

PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH ETHICS

as reflected

IN THE TESTAMENTS

of the

TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

LOUIS D. GROSS.

Hebrew Union College, April, 1909.

Mic. 9/78

PRE-CHRISTIAN JEWISH ETHICS

as reflected

IN THE TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

C O N T E N T S.

| | Page |
|--|-------|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| PART I: STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION. | |
| Chapter I. General Character and Structure of the Book..... | 9 |
| II Authorship and Integrity..... | 13 |
| III Date, and Purpose of the Author.. | 21 |
| IV Original Language..... | 29 |
| PART II: ETHICS OF THE BOOK. | |
| Chapter V. Ethical Content..... | 33 |
| VI Ethical Standards..... | 49 |
| VII Leading Ethical Teachings..... | 66 |
| VIII The Testaments as a Text- Book of Morals..... | 78 |
| Conclusion..... | 82 |
| Bibliography..... | III-V |

BIBLIOGRAPHY.CRITICAL EDITIONS OF THE TESTAMENTS.

SINKER, 1869, based on a 10th century M. S., with a collation of four other Mss.

CONYBEARE, (J.Q.R. Vol. VIII) based on a 12th century M.S. in the Vatican, with a collation of the old Armenian M.S.

CHARLES, a new critical edition (Lond. 1908) taking account of the recovered Semitic texts and the Greek codices in Athos, Patmos, Paris and Rome, and the ancient Armenian and Slavonic versions.

CRITICAL INQUIRIES.

GRABE; Spicileg. I, 129-144, 335-374.

CORRODI: Kritische Gesch. d. Chiliasmus II, 101-110.

K.J. NITZSCH: Commentatio critica de Test. XII Patr. libro V.T. pseudepigrapho, Wittenb. 1810.

KAYSER: "Die Test. der XII Patr." in the Beitrage zu den theologischen Wissenschaften, ed. by Reuss & Cunitz, 1851, III, 107-140.

VORSTMAN: Disquisitio de Test. XII Patr. origine et pretio, Rotterd., 1857.

SCHNAPP: Die Test. XII Patr. untersucht, Halle 1884.

ENCYCLOPEDIA ARTICLES.

- KOHLER: Jewish Encyclopedia, 1906, XII, 113-118.
- CHARLES: Art. "Apocalyptic Literature", Encyc. Bibl., 1899, I, 237-241.
 "Testaments XII Patr". Hastings Bible Dict. 1902, IV, 721-725; Encyc. Brit. (10th ed.) 1902, XXV, 492-493.
- CONYBEARE: Jewish Encyc. 1906, XII, 113.
- SINKER: Smith and Wace's Dict. of Christian Biography, 1887, IV, 865-874.
- DILLMANN: Art. "Pseudepigraphen", Herzog's Real-Encyc. (2nd ed.) XII, 361-362.
- BEER: Art. "Pseudepigraphen", Herzog's Real-Encyc. (3rd ed.) 1905, XVI, 253-256.

GENERAL ARTICLES.

- KOHLER: "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada, J.Q.R., 1893, V, 400-406.
- CHARLES: "Book of Jubilees", pp. 170-172, 179, 185, etc; Hibbert Journal, 1905, pp. 558-573.
- CONYBEARE: "On the Jewish Authorship of the Test. XII Patr". J.Q.R. 1893, V, 375-398.
- HILGENFELD: Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftl. Theol. 1858, p. 395 ff, 1871, p. 302 ff.
- GEIGER: Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissenschaft und Leben, 1869, pp. 116-135; 1871, pp. 123-125.

- SCHÜRER: Gesch. des Jüdischen Volkes (3rd ed.) 1898, III, 252-262.
- BOUSSET: Zeitschr. für N.T.W., 1900, 141-209. "Die Religion des Judenthums," 2nd ed. Berlin, 1906, p. 154 ff.
- EWALD: Gesch. d. Volkes Israel (3rd ed.) VII, 363-369.
- RITSCHL: Die Entstehung der Altkathol. Kirche, (1st ed.) 322 ff; (2nd ed.) 1857, 172-177.
- MONTEFIORE: "Impressions of Christianity", Hibbert Journ. Vol. III, p. 649 ff.
- WARFIELD: "The Apologetic Value of the Test. XII Patr". N. Y. Presbyt. Rev. Jan, 1880, p. 57.
- PICK: "The Test. XII Patr". Lutheran Church, Rev. 1885, pp. 161-186.

INTRODUCTION.

In the whole range of Jewish literature, biblical, post-biblical, and modern, least attention is accorded by scholars, and Jewish scholars in particular, to that department known as Apocrypha. By a strange irony of fate, that branch of our literature was stamped "non-canonical", the ספרים חיצוניים or those writings which fell short of the literary gauge of their day, and which were considered not sacred enough to "defile the hands" of those who touched them, איך כשטעצן אפ הידיים. Yet just because they were not sacred", they seem gradually to have receded in popular favor, finally to be known and cultivated only in the circles of the "elect". There seems to be a peculiar tyranny about the word "non-canonical" which has relegated this literature to the dust-laden shelf of antiquity. This is probably due to the inevitable contrast that arose between the biblical (canonic) writings, invested as these were with a special atmosphere of sanctity, and the "external" literature, which, on the current test of literary fitness, or, more likely, by a certain whim of the moment, did not happen to come up to the standard of that special sanctity. It is the same phenomenon that appears in the contrast between the religious and the secular, the sacred and the "profane", the holy and the common; and just because of the contrast, the secular and "profane" are esteemed less worthy of attention and consideration. Owing to this unjust discrimination, our non-canonical literature, with very few exceptions, has never received the attention it deserves. The tendency survives to this day, even among Jewish scholars, to regard this literature as of very minor importance. (1).

(1) Kohler is perhaps the only Jewish scholar of today (at least in America) who has undertaken extensive research work in Jewish Apocryphal literature.

The biblical, rabbinical, or Medieval literature is considered more inviting and more fruitful.

This strange neglect of an extremely important part of our literature is neither wise nor just. Our Apocrypha in reality presents a vast field of incalculable value; it is a veritable mine of unexplored treasures, and an indispensable link in the historical chain of Judaism from Ezra to the Diaspora. In many instances it is unsurpassed, as literature, even by the bible, and certainly, by the rabbinical writings. If this be true at all, it is surely true of that Apocryphal book which is treated in this thesis -- "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs."

This remarkable book has undergone many and varied fortunes. It remained for a long time a sealed book because of the mystery in which it was enshrouded, and because of the inability to distinguish its constituent elements. Only recently, in the light of keen, scholarly investigation, has it come to the front as an extremely important work. It was claimed as the child of Christianity for many centuries. But opinion now is almost unanimous regarding its Jewish origin.

The statement is often heard, sometimes even by Jews, that the best ethical and religious teaching which the Jew could produce, is contained in the Old Testament, and that the best that the Scribes and Rabbis could produce, was limited to laws, casuistry and nonsense. As to the Old Testament, the question might be asked in answer to this reproach, by what can such passages as Dt. 6-5, Levit. 19-18, Hos. 6-6, Mic. 6-8, Ps. 51-17, etc. be surpassed? But as to the later literature, that which arose and flourished just after the canon was closed, the answer is still sharper; for in this later or post-canonic literature, the many religious and ethical doctrines of the Old Testament were further developed, purified and deepened. I refer here mainly to the pre-Talmudic Haggadic literature, which, gradually separating itself from the Halacha, both of which were originally an integral part of the Midrash, evolved many fine and great things, unapproached even by the Old Testament.

