

# University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

THE PROPHET MOTIF IN NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY

being a thesis presented by

William Leslie Avery

to the University of St. Andrews

in application for the degree of

B. Phil.



Tu 5125

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS  
LIBRARY

**CERTIFICATE**

I certify that William Leslie Avery has spent three terms at Research Work in St. Andrews, that he has fulfilled the conditions of Ordinance No. 50 (St. Andrews), and that he is qualified to submit the accompanying thesis in application for the degree of B. Phil.



UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS  
LIBRARY

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of experiments carried out by me, that the thesis is my own composition, and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree.

The Research was carried out in St. Andrews.

## CAREER

I matriculated in the University of Toronto in September 1954, and followed a course leading to graduation in 1957, with the B. A. degree.

I matriculated again at the University of Toronto in 1957, and followed a course leading to graduation in 1960, with the B. D. degree.

On October 1st., 1960, I matriculated at the University of St. Andrews and commenced research on "The Prophet Motif In New Testament Christology", which is now being submitted as a B. Phil. thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION .....	1
	Old Testament Background .....	1
	Intertestamental Literature .....	5
	The Meaning and Function of προφήτης .....	10
II	EXPECTATIONS OF A PROPHET IN THE JUDAISM AND SAMARITANISM OF THE FIRST CENTURY A.D. ....	23
	Qumran .....	23
	Popular Judaism .....	42
	The Samaritans .....	56
III	JESUS AS A PROPHET .....	76
	External Similarities .....	76
	Similarities In Teaching .....	81
	Similarities In Personal Traits .....	83
	New Testament References To Jesus as Prophet .....	86
	"A" Prophet .....	96
	"The" Prophet .....	139
IV	PROPHET IN THE APOSTOLIC AND SUB-APOSTOLIC AGE .....	165
V	CONCLUSION .....	184
	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	193

## ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Apoc. and Pseud.</u>	<u>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English.</u> R. H. Charles, editor. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
ATR	Anglican Theological Review
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BASOR-SS	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research-Supplementary Studies
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
Did.	Didache
ERE	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics
ET	Expository Times
HDB	Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible
Hist. Eccl.	Historiae Ecclesiasticae, (Eusebius)
<u>Hom.</u>	<u>Homilies</u> (Pseudo-Clementine)
HTR	Howard Theological Review
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Interp.	Interpretation
IQS	The Manual of Discipline, (Dead Sea Scrolls)
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies



JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JR	Journal of Religion
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
<u>Legends</u>	<u>The Legends of the Jews</u> by L. Ginzberg. 7 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publica- tion Society of America, 1936 - 1947.
NTS	New Testament Studies
RB	Revue Biblique
<u>Recogn.</u>	<u>Recognitions (Pseudo-Clementine)</u>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SEA	Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
S. P. C. K.	Society for Promoting Christian Know- ledge
TWNT	<u>Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u> , G. Kittel, editor.
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNTW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZRG	Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistes- geschichte

Standard abbreviations have been used for Books of the Bible, and Manuscripts and Versions.

Unless otherwise stated, quotations from the Bible are from the Revised Standard Version, copyright 1946 and 1952 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

Quotations from Josephus are from the translation by W. Whiston, edited by D. S. Margoliouth.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In the New Testament, Jesus is given the designation ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. In some cases he is referred to simply as a prophet, with the suggestion that he stands in the line of the Old Testament prophets, while in others he is referred to as The Prophet, in the sense of the one who was expected. As with most of his other names and titles, this one also has an Old Testament background.

### OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND

The first Old Testament emergence of the idea of a prophet who is to come appears in Deuteronomy 18:15-18. Here is found upon the lips of Moses the words: "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren - him you shall heed - ... And the Lord said to me 'They have rightly said all that they have spoken. I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him...'"

Much debate has focused upon these words. A popular controversy among scholars is whether or not this passage



and argues that the context actually favours taking it as an individual prophet.<sup>1</sup> The prophet is represented not only as coming forth from Israel, but is also compared with Moses; therefore presumably he is an individual.

On the other hand, S. R. Driver<sup>2</sup> says that no single or particular prophet is intended, the word  $\chi' \eta \eta$  being a singular collective. The constantly recurring need for knowledge of the future meant that there would always be a need for prophets; hence the reference here is to a permanent institution<sup>3</sup> rather than to a particular individual prophet.

The characteristics of the prophet are first that he is to be an Israelite (v. 15), and secondly, like Moses (v. 15).

Driver<sup>4</sup> says that the phrase "like unto me" is limited to the sense of being Yahweh's representative with the people (vv. 16-18) although he is not necessarily such in the same degree in which Moses was. Thirdly, the prophet is to be authorized to declare the whole word of God with authority (v. 18). There is no Jewish prophet who satisfies these

<sup>1</sup>cf. G. T. Manley, The Book of the Law: Studies In The Date of Deuteronomy, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup>S. R. Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary On Deuteronomy, (ICC), p. 227.

<sup>3</sup>cf. G. A. Smith, The Book of Deuteronomy: The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Revised) p. 233 who cites (n. 1) Calvin's words that "a prophet" is used for "a number of prophets" in this passage; H. W. Robinson, The Century Bible (Revised): Deuteronomy: and Joshua, p. 149; A. C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy: A New Theory Of Its Origin, p. 108, and Deuteronomy: The Framework to The Code, p. 25; H. Cunliffe-Jones, Deuteronomy; p. 113, and G. H. Davies, "Deuteronomy" in the new Peake's Commentary On The Bible, p. 278.

<sup>4</sup>S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 228f, cf. G. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 233.

conditions, nor can any compare with Moses or be considered his superior until the coming of Jesus Christ.

Against the exclusively Messianic interpretation of previous expositors, Driver says that the majority of the commentators of his day (e.g. Hengst, Christology; p. 112ff; Keil, Espin, Oehler, O. T. Theol. #161; Orelli, O. T. Proph. p. 132f; and König, Offenb. des AT's ii p. 131) rejected it. However, he goes on to say that, along with those same scholars, he too believes that this passage includes a reference to the ideal prophet, "Who should be 'like' Moses in a pre-eminent degree, in Whom the line of individual prophets should culminate and Who should exhibit the characteristics of the prophet in their fullest perfection."<sup>1</sup>

The present writer feels that statement indicates a desire on Driver's part to have it both ways. Such an approach may well be the most accurate. When Moses spoke these words (Deut. 18:15-18), it is very unlikely that he foresaw the coming of Jesus; but when the people of Jesus' day saw in him the marks of the great prophets, they were reminded of these verses in their Scriptures, indicating that Yahweh had promised to raise up a prophet. How far the Jews had come to use Deut. 18:15-18 as a Messianic proof-text it is impossible to say, but its presence in the Qumran Scrolls<sup>2</sup> and the popular expectation of a prophet in the Gospels, and also its use by the Samaritans, indicate

---

<sup>1</sup>S. R. Driver, op. cit., p. 229, cf. H. Cunliffe-Jones, op. cit., p. 113.

<sup>2</sup>IQS 9:10-11.

that it had become quite a lively and widespread belief.

In any event, this "double interpretation" leaves the door open for the idea that this passage led to the expectation of Moses' return (Moses redivivus).<sup>1</sup>

In later Old Testament books there is found a yearning for one of the former prophets to appear.<sup>2</sup> In Psalm 74:9, the Psalmist laments that "there is no longer any prophet." The Lamentations of Jeremiah (2:9) also show that the people are sorry that Jerusalem's "prophets obtain no vision from the Lord." They can no longer receive an authentic vision because the sanctuary has been destroyed. In this verse the author is saying that Yahweh has utterly forsaken his people and comes to them no longer through any medium.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, Ezekiel 7:26 indicates that the prophets no longer obtain visions. In vain they seek out the prophet for an oracle.

#### INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE

Besides this Old Testament desire for the reappearance of prophecy, the intertestamental literature of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha looks forward to the coming of a prophet.

Ecclesiasticus 48:1ff deals with the return of Elijah. Use is made of Isaiah 49:6 along with Malachi 4:5 to suggest

<sup>1</sup>O. Cullmann, The Christology of The New Testament, p. 17, cf. Sibylline Oracles, V, p. 256ff.

<sup>2</sup>cf. H. Ewald, op. cit., VI, p. 127f.

<sup>3</sup>A. S. Herbert, "Lamentations" in the new Peake's Commentary on The Bible, p. 565.

the revival of ancient prophecy in the return of Elijah.<sup>1</sup> According to Box and Oesterley<sup>2</sup> this is one of the few passages in which Ecclesiasticus refers to the Messianic hope.

The reference to a coming prophet, is made more explicit in I Maccabees. Verse 4:46 is as follows: "So they pulled down the altar, and laid down the stones in the mountain of the House, in a convenient place, until a prophet should come<sup>3</sup> and decide concerning them." Oesterley<sup>4</sup> connects this expectation to Deut. 18:15-18 but adds that the latter is not a Messianic passage, though it may be so interpreted subsequently. He admits<sup>5</sup> that the thought of the Messiah is conceivably in the mind of the writer (I Macc. 4:46) but denies this to the Deuteronomic text. Fairweather and Black<sup>6</sup> deny the specifically Messianic reference, suggesting that the important thought in the verse is that the decision about the stones must wait until God reveals His will through the authoritative medium of a prophetic voice.

<sup>1</sup>E. Riehm, Messianic Prophecy, p. 299.

<sup>2</sup>G. H. Box and W. O. E. Oesterley in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha Of the Old Testament, (ed. R. H. Charles) vol. I, p. 499.

<sup>3</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>4</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. I, p. 82.

<sup>5</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley, The Books of The Apocrypha, Their Origin, Teaching and Contents, p. 282.

<sup>6</sup>W. Fairweather and J. S. Black, The First Book of Maccabees: The Cambridge Bible For Schools and Colleges, p. 112.



Dancy<sup>1</sup> sees in I and II Maccabees evidence that in Hellenistic Judaism many of the functions of prophecy were taken over by the Law. The Torah provided solutions for all problems (I Macc. 3:8; 12:9) except two (I Macc. 4:46; 14:41). For these the hope of a return of the prophetic spirit at some later time is set forth. However, Dancy concludes that this hope is "vague and almost formal."<sup>2</sup>

I Maccabees 9:27 gives explicit testimony that prophecy had ceased: "And there was great tribulation in Israel, such as was not since the time that a prophet appeared<sup>3</sup> unto them." This "rhetorical exaggeration"<sup>4</sup> is usually<sup>5</sup> taken to imply that their distress exceeded that experienced at any time since the days of Malachi<sup>6</sup>, with whom prophecy was believed to have ceased. But Oesterley<sup>7</sup> says that this is not necessarily so. In any event, the important thing for the present discussion is its witness to the cessation of prophecy.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. C. Dancy, A Commentary On I Maccabees, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup>idem.

<sup>3</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>4</sup>W. Fairweather and J. S. Black op. cit., p. 171.

<sup>5</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. I, p. 98 says that this is the view of Grimm, Bissell, Fairweather and Black, and Knabenbauer.

<sup>6</sup>i.e., late 5th century.

<sup>7</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley, idem.

As was intimated above<sup>1</sup>, I Maccabees 14:41 suggests that a prophet is expected: "And the Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high-priest forever, until a faithful prophet should arise".<sup>2</sup> In other words, this popular decree legitimized and made hereditary those dignities which Simon already had. This would remain so until some authentic mouthpiece of God should make some other enactment.<sup>3</sup> It would be the responsibility of the πιστός προφήτης to decide whether the present arrangement should be changed.<sup>4</sup>

As for the identity of this "faithful prophet", the old expositors generally understood him to be the Messiah, giving Deut. 18:15-18 a Messianic interpretation.<sup>5</sup> Stade<sup>6</sup> thought he was either the Messiah himself or his immediate fore-runner; Ewald<sup>7</sup> also says that these Maccabean references, (I Maccabees 4:46, 9:27, 14:41) bordered closely on the Messianic hope. Oesterley<sup>8</sup> too saw a reference to the Messiah

<sup>1</sup>p. 7.

<sup>2</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>3</sup>E. Schürer, A History of The Jewish People In The Time of Jesus Christ, Division I, vol. 1, p. 265.

<sup>4</sup>W. F. Fairweather and J. S. Black, op. cit., p. 247.

<sup>5</sup>idem.

<sup>6</sup>B. Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, II, p. 382.

<sup>7</sup>H. Ewald, op. cit., V, p. 128.

<sup>8</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley, The Books of The Apocrypha, Their Origin, Teaching and Contents, p. 282.

in I Macc. 14:41, but Westcott<sup>1</sup> thinks that any reference either to the great Prophet whom Moses foretold or to the Messiah's forerunner is doubtful. Dancy<sup>2</sup> agrees that no Messiah is intended in I Macc. 14:41. Grimm and others say that the omission of the article tells against the Messianic reference, with the qualification that the allusion is Messianic in the general sense that the "faithful prophet" first appeared in Christ.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to these references in the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha also contains the suggestion of a prophet who is to come. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs there are two such references.

The Testament of Levi 8:15 says: "And His presence is beloved as a prophet of the Most High, of the seed of Abraham our father." John Hyrcanus alone of the Maccabees is credited with the gift of prophecy,<sup>4</sup> so this verse must date from his time.<sup>5</sup> This passage is pointing out that the priestly Messiah from Levi is to be a prophet of the Most High.

<sup>1</sup>B. F. Westcott, Introduction To the Study of The Gospels, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup>J. C. Dancy, op. cit., p. 186.

<sup>3</sup>W. Fairweather and J. S. Black, idem.

<sup>4</sup>Josephus, War I.ii.8.

<sup>5</sup>ibid. between 137 and 107 B.C. but if Testament of Levi 6:11 is taken as a reference to the destruction of Samaria, it may be dated more precisely between 109 and 107 B.C.

A further Pseudepigraphic reference to a coming prophet is found in the Testament of Benjamin 9:2: "And the twelve tribes shall be gathered together there, and all the Gentiles, until the Most High shall send forth His salvation in the visitation of an only-begotten (or beloved) prophet."<sup>1</sup>

#### THE MEANING AND FUNCTION OF ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ

In the light of this clear suggestion that a prophet was yearned for and expected, and as a background both to the discussion of the expectations of a prophet in the Judaism and Samaritanism of the first century, and to the consideration of Jesus as "προφήτης", the writer will now briefly sketch in answers to the questions, "What precisely is a prophet and what was his peculiar function in the religion of Israel."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This text (c<sup>ps</sup>) which Charles says is better (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, vol. II, p. 358) is that of the Greek Manuscript of the Vatican Library, Cod. Graec. 731, the most important of all the MSS for this work, and of the Greek version of the second class, and of the first Slavonic recension. The MS in the University Library, Cambridge agrees with the reading "only-begotten prophet", but that of the Vatican Library gives a Christian recast, "His only-begotten Son." Charles, (The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 212), noting that Benjamin is called "beloved of the Lord", (XI, 2), believes that the text should read here "of a beloved prophet". cf. Testament of Levi 8:15 where it is written "his presence is beloved (underlining mine) as a prophet of the Most High".

<sup>2</sup>In this discussion, the writer acknowledges his great indebtedness to J. Muilenburg's "Old Testament Prophecy" in the new Peake's Commentary on the Bible, pp. 475ff., although he is not confined nor limited to this one article.

It is perhaps best to turn first to the linguistic explanations which have been offered for the meaning of nābhî<sup>1</sup>, the Hebrew word for prophet, which occurs over 400 times substantively in the Old Testament and more than 110 times verbally. It was formerly held that the word is derived from the verb nābha<sup>2</sup> meaning to bubble forth, pour out or foam, and was said to describe the ecstatic character of inspiration. This view has now been quite generally rejected as incorrect, even though "it is quite consistent with that element of ecstasy which is absolutely inseparable from prophecy even in its Old Testament manifestation."<sup>3</sup>

Others have sought to derive the word from the Arabic root meaning "announce". The prophet was said to be "one who is in the state of announcing a message which has been given him."<sup>2</sup>

W. F. Albright<sup>3</sup> calls attention to the common Accadian verb nabû "to call", and refers to the Code of Hammurabi where a cognate verbal adjective has the meaning of "the called", that is "an individual selected by the divinity for a specific purpose and task, ...one who is inspired by the divinus afflatus and speaks under the immediate influence

<sup>1</sup>C. Kuhl, The Prophets of Israel, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>A. Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, p. 112.

<sup>3</sup>W. F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 231.

of the God."<sup>1</sup>

This explanation has much to commend it, for the prophet's sense of vocation is lodged deep in his self-consciousness, and his call continues to influence his life and message throughout his ministries. Yet T. J. Meek<sup>2</sup>, on the basis of the same Accadian root, says the word means not only "to call" but also "to call out" or "to speak". Therefore, he interprets the word as meaning "speaker" or "spokesman", and in support of this cites the rendering of the LXX προφήτης . Meek, as others before him, supports his contention by reference to Yahweh's words to Moses: "See, I make you as God to Pharaoh; and Aaron your brother shall be your prophet. You shall speak all that I command you; and Aaron your brother shall tell Pharaoh to let the people of Israel go out of this land" (Exod. 7:1-2 (P); cf. Exod. 4:16; Deut. 18:18; Jer. 1:7, 15:16,19).

The fact that the word nābhî<sup>3</sup> is a denominative in Hebrew is clear from the niph<sup>al</sup> and hithpa<sup>el</sup> forms - "to act the part of a prophet"; very probably this is meant to indicate an ecstatic condition. Jepsen<sup>3</sup> has shown that about

<sup>1</sup>C. Kuhl, idem.

<sup>2</sup>T. J. Meek, Hebrew Origins, p. 15f.

<sup>3</sup>A. Jepsen, Nabi soziologische Studien zur Alttestamentlichen Literatur und Religionsgeschichte, p. 8; cf. H. Knight, The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness, p. 23f.

800 B.C. both the niph'al and hithpa'el forms were used almost exclusively in the sense of "rave", but that by the latter half of the sixth century, the meaning "deliver the Word of God" alone survives.

Thus while the writer agrees with Barrett<sup>1</sup> that the etymology of the word nābhî' is very obscure, he suggests that the best clue to its meaning is the Accadian nabû. However, this interpretation provides no precise denotation of the prophet's specific task.

Two other names are closely associated with nābhî': rō'eh and hōzeh. The locus classicus for the former is I Sam. 9:9: "Formerly in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, he said, Come, let us go to the seer (rō'eh), for the prophet of to-day was formerly called a seer." The verse by itself simply identifies prophet and seer, but the context suggests that the latter may have been clairvoyant (cf. vv.11, 18-20; 10:2). Partly on this basis, Hölischer<sup>2</sup> and others believed that the seer received his supernatural knowledge through dreams, night visions, or the dreamy state between sleeping and waking.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>G. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 147.

<sup>2</sup>G. Hölischer, Die Profeten, p. 125f.

<sup>3</sup>cf. J. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, p. 220, "Visions and auditions, mysterious inward promptings to speech and action are still a part of the prophet's experience."

Albright suggests that the "seer" may have been an "offshoot of the general class of diviners, which originated in Mesopotamia and spread in all directions as early as the middle of the second millenium B.C."<sup>1</sup>

Yet the nābhî<sup>1</sup> was also a rō'eh. The terminology of seeing is frequently applied to him, not least of all the Qal participle rō'eh, and in addition it is extended to prophetic auditions.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the prophet is at times identified with the seer (e.g. Isa. 30:10). T. H. Robinson<sup>3</sup> distinguishes between seer and nābhî<sup>1</sup> on the basis that the latter was ecstatic and functioned spontaneously while the seer lacked these qualities. However, it would seem difficult to differentiate too sharply between seer and prophet.

Similarly the word hōzeh, also rendered seer, is practically synonomous with rō'eh (cf. Isa. 30:10), and later Old Testament usage again makes it almost impossible to differentiate between them. (e.g. Amos 7:12, Isa. 30:10, Mic. 3:7). It is probable, as Driver<sup>4</sup> suggests, that the

<sup>1</sup>W. F. Albright, op. cit., p. 159; cf. A. Guillaume, op.cit., pp. 109, 124.

<sup>2</sup>A. R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet In Ancient Israel, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup>T. H. Robinson, "The Ecstatic Element In Old Testament Prophecy" The Expositor, Eighth series, 1921, XXI, p. 220.

<sup>4</sup>G. R. Driver, Problems Of the Hebrew Verbal System, p. 98ff; cf. A. R. Johnson, op. cit., p. 14; H. H. Rowley, "The Nature of Prophecy In The Light of Recent Study", HTR, XXXVIII, 1938, p. 10.



former (hōzeh) is Aramaic in origin while the latter (rō'eh) Arabic. The words at one time may have had different connotations but the present Old Testament text does not permit hard and fast distinctions.

While the thought of prophecy always and inevitably brings Israel to mind, it must be remembered that there were prophets in other lands of the ancient Near East even before Israel appeared on the historical scene. Prophecy is not a phenomenon that is specifically Israelite, although it was in Israel that prophecy reached its zenith.

J. H. Breasted<sup>1</sup> has written about prophets among the ancient Egyptians who exhibited high ethical ideals and genuine compassion. Similarly, Erman<sup>2</sup> refers to the Admonitions of Ipu-wer whose forthrightness, quite extraordinary by Egyptian standards, brings to mind the prophets of Israel. Furthermore, in the prophecy of Nehferrohu, foretelling the coming of an age of happiness and light, Erman<sup>3</sup> sees some affinity with Old Testament prophecy and a certain kinship with Israel's Messianic thought.

In Egypt the prophets were also priests.<sup>4</sup> According

<sup>1</sup>J. H. Breasted, The Dawn of Conscience, pp. 154-6; 183-93; 200-5.

<sup>2</sup>A. Erman, Die Literatur der Aegypter, pp. 225-37; cf. C. Kuhl, op. cit., p. 5.

<sup>3</sup>A. Erman, op. cit., pp. 151-7; cf. C. Kuhl, op. cit., p. 6.

<sup>4</sup>J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of The Greek Testament, p. 556.

to Guillaume, the same was true of Mesopotamian prophecy; the bārû was both priest and prophet, "inasmuch as he was servant of the gods,...and an interpreter and foreteller of the purpose of the gods."<sup>1</sup>

Of particular importance for the study of prophecy are the French excavations begun in 1933 at Tel el Hariri, ancient Mari, on the Middle Euphrates.<sup>2</sup> Of the few cuneiform tablets published, five contain easily recognisable parallels to Israelite prophecy. While the content of these texts is obviously different from that of Israel's literary prophets, nevertheless their form indicates a consciousness of a divine calling and commission not unlike the prophets of Israel.

Hölscher<sup>3</sup> sought to explain the origins of prophecy as it is manifested in the earlier period of Israel's religion by its presence in Asia Minor and Syria at a much earlier time. Both the Old Testament and extrabiblical records indicate that there were prophets in Canaan. Tyrian prophets were present in the court of Ahab and Jezebel (I Kings 18:19, 40; II Kings 10:19), and Jeremiah condemns the prophets of his day for prophesying by Baal. (Jer. 2:8).

<sup>1</sup>A. Guillaume, op. cit., p. 40f.

<sup>2</sup>W. von Soden, "Verkündigung des Gotteswillen durch prophetischen Wort in den Altbabylonischen Briefen aus Mari", in Die Welt des Orients, I, pp. 397-403; cf. M. Noth, Geschichte und Gotteswort in Alten Testament, pp. 12-13; (History and The Word of God in The Old Testament, BJRL, XXXII, pp. 194-206).

<sup>3</sup>G. Hölscher, op. cit., p. 140f.

The story of Wenamon's journey to Byblos in Phoenicia at the beginning of the eleventh century B.C. is important for the understanding of prophecy. It describes an ecstatic trance of one of the noble pages: "Now while he was making offerings to one of his gods, the god seized one of his youths and made him possessed."<sup>1</sup> The oracular utterance follows. Here there is a combination of ecstasy and subsequent commission.

It is probable that the immediate origins of Israelite prophecy are to be traced to a Canaanite milieu. Robertson Smith<sup>2</sup> and A. Lods<sup>3</sup> believed that Israelite prophecy arose from contact with the Canaanites. Pedersen wrote that the "whole institution belonged to Canaan and was closely connected with Canaanite culture."<sup>4</sup> Certainly its earliest manifestations are like those in Canaan (I Sam. 10:10-11; 19:23-4). Significantly, they appear chiefly in the Northern Kingdom which was more open to influence from Canaan than was the Kingdom of Judah.

Yet Israelite prophecy advanced in a direction quite different from that of her neighbours. "In the course of time Israel brought forth a specifically Israelite type of prophet, produced by the friction between the two cultures."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>J. E. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament, p. 26.

<sup>2</sup>R. Smith, Prophets of Israel, p. 390.

<sup>3</sup>A. Lods, Israel From Its Beginnings To The Middle Of The Eighth Century, p. 444f.

<sup>4</sup>J. Pedersen, Israel, III-IV, p. 111.

<sup>5</sup>J. Pedersen, idem.

The nature of the Israelite prophet may be brought into clearer focus by examining some of the expressions which are used to describe him. In the early period he is frequently called a man of God (אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים) (I Sam. 9:6-10; I Kings 12:22, 13:1; II Kings 1:9-13, 4-8). This term does not mean that he is a godly man but rather that he is physically related to Yahweh and is an extension of the divine holiness (II Kings 4:9), sharing in the power and mystery of a supernatural order. As an אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים he receives the Spirit of Yahweh. The vitality of the divine revelation and activity extends itself into his life and work. (I Sam. 10:6-10; Isa. 61:1; Ezek. 2:2; 3:12,14; 11:11; Mic. 3:8). Naturally he was feared because of this strange endowment. (I Kings 22:24-7). On the other hand, men would repair to him in times of distress or need for help or counsel. (II Kings 1:2-4, 4:18-37, 5:3ff., 19:5ff.) King and peasant alike recognise his great authority and strange power. As Pedersen says, "There was strength in visiting a man of God and being near him."<sup>1</sup>

The prophet is also a messenger. (Hag. 1:3) He is a herald who has received a report or a disclosure from Yahweh. Therefore, the basic literary form of his speech is that of the messenger's report or "news".<sup>2</sup> This explains the emphasis everywhere on proclamation and the urgency of hearing. Second Isaiah brings this prophetic motif to its

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Pedersen, op. cit., p. 120.

<sup>2</sup>M. Buber and F. Rosenzweig, "Die Sprache der Botschaft" in Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung, pp. 55-75.

climax in his proclamation of good tidings (Isa. 40:9-10, 52:7-10).

The prophet is Yahweh's herald and the style and form of his speech is especially appropriate since Yahweh has revealed himself as king from the time of the covenant.<sup>1</sup> His task was to declare what Yahweh is doing and is about to do. The prophet speaks of the future as well as of the present. The idea, popular since the rise of form criticism, that the prophets did not foretell but rather only forthtell is contradicted by every prophet whose words have been preserved.<sup>2</sup> Sometimes the word of God is related to imminent event, sometimes to the distant future, and this word he reveals to the prophets. "The prophet received superhuman knowledge of the future. If we are to understand aright the prophet, even of the highest type, we must always first ask, what event of the immediate future did he come forth to predict."<sup>3</sup>

Other terms are used to describe the prophet. He is Yahweh's Servant. (II Kings 21:10; Isa. 20:3; Amos 3:7). Yahweh's way of dealing with his people is to make his will known through his servants, the prophets. In this respect, as in many others, the prophet is an Israelite lat' exochen,

---

<sup>1</sup>G. E. Wright, "The Terminology of Old Testament Religion and its Significance", JNES, I, pp. 404-14; G. E. Mendenhall, Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East, pp. 24-50.

<sup>2</sup>cf. A. Guillaume, op. cit., p. 111.

<sup>3</sup>H. Gunkel, "The Secret Experiences Of The Prophets" Expositor, Ninth series, 1924, II, p. 30.

for Israel is called from the beginning to serve Yahweh<sup>1</sup>; thus Second Isaiah is able to gather the whole of the election-covenant tradition from the beginning into his great portrait of the Servant of the Lord. W. Manson<sup>2</sup> suggests that from the Judaism of Maccabean times the conception of prophet and martyr for God were synonymous. This motif of martyrdom certainly fits in well with the Servant one, especially that of Isaiah 53.

Again, the prophet is a watchman who takes his post on the watch-tower that he may warn Israel of the approach of danger and sound the signal (Isa. 21:11-12; Ezek. 3:17, 33:2-7; Hab. 2:1).

Further, the prophet is an assayer or tester, a term which is applied to Jeremiah whose task it is to separate the dross from the precious metal (Jer. 6:27, cf. 9:7, 15:19).

More especially it was the prophet's function to serve as the intercessor for Israel. The Elohist carries back this tradition to Abraham (Gen. 20:7), who as "prophet" prays for the life of Abimelech. But already in the early period, Samuel often interceded during his prophetic ministry (I Sam. 7:5, 12:19-25, 15:11). Amos (7:1-6), Jeremiah (7:16, 11:14, 15:1), and Ezekiel (14:14-20) pray to Yahweh on behalf of Israel and Deutero-Isaiah climaxes his poem on the Servant of the Lord in the intercessory motif. (Isa. 53:12). Thus

<sup>1</sup>C. Lindhagen, The Servant Motif In the Old Testament, p. 82ff.

<sup>2</sup>W. Manson, Jesus The Messiah, p. 126, citing in support O. Michel, Prophet and Märtyrer.

it appears that intercession was one of the authentic marks of the true prophet. (Jer. 27:18).

Furthermore, the prophet is said to stand in the council of Yahweh.<sup>1</sup> He has listened to Yahweh's announcement of an impending event and has been obedient to the command to go and proclaim to Israel what he has heard. (I Kings 22:19; Isa. 6:1ff; 40:1-11; Jer. 23:18-22).

One of the important aspects of the prophetic experience which sheds light on the nature of prophecy is the prophetic call.<sup>2</sup> (Isa. 6; Jer. 1:4-10; Ezek. 1:4-3:15). The impressive thing is that it continues to influence the prophet throughout his career; Yahweh's act of election means that he is with the prophet to watch over his word to perform it.

Thus the prophet is Yahweh's representative to his covenant people Israel. He has been sent on the great commission of proclaiming Yahweh's word. Yahweh's Spirit (ruāh) and Word (dābhār) have entered into him in a dynamic and intimate way. But the prophet is also the representative of Israel before Yahweh. As he represents Yahweh in his oracles and some of his symbolic prophecies, he also represents Israel in his prayers and intercessions, in his suffering and distress, and in other of his symbolic acts.

<sup>1</sup>H. W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation In the Old Testament, p. 167ff.

<sup>2</sup>cf. E. H. Rowley, "The Nature of Prophecy In The Light of Recent Study", HTR, XXXVIII, p. 24; cf. above p. 11f. where a prophet is one who is "called".

Yahweh's name is upon him (Jer. 15:16), and his children sometimes bear names which give concrete content to his message (Isa. 7:3, 8:1-4; Hos. 1:4-6, 8). Thus the living and dynamic power of Yahweh's word is extended into the prophet's life and into the relationship of father and son.

From this sketch of the origin and meaning of the term "prophet", the writer will now turn to a discussion of how the expectation of a prophet took concrete form in the Judaism and Samaritanism of the first century A.D.



## CHAPTER II

### EXPECTATIONS OF A PROPHET IN THE JUDAISM AND SAMARITANISM OF THE FIRST CENTURY A.D.

At the time of Christ, expectation of a coming prophet is found mainly in three places: first of all in the writings of the sect at Qumran, (now generally accepted as the Essenes)<sup>1</sup>; secondly, in "popular" Jewish hopes; and thirdly, among the Samaritans.

In spite of superficial similarities, a more detailed examination reveals the varied nature of this prophetic expectation for each group. They all maintained that an "eschatological Prophet" was to come. This rather technical term (eschatological Prophet) means that a Prophet will appear at the time of the Messiah; he will come either just before the Messiah, as his forerunner, or along with him as an assistant.

#### QUMRAN

The Dead Sea Scrolls, sacred Scriptures of the community at Qumran, indicate that this group looked for a prophet

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. W. S. LaSor "Historical Framework: The Present Status of Dead Sea Scrolls Study", Interp., XVI, 1962, p. 261.

to come. The key passage for an understanding of the figures whom the Covenanters at Qumran expected is found in the Manual of Discipline (IQS) IX 10-11<sup>1</sup> which Burrows<sup>2</sup> renders:

"...but they shall be ruled by the first laws with which the men of the community began to be disciplined, until the coming of a prophet,<sup>3</sup> and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel".

Two views emerge from the literature on this subject.<sup>4</sup> First that a single Messiah was to come, in which case the phrase "Aaron and Israel" is taken as a single unit, and the "prophet" as non-Messianic. The second more widely held view is that (at least) three figures would appear: a prophet, (perhaps of Deut. 18:15-18); and the two Messiahs, of Aaron and Israel respectively. Thus Stendahl is the spokesman for many scholars when he writes: "They [the Qumran Community] are the ones to receive the two Messiahs and the messianic Prophet".<sup>5</sup>

Gaster makes the reference to two Messiahs more explicit by translating as follows: "...until the coming of the Prophet

<sup>1</sup>According to J. T. Milik, (Ten Years of Discovery In The Wilderness of Judaea, p. 123), IQS IX 10f. does not occur in the oldest manuscript, 4QS<sup>e</sup>, which copies IQS IX 12 directly after VIII 16.

<sup>2</sup>The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 264.

<sup>3</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>4</sup>cf. M. Black, "Messianic Doctrine In The Qumran Scrolls", Texte und Untersuchung, Studia Patristica, I, p. 441.

<sup>5</sup>K. Stendahl, "The Scrolls and the New Testament: An Introduction and a Perspective", The Scrolls and the New Testament, p. 12.

and of both the priestly and the lay Messiah".<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, he sees in the reference to the "Prophet" a direct derivation from the promise of God to raise up a prophet (Deut. 18:15-18). Commenting on this passage from the Manual of Discipline (IX 10-11), Kuhn<sup>2</sup>, too, states that there is no doubt but what this expectation of a prophet is based upon the Deuteronomic promise.

The Testamonia document, which lists some proof-texts for the Messianic expectations of the sect, lends support to the belief that there is a very definite link between Deut. 18:15-18 and IQS IX 10-11. This leaf of Scriptural references is headed by Deut. 18:18f, prefaced by Deut. 5:28-9, and "joined to it (note the absence of the marginal dividing mark) in such a way as to make the wish of the people refer to the coming Prophet."<sup>3</sup> Milik<sup>4</sup> and Cross<sup>5</sup> draw attention to a fact, first noted by Msgr. Patrick Skehan<sup>6</sup> and mentioned by Brown<sup>7</sup>, namely that this Deut-

---

<sup>1</sup>T. H. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup>K. G. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel", The Scrolls and the New Testament, p. 63.

<sup>3</sup>J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", JBL LXXV, 1956, p. 186. Allegro also draws attention to the spelling of 'l] (no'aleph) in these passages but this does not alter the meaning.

<sup>4</sup>J. T. Milik, op. cit., p. 124, n.1.

<sup>5</sup>F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, p. 112, n.80.

<sup>6</sup>P. Skehan, "The Period of the Biblical Texts from Khirbet Qumran", CBQ XIX, 1957, p. 435.

<sup>7</sup>R. E. Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran", CBQ XIX, 1957, p. 82.

eronomic material as found in the Testamonia is an exact quotation according to the Samaritan recension, where it is inserted in Exodus 20:21b. Bowman<sup>1</sup>, however, denies any direct contact between the Samaritans and the Qumran sect, attributing any resemblance to their similar backgrounds.

Black<sup>2</sup> points out that in Testamonia, Deut. 18:18ff is followed by Numbers 24:15-17 (the star and sceptre prophecy) and Deut. 33:8-11 (the blessing of Levi by Jacob). Since these last two passages have been taken to refer to the Messiah of the sect and the eschatological High Priest (the priestly Messiah), the first reference (Deut. 18:18ff) may be to the expected prophet.

The order in which the Manual of Discipline passage (IX 10-11) lists these three figures, indicates that the prophet will appear, either just before the Messiahs, as their forerunner, or along with them. Certainly the idea of a prophetic forerunner was not unknown to the Jews.<sup>3</sup>

A vital question to which no definite answer can yet be given relates to the identity of the prophet whom the Covenanters awaited. Some have put forward the view that these prophecies about a prophet relate to a former member

<sup>1</sup>J. Bowman, "Contact Between Samaritan Sects and Qumran?", VT, VII, 1957, p. 189; cf. M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 262.

<sup>2</sup>M. Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, p. 157 cf. J. T. Milik, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I, p. 121ff, and J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", JBL, LXXV, p. 182ff.

<sup>3</sup>cf. below p. 42ff.

of the sect redivivus, while others interpret them as references to an entirely new figure. Brownlee<sup>1</sup> took the view that the prophet probably came to be identified with the sect's founder and thus the future expectancy narrowed to the two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.

Before proceeding further with this discussion, the writer wishes to interject mention of Gaster's<sup>2</sup> claim that the usual designation for the founder of the sect, the "Teacher of Righteousness" is incorrect; rather, he claims, he should be called "Right Teacher" in the sense of "the correct expositor", "the right guide", i.e. the man who gives the true exposition of the Torah. But surely this meaning is not excluded from the term "Teacher of Righteousness", since, for the sect, righteousness consisted in obedience to the Law.

Gaster also sees significance in the fact that in the Testamonia, the words of Moses' final blessing, which provide the source of the technical term "Teacher", (Deut. 33:8-11) are associated with the promise of a prophet (Deut. 18:18f). Thus he writes of the sect's belief: "a new Prophet and a new Teacher (perhaps, indeed, one and the same person) would arise".<sup>3</sup> He strengthens his case by citing the Palestinian Targum to Deut. 18:14, where the future

---

<sup>1</sup>W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls", The Scrolls and the New Testament, p. 44. Reprinted (as revised) from Interp., IX, 1955, pp. 71-90.

<sup>2</sup>T. H. Gaster, op. cit., p. 15.

<sup>3</sup>idem.

prophet is called expressly "the prophet of righteousness"<sup>1</sup>. If, indeed, the new Prophet is to be identified with the new Teacher, it must be asked whether by "Teacher" he means the "Right Teacher" (or Teacher of Righteousness) and is thus suggesting that the expected Prophet is to be the founder of the sect redivivus?

Brownlee, to whom reference has already been made<sup>2</sup>, took the view that the "prophet" of IQS IX 10-11 had already come as the founder of the sect, and thus that the expectation of a prophet ceased to be a living hope among the Covenanters. An extension of this view is the claim by some that the Teacher of Righteousness was expected to return either as one of the two Messiahs, or as the prophet who would precede or accompany them. Burrows rightly points out: "The question whether the teacher was expected to come again in the future depends on the question of his identity with the coming teacher of the Damascus Document, the priestly Messiah of Aaron, or the expected prophet".<sup>3</sup>

Certainly the Teacher of Righteousness who had moulded the sect into a community at Qumran was in some sense a "prophet". Fritsch points out that, as a prophet, the founder had taught from direct inspiration.<sup>4</sup> Laurin writes of him:

<sup>1</sup>ibid., p. 309.

<sup>2</sup>cf. above p. 27.

<sup>3</sup>M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 340.

<sup>4</sup>C. T. Fritsch, The Qumran Community, p. 119.

"God called the Teacher of Righteousness to be the prophet of his will."<sup>1</sup> On the basis of the Hymn Scroll (IQH e.g. IX 29-32), Brownlee argues thus: "The Psalmist (doubtless the teacher) believes himself to have been called by God to be a prophet from the moment of his conception".<sup>2</sup> Dupont-Sommer's<sup>3</sup> view that the Teacher of Righteousness was a martyr, (which Molin<sup>4</sup> considers possible but by no means certain), and Allegro's<sup>5</sup> claim that he was crucified, (which Rowley<sup>6</sup>, with reservations, admits as a possibility), are further factors in favour of Cullmann's claim that the Teacher of Righteousness died "as a prophet".<sup>7</sup>

While most, if not all, scholars would admit that the founder of the sect, the Teacher of Righteousness, was a

<sup>1</sup>R. B. Laurin, Messianism and Eschatology in The Qumran Scrolls, p. 41.

<sup>2</sup>W. H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and The New Testament", NTS, III, 1956, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup>A. Dupont-Sommer, "Le Maître de Justice fut-il mis à Mort?", VT, I, 1951, p. 200f.

