

What the Bible Actually Says About Homosexuality

Lesson 1 of 3: How to Read the Bible for a Proper Interpretation

The Problem at Hand:

1. Homosexuality is an unchangeable nature, it is not a lifestyle choice. Overwhelming sociological, psychological, and biological data informs the perspective that homosexuality is not merely a lifestyle choice. So, attempts at stopping or changing would be deeply damaging. And in fact, there is an incredibly high rate of suicide among those who have undergone conversion therapy.
2. All people are created in the image of God. As such, the Church has found ways to accept those deemed unacceptable such as felons and recovering addicts. And yet, there largely remains a refusal to accept LGBTQ+ folks. Regardless of our findings in these verses, this mistreatment is sinful.
3. The burden imposed on LGBTQ+ folks by churches and society in general is a great evil. Violence, abuse, oppression, and discrimination are being done to LGBTQ+ folks at alarming rates.
4. The attempts to find a “middle ground” wherein LGBTQ+ folks must renounce any romantic relationships and/or intimacy is deeply psychologically damaging. Likewise, the attempts by churches to find a “middle ground” wherein they remain silent on this issue is a complacent silence that reinforces the harm being done. Not speaking out against ongoing abuse enables more abuse.
5. This damage is done without sufficient justification. While about six verses in the Bible apparently condemn homosexuality, this stems from popular misunderstandings (all of which could and should be rectified by clergy of any denomination, but some have opted not to). In actuality, there are no verses in the Bible that condemn homosexuality. Regardless of the four above problems, condemnation of homosexuality in churches is not Biblical nor is it Christlike.

Inclusive, Technical Word Choice:

Throughout this series, the terms “LGBT,” “LGBTQ+,” “gay,” “homosexual,” and “homosexuality” are used almost interchangeably. This is done to best fit the context of the verses referenced and/or used to discuss at large how this group has been excluded, not to label anyone within these groups or flatten these groups into one. It should be noted that the diversity of sexual preferences and identities are not to be construed in such broad terms when referring to individual persons, but doing so serves us well here. That is, the nature of this class is concerned primarily with the nuts and bolts of biblical interpretation and Christian practice, and so inclusive terminology is used in a general sense.

Our Method of Biblical Interpretation:

The Bible should be read for its plain meaning, not forced into a biased view. And yet, countless denominations disagree on what the plain meaning is! In order to overcome this issue and not simply offer one more version of the plain meaning for others to agree or disagree with, we must employ what is referred to as the historical-critical method of interpretation. While this method is not the most useful or fun for standard preaching and teaching, it is the option most often taken in academic circles and by translators, and will allow us to arrive at the intended meaning of these verses, rather than have another opinion about them.

Presumptions of the Historical-Critical Method:

1. While the Bible is inspired by God, it was written through humans in a specific time and context.
2. The intended meaning of a verse is what the inspired writer sought to convey, it is not simply whatever we wish or have been previously taught to see in that verse.
3. The writer made use of a specific language and referenced specific cultures and contexts when conveying the message.

4. The correct meaning of a verse is the one that takes the least amount of liberties with that language, context, and culture. Where there are no points of confusion or controversy, there is the intended meaning.

Using those rules as a guide, I will demonstrate that the Bible has never made an applicable condemnation of homosexuality and that the confusion is solely the fault of modern-day readers being ignorant of the nuances within the writer's context and language. One example of this error that has already been reckoned with well would be how most modern-day churches do not ostracize divorced folks from the church anymore. This decision was done with the recognition that while God certainly laments with us in any divorce, the meaning of divorce in the modern era is a far cry from treating women as abandoned property as it was understood in its original context. That is, the concept of divorce has radically changed and with it, the condemnation of divorce must be reconsidered.

