

Question 3: How is homosexuality justified in the Bible? **Answer:** It can be justified very well despite of clear verses that speak against homosexuality. The shocking truth you must realize is that anyone can use any verse to justify any sin with any interpretation. This can even include homosexuality. The word of God is very clear in its condemnation of homosexuality. The scriptures plainly call it “an abomination,” a sin that is punishable by death, and an “unnatural” motive. Despite of these strong references, the homosexuals will try to twist the “scriptures unto their own destruction.” They will literally try to scrape off every single iota of any indication to homosexuality in the Bible. They will search any word that mentions “love” or “kiss” or “eunuch” to prove that there is some allusion to homosexuality in the passages.

The homosexuals will first claim that Jonathan knitted his soul with David, like the souls of two lovers becoming one (1 Sam. 18:1-3). But the verse is simply about a natural love from your soul for a family member or friend (Deut. 13:6). It is not referring to some sexual bond of two souls becoming one. The homosexual will try to retaliate by claiming that Jonathan was stripping himself naked to his undergarments in 1 Samuel 18:3-5. But this certainly is not the case. Though “girdle” can refer to undergarments, it can also refer to a belt that holds a sword. This verse mentions a sword with a girdle, which undoubtedly refers to a belt holding the sword. Notice 2 Samuel 20:8 says that the girdle was holding a sword and it was UPON, not inside, a garment. Furthermore, the verse says Jonathan only stripped himself of his robe; he gave (not stripped) a sword, a bow, a girdle, and several garments to David. He obviously did not wear all of this luggage.

The homosexual will come up with 1 Samuel 20:41 and Romans 16:16 as a justification for males kissing one another. However, they fail to see that this was a customary kiss for greeting. It is like the Roman Italians who still greet one another with a kiss today. There is nothing sexual about it. Moreover, there is nothing “holy” about a “holy kiss” if it is sexually perverted.

Our opponent will just not give up on the false notion that Jonathan and David were romantic partners, so they will use 2 Samuel 1:26 to prove that David's love for Jonathan was "passing the love of women." But the phrase was not a sexual reference. After all, Jesus said that our love for Him was to pass the love of family members (Matt. 10:37). This obviously did not mean it was sexual, otherwise, it would be incest! Also, David and Jonathan were certainly heterosexual, not homosexual, since they both had wives during their friendship (1 Sam. 18:26-27 & 2 Sam. 9:3).

Strangely, homosexuals somehow see in Ruth 1:16-17 that Ruth was making a love vow to Naomi of "till death do us part." What a ridiculous statement! How can this even hint that Ruth's love for Naomi was sexual? To be fair though, our opponent must realize that if it was truly a lesbian vow "till death do us part," then how come Ruth was easily willing to marry Boaz out of Naomi's wish? (3:1-5). Both of them were in full agreement on the matter.

Trying to dig up any verse that showed a homosexual relationship, opponents claim that Ashpenaz had a "tender love" with Daniel. However, Daniel 1:9 does not even say that Ashpenaz's tender love for Daniel was sexual. If it was truly homosexual, then what about a female mother who has a tender love for a male son? (Prov. 4:3). When the Bible says "tender love," it is certainly not referring to something perverted! Tender love is just like any love that is tender for other people. Our Lord had tender love for us (Ps. 103:4). Paul commanded that the brethren were to have tender hearts for one another (Eph. 4:32).

Perhaps one of the most blasphemous statements ever made was the idea that Jesus was a homosexual. The two verses that the homosexuals will quote are John 13:23, 25 and Mark 14:51-52. First of all, these passages never gave one word about some homosexual relationship. John 13 merely said that John was lying on Jesus' bosom and was loved by him. Mark 14

merely said that some half-dressed person was following Jesus in the crowd. In Western cultures, we would think this is strange, but in Eastern cultures it was perfectly natural for people to lie on other's breasts or dress differently. Jesus was certainly not a homosexual, because He fulfilled the law of Moses, which forbade homosexual practices (Matt. 5:17 cf. Lev. 20:13).

One of the favorite words that homosexuals will use to support homosexuality is "eunuch." They will argue that eunuchs throughout history were made into sex slaves for their masters. One of the most dangerous verses they will quote is Matthew 19:12, because they will claim that a man can become a homosexual and go to Heaven. Now, my question is how do they really know that the Bible word for "eunuch" was referring to male sex slaves? Perhaps, there were eunuchs throughout history who were used as male sex slaves, but there were certainly others who weren't! Have they thought about that? If they really read Matthew 19, they would have discovered that one becomes a eunuch to avoid sexual encounters (vs. 10-12). So this eunuch was definitely not a homosexual going to Heaven. It is a sin that will be judged by God in Hell.

