



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

TO: LEGISLATORS

FROM: PASTOR RALPH DROLLINGER 661-803-7970 24/7/365

DATE: APRIL 1, 2013

Several things strike me as quite peculiar regarding the U.S. Supreme Court taking up the issue of gay marriage. First, why would the Supreme Court ever accept this case and place themselves in a position of supposedly deciding whether God was correct in His ordination of marriage between one man and one woman? Does not the mere acceptance of the case telegraph a “we know better than God” attitude?

Secondly, if the Court is going to determine policy apart from biblical input, i.e. utilizing a pragmatic ideology, then should they not be truly pragmatic? For instance, today, is not one of the most important matters facing our nation the failing Ponzi scheme of Social Security? So then why not enact policies that buoy procreation? For this pragmatic reason alone, same sex marriage is impractical for our nation.

Thirdly, in their attempt to discount biblical authority and clarity, “gay marriage” proponents seem to always find an apostate “minister” who will testify before a committee or court that the Bible sanctions gay marriage. Don’t be fooled by all this; take a serious look at the Bible study that follows.

WEEKLY MEMBERS BIBLE STUDY

WEDNESDAY MORNINGS 7:45 to 8:45 AM

Hot Breakfast Served • Capitol Family Room H324 • Spouses Welcome

CONGRESSIONAL SPONSORS

Robert Aderholt, *Alabama*
 Todd Akin, *Missouri*
 Spencer Bachus, *Alabama*
 Michele Bachmann, *Minnesota*
 Marsba Blackburn, *Tennessee*
 Paul Broun, *Georgia*
 Dan Burton, *Indiana*
 John Campbell, *California*
 John Carter, *Texas*
 Bill Cassidy M.D., *Louisiana*
 Rick Crawford, *Arkansas*
 Jeff Denham, *California*
 John Duncan, Jr., *Tennessee*
 Mary Fallin, *Oklahoma*
 John Fleming, *Louisiana*
 Bill Flores, *Texas*
 Randy Forbes, *Virginia*
 Trent Franks, *Arizona*
 Scott Garrett, *New Jersey*
 Louie Gohmert, *Texas*
 Tom Graves, *Georgia*
 Ralph Hall, *Texas*
 Gregg Harper, *Mississippi*
 Pete Hoekstra, *Michigan*
 Randy Hultgren, *Illinois*
 Bill Johnson, *Ohio*
 Jim Jordan, *Ohio*
 Steve King, *Iowa*
 Doug Lamborn, *Colorado*
 James Lankford, *Oklahoma*
 Mike McIntyre, *North Carolina*
 Gary Miller, *California*
 Sue Myrick, *North Carolina*
 Randy Neugebauer, *Texas*
 Steve Pearce, *New Mexico*
 Mike Pence, *Indiana*
 Mike Pompeo, *Kansas*
 Bill Posey, *Florida*
 Tom Price, *Georgia*
 Ben Quayle, *Arizona*
 Tim Scott, *South Carolina*
 Steve Southerland, *Florida*
 Lamar Smith, *Texas*
 Marlin Stutzman, *Indiana*
 Glenn “GT” Thompson, *Pennsylvania*
 Scott Tipton, *Colorado*
 Daniel Webster, *Florida*
 Allen West, *Florida*
 Lynn Westmoreland, *Georgia*
 Joe Wilson, *South Carolina*
 Steve Womack, *Arkansas*



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

I. INTRODUCTION

If one abandons the authority of the Bible regarding same sex marriage, one can reason pragmatically for the approval of same-sex marriage in many ways. “What about the 40,000 children of gay couples in California who want their parents to have marital status? So reasoned one U.S. Supreme Court judge last week. Another pragmatic observation: “the gays whom I employ seem happy.” The problem with this kind of human reasoning is that it lacks the wisdom of the Creator – whose determinations and designs transcend the foolishness of man.

Postmodern¹ society increasingly battles the idea that marriage should carry a singular, tight definition. But if marriage is to be defined, who should define it? Is Government God’s intended institution to define Marriage? No. God has already defined marriage for everyone everywhere in His Book, and He hasn’t equivocated. One need not look very far into Scripture to learn of God’s definition of marriage, and His subsequent sweeping disapproval of homosexuality and same-sex marriage.

