

# Who is “That Prophet”?

---

By Peter Salemi

**BICOG Publication**

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

***Many have claimed to be “That Prophet” that the Apostle John wrote about in his Gospel. The followers of the religion of Islam believe Muhammad was this “prophet.” Today false Apostles and ministers that have taken over God’s church are beginning to claim that they are “that Prophet” of John 1:21. Who really is “that Prophet”?***

Gerald Flurry of the Philadelphia Church of God claims that he is “That Prophet” of John 1:21. He has concocted an elaborate complex doctrine to try and justify himself as God’s appointed Apostle, Watchman and Prophet to the church and the world. It is interesting that he *never* makes this claim on his television program; he just *hints* at it a little. It’s only when you receive the literature and attend church services that they tell you the truth. When one understands who really is “that Prophet” one can see how *blasphemous* this claim is-by Flurry or anyone else that tries to claim this title for themselves.

### **How it all Started for Flurry**

In his article “Who is that Prophet” in his Royal Vision Magazine August 2000, he goes through great lengths to prove that he is “that Prophet.”

It’s interesting, it all started by, “one of our church members brought to my attention this scripture, ‘And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?’

‘And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the *Christ*.

‘And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias [Elijah]? And he saith, I am not. Art thou THAT PROPHET? And he answered, No.’ (John 1:19-21). *This member believed ‘that prophet’ applied to me.* But he didn’t give a reason *why*. I felt I should at least study into it and beseech God for more understanding” (p.2, emphasis his and mine). Wow! If someone said to you that “I think you are Napoleon reincarnated” would you look into it? Or would you tell the person “you’re crazy”? Not Flurry! Instead of showing the person the error of his ways and thinking, he humors the person and looks into this to see if it really applied to him-does this not sound like a person just looking for more recognition in the church of God so people will follow him without question?

### **Proofs He Gives**

Now he claims that, “...the Jews knew the Bible prophesied of a coming Messiah. They did not, however, understand that he was prophesied to come *twice*” (ibid, p.2, emphasis his). He goes on to say, that after the coming of Elijah, “The Jews also knew about *another* man, another *prophet*, associated with that great end time event. There was to come, an Elijah, and also an *unknown* prophet before Christ’s return. When the Jews asked about ‘that prophet,’ they knew who they were referring to, and it appears John did too. There must have been someone else, besides Elijah-someone whom prophecy places near the end time, near Christ’s return. He wasn’t Elijah; he really was unknown as far as a name was concerned. He was simply called ‘that prophet.’” (ibid, p.2). This is the crux of his whole doctrine about who “that prophet” is. He claims there is Christ, Elijah and *that prophet*-three *distinct* individuals that were to come.

---

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

He says the Jews knew about that “Prophet.” He claims this “Prophet” to the Jews was “unknown” to the Jews. This is a total fabrication and lie. The Jews knew exactly who “that Prophet” was; their rabbinical writings and the New Testament itself demonstrates that fact as we shall see.

He claims, “A few commentaries say ‘that prophet’ is Christ, *but that doesn’t make sense*; that prophet is presented in this list as being *distinct from Christ* and Elijah” (ibid, p.2, emphasis added).

He says “a few” commentaries? Try the *vast majority* of commentaries all say Jesus is “that prophet” that fulfilled the prophecy of Deuteronomy 18:15 *which Mr. Flurry doesn’t even mention in this article whatsoever!*

Now he quotes Thayer’s Lexicon, Lange’s Commentary and the International Critical Commentary to back up his claim, *not scripture*-he leaves scripture *out* completely!

Notice how he quotes these commentaries, “Thayer’s Lexicon says the Jews believed that prophet was to, ‘arrive just before the advent of the Messiah’” (ibid, p.2).

The International Critical Commentary he quotes says, “There was a general belief that Elijah would return to Earth to prepare the way of the Messiah. This was founded on Malachi 4:5. This was another alternative. The Jews held that not only Elijah, but others of the great prophets, would return before Messiah’s appearance. This expectation of the return of one of the older prophets was the *expectation of one who was pre-eminently ‘the prophet,’ According to these commentaries the Jews thought there was ANOTHER PROPHET TO COME JUST BEFORE CHRIST’S RETURN*” (ibid, p.2, emphasis his and mine)

Lange’s Commentary he quotes says, “The prophet, with the article; the well-known prophet; a personage in their Messianic theology presumed to be familiar.” And, “This particular prophet, therefore, is meant, who should complete the forerunning office of Elijah...” (ibid, p.2).

