

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe *to you* when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorraah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe *to you* when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorraah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorraah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe *to you* when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorraah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe *to you* when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe *to you* when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources

What does the Bible really say about Homosexuality?

It actually starts with angels...



By Joshua Stucki

Also partially referencing *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull

Restoration Movement Literature

This booklet may be distributed freely in its original, unmodified form.

INTRODUCTION

This preacher does not get writer's block often; usually, ideas flow from my brain to paper fairly easily.

However, how and what to write on the very contentious topic of homosexuality in particular has perplexed me for some time.

Most preachers, scholars, and other authors who are attempting to provide Biblical evidence against homosexuality usually go to the same 7-8 passages that deal with the word "homosexuality" and make their case from there. Although this idea is effective with the reader who agrees with the author, it has not proven effective on the general populace (although I would wholeheartedly agree with those authors in their conclusions).

Therefore, I did not want to try to cover the same territory, but rather really attempt to provide something logically irrevocable, if that is possible. The deeply-ingrained technician in me, for I was in IT for fourteen years, is a detective by nature, and thousands of times over my previous career (multiple times daily in many cases) I had to prove to my clients a certain diagnosis in order to secure their funds to repair the problem. Otherwise, my clients did not necessarily enter the situation agreeable, but they left agreeable – this is my same goal as a preacher and author:

I do not merely wish to write and speak the right thing, but actually do so in an effectual manner. I do not want those who read my works merely to agree with them, but to be convinced by

them. The only difference is that I do not do this now for my affirmation for the sake of a sale, as I did in computers, but to God's glory, where I seek only His reward. (Philippians 3:14)

With this in mind, I have spent months investigating the various claims by many liberal preachers and scholars that the Bible does not actually condemn homosexuality. In order to counter that question, one must demonstrate a spelled-out, logically-equivalent, inevitable conclusion.

This is a tall order. However, it is this author's personal feeling on the matter that much of the previous Scriptural-study fervor has been lost, and we must re-discover the old arguments, as well as develop new apologetics, to effectively counter our present dilemma in culture. The Bible is infinite in its depths!

We are dealing with a specific, narrow question here: "Does the Bible say homosexuality is wrong?" This is necessarily separate from the potential science behind homosexuality, or the history surrounding it, or even whether or not the Bible is true. Of course, this preacher believes the Bible is true, but the assumption for the question we are asking is: "Assuming the Bible is true, does it say that homosexuality is wrong?"

This preacher's hypothesis (assertion, belief) is that the Bible does say homosexuality is wrong. So how does one go about proving this belief via Scripture?

Sometimes one just has to look at the bookends to get started...

THE UMBRELLA ISSUE

Homosexuality is posited under an umbrella of other sexual sins listed in the Bible – divorce, adultery, co-habitation, effeminate men, polygamy, polyandry, bestiality, pedophilia, etc. It is also mentioned among non-sexual sins, such as in Romans 1:29-31, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. The liberals say that homosexuality does not belong under this “umbrella” of sexual sin in the Bible (of course, most liberals would deny sin altogether, but for our purposes here, that is beside the point).

This is especially the position of homosexuals who call themselves Christian. There are many notable examples, possibly the most famous being Ray Boltz, who openly advertises homosexuality along with his self proclaimed faith.

Is it possible to demonstrate logically and consistently that homosexuality belongs under this general umbrella of sin that the Bible condemns? This matters because while even most liberal scholars (though not all!) would still say that pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, etc. are wrong, they believe the Bible does not put homosexuality under this umbrella. So we are not debating if there are sexual or other things in the Bible that we would all consider wrong: virtually everybody agrees at least some of the items under the sexual sin “umbrella” are wrong; we are merely debating if homosexuality belongs there also, according to the Bible.

If homosexuality does group together with these other sexual sins, the homosexuals who claim Christ have no right to do so. In fact, if those who called themselves Christians but claim

homosexuality for themselves or others as right were convinced otherwise, a large part of the homosexual movement would disappear. It is estimated that well over half of the homosexual population in the United States considers themselves Christian. Do we wonder why we have such difficulty with this issue then?

LOOKING AT THE BOOKENDS

The issue of homosexuality itself is present in the Bible – nobody debates this. Instead, liberals and conservatives and everybody in between debate what those passages *mean*. However, it is important to look at where homosexuality is in the context of the rest of agreed-to sin in the Bible. Does it fit in the umbrella – is it associated with other sexual sins in the Bible?