In addition to the narrative of Adam and Eve specifically being husband and wife in Genesis 2:24 (cf. 1:27), Proverbs 12:4 underscores God’s perspicuous (“clear”) testimony regarding His design and definition of marriage: “An excellent wife is the crown of her husband...” As in English, the Hebrew word **wife** *ishshab* unmistakably means “female” and the word for **husband** *baal* unmistakably means “male.”

Years ago I remember a legislator in the California Capitol challenging me regarding my understanding of the singularity of Scripture regarding this subject (as to suggest the Bible offers alternative viewpoints). He asked if he could present in the following week a Bible study to represent God’s supposed approval of same-sex marriage and homosexuality (keep in mind there are individuals

and “churches” who claim there is a biblical basis for this). No such study ever materialized. Last week, I heard a leading national political leader reason that in his “recollection” there was one “obscure” passage in Romans that related to this. In contrast, the following, biblically sweeping primer on the subject will help you to discover what God actually, repeatedly, says on the matter.

II. A NECESSARY PREREQUISITE

Before examining the pertinent biblical passages, allow me to comment further about the apostate “ministers” who twist the Scriptures on this and other matters.

ONE SHOULD FIRST CONSIDER WHO IS QUALIFIED TO SPEAK AUTHORITATIVELY OF THE BIBLE PER THE BIBLE

The Scriptures safeguard their personal representation. In other words, to whom should one listen to or deem credible when considering biblical argumentation? Wise is the one who accepts not everyone’s opinion on or about the Bible, be it testimonies in subcommittees on the Hill or talk show guests in a studio. The Scriptures are clear: Those who are God-appointed teachers of His Book will be characterized by certain *indicative* trademarks; the existence of these qualities are intended by God to serve to identify those whom He has appointed as His mouthpieces – those who are set apart by Him to teach, herald and preach His Word. Put the other way, one should not listen to “Bible teachers” who possess not the qualities of an overseer. In 1 Timothy 3:2 is one of those pertinent passages regarding authentications that are remarkably helpful:

An overseer, then, must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, prudent, respectable, hospitable, able to teach...



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

A legitimate spokesman for God, an **overseer** *episkopos* (or pastor-teacher, cf. Eph. 4:11-12) will be one who is **the husband of one wife**, (Lit: “a one-woman man”) indicating that he believes in male/female marriage/monogamy to begin with! The passage proceeds to exemplify other confirming characteristics of genuine Bible teachers. Pertinent and fundamental to this study, 1Timothy 3 and Titus 1 serve to filter out *illegitimate* spokespeople for God and His Word.

Several years ago I did a Bible study on “Tares in the Church” (cf. Titus 1:11, 3John 9-11) and in last week’s study I touched on the existence of Satan’s pawns, false-teachers whose singular intent, per the clear teaching of Scripture, is to mislead *believers*. All that to say this:

**CONSIDER THE LIFESTYLE
CHARACTERISTICS OF THOSE WHO CLAIM
TO BE GOD’S REPRESENTATIVES ON
HOMOSEXUALITY AND GAY MARRIAGE**

How do they measure up to 1Timothy 1 and Titus 1? Naïve are those who listen to all and everyone about divergent views on the Bible.

At the risk of being too comprehensive, and lengthy, what follows are the main passages in the Scripture related to God’s view of Homosexuality, the basic presupposition behind same-sex marriage. In what follows, notice in particular the Leviticus 18 and 20 passages that condemn males with males and Romans 1, which condemns females with females.

III. OLD TESTAMENT PASSAGES

A. GENESIS 19:4-13

In this passage, what was the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah?

Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people from

every quarter; 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 have relations with them." But Lot went out to them at the doorway, and shut the door behind him, and said, "Please, my brothers, do not act wickedly. "Now behold, I have two daughters who have not had relations with man; please let me bring them out to you, and do to them whatever you like; only do nothing to these men, inasmuch as they have come under the shelter of my roof." But they said, "Stand aside." Furthermore, they said, "This one came in as an alien, and already he is acting like a judge; now we will treat you worse than them." So they pressed hard against Lot and came near to break the door. But the men reached out their hands and brought Lot into the house with them, and shut the door. They struck the men who were at the doorway of the house with blindness, both small and great, so that they wearied themselves trying to find the doorway. Then the two men said to Lot, "Whom else have you here? A son-in-law, and your sons, and your daughters, and whomever you have in the city, bring them out of the place; for we are about to destroy this place, because their outcry has become so great before the LORD that the LORD has sent us to destroy it."

