, ни прелюбодеи, ни малакии, ни мужеложники, ни воры, ни лихоимцы, ни пьяницы, ни злоречивые, ни хищники--Царства Божия не наследуют.
TRANSLATION:
Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners - inherit the kingdom of God.

RUSSIAN BIBLE (SZ):
Разве вы не знаете, что неправедные не наследуют Царства Божьего? Смотрите, чтобы вам не обмануться. Никакие развратники, никакие идолопоклонники, нарушители супружеской верности, пассивные и активные гомосексуалисты-мужчины, воры, корыстолюбцы или пьяницы, клеветники или мошенники Царства Божьего не наследуют.
TRANSLATION:
Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? See that you are not deceived. No sexually immoral, idolaters, no, adulterers, passive and active homosexual men, thieves, drunkards, or covetous, slanderers or swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

Homosexuals attempt to argue that there is no immediate context with which to interpret μαλακοί and ἀρσενοκοῖται correctly. They are dishonest and obviously lacking any formal knowledge regarding context. When you

read the words "You shall not murder," the context is crystal clear. It exists within those words. The *specific context* of each commandment is different from each of the other commandments. The *general context*, which is the inclusion of all ten commandments, is different from the individual contexts of each commandment. The book of Proverbs is largely a collection of verses that tend *not* to be related to the preceding or succeeding verses. The context of each of these lone verses is found within itself. So to say that 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 contains no context with which to interpret the words correctly is simply being dishonest and self-deceived.

These words in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 are defining characteristics of habitually practiced sin in one's life. These words not only *describe* your actions, but they *define* who you are. One is *known* to be such a person. Verse 11 states clearly, "Such <u>*were*</u> some of you." When Jesus saved them *from* their sins (Matt. 1:21) and the Holy Spirit regenerated them, they were *new* creatures (2 Cor. 5:17) who had *put off* the former lifestyles of their old man (Eph. 4:22-24; Col. 3:9). They had *repented of* and *forsaken* their previous sins (Matt. 3:8; Luke 3:8; Rom. 8:13; 2 Tim. 2:19c) and would now live in *newness* of life (Rom. 6:4). The context is quite clear, when one is being honest and truthful.

It has been argued that it is not homosexuality that is in view in all these passages, but pederasty. This argument lacks any common sense and/or intelligent thought. Pederasty is sexual activity (esp. anal intercourse) involving a man and a boy. Μαλακοί could be interpreted as "catamite," a boy kept for homosexual practices. Ἀρσενοκοῖται could be interpreted as "sodomite," a man who commits lechery with men, a man who abuses himself with men, a man who defiles himself with men. By arguing that pederasty is in view, homosexuals are completely (and ignorantly) undermining their own stance. Pederasty is a form of homosexuality. It has no affiliation to pedophilia. No matter how you try and dice it, these two words describe the active and passive roles within homosexuality. Interestingly enough, "peder," which is a Croatian word, means "gay, queer, homosexual."

To return once more to the structure of Greek compound words, I bring your attention to the Greek *paederastia*. Its root words are παις (boy) and εραστης (lover). When combined, the compound word means "lover of boys." Here again is an example that flies in the face of the weak argument based on English compound words such as "understand," "butterfly," "honeymoon," "mandate," etc. The English language is *not* the Greek language, and vice versa. You cannot apply the rules for English grammar to other languages. This is the height of linguistic ignorance.

"Similarly, when Paul uses the image of not inheriting the kingdom of

God to describe ten kinds of 'unrighteous' people (1 Cor 6:9-10), he includes *malakoi* (the 'soft' or passive participants in homosexual acts) and *arsenokoitai* (the active instigators—a graphic term for 'those who perform male coitus') as well as thieves, drunkards and the covetous. Likewise, 1 Timothy 1:9-10 adds *arsenokoitai* to liars and perjurers in listing more than a dozen 'rebellious' types for whom the law is made. This image insists that everyone needs the law (for we all rebel against God) and drives us to the gospel announced in 1 Timothy 1:9-11."[26]

[26] *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*, 396.

REMAINING THINGS

JUDE 1:7 AND
PAIS (ΠΑΙΣ)

Do not add to His words or He will reprove you,
and you will be proved a liar.
PROVERBS 30:6

HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY

> **KJV:** "Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, 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."
>
> **QJV:** "Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after nonhuman flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."[27]

The word "nonhuman" is not even remotely an adequate translation of the Greek word *heteros* (ἑτέρας). This rendering here by the homosexual community utterly contradicts the interpretation they gave to Genesis 19:5. The phrase translated "strange flesh" is σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, which has the meaning of going after flesh unnatural to them, i.e., outside the moral law. Where do we find this moral law? Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13.

PAIS (ΠΑΙΣ): A YOUNG MALE LOVER?

With great sorrow, there is another passage of Scripture that

[27] *The Queen James Bible*, 593.

homosexuals are twisting and maligning for their cause. As such, I must address this corruption and correct it before it can do any more damage. The passage in question is Matthew 8:5-13.

> And when Jesus entered Capernaum, a centurion came to Him, imploring Him, and saying, "Lord, my servant is lying paralyzed at home, fearfully tormented." Jesus said to him, "I will come and heal him." But the centurion said, "Lord, I am not worthy for You to come under my roof, but just say the word, and my servant will be healed. For I also am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to this one, 'Go!' and he goes, and to another, 'Come!' and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this!' and he does it." Now when Jesus heard this, He marveled and said to those who were following, "Truly I say to you, I have not found such great faith with anyone in Israel. I say to you that many will come from east and west, and recline at the table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the sons of the kingdom will be cast out into the outer darkness; in that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth." And Jesus said to the centurion, "Go; it shall be done for you as you have believed." And the servant was healed that very moment.

Now, you might read the above passage and ask, "What could they possibly be trying to use as support for homosexuality here?" Well, when the centurion says, "Lord, my servant is lying paralyzed at home, fearfully tormented," the Greek word translated as "servant" is the word *pais* (παῖς). In their ignorance,[28] whether deliberate or accidental, these homosexuals claim that this word—*pais* (παις)—means "a young male lover."

Like all cults, false teachings, and other *liars*, these people have failed to examine this word throughout the rest of Scripture, because doing so is detrimental to the lies they are trying to make you swallow. In Luke 2:43, it says, "the child Jesus," which in the Greek is Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς. Are these homosexuals trying to tell us that this passage actually says, "the young male lover Jesus"? This is extremely dangerous ground for these individuals to be standing on, especially for those who call themselves ministers, reverends, pastors, and/or preachers.

The fact is, the word παῖς does not mean "a young male lover" at all. It

[28] Ignorance does not in any way, shape, or form denote or connote stupidity. The literalness of a word is its denotation; the broader associations we have with a word are its connotations. "A person can be ignorant (not knowing some fact or idea) without being stupid (incapable of learning because of a basic mental deficiency). And those who say, 'That's an ignorant idea' when they mean 'stupid idea' are expressing their own ignorance." —Paul Brians, *Common Errors in English Usage*, 118.

means "a child" and can refer to the child of either sex.[29] In Luke 8:51, the word translated as "maiden" is the Greek word παῖς. In Luke 8:54, where Jesus says, "Maid, arise," the Greek is παῖς ἐγείρου. In both these verses, the word παῖς clearly refers to a female child.

In fact, there is nothing in the Matthew 8:5-13 passage to inform us whether this servant is a male or female child. Παῖς refers to a child of either gender. Likewise, *auton* (αὐτόν), the Greek word translated as "him" from "I will come and heal him," can be translated as either "him," "her," or "it" (among many other things). But let us accept it as it has traditionally been interpreted here, as referring to a male servant.

Compare Matthew 8:5-13 to Luke 7:1-10.

> When He had completed all His discourse in the hearing of the people, He went to Capernaum. And a centurion's slave, who was highly regarded by him, was sick and about to die. When he heard about Jesus, he sent some Jewish elders asking Him to come and save the life of his slave. When they came to Jesus, they earnestly implored Him, saying, "He is worthy for You to grant this to him; for he loves our nation and it was he who built us our synagogue." Now Jesus started on His way with them; and when He was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends, saying to Him, "Lord, do not trouble Yourself further, for I am not worthy for You to come under my roof; for this reason I did not even consider myself worthy to come to You, but just say the word, and my servant will be healed. For I also am a man placed under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to this one, 'Go!' and he goes, and to another, 'Come!' and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this!' and he does it." Now when Jesus heard this, He marveled at him, and turned and said to the crowd that was following Him, "I say to you, not even in Israel have I found such great faith." When those who had been sent returned to the house, they found the slave in good health.

Matthew uses the word παῖς, meaning "child," whereas Luke uses the word *doulos* (δοῦλος), meaning "slave or servant," except in verse 7. By inferring that the word παῖς means "a young male lover," these homosexuals are eisegetically forcing an erroneous interpretation upon the word that cannot be found in the context of the passage.

