

X-Rated Pornography in the Bible:

By : Osama Abdallah

Contents

1. X-Rated Pornography in the Bible.
2. Women's breasts are important sexual objects, especially for licking and sucking!
3. Fantasizing about a girl he calls his "sister". Her vagina tastes like wine for him. And they had sex all night long. After he satisfied her really good, **she wished if he were her brother** (her biological brother nursed from her "mother's breast" as she said) so she doesn't have to take him home in secret.

- His sister's vagina tastes like "wine".
4. "Bride" is a Semitic language metaphor; it is not literal.

- The sex and lust were illegal!
5. **The entire Bible is corrupted anyway according to its Theologians!**
6. Christians practicing pornography and sodomy. Apparently they think it's ok to do it!
7. Some email-interactions with my readers.
8. King David, the Begotten Son of GOD and X-Rated Pornography.
9. **About the validity of the books of 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, and Esther.**
10. Question to Jews and Christians about King David.
11. **Does the Bible allow for women to be Lesbians?**
12. So what about those Christians who prohibit Homosexuality for men just because the Old Testament prohibits it?
13. What the Bible Says About Homosexuality? An article about homosexuality in both OT and NT in the Bible from www.godlovesfags.com
14. Homosexuality and the Bible, An Interpretation. Another article from www.godlovesfags.com
15. Conclusion.
16. Further sites to research.

1- X-Rated Pornography in the Bible:

Some Jews and Christians claim that the **praised** graphical pornography in the Bible is actually a conversation between a husband and his wife. They know well that claiming otherwise would bring **total shame** to the gospel of porn, because of the (literally) x-rated and low-life graphical pornography. There is ample evidence that prove their claim to be bogus and desperate. Let us look at this example from the many below:

Song of Songs 8:1-3 "If only you were to me like a brother, who was nursed at my mother's breasts! Then, if I found you outside, I would kiss you, and no one would despise me. I would lead you and bring you to my mother's house-- she who has taught me. I would give you spiced wine to drink [i.e., her vagina's semen!], the nectar of my pomegranates. His left arm is under my head and his right arm embraces me."

She wished if he was her brother so that she wouldn't have to take him home in secret. Now if he was truly her husband, then what would prompt her to wish that he was her brother? Were husbands back then not allowed to live with their wives? If so, how did they then consummate and have children and raise generations and societies? Were they allowed to live with each others for a while?

The obvious answer, that only the ashamed people from the Jews and Christians would deny, is that the **"lover"** was NOT her husband, and she was not his wife. Furthermore, according to "Sex in the Bible" documentary film, the two were **"a maiden (virgin) and her lover"** and not husband and wife.

"maiden" means virgin; an unmarried woman; a single girl, etc...

From <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=maiden%20>:

maid·en

n.

1.
 - a. An unmarried girl or woman.
 - b. A virgin.
2. A machine resembling the guillotine, used in Scotland in the 16th and 17th centuries to behead criminals.
3. *Sports.*
 - a. A racehorse that has never won a race.
 - b. A maiden over.

Also, **in the 4th section below**, I've proven with ample verses from the gospel of porn that **"bride"** was referring to either fiancée or girlfriend or boyfriend and not husband or wife. The terms girlfriend and boyfriend didn't exist back then. Also, the term bride was used metaphorically along with **"sister"** consecutively. The verses below

say "my sister, my bride." We can't take "bride" literal and not "sister" when they came right after each others! Also, not only the verses that I provided below prove this point, but also the itself from the "Sex in the Bible" documentary film that hosted many renowned Bible-theologians clearly and indisputably proves my point, because it says "**between a maiden and her lover**" and not "**between a wife and her husband.**"

Anyway, read section #4 below for more details and proofs.

2- Women's breasts are important sexual objects, especially for licking and sucking!

Her sexy breasts are quite "satisfying":

Let us look at [Song of Solomon 8:10](#) "**Dear brothers, I'm a walled-in virgin still, but my breasts are full— And when my lover sees me, he knows he'll soon be satisfied."**

She is a virgin with full **swelling breasts**. When her lover meets her, he will be satisfied from those swelling breasts! Obviously, she is referring to **licking, sucking and other pornographic things that I can't mention here**. Believe me this verse is not talking about them worshipping GOD Almighty together when they meet!! It is clearly and indisputably referring to graphic sex that involves her swelling breasts and other things such as intercourse.

Let us look at [Song of Songs 4:5](#) "**Your two breasts are like two fawns, like twin fawns of a gazelle that browse among the lilies.**"

Let us look at [Song of Songs 1:13](#) "**My lover is to me a sachet of myrrh resting between my breasts.**"

Praising the bed that they had sex on: Let us look at [Song of Songs 1:16](#) "**How handsome you are, my lover! Oh, how charming! And our bed is verdant**"

Let us look at [Song of Songs 1:2-4](#) "**Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth-- for your love is more delightful than wine. Pleasing is the fragrance of your perfumes; your name is like perfume poured out. No wonder the maidens love you! Take me away with you--let us hurry! Let the king bring me into his chambers. We rejoice and delight in you; we will praise your love (i.e., semen) more than wine.** How right

they are to adore you!" I don't think this would be appropriate for a kid under 18 to read. Also, I don't think it is appropriate to have such open sexuality in a divine book anyway.

His right arm sexually feeling her body: Let us look at [Song of Songs 2:6](#) "His left arm is under my head, and his right arm embraces me."

Let us look at [Song of Songs 3:4](#) "Scarcely had I passed them when I found the one my heart loves. I held him and would not let him go till I had brought him to my mother's house, to the room of the one who conceived me." So in other words, she was not married to him, and when she found him, she took him back to her bed room to have illegal sex with him? If she were married to him, she wouldn't take him to her "mother's house". She would take him to their house.

Let us look at [Song of Songs 3:10](#) "Its posts he made of silver, its base of gold. Its seat was upholstered with purple, its interior lovingly inlaid by the daughters of Jerusalem." Why does the Bible teach young men to spend all of their time and effort to try to impress all of the girls in their town so they can possibly end in bed with them?

3- Fantasizing about a girl he calls his "sister". Her vagina tastes like wine for him. And they had sex all night long. After he satisfied her really good, she wished if he were her brother (her biological brother nursed by her "mother's breast" as she said) so she doesn't have to take him home secretly:

Note: Even though she may not be his biological sister, but calling her a "sister" in a pornographic and sick situation as shown in details below is not proper, and may suggest that the sick pervert would fantasize about his biological sister if he had one.

Let us look at [Song of Songs 4:9](#) "You have stolen my heart, my sister, my bride; you have stolen my heart with one glance of your eyes, with one jewel of your necklace." Fantasizing about his sister? at least he shows in this verse that he would!.

Let us look at [Song of Songs 4:10](#) "How delightful is your love, my sister, my bride! How much more pleasing is your love than wine, and the fragrance of your perfume

than any spice!" Making love to his own sister? "pleasing is your love (making???) than wine"?

Let us look at [Song of Songs 4:12](#) "You are a garden locked up, **my sister**, my bride; you are a spring enclosed, a sealed fountain."

Showing off her breasts and vagina to him:

Sleeping with his sister: Let us look at [Song of Songs 5:4](#) "I slept but my heart was awake. Listen! My lover is knocking: 'Open to me, **my sister**, my darling, my dove, my flawless one. My head is drenched with dew, my hair with the dampness of the night.' **I have taken off my robe (i.e., she showed his breasts and vagina to him. Underwears and bras didn't exist back then!) must I put it on again?** I have washed my feet, must I soil them again? My lover thrust his hand through the latch-opening; my heart began to pound for him." What a disgusting way for someone to talk so pervertly about his sister and/or about her brother like that!!

Let us look at [Song of Songs 5:8](#) "O daughters of Jerusalem, I charge you-- if you find my lover, what will you tell him? Tell him I am faint with love." Teaching women to be sexually too open.

His sister's vagina tastes like "wine":

"How beautiful your sandaled feet, O prince's daughter! **Your graceful legs are like jewels, the work of a craftsman's hands. Your navel is a rounded goblet that never lacks blended wine.** Your waist is a mound of wheat encircled by lilies. Your breasts are like two fawns, twins of a gazelle. Your neck is like an ivory tower. Your eyes are the pools of Heshbon by the gate of Bath Rabbi.

.....

I said 'I will climb the palm tree; I will take hold of its fruit.' **May your breasts be like the clusters of the vine,** the fragrance of your breath like apples, and your mouth like the best wine. ([The NIV Bible, Song of Songs 7:1-4, 8-9](#))"

According to the documentary film "**Sex in the Bible**" on A&E TV Station, the Hebrew translation to "**Your navel**" is referring to the woman's **VAGINA**. This was sent to me by my dear brother in Islam [Mike](#) who embraced Islam just recently; may Allah Almighty always be pleased with him.

Listen to the documentary film

HERE for proofs!

http://www.answering-christianity.com/x_rated.htm

The Good Book of Love: Sex in the Bible documentary film. ([available here](#))

[Listen to the narration \(audio file\)](#). (91 seconds)

Interpretation Voice of:

Carole Fontaine

Professor of Biblical Studies

Andover-Newton Theological School

[My rebuttal to Shamoun's and Katz' "Osama's Dirty Lies" absurd and self-refuting article.](#)

Having sex all night long with that sister: Let us look at Song of Songs 7:11 "Come, my lover, let us go to the countryside, let us spend the night in the villages." And make love all night long?

She wished if he were her brother, so she doesn't have to take him home with her in secret. He must have satisfied her really good!! Let us look at Song of Songs 8:1-3 "If only you were to me like a brother, who was nursed at my mother's breasts! Then, if I found you outside, I would kiss you, and no one would despise me. I would lead you and bring you to my mother's house-- she who has taught me. I would give you spiced wine to drink [i.e., her vagina's semen!], the nectar of my pomegranates. His left arm is under my head and his right arm embraces me." She wished if he were her biological brother so she can take him home without a secret and there he can have sex with her all the time!

To all of you girls who have brothers out there:

**If you have a very attractive brother,
please don't follow the gospel of
porn's advise and to try to sleep
with him in bed!! Ok?**

Few more points to notice from Song of Songs 8:1-3 verse above:

- 1-** She wished if her boyfriend/lover was her actual brother so she wouldn't have to take him home in secret.
- 2-** She would sleep with her own brother.
- 3-** She would kiss him publicly.
- 4-** She wants him to feel her body.
- 5-** She wants him to do her all night long!
- 6-** Her wanting to kiss him publicly clearly means that the Bible's *holy* prostitute is so sexually turned on that she having him at home doing her all night long is not enough. **THEY HAVE TO MAKE OUT PUBLICLY TOO.**
Hilarious pornography indeed!

What more pornography and sick trash do you want? **Even today's internet pornography have not yet gone down to the filthy level of brothers and sisters sleeping with each others.** That's how sick and pervert the Bible really is.

Another AUDIO FILE of her and her "lover" having sex in the field.

Song of Songs 7:10-12

10 I belong to my lover, and his desire is for me.

11 Come, my lover, let us go to the countryside, let us spend the night in the villages.

12 Let us go early to the vineyards to see if the vines have budded, if their blossoms have opened, and if the pomegranates are in bloom—
there I will give you my love. (have sex in other words!)

Important Note: If you don't call the above garbage "pornography", then what else would you call it? It wouldn't surprise me to see Christians end up one day sleeping with their sisters, as Christian men are marrying men and Christian women are marrying women in California, USA.

It wouldn't surprise me to see brothers committing adultery with their sisters especially since the Bible seems to allow them to do it anyway ([any sister with a stud brother who was nursed by her "mother's breasts"](#)), especially if they both live over at their mother's home.

I am not being sarcastic!

Please visit [The Bible claims that Sarah \(Isaac's mother\) was Abraham's biological sister.](#)

4- "Bride" is a Semitic language metaphor; it is not literal:

Let us look at the following verses:

Song of Songs 4:7-9

7 All beautiful you are, my darling; there is no flaw in you.

8 Come with me from Lebanon, my bride, come with me from Lebanon. Descend from the crest of Amana, from the top of Senir, the summit of Hermon, from the lions'

dens and the mountain haunts of the leopards.

