

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis  
**Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary**

---

Master of Divinity Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

11-1-1965

# John the Baptizer, Is He Elijah Who is to Come?

Floyd Schoenhals

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, [floyd.schoenhals@gmail.com](mailto:floyd.schoenhals@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Schoenhals, Floyd, "John the Baptizer, Is He Elijah Who is to Come?" (1965). *Master of Divinity Thesis*. 61.  
<http://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv/61>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Divinity Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

JOHN THE BAPTIZER,  
IS HE ELIJAH WHO IS TO COME?

---

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for elective  
E-505

---

by  
Floyd Merlen Schoenhals  
November 1965

41110

Edgar Krentz

Advisor

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY  
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
II. ELIJAH IN JUDAISM . . . . .	3
Elijah in the Old Testament . . . . .	3
Elijah in Rabbinic Thought. . . . .	7
The Eschatological Prophet. . . . .	14
III. ELIJAH TYPOLOGY IN RELATION TO JOHN THE BAPTIZER IN THE SYNOPTICS . . . . .	18
Material Supplied by Mark and Reused for the Most Part by Matthew and Luke . .	18
Pertinent "Q" Material. . . . .	30
Material Peculiar to Luke . . . . .	36
IV. CONCLUSION. . . . .	43
Unanswered Questions. . . . .	44
FOOTNOTES. . . . .	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	55

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The prophet Elijah plays a big role in the Old Testament. He acts for Yahweh with zeal and is translated into heaven by a whirlwind without dying. His activity and particularly his translation lead to an expectation in Judaism that he would return in the end time to restore all things.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the Synoptic Gospels to answer the question, Is John the Baptizer Elijah Who is to Come? In doing this, it is necessary, first of all, to see how Elijah is presented in the Old Testament and in Rabbinic Judaism. After this, there will be an investigation of the Synoptic materials which pertain to this question. These materials have arbitrarily been divided up into three major groupings.

1. Material supplied by Mark and reused for the most part by Matthew and Luke.
2. Pertinent 'Q' material.
3. Material peculiar to Luke.

The purpose of this paper and its broad scope do not allow for a detailed exegetical study of each section listed. Nor does this study allow for a detailed analysis of the way each particular evangelist presents his material, although this will be done in certain instances. By employing this type of methodology, the paper will

raise more questions than it will solve, but will hopefully point in the direction in which they are to be solved.

## CHAPTER II

### ELIJAH IN JUDAISM

#### Elijah in the Old Testament

Elijah was a prophet of the ninth century B. C. from Tishbeh of Gilead in the Northern Kingdom.<sup>1</sup> His mission and work are recounted in the Old Testament in I Kings 17-19, 21 and II Kings 1-2. This information can be divided conveniently into three parts. First of all, there are "miracles and miraculous elements." Secondly, there is the "struggle against Baalism." Thirdly, there is the "prophet's denunciation of kings."<sup>2</sup>

1. Miracles and miraculous elements. The first thing that Elijah does, when he is brought on the scene in I Kings, is to announce to King Ahab the coming of a great drought (I Kings 17:1). During this drought Elijah, acting on the Lord's direction, goes to the brook Cherith and is fed by ravens (I Kings 17:2-9). After the brook dried up, the word of the Lord came to him and directed him to go to Zarephath and to dwell with a widow and her son. The only means of livelihood during this time was a little meal in a jar and a little oil in a cruse. Both the meal and the oil lasted throughout Elijah's stay in this place (I Kings 17:10-16). During this stay the widow's son died, but Elijah managed to bring him back

to life (I Kings 17:17-24).

Other miraculous elements are evident in Elijah's being transported by the Spirit of the Lord in connection with his conversation with Obadiah (I Kings 18:12); in the fire coming down and consuming the burnt offering on Mount Carmel (I Kings 18:20-40); in the feeding of Elijah by an angel on the journey to Horeb (I Kings 19:4-8), and in the fire from heaven which destroyed the troops of King Ahaziah who intended to capture Elijah (II Kings 1:9-16).

II Kings 2:1-12 records Elijah's translation into heaven by a whirlwind after a chariot of fire and horses of fire separate him from Elisha.<sup>3</sup>

2. Struggle against Baalism. During the reign of Ahab, Baal worship was introduced into the Northern Kingdom by Jezebel, Ahab's wife, the daughter of the king of Tyre (I Kings 16:29-33). After the drought announced in I Kings 17:1 had come, Elijah returned to Ahab to announce its end (I Kings 18:1). Ahab charged Elijah with troubling Israel. Elijah responded by telling Ahab that he was forsaking the commandments of Yahweh by following Baal. He challenged the prophets of Baal to a contest at Mount Carmel (I Kings 18:17-19). On Mount Carmel before all Israel the prophets of Baal were unable to call down fire from their god. Elijah, however, prayed and fire came down and consumed the burnt offering. The people then confessed that Yahweh is God and then seized the prophets of Baal and put them to



death (I Kings 18:20-40). At this point the rains came down and the long drought came to an end (I Kings 18:41-46).

When Jezebel heard what Elijah had done, she sent a messenger to threaten him. Because he was afraid, Elijah went to Beer-sheba in Judah and finally ends up at Mount Horeb (I Kings 19:1-8). A 'still small voice' commanded Elijah to anoint Hazael as king of Syria, Jehu as king of Israel, and Elisha to take his place as prophet (I Kings 19:9-17). "In this command and in the divine promise to keep a remnant of seven thousand faithful to the true faith (v. 18), the struggle of Baalism and Yahwism is the dominant theme."<sup>4</sup>

Elijah also condemned King Ahaziah, the son of Ahab, because he tried to elevate Baalism over Yahwism.<sup>5</sup>

3. The prophet's denunciation of kings. It has already been pointed out that Elijah stood up against King Ahab and his son Ahaziah. He denounced them because of their 'Baalistic tendencies.' In addition to this, Elijah denounced Ahab for arranging the death (through Jezebel) of Naboth so that he could acquire his vineyard (I Kings 21:17-24). In this instance the "ethical implications of Yahwism were at stake" and Elijah condemns Ahab as a murderer and a robber.<sup>6</sup>

The Old Testament account gives us the basic historical data about Elijah's prophetic role in the first half of the ninth century B. C. Evidently Elijah's work had made

such an impact on the religious thinking of later generations<sup>7</sup> that in the book of Malachi Elijah became the messenger of the Lord, a Messianic figure,<sup>8</sup> who will appear on the scene of history before the day of the Lord. Malachi 3:1 in the LXX says,

ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιθλήσεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου, καὶ ἐβαίψωνται ἕβει εἰς τὸν νάον ἑαυτοῦ κύριος, ὃν ὑμεῖς ἤκητε, καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης, ὃν ὑμεῖς θέλετε· ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται, λέγει κύριος πάντο κράτωρ.

That this ἄγγελος is Elijah is seen in Malachi 3:22-23 LXX.

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ηλῆαν τὸν θεοβίτην πρὶν ἔλθειν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, ὃς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἔλθω καὶ πατάξω τὴν γῆν ἄρδην.

It must be noted that the task of the ἄγγελος in Malachi 3:1-4 LXX is different than the task of Elijah in verses 22-23. The task of the ἄγγελος is as follows (Malachi 3:3 LXX):

καὶ καθαρεύετε χωνεύων καὶ καθαρίζων ὡς τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ ὡς τὸ χρυσίον· καὶ καθαρίσει τοὺς υἱοὺς Λευὶ καὶ χεεὶ αὐτοὺς ὡς τὸ χρυσίον καὶ ὡς τὸ ἀργύριον· καὶ ἔσονται τῷ κυρίῳ προσάγοντες θυσιάαν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.

This is different than the task of Elijah in verses 22-23 as noted above. This difference has led some to think that Malachi 3:22-23 LXX is a

later addition in which the 'messenger of the covenant' has been reinterpreted as the returning Elijah whose task is no longer to prepare the Temple, but 'to restore peace and social well-being to the community so as to avert God's wrath in the day of judgment.'<sup>9</sup>

This argument does not hold, however; because in Judaism part of the task of the returning Elijah is to restore the three pieces of property of the first temple.<sup>10</sup>

### Elijah in Rabbinic Thought

Before the specific rabbinic teaching in regard to Elijah is presented, it is necessary to take a look at one of the apocryphal writings, Ecclesiasticus 48.<sup>11</sup> Here the writer reminds his readers that Elijah *κατήγγελεν οὕτως τρίς πῦρ* (48:3).<sup>12</sup> This recalls the fact that judgment by fire is to be a prominent part of his eschatological activity according to Malachi 3:2-3.<sup>13</sup> We are also reminded that Elijah is the one

*ὁ ἐξείρας νεκρὸν ἐκ θανάτου* (48:5),  
*ὁ καταγγέλων βασιλεῖς εἰς ἰπώλειαν* (48:6),  
*ὁ χρίων βασιλεῖς ... καὶ προφήτας* (48:8),  
 and *ὁ ἀναλημφθεὶς ἐν λάβρατι πυρὸς ἐν ἄρωματι ἵππων πυρίνων* (48:9).<sup>14</sup>

Most important is what is said in 48:10. This reads as follows in the LXX:

*ὁ καταγγραθεὶς ἐν ἔλεμμοῖς εἰς καιροῦς  
 κοπάσαι ὀργὴν πρὸ θυμοῦ,  
 ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν  
 καὶ καταστῆσαι θυλὰς Ἰακωβ.*

The important function of Elijah here, which is different than Malachi, is that Elijah is *καταστῆσαι φυλὴς Ιακωβ*. We shall see below how this was interpreted in Judaism.

In Isaiah 49:6 LXX, this particular function is attributed to the servant of Yahweh.

