

Was Jesus a Homosexual?

By Steve Ray

www.CatholicConvert.com

After posting my blog entry "[Jesus and Homosexuality](#)" I received a correspondence from a Harry H. McCall, a self-proclaimed ex-reverend, on June 4, 2012. He referred me to his blog "[Debunking Christianity](#)." His post was entitled [Jesus the Homosexual: Evidence From the Gospels](#).

His blog was not a tit-for-tat response to my article, but was an article he wrote and published at the same time I uploaded my post. I am responding to the content of his blog post since he sent it to me for my comments. I always promote honest and courteous discourse, seeking the truth with charity and honesty. I hope I have accomplished that in my response below. I am strong, yes; but I also hope that my response is not angry or antagonistic.

I am writing this in a few free hours I have in Jerusalem. A busy day starts tomorrow but I thought I would respond in the few hours I have available. As I write I am looking out at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre where Jesus was crucified, died and was buried before rising from the dead. My wife and I joined the Mass in the Tomb at 5:30 AM. To my right I see the top of Mount Zion where Jesus celebrated the Last Supper. I am writing this *in context* — not only the context of Scripture and history, but the context of the land of Israel where I spend a large part of my time. (I will pray for McCall while here.)

You may rightfully say, "You don't take this guy seriously so why take the time to respond to his post on Jesus and Homosexuality?" The reason is simple. Homosexuality is becoming more and more accepted in our country. Catholics, other Christians, Jews, Muslims and other folks who condemn the homosexual lifestyle will find themselves ostracized as it becomes more recognized. We will be called bigots and old fashioned. Clever arguments will be crafted that may sound reasonable at first (just read the combox on McCall's blog post to see how gullible many people are). As with McCall's blog, they will often twist the Bible around like a rubber nose and even contend that Jesus himself was homosexual.

So, you may say, "That is stupid and I disagree." Good, but why do you disagree? When they marshal Scripture verses against you, will you be prepared to respond? That is why I am refuting this otherwise foolish and waste-of-time article. We who are not caught up in the gay life or the support thereof, need to know what we know and why.

I have no doubt that McCall does not accept the Bible as the inspired word of God, nor does he really care about what it says or why. His website is called Debunking Christianity which is what he has set out to do. He is homosexual and that is how he finds his identity, and it is his driving motivation—to eliminate biblical arguments against

homosexuality; rather to twist the Bible like a rubber nose to suit his purposes. Any discussion of Scripture by McCall is simply to twist it to fit his agenda and to confuse those who try to read it in honestly.

It is certainly not my objective to attack homosexuals or the gay lifestyle. However, it is being forced down my throat (no pun intended). It is being forced down America's throat. I hope to engage the conversation in a rational, reasoned, cordial and biblical way.

I decided the best way to respond to his attempt to paint Jesus as a homosexual was to address his claims paragraph by paragraph. I decided to give him the benefit of the doubt whenever possible, but to be exacting and uncompromising when necessary.

His words will be in **blue**; my response will be in **black**. I will point out some of the careless misspellings in his article and prove that his arguments are as flawed as his spelling and references. My actual homosexual arguments begin at the bottom of page 5; up until that point are preliminaries.

Jesus is created / redacted in each of the Gospel author's mind to give credence to their own story of Jesus which – for them – would have trouble standing on its own merits. Thus in Matthew's Gospel, Jesus is the New Moses and his life is set in a Roman Palestine context that mimics Israel in Egypt complete with the killing of the toddlers to Jesus even being taken down to Egypt by his family so – like Moses and the Israelites – Jesus comes out of Egypt.

There is no question that each author of the gospels had a message to proclaim to a specific audience. Each gospel was a true historical account presented from four distinct perspectives. They are similar to four witnesses reporting an event from different perspectives. Imagine an accident in the intersection witnessed by a man in a car behind the smashed vehicle, a woman on the 4th floor of an apartment above the intersection, a man in the car, and a woman standing on the sidewalk. Each will have a different perspective, but not contradicting the other viewpoints.

McCall's claim that the gospels have "trouble standing on its own merits" is a huge assumption and leap of faith, and is baseless. This is an assumption McCall hopes that his readers will accept without critical analysis. McCall is introducing himself as one who dismisses any historical reliability to the gospels.

I agree completely that each gospel writer has his own "agenda" writing to his own audience and explaining his particular points. I have described these varying views and their emphasis [here](#).

I agree with McCall's analysis of Matthew's purpose, but I don't agree that it is manipulating the message of Jesus Christ or that he is fabricating a story. Matthew is simply presenting a true account of Jesus to his own Hebrew contemporaries to convince them that Jesus was the true Messiah and the fulfillment of the Old Testament

prophecies. He is convincing the Jews that Jesus is their Messiah and anticipated king. One can tell a story truly while emphasizing a particular point.

Matthew presents Jesus as the New Moses and the king of Israel. The first chapter demonstrates Jesus' royal pedigree by giving his genealogy all the way back to Abraham the patriarch through David the ideal king. Matthew declares Jesus is the promised Messiah.

In Mark the theme is the Messianic Secret where the author of this Gospel portrays Jesus was working signs and wonders, but then demanding neither his disciples nor anyone to tell what they have seen Jesus do (So, if no historian recorded any miracle Jesus did, it's because Jesus himself made them swear not to tell anyone!).

Partially true. Jesus did not want the full truth revealed to the Jewish leadership before the proper time. He had work to do before going to the cross. He gaged the timing and tried to control the paparazzi's from revealing his true identity before the appropriate time (to speak in modern terms). Mark was the secretary (*amanuensis*) of St. Peter in Rome and he wrote down the gospel as dictated by St. Peter which is made abundantly clear by Eusebius (2nd-3rd century historian) who gleaned his history from the most ancient early traditions.

