3431/ HATES HUMAN SACRIFICE

Let's start with the lesson from Genesis 22:9-13: After reading this chapter of Genesis, the first question might come to your mind, Why did *** command Abraham in the first place to sacrifice his son Isaac and then stop him when he nearly did kill his son? This is where we must examine, to find out what was this all about and what kind of test was about. Why was Abraham being tested, to sacrifice Isaac as a burnt offering?

After examining the whole situation, it will turn out to us to understand that 3/3/4 was testing Abraham's faith, to see if he would obey HIS command no matter WHAT. Because 3/3/4 is the Supreme ONE with all the power and authority, that NO ONE should stand against HIM with a question. Abraham knew killing a human being was truly wrong. Of course, he does not want his very son to be killed too. Abraham was also being tested to see if he loved 3/3/4 more than HIS son Isaac. That he would do anything that 3/3/4 commanded no matter what. To put all of his loyal trust in 3/3/4.

After 3%3% stopped Abraham from nearly killing Isaac, he must have felt relief that he didn't need to kill his son. Notice, that Abraham passed two tests, if he did kill his son Isaac he would have still passed the test. Because he did obey 3%3%'s commands. On the other hand, Abraham put all the loyal trust to 3%3%, no matter what. These are the two lessons, but there is more to it.

After \$\fi\frac{1}{3}\lambda'\cdots\$ stop, Abraham nearly kills his son, \$\fi\frac{1}{3}\lambda'\text{ tells him to take the ram to sacrifice instead. From there, there is another lesson to notice there. After \$\fi\frac{1}{3}\lambda'\text{ commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son, he knew that wasn't normal or the right thing to do. He knew about the law, that sacrificing or killing humans is forbidden. The scripture book did not mention that but, we can surely see why \$\fi\frac{1}{3}\lambda'\text{ stopped Abraham from nearly killing his son Isaac. Why couldn't HE just let Abraham kill his son anyway? Because he would still pass the test by his loyally. So again, why stop Abraham from nearly killing his son and tell him to take the ram instead? According to Genesis 9:6, no one was supposed to be bloody killed.

"The one who sheds human blood, by a human will his blood be shed, for in

Shedding the Blood of Man Required for the Forgiveness of Sins?

"For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it unto you to offer upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls: for this blood shall make an atonement for the soul. Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, None of you shall eat blood: neither the stranger that sojourneth among you shall eat blood. Moreover whosoever he be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them, which by hunting taketh any beast or fowl that may be eaten, he shall pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust: For the life of all flesh is his blood, it is joined with his life: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no flesh: for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it, shall be cut off." - Leviticus 17:11-14

The lesson here is, that shedding a human's blood is an abomination in 3/3/4's eyes and it does NOT deliver us the cleansing of sins or salvation at all. The slaying of an animal and the offering of its blood the certain prescribed rites and symbolize 3/3/4's mercy to the sinner, for this, would have been his fate

These foolish New Testament doctrine books speak about the salvation of Jesus Christ, who we were told died for a man's sins. That this was ¾¼¼'s plan of salvation is all just plain wrong and untrue. We are being told who believe in him will not perish but have eternal life (John 3:16 & 1 Peter 1:19-21). The main reason why so many people fall to think that "if" Jesus had not shed His blood for us, we could never be forgiven for our sins. Implying from what Hebrews 9:22 said, which referral from what Leviticus 17:11 teaches:

"... without the shedding of blood, there can be no forgiveness of sins."

They claimed the blood of Jesus was necessary. Those who agree and believe this doctrine don't clearly understand the whole point about the blood sacrifice. We need to understand why Moses sprinkled the blood from the bowls on or toward the congregation. Is to understand the animal's blood, that this blood is representative of the sealing of 3%%'s Covenant promise to the people of Yisraelites. Again, the blood represents life is needs to be clearly understood. The teaching of the sprinkling of blood on people is significant to a vital commitment sign between 3%% and HIS people. Meaning, that this blood itself cannot forgive or cleanse a person's life from their wrongdoing. After all, this blood sacrifice is from the animal, not mankind. People do not realize how tempted they are like how Satan has tricked Adam's wife about the forbidden fruit. To think it is okay for Jesus to become a human sacrifice for us is insane.

The question here is, did any of this Covenant promise an eternal life to give which 3131/4 had commanded us to take the blood? For instance, was the animal sacrifice blood a promise of eternal life to get? The answer is simply HACK NO!

When it comes to a blood sacrifice, this Old Testament (or TANAKH) isn't univocal. This is why Isaiah, Hosea, and King David all knew the animal sacrifice blood had never entered 3/3/4 's mind because 3/3/4 do NOT delight in the blood sacrifice of bulls or goats, because HE only cares about the spiritual conditioning people understanding of their human heart and mind (See what Psalm 50:8, Hosea 6:6, Psalm 51:16, 40:6-8, Isaiah 1:11-31, Jeremiah 7:21-23).

"Fathers shall not be put to death because of their children, and children shall not be put to death because of their fathers; each one shall be put to death for his own sin."