---

[29] See Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1967), 5:636-717; Joseph H. Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2015), 473; Spiros Zodhiates, *The Complete Word Study New Testament* (Chattanooga, TN: AMG International, Inc., 1992), 1089-1090; W. E. Vine, *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1996), 76.

In the Greek, the term *erastes* was applied to an older male (though not necessarily many years older) who loved boys, while the term *eromenos*, meaning "beloved," was applied to the younger male lover. These two are precisely what Paul had in mind when he referred to *arsenokoites* and *malakos* in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10. While an *eromenos* was sometimes called a *pais*, the word παῖς itself *does not* mean "a young male lover." To argue that it means so in Matthew 8:5-13 is as ridiculous as arguing that it means so in Luke 2:43.

ILLOGICAL ARGUMENTS

YOUR 'FEELINGS' DO NOT MATTER, SO
LOSE THE EMOTIONAL MANIPULATION

Come, let us reason together...
ISAIAH 1:18

ARGUMENT #1: Segregation

Homosexuals attempt to argue that they did not and would not choose to be marginalized, ostracized, ridiculed, and "hated" by society. They attempt to stump people by the use of this argument, as if there is no logical response to answer it. Inadvertently, *yes*, homosexuals *did* choose to be marginalized, ostracized, and ridiculed by society—in the *exact same way* that a pedophile, rapist, murderer, etc., chose to be marginalized, ostracized, and ridiculed by society—because you *chose* to revel in your sin. Are you going to attempt to argue that pedophiles, rapists, and murderers are born that way and cannot help themselves? That they cannot change or choose otherwise? The same illogical argument must be applied to them as well. Did pedophiles, rapists, and murderers choose to be marginalized, ostracized, and ridiculed by society? Inadvertently, yes. Sorry, but homosexuality is *not* innate *nor* is it immutable. It is a *choice*, as *hundreds* of ex-homosexuals who have repented and come to Christ will testify to.

ARGUMENT #2: Science

Homosexuals attempt to argue for so-called "scientific" evidence that homosexuals are born that way by citing *rare* cases where, (1) with identical twins, both are homosexual, (2) with identical triplets, all are homosexual, or (3) with identical triplets where one is female and the other two are male (or vice versa), either all are homosexual or just the two with the same

gender. This so-called "evidence" is called *Stacking the Deck*. They cherry-pick their cases in order to try and manipulate the data. In other words, they lie through their teeth. If we examine the cases *correctly* and *honestly*, we will find cases where, (1) with identical twins, only one is homosexual while the other is not, (2) with identical triplets, only one is homosexual while the other two are not, or (3) with identical triplets where one is female and the other two are male (or vice versa), only one of the three is homosexual while the others are not, or one of the two with the same gender is homosexual while the other is not. They all share the same genes, the same DNA, yet the results are completely different. Why? Because *nobody* is born homosexual; they *choose* to be homosexual. There is not a shred of scientific evidence that lends any credibility to a proposed and supposed "gay gene." It *does not* exist!

ARGUMENT #3: Nature

Homosexuals attempt to argue that we see homosexuality in nature, but that is *not* the case. When a male dog mounts another male dog, there is *no* penetration. It is like when a male dog mounts your leg. Is he penetrating your leg? *No*, of course not! Even if we did see acts of homosexuality in nature, we *do not* get our morality from animals. Otherwise, if homosexuals are going to try and justify homosexuality based on the morality of animals, then we need to change our laws to allow polygamy and incestuous marriages (brother and sister, son and mother, daughter and father, niece and uncle, nephew and aunt, grandson and grandmother, granddaughter and grandfather—*all* who are of "consenting" age). Let us face it, if a female dog has puppies, when those puppies reach a certain age, not only will the male and female puppies have sex with each other, but the male puppies with have sex with their mother and the father with have sex with the female puppies. So if we are going to allow homosexuality based on this ignorant argument, then we should also allow polygamy and incestuous marriages for the same reason.

ARGUMENT #4: Comparison to Slavery

Homosexuals attempt to argue and compare themselves to slaves, claiming that they have had rights stolen from them. Homosexuals have *never* had *any* rights stolen from them. Comparing homosexuality to slavery is a *false* comparison. Homosexuality is *not* an ethnic minority. Homosexuals have *never* been bought and sold in America; they have *never* been denied the right to vote; there are *no* and have *never been* gay and straight classrooms; there are *no* and have *never been* gay and straight drinking fountains; and they have *always* had the right to hold property and participate in the political process. Homosexuals have *always* had the *same*

rights *all* Americans have had. The same sure cannot be said about African-Americans. Black people were hung like tree ornaments. When did that happen to homosexuals? Black people were burned for entertainment? When did that happen to homosexuals? Moms were raped in front of their children while dads were shot. Have any homosexuals been murdered just for trying to learn how to read? It is offensive that homosexuals would dare even attempt to compare themselves to what happened to black people. The *only* right they are trying to claim, which is a right that *does not* belong to them, is the right to marry, which is *only* permissible between a *man* and a *woman*. Marriage is a *divine* institution and its parameters were defined *very clearly* by God Almighty when He created man and woman: "For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5; Mark 10:7-8; Eph. 5:31), "So they are no longer two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, man *cannot* separate" (Matt. 19:6). This is the *only* acceptable form of sexuality and the *only* acceptable expression of sexuality.

ARGUMENT #5: "Consenting Adults"

Homosexuals attempt to argue acceptance of homosexuality based on the "consenting adults" argument. By logical conclusion of this argument, that means it is perfectly okay for a brother and a sister to hook up; that means it is perfectly okay for a father and daughter to hook up; that means it is perfectly okay for a mother and son to hook up; that means it is perfectly okay for an uncle and niece to hook up; that means it is perfectly okay for an aunt and a nephew to hook up; that means it is perfectly okay for a grandfather and a granddaughter to hook up; that means it is perfectly okay for a grandmother and grandson to hook up; and that means it is perfectly okay for near cousins to hook up. In fact, it also means it is perfectly okay for the queer variations of these scenarios to hook up as well. *All* of these were condemned alongside homosexuality in the Bible (Lev. 18 and 20; 1 Cor. 5), yet, their ridiculous, illogical, and asinine argument says all of these scenarios should be allowed because, after all, they are "consenting adults." Likewise, polygamy should be allowed because they are all "consenting adults," too.

ARGUMENT #6: Progeny

Homosexuals attempt to use the inability for heterosexual couples to have children as support for homosexuality. The fact remains, if a heterosexual couple *did not* have the obstacles in their way that prevent them from having children—regardless of their age, they *could* have children together. However, homosexual couples *can never* and *will never* have children together. *Period*! They *have to* rely on sperm donors and

surrogates because of the *impossibility* for them to produce anything on their own, which only serves to *prove* that it takes *one man* and *one woman* in order to create life. It *will never* happen with two men or two women. Heterosexual couples having to rely on sperm donors or surrogates offers *no* support for homosexuality; they are doing what is naturally required: *one man* and *one woman*. I will repeat once more for those hard of paying attention: remove the obstacles that prevent heterosexuals from being able to conceive and they *could* have children together. However, homosexuals have no such obstacles. The only obstacle in the way of homosexuals being able to reproduce is each other. Replace it with the correct counterpart and they will have no issue conceiving because God designed it to require *one man* and *one woman*.

ARGUMENT #7: Interpretations of the Church

Homosexuals attempt to argue that the church was wrong about "interracial" marriage and that they had to re-interpret Bible passages. First of all, the Bible has *never* contained *any* such verses to prohibit "interracial" marriage, so it is a blatant lie to claim re-interpretation of verses that *do not* exist. Second of all, the church was *never* wrong because you *cannot* be wrong about something that *never* existed in the first place. Certain individuals and/or denominations might have taught such things, derived from erroneously misinterpreted passages, but it is a false statement to claim the entire universal church taught such things. Finally, the verses often quoted and misapplied are commandments to Israel *not* to marry the people from the surrounding nations. This had *nothing* to do with "interracial" marriage. It had to do with spiritual purity. As God's chosen people, the reason Israel was commanded not to marry people from the surrounding nations is the *same* reason why Christians are commanded not to marry unbelievers. This argument, like their argument regarding slavery and women preachers, is an argument based on willful ignorance.

ARGUMENT #8: Ancient Terminology

Homosexuals attempt to argue that the term "homosexual," as we understand it, did not exist in ancient times. To say that the term "homosexuality" did not exist in ancient times is a stunningly irrelevant point, even if, for argument's sake, we grant that the word did not exist. *So what* if Hebrew had no word that precisely parallels our word "homosexuality"? When other words combine to describe (and condemn) homosexual acts, the presence or absence of any *particular* word is moot. Their argument here is a deceptive piece of psycholinguistic sleight-of-hand. Only a mentally blind partisan with an ax to grind could fail to find homosexual behavior in words as plain as those found in Leviticus 18:22,

20:13, and Romans 1:26-27. A description is exactly the same as a precise word. Anyone who denies this denies the reality of any language.