Gerald Flurry *does not* accurately represent what the commentaries DO say about this. He conveniently leaves *whole sections out* and picks and chooses what he wants to establish his doctrine and *again does not use scripture*.

The International Critical Commentary quoted correctly says, “This was another alternative. The Jews held that not only Elijah, but others of the great prophets, would return before Messiah’s appearance. Cf. 2 Ezra 2:17, ‘For thy help will I send my servants Isaiah and Jeremiah,’ a passage which may be pre-Christian. One of the rumors about Jesus during His Galilean ministry was that He was ‘Jeremiah or one of the prophets’ (Matt 16:14; cf. Mark 8:28). See 9:17 below. But more specific than this expectation of the return of one of the older prophets was the *expectation of one who was pre-eminently ‘the prophet,’ whose coming was looked for on the ground of Deut 18:15. This idea is not in the Synoptists [Matthew, Mark, Luke], but appears three times in Jn. (1:21, 6:14, 7:40). Christian exegesis from the beginning (Acts 3:22, Acts 7:37) found the fulfillment of Deut 18:15 in the Christ; but pre-Christian, i.e. Jewish, comment distinguished ‘the prophet like unto Moses’ from the Messiah, as is clear from the*

---

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

present passage [John 1:21] and from 7:40; see on 6:31. To the question, ‘Art thou the prophet?’ ***the only answer was No, for the Jews were mistaken in distinguishing ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος from the Christ***, whose herald John was” (emphasis added).

First, Mr. Flurry did not quote the part in the commentary where they felt the *Jews were “mistaken” in distinguishing “that prophet” from the “Messiah.”* He also did not quote the commentary that said “that prophet” was from Deut 18:15 which the New Testament says is Jesus Christ, contrary to what Flurry says that this “doesn’t make sense.” This commentary does not agree with Flurry’s doctrine.

Second, this commentary says, “*but pre-Christian, i.e. Jewish, comment distinguished ‘the prophet like unto Moses’ from the Messiah, as is clear from the present passage [John 1:21] and from 7:40; see on 6:31.*” Jewish writings reveal that they did believe Deuteronomy 18:15 meant the Messiah (see below). This commentary however makes it sound like *all the Jews* distinguished the Messiah from that prophet, but it was really a *minority* of Jews that believed this (see below); the vast majority believed “that Prophet” was the Messiah. The scriptures they quote will actually demonstrate that fact, and *not* the opposite (see below). This is understandable because this commentary is 100 years old and the Dead Sea scrolls were not discovered yet so through no fault of their own did not know the complete background of these scriptures (see below)

Thayer’s Lexicon he quotes says, “2c) of the illustrious prophet, the Jews expected before the advent of the Messiah” He fails to quote the next passage “2d) *the Messiah.*” “That Prophet” was also known as the “Messiah.” Again, Thayer’s was presenting two different beliefs; like the International Critical commentary this was written over 100 years ago and the Dead Sea scrolls were not discovered yet. But one of their beliefs was “that prophet” was the Messiah which was the *dominant* belief (see below).

Lange’s Commentary says as Flurry quotes it, “The prophet, with the article; the well-known prophet; a personage in their Messianic theology presumed to be familiar.” And, “This particular prophet, therefore, is meant, who should complete the forerunning office of Elijah...”

Now notice how Flurry leaves out a *whole section after the first quotation*, “According to Chrysostom [Bengel], Lücke, Bleek, Meyer, [Alford], ***the prophet meant would be the one spoken of in Deut 18:15***; but this we must certainly, with Hengstenberg and Tholuck, deny, ***for this prophecy was at least in Acts 3:22; Acts 7:37 referred to the Messiah. It is a question whether the passages, John 6:14; John 7:40, refer to the passage in Deuteronomy.*** From Matt 16:14 it is sufficiently evident that an expectation of Jeremiah or some one of the prophets as the *forerunner of the Messiah was cherished. Probably this expectation was connected with the doctrine of the woes of the Messiah, that is, with what was known of the suffering Messiah*, The wailing Jeremiah, or one of the later prophets of affliction, *seemed better fitted for the forerunner of the suffering Messiah*, than the stern, judicial Elijah. The gradual shaping of this expectation of Jeremiah as a guardian angel in the theocratic day of suffering, appears in 2Ma 2:7; 2Ma 15:13.” (emphasis added). This whole section explains and even disagrees with others who disagree with the notion that this did *not* mean the Messiah. The prophet completing

---

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

“forerunning” office of Elijah was the first coming of the suffering Messiah that is prophesied to come *after* Elijah (Malachi 3:1).