The general homosexual “Christian Community” interpretation expounds that the sin in evidence is not sodomy, but rather inhospitality. Proponents claim that the Hebrew word for **have relations**, or **know** *yada* has “an unknown or ambiguous meaning.” Secondly, sexual activity, they claim, is not in sight in the passage; this is supposedly supported via their referencing of Ezekiel 16:49-50 (this passage will be examined next).



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

To the interpretive contrary, the word *yada* appears 943 times in the Old Testament and is not ambiguous in meaning: “To gain knowledge or become better acquainted with someone or something” is its meaning. Keep in mind however....

**CONTEXT STRONGLY INDICATES THAT
YADA IS USED IN GENESIS AS A POLITE
EUPHEMISM FOR SEXUAL INTERCOURSE**

Yada is used euphemistically in Genesis 4:17 wherein Scripture states “Cain **knew** *yada* his wife and she conceived...”² To think of this word usage any differently leads to interpretive problems in both chapters 4 and 19. To illustrate, why did Lot panic, offering sexual substitutes (v. 8) if their sin was inhospitality? Secondly, is it not somewhat contradictory to attempt to break down another’s **door** (v. 9) in reaction to their display of inhospitality?

Further, the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah brought the following response from God: “And the LORD said, “The outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah is indeed great, and their sin is exceedingly grave” (18:20). In chapter 19, verse 13, God’s surrogate angels stated, **For we are about to destroy this place, because their outcry has become so great before the LORD that the LORD has sent us to destroy it.** All of these references and reactions by God argue against the sin being one of inhospitality.

In summary, the present day English legal verb and its respective meaning, “to sodomize” does not stem from a historical understanding of the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah being inhospitality.

B. EZEKIEL 16:49-50

The homosexual community cites Ezekiel in support of inhospitality as being the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah. But as will be seen, this passage works to the contrary and serves to actually discount their argument:

Behold, this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had arrogance, abundant food and careless ease, but she did not help the poor and needy. Thus they were haughty and committed abominations before Me. Therefore I removed them when I saw it.

Arrogance, slothfulness and blindness toward the needs of others are certainly evidences of self-centered, sinful behavior worthy of admonishment in any culture. But an additional listed iniquity in this passage is the word **abomination** *toebah* which is translated elsewhere in the Bible from Hebrew to English as “detestable acts.” For this to be a descriptor of homosexual acts is in clear view in light of Leviticus 18:22 which uses the same word synonymously to describe homosexual activity:

C. LEVITICUS 18:22

You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination.

The word **abomination** is the same Hebrew word as used in the Ezekiel 16: *toebah* is used here in conjunction with, and in summation of the existence of descriptive homosexual activity. *Toebah* is the word and label God applied when males lay together in both Ezekiel 16 and Leviticus 18. Accordingly, these passages serve to further cross-reference, identify and illuminate the underlying specific sin of Sodom and Gomorrah.

D. LEVITICUS 20:13

If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death. Their blood guiltiness is upon them.

Notice **detestable acts**. Again, it is the same Hebrew word **abomination** *toebah*, which has a clear, non-equivocating contextual meaning.



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

**BUT WHAT ABOUT PUTTING
HOMOSEXUALS TO DEATH?**

The OT book of Leviticus is God’s manual for Israel – His chosen, set apart people in His Old Covenant – whom He intended to be His distinguished-from-others, set-apart representative people. It follows that He gave them special ceremonies, laws, rituals, dietary restrictions, a personal holiness code and enforceability in order to achieve their exclusivity from the practices of the Canaanites and Egyptians. These surrounding pagans, among other immoral actions, subscribed to all kinds of sexual deviancies. Accordingly Leviticus 18 and 20 have to do with the impermissibility of various forms of sexual immorality – from sleeping with family members to bestiality. All sexual degradations are roundly prohibited and punishable in order to retain cultural purity and integrity as Yahweh’s ambassadors. Notice this idea in Deuteronomy 7:6,

For you are a holy people to the LORD your God; the LORD your God has chosen you to be a people for His own possession out of all the peoples who are on the face of the earth.

