

Response to “What the Bible Says and Doesn't Say About Homosexuality” a publication of Mel White. The numbering follows the premises that are in this publication. Quotes from this publication are in ***bold italics***. The publication can be found at <http://www.soulforce.org/article/homosexuality-bible>

I agree with Mel that prayerful and careful search into the Bible will lead to truth. I would add simply “to those that desire to find it.”

- I. ***“Most people have not carefully and prayerfully researched the biblical texts often used to condemn God’s lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender children.”*** Biblical ignorance has nothing to do with what the bible says or what God desires his people to know about His Word.
  - A. ***“Jesus says nothing about same-sex behavior.”*** Jesus did in fact teach that sex was to be in the context of marriage relationships (specifically between a man and a woman See Matthew 19:5-12)
    - i. Note he says that Marriage bond (cleaving) was between a man and a woman v5
    - ii. Note that the only thing to dissolve that bond was sexual sin (In this context this would include homosexuality)
    - iii. Note that the only other option for sexual activity is abstaining from sex v12
    - iv. Either sex between a husband and wife or no sex at all seems to cover same sex behavior by default so Jesus did deal with the subject indirectly.
  - B. ***“The Jewish prophets are silent about homosexuality.”*** Moses being the greatest of all the Jewish Prophets (a prophet is one that reveals the Word of God) would make this statement absurd. If you don't believe this then ask someone who is orthodox.
- II. ***“Historically, people’s misinterpretation of the Bible has left a trail of suffering, bloodshed, and death.”*** Comparing good honest and gracious men and women to hateful reckless and murderers is a serious flaw in this argument. Hitler was not a Christian. Many that call themselves Christian act unchristian. However, using tragic stories does not change what the Bible teaches.
- III. ***“We must be open to new truth from Scripture.”*** “New Truth?” The Bible clearly teaches that we are to reject new truth. Consider Galatians 1:6-10 ***“It took a blinding light and a voice from heaven to help the apostle Paul change his mind about certain Hebrew texts. A sheet lowered from the sky filled with all kinds of animals helped the apostle Peter gain new insights into Jewish law.”***
  - A. Paul was converted to Christ. His mind was not changed; it was transformed by the grace of God.
  - B. Peter was being disobedient to God when he refused to take the Gospel message to non-Jews because they were unclean. He did not have insight he was repentant of his disobedience.
- IV. ***“The Bible is a book about God—not a book about human sexuality.”*** Other things we don't accept?
  - A. Sex before marriage is still sin though I agree that we do not stone a person to death as punishment any longer.
  - B. Adultery is still sin
  - C. Divorce and remarriage is still sin (Adultery)
  - D. Having Sex with a woman during her period makes a person ritually unclean according to the Bible I cannot see anywhere the Bible says that it is punishable by execution. By the way the ritual cleanliness is no longer an issue as Jesus has provided a more perfect sacrifice.
  - E. The law of giving offspring to a childless widow could be broken. Also in that particular culture the concept of having an heir was of particular importance. Interestingly if this Law

