JOHN LIERMAN

The New Testament Moses

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 173

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

173

John Lierman

The New Testament Moses

Christian Perceptions of Moses and Israel in the Setting of Jewish Religion

Mohr Siebeck

JOHN LIERMAN, born 1965; 1994 M.Div. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois; 1997 M.A. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois; 2003 Ph.D., Cambridge University; currently Adjunct Professor of New Testament, Fuller Theological Seminary Southwest and Adjunct Professor of Bible Studies, Grand Canyon University, Phoenix, Ariziona.

ISBN 3-16-148202-6
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe)
978-3-16-157157-2 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019
Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.ddb.de*.

The book was printed by Druckpartner Rübelmann GmbH in Hemsbach on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Schaumann in Darmstadt.

Printed in Germany.

For Mom and Dad

Preface

This book is a significantly revised and rewritten version of a dissertation accepted by the Faculty of Divinity and the Board of Graduate Studies of Cambridge University in 2002 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Thanks are in order first of all to my *Doktorvater*, Professor William Horbury, to whom I express the most profound and heartfelt gratitude for the skillful supervision, inexhaustible patience, and unflagging encouragement he gave me while the thesis that underlies this book was in preparation. His thorough acquaintance with source material and his scholarly acumen in fields of study so far flung that among persons of merely great erudition they lie in entirely separate areas of expertise were an inspiration to me throughout my enjoyable time under his supervision.

For numerous thoughtful comments and suggestions over the whole of the thesis I am also deeply grateful to Professor Christopher Rowland, Dr. Andrew Chester, and Professor Martin Hengel. Dr. Peter Head provided helpful criticism of selected portions as well. Their kind assistance greatly aided the revision of the study to its present form.

For helping to meet not only my own financial needs, but also those of Corpus Christi College and Cambridge University, I owe a debt of thanks to many.

I am grateful to the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom for a three-year Overseas Research Students Award, to the Cambridge Overseas Trust for the award of a three-year Bursary, and to the Master and the Tutor for Advanced Students of Corpus Christi College for the award of a Purvis Scholarship. The Tutor for Advanced Students at my matriculation was Dr. Paul Hewett, to whom I am grateful not only for the financial support he was instrumental in providing, but also for inviting me to matriculate at a college which provides such a supportive environment in which to do postgraduate research. Special thanks in this respect go also to the Master Professor Haroon Ahmed, the Warden of Leckhampton Dr. Chris Howe, and the Graduate Secretary Mrs. Margaret Cathie. Also, when my studies were interrupted by a lengthy period of illness Dr. C. J. B. Brookes, then the Tutor for Advanced Students at Corpus, saw that I was provided College Hardship funding. I remain grateful to Dr. Allan C. Carlson and Dr. Harold O. J. Brown of The Howard Center for Family, Religion and Society for taking me on as an Associate of the Center on Religion and Society, and to Dr. Steven Dilsaver for providing a one-year stipend for that position. I am

grateful to the Trustees of the Crosse Fund and to the Managers of the Theological Studies Fund of the University of Cambridge for awarding me further support in the latter part of my research. Mr. Paul Riddington generously paid for private medical care for tendonitis, brought on in the line of (research) duty. My parents have provided for many needs as they have arisen and, as usual for parents, have received only a fraction of the thanks they deserve. Two other patrons who wish to remain anonymous also have my sincere thanks.

I have benefited from the support and assistance of many friends and colleagues in ways that are sometimes hard to quantify. Professor Horbury and his wife Katharine provided me with months of gracious hospitality in their home during the preparation of this book, chiefly asking in return only that I chop down a number of trees in their back garden, something I would have relished doing anyway. Dr. David Chapman was an encouraging friend and fellow researcher at the thesis stage, and he and his wife Tasha lavished delicious meals on me regularly, as if feeding me was some sort of privilege. Marko Jauhiainen gave me the computer on which nearly all my writing has been done since my own met its demise, and the rest of the Tyndale House community also provided camaraderie and support in all kinds of ways, especially the Warden, Dr. Bruce Winter, who undertook selfless and thoughtful pastoral care, the librarian Dr. Elizabeth Magba, research fellows Dr. David Instone-Brewer and Dr. Peter Williams, and the administrator, Mrs. Fiona Craig. For the work done in Phoenix, Jason and Jennifer Schumann gave me the use of their office and the freedom of their house, including the pantry and the refrigerator. A great many people seem to have fed me while I wrote this book. Not all can be named here, but I think warmly of each one.

I am grateful to Dr. Kris Burroughs for her (painfully) insightful comments on style, and for volunteering, as the last deadline neared, to share in the unrelenting tedium of indexing. Miss Helen Dalgleish ferreted out many "strange sentences!" and malapropisms throughout the whole of this study. No doubt a residue of errors persists, and responsibility for it, as well as for any persisting errors of fact or interpretation, can be laid at my door.

Phoenix, Arizona
28 September 2003

John Lierman

ad maiorem Dei gloriam

Table of Contents

Chapter 6

Baptism into Moses

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Scope and Method

This is a study of the NT witness to how Jews and Jewish Christians perceived the relationship of Moses with Israel and with the Jewish people. This is a narrowly tailored study, focusing specifically on that relationship without treating Moses in the New Testament comprehensively. The study consults ancient writings and historical material to situate the NT Moses in a larger milieu of Jewish thought. It contributes both to the knowledge of ancient Judaism and to the illumination of NT religion and theology, especially Christology.