<sup>4</sup>Noted by M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 340.

<sup>5</sup>J. M. Allegro, Broadcast talk for the B.B.C., Jan. 23, 1956; cf. Time Magazine, Feb 6th, 1956.

<sup>6</sup>H. H. Rowley, "4QP Nahum and the Teacher of Righteousness", JBL, LXXV, 1956, p. 190.

<sup>7</sup>O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity", JBL, LXXIV, 1955, p. 224; cf. p. 20 and 81 where the writer has shown that martyrdom and crucifixion were the lot of prophets at this time.

prophet, there is far from unanimous agreement that he would rise again. The fact that he had been a priest, (but with prophetic characteristics), does not, however, in itself, prevent the view that he could return as a prophet.<sup>1</sup>

Dupont-Sommer<sup>2</sup> has unremittingly maintained that the sect believed that its founder would return. On the other hand, Rowley argues that while the sect would be familiar with the idea of resurrection from Daniel, "no expectation of any resurrection, either for the Teacher or for any others, appears to have been cherished".<sup>3</sup> Bruce<sup>4</sup>, following Rabin<sup>5</sup>, takes a somewhat compromising position between these two extremes, by suggesting that the belief in the return of the Teacher of Righteousness arose from the delay in the expected end after his death. His coming would be of the nature of a "special resurrection", in advance of the general resurrection of the righteous; this would allow him to complete his work as prophetic forerunner of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. But even if it could be shown conclusively that the Teacher of Righteousness was to rise, this would not prove ipso facto that he is the prophet of IQS IX 10-11.

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Burrows op. cit., p. 334; Burrows, op. cit., p. 332 also says that there is no evidence that the coming teacher is to be a priest; T. H. Gaster op. cit., p. 38 n.3 argues that he will be a priest.

<sup>2</sup>A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 27, 44.

<sup>3</sup>cf. M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 340.; H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 70f.

<sup>4</sup>F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," NTS, II, 1955-56, p. 186.

<sup>5</sup>Ch. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, pp. 23, 37.



Another approach is taken by some who identify both the Teacher of Righteousness and the prophet of IQS (IX 10-11) with the prophet of Deuteronomy (18:15-18) and thus deduce that this Manual of Discipline reference to a coming prophet refers to the founder of the sect.

Other scholars<sup>1</sup>, however, go only half-way so to speak, identifying only one of these figures with the Deuteronomic prophet.

Since other suggestions concerning the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness do not fall, except incidentally, within the scope of this thesis subject, the writer will simply mention some in passing. Dupont-Sommer<sup>2</sup> identified the "Elect One" of the Habakkuk Commentary (V,4) with the Teacher of Righteousness whom he identified with the Messiah of Aaron and Israel. Bruce<sup>3</sup> believed that the resurrected Teacher was possibly to be the Messiah of Aaron and the "Interpreter of of the Law".<sup>4</sup> Again he sees the resurrected Teacher playing

<sup>1</sup>e.g. Vermès (Burrows, op. cit., p. 334) believes the Teacher of Righteousness is the prophet of Deut. 18:15-18, if the reference to "Teacher" is future. Laurin (op. cit., p. 41ff) also holds the sect's founder to have fulfilled Deut. 18:15-18. K. Schubert, (The Dead Sea Community, p. 113), identifies the prophet of IQS with the Deuteronomic prophet. Brownlee believed the Teacher of Righteousness was probably the prophet of IQS, IX 10-11 (cf. p. 27). Earlier he had identified this prophet with the Messiah (see below, p. 40). Later he speaks of three eschatological figures - prophet, priest and king (NTS, III, 1957, p. 199).

<sup>2</sup>A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 63f.

<sup>3</sup>F. F. Bruce, op. cit., p. 186; cf. Burrows, op. cit., p. 333.

<sup>4</sup>For discussion of this title further see below (p. 34f.).

the traditional part of Elijah, namely forerunner, though he says that the two are not to be identified. He also agrees with Greig<sup>1</sup> that the Teacher cannot be the Prophet of Deut. (18:15-18)<sup>2</sup>. Milik<sup>3</sup> has shown that if the Teacher is to return as a Messiah, he would have to be the Messiah of Aaron. Murphy<sup>4</sup> and Oesterreicher<sup>5</sup> discount any such identification. Burrows<sup>6</sup> is inclined to agree with Allegro<sup>7</sup> that the Teacher of Righteousness is the one referred to as the "Interpreter of the Law" in the Damascus Document (VI, 7; VII, 18f) and in the Florilegium. Schonfield<sup>8</sup> accepts this as possible, but prefers to make the identification with the Teacher's successor. The argument of the Jewish scholar, Teicher<sup>9</sup> is most shocking from a Christian point of view: he believes that the Teacher of Righteousness who founded the sect is Jesus.

Brownlee's position as to the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness seems to be quite elusive. Reference has

---

<sup>1</sup>J. C. G. Greig, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community", NTS, II, 1955, p. 123.

<sup>2</sup>cf. M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 334.

<sup>3</sup>J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery In The Wilderness of Judaea, p. 126f.

<sup>4</sup>Noted by M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 333.

<sup>5</sup>idem.

<sup>6</sup>M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 313.

<sup>7</sup>J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", JBL, LXXV, 1956, p. 186.

<sup>8</sup>Noted by M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 313.

<sup>9</sup>J. L. Teicher, e.g. "Jesus in the Habakkuk Scroll", JJS, III, 1952, pp. 53-55.

already been made<sup>1</sup> to his coming to believe that he was  
 b/ "propably" the prophet of IQS IX 10-11. However, when he  
 wrote on "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament"<sup>2</sup>,  
 he argues that the Teacher should probably be identified with  
 the Elijah of Malachi 3:23 (English text 4:5) and the prophet  
 of Deuteronomy 18:15-18. He quotes an impressive number of  
 scholars in support of this identification: K. Shubert<sup>3</sup>,  
 M. Black<sup>4</sup>, M. Delcor<sup>5</sup>, N. Wieder<sup>6</sup>, G. Vermès<sup>7</sup>, and Ch.  
 Rabin<sup>8</sup>. The present writer feels that Brownlee confuses the  
 issue here, by equating Elijah with the prophet of Deuteronomy  
 and assuming that those whom he cites do likewise. Such,  
 however, is not always so. Wieder<sup>9</sup>, for example, distinguishes  
 between Elijah and the prophet of Deut. 18:18, identifying  
 the latter with the prophet of IQS IX 10-11.

In the midst of this confusion, it is well to remember

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 31 n.1.

<sup>2</sup>W. H. Brownlee, NTS, III, 1956, p. 17.

<sup>3</sup>K. Shubert, Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, LXXIV, 1952, p. 22f.

<sup>4</sup>M. Black, "Servant of The Lord and Son of Man", SJT, VI, 1953, pp. 6-9; "Theological Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls", SEA, 18-19, 1953-54, p. 38f.

<sup>5</sup>M. Delcor, Revue Biblique, LXII, I, Jan 1955, p. 60f.

<sup>6</sup>N. Wieder, "The 'Law Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls", JJS, IV, 1953, pp. 158ff.

<sup>7</sup>G. Vermès, Quelques Traditions de la Communauté de Qumran, p. 51.

<sup>8</sup>Ch. Rabin, The Zadokite Fragments, p. 23.

<sup>9</sup>N. Wieder, op. cit., p. 170.

with Burrows<sup>1</sup>, that there had been a Teacher of Righteousness in the past, (who had founded the sect), and there was to be another one in the future.<sup>2</sup> Whether these two "Teachers" are one and the same person<sup>3</sup>, is still an open question.

The identification of Messianic figures is further complicated by the mention in the Damascus Fragments (CD) of the "Interpreter of the Law"<sup>4</sup>, to whom the writer has already alluded<sup>5</sup>, and whose role Wieder<sup>6</sup> considers beyond doubt to be of an eschatological nature. Citing the Manual of Discipline<sup>7</sup> and Testamonia<sup>8</sup>, he argues that the "Interpreter of the Law" is the Second Moses, the prophet foretold at Deut. 18:15-18. His line of argument is that this prophet has come in the sect's founder, the Teacher of Righteousness, who is also the "Interpreter of the Law". Dupont-Sommer<sup>9</sup>, too, makes

<sup>1</sup>M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 314, cf. H. M. Teeple, "The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet", JBL, Monograph Vol. X, p. 56; sect at Qumran, apparently believed that the prophecy [Deut. 18:15-18] had been fulfilled in the past and also would be again in the future."

<sup>2</sup>I. Rabinowitz finds reference to three teachers in the Scrolls, a past, present and future leader of the sect. cf. M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 332.

<sup>3</sup>As J. M. Allegro argues, op. cit., p. 176; cf. M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 333f.

<sup>4</sup>cf. above, p. 31.

<sup>5</sup>VI, 7, VII, 18f.

<sup>6</sup>N. Wieder, op. cit., p. 158.

<sup>7</sup>IQS. IX, 10-11.

<sup>8</sup>Where Deut. 18:18f. is cited.

<sup>9</sup>A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, p. 39ff; \_\_\_\_\_, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 33ff.

this latter identification. Wieder believed that his case was conclusively decided by reference to the Damascus Fragments where the phrase ל וישראל אהרן occurs four times.<sup>1</sup> Beside this passage he places the similar phrase from the Manual of Discipline<sup>2</sup>, but where a prophet is mentioned also: ל וישראל אהרן. He explains this discrepancy on the grounds that the Damascus Document was written after the Manual of Discipline, whose "prophet" had come in the sect's founder, the Teacher of Righteousness.

Wieder's theory depends on the dating of these documents. Laurin<sup>3</sup> in contrast gives IQS a late date, arguing that it was written after CD and the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. He explains the fact which Wieder cited to clinch his case - the mention of the prophet in IQS to prove its priorness - in the following way: The Prophet of IQS is Elijah; the Teacher of Righteousness was the Second Moses, the prophet promised at Deuteronomy 18:15-18. He had come, but Elijah was still expected, as IQS IX 10-11 indicates.

The writer will reserve judgment in this matter for the moment, to complete the discussion which gave rise to

---

<sup>1</sup>XII, 23; XIV, 19; XIX, 10; XX, 1.

<sup>2</sup>IQS, IX, 10-11.

<sup>3</sup>R. B. Laurin, op. cit., pp. 56-58, Appendix D, p. 79ff.

<sup>4</sup>J. M. Allegro, op. cit., p. 176ff.

it, namely the identity of the "Law Interpreter". Allegro<sup>1</sup> points out that 4Q Florilegium identifies one of the Messiahs with the "Interpreter of the Law"; by adding that this latter was a leading figure in the founding of the sect, he implies that it is the Teacher of Righteousness redivivus who is the Law-Interpreter, and as Messiah would be the Messiah of Aaron, since the "shoot of David"<sup>2</sup> would refer to the Messiah of Israel. Burrows<sup>3</sup> agrees that the "Interpreter of the Law" may well be the priestly Messiah, though he allows also for his identification with the prophet of IQS. Milik<sup>4</sup>, too, says that if the "Interpreter of the Law" refers to a figure who is to come in the future, he would have to be the priestly Messiah. Stendahl<sup>5</sup> argues, with Allegro<sup>6</sup>, that the fragments from Cave IV make it clear that "this Teacher, called the 'Interpreter of the Law' in the Damascus Document (VI 7; VII, 18) may be identified with the priestly Messiah to be raised in the last days."

---

<sup>1</sup>J. M. Allegro, op. cit., p. 176ff.

<sup>2</sup>4Q Patriarchal Blessings, cf. J. M. Allegro, op. cit., p. 175.

<sup>3</sup>M. Burrows, op. cit., pp. 313, 333.

<sup>4</sup>J. T. Milik, noted by M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 313.

<sup>5</sup>K. Stendahl, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>6</sup>J. M. Allegro, op. cit., p. 176f.

Stendahl, however, appears to have had second thoughts on this matter, for in a footnote<sup>1</sup> he states: "There is the possibility that the 'Interpreter of the Law' is rather to be identified with the Prophet, who will come together with the two Messiahs, IQS IX 11." Cross<sup>2</sup> goes to the extent of identifying this "Law-Interpreter with David's High Priest, Zadok. Gaster<sup>3</sup> points out that the "star" of Numbers 24:17, quoted in Testamonia, is interpreted in the Damascus Document (VII, 19) as the "Interpreter of the Law". If, as seems reasonable, the first three passages of Testamonia refer respectively to the roles of prophet, priest and king, the Numbers' passage, in second place, would logically refer to that of "priest" and thus perhaps to the priestly Messiah of Aaron. Burrows<sup>4</sup>, on the other hand, argues that if the Teacher of Righteousness is to appear again it would be as the Prophet, who might or might not be the "Interpreter of the Law".

A bit of order may be brought into this confusion by remembering with Burrows<sup>5</sup> that, as with the Teacher of

---

<sup>1</sup>K. Stendahl, op. cit., p. 250, n.3.

<sup>2</sup>F. M. Cross, Jr., noted by Burrows, op. cit., p. 313

<sup>3</sup>T. H. Gaster, op. cit., p. 80; cf. M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 335.

<sup>4</sup>ibid., p. 334.

<sup>5</sup>ibid., p. 314.

Righteousness so with the Interpreter of the Law: there had been one in the past (almost certainly the sect's founder, the Teacher of Righteousness), but also one was to come in the future; whether or not the former Interpreter of the Law was expected to re-appear is uncertain.

In the previous discussion<sup>1</sup>, another possibility for the identification of the prophet of IQS IX 10-11 was mentioned. Laurin<sup>2</sup> maintains that the prophecy of Deut. 18:15-18 was fulfilled in the Teacher of Righteousness and so the prophet expected at IQS IX 10-11 is Elijah the Messianic forerunner. There is merit in Laurin's<sup>3</sup> thesis that the sect's founder was a second Moses, "a prophet like unto Moses". However, the presence of Deut. 18:18f among the Testamonia proof-texts for the sect's Messianic beliefs, indicates that they did not hold that it had been completely fulfilled in their founder. May it not be that the Qumran community so identified itself with the Mosaic times, that they actually believed their leader was Moses redivivus? Because the former Moses had promised a prophet "like unto him" would come, should not Moses redivivus do the same? This "prophet like unto Moses(redivivus)" could be the one expected at IQS IX 10-11.

Greig<sup>4</sup> presumably identifies the prophets of IQS

<sup>1</sup>cf. p. 35.

<sup>2</sup>R. B. Laurin, op. cit., p. 56ff.

<sup>3</sup>ibid., p. 41ff.

<sup>4</sup>J. C. G. Greig, op. cit., p. 123.



and Deut. 18:15-18. The function of this Manual of Discipline prophet would be that traditionally assigned to Elijah, namely forerunner - in this case, of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. Milik<sup>1</sup> also agrees that the prophet of Deuteronomy 18:18f. in the Testamonia leaf is the prophetic forerunner rather than the royal or priestly Messiah.

However, in spite of the similarity in function, it is better not to equate this prophetic precursor of the Scrolls (IQS IX 10-11; Testamonia) with Elijah. Burrows realized this; after first suggesting an identification between the Manual of Discipline prophet and Elijah, he wrote: "The absence of an article with nby;<sup>2</sup> however, may indicate that no particular individual is meant".<sup>2</sup>

The only other suggestion, as to the identity of the prophet of IQS IX 10-11, which need be mentioned here is that of "Messiah". Higgins<sup>3</sup> inserts the words, "i.e. the Messiah" in parenthesis after the words "until the coming of a Prophet" in his rendering of IQS IX 10-11. By "Messiah" he means the Teacher of Righteousness redivivus. Burrows

<sup>1</sup>cf. M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 310.

<sup>2</sup>M. Burrows, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel", ATR, XXXIV, 1952, p. 205; cf. N. Wieder, op. cit., p. 70; cf. also L. H. Silberman, "The Two 'Messiahs' of the Manual of Discipline", VT, V, 1955, p. 78.

<sup>3</sup>A. J. B. Higgins, "Priest and Messiah", VT, III, 1953, p. 333; cf. W. D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30", HTR, XLVI, 1953, p. 127.

considers this argument "precarious"<sup>1</sup>. Brown<sup>2</sup> quotes Brownlee's comment on IQS IX 10-11 as follows: "The 'prophet' is doubtless the Messiah, whose followers ('anointed ones') will consist of two classes, priests (i.e. those of Aaron) and laity (i.e., those of Israel)"<sup>3</sup>. The weakness of identifying the prophet and the Messiah, is evident from Brownlee himself who later writes: "It appears probable that the "prophet" came to be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness".<sup>4</sup> The suggestion that Brownlee is here hinting that the Teacher of Righteousness is a Messiah, may be countered with Brownlee's own words: "Although it is possible that the Teacher of Righteousness who fulfilled the office of the Prophet was expected to return in the role of the Messiah of Aaron, these offices are properly considered separately".<sup>5</sup>

Another ingenious attempt to equate the prophet (IQS IX 10-11) and the Messiah could be made on Bowman's<sup>6</sup> suggestion that the Messiah of Israel of the Dead Sea Scrolls

<sup>1</sup>M. Burrows, op. cit., p. 204.

<sup>2</sup>R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles", The Scrolls and the New Testament, p. 44. Reprinted from CBQ, XVII, 1955, pp. 403-19; 559-74.

<sup>3</sup>W. H. Brownlee, BASOR SS, 10-12, 1951.

<sup>4</sup>W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls", The Scrolls and the New Testament, p. 44, Reprinted (as revised) from Interp., IX, 1955, pp. 71-90.

<sup>5</sup>"The Messianic Motifs of Qumran and The New Testament", NTS, III, 1957, p. 199.

<sup>6</sup>J. Bowman, op. cit., p. 189.

corresponds to the Samaritan Taheb. While the Samaritans did interpret the Taheb as the fulfillment of Deut. 18:15-18, it is very doubtful whether it could be argued, on such slim grounds, that, therefore, the Messiah of Israel expected by the sect fulfilled this prophecy. Even allowing Gaster's<sup>1</sup> suggestion that the expected prophet and the future teacher are perhaps one and the same person, Burrow's comment would require consideration: "Few, if any, have thought that the future teacher would be the royal, Davidic Messiah."<sup>2</sup>

From this discussion of the subject, it emerges that when IQS was written the sect at Qumran still looked for a prophet, two Messiahs, of Aaron and Israel, a Teacher of Righteousness, and an Interpreter of the Law.<sup>3</sup> How many, if any, of these figures overlap, is still uncertain. As far as the particular interest of this thesis is concerned, namely the Prophet (IQS IX 10-11), it seems best to see him, with Kuhn, as one of the three "heroes of redemption, who were to stand side by side in the Eschaton"<sup>4</sup>, fulfilling the roles of prophet, priest and king.

Kuhn<sup>5</sup> adds that this Essene (i.e. Qumran) juxtaposition

<sup>1</sup>T. H. Gaster, op. cit., p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>M. Burrows, More Light On The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 331.

<sup>3</sup>ibid., p. 341.

<sup>4</sup>X. G. Kuhn, op. cit., p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>ibid., p. 63f.

of the three offices of prophet (eschatological prophet), priest (Messiah of Aaron), and King (Messiah of Israel) prefigures in a remarkable way the manner in which later Church doctrine united them in the person of Jesus Christ. He draws attention to the union of these three offices in one person in the tribute of Josephus<sup>1</sup> to John Hyrcanus. Furthermore, Eusebius<sup>2</sup> points out that these three functions were united in Jesus Christ. Eusebius sees these three offices of Christ as "The Anointed One" foreshadowed, first in Aaron, the high priestly "anointed one" (Lev. 4); secondly, in Moses' successor, Joshua, and the "anointed kings"; and thirdly, in the "anointed" prophets.

While Teicher's view that the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus are to be identified must be discounted, the Scriptures of this Dead Sea sect do point out that they expected a prophet to come at the time when, in fact, Jesus was born.

#### POPULAR JUDAISM

Popular Judaism also looked for a prophet. One form of this expectation was the belief that a former great prophet would return. Teeple<sup>3</sup> has shown, in detail, how

---

<sup>1</sup>Josephus Ant. XIII. x.7, "He was esteemed by God worthy of the three greatest privileges-: the government of his nation, the dignity of the high priesthood and prophecy; for God was with him, and enabled him to know futurities."

<sup>2</sup>Hist. Eccl. I, 3.

<sup>3</sup>H. M. Teeple, "The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet", JBL, Monograph Series, Vol. X., pp. 29-43.

Moses passed through various stages of idealization and deification; from hero par excellence to the greatest prophet and man of God, leading to the belief that he had ascended to heaven and further that he would return in the Messianic era as an eschatological Prophet.

Wieder and Zeitlin have carried on a heated debate whether the Jews expected Moses to return. Zeitlin maintains that the idea of a second coming of Moses was not known to the Jews until the Middle Ages. According to Volz<sup>1</sup>, the belief in Moses' return was of late origin but he places it before Medieval times. Wieder<sup>2</sup> makes a strong case against Zeitlin<sup>3</sup>, in answer to his attack on Wieder's previous article<sup>4</sup> in which he had defended the idea of Moses' return. Wieder cites the Midrash R. to Deut. 10:1, "When I bring Elijah the prophet unto them the two of you (Elijah and Moses) shall come together". Zeitlin rejects this as "merely a homily of a rabbi" and not an "idea held by a group of people".

Wieder in reply quotes the learned and recognized Jewish scholar L. Ginzberg: "And yet the truth is that the

<sup>1</sup>P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde, p. 195; noted by Teeple, op. cit., p. 47.

<sup>2</sup>N. Wieder, "The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses", JQR, XLVI, 1954-56, pp. 356ff.

<sup>3</sup>"The Antiquity of the Hebrew Scrolls and the Piltown Hoax: A Parallel", JQR, XLV-VI, 1954-56, pp. 12-14.

<sup>4</sup>N. Wieder, "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of The Dead Sea Scrolls", JJS, IV, 1953, pp. 158-175.

most prominent feature of Rabbinic literature is its popular character....popular in the double sense of appealing to the people and being produced in the main by the people....The ancient authors....elaborate legendary material which they found at hand".<sup>1</sup>

Thus this idea of a second coming of Moses, cannot be dismissed simply as a "homily of a rabbi". His part was simply to elaborate the idea which he "found at hand" by basing it upon Nah. 1:3, interpreting "whirlwind" and "storm" as references to Moses and Elijah respectively. Furthermore Ginzberg<sup>2</sup> and Aptowitz<sup>3</sup> took this <sup>h</sup>aggadic statement as support for belief in Moses' return. h

Wieder finds the same idea reflected also in other passages: Yelamdenu cited in Yalkut I, 764, Aggadath Beresheth<sup>4</sup> and the Fragmentary Targum to Ex. 12:42<sup>5</sup>. This last reference describes a "book of memorial" in which are recorded "four nights" on which great events took place the fourth is that on which the end of the world's redemption will be accomplished. On that night, it is written, "Moses will come from the desert and the Messiah from Rome".

<sup>1</sup>L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, I, p. viii.

<sup>2</sup>ibid., V, p. 96

<sup>3</sup>V. Aptowitz, Die Parteipolitik des Hasmonaerzeit in rabinischen und pseudopig. Schriften, p. 248-9; cf. also I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2nd Series, p. 53f.

<sup>4</sup>p. 133.

<sup>5</sup>ed. M. Ginsberg, p. 37.

Ex. R 24<sup>1</sup> gives another Rabbinic tradition which claims that Moses' desert activity would not be limited to the original Exodus, but that in the future he would appear again in the desert; on that occasion he would perform a function which his pride had usurped from him before, namely the leading of the resurrected generation, which he brought forth from Egyptian bondage, into the promised land.

Wieder also cites Rabbi Maimon, the father of Maimonides, as follows: "And afterward he [Moses] presented his intercession on our behalf...he said farewell to Israel and ascended heavenwards and his Creator led him till the time should come when he will be pleased with this world and then He will send him back to it, to assist the king who is to reign in the strength of God<sup>2</sup>, that beloved one of God of whom testimony is borne in the verse, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee' (Ps. 2:7)".<sup>3</sup> In the underlined words there is a definite reference to the return of Moses to assist the Messiah.

Further testimony, witnessing to the second coming of Moses, is noted by Teeple<sup>4</sup>. He cites the Zohar, which

<sup>1</sup>cf. L. Ginzberg, Legends, II, p. 302.

<sup>2</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>3</sup>Letter of Consolation, ed. & tr. by L. M. Simmons, p. 39, (Arabic p. 24).

<sup>4</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 46.

links his return with the advent of two Messiahs. Zohar 1:25b states that the Messiahs cannot come unless Moses is there to serve the Shekinah; the reference to Shiloh in Gen. 49:10 is applied to Moses for "the numerical value of the two names, Shiloh and Moses is the same". Zohar 2:119b reads: "there will be two Messiahs and it is because of the merit of Moses that they will come."

The Slavonic Josephus<sup>1</sup> also alludes to Moses' return in the Messianic age: "Some said of him [Jesus]: our first Lawgiver has arisen from the dead...". While the authenticity of this work is doubtful, it appears that the idea implicit in this quotation, the return of Moses, was current.

In these passages, Moses is given a Messianic role, either as leader of the exiles or as forerunner; this is "a natural corollary of the parallel between the first redemption from Egypt and the last redemption in the Messianic era".<sup>2</sup>

A rabbinic source - a statement in the name of R. Yohanan b. Zakkai - shows that there existed a belief that Moses would return together with Elijah, before the Messiah<sup>3</sup>. The fact that belief in the joint return of Moses and Elijah was current at the time of Christ is reflected in the New Testament.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>War, 2:174 noted by Teeple, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>2</sup>N. Wieder, op. cit., p. 358.

<sup>3</sup>cf. p. 43 for the suggestion of this return of Moses and Elijah.

<sup>4</sup>cf. below p. 107ff.



The belief in Moses' return was no doubt bound up with the longing for the return of Mosaic times but Teeple<sup>1</sup> prefers to link it with the return of Elijah. The idea, he maintains, that Moses would come again arose gradually by analogy with beliefs concerning Elijah. Since the prophet Elijah had ascended and would return, surely the greatest Prophet, Moses, had also ascended and would return.

Sometimes the Jewish expectation took the form that the Prophet would be one like Moses rather than Moses himself. Jackson and Lake<sup>2</sup> maintain that the Jews did not look for a great prophet to appear at the end but that Christians set forth this theory on the basis of Deut. 18:15-18. When this passage was first written it referred to the permanent institution of Yahweh's prophetic line,<sup>3</sup> but later was taken as a reference to an individual prophet.<sup>4</sup>

Various figures were expected. The writer has already<sup>5</sup> dealt with the return of Moses and in that connection touched on his coming together with Elijah. There was also a separate tradition which upheld the return of Elijah by himself apart from accompanying Moses.

<sup>1</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 48. Against Brownlee, Charles, Bousset and others he discounts Deut. 18:15-18 as the source of the belief in Moses' return.

<sup>2</sup>Jackson, F. J. F. and Lake, K., The Beginnings of Christianity, I, p. 405f.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. S. R. Driver, in ICC; cf. above p. 2f.

<sup>4</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 50.

<sup>5</sup>cf. p. 42ff.

The belief, based on II Kings 2:11, that Elijah had ascended bodily into heaven is taken as a basis for this expectation. This association is borne out by the fact that in some Jewish pseudepigrapha and early Christian works,<sup>1</sup> Elijah's return is linked with the return of Enoch, the only other person whom the Jews believed had ascended to heaven (Gen. 5:24). In Mal. 4:5,6 the belief in Elijah's return is made explicit, "I will send you Elijah, the prophet..." Ginzberg<sup>2</sup> notes that this passage was later taken as a reference to the Messiah, citing the 10th century Midrash Mishle 19:87 where "Elijah" is one of the names of the Messiah. In Malachi, Elijah is the forerunner of the Day of the Lord. The Apocryphal Ecclesiasticus 48:10-11 (180 B.C.) also sets forth Elijah's return.<sup>3</sup> He will be the Prophet-Messiah, where he will gather together the scattered Jews to their homeland.

Ginzberg<sup>4</sup> believed that Elijah's Messianic activity would consist in being the forerunner, not of the Day of the Lord<sup>5</sup>, but of the Messiah; he also held that Elijah would have a part to play in effecting the promised salvation. Gaster<sup>6</sup> points to the Talmud, Menahoth 3a, B.M.

<sup>1</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>2</sup>L. Ginzberg, Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte, p. 346f; cf. Teeple, op. cit., p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>cf. p. 5f.

<sup>4</sup>L. Ginzberg, Legends, IV, p. 233ff.

<sup>5</sup>as in Malachi.

<sup>6</sup>T. H. Gaster, The Scriptures of The Dead Sea Sect, p. 315.

3a and Aboth de Rabbi Nathan 24:4 as referring to Elijah's activity as forerunner. Laurin<sup>1</sup> gives a list of Rabbinical passages which suggest that Elijah will return and his activity upon doing so: m Eduy. 8:7; b Men. 63a; 32a; 45a; b Bek. 24a; b Ber. 35b; b Shabb. 108a; b Pes. 13a; b Hab. 25a; b Yeb. 35b; 41b; 102a; b Gitt. 42b; m Baba Met. 1:8; 3:4,5; m Shek. 2:5; j Ber. 1:1; Targ. Jon. Ex. 40:10; Targ. Jon. Deut. 30:4.

Certainly the New Testament references to Elijah in the company of Moses<sup>2</sup>, indicate the persistence of the belief in his return.

Other figures were also believed to be the "prophet like Moses" who would return; one of these was Jeremiah. Ginzberg<sup>3</sup> believed that it presupposed Jeremiah's part in the work of redemption. Furthermore, he points to a Midrash quoted in the late Rimze Haftarot. Nahum, Elijah and Jeremiah, in the role essentially of Messiahs, will go to the Holy Land, seize it, and then give it to Israel as a possession. A little later Ginzberg<sup>4</sup> points out that the "prophet like Moses" is identified with Jeremiah in the Haggadah.

Background for this belief in Jeremiah's importance

<sup>1</sup>R. E. Laurin, Messianism and Eschatology in The Qumran Scrolls, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>cf. below p. 107ff.

<sup>3</sup>L. Ginzberg, Legends, VI, p. 341, n.114.

<sup>4</sup>ibid., p. 385, n.13.

is contained in II Macc. 15:13-16 where he returns temporarily in a vision to Judas Maccabeus. The Haggadah maintains that Jeremiah was meant in the promise made by God to Moses that He will raise up a prophet (Deut. 18:15-18).

In spite of Deut. 34:10, ("no prophet has arisen in Israel like Moses") the lives of these two prophets, Jeremiah and Moses, show so many resemblances that the description of Jeremiah as "a prophet like Moses" is well justified. Teeple<sup>1</sup> points out the following parallels from the Haggadah: both Moses and Jeremiah prophesied for forty years; the prophecies of both concerned Judah and Israel; a fellow tribesman of Moses (the Levite Korah) and Jeremiah, too, (Jer. 20:1) was attacked by a member of his own tribe.

Bernard<sup>2</sup> cites II Esd. 2:17 as evidence for a possibly pre-Christian<sup>3</sup> expectation of the return of great prophets: "For thy help will I send my servants, Isaiah and Jeremiah". The expectation concerning Jeremiah's return has already been discussed; the belief that Isaiah would come again does not appear to have been very widespread.

Joshua, too, was believed to be the prophet who would come. The Sibylline Oracles v. 256-259 tell of a certain exalted man who shall come down from the sky and cause the sun to stand still. To many Jew this would immediately

<sup>1</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>The Gospel According to St. John, (ICC), I, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon Saint Matthieu, p. 322, believed that this passage was of Christian origin; cf. his article "Notes Sur Le Messianisme au Temps de Jesus: L'Apocalypse d'Esdras (IV Esdras)(2)", RB, 1905, pp. 486-501.

suggest Joshua who performed this miracle (Josh. 10:12). The difficulty here is that it is virtually impossible to determine whether this Sibylline passage is genuinely Jewish or a later Christian insertion. Jeremias<sup>1</sup> maintains that it is Jewish against Lanchester<sup>2</sup> who believes it is Christian. Teeple further draws attention to the similarity between Joshua's feat at Jericho (Josh. 6:20) and that of the Egyptian Jew, who, calling himself a prophet, claimed that he would free the Jewish people from the Romans by making the walls of Jericho fall down at his command.<sup>3</sup> It is possible that this incident reflects a belief in Joshua's return. Since Yahweh had appointed Joshua to be Moses' successor (Deut. 31), it was an easy step for Judaism later to identify Joshua with the Deuteronomic prophet like Moses.

Charles believed that in the Assumption of Moses (A.D. 6-30) Joshua is the prophet promised in Deuteronomy. He draws this conclusion because in 1:5,6 mention is made of "the prophecy that was made by Moses in the book Deuteronomy", followed by a reference to Joshua's appointment. Also he notes that at 10:15, God chose Joshua "to be minister in the same covenant" as Moses<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Jeremias, TWNT, IV, 861, A 110, noted by Teeple op. cit., p. 10f.

<sup>2</sup>H. C. O. Lanchester, idem.

<sup>3</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 11; cf. Josephus Ant. XX, viii, 6; cf. below p. 181f.

<sup>4</sup>R. H. Charles, Apoc. and Pseud. II, pp. 412, 423.

Ezra is also put forward as a candidate for the title "New Moses". The Babylonian Talmud (Sanhedrin 21b-22a) points out that Ezra was as qualified to give the Law as Moses; although Moses actually gave the Torah, it was Ezra who established its text by introducing the Assyrian or square characters.

R. Jose (mid 2nd cent.) said: "Had Moses not preceded him, Ezra would have been worthy of receiving the Torah for Israel. Of Moses it is written, And Moses went up unto God, and of Ezra it is written, He, Ezra, went up from Babylon. As the going up of the former refers to the (receiving of the) Law, so does the going up of the latter. Concerning Moses, it is stated: And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments; and concerning Ezra, it is stated: For Ezra had prepared his heart to expound the law of the Lord (his God) to do it and to teach Israel statutes and judgments. And even though the Torah was not given through him, its writing was changed through him, as it is written: And the writing of the letter was written in the Aramaic character and interpreted into the Aramaic (tongue)."<sup>1</sup>

A further Talmudic reference, Berakoth 4a likens the Exodus under Ezra to the one in the days of Joshua; had the people in Ezra's time not sinned, they also would have seen miracles.

---

<sup>1</sup>Quoted by Teeple, op. cit., p. 50.

Since in these passages there is neither a reference to Deuteronomy 18:15-18, nor the suggestion of it by a command to "hearken unto him", Teeple<sup>1</sup> is quite right in tracing the source of this belief in Ezra's return, to the general longing for the return of Mosaic times, noting particularly Ezra's ability to give Torah and to perform miracles.

A relatively recent theory (published in 1948) as to the identity of the "prophet like Moses" has come from Bentzen<sup>2</sup>; he maintains that this prophet is the "Servant" in the Songs of Deutero-Isaiah (i.e. in Isaiah 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9 and 52:13-53:12). Earlier (1922), Sellin<sup>3</sup> had set forth the view that the "Servant" was Moses himself come to life again. Teeple summarizes Sellin's argument as follows: "Since to Deutero-Isaiah the messianic time appeared as a return of the days of the Israelites' wandering in the desert,...he also must have expected the return of Moses himself....Moses, too, is called the 'Servant' in the Scriptures; the Servant of Yahweh suffers in behalf of his people and so does Moses in Exod. 17 and 32 and in Num. 11-14, 16; the Servant, as had Moses, will lead his people through the desert to the homeland in Isa. 49; the Servant corresponds to Moses in that he teaches the words of Yahweh (Isa. 50:4)".<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>ibid., p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>A. Bentzen, King and Messiah, Chap's 6 and 7.

<sup>3</sup>E. Sellin, Mose und seine Bedeutung für die israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte, pp. 81-113.

<sup>4</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 56.

It would appear that in the 3rd century A.D. Rabbi Simlai,<sup>1</sup> as preserved in the Babylonian Talmud (Sotah 14a) identified the Servant with Moses; he saw references to Moses in Isa. 53:12: Moses "surrendered himself to die" for his people; Moses "was numbered with the transgressors" in that he "was condemned to die in the wilderness"; "he bore the sins of many" in that "he secured atonement for the making of the Golden Calf"; "he made intercession for the transgressors" in that "he begged Israel that they should turn in penitence". While this fanciful typology may have been acceptable when it was written, it does not commend itself to modern reputable scholarship.

The lack of any definite and unique parallel between Moses and the Servant<sup>2</sup> undoubtedly explains why Sellin's theory did not receive wide acceptance; and he himself later altered his views.

However, Bentzen revives his claim, but in a different direction, and argues that the Servant of these Songs is not Moses but the "prophet like Moses" of Deut. 18:15-18.<sup>3</sup> From Isa. 49 Bentzen draws detailed parallels between the leading of the Jews from Egypt to Canaan by Moses, and from Babylonia back to Palestine by the Servant. Further, Bentzen believes the Servant's "vicarious suffering" is patterned

<sup>1</sup>Noted by Teeple, op. cit., p. 63.

<sup>2</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 57.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Stephen's speech Acts 7:37 where the same identification is made; cf. pp. 159ff. where this passage is discussed in detail.



after that of Moses. Moses' willingness to die instead of Israel (Ex. 32:31ff), his risking of his life to intercede for his sinful nation (Deut. 9) and his inclusion in the punishment of his people (Deut. 1:37, 3:26, and 4:21) serve as a proto-type for the Servant who suffers to save the people (Isa. 53).

While on the surface this appears as a valid analogy, Gross<sup>1</sup> has shown its weakness by pointing out some of the differences between the Servant and Moses; Teeple summarizes these as follows: "Moses intercedes for his own people, but the Servant intercedes for the pagan world; God does not accept Moses' offering, whereas He does accept the offering of the Servant. Teaching torah and saving the heathen could be done by the Davidic Messiah, so these features do not make the Servant a New Moses."<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, Bentzen, himself recognized that in his suffering Moses did so only for Israel, thus lacking the universalism of the Servant whose suffering on behalf of the "many" really included everyone.

These discrepancies would seem to balance the evidence in favour of Teeple who concludes: "It is more probable that the Servant of the Songs was viewed by himself and his followers as the Leader who should perform the task at hand, and the fact that the task was somewhat parallel to that of

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Gross, Welterschaft als Religiöse Idee im Alten Testament, p. 98, n.4.

<sup>2</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 57.

Moses was coincidental."<sup>1</sup>

In this connection, however, it should be pointed out that the Servant-motif was the one which was most prominent in the life of Christ; it is quite probable that the link between the expectation of an individual prophet on the basis of Deut. 18:15-18, and the fact that Jesus is described as a "prophet" or "the Prophet" in the New Testament may be traced through this Servant-Motif from the Songs of Deutero-Isaiah.

Thus there were these various prophetic expectations among the Jews. Following a discussion of the prophet expected by the Samaritans, the writer will turn to the New Testament and see in what sense Jesus fitted into these expected motifs.

#### THE SAMARITANS

The Samaritans were another group among whom the expectation of a prophet was prominent at the time of Christ. For most of his knowledge of their beliefs concerning the one who was to come, the writer is indebted to information from the Samaritan priests, collected and edited in an essay by S. de Sacy<sup>2</sup>, entitled "Correspondance des Samaritans de Naplouse". In order to find out more about Samaritan beliefs

---

<sup>1</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 58.

<sup>2</sup>Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, XII, 1831, pp. 1ff.

correspondence with these priests was opened by J. C. Saliger in 1589; it was continued by English scholars 1672-1689, by Ludolf 1685 and by de Sacy in the nineteenth century, whose essay remains the classical authority on the subject.

For the Samaritans, Moses is the Absolute Prophet, holding a position similar to Mohammed in Islam.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it is good to be reminded of Moses' prophetic character; because of his close association with the Torah<sup>2</sup>, this aspect is often overlooked. "All his [Moses'] greatness belongs to him as a Prophet alone".<sup>3</sup> This comment by Ewald is an overstatement but it serves to remind us that Moses is not to be thought of only as a Law-giver.

The Samaritans were expecting a Prophet, as their Messiah. Various views are held as to the origin of this Samaritan "Messianic" expectation.

Gaster<sup>4</sup> believes that at the Maccabean period (c. 150 B. C.) the Jews and Samaritans held the same Messianic hope, heightened by their political situation of longing for a deliverer. He attributes differences in their Messianic ideas to the later independent introduction by both groups of foreign ideas. In this connection, Montgomery states:

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Montgomery, The Samaritans, p. 225.

