

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LXVI.



LONDON:

Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1934

774TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY FEBRUARY 5TH, 1934,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. GEORGE H. LUNN, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of Captain A. H. F. Young, R.N.R., as a Member.

The CHAIRMAN then called on the Rev. F. W. Pitt to read his paper entitled "Jesus of Nazareth—the Prophet like unto Moses."

*JESUS OF NAZARETH—THE PROPHET LIKE UNTO
MOSES.*

By the REV. F. W. PITT.

IT was not until the career of Moses was practically finished that he uttered the famous prediction that the Lord God of Israel would raise up from among them a Prophet like unto himself. (Deut. xviii, 15, 18.) It seems easy, perhaps too easy, to conclude that the great Lawgiver spake exclusively of Jesus of Nazareth. As confirmation of that view the words of Peter in his appeal to the nation are quoted :

“For Moses truly said unto the fathers : A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me. Him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass that every soul which shall not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.” (Acts iii, 22-23.)

But it should be noticed that Peter does not say definitely that the prophet was Jesus of Nazareth. Neither did Stephen. His words to the Council were :

“This is that Moses which said unto the children of Israel : A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me ; him shall ye hear.” (Acts vii, 37.)

In Heb. iii, 2, there is a comparison between

“ Christ Jesus who was faithful to him that appointed him, as Moses also was faithful in all his house.”

But in this case there is no reference to either Christ or Moses as a prophet. The comparison is of the faithfulness of one as a servant, with the other as a Son, which is no confirmation of the interpretation that Moses spake of Jesus of Nazareth as the prophet whose raising up he predicted, though they may be right who consider that each of the texts I have quoted takes it for granted.

Ancient and modern expositors are divided on the question at issue : Most Lutheran Commentators as well as many Roman Catholics and Anglicans follow the ancient fathers in regarding the text as relating solely to our Lord as the promised prophet.

Some Christians of note, including Origen and Calvin, favour the view that the words of Moses indicate a line of prophets culminating in Christ. Mediæval Jewish authorities interpret it as applying to the prophetic office generally, and not to Christ at all. But Jews in the time of St. Augustine specify David, Jeremiah, and even Joshua as the prophet of whom Moses spake. This last view is also adopted by some modern commentators. The opinions of Jewish scholars are necessarily prejudiced because the nation that rejected Jesus as the Messiah could hardly admit that the Man they crucified was the great personage predicted by Moses like unto the Lawgiver himself.

Dismissing therefore as being unreasonable the suggestion that the prophet was David or Jeremiah or such like we are left with two views :

1. The prophecy relates to Jesus of Nazareth exclusively.
2. It includes the whole order of prophets culminating in Jesus of Nazareth.

There is another claimant to the honour, and that is Mahomet. At an Advent Testimony Meeting in Kingsway Hall this last summer there appeared an Indian, resplendent in a gorgeous uniform, and wearing a huge turban throughout the service. He took the opportunity of circulating a pamphlet, of which I have a copy, issued by the London Mosque, 63, Melrose Road, S.W.18.

This pamphlet boldly states that it is clear that Christ and “ that prophet ” are different persons. The conclusion is based

on the answers of John the Baptist to questions by the messengers from Jerusalem. (John 1, 26.)

“ Art thou that prophet ? ” “ No.”

“ Art thou Elias ? ” “ No.”

“ Art thou that Christ ? ” “ No.”

“ Why baptizest thou then if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet ? ”

This, the pamphlet assumes is evidence that the Christ and the prophet are two different persons ; Elias making a third.

The argument is scarcely decisive for the questions show only what may have been the belief of the Priests and Levites of our Lord's day. John's replies do not touch that point, but merely express his renunciation of any claim to be anyone, but the herald who was unworthy to unloose the shoe latchet of Him whose coming he proclaimed.