Now, as an additional but optional to this lesson series appeal, I do take issue with the common refrain that experience and/or reason cannot inform the correct interpretation of scripture. Whereas this lesson series is concerned solely with proper biblical interpretation, and while experience and reason cannot be our sole guides as Christians, Jesus' disagreements with the Pharisees about the proper interpretation of scripture and His instruction that a "good tree bears good fruit (Matthew 7:17-18)" indicates that experience and reason should inform our interpretation of scripture. The use of reason and experience alongside scripture is also what allowed the early church to include Gentiles at the expense of Old Testament law (Acts 15:1-19). And historically, this method of interpretation has been used to (1) resolve the North American church's controversies over slavery in the 1800s, (2) accept a heliocentric model of the solar system, as well as (3) support movements for women's equality throughout church history. That is not to say that reason and experience should be elevated above scripture, but that unjust, untenable, and destructive outcomes of widely held beliefs should be cause for Christians to seriously examine scripture, making full use of their reason and experience for an interpretation that better reflects the heart of God.

What we will find using this Method of Interpretation:

When we more fully appreciate the original language and contexts of the biblical authors, we will see that the Bible never makes any applicable condemnation of homosexuality (the spontaneous attraction of one person towards another of the same sex or the actions therein insofar as they do not break with another biblical condemnation such as adultery). While there are a few instances that discuss same-sex acts, the intended meaning of these verses take no issue with those acts for them being same-sex. To read into them a condemnation of homosexuality would be like reading into Matthew 19:24 a condemnation of camels.

Obvious Examples of Reading a Condemnation of Homosexuality into the Bible:

- "Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve." -- This is an ad ignorantiam argument (claiming that absence of affirmation equates to presence of condemnation). It can just as easily be noted that Adam and Eve had two sons and yet we clearly know this is not a condemnation of having daughters.
- Household Codes (Ephesians 5:22-6:9, Colossians 3:18-4:1) -- another ad ignorantiam argument that interprets the Biblical authors' presumption of a predominantly heterosexual audience as a condemnation of other sexualities. We should note that the Bible mentions dogs several times but never mentions cats. If we employed this same logic, we would be barred from owning cats.
- "Alien flesh" in Jude verse 7. This is partially a reference to Sodom which we will be looking at in the next lesson. However, for now, note that it is referring to sex with angels / messengers from God and is an allusion to Genesis 6:1-4. It is not even tangentially condemning LGBTQ+ folks.

What the Bible Actually Says About Homosexuality

Lesson 2 of 3: Examining the Old Testament Verses

Verses Examined in this Lesson:

- Leviticus 18:22, Leviticus 20:13
- Genesis 19:1-11
- Ruth 1:16-17, Daniel 1:9
- 1 Samuel 18:1-4, 20:30, and 20:41-42

The Levitical Holiness Code (Leviticus 18:22 and Leviticus 20:13):

Leviticus 18:22 very clearly forbids homosexuality and Leviticus 20:13 describes the proper punishment, therein. However, we must determine if these verses are applicable to us. Leviticus offers both universal calls (do not murder, do not steal, etc) as well as cultural calls (do not eat pork, do not wear clothes of two different fabric types, etc). In order to figure out which this is, we need to examine the broader context of these verses in the Bible. Both of these verses are found within a section called the “Holiness Code” found in Leviticus 17-26.

The holiness code was a strict set of rules for the Hebrew people when they were a fledgling group, before entering the Promised Land of Israel. It was their fragile and fledgling nature that caused them to impose such strict consequences so as to maintain order -- they had to be strict or risk being killed by or assimilated into another group. In fact, it says as much in Leviticus 18:3 -- these verses were about staying distinct from the Egyptians and the Canaanites. As such, it should be noted that holiness here does not mean “closeness to God” so much as it means “identifies and participates fully in the ways of God’s chosen people (the Hebrews).” This is our first clue that these are not universal calls.

Even further, other Bible verses give us reason to believe that the Canaanites had a harvest festival that apparently employed ritualistic male-on-male sex acts. While the Canaanite religion itself is lost to time, the Bible repeats the reference to these festivals being “an abomination” and is likely referring to this practice in Deuteronomy 23:17 and 1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:46, and 23:7, barring Israelites from participating as “ritual prostitutes.” As such, it is likely that Leviticus 18:22 is a continuation of the thought referenced in 18:21, another consequence for participation in Canaanite rituals. That is, even within the cultural context of the day, these cultural calls were about cultic rituals that employed male-on-male sex, not about homosexuality itself.