This Midrashic literature is much older than is usually thought. Zunz in his "Gottesdienstliche Vortraege der Juden" has endeavored to establish the theory that the *גזע שית רבה* is the oldest of the *סדרות* that we have. This is not entirely true. The beginnings of Midrash are to be sought in the Hellenistic or Greek-Palestinian literature. The book of Chronicles itself is an attempt to modify and rectify the story of the *נביאים ראשונים* with a view to putting in a better light the dynasty of David and the tribe of Judah, and to project the whole history of temple-worship into Davidic times. In this sense, the book of Chronicles is a Midrashic attempt on "Samuel" and "Kings". Likewise, the Book of Jubilees bears the same relation to Genesis. Its purpose is to beautify the past, to extol the Patriarchs and make them grander, and to impress the reader with the absolute holiness of the institutions of the bible, by tracing their origin back to the Patriarchs. So also, the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" (which is closely connected with the Book of Jubilees) in which the twelve patriarchs (Jacob's sons) relate their own life story is in reality a strong example of these early Midrashic writings. (1)

- (1) In his art. "Pre-Talmudic Haggada" (J.Q.R.V. p 400 ff) Kohler points out that the Jerusalem Targum (which is much earlier than the Babylonian, or Onkelos) has preserved the true type of the old Haggada. It is really the treasury of Essene Tradition. The Targum Jerushalmi, Test. XII, Patr., and the B. of Jubilees offer one striking feature in common, viz; the biblical heroes are represented as warlike and of gigantic strength. They are inventors of certain industries; e.g., Zebulon is "the first who makes a boat to sail on the sea" (Cf. T. Zeb 6-1, and Midr. to Gen 49-13). Also, Abraham, and Moses, Seth, Henoch and Noah are inventors of trades arts and sciences in the old Haggadic writings. These very men are mystics who know how to use hidden powers and the secrets of God's holy name in war and peril.

This type of literature arose during the first two or three centuries before the Christian era. In treating of this period of Jewish history, Christian scholars often seize upon and emphasize the meaner and less worthy elements. Bousset (1) characterizes the Jewish ethical teachings of this period as particularistic, casuistic and negative. Schurer (2) calls it a period of legalistic or formal morality and says: "Ethics and theology were swallowed up in jurisprudence". Such tendencies may doubtless have existed, but the Haggadic and Apocryphal literature of that time argues strongly against such sweeping characterizations. If a literary witness is of any worth, then surely the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" is such a witness, throwing new light on the conditions of its time and demonstrating that the age was not wholly one of severe legalism, of lifeless externalism, or fruitless casuistry. The other Midrashic writings, spoken of above, are equally strong as witnesses of their day. Much of this early Haggadic literature, which is frequently of incomparable strength and beauty was appropriated by the Christian Church (3) often retouched and altered to suit its purposes, and then regarded as Christian productions.

- (1) Die Religion d. Judenth, in N. T. Zöltner, 2nd ed. Berlin 1906, pp. 154-163.
- (2) The Jewish People in the Time of J. C. 2nd ed. II-2, p 120.
- (3) Also such works as the Didache and the Didascalia.

Such was for a time the fate of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". Only in very recent times has scholarly research and criticism "re-discovered" this work and placed it where it truly belongs as a product of Jewish life and thought of the second century B. C. E.

Some few years ago, Charles wrote in regard to the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs":- "This most valuable pseudepigraph has never received the attention it deserves, but the next few years will witness a full atonement for past neglect". (1). That prediction is gradually being verified. Scholars have eagerly turned to this work with renewed interest; within the last decade most of its problems have been solved almost beyond dispute. The work is now regarded as second in importance to none composed during the period between the rise of the Maccabees and the Christian era. It reflects the tone and spirit of its time more vividly than any other contemporary work.

Historically this document is of very great importance; it represents a new order of things instituted by a new regime. Schurer (2) says that "zeal for the law of God, and the faith of the fathers eclipsed every other interest", and that "the two chief factors in the internal development are on the one hand, the priesthood and the temple services, and on the other, the institution of Scribism". The old aristocratic Sadducean priesthood was rapidly declining and fast succumbing to the irresistible force of Greek pagan culture. The Scribes represent the faithful few who zealously guarded the law. The Hellenizing tendency of the day was bitterly opposed by this handful of steadfast spirits. This Hasidic or Zealotic fervor found its culmination in the Maccabean uprising, which was not a political revolution, nor even a national rebellion, but strictly a religious war, waged in the name of God and the Law. (The battle-cry of the warriors was 'יהוה' 'ה' "the Lord is my banner"). When finally the Maccabees returned

(1) Hasting's Dict. of the B. 1902, Vol. IV, Art. Test XII Patr.

(2) Ibid. I-1, p. 5 f.

victorious, and set up the new order of the priesthood, these Hasidic defenders of the Law, still supported the sons of Mattathias, and in defiance of all tradition and early prophecy, espoused their cause as the new High Priests, the priests "of the most high God" (*ὁ ψιότου*). So enthusiastic were these early Hasidic or Pharisean supporters of the Maccabees, that one of their number, in justification of the new high priesthood and in praise of the Maccabean prowess, composed the book which we are about to examine, the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". The groundwork of this book, as a product of the second century B. C. E. is thus strikingly unique, for outside of the Book of Jubilees, it is the only apology extant in Jewish literature, for the religio-political leadership of the Maccabees from the Pharisaic standpoint.

The book is also extremely valuable from the viewpoint of eschatology; it reveals a temporary revolution in historic values, a shifting of the Messianic notion. A broad sense of humanitarianism here dominates. The writer, in his wonderful enthusiasm for the Maccabean princes, already sees the Messianic kingdom established, in which all the Gentiles are to be included; Beliar, the principle of evil will soon be destroyed, sin is about to vanish from the earth, and the resurrection of the righteous is soon at hand. John Hyrcanus, the valiant Maccabean priest-king, is the object of the author's songs of praise,-- He is even regarded by the Pharisaic Party, as the Messiah himself. Such current hopes and expectations were embodied in the groundwork of the "Testaments". But the same book contains also the strongest denunciations of the Maccabees; i.e., the later Maccabees of the first century B. C. E. or those who succeeded Hyrcanus. Such passages are of course the product of a later hand, interpolated some time in the first century B. C. E. after the unfortunate breach between the Maccabees and the Pharisees. Those who had before been the strongest friends now became violent foes to each other. The first century passages accordingly show a reversion to the old Messianic view -- the Messiah will proceed from Judah, not from Levi.

The "Testaments" thus possess undoubted historical value; but this is not their chief claim to

importance. The book was certainly not designed as a historical work like the "First Book of Maccabees", or the "Chronicles of Hyrcanus"; nor is it an apocalypse like the "Book of the Secrets of Enoch", although it contains some apocalyptic elements borrowed from the Enoch writings; nor is it to be considered as an eschatological work, although it contains much material that is valuable from the standpoint of Messianic prophecy. The historical, apocalyptic and eschatological literary currents were much in vogue at the time of which we are speaking. But the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" is essentially none of these. It belongs properly to a fourth and distinct class of literature which may be aptly termed hortatory or ethical narrative. Such works are the Book of Jubilees, Judith, Tobit, etc. This is in reality an example of that early Haggadic literature of which we have already spoken. It is the strongest proof that all moral judgment was not stifled under the rubbish of Halachic discussion, as so many non-Jewish historians of this period maintain. Its purpose was to present for emulation, the doings and fortunes of persons distinguished for their heroic faith or their exemplary piety, who at the same time had been sustained by divine help. The object of the narrative is thus not to entertain the reader, but to inculcate the truth that the fear of God is the highest wisdom. They are in the nature of prophetic exhortations put into the mouth of recognized authorities of olden time, in order to give weight to ethical precept and command.

Schurer, mistaking form for substance, classifies the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" as one of the pseudepigraphic, prophetic compositions like Daniel, Enoch, Ascension of Moses, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Apocalypse of Ezra, etc. The "Testaments" are in form a Pseudepigraphic Prophecy; but as I have pointed out above, the work is neither an apocalypse, nor an eschatology, though it contains elements of both. Essentially, and for all practical purposes, the "Testaments XII Patriarchs" is a book of ethics or moral conduct. It is cast in the form of pseudepigraph, which was a literary device of its day, to lend weight and luster to lofty and noble utterances. The foremost place in it is assigned to moral sermons, remarkable productions in their day,

reminding us of Jesus, the son of Sirach, or Philo or some other author to whom moral conduct was a matter of deeper interest than ceremonial law. The ethical standard of the writer is of a very high character, and throughout, a genuine appreciation of deep spirituality and the inwardness of the moral life is dominant, as we shall show.

