

AN APOLOGETIC AGAINST HOMOSEXUALITY

- I. Introduction and preliminary considerations.
 - A. The writings of the New Testament do not deal explicitly with the subject of homosexuality except for a few rare instances, which are all found in the Pauline Epistles.
 - B. It is never recorded that Jesus addressed the issue of homosexual activity.
 - C. The most logical explanation for this fact is not found in a permissive attitude towards the matter, but in the fact that homosexuality had already been condemned by Jewish tradition; this was something the early Christian writers recognized and accepted.
 - D. Thus, in the context of the first century, Philo of Alexandria (20 BC-50 AD), who was one of the leading exponents of Hellenistic Judaism, in his treatises repeatedly criticized sodomy and pederasty as "*illicit relations*" (On Abraham 135-136) and those that practice them as "*contrary to nature and deserving of death*". Special Laws 3.VII.37-39ⁱ
 - E. The New Testament authors then did not have any particular battle to fight on this front, needing only to align themselves with the positions current in the cultural world of the first century, which concurred with the Old Testament prohibitions.
 - F. Ironically, we now have to fight to defend the faith against attacks on this front since there has been a dramatic shift in world opinion on this matter, and a very decided pro-homosexual shift within the visible Church.
 - G. Certain authors have carefully crafted a flawed exegesis and irregular translations to lead people to unorthodox conclusions, which allow them to defend homosexual activity as being acceptable before God.
 - H. Such writers have sought to suggest that David and Jonathan were engaged in a homosexual relationship, and that Naomi and Ruth were engaged in a lesbian relationship.ⁱⁱ
 - I. These things are being done in order to change the thinking of normal people (heterosexuals) and to convince others that the homosexual lifestyle is legitimate; this is accomplished by either eliminating or distorting biblical teachings on the subject.
 - J. In order to effectively refute the arguments that are advanced against the Bible, one must understand certain isagogics and critical issues of vocabulary that are used to justify the conclusion that homosexual activity is not a sin.
 - K. While we cannot present an exhaustive history on every aspect of this theological issue, we will endeavor to deal with the critical points.
 - L. As James DeYoung has noted, "*If religion has a direct effect on morality, and morality has a direct effect on law and legislation, then pro-homosexual interpretations of Scripture have serious consequences for society.*"¹
- II. Greek culture, homosexual activity, and related legislation.
 - A. Many people recognize that the major influences on Western government were the Greek and Roman cultures.
 - B. There can be little doubt that the Greek culture was one of the leading forces in justifying homosexual activity since it was likely one of the most homosexual societies of ancient times.²
 - C. There is little doubt about the narcissistic (self-centered) character of Greek life and the influence of Greek religion.
 - D. Further, many have noted that there certainly appears to be an observable link between Greek religion and morality codes.

1. Because the gods Zeus and Hercules engaged in homosexual activity with men, Greek men felt justified in pursuing it.
 2. In fact, some have noted that the earliest accounts of homosexual behavior seem to be found in ancient pagan religious practices.³
- E. Therefore, it should not be considered unusual that there is very little Greek legislation condemning homosexual conduct.
- F. Although homosexual activity was institutionalized in the Greek military, education, home, and legal code, the law was conflicted in that it both sanctioned and proscribed homosexual activity.
- G. The primary area in which it was institutionalized was the area known as *paidierastia*, which was a socially accepted pedagogical relationship.
1. In the ancient Greek world, an older man, an *erastes* would take an *eromanos*, an adolescent boy as a student.
 2. The relationship was condoned by his parents and involved the older male teaching hunting, warfare, and adult male customs to the boy.
 3. An integral part of this relationship was sexual in nature, with the teacher being the active partner and the student playing the passive role.
 4. The rationale for this was that male dominance was a part of nature, and must be expressed in every aspect of the male-female relationship.
 5. In the *erastes/eromanos* relationship, the student was inculcated with skills in domination by submitting to sexual domination.
- H. However, while Greek law tolerated such activity as being natural and healthy, some of their greatest thinkers did not always agree.
- I. Plato (427-347 BC) wrote on the subject of this type of relationship and expressed his idea that there was an accepted form of pederasty and one against which there should be laws.
1. In his work Symposium (c. 400 BC), Plato stated that a law should be enacted that prohibited taking advantage of young boys.
 2. In later life he acknowledged that laws previously in existence should be enforced, which prohibited pederasty and homosexual activity among adults since they were “unnatural”.
 3. However, he lamented the fact that his society endorsed these things and that his contemporaries were not convinced by an appeal to the natural order.
 4. In the end, Plato suggested that society ought to enact laws against vices like homosexuality since the public should promote that which conforms to holiness and does not violate nature.
 5. His idea was that the natural laws should be reinforced by civil laws.⁴
- J. Aeschines (390-314? BC), in his work Against Timarchus, acknowledged that there were laws on the books that prohibited sexual harassment or assault of young boys.⁵
1. He further records that Greek law prohibited male prostitutes from holding office in civic affairs, or participating in religious observances.
 2. He recognized that laws that regulate moral conduct are the best means of establishing and maintaining an orderly society.
 3. This work indicates that there were laws prohibiting these things, and that the punishment was fine or death, depending on the severity of the offense.
- K. In short, these (and probably others) recognized that there should be laws that govern morality and that these laws should be sanctioned by the religious world and civil society.