Another point urged in favour of Mahomet is that “ the promised prophet must arise from among the brethren of Israel ”; i.e. “ he must be of the progeny of Ishmael.” If what I have read is true, Mahomet claimed to be a descendant of Medan, one of the sons of Keturah. He himself therefore was not a descendant of Ishmael, whose mother was Hagar. But in any case, Mahomet, being an Arab, was not a brother of the Jew. That claim could only be sustained if he were one of Jacob's descendants.

A further objection to Jesus raised by the Muslims, is that Mahomet claimed to speak the words of God, and that Jesus did not. “ Are there any words in the New Testament which are spoken by Jesus in the Name of God. Remember we want the actual words,” says the pamphlet.

My answer is that Jesus said,

“ My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me. If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself.” (John vii, 16.)

And again,

“ He that sent me is true, and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of Him.” (John viii, 26.)

And yet again,

“ As my Father hath taught me I speak these things.” (John viii, 28.)

Jesus did then claim to speak the word of God. So did Mahomet. But Moses did not say the prophet would claim to speak the words of God, but that he would actually do so.

Joseph Smith, the Mormon, and a host of others have said they spoke the words of God, but there is only One of Whom a Voice from heaven said,

“ This is My beloved Son, *HEAR HIM.*”

Let God decide upon the rival claims of Mahomet and Jesus.

Another proof is advanced in the pamphlet in support of Mahomet. It is that the words of Moses imply a complete victory of the promised prophet over his enemies. This, it is stated, is not true of Jesus.

“ He is rejected, scoffed at, maltreated, disgraced, arrested, tried, and crucified amid the rejoicings of the Jews ; and His own last lament bears testimony to His utter helplessness in the hands of His enemies : ‘ My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ’ ?

“ The prophet of Islam, however, had a different experience. He was avenged of his enemies in his own lifetime, and crowned his successes with the victorious capture of Mecca from where he had been forced to fly from his enemies eleven years before.”

“ Be it noted,” the pamphlet concludes, “ that by the reference above to Jesus’ death, it is not implied that he was a false prophet. What has been said is only from the point of view of Christians themselves. Otherwise we Muslims have perfect faith in His divine mission and believe Him to be a holy prophet who is honoured both in this life and the life to come. We do not believe Him to have died upon the Cross at the hands of the Jews, for reasons which need not be stated here, but we believe Him to have lived to a ripe old age, and died in some other clime and region on this revolving globe.”

And yet a British peer is prominent among the Muslims in England, in spite of this travesty of sacred and profane history, which is, apart from the known character of Mahomet, quite sufficient to warrant us in rejecting his claim to be the prophet like unto Moses.

How then can we decide the true import of the words which Moses spoke ?

Looking at the text there seems to be no doubt that a Person and not an Office is referred to. That person is a prophet like unto Moses. These two stand out as type and antitype ; Moses, whose work was wellnigh done, and the One who should afterwards be raised up from among the children of Israel.

With the modern increase of prophetic study it is almost exclusively understood that a prophet is one who foretells things to come. But what did Moses mean by a prophet ? He had used the word before. When Abimilech, king of Gerar took Sarah, God appeared to him and said :

“ Restore Abraham his wife, for he is a *prophet*, and he shall pray for thee and thou shalt live.”

There was no idea of prediction in that description of a prophet. Again the Lord said unto Moses :

“ See I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy *prophet*. Thou shalt speak all that I command thee and Aaron thy brother shall speak unto Pharaoh.”

In this case again the idea is that of one who should speak all that was spoken to him without any emphasis on prediction, though that might be included.

Balaam, as recorded by Moses, “ saw the vision of the Almighty, falling into a trance, but having his eyes open,” and he uttered some marvellous predictions concerning Israel. But Balaam is not called a prophet till the time of Peter’s second epistle, a fact which might suggest that since the time of Moses the word Prophet had taken on the meaning of the word as we understand it.