This thesis shall be devoted to the task of showing:

FIRST. That the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" is a distinctively Jewish document; that it was written in Hebrew in the last quarter of the second century B. C. E., by a Hasid or early Pharisee, on behalf of the high priesthood of the Maccabean family, especially on behalf of the Messianic claims of John Hyrcanus, the "phrophet-priest-king".

SECOND. We shall try to show that it is essentially an ethical book; that it was not a mere isolated or esoteric document unrelated to its time, but clearly reflects the ethical standards of its day.

THIRD. That it directly influenced the ethics of the New Testaments, especially the Sermon on the Mount and the Pauline Epistles.

The eschatological element in the book, which is professedly derived from "Enoch", while important in itself will receive no special treatment in this thesis, as our main task is to consider the ethical teaching and importance of the work, and its bearing on the life and thought of the period to which it belongs.

We shall first turn our attention to a consideration of the general character and structure of the book.

PART I.

CHARACTER AND COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL CHARACTER AND STRUCTURE.

The so-called "Testaments" of prominent figures in bible history form a special class of apocryphal literature. They were manifestly suggested by biblical passages such as the blessing of Jacob in Gen. 49, the blessing of Moses in Dt. 33, the parting speeches of Moses in Dt. 4, 29, etc., Josh. 23, 24, etc. They are, as the name implies, testaments, "wills", or last statements, supposed to have been delivered just before death. As a rule they narrate the close of the hero's life, sometimes giving a retrospect of his history, last counsels and admonitions to his children, with disclosures of the future. Moral exhortation finds a prominent place in these writings. Such for example is the "Testament of Abraham", which is mainly Haggadic; "Testament of Isaac and Jacob", an apocalypse; the "Testament of Job", which is also Haggadic; the "Testament of Moses", a prophetic-apocalyptic discourse of Moses to Joshua; the "testament of Solomon", describing the magical power of Solomon; and the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". This work, as we have already intimated, is essentially ethical, containing the parting admonitions of the twelve sons of Jacob to their children. Each of the "Patriarchs" warns against certain sins, and commends the opposite virtues, illustrating and enforcing the moral by the experience of his own life. Gad, for example, warns against hatred; Issachar extols the beauty of ~~simple-mindedness~~ ^{heartedness}; Joseph inculcates the lesson of chastity. In some, as is Joseph, the legendary narrative predominates; in others, as in Benjamin, direct ethical teachings are emphasized. Thus, each of the

Patriarchs is represented as teaching a great life-lesson in his last will, a lesson based on his own past career, relating either to a virtue practised or a vice repented of. It is in the nature of a confession, or statement on the death-bed, with the object of driving home a great moral truth.

Each of the Testaments of this work follows a definite, three-fold plan:

- (1) The Patriarch narrates to his children gathered about him, the history of his own life (1), makes a full, frank statement of his sins and the consequent punishment and suffering, or his virtues with the attendant divine rewards.
 - (2) On the basis of this statement or confession, the Patriarch addresses exhortations to his descendants to beware of the sin, or emulate the virtue, as the case may be.
 - (3) In conclusion, each Patriarch (except Gad) makes predictions regarding the future of the particular tribe in question. These are prophetic visions, in most cases to the effect that the tribe in question would apostatize from God, or sever its connection with the tribes of Judah and Levi, with the resultant misery of captivity and dispersion. In these sections (2) most of the apocalyptic passages are found. The writings of Enoch
- (1) Here the biblical narrative is enriched with fresh details and traditional elements after the manner of the Haggadic Midrash.
 - (2) Some scholars are of the opinion that the original work did not contain these prophetic-apocalyptic portions, and that the book originally included only the biographical parts with their accompanying exhortations. (Cf Schnapp: Die Test. XII P. untersucht, Halle, 1884.)

are here often appealed to and cited. The Christian additions also occur in these sections, referring to incarnation, sanctification by water (baptism), redemption through Christ, identity of Jesus with God, crucifixion, etc. Such passages (1) are evidence that the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs", like many other Midrashim, were appropriated and preserved by the church, but in Christianized form. These Christian interpolations were mainly for the purpose of making the twelve patriarchs prophesy the coming of Jesus, from Judah and Levi (2), on his father and mother's side. But the Christian passages can readily be distinguished from the Jewish groundwork.

The prophetic-apocalyptic portions of the Testaments are not essential to the main character of the work, which, as we have said, is a book of morals.

- (1) E. G., T. Lev. 10-5, 14-1, 16-1, T. Jud. 18-1, T. Dan. 5-6, T. Sim. 5-4, T. Benj. 9-1.

- (2) It is remarkable that these Christian additions represent Jesus as a descendant of the tribes of Judah and Levi alike. How was this possible? Schurer (Hist. J. P. Time of J. C., Pr 32, p 120 f) remarks that in primitive Christian tradition, stress was laid on his descent from Judah, but the Christian interpolator, finding in his text that Judah and Levi are held up as the model tribes, tries to justify this by representing Jesus as a descendant of Levi in his priestly capacity, and from Judah in his capacity as king; he had, i.e., a spiritual connection with both tribes because of his two-fold office of priest and king.

The book is a pseudepigraph in form, and the ethical injunctions are put in the mouths of the patriarchs; they are themselves represented as speaking; the biblical account is used as a basis, but in most cases, is embellished with traditional material.

In order to establish our main purpose and show that the work reflects some aspects of pre-Christian Jewish ethics, it is necessary first to identify the book as a product of Jewish thought, intimately bound up with the Spirit, conditions and events of the period in which it originated. I therefore proceed briefly to outline the critical history of the work, with an account of the conclusions that have been reached by the most eminent scholars who have investigated the problems underlying this important document.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORSHIP AND INTEGRITY.

The "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" is first definitely referred to and quoted by name by Origen (1). It is occasionally mentioned in catalogs of the sacred writings and by church councils up to the close of the sixth century (2). Then for six centuries the work completely disappeared until it was rediscovered in the middle of the thirteenth century. A very interesting account of its re-appearance is given by a contemporary chronicler, (3) Matthew of Paris, in his "Historia Anglorum". "At this time (1242), Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, accurately translated the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs from Greek into Latin. These had been for a long time unknown and hidden through the jealousy of the Jews, on account of the prophecies of the Saviour contained in them. The Greeks who were the first to come to a knowledge of this document translated it from Hebrew into Greek, and have kept it to themselves till our times. And neither in the time of the blessed Jerome, nor of any other holy

(1) Homilia XV in Josuam Ch. 6. (Ed. Lommatzsch XI, 143).

(2) There is also a doubtful reference to it in Tertullian, (C. 200, C. E.) Adv. Marconiem V-1, Scorpeace XIII, in Jerome, Adv. Vigilant C. VI, and Procopius. The Stichometry of Nicephorus and the Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae (Athanasius) mention it by name. An introductory notice to the translation of the work is found in connection with the work of Lactantius, Vol. II, of the Ante-Nicene Libr., pp 7, 9.

(3) London, 1571, p 801.

interpreter could the Christians gain an acquaintance with it, owing to the malice of the ancient Jews". (IV, 232). The chronicler then goes on to relate how the Bishop of Lincoln (Grosse-Teste) heard of the work through John de Basingstokes, who had discovered the Greek M. S. while studying at Athens. The Bishop secured the M. S. from Greece and from it, with the aid of a Greek named Nicolaus, he made a Latin translation. This version became extremely popular and was re-translated into most of the languages of Europe.

From the account of the chronicler quoted above it is not difficult to see why the book in the Grosse-Teste version became so popular. The book was used as a theological weapon against the Jews. The passages referring to Christ were taken to be genuine Jewish prophecies of the Messiah, but later, on this very ground, the work was ascribed to a Jewish Christian of the second century C. E.