*καὶ εἶπεν μοι Μέγα σοὶ ἔσται τοῦ κληθῆναι  
 γε παῖδά μου τοῦ στῆσαι τὰς φυλὰς Ιακωβ  
 καὶ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ισραὴλ ἐπιστρέψαι.*

This connection between Ecclesiasticus 48:10 and Isaiah 49:6 has led some scholars to think that Sirach expected Elijah as the Messiah.<sup>15</sup> This view, however, must be balanced by that of W. O. E. Oesterley. He says,

This is one of the few passages (Ecclesiasticus 48:10) in which Ben-Sira refers to the Messianic Hope (see also xliv. 21, xlv. 25, xlvi. 11, 22, xlviii. 24, 25, xlix. 12, l. 24, li. 12); but neither the nature of the book nor the historical circumstances of the time, by which Messianic conceptions were always conditioned, were such as to lead one to expect much stress to be laid on this subject. During the third century B. C. the Jews lived in quietude and prosperity, and the hopes concerning the Messianic Age seem to have dropped into the background; not that the Jews ever really abandoned (until quite modern times) their Messianic expectations, these only ceased, for the time being, to play an important part.<sup>16</sup>

On the basis of this statement, the idea that Sirach expected Elijah as the Messiah cannot be pressed.

The miracles which Elijah performed<sup>17</sup> provided Judaism with rich material for legends.<sup>18</sup> The obscurity of his origin gave opportunity for much discussion of his descent.<sup>19</sup> There were three particular theories about his descent.<sup>20</sup>

The first was that Elijah was from the tribe of Gad.<sup>21</sup>

This theory stressed the idea that Elijah was to prepare the way for God and was to be the redeemer of Israel.<sup>22</sup> This view is a development of Ecclesiasticus 48 and does not have much influence on Rabbinic thought.<sup>23</sup>

The second theory was that Elijah belonged to the tribe of Benjamin.<sup>24</sup> His task according to this view was to be the forerunner of the Messiah<sup>25</sup> and to announce the good news of the Messiah's coming.<sup>26</sup>

The third theory was that Elijah was a descendant of the tribe of Levi. As such he was to be the high priest of the messianic age<sup>27</sup> and a colleague of the Messiah not his forerunner.<sup>28</sup> In the light of what has already been presented about Elijah, this is important. In Malachi 3:1 LXX (quoted above) we noted that the Lord was going to send his ἀγγελος τῆς διαθήκης, identified as Elijah (Malachi 3:22-23 LXX). Malachi 2:4 LXX adds further information:

καὶ ἐπίγνωσθε διότι ἐγὼ ἐξαπέστειλα πρὸς ὑμῶν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην τοῦ εἶναι τὴν διαθήκην μου πρὸς τοὺς Λευίτας, λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

Since Elijah was to be the messenger of the covenant, and since God had said that he would make his covenant with Levi, Jewish scholars assumed that Elijah would somehow have to be related to the descendants of Levi.<sup>29</sup>

In Numbers 25:11-13 God makes a covenant of perpetual priesthood with Phineas, who had cleansed Israel by killing

a man who brought a Midianite woman into camp along with his Midianite friend. Because of the promise of the perpetual priesthood, Phineas became associated with the Messianic Age in which he was to hold the office of high priest. In time Phineas and Elijah merged.<sup>30</sup> The Rabbis were supported in this view by the Targums. The Targum of Jerusch on Numbers 25:12 says,

In einem Eide sage ihm (dem Pinechas) in meinem Namen: Siehe, ich schliesse mit ihm meinen Friedensbund, und ich will ihn zum Bundesengel (Mal 3,1) machen, und er wird leben in Ewigkeit, um die frohe Botschaft von der Erloesung zu bringen am Ende der Tage.--Der Bundesengel Mal 3,1 sonst = Elias, hier = Pinechas, weil Elias = Pinechas.<sup>31</sup>

By the second century B. C. an eschatological high priest is expected as well as the Messiah. Elijah is to be this high priest of the last time because of the application of the priestly descent to him.<sup>32</sup>

The task of the returning Elijah is mainly that of a restorer. Malachi 3:23 LXX says, ὅς ἐποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ. Ecclesiasticus 48:10 says that Elijah is καταστήσει φωνὴν ἰακώβ. In the Old Testament ἐποκαθίστημι is a technical term for the restoration of Israel to its own land by Yahweh (Jeremiah 16:15, 23:8, 24:6, Hosea 11:11) and was increasingly understood in the Messianic and eschatological sense.<sup>33</sup> Under prophetic influence it became a term for the inner restitution of the people. The returning Elijah was expected to bring about this

restitution.<sup>34</sup>

The task of the returning Elijah as restorer was interpreted by the Rabbis in various ways. These can all be subsumed under six headings.

1. Elijah will restore the purity of the Jewish family. He will secure the marriage bond and cleanse his people of illegitimate families at the beginning of the Messianic time.<sup>35</sup> Rabbi Chama ben Chanina has said,

Wenn Gott (in der messianischen Zeit) seine Schekhina (auf Israel) ruhen laesst, laesst er sie nur auf den Familien von reiner (legitimer) Herkunft in Israel ruhen; denn es heisst: Zu jener Zeit, ist Jahves Spruch, will ich zum Gott sein allen Familien Israels, und sie sollen mir zum Volk sein Jer 31, 1. Es heisst nicht: "allen Israeliten" will ich zum Gott sein, sondern: "allen Familien" (den wirklich reinen und legitimen), und sie sollen mir zum Volk sein.<sup>36</sup>

2. Elijah will restore the unity and purity of 'doctrine' (der Lehre) in Israel. This involved settling debates and making decisions on religious questions.<sup>37</sup> A passage from Baba Metzia 1:8 illustrates this task.

If a man found letters of valuation or letters of alimony or deeds of halitzah or Refusal, or deeds of arbitration, or any document drawn out by the court, he should restore them....If a man found a document among his documents and he does not know what is its nature, it must be left until Elijah comes.<sup>38</sup>

3. Elijah will restore peace in Israel.<sup>39</sup> The necessity for this role is implied in the following passage from Mishnah, Sotah 9:15:

With the footprints of the Messiah presumption shall increase and dearth reach its height; the vine shall yield its fruit but the wine shall be costly; and the empire shall fall into heresy and there shall be none

to utter reproof....The wisdom of the Scribes shall become insipid and they that shun sin shall be deemed contemptible, and truth shall nowhere be found. Children shall shame the elders, and the elders shall rise up before the children, for the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: a man's enemies are the men of his own house.<sup>40</sup>

That Elijah is viewed as the one who will restore peace is pointed out in Eduyoth 8:7.

R. Joshua said: I have received as a tradition from Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, who heard from his teacher, and his teacher from his teacher, as a Halakah given to Moses from Sinai, that Elijah will not come to declare unclean or clean, to remove afar or to bring nigh, but to remove afar those (families) that were brought nigh by violence and to bring nigh those (families) that were removed by violence. The family of Beth Zerepha was in the land beyond Jordan and Ben Zion removed it afar by force. The like of these Elijah will come to declare unclean or clean, to remove afar or to bring nigh. R. Judah says: To bring nigh but not to remove afar. R. Simeon says: To bring agreement where there is a matter for dispute. And the sages say: Neither to remove afar nor to bring nigh, but to make peace in the world as it is written, Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet... and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children and the heart of the children to their fathers.<sup>41</sup>

The type of peace that Elijah is to bring is the kind that ends strife, not only between nations but also between individuals.<sup>42</sup>

4. Elijah will restore the correct inner frame of mind (die rechte innere Verfassung) to Israel, through which he will lead the people to repentance.<sup>43</sup> "None of the earlier sources makes it Elijah's special mission to bring Israel to repentance."<sup>44</sup> The Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer, however, quotes Rabbi Judah:



Wenn die Israeliten nicht Busse tun, so werden sich nicht erloest; und die Israeliten tun Busse nur in Not und in Bedraengnis und Verstossung, und wenn sie keinen Lebensunterhalt haben. Eine grosse Busse aber wird Israel erst tun, wenn Elias gesegneten Angedenkens kommen wird, wie es heisst: Siehe, ich sende euch den Propheten Elias....dass er das Herz der Vaeter (zu Gott) bekehre durch die Kinder und das Herz der Kinder durch die Vaeter.<sup>45</sup>

5. Elijah will restore the three pieces of property of the first temple.<sup>46</sup> The Mekilta on Exodus 16:33 indicates that these items are the contents of the Ark of the Covenant. They are the vessel with manna, the vessel with the water of purification, and the vessel with the anointing oil. Some add the rod of Aaron together with its almonds and blossoms.<sup>47</sup> Jeremias points out that in the Testament of Levi and in Justin's Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo Elijah is to come to introduce, identify, and anoint the Messiah. He thinks that there is perhaps a trace of this view in the expectation that Elijah will restore the three pieces of property of the first temple.<sup>48</sup>

6. Elijah will restore the entire nation of Israel through the gathering of those who had been dispersed.<sup>49</sup> The Targum of Jerusch I on Deuteronomy 30:4 illustrates this.

Wenn eure Zerstreuten waeren an den Enden des Himmels, so wird euch von dort der Memra Jahves eures Gottes zusammenbringen durch Elias, den Hohenpriester, und euch von dort heranholen durch den Koenig, den Messias.