9 You have stolen my heart, my sister, my bride; you have stolen my heart with one glance of your eyes, with one jewel of your necklace.

Song of Songs 4:8-12

8 Come with me from Lebanon, my bride, come with me from Lebanon. Descend from the crest of Amana, from the top of Senir, the summit of Hermon, from the lions' dens and the mountain haunts of the leopards.

9 You have stolen my heart, my sister, my bride; you have stolen my heart with one glance of your eyes, with one jewel of your necklace.

10 How delightful is your love, my sister, my bride! How much more pleasing is your love than wine, and the fragrance of your perfume than any spice!

11 Your lips drop sweetness as the honeycomb, my bride; milk and honey are under your tongue. The fragrance of your garments is like that of Lebanon.

12 You are a garden locked up, my sister, my bride; you are a spring enclosed, a sealed fountain.

Song of Songs 5:1-3

1 I have come into my garden, my sister, my bride; I have gathered my myrrh with my spice. I have eaten my honeycomb and my honey; I have drunk my wine and my milk. Eat, O friends, and drink; drink your fill, O lovers. Beloved

2 I slept but my heart was awake. Listen! My lover is knocking: "**Open to me, my sister, my darling**, my dove, my flawless one. My head is drenched with dew, my hair with the dampness of the night."

3 I have taken off my robe— must I put it on again? I have washed my feet— must I soil them again?

First of all, as we clearly heard in the first [AUDIO clip](#) above, the film, which relied on well-known and renowned Biblical scholars, said that the (pornographic) poem is "**between a maiden and her lover**", not between a wife and her husband. It is important to know that in Semitic languages, the terms "boyfriend" and "girlfriend" does not exist. The titles "**my sister**" and "**my bride**" were clearly symbolic titles and not literal. We can't take "bride" literal and not "sister" when they came right after each others!

If "my bride" was literal, then

Was "my sister", that came several times right before it, also literal?

"bride" here is a title of honor because like I said, the titles "boyfriend" and "girlfriend" do not exist in Semitic languages, and therefore, "bride" was the closest title to that. That is why the words "husband" and "wife" do not exist in this poem,

because marriage was never accomplished in this relationship that contained ample sex and lust.

Also, the fact that he is asking her to come with him from Lebanon by her choice proves that she was no more than what we call today [a girlfriend or may be a fiancée](#). But she definitely was not a wife, and that is why the [AUDIO clip](#) above clearly said that the poem is "**between a maiden and her lover**", and not a maiden and her husband or a wife and her husband! The bible scholars clearly recognized the fact that there was no marriage between them.

The sex and lust were illegal!

The bottom here is that the bible sings praises for illegal sex (fornication and adultery), lust and sexually immoral life style! And even if they were, which they clearly weren't, this still doesn't justify a husband speaking in such a pornographic way about his wife and a wife about her husband.

There is absolutely no morality in this pornographic book! All it teaches is how to be lustful, loose and favor whoredom; **like the Christians world-wide need any more of that!** Look at their societies world-wide, you would see them notorious in sex without marriage, boyfriend-girlfriend relationships, alcohol, drugs, bikinis on beaches where 99% of the women's bodies are totally exposed, pornography all over the internet, teenagers losing their virginities are early years, and much more.

Is this the moral code that we must follow?

5- The entire Bible is corrupted anyway according to its Theologians!

We must know that the Bible can not be trusted. Let us look at what the Theologians and Historians of the NIV Bible wrote about the Book of Song of Songs:

* Please be advised that the Bibliography of the NIV Bible that I used is listed at the end of this article. I used the latest version of the NIV Bible.

About the book of Song of Songs: "**Verse 1 appears to ascribe authorship to Solomon. Solomon is referred to seven times, and several verses speak of the 'king', but whether he was the author remains an open question.** (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 997)"

As we clearly see, no one knows who wrote the porn-full book of Song of Songs. How can you claim that the books were indeed all revealed by GOD Almighty? If you're not sure, and you still insist on your claim, then you are committing a crime against GOD Almighty's Revelations.

(www.answering-christianity.com/authors_gospels.htm)

The NIV Bible Theologians and Historians also commented on other books of the Bible to be corrupted by the scribes:

"...portions of the book were probably **added by scribes or editors** from later periods of Israel's history... (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 183)"

The Jewish scribes had very badly corrupted the Bible and turned it into a big lie. That is why GOD Almighty said:

"How can you say, 'We [the Jews] are wise, for we have the law of the LORD,' when actually the lying pen of the scribes has handled it falsely?' (From the NIV Bible, Jeremiah 8:8)"

"How can you say, 'We are wise, and the law of the LORD is with us'? But, behold, the false pen of the scribes **has made it into a lie**. (From the RSV Bible, Jeremiah 8:8)"

In either translation above, we clearly see that the Bible has too many narrated stories and man-made cultural laws that were inserted into it that were not Divine Revelations from GOD Almighty.

It's quite obvious that the Bible is more like a man made cultural book than a divine book that is meant to be for all times and all places. Anyway, the [Bible was not even written by its original authors](#). That is why you see things such as "And Moses went up to the mountain..." instead of "And I [Moses] went up to the mountain...", or "And Jesus said to Matthew..." instead of "And Jesus said to me [Matthew]..." Most of the Books and Gospels of the Bible were written by third party people that were not even chosen by GOD, which makes the Bible just a cultural history book rather than a divine book from GOD Almighty. Please see [Question #3](#) to see why Allah Almighty allowed for the Bible of today to be corrupted.

6- Christians practicing pornography and sodomy. Apparently they think it's Ok to do it!

95% of Americans had premarital sex according to a new study!

I am a strong believer that the person's behaviors in life are influenced by the way he was brought up and the things he/she believes in. Since open sexuality and pornography are so high among the Christian society (with all my respect for you), could it be that Christians don't see the Bible as a book that really prohibits such acts? or could it be that Christians see high pornography in the Bible and think it is ok to do it?

Most Christian women wear (occasionally or often) mini skirts that expose 90% of their legs to the public, wear bikinis that expose 90% of their entire bodies to the public, go to bars and night clubs where Satan is having a great time there and watch movies that have inappropriate sexual fantasies scenes in it, such as a boyfriend making love to his girlfriend, etc....

Most Christian men have no problem looking lustfully at other women, going to clubs and bars in a hope to get laid with some woman someday and watch movies that have inappropriate sexual fantasies scenes in it, such as a boyfriend making love to his girlfriend, etc....

I blame Christianity for giving vague and confusing teachings, mixed signals, and lack of teachings on "social discipline" [12](#). It is indeed a **corrupt religion!**

7- Some email-interactions with my readers:

An email from a [Christian](#) having no problem with pornography:

The cross, in the porn industry. How can you judge people like that. **I have big plans on being a porn star**, I think that you can not see something beautiful as PORN. you lack an appreciation for art. I think you are a mad man, **how can some one learn about sex**, if they do not, see it at a very young age, I am all for, leaving X rated material around so, younger people can see it, I think If I never saw the stuff I saw as a youngster, I would not have gained the intellect that I have now, so get a life, no offense, please write more x rated bible stuff, even see if you can find some more, because it further justifies my life and the way I lead my so called Christian life, and p s I LOVE YOU :) and

I hope I have not offended you in any way shape form or fashion.

Another email from a Christian:

From: "Alex A." <[I Decided not to include the email because this might be too embarrassing or inappropriate for the person]>

To: truthspeaks@answering-christianity.com

Subject: Christian "porn"

Date: Tue, 9 Oct 2001 06:37:30 -0700 (PDT)

Hi Osama,

I think you're missing the point. The Bible is wonderful literature, it has everything in it, including romance and physical love. Vagina's tasting like wine: well, don't they, a bit? It's poetic, anyway. Lighten up, buddy. Bodies are beautiful, sex is great, and, in fact, **a lot of us are perfectly comfortable talking about how desirable our wives and girlfriends are over the dinner table**. And I bet we're more generally well adjusted people than you whacky angry lot.

Best,

Valdemars Einklins

My response: Dear Valdemars, although for the most part, your email, like the email before it above, is not worth replying to, but the reason why I posted it is to highlight to my Christian readers the word "**girlfriends**" that you used.

Nothing is more ridiculous than seeing a boyfriend and his girlfriend and their "illegitimate" kids go to Church on Sunday. If marriage is not a big deal to you, and committing fornication/adultery is also not a big deal to you, then how do you expect your religion to lead society into a GOD-Loved one?

I feel sorry for your kids for feeding them the poison of your sick Christian society by encouraging them to have boyfriends and girlfriends and possibly live with them too without marriage. Let alone having sex with them without marriage.

Discussion with one of the anti-Islamic members of the "Answering Islam" team:

I received an email from one of the members of the Christian "Answering Islam" team:

Subj: Re: Companions doesn't mean "sexually together"
Date: Wed, 14 Feb 2001 2:35:16 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Quennel Gale <queball20@yahoo.com>
To: ISLM4EVR1@aol.com

He said: "Pornography isn't porn if a man is expressing his love for his wife! What is wrong with sex between a man and a woman who are married? Didn't God first make it that way?"

My answer: First of all, it is quite obvious that the lovers above are not a "husband" and a "wife". When she wished if her lover were her brother nursed at her "mother's breasts" so she wouldn't have to take him home in secret so they can have sex all night long, that obviously proves that we don't have a husband and a wife relationship.

The KJV Bible's Historians and Theologians also claim that it wasn't a "husband" and a "wife" relationship: "[Two lovers, Solomon and a Shulamite girl, express their feelings for one another, with occasional comments made by friends. \(From the King James Version Commentary, page 945\)](#)"

The KJV Bible's Theologians and Historians say that the porn-full book talks about Solomon and his lover. But we don't know whether it was Solomon who wrote this book or not, nor do we know whether this is some ridiculous poem and a lie written after he died or not.

One must ask a simple question here: Why should there be "lovers" in the Bible? Why should there be illegal sex and disgusting pornography in the Bible?

As for pornography, before you give me some dumb answer (sorry to say that) like this one to justify the obvious pornography in the Bible, think of the woman that you will marry. Let's take your logic for a second and assumed that they were a "husband" and a "wife": If you don't mind me asking, Would you tell the entire world how round and tasty your wife's breasts and vagina are as the porn-hungry guy did in the Bible?

Yes GOD Almighty created sex as I explained in [My response to the so called "X-Rated pornography in Islam" lie](#), but He also created PRIVACIES for us. Exposing your wife's private parts is pornography by itself.

Also, as I showed from the NIV Bible's Commentary regarding the book of Song of Songs above; "Verse 1 appears to ascribe authorship to Solomon. Solomon is referred to seven times, and several verses speak of the 'king', **but whether he was the author remains an open question.** (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 997)", it is quite obvious that no one in this world knows JUST WHO WROTE THE BOOK! So the porn-full book is corrupted. I don't believe that GOD Almighty would ever inspire some one to tell the world that a "vagina tastes like wine".

Otherwise, if we were to use your logic and sense, then this means Christians should not have any problem with porn movies and magazines, since the bible has the same contents in it.

Also back to your ridiculous nonsense logic and interpretations, if exposing your wife's private parts to the entire world isn't a problem for you, as billions of people already read the Bible and learned about female lover's private parts (her breasts and vagina taste like wine for him), then think of the impact it will have on your innocent kids and their morals.

It amazes me how Christians don't have problems with sexual openness. Perhaps when one's 12 year-old daughter gets pregnant, or 10 year-old son catches the AIDS virus, then the Christian would realize how dangerous his careless attitude and views toward pornography and sexual openness are.

8- King David, the Begotten Son of GOD and X-Rated Pornography:

First King David is GOD's Begotten Son: "I (David) will declare the decree: the LORD had said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day **have I begotten thee.** (The King James Version Bible, Psalm 2:7)" In this verse, we clearly see how GOD Almighty loved King David so much, that he chose him to be His begotten Son.

The importance of King David in the Bible and to Christians and Jews:

1- King David was called "God's begotten son" in psalm 2:7 as shown above.