Mark was presenting Jesus as the ideal servant (opposite of Matthew's king) with great power to perform miracles and demonstrate his power. This is what impressed the Romans and thus Mark wrote his gospel to reach this unique audience. Jesus came not to be served but to serve. This is what servants do.

In Luke, Jesus follows the template of Elijah and emulates many of the events of this famous prophet of the Hebrew Bible such as the well known parallel being 2 Kings 1; 9-12 to Luke 9: 51 -56 (Fire from Heaven) and Luke 4: 16; 7: 11 – 17 to 2 Kings 1: 17 – 24 (The Healing the Widow's Son).

Actually, Luke is presenting Jesus as the ideal man, the Greek ideal. Luke was the only gentile, non-Jewish author in all of the Bible. If anyone was going to promote the Greek ideal, including homosexuality, it would be the Greek author Luke. But he does not promote this nor imply it. Even McCall tries to manipulate the Jewish John as the homosexual author promoting the Greek's tolerance of homosexuality but it was Luke that was the Greek author. St. Luke presents Jesus as the ideal man with a genealogy going all the way back to Adam and doesn't even give McCall's penchant for digging for gay tolerance a hint of acceptance. Interestingly, Luke speaks about women far more than any other gospel writer.

The author of the Fourth Gospel (or generally known as John) is not only well versed in the allegorical meanings (much like the Jew Philo of Alexandria, Egypt), but more importantly this author uses Greek philosophy to legitimize Jesus' life as divine. There are no earthly virgin birth accounts here (as in Matt. and Luke), but Jesus is the eternal

divine logos or Word which - as with Greek philosophical Neo-Platonism - always has been.

The Fourth Gospel is attributed to St. John because St. John wrote it. I've written a [450 page book on this gospel](#) and did the research. The earliest references extant tell us that the gospel was written by the disciple John during the reign of Emperor Trajan which began at 97 AD. John lived to be a very old man, the only disciple to escape martyrdom. No one doubted his authorship until the skepticism of the 20th century.



One is mistaken to attribute Greek philosophy as the basis of St. John's Gospel. The only way it can be done is deny the Johannine authorship of the gospel. From the earliest times the uniform testimony points to St. John the Apostle as the author. John was a Jew and steeped in Judaism. He was familiar with Greek thought by virtue of his bishopric in Ephesus where he eventually died and was buried. But to suggest that he was "Greek" in his philosophy is misguided and self-serving in this case. He and his gospel are profoundly Jewish rooted deeply in the Old Testament and the Jewish tradition.

The huge exaggeration that John was influenced by Greek thought as the basis for his writing is simply wrong. The only case McCall cites as "proof" is that John uses the term "Logos" (λόγος). Most scholars agree that the opening verses of St. John's Gospel are taken from an ancient Christian hymn of the first century. Notice its poetic rhythm and see if you can discover the extent and form of the hymn which seems to encompass the first eighteen verses. If this is the case, then John did not write those initial verses using the word "logos" but simply inserted a hymn already in wide usage.

(Picture: The Jewish Jesus, Rabbi to Jewish disciples)

One highly regarded historian and biblical scholar F. F. Bruce writes, "The term 'logos' was familiar in some Greek philosophical schools, where it denoted the principle of reason or order immanent in the universe, the principle which imposes form on the material world and constitutes the rational soul in man. It is not in Greek philosophical usage, however, that the background of John's thought and language should be sought. . . . The true background to John's thought and language is found not in Greek philosophy but in Hebrew revelation" (Bruce, *The Gospel of John*, 29).¹

The attempt to turn St. John into a toga-wearing Greek philosopher is ill-advised, incorrect, chronologically out of place and completely out of context scripturally and historically.

¹ Ray, S. *St. John's Gospel: A Study Guide and Commentary*.

Jesus in the Gospel of John is now far removed from the highly Jewish themes in the Synoptic Gospels as the Jesus of the Fourth Gospels never speaks in parables, but is well versed in Hellenistic Greek and Classical philosophy. The author of this Gospel has reinvented Jesus (apart from the Torah Jew of the Synoptic Tradition) to function much like a educated Classical Greek teacher complete with a school of students called μαθητὰς (disciples).

McCall may assume and propose that John was far removed from Jewish context but in this is sadly mistaken. He gives no proof, only speculation based on his wish to make it so. The earliest witnesses, as recorded by Eusebius in AD 325, tell us St. John was the author and the earliest contemporaries understood without question or contradiction. He is not far removed from Jesus but was an eyewitness and one of the Twelve Apostles. Far from being far removed, St. John writes a spiritual gospel covering material not covered in the Synoptics. This oversight of McCall's shows a lack of learning or lack of real interest on his part by not knowing the purpose and history of this Gospel.

Regarding parables: this is not a requirement to prove Jewish influence. There is no evidence of John being "well-versed in Hellenistic Greek and Classical philosophy" as McCall suggests. It just simply is not so. Jesus is not reinvented but is the same Jesus portrayed in the Synoptic gospels and very much immersed in the Jewish world surrounding the Second Temple and the Scriptures. Does the fact that John mentions Jesus' disciples proof he was influenced by Greek culture? Not at all. Rabbis had disciples. The word "disciple" is used 160 times in the Synoptic gospels alone.