In addition to being the restorer of Israel, there was another view which saw Elijah as a helper in time of

need. The roots of this idea are found in the story of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath, I Kings 17:8ff. That this expectation was evidenced in New Testament times can be seen in the fact that when our Lord cried out on the cross, ἐλὼι ἐλὼι λὰμὰ ραββαθάνου (Mark 15:34), some thought that he was calling for Elijah (Mark 15:35).<sup>51</sup>

G. F. Moore summarizes very well the idea of Elijah expectation in Judaism. He says,

Elijah's historical mission was to bring Israel back to wholehearted allegiance to its own God and his righteous will, and the prophecy of his return spoke only of a work to be done in Israel. His part was the preparation of the people for the imminent crisis, which in the centuries we are dealing with was understood to be the appearance of the Messiah.<sup>52</sup>

### The Eschatological Prophet

For all practical purposes prophecy died out in Judaism long before the beginning of the Christian era.<sup>53</sup> Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi were considered the last of the prophets.<sup>54</sup> Zechariah 13:3-6 makes it plain that the only prophets who were left were false ones.<sup>55</sup> However, there was a strong notion that at some time in the future prophecy would return. This return of prophecy would mark the beginning of a new age.<sup>56</sup> Joel 3:1 LXX bears this out.

καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐκχέω ἀπὸ  
τοῦ πνεύματος μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ  
προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ  
θυγατέρες ὑμῶν.

Thus, the revival of prophecy is an eschatological concept.<sup>57</sup>

This general conception of a return of prophecy became more concrete with the conviction that "a prophet would appear at the end who would be the fulfilment...of all earlier prophecy."<sup>58</sup> Cullmann says,

The idea that a single prophet would represent the whole of prophecy may have another root besides eschatology in Judaism, one which rests more on a theological speculation. It is the idea that since all prophets have proclaimed basically the same divine truth, the same prophet was successively incarnated in different men. Thus the idea arose that actually the same prophet always appeared and that each time he merely took a different form.<sup>59</sup>

The belief in Judaism was that the returning prophet would be a particular Old Testament prophet.<sup>60</sup> Deuteronomy 18:15 LXX signals this expectation: *προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀφωσφῶν σου ὡς ἐνὰ ἀναστῆσαι σου κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ἃ ἴσῃ ἀκούσασθε ...* Even though this passage does not specifically refer to the return of Moses but to a prophet like him, nevertheless a belief does arise in Judaism that Moses himself will return.<sup>61</sup>

In addition to the expectation of Moses, we have already noted the view that Elijah the prophet would return at the end time.

Enoch is also mentioned in some sources as the one who will return. Cullmann points out that it is understandable that Elijah and Enoch would be the ones to return, "since according to the Old Testament, both were

taken up directly to heaven without dying."<sup>62</sup>

Finally, there were views which combined the names so that two returning prophets were expected. Some of the sources say that Enoch and Elijah will come again, but others say that Moses and Elijah will come.<sup>63</sup>

One thing is clear, however; and that is that only one prophet was originally expected. "The variations... may be explained by the fact that it was not certain with which of the ancient prophets the coming one should be identified."<sup>64</sup>

Scobie points out the proper perspective with which to view the eschatological prophet. He says,

However the coming prophet was pictured, whether without any identification or as either Elijah or Moses come again, he is an eschatological figure. Prophecy was dead; its rebirth would be a sign of the new age. It is quite wrong therefore to speak of someone claiming to be 'merely a prophet' in contrast to someone claiming to be 'a Messianic figure'. Anyone who claimed to be a prophet was automatically claiming to be the prophet. Anyone claiming to be a prophet was claiming to be a Messianic figure, not in the sense that he was the Messiah himself, but in the sense that he was preparing for the ushering in of the new age.<sup>65</sup>

Cullmann points out the necessity of distinguishing between the eschatological prophet and the Messiah.

Originally the eschatological Prophet is not merely a forerunner of the Messiah; faith in the returning prophet is sufficient in itself, and to a certain extent runs parallel to faith in the Messiah. The Messiah actually requires no forerunner, since he himself also fulfils the role of the Prophet of the end time. Thus it can happen that Prophet and Messiah are united in the same person. It is possible that the two concepts may ultimately be traced back to a common source. Nevertheless, we do well to differentiate between the 'prophetic' and 'messianic' lines.

The eschatological Prophet of Jewish expectation originally prepares the way for Yahweh himself, since he appears at the end of days. Later the connection of the idea of the returning Prophet with that of the Messiah not only developed so that this Prophet is at the same time the Messiah, but also so that the returning Elijah is only the forerunner of the Messiah, and thus no longer the direct forerunner of God. We must maintain a clear distinction between the concept of the Prophet who is the forerunner of God and the concept of the Prophet who is the forerunner of the Messiah. We find both of them in the New Testament and must therefore evaluate them differently.<sup>66</sup>

## CHAPTER III

### ELIJAH TYPOLOGY IN RELATION TO JOHN THE BAPTIZER IN THE SYNOPTICS

Material Supplied by Mark and Reused  
for the Most Part by Matthew and Luke

1. Mark 1:1-8 (Matthew 3:1-6, 11-12; Luke 3:1-6, 15-18).<sup>1</sup>

First of all, the coming of John the Baptist is viewed as a fulfilment of prophecy (Mark 1:2-3).<sup>2</sup> Here the writer of Mark, even though he says that the information is from Isaiah the prophet, conflates three Old Testament passages. They are as follows:

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ  
προσώπου σου, ἵνα φυλάξῃς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Ex. 20:23).

ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ  
ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου (Mal. 3:1).

φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἑτοιμάσατε  
τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθεΐας ποιεῖτε τὰς  
τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (Is. 40:3).

Vincent Taylor points out that as Mark quotes, the first part of the quotation, ἰδοὺ ... προσώπου σου, agrees verbatim with the Exodus passage. The second part, ὁ κ+τ+σκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου, agrees with the Hebrew of Malachi 3:1 rather than the LXX. The rest of the quotation is taken almost verbatim from the LXX text of Isaiah 40:3.

The differences in the quotations, according to Taylor, are Mark's re-interpretation of the prophecies in a Messianic sense.<sup>3</sup>

At first we may want to question Mark's hermeneutical method. He indicates that he is going to quote from Isaiah the prophet, but ends up quoting parts of three passages from three different books. This is a typical Rabbinic technique known as 'Midrash pesher.'<sup>4</sup> The methodology employed here is to use one word to invoke the memory of another. For example, the *Ἰψιδος* of Malachi may have called to mind the *Ἰψιδος* of Exodus or vice versa. The Isaiah passage is the medium point for the understanding of the two.

The *φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ* of Mark 1:3 is connected with John the Baptizer in 1:4. John is one who was *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*. In this connection, Cranfield notes that the Massoretic Text connects 'in the wilderness' with 'prepare ye.' The Septuagint, however, connects *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ* with *βοῶντος*, which makes easy the reference of the verse to John preaching in the wilderness.<sup>5</sup> The role of the wilderness loomed large in the Old Testament. This was the place where God revealed himself to Moses (Exodus 3). It was there also that Israel went after her deliverance by Yahweh out of Egypt, where she received the law, and entered into a covenant with Yahweh. The death of Moses took place in the wilderness (Deuteronomy 34).

Elijah fled to the wilderness when he heard that Jezebel wanted to take his life (I Kings 19). This was also the place of Elijah's translation (II Kings 2). The wilderness is also to be the scene of God's future deliverance according to Hosea 2:14-15. Undoubtedly many went to the wilderness during the Maccabean revolt for this reason (I Maccabees 2:29, II Maccabees 5:27, 6:11, 10:6).<sup>6</sup>

Thus, Mark connects John the Baptizer with the *ἄγγελος* of Malachi 3:1, the *φωνή* of Isaiah 40:3, and points to the region of John's work, *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*. We have already noted that the *ἄγγελος* of Malachi 3:1 is Elijah. However, the *φωνή* of Isaiah 40:3 does not refer to Elijah. He is not mentioned anywhere in the context. In regard to the *ἐρήμος*, there is no specific mention that Elijah was to lead the people to the wilderness in preparation for the Messiah's advent, although the *ὄσος* of Malachi 3:1 may mean wilderness.<sup>7</sup>

Of particular importance for our consideration in this section of Mark is the reference to the clothing which John wore. Mark 1:6 says, *καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν δασυμένῳ τρίχας καμπίλου καὶ ἰώρην δερματίνην περι τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ* ... This reference is probably intended to recall the description of Elijah in II Kings 1:8 *LXX*,<sup>8</sup> *Ἄνθρωπος δαυὶς καὶ ἰώρην δερματίνην περιεβρωμένος τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ*. Zechariah 13:4, however, indicates to us that a hairy mantle is the traditional garb of a



Jewish prophet.<sup>9</sup> This would bring up the question whether the writer is describing John as Elijah or only as a prophet.