That change appears to be referred to in 1 Sam. ix, 9 :

“ Beforetime in Israel when a man went to enquire of God, thus he spake : Come, and let us go to the Seer, for he that is now called a Prophet was beforetime called a Seer.”

There are three Hebrew words for Prophet—*Nabi*, *Chozek*, and *Roeh*. After the expansion of the meaning of the word prophet the words are used interchangeably, but before that, in the time of Moses, only the first word—*Nabi*—is used. Abraham was a *Nabi* ; Aaron was a *Nabi* ; they were prophets in the

original sense, and not seers, and this is the word used by Moses in Deut. xiii, 1-8, and xviii, 15 and 18.

This opposes the idea that Moses predicted the raising up of a prophet like Isaiah and others in the succession of prophets, for the word when Moses spoke had not yet taken on the meaning of seer, a recorder of visions. Therefore when Moses said "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee of thy brethren like unto me" he must have had in mind his own exalted position as head and leader of the people, who was unto them as God, organizing their armies, ordering their worship, leading their praises, codifying their laws, bringing bread from heaven, and water from the flinty rock, punishing their transgressions, and pardoning their iniquities, instituting their sacrifices, appointing their times and seasons.—He introduced a new order among men. He was the leader of a movement.

The prophet "whom God would raise up shall be like unto me," he said, and neither Isaiah nor Jeremiah, though prophets, were like Moses in the sense indicated.

We must realize something of the greatness of Moses if we are to identify the prophet who was to be like him.

Aaron and Miriam, his brother and sister, evidently failed to appreciate the lofty status of Moses. He was so meek, and then he had married an Ethiopian woman, so they said, "Hath the Lord only spoken by Moses, hath he not spoken also by us? And the Lord heard it." (Num. xii.)

"And the Lord spake suddenly unto Moses and unto Aaron and unto Miriam. Come out ye three unto the tabernacle of the congregation. And they three came out. And the Lord came down in the pillar of cloud and stood in the door of the tabernacle, and called Aaron and Miriam, and He said: Hear My words. If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make Myself known unto him in a vision and will speak to him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so who is faithful in all mine house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold: wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses? And the anger of the Lord was kindled against them."

This helps us to decide the question as to what Moses meant by a "prophet like unto him." The whole line of the prophets had

dreams, visions and revelations of the Lord. David was a prophet, the Holy Ghost spake through him. He made known things to come concerning the Messiah and the Kingdom of God, but he did not introduce a new dispensation of which he was the head. The same is true of all the prophets, "from Samuel and those that followed after as many as have spoken (who) have likewise told of these days." Moses, though he also foretold things to come, was something quite different, and it was in that something that the prophet who was to be raised up was to be like unto him.

It is urged by those who include the line of prophets in the prediction of Moses that the word used "*appears* to be a collective noun." If they are not sure that it is so, it is not evidence. The only other argument that I can find in favour of the idea of a succession of prophets is that Moses went on to tell how a true prophet could be distinguished from a false prophet. But that is a very slight foundation on which to build the argument. Perhaps Moses in contrasting the true prophet with the false may have had in mind the Christ and the Antichrist—the False Prophet of the Book of Revelation. If this should seem to be far-fetched, I would point out that Jesus, when the Jews were plotting to slay Him, said, possibly referring to this passage in Deuteronomy,

"I am come in My Father's Name (the true prophet), and ye receive Me not; if another shall come in his own name (the false prophet) him ye will receive" (John v, 43), and immediately the Lord went on to say, "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses ye would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?"

Here is evidence that Jesus had in mind this very passage in Deuteronomy which is the only one in which Moses specifically wrote of Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth.

After His resurrection the Lord referred again to Deut. xviii. "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." (Luke xxiv, 27), thus favouring the idea that Moses referred to Him alone as that prophet.

From the time of Moses till the time of Christ, there were false prophets, who, like Mahomet, claimed to be the prophet like unto Moses. Jesus said, "All that ever came before Me were thieves and robbers; but the sheep did not hear them." (John x.)