However, the Greek social culture redacted in this Gospel does not stop with just Greek philosophical terms, but as in Greek society, the author of the Fourth Gospel has the older Jesus take a younger lover or what was both well known and common in Greek culture as **Pederasty** (the courting by an older male of a younger male entering puberty until his late teens). While Jesus enjoys a close relationship with his hand picked twelve apostles, the Fourth Gospel lets the reader know that Jesus has indeed chosen a young lover τὸν μαθητὴν ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς (the disciple Jesus loved (ἠγάπα = Imperfect, indicative, Active, 3 singular) who is said to lie (ἀνέπεσεν) on top of Jesus' body (κόλπῳ) at the Passover Supper.

This paragraph is not only pure conjecture, but is absurd. No proof whatever had been given that St. John used philosophical terms or thought, but to assert Jesus took a boy lover is beyond the pale of reason or cultural context. These men lived in the Jewish culture and were thoroughly Jewish. John is the one who mentions "Greeks" in his gospel, twice, and both instances indicate the distance of Greek people and culture from Jesus and his disciples. "John 7:35 reads, "The Jews said to one another, "Where does this man intend to go that we shall not find him? Does he intend to go to the Dispersion among the Greeks and teach the Greeks?" Even here the Dispersion is referring to Jews who lived outside Israel, not the to the uncircumcised, Gentile dog, unclean Greeks. Jesus and John were Jewish, living among Jews and considered the Greeks and their practices out of their social circle.

Pederasty was practiced among the Greek pagans but condemned by the Jews. John who wrote the gospel was a devout Jew. Greeks converting to Christianity had to give up all their perversions and sin in order to be accepted into the Church, the kingdom of God.

Paul writes to the Greek converts in Corinth in 1 Cor 6:9-11, “Or do you not know that the unrighteous shall 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, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And 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.”

Now to discuss briefly the phrase “the disciple whom Jesus loved.” The smokescreen of McCall’s “copy-and-paste” of the Greek syntax from lexicons does nothing to prove anything other than to suggest he is unfamiliar with Greek but has access to on-line resources. He even later gets the authors and title of one of his cut-and-paste resources wrong. More on that later.

The word “agapeo” is not the word in Scripture for sexual, erotic love. Greek has a word for that and it is “eros.” A Greek scholar explains the use of “agapeo” as used in Greek literature and Scripture,

“*Agapan* (ἄγαπᾶν) is used in its verb, noun, and adjective forms about three hundred and twenty times in the New Testament. It is a love called out of a person’s heart by “an awakened sense of value in an object which causes one to prize it.” It expresses a love of approbation and esteem. Its impulse comes from the idea of prizing. It is a love that recognizes the worthiness of the object loved. Thus, this love consists of the soul’s sense of the value and preciousness of its object, and its response to its recognized worth in admiring affection.”
In contrasting *philein* (φιλεῖν) and *agapan* (ἀγαπᾶν), we might say that the former is a love of pleasure, the latter a love of preciousness; the former a love of delight, the latter a love of esteem; the former a love called out of the heart by the apprehension of pleasurable qualities in the object loved, the latter a love called out of the heart by the apprehension of valuable qualities in the object loved; the former takes pleasure in, the latter ascribes value to; the former is a love of liking, the latter a love of prizing. (Kenneth Wuest).

If the gospel writer were referring to an erotic and sensual love, he would have used the word “eros” or possibly “*philein*.” But even “*philein*” would not suggest erotic love but a friendship which is a healthy Platonic camaraderie between men. Jesus and Peter go back and forth in John’s gospel, “Peter, do you love (agapeo) me?” to which Peter replied, “You know I love (*philein*) you.” This is within the same context as “the disciple whom Jesus loved.” Would anyone—other than a homosexual reading his predilection into every fabric of society and between every line of text—conceive of Jesus propositioning Peter for sex before his ascension into heaven? The thought is ludicrous.

If the suggestion is made that using “agapeo” implies a sexual love then one might ask about John’s usage of the word elsewhere, as in John 11:5, “Now Jesus *loved* Martha and her sister and Lazarus.” Does this imply a polygamous, incestuous relationship? Of course not. And John is not the only one whom “Jesus loved.” We read two verses earlier of Jesus’ love for Lazarus, “So the sisters sent to him, saying, ‘Lord, he whom you love is ill’ (verse 3).

Nor is eroticism involved in Mark 10:21, when after a young Jewish man runs to Jesus and asks about entering eternal life, Jesus responds, “By obeying the Commandments.” The young man says he has done that. He takes the law of Moses seriously (including the prohibition and condemnation of bestiality, incest and homosexuality). For this attitude of love of God and the commandments we read that, “Jesus looking upon him loved him, and said to him, ‘You lack one thing; go, sell what you have, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me.’” No reader will see anything here other than a fondness for the quality of soul Jesus sees in the young man. The same love that a teacher has for the student who loves to learn, who “gets it” and has a good disposition of heart. It is that love I feel for my children when I see them do well. An emotion of love wells up in my heart.

Nothing here suggests that Jesus took a lover, much less a male lover, even though the it says Jesus felt love for the man. His love was platonic and full of respect and approval. Understanding the culture alone makes McCall’s ideas laughable if it weren’t so sad and disgusting. Jesus had a close relationship with his disciples as all Jewish rabbis did with their students. A simple search of ancient Jewish literature is replete with references to Jewish rabbis with disciples seated at their feet to learn. It is a big mistake to assume (unless you are a homosexual choosing to make the gay lifestyle acceptable by looking for validation through their gay glasses, the lens through which all of life is seen) that a rabbi had students with the intent to have sex with them.

Again, I don’t believe McCall really cares what Scripture says. He is twisting it like a rubber nose to debunk Christianity and to confuse Christians. He is clever, but one sees through the sham and the lack of scholarship; the lack of honesty by anachronistically reading his own condition back into history.

Now, what does the gospel writer mean when he refers to the “disciple whom Jesus loved” which is repeated five times in John’s gospel (John 13:23, 19:26; 20:2; 21:7, 20).