Lange’s says of those he lists who deny the fact this meant the Messiah-they felt it meant a line of prophets and not *one* particular prophet as he says, “With this agrees the singular form of the promise here, and the express comparison with Moses as it is actually and historically explained, Deut 18:16 sq. The latter explanation especially, which must give the limitation to the ‘as I,’ ‘as thee,’ *opposes* every exposition which emphasizes the peculiar method of Moses in a wider (Havernick<sup>8</sup>) (Hofmann<sup>9</sup>), or a narrower sense (Kurtz,<sup>10</sup> Auberlen, Tholuck). The typical-*Messianic interpretation agrees best, both with the letter, and with the development of the Old Testament promise of the Messiah generally, and with the Mosaic time especially.* (Emphasis added). I cannot believe that Gerald Flurry would stoop this low and to twist and leave out whole sections of quotes from commentaries that are contrary to his doctrine, to establish a doctrine that he is “that prophet” that was to come.

After this, Flurry says that Elijah was Herbert Armstrong, and “that prophet” is Him, and his ministry that would come after him. He writes, “The Philadelphia Church of God has always believed that Herbert W. Armstrong fulfilled the end time type of the office of Elijah. Since he died in 1986, we know that ‘Elijah’ has come and gone. Now a prophet with no name is come on the scene [present tense]... Why would God want to focus more on the office of ‘that prophet’ now? Is it because of what is ahead?...*I also believe it is now time that God was to magnify my office. I fulfill the office of ‘that Prophet’*” (ibid, pp.2, 8, emphasis added). This is blasphemous beyond belief, Gerald Flurry stating outright that he is “that prophet” an office held by Jesus Christ!

Flurry believes that in Zechariah 3:8 and Zechariah 4:11-12, this shows the three distinct individuals of Christ who is Joshua; Elijah and that Prophet are the two anointed ones. But really the two anointed ones are the two witnesses of Revelation 11 who are on the earth *together* at the *same time!* Even the scripture itself shows that the two anointed ones are contemporaneous and *not* successive as Flurry claims, “Then said he, These *are* the two anointed ones, *that stand by* the Lord of the whole earth.” (Zech 4:14). These are “What *are* these two olive trees upon the right *side* of the candlestick and upon the left *side* thereof? ” (v.11). They stand together and are at *the same time* on the right and on the left; not one standing then the other comes and takes his place-they stand together! And every commentary will tell you that these are the two witnesses of Revelation 11. The Pulpit Commentary says, “There is a reference to this passage in Rev 11:4, where the ‘two witnesses’ are called ‘the two olive trees.; standing Before the Lord of the earth’ (Perowne).” (Read our booklets, Who is Elijah and the Two Witnesses for details).

### **Who is “that Prophet” Really?**

The scriptures are clear of who “that prophet” is. First of all it should read “the Prophet,” as the Jamieson Fausset and Brown Commentary clearly states, “**Art thou that prophet?** [ *ho* (G3588) *profetees* (G4396)] - rather, ‘*the prophet;*’ announced in **Deut 18:15**, etc.,” (emphasis added). Notice this commentary and basically all other commentaries say “that Prophet” is the prophet predicted by Moses, and the church preached that it meant Jesus Christ.

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

Now let’s examine the scripture, “And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent *priests and Levites* from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?

“And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, *I am not the Christ.*

“And they asked him, What then? *Art thou Elias?* And he saith, I am not. *Art thou that [the] prophet?* And he answered, No.” (John 1:19-21).

First of all, the very fact that the priests and the Levites asked him if he was “that prophet” clearly indicates that there was a *significant* prophecy in the Bible foretelling the coming of a *great* Prophet. It had to be a prophecy widely known among the people. It had to be a prophecy that inspired a heightened sense of anticipation and hope to the people. It had to be a standout prophecy!

