

Session 4 - What Does the Bible Say? Part 1

- Genesis 2
- Genesis 19
- Leviticus 18 & 20
- Romans 1
- 1 Corinthians 6, 1 Timothy 1

I've included articles from thirdmill.org on passages that don't mention homosexuality but are commonly interpreted, inaccurately, to carry homosexual meaning:

- Jonathan and David
- Ruth and Naomi
- The Roman Centurion

****We are not endorsing Third Mill as a ministry. We are only recommending these specific articles.**

Genesis 2:18-25

The Lord God said, "It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper suitable for him." 19 Now the Lord God had formed out of the ground all the wild animals and all the birds in the sky. He brought them to the man to see what he would name them; and whatever the man called each living creature, that was its name. 20 So the man gave names to all the livestock, the birds in the sky and all the wild animals. But for Adam no suitable helper was found. 21 So the Lord God caused the man to fall into a deep sleep; and while he was sleeping, he took one of the man's ribs and then closed up the place with flesh. 22 Then the Lord God made a woman from the rib he had taken out of the man, and he brought her to the man. 23 The man said, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called 'woman,' for she was taken out of man." 24 That is why a man leaves his father and mother and is united to his wife, and they become one flesh. 25 Adam and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame.

"suitable"

The progressive argument (*not the historical argument that we hold to*) says that the word "suitable" does not relate to a specific gender, but merely another human.

kenegdo

compound word made up of ***ke***, which means "as" or "like" and ***neged***, which means "opposite" or "against"

God made Adam a helper suitable for him, and she was like him and opposite him.

“This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called ‘woman,’ for she was taken out of man.”

Adam calls her **ishshâh** because she was taken out of **îysh**

She is bone of my bone, the same as me, AND she is different than I am.

"That is why a man leaves his father and mother and is united to his wife",

This is what God has established for what marriage is, for what marriage means.

“and they become one flesh.”

“one flesh” points to sexual intimacy. That’s why Paul uses the language of “one flesh” when warning the Corinthians against being “joined” to a prostitute. (1 Cor. 6:15-16)

“Mere physical contact - like holding hands or sticking your finger in someone’s ear - does not unite two people in an organic union, nor does it bring them together as a single subject to fulfill a biological function.” - Kevin DeYoung

Genesis 1:27–28

So God created mankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them. 28 God blessed them and said to them, “Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground.”

This is part of the purpose of bringing man and woman together in marriage - to procreate.

What about couples who can’t have kids?

“That sometimes married men and women are unable to have children by reason of biological infirmity or old age does not change the procreative purpose of marriage found in Genesis. Marriage is, by definition, that sort of union from which - if all the plumbing is working properly - children can be conceived. Homosexual unions by their very nature do not meet this definition, nor can they fulfill this procreative purpose. The issue is not, as one revisionist author argues, whether procreation is required for a marriage to be valid. The issue is whether marriage - by nature, by design, and by aim - is a covenant between two persons whose one-flesh commitment is the sort of union which produces offspring.” - Kevin DeYoung

The meaning of marriage is more than mutual sacrifice and covenantal commitment. Marriage, by its very nature, requires complementarity.

Genesis 19:1-13

The two angels arrived at Sodom in the evening, and Lot was sitting in the gateway of the city. When he saw them, he got up to meet them and bowed down with his face to the ground. 2 “My lords,” he said, “please turn aside to your servant’s house. You can wash your feet and spend the night and then go on your way early in the morning.” “No,” they answered, “we will spend the night in the square.” 3 But he insisted so strongly that they did go with him and entered his house. He prepared a meal for them, baking bread without yeast, and they ate. 4 Before they had gone to bed, all the men from every part of the city of Sodom—both young and old—surrounded the house. 5 They called to Lot, “Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us so that we can have sex with them.” 6 Lot went outside to meet them and shut the door behind him 7 and said, “No, my friends. Don’t do this wicked thing. 8 Look, I have two daughters who have never slept with a man. Let me bring them out to you, and you can do what you like with them. But don’t do anything to these men, for they have come under the protection of my roof.” 9 “Get out of our way,” they replied. “This fellow came here as a foreigner, and now he wants to play the judge! We’ll treat you worse than them.” They kept bringing pressure on Lot and moved forward to break down the door. 10 But the men inside reached out and pulled Lot back into the house and shut the door. 11 Then they struck the men who were at the door of the house, young and old, with blindness so that they could not find the door. 12 The two men said to Lot, “Do you have anyone else here—sons-in-law, sons or daughters, or anyone else in the city who belongs to you? Get them out of here, 13 because we are going to destroy this place. The outcry to the Lord against its people is so great that he has sent us to destroy it.”

