

A Conversation Between Catholics and a Noachide

(Edited. Names changed. Key argument on pages 8 & 25.)

Is it the official Catholic position that the source of false religions dogmas and beliefs are demonic interventions and deceit?

Donkey of Balaam

It's the official position of Deuteronomy 13 that miracle-workers who try to change the Torah are a test from God. "Do not listen to the words of that prophet or dreamer. God your Lord is testing you to see if you are truly able to love God your Lord with all your heart and all your soul." Empty tomb? So what. "God your Lord is testing you ..."

BTO

Healings are never demonic because only God can heal and raising the dead is never demonic because only God can raise the dead. You can't use that verse as an excuse for continuing to practice Judaism.

Donkey of Balaam

Satan isn't the "god of this world" in Judaism. He works for HaShem. Read the verse again. Who is doing the testing by sending an evil miracle-worker? "God your Lord is testing you." It doesn't say anything about demons.

There's only one reference to the son of God in the Torah (Exodus 4:22), and no warnings about rejecting the messiah (out of 613 commandments). ALL the threats and curses pertain to deviating from the Torah. Regarding its "temporary" status, this is one of numerous refutations: Thus shall the children of Israel observe the Sabbath, to make the Sabbath THROUGHOUT their generations as an EVERLASTING COVENANT. Between Me and the children of Israel, it is FOREVER a sign that [in] six days The Lord created the heaven and the earth, and on the seventh day He ceased and rested. (Exodus 31:16-17)

So why are you worshipping a miracle-working son of God? Miracle-workers are a test and the son of God is Israel. Gentiles (like us) have a moral code, the Noachide Laws.

Ax

If you're going to babble about Christians "changing" the Pentateuch you might at least quote it without distortion: Deuteronomy 13 warns of those who lead one into worshipping strange gods, not about "changing the Torah" (which the Christians did in no sense in which the Jews didn't also).

The Jews themselves don't follow all the Mosaic commandments, which they in fact cannot: many for example pertaining to sacrifices that are commanded to be offered only in the Temple, which of course was torn down in the 1st Century Anno Domini and never restored since (whereas the Christians' still stands).

The Jews then rely as much on allegorical, spiritual fulfillments of these laws. The difference is that where we received as revelation that the entire law is fulfilled in our Savior, and consistently apply this principle as received, the Jews must resort to a patchwork of competing exegeses and juridical decisions that admittedly have no divine warrant (putting aside the ridiculous fable that Moses received a second, unrecorded law).

Of course the Christian position is more advanced from the Jewish, but then the Jewish is itself advanced from the Samaritan. If the Pentateuch really is the whole of Scripture, how did the Jews dare elevate their histories, songs, proverbs, prophecies, and poetry to its level? The Samaritans at least perform their sacrifices on Gerizim, even if their high priesthood did go extinct, as did the Jews' (though not the Christians').

S

So do you reject all books apart from the Pentateuch? Would you consider yourself a Sadducee? How do you know that those are the only books or revelation to follow? You certainly do not follow the Torah, because you do not sacrifice at the Temple.

I think the point of the passage you mentioned is miracle workers who contradict the Torah, not those who claim to fulfill it.

Donkey of Balaam

In the Hebrew Bible Deut 13 starts like this: <https://www.mechon-mamre.org/e/et/et0513.htm>
Funny how it starts in a different place in yours. Talk about distortion.

>The Jews themselves don't follow all the Mosaic commandments blah blah ...

Wasn't the Temple destroyed once before? Did that cancel the "everlasting covenant," "binding for all generations"? The Temple will be restored and the true Messiah will perform sacrifices there. No faith will be required.

>putting aside the ridiculous fable that Moses received a second, unrecorded law

Show me where the Torah describes how to perform a heave offering and a wave offering, or which verses to include in tefillin. These are mentioned in the Torah but never described.

>If the Pentateuch really is the whole of Scripture

The Nevi'im and Ketuvim are a step lower than the Torah. They were not written by God. They were written by humans and canonized by the 'Anshei-HaKeneset HaGedolah (the Men of the Great Assembly). They're only in the Bible until the Messianic Era.

Please cite the chapter & verse that says the Torah will be fulfilled by the son of God.

C

here is my one shot at pointing you in a different direction.

Deuteronomy contains a prophecy... You know the one... Deuteronomy 18:18. A prophet has indeed been raised up, and to Him we must listen (cf. Acts 3:22). To close the Torah in on itself, for at least this prophecy alone, even bracketing its actual fulfillment, is self-refuting.

Here is a thought about the Temple - which cannot be rebuilt, even though it was tried once even while the Al-Aqsa mosque was not there (see the accounts of Theodoret, Sozomen, Socrates Scholasticus, Gregory Nazianzus, and John Chrysostom - all roughly contemporaries, some who spoke with eye-witnesses of the miracle). The destruction of Solomon's Temple was preceded by Hezekiah's Feast - quite the Passover (also preceded by a reform in Judah, which included the destruction of the Bronze Serpent Moses had set up...) Then the Temple is destroyed, everyone runs away, and it seems the Covenant is done and over due to the sins of Israel. The Temple is rebuilt, there is a celebration, but fire does not descend upon it like it did for Solomon...

Jesus, set up on the Cross (a new lintel and doorpost for a more dignified Lamb's Blood - this time, marking the entrance to true eternal life, outside Jerusalem, that even the Assyrians which Jonah hated more than he loved his own life might be welcomed to salvation - note the reversal), like the Bronze Serpent, also led a reform in Judah and had a great feast before He was destroyed - then everyone ran away and all hope seemed lost. But Jesus was raised from the dead. The fire came down upon the new ministers where He had initiated the new ritual for Divine worship, a sacrifice of Himself, in Himself, towards Himself, and done principally by Himself, through the ministers. The same ones had accompanied Him in the Garden of Gethsemane a few days before, where that place of death recreated the ritual of Yom Kippur (notice the progression when they walk - some stop, the High Priest continues in, etc.), marking Himself as the scapegoat, covered in blood. (This was indicated also in the Baptism - which is in the lowest place on the planet by the way, an obvious cosmic sign - but He took on the sins of those on both sides of the River, and was marking Himself as being between Life, the Sea of Galilee, and Death... the Dead Sea. Closer to Death then, but in the Resurrection He stayed near the Sea of Galilee, Life.)