- III. Roman society, laws, and comments concerning homosexuality.
- A. It seems that the Romans inherited some (most?) of their ideas about homosexuality from the Greek culture; further, it is recognized that it was relatively widespread in Roman life.
 - B. It was found in all forms like pederasty, lesbianism, mutual adult relationships, and male prostitution.
 - C. Several legal codes were enacted by the Romans to legislate homosexuality, which included some forms of taxation against homosexual prostitutes (*exsoleti*).
 1. Although it seems to have had little effect, the earliest example of this was the Lex Scantinia, which legislated against homosexual activity. c. 226 BC
 2. Polybius (c. 122 BC) asserted that military punishment was inflicted on soldiers, “*on young men who have abused their persons*”, which likely covered a number of abnormal behaviors.⁶
 3. The Lex Julia de Adulteriis, enacted in 18 BC by Augustus, made adultery a crime.
 - a. By the 3rd century AD, it was extended to include sex with boys under 17, which carried the death penalty.
 - b. As a result of legal rulings in the Empire, it was broadened in 438 AD in the Codex Theodosius to criminalize all homosexual activity.
 - c. This was repeated in the Codex of Justinian, which became the basis for Byzantine law for many centuries to come.⁷
 - D. It should be noted that the laws were often not enacted by Christian leaders (until Theodosius and Justinian), but that later rulers only sought to enforce the laws already on the books.
 - E. The legal system of Western culture with respect to civil and criminal law was largely modeled on the Greek and Roman legal systems until only very recently.
 - F. Homosexual activity was censured by some of the Stoic philosophers as being a practice that was unnatural.
 1. The Stoic philosopher Musonius Rufus (30-101 AD) describes his position on homosexual activity in his Diatriba 12 and says, “*But of all sexual relations those involving adultery are most unlawful, and no more tolerable are those of men with men, because it is a monstrous thing and contrary to nature.*”
 2. The Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus (55-117 AD) in his Annals speaks openly of the “*degeneration of youth*” with reference to open promiscuity and degeneracy during the time of Nero,
 - G. Therefore, for anyone to suggest that Greek or Roman culture embraced this as a natural expression or that some of their wisest men thought it an acceptable practice is to rewrite a portion of history.
 - H. Although the Persian, Greek, and Roman societies allowed a measure of homosexual activity, as those societies decayed, the practice became much more prevalent.
 - I. Pitirim Sorokin, in his book The Crisis of Our Age, has pointed out that “*civilizations in the midst of decay will experience increases in crime, suicide, and mental illness; further, as civilizations deteriorate into immorality of any kind, they see a decrease in productivity and creativity.*”
- IV. Vocabulary.
- A. Hebrew vocabulary.
 1. שָׁכַב (shakhabh), verb, to lie down, to recline, used of lying down with someone for the purpose of sexual relations. Gen. 19:32,34, 39:7

- a. In the New American Standard, the phrase **lie with** is used some 13 times and denotes the concept of sexual activity.
 - b. The related phrase **to lie with a male as one lies with a female** refers to engaging in male homosexual sex of some kind. Lev. 18:22, 20:13
 2. **שָׁדָשׁ** (qadhesh), is used in masculine (Deut. 23:17; I Kings 14:24) and feminine forms to refer to temple prostitutes, whether male or female. Gen. 38:21-22; Deut. 23:17
 3. **יָדָע** (yadha), verb, literally, to know or have knowledge. Most exegetes recognize that it was used as a euphemism for sexual relations in certain contexts. Gen. 4:1,17,25
- B. Greek vocabulary.
1. **ἀρσενοκοΐτης** (arsenokoites), m.noun, 2X, a compound from **ἄρσην** (arsen—male, with the stress on the masculine aspects of a man, especially sexual aspects) and **κοίτη** (koite—bed), which is used most often in the New Testament with respect to the marriage bed. Rom. 9:10, 13:13; Heb. 13:4
 - a. The etymology of the term is one of the first things the translator must consider when attempting to establish the definition.
 - b. One should then seek to analyze its usage in as many contexts as possible, which will provide a semantic range for the term in question.
 - c. However, many have recognized that this term is not well attested in Roman literature, and when it is used it is generally only found in vice lists.
 - d. In fact, it is not attested before Paul, and a sizeable group of interpreters have either suggested or recognized that Paul coined the term from the LXX. Lev. 20:13
 - e. Nevertheless, all the standard lexical works have defined the term as one who engages in sex with a male, a sodomite, a pederast, or homosexual.
 - f. In that regard, the term should be understood as the active or aggressive partner in a homosexual relationship.
 - g. Modern interpreters (many of whom are admittedly homosexual or “homosexual affirming”) have disregarded hundreds of years of scholarly work and decided that the term means only sexual aggressor, such as a rapist or sexual abuser of slaves.
 - h. Others of the same ilk have attempted to limit the term to anyone that exploits people through sexual means, and they limit it only to active male prostitutes.⁸
 - i. In order to justify their position, they have openly criticized some of the most recognized and respected biblical scholars and marginalized them as “*anti-gay*”.
 - j. The fact that they make this term mean something else essentially suggests that we cannot really know what the Scriptures mean.
 - k. As Robin Scroggs (pro-homosexual) states, “*Biblical judgments against homosexuality are not relevant to the homosexual debate today.*”⁹
 - l. Nevertheless, the term is general and condemns males lying with males without reference to age, position, authority, etc.
 2. **μαλακός** (malakos), n.noun, 4X, pertains to that which is yielding or soft to the touch (Matt. 11:8); it came to be used of unmanly males and was also used of the passive partner in a same-sex relationship.
 - a. Again, all the lexicons agree that the secondary meaning of this term focuses on the passive male in homosexual activity, the catamite.
 - b. There is plenty of documentation that the root meaning of the term **soft** was expanded to denote one who was not strong or masculine, but demonstrated female attributes (according to Greek standards of manliness).