2- Christians call Jesus "Son of David", not meaning a biological son, but rather a son in a respectful way. To respect Jesus, they call him "son of David" i.e. David is good

and respectful. See Matthew 1:1, Matthew 9:27, Matthew 12:23, Matthew 15:22, Matthew 20:30-31, Matthew 22:42, and many other verses.

3- David's Star is the Jews' holy symbol just like the Cross is the Christians' holy symbol.

Knowing the above facts, let us examine King David and fornication in the Bible:

X-Rated Pornography from the "Begotten Son of GOD":

Please be advised that I am not claiming that GOD Almighty agreed with the pornography of King David in the Bible. In fact, I don't even believe that King David did any of this. I proved below that the Books that claim this about King David are corrupted and unreliable and full of man-made doubts and lies.

David watches a women bathe, likes what he sees, and "goes in unto her." Let us look at [2 Samuel 11:2-4](#) "One evening David got up from his bed and walked around on the roof of the palace. From the roof he saw a woman bathing. The woman was very beautiful, and David sent someone to find out about her. The man said, 'Isn't this Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam and the wife of Uriah the Hittite?' Then David sent messengers to get her. **She came to him, and he slept with her.** (She had purified herself from her uncleanness.) Then she went back home." This Holy Figure in the Bible is a pervert!.

So what happened to "If a man commits adultery with another man's wife--**with the wife of his neighbor**--both the adulterer and the adulteress must be put to death. (From the NIV Bible, [Leviticus 20:10](#))"????

The woman was not only another man's wife, but also the wife of his neighbor! Double deadly crimes had been committed by the King against GOD Almighty!

How come Leviticus 20:10 was compromised in the Bible and never applied to King David?! Didn't King David know about this law? Yet, the Jews use his star as their holy symbol; the David Star, and the Christians call Jesus his son; "Son of David".

It seems to me quite clearly that the Bible is nothing but a compromised corrupted Book as Jeremiah 8:8, 2 Samuel 11:2-4 and Leviticus 20:10 above suggest.

If the strong eats the weak in the Bible, then what moral and wisdom are we to learn from this book?

Further more....

GOD supposedly inspired King David's men to get some heat for King David by having a beautiful virgin minister unto him. Let us look at [1King1:1-4](#) "When King David was old and well advanced in years, he could not keep warm even when they put covers over him. So his servants said to him, '**Let us look for a young virgin to attend the king and take care of him. She can lie beside him so that our lord the king may keep warm.**' Then they searched throughout Israel for a beautiful girl and found Abishag, a Shunammite, and **brought her to the king.** The girl was very

beautiful; she took care of the king and waited on him, but the king had no intimate relations with her." Is the Bible a porn-full man made book? or is it an inspired Divine Book from GOD Almighty? Did GOD Almighty inspire David's men to bring him a young virgin so he can sleep with her without marriage? What kind of morals are we teaching our kids here?

Let us look at [Esther 2:2-4](#) "Then the king's personal attendants proposed, '**Let a search be made for beautiful young virgins for the king.** Let the king appoint commissioners in every province of his realm to bring all these beautiful girls into the harem at the citadel of Susa. Let them be placed under the care of Hegai, the king's eunuch, who is in charge of the women; and let beauty treatments be given to them. Then let the girl who pleases the king be queen instead of Vashti.' This advice appealed to the king, and he followed it." So what we call today illegal prostitution and sex according to the "laws of the Bible" is actually allowed in the Bible? Here we see that GOD Almighty in His Divine Book, the "Holy Bible", inspired the King and his men to bring young bosomed virgins to sleep with the King, and the best one of them would replace Vashti.

9- About the validity of the books of 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, and Esther:

Here is what the NIV Bible Theologians and Historians say about the books:

About the books of 1 and 2 Samuel: "Many questions have arisen pertaining to the literary character, authorship and date of 1,2 Samuel."

"Who the author was cannot be known with certainty since the book itself gives no indication of his identity."

(From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 368).

About the books of 1 and 2 Kings: "There is little conclusive evidence as to the identity of the author of 1,2 Kings."

"Whoever the author was, it is clear that he was familiar with the book of Deuteronomy."

(From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 459).

About the book of Esther: "**Although we do not know who wrote the book of Esther, from internal evidence it is possible to make some inferences about the author and the date of composition. (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 707)**"

(www.answering-christianity.com/authors_gospels.htm)

So as we clearly see from the above quotes, no one in this world knows who wrote these books. Yet, Christians regard these books as Holy Divine Revelations from GOD Almighty.

What kind of a low and cheap man-made book the Bible really is?

10- Question to Jews and Christians about King David:

Assuming that the above lies in the Bible about King David are true, which I as a Muslim by the way don't believe that a Prophet from GOD Almighty would do these things, and Allah Almighty in the Noble Quran did talk about King David in the best way, but as to Jews and Christians, it is a must for them to believe in what's written in their corrupted and porn-full Bible. So my questions to them are:

For the Jews, after reading the above verses about King David, why do you use "King David's Star" as your holy symbol that represents Judaism?

For the Christians, why do you call Jesus "Son of David"?

Does the Bible allow for women to be Lesbians?

This section has moved to: http://www.answering-christianity.com/no_sex_with_male_slaves.htm#lesbianism_in_bible

Let us now turn the table around on the hateful bastards and ask them to show us where lesbianism is prohibited in their [gospel of porn](#), the book of women's vaginas and breasts taste like "wine".

Let us look at the following verses in the Bible:

Leviticus 20:13:

13 **If a man lies with a man** as one lies with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. **They must be put to death**; their blood will be on their own heads.

No other verse in the Bible covers homosexuality so straight forward as this one! There are other vague ones such as the damnation of Sodom and Gomorah for the "evil" and "wickedness" that they've done, but absolutely and most certainly, [Leviticus 20:13](#) is the **only verse** in the Bible that addresses homosexuality directly!

In fact, the Bible clearly distinguishes between men and women in punishments. Here are few examples:

Leviticus 20:15 **"IF A MAN has sexual relations with an animal,** he must be put to death, and you must kill the animal."

Leviticus 20:16 **"IF A WOMAN approaches an animal** to have sexual relations with it, kill both the woman and the animal. They must be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads."

Notice that the man has to be caught having sex with the animal in order for him to be executed, while the woman does not, and she would still get executed. All she has to do is look suspicious and she is dead! **Here we clearly see that men and women are separated.**

Here is another example:

Leviticus 21:9 "And the daughter of any priest, if she profane herself by playing the whore, she profaneth her father: **she shall be burnt with fire.**"

Here we see that no sons are mentioned! Only daughters. I am not saying that sons are allowed to be whores, because Leviticus 20:13 above prohibits men from doing sodomy, **but there is no question that only a daughter would get burnt with fire if the father is a priest!**


So as we clearly see, lesbianism is not condemned in the Bible's Old Testament!

The Christians' NT's homosexual verses:

1 Corinthians 6:9

9 Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the **sexually immoral** nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor **homosexual offenders**

By the way, "**homosexual offenders**" is only limited to **males**! The NIV Bible's translators twisted the translation to include females! Here is the proof from the [Arabic translation](#) and other English translations:



"Mudajioo Al-thukoor" literally means those who go to bed with males!

mudajioo is derived from the root word "madaji'a", which means beds:

"....(Next), refuse to share their beds,.....(The Noble Quran, 4:34)"

This part says: "**Wa Uhjorohunna fee al-madaji'a**". This is further proved at www.QuranSearch.com.

The Arabic transliteration in the link says "**....waohjuroohunna fee almadajiAAi....**", which is close to the one I gave.

More proof from other English translations!

Also other English translation of 1 Corinthians 6:9 conflict with the NIV Bible's twisted one:

[1 Corinthians 6:9 \(Young's literal translation\)](#)

9 have ye not known that the unrighteous the reign of God shall not inherit? be not led astray; neither whoremongers, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, **nor sodomites,**

This one agrees more with the Arabic translation above about only males!

[1 Corinthians 6:9 \(KJV\)](#)

9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, **nor abusers of themselves with mankind,**

The King James Version translation makes no mention about homosexuals!

[1 Corinthians 6:9 \(Darby\)](#)

9 Do ye not know that unrighteous [persons] shall not inherit [the] kingdom of God? Do not err: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor those who make women of themselves, **nor who abuse themselves with men,**

The Darby translation agrees more with the Arabic translation above about only males!

Clearly, 1 Corinthians 6:9 only speaks about male homosexuals!

[1 Timothy 1:10](#)

10 **for adulterers and perverts,** for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to the sound doctrine.

[Romans 1:18-32](#)

18 The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness,

19 since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them.

20 For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

21 For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened.

22 Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools

23 and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles.

24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to **sexual impurity** for the degrading of their bodies with one another.

25 They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.

26 Because of this, God gave them over to **shameful lusts. Even their women**

exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. (lies, lies and more lies in the English translation!! See below)

27 In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.

28 Furthermore, since they did not think it worthwhile to retain the knowledge of God, he gave them over to a depraved mind, to do what ought not to be done.

29 They have become filled with every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips,

30 slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents;

31 they are senseless, faithless, heartless, ruthless.

32 Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them.

Few notes to point out here:

1- Notice Paul in Romans 1:26 gave a vague and brief statement regarding women, while in Romans 1:27, he gave a more detailed description about homosexual men!

2- The English translation of the NIV Bible above is bogus and filled with deliberate lies! Here is the proof:

1- From the [Arabic translation](#):

26 لِهَذَا السَّبَبِ اسَلَّمَهُمُ اللهُ إِلَى الشَّهْوَاتِ الْمُخْتَلِفَةِ، فَإِنَّ إِنَائَهُمْ تَحَوَّلَ عَنِ اسْتِحْمَالِ اجْسَادِهِمْ
بِالطَّرِيقَةِ الطَّبِيعِيَّةِ إِلَى اسْتِحْمَالِهَا بِطَرِيقَةٍ مُخَالَفَةٍ لِلطَّبِيعَةِ.

27 وَكَذَلِكَ تَحَوَّلَ الذُّكُورُ أَيْضاً عَنِ اسْتِحْمَالِ الْإِنثَى بِالطَّرِيقَةِ الطَّبِيعِيَّةِ، وَاللَّهُوَا شَهْوَةً بَعْضُهُمْ
يُنَحِّضُ، مُرْتَكِبِينَ الْفَحْشَاءَ ذُكُوراً بِذُكُورٍ، فَاسْتَحَقُّوا أَنْ يَتَأَلَّوْا فِي أَنْفُسِهِمُ الْجَزَاءَ الْعَادِلَ عَلَى
ضَلَالِهِمْ.

Romans 1:26 reads: "...their women deviated/changed from using their bodies in the natural way to the way that is conflicting with nature."

No mention of "exchanging natural relations" as the liars of the NIV Bible above said! In other words, the verse **does not say** that women are **exchanging sex** with each others!

2- From the English translations:

[Romans 1:26 \(Young's Literal Translation\)](#)

26 Because of this did God give them up to dishonourable affections, for

even their females did **change the natural** use into that against nature;

[Romans 1:26 \(Darby\)](#)

26 For this reason God gave them up to vile lusts; for both their females **changed the natural** use into that contrary to nature;

[Romans 1:26 \(KJV\)](#)

26 For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did **change the natural** use into that which is against nature:

While these verses certainly talk about women's misuse of their bodies and practicing sex in an "unnatural" way, but couldn't this be referring to prostitution? Wouldn't prostitution with males be a valid interpretation to Romans 1:26?

Wouldn't Romans 1:26 also include women who cheat on their husbands? Also, women who have sex with animals?

Now certainly, lesbianism may fall under Romans 1:26 as well, just to be fair, but Paul never elaborated on this very exact point as he did with the males above **"inflamed with lust for one another"** and doing **"indecent acts"** with each others. And certainly, his [1 Corinthians 6:9](#) above does not address lesbians at all, which makes me doubt that he really intended to address lesbians in [Romans 1:26](#).

Also certainly, his Old Testament never talked about lesbians!

More evidence about the "unnatural ways" of women!

1. [Deuteronomy 23:17](#)

17 There shall be **no whore** of the daughters of Israel, nor a **sodomite** of the sons of Israel.

No homosexual males and no prostitute females are allowed in Israel! There is reference to homosexual males, but very vague reference to lesbian women (assuming that the female whores in the verse would fornicate with each others).