1.1.1 Focus

The basic plan of the study derives from the New Testament. The words "in the New Testament" could appropriately be appended in parentheses to each chapter title and each chapter aims to preserve and highlight the NT witness to Jewish perceptions of Moses.

The chapters divide along lines that throw the various NT presentations of Moses into sharpest relief. Sometimes those divisions may not accord with what might be expected from a study of Jewish literature generally. For example, the decision to separate treatment of Moses as Prophet from discussion of Moses as Priest could seem artificial given the intertwining of such roles in ancient Jewish (and non-Jewish) thought. The NT texts that prompt consideration of these motifs here, however, seem to treat them separately from one another; the key text on Moses' priesthood actually links it with a third role, that of an apostle. So in this case it seemed better to highlight the somewhat unusual NT treatment of Moses as a priest and keep it separate from ascriptions to Moses of the prophetic office, which by contrast is so typically associated with him.

At the same time, while commonly noticed, the prophetic office of Moses does not seem always to have been adequately appreciated, and separate treatment here facilitated a closer inspection in light of what the New Testament says on the subject. Since the New Testament seems to treat the themes separately with no obvious overlap it seemed both valuable and warranted to treat them separately here as well. The other chapters are

similarly focused to achieve the clearest possible impression of the way Moses is presented in the New Testament.

Guided principally by that NT presentation, the chapters of this study focus on the roles and relations of Moses to Israel. This happens not because of any special interest in doing mosesology by titles or in "functional mosesology" but because of this study's special focus on the relation of Moses to Israel, as opposed to Moses as a static entity or Moses as the subject of Jewish lore (though both come in for some consideration). It seemed most effective to deal with some NT evidence by recourse to prosaic headings like "Moses as King" or "Moses as Lawgiver," but in those cases it was not taken for granted what those titles mean. Part of the function of the chapters so named is to work out how NT (and other Jewish writers) saw Moses in those roles, without relying too heavily simply on the use of a given title or the naming of a given function. On the other hand, in a chapter like "The Baptism into Moses" the best procedure seemed to be to work outward from the basic datum to what it might imply about Moses, whether or not that involved the affixing to him of a specific title.

1.1.2 Arrangement

With the intent to arrange all the evidence in such a way as to throw the strongest light possible on the New Testament, the most basic decision has been to focus the chapters on aspects of the NT Moses, rather than devote each chapter to one corpus of literature, to one Jewish community or author, or to one period of history. Thus, for example, there is not a chapter on the Samaritan view of Moses and another on the rabbinic view of Moses, but rather there are chapters on Moses as King and on Moses as Lawgiver in the New Testament, with rabbinic and Samaritan discussion relevant to each theme distributed in each chapter accordingly.

The obvious weakness of the approach taken is that the study does not present in one place the complete portrait of Moses from any one era. Even the overall impression of Moses gained from the New Testament does not finally emerge until the Conclusion.

Nonetheless, despite its weaknesses the chosen strategy seemed the best way to proceed. It became apparent as work progressed that the NT evidence for Jewish estimation of Moses has not always been adequately appreciated. This seemed to be the case not with just one aspect of Moses, but with every theme considered. In some cases this malappreciation was also true of extra-NT evidence that did not match academically accepted paradigms of ancient Judaism.

Therefore, the chapter divisions here consciously underscore the ways the New Testament presents Moses. Each chapter brings in the Jewish literary context for its theme, drawing on all segments of Jewish tradition

from before, during, and after the period when the New Testament was authored.

This does not mean that all the Jewish evidence is forced into a single plane, as if no movement occurred in Jewish thought between the intertestamental period and the Talmudic era, or between Palestine and Alexandria. To the contrary, the study highlights differences in the appreciation of Moses, particularly when a New Testament author looks to be the odd man out. Still, the position here is that the literature inherited by the Jews of the first century and the literature authored by them, along with later texts containing traditions that they passed on, can all, properly handled, be of assistance in understanding and interpreting the evidence of the New Testament.

A secondary concern reflected in the layout of this study is that some Mosaic motifs detected in the sources would threaten almost to disappear if the evidence for them were scattered across several chapters dealing with several different Jewish authors or epochs of Jewish history. This might be the case for example, for the priesthood and the apostleship of Moses; the former has tenuous support reaching right back into the Old Testament, while the latter seems first to arise in the New Testament itself. Proper appreciation of either seems in part to require gathering all the evidence for Jewish treatment of these ideas together in one place for consideration. Given the fragmentary and incomplete nature of the evidence for Judaism in the first century A.D., any evidence is worthy of close consideration. Here, with that in mind, the NT evidence for the Jewish conceptions of Moses was prioritized, with other evidence set in relation to it.

Of course, inspection of even plainly established motifs, such as the role of Moses as Lawgiver, may be facilitated by a diachronic approach that attempts to bring all the available evidence on the subject into focus at once. Again, this need not imply insensitivity to genre or to provenance. The intent rather is simply to highlight the conceptions of Moses evident in the New Testament, in part by locating them, when possible, in the stream of Jewish tradition.