- had not been fulfilled in the lineage of Christ His bloodline would have been broken.
- F. I am sure that we could easily say that grabbing a men's genitals violently would be wrong. In fact our modern laws would call it assault (possibly assault with sexual motivation).
- G. The Bible does not teach prostitution is acceptable anywhere that I am aware of.
- H. God permitted Polygamy, but God clearly teaches His plan is for one man and one woman to join together in one flesh. That is the ideal. In fact the Bible is full of examples of the problems that polygamy caused in the lives of those who practiced it.
- I. Solomon's downfall was his sexuality and many concubines (study the scripture 1 Kings 11:4)
- J. Slavery was permitted as long as the slave was released after the period of his service was up. At that time the slave was allowed to become a servant if he or she chose. The Bible also gave very clear regulations about how a slave was to be treated humanely. I do not find where the Bible specifically requires or promotes slavery though. I also cannot find where the Bible condones sexual slavery as Mel White suggests.
- K. Marriage at a young age is a cultural issue as well as a life expectancy issue. One could easily argue that American culture waits too long for marriage.
- L. I am not sure where Mel White finds that the Bible teaches that women are property.
- M. Interracial marriage was not condemned but interfaith marriage was and still is.
- N. The focus on birth control to the point of forced sterilization in some countries, our culture's obsession with sexual organs, and seeing our parents nude (ugh) these cannot be good things nor things to be celebrated can they?
- O. ***“Often, the Holy Spirit uses science to teach us why those ancient words no longer apply to our modern times.”*** Are we to assume then that if Doctor's, Psychiatrists and the like were to say that people that believe in the Bible are delusional then their word would override the Word of God? In fact history is filled with examples in which the secular sciences were in conflict with the Bible and even outright hostility to the faith. In the end though it is God's Word and not the words of men that stands forever.
- V. ***“We miss what these passages say about God when we spend so much time debating what they say about sex.”***
- A. Genesis 2:21-25 ***“Because the text says it is “natural” that a man and a woman come together to create a new life, some people think this means gay or lesbian couples are “unnatural.””***
- i. This passage does not specifically condemn homosexuality as Mr White points out. In fact it does not specifically condemn anything. That is because at this point sinfulness had not been introduced to the human race. However, it does clearly establish the sexual, spiritual, physical union of two people as being between a man and a woman. To suggest that the only aspect of this union was to establish the procreation of mankind is to really miss the context of the passage. In fact the passage says nothing about procreation. So then we have at the pinnacle of God's good creation the physical, spiritual, and sexual union between man and woman. That is why this passage does lay out that homosexuality is not a part of God's plan for mankind.
- ii. I wish that you would turn the page so to speak. The very next verse says, “Did God really say, ‘You can’t eat from any tree in the garden?’” This of course is the temptation toward the original sin. The devil's trick is to question God's word, then modify God's word, followed by arousing desires that are contrary to what God has clearly commanded. The devil has continued to do this from the beginning. Keep the phrase, “Did God really say...” in mind as we deal with these other passages.
- B. Genesis 19:1-14. ***“Today, heterosexuals and homosexuals alike do well to remember that we break God’s heart when we spend all we earn on ourselves, when we forget the poor***

***and hungry, when we refuse to do justice or show mercy, when we leave strangers at the gate.”***

- i. I agree with Mel White that Sodom was not condemned for homosexuality specifically. However I disagree that they were condemned for a lack of social justice as he says. It was for a complete disregard for God and the things of God that they were judged. It was a full on rebellion against God that they were judged and condemned.
    - a) sinning against God (Gen 13:13)
    - b) Moral corruption and rejecting God (Deut 32)
    - c) Full on sinfulness with no shame (Isa 3:9)
    - d) adultery, falsehood, helping evil doers, lack of repentance (Jer 23:14)
    - e) idolatry, prostitution, a lack of social justice (Ezek 16)
    - f) sexual perversion (Jude 1:7).
  - ii. You see their perverse sexuality was a symptom of the heart that has turned away from God. Practicing homosexuality is evidence that the person is rebelling against God. This issue is the heart not the behavior. The person is rebelling in their heart. Sodom was judged because all of its inhabitants had given themselves over to rebellion against God and demonstrated it by the way that they acted including sexual perversion. Frankly to say that this was simply a matter of social injustice is very disingenuous and smacks of propaganda and not a genuine interest in the truth.
- C. Holiness Code Outdated? ***“Leviticus is a holiness code written 3,000 years ago. This code includes many of the outdated sexual laws we mentioned earlier, about Homosexuality and a lot more. It also includes prohibitions against round haircuts, tattoos, working on the Sabbath, wearing garments of mixed fabrics, eating pork or shellfish, getting your fortune told, and even playing with the skin of a pig. (There goes football!)”***
- i. Round haircuts: This was a prohibition of idol worship. Idol worship is still sinful in God's eyes
  - ii. Tattoos and cutting: This was a prohibition of occultic practices. Practicing the occult would still be consider sinful. My opinion is that we should bear the mark of Christ with our lives not colored pictures on our bodies.
  - iii. Mixed linen with wool: I am not sure what this reference has to do with this discussion. It could be a specific prohibition of wool and linen being mixed together. It also could be a prohibition of wearing multi-color expensive garments (i.e. flaunting wealth). There are many thoughts as why this might be, but no clear answer why. I suppose we will be left to contemplate this. If you are interested in this there are plenty of websites that talk about this. Interestingly this command is still observed by orthodox Jews. They even have companies that inspect clothing to make sure that it is kosher (so much for it being outdated).
  - iv. Uncleanliness related to what we eat was changed by Jesus himself (See Mark 7:19).
  - v. Fortune Telling: Again this is a prohibition of the occult which would still be considered sinful.
  - vi. Playing with pig skin? Football? Clever but misleading! This is related to the ceremonial uncleanliness of swine as food specifically and coming into contact with dead things generally. The need for ceremonial cleanliness was replaced by the sacrifice of Christ and the food laws were changed by Christ. That being the case I would still advise people to not touch dead animals unless they are properly protected to prevent getting exposed to bacteria that grow on carcasses. The Bible is filled with practical truths.
- D. Abomination? ***In Hebrew, “abominations” (TO’EBAH) are behaviors that people in a certain time and place consider tasteless or offensive. To the Jews an abomination was***