<sup>2</sup>A. Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, p. 98.

<sup>3</sup>H. Ewald, op. cit., II, p. 47 cf. Josephus, Ant. IV. viii.48.

<sup>4</sup>Gaster, Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions, I, Samaritan Eschatology, p. 273.

"In the development of Messianism the Samaritans lagged behind and largely imitated Judaism".<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Bauer's comment, which Westcott<sup>2</sup> rejects as arbitrary, that the Samaritans borrowed the notion of Messiah entirely from the later Jews, is thrown into perspective by Nutt when he writes: "The belief in a coming Messiah or 'Restorer' who plays so conspicuous a part in later Samaritan theology was probably of home origin, or at all events, even if borrowed from their neighbours, adapted to their own ideas and hopes".<sup>3</sup>

It would appear that Thomson<sup>4</sup> is right in accounting for Jewish and Samaritan differences in their Messianic ideas as a matter of emphasis.

In a footnote, Nutt<sup>5</sup> seeks to substantiate his claim for a "home origin" by pointing out that the idea of a Messiah, the Son of Joseph, would arise among the Samaritans in their eagerness to raise the tribe of Joseph at the expense of that of Judah. According to Edersheim<sup>6</sup>, this argument has no historical basis. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the Jews have a Messiah ben Joseph who will precede the Messiah

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 239.

<sup>2</sup>B. F. Westcott, Introduction To The Study of The Gospels, p. 160.

<sup>3</sup>J. W. Nutt, Fragments of A Samaritan Targum, p. 69; cf. ibid., p. 40.

<sup>4</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, The Samaritans, p. 193.

<sup>5</sup>J. W. Nutt, op. cit., p. 69f.

<sup>6</sup>A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah, I, p. 403, n.l.

ben David and fulfil the prophecies of a suffering Messiah.

It is interesting to note that even present-day Samaritans expect the Taheb, (as the one whom they expect is usually called), to be of the seed of Joseph. Though they know of no descendents of Joseph, the Samaritans believe that there are some, living somewhere in the world, and that from these the Taheb will come.<sup>1</sup>

The Samaritan belief in a coming Prophet, who would be like Moses, is a very old one. Beyond doubt the foundation for this belief was the promise of God in Deuteronomy 15:15-18, "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren - him you shall heed...I will raise up for them a prophet like you..."

Teeple<sup>2</sup> believes that this passage was associated with the Samaritan hope for a Messiah before 100 B.C. Bailey<sup>3</sup> goes further and refers to it as "ancient tradition." Merx<sup>4</sup> is being very conservative in his estimate when he suggests that the idea of a "restorer" goes back to the first century A.D. Gaster more accurately holds that this is "as old as

<sup>1</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 194.

<sup>2</sup>H. M. Teeple, "The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet", JBL, Monograph Series, Vol. X, p. 101.

<sup>3</sup>Bailey, J. W. "The Temporary Messianic Reign In the Literature of Early Judaism", JBL, LIII, 1934, p. 179.

<sup>4</sup>A. Merx, "Der Messias Oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner", ZAW, XVII, 1909, p. 32.

the Samaritan Pentateuch itself."<sup>1</sup> Jackson and Lake<sup>2</sup> are in agreement. While noting that the literature on this subject is not earlier than the fourth century A.D., they point out that these Samaritan sources really represent a primitive tradition.

The Samaritans resemble the Sadducees in rejecting all Scripture except the Law of Moses. Since their literalistic tendency will not allow them to accept any doctrine unless it is based on Scripture, they are forced to find Messianic proof-texts in their Pentateuch.

A word of explanation is necessary with reference to this "Samaritan" Pentateuch. Its most striking difference from the Jewish Law of Moses is in the Decalogue. The Samaritans have only 9 of the traditional Commandments, and these are arranged differently; as the tenth they accept a lengthy "catena-like" statement in which is incorporated the promise of God at Deuteronomy 18:15-18<sup>3</sup>. It would appear

<sup>1</sup>M. Gaster, op. cit., p. 226. Their Pentateuch is pre-Christian very probably dating from the 4th or 5th century B.C. at least.

<sup>2</sup>F. J. F. Jackson, and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, I, p. 406.

<sup>3</sup>"The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren - him shall you heed - just as you desired of the Lord your God at Horeb on the day of the assembly, when you said, 'Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, or see this great fire any more, lest I die'. And the Lord said to me, 'They have rightly said all that they have spoken. I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him.'"

that the Samaritans were driven to this view of a "Messiah-Prophet" in an attempt to equal Jewish hopes, while still maintaining their limited Canon of Scripture. According to Gaster their tenth commandment formed the basis of all Samaritan eschatological hope, which later on took concrete form in the belief of a Tahob. Thus he concludes: "The idea of a prophet arising, foretold, promised and sanctioned by the fact that it was part of the ten commandments, became a living principle among the Samaritans".<sup>1</sup>

The name by which the expected figure is most frequently designated is Tahob. The meaning of  $\text{ܐܘܪܝܢ}$  is discussed by Gesenius in his Carmina Samaritana as summarized by Cowley.<sup>2</sup> Cellarius derives it from  $\text{ܘܢ}$  "hasten", and  $\text{ܐܘܪܝܢ}$  "give". Lobstein thought its root meant "bright star", whereas Bruns derived it from "master" and Bohlen from "bright king". Gesenius' own opinion, with which Vilmar agrees, is that \_\_\_\_\_ is a participle of  $\text{ܐܘܪܝܢ}$  ( $\text{ܐܘܪܝܢ}$ ) commonly meaning "penitent" (i.e. returning) but here used transitively, "conversor", "he who restores". Merx, however, will not accept this meaning but with the support of Hilgenfeld argues for rediens, believing that the Tahob will be either Moses or Joshua redivivus. Thomson<sup>3</sup> somewhat cautiously states that the root of the word

<sup>1</sup>M. Gaster, op. cit., p. 228.

<sup>2</sup>A. Cowley, "The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah", The Expositor, 1895, Fifth Series, Vol. I., p. 164f.

<sup>3</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 193.

"appears to be" the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew  $\text{שׁוּב}$ . In accordance with the character of the Samaritan,  $\text{שׁ}$  is replaced by  $\text{ס}$  and  $\text{ב}$  by  $\text{ב}$  to give  $\text{סבס}$  which by its derivation contains the idea of returning. In the participle in which the  $\text{ב}$  reappears, the word assumes a subjective sense and means "repentance". However, it is surely significant that while  $\text{שׁוּב}$  occurs in the Pentateuch well over a hundred times, only once is it rendered in the Samaritan Targum by a derivation from  $\text{סבס}$ . Sometimes the Hebrew root itself appears. Thomson<sup>1</sup> accounts for this difference in terms of the Samaritan understanding of the Taheb's function; he will bring spiritual, rather than political restoration.

Whatever may be the precise meaning and derivation of  $\text{סבס}$ , (remembering that Samaritan usage may not be parallel with Hebrew and Aramaic), its intended sense seems to be "restorer".

He is not generally known as the Messiah although in the Ludolf letters<sup>2</sup> (III) the following quotation is found: "The Messiah has not risen yet, but he will come and his name will be Hattahab"<sup>3</sup>. Gaster states quite bluntly: "It is wrong to call him the Messiah".<sup>4</sup> What he means is that the

<sup>1</sup>idem.

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 57.

<sup>3</sup>Quoted by Eichhorn, Repertorium XIII, p. 281.

<sup>4</sup>M. Gaster, op. cit., p. 221.



idea of "Messiah" was a later addition to the original idea of a "prophet like Moses" and represents a much later stage in Samaritan Messianism.

At the Stockholm Congress of Orientalists in 1889, Dr. Merx delivered a paper dealing with a fragment of a Samaritan hymn in honour of the Taheb, which he claimed to have discovered recently. Cowley<sup>1</sup>, however, points out that Heidenham had published the whole of the hymn two years before Merx's "discovery".

There is a difference of opinion as to whether the hymn is pre-Christian, (as Thomson<sup>2</sup> believes), or written in the fourteenth century, (as Cowley maintains), or again a century later, (as Heidenham<sup>3</sup>, followed by Hilgenfeld argues). Cowley, Heidenham, and Hilgenfeld agree that it was written by Abisha ben Pinhas, but Cowley believes that he died in 778 A.H. (or A.D. 1376) while Heidenham and Hilgenfeld put his death in the fifteenth century. Of course a hymn of this nature would embody a much earlier oral tradition, whatever may be the actual date of its composition. Certainly the hymn's value, in assisting scholars to determine Samaritan eschatological teaching, cannot be denied.

The writer will now give the relevant portions of

<sup>1</sup>A. Cowley, op. cit., p. 161f.

<sup>2</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 194.

<sup>3</sup>M. Heidenham, Die Samaritanische Liturgie, p. 85, as quoted by Hilgenfeld in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, 37th year, 2nd part, p. 233.

this hymn which formed part of the Samaritan service for the Day of Atonement. He quotes from the translation by Merx and Hilgenfeld, as amended by Cowley<sup>1</sup>. "My word shall instruct thee in the memorial of the Taheb and his government. When he is born in peace, his majesty shall shine forth in the heavens and the earth, and his star in the midst of its heavens. When this Taheb groweth up his righteousness (note, or triumph) shall be revealed. The Lord shall call him and teach him his laws. He shall give him a scripture and clothe him with prophecy....The nations and the uncircumcised shall say each to his people: 'All that we (trusted) in is false, and this is he whose teaching is the truth: arise now, let us go to him, that we may enter under the shadow of his beams'. They shall come and believe in him, and in Moses and his law. The Jews also shall say: 'Let us come to his teaching. Cursed be Ezra and his words which he wrote in his wickedness. Mount Garizim is holy: there is none its like among the mountains. There the Taheb shall rejoice and answer in his heart of wisdom: 'Blessed be Israel with his seed! There is none like him among the peoples'. Oh! that mine eye had seen this Taheb and his majesty! Peace from me be upon him! May he attain unto his prophecy! May he enter into his camp! May he come unto his victory! May he overshadow his habitation! Peace be upon him! until his

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Cowley, op. cit., p. 162ff.



tribe of Levi, to which Moses belonged. The Samaritans cited the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Test. Levi 18:2ff) as evidence that the future ruler will come from the Levites.

"The beginning of the name of the prophet who will arise will be M". This Samaritan teaching to which they refer in the Correspondence<sup>1</sup>, was taken as evidence that Moses himself, whose perfection no one could equal, would return as the Taheb. Gaster points out that this belief belongs to one of four cycles of legends which the Samaritans hold, the cycle of "the return of the lost hero". He comments as follows: "The Taheb is described so that in him one can easily recognize Moses Redivivus. Moses cannot really die but he is hidden away until the time destined for his reappearance."<sup>2</sup>

"And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face." (Deut. 34:10). This tribute to Moses, in which the Samaritans read the future "shall not arise" instead of "has not risen", is linked by them with the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15-18 as a reference to Moses who will return at some future date to lead his people. The Palestinian Targum, (as Gaster<sup>3</sup> notes), inter-

---

<sup>1</sup>de Sacy, op. cit., p. 209.

<sup>2</sup>M. Gaster, The Asatir, The Samaritan Book of the 'Secrets of Moses', p. 103.

<sup>3</sup>M. Gaster, Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions, I, p. 228f.

prets this verse (Deut. 34:10) in the same sense as the Samaritans. Hilgenfeld<sup>1</sup> argues as does Juynboll<sup>2</sup> that the Taheb is to be Moses himself since the words "a prophet like you" (Deut. 18:18) are no hindrance to identifying the Taheb with Moses redivivus in the same sense as John the Baptist is "Elijah who is to come" (Matt. 17:10).

Cowley, however, objects on the grounds that "the idea of a Taheb who is Moses and yet not Moses would be quite beyond the powers of the Samaritan mind."<sup>3</sup> He further draws attention to passages in the hymn, that argue against a Taheb - Moses redivivus identification: "The Lord shall... teach him his laws. He shall give him a Scripture." But why should Moses, the Absolute Prophet, need to be taught God's law? From the statement, "They shall come and believe in him [the Taheb] and in Moses and his law.", it is evident that the writer thought of the Taheb and Moses as distinct persons.

Also an "argumentum e silentio" is cited by Cowley. Marqah, a writer of the fourth century, A.D., in a treatise on the death of Moses<sup>4</sup> makes no reference to his return as Taheb. If this had been part of their belief, certainly

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Hilgenfeld, op. cit., noted by A. Cowley op. cit., p. 165.

<sup>2</sup>T. G. H. Juynboll, Chronicon Samaritanum, p. 127, noted by A. Cowley, op. cit., p. 165.

<sup>3</sup>A. Cowley, op. cit., p. 165f.

<sup>4</sup>von E. Munk, Des Samaritaners Marqah Erzählung über den Tod Moses; noted by A. Cowley, op. cit., p. 166.

the writer would not have overlooked this opportunity to express it. Moses even says "After this day I shall never more have dealings among you."

Thomson<sup>1</sup> saw the belief in Moses' re-incarnation as based on etymology, but observes that proof for such a view is lacking. Thus the identification of the Taheb with Moses Redivivus appears to break down.

And yet it is evident that the idea of Moses' return did have a place in Samaritan tradition. What sense can be made of the two opposing views that the Taheb was to be Moses come to life again and that he was to be a prophet "like Moses"?

The writer believes that these two concepts were originally separate and distinct; but in the evolution of Samaritan Messianic expectation they came to be united in one person, so that the "Prophet like Moses" is to be Moses himself.<sup>2</sup> Scholars, overlooking this fact, argue for one or the other. In this way their confusion may be resolved.

Merx<sup>3</sup> believed that the Samaritans looked for the return of either Moses or Joshua. As a candidate for the title "prophet like unto Moses" from the Samaritans Joshua is unlikely. Bishop Eulogius appears to be the sole supporter of this view; he states that some of the Samaritans expected

<sup>1</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 194.

<sup>2</sup>cf. H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 101.

<sup>3</sup>Ein samaritanisches Fragment über den Ta'eb oder Messias, noted by A. Cowley, op. cit., p. 165.

the Messiah to be Joshua, son of Nun.<sup>1</sup> However, no proof of this claim has come as yet from Samaritan sources.

Inasmuch as Moses was the Absolute Prophet to whom no prophet could be equal and also since the Taheb was to be a prophet, it follows that the expected deliverer will be inferior to Moses. The Taheb is simply a mortal man, a human being, "an inferior replica of that Absolute Prophet" [Moses].<sup>2</sup>

As the hymn<sup>3</sup> proclaims, a star in the heavens will announce his birth. To prove that he is the chosen Prophet he will carry the Rod, sometimes called "the blossoming rod of Aaron",<sup>4</sup> sometimes described as "the wonder-working Rod of Moses"<sup>5</sup> and sometimes simply the "Rod of Miracles".<sup>6</sup>

Following his life, (the writer will presently deal more fully with the purpose and accomplishments of his life), the Taheb dies, as a further indication of his humanity. He is to be buried among the pure ones at the foot of the Holy Mountain, Mount Garizim, in a place called Maarbarta, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Photius, Bibliotheca, 1591, vol. 883; noted by J. A. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 245, n.162.

<sup>2</sup>J. A. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 225.

<sup>3</sup>cf. above p. 64.

<sup>4</sup>M. Gaster, op. cit., p. 270.

<sup>5</sup>M. Gaster, The Asatir, p. 98.

<sup>6</sup>M. Gaster, ibid., p. 51, (noting Asatir, XII, 24).

over his grave the star which had arisen at his birth will shine continually.

There is disagreement as to whether the length of the Taheb's life will be 120 or 110 years. Those<sup>1</sup> wishing to stress the similarity with Moses argue that he will live to the age of 120, as did Moses. Others<sup>2</sup>, desiring to emphasize the Taheb's inferiority to Moses, say that he will die after 110 years. At this point it might be tempting to argue that since Joshua lived 110 years this tradition points to a belief in his return. However, in the absence of further evidence<sup>3</sup> from the Samaritan sources, this line of argument cannot be substantiated. This difference concerning the length of the Taheb's life may well indicate two formerly independent traditions.

Concerning the Taheb's function, Gaster<sup>4</sup> writes that it would probably be exactly the same as Moses' had been. Before rushing to the conclusion, therefore, that the Taheb will be primarily a Law-giver, it must be remembered that for the Samaritans, Moses' greatness consisted in being the prophet par excellence.<sup>5</sup> Hence, while the kingly and priestly aspects are not lacking in the Samaritan Messianic hope, the

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Gaster, Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Traditions, I, pp. 225, 272.

<sup>2</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 194; both Cowley op. cit., p. 170, and Montgomery, op. cit., p. 249, refer to Petermann Reisen, I, 284; J. W. Nutt, op. cit., p. 71.

<sup>3</sup>Except perhaps Thomson's (op. cit., p. 193) reference to the Taheb's conquering of seven nations, as Joshua had also done.

<sup>4</sup>M. Gaster, op. cit., p. 227.

<sup>5</sup>cf. above p. 57.



prophet-motif is given pre-eminence.

In the Ludolf letter<sup>1</sup> (III), the Samaritan priests give a summary statement of the Taheb's function: "Our teachers have said...that this prophet shall arise, that all people shall submit to him and believe in him and in the Law and Mount Garizim: that the religion of Moses, son of Amram, will then appear in glory..."<sup>2</sup> This quotation makes explicit their belief that all nations will make submission to the Taheb; they interpreted this to mean that all would be converted to Samaritanism.<sup>3</sup> Thomson<sup>4</sup> holds that in this connection the Taheb will re-unite Judah and Ephraim and conquer seven nations.

As well as bringing political supremacy for the Samaritans, the Taheb's primary function will be to restore them to the Lost Covenant relationship with Yahweh<sup>5</sup> and thus bring spiritual restoration.

Alongside this emphasis on the "Restorer's" conquering

<sup>1</sup>See p. 57.

<sup>2</sup>de Sacy, op. cit., p. 209.

<sup>3</sup>A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah, I, p. 403, n.1; cf. J. Grimm, Die Samariter und ihre Stellung in der Weltgeschichte, p. 99.

<sup>4</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 193f.

<sup>5</sup>This must be what Gaster, (op. cit., p. 271), means by "restoring to divine favour".

feats, must be placed the Samaritan's claim that the Taheb will not use weapons or engage in military enterprises, but will simply establish a kingdom in a peaceful manner.<sup>1</sup>

The references to "submission" must be taken with those of "establishing the Law". The important part of submitting to Samaritanism is that all nations will come to acknowledge that the Torah, as the Samaritans have preserved it, is the True Law. The Taheb will not give new Law in the sense that Moses did; rather he will "bring to the world the message of the divine truth enshrined in the Law".<sup>2</sup> This discovery would take place at Mt. Garizim. At that "Holy Mountain", the Tablets of the Law, (either the Ten Commandments or the whole Torah), would be found and would vindicate the Samaritan claim to possess the uncorrupted Law. Also to be discovered would be the sacred vessels of the Temple, believed to have been hidden by the High Priest.<sup>3</sup> These discoveries would prove that the Taheb was the True Restorer.

For the Samaritans, Mount Garizim is holy. According to them, it was the place upon which the first altar of God for the twelve tribes was built. This view, reflected in the New Testament (John 4:20), is found in their Pentateuch at Deut. 27:4, where they read "Garizim" instead of "Ebal".

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Gaster, op. cit., p. 254.

<sup>2</sup>ibid., p. 272.

<sup>3</sup>Josephus, Ant. XVIII. iv. 112. According to the Samaritan book of Joseph, chap. 42, the High Priest Usi hid them 261 years after their entry into Canaan; noted by Nutt, op. cit., p. 20, n. 2.

It is generally acknowledged that this was a deliberate falsification of the Biblical text.

As has been suggested<sup>1</sup>, the Taheb's reign is to be temporary; after having lived 110 (possibly 120) years he would die until the time of the general resurrection. It follows from this that the kingdom which he establishes, "the second kingdom", is only a human kingdom, having no real eschatological significance.

In this connection must be taken seriously the claim by Gaster that, "there is no connection between the Taheb and the Day of Judgment."<sup>2</sup> This latter would occur just before the general resurrection, at which time the world would come to an end.

Thus the Samaritan Taheb is a messiah in the sense that he brought deliverance, but he is not a divine being as he tends to be in the developed Jewish "technical" sense of "Messiah".

As to the time of the Taheb's appearance no little uncertainty is reflected. Gaster points out four<sup>3</sup> cycles of legends, as found in the Asatir, the Taheb belonging to that of the coming to life again of the lost hero.

<sup>1</sup>cf. above p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>M. Gaster, op. cit., p. 256.

<sup>3</sup>M. Gaster, The Asatir, p. 99ff., cf. above p. 66. The four cycles are: (a) the legends of the Universal King; (b) the legends of the exposed child-hero; (c) the return of the lost hero; and (d) the Antichrist legend.

Concerning his appearing, ab Zehuka wrote in 1859 "no one knows his coming but Jehovah".<sup>1</sup> The Samaritans expected the Taheb at the beginning of the seventh millenium of the worlds history.<sup>2</sup> The confusion comes from attempts to reckon just when this will be. Montgomery<sup>3</sup> tells of a letter from the Samaritans, mailed in 1808, but dated by them "since the creation 6246 years". In 1811 Sulaneh stated: It is a great mystery with regard to Hattahab who is to come and who will manifest his spirit: happy shall we be when he arrives."<sup>4</sup> Petermann visited Nablus in 1853 and found the Samaritans expecting the Taheb's advent in five years. In 1860 he wrote: "The appearance of the Messiah is to take place 6,000 years after the creation and these have just elapsed; consequently he now, though all unconsciously is going about upon earth."<sup>5</sup> On his visit to Samaria in 1860, Dr. Mills<sup>6</sup> questioned them on the date of the Taheb's appearance and they postponed it to 1910. At present the Samaritans appear to be more reticent on the matter; probably they have reverted to the previous view that God alone knows when the Taheb will come.

---

<sup>1</sup>Quoted by Eichorn, Repertorium, XIII, 266, noted by Nutt, op. cit., p. 71, n.2.

<sup>2</sup>According to Nutt, (ibid, n.4), this is borrowed from the Jews; cf. Bab 'Aboda Zara, 9a.

<sup>3</sup>J. A. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 242.

<sup>4</sup>de Sacy, op. cit., p. 122.

<sup>5</sup>Noted by Montgomery, op. cit., p. 242, Reisen, I, p. 283.

<sup>6</sup>Noted by J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 196.

Such then was the nature of the Prophet expected by the Samaritans. Even to-day, the hope for "a prophet like Moses" still persists among this gradually decreasing group of Samaritans at Nablus.

## CHAPTER III

### JESUS AS A PROPHET

One of the popular estimates of Jesus was that he was "προφήτης ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν". In many respects Jesus stood in the line of Old Testament prophets and yet Jesus was "more than a prophet". Against the background of the expectations of a prophet in the Judaism and Samaritanism of the New Testament period, consideration must be given to the characteristics which are common both to Old Testament prophets and to Jesus, and to the references in the Scriptures where Jesus is called προφήτης .

C. H. Dodd<sup>1</sup> has made a valuable study of the similarities between Jesus and the former prophets. These may be classed under three headings: external; teaching; and personal traits.

#### I. EXTERNAL SIMILARITIES

(a) Authority. Jesus proclaimed his message with absolute authority reminiscent of the prophetic "Thus saith the Lord". Barrett<sup>2</sup> has drawn attention to the "particularly

---

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet", Mysterium Christi, pp. 53-66.

<sup>2</sup>C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and The Gospel Tradition, p. 95.

authoritative nature" of certain classes of Jesus' sayings, citing Harnack in support of his view: "Undoubtedly there is in this 'I am come', whatever it may mean, something authoritative and final. There is in it the consciousness of a divine mission, and indeed it is interchangeable with the expression, 'I was sent'".<sup>1</sup> Barrett<sup>2</sup> further mentions Windisch<sup>3</sup>, who notes the sayings introduced by the formula " ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ",<sup>4</sup> and Bultmann,<sup>5</sup> who points to the "Ich-Worte" of Jesus, both of which similarly emphasize his personal authority.

B. F. Westcott has written that the central idea of the word προφήτης is that of the "authoritative announcement of the will of God".<sup>6</sup> Davies, however, reminds us of one important difference in Jesus' authority; His was not the derived authority of the prophets. "Jesus' authority appears to have been that of one who was within the Kingdom, an expert in the will of God."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>A. Harnack, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche (1912), p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>idem.

<sup>3</sup>H. Windisch, Jesus und der Geist nach synoptischer Ueberlieferung, p. 228, n.2.

<sup>4</sup>cf. D. Daube, "The Question Of Form In Matthew - III - Amen", JTS, XLV, 1944, p. 27ff.

<sup>5</sup>R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition, pp. 161-175.

<sup>6</sup>B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According To St. John, p. 155.

<sup>7</sup>P. E. Davies, "Jesus and The Role of the Prophet", JBL, LXIV, 1945, p. 251.

(b) Vision and Audition. The great Old Testament prophets recount how in a vision<sup>1</sup> God had called them into His service. (e.g. Isa. 6:1-8). Jesus at his Baptism, and again, at the time of the Transfiguration, heard the voice of his Father; it indicated the special relationship which existed between God and Christ, and sent Jesus forth on his appointed mission, with the assurance that he had his Father's approval and support.

(c) Ability To Predict. The ability to predict was one of the required credentials of a prophet. Although Westcott believed prediction of the future was an "accident of the prophet's office"<sup>2</sup>, Higgins<sup>3</sup>, following A. Guillaume<sup>4</sup>, more correctly sees it as one of the distinctive characteristics of the Hebrew prophets. Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the Temple, (Matt. 23:38; Luke 13:35; Mark 13:2, 14:58) and the Lucan version (13:1-5) of the warning about the sword of Rome, and the collapse of the towers of Jerusalem cannot be explained away by the radical critics as vaticinia ex eventu, read back into the tradition.

(d) Symbolic Actions. The Old Testament prophets performed symbolic actions. For example, Jeremiah wore a

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. A. J. B. Higgins, "Jesus as Prophet", ET, LVII, 1945 -6, p. 293.

<sup>2</sup>B. F. Westcott, op. cit., p. 155.

<sup>3</sup>A. J. B. Higgins, op. cit., p. 292.

<sup>4</sup>A. Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, p. 111.



yoke to signify the subjugation of the nations to Babylon (Jer. 28:14) and Ezekiel shaved himself with a sword, treating the hair in peculiar ways to signify the fortunes of his people after the Babylonian conquest (Ezek. 5:1ff.).

H. Wheeler Robinson in his essay on Prophetic Symbolism writes: "They [symbolic actions] are not simply dramatic illustrations of a rather feeble kind; they are partial realizations of that which is to come, and to its coming, they themselves will contribute in their own degree. Their complete fulfilment may bring the greatest grief to the prophet, as it did to Jeremiah; yet it is the will of Yahweh, and he must both declare and further that will by every means in his power.... Any theory of prophetic symbolism which fails to do justice to its realistic element must be rejected."<sup>1</sup>

Jesus too performed symbolic actions.<sup>2</sup> His choice of twelve disciples was one example. (Lk. 22:30; Matt. 19:18) The same may be said of His entry into Jerusalem. (Mk. 11:1-11; Matt. 21:1-10; Lk. 19:29-38). Also, there is symbolic meaning in the feetwashing (John. 13:1ff.), the cursing of the fig tree<sup>3</sup> (Matt. 21:18, 19; Mk. 11:12-14), and possibly in the

---

<sup>1</sup>H. W. Robinson, "Essay on Prophetic Symbolism", Old Testament Essays, p. 10, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup>cf. A. J. B. Higgins, op. cit., p. 293.

<sup>3</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 356; in support of his view he cites Victor of Antioch who saw the withering of the fig tree as an "acted parable" in which Jesus set forth the judgment that was about to fall on Jerusalem.

cleansing of the Temple (Matt. 21:12-13; Mk. 11:15-17). Furthermore, when Jesus broke bread and took the cup, saying, in turn, "This is my Body", "This is my Blood", he was performing symbolic action.

(e) Pneumatic Possession. This was a further outward characteristic of the prophets. Taylor<sup>1</sup> cites Luke 10:21 as evidence, that Jesus shared the prophets' ecstasy - Jesus "rejoiced in spirit" - and Barrett agrees that this "at once brings to mind the nature of prophetic speech".<sup>2</sup> In spite of his reticence on the general subject of the Holy Spirit, and the fact that the main body of Jesus' reported words indicate no ecstatic frenzy, yet Jesus did behave as a Spirit-filled prophet speaking the Word of God.

(f) Miracles. Davidson<sup>3</sup> points out that another of the external criteria of true prophecy was the performance of miracles. As a miracle-worker, Jesus resembles the Old Testament prophets, in that, for both, the miracles were manifestations of the divine power. However, Jesus "went beyond the exercise of mere skill in healing; he was a miraculous physician."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup>C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 95; cf. ibid., p. 102.

<sup>3</sup>A. B. Davidson, "Prophecy and Prophets", HDB, IV, p. 117; cf. R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and The Son of Man, p. 355f; and C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 114.

<sup>4</sup>R. Otto, op. cit., p. 356.

(g) Suffering. Suffering and martyrdom were the lot of the prophets of the Old Testament; while Jesus' crucifixion was much more than the putting to death of a prophet of God, it certainly was no less than that. As Fuller observes: "Certainly martyrdom was widely associated with the prophetic vocation".<sup>1</sup> Jesus said: "it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." (Luke. 13:33), and by this he was suggesting that it was partly as a prophet that he was to die.

Thus there were these external similarities between Jesus and the Old Testament prophets. In addition, the teaching of both, often strikes essentially the same note.

## II. SIMILARITIES IN TEACHING

(a) Against "mechanical" religion. In keeping with the great prophets, Jesus reacted against the formalism and mechanical nature of their ritualistic religion.<sup>2</sup> He appeals to Isaiah (Mk. 7:6), Hosea (Matt. 9:13, 12:6), Deutero-Isaiah and Jeremiah (Mk. 11:17). Thus Jesus' ethical teaching was raised above the mere casuistical observance of the Law, to the plane of moral instinct.

(b) Eschatology. In eschatological outlook, Jesus shared much with the prophets. As Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah saw

---

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, p. 63; he cites Mark 12:4f. and parallels; Matt. 22:6; 23:30f. and parallels; 23:37 and parallels; and J. Jeremias TWNT, V, p.171.

<sup>2</sup>S. H. Hooke, Prophets and Priests, cf. P. E. Davies, op. cit., p. 251.

the "Day of the Lord" as being darkness and not light, so Jesus dissociated himself from the popular hopes of his fellow Jews. As Gressman<sup>1</sup> maintains, the prophets tended to take the fantastic eschatological conceptions of their time, (based on primitive mythology), and reinterpret them rationally in terms of political and historical realities (the menace of Assyria and Babylon); the same method of interpretation may be traced in the reference to the Roman menace in the prophecies of Jesus.

(c) God's Rule. Jesus' proclamation of the "Kingdom of God" is reminiscent of the prophetic stress on the fact that God was Lord of heaven and earth (e.g. Isa. 6:1-5), and that His rule would be vindicated in spite of the seeming power of evil.

(d) Repentance. Furthermore, Jesus' stress on repentance (μετανοεῖτε) echoes the prophets' יָשׁוּב. Both wished to bring the people to a decision by setting before them "the momentous issue between good and evil."<sup>2</sup>

(e) Poetic. In addition to these similarities in teaching with respect to content, there was also an observable

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Gressman, Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischer Eschatologie, noted by C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 61.

<sup>2</sup>C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 62.

formal resemblance. C. F. Burney<sup>1</sup> has shown in detail the poetical character of many of Jesus' utterances, reminiscent of the oracles of the Old Testament prophets.

Besides these external and didactic similarities, the affinity of Jesus with the Old Testament prophets may be seen in various personal traits.

### III. SIMILARITIES IN PERSONAL TRAITS

(a) Calling. Like the prophets, Jesus was keenly aware of his special calling or designation. He was very conscious of being sent by God (Mk. 9:37, Mt. 15:24: cf. Isa. 6:8). He believed that he was fulfilling a destiny laid upon Him by the divine will. (Lk. 12:50; Mk. 8:31- SEI , and Mk. 14:36 - his Gethsemane prayer).

(b) Intimate Communion. His prophetic vocation suggests that Jesus received divine revelations in intimate communion. (cf. Jer. 1:5, 9:24, Amos 3:7). Jesus knows God and is known by Him and receives all his teaching from God. (Mt. 11:27, Lk. 10:22).

(c) Representative of God. Thus, like the prophets, Jesus represents God; lack of obedience to him, implies the rejection of God (Mk. 9:37; cf. I. Sam. 7:7, Ezek. 33:30-33).

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. Burney, The Poetry of Our Lord.

*The Gethsemane Prayer*  
p. 142

(d) Mission to Israel. Jesus shared with the Old Testament prophets a sense of particular mission to Israel. That Jesus was sent only to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 15:24) is an overstatement, but it does indicate priorities. The choice of twelve disciples to sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Lk. 22:30; Mt. 19:28), as well as the events and sayings of his journey to Jeruslaem, imply his intention to appeal to the nation at its political and religious centre. The parable of the vineyard (Mk. 12:1-12, Matt. 23:34-36; Lk. 11:49-51) represents this appeal as the climax of a historic series of prophetic appeals. When it failed, Jesus, in true prophetic fashion, pronounced doom on the Temple and Jerusalem, and, like Isaiah (8:16-18), set apart his disciples as the "remnant". The Last Supper with his mention of the "Covenant", may be regarded as the inauguration of a New Israel.

(e) Fulfilling the Word of God. Like the prophets, Jesus thought of himself as not merely declaring the word of God, but also playing a part in its fulfilment; he believed that, under God's Providence, his ministry had actual consequences in history. In particular, Jesus believed that his death was of great significance. He foretells it not as an accident but as an "eschatological" event in God's plans, whereby God's glory is revealed in the salvation of man.

(f) Personal Religion. Furthermore, in his personal religion, Jesus stands in the succession of prophets, though greatly surpassing them. Direct and personal communion with God, led to a serene, but ready acceptance of His will, even to the extent of suffering. Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane, "re-asserting faith in the boundless power of God, craving help in desperate need, and rising to unreserved acceptance of His will, represents the ideal to which all prayer of the prophetic type tends."<sup>1</sup>

(g) Reticence to call selves "Prophet". According to Barrett,<sup>2</sup> true prophets do not refer to themselves as "prophets".

Against Fascher<sup>3</sup>, who holds that Jesus did announce himself as a prophet, Barrett<sup>4</sup> points out that only twice<sup>5</sup> did Jesus refer to himself as a prophet and then only indirectly. Mark 6:4 (and parallels) is too proverbial for great weight to be placed upon it; Luke. 13:33 is also proverbial but in this passage Jesus does speak indirectly of himself as a prophet. However, this one, (or possible two) exception<sup>s</sup>, does not reverse the claim that Jesus never plainly speaks of himself as a prophet.

While Jesus was a prophet he does not merely revive prophecy, he "fulfils" it; He is "more than a prophet".

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 65.

<sup>2</sup>C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 99.

<sup>3</sup>E. Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, p. 173ff.

<sup>4</sup>C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>5</sup>Mark 6:4 (Matt. 15:57; Lk. 4:24; cf. John 4:44) and Luke 13:33; for fuller discussion of Mark 6:4 (and parallels) and Luke 13:33 cf. below pp.86 ff, pp.114f.

"Thus, while the content of the prophetic message is present in the teaching of Jesus, it is present in a form which passes from anticipation to realization."<sup>1</sup>

However, this discussion of the ways in which Jesus was simply a great Jewish prophet, leads to the places in the New Testament where the term *προφήτης* is actually applied to Jesus or suggested by the context.

#### NEW TESTAMENT REFERENCES TO JESUS AS PROPHET

The references must be divided into those which are anarthous, calling Jesus simply A prophet, and those which refer to him as THE Prophet. These passages are confined to the Gospels and Acts. The writer will take the Gospel passages in the order in which they were written, but comment on the parallels to Mark as they occur in the other Synoptics.

#### "A" PROPHET

In Mark 6:4 (= Matt. 13:57 = Lk. 4:24; cf. Jn. 4:44) Jesus says, "A prophet is not without honour except in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house." Most commentators<sup>2</sup>, put this saying into the category of proverb; F. C. Grant essentially agrees, although

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 66.

<sup>2</sup>V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 301; J. R. Major, The Gospel of St. Mark, p. 31; J. V. Bartlet, St. Mark, (The Century Bible), p. 188; A. M. Hunter, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (Torah), p. 68; E. P. Gould, St. Mark, (ICC), p. 104; J. A. Alexander, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 27.



he more cautiously writes that it is "more or less proverbial".<sup>1</sup>

Cranfield, however, does not feel that this saying can justly be called a proverb, but adds that it is certainly an "aphorism". He continues: "While it is by no means equivalent to a direct application of the title 'prophet' to himself, it perhaps does imply that he regarded the term as expressing a certain measure of truth about himself".<sup>2</sup> Bartlet<sup>3</sup> (comparing Jer. 11:24), Taylor<sup>4</sup> and Swete<sup>5</sup> agree that Jesus here implicitly accepts the title προφήτης. Morison rightly observes that the word prophet here has "no particular reference to prediction....Our Saviour was only laying down a generic term for a specific purpose. He might have employed a more generic term."<sup>6</sup> Grant<sup>7</sup> makes a subtle distinction by suggesting that Jesus does not claim to be a prophet, but only compares himself to one. Alexander calls this saying a "familiar lesson of experience,...here applied especially to prophets, either because it had been

---

<sup>1</sup>F. C. Grant, The Interpreter's Bible, vol. VII, St. Mark, p. 728, Underlining mine.

<sup>2</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 196.

<sup>3</sup>J. V. Bartlet, op. cit., p. 188.

<sup>4</sup>V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 301.

<sup>5</sup>H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 114; however, he seems to suggest that Jesus is "the Prophet" by citing Mark 6:15; 8:28; Matt. 21:11, 46; Luke 24:19; John 4:19, 6:14, 7:40, 9:17; Acts 3:22, 7:37.

<sup>6</sup>J. Morison, A Commentary on The Gospel According to Mark, p. 155.

<sup>7</sup>F. C. Grant, op. cit., p. 728; he feels this is true for all of Mark.

actually verified in their experience more than that of others, or because it was our Lord's prophetic ministry and office which had been so contemptuously treated by his countrymen."<sup>1</sup>

This saying is found in the Oxyrynchus *λόγια*, discovered at the beginning of this century, in somewhat expanded form:<sup>2</sup>

λέγει Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτός  
 προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ  
 οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεράπείας  
 εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

As the first part of this saying is found word for word at Luke 4:24, the writer will reserve discussion of it, for the moment, except for noting that Batiffol<sup>3</sup> calls the Marcan (and Matthean) versions of this saying "sensible variants".

In Matthew 13:57, and also in Luke 4:24 and John 4:44 the reference to kinsfolk is omitted. Cranfield may well be right in citing this as evidence for the priority of Mark, since "the tendency would be to omit something discreditable to Jesus' family".<sup>4</sup> As with the Marcan version, the

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Alexander, op. cit., p. 145.

<sup>2</sup>P. Batiffol, "Les Logia Du Papyrus De Ehnesa", RB, 1897, pp. 501-543; cf. A. M. Hunter, op. cit., p. 68, and M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup>P. Batiffol, op. cit., p. 510.

<sup>4</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 197.

majority of commentators<sup>1</sup> feel that Matt. 13:52 is a proverb. A. B. Bruce aptly observes that it is a proverb which is not merely Jewish, but the common property of all mankind.

Filson<sup>2</sup> and McNeile<sup>3</sup> draw attention to the fact that Jesus here accepts the popular estimation of his person, namely προφήτης. Aquinas<sup>4</sup> quotes Remigius's comment on this verse: "He [Jesus] calls Himself a Prophet, as Moses also declares when he says 'A Prophet shall God raise up unto you of your brethren' (Deut. 18:15)." As Remigius seems to be alone in linking the Deuteronomic promise to Matt. 13:57, the validity of his claim is to be questioned.