Genesis 19 has been a popular passage revealing the sin and destruction of Sodom. It is clear that the sin of Sodom was homosexuality (vs. 4-8). Some will argue that when the inhabitants of Sodom want to "know them," it was not really sexual. But the following verses are clear that they wanted to know the men in a sexual sense (vs. 5, 8). Realizing this dilemma, they will claim that the verse never said their sin was homosexuality, but rather rape. Then they will immediately turn to Ezekiel 16:48-49 and claim that Sodom was judged specifically for their sin of inhospitality rather than homosexuality. But what about verses 47 and 50? Notice Sodom was judged for committing abominations as well. Remember that the Bible calls homosexuality an abomination (Lev. 18:22). Furthermore, Jude 7 is clear that Sodom was judged specifically for their perversion. If the opponent continues to deny this fact, here is the key word that silences the matter: sodomite. This word is referred as an abomination to God (Deut. 23:17; 1 Ki. 14:24; 2 Ki. 23:7). The term refers to the city of Sodom itself, proving that their sin was homosexuality. Though "sodomite" has been defined by corrupted scholars and dictionaries as "male prostitution," "bestiality," or other sexual acts, it definitely includes homosexuality. It is proven etymologically, historically, medically, and even currently. Note the following sources:

“Translated in the New Testament from arsenokoites, literally, ‘one who lies with a male,’ ‘a sodomite’ (1 Corinthians 6:9; 1 Timothy 1:10; the King James Version ‘for them that defile themselves with mankind’)” (Orr, James, M.A., D.D. General Editor. “ABUSE.” International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. 1915).

“Old term for any form of homosexuality, or sometimes any of numerous paraphilias” (“SODOMY.” Dorland's Medical Dictionary for Health Consumers). “old term for any form of homosexuality; sometimes extended to mean any of numerous paraphilias” (“SODOMY.” Miller-Keane Encyclopedia and Dictionary of Medicine, Nursing, and Allied Health, Seventh Edition).

“Middle English: from medieval Latin sodomia, from late Latin peccatum Sodomiticum 'sin of Sodom' (after Gen. 19:5, which implies that the men of Sodom practised homosexual rape)” (“SODOMY.” Concise Oxford English Dictionary, Eleventh Edition).

“The term is understood in history, literature, and law in several senses: (1) as denoting any homosexual practices between men, in allusion to the biblical story of Sodom (Genesis 18:19)” (“SODOMY.” Encyclopedia Britannica Online. Web. 19 Feb 2013).

“Middle English, from Anglo-French sodomie, from Late Latin Sodoma Sodom; from the homosexual proclivities of the men of the city in Genesis 19:1–11. First Known Use: 13th century” (“SODOMY.” Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Web. 19 Feb 2013).

The facts are facts. Nowadays, dictionaries are trying to redefine the word “sodomy” and “sodomite” in order to hide the true sin of Sodom. But there are etymological, historical, medical, and modern dictionaries that still show the right definition of “sodomy” and “sodomite.” There is no doubt about it. The sin of Sodom was homosexuality.

Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 clearly condemn homosexuality as an abomination in the eyes of God. In fact, it was even punishable by death. But homosexuals will reinterpret it as God was only condemning the homosexual practices adorned for pagan religious rites, not homosexuality itself. In those same chapters however, should the sins of incest, adultery, bestiality, and child sacrifice be allowed since God was only condemning them in a pagan ritual sense? Their second interpretation is that the condemnation for homosexuality was only in a ceremonial purification sense, not moral sense. Then they will refer to Jesus' statement that we do not need to abide by ceremonial purification rules (Matt. 15:18-20). But the Bible considers homosexuality as an abomination. An abomination is certainly connected to moral sins, not simply some ceremonial purification rite (Prov. 6:16-19).

Another clear verse that condemns homosexuality is Romans 1:26-28. It clearly calls homosexuality as something unnatural and vile. Our opponents will argue that it was only condemning true heterosexuals becoming homosexuals. A true homosexual is not being condemned. What a laughable interpretation! Again, there is not one single verse that shows their fantastic interpretations. Are we to say that God was only condemning people becoming

fornicators, murderers, backbiters, and haters of God (vs. 29-32)? But a true fornicator, a true murderer, a true backbiter, and a true hater of God were allowed (vs. 29-32)? What a ridiculous statement to say that God was not condemning true homosexuals, true fornicators, true murderers, and true haters of God! Their second interpretation is that it is only condemning people who do idolatrous homosexuality, not homosexuality itself. If that is the case however, then the Bible is only condemning people who are idolatrous fornicators, idolatrous murderers, idolatrous backbiters, and idolatrous haters of God (vs. 29-32). So their second argument fails. Another interpretation they will use is the Greek. They will claim that Paul was not condemning homosexuality in a moral sense. He just called it “para physin” in Greek, which really means “unusual,” rather than “unnatural.” Paul called Gentiles “unusual” in Greek, which bears no moral application (Rom. 11:24). The two other words “dishonorable” (1:24, 26) and “unseemly” (1:27) also bear no moral application when comparing with 2 Corinthians 6:8 and 11:21. Although it is true that these Greek words can bear no moral application at times, it can bear moral application at other times. Have they ever thought about that? The homosexuals in Romans 1 were definitely condemned in a moral sense, because they lied, worshipped creatures, despised God, and committed inconvenient sins worthy of death (vs. 25, 27-32).

The most common argument that homosexuals will use to justify their perverted actions is that they were born into that lifestyle. They will scrounge around for any biological or genetic statement that supports their fantastic idea. An individual does not have to debate about this matter back and forth, but rather simply use one verse: Psalms 51:5. The passage reveals that every sinner was born as a sinner, but that does not mean God approve it. Likewise, even if it is true that you were born genetically as a homosexual, it still gives no excuse for a person to remain as he is.