A third consideration is that the usefulness of presenting Jewish attitudes toward Moses community by community or period by period, instead of theme by theme, is at least potentially illusory. In the case of tightly unified (or unifiable) corpora such as the works of Philo (perhaps combined with other Alexandrians), or the Palestinian Targums, Samaritan literature, or possibly even rabbinic literature, such an approach may yield meaningful results. More fragmentary evidence from late Second Temple Judaism, however, as well as evidence from Greco-Roman authors and other literature not easily bracketed within postulated Jewish communities, is harder to work up into chapter-length presentations. (Witness scholarly attempts to characterize "intertestamental Judaism" on the basis of

scattered apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.) Where a single author is under consideration, such as Philo or Josephus, it is certainly reasonable to look for a single coherent impression of Moses or of any other figure. Rabbinic literature, by contrast, is the work of scores or perhaps hundreds of individuals, some named and some not. Rabbinic literature is also conservative by design and may be expected to harbor multifarious views carried forward by different traditions across hundreds of years. (Witness the extraordinary mélange of material accumulated by L. Ginzberg.) Literature of this kind may not yield the best results when treated like unified presentations of single authors.

Whatever approach is taken presents a risk of methodological forcing of the evidence. The appearance of homogeneity in a given presentation may arise as much from the selective and interpretive grid imposed by the scholar as from the data itself. The arrangement of the present study is not immune from this risk, but neither are the alternatives.

In sum, while the weaknesses of the plan chosen for this study are freely recognized, the strengths the plan offers are substantial and important enough to justify the approach taken here. Doubtless, at some point fresh appraisals of The Rabbinic Moses, or The Philonic Moses might complement this study. Here the focus is on The New Testament Moses.

1.1.3 Sources

The most important sources for this study are the *New Testament* texts themselves. Most NT passages that speak of Moses come in for at least some consideration, but those texts which say something directly concerned with the relation Moses was deemed to have to the Jewish people receive the closest attention. Other texts, for example those adding hagiographical color to the portrait of Moses, provide important background and context for the conclusions drawn from the more central passages.

The value of extra-NT and extrabiblical sources for illuminating NT concepts of Moses can hardly be doubted. If we lacked all other sources for Moses legends and the varied haggadic embellishments of his biblical biography we would both know of their existence and be able to make a fair reconstruction of their contents from the New Testament, so richly does it incorporate Jewish Moses lore. Above all other NT instances of Moses, the richly adorned account of Moses in the speech of Stephen shows how familiar early Christians were with Jewish embroideries of the Moses tale, embroideries more fully known from apocryphal, pseudepigraphal, and rabbinic literature. The casual reference to Jannes and Jam-

bres in 2 Tim. 3:8 similarly indicates that early Christian writers were familiar with hagiographical expansions of the biography of Moses.[1]

Outside the New Testament, a number of ancient, often rather full, Jewish treatments of Moses survive, which, while widely separated chronologically, provide reliable guides to at least a selection of Jewish opinion about Moses at about the time of the origin of the New Testament. These include, above all, Philo's lengthy *De Vita Mosis* (along with numerous references to Moses in his other works) and the recasting of the Exodus-Deuteronomy narrative in the *Antiquities* of Josephus; also important are the account of Artapanus (preserved in fragments), the more highly-dramatized but still informative *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian (also preserved in fragments), *The Assumption of Moses* (incomplete in places) and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*. Ecclesiasticus and some instances of biblical interpretation from Qumran also include interesting material. Additionally, non-Jewish treatments of Moses sometimes at least partly reflect contemporary, Jewish ideas and therefore ought to be included in discussion.

Of all of these, perhaps the writings of *Josephus*, *Pseudo-Philo*, and the *Assumption of Moses* are most obviously relevant to NT study. These three are generally held to stem from Palestine, and from about the period when the New Testament was forming. The traditions they report are more likely than those of any other Jewish writers to have been known in the milieu of the first Christians. Their perspectives on Moses quite likely share something with the conceptions of Moses circulating among those who first converted to Christianity. Their value for illuminating the New Testament on that subject is therefore undoubted.[2]

Undoubtedly, *Philo* stands in a different part of the stream of Jewish tradition than, say, the Palestinian rabbis. This, however, only adds to his

---

[1] On introduction to these two figures and the book named for them see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*, rev. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman, vol. 3.2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987), 781. Hebrews 11:23-28 appears not to be much influenced by extra-biblical legend, though the length of that pericope shows the importance of Moses in the early Church.

[2] Johannes Tromp, ed. and trans., *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*, Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, ed. A.-M. Denis and M. de Jonge, vol. 10 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), 116-17 dates the *Assumption of Moses* to the first quarter of the first century A.D. Tromp, 93-111, 114-116, 120-23 presents a thorough review of the relevant scholarship, but see also especially the exchange between John J. Collins, "The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses," in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*, ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 15-32, and George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., "An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses," in the same volume, 33-37.

importance as a witness to a non-Palestinian, though not necessarily aberrant, Jewish tradition.[3] In fact, Philo claims to draw for material on Moses not only on the Bible but also on the oral tradition of the Jewish elders (*Mos.* 1.4), and there are signs of contact between his treatment of Moses and the rabbinic midrash. His expressed dependence on Jewish tradition, combined with his representation of an educated and philosophically sophisticated sort of Jewish belief, mean that elements of the portrait of Moses which appear both in Philo and in the more obviously Palestinian sources should be regarded as very well-attested indeed. The *Exagoge* of *Ezekiel the Tragedian*, as well as the writings of other Alexandrian Jews, such as *Artapanus* and *Aristobulus*, are similarly valuable.