It goes on, and on, and on, and on, and on. (Take a look, by the way, at the timeline of the journey to Egypt and back to Canaan, vis-a-vis the construction of the First Temple to the Second Temple, and then the period between Malachi and John the Baptist... Notice any similarity? What could it mean?) The entire force of the Torah, and the Prophets, and the History, looks to this Jesus and His Divinity. Read the Parables, and the discourses with the Pharisees. Read Paul, especially Hebrews. "I have not come to abolish the law, I have come to fulfill the law." (Mt. 5:17)

Do not let yourself stand under the terrible curse of Isaiah - that you see and do not perceive, hear and do not understand... Jonah's plant has withered - it has been eaten by the Christ, and now the sun shines on all equally. We Goyim are late to the vineyard, but we will be paid the same wage.

Donkey of Balaam

"My Christian Brother, with all due respect, Jesus - peace be upon him - was not the son of God. He was a great prophet. As it is written in the Koran ..."

What's wrong with his approach? This. You don't accept the divinity of the Koran or its authority to interpret your bible. Consequently, your Moslem friend can hardly cite it as evidence like it's self-authenticating. But this is what Christians do. (Moslems also cite Deut 18:18, and Mohamed split the moon, and the Mormons had a revelation heard round the world, and on and on.)

How do you know Deut 18 (or any of the countless verses cited) have anything to do with the New Testament? Because the NT says so? Why do you accept its authority to interpret the TaNaKh? Jesus performed miracles and Paul explained their significance vis-a-vis the TaNaKh.

So what? And so what if Mohamed split the moon? Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob did not worship a trinity, and the law given to Moses prohibits additions or subtractions. It doesn't say a peep about gentiles performing sacrifices for their sins to attain "salvation" either (much less a human sacrifice!) You're reading your theology into the TaNaKh. It's not there.

The Torah explicitly states that God will test Israel with supernatural evidence on behalf of false religions. This is a chapter about epistemology, about what constitutes evidence qua evidence. Citing a miracle-worker who introduced novelties isn't evidence against it. (Mt 5:17 is as dishonest as anything ever writ. "No one comes to the father except through me" isn't a paradigm shift?)

I once felt a terrible cognitive dissonance about the scary Old Testament and how on earth it fit together with the NT. I no longer do, because it doesn't.

BTO

You're accusing God of being the author of evil.

Donkey of Balaam

"In order that they know from the shining of the sun and from the west that there is no one besides Me; I am the Lord and there is no other. Who forms light and creates darkness, Who makes peace and creates evil; I am the Lord, Who makes all these." (Isaiah 45:6-7)

God is the author of everything other than Himself. "Lucifer" is the planet Venus. The Prophet's words, "Son of the morning," were sarcastically addressed to the King of Babylon. HaSatan is not a "fallen angel" either. He is performing his assigned jobs, primarily as our accuser in the Heavenly Court. There is no independent kingdom of evil. God has no counterpart of any kind. The world unfolds according to His Providence.

"Satan, who is the god of this world, has blinded the minds of those who don't believe. They are unable to see the glorious light of the Good News. They don't understand this message about the glory of Christ, who is the exact likeness of God." (2 Corinthians 4:4)

The god of this world!?! *Do you hear yourselves!?* This is polytheism. An evil "god" is deceiving all those who reject Jesus. Deut 13 merely says God might test Israel. I don't understand how anyone can become outraged at the latter while defending the former.

MG

I don't think you understand what monotheism actually is. Otherwise, you'd know that the existence of some god doesn't threaten the the divinity of God. The gods of the pagan faiths could all be real and it'd be wrong to worship them. That's what St. Augustine pointed out in his works.

You also misinterpret Isaiah if you think "God creates evil" means "God creates evil miracle-workers to deceive people into leaving his own religion." Evil (Hebrew word: ra) in this context could mean moral evil or it could mean natural evils too - that is, those things that are harmful. See Psalms 34:19 "Many are the afflictions (ra) of the righteous; but the LORD delivers him out of them all." The RSV translates the Isaiah verse "I form light and create darkness, I make weal (shalom) and create woe (ra), I am the LORD, who does all these things." Just as light's opposite is darkness, the opposite of peace is unrest or calamity, not necessarily moral evil.

To say that God is the author of evil in the moral sense is to implicitly deny that God is all-good. For an all-good God cannot act against goodness.

BTO

Well, go on and worship the Author of All Evil. Because I sure won't.

Donkey of Balaam

Appeal to emotion is a fallacy. Appeal to maudlin sentiment is worse. Pour yourself a stiff drink and read Deut 28, starting with the 14th verse. THIS is why the Jews aren't big on new & improved stuff. (See also Leviticus 26.) Do these passages conform to your a priori conception of God? Too bad. Note well: ALL the curses are for deviating from the Torah or worshipping foreign gods: "And you shall not turn right or left from all of the words I am commanding you this day, to follow other deities to worship them." Not one word about rejecting the messiah or the son of God or the new testament.

>I don't think you understand what monotheism actually is. Otherwise, you'd know that the existence of some god doesn't threaten the the divinity of God.

God is the Source of all contingent reality. How could there be more than one? What would individuate them?

>You also misinterpret Isaiah if you think "God creates evil" means "God creates evil miracle-workers to deceive people into leaving his own religion."

Please don't put words in my mouth. That's unsanitary. Deut 13:6 ends with "so shall you clear away the evil from your midst." What evil? The prophet who leads Israel to worship foreign gods in 13:3. Who put this "evil" there in the first place? "The Lord, your God, is testing you, to know whether you really love the Lord, your God, with all your heart and with all your soul." 13:4 Pretend the NT doesn't exist. Just try. It's a thought experiment. How do you interpret this passage?

MG

Applied as consistently as possible in the way that you interpret it, we ought to reject every miracle and signs in general as signs of deception sent from God to test us. Therefore, we ought to reject all religions that use signs and wonders as evidence for their great works. Since Judaism established itself through miraculous signs, this verse, applied consistently would lead us to reject Judaism as a false religion used by God to deceive us as part of a test.

As this is self-defeating, I propose a different interpretation of that particular verse. More likely, Moses was warning the Jews of the perils of idolatry in preparation for their encounter with the Canaanites. If any universal application is to derive from this, it'd be that worshipping foreign gods would be wrong. But the Christian God is the same God as the Jewish God, as seen in the quotes below.

"Jesus said to them, 'Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am.'" (John 8:58)

"Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them." (Matthew 5:17)

Donkey of Balaam

>Since Judaism established itself through miraculous signs, this verse, applied consistently would lead us to reject Judaism as a false religion used by God to deceive us as part of a test.

