

# **A Renewed Look at the Bible and Homosexuality:**

**Examining the Six Cited Verses  
with Fresh Eyes and Making a  
Case for LGBTQ+ Affirmation**



## INTRODUCTION

### **Content Warning:**

This lesson plan is not appropriate for children. It details much of what the Bible has to say about homosexuality and sex in general. So, please keep in mind that this discussion will necessarily need maturity. Likewise, this lesson plan may ruffle some feathers as it is ultimately asserting that a consistent condemnation of homosexuality is not in the Bible. Please have the participants of this study pray together and vow to understand this lesson and one another before attempting to make themselves understood.

### **The Problem at Hand:**

1. 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” by society (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 largely stems from popular misunderstandings. While it is certainly true that “biblical” preachers and churches have condemned homosexuality, we need to assess if they are reading the Bible fairly.

### **How Do We Know a reading of the Bible is Authoritative?**

Of course, a variety of different camps and denominations read the same Bible for its plain meaning and yet do not always come to the same conclusion. So, I do not want to propose one more interpretation to agree with or disagree with. Instead, this class will focus mostly on issues of translation and context. So, we will be using these presumptions when working with a scripture:

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.

## **Should the Bible be Reasonable?**

The Bible is our ultimate authority as Christians. And yet, within it, we see numerous examples of people misusing it or being taught to read it in a more life-giving, reasonable way. 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 reason should inform our interpretation of scripture. The use of reason 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,
3. support movements for women's equality throughout church history.

That is not to say that reason 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 for an interpretation that better reflects the heart of God.

I especially want to recall for us that the Bible was used both to support and to denounce American slavery in the 1800s. While it would be unfruitful to compare and contrast the treatment of LGBTQ+ folks in the church to the institution of slavery, what should be noted is that those who supported slavery from the Bible did so by taking broad liberties with scripture. That is, they used verses that have been translated to say "slaves" when the type of slavery discussed in the Bible was more akin to indentured servitude, not the owning of a person. Similarly, this class will be examining if the cited verses we are looking at are really making a blanket statement about homosexuality or if that is simply a modern translational error.

### **Apples to Apples Approach:**

We also have to keep in mind that we are looking at an apples to apples approach here. In other words, we are not comparing the worst people we could possibly imagine who happen to be gay with the best people we could possibly imagine who happen to be straight. Nor are we comparing an orgy to a marriage. We are comparing a loving relationship between two people of the same gender with a loving relationship between two people of different genders.

Similarly, we are not attempting to make any decisions about the institution of Christian marriage here. While the Bible does uplift Christian marriages between a man and a woman, this does not mean that it makes a blanket condemnation of all homosexual relationships. We will have to leave discussion of gay marriage in the church for another time as we are looking solely at whether or not homosexuality is condemned in the Bible, not whether or not it is fitting for a Christian marriage.

## **CLEARING UP THE OBVIOUS EXAMPLES OF READING A CONDEMNATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY INTO THE BIBLE**

There are a handful of examples of times when no mention of homosexuality is in the cited scripture at all. Instead, some read around the Bible and make a conclusion not based on what is actually said. Before we go further, we need to clarify that these are not valid uses of the Bible. These are instead examples of reading our own agenda into the Bible.

### **“Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve”**

This is an *ad ignorantiam* argument (claiming that the absence of affirmation equates to the 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. More broadly, the story of Adam and Eve has a specific purpose. We cannot read into it whatever we want.

### **Household Codes (Ephesians 5:22-6:9, Colossians 3:18-4:1)**

This is another *ad ignorantiam* argument. While these verses do uplift specifically a man and a woman marrying, it is not condemning all homosexual relationships in doing so. 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. There are three potential reasons the Bible uplifts solely a man and a woman in these verses on marriage:

1. The Biblical author had a predominantly heterosexual audience in mind and therefore used language that would fit for them similar to how we might refer to a group of men and women as “those guys.”
2. The Biblical author was speaking to a specific issue at a specific time and was not attempting to make a blanket statement about all relationships for the rest of time.
3. The Biblical author may have really meant for Christian marriage to be solely between men and women. However, recall that this class is not designed to discuss the prerequisites for Christian marriage, it is designed to discuss whether or not homosexuality is condemned. Keep in mind, for instance, that two atheists in a relationship would not constitute a Christian marriage. And yet, we know that their relationship is not sinful in itself.

