ABSTRACT

Why is homosexuality denied according to theological dogmas? This article aims to evaluate the reasons for this denial, presenting them based on their own texts equivalent to doctrines, dogmas, orthodoxy. To this end, it will use the Holy Scriptures, the theological discourses addressed to biblical understanding, and all pertinent material that can satisfactorily substantiate and respond to the title-assertion. Moreover, there is also the need to seek a greater understanding of the issue of homosexuality regarding its onslaught in favor of its socioreligious recognition as an accepted sexual orientation whose subjects wish to actively participate as members or ministers of churches, free of any prejudices. Through a descriptive approach and bibliographic review, we will seek to understand all their refutations to biblical texts, investigating the compatibility of their interpretations at the level of impartiality. It is necessary to address the need to improve biblical-theological knowledge (without which it will not be possible to continue the investigation to refute or accept the
theses raised in this problem) as well as the need to improve the understanding about the claims concerning the issues involving homosexuality. It is essential to respond bilaterally to all questions in favor of a consensus among the parties involved so that all argumentative contradiction is eradicated, giving rise to the definitive acceptance of one or another position. The principles of acceptance or non-acceptance arise in order to provide a vehicle with material and immaterial solutions. The final purpose of this article is to meet this demand for intelligibility about the problem so that, once recognized, it can be effectively solved in favor of all those involved in the problem situation.
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INTRODUCTION

This article aims to point out the topics related to the question of the denial of homosexuality according to theological dogmas. “The Holy Scriptures are the Word of God” (ANDRADE, 1998, p. 140) - whose precepts are assumed to be obeyed by anyone who confesses to christian, that is, it is assumed that the one who assumes himself Christian knows in advance that the commandments contained in them are orders of God.

The Holy Bible (Holy Scriptures), without the addition of books considered apocryphal whose inspiration is not taken by divine, is composed of 39 books in the Old Testament and 27 books in the New Testament, thus distributed with their respective abbreviations and chapter numbers:

Table 1 – Books of the Old Testament and the New Testament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIBLE BOOKS AND ABBREVIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLD TESTAMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book / Abbreviation / Chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important are the biblical or Christian theologies – which emerged in the Middle Ages between the 4th and 5th centuries – and the inclusive one – which emerged in 1955 – that will often run into each other during the texts; regarding the second, characterized by the apology for the inclusion of blacks, women and homosexuals (it will be only in the last category). The objective of this study is not to simply intend to disprove the arguments of one or the other, since both have their postulates established, but to seek proof of adequacy,
coherence, symmetry and consistency of the axioms defended by them.

Divine orders, as stated earlier, are related to the life of the believer with regard to his personality and individuality in terms of behavior and sentimental, emotional, moral, spiritual experiences, etc. The Christian individual also becomes aware that God grants him free will to decide what he thinks is best for his life so that he becomes responsible for his choices. This involves the freedom to obey or disobey the divinely established rules, according to the Christian faith, and scribes and recorded; however, this does not give him the right to reverse the scriptitext – whose divine word remains unalterable in time and space as advocated in Luke 16 v.17, regardless of social changes – in favor of a conversion to new commandments exercised by today’s man who naturally tends to interpret the scripting texts in line with his needs, applying an eisege to him. It is pertinent to remember Foucault’s words (2000, p. 49): “One does not interpret what is in the meaning, but, deep down, who put the interpretation. The principle of interpretation is nothing more than the interpreter.” Whenever one wants to add something to a biblical text or remove something from it (something already foreseen by the “owner” of the scripted word) it denotes that it is an interest of the interpreter in which an idea becomes part of the text when in fact it does not, i.e., the developed eisegesis tends to manipulate the real textual intentions, revealing its impertinence. It is inferred by this that it is not the word of God that must adapt to man, but man must adapt to the word of God – an argument conducive to a Christian.

There is no “low theology” as some advocate against theologies that do not fit with thoughts and ideals of contrary theologies, for all theologies are at the same level of wanting to investigate, to seek, to understand a truth; so if a theology is low all are low. There is no better theology: queer theology is no better than traditional theology or apologetics and vice versa – apologetics does not become low theology only because it does not harmonize with the concepts of inclusive theology, for example. Therefore, no one has the right to bereave the ology of the other. It all comes down to studies for a better understanding of biblical texts and better application of them in everyday life that you want to be guided by them. There is no perfect theology. The truth is that everyone is seeking an almost inaccessible truth. Regarding the synchronous method, Ginzburg (2002, pp. 40-41) says that the text is not only what it says, but what does not say: “I did not want to detect a forgery, but rather to show that the hors-texte, what is outside the text, is also inside it, shelters between its folds: it is necessary to discover it and make it speak”. Jesus did not explicitly condemn homosexuality,
but tacitly referred to something that was written as a way of validating the text preceding his words. Read at least two of Jesus’ statements about originally biological human sexuality, which contrasts with gender ideology:

a) Jesus speaking in Matthew:

“You have not read [it’s written] that he who made them in the beginning male and female made them” (Mt 19: 4);

b) Jesus speaking in Mark:

“From the beginning of creation, God made them male and female (Mk 10:6).

The SINCE preposition implies the meaning of “up to the present day”. How to deny the semantic meaning of a text? And what about the terms “male” and “female” according to their denotative meanings?

That is, if it is to value the Scriptures, if it is so important to say that Jesus didn’t say, that Jesus didn’t condemn, that Jesus didn’t say anything contrary to homosexuality, why not value when the text shows that “He said” something reiterating a previous scripted text? It is understood from this event that the argument is only worth how much it weighs – the actions are based on the convenience of the one who does not want to accept the obvious, and seeks arguments of absence or silence to silence scripted truths. This, yes, would be a “low theology” since one cannot invent in the text what is not there.

By quoting texts such as these above, a natural tendency by those who do not agree with the word of Jesus – in which, contradictorily, he himself seeks support for his theses, as a way of validating his own concepts – is ironically refute any defense that appropriates texts such as genesis, as if it had no value for epistemological purposes.

There is an ideological-religious-biblical-cultural war rising among ordinary societies that will result in nothing, no sight of the lack of interest in reaching the truth that cries out at the core of every human being: I want God to clarify my truth; I don’t want to form it for my will. What’s my truth? What’s my real self? What I’m defending is what I really believe or what I want to believe? The human problem is internal and not external; is from the inside out and
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not from the outside in. As long as humanity doesn’t recognize this, it will continue to discuss debalde.

In conclusion, he is asked that Jesus didn’t speak, for he seems to quote Jesus because he is apparently not against his concepts, but: “If Jesus had spoken explicitly against homosexuality, what would he do, would he continue to quote Jesus? Would you listen to his voice being gay? There is an unintelligible insistence that Jesus did not speak against homosexuality. Perhaps this means that if he had spoken contrary to this theme, everyone would have accepted his rhetoric; would everyone have followed him?

1. RULES AND ACRASIAS

Each organization has in its system its own rules established in its regiments that must be strictly adhered to with the risk of punishment in case of inwarning. With ecclesiastical organization it is no different, because its system also has its own rules. There is, however, a difference between these organizational types, in which the former refers to the humanitarian partner – where man prescribes laws for natural men – and the second to the socioreligious where, usually, laws are divinely inspired and prescribed by a transcendental being, to whom faith is attributed, directed to spiritual or even natural men.

Laws are created to be obeyed, otherwise one would live in a caotized and anarchic society. When this does not happen, what is called anarchy occurs, that is, a system that denies a previously established authority, stimulating institutional chaos. The Church as a religious authority has dogmatic precepts that portray the sacred world, which must be followed by its members, although they do not lose touch with the profane world because they are inserted in it. By no longer being practiced, these precepts suffer a rupture in time and space, causing doctrinal breaks that go against the ethical principles adopted by that religious organization – here, particularly, the ecclesiastical. In this rupture, their principles of faith and practice are shaken and unstructured so that they begin to generate what is understood as a path within a previously established path that was intended to be followed.