From earliest times the “disciple whom Jesus loved” was considered to be the Apostle John, the brother of James and son of Zebedee. His mother seems to have followed them around as Jesus taught or was at least intimate with their life and mission (Mt 20:20; 27:56; Lu 8:1-3). Hardly would a Jewish mother in those days have condoned her son having such a relationship which was considered an abomination worthy of stoning at the time.

John was certainly young. He was already a disciple of John the Baptist (Jn 1:35-40). All Church tradition has accepted the unnamed disciple as John. He seems to be eager for

the truth, eager to act and full of fire (Lu 9:54), and having a passionate love for God. Why does it refer to him as the disciple Jesus loved? It has been viewed for 2,000 years as a sentiment of fondness Jesus had for John, for his youthful vigor, desire for truth, willingness to give up a money-making career to follow the Messiah. It is what one might refer to as “the teacher’s pet,” one who the teacher favors above others because of proper attitude and conduct, love of learning and obedience. John was such a disciple and as such earned Jesus’ love.

In the context of the whole writing within John’s gospel, “The use of the phrase [on his bosom] ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἰησοῦ, however, almost certainly is intended to recall the similar phrase in the prologue, where it is stated, “The only Son ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς (‘who is in the bosom of the Father’) has expounded him.” The Evangelist introduces the Beloved Disciple as standing in an analogous relation to Jesus as Jesus to the Father with respect to the revelation he was sent to make known; behind this gospel is the testimony of one who was “close to the heart” of Jesus.”²

We read in the gospel of Luke the same phrase in the story of Abraham, Lazarus and the rich man in torment, “The poor man died and was carried by the angels to Abraham’s bosom. The rich man also died and was buried” (16:22). Hardly would one expect this to have erotic overtones. Silly indeed.

What does it mean that Jesus loved this disciple? The same word “agapeo” is used in the same chapter referring to Jesus’ love for *all* the disciples. We read in John 13:1, “Now before the feast of the Passover, when Jesus knew that his hour had come to depart out of this world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end.” He loved all the disciples. This means nothing physical but the devoted love of a father for sons, a teacher for students, a coach for his team.

In the same chapter, thus IN CONTEXT, before the mention of the “disciple whom Jesus loved,” Jesus says he “loved his own who were in the world” and immediately following he says in John 13:34, “A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another; even as I have loved you, that you also love one another.” In the context of John, how is

² Beasley-Murray, G. R. (2002). *Vol. 36: Word Biblical Commentary : John*. Word Biblical Commentary (237–238). Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

that “love” (agapeo) to be interpreted and understood? Certainly not as McCall twists it to justify his homosexual gay lifestyle.

The Greek word used for “recline” needs to be understood as well. It is variously translated as “recline” or “sit” as with the crowds whom Jesus fed the miraculous loaves in the wilderness as they *sat* to eat the bread.



The word “recline” does not imply a sexual position or a position in preparation for sex. The word “recline” is used twelve times in the New Testament and is always used for the posture taken when eating a meal. Without chairs and tables like we know them, people in the first century Jewish culture lay on the floor, leaned on one elbow and ate with the right hand. A group of people would be gathered around the food on a mat or a low table and ate from a common plate. It was by nature very intimate as meals were back then. Jesus reclined with Pharisees, disciples and others for meals. Hardly does it suggest anything more than that.

“Solemn meals were taken in the Roman fashion, about a low table surrounded on three sides (the other side free for serving) by mats or couches on which the diners reclined, supporting themselves on their left arms. The present scene supposes “the disciple whom Jesus loved” (→ 3 above) to be at Jesus’ right—thus he could lean back to ask the question of v. 25. John doubtless intends a spiritual significance in stressing the position of the beloved disciple (lit., “on the breast” of Jesus; cf. 1:18; cf. 19:26f.; 20:2)” (*Jerome Biblical Commentary* by biblical and historical scholar Raymond Brown).

“The first thing said about him is not that Jesus loved him, but that he reclined ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, “close to the breast of Jesus.” This (to us) curious statement is explained by the situation of the company sharing in the meal. Instead of being seated about a table (*à la* Leonardo da Vinci!) the custom of reclining on cushions around a low table was being observed (this occurred only on special occasions, but it was mandatory for the Passover meal); the participants reclined on their left sides, supporting themselves with their left arm, leaving the right arm free; Jesus as the host would have been slightly forward of the rest; if the Beloved Disciple, who will have been on his right, leaned back to speak to Jesus he would literally have had his head at his breast. That he made such a movement at Peter’s behest is implied in v 25: ἀναπεσών (literally “falling up”) clearly means “leaning back.” The use of the phrase ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ Ἰησοῦ, however, almost certainly is intended to recall the similar phrase in the prologue, where it is stated, “The only Son ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς (‘who is in the bosom of the Father’) has expounded him.” The Evangelist introduces the Beloved Disciple as standing in an analogous relation to Jesus as Jesus to the Father with respect to

the revelation he was sent to make known; behind this gospel is the testimony of one who was “close to the heart” of Jesus.”³

To say John “laid on top of Jesus’ body” is sheer ignorance of the culture, the manner of eating a meal in ancient times and proves only one thing — that McCall is not concerned about truth, linguistics, culture or context but only in promoting his gay agenda.

[A note on English translations: To tone down the erotic nature, English translations tend to paraphrase John 13: 23: “the disciple, whom Jesus loved, was reclining next to him.” (New International Version); “The disciple Jesus loved was sitting next to Jesus at the table.” (New Living Translation); “One of his disciples, whom Jesus loved, was reclining at table close to Jesus,” (English Standard Version) and even the King James Version, “Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved.” But either these versions paraphrase the Greek with a totally new inoffensive non-erotic meaning or – like the King James Version - gives the impression this disciple was simply resting his head on the chest of a reclining Jesus.]