<sup>1</sup>F. V. Filson, The Gospel According to St. Matthew, (BNTC), p. 167; A. L. Williams, The Gospel According to St. Matthew, (Pulpit), Vol. II, p. 15; J. Morison, Commentary on The Gospel According to Matthew, p. 265; P. A. Micklethwait, St. Matthew, p. 147; M. W. Jacobus, Notes on the Gospels, Matthew, p. 152; M. Bland, Annotations on the Gospel of St. Matthew, p. 327; J. Calvin, Commentary on A Harmony of The Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke, p. 215; Chrysostom, noted by J. Calvin; A. Barnes, St. Matthew, p. 180; Messrs. De Beausobre and Lenfant, A New Version of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, p. 325; Lord Lyttelton, The Four Gospels, St. Matthew, p. 62; A. B. Bruce, The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. I, p. 205.

<sup>2</sup>F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 167.

<sup>3</sup>A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According To St. Matthew, p. 207.

<sup>4</sup>T. Aquinas, Commentary on The Four Gospels Collected Out of the Works of The Fathers, Vol. II, p. 521.

Campbell<sup>1</sup> suggests that Jesus is not accepted because the people assumed him guilty of an impious usurpation in assuming the character of a Prophet. Plummer, however, believes that the author of Matthew probably interpreted the rejection of Jesus by His own people at Nazareth as a "prophetic intimation of His rejection by the whole nation at Jerusalem".<sup>2</sup> Goodwin carries this further to say that this rejection is "in reality, human experience upon a large scale".<sup>3</sup> The same point of view underlies the idea that Jesus was rejected on natural principles which belong to the carnal heart. Lange agrees that this rejection of a prophet was a fact of experience, but adds that it was "exculpatory in its general bearing, but condemnatory in its special application in this instance".<sup>4</sup>

The Lucan parallel (Lk. 4:24) too is regarded as proverbial.<sup>5</sup> Attention has already<sup>6</sup> been drawn to the fact that this saying occurs in expanded form in the Oxyrynchus papyri.

<sup>1</sup>G. Campbell, The Four Gospels, p. 415

<sup>2</sup>A. Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary On The Gospel According To St. Matthew, p. 199

<sup>3</sup>H. Goodwin, A Commentary On The Gospel Of St. Matthew, p. 268; cf. M. W. Jacobus, op. cit., p. 152.

<sup>4</sup>J. P. Lange, A Theological and Homiletical Commentary On The Gospel Of St. Matthew, Vol. II, p. 46.

<sup>5</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 490f.; F. Godet, A Commentary On The Gospel of St. Luke, Vol. I, p. 237; J. C. Ryle, St. Luke, Vol. I, p. 124; H. D. M. Spence, St. Luke, (Pulpit), Vol. I, p. 90; Lord Lyttelton, St. Luke, p. 195; F. W. Farrar, The Gospel According to St. Luke: Cambridge Bible For Schools, p. 105, who says that this curious psychological fact has its analogy in the worldly proverb that "No man is a hero to his valet" or "Familiarity breeds contempt".

<sup>6</sup>cf. above, p. 88.

Bultmann<sup>1</sup> follows Wendling and Preuschen<sup>2</sup> in maintaining that the Oxyrynchus version underlies Luke 4:24 as well as the narrative of Mark 6:1f. Dibelius<sup>3</sup> also regards the Oxyrynchus form of the saying as original. It is far more probable that the Oxyrynchus Logion depends upon Luke, for, though less effective as a proverb, that form suits the occasion of this narrative better than the Lucan.<sup>4</sup> Lagrange<sup>5</sup> agrees that the Oxyrynchus version is a gloss of Luke.

Montefiore<sup>6</sup> notes that Luke 4:24 is out of place. A reason for this might be that Luke added verse 24 because he did not want to omit anything which he found in Mark. It must be agreed that it is placed in a better context by Mark.

Plummer gives the following loose paraphrase of Jesus' words: "But I am like the Prophets, not only in the treatment

<sup>1</sup>R. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 15, noted by J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup>Wendling and Preuschen, ZNTW, XVII, 1916, pp. 33-48, noted by J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 68.

<sup>3</sup>M. Dibelius, The Message of Jesus Christ, pp. 14, 139, noted by S. E. Johnson, Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VII, p. 425.

<sup>4</sup>cf. J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 68.

<sup>5</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Evangile Selon Saint Luc, p. 142.

<sup>6</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., p. 875.

which I receive from my own people, but also in my principles of action."<sup>1</sup> He adds that Christ is here appealing to their knowledge of Scripture, not to any facts outside the Old Testament. Montefiore<sup>2</sup>, however, following up his view that this passage is out of place, maintains that the emphasis should be placed, not so much on the reception offered to Jesus at Nazareth, as on the attitude of the Jews towards Christ and Christianity.

The Johannine form of this saying - "a prophet has no honour in his own country" (Jn. 4:44) - is taken as a proverb by most commentators.<sup>3</sup> H. B. Reynolds<sup>4</sup> more cautiously qualifies his comment by writing that John 4:44 is a proverb, or "a part, at least, of a proverb". Calvin<sup>5</sup> observes that this proverb probably arose because of the ill-treatment

<sup>1</sup>A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary On The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. 127.

<sup>2</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., p. 875.

<sup>3</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, The Gospel of John, p. 118; G. Reith, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 64; C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 206; M. Dods, The Gospel of St. John, Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. I, p. 732; E. C. Hoskyns, (ed. F. N. Davey), The Fourth Gospel, Vol. I., p. 277; J. Calvin, Commentary On The Gospel According To John, p. 177; J. C. Ryle, Expository Thoughts On The Gospels, St. John, Vol I., p. 259; W. F. Howard, The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VIII, p. 535, who points out that the Oxyrynchus Papyrus quotes this proverb in expanded form.

<sup>4</sup>H. B. Reynolds, The Gospel of St. John, (Pulpit), Vol. I, p. 176.

<sup>5</sup>J. Calvin, op. cit., p. 177; cf. G. Reith, op. cit., p. 71.

which they received by their own nation; more specifically he traces the origin to familiarity and jealousy. Certainly Jewish history vividly illustrates this truth which Jesus uttered. Judea was the country of the prophets, but the Jews accorded them very little honour.<sup>1</sup>

From this discussion of Mark 6:4, Matt. 13:57, Luke 4:24 and John 4:44 the conclusion may be drawn that Jesus here indirectly accepts the title "prophet", but the strong proverbial flavour of his words precludes any definite meaning being attached to them.

The next reference comes at Mark 6:15 where there appears one of the "oldest explanations of the puzzle of Jesus' person and work".<sup>2</sup> Some say<sup>3</sup> that he is "John the Baptist", others that he is "Elijah"; and others that he is "a prophet (or) like one of the prophets of old". It is significant that among these popular opinions there is no suggestion that he is Messiah.<sup>4</sup>

There is one major textual problem in connection with the last part of this verse: προφήτης (ἔστιν) (ἢ) ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν  
Two minor points relate first to the ἔστιν after

<sup>1</sup>T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 162, (Origen).

<sup>2</sup>O. Cullmann, The Christology of The New Testament, p. 31.

<sup>3</sup>It is disputed whether it should read ἔλεγον with

B W it, ἐλέγονσαν with D, or ἔλεγεον with SAC<sup>o</sup> λ φ Α vg. sy<sup>s</sup> pe sa bo ; cf. A. Huck, Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, p. 84; H. A. Guy, The Origin of the Gospel of Mark, p. 25, says it should be ἔλεγεον while A. W. F. Blunt, The Gospel According to St. Mark, (Clarendon), p. 179, says ἔλεγον makes "better sense".

<sup>4</sup>Schniewind, noted by C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 207; cf. O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 31.

προφήτης, which is omitted by Tisch., Treg., WH., RV.,  
 x, BC, L, Δ, I, 28, 33, and 209 and secondly to the ἦ before  
 ὧς which is rejected by Tisch., Treg., WH., RV., x, ABC, L, TT,  
 Mss. Lat., Vet., Vulg., Memph., Pesh.<sup>1</sup>. The main question relates  
 to the remaining part. Most manuscripts read: προφήτης ὧς  
 εἰς τῶν προφητῶν ("a prophet like one of the prophets"),  
 but the Western text, especially D, reads simply "he is  
 one of the prophets" (εἰς τῶν προφητῶν). Cullmann<sup>2</sup>,  
 citing as proof the parallels in Luke 9:8 and Mark 8:28,  
 argues that this passage is not a general assertion that  
 ancient prophecy is alive again, but rather the actual  
 identification of Jesus with one of the ancient prophets.  
 Furthermore, Cullmann suggests the lectio difficilior  
 argument: a copyist unaware of the former widespread  
 belief in the return of the Prophet, inserted the words  
 προφήτης ὧς to clarify a text which he could not  
 understand. Thus the reading in D is the more difficult one  
 and therefore preferable.

On the other hand, according to Cranfield, the idea  
 that one of the old prophets has returned to life is "not  
 the natural meaning of Mark's words."<sup>3</sup> Morison more bluntly

---

<sup>1</sup>E. P. Gould, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary On  
 The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 109.

<sup>2</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 34f.; cf. F. C. Grant, Inter-  
 preter's Bible, Vol. VII, p. 733 agrees, citing the O. L. and D.  
 Also A. M. Hunter, op. cit., p. 70f. does not agree explicitly,  
 but suggests the same by writing that Jesus "must be one of  
 the old prophets, perhaps Jeremiah, (Matt. 16:14)".

<sup>3</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 207.



states: "a prophet! Like one of the prophets! Such is the translation of the correct reading."<sup>1</sup> He goes on to suggest that we have here a two-fold form of the reports, the one that he was "a prophet", and the other that he was "like one of the prophets" (redivivus).

A. B. Bruce<sup>2</sup>, Allen<sup>3</sup> and Montefiore<sup>4</sup> agree that Mark did not mean that in Jesus one of the old prophets had come to life again. Branscomb quotes Montefiore's apt remark that the estimation of Jesus, a prophet like one of the prophets, "hit the mark most nearly. His freshness and originality, his power and confidence, his assurance of direct divine inspiration<sup>5</sup> are all points of resemblance between him and them. Like them 'he spoke with authority and not as the scribes'"<sup>6</sup> Branscomb rightly observes that Montefiore could also have mentioned the mighty deeds which Jesus performed, and which reminded the pious of the miracles wrought by the great prophets.<sup>7</sup> According to Swete<sup>8</sup>, Mark's meaning in 6:15 was that Jesus was on a level with the ancient prophets;

<sup>1</sup>J. Morison, op. cit., p. 162, underlining mine.

<sup>2</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 380.

<sup>3</sup>W. C. Allen, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>4</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., p. 162.

<sup>5</sup>cf. A. Menzies, The Earliest Gospel, p. 138, "Jesus certainly was inspired - to preach to his own generation as the prophets had to theirs."

<sup>6</sup>H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark, p. 106; C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., p. 162.

<sup>7</sup>cf. above, pp. 76-86 for similarities between Jesus and the prophets.

<sup>8</sup>H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 121.

as a comparison he cites the Septuagint version of Judg. 16:7, 11.<sup>1</sup>

Campbell<sup>2</sup> makes the point that οἱ προφῆται, when used as in Mark 6:15 always meant the ancient prophets. Allen<sup>3</sup>, Lange<sup>4</sup>, Bartlet<sup>5</sup>, Maclear<sup>6</sup>, Alexander<sup>7</sup>, Menzies<sup>8</sup> and Turner<sup>9</sup> argue that Jesus was a prophet of the type which had been dead for four hundred years, a successor of the ancient recognized order of prophets. Gould is anxious to maintain that the words "a prophet like one of the prophets" mean more than that he was just an ordinary prophet in distinction from the great prophet Elijah. "It is the likeness to the old prophets rather than unlikeness to some special one of them that is meant to be emphasized."<sup>10</sup> He also believes that these different opinions concerning Jesus were quite probably spoken at different times and brought together here.

Few commentators see any reference in this verse (Mark 6:15) to the prophet promised by Moses at Deut. 18:15-18.

<sup>1</sup> ἔσομαι ὡς εἰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων - "I shall be on a par with ordinary men."

<sup>2</sup>G. Campbell, The Four Gospels, Vol. II, p. 475.

<sup>3</sup>W. C. Allen, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>4</sup>J. P. Lange, Theological and Homiletical Commentary on The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, p. 269.

<sup>5</sup>J. V. Bartlet, op. cit., p. 193.

<sup>6</sup>G. F. Maclear, op. cit., p. 97 quotes J. P. Lange, idem.

<sup>7</sup>J. A. Alexander, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 153.

<sup>8</sup>A. Menzies, op. cit., p. 138.

<sup>9</sup>C. H. Turner, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 32.

<sup>10</sup>E. P. Gould, op. cit., p. 109.

Swete<sup>1</sup> says quite emphatically that the reference here is not to this prophet. Pseudo-Chrysostom<sup>2</sup>, however, believed that the people meant the Deuteronomic promise and that in this view they were entirely correct. He suggests that because they feared openly to say "This is the Christ", they veiled their surmises by pointing to the authority of Moses. Blunt<sup>3</sup> does not feel that the reference here is to the Prophet of the end time, but rather to one who stands in the succession of the great prophets. He does, however, point to Deut. 18:18 as the basis for this expectation of a prophet.

In Luke 9:8 (which corresponds to Mark 6:15) there is a clear-cut assertion "that one of the old prophets had risen". The general<sup>4</sup> interpretation is that this refers to an ancient prophet redivivus. Montefiore<sup>5</sup> agrees, but feels that Luke, perhaps misunderstood Mark 6:15. W. Manson takes the view that in saying "that one of the old prophets had risen", Luke was suggesting that "in Jesus the golden age of prophecy had revived".<sup>6</sup> Along with Swete<sup>7</sup>, who shares

---

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 121; cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 207.

<sup>2</sup>T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup>A. W. F. Blunt, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 180.

<sup>4</sup>So J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 127; V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 309; A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 380; M. J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 261.

<sup>5</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., p. 914; cf. Wellhausen, Einleitung, p. 45.

<sup>6</sup>W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke, (Moffatt), p. 102.

<sup>7</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 181.

this interpretation, he points to Deut. 18:15 as its basis. Farrar<sup>1</sup> also points to this Deuteronomic passage, and in addition to Luke 7:16 and Num. 24:7.

Godet<sup>2</sup> alone sees a Messianic reference here in Luke 9:8. For him, the words "Elijah" or "one of the prophets" meant "The Messiah is at hand". Calvin<sup>3</sup> and Manson<sup>4</sup>, however, draw attention to the fact that amidst these popular rumours about Jesus, there is no suggestion of the Messiah.

In interpreting this verse, Adeney<sup>5</sup> points to the popular Jewish notion that souls sometimes returned to live a second life on earth; this is challenged by Olshausen<sup>6</sup> who says that this doctrine of  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\mu\psi\upsilon\chi\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$  or  $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$  cannot be used to explain the opinion that one of the ancient prophets had re-appeared in Christ. Rather, he believes that the Jews understood it in the sense of actual resurrection.

What is to be made of these verses? The writer believes that in Mark 6:15, the author meant that in Jesus a new prophet had arisen of the type of the great prophets.

<sup>1</sup>F. W. Farrar, op. cit., p. 181.

<sup>2</sup>F. Godet, A Commentary On The Gospel of St. Luke, Vol. I, p. 402.

<sup>3</sup>J. Calvin, op. cit., St. Luke, Vol. II, p. 218.

<sup>4</sup>W. Manson, op. cit., p. 102.

<sup>5</sup>W. F. Adeney, St. Luke, (The Century Bible), p. 158.

<sup>6</sup>H. Olshausen, Biblical Commentary on the Gospels, St. Luke, Vol. II, p. 216.

Cullmann's suggestion<sup>1</sup> represents a possibility but it is too conjectural to warrant a change from the traditional and better attested text. As for Luke 9:8, it is difficult, or more correctly, impossible to determine whether the author wrote what he thought Mark meant or whether he deliberately changed the text. However, the meaning is surely that, in Jesus, one of the old prophets has actually returned to life.

The next reference to Jesus as  $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  comes at Mark 8:28 (= Matt. 16:14 = Lk. 9:19). At Caesarea Philippi, when Jesus asked his disciples, "Who do men say that I am?", they told him, "John the Baptist; and others say Elijah; and others one of the prophets".

Macgregor<sup>2</sup> notes that, whereas in John Jesus is called "the Prophet", the Synoptists use the "vaguer phrase" - "one of the prophets". These "popular" opinions which the disciples give are a reminder of those which had come to Herod's ears.<sup>3</sup> Turner<sup>4</sup> feels that they are repeated here from Mark 6:15. Taylor<sup>5</sup>, however, while noting the similarity,

<sup>1</sup> See above p. 94, but D which Cullmann uses for Mk. 6:15 has  $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  at Mk. 8:28, (A. Huck, op. cit., p. 97) as does also it, vg. Thus Cullmann's argument breaks down.

<sup>2</sup> G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> At Mk. 6:15; cf. F. C. Grant, op. cit., p. 765 and C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., p. 196.

<sup>4</sup> C. H. Turner, op. cit., p. 40.

<sup>5</sup> V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 376.

does not feel that it is necessary to infer that the one passage is merely an "echo" of the other.

The grammar of this verse is harsh. The words "John the Baptist" are in the accusative while "one of the prophets" is nominative.<sup>1</sup> Various minor variants have been cited, but as they do not alter the meaning there is no need to give them, but simply in passing to note their existence.<sup>2</sup>

Again as with Mark 6:15 and Luke 9:8, scholars are divided as to whether "one of the prophets" means a great prophet returned to life or a new prophet, but of their genre. The former view is taken by Alexander<sup>3</sup>, Hunter<sup>4</sup> and Morison<sup>5</sup> and perhaps Bartlet<sup>6</sup>, while the latter is maintained by Montefiore<sup>7</sup>. Blunt<sup>8</sup> simply states the alternatives and leaves it at that.

R. H. Lightfoot<sup>9</sup> observes that all of these popular opinions relate to roles of preparation, not of fulfilment

<sup>1</sup>W. C. Allen, op. cit., p. 97; A. W. F. Blunt, op. cit., p. 201.

<sup>2</sup>For more details see A. Huck, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>3</sup>J. A. Alexander, op. cit., p. 272.

<sup>4</sup>A. M. Hunter, op. cit., p. 88.

<sup>5</sup>J. Morison, op. cit., p. 238.

<sup>6</sup>J. V. Bartlet, op. cit., p. 248.

<sup>7</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., p. 196.

<sup>8</sup>A. W. F. Blunt, op. cit., p. 201

<sup>9</sup>R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, p. 33f.

and achievement. In other words, the highest popular estimate of Jesus is that he is the forerunner of the Messiah, not the Messiah himself.<sup>1</sup> It is in this sense that Maclaren speaks of the masses' "total misconception" of Jesus<sup>2</sup>. Taylor<sup>3</sup> feels that it is remarkable, despite Mark 1:24, 34; 3:11, 5:7, that popular opinion does not hold Jesus to be the Messiah. According to Branscomb<sup>4</sup> many scholars believe that Jesus thought of himself only as a prophet and not as the Messiah. It is difficult to see how this view can be substantiated, because the disciples, for whom Peter is the spokesman, go on to say that they realize that Jesus was more than the "prophet of Nazareth". He was that, but much more. Therefore he does not deny the estimation: "Thou art the Christ".

Guy<sup>5</sup>, writing about the "Repetitions" in Mark, remarks that the account reads as if Peter's words were the first acknowledgement that Jesus' status was more than "one of the prophets", yet they had already heard declarations of Christ's greatness (Mark 1:24; 1:34; 3:11; 5:7). May it not be that Mark wished to emphasize the uniqueness and importance of these words: "Thou art the Christ"?

---

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Alexander, op. cit., p. 222.

<sup>2</sup>A. B. Maclaren, Expositions of Holy Scriptures St. Mark, Vol. I, p. 331.

<sup>3</sup>V. Taylor, op. cit., p. 376.

<sup>4</sup>H. Branscomb, The Gospel of Mark, (Moffatt), p. 149.

<sup>5</sup>H. A. Guy, The Origin of The Gospel of Mark, p. 25f.

The Matthean version (Matt. 16:14) is the same as Mark 8:28, except that it adds "Jeremiah" as a popular view of Jesus. "Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets". Macgregor<sup>1</sup>, Plummer<sup>2</sup>, and Micklem<sup>3</sup> believe that Jeremiah here is possibly to be identified with the Prophet (Deut. 18:15). Johnson<sup>4</sup> says that Jeremiah is mentioned here, not because he is a great Messianic figure, but because he is one of the greatest of the prophets. According to Lightfoot<sup>5</sup>, in a Talmudic treatise the book of Jeremiah was placed first of the prophets after Kings. Nicholson<sup>6</sup> and Ryle<sup>7</sup> also note how Jeremiah is placed before the other prophets in the Jewish canon. Lagrange agrees that his inclusion is justified "in conformity with the great importance which this prophet had in Judaism".<sup>8</sup> Swete adds a second possible reason for

---

<sup>1</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 24.

<sup>2</sup>A. Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary On The Gospel According to St. Matthew, p. 199.

<sup>3</sup>P. A. Micklem, St. Matthew, p. 165.

<sup>4</sup>S. E. Johnson, op. cit., p. 449; cf. J. Morison, Commentary On The Gospel According to Matthew, p. 301.

<sup>5</sup>J. B. Lightfoot, commenting on Matt. 27:9, (Hor. Hebr.), noted by A. Carr, op. cit., p. 210; cf. Messrs. De Beausobre and Lenfant, op. cit., p. 334; M. Bland, Annotations On The Gospel of St. Matthew, p. 359; H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 177.

<sup>6</sup>E. B. Nicholson, A New Commentary On The Gospel According To Matthew, p. 149.

<sup>7</sup>J. C. Ryle, Canon of the Old Testament, p. 226, noted by A. Plummer, op. cit., p. 225.

<sup>8</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon Saint Matthieu, p. 322.



the opinion that Jesus is Jeremiah, namely "the denunciatory character of one side of our Lord's teaching."<sup>1</sup>

It was one of the Jewish traditions that Jeremiah would appear with the Messiah to restore the ark of the Covenant which he had hidden in a cave. Bruce<sup>2</sup>, Adams,<sup>3</sup> Williams,<sup>4</sup> Barnes<sup>5</sup> and Jacobus<sup>6</sup> relate this reference to him here (Matt. 16:14) to this expectation, making it also suggest his appearance as the forerunner of the Messiah.

Bruce draws attention to the use of ἄλλοι and ἕτεροι in this verse. Those who believe that Jesus is "Jeremiah or one of the prophets" are called ἕτεροι, as if to distinguish them not merely numerically (ἄλλοι), but generically. These do not connect Jesus in any way with the Messiah, "but simply thought of Him as one in whom the old prophetic charism had been revived."<sup>7</sup> Williams,<sup>8</sup> Calvin<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>H. E. Swete, op. cit., p. 177; cf. A. Edersheim, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 79. In a footnote, he (Edersheim) adds that a vision of Jeremiah in a dream was supposed to betoken chastisements, citing Berakhoth 57b, line 7 from top.

<sup>2</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 222.

<sup>3</sup>H. C. Adams, St. Matthew, p. 68.

<sup>4</sup>A. L. Williams, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 132.

<sup>5</sup>A. Barnes, St. Matthew, p. 147.

<sup>6</sup>M. W. Jacobus, Notes On The Gospels, p. 167.

<sup>7</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 223.

<sup>8</sup>A. L. Williams, op. cit., p. 133.

<sup>9</sup>J. Calvin, Commentary On A Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Vol. II, p. 287.

and Meyer<sup>1</sup> agree that none of these answers indicate that Jesus was regarded as the Messiah. Lange,<sup>2</sup> however, believes just the opposite, suggesting that by their calumnies his enemies had "succeeded in lowering the popular estimate concerning Jesus", so that the opinions are arranged here in descending order of importance, the lowest being that he was "one of the prophets". Micklem<sup>3</sup>, too, feels that public opinion which had been inclined to acclaim Jesus' Messiahship, here has ebbed to regard him as a prophet, recent or more ancient, redivivus. Filson, also, says that though all four popular views identify Jesus as a prophet, (which title he accepts), nevertheless, Jesus "was conscious of a unique role."<sup>4</sup>

Montefiore<sup>5</sup> believes that this verse points in the same direction as Luke 9:19 which speaks of one of the old prophets who has risen again<sup>6</sup>, and suggests that there is a legend that Jeremiah too, like Elijah, had not died. In this connection, Allen writes that the mention of Jeremiah "shows acquaintance with the Jewish belief in the possibility of the appearance of the illustrious dead".<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Noted by J. P. Lange, Theological and Homiletical Commentary On The Gospel Of St. Matthew, Vol. II, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup>J. P. Lange, idem.

<sup>3</sup>P. A. Micklem, op. cit., p. 165.

<sup>4</sup>F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 185.

<sup>5</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 663.

<sup>6</sup>cf. Lord Lyttelton St. Matthew, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup>W. C. Allen, St. Matthew, (ICC), p. 175.

Watson,<sup>1</sup> however, aptly notes that the doctrine of the transfiguration of souls was held by the Pharisees;<sup>2</sup> while they might have believed that the soul of John or Elijah or Jeremiah or one of the prophets had assumed the body of our Lord, these opinions are popular views, held by people at large, especially Galileans. Similarly he feels that Rabbinical evidence, cited to explain the mention here of Jeremiah, is unsatisfactory because this is a popular opinion.

In Luke (9:19) this verse reads as follows: "And they answered, 'John the Baptist; but others say, Elijah; and others, that one of the old prophets has risen.'" Here as at Luke 9:8, Luke has the idea of a former prophet returned to life, where Mark (8:28) and Matthew (16:14) have simply "one of the prophets". Montefiore<sup>3</sup> feels that, since the words "...others, that one of the old prophets is risen again" are wanting in the (S.S.), and D reads as in Matthew, the original meaning was probably merely "a prophet", not "a resurrected prophet". He does, however, observe that "a risen prophet" makes a better parallelism.<sup>4</sup> Gilmour<sup>5</sup> and Creed<sup>6</sup> feel that Luke consciously changed and revised the reading

---

<sup>1</sup>R. Watson, An Exposition Of The Gospels Of St. Matthew and St. Mark, p. 230f.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Josephus, War II, viii.14; cf. also Jackson and Lake, op. cit., I. p. 405f., who suggest that Mark 8:28 is suggestive of the belief in the re-incarnation of the righteous.

<sup>3</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 915f.

<sup>4</sup>idem., Vol. I, p. 196.

<sup>5</sup>S. M. Gilmour, The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VIII, p. 168.

<sup>6</sup>J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 130.

he found in Mark. Olshausen<sup>1</sup> again argues that the Jews believed that one of the ancient prophets had actually come to life again, and not in the sense of the transmigration of the soul of one into the body of Jesus.

The similarity to Luke 9:8 is very apparent; here there are the same popular surmises. Adeney<sup>2</sup> feels that v.19 is a repetition of v.8; Manson<sup>3</sup> more cautiously says that they "coincide".

Lagrange<sup>4</sup> sees in this verse an identification by the crowd between Jesus and "the Prophet", and suggests that they want to salute him as Messiah. Perhaps Ragg<sup>5</sup> is thinking along the same lines when, in commenting on this verse, he refers the reader to John 1:19-21.

What may be concluded from Mark 8:28 and its parallels (Matt. 16:14 and Luke 9:19)? Jesus is here likened to a great prophet, but nevertheless only A prophet; any suggestion that he is THE (Messianic) Prophet, which a few commentators find in these verses, is very obscure, and if intended, certainly well veiled.

The fact that Jesus is believed to be Elijah returned to earth indicates a somewhat widespread and distinct anticipation of the return of this prophet. However, commenting

<sup>1</sup>cf. above p. 98.

<sup>2</sup>W. F. Adeney, op. cit., p. 161.

<sup>3</sup>W. Manson, op. cit., p. 106.

<sup>4</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Evangile Selon Saint Luc, p. 265.

<sup>5</sup>L. Ragg, The Gospel According to St. Luke, p. 126.

on Mark 8:28 Jackson and Lake<sup>1</sup> point out that the suggestion that Jesus was one of the prophets (this would include Elijah) found no place in later Christian thought.

From these verses (Mark 8:28 and parallels), Teeple<sup>2</sup> concludes that the belief in Moses' return<sup>3</sup> was not prevalent among the masses since the phrase "one of the prophets" could hardly contain a veiled reference, to such a famous personage. May it not be that Moses' return was not mentioned here because it was bound up with the return of Mosaic times, particularly with freedom from foreign domination, and the crowds had no great hope that Jesus would be their leader in effecting this desired end?

But the Transfiguration Story (Mk. 9:2ff; Matt. 17:1ff.; Lk. 9:28ff.) relates the appearance of Elijah and Moses. According to Hoskyns, "it is clearly implied in the New Testament that the two prophets, Moses and Elijah were associated in popular Jewish expectation with the advent of the Messiah."<sup>4</sup> Schoeps<sup>5</sup> believes that these two are intended as witnesses to the fact that Jesus is the Messiah, as did the

<sup>1</sup>Jackson and Lake, I, op.cit., p. 405f.

<sup>2</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 47.

<sup>3</sup>On the basis of Deut. 18:15-18 some expected Moses to return in the Messianic Age; cf. above p. 42ff.

<sup>4</sup>E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, I, p. 17f.

<sup>5</sup>H. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums, p. 96.

Church Father Hilarius,<sup>1</sup> Tertullian<sup>2</sup> believed that it was Moses and Elijah who appeared because Christ was replacing the "Law and the Prophets" as authorities. Teeple<sup>3</sup> believes that Bacon's<sup>4</sup> understanding was more true to the facts, namely, that both Moses and Elijah were expected to return as eschatological prophets to usher in the Kingdom of God.

A subtle change, possibly having no significance, but which cannot be overlooked, is that in Matthew and Luke, Mark's order of these names in the Transfiguration story - Elijah and Moses - is reversed to "Moses and Elijah". This "editing" may indicate the desire of these authors to make explicit the pre-eminence of Moses.

The two witnesses (μάρτυρες) of Revelation 11:3 ff. are generally<sup>5</sup> believed to be Elijah and Moses, because of their abilities which echo the feats of these figures in the Old Testament. "They have power to shut the sky, that no rain may fall during the days of their prophesying, and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood, and to smite the earth with every plague, as often as they desire". (Rev. 11:6) These two witnesses are

<sup>1</sup>Hilarius, Commentary on Matthew (4th cent.), on Matt. 20:10; cf. H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>2</sup>Tertullian, Adv. Marc. 4:22 (A.D. 207); cf. Teeple, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>3</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>4</sup>B. W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark, Its Composition and Date, p. 164f.

<sup>5</sup>But Bishop Victorinus (d.304) believed that Revelation 11:3ff. pointed to the return of Jeremiah with Elijah, "Commentarius in Apocalypsim", in Victorini Episcopi Petavionensis Opera, CSEL, Vol. XLIX, p. 98.

represented as "olive trees"; on the basis of Zech. 4:14, where two olive trees are called "sons of oil", i.e. anointed ones and therefore Messiahs, it would appear that these witnesses are messiahs; if the word "witness" (μάρτυς) is to be taken in a more literal sense of martyr, as is quite probable, this would indicate that they were genuine prophets<sup>1</sup>. Thus it may be concluded that this passage represents a later stage of the tradition referring to the eschatological prophets or to the union of two rival concepts of the identity of the Messiah, namely Moses and Elijah.<sup>2</sup>

Matthew 21:46 states that the Pharisees in trying to arrest Jesus "feared the multitudes because they held him to be a prophet". In Greek, the last clause reads ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον. McNeille<sup>3</sup> and Lagrange<sup>4</sup> note that this is a Semitic construction, citing I Recogn. 1:13 and Job 41:23 as parallels. Lagrange<sup>5</sup> further suggests that Matthew chose this construction to avoid repeating the ὡς προφήτην of v.26. Bruce<sup>6</sup> agrees that εἰς is equivalent to ὡς; Allen<sup>7</sup> likewise says that ὡς

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 4, and W. O. Michel Prophet und Märtyrer; cf. also above pp. 20 and 81.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>A. H. McNeille, op. cit., p. 313.

<sup>4</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon Saint Matthieu, p. 401.

<sup>5</sup>ibid., p. 418.

<sup>6</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 223.

<sup>7</sup>W. C. Allen, St. Matthew, (ICC), p. 233f.

would be expected as in v.26, but instead of simply calling it a Hebraic construction, more precisely defines it, with Wellhausen<sup>1</sup>, as an Aramaism.<sup>2</sup> Morison says that the meaning of "they had him into a prophet", is that "they put him INTO the place of a prophet and held and had him there".<sup>3</sup>

As Montefiore<sup>4</sup> says, this prophetic aspect of Jesus is emphasized once more. In spite of their determination to repudiate his prophetic character, and to get rid of him, they could venture upon no violence so long as these enthusiastic pilgrims regarded him as a prophet sent by God.<sup>5</sup>

Origen observes that in spite of the validity of their esteeming Jesus as Prophet, they did not understand "His greatness in respect of His being the Son of God."<sup>6</sup>

Thus in this verse (Matt. 21:46), while popular opinion did not recognize Jesus as Messiah, it certainly regarded him as a Prophet, "inspired by God and having a Divine Mission".<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wellhausen, noted by W. C. Allen, idem.

<sup>2</sup>This is not mentioned by M. Black, An Aramaic Approach To The Gospels and Acts; or by F. Burney, op. cit.; or by F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of The Fourth Gospel.

<sup>3</sup>J. Morison, Commentary On The Gospel According to Matthew, p. 434.

<sup>4</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 715.

<sup>5</sup>F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 230; cf. P. A. Micklem, op. cit., p. 209, and A. Carr, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (Cambridge Greek Testament For Schools), p. 250; cf. H. Olshausen, Biblical Commentary On The Gospel, St. Matthew, Vol. III, p. 173.

<sup>6</sup>T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 736.

<sup>7</sup>A. L. Williams, op. cit., p. 327; cf. Origen in T. Aquinas op. cit., Vol. II, p. 736.



When Jesus brought a dead man back to life the people "glorified God, saying, 'a great prophet has arisen among us!' and 'God has visited his people!'" (Luke 7:16). Since for four centuries there had been no prophets,<sup>1</sup> the presence of one among them convinced the bystanders that "God has not forgotten his people" (Goodspeed)<sup>2</sup>, but has shown them "peculiar favour".<sup>3</sup>

The idea that he is a "great prophet" is bound up with the power from God which he possessed to perform miracles.<sup>4</sup> Montefiore notes that a prophet would be expected not merely to speak, but also to work miracles. "That God had visited his people would be a reasonable reflection after a stupendous miracle, but not after a noble speech".<sup>5</sup> According to Olshausen, the *μείγας* "refers to the greatness of the miracle"<sup>6</sup> rather than to the prophet. Manson<sup>7</sup> feels that Jesus is called "a great prophet" because he recalled to his contemporaries the achievements of Elijah or Elisha.

Farrar<sup>8</sup> alone sees in this verse a reference to the

<sup>1</sup>A. Plummer, St. Luke, (ICC), p. 200.

<sup>2</sup>The Bible, An American Translation, The New Testament, E. J. Goodspeed; cf. S. M. Gilmour, The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VIII, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup>A. Barnes, St. Luke, p. 60.

<sup>4</sup>Lord Lyttelton, St. Luke, p. 205.

<sup>5</sup>C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, Vol. II, p. 897

<sup>6</sup>H. Olshausen, op. cit., St. Luke, Vol. I, p. 288.

<sup>7</sup>W. Manson, op. cit., p. 77; cf. J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 104; F. Godet, A Commentary On The Gospel Of St. Luke, Vol. I, p. 342; A. B. Bruce, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 512, who notes a similarity with the miracle performed by Elisha at Shunem, II Kings 4.

<sup>8</sup>F. W. Farrar, op. cit., p. 148

expectation of the return of Elijah, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets; according to him, this hope was widespread at that time; he cites Luke 9:8-9 as proof.

Adeney comments that "no more is yet suspected by the people generally"<sup>1</sup>, than that Jesus is a *προφήτης μέγας*. Manson, too, feels that the idea that "God has visited his people" "need not imply that in the popular judgment the Messianic days have come".<sup>2</sup> Calvin also writes that the eulogium, "great prophet", "comes very far short of the dignity and glory of the promised Messiah".<sup>3</sup>

Sumner, however, sees these two statements by the people, as representing two stages in their realization of who Jesus was. He is a "great prophet", "yea and more than a prophet"<sup>4</sup>, because "God has visited his people." What Sumner seems to be saying implicitly, Lagrange makes explicit by writing that Jesus as the "great prophet" is "the one awaited at the time marked for salvation".<sup>5</sup>

While it is impossible to say that there is definitely no Messianic reference in this verse (Luke 7:16), it seems best to take it rather to mean that Jesus is a prophet of

<sup>1</sup>W. F. Adeney, op. cit., p. 148.

<sup>2</sup>W. Manson, op. cit., p. 77.

<sup>3</sup>J. Calvin, Commentary On a Harmony Of The Evangelists, Luke, Vol. I, p. 387.

<sup>4</sup>J. B. Sumner, A Practical Exposition of The Gospel of St. Luke, p. 124. He cites Heb 1:1, Isa. 7:14 and John 11:25,26.

<sup>5</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon St. Luc., p. 211.

the first rank, such as Moses, Elijah or Elisha, but not the eschatological Prophet of the Messianic period.

When Jesus was dining at the home of a Pharisee, "A woman of the city, who was a sinner,...brought an alabaster flask of ointment, and standing behind him at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. Now when the Pharisee who had invited him saw it, he said to himself, "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what sort of woman this is who is touching him, for she is a sinner" (Luke 7:37-39).

"If this man were a prophet...". The Pharisee had invited Jesus as a prophet. His apparent failure to discern the woman's character indicated the contrary.<sup>1</sup> As Lagrange says: "Scripture did not say that a prophet know everything, but [he should know] at least what was the moral value of the persons."<sup>2</sup> Bruce fairly comments that there is not thought of impurity here; Jesus is "simply ignorant like a common man."<sup>3</sup>

Ryle<sup>4</sup> quotes Burgon's comment: "The discernment of spirits was accounted the mark of a true prophet; and such knowledge was recognized as the very note of Messiah as

<sup>1</sup>S. M. Gilmour, op. cit., p. 143; cf. H. D. M. Spence, St. Luke, (Pulpit), Vol. I, p. 178; J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 110; W. F. Adeney, op. cit., p. 140; Lord Lyttelton, St. Luke, p. 207.

<sup>2</sup>M. J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 299; cf. 14 Recogn. 5:24ff; 3 Recogn. 13:20ff., and A. Barnes, St. Luke, p. 63.

<sup>3</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 516.

<sup>4</sup>J. C. Ryle, Luke, Vol. I, p. 241.

the confession of Nathanael<sup>1</sup> and the woman of Samaria<sup>2</sup> show." This leads the writer to question whether there is a reference to the Messiah in this verse. The decision hinges on the proper text. Vaticanus (B) puts in the article  $\delta$  προφήτης ; so does Codex Zachynthius Rescriptus (Ξ) The article is accepted by Weiss, bracketed by Westcott and Hort, put in the margin by Tregelles and rejected by Tischendorf.<sup>3</sup> If the article is genuine, it would refer to the prophet promised by Moses at Deut. 18:15-18,<sup>4</sup> and would thus designate the Messiah.<sup>5</sup> However, it seems best to agree with Creed<sup>6</sup> and Lagrange<sup>7</sup> that the article is an "interpolation", an "addition without authority". The observation here is general - "a prophet should be able to discern the character of those with whom he consorts."<sup>8</sup>

In Luke 13:33 Jesus says: "Nevertheless I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem."

<sup>1</sup>John 1:49.

<sup>2</sup>John 4:19, 29; cf. Isaiah 11:3,4.

<sup>3</sup>Noted by A. Plummer, St. Luke, (ICC), p. 211.

<sup>4</sup>L. Ragg, op. cit., p. 98; cf. A. Plummer, idem, who refers to John 1:25, and 7:40; J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 110, also cites John 1:21 and Acts 3:22.

<sup>5</sup>M. J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 229.

<sup>6</sup>J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 110.

<sup>7</sup>M. J. Lagrange, idem.

<sup>8</sup>J. M. Creed, idem.