So, there is no reason to conclude that Leviticus 18:22 or its punishment in Leviticus 20:13 are applicable outside of the original context when it was employed. And if they were, they should be directed at cult practices, not gay people. Further, following the holiness code would also cause us all to keep the feast of unleavened bread (23:1-10), blast a trumpet on Yom Kippur and Sukkot (25:9), and keep the year of Jubilee (25:40-46), amongst other calls. We cannot pick and choose from the holiness code, either it all applies or it all does not.

These verses were about remaining distinct from the Canaanites, not about a blanket condemnation of homosexuality.

The Sin of Sodom (Genesis 19:1-11):

This story is referenced more than it's known! And when read, it has some apparent leaps in logic for modern readers (why'd the men do this? Why'd Lot offer his daughters instead? etc). So, let us restate it with some of the holes filled back in. In desert cultures, hospitality codes were strictly enforced for overnight travelers (referenced in Job 31:32,

Leviticus 19:33-34, and Hebrew 13:2). They state that you were commanded to allow travelers into your home for the night so they would not freeze in the desert night. With that in mind, Lot allows two messengers from God a place to stay for the night. But, later that evening, men surround the house and demand that they be allowed to gang rape the travelers (a similar story but with men raping a traveling woman is found in Judges 19). Lot offers his daughters to the men instead of breaking the hospitality code. But, the men refuse.

This story does not state what sin occurred here. Inferences have been made that the sin was men having sex with men. However, others point to it being about holding travelers hostage and raping them. Thankfully, other verses in the Bible reference this story and clarify which interpretation is proper.

- Ezekiel 16:48- 50 - the sin of Sodom was arrogantly not helping the poor and needy but instead doing detestable things.
- Wisdom of Solomon 19:13-17 - an apocryphal text stating the sin of Sodom was treating travelers as slaves and brutalizing them.
- Partial references in the Old Testament are found in Isaiah 1:10-17, 3:9, Jeremiah 23:14, and Zephaniah 2:8-11. But, they do not give further information on the nature of the sin.
- Jesus references this story in Matthew 10:5-15. Jesus is sending out the twelve disciples and instructs them to seek lodging and food wherever they go. Then He says that if they are not shown hospitality, the town that did not welcome them will not fare as well as Sodom.

Every interpretation of this story in the Bible, including that of Jesus Himself, points to this being an issue of un-hospitality / holding people hostage and raping them. We must conclude this is not a condemnation of homosexuality. In fact, we must see the sad irony of how these verses are used. These verses are concerned with welcoming others and showing hospitality, and condemns the brutality and abuse these messengers faced. Currently, these same verses are being used to justify brutality and abuse at the expense of welcome and hospitality.

Grasping at Straws in the Other Direction (Ruth and Naomi, Daniel and the Chief Eunuch):

Some have suggested that Ruth and Naomi's relationship was oddly close (Ruth 1:16-17). Likewise, some question the closeness of Daniel with Nebuchadnezzar's chief eunuch in Daniel 1:9. However, there is no further information to suggest these passages refer to anything beyond a closeness.

The Almost Certain Affirmation of Jonathan and David (1 Samuel 18:1-4, 20:30, 41-42, 2 Samuel 1:26):

1 Samuel 18:1-4 recounts a striking show of affection from Jonathan to the young David. Then, in 20:30, king Saul has an outburst at Jonathan for his relationship with David. The Hebrew renders the precise nature of this outburst ambiguously but the Septuagint leaves it open to render this verse as Saul deriding Jonathan for his intimate companionship with David. Later, in 1 Samuel 20:41-42, David and Jonathan kiss one another, weep together, and uplift their bond eternally before the Lord before leaving one another. Finally, at the time of Jonathan's death, David says in 2 Samuel 1:26 that Jonathan's love for him surpassed that of a woman. For the earliest readers of these verses, this would have read as the love between noble military men (something widely known and practiced in that culture, another example of which is recounted in the Epic of Gilgamesh).