This study makes use of the *Targums*, as well as Samaritan and rabbinic literature. Although their final, edited form is relatively late, these corpora undoubtedly preserve material that is much earlier. The Targums in particular, though suspected of reflecting Talmudic Judaism, can point the way toward how the Hebrew Bible was understood in an earlier day.[4] The value of the Targums as witnesses to Jewish thought from long before their final redaction stems from their role in transmitting vernacular traditions conserved by regular liturgical use. (To the extent that a text comes in for regular use in public services it is protected from the "drift" to which texts that only see light in scribal halls and private studies may be subject, a phenomenon seen at its most pronounced in congregational reactions to

---

[3] See Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, ed. W. C. van Unnik, et al., vol. 14 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 100-102 on Philo as "Greek and Jew," and Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1935; reprint, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969), 180-81.

[4] Now we have manuscript evidence for written Targums from well before the turn of the era, which further indicates the value of the Targums for NT study. "Targums have long been recognised as part of the ancient literature of Judaism, but over the last century scholars have been reluctant to draw on these for NT background, reckoning that they reflect Talmudic Judaism. More recently there has been a renewed willingness to regard much targumic material as earlier, in some parts predating the destruction of the Temple. The discovery of targumic material at Qumran [4QtgJob, 11QtgJob, 4QtgLev] and an increased appreciation of the operation of synagogues at the end of the Second Temple era have contributed to this new assessment," p. 424 from David Powys, "Appendix A: The Relevance of the Palestinian Targums," in *"Hell": A Hard Look at a Hard Question: The Fate of the Unrighteous in New Testament Thought* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 424-432, which contains a thorough and detailed discussion of the utility of the Targums for the study of the NT world. Powys, 424-25 also points out the lack of evidence for rabbinic redaction of the Palestinian Targums (*Neofiti*, *Pseudo-Jonathan*, the Cairo Genizah Targum fragments, and the *Fragment Targum*) apart from clearly interpolated passages, and urges the relevance of these Targums especially for the study of late Second Temple Judaism.

even slight alterations in much-loved hymns.) Much the same can be said for the *rabbinic writings* as well since, although they are academic productions and did not have the same popular exposure enjoyed by the Targums, they self-consciously serve as preservers and repeaters of older tradition.

The profile of the *Samaritans* in the period of the New Testament may have been much higher, and more meaningful among Jews, than might now be guessed. In the first century they constituted a significant, expanding population in Palestine.[5] Josephus describes their territory as one of its three major divisions.[6] They had their own council (βουλή), which was of sufficient standing both to send an embassy to the governor of Syria, and thus to bring about the recall of Pilate to Rome.[7]

Samaritans had extensive intercourse with Jews, much of it, evidently, along theological lines, and the ties between Jewish and Samaritan communities were closer than usually supposed.[8] Of course, these links also became the sources of great tension, as is well known. Ben Sira already describes the Samaritans as a "perfidious people" (50:26), and other intertestamental writings are similarly vituperative, demonstrating the bad blood between the communities, but also their continued contact and interaction. Josephus reports a Samaritan desecration of the Temple under the governorship of Coponius (A.D. 6-9), again demonstrating ongoing contact and controversy between the two groups.[9] Even outside their homelands Samaritans and Jews were simultaneously both distinct and linked together: the Samaritan and Jewish communities of Alexandria maintained a running theological dispute that at one point led to a public debate under the patronage of Ptolemy Philometor.[10]

Undoubtedly the Jewish attitude toward Samaritans varied. In some earlier rabbinic traditions they could be seen as "almost Jewish," or at least more like Jews than Gentiles.[11] For example, *m. Dem.* 3.4 brackets Samaritans (כותים) with common Jews (עם הארץ), and not with non-Jews

---

[5] Nathan Schur, *History of the Samaritans*, Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testamentes und des antiken Judentums, ed. Matthias Augustin and Michael Mach, no. 18 (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1989), 44, 51.

[6] *B.J.* 3.48-50, the other two are Galilee and Judaea. In *Ant.* 13.50 he lists Samaria (with Peraea and Galilee) as one of three toparchies adjoining Judaea.

[7] Josephus, *Ant.* 18.88-89.

[8] Schur, *History of the Samaritans*, 43.

[9] *Ant.* 18.29-30. The Samaritans preserved memories of the incident. The destruction of the Samaritan sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim by John Hyrcanus in 128 B.C. was possibly the greatest source of bitterness between the two groups, see Schur, *History of the Samaritans*, 43.

[10] Josephus, *Ant.* 12.10; 13.74-81 (including some possibly fabulous embroidery).

[11] See Schnur, *History of the Samaritans*, 47-49.

(נכרים) for purposes of purity.[12] This once again demonstrates the (perhaps unwilling and distasteful) close community that existed between the two groups. Samaritans are certainly prominent in the New Testament, leading some scholars to think that the influence of Samaritan religion and thought is especially pronounced among the early Christians.[13] All this counts as more evidence for the relevance of Samaritan traditions for understanding Second Temple Judaism and the New Testament.