To do this, we will first look at a most unlikely story from Genesis chapter 6. Most Bible students would immediately say, “Noah’s flood?” Yes, the story of Noah’s flood begins in Genesis 6, but that is not where Genesis 6 *begins*. Genesis 6 begins with a story most scholars are honestly clueless about, or they make assumptions about it, or they just view it as an interesting side note. What is misunderstood about this passage is because it is not seen in the context of its fellow bookend: the book of Jude.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, whereas Jude is the second to the last. Yet, they both discuss these same two stories: the stories of angels going after “strange flesh” (the literal translation we will look at below) in Genesis chapter 6, and then a little later, men doing the same in Genesis 19, and how Jude ties both stories together *to the same conclusion and consequence*.

GENESIS 6:1-4, 19:4+5, AND JUDE 1:6+7

Because most are unfamiliar with the passage from Genesis 6, it is quoted here:

“Now it came about, when men began to multiply on the face of the land, and daughters were born to them, ² that the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were ^[a]beautiful; and they took wives for themselves, whomever they chose. ³ Then the LORD said, “My Spirit shall not ^[b]strive with man forever, ^[c]because he also is flesh; ^[d]nevertheless his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” ⁴ The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore *children* to them. Those were the mighty men who *were* of old, men of renown.”

The burning question is: “Who *were* the Nephilim?”

The Bible answers this question for us in the above text and other places. First, the Bible says that the Nephilim were children born to the “sons of God” and the “daughters of men.” No one argues who the “daughters of men” are; they are human women. The question is “Who are the sons of God”?

Every single Old Testament reference that uses this exact same terminology – “the sons of God” – refers to angels. See the chart below:

| Who are the “Sons of God” in the Old Testament? | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| # | Scripture Reference | “Sons of God” meaning |
| 1 | Job 1:6 | Angels |
| 2 | Job 2:1 | Angels |

| | | |
|---|----------|--------|
| 3 | Job 38:7 | Angels |
|---|----------|--------|

Now, although it's not in the context of the original Hebrew, are there New Testament verses that equate "sons of God" to angels? Yes: see Luke 20:36 and Romans 8:19.

It is also interesting to note that all ancient Jewish commentators and extra-Biblical authors understood that "the sons of God" were angels.ⁱ

So, if we are to understand the Genesis chapter 6 story in the context of the Old Testament (and to its closest-kin book of Job, which was probably also written by Moses, or at least around the same time, as virtually all scholars believe Job to be the oldest book of the Bible chronologically-speaking), angels came down and had children with women, who became the Nephilim (which literally translates, "fallen ones", as some translations actually render it).

What does this have to do with homosexuality? For all angels in the Bible who are mentioned are always depicted as men, and here they married and had children with human women, right?

The issue boils down to one fact: Jude chapter 1 sees Genesis chapter 6 and Genesis 19 (the homosexual men in Sodom and Gomorrah) as *having the same sin and consequence!*

Jude 1:6+7 is quoted below:

“⁶ And angels who did not keep their own domain, but abandoned their proper abode, He has kept in eternal bonds under

darkness for the judgment of the great day, ⁷ just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them, since they in the same way as these indulged in gross immorality and went after ^[g]strange flesh, are exhibited as an ^[h]example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

When did angels not keep their “own domain”? When did they abandon their “proper abode”? The only example in Scripture we have is Genesis 6:1-4, when angels (the “sons of God”, as understood in every Old Testament reference that uses that same terminology) came down and cohabitated with women producing children by them, thereafter called the “Nephilim”, or, the “fallen ones.”

Jude 1:6 and the beginning of verse 7 says these angels are kept “in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day *just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them*”. Jude *equates* the angels’ lusting after human women to the men of Sodom and Gomorrah lusting after flesh of the same sex.

Continuing in verse 7, Jude says “since they were *in the same way* indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh”. Again, Jude equates the angels’ sin in going after women in Genesis 6 to the men going after other men in Genesis 19.

Now many liberal scholars would stop right here and say, “No! The sin was angels and people in both situations!” The problem with that understanding is that ignores the language used in both texts. See Genesis 19:4+5 quoted below:

“Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people ^[b]from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are **the men** who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may ^[c]have relations with them.””

The men of Sodom and Gomorrah *did not know* they were seeking angels; they thought they were seeking *men*, as the passage says. Jude *equates* these two concepts in 1:7 when he says, “...since they in the same way as these indulged... and **went after** strange flesh.”