What the Bible Actually Says About Homosexuality

Lesson 3 of 3: Examining the New Testament Verses

Verses Examined in this Lesson:

- 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, 1 Timothy 1:9-10
- Romans 1:18-32
- Matthew 19:12

The List of Sins (1 Corinthians 6:9-10, 1 Timothy 1:9-10):

Twice, there is a list of sins in which homosexuality apparently appears. As these are lists of sins, there is no story to go on here. Instead, we must simply check that these verses are being translated correctly. Check these verses in several translations (see appendix 1) and you will see where the problem arises. Translators are unsure whether the list contains “male prostitutes,” “homosexuals,” or something else entirely. Thankfully, we have the Greek that we can check against. Two Greek terms are used, “malakoi” and *arsenokoitai*.” In context, “... *oute malakoi oute arsenokoitai*...” where “*oute*” is readily translated as “nor.”

Malakoi literally translates to “soft” and is typically in reference to fabrics. When used in reference to morals, it could be translated as “loose” or “unrestrained.” There is absolutely no way in which it is in specific reference to homosexuality.

Arsenokoitai is more difficult to translate. Outside of these lists, it is unused in other biblical texts. Likewise, it is unused in any surviving Greek texts from that time period. However, it can be noted that it is a compound word. *Arseno* refers to human men, plain and simple. *Koitai* comes from the word meaning “bed” and is a reference to laying with someone. So, together, this term would literally be “men-sleeper” or “bed-men.” But, this doesn’t do much to clarify what is being said here. What is a bed-man?

Some scholars assert that *arsenokoitai* is referring to masturbation. Others claim it refers to sexual perverts. Still others believe it is referring to male-on-male prostitution that was rampant when these verses were written. For instance, Antony (of Antony and Cleopatra) was a male prostitute in his younger years. Beyond this, we are at something of a loss. We simply do not know what this is specifically referring to. However, it can be quickly noted that these verses cannot be mere references to homosexuality as homosexuality was not a recognized category within sexuality at that time. That is, recall the odd phrasing of “men laying with men as they do with women” in Leviticus. The Hebrew people did not have a concept of outright homosexuality and had to work around it. Likewise, Greco-Roman culture at that time did not think in terms of heterosexuality and homosexuality (see Dale B. Martin, *Heterosexism and the Interpretation of Romans 1:18-32*; Richard Hays, *Awaiting the Redemption of Our Bodies*; and Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*). They thought in terms of a dominant and a passive partner. In their way of thinking, a dominant partner ought to pair themselves with a passive partner. However, they understood young boys to be passive partners. So, it was normative for an older man and a younger boy to be in a sexual relationship. All in all, *arsenokoitai* cannot be read simply as “homosexuality” because that is not a fair translation of an ambiguous term, and because there was no concept of homosexuality as we understand it now. It must be that there were other issues surrounding the “bed-men.”

What is Unnatural? (Romans 1:18-32):

The last supposed verse condemning homosexuality is part of Paul’s first remarks in his letter to the Romans. This section in Romans should be understood in general before we look at this specific issue (see appendix 1). Paul is

arguing that the Gentiles have ceased looking to what was apparent about God and instead became focused on creation, not the Creator (18-23). As such, this shift in focus has caused an inward shift of passions (24-27). In doing so, the Gentiles have opened the door for ritual uncleanness and real sin (28-32).

Simply, Paul is establishing a rapport with the Messianic Jews at the expense of the Gentiles. It should be noted that their feud (whether or not to practice the Old Testament law and if the Messianic Jews were closer to Christlikeness due to their heritage) was the reason Paul wrote to them in the first place. Paul works back and forth appealing to these two groups, culminating in Romans 3 where he says that all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God. That is to say, Paul is working out a diatribe and it is questionable to uplift a standalone verse in an area where Paul himself will make a statement and then contest it in the next paragraph. To put that more simply, this section is found when Paul is appealing to the Messianic Jews but he will soon enough critique his own argument about the Messianic Jews in the next chapter.

But, even beyond this, as to a plain reading of the issue of unnatural passions found in 26 and 27, we should make a few initial notes (see appendix 1). First, Paul is referring to each person's nature or character, not a universal law of nature. We know this because Paul uses this same term (*para physin*) to refer to God acting unnaturally by grafting Gentiles into a Jewish faith through the work of Jesus Christ. God was working against His previously established character, not a law of nature. So, the unnatural passions were unnatural for those people; it was out of character. With that in mind, re-examine these verses. Paul says that these people were acting out of character, overrun by passions, and doing sexual acts that were not characteristic of themselves. Specifically, he says the men were overcome and had relations with each other. And he says the women simply did unnatural relational acts, but does not specify "with other women."