You have to be kidding. You're punting. The Israelites received a revelation warning them about supernatural evidence on behalf of foreign gods. How does this apply to itself? It says "gods you have not known." It doesn't say "Including this One." It's not self-defeating; it's trinity & son-of-God defeating, which were not conceptions of God they knew.

>as seen in the quotes below

The divinity of the NT is the point of contention. Citing it as evidence is no different than a Muslim quoting the Koran about Jesus. I'd be interested in seeing a verse or two from Deuteronomy about the son of God fulfilling the Torah ...

MG

>The Israelites received a revelation warning them about supernatural evidence on behalf of foreign gods. How does this apply to itself?

It applies to itself because it implicitly rejects the Thomistic principle that the true religion is proven by way of a true miracle. According to Thomistic philosophy, God uses a true miracle (such as the Resurrection) as a way of putting His stamp of approval on a particular teaching. Since you reject this criteria, and Judaism was established using miraculous works, then one could easily argue that the God of the Old Testament is a false god and that his prophets are sent by the true God to test us.

>The divinity of the NT is the point of contention. Citing it as evidence is no different than a Muslim quoting the Koran about Jesus.

I'm not citing the NT as Scripture. I'm citing the NT because you believe that Christians worship a different God than the Jews. They don't. They claim to be a continuation of the religion, and you characterizing the Christian God as one the Israelites didn't know is a misrepresentation of Christian teaching. It'd be just as much a misinterpretation to say (for instance) that Allah is actually a pagan moon god. That's not what Muslims actually believe, and their Scripture says as much.

"And do not argue with the People of the Scripture except in a way that is best, except for those who commit injustice among them, and say, 'We believe in that which has been revealed to us and revealed to you. And our God and your God is one; and we are Muslims [in submission] to Him.'" (29:46)

Donkey of Balaam

>It applies to itself because it implicitly rejects the Thomistic principle that the true religion is proven by way of a true miracle. According to Thomistic philosophy, God uses a true miracle (such as the Resurrection) as a way of putting His stamp of approval on a particular teaching.

How is the principle of a Christian philosopher ontologically prior to a revelation from God? Aquinas drew bullseyes around the miracles in the NT. Big whoop. How did he derive this principle? One can be an Aristotelian (like Maimonides) and reject it. One can be an Aquinas fan (like me!) and reject Christianity. Aquinas' principle isn't true the way *modus ponens* is.

This is one way of looking at the Big Picture. I'm not denying the evidence for Christianity. I'm denying that it's evidence FOR Christianity. The question isn't whether Jesus fulfilled any prophecies; it's which ones. Trying to establish Christianity as an autonomous replacement with distinct evidence doesn't work if the Noachide can cite the same evidence. A prophet performs miracles, introduces novelties, and his followers insist the Torah has a shelf-life. What's the best explanation? There is one concise passage that explains everything in one fell-swoop. It's the simplest explanation by far. Christian opposition requires bending over backwards to deny what it obviously says and makes a priori (or Christian) assumptions about what God would or wouldn't do. The historicity of a miracle-working prophet trying to change Torah observance and traditional conceptions of God is evidence for the Divinity of Deuteronomy 13, confirming a prediction about supernatural phenomena and explaining why it came to be.

“Although Christianity and Islam are not true, they have played a part in the Divine scheme for the redemption of the whole of humanity by spreading some sort of ethical monotheism involving an albeit incorrect idea of Messiah, Torah and Mitzvot. ... Islam and Christianity are part of the overall process leading to the redemption [when] their imperfect ethical monotheism will be rectified through the adoption of the seven laws.” <http://www.mesora.org/Christianity-Messiah.htm>

>Since you reject this criteria, and Judaism was established using miraculous works, then one could easily argue that the God of the Old Testament is a false god and that his prophets are sent by the true God to test us.

Strange argument. What's your source for rejecting the miracles of the OT in favor of some "truer God" if this principle comes straight from the OT? "God might test Israel with supernatural evidence" isn't a free-floating *a priori* principle. It has a source and isn't justifiable in its absence. You're sawin' off the branch you're sittin' on!

>They claim to be a continuation of the religion, and you characterizing the Christian God as one the Israelites didn't know is a misrepresentation of Christian teaching.

I'm denying the truth/coherency of the trinity, which isn't found in the Torah. I'm equally critical of Jewish additions: <http://www.mesora.org/ToharHayihud.pdf>

>It'd be just as much a misinterpretation to say (for instance) that Allah is actually a pagan moon god.

Allah is metaphysically identical to HaShem. It's the authority of Mohammed and the Koran I'd dispute.

MG

>How is the principle of a Christian philosopher ontologically prior to a revelation from God?

In order to know whether a particular religion is the true religion, there must be some universally-applicable criteria. Considering that Jews, Christians, and Muslims point to miracles as evidence for their faith, it seems like evidence for miracles is evidence for a particular faith. You seem to want to say "you can only use miracles as evidence for Judaism. You can't use it for evidence of any other religion." Is this not the case? Also, citing Deuteronomy 13 won't help your case, as the interpretation of it is what's in contention.

>I'm denying the truth/coherency of the trinity, which isn't found in the Torah.

I deny the truth/coherency of Judaism as it exists in the modern day. So what? I don't claim that Jews and Muslims worship a God foreign to ours. The burden is on you to show that the Deuteronomy 13 excludes Christianity and Islam. The way I read it, it excludes idolatry/paganism.

Donkey of Balaam

>In order to know whether a particular religion is the true religion, there must be some universally-applicable criteria. Considering that Jews, Christians, and Muslims point to miracles as evidence for their faith, it seems like evidence for miracles is evidence for a particular faith.

How does Aquinas' principle adjudicate between miracles from different traditions? It's worse than useless if it can't. Deut 13 puts the kibosh on any miracles performed on behalf of "gods which you have not known."

1. When did the Israelites worship a son of God? Please cite the chapter and verse. There is only one reference to the son of God in the Torah: Exodus 4:22. There is one reference to God being a man: Numbers 23:19. There are no references to it eventually being "fulfilled" by a miracle-worker.

2. When did they conceive of God as a triune being? Deut 6:4 is absolutely foundational:
<http://www.jewfaq.org/shemaref.htm>.

Given 1 & 2, Jesus represented "gods which you have not known." Game over.

>You seem to want to say "you can only use miracles as evidence for Judaism."

What I'm saying is that given 1 & 2, any miracles performed by "the son of God" who said "no one comes to the father except through me" (among other novelties, like he and the father being one) are fulfillments of Deut 13. This isn't the God that took them out of Egypt.

>citing Deuteronomy 13 won't help your case, as the interpretation of it is what's in contention.