ARGUMENT #9: Intolerance and "Hate Speech"

Homosexuals attempt to accuse Christians of being intolerant. What is tolerance? Tolerance is the right to disagree with another person and tell them they are *wrong* while allowing them to do what they choose to do. Christians are not allowed to disagree with homosexuals; they are not allowed to hold their own "opinion." So who are the intolerant ones? Homosexuals! Furthermore, Homosexuals attempt to accuse Christians of "hate speech" merely for disagreeing with them and telling them that what they are doing is *wrong*. How is that "hate speech"? When a Christian disagrees with homosexuality, the homosexual community, and those who support them, start attacking and threatening the Christian who disagreed with homosexuality. So who is guilty of hate speech? The intolerant homosexuals! It would be nice if people would start using their God-given brain to spot illogical inconsistencies like these, but unfortunately most people do not know how to think for themselves, let alone how to think period. They allow themselves to be emotionally manipulated by the lies of homosexuals. Common sense really is not very common these days.

ARGUMENT #10: "Orientation" (read *Dis*orientation)

Homosexuals attempt to argue that they cannot change their sexual "orientation." *Orientation* is "the relative physical position or direction of something." In other words, orientation is direction, which *can* be changed. Have you ever heard people say, "I'm feeling disoriented"? *Disorientation* is "the loss of one's sense of direction, position, or relationship with one's surroundings." Therefore, homosexuals are *dis*oriented because their direction is wrong. What they are experiencing is a sexual *dis*orientation. Their "orientation" *can* be changed, as is evidenced by *hundreds* of former homosexuals who have come to faith in the Lord Jesus, repenting of the sins of their former lives. If a person has strong and/or frequent temptations toward bestiality, where his/her thoughts seem to be dominated by it, does he/she have a sexual "orientation" toward animals? No! The temptations we experience *do not* determine who or what we are. If a person has strong and/or frequent temptations toward pedophilia, where his/her thoughts seem to be dominated by it, does he/she have a sexual "orientation" toward children? No! The temptations we experience *do not* determine who or what we are. Likewise, if a person has strong and/or frequent temptations toward the same sex, where his/her thoughts seem to be dominated by it, he/she *does not* have a sexual "orientation" toward homosexuality. Just because such thoughts seem to dominate your mind *does not* mean that is who or

what you are. It is a false conclusion and assumptions made from a false conclusion. In other words, it is a logical fallacy. Homosexuals need to be *re*oriented from their *dis*orientation.

ARGUMENT #11: Contradictory Oxymoron

Homosexuals attempt to argue that there is such a thing as a gay "Christian." Aside from the fact that such is an oxymoron, a complete contradiction in terms, the truth of the matter is that a person *cannot* be a gay "Christian." Have you ever noticed how the emphasis is placed on "gay"? For a genuine Christian, the emphasis is *always* placed on Christ. Now, apart from all the passages in Scripture that condemn homosexual union and behaviour, the Bible makes it clear that, "If we say that we have fellowship with [Jesus] and yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth; but if we walk in the light as He Himself is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin" (1 John 1:6-7). Homosexuals walk in the darkness of their sin, embracing their sin, defining themselves according to their sin. To claim they are gay "Christians" exposes themselves as liars because they *do not* practice the truth (the most obvious being repentance, a complete change in direction, not merely a change of mind). The evidence that a homosexual has truly come to saving faith will be seen in the fact that, "Such *were* some of you; *but* you *were* washed, *but* you *were* sanctified, *but* you *were* justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6:11). If this has happened, the former homosexual *cannot* and *will not* continue to walk in darkness but will crucify their flesh and kill sin in their life. "Now those who belong to Christ Jesus *have* crucified the flesh with its passions and desires" (Gal. 5:24). "If you live according to the flesh, you *will* die; but if by the Spirit you are *putting to death the deeds of the body*, you will live" (Rom. 8:13). See 1 John 3:4-10. For those Christians who have been deceived into supporting this perverse abomination, I want you to pay close attention to this command from Scripture: "And *do not* participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead even *expose them*" (Eph. 5:11).

ARGUMENT #12: "Love" So-Called

Homosexuals and those who do not think there is anything wrong with homosexuality attempt to argue that "*homosexuals should be allowed to love whomever they choose*," because, after all, "*it's not hurting anybody else*." If that is the case, then if I want to "love" some female member of my family (my grandmother, my mother, my aunt, my sister, my daughter), I should be allowed to because "*it's not hurting anybody else*." Or, if I give in to homosexual temptations, if I want to "love" some male member of my

family (my grandfather, my father, my uncle, my brother, my son), I should be allowed to because "*it's not hurting anybody else*." Or, in the case of polygamy, if I want to "love" multiple women and they want to "love" me, we should be allowed to because "*it's not hurting anybody else*." This argument pretty much goes hand-in-hand with the "consenting adults" argument. Likewise, even though consent is impossible, if I want to "love" my dog or some other pet or animal, I should be allowed to because *"it's not hurting anybody else*." These people mistakenly associate their lusts, desires, infatuations, and the heat of the moment with the word "love," tossing it around loosely and carelessly. It is *not* loving to embrace sin, make room for sin, excuse sin, or cause another person to sin. There is *nothing* "loving" about homosexual relationships.

ARGUMENT #13: Unwanted Homosexuality

Homosexuals attempt to argue that they "*didn't want/choose to be gay*." Sorry, but, *yes*, you did. You *were not* born that way, and God *certainly did not* create you that way. Let us examine the logic here. *If* you were born gay, that means that you have been dealt the worst hand possible in the universe. *If* God created you to be gay, that means He played the cruelest trick in the universe on you. Why? Two reasons: (1) *If* you were born gay, *if* God created you to be gay, you were born with a *deliberately* shorter life expectancy, having an imminent death sentence hanging over you. If you engage in homosexual behaviour, you are pretty much *guaranteed* to become diseased by contracting AIDS, the average homosexual having a life expectancy of less than half of that of the average heterosexual. (2) *If* you were born gay, *if* God created you to be gay, you were born *without* a possible future, having nothing to look forward to or hope in. Since you *cannot* reproduce, your family line *ends* with you. There will be *no one* to carry on your name or your legacy. If you did not want to be gay or choose to be gay, then you should *not* be embracing it and practicing it, you should be *angry* that you are not going to live as long as the average heterosexual or see yourself in the face and life of another being created in your image. The fact is, you *did* choose to be gay, and those rewards are still yours: shorter life expectancy and the end of your family line as you know it. By saying that you "*didn't want/choose to be gay*," you are admitting that you have a choice, because if you never wanted to be gay, guess what, *you do not have to be*!

Things are designed to be united a specific way and a specific way *only*. Nothing will happen if you try to put two light bulbs together; a light bulb needs a socket. Nothing will happen if you try to put two plugs together; a plug needs an outlet. Nothing will happen if you try to put two bolts

together; a bolt needs a nut. Likewise, nothing will happen if you try to put two of the same genitalia together; the penis needs the vagina and vice versa. They were created specifically for each other. Genitalia is a part of the entire argument and cannot be left out. Homosexuals will attempt to argue that it is not a matter of genitalia, but a matter of "love." Once again, their argument lacks intelligent logic. No matter how you dice it, eventually genitalia comes into play because of their lustful desires. No matter how much I love my dog or my sibling, it is *wrong* for me to pursue a "loving" relationship with either of them. It is even more wrong for me to engage in sexual activity with either of them. Pedophiles have already begun using the same arguments that the homosexuals have been using.[30]

I wish more people had discernment, wisdom, and understanding so they could think logically and spot the homosexuals' fallacious arguments as if they were illuminated by flood lights. Nothing disturbs me more than people who do not possess the ability to think rationally and logically for themselves but instead mindlessly follow the ignorant masses. Love the homosexual, yes. Live out the Gospel before them, being the salt and the light, absolutely. But *do not* condone or support their sinful behaviour and lifestyle.

[30] http://www.greeleygazette.com/press/?p=11517.

TEMPTATIONS

THE TRUTH BEHIND HOMOSEXUALITY

But each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust. Then when lust has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and when sin is accomplished, it brings forth death.

JAMES 1:14-15

Temptations toward lying, stealing, rape, murder, homosexuality, pedophilia, etc., do not make you a liar, a thief, a rapist, a murderer, a homosexual, or a pedophile. These sorts of temptations come upon everyone to varying degrees; although every person is not going to experience the same temptations or even experience them to the same degree as others. Temptations press upon us every day. If I shared with you all the temptations I have had growing up, you would avoid me like the plague. But before you look down your nose at me and try to judge me based on information you do not know, understand that the same is also true for you—and you know it. If we were to broadcast every thought that has ever entered into your mind, you would go into hiding for the rest of your life.