As he specifically says that these acts were out of character, Paul cannot be condemning people who, by nature, are homosexual. He is condemning men whose nature is not to have relations with other men (we should also note that conversion therapy is an attempt to make people have relations outside of their nature). Simply, this is about straight people participating in a homosexual act. And when referring to women, he does not mention other women. He is likely referring to other types of lewd sex acts with men. In short, this is not a condemnation of homosexuality. This is using an example that he assumes will land with a predominantly heterosexual audience.

But, what's any of this have to do with turning away from God? We must read this passage in context yet again (see appendix 1). Paul is not having a sidebar to quickly condemn otherwise straight men who become overcome by passion and have relations with other men. Instead, Paul is using that scenario as a functional example. The shift from Creator to creation, according to Paul, has a resultant shift in our passions. Paul is arguing about a shift so deep and personal within ourselves that it would be comparable to suddenly being attracted to a different sex. On every level of analysis, this is not a condemnation of homosexuality. It is a reference to otherwise straight men having homosexual relations in order to establish a rapport with the Messianic Jews and further his point about the turn away from Creator to creation. And once again, there is a sad irony to how this verse is used. Romans 1-3 is Paul working out an argument as to why all of us, without distinction, need the grace of Jesus Christ and how it is fruitless to condemn some groups but not others.

The Only Time Jesus Addresses Any "Sexual Minorities" (Matthew 19:12):

The only time Jesus Himself talks about any "sexual minorities," for lack of a better term, is with regard to the eunuchs (men who were castrated, often at a young age to make them easier to work with as slaves). Again, Jesus never said anything about gay people. Eunuchs, though not at all a 1:1 stand-in for gay people, are the only examples of Jesus talking about "sexual minorities." And in Matthew 19:12, he commends them as models of those who seek God's Kingdom.

What the Bible Actually Says About Homosexuality

Appendix 1: Further Notes on Paul's Supposed Condemnations of Homosexuality

The List of Sins (1 Corinthians 6:9-10, 1 Timothy 1:9-10):

Twice, there is a list of sins in which homosexuality apparently appears. As they are incredibly similar, even down to the Greek phrasing, we will treat them as one. And, as these are lists of sins, there is no story to go on here. Instead, we must simply check that these verses are being translated correctly. Let's check some popular translations.

Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor men who practice homosexuality, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God. (1 Cor 6:9-10, ESV, a marginal note reads, "The two Greek terms translated by this phrase refer to the passive and active partners in consensual homosexual acts")

Do you not know that wrongdoers will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived! The sexually immoral, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, men who engage in illicit sex, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, swindlers—none of these will inherit the kingdom of God. (1 Cor 6:9-10, NRSVue)

Are you not aware that wrongdoers will never inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived! Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites, thieves, extortioners, drunkards, slanderers, swindlers—none of these will inherit the kingdom of God. (1 Cor 6:9-10, NCB)

Ἦ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι Θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν? Μὴ πλανᾶσθε: οὔτε πόρνοι, οὔτε εἰδωλολάτραι, οὔτε μοιχοὶ, οὔτε μαλακοὶ, οὔτε ἀρσενικοῖται, οὔτε κλέπται, οὔτε πλεονέκται, οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοίδοροι, οὐχ ἄρπαγες, βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν. (1 Cor 6:9-10, Greek)

Understanding Paul's Use of "Unnatural" and his Overall Argument in Romans 1:18-32:

The specific verses in question are 26-27, *"For this reason God gave them over to dishonorable passions. Their females exchanged natural intercourse for unnatural, and in the same way also the males, giving up natural intercourse with females, were consumed with their passionate desires for one another. Males committed shameless acts with males and received in their own persons the due penalty for their error."* (Romans 1:26-27, NRSVue)

Two possibilities on the use of "unnatural:"

1. He could be saying men are defying a law of nature that says men have a passion for women. Therefore, homosexuality is to be understood as going against a cosmic law of nature (which could be problematized by noting that other species, not clouded by sin, such as ducks and cats have high rates of homosexual encounters).