Ezekiel 16:47-50

Not only did you walk in their ways and do according to their abominations; within a very little time you were more corrupt than they in all your ways. **48** As I live, declares the Lord God, your sister Sodom and her daughters have not done as you and your daughters have done. **49** Behold, this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had pride, excess of food, and prosperous ease, but did not aid the poor and needy. **50** They were haughty and did an abomination before me. So I removed them, when I saw it.

Jude 5-7

Now I want to remind you, although you once fully knew it, that Jesus, who saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed those who did not believe. **6** And the angels who did not stay within their own position of authority, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains under gloomy darkness until the judgment of the great day— **7** just as Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which likewise indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural desire, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.

The progressive argument (*not the historical argument that we hold to*) says that:

1. The sin of Sodom and Gomorrah according to Genesis 19 was violent rape. Even though the men desired to have sex with men, the condemnation was due to acts of sexual violence. This is not a picture of committed, consenting same-sex couples.
2. Ezekiel reveals that Sodom and Gomorrah's sin was pride, gluttony, selfishness, and not caring for the poor. Not homosexuality.
3. Jude doesn't mention homosexuality specifically, but simply sexual immorality.

Let's take a closer look...

1. A. The fact that one single passage (Genesis 19) doesn't explicitly condemn homosexuality in its own text doesn't throw out the Levitical law, and every other passage that speaks to homosexuality.

B. This kind of reasoning has no scriptural foundation. There's no explicit indication in the text that God is specifically condemning rape. Someone who doesn't think that rape is a sin could use the same reasoning and say that God is actually specifically condemning homosexual activity.
2. In Ezekiel 16, The Hebrew word for "abomination" is *tô'ēbâ*, which is the same Hebrew word used in Leviticus 18:22 AND Leviticus 20:13 to condemn the specific "detestable" abomination of homosexual sex.
3. The Greek word for "unnatural" in Jude is *heteros*, which by definition means - the other, another, other, the other of two. The writer is describing the kind of "sexual immorality" by saying that instead of desiring the kind of relationship that is natural (the opposite gender), the kind that God intended/established, they desired "the other" flesh, instead of the flesh that they should desire.

Leviticus 18:22 - Do not have sexual relations with a man as one does with a woman; that is detestable.

Leviticus 20:13 - If a man has sexual relations with a man as one does with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. They are to be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads.

The progressive argument (*not the historical argument that we hold to*) says that it's not talking about gender, but the manner in which he lies with a woman. It's really about an authoritative/abusive type of relationship.

God puts women in high regard, makes women equal with man. Both are image bearers of God.

God blessed them and said to them, “Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground.”

This text is talking about the literal gender. Do not lie with a man.

If this was some kind of an abusive situation, it was common in the Law to punish the offender, and not the offended.

"They are to be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads."

Romans 1:24-27

Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another. 25 They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen. 26 Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural sexual relations for unnatural ones. 27 In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed shameful acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their error.

The progressive argument (*not the historical argument that we hold to*) says that this is referring to sexual excess, and abusive types of relationships.

Paul references creation. “served created things rather than the Creator”

verse 20 - For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that people are without excuse.

“Natural” means according to God’s creation and what He has established, not according to their own desire.

For “one another” - this is mutual. He’s condemning consenting individuals.

1 Corinthians 6:9-10 (NIV)

Or do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor **men who have sex with men (*arsenokoitai*)** 10 nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.

1 Corinthians 6:9-10 (KJV)

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor **effeminate (*malakai*)**, nor **abusers of themselves with mankind (*arsenokoitai*)**, 10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

1 Timothy 1:8-11

We know that the law is good if one uses it properly. 9 We also know that the law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious, for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, 10 for the sexually immoral, for **those practicing homosexuality (*arsenokoitai*)**, for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine 11 that conforms to the gospel concerning the glory of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.