Where does one find this prophecy? The one prophecy that all the commentators recognize and that Gerald flurry conveniently ignores is Deuteronomy 18:15!

“The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken;”

The New Testament church confirm that this meant Jesus Christ (Acts 7:37-38; Acts 3:20-23).

And the Jews knew it as well. After quoting Moses, it says, “Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, *as many as have spoken*, have likewise foretold of these days.” (Acts 3:24). The Jews knew a special prophet was coming in the days of John and Jesus. Moses’ prophecy was one of epic and towering proportion-and was probably known by all the people. So it was no surprise that they asked John if he was “that prophet.” Moses and the prophets prophesied of that prophet to come-and making it even more significant, since the Jews were under the yoke of the Romans, and “that prophet” was like Moses-they were expecting him to deliver them from the Romans as Moses did from the Egyptians. Randall Price says, “This messianic anticipation became even more pronounced with the loss of Jewish sovereignty through the Roman conquest (63 B.C.) leading to the expectation of a national king who would affect political and spiritual redemption.” (The Concept of the Messiah in the Old Testament p.2).

Why do you think Philip said to Nathanael, “Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, *We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.*” (John 1:45)? And when Philip said “we have found him” the context is the “Messiah” (see verses 41, 49).

Now on page 3 of his booklet, “Who is That Prophet,” Flurry says, “The Jews discussed in John’s Gospel *never thought* that Christ and the prophet were the *same* person. And John made *no attempt* to correct their belief, because they were right. John uses ‘that prophet’ to refer to a specific *but unknown person*. He is included in a list of two other prophets; Christ and Elijah. That prophet is a specific person-*distinct* from Christ and Elijah. But neither John nor the Jews knew his name” (emphasis added).

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

Now as we quoted the scriptures above the *Jews did believe* that the prophecy about “that Prophet” meant the Messiah (more proof from scriptures below). The church of God comprised mostly of Jews knew that prophecy meant Christ. They heard it all their lives in the synagogue, and came to realize that “That Prophet” meant Christ. If they did not hear in the synagogues that this prophecy of Deut 18:15 meant the Messiah they would *not* have applied it to him. They would have just said an “unknown prophet” is coming before the Lord. But no, they understood this prophecy to be Messianic, it was preached in the Synagogues as Messianic and when Jesus appeared they applied it to Christ.

Even in early first century non Biblical Jewish writings, Deuteronomy was interpreted and believed to mean the Messiah. Fourteenth century rabbi Levi Gershon applied this verse as messianic based on Midrash Thanhuma which points to the Messiah as being greater than Moses.

Rabbi Gershon deduces from the Midrash that the Messiah will be “The Prophet.” “ ‘A Prophet from the midst of thee.’ In fact, the Messiah is such a prophet as it is stated in the Midrash of the verse, ‘Behold, my Servant shall prosper’ (Isaiah 52:13)...Moses, by the miracles which he wrought, brought a single nation to the worship of God, but the Messiah will draw all peoples to the worship of God.” –Rabbi Levi ben Gershon-14th century (Rachmiel Fryland, *What The Rabbis Know About the Messiah: A Study of Genealogy and Prophecy* (Columbus, Ohio: Messianic Publishing Company, 2002), 33).

*Only a tiny minority of Jews* believed that the Christ and the Prophet were *two distinct individuals*. What was the *general* consensus? Kligerman says, “The use of the term ‘prophet’ by the Jews of Jesus day shows not only that they *expected the Messiah to be a prophet* in accordance with the promise of Deuteronomy eighteen, but also that He who performed those Miracles was indeed the Promised Prophet” (*Messianic Prophecy in the Old Testament*, pp. 22, 23, emphasis added).

In fact notice how the *Jewish New Testament* translates John 1:21 “Are you Eliyahu? No I am not, he said. Are you the prophet, *the one we’re expecting?*” Who were they expecting at this time? The Messiah! Daniel 9:26-27 prophesied that he would come after 69 weeks which worked out to the very time of Jesus. Notice what Eastman says, “One of the most interesting aspects of rabbinic Messianic speculation has to do with the time of his coming. Following the Babylonian captivity, which was from 606- 537 B.C.E., the rabbis began to pore through the scriptures to find clues regarding the time of Messiah's coming.