John A. T. Robinson is emphatic in pointing out that the fact that John wore a hairy mantle does not prove at all that he was Elijah. His argument is as follows (in reference to Mark 1:6):

This could be an illusion to II Kings 1:8, where Elijah is recognized by his wearing 'a garment of hair cloth (RSV), with a leather belt round his waist.' But the LXX and the previous English versions are almost certainly right in taking the Hebrew to mean simply that Elijah, like Esau, was a hairy man. This is the sort of man a prophet was expected to be, and, according to Zechariah 13:4, anyone who wished to be taken for a prophet would put on a hairy mantle. There is no suggestion that its wearer was intended to be identified specifically with Elijah.<sup>10</sup>

Carl Kraeling puts this view into a different perspective. He says,

That Mark and the other New Testament writers saw in the mantle and the girdle tokens of John's prophetic role and of his relation to Elijah is quite probable...but that John himself chose the garb in order to suggest prophetic authority and to conjure up allusions to Elijah is at least problematical.... In the Gospels the garments are said to be made from the hair of the camel, the very animal upon which the wilderness nomad has always depended for his sustenance, and in Old Testament days such garments probably became the typical garb of the prophet largely because the prophet was himself a man of the wilderness. Hence, it may well be that John's clothing was suggested not so much by his desire to symbolize Elijah, as by elementary requirements of his wilderness sojourn....In clothing himself in a garment made of camel's hair, John, therefore, in all probability merely reduced himself also to the homespun of the nomad. Only what he did in the wilderness eventually suggested that his garb had a greater, prophetic significance.<sup>11</sup>

2. Mark 6:14-16 (Matthew 14:1-2; Luke 9:7-9).

This passage is instructive, first of all, because it implies that the people were looking for Elijah or a prophet. When the deeds of Jesus became known some thought that he was John the Baptizer raised from the dead (Mark 6:14). Others thought that he was Elijah (Mark 6:15). Still others thought that he was a prophet (Mark 6:15). In the view of the people at this particular time John the Baptist is not regarded as Elijah, but the people speculate among themselves as to whether Jesus is Elijah or not.<sup>12</sup>

3. Mark 6:17-29 (Matthew 14:3-12; Luke 3:19-20).

This section points out the reason John the Baptizer was executed. John is cast into prison because he rebukes Herod for marrying his brother's wife (Mark 6:18). Here there are some possible parallels between this episode and some events of Elijah in the Old Testament. We have already noted how Elijah rebuked King Ahab (I Kings 17-19, 21 and II Kings 1-2). Here John rebukes King Herod. Like Jezebel (I Kings 21) Herodias is infuriated with John and wants to destroy him. (Mark 6:19).<sup>13</sup>

Kraeling has some interesting comments on this section. He says,

The Old Testament is full of stories of men of this type, men like Samuel in the days of Saul, like Nathan in the days of David, like Ahijah in the days of Jeroboam and like Jeremiah in the days of Josiah, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah. Among the most colorful is perhaps Elijah, who carried on the bitter feud with Ahab and Jezebel. No wonder then, that, John, with his wilderness life and dress, his demand for a final

decision between two alternatives, repentance or destruction, with his bold affront to the political and religious leaders of his people, and, it should be noted, with his sudden appearance in the very region from which the fiery chariot was said to have taken the prophet to heaven (II Kings 2:1-8), was believed to be Elijah himself returned to earth.<sup>14</sup>

Even though there is a parallel between John and Elijah on this issue, it must be kept in mind that there are also other parallels.

Matthew's account presents a significant difference from Mark at one particular point. Mark says that Herodias wanted John put to death (6:19), but Herod feared John because he was a *ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος καὶ ἄγιος*. Matthew says that Herod *ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον* (Matthew 14:5). It may be hard to press a parallel between John and Elijah on this section, but John is definitely regarded as a prophet.

Luke does not follow Matthew and Mark in regard to the context of John's being put into prison. In Luke John is put in prison before Jesus is baptized. In Matthew and Mark it happens much later. Luke only says a few words about John's execution and these also are in a different context (Luke 9:7-9). By having John in prison at the baptism of Jesus, Luke is indicating that John did not baptize Jesus. In Luke the ministry of John and the ministry of Jesus do not overlap as they do in Matthew and Mark. In Luke Jesus' ministry is the beginning of the Gospel, not John's as in Mark and Matthew. Luke

divides the ministries to draw a distinction between the epochs of salvation.<sup>15</sup> We shall examine this in more detail under Luke 16:16 below.

4. Mark 8:27-29 (Matthew 16:13-16; Luke 9:18-20).

This passage points out the same basic idea that we noted in Mark 6:14-16 and parallels above. Popular opinion does not hold Jesus to be the Messiah.<sup>16</sup> Rather, he is viewed as either John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the prophets. Matthew 16:14 adds the view that Jesus was Jeremiah. Some views of the expectation of the eschatological prophet (discussed above) included the prophet Jeremiah.<sup>17</sup> The importance of this section is that Jesus is not John the Baptist, nor Elijah, nor the prophet (Jeremiah), but as Peter said, *σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός* (Mark 8:29). Once again it is evident that the popular views in regard to Elijah expectation center in Jesus rather than in John the Baptizer.

5. Mark 9:2-13 (Matthew 17:1-13; Luke 9:28-36).

The story of the transfiguration comes after Peter's confession, *σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός* (Mark 8:29 and parallels) and the first prediction of the passion, *ὄψαι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν...* (Mark 8:31 and parallels). It

also comes before the second prediction of the passion (Mark 9:31 and parallels):

*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου  
 παραδίδεται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀποκτανοῦσιν  
 αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.*

That the transfiguration is specifically connected with the passion is brought out by Luke. He records a conversation Moses and Elijah had with Jesus.

ἔλεγον τὴν  
ἐξόδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἠμέτερον πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ  
(Luke 9:31).

We also notice a parallel between the transfiguration and the baptism of Jesus.<sup>18</sup> When Jesus was baptized a voice from heaven said οὐ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα (Mark 1:11). This is paralleled in Mark 9:7. Matthew's account (17:5) is the most complete. "At the Baptism Jesus received the assurance that he is the Son of God; at the Transfiguration, he receives the assurance that his sufferings are coming upon him in accordance with the will of the Father."<sup>19</sup>

Conzelmann explains the whole event of the Transfiguration as related to the passion.

The whole episode therefore has a typological meaning which points forward to the events in Jerusalem. We find all together the suffering, the sleeping of the disciples, and the fact that on 'awaking' they see his glory. The Mount of Transfiguration foreshadows the Mount of Olives, in both its aspects, for it is the place of prayer and arrest as well as the scene of the Ascension.<sup>20</sup>

Of particular concern in this paper is the appearance of Elijah and Moses and the conversation between Jesus and the disciples on the way down from the mountain.

Jeremias says that Elijah and Moses appear in the account of the transfiguration as precursors of Jesus and that their presence proclaims the inauguration of the last

time.<sup>21</sup> We have already noted that Elijah and Moses are sometimes viewed to return together.<sup>22</sup> Taylor points out that Moses and Elijah are the representatives of the Law and the Prophets. "Their very presence with Jesus is a sign that He is the Messiah, and this is probably the primary suggestion of the Markan narrative."<sup>23</sup>

The words *ἰκούετε αὐτοῦ* (Mark 9:7 and parallels) are of particular importance. They recall the words of Moses in Deuteronomy 18:15, *προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἰσραηλῶν σου ὡς ἐγὼ ἐναστῆσαι σου κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτοῦ ἰκούσεθε*.<sup>24</sup> M'Neile says in regard to this,

The abiding validity of the Law and the Prophets as 'fulfilled' by Christ (Mt. v.17) is symbolized by the harmonious converse which He holds with their representatives, Moses and Elijah. Both had held converse with God on the high mountain (Exod. xxi. 18, I Kings xix. 9ff.), which is now repeated with the Son of God. (3) The Three are enveloped in the 'cloud,' the ancient symbol of the divine Presence... The Sonship of Christ is divinely attested; to 'hear Him' is to hear the eternal Truth, of which the Law and the Prophets were but partial expressions.... To attempt, therefore, to provide for the continuous presence of Moses and Elijah was a grave mistake; all that Christians need is to have that of 'Jesus Himself.'<sup>25</sup>

As Jesus and the disciples came down from the mountain, Jesus commanded the disciples not to tell anyone what they had seen until the son of man is raised from the dead (Mark 9:9 and Matthew 17:9). The disciples then ask *τί οὖν οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι Ἠλίας δεῖ εἰσεῖν πρῶτον* (Matthew 17:10). Jesus answered them by saying, *Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα* (Matthew 17:11). The fact that Elijah has not returned

seems to the scribes to negate the possibility that Jesus is the Messiah and seems to have been advanced by the disciples as an argument against the necessity of the passion.<sup>26</sup>

In regard to the concept of restoration (ἀποκαθάρτησις), which was the work of the returning Elijah, Oepke says that in the New Testament the concept is not applied to the Messiah coming in power but to his forerunner, John the preacher of repentance in whom Jesus recognized the promised Elijah.<sup>27</sup> He says that the original politically Messianic sense of ἀποκαθάρτησις is seen in the question of the disciples to the risen Jesus εἰ καὶ ἀποκαθαίρεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ (Acts 1:6). Against this view John A. T. Robinson thinks that Jesus had been sent to do the work of restoring.<sup>28</sup> His argument is based on Acts 3:26.

ὑμῶν πρῶτον Ἰναστικής οἱ θεοὶ τὸν παῖδα  
αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλαν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα ὑμῶν  
ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν  
πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.

On the basis of this verse and its context he states that "Jesus was indeed to be the Christ. But he was also Elijah first."<sup>29</sup>

Jesus has been sent 'first' (Acts 3:26), as Servant and Prophet: he will be sent as the appointed Messiah when the time is ready. And the time will be ready when, through repentance, all things have finally been 'restored': then the renewal that will mark the messianic age can occur.<sup>30</sup>

This argument, however, is weak. *πρῶτον* is not connected with *ἀπεσταλέν* but with *ὑμῶν*. Acts 13:46 connects *πρῶτον* with *ὑμῶν* and refers to the Jews. By necessity the Word of God was spoken to the Jews first. On the basis of this, I do not see how Robinson can take *πρῶτον* with *ἀπεσταλέν*. Therefore, without the help of *πρῶτον*, he cannot say that "he has been sent first as Servant and Prophet." This also makes more tenuous his position that "he will be sent as Messiah when the time is ready."

M'Neile's treatment on this section is very helpful.