What is truly telling in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah is that the men never actually had sex with “the men” they sought; they were not guilty of the sin of homosexuality (because they never got that far); no, they were guilty of their *intent* to have sex with “the men” (their words) that were with Lot. Jude equates *the intent of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah* – which was nothing less than to have homosexual relations with who they thought were men – as the “same” (Jude 1:7) as the sin of the angels in Genesis 6:1-4, also equating the consequence for both parties.

So, Jude here equates the sin of angels having sex with women as being the same as men *intending* on having sex with men because they were **both** going after “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7).

Finally, Jude equates their joint consequence: “...**in the same way** as these indulged... are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

Otherwise, both the angels that sought strange flesh, just as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah sought after strange flesh, **are co-equal in wrongdoing and thus co-equal in consequence.**

TYING IT ALL TOGETHER IN ROMANS 1:24-32

Therefore, also, the issue of homosexuality in the Bible is not just homosexuality itself; it is rather what the Bible consistently associates with it. It equates in Genesis and Jude the sins of angels with women and men with men; without mentioning the word “homosexuality” at all, the Apostle Paul instead describes the same thing as Genesis 6 and Jude 1 in his own words:

“²⁴Therefore God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, so that their bodies would be dishonored among them. ²⁵For they exchanged the truth of God for ^[p]a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed ^[q]forever. Amen.

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

²⁸And just as they did not see fit ^[u]to acknowledge God any longer, God gave them over to a depraved mind, to do those things which are not proper, ²⁹being filled with all unrighteousness, wickedness, greed, evil; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit,

malice; *they are* gossips, ³⁰ slanderers, ^[v] haters of God, insolent, arrogant, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, ³¹ without understanding, untrustworthy, unloving, unmerciful; ³² and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them.” (Romans 1:24-32)

Several points here that match Genesis 6 and Jude 1:

- 1) “the lusts of their hearts” – first angels with woman (Genesis 6), then men with men (Genesis 19), later women with women (Romans 1), and finally all of the above in Jude 1:6+7. Of course, there are all the traditional sexual-sin passages as well to consult.
- 2) “their bodies would be dishonored” – otherwise, all of the above is dishonorable, according to the Bible.
- 3) “they exchanged the truth of God for a lie” – this language implicitly states *a choice* – “they *exchanged*”
- 4) “worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator” – a Christian resists the flesh to serve God (Matthew 26:41; Romans 6:19, 7:5, 14, 18, 25, 13 times in Romans chapter 8 alone, etc.). Here, the person who practices homosexuality in either form is putting their lust of another person above their love of God.
- 5) “gave them over to degrading passions” – otherwise, the following passions are degrading/”dishonoring” (vs.24):

5a) “women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” – lesbianism described, without using the term “homosexual” or “lesbian” – it is spelled out, defined beyond any doubt.

5b) “and in the same way” (see also Jude 1:7 again for this exact same language meaning, “equal”)

5c) “men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own person the due penalty of their error.” – gay men, again not using the word “homosexual” or “gay” but spelled out, defined beyond any doubt. This particular part of the verse tells that the equation of all the above sins is being in error and the penalty associated with that error is all alike.

6) “And just as they did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer” – **A surrendering on this issue *always* – even today – means rejecting God’s Word on other areas of sin as well.**

Homosexuality, like any other sin – sexual or not – that is embraced by a person means compromise on a host of other sins and false beliefs as well. It is a house of cards by nature.

7) “game them over to a depraved mind” – otherwise, the above “errors” that have a “due penalty” that are “degrading” and “dishonoring” – are by definition “depraved” (all quotes from the Bible, as stated above)

8) “to do those things which are not proper” – all of the above things are also “improper”

9) “being filled with all” [then a list of a bunch of *associated* or, co-equal, sins] – here homosexuality of both gay men and lesbians is spelled out and *associated*, or put under the umbrella with, a host of other sins (and their due penalty – vs. 32)

10) “although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same” – homosexuality, according to the Bible, is not something we are born with or done “under a rock” – it is a conscience choice to ignore “the ordinance of God”, the “due penalty” (“worthy of death”), and they “do the same” – again, *the Bible itself says all these things* as it has been demonstrated.

11) “but also give hearty approval to those who practice them” – again, here is an equation that those who practice homosexuality of any flavor, which is equated with the sin of the angels having sex with women in Genesis 6, is also equated to those who even simply *support* such things. **This is clearly why wedding cake bakers, photographers, florists, and restaurants do not want to cater to a gay wedding.**

Without even touching the Levitical Law condemning homosexuality, or the story of the homosexuals being condemned in the tribe of Benjamin in Judges chapters 19-21, or the various Old and New Testament passages that talk of homosexuality by name, it is clear that from bookend to bookend the Bible *equates* the original sin of angels with women to the men in Sodom and

Gomorrah (which is spelled out to be *the intent* to have sex with who they thought were men) thoroughly spelled out in graphic detail by Paul in Romans 1:24-32, where he does not even mention the word “homosexuality”.