“Some have stated that there have always been intense Messianic expectations throughout the ages, and that those expectations were no different during the time period of the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth. However, a study of such expectations reveals this is not the case. During the first two quarters of the first century C.E., more than at any time in history, Messianic expectations were very high.” (*The Time of Messiah’s Coming*).

In the book by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, we read about the tremendous expectations at the time of Jesus Christ that the Messiah would come soon, “*Prior to the first century (C.E.) the Messianic interest was not excessive...The First Century, however, especially the generation before the destruction [of the Second Temple] witnessed a*

---

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

remarkable *outburst of Messianic emotionalism*. This is to be attributed, as we shall see, not to an intensification of Roman persecution, but to the prevalent belief induced by the popular chronology of that day that the age was on the threshold of the Millennium...*when Jesus came into Galilee, 'spreading the gospel of the kingdom of God and saying the 'time is fulfilled' and the Kingdom of God is at hand,' he was voicing the opinion universally held that...the age of the kingdom of God-was at hand...it was this chronological fact which inflamed the Messianic hope rather than the Roman persecutions...Jesus appeared in the procurator-ship of Pontius Pilate (26-36 c.e.)...It seems likely, therefore, that in the minds of the people the Millennium was to begin around the year 30 C.E.* Be it remembered that it is not the Messiah who brings about the Millennium. It is the inevitable advent of the Millennium which carries along with it the Messiah and his appointed activities. The Messiah was expected around the second quarter of the First Century C.E. because the Millennium was at hand. *Prior to that time he was not expected, because according to the chronology of the day the Millennium was still considerably removed.*” (A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, 1927, Macmillan Co., pg 5-7, emphasis added).

Now *no one notices* the line of questioning in the text of John 1:19-21. According to Sanhedrin law, if there was any kind of messianic movement, the Sanhedrin had to investigate the situation in two stages. The first stage was called the stage of observation. A delegation was formed to investigate only by way of observation. They had to observe what was being said, what was being done, and what was being taught. *They were not permitted to ask any questions or raise any objections.* After a period of observation they were to return to Jerusalem, report to the Sanhedrin and give a verdict: was the movement significant or was the movement insignificant? If the movement was declared to be insignificant, the matter would be dropped. *But if the movement was declared to be significant, there would be a second stage of investigation called the stage of interrogation. In this stage they would interrogate the individual or members of the movement.* (Quotes from The Bible at Cultural Crossroads: From Translation to Communication By Harriet Hill, p.238; quotes Dr. Arnold Fruchtenbaum’s The Life of Messiah from a Jewish Perspective, emphasis added).

What we read in John was the second stage of investigation, the stage of interrogation; this is the context of the verses! Now the Levites and priests *did not* ask him if he was the Messiah. They just said, “What art thou?” (v.19). But the question if he was the Messiah was implied as John answers, “I am not the Christ” (v.20).

Then it goes on to say, “And they asked him *again*: Who then? Art thou Elijah? And he said: I am not. Art thou a [the] prophet? And he said, No.” (James Murdock NT) Notice the line of questioning, it is *repeated again*, like one *interrogating* a criminal asking the *same questions over and over* to get information using “... *the old reporter’s trick of asking the same question again in different words*, and John again answered it negatively.” (Coffman’s Commentaries on the Bible, John 1:21, emphasis added). The Jews knew that “The Prophet” meant the Messiah, they just repeated the question, and added “are you Elijah,” “are you that Prophet?” (i.e. the Messiah).

We also see an example of this in John the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter when the Pharisees interrogated the blind man. They kept asking him the same question over and over. The Blind man said, “He answered

---

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

them, *I have told you already, and ye did not hear*: wherefore would ye hear *it* again? will ye also be his disciples?” (v.27). As one can see with John the Baptist, his patience was gone as his responses went from a few words to one.

What of verse 25 of that same chapter that says, “And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not *that Christ*, nor Elias, neither *that prophet*?”

Flurry doesn’t seem to realize that this was a *different* group that came to John, “And they which were sent were *of the Pharisees*” (v.24). This source confirms, “It seems to refer to *another group* than John 1:19.” (Free Bible Commentary, p.31.By Dr. Bob Utley, professor of hermeneutics, emphasis added).

The first group were the “Levites” and “priests” (v.19), sent by the “Jews,” meaning the rulers of the nation (see Jamieson, Fausset and Brown).

