

Appendix B
Observations on Key Biblical Texts:
A Confrontation with Revisionist Homosexuals¹

I. Must Remember God’s Design in Human Sexuality

- A. Genesis 2:18-25 establishes the created order. The Hebrew words for male and female in the creation account refer “specifically to biological, sexual distinction. This natural difference defines and underlies the polarities of man and woman.” [The distinction is not] an “arbitrary accident of evolution . . . nor a mere cultural convention having the force of long-standing tradition,” [and it is] “more than incidental historical detail. It is a declaration of the proper creation order, cited with authoritative approval and moral significance by Christ. It was God’s ordained design for sexual relations to be in the form of male-female union, man and wife becoming ‘one flesh,’ and God created the distinction between the sexes to that end.”²
- B. Matthew 19:3-6 – Christ acknowledges (1) the natural order in God’s design and (2) the only alternative to God’s design is celibacy (vv. 10-12).
- C. Ephesians 5:21-33; Colossians 3:18-19; 1 Peter 3:1-7 define the complementary roles of husbands and wives. How do homosexual couples—i.e., husband to husband, wife to wife—complement one another?
- D. 1 Corinthians 7 totally ignores homosexual relationships. Verses 1-5 acknowledge the loving self-sacrifice that God designed in the husband/wife relationship—further proof that homosexuality is selfish by definition.

II. Genesis 18-19

And the LORD said, “The outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah is indeed great, and their sin is exceedingly grave.” (Gen. 18:20)

A. Observations on Genesis 19

- 1. 19:4 shows the homosexuality in Sodom as exclusively male. Though it could have been both ways, male homosexuality predominated over female homosexuality.
- 2. 19:4 shows the extent of male homosexuality – homosexuals preyed upon others so that “both young and old” were eventually converted.
- 3. 19:9 illustrates the truth of Romans 1:18 and 2:15 – In unrighteousness they suppressed the truth of Lot’s moral judgment, one that agreed with their own consciences. Note their angry reaction.
- 4. 19:9 clearly demonstrates the men’s commitment to burn with lust for other men.
- 5. 19:11 says, “. . .they wearied themselves trying to find the doorway.” With utter disregard for personal safety and well being, they relentlessly and recklessly sought to satisfy their lusts and their anger. This is an illustration of the “degrading passions” of Romans 1:26. Sadly, this exists today as homosexuals pursue sexual gratification risking

¹James R. White and Jeffrey D. Niell, *The Same Sex Controversy* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany House Publishers, 2002). Greg L. Bahnsen, *Homosexuality: A Biblical View* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1978).

²Bahnsen, 28.

AIDS and other diseases. Furthermore, the homosexual community is proud of its animal-like promiscuity.

6. Two NT passages in particular interpret the Sodom and Gomorrah event: Jude 7 and 2 Peter 2:7
 - a. Jude 7 – they “indulged in gross immorality (ἐκπορνεύω) and went after strange flesh” (σαρκὸς ἑτέρας)
 - b. 2 Peter 2:7 – Lot was distressed by the “sensual conduct of unprincipled men”