- c. It was used pejoratively by Aristophanes (445-385 BC) to describe a man, who once was a hoplite (virile warrior), but who had adopted a more leisurely and luxurious lifestyle in retirement, which was considered the lifestyle of a woman.¹⁰
 - d. The Roman playwright Plautus (252?-184 BC) used it alongside other disparaging terms to denigrate effeminate males.
 - e. The term is used in Corinthians alongside ἀρσενοκοίτης in a vice list that condemned such activity. ICor. 6:9
 - f. Even those that advance a pro-homosexual agenda admit, “*Malakos usually meant – an effeminate, highly promiscuous homosexual.*”¹¹
 - g. While the term is describing the demeanor of less than manly men, it became a term that had definite sexual connotations.
 - h. Although there are a number of Greek terms that were brought into the Roman culture, malakos occurs repeatedly in literature dealing with less than approved sexual conduct.
3. μαλακία (malakia), adjective, is only used 3 times in the New Testament and refers to a condition that involves weakness, sickness, or disease. Matt. 4:23, 9:35, 10:1
 4. It is certainly intriguing to note the relationship in the Greek language between the concept of homosexuality and the idea of illness and disease.

V. The subject of homosexual activity and the Bible.

A. Homosexual activity and the sin of Sodom. Gen. 19

1. Some interpreters have astonishingly concluded that the record of Sodom and Gomorrah makes no reference to homosexual activity at all.
2. Authors like D. Sherwin Bailey and John Boswell suggest that Christian prejudice against homosexuality is simply the result of misunderstanding the story recorded in Genesis 19.
 - a. Boswell argues that the story is grounded in the reality that the men of Sodom were anxious to interrogate the two angelic strangers to find out if they were spies.
 - b. Lot, who was a resident alien, angered the residents of Sodom by receiving foreigners without approval and without having their credentials examined by the local leaders.
 - c. The citizens became incensed and showed the most extreme discourtesy they could by demanding that Lot send them out so they could interrogate them.
 - d. Therefore, his conclusion is that when the men of Sodom demanded to “know” the strangers in Lot’s house they simply wanted to get acquainted with them.
 - e. D.S. Bailey agrees that the problem was nothing more than inhospitality; others have expanded this argument to teach that the sexual aspect of the story is simply the vehicle in which the issue of hospitality is addressed.¹²
 - f. Bailey states that in the 943 times the Hebrew verb יָדָעַ (yadha’—to know) is used in the Old Testament, only 10 have a sexual connotation.
3. While we would agree that the vast number of usages simply mean to know or to get acquainted, context must be the determining factor in arriving at the intended meaning.
4. The immediate context uses the same verb in verse 8, which obviously refers to sexual intercourse and not simply being acquainted with someone, since both his daughters were already engaged. Gen. 19:14
5. It would be quite unusual in narrative literature to use a verb with two different meanings so close together unless the author made the difference very obvious. Gen. 3:5,7
6. Further, a similar incident is recorded during the time of the Judges and most orthodox interpreters recognize that the verb יָדָעַ is used to denote sexual relations. Jdg. 19:22,25

7. Beyond these facts, the term is never used to refer to inspecting credentials or acting in an inhospitable fashion.
8. Bailey's next major argument centers on the fact that the Lord had already determined to destroy the cities of the plain before this incident.
 - a. His line of reasoning would suggest that since God had already judged Sodom then this incident had no bearing on why He had pronounced judgment.
 - b. He further states that the Bible indicates that the overthrow of Sodom had more to do with other factors than it did with sexual degeneracy.
 - c. He cites Old and New Testament passages that condemn Sodom for a number of things, none of which are homosexual in nature. Jer. 23:14; Ezek. 16:48-50; Matt. 10:15; IIPet. 2:6
9. However, the context of those passages should be examined, and at least two of them refer to immoral sexual behavior, although the Jeremiah passage is admittedly ambiguous.
 - a. Jeremiah 23:14 definitely mentions the sexual sin of adultery.
 - b. Ezekiel ends his vice list with the general term **abominations**, which is the same noun that is applied to such things as cross-dressing (Deut. 22:5), cult prostitution (Deut. 23:19), and homosexual activity. Lev. 18:22
 - c. The passage in Ezekiel cannot be referring to ancient Sodom, but is a code name applied to a contemporary of Jerusalem, which will have a future restoration. Ezek. 16:53,55
 - d. The passage in II Peter 2:6-7 has a decidedly sexual tone as seen in the various translations that describe their behavior: **sensual** (NAS), **debauched** (NET), **filthy** (NJB), and **lasciviousness** (YLT).
10. The parallel passage in Jude is not ambiguous but serves as a New Testament commentary on the reason for the destruction of Sodom.
 - a. Again, as one might expect, the pro-homosexual lobby must do an exegetical number on this passage, which orthodox interpreters have long identified as a condemnation of the sin of homosexual activity.
 - b. The first argument is that the comments in Jude do not have any bearing on the incident recorded in Genesis 19
 - c. This is refuted by the fact that the destruction of the cities of the plain is in view, which happens to be the entire context of Genesis 18, 19.
 - d. The second argument is that the passage in Jude is teaching only about respect for angels and so Jude cites an example of how people dishonor angels to prove his point.
 - e. However, the context of Jude is explicitly declared to be **ungodly persons who turn the grace of our God into licentiousness...**; it is explaining God's unprecedented judgments on various categories of negative volition.
 - f. The third attack comes on the phrase σαρκὸς ἑτέρας (sarkos heteras—different flesh, strange flesh), which some insist cannot refer to human flesh, since that is quite common to all of us, but refers instead to angelic flesh.¹³
 - g. This is problematic on a number of levels.
 - 1.) Sodom and the cities of the plain had already been condemned before the attempted assault on the angels; that interpretation would indicate that there had been an ongoing incidence of angelic sexual activity with humans, for which there is no evidence.
 - 2.) The Greek of Jude 7 also indicates that the sin of Sodom and the other cities was a perversion on an order of the angelic infiltration of Genesis 6, not the same event.