Problems of dating and provenance that attend study of Samaritan literature can be severe. Nonetheless, the paramount importance given to Moses in Samaritan thought combined with the close links between Jews and Samaritans in the Second Temple period suggests that Samaritan literature stands to make an important contribution to this study. This is particularly the case when the evidence gleaned from Samaritan sources can be seen to ratify the apparent thrust of Jewish evidence more clearly linked with the NT setting.

The targumic, rabbinic, and Samaritan corpora all attest, from roughly the second century A.D. onwards, the continuing propagation among Jews who used Aramaic and Hebrew (and among Samaritans) of traditions about Moses apparently originating in earlier periods. Owing to the relatively late dates at which such material was finally edited, its employment often becomes entangled with difficulties regarding the date and provenance of the specific tradition being considered at any one time. In nearly every case, however, material from collections edited subsequent to the NT era is of interest here not primarily because an early date can be confidently assigned to a given line of thinking, but rather because even positions formulated at relatively late dates can attest the persistence of an idea or theme arising at a much earlier time down to a later period. Naturally, writings generally considered to be relatively early, such as the Mishnah and the halakhic midrashim, are given a measure of priority over those which are widely acknowledged to be late, such as the later homiletic midrashim. Likewise, both rabbinic and targumic traditions, generally speaking, are of less moment than texts and traditions more certainly stemming from near or within the first century itself.

---

[12] See also *m. Nid.* 4.1-2; 7.3, with Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 111, 122-23. Josephus, *Ant.* 11.340-41 relates, with irritation, that the Samaritans themselves claimed connection with the Jews.

[13] Further on the high profile of the Samaritans among the Jews in John Bowman, "Samaritan Studies," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1957-58): 298-99, who argues, 298-308, that the Fourth Gospel was written with Samaritan theology clearly in mind.

1.2 Need and Prospects for This Study

The figure of Moses has always been important in NT and Jewish studies alike, but some important opportunities for further investigation remain.

First, examination of the NT depiction of Moses often takes place solely as an adjunct to the study of NT Christology. The NT material on Moses, however, urgently needs to be considered for its contribution to the *understanding of contemporary Judaism* as well. While a variety of Jewish literature from the first century A.D. has been preserved, in many respects the New Testament contains the best of those sources. As M. Hengel puts it:

> Denn daß das Neue Testament ohne die Kenntnis der zeitgenössischen jüdischen Geschichte und Religion historisch weithin unverständlich bleibt, wird heute kaum mehr bestritten. Daß es jedoch umgekehrt selbst eine wichtige Quelle für die Erforschung des Judentums seiner Zeit darstellt, wird erst allmählich erkannt.[14]

This study will seek to broaden and refine modern understanding of ancient Judaism by elucidating the (first of all Jewish) portrait of Moses found in the New Testament.

Second, the special theme of this study, *the relation of Moses to Israel and to the Jewish people*, seems particularly underexplored. The ancient conception of Moses' relationship to Israel, however, including his functions within that relationship and Israel's resultant disposition vis-à-vis Moses, is one of critical importance for understanding Jewish "ecclesiology." The same conception, especially as it stood in the Herodian age and the early Christian period, has significant bearing on the study of early Christian ecclesiology, and of the functions Christ was held to have in the Christian Church. On this score this study holds out the prospect of illuminating both ancient Judaism and early Christianity.

Third, when studies of Moses in the New Testament are undertaken, they usually look only at a single book or corpus of material (particularly the Fourth Gospel, where Moses has attracted special attention). At some stage, however, the NT material really requires treatment as a whole. This study examines the figure of Moses *across the whole New Testament*, while still respecting the distinctiveness of the various NT sources.[15]

---

[14] Martin Hengel, "Das Johannesevangelium als Quelle für die Geschichte des antiken Judentums," in *Judaica, Hellenistica, et Christiana: Kleine Schriften II*, ed. Martin Hengel with Jörg Frey and Dorothea Betz, WUNT, ed. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius, no. 109 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1999), 294-95. See also A. F. Segal, "Conversion and Messianism: Outline for a New Approach," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 299.

[15] Josef M. Kastner, "Moses im Neuen Testament" (Th.D. diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich, 1967) must be given his due here, as another effort to view Moses across the whole of the New Testament; others have made briefer attempts, such

Fourth, NT scholars have not been mistaken in supposing Moses to be important for early Christology — no doubt it is here that the figure of Moses has its chief importance for early Christianity. The *significance of Moses for early christology*, therefore, is clearly an important fourth arena of inquiry to which this study contributes. This is particularly so because the christological relevance of Moses can only be adequately assessed in light of the witness of the whole New Testament to the figure of Moses himself, properly contextualized within contemporary Judaism. The expectation of better understanding of first-century A.D. Christianity through this study has already been expressed. In particular, a fuller appreciation of the NT portrait of Moses will allow a better-informed assessment of the role of Moses in NT, and pre-NT, Christology.

1.3 Recent Study of Moses in the New Testament

Recent study of the figure of Moses in the New Testament and in ancient Judaism will now be surveyed. Research on the place Moses had in NT Christology is reviewed separately at the beginning of Chapter Eight.