The Christian Messianic prophecies in the "Testaments" have been the stumbling-block of scholars ever since. They were for a long time regarded as an integral part of the work. Such passages e.g., are: Test. Sim. 7-2,-- "For the Lord shall raise up from Levi, as it were, a high priest, and from Judah, as it were a king, God and man". 6-5,7, - "The Lord appearing on earth as a man"....."God taking a body and eating with men". T. Levi 16-3,-- "Ye slay him as ye suppose, not knowing of his resurrection". T. Zeb. 9-8,-- "Ye shall see God in the fashion of man".

There occur also many Christological phrases

like:

| | |
|------------|--|
| T. Reub. 6 | "High-priest Christ". |
| T. Lev. 2 | "Who is to ransom Israel". |
| " " | "the Lord be seen among men". |
| " " | "saving in his own person the whole race of men". |
| T. Lev. 4 | "at the suffering of the highest". |
| | "to crucify him" (Cf Matt. 27-45,53) |
| T. Lev. 10 | "Saviour of the world". |
| " " 18 | "The new priest". |
| T. Dan. 5 | "The Lord is in the midst of her..... in humility and in poverty". |
| T. Asher 7 | "having come even in his own person as man". |

Some of the clauses thus speak of Christ as a mere man, some as a God-man, and others identify him with the Father like the Patripassians. It is needless to say that these passages are products of a Christian hand. But Grosse-Teste had before him the Greek M. S. which he no doubt regarded as the original. Thus the Christological passages were considered as an integral part of the work, and for many centuries after Grosse-Teste, the Tests. XII Patr. was thought to be a Christian document.

It was not until the seventeenth century that the spell was broken, and then only temporarily. Grabe, (1) a Christian scholar was the first to make a critical analysis of the book. He advanced the theory that the Christological passages were late interpolations, and that the basis of the work was Jewish. But Grabe seemed to be in advance of his age. His theory was not well received by subsequent scholars. The old view was persisted in, and the book was ascribed to a Judaeo-Christian. Grabe was opposed by Corrodi (2), and such scholars as Nitsch (3), Sangen (4), and Sinker (5), who upheld the Jewish-Christian authorship; Ritschl (6),

- (1) Spicilegium Patrum, Oxford, 1714, I, 129-144, 335-374.
- (2) Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus, II, 101-110.
- (3) Commentatis Critica de Test. XII Patr. libro VI, pseudepigraphs, Wittenb. 1810.
- (4) Das Judenthum in Palastina, 1866, pp. 140-157.
- (5) Ed. Test. XII Patr. Cambridge, 1869, a collation of the Cambridge, Vatican and Patmos Mss.
- (6) Die Entstehung der Altkath-Kirche, 1st ed. Bonn, 1850, p. 171 ff.

Hilgenfeld (7) and Vorstman (8) who supported the Gentile-Christian authorship; and Kayser (9), who held that the work originated from Ebionitic circles. Later, Ritschl (10) retracted his first view and advanced the theory of Nazarene authorship.

But in 1884, Grabe's theory was revised by a young German scholar, Schnapp, whose views became epoch-making in the critical history of the book. Schnapp (11) showed conclusively that the Christological passages were spurious; that the work had undergone repeated revision and remodification, but that the great bulk of the book is of Jewish origin. (12)

- (7) Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftl. Theol., 1858, pp. 395 ff., 1871, pp. 302 ff.
- (8) Disquisitio de Testamentorum Patriarcharum XII, origine et pretio, Rotterd. 1857.
- (9) Beiträge z.d. Theolog. Wissenschaften (ed. Reuss and Cunitz) 1851, pp. 107-140.
- (10) Ibid. 2nd ed. 1857, pp. 172-177.
- (11) Die Testamente XII Patriarchen untersucht, Halle, 1884.
- (12) Schnapp was also the first one to suggest two different sources for the ground-work. We shall return to this question later.

Recent investigation has confirmed the view of Grabe and Schnapp. Schurer agreed with Schnapp (1) regarding the Jewish origin of the work, but was not certain as to its pre-Christian Jewish authorship. Conybeare has contributed valuable and conclusive results to this question by his investigation of the Armenian M. S., which is the oldest M. S. of the Testaments that we possess. Conybeare's collation (2) of this Armenian version shows that the original Greek text from which the Armenian translation was made, was lacking in most of the Christian interpolations. This

- (1) G. J. V. 3rd ed. 252-262. Schurer has well shown that there is nothing in the book to indicate a Jewish-Christian standpoint. Neither a Christian, nor a Jewish-Christian, could have characterized the tribes of Levi and Judah as those to whom God had committed the guidance of Israel. "Why", asks Schurer, "should the author exhort the other tribes to submit to their authority, since it was just these two tribes (the official Judaism of Palestine) that were especially rigorous in rejecting the Gosp'l?" "Therefore not even a Jewish-Christian would have given them the leading position they hold in the 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'".

- (2) J. Q. R., V 375-376, VIII, 260-268, 471-485.

is significant, especially with regard to the eulogy (1) of Paul in Test. Benj. XI (Greek Text) which is totally absent from the old Armenian version; it is also lacking, as Schurer has pointed out, in the case of another independent witness among the Mss. versions, viz., the Roman M. S. By a comparison of the Greek, Armenian and Slavonic versions and the Hebrew and Aramaic fragments (2) the fact is established beyond dispute that the "Testaments" are in reality a Jewish work, subsequently interpolated by a series of Christian scribes. Conybeare is convinced that the main body of the work is Jewish; that the Messianic passages do not reflect the general tendency of the Testaments; he terms these passages, "Christological excrescences", and finds the prevailing spirit of the book to be one of strong Jewish patriotism combined with simplicity of heart and purity of life. (3) He also suggests that in any genuine writing of a follower of Jesus of Nazareth, we should expect to find some traces of his historic life. On these grounds,

- (1) This passage was probably interpolated in the middle century C. E. Tertullian alludes to it in Adv. Marc.
- (2) Fragments of the original Semitic text were discovered in the Cairo Genizah by Gastu, Pass and Cowley. The fragment of Naphtali is Hebrew, the others (mainly Levi) are Aramaic.
- (3) Mr. Sinker himself says: "Noticeable is the strong Israelite feeling which animates the author. His affectionate clinging to the old polity is shown by the way in which he connects the Messiah not only with the tribe of Judah, but also with that of Levi; thus he is high priest as well as king".

Conybeare, like Grabe and Schnapp, pronounces the Testaments to be at bottom the work of a Jewish writer living in pre-Christian times.

It has remained for two scholars within recent years to solve this problem almost beyond question--Kohler (1) and Charles (2), both of whom have made an exhaustive and scholarly study of the work. Kohler's contributions in this field are extremely valuable and have stimulated Charles to further investigation. I shall only mention here the fact that Kohler found direct allusions to the Testaments in Sifre Nu. 12, Sotah 7-b, and Yer. Sotah 16-b. These passages speak of כתובים ראשונים (3) (early writings), Haggadic references to the Reuben-Bilhah and Judah-Tamar confessions, which occur nowhere else in Jewish literature except in the Test. XII Patr., thus at once stamping the book as of distinctively Jewish origin (4).

Charles made the matter still clearer and strengthened the results already reached. He did not, however, agree with Kohler that two distinct tendencies are visible throughout the ground-work, implying two different authors, Hasidean and Maccabean. Charles

- (1) Jewish Ency. Art. Test. XII Patr., Vol. XII; J. Q. R., V p. 400 ff.
- (2) Ency. Bib. Art. Test. XII Patr., Vol. IV; Ed. Test. XII Patr. London 1908.
- (3) We shall have to refer to this again.
- (4) Its position in the Armenian Bible (after Genesis and before the book of Joseph and Asenath) shows that it was regarded as a Jewish Apocalypse.

maintains the integrity of the original work on the ground that the Hasidean and Maccabean tendencies were identical at the time of the book's composition. Charles agrees, of course, that there are other elements in the work, but these are either the Jewish or Christian interpolations. The original book is a unit, the product of a single writer of the Pharisaic school, who was also a Hasid. He both believes in war for the sake of religion, and encourages the virtues of truthfulness, chastity, forgiveness, self-control and moderation. Charles has further pointed out that both the Hasidic and the Maccabean elements are alike universalistic in tone.