What contention? Are you sticking with the claim that it's self-referentially inconsistent? You'll need to argue for that position. My question was this: What's your source for rejecting the Torah in favor of some "truer God"? The criteria in Deut 13 comes from the Torah. It isn't some free-floating universally applicable *a priori* thingamajig. It has a source and isn't justifiable in its absence.

Originally I wrote: "Pretend the NT doesn't exist. Just try. It's a thought experiment. How do you interpret this passage (Deut 13)?"

You wrote: "Applied as consistently as possible in the way that you interpret it, we ought to reject every miracle and signs in general as signs of deception sent from God to test us"

I mostly agree, though I'd pick nits with the term "deception" and it would only be miracles that flatly contradict the Torah. What Deut 13 says is that Aquinas is wrong. Supernatural evidence doesn't necessarily prove anything.

>The burden is on you to show that the Deuteronomy 13 excludes Christianity and Islam. The way I read it, it excludes idolatry/paganism.

Actually the "burden of proof" is on any religion that claims 1 & 2. But if you want a demonstration of the idolatrous nature of the trinity, see this:
https://www.reddit.com/r/Noachide/comments/c8x3sh/the_essential_shamanstk_idolatry_is_worshiping

SM

Let's consider Deuteronomy 13 a little more carefully. What does it say should be done with this evil false prophet? It says:

"But that prophet or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death, because he has taught rebellion against the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt and redeemed you out of

the house of slavery, to make you leave the way in which the Lord your God commanded you to walk. So you shall purge the evil from your midst."

That's exactly what happened to Jesus, and what was the result? He was raised from the dead. That, I would argue, is the one thing God could *not* do to the Deut. 13 prophet, because by raising him from the dead, He would be keeping the people from "purg[ing] the evil from [their] midst." In fact, Jesus came back and founded the church.

So I think the resurrection is the one miracle that your theory can NOT countenance, precisely because of the words of Deut. 13. It is uniquely a way for God to show His endorsement of Jesus the Christ's teachings.

Donkey of Balaam

I can't state the problem better than this:

>If the Torah does not authorize the rise of christianity, then christianity simply cannot be true, regardless of how many miracles it claims--even when they are witnessed publicly.

>What christianity lives or dies by is its claim to be the "fulfillment" of Judaism. Even if all its miracles or its other claims are true, if it is not the fulfillment of Judaism, then it is not what it claims to be and must be rejected.

>It cannot "prove" that it is the fulfillment of Judaism by merely quoting its own sources and its own claims, but this is all it has ever done or all that it will ever do, for the simple reason that the Hebrew Bible says absolutely nothing about Jsus or christianity--unless one grants christianity the right to authoritatively interpret it. And one who does this believes in christianity already.

>Does the Hebrew Bible obviously and objectively authorize christianity apart from christianity's own interpretations? No it does not. So christianity must be rejected, whether Jsus was "born of a virgin," "rose from the dead," or anything else.

>Judaism is based on the Revelation at Sinai, in light of which all other claims of revelation must be judged. The eisegesis of christianity into that Revelation is just that: a foreign intrusion made in light of a later claim to "revelation." But later claims to revelation do not sit in judgment on Sinai. It sits in judgment on them.

>By what authority do you accept the gospel and its interpretation of the Hebrew Bible? Its own? That of Jsus? That of the Church? You realize none of that is any different from accepting mormonism in the name of Joseph Smith, right? No . . . you obviously don't.

>Do any of you out there even understand what I'm saying? That the Torah either explicitly declares itself a temporary "preparation" for the coming demigod messiah or else this claim is groundless and based on nothing but its own assumptions?

>Considering that the Torah had been given a thousand years prior, and made it very clear that it was to be adhered to for all time, the glorious resurrection of Jsus is irrelevant.

>"*It was Christ, too, Who revealed Himself to Moses and led the Jews to Palestine.*"

>I am quite aware that this is chrstianity's claim. But Israel received the Torah from HaShem, not Jsus. That Jsus is (lehavdil!) HaShem is a chrstian claim that comes entirely from chrstianity. It does not come from the Hebrew Bible. Once again you are assuming your conclusion without proving it. Are you intentionally being illogical, or can you simply not say anything else?

>On what grounds to chrstians even believe the "new testament" or the church has the competence to authoritatively interpret the Hebrew Bible? Can you ever see this assumption for what it is? Are you all really under some sort of spell that prevents you from seeing the logical fallacy you are trapped in?

https://www.reddit.com/r/Noachide/comments/8iuvvc/the_quotable_zionist_conspirator_if_the_torah

SM

Well, you're dodging my point. My point was aimed at a particular that you (really, your source) made, and I refuted it. That is, I showed that, contra your claim, Jesus' miracles and resurrection cannot consistently be accepted and Him still rejected, even in light of Deut. 13.

Instead of responding in any way to what I said, you moved on to another point. Your new point is that Jesus cannot be Messiah unless the Torah authorizes Him. I agree. Of course, as a Christian, I will say that Deut. 18 is that authorization (and that, as the OT prophets laid out, the OT was permanent in principle but not in fact, because too often violated). You say that's not true, but all you're offering is question-begging against me. I'm going to say, of course, that Jesus' miracles are precisely Divine authorization of this interpretation, which is coherent with the Torah, the prophets, and the history of Israel.

That's an argument for Christianity. You've given nothing to refute it.

Donkey of Balaam

>Let's consider Deuteronomy 13 a little more carefully. What does it say should be done with this evil false prophet?

“YOU SHALL NOT HEED THE WORDS OF THAT PROPHET, or that dreamer of a dream; for the Lord, your God, is testing you. . . . You shall follow the Lord, your God, fear Him, keep His commandments, heed His voice, worship Him, and cleave to Him.” 13:4-5

“For you shall hearken to the voice of the Lord your God, to keep all His commandments which I command you **THIS DAY**, to do that which is proper in the eyes of the Lord, your God.” 13:19

Under what conditions does it say they should follow the prophet? As I've posted above, in the Hebrew Bible this chapter begins with "Everything I command you that you shall be careful to do it. You shall neither add to it, nor subtract from it." (It's the last verse of chap 12 in your bible). Where are the extra instructions about dropping the "everlasting covenant" "binding for all your generations" in favor of a whole new interface iff he says he's the son of God and does X?

> He was raised from the dead. That, I would argue, is the one thing God could *not* do to the Deut. 13 prophet, because by raising him from the dead, He would be keeping the people from "purg[ing] the evil from [their] midst."