- 3.) The phrase ὁμοίον τρόπον (en homoion tropon—in like manner) indicates that the sin of the cities was in some way similar to the crossing of sexual boundaries that God had established.
- h. The fact that most translators and interpreters consider the sin of Sodom to be something that is certainly on the order of homosexual activity is seen in their translations of Jude 7.
 - 1.) **sexual immorality and unnatural desire** (NET)
 - 2.) **sexual immorality and perversion** (NIV)
 - 3.) **sexual immorality and unnatural lusts** (NJB)
 - 4.) **gross immorality and strange flesh** (NAS)
 - 5.) **sexual promiscuity and unnatural vice** (NAB)
 - 6.) JFB, in their Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible (1871), indicate in their understanding of the passage that sodomy is in view as they state, *“In later times the most enlightened heathen nations indulged in the sin of Sodom without compunction or shame.”*¹⁴
11. Derek Kidner has effectively rebutted the arguments of Bailey and others with the following observations.
 - a. Statistics on word use are no substitute for contextual evidence, or else the more rare sense of the word would never seem probable, and the passage in Genesis 19 demands the verb עָרַב be understood in a sexual sense.
 - b. It would also be grotesquely inconsequent that Lot should reply to a demand for credentials by an offer of his virgin daughters.
 - c. In Judges, no one suggests that the men of Gibeah were gaining knowledge of their victim in the sense of a personal relationship.
 - d. Conjecture about the Sodomites substitutes a trivial reason for the serious one that was behind their destruction (inhospitality vs. gross, unnatural immorality).
 - e. Apart from this, it is silenced by Jude 7, which Bailey discounts.¹⁵
- B. Homosexual activity and the Mosaic Law.
 1. God’s commands in the Mosaic Law concerning homosexuality are clear: **You will not lie with a male as one lies with a female, it is abomination.** Lev. 18:22, 20:13
 2. There can be little doubt that Moses was not attempting to establish an exhaustive code on sexual activity; instead he was dealing with the more gross offenses that were common to the nations surrounding Israel at that time.
 3. Pro-homosexual advocates usually dismiss these passages with the suggestion that they are not moral prohibitions but simply religious prohibitions.¹⁶
 4. Their conclusion is that the passages in the Mosaic Law are not arguing against homosexuality, but only against identifying with the religious practices of the Canaanites.
 5. One problem is the assumption that ritual purity and moral purity are always distinct; such a distinction would lead one to conclude that adultery was not morally wrong (Lev. 18:20), child sacrifice was moral (Lev. 18:21), and that there was nothing wrong with bestiality. (Lev. 18:23)
 6. Their second attack against this injunction is that the ceremonial aspects of the Mosaic Law have been eliminated for the Church Age believer and therefore, all aspects of the Mosaic Law have been annulled.
 - a. They ridicule believers for eating oysters, clams, and shrimp (Lev. 11:10ff), rare steaks (Lev. 17:10), and wearing blended fabrics. Deut. 22:11
 - b. They suggest that conservative Christians do not keep those who are handicapped out of the pulpit. Lev. 21:18

7. These types of attacks expose a massive ignorance of how the Mosaic Law fits into the overall plan of God in the Scriptures.
 - a. If we take their assertions to the logical conclusion, then sex with animals and incest are appropriate behaviors since homosexual activity is sandwiched between these two prohibitions.
 - b. Secondly, their position does not recognize the fact that the Mosaic Law as a code of life has been superseded by the superior Law of Christ. Rom. 10:4
 - c. While the ritual aspects and attempts to gain justification by works have been eliminated, it does not logically follow that moral precepts are no longer binding.
 - d. Paul refutes such nonsense with his assertion that the law in general, and the Mosaic Law specifically, are still active and morally binding. ITim. 1:9
 - e. Further, he asserts that bedding a male for sex is a criminal offense and should be recognized as such.
- C. Homosexual activity and the New Testament.
1. As has been stated previously, there are not a great number of passages that address the issue of homosexual behavior in the New Testament.
 2. We have dealt with several of the New Testament passages that are relevant to the discussion, but a very important passage in Romans must be addressed.
 3. The prohibitions against homosexual activity are certainly found in the vice lists of I Corinthians and I Timothy. ICor. 6:9; ITim. 1:10
 - a. Homosexual advocates argue that the vice lists include all types of behavior and that Paul was teaching only against abuse in certain areas and not complete abstinence.
 - b. They insist that Paul was dealing with sexual activity that was perverted, sinful, or exploitative—but this is not the same as rejecting either sexual orientation or specific acts as being sinful.¹⁷
 - c. However, this approach attempts to argue from silence that Paul did not consider homosexual activity to be a sin, in spite of the fact that it is in his vice lists.
 - d. As pointed out above, this is often accomplished by virtue of redefining the terms that interpreters have agreed on for centuries.
 - e. In fact, homosexual theologians admit that homosexual love is not mentioned or condemned in the Scripture.
 - f. On that point they are correct; the Bible only refers to lust and degrading passions.
 4. The major passage that devastates the practicing homosexual is found in Romans 1:24-27.
 - a. Ironically, those that promote homosexuality seek to reinterpret what is plainly stated and affirm that it condemns only a particular kind of homosexual activity.
 - b. They argue that the 20th century person that is exclusively homosexual cannot leave the natural use of the woman since his homosexuality is natural and heterosexuality would be unnatural for him.¹⁸
 - c. Their assertions are based on two assumptions: first, that homosexuality is constitutional, and second that Paul was not aware of the different types of homosexuality that existed or was not aware of their causes.
 - d. They say that the passage in Romans is teaching Paul's disdain for hedonistic homosexuals, whose jaded natures turn them into unnatural homosexuals.
 5. However, to impugn Paul's knowledge of the world in which he lived is the worst type of pretended scholarship.
 - a. Paul was from Tarsus, the third leading intellectual city in the world, ranking only behind Athens and Alexandria.

