



Biblical Sex

By Calebb Cross

Old Testament Passages
Applicable to Christians, Hebrews, and Atheists

Introduction

Our secular society and the Church are wrestling, no fighting, over the place of sex in our lives. There has been a firestorm over the past few years because some religious teachers “have had the audacity” to teach that certain heretofore forbidden sex acts were, in fact, plainly declared in Scripture (Song of Solomon). **Biblical Sex** is not the work to delineate examples of such. Those examples are understood by all. The purpose of this book is far broader in that the goal is to investigate what the Whole Scripture **says** about sex, not so much the manner and acts of it, but in what context may sex biblically occur. In accomplishing that goal, we must have the courage to let the outcome be dictated by the accurate, contextual, historical, rational, and natural interpretation of Scripture. For the next short while, set aside all preconceptions and open your mind to the evidence (and silence) of Scripture so that you may declare the whole counsel of God. Please do not make the mistake of equating “thus saith the Lord” (the Bible) with “there must be something wrong with what I’m reading because none of my pastors/priests/rabbis has ever even hinted at such nonsense,” (tradition).

I am well aware of Genesis 3:1 where the serpent asked, “Did God really say...?” Also, Jeremiah 29:32 and its implications of such in this topic. “He will have no one left among this people, nor will he see the good things I will do for my people, declares the LORD, because he has preached rebellion against me.” The responsibility is great. I ask that those who have equated tradition with “Thus saith the Lord” in context, to apply the very same standard to themselves. By the end of the book we may not agree and I may be incorrect, but I dare to

say that each reader will at least adjust the level of condemnation & judgment of their friends, relatives, and members of their religious assemblies, who have lived differently than we have all been taught, concerning sexual practice.

Foundationally, I believe the following and endeavor to be true to these beliefs. If you are either Jewish or atheist, I do not expect you to adhere to this, but I do ask that you hold me consistently to them. They are the standard that I have set for myself in this endeavor.

1. God is eternal and exists in 3 Persons; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.
2. God created all matter, energy, and life. Many readers will hold to God's creation of Adam and Eve on the 6th day. There is no argument here.
3. Mankind all sinned through the first sin of Adam and therefore, all need a Savior.
4. Jesus, the Christ (Messiah), born of the Virgin Mary, is that Savior, by means of his Deity, perfect life, and substitutionary death on the cross as payment to a Holy God for the sins of all mankind for all ages.
5. Eternal, Holy God, being omnipotent and omniscient, has the capacity to communicate to His creation and to be understood. He did so in the Bible, God's Word. He meant His Word to be understood. He said what He meant and He meant what he said. If He is silent, I must be very careful in declaring, "Thus saith the Lord" on that issue.
6. "For by grace are you saved, through faith, and that (faith) is not of yourselves, it (too) is a gift of God; not of works, lest any

person should boast." Eph 2:8-9. Mankind is "saved" from hell to heaven only through the Person and Work of the Son of God, Jesus Christ. No work of our own can procure salvation and no work of our own can lose our salvation, once given by grace through faith.

It is interesting that those who have historically screamed the loudest over "sexual sin", have in many cases been guilty of "other sins" that were not recognized to be "as sinful" as a particular sexual sin. This work will not make that mistake. As there is absolutely sexual sin (adultery, rape, domestic sexual abuse, etc.), there is also gluttony (obesity), sloth, hatred, murder, anger, spouse abuse, child abuse, selfishness, greed, envy, jealousy, neglect, control/slavery, gossip, drunkenness, etc., etc., etc. If you are guilty of any of these types of sins on an ongoing basis, then please have the decency to withhold eternal condemnation of those whose actions in the sexual area you deem to be sin. We may agree or disagree, but we must be consistent. There is no room for, "I know that I am _____, but that is not nearly as bad a sin as the _____ (lust, fornication, nudity, lasciviousness, adultery, etc.) of **that** person."

Another important preface point is that our outlook at this moment on this topic of **Biblical Sex** is indeed tinted by the glasses of our own life experiences. If we have been abused, our glasses are tinted by that abuse. If we have been an abuser, our glasses are tinted with that. If we have been sexually sinful in any respect, our glasses are tinted with that experience. If we have been sexually sinned against in any respect, our glasses are tinted with that circumstance. Furthermore, if we have had someone else preach to us, "Thus saith the Lord" and

that person was wrong, we are tinted (and tainted) by those false informational inputs. It is difficult, but we must remove ourselves, as best as we can, from that tinting. We must be honest enough to allow all evidence to be presented and we must refrain from, "That can't be true because...", until we get to the end of the study.

You have already seen the view of this author with reference to the weight of the Bible and its authority. As you read the following and as you are offended, made curious, or become convinced, that this line of theology holds merit, you will need to wrestle with these three, and only 3, possible options: 1. Either the Bible is the inspired, inerrant, Word of God that means exactly what we've been taught that it means by our instructors, or 2. It is the inspired, inerrant, Word of God that means something different (on this particular topic) than that which we have been taught, or 3. It is a book written by men, that there is no God, and this is all of no consequence. Some of you may hold to the third option. Through years of struggle, questions, lack of rational answers, and much beseeching God, I've concluded that option 2 is the best of the 3 choices. If after reading this work, you are convinced that option 1 is the only choice for you, please contribute to the discussion on the website and help those of us who hold to the other 2 positions to see that which you see.

Here we go.

(Please see the Credits on the last page)

Chapter One - In the Beginning...

Have you ever considered that when God created Adam and Eve, since according to Genesis they didn't know right from wrong, they could perform **any** sexual act with each other, or by themselves, and it was not sin? As Adam and Eve had all the body parts that we possess today, they could do anything with those parts that society does today... and it was not sinful... if they did so use them. As unsavory as this concept is, even if Adam had tried to be sexual with an animal (and since he was so close to perfection, he probably did not... however, he did do the ONE thing that he was **told not** to do... eat the fruit), it would not have been sin. I can hear some readers now, "If this guy is starting off with something as wicked as sex with animals, I can see where this is going and I'm not **about** to subject myself to such. I'm sorry, but there is nothing I can do if someone refuses to investigate. However, if honest investigation is valid, let us begin with an appropriate question. With whom did Cain (Gen 4:17), Enoch, Lamech (Gen 4:19-24), Seth (Gen 4:26), etc. have sex in order to procreate? Does it sit well with you that they obviously "married" their sisters, aunts, cousins, nieces, great nieces, great aunts, etc.? I presume that may be a shock to some. It was with me until two thoughts hit me: 1. What was the alternative? 2. Why is it a wrong to have sex with family, today? The answer to the first question is easy; there was no alternative. Even if the evolutionists are correct (and I hold that they are not), then the first real "humanoids" had to have sex with **their** close relatives since no other group had "evolved" to the point of reproductive compatibility. It is the same problem with Cain and Abel. The answer to the second thought is as reasonable; since God created Adam and Eve in perfection, and since there had

been only a few years from the original sin, entropy (the natural decay of the creation) had not yet had the time necessary to cause genetic discrepancy sufficient to cause birth defects, as is the case today. For them, there was no other option. Today, incest is foundationally wrong because of the potential of genetic birth defects, due to the impact of disease and decay on the genetic make-up of sinful man. Beyond that, any sexual action forced, coerced, or enticed, on a child (related or not), is heinous offense. That said, from Adam and Eve (or the first "human couple") until the population was large enough to have distant cousins "marrying", what was the alternative? There was none.