J. Jeremias

A particularly influential effort to describe the figure of Moses in the New Testament is the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* article by J. Jeremias (1942).[16] Jeremias summarizes Jewish thought about Moses in rabbinic writings and in the New Testament, though his treatment of individual NT books or corpora is limited to the assessment of Moses/Christ typology. That is, in the New Testament his interest lies in Christology.

For Jeremias, Moses is everywhere in the New Testament essentially the lawgiver. Jeremias alludes to the special, personal authority of Moses, implying a distinction between Moses merely mediating law and Moses creating law himself, a distinction that this study will take up in Chapter Five.[17] In addition to his role as lawgiver, Jeremias also views Moses in the New Testament as a prophet (principally of Christ).[18]

Jeremias calls attention both to what he identifies as the essentially Palestinian character of the NT portrait of Moses, as well as to what he considers

---

as J. Jeremias and his *TWNT* article (see next note). These studies, however, all have their shortcomings from the point of view of the present study, and clearly stand in a complementary position. See the review of past scholarship, below.

[16] J. Jeremias, "Μωυσῆς," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 4, Λ-Ν (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1967), 848-73.

[17] Ibid., 864-65.

[18] Ibid., 865.

Citation Index

Contents: 1. Old Testament; 2. Apocrypha; 3. New Testament; 4. Pseudepigrapha; 5. Philo; 6. Josephus; 7. Secular Authors; 8. Ecclesiastical Authors; 9. Qumran; 10. Targums; 11. Mishnah; 12. Tosefta; 13. Babylonian Talmud; 14. Jerusalem Talmud; 15. Midrash; 16. Samaritan Literature; 17. Piyyut; 18. Papyri and Manuscripts

1. Old Testament

2. Apocrypha

3. New Testament

4. Pseudepigrapha

5. Philo

6. Josephus

7. Secular Authors

8. Ecclesiastical Writers

9. Qumran Texts

10. Targums

14. Jerusalem Talmud

15. Midrash

16. Samaritan Literature

17. Piyyut

18. Jewish Liturgy

19. Papyri and Manuscripts

Author Index

Subject Index

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Alphabetical Index of the First and Second Series

Ådna, Jostein: Jesu Stellung zum Tempel. 2000. *Volume II/119.*

Ådna, Jostein and *Kvalbein, Hans* (Ed.): The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles. 2000. *Volume 127.*

Alkier, Stefan: Wunder und Wirklichkeit in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. 2001. *Volume 134.*

Anderson, Paul N.: The Christology of the Fourth Gospel. 1996. *Volume II/78.*

Appold, Mark L.: The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel. 1976. *Volume II/1.*

Arnold, Clinton E.: The Colossian Syncretism. 1995. *Volume II/77.*

Ascough, Richard S.: Paul's Macedonian Associations. 2003. *Volume II/161.*

Asiedu-Peprah, Martin: Johannine Sabbath Conflicts As Juridical Controversy. 2001. *Volume II/132.*

Avemarie, Friedrich: Die Tauferzählungen der Apostelgeschichte. 2002. *Volume 139.*

Avemarie, Friedrich and *Hermann Lichtenberger* (Ed.): Auferstehung – Ressurection. 2001. *Volume 135.*

Avemarie, Friedrich and *Hermann Lichtenberger* (Ed.): Bund und Tora. 1996. *Volume 92.*

Bachmann, Michael: Sünder oder Übertreter. 1992. *Volume 59.*

Back, Frances: Verwandlung durch Offenbarung bei Paulus. 2002. *Volume II/153.*

Baker, William R.: Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James. 1995. *Volume II/68.*

Bakke, Odd Magne: 'Concord and Peace'. 2001. *Volume II/143.*

Balla, Peter: Challenges to New Testament Theology. 1997. *Volume II/95.*

– *The Child-Parent Relationship in the New Testament and its Environment. 2003. Volume 155.*

Bammel, Ernst: Judaica. Volume I 1986. *Volume 37.*

– Volume II 1997. *Volume 91.*

Bash, Anthony: Ambassadors for Christ. 1997. *Volume II/92.*

Bauernfeind, Otto: Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. 1980. *Volume 22.*

Baum, Armin Daniel: Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum. 2001. *Volume II/138.*

Bayer, Hans Friedrich: Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection. 1986. *Volume II/20.*

Becker, Michael: Wunder und Wundertäter im früh-rabbinischen Judentum. 2002. *Volume II/144.*

Bell, Richard H.: Provoked to Jealousy. 1994. *Volume II/63.*

– No One Seeks for God. 1998. *Volume 106.*

Bennema, Cornelis: The Power of Saving Wisdom. 2002. *Volume II/148.*

Bergman, Jan: see *Kieffer, René*

Bergmeier, Roland: Das Gesetz im Römerbrief und andere Studien zum Neuen Testament. 2000. *Volume 121.*

Betz, Otto: Jesus, der Messias Israels. 1987. *Volume 42.*

– Jesus, der Herr der Kirche. 1990. *Volume 52.*

Beyschlag, Karlmann: Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis. 1974. *Volume 16.*

Bittner, Wolfgang J.: Jesu Zeichen im Johannesevangelium. 1987. *Volume II/26.*

Bjerkelund, Carl J.: Tauta Egeneto. 1987. *Volume 40.*

Blackburn, Barry Lee: Theios Anēr and the Markan Miracle Traditions. 1991. *Volume II/40.*

Bock, Darrell L.: Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus. 1998. *Volume II/106.*