### **“Alien flesh” (Jude 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.

### **Uncovering Noah’s nakedness (Genesis 9:20-22)**

After Noah got drunk and fell asleep in his tent, his son Ham came in and “uncovered his nakedness,” resulting in Noah pronouncing a curse upon him. While it is true that “uncovering his nakedness” is likely a reference to sexual sin, we can note that there is no mention of homosexuality as the issue. Consider that it would have been just as much of a sexual sin if Ham were a daughter rather than a son.

## **REASSESSING LEVITICAL HOLINESS CODES (LEVITICUS 18:22 AND 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.

### **What was the Holiness Code and is it applicable to Christians?**

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) rather than the Canaanites.” This is our first clue that these are not universal calls.

Our second clue as to whether or not these are universal calls is by taking the holiness code as a whole. That is, we can check all of the Levitical holiness code and see if there are other laws that are clearly cultural and not universal. When we do, we can appreciate that chapter 17 and 22 discusses a number of sacrifices and food laws that do not apply to us. In chapters 18 and 20 (the ones in question), we are told that having sex with your wife while she is on her period can result in being disowned from the people. While refraining from further discussion on that subject, consider if we would treat someone who did that in a similar way that we might feel justified to treat gay people using these same chapters. In Leviticus 19:19, we are forbidden from planting two kinds of seed in a single field and forbidden from wearing clothes made from two different animals. In 19:27, we are forbidden from trimming our beards. In chapter 21, we are instructed on how a priest must operate and the prescriptions are rife with things no longer applicable to us. In chapters 23 through 25, we receive instructions for festivals that we no longer perform, the year of Jubilee, etc.

### **If these verses are cultural, why were they written in the first place?**

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 of 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.

### **Conclusion:**

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 never trim our beard, keep the feast of unleavened bread, and not wear clothes of two different fabric types.

## REASSESSING 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 and attempt to force their way in.

### What's this story actually condemning?

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 (or put more kindly, breaking the hospitality code). 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. Note that it does not tell us what these “detestable things” were.
- Wisdom of Solomon 19:13-17 - an apocryphal text stating the sin of Sodom was treating travelers as slaves and brutalizing them.
- Partial references (naming that Sodom was sinful) 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 a lack of hospitality ( a kind way of saying the issue was holding people hostage and raping them).

### Conclusion:

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.

## 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 extremely similar, down to the same Greek terms in question, we will treat them as one here. And, as these are lists of sins, there is no story to go on or cross-reference to locate. Instead, we must simply check that these verses are being translated correctly. Check these verses in different Bible translations and you will see where the problem arises. Translators are unsure whether the list contains “male prostitutes,” “homosexuals,” “practicing homosexuals,” “perverts,” etc. Note that Martin Luther and John Calvin’s Bibles did not translate these verses to say “homosexuals.” Translations suggesting that these terms be translated to homosexuals began only in the 1900s and is still not a consensus understanding among translators.

### 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 in different Bible 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)*

*Ἡ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἄδικοι Θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν? Μὴ πλανᾶσθε: οὔτε πόρνοι, οὔτε εἰδωλολάτραι, οὔτε μοιχοὶ, οὔτε μαλακοὶ, οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται, οὔτε κλέπται, οὔτε πλεονέκται, οὐ μέθυσοι, οὐ λοιδόροι, οὐχ ἄρπαγες, βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν. (1 Cor 6:9-10, Greek)*

### What’s the proper translation?

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 (bed-men) is referring to masturbation. Others claim it refers to sexual pervers. 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.”

## **Conclusion:**

These verses have been translated in a ton of different ways over the years. But, translating them as a condemnation of homosexuality is a modern occurrence and is clearly inaccurate.