Gamaliel, also, said to the Priests in Council when Peter and the other apostles were brought before them, "Before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody, to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves, who were slain, and all as many as obeyed him were scattered and brought to nought. After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him; he also perished, and all as many as obeyed him were dispersed." (Acts v, 36-37.)

What they claimed to be is not clear, but their example is sufficient to prove that impostors did arise in Israel before the time of Christ. But what is more important is that none of the prophets from Samuel to John the Baptist ever claimed to be, or was recognized as the prophet like unto Moses. And more important still, when the Lord came into the world there was in the minds of many an expectation of the prophet like unto Moses.

The case of the priests who sent to John the Baptist is proof of this, for they enquired of John if he were the Christ, or Elias, or THAT prophet. (John i, 20, 21.) They did not say "Art thou 'A' prophet, but 'THAT' prophet. So Philip also said to Nathaniel, "We have found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth."

The Pharisee, to whose house Jesus went, when he saw the woman washing the Lord's feet, said, "This man if he were 'THAT' prophet (R.V.) he would have known what manner of woman this is that toucheth him." (Luke, vii.)

Again, when Jesus multiplied the loaves and fishes the men, when they had seen the miracle, said, "This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world." (John, vi, 14.)

Again, when Jesus was at the feast of tabernacles He cried, saying, "If any man thirst let Him come unto Me and drink," many of the people said, "Of a truth this is the Prophet"—others said, "this is the Christ." (John vii, 40, 41.)

From these passages and several others it is evident that the belief was current at that time that the prediction of Moses had not been fulfilled in the past. The nation still expected the prophet like unto Moses. It is true that no one seemed to have

imagined that the Messiah and the prophet were one and the same person. Undoubtedly they thought they were two persons ; but then, to this day there are Jews who think there were to be two Messiahs, one to suffer and one to reign.

Moses "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." To have brushed aside the very tangible values of the court of Pharaoh, proves that his knowledge of the Christ—the Messiah, was most definite. His intercourse with God must have impressed him with the certainties of divine promise, and brought that which was "afar off" very near, and made it very real.

But what did Moses understand by the Messiah ? The Jews, for personal and national motives demanded that the Messiah should be a King who would restore to Israel some of the glories of David and Solomon. They appear never to have thought of Him as a Redeemer, and the idea of Messiah as a King only, prevails even among some Christians to this day.

Moses thought of the Messiah pre-eminently as a Prophet. Did he also know that He would be a King and a Priest ?

It is remarkable that immediately preceding the announcement of the Prophet like unto himself Moses summarized the law for the appointment of the Aaronic Priesthood. And immediately preceding that he outlined the divine requirements of Kingship in Israel. There is no mention of them as typical of the Messiah, but it is significant that the Prophet, Priest, and King, appear in close connection in the address of Moses recorded in Deut. xvii and xviii. But if the connection is merely a coincidence it is certain that if the Messiah was to be like Moses He must not only be a Prophet ; He must be a Priest and a King, for Moses was a Prophet, Priest and King.

Moses was, as indicated, by his own direct word a Prophet, for he said :

"The Lord your God shall raise up unto you of your brethren *a prophet like unto me.*"

Moses was also a Priest. In Exod. xl he is described as fulfilling that office. He set the bread upon the holy table as the Lord commanded Moses. He lighted the lamps of the candlestick. He burnt sweet incense upon the golden altar. He offered on the brazen altar the burnt offering and the meal offering, and Moses and Aaron and his sons washed their hands and

their feet at the brazen laver ; while in Ps. xcix we read “ Moses and Aaron among His Priests.”

Therefore Moses was a Priest as well as a Prophet. He was also a King.

Deut. xxxiii, 4-5, says,

“ Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob. And he was king in Jeshurun when the heads of the people and the tribes of Israel were gathered together.”