Jesus intends to leave Galilee and meet death as a prophet in Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Taylor calls Jesus' words a "sardonic remark",<sup>2</sup> and Adeney speaks of their "mournful irony".<sup>3</sup> Plummer<sup>4</sup> remarks that Luke 13:33 is "ironical" because of the overwhelming precedent, that Jerusalem, at the very heart of Judaism, should be the recognized murderess of prophets, so much so that it was exceptional if a prophet was slain outside it. As Manson writes: "To Jerusalem alone belongs the unenviable privilege of bringing the messengers of God to their doom."<sup>5</sup>

The text here has simply προφήτην - any prophet. As Plummer correctly states: "To make it equivalent to τὸν προφήτην, and interpret it of Christ in particular, does violence to the Greek".<sup>6</sup>

Thus, in this verse, Jesus indirectly refers to himself as a prophet,<sup>7</sup> but in no way alludes to the fact that he is the Messiah.

On the first Easter day, the two on the Emmaus road spoke to their unrecognized Companion "Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God."

<sup>1</sup>S. M. Gilmour, op. cit., p. 249.

<sup>2</sup>V. Taylor, Behind The Third Gospel, p. 155.

<sup>3</sup>W. F. Adeney, op. cit., p. 220.

<sup>4</sup>A. Plummer, St. Luke, (ICC), p. 350f; cf. F. Godet, A Commentary On The Gospel of St. Luke, p. 129; T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, in The Mission and Message of Jesus, Book II, p. 569.

<sup>5</sup>W. Manson, op. cit., p. 169; cf. L. Ragg, op. cit., p. 196.

<sup>6</sup>A. Plummer, op. cit., p. 351.

<sup>7</sup>cf. above p. 85.

and all the people, and how our chief priests and rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death, and crucified him. But we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel." (Luke 24:19-21).

This represents a very "primitive Christology".<sup>1</sup> "The one to redeem Israel" is, of course, the Messiah, but the Cross had shattered their hope that Jesus was the Christ (v.21). To them he was still only a man,<sup>2</sup> a prophet.<sup>3</sup> Montefiore<sup>4</sup> feels that this noteworthy description best characterizes him. They had known Jesus as a prophet and they continued to believe in his prophetic mission.<sup>5</sup>

Lord Lyttelton<sup>6</sup> remarks that these two disciples were probably not from among the apostles because they seem to have known Christ only as a great prophet and not as the Son of God. On the contrary, the writer feels that they had held this high estimation of Jesus, ("the one to redeem Israel". v.21), but the Cross had led them to doubt it. Similarly Bede<sup>7</sup> says that these disciples either do not know who Jesus is (the Son of God) or else they conceal it

<sup>1</sup>S. M. Gilmour, op. cit., p. 422; he cites Acts. 2:22-23; cf. F. W. Farrar, op. cit., p. 360, who also sees a "remarkable parallel" in Acts 2:22.

<sup>2</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 1091.

<sup>3</sup>W. F. Adeney, op. cit., p. 391; C. G. Montefiore, idem.

<sup>4</sup>C. G. Montefiore, idem.

<sup>5</sup>J. M. Creed, op. cit., p. 296; cf. A. Barnes, St. Luke, p. 185.

<sup>6</sup>Lord Lyttelton, St. Luke, p. 279.

<sup>7</sup>Bede in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 242.

through fear of the Jews. Again this view does not take seriously enough the shock and disappointment which the Cross was to them.

Jesus was "a prophet mighty in deed and word, before God and all the people"(v.20). Campbell<sup>1</sup> cautions against mistaking "in deed" for an adverb, instead of properly relating it to the miracles which he performed.<sup>2</sup> The phrase "mighty in word" refers "to the wisdom and eloquence which our Lord displayed in his teaching".<sup>3</sup> Lagrange<sup>4</sup> also relates this phrase to his ability to predict. As Bruce aptly comments, concerning this view of Jesus as a "prophet", it is "a high estimate but not the highest".<sup>5</sup> Calvin is of the opinion that this is (v.20) "a brief description of a true prophet".<sup>6</sup> However, Maclaren<sup>7</sup> and Ryle<sup>8</sup> note its inadequacy as a true conception of our Lord's dignity. Plummer's<sup>9</sup> contention that the word προφήτης in this verse (Luke 24:19) is a kind of adjective, does not

<sup>1</sup>G. Campbell, St. Luke, p. 592.

<sup>2</sup>M. J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 604f., who also cites Acts 7:22 as a parallel to the words and acts here; cf. A. Maclaren, St. Luke, Vol II, p. 338.

<sup>3</sup>G. Campbell, idem.

<sup>4</sup>M. J. Lagrange, idem.

<sup>5</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 646.

<sup>6</sup>J. Calvin, Commentary On a Harmony Of The Evangelists, Luke, Vol. II, p. 357.

<sup>7</sup>A. Maclaren, idem.

<sup>8</sup>J. C. Ryle, Luke, Vol. II, p. 504.

<sup>9</sup>A. Plummer, op. cit., p. 553.

alter the meaning.

Olshausen points out that Dr. Paulus believes that verses 19 and 21 are contradictory; in v.21 all hope is lost while in v.19 they still call Jesus a prophet. Therefore he supposes that the two disciples held distinctly different views of redemption and so, "of verses 19, 20 the one disciple would have addressed the following verse to the other...But as it is not intimated by even a word, that verse 21 followed as the reply of one of the interlocutors to the other, this supposition is accordingly maintained. It is more proper to regard the expression ὁ μέλλων λυτρώσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ as referring to the Messiah, and by way of distinction to understand verse 19 relatively to the notion of the prophets concerning them."<sup>1</sup>

This verse, (Lk. 24:19), indicates that in spite of the fact that the Cross had robbed these disciples of their hope that Jesus was the Messiah, nevertheless, they still held him to be a distinguished prophet; the evidence for this was too extensive to be discounted.

The Fourth Evangelist also spoke of Jesus as a prophet. The woman of Samaria said to Jesus, "Sir, I perceive that you are a prophet." (John 4:19). It is generally agreed that she made this estimation of Jesus because of the insight

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Paulus in H. Olshausen, Biblical Commentary On The Gospels and On The Acts of The Apostles, Vol. IV, p. 286.



which he had into her life;<sup>1</sup> he seemed to be "divinely inspired with supernatural knowledge."<sup>2</sup> Thus he was able to make an "authoritative announcement of the will of God."<sup>3</sup> According to Godet, her words indicate that she has begun to doubt the "religious rightfulness of her nation."<sup>4</sup>

The question, as to whether the woman was making a confession of sin in this verse, need not detain this discussion. Some<sup>5</sup> feel that she is, but Luthardt<sup>6</sup> adds that not many agree, among them Ebruard and De Wette.

Some find the transition to the question of worship in verse 20 abrupt. Wendt explains that apparently in the source the woman's remark in v.19 was the answer which

<sup>1</sup>A. Barnes, Notes on The Four Gospels, p. 248; cf. Chrysostom in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 145f; G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 102, who says that insight is the "chief characteristic of the prophets"; W. Temple, Readings In St. John's Gospel, Part I, p. 62; R. H. Strachan, The Fourth Gospel, p. 154, who cites Jn. 2:24,25; W. W. Peyton, The Memorabilia of Jesus, p. 257; C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According To St. John, p. 197; G. Reith, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 64f; E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel (ed. F. N. Davey), p. 258, 266, who compares 9:17; J. H. Bernard, St. John, (ICC), p. 145; W. A. O'Connor, Commentary on The Gospel of St. John, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup>A. Plummer, St. John, (Cambridge Greek Testament For Schools And Colleges), p. 119, who cites I Sam. 9:9 as proof.

<sup>3</sup>B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According To St. John, Vol. I, p. 155; cf. W. Kelly, An Exposition of The Gospel of John, p. 87.

<sup>4</sup>F. Godet, Commentary On St. John's Gospel, Vol. II, p. 112.

<sup>5</sup>A. Plummer, op. cit., p. 119; J. Calvin, Commentary on The Gospel According to John, p. 154; D. Thomas, The Genius of The Fourth Gospel, p. 87; R. Besser, Christ, Light of The World, p. 192; Stier, Reden Jesu, Vol. IV, p. 149, noted by C. E. Luthardt St. John's Gospel, Vol. II, p. 64; and C. E. Luthardt, idem.

<sup>6</sup>idem.

followed immediately on Jesus' words in v.13ff. He comments as follows: "If the woman's recognition of Jesus as a prophet is based on her perception of the religious meaning and purpose of His words in vv.13 sq., the transition to the question where men ought to worship is no longer abrupt."<sup>1</sup> Hutcheson<sup>2</sup> and Trench<sup>3</sup> believe that it was because he was a prophet that she trusted him to settle this very difficult question of Jerusalem versus Gerazim.<sup>4</sup> Lagrange<sup>5</sup> adds that a Jew and a prophet would be a good person for her to ask, Perhaps Howard is right in seeing the woman's acknowledgment (v.19) and question as a device of the author "to open up a dialogue about true worship."<sup>6</sup>

Most commentators see nothing more in her words, "Sir, I perceive that you are a prophet" (v.19), than that Jesus is a "man of God".<sup>7</sup> Reynolds<sup>8</sup>, however, implies that her words speak of "the prophet like unto Moses" whom the Samaritans expected.<sup>9</sup> (Deut. 18:15-18).

<sup>1</sup>H. H. Wendt, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 126.

<sup>2</sup>G. Hutcheson, An Exposition of The Gospel of Jesus Christ According to John, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup>G. H. Trench, A Study of St. John's Gospel, p. 103.

<sup>4</sup>cf. above p. 73.

<sup>5</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Evangile Selon Saint Jean, p. 111.

<sup>6</sup>W. F. Howard, The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VIII, p. 481.

<sup>7</sup>R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 138; cf. Augustine in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 146; J. C. Ryle, Expository Thoughts On The Gospels: St. John, Vol. I, p. 220f., who cites Luke 24:19 as a parallel designation.

<sup>8</sup>H. B. Reynolds, The Gospel of St. John, (Pulpit) Vol. I, p. 167.

<sup>9</sup>cf. above p. 59ff.

Many of the Samaritans believed that Jesus was the Deuteronomic "prophet like Moses" (Deut. 18:15-18). In this conversation with the woman of Samaria, Jesus, in stressing the need for spirituality in religion, is told of the expected Messiah, "who would teach them all things". (John 4:25, cf.29). When Jesus proceeded to tell her "all things that ever she did" (John 4:17f.), she realized that he must be a prophet. Because all prophets since Moses had been, and would continue to be, false, until the Taheb appeared, the woman was led to the realization that Jesus must be the Prophet of Deut. 18:15-18. A further indication that Jesus was a true prophet was his interpretation of Scripture, independently of Moses<sup>1</sup> (John 4:21). That the woman believed Jesus to be the Deuteronomic prophet is borne out by the fact that immediately she tested him on the correctness of worshipping on Mt. Garizim, a fundamental point of doctrine upon which the Samaritans and Jews differed.

However, Jesus was not universally accepted as the Taheb-Messiah. Josephus<sup>2</sup> tells of a Samaritan who claimed to be the Taheb at the time when Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea; Pilate's handling of the situation occasioned his recall in A.D. 36. Very probably this pretender is to be identified with Dositheus of whom Origen wrote: "After the time of Jesus also Dositheus the Samaritan wished to

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. W. Temple, op. cit., Part I, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup>Josephus, Ant. XVIII.vi.1&2.

persuade the Samaritans that he was the Christ predicted by Moses [probably at Deut. 18:15-18] and he appears to have won over some to his views."<sup>1</sup>

A further indication that the Samaritan hopes had not been fulfilled in Jesus, is the position of influence to which Simon Magus had attained when Philip the Evangelist came to Samaria (Acts 8:5-10). The title given to him by his followers, "the power of God which is called Great", implies not only that Simon claimed to be the Taheb but also that he claimed to be "a Samaritan Jesus Christ."<sup>2</sup>

Teeple quotes the Recognitions of Clement (7:33) as portraying one of Simon's followers who says: "There is mention in our religion of a certain Prophet, whose coming was hoped for by all who observe that religion [Samaritan], through whom immortal, happy life is promised to those who believe in him [the Prophet]. We thought that this Simon was he."<sup>3</sup> Although this story's authenticity is doubtful, it may well reflect a genuine attitude held by at least some of Simon's followers.

Thus while a number of Samaritans saw in Jesus the long awaited Taheb, there were many of their number who remained essentially "Jewish" at this point.

<sup>1</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 24, quoting from Contra Celsum, I, 57.

<sup>2</sup>J. E. H. Thomson, op. cit., p. 194.

<sup>3</sup>H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 64.

Barrett<sup>1</sup> admits that it is possible to interpret this passage as referring to the Deuteronomic prophet, but since προφήτης is anarthous and in view of Jn. 4:25, he thinks it unlikely that the woman is here giving a Messianic interpretation to Deut. 18:15. Bernard<sup>2</sup>, Whitelaw<sup>3</sup> and Olshausen<sup>4</sup> go further and deny emphatically that προφήτης in v.19 refers to THE Prophet, namely the Messiah. It seems to the present writer that Barrett's is the proper approach. There is a remote possibility that the woman's words do contain a reference to the Messiah, but such an interpretation is doubtful.

When the Pharisees asked<sup>5</sup> the man who had been born blind what he thought about Jesus, who had given him sight, he said, "He is a prophet". (John 9:17). By this he meant to say that Jesus was "an extraordinary person, who could do extraordinary things."<sup>6</sup> McClymont feels that he was "God's

<sup>1</sup>C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 197.

<sup>2</sup>J. H. Bernard, op. cit., p. 145, who cites parallels in Luke 7:16,39; and Jn. 9:17.

<sup>3</sup>T. Whitelaw, The Gospel of St. John, p. 95.

<sup>4</sup>H. Olshausen, John, Vol.III, p. 415.

<sup>5</sup>According to W. A. O'Connor, Commentary On The Gospel of St. John, p. 175, the question in 9:17 was "most probably put by the friends of Jesus."

<sup>6</sup>J. H. Bernard, St. John, Vol. II, (ICG), p. 332; cf. F. Godet, op. cit., p. 369; A. Barnes, op. cit., p. 319; G. Reith, op. cit., Part II, p. 29; C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 298f; C. E. Luthardt, op. cit., p. 327.

representative and mouthpiece."<sup>1</sup> (cf. Aaron at Exodus 7:12)  
 The man's brief and plain declaration ("without circumlocution"<sup>3</sup>)  
 "He is a prophet", is a reminder of the words of the Samaritan  
 woman (4:19). Most commentators<sup>4</sup> are agreed that προφήτης  
 is used in the same sense in both passages.

Anderson<sup>5</sup> pinpoints the dilemma of the Pharisees.  
 If they allowed that Jesus was a prophet, he would be free  
 to break the law of the Sabbath; if he was not a prophet  
 they were forced to account for the miracle in some other  
 way.<sup>6</sup> Maimonides mentions that it was a common belief that  
 a prophet by his own ipse dixit might alter or relax Sabbath  
 Law.<sup>7</sup> This may be the background for Strachan's observation  
 that the man calls him a prophet, "because he resists legalism  
 and formalism."<sup>8</sup>

As with John 4:19, so concerning this verse, John 9:17,

<sup>1</sup>J. A. McClymont, op. cit., p. 216.

<sup>2</sup>The earliest use of προφήτης in the Old Testament;  
 noted by J. A. McClymont, idem.

<sup>3</sup>D. Thomas, op. cit., p. 269.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 228; C. K. Barrett,  
op. cit., p. 298; A. Richardson, The Gospel According To St.  
John, (Torch), p. 126; Lord Lyttelton, St. John, p. 318; M. J.  
 Lagrange, op. cit., p. 264; J. A. McClymont, op. cit., p. 216,  
 also cites John 6:14 as a parallel, but J. H. Bernard, op. cit.,  
 p. 332, denies such an association.

<sup>5</sup>R. Anderson, A Practical Exposition of The Gospel  
According To St. John, p. 410.

<sup>6</sup>W. F. Howard, op. cit., p. 616, points to the embarrass-  
 ment for the officials which the miracle caused.

<sup>7</sup>Maimonides, noted by H. B. Reynolds, op. cit., Vol. II,  
 p. 8, who in turn points to Dr. Farrar; cf. also J. A. McClymont,  
(The Century Bible) St. John, p. 216.

<sup>8</sup>R. H. Strachan, op. cit., p. 220.

the question of a Messianic reference is disputed. Bernard<sup>1</sup>, Hutcheson<sup>2</sup> and Trench<sup>3</sup> deny it completely, saying that Christ is called a prophet, not THE Prophet (i.e. the Messiah). On the other hand, Govett suggests that he means "the Prophet". He comments that "this miracle is a sign calling Moses in question, and showing the divine power of the foretold prophet who was to supersede Moses."<sup>4</sup> The "prophet who was to supersede Moses" must mean the one foretold at Deut. 18:15-18. Richardson, while acknowledging that προφήτης is used without the definite article here (Jn. 9:17), says that it suggests the Messiah. He argues as follows: "Later Judaism sternly forbade the claim to be a prophet (Zech. 13:2-5), and regarded the age of prophecy as over - until the Messiah (THE PROPHET) came. If Jesus were a prophet, he must be the Prophet. That the Pharisees are aware of the implication is clear from v.22."<sup>5</sup>

While Richardson may be right, he appears to overlook the short acquaintance of this man with Jesus; the writer believes that there was not sufficient time for the man to arrive at the conclusion that Jesus was the Messiah. Also,

---

<sup>1</sup>J. H. Bernard, op. cit., p. 332.

<sup>2</sup>G. Hutcheson, op. cit., p. 184.

<sup>3</sup>G. H. Trench, op. cit., p. 227.

<sup>4</sup>R. Govett, Exposition of The Gospel of St. John, Vol. I, p. 405.

<sup>5</sup>A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 126; cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 268, who, citing Mark 8:28 and John 6:14f, suggests that "The Prophet" is not necessarily "The Messiah".

it must be remembered that John the Baptist was called a prophet, without any hint of his being Messiah. Another point is that even Jesus' disciples continued to call him a prophet after the Crucifixion when they no longer entertained hopes that he was the Messiah (Luke 24:19). This indicates that it is not necessary to say that for the Jews of the New Testament period, a prophet would mean the Prophet i.e. The Messiah.

The inadequacy of the confession "He is a prophet" cannot be denied,<sup>1</sup> yet in all truth, it must be admitted that the man was not wrong in saying it.<sup>2</sup> It was "as much as the man could tell at that time, not having learnt more fully who He was."<sup>3</sup>

Before passing on to discuss the passages where Jesus is called THE Prophet, this discussion of the references to Jesus as a prophet may be completed by commenting on a number of places in the Gospels where the word προφήτης is hinted at in connection with Jesus, though not actually used.

According to Taylor,<sup>4</sup> Jesus' words to the Syrophenician

<sup>1</sup>W. Kelly, op. cit., p. 198; cf. J. Calvin, Commentary on The Gospel According to John, Vol. I, p. 378; Lord Lyttelton, St. John, p. 329; G. Hutcheson, op. cit., p. 184.

<sup>2</sup>Augustine in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 333.

<sup>3</sup>Lord Lyttelton, St. John, p. 329.

<sup>4</sup>V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 15.



woman: "For this saying you may go your way; the demon has left your daughter." (Mk. 7:29), indicate that Jesus had the prophet's "insight".

The cursing of the fig tree, (Mark 11:12-14) recalls the symbolic action of prophets.<sup>1</sup> This acted parable<sup>2</sup> is saying implicitly that Jesus is a prophet.

At Mark 11:28 the chief priests and the scribes and the elders raise the question of Jesus' authority. Cranfield<sup>3</sup> sees in the use of ἐξουσία a probable reference to the authority of the prophets. Back of their question is their wondering whether Jesus is a prophet or the Messiah. Bartlet also acknowledges the reference to a prophet here by writing: "The nature and source of Jesus' authority were like John's, derived...from heaven, i.e. prophetic in character."<sup>4</sup>

During his trial, Jesus is given the command: "Prophecy!" (Mk. 14:65; Matt. 26:67; Lk. 22:64). Cranfield says that in Mark this is to be understood, (in contrast to Luke), in the general

<sup>1</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p.356, who cites Jer. 13:lff. and 19:lff.; cf. above p.78f.

<sup>2</sup>B. W. Bacon, The Beginnings of The Gospel Story, p.160; C. E. B. Cranfield, idem.; cf. W.C. Allen, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 143; G. F. Maclear, The Gospel According To St. Mark, p. 147; although V. Taylor, The Gospel According To St. Mark, p.459, and B. H. Branscomb, op.cit., p. 201, dispute this view, this does not alter the idea that it is reminiscent of prophetic action; cf. F. C. Grant, op. cit., p. 828, who states these two views as alternatives: "It has sometimes been thought to be an 'acted parable'... or in the older, anti-Jewish exegesis, a symbol of the rejection of Judaism or a mystical prophecy of the fall of Jerusalem."

<sup>3</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 446; cf. R. Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 48, n.3, noted by C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and The Gospel Tradition, p. 96

<sup>4</sup>J. V. Bartlet, op. cit., p. 325.

sense of "Play the prophet now!"<sup>1</sup> Turner sees here (Mk. 14:65) an allusion to Christ's prophecy of the destruction of the Temple and rebuilding another in three days (Mk. 14:58 and parallels; cf. Mk. 15:29 and parallels). Thus he paraphrases it: "Give us more prophecies."<sup>2</sup> Hunter suggests as an alternative that it is a "grim game of Blind Man's Buff."<sup>3</sup> At any rate, it is an insult<sup>4</sup>, spoken "in derision of his reputation as a prophet"<sup>5</sup>, which reputation Bede<sup>6</sup> feels he wished to keep. Blunt argues that "Prophecy!" might mean: "We will teach you to be a prophet"<sup>7</sup>, while Major translates it simply "Guess"<sup>8</sup>. This latter meaning fits in with Gould's<sup>9</sup> comment that the subject of the prophecy was to be, (as seen from Matthew and Luke), who smote him. The covering of his face<sup>10</sup> would support this view.

---

<sup>1</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, op. cit., p. 446.

<sup>2</sup>C. H. Turner, op. cit., p. 73.

<sup>3</sup>A. M. Hunter, op. cit., p. 138.

<sup>4</sup>Bede in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 305.

<sup>5</sup>B. W. Bacon, op. cit., p. 213.

<sup>6</sup>idem.

<sup>7</sup>A. W. F. Blunt, op. cit., p. 257.

<sup>8</sup>J. R. Major, The Gospel of St. Mark, p. 100.

<sup>9</sup>E. P. Gould, St. Mark, (ICG), p. 280.

<sup>10</sup>G. E. P. Cox, The Gospel According To St. Matthew, (Torch), p. 159, relates that this was the custom with condemned criminals; cf. Esther 7:8.

The Matthean version<sup>1</sup> (Matt. 26:67) reads: "Prophecy to us, you Christ! Who is it that struck you?" Because Matthew omits the blindfolding, Filson<sup>2</sup> and Plummer<sup>3</sup> feel that "Prophecy" loses its meaning. Montefiore<sup>4</sup> agrees, noting that while the words "Who is it that struck you?" are added, the "covering" is omitted. According to him either both must be included, as in Luke, or both omitted. Allen<sup>5</sup>, observing the extraordinary omission of the "covering", argues that "Prophecy" may have a more general reference.

The fact that Matthew adds the word Χριστέ in this context is not without significance.<sup>6</sup> It is as Messiah<sup>7</sup> that Christ is told to "prophecy"; if he were the Messiah, they supposed that he would have supernatural knowledge and could declare "anything that is unknown or anything which cannot be known by natural knowledge or without revelation."<sup>8</sup> In this sense he is to "tell forth" rather than "foretell".<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Evangile Selon Saint Matthieu, p. 509, feels that the text of Matthew is the oldest.

<sup>2</sup>F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 284.

<sup>3</sup>A. Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary On The Gospel According To St. Matthew, p. 381.

<sup>4</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 765.

<sup>5</sup>W. C. Allen, St. Matthew, (ICC), p. 285.

<sup>6</sup>J. W. Jacobus writes that it is a "taunting challenge of His divinity", op. cit., p. 273.

<sup>7</sup>A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According To St. Matthew, p. 403.

<sup>8</sup>A. Barnes, St. Matthew, p. 341.

<sup>9</sup>G. E. P. Cox, op. cit., p. 159; cf. Lord Lyttelton, The Four Gospels, p. 126; and G. Campbell, The Four Gospels, p. 453; A. Barnes, idem.

Campbell<sup>1</sup> meticulously draws attention to the proper sense of "prophecy". He correctly says that since it relates to the future, it is not to be used here to make a declaration relating to the past action of "smiting"; he, therefore, argues for the meaning "Divine!" which is appropriate to either the past or future. The same thinking must lie behind the suggestion that "prophecy!" means "guess!"<sup>2</sup>

At any rate, the words are spoken in derision of Christ's claim to be a prophet, or at least of this popular estimation of him.<sup>3</sup> As Robinson observes: "Only a prophet could identify an assailant when blinded";<sup>4</sup> and A. Carr draws attention to the "coarse, popular idea of prophecy" which called for a "meaningless exhibition of miraculous power."<sup>5</sup>

The parallel in Luke 22:64, "Prophecy! Who is it that struck you?", is again a mockery of Jesus' prophetic ability.<sup>6</sup> The blindfolding is included, so that, as a prophet,

<sup>1</sup>G. Campbell, idem.; cf. Fritzsche in J. P. Lange, Theological And Homiletical Commentary On The Gospel of St. Matthew, Vol. III, p. 10, who interprets it: "Predict to us who shall smite thee."

<sup>2</sup>A. L. Williams, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 534; cf. M. Bland, Annotations On The Gospel Of St. Matthew, p. 533; Messrs. De Beausobre and Lenfant, A New Version of The Gospel According to St. Matthew, p. 385.

<sup>3</sup>Glossa (ordinaria) in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 927; cf. J. P. Lange, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 10; A. L. Williams, op. cit., p. 534; J. Morison, Commentary On The Gospel According To Matthew, p. 613; M. Bland, op. cit., p. 533.

<sup>4</sup>T. H. Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew, (Moffatt), p. 233.

<sup>5</sup>A. Carr, op. cit., p. 298.

<sup>6</sup>F. Godet, A Commentary On The Gospel of St. Luke, Vol. II, p. 316; cf. W. F. Adeney, (The Century Bible), St. Luke, p. 311; W. Manson, op. cit., p. 251f.

he is to tell them what he could not see.<sup>1</sup> Fritzsche<sup>2</sup> interpreted it in the sense of "Predict to us who shall smite thee", but in that case the covering would not be necessary; according to Luke he is blindfolded and then struck. Manson<sup>3</sup> relates this sarcastic abuse of Jesus to the forecast of Luke 13:33: "it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem".<sup>4</sup> These words aptly speak of the treatment which Jesus is about to receive.

In these verses (Mark 14:65; Matt. 26:67; Lk. 22:64), Jesus is implicitly called a prophet; any suggestion that he is the Prophet in the sense of the Messiah is in Matthew alone, but even there it is not strong enough for any definite conclusions to be drawn.

Davies sees in Matt. 10:40f.<sup>5</sup> a "doubtful instance where Jesus may class himself as a prophet."<sup>6</sup> He believes that this reference along with Matt. 21:11 and Matt. 21:46 may be editorial work on the part of the author of Matthew.

<sup>1</sup>J. P. Lange, idem.

<sup>2</sup>Fritzsche in J. P. Lange, idem; cf. above p. 130, n.1.

<sup>3</sup>W. Manson, op. cit., p. 251f.

<sup>4</sup>cf. above p. 114f.

<sup>5</sup>"He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me. He who receives a prophet because he is a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward and he who receives a righteous man because he is a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward."

<sup>6</sup>P. E. Davies, "Jesus and The Role of the Prophet", JBL, LXIV, 1945, p. 242.

At Matthew 11:3 (cf. Lk. 7:19), John The Baptist sent his disciples to ask Jesus if he were  $\delta \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ <sup>1</sup> or if they should look for another. Scholarship is divided on whether  $\delta \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  was meant as a designation of the Messiah. Some<sup>2</sup> say that it was while others<sup>3</sup> deny

<sup>1</sup>Hebrew  $\chi \text{ ז } \eta$  .

<sup>2</sup>W. C. Allen, St. Matthew, (ICC), p. 114, cites Matt. 3:11, Ps. 118:26, Dan. 7:13; A. L. Williams, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 723, cites Matt. 21:9 and says Ps. 118:26 is "probably" the basis for Matt. 11:3; T. H. Robinson, The Gospel of Matthew, (Moffatt), p. 100; J. Morison, Commentary On The Gospel According to St. Matthew, p. 189; J. P. Lange, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 408, cites Ps. 40:8 to show the appropriateness of this designation for the Messiah; also John 1:27; M. Bland, op. cit., p. 268, cites Gen. 49:10, Ps. 117:26 (Hebrew numbering), Isa. 35:4, 62:11, Zech. 9:9, Mark 11:10, Heb. 6:5, Hab. 2:3, Dan. 7:13 and Matt. 24:30, 26:64, Heb. 10:37; Bland adds that  $\delta \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is used for  $\delta \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ . Messrs. De Beausobre and Lenfant, op. cit., p. 303, cite Ps. 118:26, Isa. 62:11, Zech. 9:9, Mk. 11:10, and Heb. 6:5. They add that  $\delta \epsilon\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is a "compendious way of speaking." A Barnes, St. Matthew, p. 148, cites Jn. 6:14, Deut. 18:18,19; Lord Lyttelton, op. cit., St. Matthew, p. 43f.; A. Richardson, The Gospel According To St. John (Torch), p. 142; G. Campbell, op. cit., Matthew, p. 404, cites Ps. 118:26; H. Olshausen, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 52 cites Ps. 118 and Heb. 10:37; A. Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary On The Gospel According To St. Matthew, p. 159, cites Mk. 11:9, Lk. 13:35, 19:38, Heb. 10:37, Ps. 118:26, Dan. 7:13; cf. P. A. Micklem, op. cit., p. 113, who simply cites Matt. 3:11, 21:9b, John 6:14, Hab. 2:3 and Heb. 10:37 without comment.

<sup>3</sup>F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, Vol. V, p. 373; F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 136; M. J. Lagrange, Evangelie Selon Saint Matthieu, p. 219, who compares Lk. 7:19, and says that the passages cited by Klostermann, (Erich Handbuck Zum Neuen Testament, II, Matthieu, p. 149-357), Ps. 39:8, 118:26, Dan. 7:13, do not prove that it was a name known for the Messiah; cf. M. W. Jacobus, op. cit., p. 122, who writes that Matt. 11:3 refers directly to Mal. 3:1, which speaks of Elijah's coming again; similarly A. Schweitzer, The Quest of The Historical Jesus, p. 372ff.; according to McNeille (op. cit., p. 34f.), this link between John, (Matt. 11:3) and Elijah, (Mal. 3:1), is only a possibility.

that there is any such evidence. McNeile<sup>1</sup>, however, adds that while *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* was not a recognized title of the Messiah, it may be so interpreted here. Johnson cautiously observes that *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* may be a "technical term for the expected redeemer."<sup>2</sup> Bruce<sup>3</sup> cites Lutteroth who makes *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* refer to the Deuteronomic prophet (Deut. 18:15-18) whom Moses had promised. According to popular Jewish belief the Christ and this Prophet were different persons. Thus he interprets John's question as follows: "Art Thou Jesus, whom I know to be the Christ, also the Coming Prophet or must we expect another to fill that rôle?"<sup>4</sup> The same approach is taken by Cullmann who conjectures that *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* "was a terminus technicus to designate the eschatological Prophet."<sup>5</sup>

A most unusual exegesis of this passage, (Matt. 11:3), is suggested by Jerome; he takes John's question to mean: "Direct me since I am about to go down into the lower parts of the earth, whether I shall announce thee to the spirits beneath also; or whether Thou, as the Son of God, may not taste death, but will send another to this sacrament?"<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., pp. 151, 34f.

<sup>2</sup>S. E. Johnson, op. cit., p. 379.

<sup>3</sup>A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 170.

<sup>4</sup>Lutteroth, in A. B. Bruce, idem.

<sup>5</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 36; cf. ibid., p. 26.

<sup>6</sup>Jerome, in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 405.

Chrysostom<sup>1</sup> challenges this argument because the idea of preaching to Him below is ridiculous. Also John, if he had meant what Jerome indicates, would have asked "Art Thou he that is coming to the world beneath?", and not simply "Art Thou he that is to come?".

What can be made of this verse? (Matt. 11:3; cf. Luke 7:19). The writer believes that in ὁ ἐρχόμενος there is a reference to the Messiah, and also a reference to The Prophet, to the extent that ὁ ἐρχόμενος was used to refer to the promised Prophet (Deut. 18:15-18); and also to the extent that this Prophet was identified with the Messiah. It is impossible to determine how extensive these identifications were.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you!" (Matt. 23:27). Such were Jesus' words over the beloved city.<sup>2</sup> The suggestion that Jesus is here including himself in the reference to "prophets" is not without merit. Cullmann comments that "suffering is a characteristic of the destiny and indeed of the eschatological function of the prophets in general."<sup>3</sup>

At Luke 10:21, Jesus "rejoiced in the Holy Spirit". Therefore Taylor concludes that he "shared the prophet's ecstasy"<sup>4</sup>, and Barrett<sup>5</sup> notes the prophetic nature of his speech.

<sup>1</sup>Chrysostom, in T. Aquinas, idem.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Luke 13:33.

<sup>3</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 31f; cf. ibid., p. 22.

<sup>4</sup>V. Taylor, The Names of Jesus, p. 15; cf. above p. 80.

<sup>5</sup>C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and The Gospel Tradition, pp. 25, 101f., He also cites the Matthean parallel (Matt. 11:25) where there is no mention of the Holy Spirit.



When Nicodemus stated that Jesus should be given a hearing, the authorities and Pharisees replied: "Search and you will see that no prophet is to rise from Galilee." (John 7:52). Here there is the indirect suggestion that Jesus is a prophet. A textual difficulty of this verse relates to whether the reference to a prophet is past<sup>1</sup>, or present<sup>2</sup>, or future<sup>3</sup>. The perfect is supported by T.R., E., G., M and numerous cursives; the present is preferred by Tregelles, Alford, Tisch. (8th), Westcott and R.T. on the authority of B.D.K.S, and 30 cursives, the Vulgate and numerous versions<sup>4</sup>. Westcott<sup>5</sup> comments that the reference appears to be not so much to the past as to the future. Godet seems to express the proper meaning in his paraphrase: "In the person of Jesus, there has not now as the people suppose really arisen a prophet in Galilee."<sup>6</sup>

If the Pharisees meant that "no prophet had arisen in Galilee" they were certainly displaying their ignorance, for which there is "no parallel in Jewish literature."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>No prophet has arisen.

<sup>2</sup>No prophet has now arisen.

<sup>3</sup>No prophet will arise.

<sup>4</sup>H. B. Reynolds, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 322.

<sup>5</sup>B. F. Westcott, op. cit., p. 282; cf. A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 114.

<sup>6</sup>F. Godet, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 304.

<sup>7</sup>C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 275; cf. D. Thomas, op. cit., p. 207.

According to II Kings 14:25, Jonah was from Galilee.<sup>1</sup>

The same may possibly be true concerning Hosea<sup>2</sup>, Elijah<sup>3</sup>, Nahum<sup>4</sup>, and Amos<sup>5</sup>. There was a Rabbinical tradition which said: "Thou hast no single tribe in Israel from which a prophet has not come forth." (Sukkah 27b); "Thou hast no town in the land of Israel in which there has not been a prophet." (Seder Olam R. 21)<sup>6</sup>.

Thomas<sup>7</sup> and Trench<sup>8</sup> feel that misunderstanding has arisen over the preposition ἐκ, which they take to mean "being born there", true natives of the place; in this

<sup>1</sup>This is noted by W. Temple, op. cit., p. 131; R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, A Commentary, p. 186; R. Govett, op. cit., p. 333; W. Kelly, op. cit., p. 167; H. Olshausen, John, p. 491; G. Reith, op. cit., p. 134; D. Thomas, op. cit., p. 207; A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 114; A. Tholuck, Commentary on The Gospel of St. John, p. 212; A. E. Brooke, John, (Peake), p. 753; and B. F. Westcott, noted by G. H. Trench, op. cit., p. 195.

<sup>2</sup>B. F. Westcott, in G. H. Trench, idem, and A. Tholuck, op. cit., p. 212; W. Temple, op. cit., p. 131; but R. Govett, op. cit., p. 333 says that other prophets from Galilee which are mentioned are "doubtful".

<sup>3</sup>A. Tholuck, op. cit., p. 212; H. Olshausen, op. cit., p. 491; D. Thomas, op. cit., p. 207, and B. F. Westcott, in G. H. Trench, idem.

<sup>4</sup>A. Tholuck, idem; W. Kelly, op. cit., p. 167; A. E. Brooke, op. cit., p. 753, but H. Olshausen, idem, n.l. considers him "uncertain".

<sup>5</sup>B. F. Westcott in G. H. Trench, idem.

<sup>6</sup>C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 275, who notes that it is quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, II, 519 as spoken by R. Eliezer (c.A.D. 90). This rabbinical tradition is mentioned also by R. H. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 186.

<sup>7</sup>D. Thomas, op. cit., p. 207.

<sup>8</sup>G. H. Trench, op. cit., p. 195.

sense, Jonah alone qualifies. Richardson<sup>1</sup> seems to overlook<sup>2</sup> this meaning by suggesting this paraphrase: "Search Galilee and you will find no prophetic figures." As an alternative he suggests that they may be referring to The Prophet (Messiah), who will not arise in Galilee since promised in Bethlehem. Richardson is not alone in seeing in this verse (Jn. 7:52) a Messianic reference. Baumlein<sup>3</sup> understands it in this way, and Grieve<sup>4</sup> suggests that perhaps with the Sahidic it should read: "The Prophet arises not out of Galilee." Macgregor does not commit himself, but his comment on this verse that Galilee was "not the district from which the Messiah was to be expected"<sup>5</sup>, indicates that he may be following the Sahidic reading. Alcuin<sup>6</sup> sees the words of the Pharisees as a denial not only that he was the Messiah but also even that he was a prophet.

As he has suggested, the writer feels that the correct interpretation of this verse, (Jn. 7:52), is a denial that Jesus is a prophet. The slight textual attestation calls into question the Messianic application; the words "no prophet has arisen in Galilee" would indeed be very strange on Jewish, especially Pharisaic, lips. The uniqueness of it

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 114.  
<sup>2</sup>cf. also Augustine, T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 279.  
<sup>3</sup>Baumlein in R. B. Reynolds, op. cit., p. 322.  
<sup>4</sup>A. J. Grieve in John (Peake), p. 753.  
<sup>5</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 210.  
<sup>6</sup>Alcuin, in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI., p. 279.

here, (it occurs nowhere else in Jewish writings), would argue against this rendering.

To conclude this discussion of references in the Gospels where the word προφήτης is suggested concerning Jesus, mention must be made of four passages in John where the designation ὁ ἐρχόμενος<sup>1</sup> is used by Jesus of Himself or by others of Him. At John 9:39 Jesus said: "For judgment I came into this world...". At John 11:27 Martha says that she believes that Jesus is "he who is coming"<sup>2</sup> into the world." In his intimate talks with his disciples on the night before his Crucifixion, Jesus said to them: "I came"<sup>2</sup> from the Father and have come"<sup>2</sup> into the world;" (John 16:28). At John 18:37 Jesus testified: "You say that I am a king. For this I was born, and for this I have come"<sup>2</sup> into the world, to bear witness to the truth." On this last passage, Godet<sup>3</sup> cites Reuss, who gives it an impossible meaning, namely, "It is thou who sayest that I am a king; as for me, I have come into the world that ...". This would signify: "I am not a king but a simple prophet." Hengstenberg<sup>4</sup> entirely separates from this declaration the words following, which he applies exclusively to the prophetic

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. above, p. 132f; cf. John 6:14 where ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used with ὁ προφήτης. According to A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 142, the ὁ ἐρχόμενος of this verse is a "technical term in contemporary Jewish usage for the Messiah." (e.g. Matt. 11:3, Lk. 7:18, cf. Jn. 4:25, 6:14f.); B. F. Westcott, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 92, also cites Matt. 23:39, Mark 11:9, Luke 13:35, 19:38; cf. J. H. Bernard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>3</sup>F. Godet, op. cit., Vol. III., p. 252.