This reality leads us to the question of what did "marriage" consist? Was it limited to only one husband and one wife? If so, how long did it take to change that limit? Please read Genesis 4 carefully and see if there is condemnation for anyone having multiple "wives". In Genesis 5, there were many "...and he had other sons and daughters..." Did those sons and daughters just spring up out of nothing? Or did the men listed indeed have sex with their relative women? Of course they did. I submit to you that men had multiple wives, who had multiple children, who had multiple wives, who had multiple children... Do you think that **any** of the women had multiple husbands? What does Scripture **say**? Oh... it is **silent**. Therefore, can I say that they did not have multiple husbands in the very early years of humans? No. I must say that it is possible, but that I have no way of knowing. I do know that having multiple husbands/wives was not condemned by Scripture at this point, well over 6000 years ago.

Chapter Two – Pre-Israel

It is universally understood that Abraham (Abram) was the father of the Jewish Nation. Around 2000 BC, Abram was married to barren Sarah (Sarai), who gave her handmaid, Hagar, to her husband Abram as a substitute “wife” to bear a son for them (Gen 16). The only “condemnation” that Abram and Sarai received because of their sexual arrangement had to do with lack of faith in God’s Promise and their thoughts that they must “help” God with the Promise of a son. There was no condemnation from God because of the act of sex between Abram and Hagar. As a matter of fact, God blessed Hagar and made her offspring numberless, also. Now, the questions arise, “Did Abram have sex with Hagar only one time? Did Sarai leave them alone or was she present or even a part of the sex between Abram and Hagar? Did Hagar “move in” the same tent with Abram and Sarai? Did they hide the arrangement from the rest of the clan?” Where is this event **ever** called adultery? Did the Old Testament call Abram/Sarai/Hagar an adulterous relationship? Did Jesus call it adultery? Did Paul? Did the writer of Hebrews (if not Paul)? What would we call this today? Most people respond with, “But this was 4000 years ago. The culture was different then.” Granted, but was it also different than a few thousand years before this time, when Adam’s offspring was having sex with relatives, producing sons and daughters, and many were taking more than one wife without condemnation? Abraham had concubines (plural) according to Genesis 25:6 who produced sons (and one would think daughters, as well). Scripture tells us when Sarai gave Hagar to Abram. It tells us when Sarah died that Abraham “took/had taken” another wife, Keturah. Now, if one argues that he waited until Sarah had died to take Keturah, then he either already

had concubines or he only began taking them when he had married Keturah. Either way, Abraham was systematically sexually active with many women and he was **still** considered by both man and God to be the great patriarch, Abraham. Abraham's sexual activity was never made to be an issue by Scripture. Therefore, for God, Abraham's sexual activity was not an issue in any inspired writing.

Lot, who was Abraham's nephew and the one who was saved from Sodom and Gomorrah, got drunk, was systematically seduced by his two daughters, and he impregnated each of them with a son.

Gen.19:31, The daughters said, "...Our father is old, and there is no man around here to lie with us, **as is the custom all over the earth**. Notice that the term "married" was not used. ³² Lets get our father to drink wine and then lie with him and preserve our family line through our father." God did not kill either of them as it is written that He did kill Onan (to be reviewed later). This is another indication that the sex act was not the greater sin... or even a sin at all in the unusual circumstance.

Abraham's sons, Isaac and Ishmael, each had more than one wife. There was no condemnation of them for taking more than one wife, but there was condemnation for them taking non-clan wives; that is, wives who did not believe in the One True God. In Genesis 28:8-9 and Genesis 29 & 30, both Esau and Jacob had multiple wives and maidservants who were "given" to them by their wives. Wasn't this adultery? Focus on this: these wives, with whom the husbands were sexually active, **gave** other women to them. This must mean "adultery". If so, where is the condemnation? In other places, Scripture does not mince words of condemnation. Why not here?

Does this mean that since there was no deceit, no cheating, and no lying, that there was no adultery? How can this be? Today, don't many people believe that having sex with more than one person (with that one person being the 1st spouse), is adultery? But is it possible from what we have seen that God's definition of adultery may have been different than is our current understanding? Could it have been that adultery was having sex with more than one person without the knowledge and approval of the spouse(s)? Is it possible that one idea (sex with consent) is the Scriptural position and the other idea (no sex beside the 1st spouse) is the cultural position? When did adultery become **any** sex, with **any** person, at **any** time, for **any** reason, other than your first spouse? It was certainly not that during Adam's time (<4000 BC) or Abraham's time (2000 BC). Maybe it was during Jacob's life when the Nation of Israel (the people were known as **Israelites/Hebrews/Jews**) was being formed from his family, through his 12 sons by multiple wives. Let us see.

Chapter Three – Formation of Israel

According to Genesis 35:21-26, Jacob (Israel) had two wives, two maidservants given to him by his wives, and at least one concubine. There was no condemnation for this arrangement. In Genesis 36, we find that Esau had at least 3 wives and maybe concubines. The only statement of condemnation was that the wives were “unbelievers”. There is no word of more than one wife being a sin. The 12 sons of Jacob had problems in their own right. Joseph was a braggart whose big mouth caused his brothers to sell him into Egyptian slavery. Joseph’s brother, Judah, married a Canaanite woman, had three sons, Er, Onan, and Shelah, and got a wife for Er named Tamar. Er died by God’s hand and Judah told Onan to have sex with his sister-in-law “as was the custom” in order to “raise up” children for his dead brother, Er. Per Gen 38, Onan did have sex with Tamar, but withdrew, and “spilled his semen on the ground to keep from producing offspring for his brother.” God killed Onan for that “transgression”. Please pay very close attention... Genesis 38:8 says, “Then Judah said to Onan, ‘Lie **with your brother's wife** and fulfill **your duty to her as a brother-in-law** to produce offspring for your brother.’” Where does this account say, “And Onan married Tamar so that their sex would not be fornication?” It says, “...as her brother-in-law...” Does that verse now give you heartburn because it “violates” other Scripture... or because you’ve never seen it written and **not** had someone tell you “what it really means”? The account says that God killed Onan because he did **not** have reproductive sex with Tamar, not because he had some sexual contact with her.