In the NT Church Age, under the New Covenant, God abrogates (“to abolish by authoritative, official, or formal action”) Israel’s ceremonial laws, dietary regulations, Levitical priesthood, etc., as evidenced in various respective passages such as Acts 10:1-16, Colossians 2:16-17 and 1Peter 2:9, etc. These elements, like the stoning of Homosexuals, are to no longer to be practiced, in that God has instituted a New Covenant for His people in the age of the Church, per Matthew 26:28, 2Corinthians 3:6-18, and Hebrews chapters 7 to 10.

As then, what should be focused on today is the divine character behind the rituals and penalties spoken of in Leviticus. The spiritual principles upon which Ancient Israel’s rituals were rooted are

timeless because they are manifestations of the very nature and essence of the purity and holiness of God.

**LEVITICUS AND ARGUING ABOUT
HOMOSEXUALITY**

Advocates for same-sex marriage have attempted to put words in the mouth of Christian legislators. They often insinuate that Christians believe it is proper to stone homosexuals because that’s what the Israelites did in Leviticus (cf. 20:13). The response to such conjecture is quite simple.

Ask the following question in response: “Do you believe a specific act found in Leviticus is applicable for today, outside of the context of Ancient Israel?” If they answer “yes” then say “I don’t.” If they answer “no” then say, “I agree.” Either way the argument is over.

You might want to add or clarify, “Is everything in the Bible that was stated in God’s Old Covenant about Ancient Israel repeated in the New Covenant about the Church?” No, it is not. The Church and Israel are distinguishably different entities in Scripture.

The corporeal punishment, or putting to death a man who lies with a male is not a tenet found recurring in the age in which we live, the Church Age of the Bible; the NT *does not* reiterate this practice for this day in age. However, the New Testament most certainly *does* reiterate and uphold the present prohibition of homosexuality.

It is naïve, if not disingenuous, to falsely insinuate that Christian legislators hold to a belief that governments today should stone homosexuals. On the other end of the spectrum of biblical illiteracy are those who suggest that homosexuality is no longer prohibited because Israel’s holiness code is now obsolete. Both suppositions stem from a biblical ignorance pertaining to a chronological misunderstanding of Ancient Israel and the Church



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

today. Such a lack of knowledge is unfortunately too common with journalists and lawmakers. (Challenge them to begin attending a good Bible study that may lead to their salvation: 1Corinthians 2:14 states in this regard, “But a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him, *and he cannot understand them*, because they are spiritually appraised.” Emphasis mine).

E. JUDGES 19:22-23

This is a parallel passage to Genesis 19, providing further insight into the meaning of God’s narrative.

While they were celebrating, behold, the men of the city, certain worthless fellows, surrounded the house, pounding the door; and they spoke to the owner of the house, the old man, saying, “Bring out the man who came into your house that we may have relations with him.” Then the man, the owner of the house, went out to them and said to them, “No, my fellows, please do not act so wickedly; since this man has come into my house, do not commit this act of folly.

The words **wickedly** *rawah* and **act of folly** *nebalah* roundly mean “profane actions of immorality; senselessness and disgrace.” These words exhibit the wrongfulness of what it, again, means to **have relations** *yada*.

IV. NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

The Gay community claims that Jesus Himself never condemned homosexuality. Note however the following passage:

A. MATTHEW 10:14-15

Whoever does not receive you, nor heed your words, as you go out of that house or that city, shake the dust off your feet. Truly I say to you, it will be more tolerable

for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the Day of Judgment than for that city.

In this passage Jesus makes specific mention of **Sodom and Gomorrah** as He teaches His disciples. His main point is that people who reject God’s messengers – those whom He is sending out to be His witnesses – will undergo a stricter judgment than comparatively speaking, did **Sodom and Gomorrah**. Jesus is therefore indirectly acknowledging the appropriateness of the condemnation of these cities for the reason previously established. His teachings, since He is the second member of the Trinity are in concert with the whole of Scripture, both New and Old Testament, which too was penned by God (cf. 2Timothy 3:16). This is known as the analogy of Scripture: one author does not contradict another.