2. [Leviticus 20:15](#) **"IF A MAN has sexual relations with an animal, he must be put to death, and you must kill the animal."**

[Leviticus 20:16](#) **"IF A WOMAN approaches an animal to have sexual relations with it, kill both the woman and the animal. They must be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads."**

Notice here that the man has to get caught having sex with an animal in order for him to be put to death, while the woman does not necessarily have to get

caught having sex with an animal. If she only looks suspicious then she would still be put to death, while the man has to be caught doing it.

There is no question!

There is no question that we can't apply [Leviticus 20:13](#) above to lesbians, because it only talks about male homosexuals practicing anal sex. The bestiality verses of Leviticus 20:15-16 clearly and indisputably prove that the OT is as clear as the sun when it comes to separating the laws between men and women.

Therefore, Leviticus 20:13 can not be applied to lesbian women. Period!

So now why should we assume that Paul addressed lesbians and not just prostitutes, adulterous and/or bestial women in [Romans 1:26](#) above??

And even if he did, this still doesn't answer the problem of the **thousands of years gap** between uncle Paul and Leviticus 20:13 about the prohibition of lesbianism!

Leviticus 20:13 alone by itself does not in anyway, shape or form prohibit lesbianism!

So what are we to understand from [Leviticus 20:13](#) above?

The way I see it in the OT days (thousands of years before the NT verses above, assuming that they condemn lesbianism), lesbianism was not addressed at all in the Bible! In fact, lesbian-christians use this very same argument to justify their relationships! Don't believe me? Visit www.godlovesfags.com for more details. Also, read **sections 10, 11, 12 & 13** from my article [X-Rated Pornography in the Bible](#).

Open challenge to the Islam-haters!

Now I want to ask those Islam-hating polytheist trinitarian pagans to show me in their [gospel of porn](#), the book of women's vaginas and breasts taste like "**wine**", where two women going at it graphically, without even necessarily inserting anything into any of their vaginas (to make the argument less controversial), is forbidden in their book?

Pardon me for being a little graphic, but show me where the rubbing, sucking and licking between two females, **a Christian mother and her daughter for instance**, is forbidden in the gospel of porn, especially during the Old Testament days, 1000s of years before the New Testament?

- Conclusion:

There is no question that having sex with a male slave is forbidden in Islam. The Noble Quran is crystal clear about only Muslim men being allowed to have sex with female slaves.

There is also no question that Muslim women are not allowed to have sex with any man other than their own husbands. No where in the Noble Quran did Allah Almighty allow for the Muslim woman to have sex with her male-guardian's (father, brother, husband or son) male-slave, while Allah Almighty did allow for the Muslim men to have sex with the female slaves.

Islam also, as I demonstrated above, came to **gradually end** the Judeo-Christian and Pagan slavery. That is why slavery did not exist among Muslims during the Islamic Empire's golden days. The Christians and their Church, on the other hand, were notorious in enslaving other nations, especially the Africans, during their golden days in Europe.

12- So what about those Christians who prohibit Homosexuality for men just because the Old Testament prohibits it?

Well, how about considering your Pig's meat products such as ham, bacon, pork chops, etc...? Shouldn't you prohibit them too just because the Old Testament also prohibits them?

"And the pig, though it has a split hoof completely divided, does not chew the cud; it is unclean for you. You must not eat their meat or touch their carcasses; they are unclean for you. (From the NIV Bible, Leviticus 11:7-8)".

So, if you're going to prohibit Homosexuality from your Christian perspective, then there goes also your Easter and Christmas Ham and Bacon, and Barbecue Pork Chops. Otherwise, you're a selective hypocrite!

For further explanation and references to this topic, again please visit [Are Homosexuals and eating Pigs allowed in the Bible?](#)

13- What the Bible Says About Homosexuality:

The following article was taken from www.godlovesfags.com

Note: I am not desperately trying to find any resource to prove homosexuality in the Bible. The reason why I chose this homosexual site is because I learned about it from CNN.COM before, and I once saw more than 10,000 posts on their message board, for which most of the ones I read were supportive of the site. So homosexuality is a controversial topic that most Western Christians seem (from my personal experience only) to support.

What the Bible Says About Homosexuality.

In biblical times, same-gender sexual interactions could take many forms. Some were:

1. kings of conquered tribes were sometimes raped by the invading army as the ultimate symbol of defeat and humiliation.
2. some non-Jewish tribes in the area had male prostitutes in their temples that may have engaged in same-sex activities; this horrified the ancient Israelites.
3. it is reasonable to assume that many loving gay and lesbian relationships existed, but these would normally have been conducted in secret.

Only the third type would have any similarity to today's gay and lesbian consensual, committed, loving relationships.

Many versions of the Bible exist in the English language. Each reflects the world view, beliefs and mind sets of its translators. Their personal biases distort their work. There is an additional complexity facing translators: today's society is very different from that of Biblical times. It is sometimes difficult to find a current English word that matches a Hebrew or Greek term.

Many words have been translated from the original Hebrew and Greek texts as "homosexual", "sodomite", "homosexuality". However, most (perhaps all) of the references bear no similarity to today's lesbian and gay partnerships.

By carefully reading the original texts and considering the societies in which they were written, one comes to surprising conclusions:

- * The Bible has a lot to say about temple prostitution.
- * It talks about being kind to strangers in a way that has been incorrectly interpreted as referring to homosexual acts
- * It says almost nothing about homosexual feelings;
- * It says nothing about sexual orientation. The writers of the Bible assumed that everyone was heterosexual (or "straight"); the concept of sexual orientation was not developed until the late 19th century.

The Bible does make occasional references to activities which have been translated as homosexuality:

* Genesis 19 describes how two angels visited Sodom and were welcomed into Lot's house. The men of the city gathered around the house and demanded that Lot send the visitors to the mob so that they might know the angels. [The Hebrew verb yada (to know) is ambiguous. It appears 943 times in the Hebrew Scriptures (Old Testament). In only about a dozen of these cases does it refer to sexual activity; it is not clear whether the mob wanted to rape the angels or to meet with them, and perhaps attack them physically. From the context, it is obvious that their mood was not friendly]. Lot refused, but offered his two virgin daughters to be heterosexually raped if that would appease the mob. The offer was declined. God decided to destroy the city because of the wickedness of its inhabitants. The angels urged Lot and his family to flee and to not look back. Unfortunately, Lot's wife looked the wrong way, so God killed her because of her curiosity.

God was apparently not critical of Lot for offering his two daughters to be raped. However, God was angry at the other inhabitants of the town. He destroyed Sodom with fire and brimstone (sulfur). He presumably killed all of the men in the mob, their wives and other adults, as well as children, infants, newborns, etc. It

is unclear from these few verses whether God demolished the city because the citizens:

1. were uncharitable and abusive to strangers
2. wanted to rape people
3. engaged in homosexual acts
4. whether the punishment was for this single act involving Lot, or because of long lasting sinful behaviour

The Church has traditionally accepted the third explanation, and believed that the sexual activity was habitual. In fact, the term sodomy which means anal intercourse was derived from the name of the city, Sodom. But the first explanation is clearly the correct one. As recorded in Matthew 10:14-15 and Luke 10:7-16, Jesus implied that the sin of the people of Sodom was to be inhospitable to strangers. In Ezekeiel 16:48-50, God states clearly that he destroyed Sodom's sins because of their pride, their excess of food while the poor and needy suffered, and their worship of many idols; sexual activity is not even mentioned. Jude disagreed with God; he wrote that Sodom's sins were sexual in nature. Various biblical translations describe the sin as fornication, going after strange flesh, sexual immorality, perverted sensuality, homosexuality, lust of every kind, immoral acts and unnatural lust; you can take your pick.

We are faced with the inescapable and rather amusing conclusion that the condemned activities in Sodom had nothing to do with sodomy.

- Leviticus 18:22 states: "Thou shall not lie with mankind as with womankind: it is abomination." The term abomination (to'ebah) is a religious term, usually reserved for use against idolatry; it does not mean a moral evil. The verse seems to refer to temple prostitution, which was a common practice in the rest of the Middle East at that time. Qadesh referred to male religious prostitutes. (See the discussion of Deuteronomy below).
- Leviticus 20:13 states: "If a man also lie with mankind as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they should surely be put to death....". The passage is surrounded by prohibitions against incest, bestiality, adultery and intercourse during a woman's period. But this verse is the only one in the series which uses the religious term abomination; it seems also to be directed against temple prostitution.

These passages are part of the Jewish Holiness Code which also:

- permits polygamy
- prohibits sexual intercourse when a woman has her period,
- bans tattoos
- prohibits eating rare meat
- bans wearing clothes that are made from a blend of textiles
- prohibits cross-breeding livestock
- bans sowing a field with mixed seed
- prohibits eating pigs, rabbits, or some forms of seafood

- requires Saturday to be reserved as the Sabbath

Churches have abandoned the Holiness Code; it is no longer binding on modern-day Christians. They can wear tattoos, eat shrimp, wear polyester-cotton blends and engage in temple prostitution without violating this particular section of the Bible. Although this code is obsolete for Christians, many clergy still focus on those passages which deal with homosexuality.

- **Deuteronomy 23:17** states (in the King James Version) "There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel." This is an "error" by the authors of the KJV. The word qadesh in the original text was mistranslated as sodomite. Qadesh means "holy one" and is here used to refer to a man who engages in ritual prostitution in the temple. There is little evidence that the prostitutes engaged in sexual activities with men. Other Bible translations use accurate terms such as shrine prostitute, temple prostitute, prostitute and cult prostitute.
- **Judges 19** describes an event much like that at Sodom. This time, an unnamed Levite visited the town of Gibeah with his slaves and concubine. He met an old farmer and was made welcome. A gang of men appeared and demanded that the old man send out the Levite that they might homosexually rape or assault him. (It is again not clear what the precise meaning of the verb to know was). The old man argued that they should not abuse the visitor. He offered to give them both the Levite's concubine and his own virgin daughter to be heterosexually raped. The mob accepted the former, raped her all night and finally killed her. The Levite sliced up her body into 12 pieces and sent one to each of the tribes of Israel. This triggered a war between the inhabitants of Gibeah and the Israelites during which tens of thousands died. There was no condemnation against the Levite for sacrificing his concubine, or for committing an indignity to a body. Judges 20:5 emphasizes that the aim of the mob was to kill the stranger - the ultimate act of inhospitality. It appears that these passages condemn abusive treatment of visitors. If they actually refer to homosexual activity, then they condemn homosexual rape; they have nothing at all to say about consensual homosexual relationships.
- **I Kings 14:24 and 15:12** again refer to temple prostitution. The original word qadesh is mistranslated as sodomite (homosexual) in the King James Version, but as male prostitute, male cult prostitutes, and male shrine prostitutes in more accurate versions. As mentioned before, there is little evidence that homosexuality was involved. Again, the text has nothing to say about consensual homosexual relationships.
- **Romans 1:26 and 27**, according to most Biblical scholars, condemns all gay and lesbian activity. Paul criticizes sexual activity which is against a person's nature or disposition. But a minority of scholars interpret the passage differently: in Greek society of the time, homosexuality and bisexuality was regarded as a natural activity for some people. Thus Paul might have been criticizing heterosexuals who were engaged in homosexual activities against their nature. He might not be referring to homosexuals or bisexuals at all.
The verses preceding 26 might indicate that he was referring to sexual acts associated with idol worship. The verse is too vague to be interpreted as a blanket prohibition of all same-sex activities.
- **I Cor 6:9** Paul lists a many activities that will prevent people from inheriting the Kingdom of God. One has been variously translated as effeminate, homosexuals, or sexual perverts. The original Greek text reads malakoi arsenokoitai. The first word means soft; the meaning of the second word has been lost. It was once used to refer to a male temple prostitute (as in the verses from the Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament

described above). The early Church interpreted the phrase as referring to people of soft morals; i.e. unethical. From the time of Martin Luther, it was interpreted as referring to masturbation . More recently, it has been translated as referring to homosexuals . Each Translator seem to take whatever activity that their society particularly disapproves of and use it in this verse.