Bockmuehl, Markus N.A.: Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity. 1990. *Volume II/36.*

Bøe, Sverre: Gog and Magog. 2001. *Volume II/135.*

Böhlig, Alexander: Gnosis und Synkretismus. Teil 1 1989. *Volume 47* – Teil 2 1989. *Volume 48.*

Böhm, Martina: Samarien und die Samaritai bei Lukas. 1999. *Volume II/111.*

Böttrich, Christfried: Weltweisheit – Menschheitsethik – Urkult. 1992. *Volume II/50.*

Bolyki, János: Jesu Tischgemeinschaften. 1997. *Volume II/96.*

Bosman, Philip: Conscience in Philo and Paul. 2003. *Volume II/166.*
Bovon, François: Studies in Early Christianity. 2003. *Volume 161.*
Brocke, Christoph vom: Thessaloniki – Stadt des Kassander und Gemeinde des Paulus. 2001. *Volume II/125.*
Brunson, Andrew: Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John. 2003. *Volume II/158.*
Büchli, Jörg: Der Poimandres – ein paganisiertes Evangelium. 1987. *Volume II/27.*
Bühner, Jan A.: Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium. 1977. *Volume II/2.*
Burchard, Christoph: Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth. 1965. *Volume 8.*
– Studien zur Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Ed. von D. Sänger. 1998. *Volume 107.*
Burnett, Richard: Karl Barth's Theological Exegesis. 2001. *Volume II/145.*
Byron, John: Slavery Metaphors in Early Judaism and Pauline Christianity. 2003. *Volume II/162.*
Byrskog, Samuel: Story as History – History as Story. 2000. *Volume 123.*
Cancik, Hubert (Ed.): Markus-Philologie. 1984. *Volume 33.*
Capes, David B.: Old Testament Yaweh Texts in Paul's Christology. 1992. *Volume II/47.*
Caragounis, Chrys C.: The Son of Man. 1986. *Volume 38.*
– see *Fridrichsen, Anton.*
Carleton Paget, James: The Epistle of Barnabas. 1994. *Volume II/64.*
Carson, D.A., O'Brien, Peter T. and *Mark Seifrid* (Ed.): Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism. Volume 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism. *Volume II/140.*
Ciampa, Roy E.: The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2. 1998. *Volume II/102.*
Classen, Carl Joachim: Rhetorical Criticsm of the New Testament. 2000. *Volume 128.*
Colpe, Carsten: Iranier – Aramäer – Hebräer – Hellenen. 2003. *Volume 154.*
Crump, David: Jesus the Intercessor. 1992. *Volume II/49.*
Dahl, Nils Alstrup: Studies in Ephesians. 2000. *Volume 131.*
Deines, Roland: Jüdische Steingefäße und pharisäische Frömmigkeit. 1993. *Volume II/52.*
– Die Pharisäer. 1997. *Volume 101.*
Dettwiler, Andreas and *Jean Zumstein (Ed.):* Kreuzestheologie im Neuen Testament. 2002. *Volume 151.*
Dickson, John P.: Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities. 2003. *Volume II/159.*
Dietzfelbinger, Christian: Der Abschied des Kommenden. 1997. *Volume 95.*
Dobbeler, Axel von: Glaube als Teilhabe. 1987. *Volume II/22.*
Du Toit, David S.: Theios Anthropos. 1997. *Volume II/91*
Dunn, James D.G. (Ed.): Jews and Christians. 1992. *Volume 66.*
– Paul and the Mosaic Law. 1996. *Volume 89.*
Dunn, James D.G., Hans Klein, Ulrich Luz and *Vasile Mihoc* (Ed.): Auslegung der Bibel in orthodoxer und westlicher Perspektive. 2000. *Volume 130.*
Ebertz, Michael N.: Das Charisma des Gekreuzigten. 1987. *Volume 45.*
Eckstein, Hans-Joachim: Der Begriff Syneidesis bei Paulus. 1983. *Volume II/10.*
– Verheißung und Gesetz. 1996. *Volume 86.*
Ego, Beate: Im Himmel wie auf Erden. 1989. *Volume II/34*
Ego, Beate and *Lange, Armin* with *Pilhofer, Peter (Ed.):* Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community without Temple. 1999. *Volume 118.*
Eisen, Ute E.: see *Paulsen, Henning.*
Ellis, E. Earle: Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity. 1978. *Volume 18.*
– The Old Testament in Early Christianity. 1991. *Volume 54.*
Endo, Masanobu: Creation and Christology. 2002. *Volume 149.*
Ennulat, Andreas: Die 'Minor Agreements'. 1994. *Volume II/62.*
Ensor, Peter W.: Jesus and His 'Works'. 1996. *Volume II/85.*
Eskola, Timo: Messiah and the Throne. 2001. *Volume II/142.*
– Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology. 1998. *Volume II/100.*
Fatehi, Mehrdad: The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul. 2000. *Volume II/128.*
Feldmeier, Reinhard: Die Krisis des Gottessohnes. 1987. *Volume II/21.*
– Die Christen als Fremde. 1992. *Volume 64.*
Feldmeier, Reinhard and *Ulrich Heckel* (Ed.): Die Heiden. 1994. *Volume 70.*
Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T.: Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology. 1997. *Volume II/94.*
Förster, Niclas: Marcus Magus. 1999. *Volume 114.*
Forbes, Christopher Brian: Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment. 1995. *Volume II/75.*

- Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11. 1976, ²1991. *Volume 17.*
- Paulusstudien. 1989, ²1994. *Volume 51.*
- Neutestamentliche Studien. 2000. *Volume 132.*
- Paulusstudien II. 2002. *Volume 143.*

Hofius, Otfried and *Hans-Christian Kammler:* Johannesstudien. 1996. *Volume 88.*

Holtz, Traugott: Geschichte und Theologie des Urchristentums. 1991. *Volume 57.*

Hommel, Hildebrecht: Sebasmata. Volume 1 1983. *Volume 31* – Volume 2 1984. *Volume 32.*

Hvalvik, Reidar: The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant. 1996. *Volume II/82.*

Johns, Loren L.: The Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John. 2003. *Volume II/167.*

Joubert, Stephan: Paul as Benefactor. 2000. *Volume II/124.*

Jungbauer, Harry: „Ehre Vater und Mutter". 2002. *Volume II/146.*

Kähler, Christoph: Jesu Gleichnisse als Poesie und Therapie. 1995. *Volume 78.*

Kamlah, Ehrhard: Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament. 1964. *Volume 7.*

Kammler, Hans-Christian: Christologie und Eschatologie. 2000. *Volume 126.*

- Kreuz und Weisheit. 2003. *Volume 159.*
- see *Hofius, Otfried.*

Kelhoffer, James A.: Miracle and Mission. 1999. *Volume II/112.*

Kieffer, René and *Jan Bergman (Ed.):* La Main de Dieu / Die Hand Gottes. 1997. *Volume 94.*

Kim, Seyoon: The Origin of Paul's Gospel. 1981, ²1984. *Volume II/4.*

- "The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God. 1983. *Volume 30.*

Klauck, Hans-Josef: Religion und Gesellschaft im frühen Christentum. 2003. *Volume 152.*

Klein, Hans: see *Dunn, James D.G.*.

Kleinknecht, Karl Th.: Der leidende Gerechtfertigte. 1984, ²1988. *Volume II/13.*

Klinghardt, Matthias: Gesetz und Volk Gottes. 1988. *Volume II/32.*

Koch, Stefan: Rechtliche Regelung von Konflikten im frühen Christentum. 2004. *Volume II/174.*

Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich: Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus. 1987. *Volume II/24.*

Kooten, George H. van: Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School. 2003. *Volume II/171.*

Korn, Manfred: Die Geschichte Jesu in veränderter Zeit. 1993. *Volume II/51.*

Koskenniemi, Erkki: Apollonios von Tyana in der neutestamentlichen Exegese. 1994. *Volume II/61.*

Kraus, Thomas J.: Sprache, Stil und historischer Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefes. 2001. *Volume II/136.*

Kraus, Wolfgang: Das Volk Gottes. 1996. *Volume 85.*

- and *Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr* (Ed.): Frühjudentum und Neues Testament im Horizont Biblischer Theologie. 2003. *Volume 162.*
- see *Walter, Nikolaus.*

Kreplin, Matthias: Das Selbstverständnis Jesu. 2001. *Volume II/141.*

Kuhn, Karl G.: Achtzehngebet und Vaterunser und der Reim. 1950. *Volume 1.*

Kvalbein, Hans: see *Ådna, Jostein.*

Laansma, Jon: I Will Give You Rest. 1997. *Volume II/98.*

Labahn, Michael: Offenbarung in Zeichen und Wort. 2000. *Volume II/117.*

Lambers-Petry, Doris: see *Tomson, Peter J.*

Lange, Armin: see *Ego, Beate.*

Lampe, Peter: Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten. 1987, ²1989. *Volume II/18.*

Landmesser, Christof: Wahrheit als Grundbegriff neutestamentlicher Wissenschaft. 1999. *Volume 113.*

- Jüngerberufung und Zuwendung zu Gott. 2000. *Volume 133.*

Lau, Andrew: Manifest in Flesh. 1996. *Volume II/86.*

Lawrence, Louise: An Ethnography of the Gospel of Matthew. 2003. *Volume II/165.*

Lee, Pilchan: The New Jerusalem in the Book of Relevation. 2000. *Volume II/129.*

Lichtenberger, Hermann: see *Avemarie, Friedrich.*

Lierman, John: The New Testament Moses. 2004. *Volume II/173.*

Lieu, Samuel N.C.: Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China. ²1992. *Volume 63.*

Loader, William R.G.: Jesus' Attitude Towards the Law. 1997. *Volume II/97.*

Löhr, Gebhard: Verherrlichung Gottes durch Philosophie. 1997. *Volume 97.*

Löhr, Hermut: Studien zum frühchristlichen und frühjüdischen Gebet. 2003. *Volume160.*

– *:* see *Hengel, Martin.*

Löhr, Winrich Alfried: Basilides und seine Schule. 1995. *Volume 83.*

Luomanen, Petri: Entering the Kingdom of Heaven. 1998. *Volume II/101.*

Luz, Ulrich: see *Dunn, James D.G.*

Maier, Gerhard: Mensch und freier Wille. 1971. *Volume 12.*

For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D–72010 Tübingen/Germany
Up-to-date information on the internet at www.mohr.de