But notice the second group, it says they were “*of the Pharisees*,” meaning they were sent by the Pharisees. Dr. Bob Utley again says, “This text is ambiguous. It can mean (1) the Pharisees *sent* John’s questioners (cf. John 1:19).” (p.31) who were this group of people?

Notice the question! They said to John, “Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?” (v.25). Now it’s interesting to note that, “... in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls that these three *personages represented the Essene view that there would be three different Messianic figures*” (Free Bible Commentary, p.31, By Dr. Bob Utley, professor of hermeneutics). These were the Essenes! This was an Essene belief of the Messiah, and they asked John according to *their belief* that if he wasn’t any of these prophetic figures then “Why do you Baptize?” The Pharisees sent them to investigate for them since the Essenes were already in the wilderness, and John was preaching there, so they sent them, and then the Essenes reported back to them. The Pharisees and the Essenes often worked together. In the New Testament one can read of, “Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in *his* talk....And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying...” (Matthew 22:15, 16).

Mark 3:6 as well says, “And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel *with the Herodians against him*, how they might destroy him.” The Herodians were the Essenes!

The reason they were called the “Herodians” is for the simple fact that the Essenes were the favorite religious group of Herod, and that they enjoyed special status among the people during the reign of Herod (31- 4 BC). Josephus even reports, “he [Herod] continued to honour all the Essens” (Antiquities of the Jews - Book XV Chapter 10. Paragraph 5.) Also Josephus speaks of the Essens as living “not in one city” but “in large numbers in every town”. Josephus’ reference to a “gate of the Essenes” in his description of the course of “the most ancient” of the three walls of Jerusalem, in the Mount Zion area, perhaps suggests an Essene community living in this quarter of the city or regularly gathering at this part of the Temple precincts. ( Josephus (c. 75). The Wars of the Jews. 2.124.)

---

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

Philo speaks of “more than four thousand” Essaioi living in “Palestine and Syria,” more precisely, “in many cities of Judaea and in many villages and grouped in great societies of many members” ( Philo (c. 20–54). *Quod Omnis Probus Liber*. XII.75; Philo. *Hypothetica*. 11.1. in Eusebius. *Praeparatio Evangelica*. VIII.). Can one actually think that the New Testament wouldn’t mention a group like the Essenes who were almost as big as the Pharisees in Jesus day? Constantin Daniel, Yigael Yadin, and Otto Betz who wrote an intriguing article titled “Jesus and the Temple Scroll,” prove that the Essenes were the Herodians of the New Testament.

Now Flurry says, “John made *no attempt* to correct their belief, because they were right” *This is simply not true!* John 1:26, says, “John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you, *whom ye know not;*”

Another translations has “John’s answer was: I give baptism with water; but there is one among you of whom you have no *knowledge;*” (BBE).

The Greek word here is “eidō” (Strong’s #1492). This also means “understanding” (see Thayer’s and Strong’s), and it is translated twice that way in 1Cor 13:2 and 1Cor 14:16, and “knowledge” once in Acts 24:22. Due to the context of the verses in John, “John was validating that they didn’t really know what they were talking about when they asked about Christ, Elijah and that Prophet-thus proving these religionists *did not understand* the person or purpose of Christ; and if they did not understand the person or purpose of Christ, then they did not know that Christ and THAT PROPHET *were one and the same person*” (Prove All Things, by Garfield Gregoire, p.32, emphasis his and mine). Their beliefs of what they thought about Messiah were wrong, and John the Baptist told them so; they had no understanding of the Messiah and his mission, and a reading of the Dead Sea scrolls of their belief of the Messiah also demonstrates many errors they had about the Messiah.

The Essenes were only in the *minority* in Israel; Gerald Flurry makes it sound like all the Jews believed this when it is simply not true. The Essenes were a very tiny minority in Palestine; only “about 4000 in Israel” (Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah p.324) as opposed to the Pharisees were also a minority, “comparatively small, numbering only about 6000 members” (Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, p.311). So this scripture (John 1:25) does *not* reflect the general belief of the Jews.

The general belief was “that prophet” meant the Messiah and John chapter 7 demonstrates will demonstrate that fact.