It says to kill the prophet. "Purging the evil" is defined as doing this. How did Jesus remain in the "midst" of the Torah True community who didn't follow him? Why can't the test be ongoing, or have more than one ultimate purpose (like introducing the world to the "Old Testament" and its key concepts?)

>So I think the resurrection is the one miracle that your theory can NOT countenance, precisely because of the words of Deut. 13. It is uniquely a way for God to show His endorsement of Jesus the Christ's teachings.

And Deut 13 says this where? Show me "worship Jesus the Christ" in the Torah. Or anywhere. You can't. Maybe my previous post wasn't misdirected.

Here's some good resources on Deut 18:

<http://thejewishhome.org/counter/Deut18.pdf>

<https://nojesus4jews.weebly.com/365-prophecy-index.html>

SM

If killing Him was supposed to purge the evil, then it certainly failed, didn't it? That's why we're having this conversation. And it failed precisely because God resurrected him. Contra the words of Deut. 13.

I already read that stuff on Deut. 18. I get that that's the Jewish position. But I don't think that holding that and also accepting the resurrection is consistent.

What is your position on the prophets, btw? I know you don't view them as equal to the Torah. But do you view them as wrong?

Donkey of Balaam

1. The Torah explicitly says God will use supernatural evidence on behalf of false religions to test Israel. False religions are identified as those recognizing “gods which you have not known.”
2. The Torah contains NOTHING about Jesus the Christ, son of God, who is also fully God, the "symbolic fulfillment" of the Law and messianic prophecies. That's emphatically not the God who took them out of Egypt, who commanded the following:

And I will establish My covenant between Me and between you and between your seed after you THROUGHOUT their generations as an EVERLASTING COVENANT. (Genesis 17:7)

And [Passover] shall be for you as a memorial, and you shall celebrate it as a festival for the Lord; THROUGHOUT your generations, you shall celebrate it as an EVERLASTING STATUTE. (Exodus 12:14)

Thus shall the children of Israel observe the Sabbath, to make the Sabbath THROUGHOUT their generations as an EVERLASTING COVENANT. BETWEEN ME AND THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, it is FOREVER a sign that [in] six days The Lord created the heaven and the earth, and on the seventh day He ceased and rested. (Exodus 31:16-17)

[This is] an ETERNAL STATUTE for ALL your generations, in all your dwelling places: You shall not eat any blood or fat. (Lev. 3:17)

[Yom Kippur] is a Sabbath of rest for you, and you shall afflict yourselves. It is an ETERNAL STATUTE. (Lev. 16:31)

And you shall celebrate [Succoth] as a festival to the Lord for seven days in the year. [It is] an ETERNAL STATUTE throughout your generations [that] you celebrate it in the seventh month. (Lev. 23:41)

Do not add to the word which I command you, nor diminish from it, to observe the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you. (Deuteronomy 4:2, 13:1)

Please show me the Torah source of your claim that Special Miracles on behalf of Jesus the Christ, son of God, who is also fully God, the "symbolic fulfillment" of the Law and messianic prophecies cancels or changes any of the above.

Regarding the Prophets, I admire William Craig's honesty:

>When you look at the prophecies in the Old Testament they give virtually no clue that Messiah isn't going to be this triumphant king.

>This is what was supposed to happen. His government was supposed to be without end, and he was supposed to rule in Jerusalem. So scholars are generally agreed that you can't explain the origin of the disciples' belief in Jesus' resurrection by saying they went back to the Old

Testament and found these proof texts that would lead them to think that he is risen from the dead. Those proof texts just aren't there.

>I think we need to be quite candid with our Jewish friends and say apart from the event of Jesus and what happened, you wouldn't ever think that these prophecies were talking about these things.

>[H]ow does Paul interpret this problem? He says, whenever Jews read the Scriptures, a veil lies over their minds so that they can't understand it. He says only when a person comes to the Lord is the veil removed, and he says this comes from the Spirit of Christ.

>Now prior to Jesus, [Isaiah 53] wasn't read in that way. That wasn't read as being a Messianic passage. Even in that passage, I think the resurrection is hinted at, but it is not something that you would infer unless you were looking for it."

https://www.reddit.com/r/Noachide/comments/9m71k7/william_craig_when_you_look_at_the_prophecies_in

There's no "veil" over my mind. To the contrary. BTW, where does Paul get his authority? Nathan of Gaza, too, had a dream:

https://scholarship.tricolib.brynmawr.edu/bitstream/handle/10066/8207/2012BenjaminP_thesis.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

EDIT: I forgot some "everlasting" stuff. Easy to do. It's everywhere.

And God said: "This is the sign of the covenant, which I am placing between Me and between you, and between every living soul that is with you, FOR EVERLASTING GENERATIONS. ... And the rainbow shall be in the cloud, and I will see it, to remember THE EVERLASTING COVENANT between God and between every living creature among all flesh, which is on the earth." (Genesis 9:12,16)

What's contained in this covenant? Was God wrong to assign it to "everlasting generations"? False starts appear in Acts 15 and Jubilees. The Talmud has discussions dating from the early second temple period.

SM

Yes, it was everlasting if they didn't break it. If they did, they would be scattered and driven away, and etc. They were.

You didn't directly answer my question, by the way -- please do. Do you believe the prophets were of God / telling truth?

Donkey of Balaam

>it was everlasting if they didn't break it.

Source?

>If they did, they would be scattered and driven away, and etc. They were.

And what does Deut. 30:1-10 say? "The Lord, your God, will bring back your exiles, and He will have mercy upon you. He will once again gather you from all the nations, where the Lord, your God, had dispersed you. ... And you will return and listen to the voice of the Lord, and fulfill ALL His commandments, which I command you THIS DAY. ... For the Lord will once again rejoice over you for good, as He rejoiced over your forefathers, when you obey the Lord, your God, to observe His commandments and His statutes WRITTEN IN THIS TORAH SCROLL."

For the last time: Where does He command them to follow the son of God?

>Do you believe the prophets were of God / telling truth?

"The Nevi'im (Prophets) are a step lower than the Torah. They were not written by God Himself. They were written by the Prophets in their own words under the spirit of nevu'ah (prophecy). They are not higher than the Torah. If any prophet had ever prophesied that one day the Torah would be "fulfilled" and replaced by something else, he would have been put to death as a false prophet; and certainly his "prophecy" would not have been canonized by the 'Anshei-HaKeneset HaGedolah (the Men of the Great Assembly), which was made up of genuine Prophets and Biblical figures like Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, Malachi, Mordecai (of the Purim story), and the High Priests Yehoshua and Shimon HaTzaddik.