There is no “toning down” necessary for there was never an erotic element in the text. The eroticism is being read *into* the text by a gay man ridiculously wrenching the obvious reading out of it’s literary and cultural context to justify his own predilections. We have discussed at length above the situation of men reclining at table, heads on bosoms, etc. There is no need to rehash that here.

[Note on ἡγάπα (Agape Love): Though Christians claim that agape is used only as spiritual or divine love, this claim cannot be supported in the Bible or more in precisely the LXX (Septuagint). In the story of The Rape of Tamar by her brother Amnon in 2 Samuel 13, we are told in 13: 1 that “... καὶ ἡγάπησεν αὐτὴν ἀμνων υἱὸς δαυιδ.” “and Amnon the son of David loved (agaped) her”. Here agape as used for the love of lust which would finally lead to rape. Thus, likewise, Jesus’ love for this one special disciple could just as well be one of sexual lust.]

Nowhere do I, nor others I know or have read, say *agapeo* is used for exclusively spiritual or divine love, though that is it’s general import.⁴ For example, in the New Testament we read of Demas who abandoned St. Paul and the apostolic work because he loved (*agapeo*) the world: “For Demas, in love with this present world, has deserted

³ Beasley-Murray, G. R. (2002). *Vol. 36: Word Biblical Commentary : John*. Word Biblical Commentary (237–238). Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

⁴ *Agapan* (Ἀγαπᾶν) is used in its verb, noun, and adjective forms about three hundred and twenty times in the New Testament. It is a love called out of a person’s heart by “an awakened sense of value in an object which causes one to prize it.” It expresses a love of approbation and esteem. Its impulse comes from the idea of prizing. It is a love that recognizes the worthiness of the object loved. Thus, this love consists of the soul’s sense of the value and preciousness of its object, and its response to its recognized worth in admiring affection.” (*Wuest’s Word Studies in the Greek New Testament*).

me and gone to Thessalonica... (2 Timothy 4:10). Obviously this is not a godlike or spiritual love. Wrong again Mr. McCall.

The love of Amnon for Tamar could have started out as a non-erotic love and then later spiraled into a lustful love. However, the important thing here is that one must refer to *context* to understand a word in its full intended meaning. In translation context is king. The Greek word *agapeo* is used 143 times in the New Testament and *never* is it used in the sense of *eros* or romantic love.

Notice that McCall is forced to go back to a Greek translation of the Old Testament (originally written in Hebrew) to find even one obscure occurrence of *agapeo* used in a carnal way. But he will fail to find any inkling of such a meaning in John's gospel (used 37 times, the obvious context) or in the New Testament as a whole (143 times, the wider context) or the writings of the early Church (the obvious extended context). Such a stretching of linguistics is a drastic step indeed, but one that must be taken by a man with an agenda but not much interest for truth or context.

[Note on κόλπω (torso): The English translation of just where the beloved disciple was lying on Jesus' body is highly paraphrased from this disciple simply reclining next to Jesus to lying on Jesus' breast. However, the Oxford Classical Dictionary of Liddle, Scott, and Jones gives the first definition of κόλπος either as bosom or lap. The second definition places κόλπος in the genital area between the legs as in the vagina area in women. In the LXX, it can be used for a position of sex intercourse as with Abraham and Hagar: "...ἐγὼ δέδωκα τὴν παιδίσκη μου εἰς τὸν κόλπον σου..." (I have given my maid into your bosom) (Genesis 16: 5).]

Just for the record, Liddel is spelled wrong by McCall (not Liddle, but Liddel). And it is not the Oxford Classical Dictionary but *A Greek-English Lexicon*. This gives some indication of McCall's scholarship :-)

Again the words must be seen and understood in their context to understand their breadth of meaning. St. John uses the word *kolpos* twice, once in John 13:23 and again in John 1:18 which reads, "No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known." Surely no sexual innuendo is intended here. This Greek word is used six times in the New Testament and never in a sexual way. Lazarus is in the bosom of Abraham, grain in a lap, the closeness of a son and father as Jesus is in the bosom of the Father. The word can have a range of meaning. But never in the New Testament is it used in a sexual context but rather one of close friendship. We often refer in modern English to a "bosom friend." This simply means a close friend, so close we feel them our heart, our inner being.

To emphasize the homo-social background of this event, two of the Synoptics even have Jesus giving orders to Peter and John to seek out a gay man: "And He said to them, "When you have entered the city, a man will meet you carrying a pitcher of water; follow him into the house that he enters. "And you shall say to the owner of the house, 'The Teacher says to you, "Where is the guest room in which I may eat the Passover

with My disciples?” “And he will show you a large, furnished upper room; prepare it there.” (Luke 22: 10 -12 = Mark 14: 13 – 15) In first century Palestine, only women carried water from a well (Genesis 24; 11; John 4: 7) and any man doing a woman’s job would be consider effeminate; thus making it easy for his disciples (John likely being gay himself) to locate him.

McCall notices this incident of a man carrying water in Jerusalem. He also draws an astute conclusion. Men didn’t carry water in First Century Judea. But he is very incorrect in his attempt to explain why. First, Jesus did not tell his disciples to find a “gay man,” he simply directed them to find a man carrying a pitcher of water (Mark 14:13; Luke 22:10). McCall claims “any man doing a woman’s job would be consider effeminate; thus making it easy for his disciples (John likely being gay himself) to locate him.” This is a huge and ridiculous leap into nonsense for the following reasons. First, there were no “gay communities” or “acceptance of homosexuality” in the Jewish community in Jerusalem. For the Jews homosexuality was an utter abomination along with incest, bestiality and other sexual perversions (Lev 18:22).