I will give you one example: When I was an adolescent, while cutting up some vegetable or other, the strangest temptation entered my mind and told me to cut my wrists. My immediate thought was, *Why would I want to hurt myself in this way?* I dismissed the temptation and carried on with what I was doing. Why would such a temptation enter my mind? I have never had the desire to hurt myself, nor do I have such a desire now; and that temptation has never returned.

Many people are tempted with homosexual thoughts at varying times in life, but having such temptations—even *strong* temptations—*does not* make you homosexual *nor* does it mean you were born that way. To give in to those temptations and act upon them makes you homosexual, just as giving

in to and acting upon the temptations to lie make you a liar and giving in to and acting upon the temptations to murder make you a murderer. Those who profess to be homosexual and/or bi-sexual, because of having these temptations—perhaps strongly and/or frequently—falsely conclude, *Well, I have these desires, so therefore I must be gay/bi-sexual*. If you have the temptation or the urge to have sex with an animal, and if that temptation or urge occurs frequently and/or strongly, it *does not* mean you were born with an "orientation" toward bestiality, *nor* does it mean you ought to go ahead and have sex with animals.

Temptations, no matter how frequent or how strong, *do not* determine what is true, right, moral, or natural. A child may have temptations to kill animals, and as he/she grows older those temptations may increase toward the point of killing a person. Yes, you were born in sin, but no, you were not born a murderer, let alone a homosexual. You became that when you committed the act, and you can become part of the "such *were* some of you" (1 Cor. 6:11) if you renounce and forsake that behaviour and repent and trust in the Lord. Temptations are not sin. When you entertain those temptations in your mind, or you act out upon those temptations physically, then you are guilty of sin because the intention of your heart is made known.

Do not equate temptations, urges, or desires with who you supposedly are!

IT IS *ALL* HOMOSEXUALITY

ANYTHING NOT HETEROSEXUALITY IS A VARIANT FORM OF HOMOSEXUALITY

He who speaks truth tells what is right, But a false witness, deceit.

PROVERBS 12:17

Pansexual, polysexual, omnisexual, and ambisexual are nothing more than various terms for bisexuality. Why? Because there are *only two* genders: *male* and *female*. These other terms merely exhibit a greater mental confusion than those who claim to be bisexual. Pansexuality is defined as someone with a sexual attraction to (or sexual relation with) people of either gender, regardless of whether they are straight, gay, transgender, androgynous, etc.

The simple reality is this: *All* of these terms are nothing more than different forms of homosexuality, just as pederasty is. Anyone who has sex with someone of the same gender is committing homosexuality. Homosexuality is *not* an identity, it is an *act* a person commits. Anyone who attempts to find an "identity" in sex is seriously confused. That is like trying to find your identity in being an adulterer, a fornicator, or a rapist. Absolutely absurd!

Transsexuals, or transgendered individuals, are nothing more than homosexuals, too. Changing your external appearance so you can get away with committing homosexual acts *does not* change a thing. You were born a male, you have a penis, therefore *you are a man*, regardless of the physical changes you make to yourself or the changing of your name (Ahem! *Bruce* Jenner and *Bob* Tur). You were born a female, you have a vagina, therefore *you are a woman*, regardless of the physical changes you make to yourself or the changing of your name. You *are not* a woman trapped in a man's

body or a man trapped in a woman's body. If you think or feel that way, you have a serious disconnect from reality and need to seek professional help.

Homosexuality is homosexuality is homosexuality. That is what professing homosexuals do not seem to comprehend. It *does not* matter how you dress it up or how you attempt to colour it or what title you call it, homosexuality is *still* homosexuality. Whether they called it homosexuality or not back before the word "homosexual" was ever coined *does not* change the fact it is *still* homosexuality. Pederasty, bisexuality, pansexuality, polysexuality, omnisexuality, ambisexuality; it is *all* homosexuality. They are *not* different genders. Look at any creature on this planet and you will see two different types: *male* or *female*. You are either one or the other.

Biology, nature, common sense and intelligence inform us that the penis was designed to be inserted into the vagina and the vagina was designed to receive the penis. The penis *does not* belong in the anus. Period! Talk about humiliation and degradation. Falsely slapping the label "love" on it *does not* make it alright, nor is it an expression of love. Homosexuality, like fornication, adultery, rape, incest, polygamy, bestiality, necrophilia, and pedophilia, is an expression of *lust*. It is an expression of a perverse mind. Pure and simple. It has *nothing* to do with love whatsoever. It is truly sad how society has forgotten what love actually is and has associated the act of sex with love.

> And [Jesus] answered and said, "Have you not read, that He who created them from the beginning MADE THEM *MALE* AND *FEMALE*, and said, 'FOR THIS CAUSE *A MAN* SHALL LEAVE HIS FATHER AND MOTHER, AND SHALL CLEAVE TO *HIS WIFE*; AND *THE TWO SHALL BECOME ONE FLESH*'? Consequently they are no longer two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let no man separate." (Matthew 19:4-6)

That verse deals with the fact of *two genders* (male and female); it deals with the fact of *proper sexual conduct* (a man and a woman); and it deals with the *correct definition of marriage* (one man with one woman for life). Homosexuality, regardless of its appearance, is *not* an appropriate form of sexual conduct (nor is bestiality, necrophilia, or pedophilia), *nor* is the union of two homosexuals "marriage" by any stretch of the imagination. You can perform all the linguistic gymnastics you want, but two homosexuals will *never* be "married." God created marriage and gave its parameters: *one* man and *one* woman. Homosexuality is an abomination in the eyes of the Lord our God and it is a perversion of *both* human *and* sexual natures.

GENDER & SEX

HOW MANY GENDERS EXIST?
TWO OR MANY?

And He answered and said, "Have you not read that He who created them from the beginning MADE THEM MALE AND FEMALE...?"
MATTHEW 19:4

Another moral shift is taking place in our society, where people refuse to call things by their proper names (demonstrative of the fact they lack wisdom), bowing down to mental health issues rather than getting these people the psychological help they so desperately need. First it was homosexuality. Now it is transsexualism/transgenderism, which is merely a variant form of homosexuality. If you follow the news at all, soon it will be bestiality/zoophilia and pedophilia. Where do we draw the line?

> "Have you not read, that He who created them from the beginning made them *male* and *female?*" (Matt. 19:4; Mark 10:6)

There are *only* two genders, *two* sexes: *male* and *female*! Nothing more. *Not* 3. *Not* 4. *Not* 12. *Not* 50. *Not* 70, as appears on FaceBook. *Two*! *Male* and *Female*!

We *must* respect biological/inherent identity; *not* mental deficiencies and sexual reconstructions! Identity is the sameness in all that constitutes the objective reality of a thing. If you were born with a penis, you are a *boy*, and your parents (if they love you) and society *must* treat you accordingly, *correcting you* if you start erroneously thinking that you are a female. If you were born with a vagina, you are a *girl*, and your parents (if they love you) and society *must* treat you accordingly, *correcting you* if you start erroneously thinking that you are a male. Anything less than this is child

abuse! Society needs to quit attacking our children and attempting to confuse them from a young age.

Bruce Jenner is a *male*; *he* can have all the plastic surgery *he* wants in order to try and look like a woman but *he* will always remain *a man*; and *he* can desire to be called Caitlyn all *he* wants, but *his* name will still be *Bruce*. *His* identity is and will forever be that of *a male*. It *does not* matter what *he* "feels like" inside. Bob Tur is a *male*; *he* can have all the plastic surgery *he* wants in order to try and look like a woman but *he* will always remain *a man*; and *he* can desire to be called Zoe all *he* wants, but *his* name will still be *Bob*. *His* identity is and will forever be that of *a male*. It *does not* matter what *he* "feels like" inside. Neither of these *men* will *ever* have PMS; neither of these *men* will *ever* go through menopause; and neither of these *men* will *ever* give birth to a child. They were, are, and will always be *men*!

Sexuality refers to possessing sexual feelings and desires collectively. It has *nothing* to do with your *dis*orientation! *Genitalia* (the *genitals*) refers to the biological sexual reproductive organ you were born with; the *penis* or the *vagina*. *Gender* does not! *Sex* does not! Both *gender* and *sex* refer to being either *male* (a *boy* or a *man*) or *female* (a *girl* or a *woman*). A *man* is an adult human *male*, having the genitalia of the *penis*. A *woman* is an adult human *female*, having the genitalia of the *vagina*. *Male* is the attribute of a *man*. *Female* is the attribute of a *woman*. *Masculine* refers to the characteristic of men. *Feminine* refers to the characteristic of women.

Infants are not “assigned” a sex at birth; birth sex declares itself anatomically in utero and is *clearly* evident and acknowledged at birth. From the time you are conceived, your gender/sex has already been determined. The second you come out of the womb, your gender/sex can be *plainly seen* by *everyone*! You either have a *penis*, identifying you as part of the *male* gender/sex, making you a *boy* who will grow up to become a *man*; or you have a *vagina*, identifying you as part of the *female* gender/sex, making you a *girl* who will grow up to become a *woman*.