Through the critical research of Conybeare, Kohler and Charles, it is now almost generally conceded that the work on the whole could have been written by none other than a Jew of the Pharisaic school; that it can be understood only through a knowledge of the Targums, Midrashim, and the history of pre-Christian Judaism; that outside of a dozen or more Christological clauses, the work is thoroughly Jewish in thought and idiom. We have already observed that owing to the breach between the Maccabees and Pharisees, further Jewish elements were added whose purpose and spirit were directly opposed to the ground-work itself. These Jewish additions were no doubt also from the hand of a Pharisee, whose purpose was to attack the corrupt and venal Maccabean princes of the first century B. C. E. These passages are in all instances readily discernible.

We are now in a position to more clearly approximate the date of our work, and to gain a clearer notion of its object and relation to its time.

CHAPTER III.

DATE AND PURPOSE OF THE AUTHOR.

Sinker and Schurer after him place the Testaments in the first century A. C. E., on the ground that the author alludes to the laying waste of the Temple and the destruction of Jerusalem (1). Kohler, however, has conclusively shown that the book, shorn of its Christian additions, can be none other than a product of the Maccabean period; for it reflects throughout the spirit of that age and is in fact in the nature of an apology for a new order of things; viz., the Maccabean priesthood, or, in other words, the new warrior-priests. This is established, beyond any question as Kohler has shown, also by the internal evidence of the book itself. Thus Reuben (6-10) admonishes his sons, "Draw ye near to Levi in humility of heart, that ye may receive the blessing from his mouth, because the Lord has chosen him to be king over all the nations". Here a high priest who is also king is plainly referred to. This could have been none other than one of the famous Maccabean priest-kings of the second century B. C. This view is confirmed by the passage immediately following: "And bow down before his seed; for on our behalf it shall die for you in wars visible and invisible (2), and will be among you an eternal king". The words ἀποθάρσυνται ἐν πολέμοις ὁσάτοῖς καὶ ἀοσάτοῖς can be interpreted only of a high priest who is also a

- (1) Cf. Lev. 15-1, 16-4; T. Jud. 22-1,2; T. Zeb. 9-2,4. But Charles has identified these passages as part of the first century Jewish additions (70-40 B. C.) They are thus to be regarded as genuine prophecies which were partly realized in 70 A. C. E.
- (2) This refers to the two-fold (temporal and spiritual) sovereignty of the Maccabean prince-priests.

warrior. So in Simeon 5-5, "Levi shall wage the wars (1) of the Lord". This double function is further referred to in Reuben 6 by the words: , διατελεῖ εἰς κείαν καὶ δυοίας ὑπὲρ πατὸς Ἰσραὴλ; also: εὐλογησεται τὸν Ἰσραὴλ..... ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐξελέξατο κύριος βασιλεύειν πατὸς τοῦ λαοῦ.

In Levi (8-14) the reference is, if possible, still clearer:

ὁ τρίτος ἐπικληθήσεται αὐτῷ ὄνομα καιρὸν, ὅτι βασιλεὺς ἐν τῷ Ἰουδα ἡραστήσεται καὶ ποιήσει ἱερατεῖαν νεάν, κατὰ τὸν τύπον τῶν ἑδρών εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

Thus, the high priest is not only high priest and civil ruler, but also a warrior. Such unquestionably were the Maccabean princes. This is further borne out by other marks of the priestly dynasty, as in the passage (Levi 8-14) just quoted; there it is said that the priesthood shall be called by a "new name"; and it was the Maccabean high priests who were the first Jewish priests to assume the title "Priests of the Most High God" (ἀρχιερεὺς θεοῦ ὑψίστου). This was the ancient title attributed to Melchizedek in Gen. 14-18 (מלך שם אלהים) and here we find it revived by the new (Maccabean) holders of the high-priesthood, after they had displaced the Zadokite highpriesthood, the legitimate and traditional holders of the office. This title occurs in Josephus (2),

- (1) The "wars" spoken of here are, of course, an allusion to the Maccabean uprising.
- (2) Ant. XVI, 6, 2, where Hyrcanus II is called: ἀρχιερεὺς θεοῦ ὑψίστου

the Talmud (1), the Book of Jubilees (2) and the Assumption (3) of Moses. It is also probably referred to in the 110th Psalm where the priest-king (supposed to refer to Simon the Maccabee) is addressed as a "priest forever" after the order of Melchizedek. Our text (Levi 8-14) accordingly provides that this new name shall signify the high priesthood.

Of course, by this, any of the Maccabean priest-kings of the latter half of the second century B. C. might have been meant, for they were all eminently fitting and deserving of such a distinction. The Hasidim or early Pharisees championed the cause of this new priesthood and supported the Maccabees until the close of the second century B. C. Then came the breach; the Maccabees broke with the Pharisees, joined the opposing party, the Saducees, and even began to persecute their former allies, the Pharisees. How infamous and corrupt were these later Maccabees (of the first century B. C.) is a matter of history. This accounts for the fact that the Testaments themselves so bitterly condemn the Maccabean high priests (i.e., the later ones) who formerly had been the central object of the book's praises and hymns. Such passages where the later Maccabees are denounced are, of course, the Jewish interpolations of the first century B. C., of which we have already spoken. In Levi 14-5, E. G., occur these words: "The offerings of the Lord shall ye rob, and from his portion shall

- (1) Rosh Hashonah, 18 b: "In such a year of Jonathan, priest of the Most High God".
- (2) 32-1, 36-16.
- (3) Assump. Mosis 6-1, "Sacerdotes Summi Dei".

ye steal, and before sacrificing to the Lord, ye shall take the choicest parts and eat them contemptuously with harlots.....and the daughters of Gentiles shall ye take to wife, purifying them with an unlawful purification; and your union shall be like unto Sodom and Gomorrah. And ye shall be puffed up because of your priesthood, lifting yourself up against men....for ye shall condemn the holy things with jests and laughter". Josephus (1) ascribes these very things to Alexander Jannaeus.

It is thus evident that the groundwork of our book was written when the Pharisees and Maccabees were still united, and therefore, by a Pharisean upholder of the earlier Maccabean dynasty. We can thus safely date the work some time between 153 when the highpriest office was first assumed by Jonathon the Maccabee, and the closing years of the second century when the break between the Pharisees and Maccabees occurred.

We are enabled, however, by further internal evidence to draw the lines of termini a quo and ad quem still more closely together. We have already seen (p 22) that the two-fold function spoken of in Test. Levi 8-14, is a direct allusion to the Maccabean priest-kings of the second century B. C. Now the passage immediately following (Levi 8-15) offers the most conclusive evidence for our purpose; for here the author assigns to one of these Maccabean high-priests, prophetic gifts as well as the functions of king and priest:

ἡ δὲ παρουσία αὐτοῦ
ἀγαπητή, ὡς προφήτης δούλου

A single, definite person is thus spoken of, as one who shall unite the crowns of royalty and priesthood with that of prophecy. This is John Hyrcanus, for to no one in all Jewish history is this triple office of prophet-priest-king ascribed except to him.

(1) Ant. XIII, 14-2.

Josephus (1) dwells on the uniqueness of Hyrcanus in this respect. The Talmud (2) also acknowledges his peculiar gifts.