- b. Paul was well informed on the Jewish culture, and he could quote the Stoic poets and recite Stoic virtues at will, suggesting he was equally understanding of Greco-Roman culture.
- c. Thirdly, he was very well-traveled and would have been exposed to the cultures of Israel, Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Rome, and possibly others.¹⁹
- 6. The argument of Romans 1 is very straightforward to the intellectually honest person, but homosexual theologians seek to reinterpret the meaning to justify sinful activity.
 - a. As Blair states, *“In the letter, the practice (of homosexuality) is seen as a resultant and unfortunate structural problem in the world after the Fall from the original created order.”*
 - b. What Blair refers to as *“an unfortunate structural problem”* is actually sin.
 - c. He goes on to say *“The homosexual reference, however, seems literarily most fitting since it illustrates what was perceived to be a reversal of a norm variously described by Paul as the exchange of the truth for a lie, professing wisdom for foolishness, and honoring and serving the creature more than the Creator.”*²⁰
 - d. The *“reversal of a norm”* is also another way of saying sin and depravity; further, to say that homosexuality is just an illustration of depravity, if homosexuality is not itself depraved, is illogical.
- 7. The structure, interpretation, and significance of Romans 1:18ff
 - a. Paul begins this section by explaining why the wrath of God is directed toward ungodliness and unrighteousness. Rom. 1:18
 - b. He indicates that man is without a legitimate excuse before God since He has provided both an internal and external witness to His existence in natural revelation. Rom. 1:19-20
 - c. However, even when the human race recognized the existence of God, they did not respond properly to this knowledge. Rom. 1:21
 - d. The natural response of honor and praise was suppressed and replaced instead with **futile speculations**. Rom. 1:21
 - e. This led to intellectual decay and the resultant spiritual darkness that characterizes those that reject the truth.
 - f. When the mind God provided man is not used for the purpose for which it was provided (to know God), it results in the degradation of the mind and the judgment of God. Rom. 1:21-22
 - g. Since mankind sought to fill the void left by their rejection of the Living God, they resorted to lifeless idols, which became increasingly ridiculous. Rom. 1:23
 - h. At this point, man bowed down to his own glory, and then to the creatures over whom he was commanded to rule. Gen. 1:26
 - i. The order God established at creation has thereby been reversed, which resulted in further judgment by God.
 - j. Three times in verses 24-28, Paul states that **God gave them over**, which is recognized not only as a judicial act by which God no longer restrains the evil in the hearts of men, but as God’s active retribution against them.
 - k. The result of their theological rejection of God was to exchange the truth for a lie. Rom. 1:25
 - l. Since they wanted a theological exchange, God responded with a judgment that resulted in the moral change of those that rejected Him.
 - m. The fact that he introduces the idea of lesbianism as being a judgment from God on women is designed to shock the audience. Rom. 1:26

- n. Normally, the last segment to be affected in the decline of the culture are the women; Paul is presenting proof that normal virtue is gone, that the women have also degenerated to the most debasing of activities.
 - o. He categorizes homosexual activity between females as an exchange of the natural order and use of the female body for an unnatural (παρὰ φύσιν—para phusin—against nature, in opposition to what is normal and acceptable) use.
 - p. Most, if not all lexicons indicate that in this context the term χρῆσις (chresis) refers to the natural function of the female in sexual relations.
 - q. He labels their desires for this unnatural activity as **vile, dishonorable, shameful, or degrading lusts.**
 - r. Paul equally condemns males that engage in homosexual activity, as he applies all he has said about the females to the males by using the adverb ὁμοίως (homoios—in the same way, likewise).
 - s. The natural desire that males have for females has now become perverted into unnatural desire for male-on-male sex.
 - t. Paul condemns this activity as **indecent, shameful, or filthy** as he details their inflamed sexual desire to engage in such patently disgraceful behavior.
 - u. Such activity is characteristic of those that have ceased to acknowledge God and His will in matters.
 - v. Paul uses a play on words in the Greek to indicate that these types of people put God to the test and did not find He met their standards; therefore, God delivered them to a mind that does not meet the test—a substandard, unqualified, or worthless mind.
8. This passage leaves no doubt that Paul considered the shameful abominations of homosexual activity to be a direct result of rejecting God, substituting other gods, and God's judgment on their theology.