There are some authorities who claim that these words do not apply to Moses but to God, and for the reason that Moses is nowhere else called a king. But there are equally great authorities who believe Moses *was* referred to and it is certain that Moses discharged all the functions of a king although he was not crowned as such. We must also remember that he is only once spoken of as a Priest, and that he discharged the function of a Priest without the anointing that Aaron had.

I conclude, therefore, from these references, that Moses was a Prophet, a Priest, and a King, and if the Messiah was to be like unto Moses He also must be a Prophet, a Priest, and a King.

Moses himself said that the promised One would be a Prophet like unto him, and Ps. cx says :

“ Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek,”

and Ps. ii, foretells the day when God will “ set His King upon His holy hill of Zion.”

Therefore it is evident that the promised Messiah was to be not only a King, but a Prophet, Priest and King, just as Moses was, and it is most significant that in the New Testament the names of Moses and Christ are linked together in reference to each of the three offices.

Jesus was the prophet of a new dispensation. It was as a prophet He ministered during His life on earth. He did not do so as a Priest, for “ if He were on earth He should not be a Priest.” (Heb. viii, 4.) Neither did He rule as a King. He said, “ My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered into the hands of the Jews ; but now is my kingdom not of this world.” (John viii, 36.)

The Lord spoke of Himself as a prophet—"A prophet is not without honour save in his own country and in his own house." (Matt. xiii, 57.)

And again, "I must walk to-day and to-morrow and the day following, for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." (Luke xiii, 33.)

After His resurrection the disciples said of Him, "Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people." (Luke xxiv, 19.)

It is then as a prophet that Jesus ministered while on earth, and it is as a prophet that His Name is linked with that of Moses in John i, 17 :

"The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

Moses was the prophet of the dispensation of the law, and Jesus was the prophet of the dispensation of grace.

When Jesus died and rose again He ascended into heaven, our Great High Priest, there to appear in the presence of God for us. His ministry as a Prophet being finished, His ministry as a Priest began, and again His name is linked with that of Moses :

"Consider the apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to Him that appointed Him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house."—(Heb. iii, 1-2.)

As a Priest the name of Jesus is linked with that of Moses.

Finally, as a King the name of Jesus is linked with that of Moses. Presently when the victors stand upon the sea of glass having the harps of God they will sing "the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, thou King of Saints" (or ages or nations). (Rev. xv, 3.)

However much one man might have been a prophet like Moses, or another man a Priest like Moses, or another man a King like Moses, no one man but Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, the Messiah, was both a Prophet, a Priest, and King as Moses was, and that great fact seems to have been in the mind of the Holy Spirit when He caused the two names to be mentioned together when speaking of Jesus as Prophet, Priest, and King.

Balaam was a prophet, but he was not at all like Moses. He was a timeserver who accepted the rewards of divination, and he was neither a Priest nor a King.

Caiaphas was a Priest, but he was not a King, and though on one great occasion he prophesied he was not at all like Moses.

David was a prophet and a King, but he also came short of the exact likeness of Moses in that he was not a Priest. But Jesus of Nazareth was a Prophet, Priest and King, and in these three offices He was the one and only antitype of Moses who has appeared on the pages of history. And not only was Jesus of Nazareth like Moses in what He was, He was like Moses in what He did.

Moses brought a people from bondage to liberty—so did Jesus. Moses instituted the covenant of the law. Jesus instituted the covenant of grace. Moses shed and sprinkled the blood of redemption, and so did Jesus. Moses was the instrument of God in the great work of organizing a horde of slaves and making them a chosen nation, a peculiar people. So did Jesus. Moses led and fed the people in their wilderness journey. So does Jesus. And all that Moses did under the dispensation of the law Jesus does under the dispensation of grace.

We therefore conclude that till Jesus of Nazareth came into the world “there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses whom the Lord knew face to face.”

DISCUSSION.

On the call of the CHAIRMAN (Rev. G. H. Lunn) the thanks of the meeting was accorded to the lecturer, and the subject was open for discussion.

