

Pastor-teacher Don Hargrove
Faith Bible Church <http://www.fbcweb.org/doctrines.html>
Sept., 3 2011

JEWISH APOLOGETICS (114)
<http://www.fbcweb.org/Doctrines/Jewish-Apologetics-114.pdf>

Objection #97: Even modern Christian scholars reject the so-called Old Testament proof texts about Jesus. Just check most modern Christian Bible commentaries and translations.

Brown's short response to this objection:

Those "Christian" scholars who reject the so-called proof texts to which you refer are the very same scholars who reject any clear expectation of a Messiah of any kind—Jewish or Christian—in the Hebrew Scriptures. Their findings are just as incompatible with traditional Judaism as they are with traditional Christianity. On the other hand—and you might find this interesting—most of these very same scholars fully recognize the New Testament methods of interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures as thoroughly Jewish, and in keeping with the style of the Dead Sea Scrolls and later Rabbinic writings, except often more sober! In any case, the real issue is not whether these scholars believe that Jesus is the Messiah of the Tanakh. The issue is: Is Jesus, in fact, that prophesied Messiah?¹

Brown proceeds to unpack these comments and illustrates how both Judaism and Christianity have *liberal* scholars who deny the divine inspiration of Scripture, and thus they deny any supernatural fulfillment of prophecy in the Bible. Furthermore, he shows how these liberal "Christian" scholars who deny the verbal inspiration of the Bible *do* recognize the Jewishness of the New Testament "proof" texts. The question is not which scholars believe Jesus is the promised Jewish Messiah. The question is, What do the prophecies say and who do they point to. They clearly speak of Jesus!

This Jewish objection commits the logic fallacy that is found under the broad category of fallacies of diversion. The technical name is *ad verecundiam*, "the appeal to reverence," i.e.

¹Michael L. Brown, *Messianic Prophecy Objections—Volume 3*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2003), 164-67. In his book, Brown lists the objection and then gives a short response which is followed by a more developed response. This DDR series, for the most part, tracks the objection and his *short* response after which you will find my comments. I highly recommend his book if you are interested in his longer responses (there is far too much material to include in this series).

reverence for authority. This *diversionary* fallacy is the illegitimate appeal to authority, or the appeal to illegitimate authority. The appeal is illegitimate when it is 1) irrelevant, 2) unreliable, 3) unnecessary, 4) dogmatic, and/or 5) uncritical. All five apply in this objection: 1) What liberal Christians believe is *irrelevant*—since we are talking about prophetic supernatural revelation of prophecy which they reject; 2) the citation of “Christian” scholars is *unreliable* because they do not believe in any fulfillment of prophecy—they are unreliable when it comes to supernatural prophetic revelation; 3) the use of these “scholars” is unnecessary because it really does not matter what those with naturalistic presuppositions believe when it comes to the supernatural; 4) the citation is *dogmatic* leaving the impression that all “modern Christian scholars” reject NT fulfillment of the OT—which is patently false! and 5) the use of “modern Christian scholars” against the truths of Christianity is *uncritical*. Many of the world’s greatest thinkers are modern Christian scholars who believe in Jesus’s literal fulfillment of OT messianic passages as recorded in the NT.

In the Logos,

Pastor Don