### **What the Bible says...**

The New Testament demonstrates the fact that the Jews knew “That Prophet” was the “Prophet like unto Moses” that was to come, and that he was the Messiah; and *they gave that title to Jesus* regardless of what Mr. Flurry believes:

“Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said This is of a truth *that prophet* that should come into the world.” (John 6:14). Some argue here that Jesus did not agree with this claim; but Jesus *does not refute it* either. Instead Jesus just lets the *people testify* to the

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

truth-this is what Jesus is doing, as Brant Pitre says, “This is an extremely important insight: Jesus does not go around shoving the mystery of his divinity down people's throats. *He wants them to freely come to believe in him.* He wants *them* to freely arrive at their *own conclusions* about who he is and how they are going to respond to him...During his public ministry, Jesus *wants his audience to ask for themselves:* Who is this man? And what is his relationship with the one God?” (The Case For Jesus, pp.151, 152, emphasis his and mine).

However Jesus does agree with this because he does say Moses did write of him, and he teaches his disciples this fact (see scriptures below), then the New Testament church quotes Moses' prophecy and say that this meant Jesus Christ (see Acts 3:20-23). Why would the Apostles quote this prophecy unless *Jesus taught them* the prophecy out of the law of Moses which he did (see Luke 24:27, 44).

“Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is *the Prophet.*” (John 7:40).

Yet the next verse says, “Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee?” (v.41); did this mean a separate individual from the Prophet? No! Notice the latter end of that verse, “Shall Christ come out of Galilee?” Later in that same chapter it says, “They [chief priests and Pharisees, see v.45] answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: *for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.*” (v.52). they either called him Christ, or the Prophet both titles were interchangeable. *The International Critical Commentary is in error about this passage; it actually proves “the Prophet” meant the Messiah.*

In Acts 3:20, 22-23 the Apostle Peter preached, “And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you:

“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 will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.*” (see also Acts 7:37). Was there any debate recorded about “that Prophet” *not* being the Messiah from Peter's audience? No! Flurry says the idea of “that Prophet” being Christ “doesn't make sense,” so I guess the New Testament doesn't make sense to him either?

Jesus himself believed and preached it as well, “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?” (John 5:46-47). I could quote all the commentaries; but they pretty much agree that Jesus was speaking of many scriptures in the law including Deuteronomy 18:15. I'll just quote you one source, “He wrote of the Messiah, and I am the Messiah, Gen 3:15; Gen 12:3; compare John 8:56; Gen 49:10; **Deut 18:15.**” (Albert Barnes Notes, emphasis added).

Luke 24:27, 44, Jesus said again, “And beginning at *Moses* and all the prophets, *he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.*...These *are* the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the *law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.*” Notice Jesus taught

---

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

them out of the law of Moses concerning himself, no doubt that included the prophecy of Deuteronomy 18.

Barnes Notes again says, “Concerning the Messiah. It does not appear that he ‘applied’ them to himself, but left them, probably, to make the application. He showed what the Scriptures foretold, *and ‘they’ saw that these things applied to Jesus of Nazareth, and began to be satisfied that he was the Messiah.* The most striking passages foretelling the character and sufferings of Christ are the following, which we may suppose it possible our Saviour dwelt upon to convince them that, though he was crucified, yet he was the Christ: Gen 3:15; **Deut 18:15**; Gen 49:10; Num 21:8-9; Isa 53:1-12; Dan 9:25-27; Isa 9:6-7; Psalm 110:1-7; Psalm 16:1-11; 22; Mal 4:2-6.” (emphasis added).

### **Did Jesus fulfill the Prophecy of Deut 18?**

Moses wrote, “The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken;

“According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the LORD my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not.

“And the LORD said unto me, They have well *spoken that* which they have spoken.

“I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.

“And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require *it* of him.” (Deut 18:15-19).