Second, the Essenes were a group of very religious Jews during the time of Christ. They are most well known as the inhabitants of Qumran. Essenes were celibate and monastic, actually the forerunners of the monastic monks of Christianity. St. John the Baptist baptized in the wilderness less than three miles from Qumran. There were no women at Qumran, not because the men were gay but because they lived a strict celibate lifestyle seeking to be the children of light and holy like God was holy. They spent their nights solitary in the caves above the small town of Qumran.

One of the gates into Jerusalem was the Essenes Gate which let to a section of the city where an Essenes community dwelled. As one dictionary states, “Gate of the Essenes: A gate in Jerusalem (not mentioned in the Bible) that was south of the Hippicus Tower, near a place named Bethso, and at the point where “the most ancient wall” changed orientation (Jos. *War* 5.4.2 §§140–45). It was probably on the SW hill of the city [near the location of the Upper Room!]; there may have been an Essene quarter near it.”⁵

Anchor Bible Dictionary states, “Numerous investigators believe that the Essene Gate bears the name of an Essene settlement in the immediate vicinity.”⁶ This was located very near the Upper Room.

Since there were no women in the Essenes community, men had to carry their own water. Far from being sexually promiscuous, they were the exact opposite—celibate and avoided all sex and many common luxuries of the day. Jesus sent Peter and John to find an Essenes! Quite different from the anachronistic version of McCall.

⁵ Silva, M., & Tenney, M. C. (2009). *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible, Volume 2, D-G* (Revised, Full-Color Edition) (408). Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation.

⁶ The authoritative 5-volumn, *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. 1996 (D. N. Freedman, G. A. Herion, D. F. Graf, J. D. Pleins & A. B. Beck, Ed.). New York: Doubleday.

The fact that Luke adds phrase “τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας” (to the master of the house) gives the reader a second homo-social indication that this house is occupied by two men or gay lovers that Jesus likely had met on an earlier occasion in Jerusalem. Thus for the conservative Christian, the Passover Meal (Last Supper) was celebrated in a gay couple’s home where Jesus could be at sexual ease with his disciples and to express openly his affections for the special disciple he loved (ἠγάπα).

How in the world does McCall jump to the conclusion that the Greek word οἰκοδεσπότης means the house was owned by a gay man? This Greek word is made of two words *house* and *despot*, or *lord*. This word is variably translated as *landowner*, *master*, *head of the household*, or *owner*. An example of this Greek word’s usage elsewhere in the Gospels: “Matthew 20:1, “For the kingdom of heaven is like a landowner who went out early in the morning to hire laborers for his vineyard.” Any implication of homosexuality here? I don’t think so.

The assumptions made here are irrational, unfounded, contrary to reality and wishful thinking in the extreme.

Of all the four Gospels, the Fourth Gospel is the only one to use the phrase “ὃν ἠγάπα” or “whom he loved” four times: John 13: 23, 19: 26, 21: 7 and 21:20 with only 20: 2 (now redacted) for the tomb of the dead Jesus to read “ὃν ἐφίλει or the Aorist of the Greek root for fellowship or brotherly love:.

He can assume it was redacted all day long, but he has no proof whatever. All the most ancient manuscripts contain the word φιλία. All this proves is that the words may possibly be used sometimes as synonyms. This point is not important anyway.

Interestingly, the Gospel of John even goes as far to tell its Greek readers that Jesus’ own disciples were shocked to find Jesus alone talking to a woman: “...καὶ ἐθαύμασαν (astounded) ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει...” “...and they were astounded / shocked that He had been speaking with a woman...” (John 4: 27) The text tells us that when the disciples returned from buying food, they were shocked to find Jesus talking to a woman. (Notice, the disciples had no way of knowing if this woman was a Samaritan or not. They simply saw Jesus talking to a woman and were shocked!)

First, a few points. First, McCall says they didn’t know she was a Samaritan. Of course they knew it. They were passing through Samaria and stopped in the Samaritan village of Sychar. This was a Samaritan town in a Samaritan territory. Of course they knew the local woman at the well was a Samaritan. She sure wasn’t Chinese.

Second, even gay men talk with women, or is there some new unspoken rule that gay men only speak to gay men and strictly avoid speaking to women? Would I be astounded to find McCall sitting talking to a woman? There must have been another reason they were amazed Jesus was speaking to a woman.

The culture of the Jews in the First Century was quite different from today. Men and women did not intermingle like we do now. For example in the synagogue men and women were separated. They traveled separately. It is still that way in parts of the Middle East. The disciples were shocked because Jesus was freely speaking with a woman which just wasn't done in polite society. Jesus' conversation surprised the disciples because he overcame two Jewish prejudices in that culture—conversation with a Samaritan and conversation with a woman.

In *Manners and Customs of the Bible* we read, “The disciples’ astonishment was not only because of the non-intercourse of the Jews and Samaritans, but also because it was unusual for a Jewish teacher to converse with a woman in a public place. Women were not to be saluted or spoken to in the street, and they were not to be instructed in the law.”⁷ And for those who don't know it, “non-intercourse” is not referring to sex but to communication and association.