Kohler was the first to call attention to the identity of this prophet-priest-king with John Hyrcanus. Charles (3) confirmed this position and further substantiated it. Kohler (4) also pointed out another very important coincidence that aids considerably in fixing the date of our work. He showed that the legendary account of the campaigns of the

(1) Bell. Jud. I, 2, 8.) : τρία γούν τὰ
 κρατιστεύοντα μόνος εἶχε τὴν τε ἀρχὴν
 τοῦ ἔθνους καὶ τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην καὶ
 προφητείαν
 Ant. XIII, 10, 7) τριῶν τῶν μεγίστων ἄξιος
 ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κρείδεις, ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἔθνους,
 καὶ τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς τιμῆς καὶ προφητείας.
 συγῆν, γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸ δοῦν καὶ τῶν
 μιλόντων πρὸς αὐτὸν παρῆν αὐτῷ
 τε εἰδέναι καὶ προλέγειν.

(2) Jer. Tal. Sotah 9-12 refers to Hyrcanus as having been the recipient of a "Bath Kol". Kiddushin 66a, describes Hyrcanus as the "second David", wearing two separate crowns (royal and priestly).

(3) Encycl. Bib. 1899, I, 237-241.

(4) J. Q. R., V, 400f. Jewish Ency. Vol. XII, Art. Test. XII Patr.

sons of Jacob narrates in Test. Judah (III-VII) are direct allusions to the Maccabean wars (1). The more important point of identity, however, is the previously mentioned fact that the Testaments refer directly to John Hyrcanus. We can therefore, with almost full certainty, all evidence so far considered, place the Testaments somewhere between 137 and

- (1) This story is referred to in Targ. Jon. on Gen. 48-22. The Book of Jubilees also contains this narrative. It is probable that both the B. of Jubilees (34-1,9) and the Testaments drew this material from a common source, viz: the Midrash Wajjisan (Jellinek, Beth ha-Midrash III, 1-3). It is also found in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel XXXVI and in the Book of Jashar (Dict. des Apocr. II, 1173-1184). It is therefore extremely likely that an elaborated (Midrashic) account of the war of the Amorite kings against Jacob and his sons existed independently in the middle of the second century B. C. The account of the war between Jacob and Esau in T. Jud. IX is also found in Jub. 37-38. (Here it is possible that Yalkut Shimeoni (T 322) which also contains the narrative) was used as a common source. The actual historial account of the Maccabean wars, has of course been preserved in the First Book of Maccabees. Here (Cf. ch 5, I Maccabees) Judas' victories over such enemies as Esau, Ammon, etc. are recorded.

105 B. C. (1).

The Messianic prophecies in the Testaments also point strongly to this dating, for in that century there occurs, as we have already had occasion to mention, a remarkable, though temporary revolution in Jewish belief. As Charles (2) has so aptly pointed out

- (1) To this period is assigned by the foremost textual critics, the Messianic hymns in Dan. 5-23, 33, and Judah 24, and the account of the resurrection in Judah 25. In Napht. 5, 14, 16 are cited in succession the nations that dominated Israel:

Ἀσσύριοι, Μήδοι, Πέρσαι, Ἑλιμαῖοι,
Γελαχαῖοι, Χαλδαῖοι, Σύροι κληρο-
νομήσουσιν ἐν ἀρχμαλώσει, τὰ δώδεκα
σκήπτρα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

The last of these is the Syrians. The passage was therefore written before the conquest of Israel by Rome. No reason, however, can be assigned for placing the term *ad quem* later than 105 B. C. (Breach between the Pharisees and Maccabees) and the most plausible date of our work is therefore 137-105 B. C. But the date can be defined perhaps even more closely than this, if we consider that, since the Testaments were written in praise of the Maccabean priest-kings and especially of John Hyrcanus, it would be more likely that they were composed when Hyrcanus had reached the zenith of his glory, i.e. after his final victory over the Syrians in 109. In accordance with this, we can place the book between 109 (Hyrcanus' final victory) and 105 (his breach with the Pharisees).

- (2) Hibbert Journal vol. III 1905, p 567 f.

the Jewish works of the second century B. C. are surprisingly silent about the Messiah being descended from Judah. The Messianic king is often described in the literature of this century, but his descent is no longer traced to Judah but to Levi; and this remarkable fact is reflected clearly in the Testaments as we would naturally expect on the ground of the date given above. We can account for this in only one way: that the great Maccabean family traced its descent to Levi. Now since the Maccabean family represents the foremost influence in the Jewish history of the second century B. C., what can be more natural than the expectation that the kingdom of God would be ushered in by that family, and even the Messiah spring from it? Thus we are prepared to find that the subject of one of the noble Messianic hymns in the Testaments (1) is the great Maccabean prince, John Hyrcanus, the prophet-priest-king.

Thus, all the evidence, external and internal, points to the last quarter of the second century B. C. as the time when the ground-work of the Testaments was written. Only within the last few years have scholars come to the conclusion that this is the true date of the Testaments.

With the conviction established that the Christological passages are interpolations of the Church, and that the groundwork is a Jewish product of the Maccabean era, the book is no longer a theological weapon fore-shadowing the coming of Jesus, nor is it any longer a mere literary curiosity of the first or second Christian century, but an ethical and historical document of first class importance. Conybeare, in commenting upon the true date of the Testaments, uses the following significant words: "At the same time that the Testaments thus lose all value as an early monument of Christianity, composed between the taking of Jerusalem by Titus and the revolt of Bar Kochba, they gain a new value as a record of the feelings and aspirations of the Jews in the age immediately preceding Jesus Christ".

(1) Test. Levi ch. 18.

CHAPTER IV.

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE BOOK.

With the authorship, date and integrity of the Testaments practically ascertained, the question of the original language in which they were composed can be more readily determined. Grabe, with rare insight, was the first one to advocate a Hebrew, or at least Semitic original. His argument was based only on the ground of style; he did not possess the documentary evidence necessary for a linguistic proof. Kayser, Schurer and Schnapp advanced the view that the received Greek text was a paraphrase of an old original Aramaic Midrash interpolated by generations of Christians. This was apparently substantiated by the M. S. (1) of the Aramaic version which Schechter brought from the Cairo Genizah in 1896. It is only within recent years that Grabe's conjecture of a Hebrew original has been confirmed. Even so eminent a scholar as Dillman (2) wrote: "Since the publication of Nitzsch's study, all are agreed that the book is not a translation but was originally written in Greek"; and according to Sinker: "The Testaments in their present form were no doubt written in the Hellenistic Greek in which we now possess them, presenting, as they do, none of the peculiar marks which characterize a version". It was Kohler (3), however, who brought the question again to the front,

- (1) Pub. by Pass and Arendzen in J. Q. R. 1900, 651-661.
- (2) Herzog, Real Encycl., XII, 362.
- (3) Jewish Encycl. XII, Art. Tests. XII Patr.

and showed that the Hebrew was the original language of the Testaments on three different counts:

- (1) The etymologies of the names; e.g. "Simeon" in T. Sim. 2-2 (1); "Gershom" in T. Levi 11-2 (2); "Judah" in T. Jud. 1-3 (3), etc., etc.
- (2) The Hebrew parallelism of poetry.
- (3) Mistranslations of Hebrew words; e.g. "King Zur" for "King of Hazor"; "King Tapuah" for "King of Tapuah".

Charles (4) writes that he was stimulated by Kohler's arguments to make a special study of the question, with the following results:

- (1) Hebrew constructions and expressions are prevalent throughout the work: "Though the vocabulary is Greek, the idiom is Hebraic", e.g. Reuben 3-8: $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\iota\omega\gamma\acute{\iota}\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omega\ \rho\acute{o}\mu\omega = \pi\eta\gamma\eta\ \gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\eta$
 " 4-6: $\sigma\acute{o}\kappa \epsilon\iota\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\omega} \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma = \sigma\alpha\gamma\chi\ \chi\epsilon\iota\lambda$
 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\omega} \epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\tau\omicron = \gamma\eta\gamma\ \iota\gamma$
- (2) Paronomasiae lost in the Greek can be restored by re-translation in the Hebrew. Examples of this are frequent and have to do mostly with the names of the Patriarchs as above treated.
- (3) Obscurity and unintelligibility in the Greek become clear on translation into the Hebrew. One example of this will suffice: T. Lev. 2-7, $\epsilon\tau\delta\omicron\nu \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota \epsilon\delta\omega\epsilon \pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon \kappa\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$. Here $\kappa\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu = \chi\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma$ which is probably corrupt for $\chi\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma$ or $\chi\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma = \epsilon\iota\varsigma \tau\omega\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ or $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \sigma\tau\epsilon\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$.^①

(5).