VI. Views on homosexual activity following the writing of the Bible.

- A. The Church Fathers were the early and influential theologians and writers in the Christian church, particularly those of the first five centuries of Christian history.
- B. The term means specifically writers and teachers of the Church, not believers in general; normally it does not include the New Testament authors.
- C. The very earliest Church Fathers, who wrote during the first two generations after the Apostles of Christ, are often called the Apostolic Fathers.
- D. They are often further divided by the Council of Nicea: the writers up until 325 AD are called the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and those after that date are the Post-Nicene Fathers.
- E. The Ante-Nicene writings and their views on homosexuality.
 - a. The Didache, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Apostolic Constitutions (c. 2nd century AD) all condemn the practice of παιδοφθωρία (paidophthoria), which is a compound that means to corrupt boys.
 - b. It is translated by the phrases **corrupt boys, commit pederasty, molest children, or commit sodomy.**²¹
 - c. Justin Martyr (150 AD) in his First Apology condemns all forms of sexual deviance and speaks of those who are “*openly mutilated for the purpose of sodomy*”. XXVII
 - d. Likewise, Clement of Alexandria (190 AD) speaks disparagingly of “*boys, taught to deny their sex, act the part of women, and men play the part of women, and women that of men, contrary to nature*”. The Instructor Book III, Chapter III
 - e. While Tertullian (220 AD) condemned adultery and fornication, he spoke of “*other frenzies of passions, beyond the laws of nature...which are not sins, but monstrosities.*” On Modesty Chapter IV

- f. Cyprian of Carthage (250 AD) refers to the degradation of men in very severe terms as he states, *“Turn your looks to the abominations, not less to be deplored, of another kind of spectacle. . . . Men are emasculated, and all the pride and vigor of their sex is effeminated in the disgrace of their enervated body; and he is more pleasing there who has most completely broken down the man into the woman. He grows into praise by virtue of his crime; and the more he is degraded, the more skillful he is considered to be.”*²²
- F. Nicene and Post-Nicene opinions on the subject of homosexuality.
 1. Eusebius of Caesarea (320 AD) notes that in the Law of Moses God had, *“forbidden all unlawful marriage, and all unseemly practice, and the union of women with women and men with men.”* The Proof of the Gospel Book IV, Chapter 10
 2. John Chrysostom (390 AD) spoke of those that, *“were addicted to the love of boys, and one of their wise men made a law that pederasty . . . should not be allowed to slaves, as if it was an honorable thing; and they had houses for this purpose, in which it was openly practiced. And if all that was done among them was related, it would be seen that they openly outraged nature, and there was none to restrain them.”* Homilies on Titus
 3. In fact, he condemned homosexual activity between men and women in his Homilies on Matthew and Romans.
 4. Augustine (397 AD) wrote that, *“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.”* Confessions 3.8.15
- G. In short, from the time that Paul condemned these types of activities in the New Testament, there was a consistent witness in Church history that likewise continued to condemn homosexual activity.

VII. Homosexuality and salvation.

A. Ph₁ salvation.

1. Having gone to great lengths to document that the moral and legal position on homosexuality is that it is a sin before God, one must address the issue of salvation.
2. We have documented that the Bible is quite plain that those who engage in this type of lifestyle are opposed by God and under His active judgment.
3. However, this sin, like all others with the exception of unbelief, is a sin for which Christ died; therefore, it is one that can be forgiven. IICor. 5:21; IPet. 2:24
4. As such, like any unbeliever that comes to faith in Christ, the homosexual can experience forgiveness, receiving the imputation of God’s righteousness and eternal life. Jn. 3:16
5. Paul indicates that the Church at Corinth was comprised of some believers that at one time were practicing homosexuals. ICor. 6:9,11

B. Ph₂ salvation.

1. The Bible makes it plain that one of the purposes of Bible doctrine in time is to deal with our failures under God’s system of grace and attempt to minimize sinful behavior. I Jn. 2:1; Rom. 6:1-2
2. Like other vices, one who continues to practice homosexual activity after salvation is to come under the doctrine of separation. ICor. 5:11
3. This is to be enforced on a personal level as well as on the corporate level. ICor. 5:13

4. The believer that commits this sin, recognizes his mistake, and confesses it is instantly restored to fellowship with God. IJn. 1:9
 5. However, if he had been removed from the local church for flagrant sinning, he would have to be examined by the leadership to ascertain whether he should re-admitted to the fellowship of the local church. IICor. 2:6
 6. If he has repented of his homosexual activity, he is to be readmitted as a member in good standing and encouraged by the congregation as is appropriate. IICor. 2:7-8
 7. The principle of separation on a personal and corporate level is designed to teach people that flagrant sinning brings reproach on the believer that practices it and that the local church will not compromise its witness by tolerating such activity.
 8. If a believer comes in contact with a believer that has been ejected from the local church, he should avoid socializing with him, but instead should give him a firm but polite exhortation to stop his activity. IIThess. 3:14-15
 9. One should recognize that if things proceed to the point of excommunication, there may be residual issues that could impact the remainder of his Ph₂ niche.
 10. Believers should be discerning enough to recognize that the leadership of the local church must approach future decisions on the basis of biblical mandates, the best interests of the church corporately, the best interests of individuals, and existing civil laws.
- C. Ph₃ salvation.
1. Once any person believes in Jesus Christ for salvation Ph₁ he cannot lose his salvation due to any future sinful activity. Jn. 10:28
 2. While a believer cannot lose his salvation, he can lose his rewards and be denied his portion of inheritance. ICor. 6:9-10
 3. SG₃ can be forfeited when the believer continually practices STA activity, which he does not acknowledge by confession. IJn. 1:9
 4. Further, it is clear that one of the purposes of learning Bible doctrine is to work on our areas of weakness and to not engage in perpetual sinning. IJn. 2:1
 5. Therefore, the believer that practices homosexual activity following salvation suffers loss at the Bema Seat, but he will spend his eternity in Heaven. ICor. 3:15