It is not necessary to argue the meaning of the word “homosexuality” in Scripture, as Scripture spells out specifically the sexual (and other) acts it condemns in Genesis 6:1-4, 19:5+6, Romans 1:24-32, and Jude 1:6+7, where homosexuality is not translated by word but *spelled out* in action and thought to be equivalent in its condemnation with not only other sexual sin, but sin in general.

In conclusion, it is absolutely accurate to say that the Bible says homosexuality is wrong *in detail*. The Bible equates it with the sin of “strange flesh” (Jude 1:7), in all forms in Romans 1:24-32, and with merely the *intent* to commit homosexual acts (Genesis 19:5+6).

SCRIPTURE’S WARNINGS

This author, finally, is reminded of a verse all people – especially homosexuals who call themselves Christians *and all those who support them* (Romans 1:32), should hear:

“²⁶Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for their fathers used to ^[a]treat the false prophets in the same way.”

Christianity – in its Biblically-practiced form – *has never been popular* in culture. Now that homosexuality is absolutely all the rage, this alone should make anyone take notice, pause, and ask if

this mass-acceptance of a previously-understood, long-held, traditional taboo dating back thousands of years deserves extreme skepticism.

As well, for those leaders, preachers, ministers, and teachers who call themselves Christians, Scripture has an especially odious warning:

“Let not many *of you* become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a ^[a]stricter judgment.” (James 3:1)

When secularists and atheists (unapologetically called “fools” by Scripture in Psalms 14:1) *praise* your efforts to give LGBTQ people a place in the membership and leadership of the church, in civil marriage, etc. how can you not raise an eyebrow? How can you join the ranks of those who support such things, that Paul spells out in Romans 8:24-31, and then specifically condemns these supporting people in Romans 8:32?

Paul warned Timothy, and warns us the same, about these very “teachers”:

“For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but *wanting* to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires, ⁴ and will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” (2 Timothy 4:3+4)

OUR CHARGE ON ALL ISSUES REGARDING SIN

Church, we cannot compromise on homosexuality, because we cannot compromise on *sin*. Christ had to die to defeat sin! Shall we sin more so that grace may increase? May it never be! (Romans 6:1+2) The Bible *equates* homosexuality with sin as the same thing (Jude 1:6+7 makes this abundantly clear, even using language like, “in the same way”). We cannot argue terms here because the terms are not up for debate: when “homosexuality” appears in the Bible, it is not a matter of debating the meaning of the Greek word, because the Bible spells the acts of homosexuality out for us and what it means in several other passages in more detail than most of us really want to picture in our minds. *Undoubtedly, God wanted no misunderstanding on this issue!* We can conclude safely that any “misunderstanding” is exactly what Paul calls it in Romans 1:25 – “...they exchanged the truth of God for a lie...”

As much as even we would like to believe that people are somehow innocently victims of today’s cultural swing towards homosexuality, Scripture does not testify to this – they exchanged the truth of God for a lie (Romans 1:25); they purposefully gather teachers around them who tell them what they *want* to hear (2 Timothy 4:3+4).

Scripture does not avoid the difficult topics so neither can us. I myself can testify that I do not *want* to confront culture on this issue; inevitably, persecution comes when one stands on the Word of God. Rather, Christians everywhere are *compelled* to confront culture on this issue among others: 1 Peter 3:15 says we should

always have answer for those who ask us, but only also in grace and love (see especially also 1 Corinthians 13:2!).

Jesus told us pray for those who persecute us for our beliefs and practice (Matthew 5:44). Paul says the same in Romans 12:14.

Jesus also told us *the world will not accept us*. (Matthew 10:22; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:17; John 15:18) We are not Christians because we hope one day *to be liked*; we are Christians because the Bible tells us truth, and that truth leads to eternal life! (John 14:6)

Under *no other name* can be a man be saved than under Christ's (Acts 4:12). We are not witnesses or defenders of culture; we are witnesses and defenders of the faith "once for all" (Jude 1:3), entrusted to us until Jesus' return. Be faithful, church! Stand firm! And you will inherit the crown of life! (Revelation 2:10)

ⁱ See *The Eternal Struggle* by George L. Faull for more information on "the sons of God" from ancient Jewish sources