B. Revisionist Attempts – What is the sin of Sodom?

1. The sin of Sodom and Gomorrah was a **lack of hospitality**
 - a. In Semitic, near eastern culture you were responsible for receiving and entertaining strangers, even enemies. Abraham demonstrated the near eastern ideal when he received the angels in chapter 18.
 - b. Lot actually sinned against the elders at the gate by not letting them “know” the angels (i.e., show hospitality).
 - c. Even Ezekiel 16:48-49 says their sin was not helping the poor and the needy.
 - d. Responses:
 - 1) Certainly we can see other sins in Ezekiel 16:49 (arrogance, gluttony, carelessness, not helping the poor and needy), but read on ...
 - 2) **Ezekiel 16:50** kills the argument since it cannot be left out of the list – “Thus they were haughty and committed abominations before Me. Therefore I removed them when I saw it.” Thus the sins of Ezekiel 16:49 are sins that accompany homosexuality.
 - 3) There is no damage done to the biblical view of homosexuality by making it one of several sins that angered the Lord.
 - 4) Ezekiel, citing the Sodom and Gomorrah, pre-Mosaic law account, could only cite homosexuality as an abomination. Nothing but the homosexual behavior of Sodom and Gomorrah can be called “abominations” (חַיֵּעֲבָה) according to the Torah (Leviticus 18 and 20). “Abominations” therefore is not merely a reference to cultic or societal taboos (as Daniel Helminiak claims). Rather, Ezekiel has interpreted Sodom and Gomorrah in light of Leviticus 18 and 20.
 - 5) It is ludicrous to say God destroyed the cities of the plain in the manner described in 19:24-28 for not showing hospitality
 - 6) It is also ludicrous to say God destroyed all the cities in the region for the actions of just one city, Sodom, where Lot lived. Would not other cities have shown hospitality?
2. The sin of Sodom and Gomorrah was **homosexual rape**, not monogamous loving same sex relationships.
 - a. In Genesis 19:5 the men state their intentions to “know” (יָדַע) the men who came to see Lot. The word “know” is defined in context by 19:8 – Lot’s daughters had not “known” a man. Also, note the parallels with **Judges 19:22-25** where the sons of Belial wanted homosexual sex (again the word is יָדַע).
 - b. In Genesis 19:7, Lot calls their stated intention to know the men a “wicked act” and offers an alternative. James White says he may have been buying time with the offer, knowing these men were such that they wouldn’t accept it.³
 - c. Lot calls their intentions wicked prior to a rape situation; he obviously didn’t sense any threat, having closed the door behind him (19:6).

³White and Niell, 35.

- d. The men understood Lot’s words as a moral judgment and it angered them (19:9)—it is only *after* his moral judgment that their actions become forceful.
3. The sin of Sodom was going after “strange flesh”, that is, desiring to have **sex with angels** (cf. Jude 7).
 - The Sodomites referred to the angels as “men” (הַאֲנָשִׁים), not angels (הַמַּלְאָכִים); they didn’t know they were angels.
 - Going after “strange *flesh*” (σαρκὸς ἑτέρας) in Jude 7 shows the intent of their hearts to have sex with men of flesh, not angelic, spiritual beings.

III. Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13

Objection: Are the prohibitions part of OT ceremonial codes no longer enforced? (1) the penalty for violation was death, a penalty for violating a moral code, not ceremonial law; (2) NT writers considered the laws to be applicable (where?) – these two reasons from Welch JBC article)

A. Revisionist Attempts

1. Leviticus and other OT texts only relevant to the Jews – this is the most common way around this and is especially effective for those who are confused about the way the OT relates to the NT.
2. You are inconsistent to cite Leviticus 18 and 22 for prohibitions against homosexuality when you breed two kinds of cattle, sow your field with two kinds of seed, or wear clothes with two kinds of material mixed together (Lev. 19:19). Also, many other things in the OT are חֵיֶעֱבָה as well, why do we pick on homosexuality but ignore the others?
3. The people in Bible times (Leviticus and Romans) knew nothing of mutual, monogamous, loving relationships. Those passages rightly condemn the sin of inversion where naturally heterosexual people engage in homosexual acts because they violate their own, God-given nature. The person who is naturally homosexual is doing nothing contrary to his God-given nature.

B. Points of Response

1. NT writers cite the OT therefore OT texts are not only relevant to the Jews
 - a. Paul is referencing Leviticus 20:11 as the basis of his condemnation of the sin in the Corinthian church (1 Cor. 5:1).
 - b. Paul coins a term from the LXX translation of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13; the LXX uses the words ἄρσενος κοίτην in 18:22 and 20:13 (lit. bed a male); cf. 1 Cor. 6:9 and 1 Tim. 1:10 where Paul coins the term ἄρσενοκοίτης, a term that explicitly identifies the sin.
2. Leviticus 18:22-23 calls homosexuality and bestiality חֵיֶעֱבָה.
 - a. Answering the fool according to his folly on the question of things called חֵיֶעֱבָה, consider this: If Lev. 20:13 is no longer חֵיֶעֱבָה, neither is bestiality or those acts in the surrounding context either (20:10-12, 14-16).
 - b. The Hebrew word generally means the “persons, things, or practices that offend one’s ritual or moral order.”⁴
 - c. [It] is apparent that homosexuality was a prominent part of Canaanite practice, most likely an element of their worship (cult prostitution). This practice of a man lying with another man “after the manner of lying with a woman” ... was abhorrent to

⁴Grisanti, *NIDOTTE*, 4:314.