This account of Onan has caused many religious people to infer that the "spilling of semen" outside of the woman to be the "sin". Their reasoning is that since the time of Onan, ejaculation outside the woman was tantamount to masturbation, thus making masturbation to be sin as well. The fact is that masturbation is nowhere even mentioned in scripture. I will defer to Dr. James Dobson's most excellent rebuttal to that strained position. To paraphrase and summarize Dr. Dobson, "How can a nearly universal teen-to-adulthood (at least) male activity (and close to that as a female activity) which is never even mentioned in the Scriptures, possibly be a sin against God?" If you're reading this, are you willing to stand before your congregation and declare, "I have never masturbated" or "I have not masturbated once I was grown" or "I have not masturbated since I married"? Here is a better offer; if you can really declare such, simply send an email to author@BiblicalSex.info. I will tally the results and post them in anonymity for all to discover that, "there is none that has not masturbated more than we let on in public, no not one." Are you now finally being honest with yourself? Do you now see that "our customs" in our religious congregations are not equivalent to Scripture, nor are they anywhere nearly as honest as is Scripture? Since you, yes you, are being 100% honest with yourself and Almighty God, continue in that vein while you complete this book. It will not kill you. It will not send you to hell. For those of you who continue to lie to yourselves and to God... that is your choice. "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord"... and be honest.

Did God "forget" to mention masturbation? Was he "ashamed" to bring it up, seeing that he addressed almost every other possible sexual act? But when we masturbate, we lust... don't we? That's what

we've been **told**. We are pointed to passages that use the word "lust", but we're never shown what the definition is claimed to be in Scripture. Is our definition of "lust" accurate? If it is not accurate, then even the thoughts that may be occurring during the act of masturbation could not be sinful. A careful look at the text reveals that the sin was in **not** having reproductive sex with Onan's sister-in-law. Do you see that? The sin was that he refused to have reproductive sex with his sister-in-law in order "to raise up children" for his dead brother. Onan's brother, Er, was wicked, so God killed him. Er's brother, Onan, didn't want to have children who were not "legally" his own, so he withdrew from the act of sex with Tamar. Notice that he did not masturbate. He **failed** to have **sex** and God killed him. Whatever this account was, it was not a condemnation of a man having sex with his brother's wife. Am I saying that it is ok today to have sex with your brother's wife? Absolutely not. I am saying this... the thought that the Bible teaches that, short of murder, sexual acts with someone other than your one and only spouse are the most heinous sins that mankind can commit, is absolutely false. There had been so much sex performed from Genesis 2 through Genesis 38 that it is difficult to keep account. Here is the obvious, massive question: **WHERE IS THE CONDEMNATION BY GOD OF ANY OF IT?**

It gets better... or worse, as the case may be. After Onan's death, Judah told Tamar to go live in her own father's house until his third son, Shelah, was grown so that she could have children by Shelah. Now this opens a pretty large can of worms. Just how old will Tamar be when Shelah is considered to be grown? Further, how old will Shelah be when he is considered old enough to father children? Will there be a 15 year old male having sex with a 30 - 40 year old female,

and it be “right”, if Judah’s plan works? It didn’t work, by the way, but you see the problem. Do we have God saying by way of Scripture or culture, “Ok, little boy, when you become sexually mature, we already have your sex partner picked out for you so that you may have children?” Why is that clear fact swept under the rug? It is because we have always avoided the uncomfortable Scriptural sexual issues.

Judah failed to give Tamar to Shelah, so Tamar took matters into her own hands. She tricked Judah into thinking that she was a prostitute, had sex with him and got pregnant, and then she disappeared. Three months later, it was discovered that Tamar, “Judah’s daughter-in-law”, was pregnant while still being promised to Shelah, and Judah was incensed. “Let’s burn her to death!” was his declaration. However, this was one sharp woman. She had proof **who** her baby’s father was! When Judah was caught, he did precisely what “we” should be willing to do and what “our congregations” should allow “us” to do when we fail in the area of sex. Judah declared, “She is more righteous than I, since I wouldn’t give her to my son, Shelah. And he did not sleep with her again.” Stop. Think. What did Judah **not** say? He did not say, “I am sorry that I had sex with a woman to whom I was not married.” He did not say, “I am sorry that I had sex with a supposed prostitute.” He **said**, because “... I wouldn’t give her to my son...” His confession was not for sex of any kind. His confession was for breaking his word to Shelah! Judah knowingly had sex with a supposed “prostitute”. When a member of his “family” was accused of **being** a prostitute, Judah wanted to kill her. But when he saw that her action and his action were one and the same, **he confessed his real sin** and made things right by Tamar. She had her offspring and she had her life. Ask yourself, “Why was the sex act **not condemned** by Scripture?”

So, here we have sexual acts by one woman with 3 different men. Please identify the sinful acts, if any. Was it sex with her “wicked” husband? Was it sex with her brother-in-law? Was it sex with her father-in-law? Or was any one of these acts by Tamar considered by God to be sin? Remember, God killed two of her sexual partners, but He did not kill Judah or her. In this entire account, there was only one instance of sex in which deceit was a part; that between Judah and Tamar. However, notice that it was “double deceit”. Tamar’s sex life prior thereto, and probably thereafter, was not of deceit and was not even hinted at being sinful. That concept of deceit shows itself to be a central part of sin, once again.

Around 1800 BC, Genesis 39 takes us to Joseph’s encounter with Potiphar’s wife. Verse 9 tells us that Joseph had an iron grasp on right and wrong. He said, “No one is greater in this house than I am. **My master has withheld nothing from me except you, because you are his wife.** How then could I do such a wicked thing and **sin against God?**” Joseph knew what was expected of him by his master. We like to focus on the “...except you, because you are his wife,” part. How large was Potiphar’s household? Doesn’t Joseph imply that others worked in the house? Do you think that there were more residents there than just Potiphar, his wife, and Joseph? “No one is greater in this house than I am,” connotes that others were present... many others. Joseph absolutely and successfully refrained from sex **with Potiphar’s wife.** However, the Bible is silent regarding other females in the house who were available to Joseph. I can hear your thoughts. “**No way!** Joseph was a righteous man! He would **never** have sex with anyone other than **his own wife!!!**” Based upon the emphasis

we've all been trained under, that is a natural response. But if we look at what the Bible **says** and not at what we **think** it **should** say, is that reasonable? Indeed, the only account we have of Joseph being sexually active was with his **Egyptian** wife. Let us fast forward to Genesis 41:45. Joseph has come out of the prison in which the lying wife of Potiphar caused him to be placed. He has interpreted Pharaoh's dreams and has been placed over all of Egypt, second only to Pharaoh, himself. V45: "Pharaoh gave Joseph the name Zaphenath-Paneah and gave him Asenath daughter of Potiphara, priest of On, ^[e] to be his wife." He **now** had a wife, **but she was not an Israelite**. Recall that marrying one of a different faith, or of no faith, is the problem that Solomon had, later. Joseph did it, had sex with her, had children with her, and I'll just bet that she became a believer. No condemnation by God can be found. Of all the Old Testament heroes, Joseph stands alone with no record of him having sexual relations with anyone other than his very first wife, Asenath. Do you think that a "dozens-to-one" monogamous hero ratio is a "normal" percentage? Do you really think that Malachi 3:6, "For I am the LORD, **I change not**," really means, "I know I said 1 husband for 1 wife and I haven't enforced that for a couple thousand years, but sit tight. **I will reinstate it later...**"?