A third possibility could happen at birth, but this is *not* a separate gender/sex. A hermaphrodite is someone who, as the result of a birth defect (the mutation of existing genetic information), is born with *both* a penis *and* a vagina (though typically only one of these will function). It is a genetic abnormality. Specialists can now perform an ultrasound, blood test, chromosome analysis, and even do exploratory surgery to find out the baby's true gender/sex. However, many regard hermaphrodites as being male because they possess the Y chromosome, which is male-specific. But that is an entirely different discussion.

The *fact* is, there are *two* genders and *only* two genders: *male* and *female*. *Males* (*men*) have a *penis*. *Females* (*women*) have a *vagina*. The boy from the movie *Kindergarten Cop* said it best, and said it with intelligence

and wisdom: "*Boys have a penis. Girls have a vagina.*" It is *that* simple. Period! Gender *is not* a spectrum! The word *gender* and the word *sex* are the *exact same word*; they are *interchangeable*, as demonstrated clearly from any competent dictionary on the English language.

> **GENDER.** *ſ.* [*genus*, Lat.] 1. A kind; a ſort. *Shakeſp.* 2. A ſex. 3. [In grammar.] A denomination given to nouns, from their being joined with an adjective in this or that termination. *Clarke*.
> **SEX.** *ſ.* [*ſexe*, Fr. *ſexus*, Lat.] 1. The property by which any animal is male or female. Milton. 2. Womankind; by way of emphaſis. Dryden.
>
> **—Samuel Johnson's 1768 & 1792**
> **Dictionary of the English Language**

> **GENDER**, (jen'-der) *n.s.* A kind; a sort; a sex. In grammar, A distinction of nouns in regard to sex.
> **SEX**, (seks) *n.s.* The property by which any animal is male or female; womankind, by way of emphasis.
>
> **—Samuel Johnson & John Walker's 1828**
> **Dictionary of the English Language**

> **GENDER** *n.* **1.** Properly, kind; sort. **2.** A sex, male or female.
> **SEX** *n.* **1.** The distinction between male and female; or that property or character by which an animal is male or female.
>
> **—Noah Webster's 1828 American**
> **Dictionary of the English Language**

> **gender** *n.* **1a** a person's sex, either of the sexes.
> **sex** *n.* **1** either of the main divisions (male and female) into which living things are placed on the basis of their reproductive functions. **2** the fact of belonging to one of these. **3** males or females collectively. **4** sexual intercourse.
>
> **—The Canadian Oxford Paperback Dictionary**

> **gender** *n.* **1:** SEX
> **sex** *n.* **1:** either of two divisions of organisms distinguished respectively as male or female **2:** the sum of the structural, functional, and behavioral characteristics of living beings that subserve reproduction by two interacting parents and that distinguish males and females
>
> **—Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary**

Step outside your door and into a throng of people. What do you see? You see *two* things: *males* and *females*; *hes* and *shes*. Period! Two genders. Two sexes. Two pronouns. Every child can tell the difference between the two genders. Unfortunately, you have to be college educated to be stupid enough to deny this reality.

MENTAL INSANITY

DEMANDING THAT THE REST OF THE WORLD ACCOMMODATE YOUR DISCONNECT FROM REALITY

The heart is more deceitful than all else And is desperately sick; Who can understand it?
JEREMIAH 17:9

Where do these ignorant, anti-intellectual people these days get off saying that it is my "right" if I want to "identify" myself as a red balloon or the Easter Bunny?!? No matter how much I believe myself to be a red balloon or the Easter Bunny, or want to be "identified" as a red balloon or the Easter Bunny, the *truth* and *objective reality* is that I am *not* a red balloon or the Easter Bunny, nor will I *ever* be a red balloon or the Easter Bunny. I am and will always be a *male human being*!!! If I think of myself as anything other than what I truly, physically am, then I am a *liar* (lying to myself) and am mentally disconnected from reality and the truth. Why are we allowing these mentally ill individuals to demand that society excuse and accommodate their mental disconnect from reality? Life is not some fantasy you get to play out in your mind while demanding the rest of us play along with it!

There is a woman, Nano, from Oslo, Norway, who actually "identifies" as a cat. She actually believes that she was born as the wrong species. Sadly, society plays into her delusion by accommodating her mental insanity and disconnect from reality. All she has to do is look in a mirror and her identity will be made clear: she is a *human female*, a *woman*. She has never been a cat, she is not presently a cat, and she will never be a cat. Why are people catering to her psychological illness? People are starting to do the same thing for transpeople. If you are struggling with your sexual identity, the solution is extremely simple... *Look down your pants*!

Transsexualism/transgenderism is only a part of a greater disease plaguing our society. Yes, we need to love these people and show them grace, but we *do not* accept their behaviour under *any* circumstances, just as we *do not* accept the behaviour of homosexuals under *any* circumstances. These people need help. *Stop* being brainwashed and emotionally manipulated by them and their illogical, emotional arguments!

Our society quickly needs a reform, because we are headed down a dangerous road from which there is no return. Justice will be meted out one way or another. If not by another country conquering us (as has repeatedly been the case throughout history), then by the swift return of the Lord Jesus to judge the world in sin and righteousness. We need God back in our countries again. We need a foundation of morality again; of right and wrong. Everything we see taking place in our society right now is just a small sample of God's judgment being poured out upon us.

> For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because that which is known about God is evident within them; for God made it evident to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse. For even though they knew God, they did not honor Him as God or give thanks, but they became futile in their speculations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image in the form of corruptible man and of birds and four-footed animals and crawling creatures. Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. For they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error. And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malice; they are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them. (Romans 1:18-32)

TRANSPEOPLE'S IGNORANCE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Certain transpeople want to be identified by the pronouns "they" and "them." They ignorantly argue that "*singular 'they' pronouns go all the way back to Shakespeare*." These individuals need to go back to public school and get an education in English grammar. The pronouns "they" and "them" have *always* been plural. They are used singularly as a replacement for "he/she" when the identity of the subject is *unknown*.

Have any of these people read any works from Shakespeare's era? Earlier? Later? Do any of them have a degree in English? I am willing to bet that, *no*, they do not. Here are some examples of their arguments:

- "If *a person* is born of a ... gloomy temper ... *they* cannot help it."— Chesterfield, *Letter to his son* (1759)
- "Now *nobody* does anything well that *they* cannot help doing"— Ruskin, *The Crown of Wild Olive* (1866)
- "*Nobody* in *their* senses would give sixpence on the strength of a promissory note of the kind."— Bagehot, *The Liberal Magazine* (1910)

Where you find the word "they" and "their," you can replace it with "he/she." "They" is simply used in general instances where you are unsure of the identity of the specific person it applies to, much the same way that "he/she" would be used.

A human being can *only* be either a *male*—a *he*, or a *female*—a *she*. When a *man* or a *woman* stands before you, it is *improper* and *incorrect* to refer to him/her as "they." When you stand in the middle of a crowd of human beings, I dare you to point out with accuracy the imagined "theys" and "thems" in the crowd. All you see is *hes* and *shes*, which you can easily identify with pinpoint accuracy. The *entire* mixed group of *men* and *women* can be referred to plurally as "they" and "them," but individual *males* and *females* ***cannot***!

Like all anti-intellectual individuals, transpeople attempt to build straw men arguments based on illogical and emotional reasoning. Yes, transpeople are human, too, but these people suffer from a disconnect from reality (thinking they are something they are not, or wanting to be something they are not) and demand the rest of society accommodate that mental insanity rather than getting them the help they desperately need to face and accept reality and truth. Mocking and making fun of a transperson is no different than mocking or making fun of any other handicapped individual. These people need help.

Transpeople argue illogically, fallaciously, and falsely that if they were integrated more into society and people used their imaginary self-made "pronouns," that there would not be so many transpeople committing

suicide. That argument is in contradiction to the facts. In places like San Francisco where transpeople are more than integrated and accepted, where people go out of their way not to "offend" them, why are their suicide rates climbing? Simple. Because accommodating their mental insanity *does not* change a thing; it *does not* help them. They *know* that they are *not* what they are pretending to be and want others to pretend they are. Yes, I know there are those who are not pretending and actually *think* they are something they are *not*, and that is because they are sick and disconnected from reality. They need psychological help.

To sum up, "they" and "them" have *always* been plural pronouns. They have been, and are, used as singular pronoun replacements for "he/she" where the general identity of the specific individual is unknown. Proper English grammar uses "he/she," whereas our everyday speech tends to use "they" and "them." For example:

> Our new teacher will be coming through the door any moment. I hope they have a better curriculum planned than our previous teacher.

...or...

> Our new teacher will be coming through the door any moment. I hope he/she has a better curriculum planned than our previous teacher.

"They" and "he/she" is used when the identity of the specific individual is unknown. The speech is general, applying to whoever fits the bill. But as soon as that teacher walks through the door, there remains no more question as to whether the teacher is a *he* or a *she*. Those are the *only* ***two*** options.