<sup>4</sup>E. W. Hengstenberg in F. Godet, Commentary On St. John's Gospel, Vol. III, p. 252.

office of Jesus Christ. But it is quite evident that Jesus wishes to explain by them in what sense He is King.

According to Bernard,<sup>1</sup> ὁ ἐρχόμενος was the popular description for the coming Prophet. If this is so, these Johannine passages, (John 9:39, John 11:37, John 16:28, John 18:37), may contain veiled references to Jesus as the Messiah. This conclusion, however, hinges on the extent to which THE Prophet was identified with the Messiah. Therefore, it is necessary to proceed with a discussion of the passages where Jesus is referred to as ὁ προφήτης, in order to ascertain their meaning and Messianic importance.

#### "THE" PROPHET

The only undisputed Synoptic reference where Jesus is called THE Prophet comes at Matt. 21:11. When Jesus made his entry into Jerusalem riding upon a donkey, the people of the city asked, "Who is this?". They received the reply from the crowds, "This is the prophet<sup>2</sup> Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee" (Matt. 21:11). Nicholson<sup>3</sup> and Morison<sup>4</sup> discuss the textual problem in connection with the word order of this reply which some manuscripts give as "This is Jesus, the prophet from Nazareth of Galilee." Morison feels that the reading "...the prophet Jesus..." is probably original,

<sup>1</sup>J. H. Bernard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>3</sup>E. B. Nicholson, op. cit., p. 177.

<sup>4</sup>J. Morison, op. cit., p. 408.

since it is supported by the Sinaitic, Vatican and Cambridge manuscripts, as well as the Sahidic, Coptic, and Armenian versions, and Origen and Eusebius. Furthermore, it is approved by Lachman, Tisch., Treg. and Alford. Nicholson agrees that this reading is supported by S V D, the South and North Egyptian, Origen once<sup>1</sup> and Eusebius; however, he goes further than Morison by pointing out that the variant "...Jesus, the prophet..." is found in C, the three Latin versions, Cureton and the Peshitta Syriac, Origen twice<sup>1</sup> and Chrysostom. Personally, the writer feels that the meaning is the same whichever order of the words is adopted.

In calling Jesus  $\delta \pi \rho \phi \eta \tau \eta \varsigma$  did the people wish to suggest any more than that Jesus was simply a prophet? Some<sup>2</sup> think not. Others see here a reference to the promised Prophet of Deut. 18:15-18. Jerome<sup>3</sup>, Filson<sup>4</sup>, and Morison<sup>5</sup> point to this passage as the background of this verse (Matt. 21:11ff.).

Some commentators carry this view a step further and

<sup>1</sup>Not mentioned by J. Morison, idem.

<sup>2</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 297, "the well-known Prophet"; he refers to Matt. 13:57 and 21:46 to substantiate his adjective "well-known"; Jerome, in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 711, who says that they "begin with the lesser designation that they may come to the higher"; M. W. Jacobus, op. cit., p. 204, "a common appellation"; H. Goodwin, A Commentary On The Gospel Of St. Matthew, p. 389; he feels that the crowd called Jesus the prophet rather than the Messiah to avoid an uproar; C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 707; S. E. Johnson, op. cit., p. 503, who feels Jesus' action, in riding into the city and in cleansing the Temple, suggests the role of "prophet"; P. A. Micklem, op. cit., p. 202; A. B. Bruce, op. cit., p. 262, who calls it a "circumstantial answer"; cf. O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 35, who sees "a prophet" as a possibility, but prefers the interpretation "The prophet of the end time".

<sup>3</sup>Jerome, in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 711.

<sup>4</sup>F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 221.

<sup>5</sup>J. Morison, op. cit., p. 408, who cites Jn. 1:21, 6:14; Acts 3:22, 7:37.

say that ὁ προφήτης is a reference to the Messiah. Olshausen<sup>1</sup> and Filson<sup>2</sup> do so explicitly and Grieve<sup>3</sup> says that the appellation is "no contradiction to Matt. 21:9 'the Son of David'". The Messianic reference is denied by Montefiore<sup>4</sup>, Plummer<sup>5</sup>, and Goodwin<sup>6</sup>; also Lange<sup>7</sup>, noting the ambiguous nature of the attestation, "the Prophet", suggests that it may not refer to the Messiah. Williams<sup>8</sup> simply states the alternatives without concluding which one he feels is the correct one. For him, Jesus is "the Prophet" in the sense of being the one foretold<sup>9</sup>, or as being inspired and commissioned by God, as were all true prophets.

Similarly, Cullmann<sup>10</sup> suggests that here Jesus could be simply a prophet, but more probably THE Prophet by which he means the Messiah. Lagrange<sup>11</sup> sees in this account of

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Olshausen, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 147; cf. A. L. Williams, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 315, who cites John 1:21, 6:14; however he also cites John 9:17, including the sense "a prophet" as a possible interpretation.

<sup>2</sup>F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 220f.

<sup>3</sup>A. J. Grieve, St. Matthew (Peake), p. 718.

<sup>4</sup>C. G. Montefiore, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 707; he cites Loisy who thinks verses 10, 11 are probably the creation of the Evangelist; cf. B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, p. 312.

<sup>5</sup>A. Plummer, op. cit., p. 287.

<sup>6</sup>H. Goodwin, op. cit., p. 389.

<sup>7</sup>J. P. Lange, Theological and Homiletical Commentary On The Gospel Of St. Matthew, p. 269f., who comments on Meyer's interpretation "the well-known prophet".

<sup>8</sup>A. L. Williams, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 315.

<sup>9</sup>He does not cite Deut. 18:15-18 but only John 1:21, 6:14.

<sup>10</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 35.

<sup>11</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon Saint Matthieu, p. 401.

Jesus' entry into Jerusalem two groups: the one<sup>1</sup> seeking to acclaim him Messiah ("Hosanna to the Son of David!" Matt. 21:9); and the other<sup>2</sup> simply calling him a "prophet". While this is an ingenious suggestion, it is far too conjectural to be conclusive.

Filson seems to have the correct interpretation of Jesus' action and his being called "the Prophet". "The event was an acted Messianic confession, intended to show to the discerning that the Suffering Servant figure defined the kind of Messiah he was."<sup>3</sup> Pointing to Deut. 18:15-18, Filson adds: "This role of the Messianic prophet was considered so important that even John the Baptist dared not claim to fulfil it. (John 1:21) This role of the Messianic prophet of the last days was obviously not a minor one to the crowds or the gospel writer; here at the climax of the entry scene, it calls attention away from political Messiahship to the prophetic Kingdom message of Jesus."<sup>4</sup>

Thus it is not completely true to say that Jesus is not called the Prophet in the Synoptics.<sup>5</sup> Cullmann<sup>6</sup> may be

<sup>1</sup>Those from Galilee.

<sup>2</sup>Those from Jericho.

<sup>3</sup>F. V. Filson, op. cit., p. 220.

<sup>4</sup>ibid., p. 221f.

<sup>5</sup>This view is set forth by W. F. Howard, op. cit., p. 481 and J. H. Bernard, op. cit., p. 37.

<sup>6</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 35.



right in suggesting that it is repeated only as the opinion of others and not used by the author to express his own faith in Jesus. This fact argues in favour of its authenticity.

Now it is necessary to proceed to the Johannine passages where  $\delta\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  is used Messianically and applied to Jesus.

At John 1:21, the priests and Levites from Jerusalem ask John the Baptist: "Are you the prophet? [ $\delta\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ ]" . Almost unanimously the commentators<sup>1</sup> see here a reference to the prophet promised at Deut. 18:15-18. There are, however, some notable exceptions. Augustine<sup>2</sup>, Gregory<sup>3</sup>, and Luther<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>J. H. Bernard, op. cit., p. 37; G. H. Trench, op. cit., p. 23; R. H. Strachan, The Fourth Gospel, p. 112; A. Plummer, St. John (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges), p. 28; M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon Saint Jean, p. 36; Bleek (loc. cit. p. 423ff.) in H. Olshausen, op. cit., John, p. 359, n.1; J. C. Ryle, St. John, Vol. I, p. 51, following Cyril and Chrysostom prefers "the Prophet" but notes that Augustine and Gregory interpret it as "a prophet"; Origen, in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 49; G. Campbell, St. John, p. 603; A. Barnes, op. cit., p. 211; G. Hutcheson, op. cit., p. 13; M. F. Sadler, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 27; H. C. Adams, The Greek Text of The Gospels, Part IV, St. John, p. 3; A. E. Brooke, op. cit., p. 747; F. H. Dunwell, A Commentary On The Gospel According to St. John, p. 23, who suggests as an alternative "some distinguished prophet who would immediately precede the coming of the Messiah"; R. Govett, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 30, who says it refers to the Christ; E. W. Hengstenberg, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 65, who points out that this is the only passage in the Old Testament in which a future messenger of God is announced as a "Prophet"; A. Tholuck, op. cit., p. 82; D. Thomas, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 30, sees it as a strong possibility; H. E. Wendt, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 14, by implication; A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 47; C. J. Wright, Book III, Jesus: The Revelation Of God in The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 717; E. C. Hoskyns, (ed. F. N. Davey), op. cit., Vol. I, p. 171; G. Reith, op. cit., I, p. 17; B. F. Westcott, op. cit., p. 34; H. B. Reynolds, op. cit., p. 27, states it as a doubtful possibility; J. A. McClymont, op. cit., p. 123f; G. E. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 24; W. F. Howard, op. cit., p. 481; T. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 29, who cites Chrysostom, Bengel, Meyer, Godet and Westcott in support of his view.

<sup>2</sup>Augustine, in J.C. Ryle, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 51.

<sup>3</sup>Gregory, in J.C. Ryle, idem.

<sup>4</sup>Luther, in E. W. Hengstenberg, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 65, who says that Luther has "essentially altered the sense".

interpreted it as "a prophet"; Calvin<sup>1</sup> criticizes Erasmus for inaccurately limiting the designation προφήτης in this context to Christ. According to Calvin<sup>1</sup> the article ὁ προφήτης carries no emphasis in this passage. Fascher<sup>2</sup> agrees that for John "prophet" and "the prophet" signify the same thing. Reynolds<sup>3</sup> says it is "doubtful", and O'Connor<sup>4</sup> denies explicitly that the allusion here is to Deuteronomy 18, which, he adds, referred to Christ. Many others do not doubt the Deuteronomic allusion, but question whether ὁ προφήτης here, (John 1:21), means the Messiah.

At this point, some distinguish between the Jewish and Christian positions. The Jews did not identify the Prophet and the Messiah<sup>5</sup>; according to Dods<sup>6</sup>, Macgregor<sup>7</sup>, and

<sup>1</sup>J. Calvin, Commentary On The Gospel According To John, Vol. I, p. 57; cf. J. C. Ryle, who mentions with disapproval the marginal reading "a prophet"; J. B. Sumner, A Practical Exposition Of The Gospel According To St. John, p. 51, and F. H. Dunwell, op. cit., p. 23, simply state the alternatives, "a prophet" or "the prophet", without indicating which is more appropriate.

<sup>2</sup>E. Fascher, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, p. 179 cf. R. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 61.

<sup>3</sup>H. B. Reynolds, op. cit., p. 27.

<sup>4</sup>W. A. O'Connor, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>5</sup>J. H. Bernard, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 37; G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 24, although he feels they may be identified at Jn. 6:14; J. C. Ryle, St. John, Vol. I, p. 51; Origen, In T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 49; J. B. Lightfoot, "Internal Evidence For the Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel", The Expositor, Fourth Series, Vol. I, 1890, p. 85; M. F. Sadler, op. cit., p. 27, says that "the Jews did not universally understand this prophecy of the Messiah"; M. Dods, op. cit., p. 693, who cites also 7:40; and by implication, C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of The Fourth Gospel, p. 239.

<sup>6</sup>M. Dods, op. cit., p. 693.

<sup>7</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 24.

Richardson<sup>1</sup> the Christians were responsible for this identification between  $\delta \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  and the Messiah.

Others are less explicit as to who makes the distinction. Howard<sup>2</sup>, R. H. Lightfoot<sup>3</sup>, Plummer<sup>4</sup>, Godet<sup>5</sup>, Hengstenberg<sup>6</sup>, Luthardt<sup>7</sup>, citing Hoffmann, and Whitelaw<sup>8</sup>, citing Grotius, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Hengstenberg, and Lange simply say that the distinction is made.

Similarly, some<sup>9</sup> who argue that  $\delta \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  was identified with the Messiah do not state whether this is done by Jews or by Christians.

<sup>1</sup>A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 47, who cites Acts 3:22; cf. M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon Saint Jean, p. 36, who remarks that all the ancients, except Origen and Jerome, saw in Deut. 18:15 only the Christ.

<sup>2</sup>W. F. Howard, op. cit., p. 481.

<sup>3</sup>R. H. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 102.

<sup>4</sup>A. Plummer, St. John, (Cambridge Greek Testament), p. 28.

<sup>5</sup>F. Godet, Commentary on St. John's Gospel Vol. I, p. 411f. He cites Justin's Dialogue with Trypho for the view that the Messiah was to remain hidden till pointed out and consecrated by this prophet.

<sup>6</sup>E. W. Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 65f. He cites Jn. 1:46, 6:14, 4:25, Acts 3:22 and 7:37 to prove that in the time of Christ this passage was Messianic. According to him this text has nothing to with Lk. 9:19 and Matt. 16:14.

<sup>7</sup>C. E. Luthardt, op. cit., p. 303.

<sup>8</sup>T. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 29.

<sup>9</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Évangile Selon Saint Jean, p. 36; R. Govett, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 30; Cremer, Biblical Lexicon, pp. 568, 569, noted by T. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 29.

Some notice that this reference to Deut. 18:15-18 is here applied to a definite individual<sup>1</sup> rather than being a general reference to the whole order of prophets.<sup>2</sup> Some commentators<sup>3</sup> argue that there is a reference here to the return of one of the great prophets.<sup>4</sup>

Linked up with this is the suggestion that he is to be the forerunner of the Messiah.<sup>5</sup> A few simply state that "the prophet" may refer to "a prophet" or "a Messianic forerunner" or "the Prophet", and leave it to the reader to

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Reith, op. cit., Part I, p. 17; cf. M. J. Lagrange, Evangile Selon Saint Jean, p. 36, who says it may be taken as referring only to Christ, but, with Hummelauer, says that it may also refer to "omnes prophetas veteris Testamenti non excludo Christo."

<sup>2</sup>According to R. Baltmann, op. cit., p. 61, n.5, it was so understood by the Rabbis. He also denies that the expectation of the prophet on the basis of Deut. 18:15-18 is Jewish.

<sup>3</sup>G. Campbell, St. John, p. 604; C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 144, who gives as an alternative a "new prophet"; H. B. Reynolds, op. cit., p. 27, mentions it but considers it "doubtful"; R. Anderson, op. cit., p. 48, suggests it is "Jeremiah or some other of the ancient prophets"; Calvin, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 57, denies that this verse refers to one of the ancient prophets; F. A. Paley, The Gospel of St. John, p. 5, says that "the Prophet" is Isaiah; cf. Jn. 1:23; according to Lightfoot in J. C. Ryle, St. John, Vol. I, p. 51, there was a common expectation among the Jews that the prophets were to rise again at the coming of the Messiah.

<sup>4</sup>cf. Luke 9:19, Mark 8:28 and Matt 16:14.

<sup>5</sup>J. H. Bernard, op. cit., p. 37, says that the Jews expected Elijah, and also, on the basis of II Esd. 2:17, Isaiah and Jeremiah to return before the Messiah's coming; R. Besser, op. cit., p. 47, who says it may be a "mighty prophetic Moses" or "Jeremiah"; A. Tholuck, op. cit., p. 82, who says it was "some special distinguished prophet" or "Jeremiah" (Matt. 16:14; II Macc. 15:13ff.); W. A. O'Connor, op. cit., p. 12, mentions particularly "Elijah"; A. E. Brooke, op. cit., p. 747, points to Mal. 4:5 and Deut. 18:15 as pointing to the Messiah's precursors; A. Barnes, op. cit., p. 211, says that Elijah and Jeremiah were expected; R. Baltmann, op. cit., p. 61, n.5, denies that Jeremiah is to be forerunner; so does Bleek in H. Olshausen, op. cit., p. 359, n.1; Olshausen himself sees a reference to Elias, who is to precede the Messiah, or Jeremiah; F. H. Dunwell, op. cit., p. 23.

draw his conclusions from these alternatives.<sup>1</sup> Calvin denies that there is any suggestion in John 1:21 of the return of one of the ancient prophets<sup>2</sup>; he makes the question relate to the office<sup>3</sup> of prophet, asking John if God had appointed him to be a prophet. The writer agrees with Ryle<sup>4</sup> that the Greek article is too strong to be rendered "a"; ὁ προφήτης is a reference to the eschatological prophet of the end-time, expected on the current interpretation of Deut. 18:15-18, who was not yet identified in Jewish thinking with the Messiah.<sup>5</sup>

After Jesus' feeding of the five thousand, the people exclaimed: "This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world!" (John 6:14). Again most commentators<sup>6</sup> point to Deut. 18:15-18 as the basis for this comment. Reynolds,<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Sumner, op. cit., p. 51; F. H. Dunwell, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>2</sup>J. Calvin, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup>cf. R. H. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 102.

<sup>4</sup>J. C. Ryle, Expository Thoughts on St. John Vol. I, p. 51.

<sup>5</sup>cf. below, p. 153.

<sup>6</sup>M. J. Lagrange, Evangile Selon Saint Jean, p. 165; J. C. Ryle, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 336; G. Hutcheson, op. cit., p. 92; M. Dods, op. cit., p. 732; E. W. Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 315; W. A. O'Connor, op. cit., p. 103; C. E. Luthardt, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 150; W. Temple, op. cit., p. 75; A. Tholuck, op. cit., p. 171; R. Govett, op. cit., p. 242; G. H. Trench, op. cit., p. 152; J. H. Bernard, op. cit., p. 183; J. A. McClymont, op. cit., p. 177; F. Godet, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 211; B. F. Westcott, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 216; A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 100; R. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 158, n.2, who does not think that "the prophet" refers to the second coming of Moses; cf. J. Jeremias, Golgotha, p. 83; Richardson adds that what is implicit in Mark, is made explicit in John; i.e. Jesus is the prophet of Deut. 18.

<sup>7</sup>H. B. Reynolds, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 252.

Whitelaw<sup>1</sup>, and Barrett<sup>2</sup> more cautiously suggest that  
 ὁ προφήτης might probably be the one promised  
 at Deut. 18:15-18.

Again, as with the previous passage (John 1:21), the  
 Messianic reference of this verse (John 6:14) is very strong.  
 In contrast to John 1:21,<sup>3</sup> however, this passage seems to  
 identify the Prophet and the Messiah.<sup>4</sup> His power to perform  
 the miracle,<sup>5</sup> plus the benevolence manifested<sup>6</sup>, are taken

<sup>1</sup>T. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 44f., who compares the experience  
 of Nicodemus, John 3:3.

<sup>2</sup>C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 231.

<sup>3</sup>cf. above pp. 143ff.; cf. also John 7:40 and below pp. 151ff.

<sup>4</sup>This is maintained by F. Godet, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 211;  
 G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 131; M Dods, op. cit., p. 749;  
 W. A. O'Connor, op. cit., p. 103; D. Thomas, op. cit., Vol. I,  
 p. 143; R. H. Strachan, op. cit., p. 180f; A. Barnes, op. cit.,  
 p. 276; H. Olshausen, John, Vol. III, p. 446f., but he adds  
 that it was as political Messiah; according to him ὁ προφήτης  
 here stands κατ' ἐξοχήν for the Messiah.

<sup>5</sup>J. Calvin, op. cit., p. 233; J. B. Sumner, op. cit., p. 167;  
 H. H. Wendt, op. cit., p. 76, who adds that it is strange that  
 after the miracle and proclamation of Jesus as "the prophet..."  
 and their desire to make King, they now ask for a "sign"; J. A.  
 McClymont, op. cit., p. 177, who compares Moses' feeding of the  
 Israelites in the wilderness; J. H. Bernard, op. cit., p. 183;  
 A. Plummer, St. John, (Cambridge Greek Testament), p. 150, who  
 also refers to the manna and Moses; T. Keim, Jesus of Nazara,  
 Vol. IV, pp. 197ff., gives details of the Jewish expectation  
 that a miraculous feeding, like the manna, would be performed  
 by the second Deliverer; cf. M. Black, "Servant of the Lord and  
 Son of Man", SJT, VI, 1953, p. 3; E. W. Hengstenberg, op. cit.,  
 Vol. I, p. 315; R. H. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 165, says that it  
 "may mean" the Messiah, comparing v.15, in contrast to John  
 1:21, 7:40; according to C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 231, Deut.  
 18:15ff. was only Messianic for Samaritans and Christians; he  
 cites I Corin. 10:3,16 as a parallel for the "miraculous feeding";  
 according to C. J. Wright, op. cit., p. 766, John inserted the  
 details about the feeding, on the basis of Elisha's feeding of  
 the hundred men (II Kings, 4:42), in his desire to declare that  
 a prophet greater than Elisha was here.

<sup>6</sup>Added by A. Barnes, op. cit., p. 276, in addition to the  
 ability to perform the miracle.

as proof of his Messiahship. Furthermore, the action which the people are prepared to take, namely, to make Jesus King, indicate that they held him to be the Messiah.<sup>1</sup>

Their designation of Jesus ὁ προφῆτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος<sup>2</sup> εἰς τὸν κόσμον further indicates that they identify him with the Messiah<sup>3</sup>. Even Dodd<sup>4</sup>, who says that this phrase is not a Messianic title, admits that here (John 6:14) it is quasi-Messianic. However, Luthardt<sup>5</sup> says that it is uncertain how the prophet of Deut. 18:15 was related to the Messianic conception of the nation. Lightfoot agrees that the "connexion is not obviously explained by the Messianic conception of the age."<sup>6</sup> Part of the explanation may be that their conception of the Messiah is "too gross

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Dods, op. cit., p. 749; cf. W. Kelly, op. cit., p. 128; E. C. Hoskyns, (ed. F. N. Davey) op. cit., Vol. I, p. 326; R. Anderson, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 249f.; M. F. Sadler, op. cit., p. 150, points out that according to all the Jewish sacred books, "the Prophet" was to be more than a prophet; he was to be a leader like Moses and a King like David; H. H. Wendt, op. cit., p. 76.

<sup>2</sup>cf. above, p. 132ff., and p. 138f.

<sup>3</sup>R. Anderson, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 250; F. Godet, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 211; G. H. Trench, op. cit., p. 152; T. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 45; M. Dods, op. cit., p. 732; G. Reith, op. cit., Part I, p. 97, says that the phrase "that cometh into the world" is John's "frequent periphrasis"; C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 231; B. F. Westcott, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 216, who says that the phrase "the prophet that cometh into the world" is peculiar to St. John, yet he compares Matt. 21:11 and Acts 7:37; G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 131, observes that the words ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον were applied to the Logos at John 1:9.

<sup>4</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of The Fourth Gospel, p. 23

<sup>5</sup>C. E. Luthardt, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 150.

<sup>6</sup>J. B. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 85.

and earthly."<sup>1</sup> As Howard comments: "They misunderstood the nature of the sign."<sup>2</sup> Temple<sup>3</sup> also feels that the sign which suggested to them the Deuteronomic prophet became a little confused because they also wanted to treat Jesus as the Messianic King. Because of the mistaken motive for their action, Jesus refuses to be King.<sup>4</sup> When they realized that Jesus was the Prophet, instead of saying "he can tell us heavenly truths", they murmured "he can exalt us to wealth and power."<sup>5</sup> This thought was part of the motivation for their treatment of Jesus.

Alcuin<sup>6</sup> comments that the people only call the Lord a Prophet, because their faith is still weak, not realizing that he is God. However, the article ( ὁ προφήτης ) does suggest that he was distinct from other prophets.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, the Messianic reference in this verse (Jn. 6:14) is too great to be overlooked. In this passage, Jesus is the Prophet expected on the basis of Deut. 18:15-18; he is also the Messiah.

<sup>1</sup>F. H. Dunwell, op. cit., p. 138; cf. A. Tholuck, op. cit., p. 171.

<sup>2</sup>W. F. Howard, op. cit., p. 556f.

<sup>3</sup>W. Temple, op. cit., p. 75.

<sup>4</sup>W. Kelly, op. cit., p. 128.

<sup>5</sup>J. B. Sumner, op. cit., p. 167.

<sup>6</sup>Alcuin, in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 213.

<sup>7</sup>cf. Chrysostom, in T. Aquinas, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 214.



This identification between the Prophet and the Messiah, however, is not made at John 7:40f.<sup>1</sup> After Jesus had spoken at the Feast of Tabernacles, "some of the people said, 'This is really the prophet.' Others said, 'This is the Christ.'" (Jn. 7:40f.). Deut. 18:15-18 is generally<sup>2</sup> taken to be the background for the first estimation, ὁ προφήτης .

On the other hand, some state it as a possibility but suggest other alternatives.<sup>3</sup> Thomas<sup>4</sup> interprets "the prophet" to mean one of the old prophets whom some expected. Brooke<sup>5</sup> suggests that it is a possible reference to Jeremiah raised from the dead. In this context, Anderson<sup>6</sup> and Dunwell<sup>7</sup> say that "the prophet" may refer to the forerunner of the Messiah. O'Connor quite rightly observes that "the words of Jesus must have presented a clear and forcible idea to produce

<sup>1</sup>cf. John 1:21, and above pp. 143ff.

<sup>2</sup>J. A. McClymont, op. cit., p. 198; A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 112; G. H. Trench, op. cit., p. 193; he cites also Acts 3:22; T. Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 189; E. W. Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 420; M. F. Sadler, op. cit., p. 202; G. Hutcheson, op. cit., p. 146; B. F. Westcott, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 280; H. B. Reynolds, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 319, says the reference is "in all probability" to Deut. 18:15; C. K. Barrett, op. cit., p. 272, points out that this is not a Messianic interpretation of Deut. 18:15; for ὁ προφήτης he compares John 1:21, 24, 6:14, perhaps 4:19 but not 9:17.

<sup>3</sup>cf. H. C. Adams, op. cit., p. 21, who points to Ps. 132:11 and Micah 5:2.

<sup>4</sup>D. Thomas, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 206.

<sup>5</sup>A. E. Brooke, op. cit., p. 753; cf. Matt. 16:14.

<sup>6</sup>R. Anderson, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 326.

<sup>7</sup>F. H. Dunwell, op. cit., p. 178, n.1.

this effect."<sup>1</sup>

Dods<sup>2</sup> is of the opinion that while some call Jesus the Prophet, others go a step further and call him the Christ. Similarly Macgregor<sup>3</sup> sees the two views of Jesus, (namely, "the prophet" and "the Christ"), as two stages in the growth of belief. Apparently Besser<sup>4</sup> interprets ὁ προφήτης in the sense of a prophet, for he says that the designation "the Christ" was given because no mere prophet could ever have invited to himself, those who thirst. Strachan accounts for these two views of Jesus by crediting them to the Evangelist's "remarkable knowledge of the variety of popular Messianic expectation."<sup>5</sup> Kelly<sup>6</sup> asks whether these two estimations should be placed in causal relationship: Was Jesus the Messiah from Bethlehem, and of David's line, because He was the despised prophet of Galilee? Calvin<sup>7</sup> observes that "the Christ" is a more correct opinion than the first; he, too, overlooks the article (ὁ προφήτης), pointing to the inadequacy of the acknowledgement a prophet, for the Son of God.

<sup>1</sup>W. A. O'Connor, op. cit., p. 144.

<sup>2</sup>M. Dods, op. cit., p. 768.

<sup>3</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 209.

<sup>4</sup>R. Besser, op. cit., p. 349.

<sup>5</sup>R. H. Strachan, op. cit., p. 203.

<sup>6</sup>W. Kelly, op. cit., p. 165.

<sup>7</sup>J. Calvin, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 311.

Whether or not the Jews identified "the Prophet" and "the Messiah" is an open question.<sup>1</sup> At any rate they are distinguished here. Lagrange<sup>2</sup>, again, points to two factions for the two opinions. He admits that in Jn. 6:14, the Galileans equate "the Prophet" and "the Messiah", but argues that at Jerusalem the two were separate.<sup>3</sup> Hutcheson,<sup>4</sup> however, draws attention to the fact that  $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  was to be one of the offices of the Messiah. They were certain that the marks of the prophet of Deut. 18:15-18 would be present in the Messiah, but what additional ones He would have, were not clearly defined.<sup>5</sup> The writer believes that here (John 7:40), as at John 1:21,  $\delta\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  is a reference to the prophet expected on the basis of Deut. 18:15-18, who had not yet been identified in Jewish thinking with the Messiah.

This discussion of the Johannine passages where  $\delta\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  is used may be concluded with some words from Dodd: "It is, in any case, clear that for him [John] the title  $\delta\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  is not an appropriate one, though it may represent a stage towards a true estimate

---

<sup>1</sup>e.g. M. F. Sadler, op. cit., p. 202, says they did, but J. B. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 85, says they did not; cf. above p. 144f. and below p. 155ff.

<sup>2</sup>M. J. Lagrange, op. cit., p. 217f; cf. above p. 142.

<sup>3</sup>cf. G. Hutcheson, op. cit., p. 92, who agrees.

<sup>4</sup>idem.

<sup>5</sup>E. W. Hengstenberg, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 410; cf. John 1:21.

of the status of Jesus."<sup>1</sup>

In the Acts of the Apostles, our oldest Christological source,<sup>2</sup> Peter and Stephen apply Deut. 18:15 to Jesus.

In his speech following the healing of the man lame from birth, Peter exclaimed: "Moses said, 'The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised

me up...'" (Acts 3:22). μωυσης μὲν εἶπεν ὅτι προφήτην ...

Some manuscripts add after μὲν , γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας εἶπεν...

However, these words are wanting in κ, A, B, C and are rightly rejected by Lachman and Tischendorf.<sup>3</sup> The words which Peter cites from Moses are a free rendering of the LXX of Deut. 18:15,<sup>4</sup> combined with Leviticus 23:29.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, op. cit., p. 240.

<sup>2</sup>M. Black, "Servant of The Lord and Son of Man", SJT, VI, 1953, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup>P. J. Gloag, Commentary On The Acts of The Apostles, p. 121; cf. G. V. Lechler and K. Gerok (ed. J. P. Lange), Commentary On The Acts of The Apostles, Vol. I, p. 139; J. A. Alexander, The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I, p. 118f; J. R. Lumby, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 109.

<sup>4</sup>P. J. Gloag, op. cit., p. 135; cf. T. E. Page and A. S. Walpole, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 29; R. J. Knowling, Expositor's Greek Testament, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 117; J. R. Lumby, op. cit., p. 116; E. Jacquier, Les Actes Des Apôtres, p. 114; H. B. Hackett, A Commentary On The Acts of The Apostles, p. 64; T. M. Lindsay, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 113; A. Loisy, Les Actes Des Apôtres, p. 235; G. H. C. Macgregor, The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. IX, p. 60; K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, The Beginnings Of Christianity, Part I, Vol. IV, p. 38.

It is generally agreed that Peter is quoting from some Testamonia<sup>1</sup> document, which consisted of Messianic proof-texts from the Old Testament.

The difficulty arises in deciding whether this Testamonia was used by both Jews and Christians or only the latter. Tied up with this is the question of whether Jews ever interpreted Deut. 18:15 in a Messianic way to the extent of identifying "the Prophet" and "the Messiah". Hackett,<sup>2</sup> Gfrörer,<sup>3</sup> Alford,<sup>4</sup> F. F. Bruce,<sup>5</sup> W. F. Furneaux,<sup>6</sup> and, by implication, Jackson,<sup>7</sup> include the Jews as the users of these "proof-texts", whereas, Macgregor<sup>8</sup>, Rackham<sup>9</sup>, and Dupont<sup>10</sup> limit them to the Christians.

<sup>1</sup>K. Lake and H. J. Cadbury, idem; F. F. Bruce, op. cit., p. 133, J. R. Harris, Testamonies I, II, noted by F. F. Bruce, ibid., p. 78 and C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary On The Acts Of The Appostles, p. 80; F. J. F. Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles, (Moffatt), p. 29; G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 60; C. H. Dodd, According to The Scriptures, pp. 52-56, with reservations, suggests such a collection; cf. C. S. C. Williams, idem.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Hackett, op. cit., p. 64.

<sup>3</sup>A. F. Gfrörer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils; cf. F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, op. cit., Part I, Vol. I, p. 404f.

<sup>4</sup>H. Alford, Homilies on The Former Part of the Acts of the Apostles, p. 141.

<sup>5</sup>F. F. Bruce, op. cit., p. 113.

<sup>6</sup>W. F. Furneaux, The Acts of The Apostles, p. 56.

<sup>7</sup>F. J. F. Jackson, The Acts of The Apostles. (Moffatt), p. 29; cf. ibid., p. 62.

<sup>8</sup>G. H. C. Macgregor, op. cit., p. 60.

<sup>9</sup>R. B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, (Westminster), p. 54, who adds that to compare anyone to Moses was considered blasphemous by the Jews; cf. below, p. 158 n.1.

<sup>10</sup>J. Dupont, Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, 1953, pp. 321ff., noted by C. S. C. Williams, op. cit., p. 80.

The meaning of Deut. 18:15 has already been discussed.<sup>1</sup> In noting Peter's use of it here, some make the comment that Moses was referring generally to the whole prophetic order.<sup>2</sup> Of course, this is challenged by other scholars who say that Moses was foretelling the Messiah.<sup>3</sup>

Another position is sometimes set forth as a compromise. It allows for development in interpretation. Alford<sup>4</sup> feels that the Jews at first understood Deut. 18:15 of the Messiah, but later came to refer it to the whole range of prophets. Rabbinical evidence seems to indicate the very opposite process. At first it was thought that Moses spoke of the prophetic order but later an individual prophet came

<sup>1</sup>cf. above, pp. 1ff.

<sup>2</sup>A. Barnes, Notes Explanatory and Practical on the Acts of the Apostles, p. 33; F. F. Bruce, op. cit., p. 113, but he adds that this original meaning later changed to mean "one particular Prophet"; W. M. Furneaux, op. cit., p. 56, gives the same interpretation as Bruce; J. Calvin, Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I, p. 154; P. J. Gloag, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 135, who cites Olshausen, Neander and De Wette in support; F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, idem., point out that the only possible source of confusion is Deut. 34:10.

<sup>3</sup>P. J. Gloag, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 135; J. A. Alexander, The Acts of the Apostles, (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges), p. 116, cites Ex. 4:20; Zech. 9:9; Pg. 72:16; Num. 21:17; Joel 3:18 and Midrash Rabbah on Eccl. 1:9 to show how the Jews identified "the Prophet" with "the Messiah"; A. F. Gröner, Das Jahrhundert des Heils, cited by F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 404f; according to H. B. Hackett, op. cit., p. 64, Deut. 18:15 was taken in a Messianic way by the Jews of the Apostolic Age; so also W. M. Furneaux, idem.

<sup>4</sup>H. Alford, op. cit., p. 14.

to be expected and, in turn, he was identified with the Messiah.<sup>1</sup> Bruce<sup>2</sup> agrees that originally Deut. 18:15 referred to the order of prophets but later came to mean one particular prophet. The writer believes that this is the proper approach.

The precise meaning of  $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}$  is disputed by some commentators. The RSV takes it in the sense of "God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up."<sup>3</sup> The  $\omega\varsigma$  which translates the Hebrew  $\text{ו}$  is common in the LXX.<sup>4</sup> Barnes<sup>5</sup> says that the prophet is not to be like Moses in all things, but in making known the will of God; he cautions against pressing the idea of resemblance too far.

In the same way, Loisy<sup>6</sup> and Jacquier<sup>7</sup> indicate that the similarity between Moses and Jesus is chiefly that both are mediators of divine revelation. Lyttelton observes that "Moses was a type of Christ as being the leader and lawgiver of the people and more particularly as being the

<sup>1</sup>cf. J. R. Lumby, idem.

<sup>2</sup>F. F. Bruce, idem; he cites the Clementine Recognitions, I.36 as giving this quotation verbatim.

<sup>3</sup>Underlining mine; cf. The New English Bible, which gives the same reading in the text, but in note b suggests the alternative "like me".

<sup>4</sup>cf. R. Lumby, op. cit., p. 116, e.g. Judges 8:18.

<sup>5</sup>A. Barnes, op. cit., p. 34.

<sup>6</sup>A. Loisy, idem.

<sup>7</sup>E. Jacquier, idem; he cites Gal. 3:19 and Heb. 9:13 in support.

minister of the Covenant of God."<sup>1</sup> The same reasoning may lie behind Rackham's statement that "the idea of the covenant is in the bottom of Peter's mind"<sup>2</sup> as he speaks here (Acts 3:22).

Alexander<sup>3</sup> and Lumby<sup>4</sup> draw attention to the fact that *ὡς ἐγώ* may qualify the words immediately preceding them in the sense that Moses is saying, the prophet will be "one of yourselves, belonging to your race and lineage as I do."<sup>5</sup> Certainly this meaning is very possible, but also the way it reads in the RSV makes very good sense. There is no need for these renderings to be mutually exclusive; it is not necessary for the reader to choose between them.

In the word *ἀναστῆσει*, some see a reference to the resurrection<sup>6</sup> (cf. v.26), but Furneaux<sup>7</sup> denies this interpretation. It is best to take it in the sense of "send into the world"<sup>8</sup>, but possibly it may have this secondary

<sup>1</sup>Lord Lyttelton Acts, p. 386; cf. E. Jacquier, idem., who agrees, adding that for Jews this is blasphemy. He cites Heb. 3:1-6 where the comparison between Jesus and Moses is developed.

<sup>2</sup>R. B. Rackham, idem.

<sup>3</sup>J. A. Alexander, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 119.

<sup>4</sup>J. R. Lumby, (A Smaller Cambridge Bible For Schools), The Acts of the Apostles, p. 22.

<sup>5</sup>J. A. Alexander, idem.

<sup>6</sup>R. Knox, A New Testament Commentary For English Readers, Vol. II, p. 11. He says it is a "play on words"; cf. C. S. C. Williams, idem., who points out that it is definitely a "secondary meaning".

<sup>7</sup>W. M. Furneaux, idem.

<sup>8</sup>A. W. F. Blunt, The Acts of The Apostles, (Clarendon), p. 149.



overtone in meaning.

Stephen also - not indirectly but by implication - applies Deut. 18:15-18 to Jesus. He quotes Moses as saying to the Israelites: "God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up." (Acts 7:37). Some manuscripts (C, D, E, 614, Gg., Par., Wernz, Vg., Pesch., Harkl., Boh., Arm., Eth.) add<sup>1</sup> ἀποδοῦς ἀκούσας θς, but in view of its omission<sup>2</sup> by X, A, B, H, P, 38, 61, Sah, and Chrys. it is most likely spurious, added either by assimilation or in imitation in order to harmonize with Deut. 18:15 and Acts 3:22.<sup>3</sup> In view of the doubtful genuineness of the injunction, the comment of Barnes loses much of its relevance:

"Stephen introduced the [Acts 7:37] to remind them of this promise of a Messiah and especially their obligation to hear and obey."<sup>4</sup>

As well as pointing to the dignity of Moses,<sup>5</sup> Stephen is drawing the parallel between the rejection of Moses and the

<sup>1</sup>E. Jacquier, op. cit., p. 223.

<sup>2</sup>E. Jacquier, idem; cf. J. R. Lumby, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 159; cf. also G. V. Lechler and K. Gerok, (ed. J. P. Lange), Commentary On The Acts of The Apostles, Vol. I, p. 246, who say "it would be sooner inserted from the Hebrew and LXX than omitted if original."

<sup>3</sup>Lachmann, Tischendorf and Meyer; noted by H. B. Hackett, op. cit., p. 106, and by G. V. Lechler and K. Gerok (ed. J. P. Lange), idem; cf. F. F. Bruce, op. cit., p. 172; J. A. Alexander, op. cit., p. 286; A. Menzies, The Acts of the Apostles, (Peake), p. 784.

<sup>4</sup>A. Barnes, op. cit., p. 193.