It is in this prism that the question of the denial of homosexuality by the Church is framed, not because it is willing to discriminate homosexuality, but because everything pertinent to
this sexual orientation is already previously recorded in her larger book – the Holy Bible – as a sociobehavioral element divinely disapproved and classified as unnatural by which they determine the laws transcribed by those men who believe themselves divinely inspired. The lack of understanding of this position of the Church has led millions of people to condemn it to a state of perversity that, in reality, at least in this sense, does not portray its real intention, which reflects the mere desire and right to obey the ordinances established in its midst in order to be consistent with the proposed religious objectives.

It is believed that following another parameter would deconfigure the identity of the Church. It has biblical doctrines that are held by true because confirmed in its scripted context. There is no way to talk about the Church’s denial of homosexuality without quoting its instituter, Jesus Christ; without mentioning his law, the Holy Bible; without mentioning his teachings, biblical doctrines; without quoting God, what he is. All this implies a sense of impartiality, not partiality, for it is not intended to judge here that everyone should profess a faith in God or In Jesus Christ (have seen the specific subject being dealt with in this research being related to the Church) or in any other gods, but clarify their institutional regulations that provide for the meaning of obedience by anyone who wants to belong to his membership.

He who enters a Church knows beforehand that she has laws, commandments, doctrines, ethical and moral opinions, rites, symbols, etc., but no one is or is obliged to follow these things, having every right to refuse them, and to do so, if it does not harmonize with its statutes, should not seek to modify them at their convenience, i.e., or adapt to them or found their own institution with their own commandments; therefore, there is no way to transform laws prescribed by the very instituter of a particular organization, in this case the ecclesiastical, without its endorsement since it is known to be written and sacramented that what was recorded in the Holy Scriptures was once and foremost without any possible modifications, as found in biblical references that attest to this truth (Pr 30:5,6; Rev 22:18,19; 1 Cor 4:6; Gl 1:8,9; 2 John 1:9).

However, many changes have emerged in biblical texts that mischaracterize the person of God as described in them. For example, John’s first epistle, chapter four, verse eight, declares that “God is love.” Replacing this statement (biased or not), theologian Althaus-Reid (2001, p. 147) declares that “God is desire”. Would there be in this change any objective of desacralization of the divine person in question? Considering the semantic and semantic
perspectives of the words: What would love be? What would desire be? Would they be synonymous words? Would that last word have the same meaning as the one originally inserted? Is there in this last place some sense of eroticism, sensuality, which lead to believe in the possibility of an indecent theology as proposed by the author? She advocates the warping of theology (Twisted or Indecent Theology) in order to break with the heterosexual ideology that is considered as a universal model of sexuality.

There is a misunderstanding of the question of the phrase “God is love” to which one attributes the sense that everything that involves love is approved by God. It is necessary to study, to improve the knowledge of the word love in order to understand what exactly this biblical phrase (1 Jn 4:8) means. It is not, therefore, the case of deconstructing what is divinely inspired by the Bible in favor of a construction created by men in contradiction to that inspiration given by God to biblical men who have developed it over a while - beginning and ending - provided by the one who believes himself the owner of the absolute truth described in the whole book that is considered sacred. This love of God is actually an unconditional love, the so-called “agape love”, the one that was manifested by God when he offered his Son to provide the salvation of a humanity lost in errors (natural vision) and sins (spiritual vision), which he wanted to rescue; it is not, therefore, a love Eros (romantic), Philia (friendship/branch) or Storge (brotherly/affection). From what the Scriptures declare, no one has this love but God himself. Therefore, it does not serve as an argument in defense of specific issues such as prejudices against the biblical word in favor of what it condemns.

The anti-homophobia movements and activities that arise in the name of love (desire?) should focus more on social issues that demean citizens’ civil rights, regardless of sexual orientation, than on banning biblical texts dealing with God’s view of homosexuality, to which they can modify the corresponding texts, but the vision of God once forever declared as seen in biblical records will not change, and , then, the following questions enter based on Bible verses: a) Does your heart condemn you in what you do? (1 John 3:21). If he does not condemn, the biblical texts will not affect him under any circumstances, and therefore no intervention contrary to the biblical text is necessary, but if he condemns, condemned already is and modifications will not alter those circumstances; b) When do you do what you think should make your conscience condemn so? (Rom 14:22). They are verses like these that guarantee to those who read that what he does that does not inspire self-confidence or security puts him in the condition of feeling in sin, that is, that damning condition not by
others from outside, but first by himself, regardless of the vision or opinion of others.

However, as much as the claim for a right followed by approval is fair, the hypotheses described above cannot be mitigated by external factors – for example, in this specific case, through an anti-homophobia law created in favor of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, transsexual and intersexual (LGBTTI) population that cites homophobic points punishable by those who infringe them; on the other hand, a law criticized by the Evangelical Caucus that demands rights to religious freedom and opinion, in addition to confronting family values and principles consolidated in the Federal Constitution (VAZ, 2017) – because it is more a psycho-pneumo-emotional condition than a sociocultural complacation – the first focused on inner well-being; the second, for outdoor well-being. Philosophizing, material achievements cannot always meet the real ontological needs of the subjects of an action.

Musskopf (2008) intends to present a new discourse that breaks with previous forms in relation to the theme of homosexuality, bringing to existence a new subject who favors the deconstruction of the meaning of sodomy by trying to disconnect it from the biblical context concerning the narrative of Sodom and Gomorrah – that event had its unique moment that characterized an abominable action in the eyes of God as described in this passage; there is, therefore, no way to unlink it theologically from the context for the purpose of favoring a postmodern ideology that advocates new approaches on the subject. This was a historical moment within a socioreligious perspective of the time that was recorded for practical purposes for every reader at all times since the Holy Bible is a book of irrevocable literary character that does not fit with human impressions nor allows to be modified by them.

As far as the Church as a religious institutional organization has the right to demand obedience to what it advocates as a norm of faith and conduct to be explained and experienced by its members without suffering retaliation by others who, desiring to be part of the member, or rather, desiring to be a Christian belonging to a church that has the Bible as a book-law, manual of inland regiment, do not feel welcomed by it due to an issue already foreseen in its terms, rejecting its precepts of the way pre-established in its governmental structure?
2. CLARIFYING THEOLOGICAL VIESES

It is necessary to know the bases that support the non-acceptance of homosexuality in the church and to recognize its credibility, acceptability, applicability, in this religious sphere without offense to contrary mentalities, but only seeking a clarification about fundamental concepts in order to provide a better understanding for those whose ideologies, which directly or indirectly involve ideological issues, do not harmonize with the biblical-theological-ecclesiastical theses, but with biology and culture as the philosopher Judith Butler says, an icon of queer and gender theory: “To be human is to live at the intersection between biology and culture”, as if religion did not belong to the sphere of humanity. So why would you want to modify the religious statutes advocated by ecclesiastical institutions when proponents of that theory and ideology understand that biological sex and male and female identities are formed respectively by physical aspects and social constructions due to historical and social influences?

There is an urgent need to contribute to clarifying the fundamental reasons for why the Church is antagonically positioning itself to homosexuality, which is intrinsically linked to the gender ideology that has caused many controversies in today’s society. How is (homo)sexuality biblically predicted so that it can be contemplated as a physiological need? According to the Pyramid of The Needs of Maslow (Gallardo, 2019) of the humanist psychologist Abraham Maslow, considering that physiology deals with the organic functions that propitiate the manifestation of life, sexual reproduction is classified as a physiological necessity because it is responsible for the propagation of species. How would the human species spread through homosexual athet?

Figure 1 – Pyramid of Maslow’s Needs
It is indispensable that these are the contradictions in this struggle for the recognition of homosexuality by the Church so that the problems of non-acceptance may be addressed in an intelligible and just way. The idea of gender is offensive to those who base their worldview on the Bible, as highlighted in the words of american philosopher Judith Butler:

The concept of gender generates a lot of fear. It is a very misunderstood idea and represented as caricature. Even Pope Francis condemned ‘gender as a diabolical ideology,’ Butler says. It is a criticism made by right-wing Catholicism that caught between those who believe that the concept denies the natural differences between the sexes and threatens marriage and the family, the basis of heterosexuality. If you base your worldview on the Bible, then the idea of gender is going to be really offensive. (BARIFOUSE, 2017)

This implies that the gender ideology that is linked to homosexuality goes against the Bible. However, a) homosexuals find themselves in a struggle to be accepted by the Church b)
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which has the Bible as a dogmatic reference, c) this same Bible that makes them feel offended and morally attacked due to the d) respective texts that they consider heteronormative and, consequently, homophobic. However, they intend – and have already done – and) modify these texts or even eliminate them from the Bible to f) remove any possibility of confrontation with their sexual orientation, so as to g) avoid discomfort regarding the applicability of the biblical word in everyday life that does not correspond to the sacred text. What, then, are the changes in biblical texts used to form a new Bible written by human understanding? What bible will this be, the postmodern post-vetero-neo-testament Bible inspired by men?