	<i>malakoi . . . arsenokoitai</i> (1 Cor. 6:9)	<i>arsenokoitai</i> (1 Tim. 1:10)
English Standard Version	men who practice homosexuality	men who practice homosexuality
Holman Christian Standard Bible	anyone practicing homosexuality	homosexuals
King James Version	effeminate . . . abusers of themselves with mankind	them that defile themselves with mankind
New American Bible	boy prostitutes . . . practicing homosexuals	practicing homosexuals
New American Standard Bible	effeminate . . . homosexuals	homosexuals
New International Version (2011)	men who have sex with men	those practicing homosexuality
New King James Version	homosexuals . . . sodomites	sodomites
New Living Translation	male prostitutes . . . [those who] practice homosexuality	[those who] practice homosexuality
New Revised Standard Version	male prostitutes, sodomites	sodomites

The progressive argument (*not the historical argument that we hold to*) says this text refers to a specific kind of homosexual behavior, pederasty or prostitution of boys. These passages are not talking about committed, consensual same sex relationships.

Arsenokoitai - plural of *Arsenokoitēs*

Combination of *arsēn* (man) and *koitē* (bed).

Literally translated as... “bedders of men” or “those who take males to bed”

This Greek word doesn’t appear in Greek literature until Paul uses it in 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy.

It’s as if he creates the word himself using words from Leviticus.

Greek translation of Hebrew text

Leviticus 18:22 - *meta arsenos ou koimēthēsē koitēn gynaikos*

(you shall not lie with a male as with a woman)

Leviticus 20:13 - *hos an koimēthē meta arsenos koitēn gynaikos*

(Whoever shall lie with a male as with a woman)

It’s clear Paul’s use of *arsenokoitai* is taken from Leviticus.

If Paul is talking about men who take advantage of boys, why not use the word “*paiderastes*” (the love of boys) or “*paidophthoros*” (corrupter of boys) or *paidophthoreo* (seducer of boys).

He does not.

Paul writes Romans 1. His message on this topic is consistent.

The best translation for *Arsenokoitai* is “men who lie with other men”

Malakai - plural of *Malakōs*

soft to the touch

effeminate, as in men who are penetrated by another man

Paul is condemning both the **active and passive** roles in same-sex sexual activity.

“Homosexual” means the *practice*, not the *orientation*.

This word can be confusing because we live in a culture that uses that term to refer to the orientation.

Was David a Homosexual? - 1 Samuel 18:1-4

Question

Based upon [1 Samuel 18:1-4](#), was David a homosexual?

Answer

[1 Samuel 18:1-4](#) After David had finished talking with Saul, Jonathan became one in spirit with David, and he loved him as himself. From that day Saul kept David with him and did not let him return to his father's house. And Jonathan made a covenant with David because he loved him as himself. Jonathan took off the robe he was wearing and gave it to David, along with his tunic, and even his sword, his bow and his belt.

No, we should not understand that David was a homosexual from this or any other text.

Homosexuality is a sin and one which neither David nor Jonathan was ever judged for in Scripture. David was judged for being an adulterer and a murderer, and God would not have missed homosexuality had it been a reality in David's life! The Bible condemns David's adultery with Bathsheba - the sin affected him, his children and the entire nation of Israel. However, there is no condemnation of the relationship David and Jonathan. Why? Because there was no homosexual relationship.

There is no linguistic similarity between [1 Samuel 18:1-4](#) and the language of [Genesis 2:24](#) and "becoming one flesh." David loved Jonathan, but there are different types of love. The love expressed here is that of loyal friendship, as a brother ([2 Sam. 1:26](#); cf. [Gen. 44:30](#)), and not erotic love. Linguistically the exact same word in Hebrew ('*ahab*') is used to describe all of Israel and Judah's love for David ([1 Sam. 18:16](#)). Moreover, Jonathan did not strip himself of all his clothes in front of David, rather just his armour and robe ([1 Sam. 18:4](#)). As *The Spirit of the Reformation Bible* states:

As a crown prince, Jonathan would likely have entertained the expectation that he would succeed his father as king ([1 Sam. 20:31](#)). In [1 Samuel 13:22](#) Jonathan and Saul had been distinguished from the rest of the people by their possession of their swords and spears. Here Jonathan's transference of his robe and weaponry to David not only signified his self-giving loyalty but also implied that, even at this early stage, he recognized David as God's choice for the next king (see [1 Sam. 23:17](#)).