C. ROMANS 1:26-27

For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and 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 indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

Paul’s reasoning in Romans is based in the congruity of creation: throughout God’s creative order there are male and female species necessary for procreation. God distinctively created male and female human beings as well (Gen. 1:27), and as mentioned in the introduction, Genesis 2:24 states that marriage is between a man and a woman: “For this reason a **man** shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his **wife**; and they shall become one flesh.” Literally *ish* shall be joined to *ishshab*. Marriage and God’s way of reproduction are parallel, congruous truths. Romans could not be any clearer about this. Based in the creative order



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

and instruction in the OT Book of Genesis, this passage accordingly underscores the sin of both Lesbianism and Homosexuality. The literal Greek for the English translation **their woman exchanged the natural function** is “changed the natural use for the use beside.” The homosexual interpretive idea that **natural function** relates to the natural homosexual desire one already possesses is unfounded here and in the corpus of Scripture. To travel that road of interpretation is to fight the analogy of Scripture and the respective weight of cross-references and the contexts of all the aforementioned passages in this study. Nowhere in Scripture is this Gay community interpretive idea validated; it is a biased imposing, which is so common with apostate teachers, a.k.a. Scripture twisters.

Further and importantly, note Paul’s choice of the Greek words for **women** and **men**. He uses not *gune* and *anthropos* that describe the dignity of **women** and **men**. Rather he uses *theleia* and *arsen* that are descriptive of sexual gender only. Paul’s refusal to ascribe even an implied dignity to those who degenerate into homosexuality is a powerful insight into the mind of God on the subject.

Additionally Paul uses the Greek word *aschemosune* in this passage. Translated into English it is **indecent acts**. He uses the same word in 1Corinthians 13:5 in opposition to true love when he states, “love does not act *aschemosune* **unbecomingly**. This literally means true love does not seek after its own lust and want. Real love is other-oriented; it always seeks their best interests.

In its broader context, this section of Romans relates to evidences *indicative* of a point at which God no longer restrains sin – when He withdraws His common grace. The existence of homosexuality per this passage is therefore evidence of a **God gave them over** situation. When God removes His restraint in a culture or a person the accompanying evidences of that reality are those listed in this passage. The increasing prevalence of lesbianism

and homosexuality is one of those indicators. A good sound bite summary of Romans 1 is this:

**WHEN A SOCIETY FORSAKES THE AUTHOR
OF CREATION, IT WILL INEVITABLY
FORSAKE THE ORDER OF CREATION**

Make no mistake; Romans chapter 1 is not an obscure passage whose meaning has been lost to history.

D. 1CORINTHIANS 6:9-11

Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God. Such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.

The Greek word here for **homosexuals** is *arsenokoitas*. It is a compound noun. *Arsen* **male**, and *koitas* **sexual intercourse** (English: “coitus”). The word is unmistakable in its meaning. These two words are individually used repeatedly throughout the NT with those respective meanings. Arndt and Gingrich in their classic and highly respected work, *The Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* state on page 109, “Arsenokoitas: ‘A male who practices homosexuality’ was the use of the word in extra-biblical literature of the time.”

It is therefore dishonest for the homosexual “Church” to state that the original meaning of this compound Greek noun “has been lost...and that it would appear to have no relationship to consensual homosexual activity.” In addition they mislead, reasoning that the word “homosexual” (the English word) does not appear in the original manuscripts of the Bible. Empirically true, but intended to



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

mislead. Instead the Greek word *arsenokoitas* does appear, which is a much more precise, descriptive and definitive word of the sin in question than is its English counterpart.

E. 1TIMOTHY 1:9-10

Realizing the fact that law is not made for a righteous person, but for those who are lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers and immoral men and homosexuals and kidnappers and liars and perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound teaching,

In this passage, as in the former 1Corinthians passage, Paul's point is that the **law** of God is intended to reveal by way of one's comparison to it, an individual's need for Christ so as lead to trust in Him. For any evangelist, be it Timothy or presently, to fail to state what sin actually is, is to confuse a person: What it is one needs to be saved from? Here listed, as a sin, is the same compound Greek noun *arsenokoitas*. This passage and 1Corinthians 6:11 illustrate...

ONE NEEDS TO BE SAVED FROM THE SIN OF HOMOSEXUALITY AS WERE SOME CORINTHIANS

F. 2PETER 2:6-10

And if He condemned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to destruction by reducing them to ashes, having made them an example to those who would live ungodly lives thereafter; and if He rescued righteous Lot, oppressed by the sensual conduct of unprincipled men.... then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from temptation, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment for the day of judgment and especially those who

indulge the flesh in its corrupt desires and despise authority...