PRESUMPTUOUS ARGUMENT #1: SLAVERY

DID THE CHURCH RE-INTERPRET WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS?

Slaves, in all things obey those who are your masters on earth, not with external service, as those who merely please men, but with sincerity of heart, fearing the Lord.

COLOSSIANS 3:22

Earlier in the book, we mentioned that homosexuals claim that the church has "*re-interpreted*" the Bible on subjects such as slavery and women pastors. As promised, we are now going to examine both of these claims so see what the Bible truly has to say.

There appear to be many individuals who seem to enjoy using slavery as a support crutch for whatever false cause they hold. This is especially true with regard to homosexuality. They claim that many texts have been "*re-interpreted*" in the case of slavery. However, this is a lie. The texts on slavery have *never* been re-interpreted because they *cannot* be re-interpreted. They say what they mean and mean what they say. *Nowhere* in the Bible will you find a text that condemns slavery. The Bible condemns the abuse of slaves, but nowhere condemns slavery itself. In fact, it was the Old Testament that first provided dignity for slaves (Ex. 21:1-11; Deut. 15:12-18). In the New Testament, Jesus *never* condemns slavery, nor do any of the other Apostles. In fact, it was Paul who wrote in regard to slaves and their masters the most, yet he never condemned it (Eph. 6:5-9; Col. 3:22-25; 1 Tim. 6:1-2; Titus 2:9-10; Phile. 1:10-21). Peter also briefly addressed slaves (1 Pet. 2:18-20).

The individuals who attempt to use slavery as their support crutch claim that the church was "morally blind" on the issue in the past and that presently those texts have been "*re-interpreted*" and objected against. Both the premise and the conclusion of these individuals is false. The church was

never the leading party behind the mistreatment of slaves that occurred in Britain and the United States. No doubt there were "Christians" and common men who used the various passages in the Bible to their advantage, but they did so lop-sided, ignoring what the Scriptures say to the masters. A similar example would be a "Christian" or common man who uses the passages in the Bible regarding his wife's submission to his advantage.

You see, homosexuals attempt to relate slavery to homosexuality, but do so in error. The Bible is against homosexuality (Gen. 19:4-9; Lev. 18:22; 20:13; Jud. 19:22-24; Rom. 1:26-27; 1 Cor. 6:9; 1 Tim. 1:10). It is *not* against slavery. A true related scenario to slavery would be a tyrannical husband, for both things have common ground: positive Scripture abused for personal purposes. Yes, the Bible commands wives to submit to their husband's authority as head of the home, but this is not a mindless slave-like submission. The Bible tells her to do so "as to the Lord" (Eph. 5:22). The other side of that is the command to husbands to "love your wives, as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up for her" (Eph. 5:25). Neither command is incumbent upon the other. The wife is not to submit only when her husband loves her, nor is the husband to love only when his wife submits. The commands are absolute whether or not the other deserves it or has earned it.

Likewise, slaves and masters are instructed how to act and treat each other. But remember, this is in regard to Christian slaves and Christian masters. The end result is that Christ is revealed and glorified. If a Christian slave has a master who is not Christian, he is to act in such a way toward him so as to glorify Christ. If a Christian master has slaves who are not Christian, he is to act in such a way toward them as to glorify Christ. You will find the same thing true with regard to husbands and wives (1 Cor. 7:12-16). By their conduct, the other might be won to Christ.

If you are rich enough to afford butlers or maids, you have slaves. The objection might be raised that butlers and maids are paid, but that objection is overruled as slaves in the Bible were not only provided for but sometimes paid, too. Having all your provisions met is the same as if you were paid for them, but you receive them freely. Rich people today who can afford butlers or maids or someone who serves in a slave capacity *still* mistreat their slaves while others treat them with the respect and dignity they deserve as human beings. Just because someone twists Scripture for their own perverted purposes does not mean the thing is wrong to begin with. Slavery in the Bible was not the same as the slavery of modern times. The period of slavery was limited to six years (Ex. 21:2). Slaves had rights and protection under the Law (Ex. 21:20). It was also possible for slaves to attain positions of power and honour (Gen. 24:2; 41:12).

Lastly, Christians are *slaves* of Christ Jesus. In many of Jesus' parables,

God's people are likened to slaves (Matt. 24:45-51; 25:14-30; Mark 12:1-12; Luke 12:42-48; 14:16-24; 19:12-27; 20:9-18). In the New Testament, the Greek word for "slave" is δουλος, which can also be translated as "bond-servant" (bound to serve, i.e., slave). Romans 6:16-18 says, "Do you not know that when you present yourselves to someone as slaves for obedience, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin resulting in death, or of obedience resulting in righteousness? But thanks be to God that though you were slaves of sin, you became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching to which you were committed, and having been freed from sin, you became slaves of righteousness." Make no mistake about it, we *are* slaves to sin and the devil. Jesus said in John 8:34, "everyone who commits sin is the slave of sin." When we are freed from sin, we become "enslaved to God" (Rom. 6:22). Some Christians do not seem to like that terminology, but that is the truth of reality. The Bible clearly calls us slaves. Jesus, as our Master, gets to command us as He wills, and we are to obey. Jesus will not be your Saviour if He cannot be your Lord and be in control of *all* of your life.

Here is a list of Bible saints who explicitly identified themselves as slaves of God or Christ: the virgin Mary, Paul, James, Jude, and John. Peter said, "Live as slaves of God" (1 Peter 2:16). Paul wrote, "You have become slaves of God" (Romans 6:22). Jesus commanded his disciples to regard themselves as slaves of God (Luke 17:10).

The Bible affirms *both* our slavery *and* our sonship to God. It is *utterly impossible* to *read* the Bible, *pay attention* when you read it, and *miss this point*. We call God "Father" because we are his children, and "Lord" ("Master") because we are his slaves. God's fatherhood does not trump his lordship, and our sonship does not trump our servitude.

PRESUMPTUOUS ARGUMENT #2: WOMEN PASTORS

WHAT DID GOD SAY ABOUT IT, AND WHAT ROLE DID GOD GIVE WOMEN?

I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man...
1 TIMOTHY 2:12

The Bible makes it clear as to the woman's position in the church. Observe:

> As in all the churches of the saints, the women are to keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but are to subject themselves just as the Law also says. If they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is improper for a woman to speak in church. Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached? If anyone thinks he is a prophet, or spiritual, let him recognize that the things I write to you are a command of the Lord. If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized. (1 Corinthians 14:33b-38)

Now, this passage is *not* saying that women are forbidden from *ever* talking in church altogether. That would be a gross misrepresentation of what this passage is saying. It is speaking in regard to role, authority, and revelation. Note Paul's questions to them: "Or was it from you that the word of God came? Or are you the only ones it has reached?" (v.36). The answer is, of course, "No." Paul makes it clear what the end result should be: "If anyone thinks he is a prophet, or spiritual, let him recognize that the things I write to you are a command of the Lord. If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized" (vv.37-38). In other words, if a woman believes herself to be gifted or spiritual, she should recognize that what Paul is saying is coming directly from God and that she ought to be obedient to God's Word. Otherwise, she is living in open rebellion and disobedience.

Why are women not permitted to speak? Observe:

> A woman must quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness. But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet. For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve. And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression. (1 Timothy 2:11-14)

The reason has to do with roles and authority given by God. Nowadays, people attempt to use the ignorant arguments that either "*that was for back then, it is not for today*," or "*Paul was a chauvinist*." Let us address the second argument first. The Bible informs us that "All Scripture is inspired by God" (2 Tim. 3:16). Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, wrote what *God* wanted him to write. Ergo, if Paul is "chauvinistic," then so is God because He inspired Paul with what he should write. Note carefully Paul's source of authority: "the things I write to you are a command of the Lord" (1 Cor. 14:37). Furthermore, addressing the first argument, since God "is the same yesterday and today and forever" (Heb. 13:8), what was written for back then also applies for today. God's Word is an extension of Himself, and if He does not change, neither does His Word.