- **1 Tim 1:9** again refers to malakoi arsenokoitai which has been variously translated as homosexuals, sexual perverts etc. Again, the original meaning of the text as been lost.
- **Jude 7** refers to the people of Sodom as "giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh". Strange flesh has been variously translated as perverted sensuality, unnatural lust, lust of men for other men, and perversion. Again, it is unclear what is being referred to here. Some biblical scholars interpret this as referring to an ancient Jewish legend that the women of Sodom engaged in sexual intercourse with angels.

In summary:

- homosexual activity in the temple by male prostitutes is clearly prohibited by the Hebrew Scriptures (Old Testament).
- homosexual activity in general may have been prohibited at the time by the Holiness Code, but that code is no longer binding on Christians today.
- St. Paul considered at least some male and female homosexual acts to be forbidden, but it is unclear precisely which acts are included. He may have been referring to temple prostitution, or to people who are not innately gay, lesbian or bisexual engaging in homosexual acts. One should note that Paul also condemned women preaching (1 Cor 14:34) or wearing gold or pearls (1 Tim 2:11). He also accepted and did not condemn the institution of slavery. Some Christians feel that his writings are not a useful guide for ethics and morals in the 20th Century.
- Jesus made many hundreds of statements regarding belief and behaviour. However He never mentioned homosexuality.
- There are two Biblical same-sex relationships (one between two women, the other two men) reported in the Bible in a positive light. They appear to have progressed well beyond friendship. They were likely homosexual affairs, although not necessarily sexually active relationships:
 - Ruth 1:16, 2:10-11 between Ruth and Naomi
 - 1 Samuel 18:1-4, 1 Samuel 20:41-42 and 2 Samuel 1:25-26 between David and Jonathan. (Some translations of the Bible distort the original Hebrew text, particularly of 1 Samuel 20)
- It is the subject of endless debate whether St. Paul's prohibition of at least some homosexual acts was:
 - for the people in the vicinity of the Mediterranean during the 1st Century CE, or
 - for all people, forever.

One can argue that the ancient Israelites were surrounded by warlike tribes. Their fertility was very important if the group was to survive. The early Christian church was also surrounded by enemies. Homosexuals tend to have few children; thus their presence would be met with opposition. At the end of the 20th Century, conditions are the exact opposite; we are threatened by our excessive fertility. Perhaps Paul's criticism of homosexuality is no longer valid, like his various prohibitions against women's behaviour.

Please visit

http://www.answering-christianity.com/x_rated.htm

[Homosexual Marriage in Islam?](#)

[What is the punishment for Gays and Lesbians in Islam?](#)

[Is anal sex really allowed in Islam?](#) It is prohibited between the Husband and the Wife.

[What is the punishment for fornication and adultery in Islam?](#)

[What is the punishment for rape in Christianity and Islam?](#) See how the Bible tolerates it and even indirectly promotes it to happen to single women.

[Does Paradise in Islam really have Lesbianism in it?](#)

[X-Rated Pornography in the Noble Quran?](#) Bunch of nonsense put together by anti-Islamics.

14- Homosexuality and the Bible, An Interpretation:

The following article was taken from www.godlovesfags.com

Note: This is the same note as the one in the previous section. I am not desperately trying to find any resource to prove homosexuality in the Bible. The reason why I chose this homosexual site is because I learned about it from CNN.COM before, and I once saw more than 10,000 posts on their message board, for which most of the ones I read were supportive of the site. So homosexuality is a controversial topic that most Western Christians seem (from my personal experience only) to support.

Homosexuality and the Bible, An Interpretation

by Walter Barnett

About the author:

A native of Texas Walter Barnett graduated summa cum laude from Yale University, where he was president of Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship. He

earned his Doctor of Jurisprudence at the University of Texas and his Master of Laws at Columbia University. He was also a Fullbright Scholar at the College of Europe in Belgium. After a brief period of law practice in Texas he served for four years on the staff of the Legal Adviser of the U.S department of State in Washington, and then taught for ten years in the law schools of the Universities of Miami, New Mexico and Texas and at Hastings College of Law at the University of California. He also worked for nearly two years as Program Interpreter for the Friends Committee on Legislation of California and is a member of the San Francisco Monthly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. Since the beginning of 1979 he has been living with the Catholic Workers, first in Los Angeles and now in Redwood City, California.

His interest in the subject of this pamphlet goes back to 1969 when he became involved in the struggle for civil rights of Gay people. This culminated in his first book, *Sexual Freedom and the Constitution - An Inquiry into the Constitutionality of Repressive Sex Laws* (University of New Mexico Press, 1973). He is also the author of *Jesus - the Story of His Life* (Nelson-Hall, Inc., 1976). He was moved to write this pamphlet as a result of the recent efforts of Anita Bryant in Florida and John Briggs in California to marshal Christian support for their campaigns against the rights of homosexuals.

Request for permission to quote or to translate should be addressed to Pendle Hill Publications, Wallingford, PA 19086. USA.

ISBN 0-87574-226-2

Most Christians are still uneasy about homosexuality. Even Gay Christians themselves often share this uneasiness, because we have all been brought up in the same Christian tradition. There are many causes for the uneasiness; but the one cause which seems most important in the minds of all is the conviction that the Bible condemns homosexuality, in itself and in all its manifestations.

In recent years a slow change has begun to occur in Christian attitudes towards homosexuality and homosexual persons. Some Christians while maintaining the traditional attitude for themselves, have become prepared to admit that it is not necessary in secular society to punish homosexuals for behaviour which is permissible to heterosexuals. On this basis, most which is Christian churches have now made formal statements supporting the right of homosexual people of protection against discrimination.

Some Christians have gone further and acknowledge that the particular virulence with which some people have attached and condemned homosexual acts and homosexual persons is totally unjustified, if a caring person weighs the relative importance given to homosexual behavior in the Bible, and especially if he or she respects the attitudes appropriate for a Christian when dealing with fellow human beings. Some theologians and a number of Gay Christians, working from a growing understanding of the biblical texts, have come to the conclusion that the Bible does not exclude homosexual people from the Christian Fellowship, within bounds analogous to those applied to heterosexuals.

The Bible does mention homosexual behavior in extremely negative terms in a handful of widely scattered verses, but modern research has turned up considerable evidence casting doubt on the traditional interpretation of these passages - an interpretation that has borne tragic consequences for homosexuals throughout almost the whole of Christian history. The purpose here is to examine this evidence, together with some of the light science has shed on the subject of

psychosexual development, in the hope that it will lead to a more informed appraisal.

The critical fact generally unknown to or overlooked by heterosexuals is that homosexuality is something quite distinct from homosexual behaviour and even from homosexual desires or lust. Homosexuality is an emotional and affectional orientation towards people of the same sex. It may or may not involve sexual acts, though of course it usually does. On the other hand, homosexual acts can be and are performed by both homosexuals AND heterosexuals, and homosexual desire or lust is probably experienced by most heterosexuals. (The most common instances of extensive homosexual behaviour by heterosexuals occur in those situations such as prisons where heterosexual partners are unavailable.) This is why those who possess this same-sex emotional orientation abjure the term homosexual and call themselves by their own slang word, Gay. The word homosexual for them overemphasizes the specifically sexual element in their feelings. Because it was coined by the scientific community to label them, it also carries overtones of clinical pathology which they reject. Since 1974 the American Psychiatric Association and the American Psychological Association have both officially disavowed this implication of the label, but the Gay community continues to reject the word. So even in general usages "gay" is replacing "homosexual" just as "black" or "Afro-American" has replaced "Negro".

Most people grow up to want and seek an intimate and loving relationship with a person of the opposite sex. Gay people on the other hand are those who have discovered that they want and seek such a relationship with a person of the same sex. Why and how this variant occurs is not now and probably never will be the subject of any pat explanation because it is the consequence of a wide range of factors, some of which are environmental and some possibly hereditary or physical. What is important, though, from the point of view of sin is that most Gay people have no conscious recollection of ever having chosen this orientation any more than the ordinary heterosexual ever consciously chose to want the opposite sex. It is simply a given in their emotional make-up, an integral part of the personality. And they sense that nothing on earth will ever change this, just as the ordinary heterosexual cannot imagine changing into a homosexual.

Some people are truly bisexual; they find both sexes equally interesting and attractive. These however are few and far between. The orientation of the great majority is fixed and definite, towards either the opposite sex or their own. This is not to deny that many people engage in some experimentation on both sides of the fence before they know for sure which side is home, but it is a mistake to conclude from this fact that all people are basically bisexual. It is equally a mistake to conclude that all people are basically heterosexual and a few are lured away into homosexuality by seduction. The truth rather seems to be that human sexuality is initially free-floating and unattached, that an emotional interest develops very early in life, and that this interest then comes increasingly to the fore as puberty and adolescence bring on explicitly sexual fantasies and behaviour.

The reason therefore why Gay people seek out others of their own sex and engage in sexual behaviour with them is not that they are incapable of bridling their lusts or are perversely determined to disobey God but simply because the option open to the rest of humankind - a heterosexual relationship and specifically marriage to a partner of the opposite sex - is not open to them. Legally of course it is open, but emotionally it is not. It would for them be living a lie - a sin against their partner as well as themselves. Such a relationship does not perform for them the function it is meant to perform - to satisfy, to recreate, to replenish. Unlike the heterosexual they feel completed only by a person of the

same sex.

This is not to say that Gay people are incapable of heterosexual behaviour. Many can perform heterosexual coitus just as many heterosexual people are capable of engaging in homosexual acts. But if given the choice they will prefer a partner of the same sex, not out of mere perversity but because it is only a partner of the same sex who satisfies them emotionally.

Now in order for anything to be a sin there must be a possibility of moral choice. Where there is no choice there can be no sin. So if one's sexual orientation is not a matter of choice, it cannot be a sin to be a homosexual. True, it may be admitted, but one does have the choice of committing or not homosexual acts. This boils down to saying that whether or not homosexuality - the orientation - is a sin, homosexual behaviour invariably is.

The cruelty of this position is that it leaves only one option open to Gay people who take their relationship to God seriously - the option of total and complete life long celibacy. Because as already noted the option open to the rest of the world - heterosexual marriage - is immoral and unethical, yes sinful, for a Gay person. But the church would never dream of imposing such a burden on heterosexuals. Even the Roman Catholic Church which requires celibacy of its priests has always admitted this to be a special calling for those select few to whom God has given the ability to accept it; it is not for everyone. Heterosexual Christians should beware of doing like the Pharisees of old, laying down on the backs of other people a yoke they themselves would find impossible to bear.

Actually the Bible appears unequivocally to condemn only three things:

(1) homosexual rape; (2) the ritual homosexual prostitution that was part of the Canaanite fertility cult and at one time apparently taken over into Jewish practice as well; and (3) homosexual lust and behaviour of the part of heterosexuals.

On the subject of homosexuality as an orientation, and on consensual behaviour by people who possess that orientation, it is wholly silent. The orientation as such was apparently unknown to or at least unrecognised by the Biblical authors. If we may assume that the Biblical authors were themselves all heterosexual this would not be at all surprising. For that matter it has only been since about 1890 that the science of psychology began to recognise homosexuality as a distinct entity.

In the first place homosexuality and homosexual behaviour are never anywhere in the Bible mentioned either by Jesus Christ himself or any of the Old Testament prophets. If it really were a sin in God's sight surely he or they or both would have inveighed against it. This fact should be of cardinal importance to the thinking of any person who purports to follow Jesus.

The story of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 18 and 19 has traditionally in Christianity been thought to demonstrate God's condemnation of homosexual behaviour. All this because the Hebrew word meaning "to know" in Genesis 19:5 has been interpreted to mean "have sexual intercourse with." "They [the townsmen of Sodom] called to Lot, 'Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to use, that we may know them.' "

In the story God informs Abraham that these two cities will be destroyed because of their great wickedness, but the wickedness is never specified. Abraham persuades God to spare the cities if even ten righteous men can be found in them. Two angels then come to Sodom to investigate and are given hospitality by Abraham's nephew Lot. All the townsmen both young and old surround the

house and demand to "know" the two strangers, but Lot refuses to surrender them up and offers instead his two virgin daughters. When this offer is rejected, the angels pull Lot inside and shut the door, striking the townsmen blind so that they grope about in darkness. The angels then urge Lot and his household to flee the city to escape its destruction.