Lieut.-Col. MOLONY said: I expect that we shall agree that Mr. Pitt has proved his point, and that we are entitled to include Deut. xviii, 15 and 18 among the predictions of the first coming of Jesus Christ. Mr. Pitt was well advised to speak about expectation. You will remember that he quoted four cases in which the Jews of Christ's day spoke about “*that* Prophet” and *the* Prophet, in a way that made it almost certain that they were referring to Moses' prediction.

I am not a lawyer, but I believe that lawyers would agree that expectation is an important link in our chain of proofs. If you

have a remarkable prediction about a matter which could not be foreseen, and their expectation on the same lines lasting right up to fulfilment, and lastly an exact fulfilment that cannot be attributed to its being brought about, so to speak, on purpose; then you have a very complete line of evidence that the prediction was due to divine inspiration.

I am sure that we do well to stress the prediction that Messiah was to be a great prophet or teacher. Because almost everybody agrees that Jesus was a very great Teacher. Mr. Pitt was doubtless right to confine his remarks to only one of these predictions, seeing that he had so much relevant matter to say about it. We shall, however, do well to remember that there were several others. I could quote four distinct predictions that Messiah was to be a great teacher, in Isaiah alone. And there is Psalm xxii, 22, where the Messiah says to God Himself, " I will declare Thy name unto My brethren." Now we know that the name always stood for the qualities, so this was a prediction that Messiah would teach us the qualities of God.

And may I add two passages proving expectation beside those cited by Mr. Pitt. They are Luke ii, 32 and John iv, 25. Mr. Pitt said, " The Jews . . . appear never to have thought of Him as a Redeemer " ; but a few chosen spirits appear to have expected Him to be a sufferer. See Luke ii, 35. I believe that myrrh was chosen as one of the gifts because the eastern sages knew that their Judean brethren were ignoring the predictions of Christ's sufferings, and were likely to be ultimately scandalized if they did not learn to associate Messiah with suffering. I was surprised that Mr. Pitt said so much about Moslem opinion. His reason may have been this, namely, to show that Moses' prediction was fulfilled by some other teacher, is practically the only way of meeting the Christian argument. Mr. Pitt well showed how futile the attempt is in the case of Mahomet. I beg to thank Mr. Pitt for a very useful paper.

REV. ARTHUR W. PAYNE was specially thankful for the paper in view of the menace of Islam.

He thought that it could not be said that the Jews were not looking for a Redeemer, for we read in Luke i, 68, of the words of Zacharias the father of John the Baptist: " Blessed be the Lord

God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people ”; and of Anna, who spake of Him, the child Jesus, “ to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem ” (Luke ii, to 38); and also to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus after the resurrection, when speaking to the risen, but unrecognized Lord, they said, “ But we trusted it had been He which should have redeemed Israel.”

One remembered that the Moslem body was still the most numerous in Palestine, and that over the Dome of the Rock in the Temple area, of which they are in possession, were the words in Arabic : “ Jesus is not the Son of God ; God had no Son ; God does not beget nor is begotten ”—this statement on the very spot where our Lord spoke of “ My House,” “ My Father’s House.”

Mr. R. DUNCAN said that “ whom the Lord knew face to face ” was the outstanding feature of similarity between Jesus of Nazareth and Moses. Pondering the scripture records, other points of likeness besides those Mr. Pitt has so interestingly brought out will be revealed. Malice of wicked kings would have cut off both Moses and Jesus in infancy ; had not sanctuary for both, under the care of their mothers, been found in Egypt. Meekness was a great characteristic of the man Moses, and Jesus said of Himself “ I am meek and lowly in heart.” Before Israel could enter into the Promised Land, it was necessary that Moses should die, and Jesus also had to taste death for every man before newness of life became possible for mankind. In the course of his farewell words to Israel, Moses said “ The Lord was displeased with me for your sakes,” ; and was it not for our sakes that Jesus was made a curse. (Gal. iii, 13).