More of the relationship is revealed in [1 Sam. 20:41](#) where there is a holy kiss (cf. [Rom. 16:16](#); [1 Cor. 16:20](#); [2 Cor. 13:12](#); [1 Thess. 5:26](#)), which was common in this culture and not erotic. They also wept together. This was a deep friendship, just as Jonathon later states, "Go in peace, for we have sworn friendship with each other in the name of the LORD, saying, 'The LORD is witness between you and me, and between your descendants and my descendants forever'" ([1 Sam. 20:42](#)).

David was attracted to women - even too much so as with Bathsheba ([2 Sam. 11](#)). He had a number of wives (Ahinoam of Jezreel, Abigail the Carmel, Maachah the daughter of King Talmi of Geshur, Haggith, Abital, Eglah, and Bathsheba, the daughter of Ammiel - [1 Chron. 3](#)). David was not sexually attracted to other men. Rather than being evidence for a homosexual relationship, David and Jonathan's friendship is proof that two men can be friends and not be homosexuals.

<https://thirdmill.org/answers/answer.asp/file/40617>

Were Ruth and Naomi Lesbians?

Question

A lesbian couple I know claim that their relationship is biblical based upon the use of the word "cleave" in [Ruth 1:14](#) and Genesis 2. Is lesbianism biblical?

Answer

Thanks for your question. Lesbianism is condemned in Scripture ([Rom 1:26-27](#); cf. [Lev 18:3](#) - the *Sifra* [an early rabbinic commentary on the book of Leviticus] interprets this passage to include that women can't marry other women). The Apostle Paul also makes it clear in Romans 1 that same sex relations, including lesbian relationships, are ungodly, unrighteous, vain, foolish, unclean, dishonorable, corruptible, vile, unnatural, lustful, and the product of a debased mind ([Rom 1:21-28](#)). God does not look at such relationships as a biblical "family," but as sinful unions ([1 Cor 6:16](#)).

Texts

[Genesis 2:24](#) Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall **cleave unto** his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

[Ruth 1:14](#) Then they lifted up their voices and wept again. And Orpah kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth **clung to** her.

False Claim(s) of the LGBT Community

First, let's briefly look at the LGBT argument. The LGBT community states that the same Hebrew word (*dabaq*, meaning "to cleave") is used in [Genesis 2:24](#) to describe Adam and Eve's relationship and in [Ruth 1:14](#) to describe Ruth's and Naomi's relationship. They state that Ruth and Naomi are "one flesh" just as Adam and Eve were. Therefore, lesbian relationships are biblical.

This is not a logical argument. Just because people become "one flesh" does not make a relationship biblical, as they that are joined to prostitutes are also joined as "one flesh" ([1 Cor 6:16](#)). The Bible does not speak highly of such unions. In addition, just because the same words are found in the Bible does not mean that there is an exact one to one correlation between them. EX: There are two main Adams mentioned in Scripture: (1) the first Adam who sinned in the Garden ([Gen. 3](#)) and (2) the second and last man Adam - Jesus Christ ([1 Cor 15:45, 47](#); cf. [Rom 5:12-21](#)). Are we suppose to infer from this that because two individuals are named Adam that both sinned? While these passages do relate to one another, there is not an exact one to one correlation, as Jesus never sinned ([Heb 4:15](#), etc.). The LGBT community is employing *isogesis*, not proper biblical *exegesis*.

Context of Verses

Second, context establishes the meaning of terms in Scripture. While the Hebrew word *dabaq* is used in both verses, the contexts are different. [Genesis 2:24](#) is speaking of the first covenant marriage. [Ruth 1:14](#) is speaking of a family covenant. In the texts there is not an exact one to one correspondence. Naomi decided to move back to Judea ([Ruth 1:6-7](#)) and during the journey she discharged her daughters-in-law Orpah and Ruth from any moral obligation to accompany her ([Ruth 1:8-13](#)). But Ruth remained (*clung*) to her anyway and accompanied her to Judea ([Ruth 1:14-17](#)). The Hebrew word *dabaq* is used many times in Scripture in non-erotic ways ([Deut 11:22](#); [28:21](#); [30:20](#); [2 Kings 5:27](#); [Psa 22:15](#); [Ezek 3:26](#), etc.). The same term (interpreted as "keep close") is even used in [Ruth 2:8, 21, 23](#). None of the uses are an invitation to form an erotic covenant union with either men or women.