VIII. Homosexuality and the last days.

- A. This point will detail the reasons for this apologetic, since we live during the time in history that was envisioned in some of the prophecies concerning the last days. Jude 3
- B. The books of Second Peter and Jude contain detailed prophecies about the last days; both indicate that there would be false teachers that would advocate sexual license under the guise of promoting grace. Jude 4
- C. As is typical, those that advocate a pro-homosexual agenda have sought to discredit these books by undermining their veracity and/or authority, or by attacking the author's credentials.²³
- D. Both prophecies indicate that the means by which these people would gain entrance to believers is by sneaking in under false pretenses. Jude 4; IIPet 2:1
 1. παρεῖσδύω (pareisduo) is used only in Jude and means to slip in stealthily, to worm one's way in, or to sneak in under false pretenses.
 2. Peter uses a similar term παρεῖσάγω (pareisago), which means to bring something in that becomes an addition to something else.
 3. The cognate παρείσακτος (pareisaktos) is used in Gal. 2:4 and has the similar idea of acting in a surreptitious manner, sneaking or smuggling in. IIPet. 2:1

4. Therefore, it should not be surprising if these people are not immediately obvious as false teachers; further, it should not be surprising that their arguments contain some plausible rationales.
- E. Both authors indicate that these people and their doctrines will be characterized by ἀσέλγεια (aselgeia).
1. The term denotes those who lack self-restraint, who conduct themselves in a manner that violates all bounds of what is socially acceptable; self-abandoned, lustfully indulgent, licentious, sensual, or debauched. IIPet. 2:2; Jude 4
 2. John MacArthur as noted that the term refers to the person who is so dominated by his sin nature that he doesn't care what people say or think; he is not shocked by his own sinning since he has no sense of decency or shame.
 3. The term is specifically applied to the men of Sodom and the debauched lifestyle that Lot observed on a daily basis. IIPet. 2:7
- F. There can be little doubt that what is in view is a form of gross immorality as seen in the hapax ἐκπορνεύω (ekporneuo), which denotes some sort of immorality.
1. While this word is not well attested in extant literature, most have taken it to be a strengthened form of πορνεύω (porneuo) and translate it **flagrant/excessive immorality**.
 2. However, it is possible to understand the εκ (ek) prefix in its natural sense of **out of, or away from**, which would suggest immorality that was out of the norm.
 3. In no case can one understand the etymology of this word to have anything to do with hospitality.
- G. Their flagrant or abnormal immorality involved σαρκὸς ἑτέρας (sarkos heteras—different flesh, strange flesh), which must be understood as a different kind of flesh than the one established by God for sex.
1. While the pro-homosexual interpreters want to see this as angelic flesh, Sodom and the cities of the plain had already been condemned before the attempted assault on the angels.
 2. That interpretation would indicate that there had been an ongoing incidence of angelic sexual activity with humans prior to Genesis 18, for which there is no evidence.
 3. The Greek of Jude 7 indicates that the sin of Sodom and the other cities was a perversion similar to the angelic infiltration of Genesis 6; **not the same event**.
 4. Further, there is no evidence from the Genesis account that the men of Sodom perceived Lot's visitors to be anything other than normal men; there is no reference to angels by Lot or the Sodomites.
 5. It is very easy to understand the reality that having sex with the flesh of a male is **very different** than having sex with the flesh of a female.
- H. Any one of these facts individually might not be sufficient to document that the sin of Sodom was specifically homosexual activity.
- I. However, when taken together in the contexts in which we find them, and when coupled with what we know of the Bible and subsequent Church history, it becomes impossible for the intellectually honest person to arrive at any other conclusion.
- J. Therefore, the clear teaching of both these books is that the last days will see a rise of false teachers with the specific agenda of **turning the grace of God into licentiousness**. Jude 4
1. This is to be understood in a general sense of sexual immorality that is redefined by the false teachers as constituting God's grace.
 2. It is fairly common among theological liberals to promote sexual freedom or liberation with the promise that anything done between two consenting adults is acceptable before God.²⁴

3. Jude connects the behavior that modern liberals promote with the behavior of notorious rebels that God judged with the Greek term ὁμοίως (homoios—likewise, in the same way). Jude 8
4. This certainly suggests that these modern false teachers also advocate or endorse the crossing of sexual boundaries established by God in order to pursue their chosen brand of immorality.
5. We simply suggest that theological liberals that tolerate, promote, sanction, or endorse homosexual activity are a subset of false teachers that promote immorality through their teachings.
6. Both Peter and Jude agree that these false teachers' theological perspective is hardly the work of sound exegesis; they merely dream up heterodox interpretations and theological rationalizations for their activities. Jude 8
 - a. Their promise of sexual liberation is really a matter of **defiling the flesh**.
 - b. They are characterized by a rejection of established authorities, which would include sound exegetes, centuries of interpreters, and established lexical works. Jude 8; IIPet. 2:10
 - c. Further, much of the sexual liberation (deviance) that has come to pass has been promoted by the “liberation of women”, which is doublespeak (language that distorts or disguises its actual meaning) for rejecting the established authority of the man in the male/female relationship.
 - d. As they reject authority, they move on to verbally attack the doctrines that have been considered hallmarks of the Christian faith for centuries as they **blaspheme glories**.
 - e. This would include glorious events (supernatural events, miracles), which the liberal theologians have sought to dream away with naturalistic explanations.