Verse 13 of 1 Timothy 2 begins with "for" and gives the "cause" of Paul's statement in verses 11-12. Why should women not teach or have authority over men? Because "it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve. And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression." Eve was created to be a "helper" for Adam. This order of creation has universal application in the family (Eph. 5:22-33) and the church. God has ordained that only *men* are to serve in positions of spiritual teaching authority in the church. The qualifications for elders/overseers/bishops/pastors *clearly* indicate men. Observe:

> It is a trustworthy statement: if any man aspires to the office of overseer, it is a fine work he desires to do. An overseer, then, must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, prudent, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, not addicted to wine or pugnacious, but gentle, peaceable, free from the love of money. He must be one who manages his own household well, keeping his children under control with all dignity (but if a man does not know how to manage his own household, how will he take care of the church of God?), and not a new convert, so that he will not become conceited and fall into the condemnation incurred by the devil. And he must have a good reputation with those outside the church, so that he will not fall into reproach and the snare of the devil. Deacons likewise must be men of dignity, not double-tongued, or addicted to much wine or fond of sordid gain, but holding to the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience. These men must also first be tested, then let them serve

> as deacons if they are beyond reproach. Women must likewise be dignified, not malicious gossips, but temperate, faithful in all things. Deacons must be husbands of only one wife, and good managers of their children and their own households. For those who have served well as deacons obtain for themselves a high standing and great confidence in the faith that is in Christ Jesus. (1 Timothy 3:1-13)

> For this reason I left you in Crete, that you would set in order what remains and appoint elders in every city as I directed you, namely, if any man is above reproach, the husband of one wife, having children who believe, not accused of dissipation or rebellion. For the overseer must be above reproach as God's steward, not self-willed, not quick-tempered, not addicted to wine, not pugnacious, not fond of sordid gain, but hospitable, loving what is good, sensible, just, devout, self-controlled, holding fast the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching, so that he will be able both to exhort in sound doctrine and to refute those who contradict it. (Titus 1:5-9)

An examination of the Greek reveals that masculine pronouns are used *exclusively*. Ergo, women are *not* allowed to be pastors!

Many ignorant arguments have been made using the Bible in an attempt to draw support for women pastors. Some of those arguments are as follows:

1. Deborah the prophetess (Judges 4:4-14). Deborah was a judge over Israel; not a pastor. Her being a judge over Israel was judgment upon Israel because no man was willing to step up and take on the responsibility for leading Israel. You can see this in Barak's words to her: "If you will go with me, then I will go; but if you will not go with me, I will not go" (v. 8). If ever there was a call to man-up and be a man, it was here.
2. The talking donkey (Numbers 22:22-33). This has got to be the most ridiculous argument ever. Because the donkey was female, they say it is okay for women to be pastors. First of all, what does a talking donkey have to do with being a pastor? Second of all, the donkey, while being female, spoke with a *man's* voice (2 Peter 2:16).
3. Phoebe (Romans 16:1-2). Phoebe was not a pastor. She was a deaconess, as revealed by the Greek word *diakonos* (διακονος). She was a servant of the church.

WOMAN'S ROLE IN THE FAMILY AND CHURCH

> Wives, be subject/submissive (ὑποτάσσεσθε) to your own husbands, <u>as to the Lord</u>. For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the

> head of the church, He Himself being the Savior of the body. But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything. (Ephesians 5:22-24)
>
> Wives, be subject/submissive (ὑποτάσσεσθε) to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord. (Colossians 3:18)
>
> Older women likewise are to be reverent in their behavior, not malicious gossips nor enslaved to much wine, teaching what is good, so that they may encourage the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sensible, pure, workers at home, kind, being subject/submissive (ὑποτασσομένας) to their own husbands, so that the word of God will not be dishonored. (Titus 2:3-5)
>
> In the same way, you wives, be subject/submissive (ὑποτασσόμεναι) to your own husbands so that even if any of them are disobedient to the word, they may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives, as they observe your chaste and respectful behavior. (1 Peter 3:1-2)

The Greek word *hupotasso* (υποτασσω; 5293) means "to subordinate; to subject, put in subjection; to obey; to submit; to yield to one's admonition or advice."

Wives are to be submissive to their husbands "in everything" (Eph. 5:24). While a good husband will listen to the wise council of his godly wife, nevertheless, whether right or wrong, the final decision is his to make and he bears the burden for it before God alone. As we are told in 1 Timothy 2:14, "it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression." Yet, who did God hold accountable? Adam. Why? Because he "is the head of the wife" (Eph. 5:22; 1 Cor. 11:3).

In each of the passages above, the reason *why* a wife should submit to her husband is given: because "it is fitting in the Lord" (Col. 3:18); "so that the word of God will not be dishonored" (Titus 2:5); and "so that even if any of [their husbands] are disobedient to the word, they may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives" (1 Pet. 3:1). The ultimate reason is that they are to do so "as to the Lord" (Eph. 5:22). The implication here is that if she will not be submissive to the Lord, then she will not be submissive to her husband, which, then, is disobedience to the Lord. This disobedience is *not* to be judged by the husband, but the husband is to "love (ἀγαπᾶτε) [his wife], just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up for her" (Eph. 5:25). *Agapao* (αγαπαω; 25) denotes "to take pleasure in the thing, prize it above all other things, be unwilling to abandon it or do without it." *Agape* love is unconditional, sacrificial love that is given whether the other person deserves it or has earned it.

In the Garden of Eden, after Eve was deceived and fell into

transgression, God pronounced this curse upon her: "your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over you" (Gen. 3:16). It does not mean she will desire him affectionately, as some pervert it to mean, but that she will desire his position over her. The logical question here, to those who pervert it, should be: How is it a curse for a wife to affectionately desire her husband? It is not. As God said through Paul, "I do not allow a woman to...exercise authority over a man" (1 Tim. 2:12). This in no way devalues the worth of a woman, especially a good, godly woman whose "worth is far above jewels" (Prov. 31:10). Men and women *are* equal in the sight of God, being made in His image, but they are made in different aspects of His image and have been given different roles. In the Godhead, while Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are completely equal, nevertheless they have different roles. The Son *is* equal to the Father, yet the Son *submits* to the Father. The Holy Spirit *is* equal to both the Father and the Son, yet the Spirit *submits* to both the Father and the Son. A woman's submission to her husband should be a joyous occasion, and her husband's loving her unconditionally and sacrificially makes it easier for her to do.

Whether a husband is obeying his role or not is *not* up to the wife to nag him about and try to control him with. She is to obey *her* role before the Lord because she will answer for it when Jesus returns. Whether a wife is obeying her role or not is *not* up to the husband to nag her about and try to control her with. He is to obey *his* role before the Lord because he will answer for it when Jesus returns. Neither command is incumbent upon the other. The wife is not to submit only when her husband loves her, nor is the husband to love only when his wife submits. The commands are absolute whether or not the other person deserves it or has earned it. Women tend to want to usurp their husband's position over them and men tend to want to rule over their wives tyrannically. Both are sins. If we call ourselves Christians, we need to obey God in everything.

CONCLUSION

As you have witnessed first-hand, homosexuals and pro-gay theologians constantly and consistently lace their arguments with error, misinformation, inferences, presumptions, assumptions, conclusions drawn on assumptions, pretext, front-loading, and eisegetical interpretations based on their feelings and opinions. Their arguments are riddled with sloppy and dishonest scholarship, blatant plagiarism, copy errors, selective citations, truncated quotations of text, and creative editing. Homosexuals and pro-gay theologians delight in ripping verses and passages from their context, habitually failing to apply the rules of hermeneutics (the science and art of biblical interpretation) and engage in honest, responsible, sound biblical exegesis. Their arguments tend to rely on the unscholarly works of such homosexual and pro-gay authors as John Boswell, Jack Rogers, Dale Martin, and Justin R. Cannon (to name a few). These men have absolutely *zero* credibility whatsoever.

As I stated in the Introduction, *homosexuals are not our enemies*. They are merely deluded into thinking that the strong and/or frequent temptations they feel somehow mean that that is who or what they are. The same is true of transsexual/transgender people. They place far too much emphasis on their "feelings" while denying the truth of reality staring them right in the face. We need to love these people and extend grace to them, but we *do not* under any circumstances accept, condone, or support their behaviour or make excuses for it. If we love these people, or any other sinner, we *must*

speak the truth to them just as the truth was spoken to us. God is in the business of changing minds and saving souls, and these people can become part of the "such *were* some of you" (1 Cor. 6:10) with the rest of us. You just need to know the truth, speak the truth, and stand for the truth.

HUMANITY BY DESIGN

God Created Humanity in *This* Way:

> "Have you not read, that He who created them from the beginning made them male and female" (Matt. 19:4; Mark 10:6).

God said, "It is not good for the man to be alone" (Gen. 2:18a). Any man; every man; all encompassed in Adam, our head and representative. God then continued by saying, "I will make a helper suitable for him" (Gen. 2:18b). The phrase "meet for" (KJV) in Genesis 2:18 comes from two Hebrew words. The first, #5048, is a preposition indicating *before, in front of, opposite*. The second, #3509.1, is *a marker of comparison: as, like; a marker of similarity or correspondence*. The phrase "meet for" in the Hebrew indicates something that is both *similar* yet *different*; something that was similar to Adam yet completely different from him. *Not* a mirrored image, which is entirely *the same* and *identical*. As other translations render it (more accurately, I might add), *this* is what was "suitable" for not only Adam but for *every* man—*woman*. Every animal in the animal kingdom had its suitable pair, something that was similar but different—its female counterpart. The similarity was in its kind; the difference was in its make up. Adam saw that every animal had its appropriate pair while he did not. Thus, God said "It is not good for man to be alone." In creating the "suitable" helper for Adam, He created *woman*. Woman is similar to Adam, being of the same species; but different from him, being a woman and having womanly parts rather than manly parts. This difference would be key to the mandate that God would give to the two of them, which is the same mandate given to *all mankind*—"Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:28).

