



Did He Sound Evil?

From ﷲ's books from the law standpoint, how would the books of the law not accept what these three scripture verses said: **Luke 14:26**, **Matthew 12:31-32**, and **Mark 3:28-30** and why? It's also one of the many reasons why I, Bro. Pouliot does not accept the Bible about Jesus.

From ﷲ's books of the law standpoint, those New Testament verses would not be accepted because it conflicts with core of ﷲ's principles law about honoring parents, the nature of blasphemy, and the sufficiency and eternity of the books of the law itself. ﷲ's Law-faithful Israelites would see that as outside the Sinaitic revolution and, in key points, contradicting it.

Honoring and loving parents (Luke 14:26)

Luke 14:26 speaks of **"hating"** father, mother, wife, children, brothers, sisters—even one's own life—to be a disciple of Jesus. From a ﷲ's law standpoint:

- ﷲ's Commandments require **"Honor your father and your mother,"** making this a foundational obligation, not something to relativize or oppose.
- ﷲ's law repeatedly presents the family as a **central** covenantal unit, where loyalty, respect, and care for parents are commanded and praised, not rejected. A demand to **"hate"** one's parents as a religious ideal would therefore be read as contradicting this positive command.

So, ﷲ's law-based perspective would say that a verse that seems to make "hating" one's parents a spiritual requirement cannot come from the same creator ONE who commanded honoring parents as a permanent law.

Blasphemy and forgiveness (Matthew 12:31–32; Mark 3:28–30)

Those passages speak about a unique, unforgivable sin: **"blasphemy against the Holy Spirit,"** while saying that other blasphemies (even "against the Son of Man") can be forgiven. From ﷲ's law-only vantage point:

- The book of the law defines blasphemy in legal terms as cursing the Name of ﷲ, with a specified earthly penalty (death by stoning), but it does not lay out a Christian-style distinction between forgivable and unforgivable blasphemies in the afterlife tied to a "Holy Spirit" category.

- Since ﷺ's law is viewed as complete and perfect, adding a new, special sin category that is uniquely and eternally unforgivable, and tying it to faith-response to a later figure, would be seen as introducing a new theology that the books of the law neither teaches nor authorizes.

Thus, ﷺ's law-centered Israelites would say these statements introduce concepts about sin and forgiveness not grounded in the written books of the law's own categories and covenantal structure.

There is more evidence to look at and to understand Deuteronomy 18:15-19 as promising **only ONE** future prophet like Moses vs. multiple later figures of the prophets (including Jesus) failing that singular role.

Singular Prophet Claim

Deuteronomy 18:15 promises *"a prophet like me (Moses) from among your brothers,"* often read as one individual, contrasting with prophets in Joshua, Kings, or New Testament figures, supporting the view that no further revelation was authorized post-Moses. Critics of later texts argue that multiplicity itself violates the "one prophet" expectation and Deut 13's tests.

Implications for Jesus

Under this framework, Jesus introduces new teachings (e.g., Matt 5:17-48 expansions) and claims fulfillment beyond ﷺ's law, failing Deut 4:2 and 13 by adding words; his non-destruction of rejectors (per Deut 18:19) and lack of Moses-like signs further disqualify him as the sole prophet. This aligns with Yisraelite critiques rejecting New Testament books as covenant-breaking additions.

Deuteronomy 18:19 states that ﷺ will hold accountable ("require it of him") anyone who refuses to listen to the words of the prophet like Moses, spoken in ﷺ's name, which some interpret as divine judgment or destruction, though the text does not specify immediate physical death.

Lack of Destruction for Rejectors

No widespread or immediate destruction befell those who rejected Jesus during his lifetime, as recorded in the Gospels—Pharisees, scribes, and crowds often opposed him without perishing on the spot, unlike some ﷺ's law examples of swift judgment for rebellion. This absence aligns with your point that Jesus fails the Deuteronomy 18 test if it demands observable, contemporary punishment for non-listeners.

Broader Test Context

The verse emphasizes ultimate accountability rather than a rigid timeline, but under a strict ٱ's law-only reading (per Deut 4:2), any prophet whose words lack the promised enforcement mechanism disqualifies themselves, reinforcing critiques of later figures like Jesus.

Authority and Finality of ٱ's Law vs. Later Claims

At a more fundamental standpoint, from ٱ's law standpoint:

- ٱ's law is the supreme revealed law, given once at Sinai to the entire people, and it explicitly warns against prophets who promote a new path or alter the commandments, even if they produce signs or wonders.
- Any later writing that alters the hierarchy of commandments (for example, devaluing family honor in favor of allegiance to a later teacher, or changing the framework of sin, punishment, and forgiveness) would be judged by the books of the law on their own criteria as not authoritative and potentially misleading.

So, the reason ٱ's law standpoint "would not accept" those specific so-called gospel statements that Jesus said is not only that it conflicts ٱ's principles law, but also that the books of the law were already established and done since creation. We also notice how he spoke like an evil one. He is one of many false prophets in the Bible, who all fails the test based on Deuteronomy 18.

But the main point is to understand that no later revelation or new doctrine may revise or replace its covenantal norms. **Deuteronomy 4:2** and **chapter 13** remind us that; that we aren't supposed to have any other additional new written book after Moses' era.