Illustratively, in disagreement with White’s words immediately below, it can be asserted that there is a vocabulary and meaning literality between the Old and New Testament sparsely complexed with a unique context that presents semantic-textual inchange amid sociocultural changes over the centuries. Therefore, the placements in Genesis 19:4,5 and 1 Cor 6:10 in which there is an etymological-toponymic and terminological correspondence: “men of Sodom” and “sodomites”.

Over the centuries, the Holy Spirit has taught us that certain verses of the Bible should not be understood as God’s law for all periods of time. Some verses are specific to a culture and to the time and are no longer seen as appropriate, wise, or righteous. (WHITE, 2013)

According to White, Bible verses must be adaptable to different times and cultures in order to manifest aspects of applicability with wisdom and justice. However, such reasoning runs counter to one of the principles intrinsic to the nature of God – immutability, which harmonizes with the principle of God’s eternity whose nature is not limited to time and space, as announced in Psalm90:2; John 17:5. It is known, however, that in order to have changes in a being it is necessary that there be a chronological order that requires the existence of a moment or phase before and after the change; therefore, this suggests that changes occur in line with time limitations, and, through biblical contexts, God is not a limited being

According to Menzies and Horton (1995, p. 49), “God is unchangeable (not susceptible to change) and eternal. Divine nature does not change, it will never change.” Review the verses: Malahes 3:6; Luke 21:33; James 1:17. How can White then declare that the Holy
Ghost has taught him that they are specific to certain cultures and times and are not applicable to all periods? In this case, the word script would be at least contradictory, and therefore unreliable; therefore, the revelation that White assumes he received from the Holy Spirit should also have no credibility. Therefore, it would not be good for him or anyone else. The Bible would become a disposable book.

What is the relevance of this question? What is its importance in the field of theorization? The choice of this theme occurred through the perception of the need to help clarify the reasons presented by the Church to justify its denial of homosexuality. The references researched and cited, in turn, were based on the pertinent contextualization of the authors involved in pros and cons, referencing defense or refutation to the theme under study.

The various questions concerning this discussion have not yet been answered satisfactorily. This can be confirmed by the countless physical or web literatures (Campello, 2010, p. 87) – the researcher’s neologism that indicates the use of the WEB by the spider-writer who hooks readers into the web [web] that compare to easy prey like helpless flies – whose poor and unfortunate texts do not present a definitely convincing answer that clearly explains the reason for the problem and a possible solution. The fact of not having found an adequate and satisfactory answer to this case so far acts as a stimulating factor in the sense of finding a concrete answer to the question of whether or not to be intrinsically linked to having or not having rights ". so that it will clarify once and for all, and, of course, to anyone who may truly be interested – it is known that even those who seek solutions do not really want them – and become useful for the purpose they aim to achieve. Thus, beginning this cycle of satisfactory responses, however convincing based on the biblical text, which has been the target of condemnation at the level of meanings, follows a brief exegesis of some of the most commented verses.

Before, however, it should be emphasized that although this article belongs to a scientific scale it uses extrascientific resources due to the biblical-religious theme that is inherent to it given the dialectic to be treated. Analyzing Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians, chapter six, verses nine to eleven, considering the context before and after the target verse: “Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not erreine: neither the debauch, nor the idolatetes, nor the adulterers, nor the epheminates, nor the sodomites, nor the thieves, nor the misers, nor the drunks, nor the evil ones, nor the robbers shall inherit the
kingdom of God. And that’s what some have been; but ye have been washed away, but ye have been sanctified, but ye have been justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God” (Version: Almeida Revised and Corrected – ARC); “You know that the wicked will have no part in the Kingdom of God. Make no mistake, for the immoral, the idol worshippers, the adulterers, homosexuals, thieves, the misers, the drunks, the slanderers and the robbers will have no part in the Kingdom of God. Some of you were like that. But they were washed away from sin, separated to belong to God, and accepted by him through the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God” (Version: New Translation in Today’s Language – NTLH); the following is understood: They are unjust those who will not receive God’s salvation. Who are they? Verse ten presents them, and among them are the epheminates and sodomites, i.e., homosexuals – the focus of this research concerning the Church whose base book is the Bible – and announces their eternal doom. Verse eleven begins, then, communicating the perdition of those who remain in sin, and the salvation of those who regenerate.

What is sin, then? It is all that makes communion between God and man impossible. A person can believe in the existence of God – believing that God exists is different from the manifestation of faith – but this does not mean communion since it requires harmony in the way of feeling, thinking and acting according to the precepts outlined by God; communion reflects an identification in which there is a connection between them that unites them spiritually. It is not necessary to be a member of a church to manifest this communion that goes far beyond simply praying, fasting, sacrificing, practicing religiousities, etc. Sin is, in a light, the separation between man and God. It is infer from the biblical text (Tsg 5:20) that God does not desire the death of anyone (wicked), but that he repents of his sin, that is, from what drives him away from God since his grace remains available regardless of the extent of man’s rebellion against him. No matter how many sins have been committed; it is important, rather, that you abandon them since they interrupt their friendship with God, causing a life of self-confidence that produces excellent results in the eternal life, but has no power of spiritual salvation. Does it matter? Here’s the thing. Faith or self-confidence? If the struggle fought is for a matter of spiritual value, rejecting faith in favor of self-confidence is at least contradictory. And faith brings with it other values such as obedience and dependence.

And what regeneration is that? From what is apparent from the biblical texts, what counts is the sincere assumption of what is assimilated as sin and the corresponding dissatisfaction
resulting from it; as it is written that God probes hearts and knows that one would like to be or act differently for the purpose of corresponding to what he conceives as pleasant to God, but he does not succeed because of the weakness of his humanity. This expresses what appears as faith that acts as honor to God, and this is imputed to the person for justice. On the other hand, there are those who do not care about biblical positions, dismembering them from their respective texts, assuming their own will and understandings to the detriment of God’s prazygoability, resolving their afflictions and questioning scans from a personal cognition.

Roughly speaking, this literal interpretation is taxing and definitive without further explanation; however, these verses must be analyzed in the light of the between rows that exist in other biblical contexts, so it is insating that the Bible is explained by itself. Consider themselves, therefore, biblical passages that reveal God’s grace about people who sinned but did not conform to their sinful life, condemning themselves in a process of introspection that led to self-knowledge: 1) “I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want this to do” (Rom 7:19), actions intrinsic to humanity – even if it was in sin, did not demonstrate full satisfaction with its practice; these words of the Apostle Paul reveal his nonconformism to a certain circumstance in his life. This type of nonconformism is a reaction that pleases God, because it reveals a concern for recognizing that he is displeasing God, thus reflecting a manifestation of faith and veneration for the divine person, even though he is in sin. These are confessions of recognition of sins arising from a spiritual nuisance in the face of divine presence; that is, there was no full satisfaction, a purchase in committing sins, an accommodation in a life of sins, but there was an everyday self-collection, not forgotten, intermittent.

The fact that a person is living a life of sin does not necessarily mean that they will lose their salvation. According to another Biblical quote: 2) “Everyone who remains in him is not in sin. Everyone who is in sin has neither seen nor knew him” (1 Jn 3:6), that is, as long as the person keeps in touch with God, despite sin — caring about his judgment, desiring to please him, feeling that spiritual discomfort that leads him to believe that a change of behavior and attitude would bring him inner peace, seeking the face of God at every restlessness about his life circumstances, even if this search is not manifest, but occurs at the heart of being that silences hidden truths – it has guaranteed its salvation, and is therefore free from condemnation; otherwise, there would be no saving opportunity for any human being on the
face of the earth since the whole world is a sinner according to Paul’s words in Romans 3:23 — “all have sinned and are destitute of the glory of God.”