In contrast with their (Scribes') teaching, Jesus says...that Elijah had already come in the person of the Baptist. But it cannot be said of the Baptist that he 'set right, restored, all things;' Mt.'s *ἔτι* ... *ἔτι* implies, 'It is true that the scribes teach that Elijah cometh, etc., but I say he has already come; but so far from restoring all things, they did unto him whatever they wished.' If this is the meaning in Mt. Jesus corrects the scribal tradition. Mt. abbreviates Mk., which is no less obscure. Mk.'s *ἔτι* should perhaps be omitted..., but in any case *καὶ πρῶτον* is difficult unless the first sentence is interrogative: 'Elijah having come first restoreth (prophetic pres.) all things. Then how is it that Scripture foretells the passion of the Messiah?' i.e. Why is the Passion necessary if Elijah's work is to put everything right first? Then Mk.'s following verse (*ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ*) solves the difficulty by showing that Elijah had indeed come, but did not restore all things because he (i.e. the Baptist) was killed, and therefore the prophecies of the Passion find room for fulfilment.<sup>31</sup>

Matthew 17:12-13 points out that when Jesus says,

Elijah has already come, and they did not know him, but did to him whatever they pleased. So also the Son of man will suffer at their hands. Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist. (RSV),



part of the task of the returning Elijah was to share the fate of suffering with the ancient prophets.<sup>32</sup> This task is fulfilled in the execution of John the Baptist.<sup>33</sup>

Duncan has some good comments in connection with this passage.

Most important of all, however, is the stress which Jesus here lays on the sufferings of the new Elijah. He must not lose this opportunity of training his disciples to see that what happened to John happened in accordance with the divine purpose. Suffering and rejection are part of the lot which God has ordained for his servants. And, more particularly, if they were the lot appointed for the Elijah, how much more are they appointed for him for whom the Baptist (in his role of the Elijah) was the forerunner.<sup>34</sup>

Thus, on the basis of Mark and Matthew on this section, John the Baptizer fulfilled the role of Elijah. It is interesting to note that Luke omits the question of the disciples concerning the coming of Elijah and the reply of Jesus. On the basis of this it is safe to assume that Luke at this point does not regard John the Baptist as Elijah.<sup>35</sup>

6. Mark 11:27-33 (Matthew 21:23-27; Luke 20:1-8).

In this section the chief priests and scribes come to Jesus and ask him *ἐν ποίῃ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς* (Mark 11:28 and parallels). In turn Jesus asks them a question as to whether the baptism of John was from heaven or from men (Mark 11:30 and parallels). They were afraid to answer this question because of the people who regarded John as a *προφῆτης* (Mark 11:32 and parallels).

## Pertinent "Q" Material

## 1. Matthew 3:7-10 - Luke 3:7-9

This section is on John's preaching of repentance. Although it does not relate specifically to the question as to whether John the Baptizer is Elijah or not, it is important for us to gain an understanding of John himself. The important thing to note is that many of the phrases that John uses, 'brood of vipers,' and 'tree' (also others in Matthew 3:11-12 and Luke 3:15-18, such as 'winnowing fork,' and 'threshing floor') have a long history in the language of Hebrew prophecy.<sup>36</sup>

2. Matthew 11:2-19 - Luke 7:18-35. (Matthew 11:12-13 = Luke 16:16).

When John was in prison, he heard about what the Christ was doing. He sent his disciples to Jesus to ask him, οὐ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν (Matthew 11:3). Cullmann concludes on the basis of this verse that "John did not think of himself as the Prophet of the end time in the sense of one preparing the way for God."<sup>37</sup> John's question implies that he is still looking for another one sent from God to come after him. It is generally agreed that ὁ ἐρχόμενος was not recognized as a title for the Messiah. Rather, the title probably refers to a "heavenly Personality; not clearly defined, who might be variously thought of as a Messiah or some Forerunner of the Kingdom."<sup>38</sup> M'Neile indicates that on

the basis of Jesus' statement in reference to the Baptizer in Matthew 11:14, *αὐτὸς ἔφη 'Ηλίας ὁ μέλλων εἶναί με,* John's question in Matthew 11:3 might mean, 'Are you Elijah who is to come?'<sup>39</sup>

It was a popular expectation that Elijah's advent would usher in the last day...; and nothing could add greater emphasis to John's prediction of the imminence of the divine kingdom than to declare that Elijah would immediately come after him....But, though attractive, it presents difficulties. The Baptist's description of the future action of him who should come after him ('He shall baptize you etc.,'...) did not correspond with the popular expectation of Elijah.<sup>40</sup>

Jesus answers the question of John's disciples by saying, *Τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν κτλ.* (Matthew 11:5-6).

These words are Isaianic. They recall the action of the anointed prophet in Isaiah 61:1 and the action of God in Isaiah 35:5.<sup>41</sup> According to Luke 3:15, some people wondered if John were the Messiah. Since he was not, this hope, also of John, was transferred to Jesus. But since Jesus was doing nothing to fulfill the popular conception of the Messiah (earthly ruler), John himself was doubtful about Jesus.<sup>42</sup> The answer of Jesus to John's disciples then meant,

'Ponder my works; they are not what you expect from the Messiah, but they show that the powers of evil are being undermined, and that the Messianic age is very close'...The Lord would not openly declare the truth, which was to be revealed in due time to the Twelve..., but the Baptist was encouraged to persevere in his hope.<sup>43</sup>

In Matthew 11:7-19 and in the Lucan parallel, Jesus' words about John are recorded. According to Jesus John

is not a *κάλυμνον ὑπὸ ἰσθίου σαλευόμενον* (Matthew 11:7); he is not an *ἄνθρωπον ἐν μετακοῖς ἠφιερμένον* (Matthew 11:8). John is a *προφήτης* even *περισσότερον προφήτου* (Matthew 11:9). John is the *ἄγγελος* of Malachi 3:1 (Matthew 11:10). He is the prophet who is come at the end of time, the returning Elijah, who is the forerunner of the Messiah.<sup>44</sup> It is important to note that John does not identify himself with Elijah; it is Jesus who does this.<sup>45</sup> In Matthew 11:14, Jesus says, in reference to John, *καὶ εἰ θέλετε δεῖξαι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχομαι*. Luke omits this reference, and thereby shies away from the identification of John with Elijah. He does, however, include the Malachi passage (Luke 7:27).

Matthew 11:12-13 = Luke 16:16 is one of the most difficult sayings in the Gospels to interpret.<sup>46</sup> The differences between Matthew and Luke are great. Matthew's account is as follows:

*ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ  
ἕως ἄρτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιάται  
ἀρπάξουσιν αὐτήν. πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ οἱ  
νόμοι ἕως Ἰωάννου ἐπροφήτευσαν.*

Luke, however, reads,

*ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου  
ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται  
καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται.*

It is generally held that Matthew's form is closer to the original.<sup>47</sup> Luke's statement is then viewed as an attempt to clarify the obscurity of Matthew.<sup>48</sup> Frederick W. Danker

shows that Luke 16:16 is "best understood as emanating from Jesus' and the early church's critics, who take a dim view of the populatization of the kingdom and of its alleged antinomian universalism."<sup>49</sup>

Kraeling points out three facts about the saying that should be noted here. He says,

The first is that the word interprets history as revealing movement toward the fulfillment of a divinely ordained purpose and divides this movement into periods. The second is that if Matthew has preserved its original import correctly, the word distinguishes three periods in that movement; the first a period of anticipation represented by the prophecies of the Law and the Prophets; the second a period of violence that begins with John, continues to the moment at which Jesus speaks and is not yet at an end; and the third a period unmentioned but implied, when the violence of the present will give way to the peace of fulfillment. The third salient fact about the saying is that, if Matthew has preserved the original sense correctly, the violence is that of hostile Satanic forces assailing the Kingdom from without.<sup>50</sup>

Thus, according to Kraeling, history is divided into three periods. John begins the second period which Jesus continues.

Luke, however, does not show that the ministry of John is continuous with that of Jesus. Rather, he says that there is a dividing line between John and Jesus.<sup>51</sup>

"The Law and the prophets endured till John. From then on the kingdom of God is proclaimed and everyone forces his way into it."<sup>52</sup> According to Luke, therefore, there are two eras; the Law and the prophets is the old era, and the kingdom is the new era.<sup>53</sup> John belongs to the

old era. Jesus belongs to the new.<sup>54</sup>

In these words Jesus is not only speaking about John; he is also speaking about himself. When Jesus declares the end of the reign of prophecy and law, and when he says that John the Baptist is Elijah, he is saying that he is the Messiah.<sup>55</sup>

If men are looking for an Elijah redivivus, they are invited to see that their expectation has been fulfilled in the Baptist. Similarly, if they are looking for a Messiah, Jesus would have them recognize that His ministry is truly messianic.<sup>56</sup>

Manson has an interesting note on these verses in connection with John. He says that

The real parallel to John in the Old Testament is not Elijah but Moses. Just as Moses led the children of Israel to the borders of the Promised Land, but could not himself enter, so John led his followers up to the verge of the new order initiated by Jesus, but could not himself enter. He was the last and greatest of the heroes of faith, who looked for 'the city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God,' who died without receiving the promises.<sup>57</sup>

At this point it is important to show how Matthew's Gospel views John the Baptizer. First of all, there is a very close relationship between John and Jesus.<sup>58</sup> In fact, the content of their proclamation is the same. In Matthew 3:2 John proclaims, *μετανοεῖτε ἵνα ἴψω βαπτισθῆτε τῶν οὐρανῶν*. In Matthew 4:17 the content of Jesus' proclamation is the very same. On the other hand, in Mark Jesus is the only one who proclaims the kingdom (1:15). In Luke Jesus' first proclamation is a quotation from Isaiah 61:1-2 (Luke 4:18-19). In Matthew

21:31-32 Jesus tells the chief priests and elders of the people, ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς υἱῶν ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ οὐκ ἠπαύσατε αὐτῷ. The chief priests and elders did not believe John, but the tax collectors and sinners did. The proclamation not only of Jesus but also of John led to repentance and preparation to enter the Kingdom of God.<sup>59</sup>

Also, it has already been stated that after the disciples of John came to Jesus to ask him who he was, Jesus told the people that John is Elijah who is to come (Matthew 11:14).

