Dear Brother Faull,

Regarding **Matthew 19:11-12:** [11] But he said to them, "Not everyone can accept this teaching, but only those to whom it is given. [12] For there are eunuchs who have been so from birth, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by others, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Let anyone accept this who can."

The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989), **Matthew 19:11-12**.

I read on your site where you mention the earlier verse in Matthew, however, why did you stop?

Here Jesus speaks of eunuchs who are born that way. A eunuch in the first century was the '*one who has charge of the bedchamber',* often a castrated male but also a homosexual male. Clearly here Jesus is telling us that homosexuality is an inborn trait.

I also noted that your entire argument was based on an English translation of the Biblical text, rather than on the actual Koine Greek.

Many Greek scholars do not agree with the translations commonly in use, particularly the King James and New King James versions. If you want your argument to have merit, you really need to go directly to the Greek.

That is what I did.

MR. FAULL's ANSWER

So the word "Eunuch" means homosexual? I get it now!!! "Some are born (homosexual). Some are made (homosexuals) by men, and some became (homosexuals) for the Kingdom of Heavens sake. If you're able to receive this idea of being homosexual, receive it."

How did I miss it? It is so plain. That is what you mean to say is it not? This is such absurdity. And why do you want it to be translated that way? Is it not to merely come up with the idea that homosexuality is acceptable to Him who said, "In the beginning He created them male and female?" And, "A man is to leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they two shall become one flesh."

He should have said "He made them male and female and homosexual who should leave their father and father or mother and mother (as the case may be) and cleave unto his or her significant other and become one family."

Is that really what Jesus meant?

Every nation, race, and religion, for all the years since creation, has condemned it, but you have negated it by an alleged knowledge of Greek.

The Biblical Greek text says "*eunonchas* (Strong's number 2135) from *eune* (bed) and 2192 *echo* (hold)".
The Greek dictionary says "a castrated person (such being employed in oriental bedchambers), by extension an impotent or unmarried man. By implication, a chamberlain (state-officer), a eunuch."

I am fully aware that the homosexuals are trying to change the meaning of the term. They must give new definition to words and in these new meanings to words, they can push their agenda.

It is so sad to me, and I mean you no harm, but it breaks my heart that sincere folk like you are being fed these wrong definitions of words.

Thank you so much for writing and I pray that God will spare your life so you may seriously do some thinking about His Word.

It does not make any difference which translation you use, the sin is condemned in both the Old and New Covenant Scriptures.

Please do not be deceived.

1 Corinthians 6:9-11 is worthy of your consideration. "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(*), 10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. 11 And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

Please have a good day. I wish you well.

(*) New Translations say "homosexuals".

REPLY FROM READER

I don't WANT to translate it that way. That is merely the CORRECT translation.

I am more interested in translating the Bible correctly than trying to make it fit any traditions.

However, Jesus was talking about "eunuchs", some are born with no interest in women, they are natural eunuchs and what we now refer to as homosexuals, some are made eunuchs through castration, and some choose to fore-swear women and become self-made eunuchs.

My only agenda is to promulgate a correct translation of the Bible, Old Testament and New Testament. In the last 100 years archaeologists have found a huge number of manuscripts from the first century, mostly parts of the New Testament but also extra Biblical material, that have given us a much better grasp of the correct translations of the Greek. The Dead Sea Scrolls did that for the Old Testament in Hebrew, as well.

The idea that the Bible condemns homosexuality is simply not supported by Scripture based on what we now know.

I am sorry if this disturbs you.

By the way, until the last 400 or 500 years, almost all nations and cultures accepted homosexuality. In fact, up until the 18th or 19th century the very concept of homosexuality was unknown, that is when the word homosexual was invented.

May the Lord be with you.

MR. FAULL's FINAL ANSWER

Oh how deceived you are not only about the Bible, but History.

The word "homosexual" was not a word till 1896 or so. That, of course, does not mean they did not exist. Read how the citizens of America drove them out of the colonies and the Indians were driven out of their villages for their sodomy. It was then called "buggerism".

I do not know what Greek book you're using but I want one too, so please give me the name of the Greek Lexicon you're using and your historical proofs you refer to but do not prove. You challenged me to look at the Greek. I already had before I wrote the article.

I already gave you Strong's definition in the last letter. Here is Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament words. It says it is "an emasculated man", "a eunuch".

Then it gives **Matthew 19:12** as the example. In the third instance in that verse, "one naturally incapacitated for, or voluntarily abstaining from, wedlock". C. "One such in a position of high authority". **Acts 8:27,39** This is the noun definition.

Under Verb form A, "To make a eunuch", in passive voice "were made eunuchs" probably an illusion by the Lord to the fact that there were eunuchs in the courts of the Herods, as would be well known to His hearers."

Now I suggest you go to Thayer's, and any other Lexicon, and find out that they say the same. Someone is lying to you. Name who it is as your authority. I see no reason I should accept your word for it. I named you two Lexicons that were sitting on my desk at the time I wrote the article.

By the way, how do you make a man a homosexual? I know how you make a eunuch but I do not know how you make a homosexual.

Also, how would becoming a homosexual benefit the Kingdom of Heaven?

Why do you just want the first mention of a eunuch in that verse to be a homosexual and the other two mentioned in that same verse to not be homosexual? Your bias is showing.

You're looking for a verse that says people are born that way. He never made them that way in the beginning and in the Old Testament He forbade it and called it "an abomination".

Also, I would like to know which of the hundreds of translations ever have translated it that way? Name one except perhaps some new one put out by the Metropolitan abomination.