Chapter Four – The Law

By about 1400 BC, a man named Moses came on the scene. Who were Moses' parents? Exodus 6:20 says, "Amram married his father's sister Jochebed, who bore him Aaron and Moses." Right before the giving of The Law, the man to whom The Law was given was born to a woman married to her brother's son. That is, aunt and nephew were married. Do you think they had sex? Do you think it was just twice (once for each child)? I know... those were different times...

Numbers 36:10-12 says that Moses ordered (by God) the women to marry within their own tribe. The women named married their cousins. The purpose was so that inheritance would stay within families. Judges 1:11-12 tells us that Othniel married his first cousin, Acsah.

Exodus 22:16 establishes that having premarital sex is not, in and of itself, a violation of The Law. "If a man seduces a virgin who is not pledged to be married and sleeps with her, he must pay the bride-price, and she shall be his wife. ¹⁷ If her father absolutely refuses to give her to him, he must still pay the bride-price for virgins." Notice that nothing happens to the man or the woman if the father refuses to allow the marriage, other than the bride price must be paid.

Verse ¹⁹ "Anyone who has sexual relations with an animal must be put to death."

Leviticus Chapter 18 lays out the regulations **for the Israelites** with regard to sex. No sex with close relatives of yours: mother, step-mother, sister or half-sister, granddaughter, aunt, daughter-in-law,

sister-in-law. No sex with a woman (doesn't say "wife") and also with her daughter or granddaughter. Do not take your wife's sister while your wife is living. No sex while a woman is on her period. No sex with your neighbor's wife. No male to male sex. No male or female sex with animals. Note when you read Chapter 18 that God omits directions to women that are equal to those directed to men. There is the lack of son, brother, uncle, grandfather, etc. The second most obvious omission is the lack of a directive forbidding women to have sex with other women. Did God "forget" that? The most obvious "omission" in Leviticus 18 is the absence of any directive to marry anyone. The prohibitions are for sex and are not directives toward marriage. Do you think that the married guy, Moses, or that the Creator of the universe as well as the act of sex, "forgot" that minor point? This is an entire and very specific chapter that has every opportunity to identify all female prohibitions and only states sex with animals. It also delineates the limitation on the vast majority of sexual couplings possible within families and never once mentions marriage. I can hear some people now, "Well, you're just looking for ways you can have all the demonic sex you want." No, actually I'm looking for ways to justify with the words of Scripture all the humanly manufactured rules set upon God's most complex created beings; rules that have caused untold anguish and guilt on millions of people for hundreds of years. If you're reading this and you have **not repeatedly** said to yourself and to God, "I sinned, and I'm sorry, Lord. I'll do better. I'm sorry, Lord. I'll do better. I'm sorry, Lord. I'll do better. I'm sorry, Lord. I'll change...but in **years**, I've been unable to change in the face of the most powerful Design of an Almighty God," then please email me at author@BiblicalSex.info. Again, I'll give you the tally of emails vs. book purchases so the e-mailers can have

the opportunity to see the ratio of book buyers to those who have never had this problem. For those of us who are finally saying, "I get it," then you don't need to email, but you are more than welcome to do so. I thought I was the only "sinner", too. You are not the only person who has struggled with this "problem".

The implications of Leviticus 19:20 are interesting. (You recall that some sex outside of marriage carried the death penalty.) ²⁰ If a man sleeps with a woman **who is a slave girl promised** to another man but who has not been ransomed or given her freedom, there must be due punishment. Yet **they are not to be put to death, because she had not been freed.** ²¹ The man, however, must bring a ram to the entrance to the Tent of Meeting for **a guilt offering** to the LORD. ²² With the ram of the guilt offering the priest is to make atonement for him before the LORD for the sin **he** has committed, and **his** sin will be forgiven." Notice that because of the difference in the penalties (death vs. offering), the offense was not sex prior to marriage. Then, what was the offense? **Could it have been deceit?** That is, taking value that wasn't rightly yours (she was **promised**); or giving value that was not unilaterally yours to give? Keep those thoughts in mind as we look at the various sins throughout Scripture. There is also a question of station in life in this instance. The sex act was not equal with different women. If this had been an Israelite woman, the consequences would have been much different. In this instance of a slave woman, there is not death in the equation. The act of sex is the same. There is male and female. The participants are not married. Since the woman has not yet been "bought", there is no violation of another relationship. Hence, is it sex in itself with which the God of the universe is concerned? Or is the act of sex the secondary issue

with **violation of relationships already established** that of primary concern to Him? How did he treat idolaters (worshippers of other gods)? He used **sexual deceit** as an example of **those who sinned against Him as to other gods**, but that very sin could be done completely removed from anything sexual. Granted, historically, idolatry many times consisted of sex acts, but idolatry could be committed without sex and sex could be performed without idolatry.

Leviticus 20 shows a stark difference in the act of sex and its consequences in differing circumstances. Vs 15 & 16 demand death to both the human and the animal engaging in sex. However, a brother and sister are not put to death in vs. 17. Vs. 18 makes having sex during a woman's period a sin, but not to death. Incest with an aunt is not a death offense. It's a good thing, or Moses would not have existed to write the laws, would he? In all cases, penetration exists. But death is required in only one of these cases. If the sex act is the focus by God, then He is inconsistent. If He is not inconsistent, then the sin is something other than the act of sex.

Deuteronomy 21:15-17 establishes by Law that more than one wife was right and proper and good, at that time. This is clear. It is written for all to read. It is interesting that if the situation has been reversed at a later time, an equally clear reversal cannot be quoted. The passage says, "¹⁵ If a man has two wives, and he loves one but not the other, and both bear him sons but the firstborn is the son of the wife he does not love, ¹⁶ when he wills his property to his sons, he must not give the rights of the firstborn to the son of the wife he loves in preference to his actual firstborn, the son of the wife he does not love. ¹⁷ He must acknowledge the son of his unloved wife as the

firstborn by giving him a double share of all he has. That son is the first sign of his father's strength. The right of the firstborn belongs to him." Notice the clarity of fairness of the rules set forth. There is no ambiguity. There is no waffling by the Author. It is clear that the wives are to be treated fairly. Where is this approved situation clearly rescinded?