In the account of John's execution Mark says that the people regarded him as a righteous and holy man (Mark 6:20), but Matthew says that the people regarded him as a prophet (Matthew 14:5).

In Jesus' discourse with the disciples coming down from the Mount of Transfiguration, both Matthew and Mark state that Jesus says that Elijah has already come (Mark 9:13 = Matthew 17:12), but only Matthew says that the disciples understood that he was talking about John the Baptizer (Matthew 17:13).

Thus, Matthew's Gospel presents a high view of John the Baptizer. He has a very close relationship with Jesus, and he is definitely portrayed as Elijah.

## Material Peculiar to Luke

Luke is unique in his presentation. He includes not only a birth and infancy account of Jesus, but also of John the Baptizer. John's father is Ζαχαρίας, ἱεραὸς ἐκ βενιαμίν Ἀβιά (Luke 1:5). In I Chronicles 24:10 Abijah is mentioned in a list of the divisions of the sons of Aaron. The wife of Zechariah is Ἐλισάβετ, the same name as Aaron's wife in Exodus 6:23.

Scobie says that every sentence of the birth and infancy account echoes the Old Testament.<sup>60</sup> This is borne out in reference to Luke 1:5 not only by the Old Testament names employed, but also by the fact that the style and vocabulary of the verse recall Judges 13:2, the opening reference to the birth of Samson.<sup>61</sup>

Luke 1:7 points out that Zechariah and Elizabeth had no children, because Elizabeth was barren and both were very old. This recalls Abraham and Sarah in the Old Testament (Genesis 18:11).

The word of the ἀγγελος in Luke 1:13 to Zechariah parallels the words of ὁ Θεός to Abraham in Genesis 17:19.

The child to be born to Zechariah and Elizabeth is not to drink either wine nor strong drink (Luke 1:15). According to Numbers 6:3, part of the vows of a Nazirite was that he was not to partake of wine and strong drink. The angel of the Lord came to the mother of Samson (before he was born) and said that he was not to drink wine or



strong drink because he was to be a Nazirite (Judges 13: 4-7). The LXX text of I Samuel 1:11 indicates that Samuel was to be like a Nazirite. Apart from Luke 1:15 there is no reference to John being a Nazirite. Scobie points out that there is no evidence that he fulfilled a vow; there is no evidence that he let his hair grow; and there is no mention that he followed strictly the laws of purity. He was probably not a life long Nazirite, even though he may have been influenced by this discipline.<sup>62</sup> Creed holds that John was not a Nazirite but that a certain contrast between strong drink and the Holy Spirit is what is implied (cf. Ephesians 5:18).<sup>63</sup>

Luke 1:16-17 tells us what John is to do.

καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψει  
ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν· καὶ αὐτὸς προ-  
ελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει  
Ἡλίου, ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα  
καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, ἔτοιμάσει  
κύριω λαὸν κατασκευασμένον.

In these verses John is not directly said to be Elijah,<sup>64</sup> but is linked with Elijah.<sup>65</sup> He is not specifically Elijah, but his mission is like that of Elijah in Malachi.<sup>66</sup> This almost becomes a matter of semantics after one thinks about it for a while. John is not Elijah, but he is like Elijah. To be "in the spirit and power of Elijah" is not the same as being Elijah. But it is safe to say that John is the one who will set the stage for the eschatological

deliverance.<sup>67</sup> Even though he is not specifically Elijah, he is pictured as doing the work for this prophet.<sup>68</sup>

Zechariah's response to the words of the angel, "How shall I know this? For I am an old man and my wife is advanced in years." (Luke 1:18), is similar to the response of Abraham in Genesis 15:8, and to the age of Abraham and Sarah in Genesis 18:11f. and Genesis 17:17.

The opening verse of the Magnificat (Luke 1:46) presents us with a textual problem. Some manuscripts substitute Elisabeth for *Μαριάν*. This has led many scholars to view *Μαριάν* as not original.<sup>69</sup> Scobie holds that originally Elizabeth was the speaker but that it was changed to Mary to lay more stress on Jesus' birth.<sup>70</sup> It would definitely make sense if the words were originally Elizabeth's, because the words of the Magnificat follow closely the prayer of Hannah in I Samuel 2. Both Elizabeth and Hanna were childless and both rejoice in the Lord for the blessing of a child.<sup>71</sup> If we take the view that the words were originally Elizabeth's, then we see a parallel between John and Samuel.

The Benedictus, Luke 1:68-79, also presents us with some problems. The context refers to the birth of John. Zechariah is prophesying and one can assume that he is speaking about John. However, Luke 1:69, *καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*, does not refer to John but to Jesus (Luke 1:32).<sup>72</sup> The usual

interpretation is that the first part of the Benedictus, Luke 1:68-75, refers to Jesus, but the last part, Luke 1:76-79, refers to John.<sup>73</sup> John A. T. Robinson holds that originally the entire Benedictus referred to Jesus. His argument is that the *παιδίον* of Luke 1:76 is the same as the *παῖς* of Acts 3:13, 26, which refers to Jesus.<sup>74</sup>

*παῖς* is a term for the Servant of God (Isaiah 42:1), and in the New Testament is applied to Jesus (Acts 3:13, 26). However Zechariah does not use the term, *παῖς*, but *παιδίον*, a general term for a new born child (Genesis 17:12). In Luke 1:80 *παιδίον* refers to John because he was *ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις*. Thus, on the basis of *παιδίον*, one cannot conclude that the entire Benedictus refers to Jesus. A more likely explanation is that the Benedictus originally celebrated the birth of John but that the reference to David was inserted by Luke when he received his source in order to play down the high estimate of John.<sup>75</sup>

Luke 1:68-75, then, probably refers to Jesus, and Luke 1:76-78 refers to John. In v. 76 John is called *προφήτης ὑψίστου*. The baby to be born to Mary, however, is to be called the *υἱὸς ὑψίστου* (Luke 1:32).<sup>76</sup> As a *προφήτης* John is to go *ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ*. Christians interpreted as Jesus Christ. In Malachi, however, *κύριος* is God himself.<sup>77</sup> John is the prophet of the end time.<sup>78</sup> and is connected with the *ἰσραήλ* of Malachi 3:1.

The account of the birth of John the Baptizer ends with a summary of his growth.

τὸ δὲ παῖδιόν, ἠύβηεν καὶ ἐκρῆται οὗτο  
πνεύματι, καὶ ἦν δὲν ταῖς ἐρήμοις εὐς ἡμέρας  
ἀναδούξων αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰρηνά.

This is similar to what is said of Samson in Judges 13:24 and Samuel in I Samuel 2:26.<sup>79</sup>

Lampe sets the birth and infancy narrative into a very good perspective. He says,

One of the most striking features of Lk.-Ac. is the prominence accorded to the Holy Spirit. As in the OT, the Spirit is the power of God, manifested particularly in prophesying and in ecstatic phenomena. The Gospel begins in the setting of a fresh upsurge of the Spirit's inspiration, and the narratives of John and of the infancy are full of allusions to prophetic inspiration, John himself being in the highest degree a Spirit-possessed prophet. This new revival of the prophetic inspiration is intended to point to, and witness to, Christ, and he himself is born through the operation of the Spirit and at his Baptism becomes the recipient of the Spirit in a unique manner and degree.<sup>80</sup>

## 2. Luke 3:1-2

The significant element for our consideration here is a statement in verse 2, ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννου τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. This recalls Jeremiah 1:1 LXX, τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Ἰερεμίου τὸν τοῦ Χαλκίου ἐκ τῶν ἱερέων.

There are other references in the Old Testament which are similar, particularly in reference to Ezekiel (6:1), Hosea (1:1), Jonah (1:1), Micah (1:1), Zephaniah (1:1), Haggai (1:1), Zechariah (1:1) and Elijah (I Kings 17:2).<sup>81</sup>

The word of the Lord comes to John just as to the prophets

of old. He is a prophet according to the Old Testament pattern.<sup>82</sup>

In this passage Luke omits the references to the type of clothing which John wore. Both Mark (1:6) and Matthew (3:4) tell us the type of clothing he wore and we saw that this was reminiscent of Elijah, even though it could also refer just to a prophet.

On the basis of this passage we can say that Luke does not tie up John with Elijah. John is simply a prophet and he is not specifically connected with any particular prophet who was expected to return.

Luke certainly takes a different attitude toward John in comparison with Matthew and Mark. We have noted that Luke omits the question of the disciples concerning the coming of Elijah and the reply of Jesus in the account of the transfiguration. Also, in Jesus' remarks about John (Luke 7:24ff.), after John's disciples came to ask him who he was, Luke omits the phrase, *καὶ εἰ θέλετε δεῖσθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν ἡλίας ἐ μέλλων ἔρχομαι* (Matthew 11:14).

What, then, is the significance of John the Baptizer according to Luke? First of all, the prologue of Luke (chapters 1 and 2), the narratives of the infancy of John and Jesus, are regarded by some scholars to have been added later and appear to have come from a separate source.<sup>83</sup> Some have considered part of this source (Luke 1:5-80) to

be originally a Baptist document which serves as an introduction to the birth narrative of Jesus.<sup>84</sup> Thus, if this view is accepted, Luke's Gospel originally begins with chapter 3.<sup>85</sup> On the basis of this, an accurate account of Luke's view of whether John is Elijah must come from chapter 3 on.