Actually in the Bible this Hebrew word "to know" rarely means sexual intercourse. Apart from this story and the counterpart tale in Judges 19, it has that meaning in only about fifteen instances out of more than 900, and in all those few instances it denotes heterosexual coitus as, for instance, in Genesis 19:8). Some scholars believe that here, because of the circumstances, it has only its usual meaning of "become acquainted with."

Lot himself was a resident alien in Sodom, and for such a person to harbor two other foreigners within the city's gates could well rouse suspicion that they were spies looking for weaknesses in its defenses that a potential enemy could exploit. The townsmen therefore had a perfectly justifiable excuse for demanding that the two strangers show themselves so that their identities and the purpose of their visit could be ascertained. Lot's reaction however indicates that there was some serious mischief afoot, and his offering the townsmen intercourse with his two virgin daughters to keep them from doing anything to his guests does seem to support the notion that the mischief was specifically sexual.

Even if the sexual interpretation is correct, the sin of Sodom does not necessarily lie in homosexuality or homosexual behaviour. Rather, this wicked thing that Lot enjoins the townsmen not to do is rape pure and simple, and gang rape at that. Rape is not a sin peculiar to homosexuality; it occurs far more often in a heterosexual context. Its sinfulness lies not in the context, whether heterosexual or homosexual, but in the victimisation of the nonconsenting partner.

In our reading today of this story we overlook a little known fact - that the entire ancient Near East hospitality to sojourners and travellers was not seen to be, as with us, a merely a voluntary option but rather was a sacred religious duty. See Leviticus 19:33-34; Matthew 25:35, 38, and 43. Thus whatever the townsmen intended, any kind of mistreatment or indignity inflicted on Lot's guests would be a sin. It would violate the sacred obligation of hospitality. And indeed this latter is the sin or wrong Lot's own words indicate in verse 8 - "Don't do anything to these men, for you know they have come under the shelter of my roof." This interpretation is further buttressed by the fact that the story presents in such marked contrast to the behaviour of the Sodomites the elaborate hospitality shown the angelic visitors by Abraham and Lot.

Finally it is worth noting for future reference that sexual intercourse between humans and angels - two different orders of creation - would in itself have been wrong in the eyes of the Jews, who would remember that in Genesis 6:1-8 the disaster of the Great Flood comes hard on the heels of a charge that the "sons of God" (presumably angels) took to wife the daughters of men.

The idea that the Sodom story is not an indictment of homosexuality is no new-fangled interpretation. Most later Jewish commentary on it both inside and outside of the Bible does not make out the sin of these cities to be homosexuality or homosexual behaviour. According to Isaiah 1:9 and 3:9, it was a lack of social justice; according to Ezekiel 16:46-52 it was disregard for the poor; and according to Jeremiah 23:14 it was general immorality. Though ancient Rabbinical literature - the Talmud and Midrashim - often refers to Sodom in connections with sins of pride, arrogance and inhospitality, it contains only one mention of anything homosexual, namely a midrash emphasising rape and robbery of

strangers. ("The Sodomites made an agreement among themselves whenever a stranger visited them they should force him to sodomy and rob him of his money.") It is primarily among Philo of Alexandria and Josephus, that we find the homosexual interpretation, and it is probably from Josephus that the interpretation eventually found its way into the Christian Church.

In the New Testament two passages - II Peter 2:4-9 and Jude 6-7 - refer to Sodom and Gomorrah as examples of God's judgement on the wicked in such terms as apparently to adopt a sexual interpretation. The former refers to the townsmen of Sodom as licentious or "unprincipled in their lusts," and the latter says that they gave themselves to fornication and went after different flesh. Neither passage contributes anything more on the subject. But it is important to bear in mind that both authors may have been thinking not of homosexual intercourse but of intercourse between different orders of creation (humans and angels). Both authors refer to God having likewise judged the angels who sinned, and Peter refers to the story of the Flood. Consequently both were probably only reiterating the view found in some Jewish writings from the same general period, namely the Testament of Naphtali 2:4-5, and the Book of Jubilees 7:20-22, 16:5-6, and 20:5-6. The view found in these other writings is that the Sodomites were cursed for having changed the order of nature by running after angels just as the angels have been cursed at the flood for having gone a-whoring after the daughters of men.

Jesus himself mentions Sodom and Gomorrah but only to say that they will be judged less severely than the towns that rejected his disciples or refused to repent even after witnessing the works he performed (Matthew 10:14-15, and 11:20-24, Luke 10:10-12, and 17:28-29). None of these passages tells us his interpretation of the Sodom story, though the fact that he linked the name of Sodom with refusal to welcome his disciples may give us a hint. And the parallel to the Sodom story reported in Luke 9:51-56 in which James and John the sons of Zebedee beseech Jesus to call down from heaven destruction by fire on an inhospitable Samaritan town provides at least some confirmation that Jesus and his disciples held the more prevalent view within Jewish tradition that the sin depicted in the Sodom story was inhospitable treatment of travellers rather than homosexuality or homosexual behaviour.

The story in Judges 19 of the outrage at Gibeah is very similar to that of Sodom and Gomorrah, and some scholars consider the one derived from the other. Here again the Hebrew word "to know" is used (Judges 19:22) and the host's offer of two females as diversion implies that it is to be taken in a sexual sense. In this story, however, the male guest pushes his concubine out the door, and the townsmen of Gibeah "know" and abuse her all night long, as a result of which she dies. Yet this story goes on to say explicitly (Judges 20:4-5) that the townsmen's intention was to kill the male guest. So the mischief that was afoot here was not merely sexual, even homosexual rape; it was murder. And it ended in a heterosexual gang rape that took the woman's life.

Even if the original intent of both the townsmen of Sodom and those of Gibeah was homosexual rape, obviously both stories are about heterosexual males who indulge in it as a sport. Otherwise the offer in both stories of females as a diversionary sexual object makes no sense. To extend such an offer to homosexual males would be pointless because it would hold no interest for them.

In Deuteronomy 23:17-18, in I Kings 14:24, 15:12, and 22:46, in II Kings 23:7, and in Job 36:14, there are references to a *kadesh* (singular) or to *kedeshim* (plural), which literally mean "holy man" and "holy men". Some translations of

the Bible render these terms by the English word sodomite(s). The passage in Deuteronomy forbids Israelite men to become such, and likewise forbids an Israelite woman to become a kedeshah - the same word for the feminine gender. Modern Bible Scholars believe these terms refer to priests and priestesses of the Canaanite fertility cult, and evidence outside the Bible supports the inference that both types of functionaries engage in sexual intercourse with male worshippers as part of the ritual. Indeed the Deuteronomy passage by poetic parallelism appears to equate kedeshah with the Hebrew word for a female prostitute (zonah). The 38th chapter of Genesis and Hosea 4:12-14 also support this equation. Thus the better translation of kadeshikadeshim would be "male cult prostitute(s)."

Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 enjoin the men of Israel not to "lie with a male as with a woman," for which the latter verse invokes the death penalty. It is stated to be to'ebah. This Hebrew word, generally translated as abomination in English, is used in the Old Testament to refer to idolatry and to practices associated with idolatry. And in deed the whole context of these injunctions is a polemic against the Israelites imitating the defiling practices of the Canaanites whom they displaced in Palestine. Thus again, the prohibition is probably directed against the practice of ritual homosexual prostitution as found in the Canaanite fertility cult. In any event the intent cannot be to condemn all homosexuality and homosexual behaviour because there is no prohibition whatever in Leviticus against women having sexual relations with other women. This can hardly be explained as an oversight or on the basis that what women do is never of any consequence, because these chapters do contain explicit prohibitions against both male and female intercourse with an animal. So if homosexual behaviour is supposedly such an evil in God's sight, why does Leviticus forbid it only to males and not to females ?

Apart from the association of male homosexual acts with Canaanite idolatry, the answer probably lies mainly in a concern for the "seed" of life rather than a concern about homosexuality per se. The Hebrews like other ancient peoples had no accurate knowledge of conception. They did not know that women produce eggs which the man's sperm fertilizes, but apparently thought that the seed came solely from the man; when "sowed" in a woman it would grow into a new being just as a seed from plants will sprout and grow when sowed in the earth. They likewise did not know that matings between different species are sterile. Thus men must not expend their seed in other males where it would be unproductive, or in animals where it might result in a "confusion" such as a centaur. Women are forbidden to receive seed from an animal for the same reason, but because presumably they have no seed, what they do among themselves is inconsequential.

Also, in the patriarchal society of the ancient Hebrews the status and dignity of the male was held to be inviolable, so much so that even the women of the house must be sacrificed to preserve if need be, as in the Sodom and Gibeah stories. In the ancient Near East it was not uncommon for the victors in war to rape vanquished kings or warriors as a mark of utter subjection and contempt. The Hebrews unlike the Greeks may thus have associated male homosexuality with disrespect and debasement of the male sex and viewed it as intolerable for that reason. Moreover, any society that exalts the male sex over the female may tend to associate male homosexuality with effeminacy. It therefore becomes tabooed to keep the dominant sex from being assimilated to the status of women.

Even if these Levitical injunctions are to be read as an absolute prohibition against males engaging in homosexual behaviour under any and all circumstances, it is worth asking why this should be deemed binding on

Christians when so many other injunctions of the Pentateuch are not. For instance these same chapters of levticus make punishable by banishment the sin of a man having intercourse with his wife during menstrual period (Leviticus 18:19 and 20:18). Leviticus also forbids the wearing of cloth made of two different kinds of fibers, say for instance cotton and polyester (Leviticus 19:19). And what about Exodus 22:18, requiring that witches be put to death?

The only three remaining Biblical passages that conceivably touch on homosexual behaviour are found in I Corinthians 6:9, I Timothy 1:10, and Romans 1:18-32.

In I Corinthians 6:9 Paul asks his readers, "Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God?" He then proceeds to list certain categories of people as examples of those who will not inherit the kingdom. In this list two of the Greek words, namely malakoi and arsenokoitai, have usually been rendered in English translation by a single term such as "homosexuals," "sodomites," "sexual perverts," or "homosexual perverts."

Please visit

<http://www.answering-christianity.com/x Rated.htm>

[Homosexual Marriage in Islam?](#)

[What is the punishment for Gays and Lesbians in Islam?](#)

[Is anal sex really allowed in Islam?](#) It is prohibited between the Husband and the Wife.

[What is the punishment for fornication and adultery in Islam?](#)

[What is the punishment for rape in Christianity and Islam?](#) See how the Bible tolerates it and even indirectly promotes it to happen to single women.

[Does Paradise in Islam really have Lesbianism in it?](#)

[X-Rated Pornography in the Noble Quran?](#) Bunch of nonsense put together by anti-Islamics.

15- Conclusion:

It's quite obvious that the Bible:

1- Has ample material in it for porn seekers and perverts, which quite obviously makes it a porn-full book.

2- Allows men to have sex (without marriage) with virgin women and non virgin women, but prefers to do it with virgin women.

3- The Bible allows for sisters to fantasize about or even have sex with their own biological brothers, who were nursed by their "mother's breasts".

Note: I understand that the use of the word "sister" doesn't necessarily mean that they were biological siblings. But when she says that she wished if he were her brother who was nursed at her "mother's breasts", so she wouldn't have to take him home in secret anymore so they can have as much sex as they want does indeed suggest that she would sleep with her own biological brother, hence the porn-full bible does allow for sisters to fantasize or even have sex with their biological brothers, or at the very least allows them to have that sick mentality!

4- Fornication is allowed in the Bible and is practiced widely among the holiest people of the Bible.

5- The Bible is a compromised book. The strong in the Bible eats the weak as was shown in the story of King David sleeping with his neighbor's wife and getting away with it without any punishment. Meanwhile, the Bible punishes to death the person who sleeps with his neighbor's wife.