"The Nevi'im and Ketuvim were canonized to be read only until the coming of Mashiach, after which they will no longer be relevant. In the Messianic era, only the Torah and the Scroll of Esther will still be retained and read liturgically in the prayer service as they are today."

https://www.reddit.com/r/Noachide/comments/77c4mu/mvn_most_valuable_noachide/

Big fan of Hosea: For the children of Israel shall remain for many days, having neither king, nor prince, nor sacrifice, nor pillar, nor ephod nor teraphim. Afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God and David their king, and they shall come trembling to the Lord and to His goodness at the end of days. (Hosea 3:4-5)

SM

"For the last time: Where does He command them to follow the son of God?"

In Deut. 18, of course. But we're not going to agree about this point.

I mean, he doesn't call him that. But he doesn't call him anything. Where in the Constitution does it say to make Donald Trump President?

As for Deut. 30: indeed, and they were brought back from exile to the land. And the prophets who predicted both the exile and the return predicted Christ. For example, Jeremiah 31:31-34:

“Behold, the days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant that they broke, though I was their husband, declares the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, declares the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts. And I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And no longer shall each one teach his neighbor and each his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord,’ for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, declares the Lord. For I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.”

Donkey of Balaam

>Where in the Constitution does it say to make Donald Trump President?

This is not remotely analogous to the question "Where in the Torah does it tell us Who to worship as God?"

>And no longer shall each one teach his neighbor and each his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord,’ for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest, declares the Lord

But I'm trying to teach you about God and you're trying to teach me. How can Jeremiah 31 apply to the NT or the current situation? Nobody agrees on theology. Our conversation is proof that this verse doesn't apply to the NT. You're quoting it because your bible contains a NT and you simply assume its authority from the get-go. (I did this too when I was a Christian.)

That passage says a new covenant between Israel and Judah. Where are the instructions for gentiles? You didn't respond to my question about God's covenant with them:

And God said: "This is the sign of the covenant, which I am placing between Me and between you, and between every living soul that is with you, FOR EVERLASTING GENERATIONS. ... And the rainbow shall be in the cloud, and I will see it, to remember THE EVERLASTING COVENANT between God and between every living creature among all flesh, which is on the earth." (Genesis 9:12,16)

Was God wrong to assign it to "everlasting generations"? False starts appear in Acts 15 and Jubilees. The Talmud has discussions dating from the early second temple period, which is long before your religion started. The NT has no authority to add or subtract from it.

Returning to an earlier theme on whether God causes "evil," Aquinas on predestination is a revelation: https://www.reddit.com/r/Noachide/comments/f0dlfn/catholic_predestination
Tell me more about how mean God would be to test Israel with a miracle-worker. (Free will "problem" my eye.)

Per Maimonides, something like "free will" is baked into reality. For instance, the very chosenness of Israel was an historic contingency: If Abraham hadn't rediscovered monotheism with a cosmo argument, if it had been a Navajo, then his descendants would have had big brother status among the nations and the Torah would have been set in Nevada (I'd love to read the one where it's the Irish. We'd botch things in different and interesting ways.) Hezekiah could have launched the Messianic Era but didn't share his good news with the gentiles. The Exodus could have culminated in the Messianic Era: <https://www.amazon.com/Exodus-You-Almost-Passed-Over/dp/0997347600>

Predestination is Squaresville, daddy-o. There's no predestined salvation from eternal damnation in the TaNaKh.

SM

The point is that Jeremiah 31 says that there will be a new covenant and it will be unlike the old; contra your assertion that the old must be eternal *no matter what happens.*

I'm not sure what your point about the Noahic covenant is. That's a different covenant than the one with Israel / Moses. Why are you quoting Gen. 9?

Also, I'm quoting from the OT, not from the NT, so I don't see why you're accusing me of circular reasoning. You just said you do accept the prophets.

Donkey of Balaam

The point is that this has nothing to do with the NT. Jeremiah 31:30-34 wasn't fulfilled during the first century. It contains two prophecies: the ingathering of the Jewish People to Israel and universal knowledge of God. I can check Drudge and see these haven't happened. What law was written on the hearts of everyone in the house of Israel and the house of Judah, given which they no longer need to teach each other about God? Israel is a secular democracy (groan!) and the earth is sunk in theological darkness.

Why don't Christians quote verses 29-30, which seem to belie the concept of vicarious atonement. "Everyone shall die for his own iniquity." That's weird. And there's the awkward verse 36: "If the heavens above will be measured and the foundations of the earth below will be fathomed, I too will reject all the seed of Israel because of all they did, says the Lord."

>and it will be unlike the old; contra your assertion that the old must be eternal *no matter what happens.*

My assertion? I quoted umpteen passages written by Almighty God on the eternal contents of the Torah, practically begged you for anything about Jesus the Christ, and you said “Where in the Constitution does it say to make Donald Trump President.”

Where does Jeremiah say the old covenant is canceled, that it's not eternal? Hebrews 8:13 says that, Jeremiah doesn't. The only difference between the two covenants is where they reside. The original Sinai Covenant was placed in the mouths of the Israelites: Exodus 13:9 – “And it shall be to you for a sign upon your hand, and for a memorial between your eyes, in order that the Torah of the Lord shall be in your mouth.” This contract was verbally agreed to, as indicated in Exodus 24:3,7. Jeremiah says, "I will inscribe it upon their heart." It says nothing about canceling the Torah; it describes a new means of access that won't require theological debate. We're not waiting for "the end of the world" or "doomsday" or the world burning up. We're waiting for the Kingdom of God on earth--literally, complete with universal knowledge of God and world peace. This is what the Prophets were prophesying about.

> I don't see why you're accusing me of circular reasoning.

I don't accept the NT's authority to interpret the TaNaKh. Period. You're quoting its deceptively truncated proof-text and Rube Goldberg interpretation like it flows organically from what Jeremiah wrote. It obviously doesn't. Again, are we or are we not trying to teach each other about God? How is this compatible with verse 34? Don't let cognitive dissonance + the sunk-cost fallacy guide your theology.

>You just said you do accept the prophets.

Testify: Isaiah 2:1-4, Ezekiel 37:24-28, Zechariah 8:22-23, Micah 4:1-3, and countless others that have nada to do with Jesus. It must be that “veil” covering my mind that Paul writes about. I can't find one reference to Jesus the son of God anywhere in the Prophets.

> I'm not sure what your point about the Noahic covenant is. That's a different covenant than the one with Israel / Moses.