***not a law, not something evil like rape or murder forbidden by the Ten Commandments. It was a common behavior by non-Jews that Jews thought was displeasing to God.*** To suggest that in the context was that Jews thought that homosexuality was simply “tasteless or offensive” and only for that “certain place and time” is in itself tasteless and offensive as well as outrageous. Looking at the context that the passage containing the prohibition (Lev 18:22) we find that this prohibition is bracketed by child sacrifice (v21) and sex with animals (v23). Using Mel White's logic then could it be that child sacrifice and sex with animals would be OK in another cultural context because they are simply an abomination to the people and not law of God.

- E. Pre-scientific? ***“Because the Hebrew pre-scientific understanding was that the male semen contained the whole of life. With no knowledge of eggs and ovulation, it was assumed that the man’s sperm contained the whole child and that the woman provided only the incubating space. Therefore, the spilling of semen without possibility of having a child was considered murder.”*** Mel White is not addressing historical context of the Bible. Clearly God knows that ovulation is the way of new life and it is His Word. Consider: *“I will put hostility between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed. He will strike your head, and you will strike his heel” Gen 3:15.* Clearly this passage teaches that the offspring (seed) is with the woman which is a direct challenge to Mel White's understanding of the historical context. By the way Genesis and Leviticus were both written by Moses according to tradition. So he would have known that the seed was with the woman.
- F. Romans 1:26-27. ***“Did God really say...”*** *“26 This is why God delivered them over to degrading passions. For even their females exchanged natural sexual intercourse for what is unnatural. 27 The males in the same way also left natural sexual intercourse with females and were inflamed in their lust for one another. Males committed shameless acts with males and received in their own persons the appropriate penalty for their perversion.” Romans 1:26-27*
- i. Paul was talking about all who sin (v18) not simply temple prostitution. In fact temple prostitution mentioned in other passages is not even spoken here. The key to understanding this passage is in verse 18. Paul plainly says that there are those that suppress the truth by their own unrighteousness.
  - ii. Then he goes on to point out that they:
    - a) are without excuse (v 20),
    - b) become deceived and confused (v21),
    - c) are depraved (v 22),
    - d) ultimately engaged in sexually perverse behavior (v26-27),
    - e) committed other acts of sinfulness (v 28-31).
    - f) in the end celebrate those that practice the same (v 32).
  - iii. There is a profound statement in this section, “But the Bible is also clear that when passion gets control of our lives, we’re in deep trouble.” It seems that passion has control over Mel White's theology when the Bible should be his guide.
- G. 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:10 ***“Did God really say...”*** *“9 Do you not know that the unjust will not inherit God’s kingdom? Do not be deceived: no sexually immoral people, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes (malokois), homosexuals (arsenokoitai), 10 thieves, greedy people, drunkards, revilers, or swindlers will inherit God’s kingdom.” 1 Cor 6:9-10 and “9 We know that the law is not meant for a righteous person, but for the lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinful, for the unholy and irreverent, for those who kill their fathers and mothers, for murderers, 10 for the sexually immoral and homosexuals, for kidnappers, liars, perjurers, and for whatever else is contrary to the sound teaching 11*

*based on the glorious gospel of the blessed God that was entrusted to me.” 1 Tim 1:9-11*