6- The Bible seems to have no problem with Lesbianism what so ever, and if the Old Testament is ignored, then it most definitely seem to have no problem with Homosexuality for both men and women in general, since the Christians of today have no problem eating Pig's meat, which clearly was prohibited in the Old Testament and was never addressed in the New Testament.

The Bible talks about porn very openly. It also talks about how round and tasty the women's breasts and vaginas are. If women are sex objects in the Bible, then how is that supposed to be respectful to women? It is quite obvious that the Bible is man made corruption and not the true Living Word of GOD Almighty.

Would you trust your own little kid to read the Bible privately?

Would you talk about how "round" and "tasty like wine" your wife's or girlfriend's (lover's) or biological sister's breasts and vagina are to your family and friends on the dinner table during Christmas, Thanksgiving or Easter?

Do you honestly believe that the above verses were inspired from GOD Almighty?
You judge for yourself!

My dear Christian friend, I am not trying to upset you. I wasn't the one who wrote the Bible. And I wasn't the one who corrupted it either. Please open your heart to Islam, [the One True Religion that Calls for the Oneness and Worship of Allah Almighty](#), and Allah Almighty will help you.

Further sites to research:

[95% of Americans had premarital sex according to a new study!](#)

<http://www.evilm Bible.com/>

[Fathers are literally allowed to stick their fingers into their own daughters' vaginas in the Bible before the daughters get married.](#)

[Forcing 3-year old slave girls into sex in both the Bible and the Talmud.](#)

[Jesus kissed Mary Magdalene on the mouth!](#)

[My rebuttal to Sam Shamoun's "Osama Abdallah's Obsession with Pedophilia in the Bible" article.](#)

[What is the punishment for rape in Christianity and Islam?](#) See how the Bible tolerates it and even indirectly promotes it to happen to single women.

[Contradicting errors even in Porn in the Bible.](#)

[History of man's corruption in the Bible.](#) The Bible was not even written by the Prophets of GOD and the Disciples of Jesus.

[Christianity is the cause of our social corruptions today.](#)

[Women rights in Christianity?](#)

[Church Priests/Ministers who changed their sex and still preach in their Churches.](#)

[Priests with the AIDS.](#)

[Homosexual Marriage in Islam?](#)

[What is the punishment for Gays and Lesbians in Islam?](#)

[Is anal sex really allowed in Islam?](#) It is prohibited between the Husband and the Wife.

[Science proved that Homosexuals are born natural. How then can Islam prohibit homosexuality?](#)

[What is the punishment for fornication and adultery in Islam?](#)

[What is the punishment for rape in Christianity and Islam?](#) See how the Bible tolerates it and even indirectly promotes it to happen to single women.

[Does Paradise in Islam really have Lesbianism in it?](#)

[X-Rated Pornography in the Bible.](#)

[X-Rated Pornography in the Noble Quran?](#) Bunch of nonsense put together by anti-Islamics.

[Are Homosexuals and eating Pigs allowed in the Bible?](#)

[The Bible claims that Sarah \(Isaac's mother\) was Abraham's biological sister.](#)

[The lust for virgins and the degradation of non-virgins in the Bible's OT and NT.](#)

[Disturbing Stories in the Bible.](#)

[Bikini Christianity.](#)

Marrying your children!

[The Bible in Leviticus 20:21 allows for **parents to marry their children!**](#)

http://www.answering-christianity.com/abrogation_in_bible.htm#marriage_with_children

Can a man marry his brother's wife or not?

This section is divided into the following sub-sections:

- (a)- The Verses.
- (b)- Biological Contradiction and False Promise on "they will be childless."
- (c)- Rejecting of the blood-relationship, hence **allowing for the parents to marry the unrelated children!!**
- (d)- Sam Shamoun got destroyed and silenced once again!

(a)- The Verses:

Leviticus 20:21

If a man marries his brother's wife, it is an act of impurity; he has dishonored his brother. They will be childless.

Deuteronomy 25:5

If brothers are living together and one of them dies without a son, his widow must not marry outside the family. Her husband's brother shall take her and marry her and fulfill the duty of a brother-in-law to her.

How am I supposed to read this?! Don't tell nonsense such as "The first verse is talking about a divorced wife, while the second one is talking about a widowed wife," because Lev. 20:21 never mentioned a divorce case or a deceased brother. You are only reading the divorce into the text. Also, it is quite possible that Lev. 20:21 was referring to a widowed wife, and then the verse got abrogated by Deut. 25:5.

In any case, the abrogation is quite clear. Marrying the brother's wife was at first forbidden and considered impure, shameful and dishonoring to the brother, and then not only it became permissible, **but also mandatory in the case of death!**

(b)- Biological Contradiction and False Promise:

Let us again look at Leviticus 20:21:

Leviticus 20:21

If a man marries his brother's wife, it is an act of impurity; he has dishonored his brother. They will be childless.

Would GOD Almighty really deprive the couple from having children (by causing either of them to become **barren**) as promised in the verse?? Like much of the countless scientific blunders and false prophecies and promises in the bible, **this one stinks** just as bad as the rest of them, because scientifically it would never happen! She will get pregnant and they will probably have 10 kids, and all boys too since the bible hates girls (more "gain" to the supposedly "childless" couple, and more defiance to the corrupt verse in other words):

Ecclesiasticus 22:3 "...and the birth of ANY daughter is a loss" (From the New Jerusalem Bible. It's a Roman Catholics Bible)

Revelation 14:4 "Those are those (men) who **did not defile themselves with women**, for they kept themselves pure. They follow the Lamb wherever he goes. They were purchased from among men and offered as first fruits to God and the Lamb."

If a woman gives birth to a baby boy, then she becomes unclean for 7 days. But if she gives birth to a baby girl, then she becomes unclean for 14 days. So in other words, the birth of any female causes double the pollution: **Leviticus 12:2-5** "Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a woman have conceived seed, and born a MALE child: then she shall be unclean **SEVEN DAYS**; according to the days of the separation for her infirmity shall she be unclean. And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised. And she shall then continue in the blood of her purifying **THIRTY THREE** days; she shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purifying be fulfilled. But if she bear a FEMALE child, then she shall be unclean **TWO WEEKS**, as in her separation: and she shall continue in the blood of her purifying **SIXTY SIX** days."

1 week for the boy, 2 weeks for the girl.

1 month for the boy, 2 months for the girl.

If a woman tries to save her husband from a beating by grabbing the other man's private parts to lift him off her husband, then both her hands must get cut off: **Deuteronomy 25:11-12** "And in case men struggle together (in a fight) with one another, and the wife of the one has come near to deliver her husband out of the striking one (to save her husband), and she has thrust out her hand and **grabbed hold of his private (the other man's groin), she must then get both her hands cut off,** and the eyes of the men must feel no sorrow."

Allah Almighty said regarding the birth of females in the Noble Quran:

"When news is brought to one of them, of **(the birth of) a female (child), his face darkens, and he is filled with inward grief!** With shame does he hide himself from his people, Because of the bad news He has had! Shall he retain it On (sufferance and) contempt, Or bury it in the dust? **Ah! what an evil (choice) They decide on!** (The Noble Quran, 16:58-59)" So considering the birth of females as a bad thing is evil by itself in the Noble Quran.

Please visit: www.answering-christianity.com/view_of_women.htm to compare Islam's views on women VS the Bible's negative views and attitude.

Also, Allah Almighty said:

"Know they not Allah Knoweth what they conceal and what they reveal? And there are among them illiterates, who know not the Book (i.e., the Bible), but (see therein their own) desires, and they do nothing but conjecture. Then woe to those who write the Book with their own hands, and then say: 'This is from Allah,' To traffic with it for

a miserable price! **Woe to them for what their hands do write**, and for the gain they make thereby. (The Noble Quran, 2:77-78)"

"O Apostle! let not those grieve thee, who race each other into unbelief: (whether it be) among those who say "We believe" with their lips but whose hearts have no faith; or it be among the Jews,- men who will listen to any lie,- will listen even to others who have never so much as come to thee. **They change the words from their (right) times and places:** they say, 'If ye are given this, take it, but if not, beware!' If any one's trial is intended by God, thou hast no authority in the least for him against God. For such - it is not God's will to purify their hearts. For them there is disgrace in this world, and in the Hereafter a heavy punishment. (The Noble Quran, 5:41)"

"Who can be more wicked than one who inventeth a lie against God, or saith, "I have received inspiration," when he hath received none, or (again) who saith, "I can reveal the like of what God hath revealed"? If thou couldst but see how the wicked (do fare) in the flood of confusion at death! - the angels stretch forth their hands, (saying),"Yield up your souls: this day shall ye receive your reward,- a penalty of shame, for that ye used to tell lies against God, and scornfully to reject of His signs!" (The Noble Quran, 6:93)"

Since the books of Moses weren't written by Prophet Moses, nor were the Prophets' "books" written by the real Prophets, many liars have attributed lies on the mouths of GOD Almighty's Prophets, peace be upon all of them. For clear-cut proofs from the bible's own theologians admissions, please visit:

www.answering-christianity.com/authors_gospels.htm

www.answering-christianity.com/contra.htm

(C)- Rejecting of the blood-relationship, hence allowing for the parents to marry the unrelated children!!

Let us again look at Leviticus 20:21:

[Leviticus 20:21](#)

If a man marries his brother's wife, it is an act of impurity; he has dishonored his brother. **They will be childless.**

If the interpretation in sub-section "b" above is wrong - that GOD Almighty didn't supposedly promise to cause either of the parents to become barren - then the only interpretation left for this verse is that the children born from the new married couple are not considered actual legitimate children. So in the case of sin (a Jewish man and a Jewish woman violated Leviticus 20:21 and got married in **some land** today), **the**

children are considered strangers! This means that they can neither inherit nor carry the family's last name.

So if this is the case, then here are some serious questions:

1- Since the children are not related to either of the parents, can we now marry any of the parents' children, from their previous marriages, to the new children?

2- Can the mother, in case of divorce, marry any of the unrelated boys?

3- Can the father do an act of polygamy and marry any of the unrelated girls, **especially if they're not legally registered under his name?**

See proofs about [polygamy being allowed in both the Old and New Testaments in the Bible.](#)

I am sure that your natural inclination for an answer will be "NO" if you are a Jew or Christian, because these questions sound quite outrageous! But let us leave emotions aside for a second and let us think objectively here. **Please explain to me what does "they will be childless" exactly mean?** If neither of the parents is promised to become barren, then what else does it mean? And if the relationship between the parents and the new children is not approved by GOD Almighty, then

Show me the verse from the Bible that prohibits any of the parents from marrying any of these unrelated children!

If the child is now **forbidden** from even carrying the family's name, despite the fact that both his parents are known and are even still alive, and is also forbidden from inheriting, then why on earth would you think that the Bible doesn't allow for any of them to marry any of the unrelated children??

Whether this sounds very sick to you and me or not, that is not relevant here! What's relevant is that the Bible does allow for the parents to marry their own children in some cases.

(d)- Sam Shamoun got destroyed and silenced once again!

Sam Shamoun tried in the past to bring a new lie and twisted interpretations against the Noble Quran using this subject. He got annihilated very bad with ample Noble Quranic Verses that thoroughly refuted him:

[Does Islam really allow for fathers to marry their bastard daughters?](#) (also, his fabrication of quotes is thoroughly exposed here)

- [Can Muslims Marry their Daughters?](#)

Basically, the proofs in the above sub-section went right **through his skull**, because his own lies can now only be found in his Bible!

95% of Americans had premarital sex according to a new study!

As this site has successfully proven - through Allah Almighty's Grace and Will - that the Bible is the real cause and problem for the deterioration of morality, especially when it comes to sex, among Christians world-wide, because it is [a sick pornographic book](#) that contains overwhelming amount of graphic pornography in it, along with its **singings and praising of how women's vaginas and breasts literally taste like "wine,"** the following "reality check" further proves and enforces our claims and proofs about the [gospel of porn](#) being the real cause for the whoredom and prostitution that Christians had been historically living in, and continue to live in world-wide.

It is quite obvious that where ever there are Christian-dominated societies, there is always a great deal of illegal sex, boyfriend-girlfriend sexual relationships, bikinis, mini-skirts and other sexually arousing clothes, lust, pornography (on the internet and on TV), homosexuality, sodomy, drugs, alcohol, bastard children (children born out of wedlock), and so on....