The third argument is conclusive. All this

- (1) Cf. Gen. 29-33.
- (2) Cf. Ex. 2-22.
- (3) Cf. Gen. 29-35
- (4) Ed. Test. XII Patr., London, 1906.
- (5) In Chagiga 12-b, the second heaven is called $\chi\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma$

points to the belief that the Greek text is a translation from the Hebrew. Furthermore, there are two Greek recensions. The inconsistencies in these two recensions are made clear when the text is re-translated into Hebrew; e.g., according to one recension, Reuben addresses his children (T. Reub. 4-1) as follows:

μοχθοῦντες ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς καὶ ἐν γραμμασί=

"expend your energies on good works and on learning".

According to the second recension:

μοχθοῦντες ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀποπλανώμενοι ἐν γραμμασί=

"expend your energies on works and departing in learning", which, of course, is unintelligible; but if both versions are translated into Hebrew, we can plainly see the source of the error. Thus, $\alpha' \gamma' \psi'$ (καλῶς) was wrongly read as $\alpha' \gamma' \psi\iota$ (καὶ ἀποπλανώμενοι) *i.e.*

$\alpha' \gamma' \tau\omicron\iota$ Such examples might be multiplied indefinitely, but the evidence could not be clearer, that the Testaments were originally composed in Hebrew.

We have thus far found that all the circumstances of date, authorship, aim and original language argue, beyond dispute, that the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" is a distinctively Jewish document, and a product of Jewish thought. As to the real identity of the author himself, we can say nothing certain, except that he was a Pharisee with priestly inclinations, for the book emphasizes the distinctive teachings which distinguished the Pharisees from the Sadducees (1).

- (1) Geiger thinks there are traces of Sadducean law throughout the book; but the book is not the work of Sadducean authors, because of the constant reference to the heavenly tablets of Enoch, and the spirits and angels participating in earthly affairs.

We shall now turn to the book from the viewpoint of ethical content and teachings, and shall treat it as a product and exponent of pre-Christian Jewish Ethics.

PART II.ETHICS OF THE BOOK.CHAPTER V.ETHICAL CONTENT.

The chief and overwhelming importance of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" lies, as has already been stated, in its ethical significance. As a product of ancient Essene or Hasidic circles, from which the old Haggada proceeded, it is fundamentally a work of moral exhortation in a narrative setting. It is neither a collection of moral maxims nor a philosophical system of ethical instruction; but it embodies that conception of morals and moral instruction which has always distinguished Jewish ethics from all other ancient systems.

Ethics in general is ordinarily defined as a systematized form of conduct grown into habit, or, as a rule or rules of conduct brought into a system; it is based on the idea of summum bonum applied to man individually or to society in general. It raises the question: what is the rule of conduct to achieve? And its answer is either individual happiness (Eudaimonism) or the state, society reaching its highest, most permanent good.

Such is the conception of ethics as a philosophical system. As such, it is altogether apart from the motive "to do right"; it simply comprises the facts of conduct involved in the relation between man and society; it develops these facts, finds ruling principles of conduct, and builds upon them its ethics. The ancient Greek ethics, for instance, was just such a philosophical system; it was in reality an aesthetics, with the symmetrical man as its end and aim. Greek ethics was thus either utilitarian, or, as with Plato, an intuitive or idealistic system of conduct, based

on the conception that it is after all a cosmic power or ideal after which man is to shape himself and attain the virtue necessary to make an ideal state. Another characteristic view of ancient ethics was the Oriental or Hindoo ascetic ethics, a negative conception, according to which the object of man is not so much to obtain happiness as to bear the burdens of life and retain a calm demeanor amid trials and suffering, to display, i.e., the wisdom of perfect quietude, perfect self-control; life is a great, painful struggle, therefore overcome life by this philosophical attitude of quietism.

It is patent that both of these systems, representative of the extremes of philosophical ethics, lack that which is the very heart of all true morality--the motive idea, or power to make life serve an ideal, i.e., the "ought" element, the consciousness of obligation is completely lacking. It is just this new element that Jewish ethics contains and emphasizes, and herein is Jewish ethics different from the systems above mentioned, while Christian ethics is a combination of all three systems, with the chief emphasis upon the pessimistic or ascetic element.

In point of fact it is erroneous to speak of Jewish ethics as a system or a philosophy. The Jew has no written codes (1) of morality; he has never taken the phenomenon of human conduct and scanned it in the cold light of philosophy; for him, ethics is neither a system of rules nor an abstraction of philosophy, but it is implicit in life itself; for him, moral valuation is inherent in the nature of man and inwoven in the very texture of the universe. The Jew lived his

- (1) The "Pirke Avoth" is not an ethical system, or code of rules, but a collection of famous Rabbinical utterances with ethical intent.

ethics; he never philosophized or moralized about it.

Now the Jewish ethics is peculiar for having the motive power of an ideal, i.e., the obliging power that lies in the religious idea; for the God-idea is the center of Jewish ethics. We cannot altogether separate religion from ethics. Not ethics as merely a science of conduct, but as containing the motive-power which is in religion alone, is the Jewish idea; the fundamental relationship between ethics and religion is characteristic of Jewish ethical thought. For the Jew, religion gives to ethics its sanction, i. e., the consciousness of obligation and responsibility. "I am the Lord, thy God" underlies his ethics; i.e., there is in man a higher "I", which is the "ought", the sanction, the sense of obligation, pointing back to that which we can only call religion. In other words, it is God who speaks to us through ethics. The ideal which ethics embodies is best defined by the Jewish idea of holiness: the God of holiness gives sanctity to every step of life, and to all the steps, individual or general which lead to human perfection.

Such is the view of ethics as reflected in the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". This work presents not a science of conduct, nor a philosophical system, nor a series of ethical maxims. It is a document which attempts to portray life, with God as the center of life. Throughout the whole book in all the patriarchal utterances, God is the sanction of right conduct and the motive of noble action. Simeon (4-4) e.g. says: "Now Joseph was a good man and had the spirit of God within him". Such passages are frequent throughout the work. Ethics and religion were for our author completely bound up with each other. True, the author's viewpoint is the Jewish religion, but--and this is noteworthy--it is not religion as a doctrinal or ceremonial system, but religion as a broad, underlying conception of life. It is significant that the author nowhere inculcates the observance of ceremonial law; the injunctions throughout the book are of a broadly religious-moral character. He decries the evils of envy, avarice, lying, incontinency, and exhorts to love of neighbor, compassion, integrity.

The breadth and scope of the author are at all times manifest. He is not merely negative in his moral requirements, demanding that this should not be done and that should be avoided; he is also strongly positive and direct in his moral appeal, extolling the virtues that move to action and contribute to the fulness of life. There is, however, one vice that is bitterly inveighed against by almost all the "Patriarchs". It is that of fornication. This is extremely interesting as it is a reflex of the period in which the author lived. It is not merely an exhortation to physical purity. It indicates the reaction of the Maccabean heroes and followers against the Hellenizing tendencies of luxury and lasciviousness that were then current, and the opposition to religious paganism and foreign admixture which the "Zealots" or Kanaim so vigorously assailed. Thus, just like physical purity, so was moral and religious purity a passion with the author of the "Testaments".

Before entering upon the ethical content of the Testaments in detail, it will be well to observe that a strong universalistic note underlies the work. This is especially manifest in the Messianic or apocalyptic sections. Unlike its sister-work, the Book of Jubilees, the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" is broadly humanitarian and admits the natives into its scheme of salvation. The Messianic era is a world era comprising all peoples, in which the righteous dead of all nations shall rise to share in the blessings of life.