Nevertheless, as referenced in Romans 5:16c, 3) “In the case of salvation, God forgives those who have committed many sins, though they do not deserve this forgiveness.” There is a very vast list of various types of sins, and some commit one kind, and others commit another kind, so that everyone sins. The big problem is insipidity concerning admittedly accepted sin and assumedly unwanted sin. It seems that the supply of this need would be a more effective solution to the mind and spirit than attempts at biblical-textual modifications. However, this also depends on situating the will at that specific point of the soul,

The action of wanting to discover an internal influence that is greater than the external one. As secular or scientific people say that the problem of the subject is irreversible (...) God inspires the subject to an introspective analysis that makes him bare his ego and thus can understand the reason that leads him to that state; only then does he find himself able to find the solution to his problem that afflicts him so much. (...) it is necessary that, through this self-analysis, the subject recognizes that his discomfort comes from his own actions, and, without subterfuge, without shame and without fear, confess to himself the disease of the soul. (CAMPELLO, 2015, p. 160,161)

Although it is also understood that the opposite is true for those who conceive it, as sugestiona Musskopf (2008) as to diasporic attitudes that lead to a want of self-modification in the condition of foreigner who does not adapt to the strange land because it manifests a mentality incompatibly to other mentalities, causing an uprising of questions and answers only provisional in order to resist forces that are supposed antagonistic by belonging to a doctrinal line divergent according to their understanding particularly since there is no heterocentric theology, but a theology, to which it should be mentioned, which according to Andrade (1998) has as characteristic the orderly and systematic study of the Supreme Being (and not centered on a heterosexual being) and its relationship with humanity and which is based on the revelation of God that is found in the Holy Bible, natural revelation and religious experience, employing logic and other methodologies for didactic purposes.

A heterocentric theology would not be a theology centered on God, but on man (the human
being). When one classifies common or primitive theology as heterocentric, it means that it believes that the entire Holy Bible – its object of study – is a book, in the category of common books, that disparages anyone who is against that supposed theological path, as if it were already a misplaced being, leading it to understand that there is no stable belonging to it. The essence of theology, however, is lost in the midst of this search for a fixed place that resists this supposed heterocentrism (Musskopf, 2008); supposed because theology having God and his revelation as an object of study would not support a change in this parameter without succumbing to the consequences of these changes in the content of the respective biblical texts that are carried out and developed by human cognition whose interpretation intends to transform a literality that admits interpretations, but does not fit with contextualizations formed from socio-humanitarian events to the detriment of biblical-spiritual events; such a change would destructure the biblical-textual content, as it would create bifurccities that, consequently, would eliminate the only path to which it is directed. To say that this theology, which has God as a central figure, is heterocentric means to say that it is a study of God centered on heterosexual man, that is, a theology that studies a God whose writings focus on heterosexuality – biologically man and woman (as if only this should not correspond to biblical records, but also homosexuality) – having more importance than other themes, since in this theological dispute all others seem to fall by the wayside. In inclusive theology, which excludes heterocentric theology as it designates and which also denotes a mistaken designation, the divine person is relegated to a level of demerit, like a god-graced (MUSSKOPF, 2008) – a God full of grace, a funny God or a wretched God? – with regard to the processes of building male identities where the grace of the world transforms God. Can God be transformed by the hand of man? What kind of God is that? Does he exist? Through such placements, what so much relevance does he have for them to care about their dictates, or rather, with their scripted records if it is now grace of the and now tyrant? All this seems to generate an inversion of values.

The relationship and conflicts with the church cannot change the theological course with the belief that it will change God’s mentality. If Pilate, being a man, said that what he had written, had written (John 19:22), not modifying his text, and his order was obeyed, why the obstinacy in not accepting the texts of God? Would this happen for your invisibility? What is the primary purpose of the Church? Inclusive theology shows not to have as main focus the study of the salvation of humanity through redemptive work, the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, but the ecclesiastical-religious placement, without leaving aside the sociocultural, of a class
of people who feel wronged, discriminated and excluded (MUSSKOPF, 2008) by a heterocentric-heteronormative theology that they believe exists. Religious institutions, such as churches, which are based on the Holy Scriptures, tend to seek to obey the precepts and doctrines recorded there, and this has nothing to do with the meaning of people (Det 10:17; 2 Pr 19:7; Job 13:10; 34:10; Mi 2:9; At 10:34; Rm 2:11; Eph 6:9; Tg 2:1.9; Cl 3:25; 1 Pe 1:17); if it were so, God would not command foreigners to be welcomed, for example (22:21; 23:9; Lv 19:34; Det 10:19), but at least it has to do with the willingness to follow divine instructions (Pr 1:7; 8:33; 10:17; 15:33; Sl 32:8; Is 28:26; 2 Tm 3:16), while welcoming the needy, the wronged, the despised, etc. When they fail to do so, it cannot be attributed to God, but it must be to men who do not keep the divine commandments. These are (pre)engaged in producing logorrheas that despise the importance of logos through a swear stream whose content is only a copy of other people’s verborrases who equally despise the Word. What’s God’s fault for that? Man wastes what is precious and God pays the bill! Every human life is precious in God’s eyes and needs to be cared for. Who has neglected this care and in the name of what? Thus, much more important things to be done than wars of letters are discovered: “the letter kills” (2 Cor 3:6).

Analyzing the First Book of Samuel — chapter eighteen, verses one through four; chapter twenty, verses three and forty-one – together with the Second Book of Samuel – chapter one, verses twenty-five to twenty-six – considering the textual equivalence between the two, explains what seems not to be clearly evidenced:

And it came to say that when he had finished speaking to Saul, Jonathan’s soul was connected with David’s soul; and Jonathan loved him, as to his own soul. And Saul that day took him, and he did not allow him to return to his father’s house. And Jonathan and David made a covenant, for Jonathan loved him as to his own soul. And Jonathan stripped himself of the cloak he bore upon him, and gave it to David, as well as his dresses, even his sword, and his bow. Then David swore again, and said, Many ye know thy father that I found grace in your eyes; for he said, Do not know this Jonathan, that he may not be hurt; and indeed the Lord lives, and your soul lives, that there is only one step between me and death. And Jonathan said unto David, Whatever thy soul says, I will do unto you. And when the young man was gone, David arose from the southern band, and cast himself upon his face on the ground, and bowed three times; and they kissed
each other, and wept together, until David cried much more. How the brave fell in the middle of the skin! Jonathan on your highs was wounded. Distressed I am for you, my brother Jonathan; how much amabile you were to me! More wonderful to me was your love than the love of women. (BÍBLIA SAGRADA, 1995, p. 303, 305, 307, 319)

Adherents of Inclusive Theology admit that one cannot prove the conjectures raised about a possible sexual relationship between the biblical characters David and Jonathan, but allow themselves to be seduced by the convenience of interpretation, silva, respectively:

In the case of the story of David and Jonathan, this virtuality occurs at the crossroads of social positions, Jonathan as a prince and David from a sheepherder to a warrior who would become king. Two men who connected by an atypical conjuncture, who engendered an alliance of generations. If in fact, they incurred homosexuality, it is not one hundred percent proven. However, the ambiguity of the narrative and the unfolding of events allow IT fans to say yes. (SILVA, 2017, p. 6.7)

And Musskopf:

the narratives about Jonathan and David and Ruth and Noemi [...] are the most prominent in this area. Rather anachronically, although with undoubted gains in pastoral terms, these characters come to represent the homosexual experience in the Bible [...] there seems to be a belief in the fact that if we prove that Jonathan and David were gay and Ruth and Noemi were lesbians (categories that only came to be used in the twentieth century), the participation of homosexuals in churches would be guaranteed (MUSSKOPF, 2010 , pp. 260-261 apud MARANHÃO FILHO, 2016, p. 154).

Jonathan and David enjoyed a deep and sublime friendship that was born spontaneously between them and did not succumb amid persecuti[Pv 17:17]on, remaining steadfast even after death [2 Sm 9:7,13]. This is one of the greatest examples of friendship in the Bible. They both met each other with the affection they did not experience in their own families.
The gifts David received from Jonathan symbolized a pledge to the vow of friendship between them; David, being poor, gave what he possessed – love and respect; Jonathan gave material goods. By giving David his belongings as his cape, his robes, his sword, his bow, and his belt, Jonathan transferred to David the right of succession to his father’s throne as a preview of the coming. Classically speaking, “Homer’s Iliad” (VI. 230) presents a similar event between Glaucus and Diomedes when they exchange each other clothes and weapons. Today, it is also very common for football players to change shirts at the end of matches.