Conzelmann states Luke's view of John in part as follows:

John is not the Messiah but 'only' the preparer of the way. He may be Elijah. Luke's argument, however, is the reverse of this: John is not the precursor, for there is no such thing, but he is the last of the prophets... Luke ix, 8 informs us that John is dead and appears no more. Nothing definite is said about Elijah: but this applies only in the actual historical situation, that is to say, in the case of Herod. We have to distinguish between what Luke makes Herod say and what he himself thinks....As far as Elijah and Moses are concerned, Luke answers the undecided question in the story of the Transfiguration, ix, 28-36. With their appearances here the role of both of them is completed. Luke emphasizes, by way of correcting his source, that this is in fact their role: they come as heavenly messengers to Jesus, but only to him, not publicly. According to Luke they do not even speak in the hearing of the three disciples. Therefore it is foolish to look for precursors; the Kingdom does not come *κατὰ παρά τινος*, it comes suddenly. In Luke's view evidently this element of surprise is a refutation of the apocalyptic idea of the precursor. Luke xvii, 30ff. is relevant to this. Any suggestion of a false interpretation has to be removed. As a consequence therefore Mark ix, 9-12 is omitted. The Elijah-motif is excluded also from the account of Jesus' death, hence the absence of Mark xv, 35.<sup>86</sup>

John is not Elijah, according to Luke, but we have concluded that he is a prophet.

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSION

There are many items which lead us to conclude that John the Baptizer was Elijah who is to come. In many references we have seen that John is connected with the *Ἰησοῦς* of Malachi 3, whom we have concluded is Elijah. John wears clothing that is reminiscent of Elijah, even though it was clothing that was characteristic of any prophet. John performs his ministry in the wilderness, the area of Elijah's translation and other significant events in the history of God's people. His rebuking of Herod recalls Elijah's rebuking of Ahab, even though there are other parallels. Most convincing, however, are the words of Jesus himself who says that John is Elijah who is to come (Matthew 11:14).

The attitude of the people, however, does not help us. The people do not regard John as Elijah, but some of them wonder if he is the Messiah (Luke 3:15). The people wonder if Jesus is Elijah (Mark 6:15).

It is definitely apparent that John does not openly state that he is Elijah. In fact, when he sends his disciples to Jesus to ask him who he is, if he is the one who is to come, we discussed the possibility that perhaps John is asking Jesus if he is Elijah.

The prologue of Luke, which is also filled with many

prophetic and other Old Testament allusions, such as tie-ups with Samuel, Samson and others, does link up John with Elijah, even though it does not specifically state that he is Elijah. The rest of Luke does not consider John to be Elijah. Luke omits many references which would make us think that John is Elijah. However, Luke does relate the Malachi passage to John in 7:27, but then promptly omits the statement of Matthew that John is Elijah. Certainly Luke has his own purposes in mind by playing down the role of John.

Thus, in the Synoptics we do not get a unified picture of John in relation to the question of whether he is Elijah who is to come. Yet it is certain that according to the Synoptics the early church and Jesus himself regarded John the Baptizer as the prophet who was the forerunner of the Messiah.<sup>1</sup> John may not specifically be Elijah, but he does do, at least according to Jesus, the work of Elijah (Matthew 11:14).

#### Unanswered Questions

A study as broad as this one leaves a lot of unanswered questions. First of all, a more detailed exegetical study of the materials involved would help clarify many of the problems and undoubtedly alter many of the conclusions.

The materials from the Dead Sea Scrolls, particularly the idea of the two Messiahs, would be helpful in this



discussion. John's own relationship to the Dead Sea Community would also contribute to our understanding of him.

A detailed study of *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* in regard to its relation to Elijah and to Jesus would clarify the relationship between Elijah and John, Elijah and Jesus, and Jesus and John.

Very little consideration was given in this paper to the content of John's proclamation. This would be helpful in understanding him, not only in regard to the question as to whether he is Elijah or not, but also in regard to his relationship to Jesus.

I did not find any evidence that parallels the Baptism of John with Elijah, but an investigation of it and the Baptist movement would yield fruit in an evaluation of John.

Many questions could be asked as to the relationship between John and Jesus. Is there any evidence that Jesus was a disciple of John but later went his own way, as some have indicated?

Jesus' raising of the widow's son at Nain (Luke 7: 11-17) recalls Elijah's raising of the widow's son at Zarephath (I Kings 17:17-24). Are there any other parallels between Jesus and Elijah? If so what is the significance of these in relation to the question under consideration?

After the event of Jesus' raising the widow's son at

Nain, the people call Jesus a great prophet. What does it mean that Jesus is a prophet, and what is the difference between John being a prophet and Jesus being a prophet?

A consideration of the source theories in regard to the prologue of Luke would help to establish whether the material was originally a Baptist document that is altered by Luke or is it something else.

By choice the Fourth Gospel was omitted from consideration in this paper. But certainly a consideration of it as well as the Acts of the Apostles would help give us the total New Testament picture of John.

Going back to the area of eschatological expectation, much more attention could be given to the role of Moses in Jewish expectation, not only in relation to Elijah expectation, but also to see how this manifests itself in the New Testament.

This paper pointed out the differences in the way each Gospel, particularly Matthew and Luke, portrayed John. However, the question of why there are differences was not answered, even though in some instances this may have been alluded to. This is by far the most important unanswered question.

In short, more questions were raised in this study than were solved.

## FOOTNOTES

### CHAPTER II

<sup>1</sup>Stephen Szikszai, "Elijah the Prophet," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 88.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 88-89.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 89-90.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 90.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Joachim Jeremias, "Ἠλιείας," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), II, 928.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 931.

<sup>9</sup>Charles H. H. Scobie, John the Baptist (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 120. In this reference Scobie refers to R. C. Dentan, Interpreter's Bible, VI, 1144.

<sup>10</sup>Herman L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956), IV, 2, 797.

<sup>11</sup>Also known as the Wisdom of Sirach.

<sup>12</sup>See I Kings 18:38 and II Kings 1:10, 12 and the discussion above on Elijah in the Old Testament.

<sup>13</sup>W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," The Scrolls and the New Testament, edited by Krister Stendahl (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 48.

<sup>14</sup>See the discussion above on Elijah in the Old Testament. "The close connection with Elijah's translation shows us why Elijah especially was chosen as the future prophet. He did not die as men do, but was taken up by a whirlwind into heaven (II Kings 2:11)." Scobie, pp. 120-21.

- <sup>15</sup>Brownlee, p. 48 and Jeremias, p. 931.
- <sup>16</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley, "Sirach," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, edited by R. H. Charles (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913), I, 501.
- <sup>17</sup>See above under Elijah in the Old Testament.
- <sup>18</sup>Jeremias, p. 930.
- <sup>19</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>20</sup>Ibid. See also T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: S C M Press, LTD, 1954), p. 69.
- <sup>21</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>22</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 782-84.
- <sup>23</sup>Manson, p. 69.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 784-89.
- <sup>26</sup>Manson, p. 69.
- <sup>27</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 789.
- <sup>28</sup>Manson, p. 69.
- <sup>29</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 789-90.
- <sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 790.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 791.
- <sup>32</sup>Jeremias, pp. 932-33.
- <sup>33</sup>Albrecht Oepke, "Ἰσοκαθίστημι, Ἰσοκατάστασις," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), I, 388.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>35</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 792-94.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 793.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid., pp. 794-96. See also Jeremias, p. 934.

<sup>38</sup>Herbert Danby, The Mishnah (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 348. Other passages from the Mishnah which apply here are Baba Metzia 2:8, 3:4-5, and Shekalim 2:5.

<sup>39</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 796-97.

<sup>40</sup>Danby, p. 306.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 436-37.

<sup>42</sup>Werner Foerster, "εἰρηνία," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), II, 409.

<sup>43</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 797.

<sup>44</sup>Moore, II, p. 359.

<sup>45</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 797. G. F. Moore notes that this conception must be older than this testimony and that John the Baptist is a witness to it. II, 359.

<sup>46</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 797.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Jeremias, p. 934.

<sup>49</sup>Billerbeck, IV, 2, 797-98.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 797.

<sup>51</sup>Jeremias, p. 936.

<sup>52</sup>Moore, II, p. 358.

<sup>53</sup>Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 14.

<sup>54</sup>Scobie, p. 118.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid.

<sup>56</sup>Cullmann, p. 14. Scobie, p. 118.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.

<sup>58</sup>Cullmann, p. 15.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 17.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., pp. 17-18.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., pp. 18-19.

<sup>65</sup>Scobie, p. 123.

<sup>66</sup>Cullmann, p. 23.

### CHAPTER III

<sup>1</sup>As it was pointed out in the introductory chapter, this will not be a verse by verse exegetical study, but rather an examination of the contents of each section in relation to the pertinent material presented which deals with the topic under consideration. The emphasis will be on the Marcan passages.

<sup>2</sup>Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963), p. 151.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 153.

<sup>4</sup>J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, translated from the Dutch by Mrs. G. E. van Baaren-Pape (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V. - G. A. Hak & Dr. H. J. Prakke, 1954), pp. 109-10. Doeve does not deal specifically with the passage under consideration, but he does explain the methodology involved.

<sup>5</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 40.

<sup>6</sup>Charles H. H. Scobie, John the Baptist (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 44-45 and 127. The significance of Luke's difference in geography will be brought out later in the section dealing with material peculiar to Luke.

<sup>7</sup>William David Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1964), p. 28.

<sup>8</sup>Taylor, p. 156.

<sup>9</sup>Scobie, p. 128.

<sup>10</sup>John A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," Twelve New Testament Studies (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962), p. 29, note 2.

<sup>11</sup>Carl H. Kraeling, John the Baptist (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), pp. 14-15.

<sup>12</sup>Robinson, pp. 32-33. See also Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 31-36.

<sup>13</sup>Taylor, p. 312.