Yahweh because it perverted the heterosexual relationship ordained by him (Gen. 2:24; 4:1). Anyone who committed this abomination must be executed (Lev. 20:13).⁵

- d. Greg Bahnsen also points out that “homosexual lust is in a sense even worse [than heterosexual ones]; while heterosexual drives are God-given, promote the cultural mandate, and are fulfilled within marriage, homosexuality is always immoral in any context.”⁶
3. Notes on 18:24-30:
 - a. Don’t defile yourselves by these things (preceding verses) because the rest of the nations have defiled themselves in those ways and therefore God destroyed them based on those vile acts.
 - b. The Canaanite nations were engaged in all these depraved acts (incest, bestiality, homosexuality, etc.) and God punished them for it using Israel as His tool of judgment.
 - c. Note that God gave the Law to Israel and never sent missionaries to the surrounding nations that they might receive the standard and be warned – is that fair?
 - 1) Romans 1 reveals how their depravity manifests the judgment of God upon them (1:18 is a present passive indicative, continuous aspect).
 - 2) Romans 2:14-15 shows how the work of the Law is already written on their hearts, and their conscience witnesses to the fact.
 - 3) You can be sure that no one offering their child to Molech (18:21) walked away from the sacrifice with a clean conscience; the same was true regarding homosexuality, bestiality, etc. Those acts brought defilement, guilt, shame, and an accusing conscience. Repeated defilement seared and silenced the conscience.
 - d. Both Leviticus 18 and 22 deny the propriety or acceptability of the homosexual act itself – questions about “mutual, monogamous, loving relationships” and “inversion” are totally irrelevant; they are mere smokescreens!

IV. 1 Corinthians 6:9-11 (1 Timothy 1:10)

A. What the passages actually say in their context:

1. 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. And 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. 6:9-11).
2. [R]ealizing the fact that law is not made for a righteous man, but for those who are *lawless* and *rebellious*, for the *ungodly* and *sinner*s, for the *unholy* and *profane*, for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers and immoral men and **homosexuals** and kidnappers and liars and perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound teaching, according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, with which I have been entrusted (1 Tim. 1:9-11).

B. Observations:

1. Each list is of behaviors that characterize the unrighteous (the unrighteous, lawless, rebellious, ungodly, sinners, unholy, and profane) – “these are lifestyles, regular behavior patterns, habits of mind and action. Paul has in view not single lapses followed by

⁵Ibid., 4:316.

⁶Bahnsen, 68.

- repentance, forgiveness and greater watchfulness, with God's help against recurrence, but ways of life in which some of his readers were set, believing that for Christians there was no harm in them."⁷
2. These "are ways of sin, which, if not repented of and forsaken, will keep people out of God's kingdom of salvation. Clearly, self-indulgence and self-service (I borrow the phrase from the gas stations), free from self-discipline and self-denial, is the attitude they express and a lack of moral discernment at their heart."⁸
 3. These passages preclude the genetic argument – the behaviors characterize the unrighteous and are contrary to sound teaching that is in accordance with the gospel. There is therefore no such thing as a homosexual Christian. How can coveting, swindling, fornicating, lying, perjuring, kidnapping, and committing adultery and murder be tied to genetics?
 4. "Such were some of you" indicates that though they once practiced these things continuously (**imperfect** tense), they were washed, sanctified, and justified (**aorist** tenses).
 5. Washed, sanctified, and justified indicate that people who practice homosexuality need deliverance from the pollution, the lack of consecration, and the condemnation of their sin, *just like every other sinner*.
 6. Homosexuals object to Christians citation of these passages because the word **ἀρσενοκοίτης** is not found in Greek literature prior to Paul. Paul clearly coined the term from the LXX of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13. The term descriptively refers to what two men do in bed.
 7. **Packer** comments on the two terms: "The first, *arsenokoitai*, means literally, male-bedders, which seems clear enough, the second, *malakoi*, is used in many connections to mean unmanly, womanish and effeminate, and here refers to males matching the woman's part in physical sex. In this context, where two terms for sexual misbehaviour have already been used, there is really no doubt as to what Paul has in mind."⁹

V. Romans 1:18-32

Objections: Are the biblical prohibitions relevant to committed homosexual relationships? How can a committed relationship of love be denied to two sincere people?