It was just another example of an everlasting covenant, only it applies to all non-Jewish humanity for everlasting generations. Most of the laws in the Torah don't apply to gentiles then or now.

G

Too late to get in the weeds, but I would like to make a general comment. It is my general impression that Anonymous is proceeding as if modern Judaism (in whatever form you take it) is not itself a re-interpretation of the Torah inside a specific tradition, which is a preposterous proposition. There is no more temple; no longer sacrifices are being offered to Yaweh; if we go through the prescriptions of the Mosaic law I am pretty sure many of them have been laid to the wayside. To take on the hard task of exegesis of the passages of the Old Testament is all a necessary part of the argument between Christians and Jews, and it will depend on the

assumptions one brings to the table and the priors one has. Presumably, Anonymous accepts the Old Testament as authoritative and the true voice of God on some kind of argument that attests it as divine revelation; so does the Christian, whose starting point is the resurrection of the Lord, and through which lens the Old Testament must be interpreted. Anonymous protests. As per my reasons above, he protests too much.

Donkey of Balaam

>Too late to get in the weeds

You could at least read the posts.

>There is no more temple; no longer sacrifices are being offered to Yaweh; if we go through the prescriptions of the Mosaic law I am pretty sure many of them have been laid to the wayside.

Deja vu ad infinitum. Hosea 3 says what? "For the children of Israel shall remain for many days, having neither king, nor prince, nor sacrifice, nor pillar, nor ephod nor teraphim. Afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God and David their king, and they shall come trembling to the Lord and to His goodness at the END OF DAYS."

The "evidence" you cited against Judaism was foretold by the Prophets and Deut 28 (also cited above). It's actually evidence for my position. In the "end of days," after a brutal exile, Israel will have a King and they'll seek "the Lord their God." Has this happened? It doesn't say a word about any son of God replacing the Torah's Laws. It doesn't say to worship the Messiah as a deity either. You're doing it wrong.

>the Christian, whose starting point is the resurrection of the Lord, and through which lens the Old Testament must be interpreted.

Because ... the NT says so, the authority of which is the point in contention. Who's on first?

You know that exhaustion you feel when your protestant friends rattle off their fave verses "proving" the solas, and you have to break it to them that only the magisterium has the sacred authority to interpret scripture, that Marty & Co. may as well be pitching Jainism? That's my position against the NT. The Torah is the heritage of Jacob. In the end of days Israel will have a King and a Temple where he performs animal sacrifices (those scary ones that Leviticus says are eternal).

>To take on the hard task of exegesis of the passages of the Old Testament is all a necessary part of the argument between Christians and Jews, and it will depend on the assumptions one brings to the table and the priors one has.

It's a hard task for you because the TaNaKh never says it's going to be replaced by Jesus the son of God. Philosophic conservative here. My dear liberal friend, new things have to establish themselves against that which has already been established. Israel read the Torah without the NT

for over a thousand years. Your "priors" include the truth of your conclusion, that you have the authority to reinterpret the Hebrew Bible. How do you respond to Moslems and Mormons who have their own consequent-affirming priors regarding the NT? Do you treat it as serious evidence requiring the "hard task of exegesis"?

SM

So, we can each assert our own interpretations back and forth to each other ad infinitum, and you can keep saying I'm quoting the NT when I'm not, and etc.

I'm making arguments only from what YOU accept as Scripture. Whatever Jeremiah 31 means, it is clear that it means that the covenant that you keep asserting cannot possibly ever be changed or replaced is, in fact, going to be changed and/or replaced.

That's not me saying anything about Jesus, or Paul, or anything else. It's me saying something about you, to wit: you're wrong about the Mosaic covenant.

"It was just another example of an everlasting covenant, only it applies to all non-Jewish human for everlasting generations. Most of the laws in the Torah don't apply to gentiles then or now."

Agreed.

Donkey of Balaam

>we can each assert our own interpretations back and forth to each other ad infinitum

Back and forth? I'm still waiting for your interpretation of the passage that says we won't have to teach each other about God because "they shall all know Me from their smallest to their greatest." Zero is a long way from ad infinitum. I've told you what it means and how it can't possibly apply to any period in the last 2k years. You haven't responded. Do you think you can just flash the words NEW COVENANT and I'll fall into some trance? For the last time:

1. Are we teaching each other about God? It sure seems like it. I deny that Jesus was divine in any way. I maintain that HaShem alone Is God, that the TaNaKh never authorizes Jesus or Paul or Mohammed or John Smith, that the only True Religion was given at Sinai and all subsequent claimants are imposters. This is what I've been trying to teach you about God. And you're trying to teach me I'm wrong.
2. How is #1 compatible with a new covenant characterized by no one teaching each other about God? Are we currently in the Messianic Era? Did Jesus usher it in? Why are strangers debating fundamental issues in theology/ontology during a new covenant when

"no longer shall one teach his neighbor or [shall] one [teach] his brother, saying, "Know the Lord," for they shall all know Me from their smallest to their greatest"?"

>I'm making arguments only from what YOU accept as Scripture.

Heh. And it's just an amazing coincidence the passage is identical to the one in Hebrews, which conveniently chops off verses that refute the meaning your religion asserts. Shame on me for noticing, and demonstrating it doesn't stand alone or mean what you think.

>Whatever Jeremiah 31 means,

Whatever? Dude, don't harsh my mellow with all your Bible words. Whatever it means it has to mean what you keep repeating and you can ignore my arguments. I haven't seen such a stirring use of 'whatever' since Hegel.

>it is clear that it means that the covenant that you keep asserting cannot possibly ever be changed or replaced is, in fact, going to be changed and/or replaced.

I quoted a verse you conveniently omitted: If the heavens above will be measured and the foundations of the earth below will be fathomed, I too will reject all the seed of Israel because of all they did, says the Lord. 31:36

Does your interpretation of Jeremiah 31 entail that Israel will lose their status as God's Chosen Nation? Don't be coy. This isn't a Jane Austen novel. We both know it does. How is that interpretation compatible with this verse?

If you agree that the Noachide Covenant is everlasting, what difference does it make what arrangements God makes with Israel? Nothing hinges on Jeremiah 31 for us. It explicitly says a covenant between Judah and Israel. Show me the new covenant with gentiles in Jeremiah. You can't, so why are you quoting it.

SM

A little less attitude there would go a long way, my dude.

"Back and forth? I'm still waiting for your interpretation of the passage that says we won't have to teach each other about God because 'they shall all know Me from their smallest to their greatest.'"

That will be fulfilled at the eschaton.