<sup>5</sup>R. J. Knowling, op. cit., p. 193; cf. G. V. Lechler and K. Gerok, op. cit., p. 248; P. J. Gloag, op. cit., p. 247; J. A. Alexander, op. cit., p. 286f.

rejection of Jesus,<sup>1</sup> the prophet whom he promised. This may be one of the meanings which  $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}$  is meant to convey. The Vulgate<sup>2</sup> links these words with what follows. Most seem to make it refer to Moses' dignity and rank, but it may mean "one of yourselves, as I am."

Few commentators<sup>3</sup> question the Messianic reference of this verse. For Stephen the prophet of Deuteronomy (18:15-18) was the Christ.<sup>4</sup> In other words, Moses declared that his work was only preparatory,<sup>5</sup> and after him would come a Prophet whose authority would supersede his own.<sup>6</sup> Only the Messiah could be esteemed so highly.

The historicity of this passage is doubted by some. Zeller<sup>7</sup> argues that since it was impossible to present

<sup>1</sup>J. R. Lumby, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 169; cf. J. B. Sumner, Practical Exposition of The Acts of the Apostles, p. 96; G. V. Lechler and K. Gerok, op. cit., p. 251, who comment: "Moses, a type of Christ"; R. R. Williams, The Acts of the Apostles, (Torch), p. 73; J. A. Findlay, The Acts of The Apostles, p. 95, who notices how Stephen's speech "wounded his hearers"; M. Black, "Servant of the Lord and Son of Man", SJT, VI, 1953, p. 3; F. J. F. Jackson, op. cit., p. 62f, who adds: "The rejection of Moses is linked to the rejection of the laws and customs which Stephen had been accused of trying to subvert."; F. F. Bruce, op. cit., p. 172.

<sup>2</sup>J. A. Alexander, op. cit., p. 286f.

<sup>3</sup>if any.

<sup>4</sup>E. Jacquier, op. cit., p. 223; cf. M. Baumgarten, The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I, p. 156; H. B. Hackett, op. cit., p. 106.

<sup>5</sup>R. B. Rackham, op. cit., p. 104.

<sup>6</sup>C. J. Blomfield, Twelve Lectures On The Acts of the Apostles, p. 40.

<sup>7</sup>E. Zeller, The Contents and Origin of The Acts of The Apostles, p. 241f.

an accurate recollection of the words spoken by Stephen, Luke, the author of Acts composed this speech himself. Menzies<sup>1</sup> feels particularly that verse 37 (Deut. 18:15) is out of place here, introducing Christ too soon for the argument. Dibelius<sup>2</sup> is of the opinion that Luke inserts this speech into the story of Stephen's martyrdom, as a device to introduce the conflict between Judaism and Christianity. For this reason the didactic element prevails.

Regardless of whether the words of this speech were actually spoken by Stephen, or put into his mouth by Luke, they do represent one of our earliest Christological sources.<sup>3</sup> Although the hearers are left to draw their own conclusions, Stephen is clearly implying that Jesus is the Deuteronomic prophet as well as being the Messiah.

These are the only passages in Acts where the Deuteronomic prophet and Jesus are clearly linked. Subsequent passages in Acts speak of "prophets"<sup>4</sup>, but not "The" Prophet.

More must be said concerning Peter's speech at Acts 3:22-26. Here there is a close juxtaposition between Deut. 18:15 and Isa. 53. "Moses said, 'The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up. You

<sup>1</sup>A. Menzies, idem.; he feels that it is added in repetition of Acts 3:22.

<sup>2</sup>M. Dibelius, Studies In The Acts of The Apostles, p. 168ff.

<sup>3</sup>M. Black, idem.

<sup>4</sup>cf. below, p. 173ff.

shall listen to him in whatever he tells you....' God, having raised up his servant, sent him to you first, to bless you in turning every one of you from your wickedness." (Acts 3:22,26) "The entirely new and revolutionary idea is, of course, that it is Jesus of Nazareth who is the Prophet and the Servant of the Lord, a Prophet like unto Moses, who fulfilled the destiny of Isaiah's prophecies."<sup>1</sup> Thus "the novissimum at Acts 3:22-26 is not the idea of a Suffering Prophet-Servant like unto Moses, but the identification of that figure with Jesus of Nazareth."<sup>2</sup>

The same understanding may lie behind Mark's account of how Jesus, after the Caesarea Philippi incident, begins to teach that the Son of Man must suffer. The idea of a suffering prophet could account for his arrangement of material. Weight is added to this interpretation when it is remembered that Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi is preceded by the feeding of the five thousand. This miracle may well be meant to represent Jesus as a "second Moses", repeating the miracle of the manna, in fulfilment of the Jewish expectation that a miraculous feeding, like the manna, would be performed by the second Deliverer.<sup>3</sup>

Also Peter's Confession is followed by the Transfiguration; in the words ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ , Taylor<sup>4</sup> believes that

<sup>1</sup>M. Black, op. cit., p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>M. Black, op. cit., p. 9.

<sup>3</sup>T. Keim, Jesus of Nazareth, Vol. IV, pp. 197ff; cf. M. Black, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>4</sup>V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 392; cf. M. Black, op. cit., p. 9, n.2.

Mark has in mind Deut. 18:15-18, where Moses promises a prophet unto whom the people are commanded to hearken. Thus, Dr. Black concludes that "the motif of redemptive suffering...has been introduced in the New Testament Christology...from...the belief in the Prophet and his fulfilment of Isa. 53."<sup>1</sup> Certainly Acts 3:22-26 indicates that this conclusion was embedded in the earliest tradition.

The Christological designation "Servant", according to Cullmann "deserves more attention in contemporary theology than it usually receives, not only because it is one of the oldest answers to the question who Jesus is, but also because it goes back to Jesus himself and therefore opens to us most clearly the secret of his self-consciousness. In this respect it would be even more correct to speak of a Paix-consciousness of Jesus than of his messianic-consciousness. But...even for him himself the ebed concept does not comprehend his whole work. For this reason, he conferred upon himself the title 'Son of Man', which he of course related to the idea of the ebed Yahweh."<sup>2</sup>

Thus it is possible to conclude with Bruce: "In Christianity the conceptions of a royal and priestly Messiah, together with that of the eschatological Prophet have been united in Jesus.... The Christian Messiah discharges his ministry as prophet and priest and king alike - all three

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Black, op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 81f.

notes receiving their distinctive quality from the historical figure of the Son of Man who came not to be served by others but to be a servant himself and to give his life as a ransom for many."<sup>1</sup>

WIDE WORLD  
ACQUISITION  
SERVICES  
MEMPHIS  
TENN

---

<sup>1</sup>F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity", NTS, II, 1956, p. 180f.

## CHAPTER IV

### PROPHET IN THE APOSTOLIC AND SUB-APOSTOLIC AGE

Along with these passages in the accepted Canon of the New Testament where Jesus is referred to as  $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ , mention must be made of the New Testament Apocryphal writings, from which such references are not absent.

The Gospel of Hebrews<sup>1</sup> had the prophet as its fundamental Christological concept. On fragment<sup>2</sup> says that at the conclusion of His Baptism, the Spirit says to Jesus: "In all the prophets I have awaited you, that you might come and that I might rest in you." Unfortunately the complete text of this Gospel has been lost, but the ancient Jewish Christian literary source The Preaching of Peter<sup>3</sup> (Kerygmata Petrou) helps to bridge the gap. In this document Jesus is repeatedly referred to as "the True Prophet", (  $\delta \alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\varsigma \pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  ). Its emphasis upon the speculative and Gnostic element may be noted from the constant association of the adjective

---

<sup>1</sup>Written between A.D. 120 and 150, and used by Jewish Christians; cf. E. J. Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature, p. 66ff.

<sup>2</sup>Preserved in Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah 11:2 (PL 24, 145); cf. O. Cullmann, The Christology of The New Testament, p. 16, n.3, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Written at the beginning of the second century; cf. E. J. Goodspeed, op. cit., pp. 130ff.

"true" and the noun "Prophet". On the other hand, the old eschatological element falls more into the background. It is not so much that the Prophet introduces the end time (der endzeitliche Prophet) and thus fulfills all former prophecy, but rather that he represents in its perfection the "truth" proclaimed by all the prophets.<sup>1</sup>

The idea that a single prophet would represent the whole of prophecy has a double root in Judaism: eschatology certainly plays its part, providing the idea of the expectation of the prophet who would appear at the end of days; however, theological speculation also sets forth the view that since all prophets have proclaimed basically the same divine truth, it was the same prophet who was successively incarnated in different men. Thus the idea arose that actually the same prophet always appeared, merely taking a different form each time.

This second root which has a background in Gnosticism, indicates a connection with Rabbinism. Some scholars<sup>2</sup> are now prepared to admit, in spite of the anti-Gnostic

<sup>1</sup>cf. the use of *λογος* in John.

<sup>2</sup>H. A. Fischel, "Jewish Gnosticism in the Fourth Gospel", JBL, LXV, p. 163, n.43, refers to Odeberg's works; F. C. Burkitt, "The Apocalypses: Their Place in Jewish History" in Judaism and The Beginnings of Christianity; G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, The Age of the Tannaim; W. Foerster, Die Erloesungschöpfung des Spaetjudentums Morgenland 28; Ch. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus and G. G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism. cf. O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 39; p. 146 n.1; R. Bultmann, Gnomon, 1954, pp. 177ff; H. J. Schoeps, "Das gnostische Judentum in den Dead Sea Scrolls", in Zeitschrift für Religions Und Geistesgeschichte, 1954, p. 277; cf. also R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy, pp. 172ff.



tendency in Rabbinism, that there is some link between the two.

Fischel<sup>1</sup> discusses the idea of "the prophet of the age"; this is the belief that every age had or should have its prophet. In the Rabbinic Chronicle Seder Olam Rabba<sup>2</sup>, composed mainly of Tannaitic material, an attempt is made to arrange almost all of the Jewish prophets in a chronological list, probably implying that every age had its prophet. Josephus<sup>3</sup> speaks of a  $\delta\iota\alpha\delta\omicron\chi\eta$ , a succession of prophets. Even though Amos (760), Isaiah (740), Hosea (740) and Micah (720) were virtually contemporaries, the Midrash tries to establish their chronological succession. Further evidence is implied from the story that Huldah, Jeremiah's female contemporary, was permitted to prophesy only when that great prophet was absent (II Kings 22:14). The instrumentality of "halakhic considerations"<sup>4</sup> in bringing about the idea that there was only one "official" prophet for every age is also mentioned. Moreover, Fischel cites the promise of Deuteronomy 18:15-18, which early

---

<sup>1</sup>H. A. Fischel, op. cit., pp. 166ff.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 20 ed. B. Ratner; cf. ch. V in A. Neubauer's edition in Medieval Jewish Chronicles.

<sup>3</sup>F. Josephus, On The Antiquity of The Jews Against Apion I.viii.41.

<sup>4</sup>H. A. Fischel, op. cit., p. 167, n.3.

Rabbinical sources took as a reference to the prophets in general, and which thus lent weight to the view that every age could expect a prophet like Moses.<sup>1</sup>

According to a Midrash of a Rabbinical-Gnostic nature, Adam, in a state of ecstasy, was shown a detailed vision of all the future generations of mankind "from creation to resurrection", foreseeing their leaders, prophets,<sup>2</sup> sages, providers and judges.<sup>3</sup> Both the Gnostics and Rabbis acknowledged the greatness of Adam. For the former he was the first incarnation of the one true prophet, while for the latter, he was the outstanding prophet.<sup>4</sup> The idea that all future prophets spring from him may be the reflection of the idea that he is reincarnated in all of them. Furthermore, Adam, Methuselah, Jacob and Elijah, all prophets according to both Rabbinic and Gnostic belief<sup>5</sup>, "saw each other, learned Torah from each other, and rolled up [outlived] the whole world."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Siphre Deut. 175 and Yalkut Shim'oni on Deut. 18:15; Siphre Deut. 176 on 18:16, partly parallel: Mekilta Ex. 20:19.

<sup>2</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>3</sup>Sed. Ol. R. 30 end.

<sup>4</sup>Gen. R. 44; II Baruch 4:2-7; Baba Kamma 14b; Origen, De Principiis I.37; Josephus, Ant. IV. 8.49; Targ. Cant. 1.1; cf. L. Ginzberg, The Legends Of The Jews, V p. 83 n.30.

<sup>5</sup>The Midrash from which the quotation about them is taken adds Shem, Amram, and Ahijah to the list. These four (Adam, Methuselah, Jacob and Elijah) are prophets in the sense that they are reincarnations of the one true prophet of Gnostic speculation.

<sup>6</sup>cf. H. A. Fischel, op. cit., p. 169.

It is very probable that the Gnostic idea of the repeatedly incarnated true prophet was combined with the Rabbinic idea of the one authoritative prophet of the age: in Rabbinic Judaism, the Holy Spirit, the essence of prophecy, remained the same through the centuries. In the third century, the Rabbis taught that all prophets were pre-existent, and that their prophecies were either revealed in advance at Mount Sinai or identical with the Mosaic revelation.<sup>1</sup> No doubt the all-pervading tendency of Amoraic Judaism to stress the universal and eternal significance of the Torah was partly responsible for this idea; however, "the fact that the Rabbis could occasionally combine all the historical, individually different, prophets into a single divine revelation, indicates that the perennial prophet of the Gnostics could not have been entirely unacceptable to them",<sup>2</sup> in spite of its lack of documentary attestation.<sup>3</sup>

To return to the Kerygmata Petrou which gave rise to this discussion of the connection between Gnosticism and Rabbinism, it must be pointed out that this Jewish

---

<sup>1</sup>Berakoth 5a; Tan huma Jethro 11; Eccl. R. on 1:10; Ex. R. 28:6. The authors are Simeon b. Lakish, Joshua b. Levi, Isaac, and Helbo.

<sup>2</sup>H. A. Fischel, op. cit., p. 169.

<sup>3</sup>Only in Cabalistic writings (e.g. Yalkut Reubeni on Gen. 4:1; cf. L. Ginzberg, op. cit., V, p. 149, n.52) with a single possible exception in Tannaitic sources - the reduction of the Seven Pillars of the Earth, identified with seven prophets in Alphabethoth and in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies I. viii.14, to one pillar called "Zaddik" in the opinion of El'azar b. Shammua in Hagiga 12b; cf. H. A. Fischel, idem., and idem., n.76.

Christian document has a pronounced Gnostic character.<sup>1</sup> The very first chapter speaks of the activity of the True Prophet. A house full of smoke is used to represent the world with its sins and errors. Although the people inside sincerely try to reach the truth, their efforts are in vain; only the True Prophet is able to open the door and let in the truth. The writing then proceeds to point out that this Prophet is Christ, who entered the world for the first time in the person of Adam. Since the creation of the world this True Prophet has changed his name and form,<sup>2</sup> incarnating himself again and again.<sup>3</sup> Moses renewed the eternal law which Adam had already proclaimed. However, he extended it provisionally<sup>4</sup> to allow sacrifices, in deference to the people's stubbornness. The Jewish Christians laid particular emphasis on the fact that one of the most important functions of the True Prophet was to complete and correct the work of Moses by abolishing sacrifices. Thus from Adam to Jesus there is a direct line of the Prophet, of whom Jesus is the true incarnation.

---

<sup>1</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 39.

<sup>2</sup>Pseudo-Clementine Hom. III. xx.2 and Recogn. II 22; cf. O. Cullmann op. cit., p. 16 and idem., n.2; op. cit., p. 40.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. in Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses.

<sup>4</sup>The sacrifices were provisioned because Moses himself promised a future prophet, (Deut. 18:15), who could alter these regulations.

The Pseudo-Clementine literature relating to the "True Prophet" sometimes suggests that he is the prophet whom Moses promised (Deut. 18:15-18). The Preaching of Peter cites this Deuteronomic text. In Recognitions I.43 Peter says that the Jews "often sent for us to talk with them about Jesus, in order to find out whether he was the Prophet whom Moses predicted would come."<sup>1</sup> Also Recognitions VII.33 quotes a former follower of Simon Magus, the Samaritan miracle worker: "There is mention in our religion of a certain Prophet, whose coming was hoped for by all who observe that religion (Samaritan), through whom immortal, happy life is promised to those who believe in him. We thought that this Simon was he."<sup>2</sup> These passages indicate that the motif of the Mosaic prophet continued to be a lively concept.

Another feature of the theory of the True Prophet is that it runs parallel to the line of the False Prophet. Good and evil are related respectively to true and false prophecy. This speculation took over Gnosticism's popular dualistic conception of good and evil and adapted it to its own particular concept. This antithesis directed specifically against the sect of John the Baptist's disciples

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 17.

<sup>2</sup>cf. H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 64; cf. also above p. 122.

(later absorbed into the Mandaeans<sup>1</sup>), formed part of the basis for a debate at the beginning of the second century between the disciples of John and the Jewish Christians. It would appear that the intention behind this system of conjoined pairs is to set Jesus, the True Prophet, over against John the Baptist, the False Prophet; the latter's disciples claimed the opposite title (True Prophet) for him in the belief that he was the final Prophet who prepared the way for God. Also, in Recognitions I.60 it is evident that the later sect of John's disciples believed him to be the Messiah. On the other hand, in designating Jesus as the "True Prophet", the Jewish Christians went so far as to call John the Baptist a "false prophet".

Thus it is seen that their whole doctrine of salvation is dominated by the prophetic concept; the positive teaching of these Jewish Christians, as well as their polemic, is oriented around the concept of the Prophet.

The presence of these references to "the Prophet" is important for this study; they indicate that the concept  $\delta \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  continued into the Apostolic and sub-apostolic age. Resting as it did on the conception of the returning Prophet, Cullmann is probably right in saying that it is "without doubt one of the oldest Christologies we

---

<sup>1</sup>In their sacred writings, Jesus appears as an imposter, a "false Messiah", while John, on the other hand, appears as "the Prophet". Several times in the Mandaean account of John's birth, the following words occur: "John will take the Jordan and he will be called Prophet in Jerusalem." cf. M. Lidzbarski, Johannesbuch der Mandäer p. 78, and O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 27, and idem., n.1 and n.2.

possess."<sup>1</sup>

Because the prophet motif relates to Jesus' earthly activity it might be felt that it ceased with His ascension. Grierson warns against such a view, pointing out that Christ's prophetic work is carried on by Him, through the instrumentality of His Church, which, in turn, is inspired by His Spirit. "In a word, the Church in her teaching office is taught, confirmed and guided by Jesus Christ, her ever living Prophet."<sup>2</sup>

He goes on to refer to the early Church's order of prophets. Prophecy provided a great link between the Old and New Testaments.<sup>3</sup> Christian prophecy was born on the day of Pentecost with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. (Acts 2). Outwardly similar to prophecy, (although less preferable, I Corin. 14:1ff.) was glossolalia (Acts 2:4, 19:6; I Corin. 12:10-11; 14:1ff). Both were forms of ecstatic speech, although prophecy, unlike speaking with tongues, was intelligible to the hearer. However, while glossolalia died out within a generation, the prophet continued to share with the apostle the place of pre-eminence in the Church; it was through the prophet that the Spirit spoke to the Churches; through him men might "hear what

---

<sup>1</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 42.

<sup>2</sup>C. T. P. Grierson, "Prophet", Dictionary of Christ and The Gospels, Vol. II, p. 441.

<sup>3</sup>R. B. Rackham, The Acts of The Apostles, (Westminster), xciv.

the Spirit says to the Churches." (Rev. 2:7,11,17,29; 3:6, 13,22).<sup>1</sup>

In the Judaism of the first century, prophecy was confined to apocalyptic predictions of the End with all its preliminary woes. Some scholars<sup>2</sup> have argued that Christian prophecy conformed to the same pattern. Certainly the element of apocalyptic is found in Revelation; its Christology is most apocalyptic. Rawlinson<sup>3</sup> may be right in calling Mark's "Little Apocalypse" the work of a Christian prophet. But this does not mean that the primitive Church was bound to follow the Jewish precedent. On the contrary, the balance of evidence is against such a contention. John the Baptist, and then Jesus revived prophecy in its classical form, and New Testament prophecy covers many types of inspired utterance. Indeed, the power to predict, while sometimes given to the prophet, (Acts 11:28, 20:23, 21:11, I Peter 1:10), was not his distinctive or most important characteristic.<sup>4</sup> Inspired preaching was certainly included in prophecy (I Thess. 1:5, I Corin. 2:4), and along with it paraclesis which Selwyn defines as "the moral strengthening which comes from the

<sup>1</sup>cf. J. B. Caird, The Apostolic Age, p. 61ff.

<sup>2</sup>P. Carrington, The Meaning of Revelation, pp. 57-61; W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 34-38; cf. H. A. Guy, New Testament Prophecy, Its Origin and Significance, p. 105.

<sup>3</sup>A. E. J. Rawlinson, The Gospel according to Saint Mark, (Westminster), p. 181.

<sup>4</sup>R. B. Rackham, op. cit., xciv; H. M. Gwatkin, "Prophet in The New Testament", HDB, Vol. IV, p. 127; cf. above p. 78.



presence and guidance of those who are strong in faith."<sup>1</sup> Paul makes paraeclesis one of the characteristics of prophecy, declaring that the prophet "speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation." (ICorin. 14:3; cf. Acts 9:31, 14:31f.). Thus prophecy is among the "higher gifts" which are earnestly to be desired (I Corin. 12:31), because the prophet "builds up the Christian character, utters ethical precepts and warnings, and gives the encouragement arising from personal testimony, example and sympathy."<sup>2</sup>

John of Patmos writes that the true spirit of prophecy was evinced in bearing witness to Jesus (Rev. 1:2f, 19:10; cf. I John 4:3; I Corin. 12:3). It appears that "the early Church considered bold confession to be one of the outstanding gifts of the Spirit, though not confined to the ranks of those properly called prophets."<sup>3</sup> Linked with fearless confession (Acts 4:31) was the gift of joy, so that the record of the early Church puts joy and bold confession together as gifts of the one spirit (e.g. Acts 5:41).

Moreover, the Christian prophet lived in a community

<sup>1</sup>E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of Saint Peter, p. 262.

<sup>2</sup>R. M. Pope, "Prophecy, Prophet, Prophetess", Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, Vol. II, p. 280; cf. R. B. Rackham, idem., who says that prophecy denotes "the effect of the inspiration of the Spirit as it finds utterance in exhortation, instruction, encouragement and consolation."

<sup>3</sup>G. B. Caird, op. cit., p. 63.

and many of his spiritual gifts were shared by other Christians; indeed, there is some suggestion that all Christians were in some sense prophets. At Pentecost the gift of the Spirit was "poured out on all flesh" (Acts 2:17-18; cf. Joel 2:28-32). Thus prophecy was confined to no class. Gentile as well as Jewish Christian Churches were endowed by the Spirit's gift of prophecy (cf. I Corin. 12-14, especially 12:8-10 and 14:26).

All can prophecy (I Corin. 14:31), both men and women (Acts 13:1-3, 15:22,32, 21:9; I Corin. 11:5). Prophecy is presumably the greatest gift which the ordinary Church member could exercise (I Corin. 12:28f).<sup>1</sup> This raises the question of whether or not prophets were ever a distinct order of the Church. Guy<sup>2</sup> denies that the prophets were ever a separate category of Church leaders. Rackham<sup>3</sup> is probably right, however, in suggesting that some, possessing the gift in a higher degree than their fellows, devoted their lives specially to the exercise of prophecy. These latter, distinguished from the great inspired individuals who were closely associated with the apostles as founders of the Church, and from the ordinary Christians, Rackham<sup>4</sup> calls "professional"

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. H. A. Guy, op. cit., p. 95.

<sup>2</sup>H. A. Guy, op. cit., p. 94.

<sup>3</sup>R. B. Rackham, idem.

<sup>4</sup>R. B. Rackham, op. cit., xcxf.

prophets, abounding in great numbers<sup>1</sup>, of whom Agabus is the type, and corresponding to the order of wandering prophets in the Didache (11:1-11, 13:1). Grierson<sup>2</sup> also refers to the Church's order of prophets, placed by St. Paul second in his list of Church ministrants (I Corin. 12:28; Eph. 4:11). Although individual inspiration is legitimate and undoubted, the fact that prophecy was mainly a community movement meant that it was subject to the control of the prophets, and also that the prophets exercised their powers in the Christian meeting. (I Corin. 12:4ff, 13:9, 14:16, 23, 26ff; Acts 11:27, 13:1).

Part of the prophetic gift included the leading of the praises and prayers of public worship. Luke describes the Church at Antioch meeting for worship under the leadership of five prophets. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit Paul and Barnabas were commissioned for a new missionary enterprise (Acts 13:1-3), no doubt spoken through the lips of one of the remaining prophets - Simeon, Lucius or Manaen.<sup>3</sup> Luke also describes the Benedictus as a prophecy (Luke 1:67) and a rubric in the Didache (10:7) indicates that the prophet is not to be bound by any set form of worship. The hymns of Revelation are the work of a prophet, as are the many elevated and rhythmical

---

<sup>1</sup>At Antioch (Acts 11:27, 13:1), Thessalonica (I Thess. 5:20), Corinth (I Corin. 14:32f), Rome (Rom. 12:6f), and in every city (Acts 20:23).

<sup>2</sup>G. T. P. Grierson, idem.

<sup>3</sup>G. B. Caird, op. cit., p. 64.

passages in Paul's writings, who was also among the prophets.

However, "the greatest source of the prophet's authority and influence and the gift which distinguished him from his brethren was his power to pronounce specific instructions for the conduct of Church affairs."<sup>1</sup> Mention has already been made of the setting apart of Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13:1-3). On the second journey, when the Spirit forbade the missionaries to preach, first in Asia, and then in Bithynia, the spokesman was almost certainly the prophet Silas (Acts 16:6f). Timothy is designated to his office by prophecy (I Tim. 1:18, 4:14). Furthermore, I Peter (1:10-12) and Ephesians (3:4-6) attribute to Christian prophets the revelations which initiated the Gentile mission of the Church.

However, this high esteem of the prophet did not continue indefinitely. In the Didache<sup>2</sup> the prophet is still given a high rank, but in the Apostolic Fathers prophets are not mentioned.<sup>3</sup> One of the reasons for the disappearance of the rank of the Christian prophets was no doubt their clash with the Church's authoritative organization and discipline.<sup>4</sup> A far more cogent reason was the abuse of the gift of prophecy. The spiritual dignity and power of prophecy were not maintained; even the apostolic safeguards did not prevent its counterfeit from bringing so much discredit upon prophecy, that Christian

<sup>1</sup>G. B. Caird, idem.

<sup>2</sup>Written before the end of the first century. Did. 10:7, 11:3-11, 13:1.

<sup>3</sup>R. M. Pope, op. cit., p. 281.

<sup>4</sup>C. T. P. Grierson, idem.

prophets were gradually replaced by teachers and preachers of special power and capacity.<sup>1</sup>

Thus it is seen that the prophets were important to the early Church, in the sense that they carried on its inherent prophetic power; through them, the prophetic office of the ascended Christ was exhibited. Though as a class prophets disappeared, it must be remembered that the prophetic spirit is ever present in the Church. In this age, as always, the Christian Church needs to utter any spiritual communication which she may receive from Christ, her Prophet.<sup>2</sup>

Further evidence of the persistence of the idea of prophecy, with Messianic overtones, is found in Josephus as he writes about the faith of various fanatics, miracle workers and political heroes of his period. Klausner<sup>3</sup> refers to two words used by Josephus in describing the two kinds of revolutionaries to which the Jewish Messianic idea gave rise, namely, ἰσχυροὶ καὶ ληστρικοί - imposters and assassins - who were false Messiahs and false prophets.

Prophecy is found among the Essenes. Josephus mentions the prophet<sup>4</sup> Judas, of the sect of the Essenes whose predictions always proved to be true (Ant. XIII.xi.2; War I.iii.4). The one mentioned here is that of the slaying of Antigonus. This foreknowledge of future events was also possessed by Manahem,

<sup>1</sup>R. M. Pope, idem.; C. T. P. Grierson, idem.; R. B. Rackham, op. cit., xcvi.

<sup>2</sup>C. T. P. Grierson, idem.

<sup>3</sup>J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, p. 562.

<sup>4</sup>Underlining mine.

who likewise belonged to the Essenes (Ant. XV.x.5). Furthermore, Simon the Essene had the power of interpreting dreams (Ant. XVII.xiii.3).

Under Pontius Pilate a Samaritan lied to the people and "bid them to get together upon Mount Gerizzim which is by them looked upon as the most holy of all mountains, and assured them, that when they were come thither, he would shew them those sacred vessels which were laid under that place, because Moses put them there." Believing his words to be probable, they assembled at the village Tirathana, in order "to go up the mountain in a great multitude together." However, Pilate's horsemen and footmen fell upon the company and many of them were slain (Ant. XVIII.iv.1). This Samaritan indicates by his action that he played the part of the Messiah, who in Samaritanism took the form of the Prophet.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly when Fadus was procurator, the magician Theudas "persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them, and follow him to the river Jordan; for he told them that he was a prophet<sup>2</sup> and that he would by his own command, divide the river, and afford them an easy

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. above pp. 57ff. It is just possible that this Samaritan is Dositheus, (cf. above pp. 121f.), whom Origen, (Contra Celsum I.57), mentioned as arising after the time of Jesus, wishing to persuade the Samaritans that he was the Messiah predicted by Moses. (i.e. very probably at Deut. 18:15).

<sup>2</sup>Underlining mine.

passage over it;<sup>1</sup> and many were deluded by his words." But Fadus sent his horsemen against them and "falling upon many of them unexpectedly slew many of them, and took many of them alive. They also took Theudas alive and cut off his head and carried it back to Jerusalem." (Ant. XX.v.1).

Josephus further relates how Jewish imposters and false prophets<sup>2</sup> "persuaded the multitude to follow them into the wilderness<sup>3</sup>, and pretended that they would exhibit manifest wonders and signs, that should be performed by the providence of God. And many that were prevailed on by them suffered the punishments of their folly, for Felix brought them back and then punished them." (Ant. XX.viii.6).

Moreover, about the same time an Egyptian came to Jerusalem, saying that "he was a prophet<sup>4</sup> and advised the multitude<sup>5</sup> of the common people to go along with him to the mount of Olives.... He said farther that he would show

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Moses at the Red Sea (Ex. 14:16ff); cf. J. Jeremias, "μωυσης" " TWNT, Band IV, p. 866.

<sup>2</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>3</sup>J. Jeremias ("μωυσης" in TWNT, Band IV, p. 866), believes that this desire to lead the people into the ερημος, even as Moses had done in his day, indicates that these leaders viewed themselves as Mosaic eschatological prophets. According to him, this march into the desert or wilderness must have been a stereotyped feature for the eschatological Prophet like Moses in the first century A.D. However, since some, who apparently claimed to be the eschatological Prophet, did not use this feature, it would appear that not every eschatological Prophet claimed to be a New Moses. (cf. H. M. Teeple, op. cit., p. 65).

<sup>4</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>5</sup>30,000 according to the parallel account in War II.xiii.5.

them from hence, how, at his command the walls of Jerusalem would fall down; and he promised them that he would procure them an entrance into the city through those walls when they were fallen down." Felix, however, came against them with his horsemen and footmen from Jerusalem, slew four hundred of them and captured two hundred alive. "But the Egyptian himself escaped out of the fight and did not appear any more." (Ant. XX.viii.6; cf. War II.xiii.5).

Also, there is mention of the Judaeans who, under Festus, "had been seduced by a certain imposter, who promised them deliverance and freedom from the miseries they were under, if they would but follow him as far as the wilderness.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly those forces that were sent<sup>2</sup> destroyed both him that had deluded them and those that were his followers also." (Ant. XX.viii.10).

Besides these references to "prophet" in Josephus' Antiquities of The Jews, there are also some in his Jewish War which are relevant to this study. In addition to those which have been cited already<sup>3</sup>, because they parallel accounts in the Antiquities, the following may be noted.

Josephus writes about people who were destroyed by the

<sup>1</sup>cf. above p. 181, n.3.

<sup>2</sup>Both horsemen and footmen.

<sup>3</sup>Judas the Essene, War I.iii.4; cf. above p. 179, and the Egyptian "prophet", War II.xiii.5; cf. above p. 181.



Roman soldiers. "A false prophet<sup>1</sup> was the occasion of these people's destruction, who had made public proclamation in the city that very day, that 'God commanded them to get up upon the temple, and that there they should receive miraculous signs of their deliverance.'" Josephus goes on to say that there were "a great number of false prophets" (War VI.v.2).

Josephus also mentions Jonathan of the Sicarii, who prevailed upon a considerable number of the people of Cyrene, and "led them into the desert"<sup>2</sup> upon promising them that he would shew them signs and apparitions." (War VI.xi.1).

These excerpts from Josephus indicate that the hopes of the Jews for a political Messiah did not end with Jesus, and also that the prophet motif continued to play a large part in their thinking.

In view of the fact that prophets (both true and false) continued to appear at this time, it is necessary now, in conclusion, to consider to what extent the prophet motif is really present as an element in the developing Christology of the New Testament; and also to suggest why the designation ceased to be used of Christ.

<sup>1</sup>Underlining mine.

<sup>2</sup>cf. above p. 181, n.3.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

In the time of Jesus there was a lively hope for "the Prophet". Thus, the prophet motif plays a significant part in the developing Christology of the New Testament.

In Matthew, certainly, the prophet motif stands behind many passages; in some of these it is not readily apparent that this is the case. The writer has already<sup>1</sup> discussed the Messianic significance of those Matthaean passages where Jesus is called *προφήτης*, and also those where the Messiah-Prophet motif is suggested. According to Gfrörer<sup>2</sup>, Matthew particularly has the prophet motif; this he relates to Deuteronomy 18:15-18, where Moses promises a prophet. Thus he feels that Jesus is a "new Moses". He mentions several additional passages where Jesus fits into the role of the "new Moses Prophet-Messiah". In the flight to Egypt (Matt. 2:13ff.), there is a parallel with the Pharaoh-Moses story; Jesus presents his teachings on a mountain (Matt. 5-7), just as Moses had done on Mount Sinai; furthermore, on that occasion, Jesus reinterpreted the Laws of Moses into what

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. above pp. 88ff.

<sup>2</sup>A. F. Gfrörer, Das Jahrhundert des Heils, Vol. II, pp. 219ff.

*Geschichte des Christentums*

amounted to a new Law<sup>1</sup>; the feeding of the 5,000 (Matt. 14:19) is reminiscent of the manna which God supplied to the people in the wilderness at Moses' bidding; in Matt. 19:28, Gfrörer feels that Jesus took upon himself the role of Deut. 18:15-18 in that he chose twelve disciples who would be judges; when Jesus died, others were raised from their graves (Matt. 27:52,53); some believed that this had already happened with Moses, and therefore, that it should happen when the true Messiah appeared. In this way, Gfrörer makes it plain that Jesus the Prophet-Messiah is a second Moses; and also, the importance of the prophet motif for Matthew's Christology is made clearer.

The prophet motif is also present in the Christology of Mark. However, because of its non-Jewish flavour, most of the references in this Gospel point to Jesus simply as a prophet, rather than the Prophet. Nevertheless, the primitive nature of Mark indicates that, from the earliest, the idea of "prophet" was not absent from the popular estimate of Jesus.

Similarly Luke, written by a Gentile, does not contain many references to Jesus as the Prophet. In his Gospel, Luke does, however, suggest quite strongly that Jesus is a prophet.

---

<sup>1</sup>B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, xv-xvii, has suggested that Matthew grouped the teachings of Jesus into five major blocks (Matt. 5-7; 9:36-11:1; 13:1-53; 18:1-19:1; 24-25) in an intentional parallel to the five books of the ancient Torah. cf. F. W. Green, The Gospel According to Matthew, (Clarendon), p. 5; cf. also J. Bright, The Kingdom of God, p. 203f., who points out, (p. 204, n.27), that the idea of a "Christian Pentateuch" goes back as far as Papias (2nd century A.D.).

Thus, when Gentile Christianity and Jewish Christianity were drawn together, the fact that Mark and Luke had included  $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  in their Christologies meant that the door was open to identify Jesus with the Prophet, who held an important place in Jewish expectation.

In John, the prophet motif also appears. In some passages Jesus is simply a prophet, while in others he is the Prophet. It would appear that John in his Christology wished to remind his readers both of Jesus' prophetic characteristics, and of the Jewish background for calling Jesus the Prophet. But also, he goes further in suggesting that the prophet motif, while valid, is only a partial estimate of the person of Jesus Christ.

Although in his Gospel Luke does not give many explicit references to Jesus as the Prophet, his Acts of the Apostles indicates that this prophet motif really played a large part in his Christology. The writer has drawn attention<sup>1</sup> to Peter's speech (Acts 3:22ff.), and to Stephen's words (Acts 7:37). Later references in Acts are to the New Testament "order of prophets"; according to Grierson<sup>2</sup>, forceful speakers, inspired by the Holy Spirit carry on Christ's ministry as Prophet to-day.

Furthermore, the Epistles have references to the "order of prophets"<sup>3</sup>. The absence of specific references

<sup>1</sup>cf. above pp. 154ff.

<sup>2</sup>C. T. P. Grierson, idem. cf. above p. 173 and p. 177.

<sup>3</sup>cf. above p. 177.

to the Prophet does not mean that it ceased to play a part in their thinking. Even if it has passed from their distinct and conscious vocabulary, it was still present as a concept in their thinking. Paul, in his developed Christology, emphasizes the atoning death of Christ, in which he fulfils the role of the Suffering Servant. In Acts 3:22ff. the Suffering Prophet-Servant is identified with Christ. Thus, Paul's stress on the Suffering Servant's completed work of redemption may well contain veiled references to the Prophet. Because earlier in the New Testament, on the day of Pentecost, the conception of Jesus as the Suffering Servant had been united with that of the Prophet, it is quite possible that the prophet motif stood in the background of Paul's thinking when he spoke of the vicarious suffering of the Servant.<sup>1</sup>

Revelation has a very apocalyptic Christology. However, in Rev. 11:3ff. there is mention of two prophets, who are generally believed to be Moses and Elijah.<sup>2</sup> If this identification is true, as it almost certainly is, then this passage indicates that the idea of a Messianic prophet persisted beyond the Apostolic Age.

Thus it is possible to conclude that the prophet motif did play an important part in the developing Christology of the New Testament. Certainly this motif was valuable as a solution to the New Testament Christological problem. The

---

<sup>1</sup>Furthermore, Paul had been present when Stephen spoke of Jesus as the Prophet promised by Moses (Acts 7:37; 8:1).

<sup>2</sup>cf. above p. 108f.

application of the title προφήτης to Jesus accounts fully for both his preaching activity and the unique authority of his eschatological vocation and appearance in the end time. Also, this concept takes into account the unique and unrepeatable character of the person and work of Jesus.

Furthermore, the prophet motif combines readily with other essential Christological concepts. It combines with that of Messiah since the Messiah also appears at the end of days, and is the one who directly prepares the way for the Kingdom of God. The Johannine λόγος unites the work and person of the Prophet; Jesus is himself the Word. In Hebrews (1:1-3) the concept προφήτης is connected with that of the Son of God. Since it is the eschatological fate of the Prophet to suffer in fulfilling his function<sup>1</sup>, the Suffering Servant motif also identifies with it.

Of all the early Christian titles of honour conferred upon him, the designation προφήτης is the only one which suggests the expectation of a second coming of Jesus to earth. Jesus predicted that he would return again. The Jewish Messiah does not return but the Prophet does. Thus a common idea of contemporary Judaism at least prepared the way for Jesus to prophecy his own return.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>H. J. Schoeps, "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde", Aus frühchristlicher Zeit, pp. 126ff.; J. Jeremias, "Ἡ λ(ε)ίψ", TWNT, II, p. 944; cf. O. Cullmann, The Christology of The New Testament, p. 22, n.5, 6; cf. also R. H. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, p. 63f.

<sup>2</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 16 and p. 37.

In spite of these factors the title "prophet" ceased to be used of Christ. The writer wishes now to suggest certain reasons why the term  $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  disappeared as a designation of Christ.

First of all, since Jesus did not fit the role exactly<sup>1</sup>, the title did not suit him perfectly<sup>2</sup>. Disturbing elements in the original impact which Jesus made indicated that he could not be simply categorized along with the great prophets.