Peter incorporates these OT cities as a historical example to illustrate his point. Pro-homosexual interpreters oft intentionally overlook the pertinent words in this passage, and the passage as a whole. The late Peter J. Gomes is such a man; the former pro-homosexual chaplain of Harvard University. For him to mention these clear and straightforward passages would have destroyed the thesis of his book.³

Condemned *katarerino* means, "To pass sentence on because of a crime." In the construct of the passage, such condemnation is directly related to the **sensual conduct** *aselgeia* "wantonness and licentiousness" of the men of **Sodom and Gomorrah**. The ancient use of *aselgeia* was a description of "whatever was disgraceful..., that which is characterized by moral impurity or filth." Lastly **corrupt desires** *miasmos epithumia* further defines the reasons for God's condemnation. This Greek word sequence means, "A strong desire to defile."

This is another passage (as if necessary) that helps to interpret the meaning of the sin of Genesis 19. In light of the specific and descriptive words used here in 2Peter, it is intellectually impossible to interpret *yada* to mean, "to get acquainted and build a friendship."

G. JUDE 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 strange flesh, are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.

Jude underscores more of the same. (Many followers of Christ do not realize how many passages there are in the Bible about homosexuality being a sin). The homosexual community generally



THE BIBLE, SUPREME COURT, AND SAME SEX MARRIAGE

states that the translators of the original Greek New Testament were unclear as to the meaning of these passages and therefore selected their favorite sin(s) to attack. However, the word for **gross immorality** *ekporneuo* is a heightened sense of *porneuo*, which means “fornication, “accordingly” excessive fornication, and **strange flesh** *heteras* means “another man.”⁴

Lastly, the context of this passage pertains to apostasy – those who seem to be followers of Christ but in actuality are imposters. Jude’s point is similar to that of Romans: Homosexuality is an indication of reprobation, and Sodom and Gomorrah are used repeatedly throughout Scripture to pictorially illustrate God’s very strong attitude regarding this aberrant act.

V. SUMMARY

Homosexuality and Same-Sex Marriage are illegitimate in God’s eyes. His Word is repetitive, perspicuous and clear on the subject. Jesus, Paul, Peter and Jude all speak to the sin of Homosexuality in the NT. For an individual or society to engage in or endorse it is to head in a direction contrary to God’s desire; it is to invite not His blessings.

Further, the growing prevalence of Homosexuality is indicative of God having given over a person or persons more so than a sin that will lead to God’s judgment, although that is true as well.

Not only is homosexuality and same sex marriage voided by God in His Word, but biology as well castigates homosexuality and same sex marriage: The ultimate outcome is the discontinuation of the species since homosexuals cannot procreate. For sure one cannot be a homosexual and an evolutionist at the same time.

VI. CONCLUSION

There is hope for all caught in such a pernicious addiction. Jesus Christ came to liberate sinners!

“But such were some of you, but you were washed...” states Paul regarding Homosexuals in 1Corinthians 6:11. Therein is the heart of the minister and the believer toward those who are addicted to whatever sin – to love the sinner, while remaining inalterable about biblically explicit sin. Contextually, some of the Corinthian church members were formerly homosexuals, but by God’s grace they found new life in Christ! One need repent and believe on the Savior today to receive the gift of eternal life, freedom from, and power over the bondage to whatever sin. Lastly,

**IT IS NOT THE PLACE OF THE STATE,
ITS POPULACE OR ITS COURTS
TO REDEFINE WHAT GOD HAS CREATED.
SUCH IS ARROGANCE
OF THE HIGHEST ORDER.
MAN SHOULD NOT ATTEMPT TO
REDEFINE GOD’S WAYS;
GOD’S WAYS SHOULD DEFINE MAN’S.**

Legalizing same-sex marriage in any state or the nation as a whole is a very, very serious matter in the eyes of God, and in light of Genesis 19, such “progressive thinking” eventually evokes His wrath.

¹ “A lack of belief in absolute truth.”

² *Yada* is used twelve times in the Old Testament with this euphemistic understanding. Euphemism: the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive word or expressions for one that is harsh, indelicate, or otherwise unpleasant or taboo (Merriam and Webster).

³ Gomes, Peter J. *The Good Book* (New York, William and Morrow Company, 1996). In his supposedly comprehensive biblical treatment of the subject he ignores even mentioning some of the pertinent passages recorded in the Bible and dealt with herein.

⁴ Helpful to understanding what Jude means is the fact that the angels who came to visit Lot in Genesis 19, came in physical form (ref. 19:3, wherein they ate bread). One can conclude that the angels had angelic beauty in physical form. In this sense then, the Sodomites went after “strange flesh.”