Before he was persecuted by Saul, he made David a squire, and Jonathan gave him the weapons. The cover symbolizes protection; the armor symbolizes safety; the sword symbolizes efficiency; the bow symbolizes power; the belt symbolizes friendship. When David was persecuted by Saul, Jonathan’s father, he acted as David’s ally.

Here comes the golden key that definitively closes the conjecture doors related to the kind of love that involved these two male biblical characters, two friends: “Jonathan’s soul was connected with the soul of David” (1 Sam 18:1). “If you have turned on” – Indicative mode of the verb “ligar” (pronominal) in the Perfect Pretérito time. “To bind”, equivalent to “Unite” or “Atar”, indicating a permanent state: the Hebrew verb ניקשֶרַה /NIQESHÈRÅH/ (Hebrew Bible Transliterated, 2020, 1 Sm 18:1) has as best expression the pronominal verb “to coalesce”. In Genesis 44:30 – “Now, therefore, when I go to thy servant, my father, and the young man not to go with us, as his soul is connected with his soul,” there is also love between two male characters, father and son, Jacob and Benjamin. “It’s on” – Indicative Mode of the verb “to be” (binding verb, not not not a not-nod or copulsive) in the present tense, forming the Predicate of the Subject, indicating a permanent state: (using the same Hebrew verb of 1 Samuel 18:1) קשֶר /QËSHURÅH/ (Hebrew Bible Transliterated, 2020, Gn 44:30) “clump together”. The union of souls through deep affection was typically Hebrew concept (feeling like Moses’s for the nation in Exodus 18:18).

Who has not experienced the excellence of a brotherly love that goes beyond the extent of a romantic love? It is this kind of love that these verses deal with. It seems even that this biblical fact of love between two friends, occurred in the history of servants of God so that being recorded for reading in times to come, in his omniscience, God provided all this event to give mankind the opportunity to manifest their thoughts and interpretations that vary from mind to mind, according to which they carry in their hearts; everything they think and everything
they interpret is a reflection of their interior, as Jesus says: what misowns man is not what enters through his mouth, but what comes out of his mouth, comes from the heart. The Bible reads the following guidelines: “Examine man himself (1 Cor 11:28) and “See if there is any evil way in me” (Su 139:24). Romans 14:22 declares that he who does not condemn himself in what he approves is happy is happy. Therefore, if after doing an exegesis, any previous interpretation bothers, this denotes a self-condemnation of the interpreter. It is known that there is a great possibility of deep relationships between people of the same sex without sexual involvement. However, it seems that some express great interest in passages such as these in order to corroborate their own behaviors and attitudes as if being blessed by God by being included in the Bible as well as Ruth and Naomi; however, it is necessary to remember that there is a deep relationship also between man and Christ, and thus it becomes easier to understand that, instead of considering these types of relationships as based on sex, one can view them as being pious relationships between men (people of both sexes).

Interpretations are free and, in most cases, are consistent with convictions or conveniences, making them, in this case, biased.

In fact, this inclusive reading, in addition to deconstructing hegemonic interpretations of homosexuality, also seeks to identify and positive possible examples of homosexual individuals in the biblical narrative. It is in this sense that the story of David and Jonathan gains new tones and contours. According to Feitosa, inclusive theology proposes “a careful review of what the Bible says about homosexuality. Promoting “the encounter between sexual minorities and scripture, building a sense of affirmation and empowerment in the hearts of those who feel excluded from the Bible or condemned by it” (SILVA, 2016, p.2).

From what is understood, the Bible is what has been written since it began to be written by men inspired by God. Here, however, arises an inclusive theology that defends an inclusive Bible that arises “in favor of a certain class of people” – “just reason” – but excludes certain texts from the original Bible or explains them according to what they think is a judicious understanding, but why not say biased because it is corresponding to the conveniences themselves? A new Bible that includes human concepts, but excludes divine precepts, i.e., seeks to deconstruct the meaning of what is evidenced according to what the author himself meant in favor of a semantic construction a posteriori that is in line with his personal goals. A
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paradoxical, contradictory situation.

Inclusive Theology (FEITOSA, 2011), a branch of traditional theology aimed at the inclusion not only of homosexual people, but also of socially stigmatized categories such as blacks and women, arguing that “all who make up human diversity, whatever, have free access to God through the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross.” Advocates that everyone should be accepted regardless of sexual orientation so that they are not marginalized by society, specifically in the religious context; it requires a theology that contemplates the need for acceptance by religions, especially Christianity. With regard to “acceptance,” he seeks his defense in the biblical phrase, both Old Testament and New Testament, “God does not respect people,” which is found in: Det 10:17; 2 Cr 19:7; At 10:34; Rm 2:11; Eph 6:9; Cl 3:25; Tg 2:9; 1 Pe 1:17. As for the term “Meaning”, from the Greek “προσωπολήμα” /prosopolepsia/, this denotes favoritism, display of trends, conditional preference, discriminatory aspect, partiality in the treatment of people. The truth is that the one who distinguishes between people is society itself and not God. The preaching of the gospel is for all who recognize the need to know Christ, the Incarnate Logos, the Word, to which it must be believed and obeyed. Therefore, if a person professes his or her faith in Christ, he or she becomes a participant in his plan of salvation and fits into that context of divine impartiality.

Adherents of inclusive theology often confuse this notion of divine non-meaning on the issue of homosexuality by citing the Ethiopian eunuch (Jer 39:16-18) as an example of a homosexual who was saved by God. The interpretative failure falls on the point of misunderstanding regarding the action of “adoption”, that is, the text makes it clear in the final words of that chapter that the eunuch received divine salvation due to his spiritual relationship with God regardless of his ethnic origin, proving that God does not respect people as to nationalities; the text has nothing to do with the issue of homosexuality because of the simple fact that that character is a eunuch.

There is, therefore, a misrepresenting of meanings with respect to biblical texts since God pours out his love and grace upon everyone so that they will not be rejected by anyone. However, God offers his salvation to all by teaching them to leave their worldly passions and devoting themselves to him (Titus 2:11,12), repenting of their sins (2 Pe 3:9). Explaining: God loves everyone without distinction and, therefore, no one has the right to deny the other since he being God does not. God does not reject a person, the human being, nor does he
teach religious leaders to do so since Christ’s saving work is for all (1 Mt 2:4) – homosexuals, etc. – let it be emphasized, all those who recognize Christ as the Savior and remain in him, that is, they repent of their sins since they recognize them as sins (if there is no recognition of sin, there is no way to repent of sin, and to be with Christ one must confess sins to receive deliverance and salvation; otherwise, it would not mean being with Christ. But being with Christ or being in Christ’s Church would then be just a mere social conquest, a mere victory to defeat what they suppose to be human ideologies based on classical theology? What does this have to do with faith in God, with true Christianity?) and begin to obey their principles revealed in cryptist. Man cannot make sense of people because he cannot judge anyone, and God who can judge everyone does not sense people because he wants to save everyone, and for that, gives them the opportunity of repentance.

However, not everyone wants salvation (this is the responsibility of man and not of God) because this would imply metanoias concerning secular issues to which they are specifically physically and emotionally linked, to the detriment of metanoia concerning divine issues that involves holiness – who wants to be holy as God (1 Pe 1:16); who is willing to resist the calls of the flesh; who is willing to abandon their own desires in order to satisfy God’s desire? God-directed metanoia is well illustrated from a key verse that clarifies the theme of the predestination of salvation: “he predestined them to conform to the image of his Son” (Rom 8:29): “conforming to the image of Jesus, i.e., without sin, obedient unto death; who wants to obey in exchange for their own suffering? Who is fit to be like Christ, or at least try to be so? Who at least seeks every day to do things according to Jesus’ direction? What are Jesus’ directions to homosexuality? Who is, in fact, interested in matching that? Who wants to apply to the biblical words of Ezekiel (18:21,22) on the conversion of sins (provided they are assumedly recognized) under the aegis of the custody of Biblical-Christian statutes by acting according to divine righteousness? What is divine righteousness? Is it designed by men according to temporaneities and culturalisms? Is God so such a limited being, contradicting all the attributes related to him in the full context of the Holy Scriptures? If so, then the whole Bible is a lie, and if it is a lie, why the desire to keep only a part of it, modifying the other? Why not get it completely out of it and create a whole new Bible with a god that follows the new mentalities with each new era – a changeable, finite, limited, progressive God?