God Intended Human Relationships to Function Like *This*:

> "For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5; Mark 10:7-8).

The creation account gives a *very* clear picture—a standard—of God's intention for *all* human relationships. The *only* standard for sexual expression you will find consistently praised in *both* Testaments is that of

heterosexual monogamy. Throughout the *entire* Bible, only *that* standard is upheld. Both Jesus and the Apostle Paul upheld the standard of heterosexuality. If I uphold the life of a child in the womb, I am *necessarily* opposed to abortion. Likewise, Scripture, Jesus, and the Apostle Paul, while upholding the standard of heterosexuality, are *necessarily* opposed to homosexuality (and every other sexual deviation). The statement encompasses *every* man; *all* men: "For this reason *a man* [any man, every man, all men] shall leave his father and his mother, and *be joined to his wife*; and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24). Jesus made the point of directing his listeners back to the beginning, the creation of humanity, which tells us *everything* we need to know about God's design, plan, and intention for human relationships. Anything outside of *this* union—*one man* and *one woman*—is a perverse, abnormal, unnatural, abominable sexual deviation.

God Gave Humanity *This* Mandate:

> "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:22).

Man and woman were perfectly designed for each other; *both* for pleasure *and* for procreation: "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:28). The genital parts of both man and woman were designed differently yet complimentary—they fit together perfectly. They are, by design, perfectly fit for each other; perfectly matched. Like a light bulb and a socket, a plug and an outlet, a bolt and a nut, male and female genitalia were *perfectly* designed for complimentary union. This union of *man* and *woman* is the *only* means with which to create progeny and carry on one's family name as well as the human race. Humanity would die outside of this union and this mandate. *Every* living creature that God created, those in the water, those in the air, and those on the land, were *all* given the mandate to "be fruitful and multiply." They could not fill the waters and the air and the land otherwise. Humanity was given the same mandate, which is an *expectancy* of how God intended human relationships to function, the standard upheld by *both* Jesus and the Apostle Paul.

Once again, there are *two* genders, and *only* two genders: *male* and *female*. Marriage was instituted *by God* and is defined *by God* as consisting of *one man* and *one woman* for life. Heterosexuality is the *only* appropriate form of sexuality, upheld through the entire Bible and by Jesus and the Apostles Paul and Peter. Homosexuality is a perversion of *both* human *and* sexual natures. Anything outside of the union of *one man* and *one woman* is simply, purely, and completely *wrong*!

If you are interested in learning the truth concerning homosexuals and homosexuality, I encourage you to read this information (site links in the footnotes):

- *Pro-Life Activist's Encyclopedia, Chapter 117: The True Objective of `Gay Rights' - Total Domination!*[31]
- *Pro-Life Activist's Encyclopedia, Chapter 118: Homosexual Tactics: Anything Goes!*[32]
- *The Real Homosexual Agenda*[33]

For more biblical responses on the issue of homosexuality, I encourage you to read these books:

- *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics* by Robert A. J. Gagnon
- *A Queer Thing Happened to America* by Michael L. Brown
- *Can You Be Gay and Christian?* by Michael L. Brown
- *Outlasting the Gay Revolution* by Michael L. Brown
- *Divine Eros* by Joy E. Corey
- *The Same Sex Controversy* by James R. White and Jeffrey D. Niell
- *The Complete Christian Guide to Understanding Homosexuality* by Joe Dallas (a former practicing homosexual) & Nancy Heche
- *The Gay Gospel? How Pro-Gay Advocates Misread the Bible* by Joe Dallas (a former practicing homosexual)
- *What Does the Bible Really Teach about Homosexuality?* by Kevin DeYoung
- *The Facts on Homosexuality* by John Ankerberg & John Weldon
- *The Homosexual Agenda: Exposing the Principle Threat to Religious Freedom Today* by Alan Sears and Craig Osten

[31] https://web.archive.org/web/19980422204729/http://all.org/plae/plae117.htm
[32] https://web.archive.org/web/19980422204752/http://all.org/plae/plae118.htm
[33] http://www.truenews.org/Homosexuality/real_agenda.html

THE GOSPEL

In life, you will be faced with a great deal of decisions you must make, but none is as important as your decision as to where your soul will spend eternity. Do you consider yourself to be a good person? The Dictionary defines “good” as being “morally perfect.” Let us do a little test and see how you fair. How many lies have you told in your life? This includes fibs and "white lies." What do you call someone who lies? A liar. Ever stolen something? The size and value are irrelevant. What do you call someone who steals? A thief. Jesus said, “Whoever looks upon another person, to lust after them, has already committed adultery with them in their heart.” Have you ever looked with lust? By your own admission, you are a lying, thieving, adulterer at heart; and we’ve only looked at three of the Ten Commandments. That’s how God sees you: a lying, thieving, adulterer. The Bible says, “All liars, [thieves and adulterers] will have their place in the Lake of Fire.”

Nothing is hid from God’s holy eyes. He sees your every thought and He will judge you accordingly. If you were to die today and stand before the Judgment Seat, would you be found innocent or guilty? Listen to your conscience. You *know* you would be guilty. Do you think you would go to Heaven or Hell? You would go to Hell. You may say to yourself, “But I tell God I am sorry for the things I do.” If you were in court because you just raped and murdered a young girl, no matter how truly sorry you were for your crimes, ***if*** the judge was a *good* judge he could not let you go just

because you are sorry. You *must* be punished. The Bible says, "The soul that sins it shall die" and "The wages of sin is death." God is infinitely more good and more just than any human judge and *all* sin is against Him. Because you have a conscience, you have sinned with knowledge. Each time you told a lie or stole or looked with lust you *knew* you were doing wrong.

God is infinitely holy, infinitely perfect, and infinitely righteous. In order for you to enter Heaven, you *must* have a holiness, perfection, and righteousness *equal* to that of God's. You may say to yourself, "But I go to church; I give to this charity; I do all these good things." The Bible says, "*All* our righteous deeds are as a filthy rag." You have sinned against an infinitely holy God. By good works shall *no* man be saved. You will spend an eternity in Hell, eternally separated from God and His goodness, suffering in constant reminder of your sins for all eternity. Because of your sin, God's anger and wrath abides on you.

But..., there is good news. Imagine you are standing in front of a judge, guilty of multiple serious crimes. All the evidence has been presented and there is no doubt about your guilt. Your apologies and good works cannot erase your crimes; therefore you must be punished. The fine for your crime is $500,000 or imprisonment, but you do not have two pennies to rub together. The judge is about to pass sentence when someone you do not even know steps in and pays your fine for you! The court accepts the money and declares that you are free to go. The law has been satisfied, your debt has been paid in full, and the stranger's sacrifice was a demonstration of his love for you. That is what God did for *you* 2000 years ago.

It is not God's will that you should perish. He is rich with mercy. That is why He sent Jesus Christ, His only Son—God in the flesh—to condemn sin in the flesh by living an absolutely perfect life. Through Jesus Christ, God has provided a way for you to be forgiven. Jesus Christ took the punishment for *your* sins. The Bible says, "God demonstrated His love toward us, in that, while we were still sinners, Christ died for us." The cup Christ prayed three times that God the Father would let pass from Him contained *all* the wrath, anger, and hatred of Almighty God toward sinners. He bore *your* sins on *His* body upon a cross that was meant for *you*. Jesus Christ laid His life down and died for *your* sins. The Bible says, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Jesus Christ will provide you with a holiness, perfection, and righteousness that is *equal* to that of God's – ***if*** you repent and believe. All you need to do is repent of your sins, forsaking them, and turn to God, believing in what Christ accomplished on the cross. To repent is to have a change of mind about sin and about God, and it means to turn *from* your sins and to turn *to* God. It means to *stop*, turn 180 degrees, and continue in the opposite direction.

You have just heard the Gospel of the Bible. If you do not set your soul right with God, you will be *without* excuse and you *will* die in your sins and you *will* spend an eternity in Hell. If I do not believe in Mac Trucks and I stand out on the freeway, it will not change reality. You could leave here today and be struck by another car and instantly killed. Then it will be too late. Where will *you* spend eternity? If this concerns you, you may pray something like this: "Dear God, I know that I am a sinner deserving of eternal punishment for the sin I've committed against You. I repent of my sins (name them), turning *from* them and *to* You. This day I put my trust in Jesus Christ as my Saviour and make Him Lord of my Life. Reveal Yourself in me. Please take away the sins from your servant, forgive me, and grant me your gift of everlasting life. In Jesus' name I pray, Amen." Then go home, read your Bible every day and obey what it says. Earnestly seek God and wait for Him to reveal Himself in you.