OR

2. He could be saying men are acting unnaturally (or "out of character") and having sex with other men. This would infer that Paul is using "men" here as a shorthand for "straight men" and is therefore merely presuming a predominantly heterosexual audience, not taking issue with homosexuality itself.

The first option is a condemnation of homosexuality and the second is a condemnation of straight men having gay sex. To understand how Paul is using the term, let us look to Romans 11:24 where Paul uses “unnatural” (*para physin*) once more.

“For if you have been cut from what is by nature a wild olive tree and grafted, contrary to nature, into a cultivated olive tree, how much more will these natural branches be grafted back into their own olive tree.”
(Romans 11:24, NRSVue)

In this verse, Paul is expounding on his argument that Gentiles have been grafted into God’s covenantal relationship with Israel. And here, it is plain to us that God was not defying nature, God was acting out of character. Therefore, we can conclude that Paul is meaning the second option in Romans 1 (unnatural as “out of character”). He was merely presuming a predominantly heterosexual audience to discuss people acting out of character, he was not taking issue with homosexuality itself.

“For this reason God gave them over to dishonorable passions. Their females exchanged [their characteristic] intercourse for [intercourse that was out of character], and in the same way also the males, giving up [those men’s characteristic] intercourse with females, were consumed with their passionate desires for one another. Males committed shameless acts with males and received in their own persons the due penalty for their error.”
(Romans 1:26-27, NRSVue with “unnatural” retranslated to better fit with Paul’s use of the term in Romans 11:24)

It was in those men’s nature / character to have intercourse with women in the first place. Otherwise, the verses just wouldn’t make any sense. Simply, he’s not talking about gay people, he’s talking about straight people having gay sex / untamed passions. (We should note, by the way, it would be “unnatural” to force gay folks to have a straight relationship).

Paul’s argument in Romans 1:18-32:

Beyond noting that Paul’s use of “unnatural” isn’t what we often assume, a quick aside to condemn gay people just wouldn’t flow with Paul’s argument here. Paul is arguing that we have ceased looking to what was apparent about God and instead became focused on the creation, not the Creator (18-23). As such, this shift in focus has caused an inward shift of passions (24-27). In doing so, we have opened the door for sin (28-32).

Looks to Creator → has in character passions → does not sin

OR

Looks to creation → has out-of-character passions → sins

It would be nonsensical for Paul to make a quick sidebar to condemn homosexuality in verses 26-27 because the very structure of his argument does not allow for that. He is using out-of-character sexual activity as an example of untamed passions here, not listing sins that result from this shift. Note that when Paul does list out the sins that arise from this shift in focus and passions (28-32), he does not list homosexuality.

What the Bible Actually Says About Homosexuality
Appendix 2: What a Clear, Biblical Condemnation Looks Like in Brief

Verse	Important Details	Is this actually about adultery?
<i>If a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor, both the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. - Leviticus 20:10</i>	Part of the Holiness code, questionable if it applies to us today (see lesson one, on the Levitical Holiness Code).	Yes.
<i>Let marriage be held in honor among all, and let the marriage bed be undefiled, for God will judge the sexually immoral and adulterous. - Hebrews 13:4</i>		Yes.
<i>You shall not commit adultery. - Exodus 20:14</i>	One of the Ten Commandments	Yes.
<i>He who commits adultery lacks sense; he who does it destroys himself. - Proverbs 6:32</i>		Yes.
<i>You have heard that it was said, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lustful intent has already committed adultery with her in his heart. - Matthew 5:27-28</i>	The words of Jesus, presuming and furthering a condemnation of adultery	Yes.
<i>If a man is found lying with the wife of another man, both of them shall die, the man who lay with the woman, and the woman. So you shall purge the evil from Israel. - Deuteronomy 22:22</i>		Yes.
1 Corinthians 7	A condemnation of adultery at length	Yes.
<i>For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, sexual immorality, theft, false witness, slander. - Matthew 15:19</i>	The words of Jesus	Yes.
Proverbs 6:24-29		Yes.
John 8:4-11	Even while forgiving her, Jesus acknowledges the sin of adultery in the woman caught	Yes.
And many, many more		