## PAUL'S GRAND THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT (ROMANS 1)

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)

### What is even happening in Romans 1 to begin with?

We must first appreciate the argument Paul is presenting here and then see if a condemnation of homosexuality fits into it. In this chapter, Paul is arguing that we have ceased looking to what was apparent about God and instead became focused on the creation, not the Creator (verses 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). Put another way, Paul is making a doublebound point here about our human nature.

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

OR

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

Notice that in verses 28-32, Paul lists a wide variety of sins that result from out-of-character passions and he does not mention homosexuality in them. Instead, the apparent condemnation of homosexuality is an example Paul is using to describe the out-of-character passions. Think of it like this; Paul is saying that a shift from God to creation would be like waking up tomorrow morning suddenly being attracted to the opposite gender. This is not a condemnation, this is a functional example Paul is using.

### What's “natural” and “unnatural” intercourse?

Beyond noting that Paul is not listing “unnatural” intercourse as a sin, but describing an example of our shift from God to creation, we can further see that this is not a condemnation of homosexuality by understanding more fully what Paul means by “unnatural” intercourse. Two possibilities as to what “unnatural” means are possible:

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).
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 using the term “unnatural” or *para physin* to mean 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. If we expanded the translation of Romans 1:26-27 to make use of the way Paul uses “unnatural” later in his letter, it would read as follows:

*“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. So, simply, Paul’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).

**Conclusion:**

These verses are about a shift in our passions that happen as a result of losing sight of God. While Paul uses a heterosexual example, his issue is that the passions are out of character, not that they’re homosexual in nature. We can infer that he’d be appalled with how LGBTQ+ folks are pressured to live in an out of character way.

## STORIES OF LGBTQ+ AFFIRMATION IN THE BIBLE

### **JONATHAN AND DAVID’S RELATIONSHIP (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 military men.

#### **Conclusion:**

The Bible even features a story of king David caught up in a homosexual relationship and provides no condemnation for it.

### **THE ONLY TIME JESUS ADDRESSED 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.

#### **Conclusion:**

Even Jesus Himself, when given full opportunity to condemn people outside the bounds of a heterosexual relationship, chooses instead to welcome and affirm them.

## IN REVIEW

### **Verses and terms that have nothing to do with this discussion:**

“Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve” - an ad ignorantium argument. Adam and Eve had two sons, but this is not a condemnation of having daughters either.

“Christian marriage” - we are not advocating for Christian LGBTQ+ marriages here. Instead, we are only asking if homosexuality is condemned. And we can observe that a heterosexual atheist couple would also not meet the criteria of a Christian marriage.

“Alien flesh” (Jude 7) - this is a reference to angels / messengers from God, not gay people.

“Uncovering Noah’s nakedness” - this is a sexual sin but there is no mention that it was sinful for being homosexual in nature. We can plainly see it would be sinful even if it were a man and his daughter.

### **Old Testament Verses:**

Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 - These verses are not applicable laws for today and even in their original context were about remaining distinct from the Canaanites, not about a blanket condemnation of homosexuality.

Genesis 19:1-11 - 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.

1 Samuel 18:1-4, 20:30, 41-42, 2 Samuel 1:26 - quite clearly an account of king David having a homoerotic relationship with Johnathan.

### **New Testament Verses:**

1 Corinthians 6:9-10, 1 Timothy 1:9-10 - These verses have been translated in a ton of different ways over the years. But, translating them as a condemnation of homosexuality is a modern occurrence and clearly inaccurate.

Romans 1:18-32 - These verses are about a shift in our passions that happen as a result of losing sight of God. While Paul uses a heterosexual example, his issue is that the passions are out of character, not that they’re homosexual in nature. We can infer that he’d be appalled with how LGBTQ+ folks are pressured to live in an out of character way.

Matthew 19:12 - The only time Jesus ever addressed any “sexual minorities,” He affirms them as models of those who seek God’s Kingdom.

### **In conclusion:**

These verses at times mention homosexuality but their issue is a sexual sin that would be just as heinous if it were done between a man and a woman. Either that or we have simply read into them a condemnation of homosexuality where there is not one. All in all, upon closer examination, the Bible does not provide a blanket condemnation of homosexuality that would be applicable to Christians today.