A. Observations

1. Suppression of the truth is not a mere intellectual issue; it is a moral one (1:18).
2. God clearly revealed Himself so that men are without excuse (1:19-20).
3. Take note of the word 'exchange' (**ἀλλάσσω** in v. 23 and **μεταλλάσσω** in vv. 25 and 26) in the context:
 - a. The glory of God for an image, the truth of God for the lie, and the natural function for the unnatural.
 - b. Those who make the exchange are making a choice to do so.
4. These things cannot be redefined as less than sinful.
 - a. They follow "degrading passions" and engage in acts that are "unnatural" and "indecent."

⁷Packer, "And 'No' to Same-Sex Unions."

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

- b. The lists both before and after vv. 26-27 are clearly lists of sins.
- 5. Man's choice to 'exchange' is God's judicial act.
- 6. The relationship is mutual and reciprocal – they burned in their desire for one another (**ἔξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους**) – the issue is clearly sexual desire.
 - a. This precludes pederasty, gang rape, and cultic ritual.
 - b. With this verse both the outward act and the inward thought (a.k.a. 'orientation') are condemned.
- 7. "Natural function" points to God's creative purpose and design.
- 8. Lesbianism is also against nature, not against what is common in society – "even their women" suggests something that is over the top.
- 9. Those in v. 32 who know that those who practice homosexuality are deserving of death have been informed by Leviticus 20:13.
- 10. Those in v. 32 who know what God thinks about homosexuality not only continue to participate in it but approve of those who join them – sinners encourage other sinners. This is the current situation in American society.
- 11. The only remedy to this picture is God's regenerating grace and the imputed righteousness of God.
 - a. Preach the good news, but only after you've preached the bad news.
 - b. Therefore you cannot counsel a homosexual – he's got to be born again first.

B. Objections

1. Isn't biblical homosexuality "unnatural" while contemporary homosexuality is "natural"? Paul was speaking against inversion—naturally inclined heterosexuals engaging in homosexual acts—not people who were born with a natural inclination for their own sex.
 - a. Assumptions
 - 1) Paul was bound by his culture
 - 2) Argument assumes an evolutionary bias – our modern culture is more sophisticated than the primitive cultures of the Bible
 - b. Tactic – Undercut the authority of the text by speaking of Paul's cultural boundaries so that modern men don't need to listen to it.
 - c. Exegetical issue – The meaning of "against nature" (**παρὰ φύσιν**; cf. Rom. 1:26; 11:21; 11:24) – The Romans 11:24 solves the issue pretty easily in that **παρὰ φύσιν** (unnatural) is contrasted against **κατὰ φύσιν** (natural).
 - d. Historical Note – Plato wrote about every aspect of homosexuality in his own culture that is common and characteristic today over 100 years before Paul.
2. Paul is only speaking against pederasty—where an older man and a younger boy in 'loving' relationships—a practice very common in Greek society as attested by Greek literature (Plato, etc.).
 - a. This is just a red herring since, very plainly, the verse says, "women with women" and "men with men" and the term 'boy' (**παῖς**) is not to be found.
 - b. Tactic – Get your attention off of the text where the verse is glaringly plain.

List of verses explicitly dealing with the homosexual issue:

Genesis 13:10-13*

Genesis 18-19*

Leviticus 18:22*

Leviticus 20:13*

Deuteronomy 29:23; 32:32

Judges 19:16ff.*

Isaiah 1:9; 3:9; 13:19

Jeremiah 23:14; 49:18; 50:40

Lamentations 4:6

Ezekiel 16:46-56*

Amos 4:11

Zephaniah 2:9

Matthew 10:15; 11:23-24

Matthew 19 – eunuchs from birth are not constitutional homosexuals

Luke 10:12; 17:28, 32

Romans 1:18-32*; 9:29

1 Corinthians 6:9-11*

1 Corinthians 7:2-5* (having authority over one another's bodies)

Galatians 5:19-21*

Ephesians 5:3-5*

1 Timothy 1:9-11*

2 Peter 2:6-9*

Jude 7*

Revelation 11:8

Recommended Resources:

- *The Same Sex Controversy*, James R. White and Jeffrey D. Niell
- *Homosexuality: A Biblical View*, Greg L. Bahnsen