The only person who fits this prophetic profile is Jesus Christ the Lord. This is due to the following reasons:

1. Christ states that Moses wrote about him. (c.f. John 5:46)
2. The Apostles quote this passage as being fulfilled in Christ. (c.f. John 1:45; Acts 3:17-24)
3. On both their births, infant deaths were enacted. (c.f. Ex. 1:15-16,22; Mt. 2:13)
4. Both were rescued by divine intervention. (c.f. Ex. 2:2-10; Mt. 2:13)
5. Christ being the Son of God knew God the Father “face to face”- as did Moses. In fact, Christ is the image of God and is God’s exact representation. (c.f. Mt. 11:27; John 1:1-3,14,18; John 14:9; Col. 1:15-17; Heb. 1:2,3).
6. God prepared Moses for his mission by his wandering in the wilderness for forty years; Christ for forty days. (c.f. Ex. 7:7; Mt. 4:1)
7. Christ, like Moses, shone with glorious light at the Mount of Transfiguration. (c.f. Ex. 34:29; Mt. 17:2)
8. Christ performed greater miracles than Moses. An example would be raising the dead. (c.f. John 11:25-26,43-44)
9. Christ spoke the words of God alone. (c.f. John 8:28; 12:49)
10. Christ, like Moses, intercedes on behalf of men. (c.f. Exodus 32:30-32; 1 Tim. 2:5)
11. Christ, like Moses, is the mediator of God’s covenant. (c.f. Exodus 24:4-8; Mark 14:24; 1 Cor. 11:23-25)

## Who is “That Prophet”?

---

12. Christ and Moses liberated their people from bondage; one from slavery, the other from sin. (c.f. Exodus; Isaiah 53; John 8:32-36; Gal. 5:1)
13. Christ, like Moses, is an Israelite, Jesus from the tribe of Judah. (c.f. Num. 26:59; Luke 3:22-38).
14. Israel was baptized unto Moses, as the “Israel of God” is baptized unto Christ (c.f. 1 Corinth 10:2; Matthew 28:19; Acts 2:38; Gal 6:16).
15. In the end time they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb (c.f. Ex 15:1-19. Deut 32:1-43; Rev 5:9; 15:3)
16. Jesus called himself a “Prophet” and the people considered him a “prophet” (c.f. Luke 13:33; Matt 21:11; Luke 7:16; 24:19; John 4:19; 6:14; 7:40; 9:17).
17. Just as there were 400 years of silence before God sent Moses to deliver Israel from her bondage to Pharaoh, so there were 400 years of silence before God sent His own Son, Jesus, to utterly deliver Israel from her ultimate bondage to sin and death.
18. Both were faithful to God (Num 12:5-7; Heb 3:1-2)
19. Both gave the people bread from Heaven (Ex 16:14-16; John 6:32-35)
20. Both were teachers (Deut 4:1-5; Matt 22:16; John 3:22)

To claim this title is to claim to be Christ himself. Gerald Flurry should really think of what he is doing. He claims to be an Apostle, a Watchman, that Prophet Etc...But when one examines all of these doctrines, one can conclude that he actually falls into *this category*, “Take heed that no man deceive you.

“For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ [Jesus is the Christ]; and shall deceive many.

“And many false *prophets* shall rise, and shall deceive many.

“For there shall arise false *Christs*, and false *prophets*, and shall shew great signs and *wonders*; insomuch that, if *it were* possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” (Matthew 24: 4, 5, 11, 24).

Interesting in his video “Who is that Prophet” (see on YouTube) he says that his ministry is a “wonder” and a sign of where God is working today. And Jesus said, “if *it were* possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” Many in the church of God believe this doctrine that Flurry is “That Prophet.” Jesus said that these would be signs of False Prophets and false Christ’s in the end time.

God also says of people who claim to be “That Prophet” and what will happen to them, “But *the prophet*, which shall presume to speak a word in my name [the true Prophet Deut 18:18-19 does this, who is Jesus], which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even *that prophet* shall die.” (Deut 18:20). Flurry claims to be “that prophet” and he claims to speak “in the name” of God. God says those that do this will be put to death!

Even Herbert W. Armstrong and the Worldwide Church of God who Flurry practically worships believed Jesus was “that Prophet,” “...for there was to be only one other prophet like Moses to arise, and *that prophet* - Jesus Christ - completed the Word of God through His disciples” (The Good News, March 1962 “Is Judaism the Law of Moses?”, pg. 13, emphasis added).

To Flurry, he says only “a few commentaries says ‘that prophet’ is Christ” (ibid, p.2), but the fact of the matter is virtually ALL commentaries say he is! To him “it doesn’t make sense” (ibid,

## Who is "That Prophet"?

---

p.2). He is too blind spiritually to see due to his vanity and ego. I pray that the congregations see this deception and beg him to repent of all his false doctrines. That group has a lot of things to think about and go over about these strange doctrines they have accepted, God help them.