Sexual Orientation of Ruth and Naomi

Third, if we briefly look at some facts regarding the Book of Ruth, we can see Ruth's and Naomi's sexual orientation:

- (1) Naomi was the wife of Elimelech, and had two children: Mahlon and Chilion ([Ruth 1:2](#)).
- (2) Ruth was the wife of Naomi's son, Mahlon ([Ruth 4:10](#)).
- (3) Ruth and Naomi were "family." Look at the use of "mother-in-law," "daughter-in-law" and "daughter" throughout the Book of Ruth

(Ruth 1:6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14-17, 22; 2:2, 11, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23; 3:1, 6, 16, 17, 18; 4:15).

- (4) Naomi was old when Ruth's husband died (Ruth 1:12).
- (5) Naomi expected Ruth to seek another husband and assisted her in the same (Ruth 1:13).
- (6) Boaz saw Ruth as a virtuous woman (Ruth 3:10-11).
- (7) Ruth married Boaz (Ruth 4:13).

So, Ruth and Naomi were "family." The only sexual orientation and relationships of Ruth and Naomi shown in Scripture are with their husbands.

We're Family

Fourth, what Ruth is essentially saying in Ruth 1:14-17 is - 'We're family' (see #3 above). You are my mother and I am your daughter and I desire to remain your daughter. Where you live I will live. I am part of your people. Your God is my God. I will be buried where you are buried. 'We're family.'

'We're family'

(Ruth 1:6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 22; 2:2, 11, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23; 3:1, 6, 16, 17, 18; 4:15) is the essence of Ruth 1:14-17, so much so that Naomi looks to fulfill her obligations as a mother to her daughter. The two of them work together to secure a husband - *not a wife* - for Ruth. In due course, Boaz takes his role as the kinsman redeemer (Ruth 4:8-10), a role he can only take because he is "family" too.

So, the covenant Ruth makes with Naomi is of daughter-to-mother and not lesbian lover-to-lover. Clearly, Ruth and Naomi weren't lesbians.

<https://thirdmill.org/answers/answer.asp/file/45594>

Homosexuality and the Centurion's Servant?

Question

Thank you for your site and the correct biblical stance on homosexuality. I was wondering about the Centurion's servant ([Matt 8:5-13](#); [Luke 7:1-10](#)). Some are using what I call a

"rainbow interpretation" of *pais* (boy, or young man) in those texts saying it refers to a homosexual relation between the centurion and his slave.

Answer

[Matthew 8:5-13](#), [Luke 7:1-10](#), and [John 4:43-54](#) (see below) are interesting passages. Each contains a story concerning a Centurion (meaning "captain of 100"). Though closely related the different authors each write of a different set of events (in [Matt 8:6](#) the servant is paralyzed and dreadfully tormented, while in [Luke 7:2](#) the servant is sick and ready to die, and in [John 4:46](#), [47](#), [49](#) we observe a sick son who is at the point of death).

The gay revisionist interpretation of these stories of these Centurions is of course unfounded in the biblical text for numerous reasons. Some of these include:

(1) Though Plato and some others (among them Thucydides, Eupolis, Aeschines, Callimachus, and Plutarch) in secular history may have used the term *pais* on a "few occasions" to refer to "beloved or same sex lover" (note that their uses do not "all" indicate a homosexual use) what is at stake here is how the Bible uses the term *pais*. In reviewing numerous Greek Lexicons (including, Bauer, Liddell & Scott, Mounce, Spicq, Thayer, etc.) and various concordances/dictionaries (including, Kittel, Strong's, Vine's, Young's, etc.) not a single one refers to a homosexual relationship. Of the 24 uses of *pais* in the Greek New Testament, unless these closely related stories are the exception, it is never used of a homosexual relationship!

(2) In [Luke 7:2](#) the doctor uses *doulos* (slave) to refer to the Centurion's servant and in [Luke 7:7](#) he uses the term *pais* (boy) to refer to the same person. So, the words are being used interchangeably. Compare [Matthew 8:9](#) which uses *doulo* (servant). Clearly, the meaning then is a 'young servant.'

(3) Though related to # 1 above, we need to re-emphasize that there is no possible way *pais* could mean a homosexual in: [Matthew 2:16](#); [12:18](#); [14:2](#); [17:18](#); [21:16](#); [Luke 1:69](#); [8:51](#), [54](#), [9:42](#); [John 4:51](#); and [Acts 3:13](#), etc.