When God gave Moses the Law, there were specific restrictions placed on sexual relations. There was an absence of instruction as to sexual technique being limited (manual, vaginal, oral, anal, etc.), making a discussion regarding what is a "proper" position/act is moot, even in the times of the Law. (News flash: stop worrying if a particular sex act with your spouse is sinful. If both of you want the act, then it is not sinful. If one of you does not want it, the sin would be in forcing the issue. Caution: that doesn't allow the "non-wanting" spouse to decline because **he/she** thinks the act itself, is sinful.) The limitations were placed on "with whom and when" sex was proper. Also notice that there is no mention of a limit on the number of spouses allowed. Now please, if God was concerned with the nuances for which He gave inspired revelation limiting sex, do you really think that He "forgot" to mention how many wives a man should have? You notice I only said "wives". In 1500 BC, in the culture at hand, there is no record of women having multiple husbands, period. Such could have been practiced elsewhere. We do not know. In 40 AD, women were scripturally prohibited from even speaking in a Christian church (I Cor. 14:34). In 2010, churches would collapse if women didn't help to run them. With regard to women speaking in church, Scripture has been adapted to the times, in known violation of direct commandment of the New Testament writers. Is that sin? Is it less so than multiple

spouses? Who says? Here is the point for our current discussion: If during the times of the Law, God did not limit the number of wives, and nowhere in Scripture do we find the number being limited for the average person, how do we cause the violation of that which is a **cultural standard** to be called "sin"? While God was limiting sexual activity for the Israelites, why did he not give a syllable to manual, vaginal, oral, anal, or self, sex? Did He forget?

It is interesting to note that nowhere in Scripture is the word "adultery" defined succinctly. Leviticus 20: 10 says, "If a man commits adultery with another man's wife..." death is the penalty for both parties involved. By inference, we can determine that since adultery may be committed with another's wife, adultery may also be committed by a married person with a sex-partner who is not married to anyone. Most Christians today define "adultery" as a married person performing any sex act with a person who is not his/her spouse. That, without dispute, is certainly the U.S. cultural norm. But, is it the Biblical definition? We think that you are seeing what the definition of Biblical adultery is, but we will withhold our written conclusion at this time.

Chapter 5 – Historical Books & Poetic Books

In a King James Version search at www.biblegateway.com, the only reference to “fornication” in the historical books is located in II Chronicles 21: 10-21, with “whoring” being also used. There is no reference to “sex” or “adultery” in the KJV search in all of the historical books, Joshua through Esther. With reference to the II Chronicles usage, it is clear that the author is citing spiritual unfaithfulness as opposed to physical acts, due to the context of the passage, especially using the phrase “Moreover he made high places in the mountains,” a clear reference to ancient idol worship, in verse 11.

One of the most intriguing accounts dealing with lust, adultery, marriage, and multiple sexual partners, is found in II Samuel 11 where David, the king, sees, desires, and beds, Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, one of David’s warriors. The story is well known as David, from his rooftop, saw Bathsheba bathing in a garden nearby. Bathsheba was beautiful and David wanted her, so he sent for her and took her. This act was certainly hidden from everyone of importance... or so David thought. Bathsheba got pregnant; David summoned Uriah from battle so that Uriah could spend the night with his wife, Bathsheba, thereby removing suspicion from both Bathsheba and David. It didn’t work. Uriah was a man of honor and would not enjoy his own wife while his men were in the throes of battle; No way... not happening. The result was that David murdered Uriah in order to hide his **lust** and **adultery**. Keep in mind that at this time David already had at least 7 wives and who knows how many concubines (formal girlfriends). Now begin the exceedingly interesting observations.

Scripture clearly calls that first encounter with Bathsheba “adultery”. What about the other wives and girlfriends? Where in the Bible are they called adulterous or sinful? Nowhere. Was David stricken from ever serving God after these sins of adultery and murder? No. Then why do many churches today forbid divorced men and all women from holding some offices in church? Yes, we’ll speak directly to the pastor/deacon discussion in the New Testament in a later book. Did God banish David from His service? He did not. Did God allow the human ancestors of Jesus Christ to be removed from David? He did not. As a matter of fact, David married Bathsheba (his 8th wife) and from this (**formerly** adulterous) union came Solomon, a direct ancestor of Joseph, the earthly father (position) of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew. Note that the lineage in Luke 3 arguably follows the ancestry of Mary, Jesus’ mother.

We will address the confrontation of David by the prophet Nathan in the conclusion of this work. For now, let it suffice that unless one determines to believe something completely different from what Scripture actually says, then one will see conclusively that what we have been taught and what God **said** are two entirely different concepts.

In review: lust, adultery, murder, 8th marriage, offspring, Messiah. This certainly begs the question, “In God’s eye is sexual sin really 2nd only to murder in heinousness?” That’s how you and I have been raised to view it. Oh, I know, “we’ve been raised to understand that sin is sin” from God’s viewpoint. Then pray tell why we treat our fellow congregation members with such severity when dealing with sexual sin vs. all other sins? If you say, “We don’t,” then you know you’re not

answering honestly. We do. When was the last time a church took action against repeated, consistent, gluttony? How many preachers would that one remove from the pulpit, if enforced?

Let us move to the Poetic Books of the Old Testament. Much of Psalms and Proverbs talks of that which has been called sexual sin. David wrote of his own failings in Psalms. A word search in KJV for “adultery” reveals one reference in Proverbs 6, while the same search in NIV reveals Ps 51:1 with David and Bathsheba, but only as a foreword. At www.bible.org, using the New English Translation (NET), a search for “sex” reveals 19 occurrences in all of scripture, with one being in Pr 6:29. We will focus on the better known instances and will not be exhaustive in our treatment of all possible references.

Proverbs 5 and 6 speak directly to an act called “adultery” and with much wise counsel included in those chapters. The only time the word “adultery” is used is in Pr 6:32, but there is no definition given. The reference is usually to a “strange woman” and a “whorish woman”. To confuse matters more, the human writer was none other than King Solomon, a man who had 700 wives and 300 concubines (I Kings 11:3).

One might say that because of his “experience”, Solomon knew that one wife was enough; or that he wrote Song of Solomon before he began his polygamous ways. Both of those ideas stretch credible thought. Song of Solomon is an erotically explicit love story about “the love of his life”. Was she his first wife, was she his 700th, or was she a concubine? It doesn’t matter if there were 999 other sexual partners. In the best case, imagine Solomon’s mind as he was penning inspired,

inerrant Scripture about both adultery (in Proverbs) and his own love of his “beloved” (In Song of Solomon). If sex with anyone other than one’s first spouse is “adultery”, he committed adultery thousands upon thousands of times during his lifetime. How did he feel when he was “inspired” to write the direct opposite of that which he did... if indeed the definition of “adultery” was then, or is now, “any sex with anyone other than one’s first spouse, for any reason”? He had to feel like the worst hypocrite in history. If he did not feel like the worst hypocrite in history, was the definition of “adultery” something else, entirely? Note must be made that the Song of Solomon may very well have been written by Solomon (or someone else) about two unmarried lovers who were on their way to marriage. If such is the case, why was the sex not called fornication? (Incorrect, circular reasoning would say, “Since the sex is not called fornication, they were obviously married.) Evidence for the account being by Solomon about two other unmarried people is the normal reading of Song of Solomon 8:11-12 where the woman compares the value of her “vineyard” with the value of Solomon’s real vineyard in Baal-Hamon. Do you think she was comparing her pleasure-producing “vineyard” with the grape-producing vineyard of her own lover/husband? Or is it possible that she was speaking to her lover and discussing the absent King’s so-called “valuables” that were in reality, simply “things” when compared to her true treasure? If Solomon was present, that statement could have been an affront to him. I suppose it could have been worded in such a way as to be enlightening to a present Solomon/husband, but how much more exciting if it was simply alluding to Solomon for the benefit of her lover who **was** present? In addition, the early part of the book reads as if the two lovers are stealing away from the King’s palace and hiding in the woods as the NET reads in 1:16-17. “The lush

foliage is our canopied bed; the cedars are the beams of our bedroom chamber; the pines are the rafters of our bedroom." This occurred outside! The verses preceding and following 16 and 17 connote explicit sexual activity. READ IT! Since they were probably not yet married, our congregations would call that fornication. Why did God not do so?

