

New Testament seriously, Jude's unequivocal statement cannot be dismissed as merely an error copied from Jewish pseudepigraphy. To be sure, homosexual behavior was not Sodom's only sin; but according to Scripture it was certainly one of them.

b. Comments on Judges 19

Concerning Derrick Bailey's view of Judges 19, John Stott writes:

Bailey handled the Gibeah story in the same way. Another resident alien (this time an anonymous "old man") invites two strangers (not angels but a Levite and his concubine) into his home. Evil men surround the house and make the same demand as the Sodomites, that the visitor be brought out "so that we may know him." The owner of the house first begs them not to be so "vile" to his "guest," and then offers his daughter and the concubine to them instead. The sin of the men of Gibeah, it is again suggested, was not their proposal of homosexual intercourse but their violation of the laws of hospitality.

Stott makes the same critique of Bailey's view of Judges 19 as of Bailey's view of Genesis 19 (see above).

c. Comments on Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13

Are these prohibitions referring to ordinary homosexual acts between men, or to cultic taboos on temple prostitution connected with fertility rituals?

If the latter is true (as the revisionists claim), then these texts have no relevance to homosexual relationships today.

d. Comments on Romans 1

Is Paul condemning those who display a homosexual disposition, or those who, although they are inclined toward heterosexuality, yet indulge in homosexual practices (i.e., perversion)?

If the latter is true, (as the revisionists claim), then this passage has nothing to say concerning committed, loving homosexual partnerships. They claim that the persons spoken of here are not simply men and women who are engaged in homosexual practices, but shameless, profligate, promiscuous persons whom God has judicially given up because, although they previously had heterosexual relations, they have abandoned them for homosexual relations.

e. Comments on I Corinthians 6 and I Timothy 1

Are these persons simply homosexual adults who are consenting and committed to one another, or older men and postpubertal boys involved in commercial pederasty; i.e., male prostitution and corruption of the young?

If the latter is true (as the revisionists claim), then these verses say nothing about the exclusion of practicing homosexuals from the kingdom of God.