(4) [Leviticus 18:22](#) and [20:13](#) are Old Testament law regarding homosexuality. The Jewish elders in [Luke 7:3-5](#) would not have supported a homosexual relationship. The elders of the Jews would not have been pleading the Centurion's case had he been a homosexual. Rather they would have seen to his punishment!

(5) Jesus mere association with tax collectors and sinners does not suggest support for their behavior. Accepting someone where they are at in a moment of time for the sake of evangelizing them does not mean one condones the other's sinful behavior.

(6) Matthew, Luke, and John did not interpret Jesus' healing as support for homosexuality. Sex is not even a topic of concern by any of the writers inspired by the Holy Spirit.

(7) Last, but not least, the gay community seeks to prove too much. If we grant them their interpretation (which linguistically we can't), they must also take with that the Centurion's **repentance** ("I am not worthy to have you come under my roof," [Luke 7:6](#); cf. [Matt 8:8](#)) and **faith** ("I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith," [Luke 7:9](#); cf. [Matt 8:9-12](#)). In [John 4:53](#), the Centurion and the whole household **believed**.

Repentance and faith (or belief) are flip sides of the same coin of conversion which comes after regeneration in the order of salvation. Though the Christian life is one of continual repentance and faith, repentance is a full and complete gift of God ([2 Tim 2:24-26](#)). It is total in scope ([Isa 55:6-7](#); cf. [Isa 40:3-4](#); [Matt 9:12](#); [Luke 13:5](#); [Acts 2:38](#); [3:19](#)). The Westminster Shorter Catechism, Question 15 says, "What is that turning from sin which is part of true repentance?" And the answer comes, "The turning from sin which is part of true repentance doth consist in two things. One, in a turning from all gross sins in regard of our course and conversation; two, in a turning from all other sins in regard of our hearts and affections." Robert Shaw in his exposition of the Confessions says, "True repentance includes grief, or deep contrition and godly sorrow for sin. . . . the sorrow of a true penitent is for sin as committed against God - as rebellion against his rightful authority - as a violation of his holy law, and as a most base, ungrateful return for all his goodness. [Psa. 51:4](#)."

So, seeing the Centurion repented of his sin, this had to include his "alleged homosexuality" ([Lev 18:22](#); [20:13](#); [Rom 1:26-27](#); [1 Cor 6:9-10](#)).

Therefore, the gay community has just proven from their own isogesis (reading into a text that which is not intended) the just condemnation of homosexuality and the need to be delivered from it.

While we agree with this final conclusion (that is, the just condemnation of homosexuality and the need to be delivered from it), this is not what [Matthew 8:5-13](#), [Luke 7:1-10](#), and [John 4:43-54](#) are teaching us. However, [1 Corinthians 6:9-11](#) does teach this principle. Please note that it teaches not only that homosexuality is a sin that needs to be repented of but numerous other sins as well. See "Is Passive Homosexuality Permitted in Scripture? [1 Corinthians 6:9](#)" and "No Cake for You?" below.

The Bible speaks of one relationship approved and considered ideal by God; that of the marriage of a male and female ([Gen 1:27](#); [Matt 19:1-9](#)). See "Same-Sex Love" below. Though polygamy and concubines were granted in redemptive history (see "Polygamy, OK?" below) it was never God's ideal. Homosexuality was (and still is) the result of depraved minds ([Rom 1:18-32](#)) and God clearly judged it as sinful (along with some other sins, [Gen 19:8](#); [Ezek 16:49-50](#)) in Sodom and Gomorrah ([Gen. 18:1-19:29](#)). The Bible never speaks favorably of homosexual relationships. Christians are still under the moral law of God. See "Antinomianism and Homosexuality?" below.

The multi-colored use of *pais* to prove the homosexual case is just another indication of sinful minds at work ([Rom 1:18-32](#)) to justify a vice. Beware that similar to the cult of the Jehovah Witnesses and their *New World Translation* of the Bible or the Atheist's *Skeptic's Annotated Bible*, LGBT advocates are developing revised Bibles to showcase the errors of their translations (i.e. [The Queen James Bible](#) revises eight verses to support the homosexual lifestyle: [Gen. 19:5](#); [Lev. 18:22](#); [Lev. 20:13](#); [Rom. 1:26](#); [Rom. 1:27](#); [1 Cor. 6:9](#); [1 Tim. 1:10](#); [Jude 1:7](#)).

<https://thirdmill.org/answers/answer.asp/file/44387>