And no, Israel will never cease being a nation before Him. There will always indeed be a remnant.

Incidentally, who's selectively quoting now? v. 37:

"Thus says the Lord: "If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth below can be explored, then I will cast off all the offspring of Israel for all that they have done," declares the Lord."

So He says He will not reject ALL the offspring of Israel. He does not say that at every intermediate time, they will be the unique chosen nation and nobody else will be grafted in. Much as you might try to sneak the word "Chosen nation" into the passage where it is not.

Yes, we're trying to teach each other about God. See above.

You too must accept that there are multi-part fulfillments of prophecy. After all, there is no sacrifice system being practiced today, notwithstanding the "forevers."

Incidentally, a question: the Jews being driven from Israel and the collapse of the sacrificial system is clearly, in the Torah, a punishment for breaking the covenant. How, according to you, did they do that during the second temple period?

Ultimately, it is God who interprets Himself. You are ignoring His clear work interpreting Himself, rejecting a prophet who never taught anybody to worship any God but Jehovah, and whom God accredited by resurrection (something never dreamed of in Deut. 13); at your peril. I pray you will renounce your rebellion against God's anointed.

Donkey of Balaam

>That will be fulfilled at the eschaton.

Which means this prophecy hasn't been fulfilled. Thanks. That's what I've been saying. Kinda zaps the evidence for your position that this covenant (whatever it is) already replaced the old one.

Where does Jeremiah mention an eschaton? He doesn't. That's an epicycle posited by your church (along with grafting). Judah & Israel will have God's Law inscribed upon their hearts AND no longer shall one teach his neighbor about God. They go together. You can't have this new covenant absent its definitive features.

>You too must accept that there are multi-part fulfillments of prophecy

I've cited several prophecies that haven't been fulfilled in this thread, like the one in Hosea involving the end of days.

>at your peril. I pray you will renounce your rebellion against God's anointed.

Speaking of prophecies unfulfilled, when was Jesus anointed king of Israel? He simply fails ALL the Messianic requirements: <http://thejewishhome.org/counter/Wanted.pdf>

Do you really think God tortures people for having the wrong theology? Condolences. That's defamation of character, and it's not in the TaNaKh. Our differences go far deeper than this verse or that. They're different paradigms:

https://www.reddit.com/r/Noachide/comments/8jk2g1/a_noachides_response_to_christianity

Peace out.

G

"You know that exhaustion you feel when your protestant friends rattle off their fave verses "proving" the solas, and you have to break it to them that only the magisterium has the sacred authority to interpret scripture"

You are arguing like a tiresome protestant, I will give you that, but for your information what you quote is not (part of the) the argument against Sola Scriptura. And since you are quoting the purported argument approvingly, and since it is a patent case of question begging, it follows you are begging the question, and admit it implicitly.

"Because ... the NT says so, the authority of which is the point in contention. Who's on first?"

Don't be an idiot. There is more historical evidence for the resurrection than for any of the miracles testified in the Old Testament; taking your objection to your logical conclusion, why the heck do you believe God gave a divine revelation to the Jewish people in the first place? You may not find the evidence for the resurrection anywhere near compelling, but reducing it to a mere question of authority of the NT is just dumbassery. And no, my point of contention was not whether the NT has authority or not.

"It's a hard task for you because the TaNaKh never says it's going to be replaced by Jesus the son of God. Philosophic conservative here. My dear liberal friend, new things have to establish themselves against that which has already been established. Israel read the Torah without the NT for over a thousand years. Your "priors" include the truth of your conclusion, that you have the authority to reinterpret the Hebrew Bible."

I do not know how you manage to pull "liberal friend" from your ass, as I am neither a liberal (political or otherwise) nor your friend. Your mischaracterizations are also tiresome: that it is a hard task is not because of what the Tanakh says or does not say (what a stupid aside), it is simply an empirical fact -- it is not like there is wholesale agreement over the meaning of the OT. That Israel read the Torah without the NT is a quite obvious historical fact that solves nothing. My point was that to talk of Christians "re-interpreting" as if you yourself are not engaging in an interpretative act, is nothing but pure delusion. It has nothing to do with authority.

And since this is going nowhere, I beg your leave.

Donkey of Balaam

> I beg your leave.

Is this Henry James?

> idiot... dumbassery... stupid...

Nope.

>There is more historical evidence for the resurrection than for any of the miracles testified in the Old Testament

I'm not denying the resurrection; **I'M DENYING IT'S EVIDENCE FOR CHRISTIANITY. Wrap your mind around that argument. It's the new kid on the block. I'm pulling the rug out from under you.** The TaNaKh says God will send prophets to test Israel with miracles on behalf of bogus religions. It never, not once, not anywhere says the son of God will fulfill it. My explanatory paradigm explains this better than yours. That's my argument. Maybe you can respond to it. Pro-tip: read the failed attempts above before trying.

> why the heck do you believe God gave a divine revelation to the Jewish people in the first place?

Ahem: <http://www.mesora.org/god>. Didn't Jesus believe in it? He not only affirmed Moses' authorship of the Torah, he spoke of the days of Noah. Jesus wasn't a reform rabbi. If there's no reason to believe in the Revelation at Sinai why the heck do you follow someone who claimed to fulfill the Law given there? This. Makes. No. Sense. And it's nothing short of hypocrisy to chide someone who believes what your lord & savior explicitly affirmed.

> it is not like there is wholesale agreement over the meaning of the OT.

Who does it say has the authority to interpret it? The heritage of ____? The Torah isn't addressed to gentiles at all.

General point that's been raised several times: **Deut 18 refers to a prophet.** "I will set up a prophet for them from among their brothers like you, and I will put My words into his mouth, and he will speak to them all that I command him." In the Hebrew Bible, every single prophet and prophetess without exception was a human being with a human mommy & daddy. A prophet is a mortal who has a vision of HaShem, receives a message and puts it into his own words. Prophets have different levels of access, with Moses having the greatest. The Christian claim is that Jesus was God. You don't get to redefine 'prophet' like this. (Or to redefine 'Messiah.' Or twist Deut 6:4 into a trinity.) Parse Deut 18 with the prophet = God: "I will put My words into My mouth, and I/we will speak to them all that I command Me/us/them." Makes perfect sense!

...

Man, I can be a jerk! My apologies for the attitude. I'm funnier in person. (Well, less awful.)

My points stand, of course.

Note to Dr. Feser: for some of us you're the Indiana Jones of Classical Theism. Word.

Posting as Anonymous <https://edwardfeser.blogspot.com/2020/01/preternatural-theology.html>