A definitive passage that prioritizes God's requirements is detailed in I Kings 11:1-13. Verses 1 & 2 state clearly, "King Solomon, however, loved many foreign women besides Pharaoh's daughter—Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Sidonians and Hittites.² They were from nations about which the LORD had told the Israelites, "You must not intermarry with them, **because they will surely turn your hearts after their gods.**" Nevertheless, **Solomon held fast to them in love.**" Notice that the command of God told why Solomon was not to marry these particular women: "... because they will surely turn your hearts after their gods." Did God "forget" to say, "...oh, and also, because I meant to clarify in Genesis (but I forgot to do that as well) a king should have only one wife and that sex with all the other wives is surely adultery"? Is that what the Bible says is the reason that God was angry with Solomon? It does not say that. It says that He was angry with Solomon because he married women who would turn his heart away from God, and they did do that. The sex had less than nothing to do with God's displeasure. Reading the remainder of the chapter, it is abundantly clear that Solomon sinned because he turned away from God and turned to foreign gods. It is not because of the number of women he loved, fondled, or penetrated! If that were the case, don't you think the God of creation would and could clearly say

so? Do you see this theme throughout the Old Testament examples given so far?

Chapter 6 – The Prophets

As we move to the Prophets, we must address that “spiritual adultery” is the act that brought God’s greatest condemnation and that physical adultery was simply a picture of that spiritual adultery. God’s view of Israel in the Old Testament used the illustration of physical adultery as a picture of Israel turning away from God. His view of the Church in the New Testament used the illustration of the husband/wife relationship as the picture of the relationship between Jesus and His bride, the Church. Is there any disagreement with this paragraph so far? I hope there is not as this is the orthodox position.

When we look at what the Prophets wrote, a search for certain words and phrases shows immediately that the sexual sins discussed are almost entirely used as examples of the “greater sin”, that of idolatry; leaving the worship of God and moving to the worship of idols made by human hands. How interesting to note that when words such as “whore”, “whoring”, “adultery”, and “fornication”, are used, they speak almost unanimously of the Israelites’ spiritual removal from God. Very seldom is a physical sexual act in view. In almost all instances, the whoring, adultery, and fornication are used as a euphemism for spiritual deceit... cheating... duplicity... fraud. I am in no case minimizing that whoring, adultery, and fornication, in a physical, sexual sense are sins. I am saying that the definitions of those words are exceedingly important in the physical, and therefore, the spiritual contexts.

Take a careful look at Isaiah 57: 3-13. In the King James Version, the word “whore” appears in verse 3. It is obvious by reading the

remaining verses through verse 13 that the writer is speaking of those who have produced spiritually illegitimate offspring by committing “adultery” with the religions (or no religion) of the people of the area.

Please go to www.biblegateway.com and search for each word in the King James Version, limiting the search to Isaiah through Malachi, the Prophetic Books. Once the results are displayed, it would be better to convert to either the New International Version or to the New Living Translation for both readability and accuracy. If you wish to consult the most conservative modern translation complete with the most scholarly notes available, then www.bible.org would be the site for you. Once there, click on the NET Bible tab. NET stands for New English Translation. Remember, the original search for these words must be done in the King James Version as it is the version upon which most preaching about sex is founded and therefore contains the words listed. Here are the results:

Whore (whoredom)– Isaiah 57:3, Jeremiah 3:2, 3:3, 3:9, 13:27, Ezekiel 16:17, 20, 22, 25, 26, 28, 33, 36; 20:30, 23:3, 7, 8, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 27, 29, 35; 43:9; Hosea 1:2, 2:2, 4:10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18; 5:3, 4; 6:10; Nahum 3:4.

Whoring – Ezekiel 6:9; 23:30; Hosea 4:12; 9:1.

Adultery – Jeremiah 3:8, 9; 5:7; 7:9; 23:14; 29:23; Ezekiel 16:32; 23:37; Hosea 4:2, 13, 14.

Fornication – Isaiah 23:17; Ezekiel 16:15, 26, 29.

Do you see a pattern here? THE SIN was turning away from God and TO other gods. The primary sin was not sexual. Could sexual activity be sin? Of course it could. Let us investigate.

Could this particular nation's citizens travel to other lands? Yes. Could this nation's citizens trade with other peoples? Yes, they could. Were they allowed to help people of other tribes if they "had a flat tire"? Certainly, they could. Then, what was the limitation? The limitation was giving to "other gods" that which belonged to, and was reserved for, Jehovah God. In other words, deceit, cheating, duplicity, fraud, was the sin for which God was condemning these people. In human relationships, the most insidious, hurtful, malicious, sin is most easily identified by the majority of people as "sexual deceit". However, even non-sexual "affairs" are more damaging to relationships than any affront other than a physically sexual "affair". Allow me to illustrate. Imagine that two people fall in love, marry, and make their plans for a long and happy life. What is the "right" thing to do if one of the two finds himself or herself in a situation so that sexual copulation cannot be performed for physical or health reasons? Is a loving spouse "right" in saying to his/her able spouse, "That's too bad, Honey. You signed on this marriage for the long haul and I no longer can have sex, so you no longer may have sex! Those legalists out there may say, "Praise God, that spouse will bring so much glory to God by being a loving servant to that unable spouse for all those years!" That may be. But, I submit to you that the real grace could come when the unable spouse says to the able spouse, "Honey, I love you more than life itself. There is no way that I'm going to sit here for the next 30 years and force you to be celibate when you have the need, the desire, and the ability, for sexual fulfillment. Here's what I propose; let's find

a loving, able substitute who we both agree can fulfill that which I cannot fulfill. I will love you and remain committed to you for as long as I live. I would like to be present and help as much as I can during sex, but I understand that you may need time with him/her so that you may be completely free to express your physical response that God Himself has built into you." You may say, "Well, that is obviously sin." Ok, where in Scripture is that situation identified as sin? We have already covered most of the Old Testament and we have seen what Sarai did for Abram with Hagar and we have seen what happened with Tamar, Onan, and Judah. Is this not similar to those two instances? Is being selfless committing adultery? Is anyone being defrauded? Is any deceit involved? Certainly, sexual intercourse will be had along with other sexual acts, but is anyone being deceived or betrayed? Look at the reverse. Abraham asked Sarah (being his half-sister as well as being his wife) to have sex with others. Please read Genesis 20 with careful attention to verse 5 where both Abraham and Sarah were in agreement, and to verse 12 where Abraham declares Sarah to be his half-sister.