By making an exegesis of these verses above, it can be insured that God does not act in this way, whether with regard to race – white, black, etc.; whether in terms of gender – male and
female; whether with regard to age – children, young people or the elderly; whether in terms of social status – belonging, power and prestige, according to the three P’s of Max Weber’s sociology that conceived social hierarchies according to the social, political and economic sectors. However, society commits the “sacrilege” of the distinction between its social subjects. Every way man is straight to his eyes, but God probes his heart (Pr 21:2). Human partiality is incompatible with the impartiality of God since the judgment resulting from both has divergent bases: the first aims at a preference, a predilection, a favoritism, which is not consistent with the attribute of divine morality; the second is precisely one of God’s moral attributes. Therefore, God will not judge a person by these qualifications, but by his relationship with him, for he probes his mind and heart (1 Sam 16:7; 1 Cr 28:9; Jr 32:19; Rm 2:6; 8:27; Ap 2:23). And what does that mean? A mind and heart turned to God reveals the interest and willingness to follow the divine precepts as biblically advocated; that is, they manifest the search for obedience through the knowledge of the biblical text. It is concluded, therefore, that in order to have communion with God it is necessary that, rather, there be a predisposition to follow his directions in obedient practice (Ex 15:26; 19:5; 20:20; Dt 4:2; 6:1,2; 10:12,13; 1 Sm 15:22; Ecc 12:13; Jr 7:23; Mt 22:37; Mc 12:33; Heb 10:9).

The basis of Inclusive Theology is in Acts 10:34 and 35 which says that God does not sense people. In the text in question we see the salvation of an Ethiopian eunuch, they are considered by the Bible as sexually excluded and are considered by many as homosexuals of antiquity. Inclusive Theology aims at the inclusion of all people in the gospel of Christ, since it is inclusive. (LIMA, 2015)

Would inclusion be synonymous with salvation? What is, in fact, the real interest of inclusion? Zibordi (2012) asserts that the interpretation of the Bible and the strategy of evangelization of the movement called “inclusive theology” or “inclusive church” are an aberration in the light of Scripture, and cites Lanna Holder, pastor in the Church City of Refuge, the first Brazilian pastor to declare her homosexuality, ex-homosexual and ex-heterosexual, whose “eisegese” or “exegayse” about the Gospel preached by her – “evangaylho” – , creates a false gospel based on a rereading of the sacred text, attributing new definitions to the historical interpretations of the texts dealing with the sin of homosexuality.

Rereadings, deconstruction, reconstruction of the sacred text do not find biblical support that
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guarantees its theses. In “Talar Rosa”, Musskopf presents the position of the council of the Evangelical Church of Lutheran Confession in Brazil regarding the Ecclesiastical Ministry and Homosexuality. The following highlighted phrase clarifies the indefiniteness or inaccuracy of biblical events corresponding to homosexuality practices, although, in later lines, it emphasizes the importance of love for homosexual people, which, logically, is out of dispute.

“There is no absolute consensus among experts, either in science as to the nature of homosexuality, nor in the biblical interpretation of those passages that allude to homosexuality. Nor is there this consensus in the IECLB yet.” Later, in the last item of the list of positions there is the following clarification regarding homosexual people seeking space in the Church, intending to resignify the black Talar, deconstructing it and reconstructing it in pink, that is, as revealing an incompatibility of their homoaffective experience with a model they call heterocentric with regard to the ecclesiastical sphere:

We do not deny that homosexual people, who live their condition without causing scandal, can do blessed work in the community by putting at the service of the Gospel the gifts that God has given them. But we also note that, at the present time of the Church, there is no conditions for a practicing homosexual person to assume the public exercise of ecclesiastical ministry in the IECLB. (MUSSKOPF, 2004, p. 191)

Moreover, the present study is relevant in the sense of reaching the masses worldwide, because the question raised is universal. There are an endless number of people suffering from their current life circumstances, taking directions that may satiate their ego, but they will not always be able to satisfy their real needs that allow them to achieve the goal of ontological-sociocultural-religious self-purchase. Through this research, it is intended that they can achieve an understanding regardless of whether they want to follow it or not, but at least they will come to understand why the bases favorable and unfavorable to their lifestyle concerned, specifically, their sexual orientation with regard to the religious sphere, more particularly the corresponding view of the Church, empowering them to intelligible knowledge about the subject that affects their lives and the understanding of what must be done in order to live a quality life, especially in the biblical-religious sphere on which research is based.
3. BILATERAL INTOLERANCES

“There is no limit to the production of books” (Ecto 12:12).

There is no limit to deepening studies that will serve as an aid to humanity since it seeks its inclusion in all social sectors regardless of their life circumstances. The sociobehavioral phenomenon of homosexuality and the like reflects the struggle of this class for rights that it believes it possesses, and, of course, has us. This is with regard to the misunderstandings and intolerances that arise against it. These take place in various sectors of life in society, but we will stick here specifically to the religious with regard to biblical-exegetical and socioecclesiastical issues.

It is necessary that there is exegetical suitability to present defenses of biblical interpretations, i.e., biblical interpretations must be in line with the whole scripted context since the word divine is all concatenated, a passage linking to another passage as occurs in the cross-reference; this, by itself, already demonstrates the credibility of the biblical text which presents confirmations and clarifications alike.

It seems that the Holy Bible textually offers means of liberation, healing, provision, etc., regardless of preaching in temples, churches. But it also seems that this involves faith, an issue that is not necessarily under discussion here, but may occur, according to the need for certain issues. Specifically in the area of knowledge of the Sciences of Religions, there needs to be a commitment to the objectives to be achieved through aspiration for a sense of justice and truth around the whole theme under development. The main objective is not to question theses defended in favor of homosexuality in contrast to biblical-religious precepts in order to confront them, nor to repudiate their philosophical or religious qualities, let alone to refute their sociological ideals, but to focus on the reason of the research that is to know the ecclesiastical foundations that deny homosexuality in their bois. And, after knowing them, compare them to those arguments and new interpretations proposed in order to assess their credibility, and, if confirmed, continue to accept them in the relevant environments and means.

In this area of knowledge, which maintains interrelations with other areas of life, pragmatic means can be found that will collaborate with the expectation of supporting society as a
whole as well as each individual separately within a collective whether secular or religious. Themes like this in progress usually lean on an indication of universally religious characteristic, besides the social one, because they involve spiritual principles beyond the natural ones, and the religion scientist has the ability to recognize the common traits between these and those and administer them in favor of practical solutions amidst the relevant methodologies that can corroborate their theses.

The Sciences of Religions allow other social and psychological sciences to establish relationships with each other and this favors more appropriate and effective studies for the good of humanity. Aristotle said that “man is by nature a social animal”, because he has instincts or leaps that he himself cannot explain, and it is from this human animal that these sciences are in charge of studying and clarifying its most reclusive aspects as a starting point for the perfect understanding of its threefold structure: body, soul and spirit.

Brito (2006) asks about how the existence of the present man is explained with his disagreements, with his perfidies, with his weakness, with his miseries; as it explains the present society, where life is a lie, a fraud, an evil for man, and deep down, a nothing. All this means: society is imperfect; more than that: society is imperfect, society is the greatest of imperfections; in a word: society is the empire of evil. According to this proposition, what hope would there be for humanity if it were not for the scientific and religious elucidations that arise for the natural or spiritual man?