- i. Simply put Paul states that a person cannot continue in sinfulness and be committed to the kingdom of God. The term Pornia would generally cover all sexual sin. We also have sex outside of Marriage (adultery), Sex with prostitute both male and female, as well as other types of sin.
- ii. ***“Here’s where the confusion begins. What’s a malokois? What’s an arsenokoitai? Actually, those two Greek words have confused scholars to this very day.”***
  - a) Malikois: I agree with Mel White that Malokois is “effeminate call boys” (i.e. Male Prostitutes)
  - b) Arsenokoitês is from two root words in the Greek. The first word is male and the second is bed. The Greek word for bed is used alone four times in the new testament and 3 of the 4 it is used in a sexual context. The difficulty in translating this word lies in the fact that bedding a male is not sufficiently clear euphemism for homosexuality to those that do not want to see it as such. To put it in modern vernacular it would be like a man going to another man and saying, “I want to go to bed with you.” I do not see the confusion here.

**VI. *“The biblical authors are silent about homosexual orientation as we know it today. They neither approve it nor condemn it.”***

- A. The Bible is the clear authority on things related to spirituality, religion, and morality. To compare the world is flat to the engaging in sexual behavior is not a fair comparison. I cannot control the shape of the world, but I do have control over my behavior. The Bible is the authority of my life for how I am to live as a Christian and guides my behavior. I do not say this as a person that has already been made perfect, but as a person that is continuing the road that God has put me on.
- B. If use the logic that Mel White is using then I would say that there is a whole host of things that cannot be addressed in a moral or spiritual sense. For example the Bible does not specifically condone or condemn Internet pornography. So this must be a neutral subject with regard to Godliness. However, if I apply the authority of the scriptures then I find that lust for and unnatural passions for sex is sinfulness, so I can reasonably conclude that Internet Pornography is sinful even though there is no specific prohibition against it.
- C. In the same way I think that reading what the Bible does say about homosexual behavior it is reasonable to conclude that this to is sinfulness, without regard to the specific type of homosexuality that a person may be referring to or “as we know it today.”

**VII. *“Although the prophets, Jesus, and other biblical authors say nothing about homosexual orientation as we understand it today, they are clear about one thing: As we search for truth, we are to “love one another.”...There is a growing body of evidence from science, psychology, history, psychiatry, medicine, and personal experience that leads to a clear verdict: Homosexuality is neither a sickness nor a sin. Unfortunately, the church has always been slow, if not the last institution on earth, to accept new truth.”***

- A. This quote is quite revealing to me about the Gay Christian theology. When in history has science, psychology, history, psychiatry, or medicine been the authority on what is and is not sinfulness?
- B. Also the phrase “new truth.” For there to be new truth there must be an old truth or a truth that is being abandoned. Unfortunately for this movement the Bible clearly teaches that “new truth” is not really truth at all.
- C. Arguing from scientific position also is weak. Let's say that Science was able to identify a pedophile gene, would that then automatically mean that we needed to take a morally neutral position on this type of attraction? Or would we still be justified in passing and enforcing laws against this type of behavior?

D. A less extreme example would be drunkenness. Alcoholism clearly has genetic underpinning according to scientific research. Does that mean that an Alcoholic is no longer morally responsible for his or her behavior since this was not known when the Bible was written condemning drunkenness.

VIII. ***“Whatever some people believe the Bible says about homosexuality, they must not use that belief to deny homosexuals their basic civil rights. To discriminate against sexual or gender minorities is unjust and un-American.”***

A. I would say that with regard to civil rights that the problem is not that discrimination occurs, but that there is a huge intolerance of those that hold moral standards that differ from the homosexual community.

i. If I say that homosexuality is a sin then I am instantly categorized as someone who hates people when nothing could be further from the truth. My desire is to rescue people from a path of misery and separation from God. The time that I put into responding comes from a hope that I might convince some that read this to turn around. If I hated them I would say nothing with full knowledge that they are heading toward ultimate destruction.

ii. I find that the level of intolerance on the part of the political GLBT movement to be as forceful and hurtful as any intolerance that occurs on the side of conservative Christianity.

B. The notion of equal rights also crosses into the definition of marriage. I think that homosexual marriage drives home the rebellion that is in the hearts of those that stand in opposition to the truth of God. There is no tenable position that could be taken from the Bible to justify homosexual marriage. Rather this falls into the category found at the end of Romans chapter one “they give hearty approval to those that practice these things.”

My prayer is that God would lift the veil that is in front of you and that you would repent and give your life to Christ before it is too late.