Can any circumstance ever allow for a spouse to have sex with others? Is this author the only person to have thought of this concept (short of Satan himself according to some)? What would you think if you knew that the Reformer, Martin Luther, preached that very concept about 500 years ago? Look for Part I, paragraph 10 (you will have to count them, as they are not numbered) when you copy/paste this link:
www.warwick.ac.uk/fac/arts/History/teaching/protref/women/WR0913.htm

So far, what have we already observed? Multiple spouses, sex with servants was different than sex with free Israelites, sex with some relatives carried a far worse penalty than did sex with other relatives, adultery with a woman after your 7th wife can become non-adultery if you make her your 8th wife, and there were exceptions even to these "rules". Therefore, in the Old Testament, what constituted adultery, fornication, whoring? Is there evidence that the insertion of "Tab A" into "Slot B" was **not** sin **unless** it was synonymous with cheating, deceit, fraud? As to what the New Testament says, that book is forthcoming. In the meantime, please do your own research in context and try to determine where this work is correct and where/why it is incorrect.

Conclusion

I know that over many centuries “holy men” have declared that any sexual activity different than what they determined to be right, is “sin”. I do know that our attitudes (yours and mine) about sex are embedded into our consciences and that our consciences can very well be offended, even if we are convinced that evil is good and good is evil. Do you doubt that? There are people in this world who are sure that what they do is right, righteous, and good, even if it involves killing hundreds and thousands by flying airplanes into buildings, as was done on 9/11. My conscience may be wrong. My conclusions may be wrong. However, such has not been proven by the use of the passages cited in this most candid (albeit possibly in your opinion a flawed) study.

The definitive passage (mentioned in the 5th chapter) is II Samuel 12. When the prophet Nathan confronted King David about his adultery with Bathsheba and his murder of Uriah, clear language was used that will either cause a reader to declare, “I just can’t **believe** that,” or it will cause one to say, “God has not made desire and sex the most heinous sins next to murder! Many other Scriptural topics trump sex.” Notice in the passage that it is clear that the original sex with Bathsheba was adultery and therefore, sin, and that the killing of Uriah was indeed premeditated murder. None of us will differ on that point. Here is where the problem arises; Nathan quotes Almighty God as not only allowing, condoning, and conferring, the throne to David, but he quotes God as having both planned and supplied the **wives** (plural) of Saul **to** David. Check your blood pressure. Be calm. It is not the end of the world. Now, with this being written, there are 3, and only three,

possibilities for this passage: 1. This passage is not inspired by God.
2. It is inspired, but it **means** something **different** than what it **says**.
3. It is inspired by God and it means exactly what it says. Unless the reader is an atheist, then the obvious answer is number 3. Therefore, we must all acknowledge that what God **did** is not the same as what we have been **taught** that He **says**. (Hold tight for this next **long** sentence.) The implication is that we must now revisit all the passages that have been incorrectly used to foster a spirit of “sex given by God has always and only been intended to be experienced inside a monogamous marriage with no burning desire (understood until now as lust) and there should be no thought of sexual activity anywhere at anytime prior to and outside of that marriage of a husband and wife.” We are now obligated to see if the original intention of those passages was rather to use certain sex instruction as examples of teaching a greater lesson than “just sex”.

If the attitudes about “thus saith the Lord” concerning sex for all these years are wrong, the question is begged, “Why have we allowed them to remain wrong?” My studied opinion is this:

- The laity has failed to study for themselves and to hold the “professionals” accountable. We have incorrectly allowed the ministers/priests/rabbis to enforce upon us that which God Himself did not say. Are you courageous to ask politely, “If this passage says thus and so, why do we not believe it?”
- Jealousy. We are not only innately jealous, but we have been conditioned by our parents and their parents and their parents to think, “Mine, mine, mine,” just like small children playing with toys. We have been taught that we “own” our

spouse/girlfriend/boyfriend and that “an act so intimate with anyone other than us is taking away from us. Is the best sex when you give or when you take? Is the best sex when you thank your partner for the wonderful experience or when your partner thanks you for honoring them with your caring attentions?

- We lie to ourselves, our congregations, our family, and our friends. I submit that the vast majority of the readers here have masturbated this year without your partner’s knowledge. If you are an exception to that statement, please email me and tell me. Once again, I will maintain your confidence that you have not masturbated, but will also tally the numbers vs. the number of book purchases. If no one emails, what does that tell you?

We have desires that God built into us to do what is universally considered to be “oh so naughty” and we don’t tell our spouse that we have those desires. They don’t tell us either. We desire to see naughty, to be naughty, and to share naughty. The drive is so strong that it returns time and time again. Women swoon over the muscles in the ad, at the beach, on TV, in the movies. If you say that you don’t, what you mean is that you don’t **tell** or that you try not to admit it to yourself. Do you really think that anyone believes that you can execute more control than the Creator who made you, so that you may effectively override that which was Designed into you? Men are Designed to look at, stare at, desire to touch, taste, and feel, beautiful women. Look at that which you have just read! It has been done for thousands of years! If you are religious, the God who made you is the One Who designed this system. Is this sin? Or is this Design? We

have been taught that we must control ourselves within the confines of that which “godly men” have stated is “God’s will”. The big problem is that we can’t seem to find in the Old Testament where **God** ever actually **required** that which we **say** He required.

The core of the Old Testament Law is found in Exodus 20... The Ten Commandments. Let us carefully consider them as we may have never considered them before. Jewish people still hold them to be effective today. Uninformed Christians do so as well. Christians should not do so, but many of us do. This will be addressed in detail in the following book, **Biblical Sex – NT**. As we review the 10 commandments, we find that the first four are specifically about God and the honor of Him. If reviewed carefully, we discover that all 4 require us to give Him the proper honor and reverence. Failure to do so is sin. Notice that they all require honesty, forthrightness, loyalty, and truth. No deceit is permissible when it comes to our view and treatment of God. We often fail to note the specifics of verses 5 and 6. Please do so now. Do you want to claim ownership of that today as part of your judgment?