A marked contrast between Jesus and Moses is apparent, however, in their teaching methods. Moses never had recourse to parable whereas it is said of Jesus, in his words to the people generally, “ without a parable spake He not unto them.” But is it not probable that mercy may have prompted the use of the parabolic form. Except to those who had ears to hear the meaning of the parables was hidden, and, in the case of the great multitude of the people, the responsibility for non-acceptance of the word was therefore lessened.

Dr. THIRTLE associated himself very heartily with the argument developed by the lecturer, and while accepting without question the position that the vision of Moses embraced the Person and work of Christ, pointed out as a curious fact, that the Samaritan people, whose sacred Scriptures are limited to the Pentateuch, had an outlook that did not include the majestic parts and functions of the Messiah. When the woman at the well of Sychar said: "I know that Messiah cometh," she seems to have accepted the Jewish expectation. As a fact, however, the Israelitish remnant in Samaria, to this day settled at Nablus, are able to conceive of no prophet beside Moses. Hence they await the Coming One, the *Tahéb*, in other words, *Moses himself*, who, though hidden in death, will (as they hold) at the end-time return and carry forward the larger purpose of God. This has been made clear from the publication of the *Asatir* or "Secrets of Moses," discovered and published by the learned Dr. Gaster a few years ago. If not definitely edifying, this point of view is curious, and yields support to the interpretation of our lecturer to-day, when holding that Moses had in mind an individual, one whom the Jewish people have anticipated as the Messiah, and whom Christians as a community accept as Prophet, Priest and King.

The Rev. Principal H. S. CURR said: Like the speakers who have preceded me, I have enjoyed Mr. Pitt's paper. I find myself in complete accord with all the contentions which he advances. It is indubitable that Our Lord is the pre-eminent Prophet of whom Moses spoke in his address to the Israelites, and which has been preserved for us in Deuteronomy. In thinking of Our Lord as the Prince of Prophets, it is well to remember that that does not render full justice to all that He was along these lines. The full significance of that statement will become more clear if the function of the prophet be recalled.

Fundamentally He is the spokesman of another Person. Thus Aaron is expressly described and defined in a famous passage (Exod. vii, 1) as the prophet of his brother Moses in the sense that he would utter eloquently and effectively the words put into his lips by his leader. Our Lord was, moreover, a prophet in a profounder sense than that. The spokesman of the Father He

unquestionably was, as the quotation from His teaching on the subject, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel, and cited by Mr. Pitt in his paper, proves, but surely He was much more. He spoke in His own authority, and by His own authority. He was no echo of anybody else. He prophesied in the sense that He foretold and forthtold, but in a very different way from Isaiah or Jeremiah. They could only repeat what God by His Holy Spirit had first said to them. Christ spoke on His Own account, and on His own initiative for He was Very God of Very God as well as Very Man of Very Man.

These observations show how far Christ is removed from Mohammed. The foundation of Islam is expressed in a sentence which is usually rendered: "There is one God, and Mohammed is God's apostle (prophet)." That statement embodies Mohammed's claim, which is a supreme example of self-deception, unconscious indeed, but profound. The Christian, however, would not feel that the status of the Divine Saviour has been adequately defined by being described as God's Prophet. Christ is all that; but He is a great deal more. Just as He is not only Priest but sacrifice as well, so too, He is both Prophet and prophecy in Himself. He declared that He Himself was the Truth, and that all who were of the truth hear His voice.

LECTURER'S REPLY.

The establishment of the Moslem religion in England is sufficient reason for attempting to refute the claim that Mahomet was the prophet spoken of by Moses. The Moslem Menace is a tremendous barrier to Christian Missions, and I think the Victoria Institute did well in making an opportunity for members to contribute their views on a great subject.

I am much encouraged by the warm and unanimous support of the paper.