IX. Conclusions.

- A. In spite of all objections to the contrary, the Bible is clear on the matter of homosexual activity and God's opinion on the subject.
- B. The specious arguments of the homosexual or homosexual-affirming theologians and community does not effectively undermine the weight of Scripture or the weight of centuries of theological commentary.
- C. In fact, their perversions of the Word of God were foretold in the prophecies of II Peter and Jude; they are effectively fulfilling those prophecies in their zeal to justify this sin.
- D. The misguided attempts to suggest that homosexuality is some sort of disease, genetically inherited and unable to be changed or controlled, does not hold water.
 1. The implication is often that one who has such a genetic predisposition is not responsible for it and should be free to express himself.
 2. Assuming that one is born with genetic predispositions, it does not mean that they are not sinful; in fact, given what we know of the sin nature it would tend to suggest that they are sinful. Ps. 51:5
 3. Do we, as a society and individuals, allow those born with a tendency to steal, lie, fornicate, murder (or any other sin) simply acquiesce to those with such propensities and allow them to express them at will?
 4. Nevertheless, this is what the homosexual lobby believes we should do in the case of queers.
 5. The heredity defense will not stand the test of a thinking person in moral matters; nor will it stand the test of intellectual honesty in the matter of homosexuality.
- E. The second argument often advanced is that the nature of homosexuals is the result of their environment; very often, it is the fault of a domineering mother/female.

1. Researchers have suggested that faulty family roles have contributed to the practice; this includes dominant mothers and/or absent or disinterested fathers.
 2. Other research concludes that homosexuals may come from homes with physical and/or sexual abuse.
 3. However, this rationale (however much truth is in it) still does not excuse anyone from committing sins against individuals or society.
 4. How many people have come from the same or similar backgrounds, suffered emotional or sexual abuse, and have risen above it to excel as human beings?
 5. Do we excuse any anti-social, illegal, or immoral activity because the person was raised in difficult circumstances?
 6. While we may have compassion on and sympathize with those that have had lives that are less than desirable, we cannot excuse unethical, unnatural behavior.
- F. Paul states unequivocally that the root cause of homosexual activity is found in rebellion against the revealed nature of God and the rejection of the function of the conscience. Rom. 1:18ff
1. In the writings of Paul and other great thinkers like Plato, William of Ockham, George Washington,²⁵ John Quincy Adams,²⁶ and many of our great leaders, there was a clear connection between God's revelation and human morality.
 2. Even those that practice Wicca (a neo-pagan religion) admit that teachings about morality have been largely influenced by the Christian religion.²⁷
- G. As stated in the introduction, religion has a direct effect on morality, and morality has a direct effect on law and legislation.
- H. Paul makes it quite clear that God's view on the matter of law in general, and the Mosaic Law specifically, should legislate against homosexuality and other crimes. ITim. 1:10
- I. Therefore, pro-homosexual legislation is not only a violation of God's view, it is antinomian in its very character.

ⁱ "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 for midable 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."

ii. http://www.telc.ca/pdf/Buck_Homosexuality.pdf p. 18-19

1. James DeYoung, The Old Testament Witness to Homosexuality; A Critical Assessment of the Prohomosexual Interpretation of Scripture
2. <http://www.geocities.com/pharsea/Greeks.html> citing Greenberg, The Construction of Homosexuality.
3. Homosexuality in History@copyright2000 by Reverend Robert J. Buchanan
4. Plato, Laws, 838-842a <http://oll.libertyfund.org/Home3/HTML.php?recordID=0813>
5. Aeschines, Against Timarchus 12.16.21 <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/aeschines.html>
6. Polybius, Histories. 6.37.9 http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Polybius/6*.html
7. <http://www.incommunion.org/articles/the-orthodox-church-and-society/iv>
8. J. Boswell Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality. p. 341-353
9. Robin Scroggs The New Testament and Homosexuality p. 127-129
10. <http://ancienthistory.about.com/library/weekly/aa011500a.htm>

-
11. http://forum.ship-of-fools.com/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic;f=7;t=000047;p=25 Posted by Wasteland
 12. D.S. Bailey Homosexuality and the Western Tradition p. 4-5
 13. <http://www.allfaith.com/Religions/Christianity/jude7.html>
 14. <http://www.ccel.org/j/jfb/jfb/JFB65.htm>
 15. Derek Kidner, Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary p. 137
 16. Ralph Blair An Evangelical Look at Homosexuality p. 3
 17. *ibid* p. 6
 18. Kim Stablinski Homosexuality, What the Bible Does and Does not Say. *The Ladder*, July, 1969
 19. P. Michael Ukleja The Bible and Homosexuality—Homosexuality in the New Testament
 20. Ralph Blair An Evangelical Look at Homosexuality p. 7
 21. <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/didache.html> Didache 2.2; Barnabas 19.4; Apostolic Book 6 Section V.XXVIII
 22. http://www.catholic.com/library/Early_Teachings_on_Homosexuality.asp
 23. <http://www.themillennialdispensation.org/wjch.html>
http://www.awitness.org/journal/bible_homosexuality.html
Summary Conclusion: Which proves nothing, for a second point I wished to make is that the Bible is not 'the Word of God' but rather it is a mirror in which you see reflected the religious community in all its diverse manifestations, both good and bad and in between, and as the military propoganda reveals, the Bible also reflects the larger community (this being mostly due to the fact that there was no 'separation between religion and state' in ancient cultures, thus religion and the military were all bound together).
 24. Christian beliefs and attitudes towards homosexuality are now split, with liberal denominations now giving gays and lesbians full access to membership and ordination. http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom_mar2.htm
 25. "And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."
 26. The law given from Sinai was a civil and municipal as well as a moral and religious code; it contained many statutes . . . of universal application-laws essential to the existence of men in society, and most of which have been enacted by every nation which ever professed any code of laws.
<http://www.wallbuilders.com/resources/search/detail.php?ResourceID=21>
 27. One of the greatest contributions that Christianity and Judaism have imparted on our society is the institution of morality. Previous religions, especially those of Greece and Rome, placed little importance on the teaching of morality. This was left to the philosophers who in turn described their own moral beliefs and systems to their students, creating a moral code which was as diverse and disorganized as there were philosophers to listen to.
<http://www.angelfire.com/realm2/amethystbt/morality.html>