Therefore, it is urgent that both sides of the problem situation be studied. To this end, it is necessary to resort to the related sources of this dialectic in which the reliability of the propositions presented in which one of the parties will prove its correction and, consequently, its assumption must occur by both parties, causing due conciliation and termination of contradictions. These sources, however, have to do with authors whose works are closely linked to this specific theme of research, considering the bibliographic, physical and virtual diversity, concerning each part:

a) Christian apologetics;

b) Bibles;
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c) Biblical concordance and commentary;

d) Homosexual defense;

e) theological books and dictionaries;

f) Enlightening books/e-books;

g) Biblical manuals;

h) news in newspapers, magazines, social networks;

i) Sites

As the subject involves the Church, everything related to it is of paramount importance to this study: its base book, its doctrines, its dogmas, its rites, etc. This also applies to the issue of homosexuality in this religious field. Therefore, it is interesting to know the mechanisms of action of the church together with today's sociocultural aspects as the case of the struggle for homosexuals to belong to a church without suffering any discrimination. First, then, one asks: what is the Church?

CHURCH – [Do heb. qahal, assembly of the people of God; do gr. ekklesia, public assembly] Mystical organism composed of all who, by faith, accept the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and have the word of God as their only rule of faith and conduct (Eph 5:30-33). In the New Testament, the same term applies to gathering the faithful in a certain place to worship God, strengthen Christian communion and develop Christian service (Fm 2). (ANDRADE, 1998, p.182)

Dever (2007) understands that, according to the New Testament, the church is a body of people who confess to having been saved only by the grace of God only for their glory and through faith in Christ and it is for believers who have received the new birth from God and who gather in a pactual community. It is inferfrom these definitions that the Church has primordial elements inserted in her whole (in line with other elements not mentioned here), such as: faith, acceptance of Christ’s sacrifice, the Holy Scriptures as a rule of faith and conduct, congregation of the faithful, communion and Christian work, salvation by the grace
Secondly, one asks: what is Homosexuality? The term has its origin in ancient Greek ὁμός (homos) – equal, + Latin sexus - sex, + -dade - nominal suffix that expresses state or quality, and is attributed to the condition of a human being, or even certain animals, with regard to its physical and/or emotional attraction by another of the same sex or gender that characterizes it as homosexual. The respective word homosexual was first used in 1869 by the Austro-Hungarian writer Karl Maria Kertbeny in attempting to combat paragraph 143 of the Prussian Penal Code that criminalized this sexual practice, which he defended as an innate and natural condition (Teixeira Filho, 2011). In contrast, Szklarz (2016) says that “although science is moving towards the notion that homosexuality is innate, biology is not completely decisive”, and endorses his statement citing the words of psychiatrist Carmita Abdo for whom the predisposition to homosexuality manifests itself or not depending on the person’s life experiences. Similarly Malott (1996 apud Mizael, 2018, p.18) states that “sexual roles and behavioral styles are learned through contingencies of refinement and punishment” with what Silva and Menandro agree (2019): “homosexuality, according to evangelical pastoral perspectives, is an antinature, a spiritual problem and, above all, it is a learned behavior”. This understanding corresponds to GotQuestions (2017) position about a person becoming homosexual because of sin (Rom 1:24-27) and by his own choice since “God does not create the person with homosexual desires” and that “the person may be born with a great tendency to homosexuality.”

It is understood, from these definitions, that a homosexual person (a being) is one who manifests sexual, physical, affective, and spiritual attraction, by another of the same sex whose behavior may have been learned or have other possible causes. However, the possible causes of homosexuality are not what is sought to be addressed in this article. According to the above, it is intended to introduce the question of the relationship between Church and homosexuality, presenting its definitions and some embedded positions. These citations briefly present etymological, scientific and biblical aspects, which are a preview of the guidelines of this article. Everything that is relevant with regard to the present theme should be investigated, taking into account the premises of pros and cons, in an impartial manner, referring to the positions highlighted in this dialectic: Homosexuality/Church. It should be emphasized that the objective here is to seek and confirm the reasons relevant to the respective apology presented.
At odds with Musskopf’s words (2008, p. 18), “God, in this play with the processes of constructing male identities, has become a ‘god-graced’” – a noun that refers to the idea that God is transformed by the grace of the world (or could even mean from the perspective of other interpretive eyes, a wretched God or a funny God; , “Do not errem: God does not let himself be mocked” (Gal 6:7), two contradictory arguments are confronted that denote the lack of a consensus, between musskopfiana placement and biblical exhortation, in the search for the transformation of reality from faith, with the Bible as an instrument of this transformation (MUSSKOPF, 2008), a social transformation that arises from a homosexual-gay-queer context. Bible as an instrument! An instrument of transformation that previously underwent transformation, that is, to transform it had to be transformed first in order to adapt to the transformation.

This theory of the “God-graced in a changing world” fosters erroneous understanding from the project “The grace of the world transforms God”, organized by Nancy Cardoso, Ela Eggert and Andre S. Musskopf as a contribution to the discussion proposed by the World Council of Churches (IMC) in its IX Assembly in Porto Alegre whose theme was “God, in your grace, transforms the world”. According to Musskopf (2009, p. 33), the proposal affirms the right (and the need) to refuse commas, bring God closer to the world, decolonizing him and revisiting his images that normalize wounded relationships, and affirms grace from movements of transformation and recreation. Grace as synonymous with jokes, joke, is in contradiction with the principle of the gift of grace as a synonym for supernatural gift as a means of salvation that belongs to God, and not to the world, for the world does not possess the gift of grace, and therefore the proposition becomes ineffective to cause God’s transformation (Heb 13:8).

In reality, this provides not a continuity of theological construction as suggested – “a liberating path for people discriminated against and excluded because of their sexual orientation or gender identity” – but a discontinuity of this construction because it is not based on traditional theology whose discourses they consider heterocentric hegemonic, but on a theology that, although worthily, is based against principles rooted in society that have nothing to do with divine principles. , antagonizes the latter by using the queer approach itself as a “provocation”, not only against the limitations of gender analyses that make homoculture impossible, but against what is contained in that theology that they intend to “discontinue/continue”, i.e., biblical doctrines and principles whose theological explanations
do not seem to be consistent with that desired transformation.

For example, the central character of the work “Via(da)gens Teológicas” (MUSSKOPF, 2008, p. 26) is a deer whose constitutive elements serve to show that the theology they intend to build from queer itineraries that articulate religiosity and sexuality it cannot be done except as a via(da)gem. And what is a viaduct? The syllable -da added to the noun “trip” inserts a new meaning into the initial term: a construction of sexual identities based on itineraries that the new theology must follow that end up showing a queer theology that, among other points, is based on stories that present a “new way of doing and thinking” based on the ambiguity of being and doing as a phenomenon of resistance to what is understood as an antidote against absolutisms and fanaticism, proposing that it be a basic condition of man, of the church, of life, theology; however, there is no ambiguity in any of these elements; there is no “ambiguity in the constitution of identity (sexual and religious)“. Ambiguity is synonymous with doubt, uncertainty, with a varied meaning. How can something that expresses a character of uncertainty serve as an epistemological principle to articulate themes for diverse discussions? It can even be used as a resistance phenomenon to not respond and provide a plausible solution, but only to try to deconstruct any counter force. What benefit is there in that? What clarifying answer? What science, founded on uncertain principles?

Precisely at this point, one cannot classify the human being as an ambiguous being. An ambiguous person has some psychological disorder since the human being is not essentially bipolar, because the manifestation of bipolarity is a reflection of a psychopathology, something not intrinsic to human nature, but the result of some human conditionings; therefore, ambiguity is related to the state and not to being.

Man does not have two characters as good and bad simultaneously – he is not ambiguous, does not live in a permanent state of ambiguity; what actually occurs in human life is a manifestation of distinct emotions that lead man to commit good and bad acts – “commit”, not “to be” – and these acts are mere consequences of certain conditions imposed or overcame by him. Illustrating, a bandit who has a good heart, but manifests a bad social behavior; he is not ambiguous, for he is not good and bad – he is good, but he practices bad things.
For example, my grandfather Francisco Baptista Campello lived in Ceará-Mirim where, for a period, Virgulino Ferreira da Silva, alias Lampião, the King of Cangaço, one of the biggest bandits in Brazil, robin hood of the Brazilian backcountry who cared about the poor and helped them. One day, my grandfather met Lampião and gave him the desire to join his gang, to which Lampião immediately replied, “Oh, boy, this is no place for you, no; goes to school to study; this is what you have to do.” Lampião was an outlaw who valued education as he guided my grandfather contrary to what he proposed when he could have accepted him into the pack, giving him the respective instructions on how to become a bandit and become fit to be part of the gang; however, he wanted the good of children, that is, a bandit who followed the path of evil, but who taught the way of good, at least to children.