You can bet your bottom dollar that these are the natural results and outcomes that the Christian societies breed. But why are they always like that? Why do they strive and thrive on being whores? The answer again lies in their [gospel of porn](#), **the book of women's vaginas and breasts literally taste like "wine"**. Have they not gotten

confusing teachings and explicit pornography from their bible, they would've been much better. But because they follow a man-altered and man-made corrupt book that contains ample contradictions, mixed signals, and violations to GOD Almighty's Divine Moral Code, they and their churches see no problem in the things that I just mentioned. On the contrary and most ironically, they now have homosexual churches.

Anyway, please do visit the [X-Rated Pornography in the Bible](#) article to see how the Bible truly condones illegal sex!

From

<http://www.cnn.com/2006/HEALTH/12/19/premarital.sex.ap/index.html>:

Reality check: **95 percent** of Americans had premarital sex

POSTED: 8:42 p.m. EST, December 20, 2006 POSTED: 8:42 p.m. EST, December 20, 2006

NEW YORK (AP) -- **More than nine out of 10 Americans, men and women alike, have had premarital sex**, according to a new study. The high rates extend even to women born in the 1940s, challenging perceptions that people were more chaste in the past.

"This is reality-check research," said the study's author, Lawrence Finer. "Premarital sex is normal behavior for the vast majority of Americans, **and has been for decades.**"

.....

The study, examining how sexual behavior before marriage has changed over time, was based on interviews conducted **with more than 38,000 people** -- about 33,000 of them women -- in 1982, 1988, 1995 and 2002 for the federal National Survey of Family Growth. According to Finer's analysis, 99 percent of the respondents had had sex by age 44, and 95 percent had done so before marriage.

.....

"The data clearly show that the majority of older teens and adults have already had sex before marriage, which calls into question the federal government's funding of abstinence-only-until-marriage programs for 12- to 29-year-olds," Finer said.

From

<http://www.foxnews.com/wires/2006Dec19/0,4670,PremaritalSex,00.html>:

Most Americans Have Had Premarital Sex

Tuesday, December 19, 2006

NEW YORK — More than nine out of 10 Americans, men and women alike, have had premarital sex, according to a new study. The high rates extend even to women born in the 1940s, challenging perceptions that people were more chaste in the past.

"This is reality-check research," said the study's author, Lawrence Finer. "Premarital sex is normal behavior for the vast majority of Americans, and has been for decades."

Conclusion:

Christians are lost because they have no Truth to follow; only men's books. Islam is the real solution to their immoralities and problems.

Therefore, embrace Islam and you will be saved!

Why are Christians so notorious in sinning throughout the world? What is the real secret behind it?

Why are Christians so notorious in sinning throughout the world? What is the real secret behind it?

As the latest devastating and quite embarrassing reality check study about premarital sex in the United States of America have revealed, 95% of all Americans had premarital sex! Now of course, one must take into consideration that out of the 250 million Americans, there are around 12 to 15 million Muslims, which puts them around the 5% percentile. This means that almost 100% of the Jews and Christians in the US had sex before marriage!

So why is that? What is it about Christians that makes them so noticeably attracted to pornography, sex, sodomy, homosexuality, lust, drugs, alcohol (thousands die from fatal "drinking and driving" accidents every year), bikinis where 99% of the woman's nakedness is fully exposed, inappropriate clothes, immoral TV and media (their white and black-race music is all about love and sex), violence, gangs, thugs and so on? Why is it that where ever there are Christian dominated societies, these evil things are always at their PRIME?

I've debated Christians long and hard on this subject before, and even demonstrated to them that their bible sings praises and glories about [women's vaginas and breasts tasting like "wine"](#), hence it is a book that promotes pornography, but they still insist that Christianity does not promote these things and that it is man that always falls short from the Glory and Will of GOD Almighty. But non-Christians throughout history and throughout the world, including pagans, all combined aren't even close to the Christians when it comes to these evil things!! And in Islam, we don't really fall that short from the Glory and Will of GOD Almighty. A Muslim who lives in an Islamic atmosphere is completely ignorant about these things!

The Reason!

After long and hard discussions with Christians, and after giving much thought into this subject, I think I have finally reached the real and main reason as to why these polytheist trinitarian pagans and infidels are so big and attracted and dying for doing the evil things that I mentioned above. You see, in the past my main argument was simply this:

- 1- The Bible contains ample pornography in it.
- 2- The Bible contains ample mixed signals and confusing messages about morality, in it, that the Christian reader can not draw the lines from them about what is sin and what is not, especially when it comes to things that are socially and widely accepted such as wearing bikinis, drinking alcohol, taking drugs, and going to bars and personally promoting evil and mischief in the society by supporting these things in wealth and in person (by physically being there).
- 3- The Bible contains countless contradictions and corruption both in text and conflicts with confirmed history, that no sane person would take it seriously especially when his sexual, alcoholic and/or drugs urge is at its highest peak! By the way, ironically, even the Bible's own theologians say that the Bible contains ample "fairy tales," "fictions," "fables" and "[contradictions](#)":
 - [The Christian and Bible theologians call them "fictions that exist in the Bible"!](#)
 - [The Christian and Bible theologians say "The original manuscripts had been lost"!](#)
 - [The Christian and Bible theologians call them "fairy tales and fables in the Bible"!](#)

So given these indisputable facts that even among the bible theologians themselves don't disagree with, I simply said that the Bible follower will always fall into sin because all he has is satan to guide him/her. But even with these irrefutable points,

many Christians have still objected to them and said that the Bible is innocent from promoting the evil things mentioned above!

With this said, let me now silence those folks, and I say this respectfully and without hostility, with a new fact about their Bible that will shed more light upon them by Allah Almighty's Grace, Mercy and Will:

The "man falls short" lie!

As I mentioned above, most Christians use the claim and excuse about "man always falls short from the Glory and Will of GOD Almighty." This, however, is a very dangerous statement and belief, especially when one follows a corrupt and self-contradicting book like the Bible! The Christians' religion is so perverted and so corrupt that it teaches them that everything that man does is a sin! Man is so surrounded and so flooded with sin that there is no way his belief in GOD Almighty and righteousness would save him from the Eternal Punishment of Hell. He needs a savior and that savior is none other than their false god, [who ran to Egypt for his life from King Herod](#), and who said only GOD Almighty knows and no one else [when he was asked about when the Hour will come](#) [2], Jesus Christ.

Their lies not mentioned in the OT: Now it is worth mentioning that the [crucifixion and resurrection lies](#) that form the entire christian belief, [have no basis](#) whatsoever in the Bible's Old Testament!

Now to us Muslims, Jesus Christ is a Prophet from GOD Almighty just like all of the other Prophets, peace and blessings be upon all of them (**that includes Prophet Muhammad also**), but to the Christians, he is the Creator of the Universe despite this god's embarrassing weaknesses and the [countless others that we mentioned on the site](#). Now it is also worth mentioning that Prophet Jesus said that he is not "good" and that **only GOD Almighty "good" and no one else** (Mark 10:18, Luke 18:19) [1]. This was his response when a person called him ["good master"](#).

But anyway back to the point, the Christians have so minimized the meaning of "sin" and turned everything into a "sin" including even breathing air, that it no longer became required of them to really try to stop themselves from committing any sin because, to these corrupt infidels, the flood of sins and sinning is so overwhelming that one might as well just give up and live and enjoy his life to the fullest as they are exactly doing now and have been consistently doing throughout the world and history. **They also invented the lie of that all sins are equal and all sins deserve the punishment of death!** So to these infidels, saying an inappropriate word to someone is the same as committing adultery. This again takes us back to the point about them turning everything into a sin and that only their false god, Jesus, can cause for these sins to be forgiven.

They have destroyed the true meaning of the word sin!

And they have invented the lie of "the savior"

Again, please visit: [Did Isaiah 53 really prophesies about the crucifixion of Jesus?](#)

[The Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.](#)

- [Part II.](#)
- [Part III.](#)

to see how this lie of the savior is thoroughly refuted and exposed, and also, to see how the **resurrection hoax** was never prophesied in the OT.

Also, **the crucifixion is a lie** according to [Jesus' disciples' own and personal writings in the early Christians' writings](#), and also according to Allah Almighty's own Words in the Noble Quran:

"That they rejected Faith; That they uttered against Mary A grave false charge; That they said (in boast): 'We killed Christ Jesus The son of Mary, The Messenger of Allah.' But they killed him not, Nor crucified him, but so it was made to appear to them, **and those who differ therein are full of doubts, with no (certain) knowledge, but only conjecture to follow,** for of a surety they killed him not. Nay, Allah raised him up Unto Himself; and Allah Is Exalted in Power, Wise. And there is none of the people of the book (Jews and Christians) But must believe in him (Jesus) Before his death; And on the Day of Judgment He (Jesus) will be a witness Against them. (The Noble Quran, 4:156-159)"

See also: www.answering-christianity.com/crucified.htm

The infidels know of no sin! That is why everything is allowed and doable to them, and that is why they see it as no big deal that [95% \(if not even more\) of their people are basically, in plain English, whores!](#) These polytheist trinitarian infidels are so lost and so desperate that they really are in a desperate need for Islam!! **Islam is their absolute ONE and ONLY solution**, not their false god whom they falsely and unjustly turned him into GOD despite the fact that the man clearly said that he was not:

"And behold! God will say: "O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of God?" **He will say: "Glory to Thee! never could I say what I had no right (to say).** Had I said such a thing, thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine. For Thou knowest in full all that is hidden. (The Noble Quran, 5:116)"

The Evangelicals do indeed [worship Jesus](#), and the [Catholics worship both Jesus and Mary](#). Not only that, but some Catholics also have the "[holy family trinity](#)", which consists of the Father, Mother and Son:



The Priest's "tallest (middle) [finger represents the father](#), the next [tallest \(index\), the mother](#), the [small thumb, the child](#)."

The "Mother of GOD" and "Holy Christ" blasphemous prayers:

If you watch the Catholics' prayers, you'll see their singings of praise to [Mary being the exalted and adored mother of GOD](#), and if you watch the Evangelicals pray, then you'll always see them [pray in Jesus' name](#), the man [who ran to Egypt for his life from King Herod](#), and who said only GOD Almighty knows and no one else [when he was asked about when the Hour will come](#) [2].

Also, if you've watched the recent King Kong movie, then you'll recall when Bruce Bexter saw the charging prey-dinosaurs coming toward him. What did he say out of fear? "[Mother of GOD!](#)" in reference to Mary. That was his prayer before he ran for his life from the charging dinosaurs. And what did the hero of the movie, Jack Driscoll, say when he saw them charging? "[Holy Christ!](#)" Now even though it's just a movie, but the characters did very well represent the mainstream Christians and their core blasphemous beliefs.

Also, even the polytheist trinitarian infidel, Sam Shamoun, always says "[Lord Jesus willing](#)," despite the fact that Jesus himself said "[do not call me good, only GOD is good](#)." (Mark 10:18, Luke 18:19) [1]

So, so much for their corruption and lies. Their Bible is a false book that was made and altered by men, and it is a book and a religion that promotes immorality and all of the sins that I mentioned above because it is not the True Word of GOD Almighty. The followers of the Holy Word of GOD Almighty are known by their works and fruits and only Islam's followers have the highest moral characters, ethics and fear and respect to GOD Almighty.

Therefore my dear Christian and Jewish reader, embrace Islam and you'll be saved. Otherwise, you have only yourself to blame for all of the blasphemy that you live and believe in.

Book Information (Bibliography):

1- The NIV Study Bible, 10th Anniversary Edition.

General Editor: Kenneth Barker.

Associate Editors: Donald Burdick, John Stek, Walter Wessel and Ronald Youngblood.

Published at: Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, MI 49530, USA

ISBN: 0-310-92589-4.

2- Holy Bible - King James Version.

KJV Giant Print, personal size reference Bible.

Published by Zondervan Publishing House.

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49530, U.S.A.

Printed in the United States of America

00 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

http://www.answering-christianity.com/x_rated.htm