A few more authoritative quotes will suffice to prove that McCall's assumptions are unfounded and foolish; another attempt to support his agenda by twisting facts and Scripture. Only the ignorant will believe him and his tales. A few last quotes (of which I could add a hundred more):

There was a rabbinical precept: “Let no one talk with a woman in the street, no, not with his own wife” (Lightfoot, *Hor, Hebr.* iii. 287). The disciples held Jesus to be a rabbi and felt that he was acting in a way beneath his dignity.⁸

The disciples were shocked, not because Jesus was talking with *the* woman (kjv) —a Samaritan—but with *a* woman! That is characteristic of attitudes to women reflected in Jewish rabbinical writings. Billerbeck cites, among other extraordinary examples, *Abq* 2 (1d): “One should not talk with a woman on the street, not even with his own wife, and certainly not with somebody's else's wife, because of the gossip of men,” and *Qidd.* 70a: “It is forbidden to give a woman any greeting” (*Kommentar* 2:438).⁹

There was a definite cultural reason the disciples were shocked to see Jesus talking to a woman and it was not caused by the wild speculations of McCall.

Finally, the following two verses in Mark add nothing to the Passion Narrative and are oddly out of place: “A young man was following Him, wearing nothing but a linen sheet over his naked body; and they seized him. But he pulled free of the linen sheet and

⁷ Freeman, J. M., & Chadwick, H. J. (1998). *Manners & customs of the Bible* (Rev. ed.].) (514). North Brunswick, NJ: Bridge-Logos Publishers.

⁸ Robertson, A. (1997). *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (Jn 4:27). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems.

⁹ Beasley-Murray, G. R. (2002). *Vol. 36: Word Biblical Commentary : John*. Word Biblical Commentary (62). Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

escaped naked. (Mark 14: 51 – 52) However, if we consider the logical conclusion that of the twelve disciples Jesus took with him to the Garden and then the three disciples Jesus carried even further with him into the Garden (Peter, James and John), Jesus' final hours were likely spent in both prayer and in the arms his lover be it John or a unnamed youth wearing a loose fitting garment over his naked body covered with a "linen sheet" providing easy sexual access and comfort for a deeply troubled Jesus.

Undeniably this is a strange passage on first reading but let's look at it more closely—again in context. Jesus had twelve disciples but three of them were close confidants. They alone accompanied him on three recorded occasions: the Transfiguration, the healing of Jairus' daughter and the agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. On another occasion it is mentioned that he was questioned in private with a different group: Peter, Andrew, James and John (Mk 13:3).

Jesus had three special “students” to whom he gave extra attention. John was young and devout, full of love for God and obedience to the Law, seeking God from his youth (even following the Essene John the Baptist). He held a special place of affection with Jesus. Peter also had a special relationship with Jesus, even given the keys of the kingdom of God. I think Jesus loved Peter for his strength and commitment even though he failed more often than not. Like the rich young ruler who was loved by Jesus because of his desire to please God, so Peter stood out from the crowd for his devotion and desire to serve God. James was eager for God and the truth would be the first to die a martyr's death.



Jesus took these three disciples to the Mount of Transfiguration (Mount Tabor). At the Transfiguration Jesus conversed with Moses who was the one that said homosexuality was an abomination. Jesus came, in his own words to fulfill the Law, not to negate it as the homosexuals wish he had done.

In Matthew 5:17–19 Jesus said, “Do not think that I came to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I did not come to abolish, but to fulfill. For truly I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not the smallest letter or stroke shall pass away from the Law, until all is accomplished. Whoever then annuls one of the least of these commandments, and so teaches others, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever keeps and teaches *them*, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” Ouch!

Remember what the Law said about bestiality, homosexuality, adultery, incest and more. They are all lumped with other deviant behavior under the category of abomination. Read my blog about [Jesus and Homosexuality](#) for more on that matter.

It was not unusual for a Rabbi to have special students, any more than it is surprising that teachers today have favorite students. Peter, James and John held that place with Jesus. Peter would be chosen as head of the Church, given the keys and be the rock foundation of the Church. There was much to teach him. James would live the shortest, being martyred first in Acts 12. John would live the longest, taking care of Jesus' mother and spreading the good news of God's Kingdom until the end of the century. No wonder these three held a special place in the heart of Jesus.



Now to the Garden and the man with the sheet. A few comments on this interesting story. What should be noticed is that this story has logical explanations far removed from the gay's explanation. Never in 2,000 years has anyone stooped so low as to suggest a gay liaison. Jesus was under duress with blood oozing from his pores. Angels from heaven came to comfort and assist him. Not the ideal time for a homosexual tryst. What a stupid and ridiculous suggestion, actually a lewd and vulgar suggestion. Here are a few excellent quotes from reputable and scholarly works. I searched over 50 commentaries and historical references and none even *suggested* something as unseemly as McCall claims as though it is well established. It is only wishful thinking of a gay man trying to justify his urges.

The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide, Volume 3: S. Matthew's Gospel—Chaps. 22 to 28 and S. Mark's Gospel—Complete

“Cajetan (*in Jentaculis*) and others conjecture that this *young man* was a member or servant of a house adjacent to the garden, who, being awoken by the noise made by those who were apprehending Christ as they passed by, rose up from his bed, and ran to see what was being done. That he was a favourer or disciple of Christ appears from what Mark says, *he followed Him*.”¹⁰ A youth who sees the abuse of Jesus, the severing of an ear by Peter's sword and the wild commotion would send any youth running in a panic after coming to see what was happening.

¹⁰ Cornelius à Lapide. (1891). *The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide, Volume 3: S. Matthew's Gospel—Chaps. 22 to 28 and S. Mark's Gospel—Complete* (T. W. Mossman, Trans.) (Third Edition) (438). London: John Hodges.

