

The Bible is our best book on "sex" [= erotic genital activity, not "sexuality"--though the Bible is also our best book on sexuality], and on this subject--as on all others!--it needs perpetual re-interpreting. This thinksheet is my third (the others being #816 and #822) on one dimension of sex, viz. homosexuality [male/female]. I emphasize that it is "a," not the only or authoritative reflection, on homosexuality and the Bible; and that it is not a biblical, but a biblical-theological, treatment [i.e., it puts homosex in the context of the biblical way of seeing and living in the world, rather than only in the light of what the Bible explicitly says about homosex, which is entirely no-no]. About twenty biblical texts are involved, but I've not taken space for them here: see them, excellently used, in the relevant articles ("Homosexuality"; "Sex, sexual behavior"; etc.) in the just-published THE INTERPRETER'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE: SUPPLEMENTARY VOL. (Abingdon/76).

1. Everything God has made is good, so sex potential is good. This implies the biology/behavior distinction: your actual genital history, except for being really-irresistably raped, is your responsibility: "sex" is not good; it isn't evil either; and it isn't, as so many are now claiming, morally neutral.

2. Sex potential as created by God is (a) physically "good" and (b) only in the divine intention morally "good." The absence of this potential is "evil" in physical, not moral, sense. A human being without the full human potential is "evil" in the sense of a defective--e.g., my eyes are genetically defective and two of my ribs are congenitally defective [and almost all God's chillun are physical defectives in some way or other]. Hypohormonism (a man low on testosterone, a woman low on estrogens) is as defective as my mixed dominance and sinisterism [all my family being lefthanded in a righthanded world prejudiced and discriminating--e.g., in furniture --against us lefties]. The defect (lack) in sex hormones is a physical condition, which I mark by the word "homosexuality," a biological evil; by "homosex" I mean not biology but behavior, viz. a genital relationship between two persons of the same sex. The Bible has nothing to say about "homosexuality," and badmouths "homosex." Does God create all babies, or only some? If all, then God creates "homosexuality," which therefore must be good [or at least not evil], though not best, since lacking full-potential. Gay-liberation rhetoric often evades the issue I'm raising in this paragraph, viz. defectiveness; and ambiversion liberation [switch-sex], even more. I hold, here, with biology and the Bible.

3. All societies regulate sex, chiefly for social tranquility. The governing idea in biblical society is "the covenant": God will ask not what you did with your genitals but what you did with your covenants, with him and his creatures. In the Bible, sex is for (a) cocreation not of babies but of man-woman relationship, (b) procreation, and (c) recreation [pleasure, play]. Beautiful when all is celebration of the good life of creation in praise to the Creator! Too bad a primitive tabu constricted that creation-vision--the tabu of the sacredness of semen--a heavy factor in the now-insustainable notion of male-dominance/female-submission [woman being only a semen receptacle, in procreation], ratified by "the missionary position" [male always above in intercourse]. The ancient Hebrews didn't have a whiff of the [Neoplatonic] negative attitude toward the body: they valued it and celebrated its potential and achievements. But they feared [and how they experienced!] its disruptive potential, and so supported that tabu of semen as one of a cluster of tabus functioning to fence sexuality into the marriage covenant. Thus, "good" sex meant marital only--excluding homosex, bestiality, fornication, adultery, incest, rape, and prostitution. Nowhere does the Bible consider a possibility that has appeared in our culture, viz. covenantal ["marital"] homosex, which is extremely rare, and much harder to sustain than covenantal heterosex ["marriage"], which is hard enough! I see a lot of heterosex that isn't creational at all [co-, pro-, or re-], and a little homo_{sex} that is co- and re-creational [and shouldn't be faulted for not being able to be pro-].

4. Almost all homosex is evil in the moral sense, i.e. in the eyes of God--a cop-out on heterosexual confrontation-relationship, a support for others' cop-out, a temptation to boys and girls to the same cop-out and therefore a social cancer and root of corruption. A sad, sick, sinful scene....Read me fair, y'all!