Biblically, there is no ambiguous human being: “All have gone from the right path” (Rom 3:12). It is understood, therefore, that all belonged in the right way; therefore, all were correct, in their original essence, implying in this correction all the other corresponding qualities such as goodness, perfection, righteousness, etc. Everyone was just correct, unambiguous. However, after the spiritual fall reported in the Book of Genesis (3:6), sin revealed in human character and human conduct through actions and words – giving rise to multiple manifestations of good and evil, right and wrong, which suggests the understanding of ontological ambiguity – proves that nothing good can come from people, for they have all lost that original essence and moved away from the correct path, giving vent to moral and spiritual bifurcacies that escape the direction that was drawn to them at the beginning. This seems to be what the Bible reveals, that man was created good, but he misbecame in the middle of the road. It is understood, therefore, that man is not ambiguous by nature; he becomes circumstantially ambiguous, i.e., his personality is shaped by adapting to a particular occasion or condition – a matter of state and not of being.

Vlahou (2007) quotes Umberto Veronesi, an oncologist, who scientifically states: “Man is losing his characteristics and tends to turn into a sexually ambiguous figure, while the woman is becoming more masculine. In this way, society evolves into a unique model.” That is, men and women are not sexually ambiguous, but tend to become in this – they are losing their original characteristics, just as they biblically got lost along the way: a biblical-scientific question. It is insured from the assertion of said doctor that to be ambiguous by nature everything in man should be ambiguous, but in the present case explained by him, it is not.
And yet, dicionaristically,

When we talk about ambiguity, that something or someone is ambiguous, we mean that that person or circumstance does not show us their true characteristics if it does not hide them or make them clear. This can be a decision especially made (when a person is clearly ambiguous on certain occasions depending on their interest and the audience it presents) or fortuitous (such as when a situation is difficult to understand or understand in its essence). Ambiguity applies to people who usually have a leave of negativity, as it means that the individual in question is not totally honest or sincere and who hides his true being through various facets, expressions or ways of thinking (Editorial Que Conceito, 2005-2019).

conceptualizing the term, “Ambiguity applies to people who (...), it is understood that ambiguity is a condition that applies specifically to certain people, not to all people; this is a condition that cannot be generalised. Therefore, further proof that the human being is not an essentially ambiguous being. One cannot confuse “being” with “being” or “becoming”. Moreover, this present text, from which it is highlighted that “the individual hides his true being”, is in line with the biblical text (Gen 3:10 – the same chapter mentioned above referring to the fall of man) where man declares “I hid”; in ambiguity, man hides his true being, thus presenting one of the faces that opportunely manifests itself, hiding a real essence characteristically his own.

Conclusion: man is not ambiguous as they intend or suggest that he is.

Given this answer, let us return to the subject of the term used in the title of the above-mentioned work: Via(da)gens (...). This noun, in its original form – Viadagem –, whose syllable is in parentheses (considering the intended meaning of “viadagens” indispensable to the work because it is emphatic for its theme, of which the intention of the author to mean “Travels” is understood, given the context of the work that portrays theological journeys in Latin American territory, presenting situations rarely studied by traditional theology concerning the LGBTTI class, was only found in the Informal Dictionary with the following definitions: by Atoabh (2007) – “Attitudes that connote homosexuality”; by Tavares (2014) – “Effeminate behavior of certain men. The same as veadagem”; by Chini (2014) – “Effeminate
behavior of homosexual man”. Confronting “Veadagem”: Deer attitude (male homosexual).

The term “Viado”, from which the term “viadagem” is derived, also appears only in the same Informal Dictionary, providing an extra and more detailed explanation of the term in question:

a) The origin of the word fagdo, meaning male homosexual, probably comes from misplaced;

b) Homosexual man;

c) Word originated from the reduction of the word misplaced, the one who misplaced, changed from one normal path to another for which it had not been intended. So faged is the man who changed his sexual route, homosexual;

d) Pejorative way of calling homosexuals, the most correct would be homosexual, or

Confronting “Deer”: Many people confuse DEER with VIADO. “Viado” is the reduction of “misplaced” (which went out of the way, out of the way) and is used to designate male homosexuals. The “deer” is an animal. (sic)

Thus, “viadagem” is a derivation of the term “viado”. The latter denotes a being (un) guided by an itinerary initially proposed in the face of a new one. This deviation requires new routes that, in turn, require changes in plans. Therefore, there would be no way for a “viado” (according to the dictionary description above) to make trips without viaducts, as stated by Musskopf (2008, p. 26): “the theology that is proposed to build from these itineraries cannot be done unless via(da)gem”, because this attribute is peculiar to him; there would be no way for a “fagot” (strayed) to take old paths from which he has already strayed. Hence, it is inferred that it is necessary to plan, to devise a new path in a new direction. Logically, the author knew the terms well and knew all their implications when creating the title of the work; soon, he started to talk about the new theological path and to try to adapt it to a new theological sphere that includes “viable” human beings, ie, stray - who are deviated from the normal path, out of the way to which they were first sent, as described above -, and now they need to be sent to a new path in which they do not feel “viados” (transferred), but introduced. This new path proposed for these people is found in queer theology, which in Musskopf’s work, for example, dialogues with the painting by Frida Khalo (1946), La venadita
“or” The injured deer “- associating it with homosexuality in Brazilian context, according to Musskopf (2008, p. 5) -, which represented her, a fragile deer, defenseless and condemned to martyrdom after being wounded by hunters in a forest; he appears to be free, but is actually in a maze of trees that imprison him, preventing his escape. Maribondo (2007), tries to explain the term “Veado”:

Etymology: there is no satisfactory explanation for the use of the word as taboo for male homosexuals, but it is said that in the times of the Empire, from the mid-nineteenth century, in squares of Rio de Janeiro, boys gathered happily, forming flocks to, among other objectives, meet the rich of the time in search of sexual adventures. When the police, who were never very close in deer, approached to curb the hunt, the young woman ran off in heels, as do their cervid homonyms. It was from there that the denomination emerged that was established as one of the most popular insults in Brazil. (sic)

Given this conceptualization, it does not seem to be very favorable a very rich work in detail so that the said work employs a term that is considered as insult, however much there are artistic and literary works that do, but it even has a pejorative connotation, not being much appreciated its use to defend these of such sociocultural responsibility.

4. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In the meantime, it is clear that there is a need for impartial bilateral studies on this subject. This article glimpses the concern about the conceptualization of the bases for refutation of homosexuality in the biblical perspective, considering the socio-religious, socio-scribe, socio-ecclesiastical aspects, as needed, so that they are not personal interpretations or views of the researcher to be defended, but that it intends to present the biblical discourse in all its respective context together with extrabiblical arguments , and even secular, in order to evaluate the discourses referring to it whether they are consonant or dissonant from arguments that, precisely evaluated, may be considered relevant or not. To this end, one can evaluate a) the biblical arguments that elucidate the refutations to homosexuality recommended by the Church, which has as a legal religious instrument the Holy Bible, as well as of the extrabiblical ones that maintain a relationship of homogeneity as that religious
instrument. This will be done with the purpose of reaching a unanimous consensus on whether there are concrete and preciput scriptural bases for homosexuality to be denied in the Church; b) the arguments of the apologists of the phenomenon of homosexuality, who fight for its inclusion in the ecclesiastical environment, taking into account the legal religious instrument of the Church which is the Holy Bible on which their arguments are based, among others. The most important thing is to be able to reach a unanimous consensus on whether there are concrete and precipuous scriptural bases for homosexuality to be accepted in the Church.

It is necessary to consider pro-refutation and anti-refutation arguments in order to continue the development of the purpose of this article, which is to elucidate the position related to the gender issue that is fully in line with the biblical thesis (regimental basis of the Church) regarding the sphere of human sexuality. There is, therefore, a need to make a comparison of the arguments about the Church’s position on homosexuality and the positioning of its apologists in order to reach a rational and logical consensus on what is desirable and applicable in terms of pacification and respect for both claims with regard to their respective rights and duties, or rather applying the terms, of how to manifest themselves, responsibly and consciously, in view of their respective conditions of application.
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