Word Biblical Commentary : Mark 8:27-16:20

“Tradition has held that this curious story, which both Matthew and Luke understandably chose to omit, may be autobiographical [by St. Mark]. Cranfield speculates further by suggesting that this figure, hearing of Judas’s treachery, had dressed hurriedly and had dashed outside to warn Jesus of the approach of the party sent to arrest him.”¹¹

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark

“εανίσκος τις συνηκολούθει— a certain young man accompanied him. This is a singular episode in the tragedy of our Lord’s betrayal, and it is still more singular that it should have found its way into the account, forming, as it does, a picturesque incident, but not an essential of the event. The linen cloth was a sheet which he had thrown around him, when he got out of his bed, probably aroused by the stir which the crowd made when it passed by his house. Evidently he was a disciple, but his hasty dress shows that he was not one of the twelve. The failure to mention his name does not show that it was unknown to Mk.; see v. 47. Rather, this, together with the mention of an event otherwise so trivial, might easily point to Mk. himself as the person.”¹²

John Lightfoot, a biblical scholar with few equals spent two pages or more on this incident in Mark’s gospel in his *Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica, Volume 2, Matthew-Mark*. He explains the situation, the wording and clothing within the context of Judaism. Nothing suggests anything unseemly and all is explained reasonably without resort to gay hysteria or prolepsis (error in time or chronological placement). It is recommended reading though too long to include here.

One of the comments in McCall’s combox is reproduced below. It presents another couple of alleged “biblical proofs” of gayness in the gospels. I will respond to these questions as well:

It should also be mentioned that the possibility of a pederastic relationship between Jesus and his disciples is also supported by the gospels mention of only Jesus and Peter having to pay taxes (meaning the remaining disciples were underage)



¹¹ Evans, C. A. (2002). *Vol. 34B: Word Biblical Commentary : Mark 8:27-16:20*. Word Biblical Commentary (428). Dallas: Word, Incorporated.

¹² Gould, E. P. (1922). *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (276). New York: C. Scribner's sons.

and that Jesus made no reference to the relationship between the centurion and his 'pais" I am sure that if Jesus found it to be "sinful"--he would have mentioned it. Being that pederasty was "normal" in the Hellenized world that Jesus lived in, the unknown writers of the gospel thought nothing of it.

Centurions had servants and slaves not homosexual lovers. There is no hint of this—much less proof. The assumptions presented in these arguments are quite ridiculous. The Greek word “*pais*” is used twenty-four times in the New Testament. The author claims without qualification that this “servant” is a homosexual partner. However, the word “*pais*” has a wide range of meaning, none of which even assumes or suggests a gay boy lover. In some passages it refers to the infants under two years old targeted by King Herod for death (Matt 2:16), of Jesus as the servant and beloved of the Father (Matt 12:18), of David the servant of God (Luke 1:69), slaves to be beaten for disobedience (Luke 12:45) and even a father’s son (John 4:51) to mention a few. In no way can one conclude or assume that the centurion’s servant was a boy sexual partner. The assumption is ludicrous.

And that Peter and Jesus were the only ones liable for the tax and the others were all underage thus adolescent lovers is equally ludicrous. Matthew the tax collector for Rome was under age? Judas Iscariot the accountant and conniving thief was a young teenager? Really!

Jesus lived in the Greco-Roman world, but he moved and functioned in the very isolated insulated Jewish world. He was not Greek or Roman. He was Jewish. As Galatians 4:4 says, “But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law.” Jesus was thoroughly Jewish and obeyed the Law of Moses perfectly. He never did nor intended to eliminate the moral requirements of that Law nor condone those who did. He spent his time with Jews, in the Temple and in the synagogues. His contact with gentiles was limited and he loved those who were god-fearing. See my earlier points about Jesus’ Jewishness.

If Jesus and his disciples were practicing homosexuals, why do we not see it espoused in their writings and preaching? Why was this new and approved lifestyle not part of the apostolic preaching — especially if it was so accepted in the Greco-Roman world as you suppose? Oh, out of fear you say? They were cowards and unwilling to come out of the proverbial closet? Yet we find them quite willing to die as martyrs for the truth of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Had they been gay they would have preached it from the hilltops. Rather, they condemned it in no uncertain terms.

“Unknown writers of the gospels?” One needs only read the literature and the writings of those who knew because of their proximity to the writings. Matthew the disciple wrote Matthew; Mark the amanuensis of Peter wrote Mark; Luke wrote Luke and St. John the Apostle wrote John. Deny it if you wish, but I will side with those who knew from the age when they were written. For more, read Eusebius’s church history written in 325 AD after gathering the testimonies and writings from the centuries preceding him.

All told the so-called biblical arguments used by McCall and other homosexual proponents to justify the perversion of homosexuality are ridiculous at best, deceitful at worse. They do not care about Scripture, but they know Christians *do* care about Scripture. So what do they do? They come up with novel interpretations, “discover” new meanings that have never been understood before. They wrench the words and content of the Bible out of context, twist it out of its obvious, normal meaning, and insert into the Bible their own anachronistic lifestyle (anachronism is an act of attributing a custom, event, or object to a period to which it does not belong). They attempt to undermine Scripture to justify their perversions. Soon we will have people doing the same to justify bestiality, pedophilia, incest, polygamy and any host of other aberrations their hormones can imagine and demand. It is already done to promote abortion, contraception, infanticide and euthanasia.

It is time for Catholics to arise along with other Christians and reasonable people to speak the truth without fear of retaliation. The gays preach tolerance, but there is no group of people who are less tolerant. They identify themselves by their sexual orientation. It is *who they are*. If you oppose the gay lifestyle you will be called a bigot and a hateful person. It amazes me that I am called a bigot for opposing homosexual acts, but they are the real bigots who hate me for speaking my mind and exercising my freedom of speech.

As further arguments are presented I will address them fairly, biblically and without twisting Scripture out of context or showing an irrational bias.