The last 6 Commandments relate to how mankind treats mankind. Commandments 7 and 10 are of specific focus for us in this study. Note that vs. 14 states, “You shall not commit adultery,” but no definition is given. I know, “it means sex with anyone other than your one and only wife!” Did Moses commit adultery? Did Saul? Did David before Bathsheba? Did Solomon? Are you willing to go to that extreme? Look at verse 17; “**You**

shall not covet your neighbor's house. You shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his manservant or maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbor." Does that verse ring true with the other verses of the 10 Commandments? Does verse 17 ring true with verse 14, if and only if, verse 14 means that for which God judged David with a vengeance; that David **desired so much** that he was willing to **take (lust)** another person (Bathsheba) and to **take life (murder)** from another person (Uriah)? Or, against all 9 other Commandments, does verse 14 mean "any sex, for any reason, at any time, with anyone other than your very first spouse"? After the careful and honest review in context of all these passages, do you really think that the God of the universe, Who built the sexual system to be completely fool-proof, really meant that adultery is as shallow as that? Doesn't it make much more reasonable (like the way physics works) that He is more concerned with the lying, deceit, damage, cheating, betrayal, and family harm, that **real adultery** forces on His creation?

Once we agree that an omnipotent God created the existence of mankind to continue until He decrees otherwise, that the uncontrollably intense desire to have sex is normal and good? Then, what is lust? Look at David. Could it be the **desire for sex** with "**that**" person being **so great** that you are **willing to do anything** in order to have sex with "**that**" person when in reality you have **no right** to do so? For you Christian readers, which definition fits Jesus' admonition, "... to lust after her, you have committed adultery already with her in your heart," better; the traditional one or the one you now understand?

I submit to you, men are **supposed** to have sexual desire and arousal over beautiful women. Men were **built that way** by an omnipotent Creator. It is not lust. It is desire. Lust is sin. Desire is Design.

What about fornication and homosexuality? Ah, but we must leave something for the next book, don't we.

We teach our children to live the same way as we were taught... and all this **after** we have felt in our hearts and souls, "Sexual desire is so difficult to control and manage that I have been unable to 'die to self daily' and to change my desires." We force this very same structure and guilt on our children because "it is obviously right as so many people for so long have said it's right," and not because we have been able to find in Scripture where God says, "Sex is the most important part of anything you will ever do within human relationships and I command you to never have sex before you're married and then you should never have sex under any circumstances with anyone other than your spouse after you're married and then if you divorce you are never to remarry or ever have sex again." How simple was that to write? Was it too hard for God and all 40 of His human authors? Do you think He forgot? Do you think that sentiment is stated anywhere in the Old Testament? I know. You say, "Wait until we get into the New Testament! It's got to be in there!" We shall see.

- We are lazy with ourselves. We have been taught, "Men, any kind of erotic photos are sin because they cause lust in our bed

which is sin... or lust about another, which is sin. As importantly, because those models are so perfect, they cause our wives to feel inferior..." Some observations: Even if we were raised not to keep ourselves in shape with a view to "the greatest physical pleasure in life takes place while naked with another person," once we are grown, that responsibility lies squarely in our own hands. We use as an **excuse** that our spouse looking at other people causes us to feel less desirable, when the real reason is that we have not kept our own temple as we know that we should have. The only exception to not keeping our temple for our God and for our spouse is being physically or mentally handicapped. Period. Anything outside of that exception is simply an excuse that tries to transfer responsibility from where it belongs (ourselves), to another person, thereby "making me feel better" but not solving any problem. Many times one's sexual sin is hidden. One's gluttony is not. If you are guilty of one, have the decency not to judge another for his or hers. Secondly, whether a couple watches another couple have sex in person or on a TV, they are two consenting (hopefully married) adults who wish to enjoy sexual pleasures that many people don't allow themselves to enjoy. Do you think that is wrong? Let us compare. Consider all of the various sexual techniques and all your friends. Do you really believe that none of your friends would think (if they knew what you do) that all of your sexual activities are "ok"? Or do you think that you would agree with all of your friends' sexual activities and you would not say, "Yuck" to any of them? There are some really unusual sexual activities out there. You will not agree with all of them and your friends will not agree with all of yours. Therefore, this one

activity of watching other people perform sex acts, if both partners wish to view them, is universally wrong? There have been other situations that appeared at first glance to be “wrong” across the board, but which were not wrong once the full situation was known. I refer you to Abram, Sarai, and Hagar, as well as to Onan, Tamar, and Judah.

Having said all that, parents, accept your responsibility not only to get yourselves in the position to be naked at a moment's notice and not be embarrassed, but teach your teenagers that they will have far more pleasure when they are married if they are not ashamed of their “temples”! Is that harsh? Maybe. But reality says that God designed both women and men to enjoy looking **at** the body we love as well as looking **at** that body **while** we're making love to it. Do you think that God thought, “I really don't want to have to do this, but I must make a way to ensure the reproduction of each species. Therefore, begrudgingly, I'll create desire and need and sex, but it is always to be done in the dark and behind closed doors. Also, you're stuck with the one person you marry regardless of whether that person balloons or not, becomes a drunkard or not, a druggie or not, or abusive or not?” Or do you think it makes more sense for the Creator of the universe to say about creation, “You like what you've seen so far? Well, watch this! I'm about to create the most amazing process that can never be reversed by anyone stupid enough to think they can take control of what I make (whether by willpower or fiat) and in addition to that, I will make it the most pleasurable event in the life of every creature I

make!" Now, which statement sounds more like an omnipotent God?

Dear Reader, it is my hope that you have at least determined to study for yourself that which you (unless you are atheist) declare to guide your daily life. This concept may very well have fried your brain. My intent was for each reader to begin to realize that Almighty God is far bigger than any organized religious group can possibly begin to define. If you dogmatically disagree and oppose that which you've read, that is fine. If you have thought, "Hallelujah! I just knew that there was an answer for the way that I am. I've tried and tried and tried to 'get right with God' and all along I was right with God. It was the 'leadership' of my congregation who didn't understand."

If you are/were an atheist, you may not yet buy that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, but I think that you now see that not all religious people are blind leading the blind. If you would like to know more about how this author understands that which may cause you concern... those parts of Scripture that are not sex-related, please email me at author@BiblicalSex.info. Again, your confidentiality is assured.

To all who are incensed that anyone would dare question the "revered leaders" of faith and their understanding of Scripture, please know that your contact is welcome, as well. Simply know that any declaration of my fallacies, without evidence placed in context to guide otherwise, is opinion. Please email and/or post on the site, www.BiblicalSex.info, so that we may improve on this beginning work of scholarship. All email will be considered strictly confidential unless clear permission is given

to disclose authorship. Consideration of the New Testament passages was intentionally omitted from Biblical Sex. There is more work to be done.

Prepare yourselves... **Biblical Sex – New Testament** is coming.

Credits:

Unless otherwise noted, all Bible references and quotations were taken from the versions available at www.biblegateway.com and www.bible.org, including the King James Version, the New International Version, and the New English Translation (NET).

Please tell your friends about **Biblical Sex**. Whether they will like it or hate it, they certainly need to know about it. Please don't send them a copy of yours without paying for their copy. That is theft. If you have received a copy of this book by email, please be honorable and go to www.BiblicalSex.info and purchase a copy. Failure to do so means that you have been complicit in the theft of the book which is every bit as sinful as any sexual sin... and we're confident that you don't want to be guilty of that.