<sup>14</sup>Kraeling, p. 92.

<sup>15</sup>Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, translated from the German by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), pp. 21, 26-27.

<sup>16</sup>Taylor, p. 376.

<sup>17</sup>Cullmann, p. 18. See also Alan Hugh M'Neile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan & Co LTD, 1961), p. 239.

<sup>18</sup>Francis Wright Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), p. 143.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Conzelmann, p. 59.

<sup>21</sup>Joachim Jeremias. "Ἡλιούλας," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), II, 939.

<sup>22</sup>Cullmann, p. 18. M'Neile, p. 249. See above under The Eschatological Prophet.

<sup>23</sup>Taylor, p. 390.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 392.

<sup>25</sup>M'Neile, p. 251.

- <sup>26</sup>Jeremias, II, p. 937.
- <sup>27</sup>Albrecht Oepke, "Ἰσοκαθίσταμι, ἰσοκατάστατος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel, translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), I, 389.
- <sup>28</sup>Robinson, p. 47.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>30</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>31</sup>M'Neile, p. 253.
- <sup>32</sup>Cullmann, p. 22.
- <sup>33</sup>Jeremias, II, p. 940.
- <sup>34</sup>George S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949), p. 103.
- <sup>35</sup>John Martin Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London: Macmillan & Co LTD, 1965), p. 135. Luke's treatment of John as Elijah will be taken up in more detail below.
- <sup>36</sup>Kraeling, pp. 39-40, 42-44, and 50.
- <sup>37</sup>Cullmann, p. 25.
- <sup>38</sup>M'Neile, p. 151. See also Duncan, p. 94.
- <sup>39</sup>M'Neile, p. 34.
- <sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 34-35.
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 152.
- <sup>42</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>43</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>44</sup>Cullmann, p. 24. Scobie, p. 157. Kraeling, p. 141. M'Neile, p. 154. Creed, p. 107.
- <sup>45</sup>T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: S C M Press, LTD, 1954), p. 69. See also Albert Schweitzer, The Quest for the Historical Jesus, translated from the German by W. Montgomery (London: A. & C. Black, LTD, 1926), p. 371.



<sup>46</sup>Kraeling, p. 156.

<sup>47</sup>Manson, p. 134.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid.

<sup>49</sup>Frederick W. Danker, "Luke 16:16 - An Opposition Legion," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 232.

<sup>50</sup>Kraeling, p. 156.

<sup>51</sup>Conzelmann, p. 26. See also pp. 16, 20-25, 40, 101, 112 f., 160 f., 185 and 220.

<sup>52</sup>Danker, p. 231.

<sup>53</sup>Scobie, p. 158.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.

<sup>55</sup>Duncan, p. 100.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 101.

<sup>57</sup>Manson, p. 70.

<sup>58</sup>James L. Jones, "References to John the Baptist in the Gospel according to St. Matthew," Anglican Theological Review, XLI (1959), 299.

<sup>59</sup>Clayton R. Bowen, "John the Baptist in the New Testament," The American Journal of Theology, XVI (1912), 90.

<sup>60</sup>Scobie, p. 50.

<sup>61</sup>Creed, p. 9.

<sup>62</sup>Scobie, p. 137.

<sup>63</sup>Creed, p. 11.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid.

<sup>65</sup>Conzelmann, p. 24.

<sup>66</sup>Geoffrey W. H. Lampe, "Luke," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd), p. 823.

- <sup>67</sup>Kraeling, p. 17.
- <sup>68</sup>Beare, p. 33. See also Scobie, p. 126.
- <sup>69</sup>Creed, p. 22. Scobie, p. 55.
- <sup>70</sup>Scobie, pp. 54-55.
- <sup>71</sup>Creed, p. 22.
- <sup>72</sup>Ibid., pp. 25-26.
- <sup>73</sup>Scobie, p. 55.
- <sup>74</sup>Robinson, p. 52.
- <sup>75</sup>Scobie, p. 55.
- <sup>76</sup>Creed, p. 26.
- <sup>77</sup>Kraeling, p. 53. See also Cullmann, p. 25.
- <sup>78</sup>Cullmann, p. 25.
- <sup>79</sup>Creed, p. 27.
- <sup>80</sup>Lampe, p. 823.
- <sup>81</sup>Bowen, p. 92.
- <sup>82</sup>Scobie, p. 127. Cullmann, p. 15.
- <sup>83</sup>Scobie, p. 14.
- <sup>84</sup>W. R. Farmer, "John the Baptist," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, edited by George Arthur Buttrick (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), II, 956. See also Conzelmann, p. 22, note 1.
- <sup>85</sup>Scobie, p. 14.
- <sup>86</sup>Conzelmann, p. 25.

## CHAPTER IV

- <sup>1</sup>Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959), p. 26.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Primary Sources

Aland, Kurt, editor. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum.  
Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

Bible, Holy. Revised Standard Version.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated from the German and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint. 3 vols. in two. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Moulton, W. F., A. S. Geden, and K. H. Moulton, editors. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Nestle, Erwin, and Kurt Aland, editors. Novum Testamentum Graece. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.

Rahlfs, Alfred, editor. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959.

### B. Secondary Sources

Bammel, E. "Is Luke 16, 16-18 of Baptist's Provenience?" Harvard Theological Review, LI (1958), 101-107.

Barns, Thomas. "The Baptism of John," The Expositor, VI (1897), 139-153.

Beare, Francis Wright. The Earliest Records of Jesus. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Benoit, Pierre. "L'Enfance De Jean-Baptiste Selon Luc I," New Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 169-194.

Bowen, Clayton R. "John the Baptist in the New Testament," The American Journal of Theology, XVI (1912), 90-106.

- Brownlee, W. H. "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957, 33-53.
- Burkill, T. A. "St. Mark's Philosophy of History," New Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 142-148.
- Burrows, Millar. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Viking Press, 1958.
- . The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: Viking Press, 1955.
- Charles, R. H., editor. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated from the German by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. The Gospel According to Saint Mark. Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to St. Luke. London: Macmillan & Co LTD, 1965.
- Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- . "Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 213-226.
- Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Danker, Frederick W. "Luke 16:16 - An Opposition Logion," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 231-243.
- Doeve, J. W. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Translated from the Dutch by Mrs. G. E. van Baaren-Pape. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V. - G. A. Hak & Dr. H. J. Prakke, 1954.
- Davies, William David. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1964.

- Deane, Anthony C. "The Ministry of John the Baptist," The Expositor, XIII (1917), 420-431.
- Denney, James. "Jesus' Estimate of John the Baptist," The Expositor, VII (1909), 60-75.
- Dods, Marcus. "The Baptist's Message to Jesus," The Expositor, I (1895), 201-212.
- Duncan, George S. Jesus, Son of Man. New York: Macmillan Company, 1949.
- Farmer, W. R. "John the Baptist," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. II, 955-962.
- Foerster, Werner. "Ἰωάννης," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964. II, 400-420.
- Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1964.
- Geyser, A. S. "Short Notes - The Youth of John the Baptist," Novum Testamentum, I (1956), 70-75.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Ἰωάννης," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964. II, 928-941.
- Jones, James L. "References to John the Baptist in the Gospel according to St. Matthew," Anglican Theological Review, XLI (1959), 298-302.
- Kiddle, Martin. "The Teaching of John the Baptist," The Expository Times, XLVIII (1937), 396-400.
- Kraeling, Carl H. John the Baptist. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Krieger, Norbert. "Barfuss Busse Tun," Novem Testamentum, I (1956), 227-228.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg. "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," The Scrolls and the New Testament. Edited by Krister Stendahl. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957, 54-64.

- Lampe, Geoffrey W. H. "Luke," Peake's Commentary on the Bible. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962. 820-843.
- Leimer, M. "Die Taufe Johannis des Täuflers in ihrem Verhaeltnis zu Christi Taufe," Concordia Theological Monthly, XIV (1943), 197-206.
- Lightfoot, R. H. The Gospel Message of St. Mark. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- M'Neile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Macmillan & Co. LTD, 1961.
- MacNeill, H. L. "The Sitz im Leben of Luke," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXV (1946), 123-130.
- Manek, Jindrich. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," Novum Testamentum, II (1958), 8-23.
- Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: S C M Press, LTD, 1954.
- . The Teachings of Jesus. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, The Age of the Tannaim. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Insights into the New Testament from the Dead Sea Scrolls," American Ecclesiastical Review, CXXXV (1956), 9-22.
- Murray, J. O. F. "The Witness of the Baptist to Jesus," The Expository Times, XXXVIII (1925), 103-109.
- Oepke, Albrecht. "ἸΠΟΚΑΘΙΣΤΗΜΑ, ἸΠΟΚΑΤΑΓΡΑΦΙΣ," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated from the German by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964. I, 387-393.
- Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957.
- Robinson, John A. T. "Elijah, John and Jesus," Twelve New Testament Studies. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962. 28-52.
- . "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community," Twelve New Testament Studies. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1962. 9-27.

- Schlatter, Adolf. Johannes der Tauefer. Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt AG., 1956.
- Schweitzer, Albert. The Quest for the Historical Jesus. Translated from the German by W. Montgomery. London: A. & C. Black, LTD, 1926.
- Scobie, Charles H. H. John the Baptist. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- Scott, E. F. "John the Baptist and His Message," The Expositor, VI (1908), 68-76.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Matthew," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962. 769-798.
- Steinmann, Jean. Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition. Translated from the French by Michael Boyes. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 4 vols. Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956.
- Szikszai, Stephen. "Elijah the Prophet," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. II, 88-90.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963.
- Winter, Paul. "The Proto-Source of Luke I," Novum Testamentum, I (1956), 184-199.
- Yates, J. E. "The Form of Mark I," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-58), 334-338.