Secondly, the presence of other prophets in the continuing Christian movement detracted from the uniqueness of this title for Jesus. Furthermore, the pagan world had its prophets; and false prophets brought disfavour upon the office<sup>3</sup>. Bound up with this is the disappearance of the spontaneity of the prophetic gift, under rigid organization of the Church.<sup>4</sup>

Thirdly, the rise and use of other titles - Messiah, Christ, Son, Son of Man, Son of God - meant the suppression of this most primitive one. These other titles proved more adequate to express what the Christian community found in Jesus. The Prophet belongs to the category which W. Manson calls "imperfect types of Christian witness", in the sense

<sup>1</sup>P. E. Davies, "Jesus and The Role of the Prophet", JBL, LXIV, 1945, p. 254.

<sup>2</sup>W. A. Curtis, Jesus Christ the Teacher, p. 40.

<sup>3</sup>cf. above p. 178.

<sup>4</sup>idem.

that individuals confess Jesus first to be a prophet and then are "brought to register a higher verdict."<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, these other designations never blotted out entirely the earliest impression that Jesus was the prophet of Nazareth.

In the fourth place, the religious experience of the early Church was broader in its expression than mere prophecy. Many gifts came of one Spirit (1 Corin. 12:4ff.), and yet that Spirit was traced back to Jesus. Therefore, it may be inferred that, just as prophecy does not cover the developing religious experience, so *προφήτης* is not adequate for the original moving force and founder, Jesus. The concept of the Spirit was used to explain the whole new religious experience, and it was forgotten that originally it was the explanation of the prophet's career.

Finally, it may be noted that the designation Prophet has a strong Jewish flavour. The Old Testament prophets had a definite place in the Jewish heritage. Although prophecy had ceased at the time of Jesus, the prophet was still a living conception with the Jewish people<sup>2</sup>, and it is no accident that some of them refer to Jesus as *προφήτης*. It is probably true that the suppression of this title is bound up with the disappearance of Jewish Christianity.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 4, e.g. the Samaritan woman (John 4:19,25-26) and the man born blind (John 9:17, 35-38). For detailed comment on these passages cf. above pp. 118ff.

<sup>2</sup>A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity, I, pp. 414ff.; cf. P. E. Davies, op. cit., p. 246.

<sup>3</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 49f.; cf. F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, I, p. 408, who place "prophet" among the "Jewish terms" used to describe Jesus.



The Church Fathers tended to think of the Prophet promised in Deuteronomy (18:15-18) as referring to Christ. This connection can be traced back as far as Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, (both of whom flourished around A.D. 200); Origen (185-254) and Eusebius (c.280-340) continue it. However, Jackson and Lake<sup>1</sup> doubt whether it was used in the middle of the second century. Neither Justin Martyr (c.114-168) nor Irenaeus (c.115-190) quote the Deuteronomic text; the Apologists, even Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, and the Apostolic Fathers seem to ignore this application.

It may well be that this silence on Jesus the Prophet from the writing of John's Gospel<sup>2</sup> till after the middle of the second century is related to the disappearance both of Jewish Christianity and of the office of the prophet in the Christian Church. This latter, in turn, is replaced by the subsequent development in Christian theology of the view of the prophetic office of the ascended Christ<sup>3</sup>; in this way Christ's ministry as Prophet is carried on to-day.

Many books dealing with the present renewed emphasis on Christology give little or no place to this title προφήτης. Even Cullmann has reservations and feels obliged to justify his inclusion of the chapter "Jesus the Prophet"<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>op. cit., p. 406.

<sup>2</sup>Generally believed to have been written in the last decade of the first century.

<sup>3</sup>cf. above p. 173.

<sup>4</sup>O. Cullmann, op. cit., p. 6 and pp. 13f.

This study has attempted to show both the extent and the importance of the Prophet motif in New Testament Christology.

WYDELL C. WYDELL

WYDELL C. WYDELL

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, I., Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Second Series. Cambridge: University Press, 1924.
- Adams, H. C., The Greek Text Of The Gospels with Prologema, Notes and References, Parts I - IV. London: D. Nutt, 1857.
- Adeney, W. F., The Century Bible: St Luke. Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack Ltd., 1925.
- Albright, W. F. From the Stone Age to Christianity. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1940.
- Alexander, J. A., The Acts Of The Apostles. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1857.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1866.
- Alford, H., Homilies On The Former Part of The Acts of the Apostles, Chapters I - X. London: Rivingtons, 1858.
- Allegro, J. M., "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect", JBL, LXXV, 1956, pp. 89 - 95.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", JBL, LXXV, 1956, pp. 174 - 186.
- Allen, W. C., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew, (ICC). Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel According To Saint Mark, (The Oxford Church Biblical Commentary). London: Rivingtons, 1915.
- Anderson, R., A Practical Exposition of the Gospel According To St. John, 2 vols. London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1841.
- Aquinas, T., Commentary On The Four Gospels Collected Out Of The Works Of The Fathers, New Edition, 6 vols. Oxford & London: James Parker & Co., 1870.
- Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W., "προφήτης", Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- Askwith, H. E., The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.

- Bacon, B. W., Studies in Matthew. London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Beginnings Of The Gospel Story. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1907.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The 'Coming One' of John the Baptist", Expositor, Sixth Series, IV. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1904, pp. 1 - 20.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Fourth Gospel In Research and Debate. New York: Moffatt, Yard & Co., 1910.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925.
- Bailey, J. W., "The Temporary Messianic Reign In the Literature of Early Judaism", JBL, LIII, 1934, pp. 170 - 187.
- Balmforth, H., The Gospel According To Saint Luke, (The Clarendon Bible). Oxford: Clarendon, 1930.
- Barnes, A., Notes Explanatory and Practical On The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. III, Cummings Edition, Philadelphia, 1832.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Notes On The Four Gospels. 2 vols. Cummings Edition, Philadelphia, 1832.
- Barrett, C. K., The Gospel According To St. John. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Holy Spirit and The Gospel Tradition. S. P. C. K., 1954.
- Barthélemy, D., and Milik, J. T., Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Bartlet, J. V., The Century Bible: St. Mark. Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack Ltd., 1922.
- Batiffol, P., "Les Logia Du Papyrus De Ehnesa", RB, IV, 1897, pp. 501 - 543.
- Baumgarten, M., The Acts of The Apostles. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1854, (translated by A. J. W. Morrison).
- Benson, E. W., Addresses on The Acts of the Apostles. London: Macmillan, 1901.

- Bentzen, A., King and Messiah. London: Lutterworth, 1955.
- Bernard, J. H. The Gospel According to St. John, (ICC). 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928.
- Besser, R., Christ, Light of the World. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1861, (translated by M. G. Huxtable).
- Biscoe, R., The History of the Acts of the Holy Apostles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1829.
- Black, M., An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946, (1954).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Messianic Doctrine In the Qumran Scrolls", Studia Patristica. K. Alland and F. L. Cross, editors. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957, pp. 441 - 459.
- \_\_\_\_\_, General Editor, Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Toronto: Nelson & Sons, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Servant of the Lord and Son of Man", SJT, VI, 1953, pp. 1 - 11.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1961.
- Bland, M., Annotations on the Gospel of St. Matthew. Cambridge: Deighton, Stevenson & Newby, 1828.
- Blomfield, C. J., Twelve Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles. London: Printed for B. Fellowes and C. & J. Rivington, 1828.
- Blunt, A. W. F., The Gospel According To Saint Mark, (The Clarendon Bible). Oxford: Clarendon, 1929.
- Bowen, F., Key To The Acts of the Apostles. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1869.
- Bowman, J., "Contact Between Samaritan Sects and Qumran?", VT, VII, 1957, pp. 184 - 189.
- Box, G. H., and Oesterley, W. O. E., "The Book Of Sirach", Apoc. and Pseud., I, pp. 268 - 517.
- Branscomb, B. H., The Gospel of Mark, (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary). London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.

- Breasted, J. H., The Dawn Of Conscience. New York & London: C. Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- Brewster, J., Lectures On The Acts Of The Apostles. London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1830.
- Briggs, C. A., Messianic Prophecy. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1886.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Messiah Of The Gospels. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1894.
- Bright, J., The Kingdom Of God: The Biblical Concept and Its Meaning For the Church. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953.
- Brooke, A. E., "John", A Commentary on the Bible. A. S. Peake, editor, assisted by A. C. Grieve. London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Commentary of Origen on St. John's Gospel. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1896.
- Broomfield, G. W., John, Peter and The Fourth Gospel. London: S. P. C. K., 1934.
- Brown, R. E., "The Messianism of Qumran", CBQ, XIX, 1957, pp. 53 - 82.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles", CBQ, XVII, 1955, pp. 559 - 574.
- Browning, W. R. F., The Gospel According To Saint Luke, (Torch Bible Commentaries). London: SCM, 1960.
- Brownlee, W. H., BASOR SS, 10 - 12, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls", The Scrolls and the New Testament. K. Stendahl, editor. London: SCM, 1958, pp. 33 - 53. (Reprinted, as revised, from Interpretation, IX, 1955, pp. 71 - 90).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Messianic Motifs of Qumran and The New Testament", NTS, III, 1957, pp. 12 - 30, 195 - 210.
- Bruce, A. B., "The Synoptic Gospels", The Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. I, W. Robertson Nicoll, editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Bruce, F. F., "Qumran and Early Christianity", NTS, II, 1956, pp. 176 - 190.

- \_\_\_\_\_, The Acts of the Apostles. London: Tyndale, 1951.
- Buber, M., and Rosenzweig, F., "Die Sprache der Botschaft", Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung. 3 vols. Köln: Hegner, 1954 - 1958.
- Bultmann, R., Das Evangelium des Johannes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1941 (1959).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition. Göttingen; Vandenhoeck, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "History and Eschatology in the New Testament", NTS, I, 1954, pp. 5 - 16.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Jesus and the Word. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1935, (translated by L. P. Smith and E. Huntress).
- Burkitt, F. C., "The Apocalypses: Their Place in Jewish History", Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity. London: H. Milford, 1914.
- Burney, C. F., The Aramaic Origin Of The Fourth Gospel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1922.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Poetry Of Our Lord. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.
- Burrows, M., More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Seeker & Warburg, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Seeker & Warburg, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel", ATR, XXIV, 1952, pp. 202 - 206.
- Burton, H., "Christ and the Samaritans", Expositor, First Series, IV. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1877, pp. 186 - 196.
- Cadbury, H. J., "Jesus and the Prophets", JR, V, 1925, pp. 607 - 622.
- Cadoux, A. T., The Sources of the Second Gospel. London: J. Clarke & Co., N. D.
- Caird, G. B., The Apostolic Age. London: Duckworth, 1955.

- Calvin, J., Commentary On A Harmony Of The Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke. 3 vols. Edingurgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1845 (1555); (translated by W. Pringle).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Commentary On The Acts Of The Apostles. 2 vols. Edingurgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844 (1585), (translated by C. Fetherstone and H. Beveridge).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Commentary On The Gospel According To John. 2 vols. Edingurgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847 (1553); (translated by W. Pringle).
- Cambell, C., Critical Studies In St. Luke's Gospel. Edingurgh & London: W. Blackwood & Sons, 1891.
- Campbell, G., The Four Gospels: Translated from the Greek with Preliminary Dissertations and Notes Critical and Explanatory. 2 vols. London: Printed for A. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1789.
- Carr, A., The Gospel According To St. Matthew (Cambridge Greek Testament For Schools). Cambridge: University Press, 1881.
- Charles, R. H., A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity, from Pre-Prophetic Times till the Close of the New Testament. London: A. & C. Black, 1899.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. London: S. P. C. K., 1917.
- Charnwood, Lord, According To St. John. London: Hodder & Stoughton, N. D.
- Cohen, S. S., "The Place of Jesus in the Religious Life of His Day", JBL, XLVIII, 1929, pp. 82 - 108.
- Cook, H., The Prophets Of The Bible. London: SCM, 1935.
- Cowley, A., "The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah", Expositor, Fifth Series, I. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1895, pp. 161 - 174.
- Cox, G. E. P., The Gospel According To St. Matthew, (Torch Bible Commentaries). London: SCM, 1952.



- Cranfield, C. E. B., The Gospel According To Saint Mark, An Introduction and Commentary, (Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary). Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- Creed, J. M., The Gospel According To St. Luke. London: Macmillan, 1930.
- Cross, F. M., Jr., The Ancient Library Of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. London: Duckworth, 1958.
- Cullmann, O., The Christology of the New Testament. London: SCM, 1957, (translated by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts For Research into the Beginnings of Christianity", JBL, LXXIV, 1955, pp. 213 - 226.
- Curtis, W. A., Jesus Christ the Teacher. Oxford: University Press, 1943.
- Dancy, J. C., A Commentary On I Maccabees. Oxford: Blackwell, 1954.
- Daube, D., "Three Questions Of Form In Matthew - III - Amen", JTS, XLV, 1944, pp. 27 - 31.
- Davidson, A. B., "Prophecy and Prophets", Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. IV, J. Hastings, editor. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898 - 1905, pp. 106 - 128.
- Davidson, W. T., "Prophecy, Prophets", Dictionary of the Bible. J. Hastings, editor. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1909, pp. 757 - 764.
- Davies, G. H., "Deuteronomy", Peake's Commentary on the Bible. M. Black, editor. Toronto: Nelson & Sons, 1962.
- Davies, P. E., "Jesus and the Role of the Prophet", JBL, LXIV, 1945, pp. 241 - 254.
- Davies, W. D., "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30", HTR, XLVI, 1953, pp. 113 - 39.
- De Beausobre and Lenfant, Messrs., A New Version of the Gospel According To St. Matthew. London: Printed for Law and Whittaker, 1816.
- del Medico, H. E., The Riddle Of The Scrolls. London: Burke, 1958, (translated by H. Garner).

- de Sacy, K. S., éditor, "Correspondance des Samaritains de Naplouse pendant les Années 1808 et suivant", Notices Et Extraits Des Manuscrits De La Bibliothèque Du Roi Et Autres Bibliothèques, XII. Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1831.
- Dibelius, M., Gospel Criticism and Christology. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Studies In The Acts of the Apostles. London: SCM, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Message Of Jesus Christ. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1939.
- Dick, J., Lectures On The Acts of the Apostles. Glasgow: Jackson & Orr, 1822.
- Dodd, C. H., "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet", Mysterium Christi. G. K. Bell and A. Deissmann, editors. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1930, pp. 56 - 66.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- Dods, M., "The Gospel Of St. John", The Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. I, W. Robertson Nicoll, editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Driver, S. R., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. (ICC). Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1896.
- Drummond, J., The Jewish Messiah. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1877.
- Dunwell, F. H., A Commentary On The Gospel According To St. John. London: J. T. Hayes, 1872.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., "Le Maître de Justice fut-il mis a mort", VT, I, 1951, pp. 200 - 215.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Dead Sea Scrolls, A Preliminary Survey. Oxford: Blackwell, 1954, (translated by E. M. Rowley).
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes: New Studies On The Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., 1954, (translated by R. D. Barnett).
- Easton, B. S., The Gospel According To St. Luke. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1926.
- Edersheim, A., The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Vols. I & II. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1883.

- Erman, A., Die Literatur der Aegypter. Leipzig, Deichert, 1923.
- Ewald, H., History of Israel. Vols. IV & V, (translated by J. E. Carpenter); Vol. VI, (translated by J. F. Smith). London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1871, 1874, 1883.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Life of Jesus Christ. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1865, (translated and edited by O. Glover).
- Fairweather, W. and J. S. Black, The First Book of Maccabees (The Cambridge Bible For Schools and Colleges). Cambridge: University Press, 1908.
- Farrar, F. W., The Gospel According To St. Luke, (Cambridge Bible For Schools). Cambridge: University Press, 1880.
- Farrer, A., St. Matthew and St. Mark. Westminster: Dacre, 1954.
- Fascher, E., ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. Geissen: Töpelmann, 1927.
- Filson, F. V., The Gospel According To St. Matthew, (NTC). London: A. & C. Black, 1960.
- Findlay, J. A., The Acts of the Apostles. London: SCM, 1934.
- Fischel, H. A., "Jewish Gnosticism in the Fourth Gospel", JBL, LXV, 1946, pp. 157 - 174.
- Foerster, W., Die Erloesungschöpfung des Spätjudentums, Morgenland 28. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1936.
- Friedrich, G., "Propheten und Prophezeien im Neuen Testamentum", TWNT, VI, 1959, pp. 829 - 863.
- Fritsch, C. T., The Qumran Community: Its History and Scrolls. New York: Macmillan, 1956.
- Fuller, R. H., The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. London: SCM, 1954.
- Furneaux, W. M., The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary For English Readers. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.
- Garvie, A. E., The Beloved Disciple. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1922.
- Gaster, M., The Asatir: The Samaritan Book of The 'Secrets of Moses'. London: Royal Asiatic Society, Oriental Translation Fund, New Series, Vol. XXVI, 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Samaritans. (Schweich Lectures, 1923), London: H. Milford, 1925.

- \_\_\_\_\_, The Samaritans: Oral Law and Ancient Traditions.  
I. Samaritan Eschatology. London: Search, 1932.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Transmigration (Jewish)", ERE, J. Hastings, editor.  
Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921.
- Gaster, T. H., The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect. London:  
Seeker & Warburg, 1957.
- Gfrörer, A. F., Geschichte des Urchristenthums: Das Jahrhundert  
des Heils. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Schweizerbart, 1838.
- Gilmour, S. M., "The Gospel According To St. Luke", The Inter-  
preter's Bible. Vol. VIII. New York & Nashville:  
Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952.
- Ginzberg, L., Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte. Philadelphia:  
Jewish Publication Society of America, 1922.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Legends of the Jews. 7 vols. Philadelphia:  
Jewish Publication Society of America, 1936 - 1947,  
(translated by H. Szold and P. Rodin).
- Gloag, P. J., Commentary On The Acts Of The Apostles. 2 vols.  
Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1920.
- Godet, F., A Commentary On The Gospel of St. Luke. 2 vols.  
Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1869, (translated by E. W.  
Shalders and M. D. Cusin).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Commentary On St. John's Gospel. 3 vols. Edinburgh:  
T & T Clark, 1892 - 1895, (translated by S. Taylor and  
M. D. Cusin).
- Goode, W., "Prophet, Teacher Sent From God", Essays on the  
Names and Titles of Christ. Vol. VI, Series XII, Essay  
II. London: Printed for L. B. Seekey & J. Hatchard &  
Son, 1822, pp. 240 - 257.
- Goodspeed, R. J., A History Of Early Christian Literature.  
Chicago: University Press, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Bible, an American translation: The New  
Testament. Chicago: University Press, 1938.
- Goodwin, H., A Commentary On The Gospel Of St. Matthew. Cam-  
bridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1857.
- Gould, E. P., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel  
According to St. MARK. (ICC). Edinburgh: T & T Clark,  
1896.

- Govett, R., Exposition of the Gospel of St. John. 2 vols. London: Beemrose & Sons, 1881.
- Grant, F. C., "The Gospel According To St. Mark", The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. VII. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1951.
- Green, F. W., The Gospel According to Matthew, (The Clarendon Bible). Oxford: Clarendon, 1936.
- Greig, J. C. G., "The Teacher of Righteousness and The Qumran Community", NTS, II, 1955 - 56, pp. 119 - 126.
- Grierson, C. T. P., "Prophet", Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. J. Hastings, editor. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1908, pp. 431 - 441.
- Grieve, A. J., "Matthew", A Commentary on the Bible. A. S. Peake, editor, assisted by A. C. Grieve. London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1919.
- Guignebert, C., The Jewish World In The Time of Jesus. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1939, (translated by S. H. Hooke).
- Guillaume, A., Prophecy and Divination. (Bampton Lectures, 1938). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
- Gunkel, H., "The Secret Experiences Of The Prophets", Expositor, Ninth Series, II. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1924, pp. 23 - 32.
- Guy, H. A., New Testament Prophecy, Its Origin and Significance. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Origin of the Gospel of Mark. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1954.
- Gwatkin, H. M., "Prophet in the New Testament", Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. IV, J. Hastings, editor. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902, p. 128.
- Hackett, H. B., A Commentary On The Acts Of The Apostles. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1877.
- Harnack, A., The Acts of the Apostles. London: Williams & Norgate, 1909, (translated by J. R. Wilkinson).
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Expansion Of Christianity. London: Williams, 1904, (translated & edited by J. Moffatt).

- Harris, J. R., Testamonies. Cambridge: University Press, 1916 - 1920.
- Hengstenberg, E. W., Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1865.
- Herbert, A. S., "Lamentations", Peake's Commentary on the Bible. M. Black, editor. Toronto: Nelson & Sons, 1952.
- Higgins, A. J. B., "Jesus as Prophet", ET, LVII, 1945 - 1946, pp. 292 - 294.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Priest and Messiah", VT, III, 1953, pp. 321 - 336.
- Hoskyns, E. C., The Fourth Gospel. 2 vols., F. N. Davey, editor. London: Faber & Faber, 1940.
- Howard, W. F., The Fourth Gosepl in Recent Criticism and Interpretation. London & Epworth: J. A. Sharp, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Gospel According To St. John", The Interpreter's Bible. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1952.
- Humphry, W. G., A Commentary On The Book Of The Acts Of The Apostles. London: J. W. Parker & Sons, 1854.
- Hunter, A. M., The Gospel According To Saint Mark, (Torch Bible Commentaries). London: SCM, 1949.
- Hutcheson, G., An Exposition Of The Gospel Of Jesus Christ According To John. London: Printed for R. Smith, 1657.
- Jacobus, M. W., Notes On The Gospels: Matthew. Edinburgh: W. Olisphant & Co., 1862.
- Jackson, F. J. F., The Acts Of The Apostles, (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Lake, K., editors, The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1920 - 1933.
- Jackson, H. L., The Problem Of The Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: University Press, 1918.
- Jacquier, E., Les Actes Des Apôtres. Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1926.

- James, M. R., The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1924.
- Jeremias, J., "Ἡλιεύς", TWNT, II, 1935, pp. 930 - 943.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Μωυσῆς", TWNT, IV, 1942, pp. 852 - 878.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "παῖς Θεοῦ", TWNT, V, 1954, pp. 653 - 713.
- Johnson, A. R., Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Cultic Prophet In Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1944.
- Johnson, S. E., "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Church of Jerusalem in Acts", ZAW, LXVI, 1954, pp. 106 - 120.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospel According To St. Matthew", The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. VII, New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1951.
- Josephus, F., The Works Of Flavius Josephus. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1906, (translated by W. Whiston and newly edited by D. S. Margoliouth).
- Keim, T., Jesus of Nazara. Vols. I & IV, London: Williams & Northgate, 1876.
- Kelly, W., An Exposition Of The Gospel Of John. London: T. Weston, 1898.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lectures On The Gospel Of Matthew. London: G. Morrish, 1868.
- Kilpatrick, G. D., The Origins Of The Gospel According To Saint Matthew. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.
- Klausner, J., From Jesus To Paul. London: Allen & Unwin, 1944, (translated by W. Stinespring).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus of Nazareth. London: Allen & Unwin, 1925, (translated by H. Danby).
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Messianic Idea In Israel. London: Allen & Unwin, 1956, (translated by W. Stinespring).
- Kleist, J. A., Ancient Christian Writers: The Didache et al. (Newly translated and annotated by J. A. Kleist). Westminster: Newman, 1948.
- Knight, H., The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness. London & Redhill: Lutterworth, 1947.

- Knowling, R. J., "The Acts Of The Apostles", The Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. II, W. Robertson Nicoll, editor. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Knox, R. A., "Acts Of The Apostles", A New Testament Commentary For English Readers. Vol. II. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1954.
- Knox, W. L., St. Paul and The Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: University Press, 1925.
- Krämer, H., "Die Wortgruppe in der Profangräzität", TWNT, VI, 1959, pp. 783 - 795.
- Kuhl, C., The Prophets of Israel. Edinburgh & London: Oliver & Boyd, 1960, (translated by R. J. Ehrlich and J. P. Smith).
- Kuhn, K. G., "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel", The Scrolls and the New Testament. K. Stendall, editor. London: SCM, 1958.
- Lagrange, M. J., Evangile Selon Saint Jean. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Evangile Selon Saint Luc. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Evangile Selon Saint Marc. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Evangile Selon Saint Matthieu. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Notes Sur le Messianisme au Temps de Jesus: L'Apocalypse d'Esdras, (IV Esdras) (2)" RB, XII, 1905, pp. 486 - 501.
- Lambert, J. C., "Prophet", Dictionary of the Bible. J. Hastings, editor. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1909, pp. 764 - 765.
- Lange, J. P., Theological and Homiletical Commentary On The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1861 - 1862, (translated by A. Edersheim).
- La Sor, W. S., "Historical Framework: The Present Status of Dead Sea Scrolls Study", Interp. XVI, 1962, pp. 259 - 279.
- Laurin, R. B., Messianism and Eschatology in the Qumran Scrolls. Ph. D. thesis, 1956, St. Andrews University.



- Leaney, A. R. C., A Commentary On The Gospel According To St. Luke, (HNTC). London: A. & C. Black, 1958.
- Lechler, G. V., and Gerok, K., Commentary On The Acts Of The Apostles. 2 vols., J. P. Lange, editor. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1864, (translated by P. J. Gloag).
- Lidzbarski, M., Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer. Geissen: Töpelmann, 1915.
- Lightfoot, J. B., "Internal Evidence For The Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel", Expositor. Fourth Series, I. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1890, pp. 1 - 21, 80 - 92, 176 - 188.
- Lightfoot, R. H., St. John's Gospel: A Commentary. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel Message Of St. Mark. Oxford: Clarendon, 1950.
- Lindsay, T. M., The Acts of the Apostles, (Handbook for Bible Classes and Private Students). Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1884.
- Lods, A., Israel From Its Beginning To The Middle Of The Eighth Century. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1932, (translated by S. H. Hooke).
- Loisy, A., Les Actes Des Apôtres. Paris: E. Nourry, 1920.
- Lumby, J. R., The Acts Of The Apostles, (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges). Cambridge: University Press, 1885.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Acts Of The Apostles, (The Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools). Cambridge: University Press, 1890.
- Luthardt, C. E., St. John's Gospel. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1876, (translated by C. R. Gregory).
- Lyttelton, Lord, The Four Gospels and The Acts of the Apostles with Explanatory Notes. London: Rivingtons, 1856.
- Macgregor, G. H. C., "The Acts Of The Apostles", The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. IX. New York & Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Gospel Of John", (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.

- Maclaren, A., Expositions Of Holy Scripture: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts Of The Apostles. 12 vols. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1905 - 1908.
- Maclear, G. F., The Gospel According To St. Mark, (Cambridge Greek Testament For Schools and Colleges). Cambridge: University Press, 1883.
- Major, H. D. A., and Manson, T. W., and Wright, C. J., The Mission and Message of Jesus: An Exposition Of The Gospels In The Light Of Modern Research. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1938.
- Major, J. R., The Gospel Of St. Mark. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1871.
- Manley, G. T., The Book Of The Law: Studies In The Date Of Deuteronomy. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Manson, T. W., The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- Manson, W., Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1943.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Gospel of Luke", (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.
- Maurice, F. D., The Gospel Of The Kingdom Of Heaven. London: Macmillan, 1888.
- McClymont, J. A., The Century Bible: St. John. Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, N. D.
- McNeile, A. H., The Gospel According To St. Matthew. London: Macmillan, 1915.
- Meek, T. J., Hebrew Origins. Toronto: University Press, 1951.
- Mendenhall, G. E., Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East. Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955.
- Menzies, A., "Acts", A Commentary on the Bible. A. S. Peake, editor, assisted by A. C. Grieve. London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Earliest Gospel. London: Macmillan, 1901.
- Merx, A., Das Evangelium Des Johannes. Berlin: Reimer, 1911.

- \_\_\_\_\_, Der Messias Oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner, Beihefte Zur ZAW, XVIII, Geissen: Töpelmann, 1909.
- Meyer, R., "Prophetentum und Propheten in Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit", TWNT, VI, 1959, pp. 813 - 828.
- Micklem, P. A., St. Matthew, (Westminster Commentaries). London: Methuen, 1917.
- Milik, J. T., Ten Years Of Discovery In The Wilderness Of Judaea. London: SCM, 1959, (translated by J. Strugnell).
- Montefiore, C. G., The Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. London: Macmillan, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Loewe, H., A Rabbinic Anthology: Selected and Arranged with Comments and Introductions. London: Macmillan, 1938.
- Montgomery, J. A., The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect, their History, Theology, and Literature. Philadelphia: Winston, 1907.
- Moore, G. F., Judaism In The First Centuries of the Christian Era, The Age of the Tannaim. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927 - 1930.
- Morison, J., A Commentary On The Gospel According To Mark. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1873.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Commentary On The Gospel According To Matthew. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1870.
- Moulton, J. H., and Milligan, G., The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914 - 1929.
- Mowinkel, S., He That Cometh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956, (translated by G. W. Anderson).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The 'Spirit' and the 'Word' in Pre-Exilic Reforming Prophets", JBL, LIII, 1934, pp. 197 - 227.
- Nicholson, E. B., A New Commentary On The Gospel According To Matthew. London: Kegan Paul, 1881.
- Noth, M., "History and the Word of God in the Old Testament", BJRL, XXXII, 1950, pp. 194 - 206.
- Nutt, J. W., Fragments Of A Samaritan Targum. London: Trübner, 1874.

- O'Connor, W. A., Commentary On The Gospel of St. John. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1874.
- Oesterley, W. O. E., An Introduction To The Books of the Apocrypha. London: S. P. C. K., 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Books Of The Apocrypha, Their Origin, Teaching and Contents. London: Robert Scott, 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Evolution Of The Messianic Idea. London: Pitman & Sons, 1908.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The First Book of Maccabees", Apoc. and Pseud., I, pp. 59 - 124.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Wisdom Of Jesus, The Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, Introduction and Notes. (Cambridge Bible For Schools and Colleges). Revised edition, Cambridge: University Press, 1912.
- Olshausen, H., Biblical Commentary On The Gospels and On The Acts of the Apostles. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1856 - 1859.
- Otto, R., Kingdom of God and Son of Man. London: Lutterworth, 1938, (translated by F. V. Filson and B. L. Woolf).
- Page, T. E., and Walpole, S., The Acts Of The Apostles. London: Macmillan, 1895.
- Paley, F. A., The Gospel Of St. John. London: Swan, Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co., 1887.
- Peake, A. S., editor, assisted by A. C. Grieve, A Commentary On The Bible. London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1919.
- Pedersen, J., Israel, III - IV. London: H. Milford, 1940.
- Peyton, W. W., The Memorabilia Of Jesus. London & Edinburgh: A. & C. Black, 1892.
- Pierson, A. T., The Acts Of The Holy Spirit As Set Forth In The Acts Of The Apostles. London: Morgan & Scott, N. D.
- Plummer, A., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According To St. Luke, (ICC). Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898.
- \_\_\_\_\_, An Exegetical Commentary On The Gospel According To St. Matthew. London: Robert Scott, 1909.

- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel According To St. John. (Cambridge Greek Testament For Schools and Colleges). Cambridge: University Press, 1896.
- Pope, R. M., "Prophecy, Prophet, Prophetess", Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. J. Hastings, editor. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1918, pp. 279 - 281.
- Pritchard, J. B., Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating To The Old Testament. Princeton: University Press, 1950.
- Rabin, C., The Zadokite Documents. Oxford: University Press, 1954.
- Rackham, R. B., The Acts Of The Apostles, (Westminster Commentaries). London: Methuen, 1901.
- Ragg, L., The Gospel According To St. Luke, (Westminster Commentaries). London: Methuen, 1922.
- Rankin, O. S., "Prophet, Seer", A Theological Word Book of The Bible. A. Richardson, editor. London: SCM, 1950.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J., The Gospel According To St. Mark, (Westminster Commentaries). London: Methuen, 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926.
- Redlich, E. B., An Introduction To The Fourth Gospel. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1939.
- Reith, G., The Gospel According To St. John, (Handbook For Bible Classes and Private Students). Edinburgh: T & T Clark, N. D.
- Rendtorff, R., "X'Q'Q' im Alten Testament", TWNT, VI, 1959, pp. 796 - 813.
- Reynolds, H. B., The Gospel of St. John, (The Pulpit Commentary). 2 vols. London & New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906.
- Richardson, A., The Gospel According To St. John, (Torch Bible Commentaries). London: SCM, 1959.
- Riehm, E., Messianic Prophecy. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1876.
- Ringgren, H., The Messiah of the Old Testament. London: SCM, 1956.
- Robinson, H. W., Inspiration and Revelation In The Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.

- \_\_\_\_\_, "Prophetic Symbolism", Old Testament Essays.  
D. C. Simpson, Editor. London: Griffin, 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Century Bible: Deuteronomy and Joshua.  
Revised edition. Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, N. D.
- Robinson, T. H., "The Ecstatic Element In Old Testament Prophecy",  
Expositor, Eighth Series, XXI. London: Hodder &  
Stoughton, 1921, pp. 217 - 238.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel Of Matthew, (The Moffatt New Testa-  
ment Commentary). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.
- Rowley, H. H., "4QP Nahum and the Teacher of Righteousness",  
JEL, LXXV, 1956, pp. 188 - 193.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor, Studies In Old Testament Prophecy.  
Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950, (Presented to T. H.  
Robinson).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent  
Study", HTR, XXXVIII, 1945, pp. 1 - 38.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls.  
Oxford: Blackwell, 1952.
- Ryle, J. C., Expository Thoughts On The Gospels. 6 vols.  
New York: Carter & Bros., 1857 - 1865.
- Sadler, M. F., The Gospel According To St. John. London:  
G. Bell & Sons, 1883.
- Sanday, W., The Criticism Of The Fourth Gospel. Oxford:  
Clarendon, 1905.
- Schmidt, N., The Prophet of Nazareth. New York: Macmillan,  
1905.
- Schaepe, H. J., "Das gnostische Judentum in den Dead Sea  
Scrolls", ZRG, VI, 1954, pp. 1 - 4.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Tübingen: J. C.  
B. Mohr, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Theologie Und Geschichte Des Judenchristentums.  
Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.
- Scholem, G. G., Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism. (Revised  
edition). New York: Schocken Books, 1946.
- Schubert, K., The Dead Sea Community, Its Origin and Teaching.  
New York: Harper & Bros., 1959, (translated by J. W.  
Doberstein).

- Scott, E. F., The Fourth Gospel, Its Theology and Purpose. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906.
- Schürer, E., A History Of The Jewish People In The Time Of Jesus Christ. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1890 - 1891, (translated by J. Macherson, vols. I & II, and S. Taylor and P. Christie vols. III, IV, V).
- Schweitzer, A., The Quest Of The Historical Jesus. London: A. & C. Black, 1910.
- Sellin, E., Mose und seine Bedeutung für die israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte. Leipzig: Deichert, 1922.
- Selwyn, E. G., The First Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan, 1946.
- Silbermann, L. H., "The Two 'Messiahs' of the Manual of Discipline", VT, V, 1955, pp. 77 - 82.
- Skehan, P., "The Period of the Biblical Texts from Khirbet Qumran", CBQ, XIX, 1957, pp. 435 - 440.
- Skinner, J., Prophecy and Religion. Cambridge: University Press, 1922.
- Smith, G. A., The Book of Deuteronomy, (The Cambridge Bible For Schools and Colleges). Revised edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1918.
- Smith, W. R., The Prophets of Israel. New York: Appleton, 1882.
- Spence, H. D. M., The Gospel of St. Luke, (The Pulpit Commentary). London & New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906.
- Stade, B., Geschichte des Volkes Israel. 2 vols. Berlin: Baumgärtel, 1887 - 1888.
- Stanton, V. H., The Jewish and The Christian Messiah. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1886.
- Stendahl, K., editor, The Scrolls and the New Testament. London: SCM, 1958.
- Stevens, G. B., The Johannine Theology. London: R. D. Dickinson, 1894.
- Strachan, R. H., The Fourth Evangelist, Dramatist or Historian. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1925.

- \_\_\_\_\_, The Fourth Gospel, New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- Strack, H. L., Introduction To The Talmud and Midrash. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1931.
- Sumner, J. B., A Practical Exposition Of The Acts of the Apostles. London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1838.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Practical Exposition Of The Gospel According To St. John. London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1835.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Practical Exposition Of The Gospel of St. Luke. London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1839.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Practical Exposition Of The Gospels Of St. Matthew and St. Mark in the Form of Lectures. London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1831.
- Swete, H. B., The Gospel According To St. Mark. London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Taylor, V., Behind The Third Gospel. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Names of Jesus. London: Macmillan, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The First Draft Of St. Luke's Gospel. London: S. P. C. K., 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel According To St. Mark. London: Macmillan, 1955.
- Teepie, H. M., "The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet", JBL, Monograph Series, Vol. X, 1957.
- Teicher, J. L., "Jesus in the Habakkuk Scroll", JJS, III, 1952, pp. 53 - 55.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Jesus' Sayings in the Dead Sea Scrolls", JJS, V, 1954, p. 38.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Habakkuk Scroll", JJS, V, 1954, pp. 47 - 59.
- Temple, W., Readings in St. John's Gospel. 2 parts. London: Macmillan, 1943.
- Tholuck, A., Commentary On The Gospel Of St. John. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1860.
- Thomas, D., The Genius Of The Fourth Gospel. 2 vols. London: R. D. Dickinson, 1885.



Thomson, J. E. H., "The Samaritans", ET, XI, 1889 - 1900, pp. 375 - 377.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Samaritans, Their Testimony To The Religion Of Israel. Edinburgh & London: Oliver & Boyd, 1919.

Trench, G. H., A Study Of St. John's Gospel. London: J. Murray, 1918.

Trollope, W., The Gospel According To St. Matthew. Cambridge: J. Hall & Son, 1871, (Revised by W. H. C. Rowlandson).

Turner, C. H., The Gospel According To St. Mark, Introduction and Commentary. London: S. P. C. K., 1928.

Volz, P., Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba. Tübingen & Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1903.

Watson, R., An Exposition Of The Gospel of St. Luke. London: J. Mason, 1833.

\_\_\_\_\_, An Exposition Of The Gospels Of St. Matthew and St. Mark. London: J. Mason, 1833.

Welch, A. C., The Code Of Deuteronomy: A New Theory Of Its Origin. London: Clarke, 1924.

Wendt, H. H., The Gospel According To St. John. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902, (translated by E. Lummis).

\_\_\_\_\_, The Teaching Of Jesus. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1892, (translated by J. Wilson).

Westcott, B. F., Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. London: Macmillan, 1875.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Gospel According To St. John. 2 vols. London: J. Murray, 1908.

Wieder, N., "Notes On The New Documents from the Fourth Cave of Qumran", JJS, VII, 1956, pp. 71 - 76.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Doctrine Of Two Messiahs Among The Karaites", JJS, VI, 1955, pp. 14 - 25.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Idea Of A Second Coming Of Moses", JQR, XLV - XLVI, 1954 - 1956, pp. 356 - 364.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses", JJS, IV, 1953, pp. 158 - 175.

- Williams, A. L., and Deane, W. J., The Gospel According To St. Matthew, (The Pulpit Commentary). 2 vols. London & New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906.
- Williams, C. S. C., A Commentary On The Acts of the Apostles, (BNTC). London: A. & C. Black, 1957.
- Williams, R. R., The Acts of the Apostles, (Torch Bible Commentaries). London: SCM, 1953.
- Wilson, R. McL., The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy. London: Mowbray, 1958.
- Windisch, H., "Jesus und der Geist in Johannes Evangelium", Amicitiae Corolla. H. G. Wood, editor. London: University Press, 1933, pp. 303 - 318.
- Wood, H. G., "Mark", A Commentary on the Bible. A. S. Peake, editor, assisted by A. C. Grieve. London: T. C. & E. C. Jack, 1919.
- Wright, A., The Gospel According To St. Luke. London: Macmillan, 1900.
- Wright, G. E., "The Terminology of Old Testament Religion and Its Significance", JNES, I, 1942, pp. 404 - 414.
- Young, F. W., "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination", JBL, LXVIII, 1949, pp. 285 - 299.
- Zeller, E., The Contents and Origin of The Acts of the Apostles. 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1875.
- Zeitlin, S., "The Antiquity of the Hebrew Scrolls and the Piltown Hoax: A Parallel", JQR, XLV - XLVI, 1954 - 1956, pp. 1 - 29.