But it is mainly as a work of hortatory ethics that the Testaments concerns us now. This element is chiefly characteristic of those sections of the book in which the patriarch is represented as relating his life-story to his assembled children and calling upon them to follow and observe the good which they themselves had observed, or steer clear of the evils and vices which they had indulged in, or steered clear of. Accordingly each patriarch has some special evil to condemn, on the ground of his own experience,

or some particular good to recommend, as follows:

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Reuben: | Evil desires, especially as regards women. |
| Simeon: | Envy. |
| Levi: | Priesthood and Pride. |
| Judah: | Courage, avarice and fornication. |
| Issachar: | Simplicity. |
| Zebulon: | Compassion and pity. |
| Dan: | Anger and falsehood. |
| Naphtali: | Natural goodness. |
| Gad: | Hatred. |
| Asher: | Integrity and duplicity. |
| Joseph: | Chastity and temperance. |
| Benjamin: | Purity of the heart. |

Each one of these qualities, good or bad, is given definiteness and concreteness by vivid illustrations from the life and career of the patriarch. Each "testament" is like a confession in which actual facts are first stated, after which the ethical implications or lessons are drawn. Thus, the evident ethical purpose of the first Testament (Reuben) is to warn against fornication and lascivious thoughts, and to inculcate chastity and purity. Accordingly he relates the story (1) of his incestuous crime with Bilhah in Edar near Bethlehem: he recounts how in consequence of this God smote him with a dread disease of the loins; and how deeply he repented (2) and atoned for his sinful act, until through his father's prayer he recovered. In the spirit of this confession and sincere statement of penitence, Reuben gives voice to deep moral exhortations; he draws the moral lesson, as it were, from his own life and

(1) Cf. Gen. 35-21, 22.

(2) In connection with his repentance, Reuben speaks of fasting for a long period, and abstaining from wine, meat and pleasant bread (Cf. Dan 10-3; cf also, Pesik 159-b; Gen. Rab. 82-12, 84-18).

experience. He first enumerates and describes the "seven spirits (1) of deceit", or the spirits of Beliar, the arch-demon, "appointed against man"; the first and foremost of these evil spirits is fornication "seated in the nature and in the senses". These spirits or demons, symbolizing evil temptations, are opposed by truth, or the law of God; thus after naming them Reuben says: "and so perisheth every young man, darkening his mind from the truth, and not understanding the law of God, nor obeying the admonitions of his fathers, as befell me also in my youth. And now, my children, love the truth and it will preserve you". Reuben now proceeds to indicate directly the specific evils, which on the basis of his own experience, he desires and exhorts his descendants to avoid: "Pay no heed to the face of a woman (2), nor associate (be alone) with another man's wife (3), nor meddle with the affairs of womankind (4)". He particularly enjoins against lustful thoughts (5), for when man is filled with the spirit of Beliar, it is the imagination that can work great iniquity; man should not allow himself to be overcome, or captivated by the enticing

- (1) Fornication, incontinence, fighting, obsequiousness, pride, lying, injustice. These are represented as those spirits of deceit or temptation which lie in wait for youth. The demonology of the Testaments is very complicated. We shall refer to this more in detail later.
- (2) Cf. Matt. 5-28; Sefre Nu. 115; Ber. 12-b, 14-a; Ned. 20-b; B. B. 57-b; Ab. Zorah 20-a.b.
- (3) Sanhed. 21-a; Sirach 9-9, 41-17, 21.
- (4) Kid. 70-a, 80-b; Avoth 1-5; Sirach 41-21.
- (5) Ber. 12-a; Yoma 29-a.

charms and devices of woman (1). Reuben here, of course, refers to the pernicious influence of lascivious thought; he emphasizes the fact, that, not only licentious conduct, but even the longing for licentiousness or מִלִּצְוֹת , is destructive (2). What Reuben is here insisting upon is purity of heart. This is the positive element in his teaching. Purity of mind and wholesome mental occupation are a steel-clad armor of defense against the machinations of Beliar, the spirit of fornication. "For if fornication overcome not your mind, neither can Beliar overcome you", i.e., Beliar has no power over the pure. Thus the central ethical thought in Reuben is that a pure mind is requisite to a pure life. Here we have a recognition of the subtle power of mental suggestion and association. Reuben advises healthful pre-occupation; he exhorts his children not to succumb to the vicious influence of woman's beauty, "but walk in singleness of heart in the fear of the Lord, and expend labor on good works, and on study and on your flocks until the Lord give you a wife.....that ye suffer not as I did". Reuben cites Joseph as one who was saved from temptation by his singleness of heart in the fear of God. The Testament closes with a monition to submit to the joint rule of Levi and Judah. A brief resume of the rest of the Testaments will show us that they follow, as a rule, the same plan as the Testament of Reuben.

- (1) Prov. 6-25; Sirach 23-4; Eccles. 7-26.
The description of the arts and wiles of wicked women (Reuben 5-1,4) strongly reminds us of Prov. 7.
- (2) Job 31-1; Prov. 7-26,27.

SIMEON-----ENVY.

Simeon tells his children of his jealousy of Joseph; how he hated him and plotted his death, but was prevented by Judah who sold Joseph into slavery. Simeon regards the paralysis of his right hand as a divine punishment. He sincerely repents and fasts for two years. He speaks of his imprisonment in Egypt by Joseph as a just punishment (1). Then, on the basis of his own experience, Simeon warns his children against jealousy, describing its great destructive power. Joseph is an example to be emulated; he loved his brothers, even though they hated him, for the evil eye had no power over him (2). Simeon then voices a most beautiful description of the Messianic era, when the "prince of deceit" and the "spirit of jealousy" will give way to the fear of God; after envy is banished from the heart, triumph and victory will come and the kingdom of the God of Israel will be established. The Testament closes with a warning not to rebel against the Maccabean dynasty, represented by Levi, the priest, and Judah, the king.

(1) Cf. Targ, Yer. to Gen. 37-19, 42-24;
Gen. Rab. 91-6.

(2) Cf. Targ. Yer. to Gen. 49-22; Sotah 36-b.

LEVI-----PRIDE.

Levi tells his children of his election to the priesthood (1). As a youth, he beheld the iniquity and corruptness of man and was filled with the deepest sorrow. God answers his petition for salvation through an angel, and shows him the throne of God in the third heaven (2). Levi is then invested with the priestly dignity, by the divine command to stand in the presence of God and serve him as his son. He is to be endowed with understanding in order to become a light of knowledge to Israel. The priesthood is conferred upon him by angels. The three kingdoms, (1st) the priests, (2nd) the scribes, and (3rd) the guardians of the sanctuary are to spring from him. These are represented by Moses (Nu. 12-7), Aaron and John Hyrcanus, the royal priest, who in addition was to manifest prophetic power (3). Levi recounts his act of vengeance on Schechem (4) "the city of folly", as in accord with the will of God and as fitting him for the priesthood. Levi then exhorts his children to walk in the way of the Law, in simplicity of heart and in the fear of God. The

- (1) Kohler believes that this Testament contains two different accounts of Levi's election: (1) a Hasidean account, spiritual in character (Ch. 1-4), and (2) a Maccabean account (Ch. 5-7) political in character. Charles thinks that, while this Testament bears the marks of extensive revision and reduction, these two tendencies, Pharisean and Maccabean, are characteristic of the author throughout the groundwork.
- (2) The doctrine of the seven heavens was current in Judaism before and after C. E. It is elaborated in 2 Enoch; it is also found in Tal. Chag. 12-b; Ber. Rab. Ch. 6, and is implied in 4 Ezra 6-81,87.
- (3) Cf. Josephus, B. J. 1-2, pr. 8. Josef. Sotah 13-5.
- (4) Cf. Jubilees 30-17,23.

study of the Law should never cease, but should be transmitted from generation to generation. "Get knowledge" is the keynote of this Testament. A wonderful eulogy is addressed to Wisdom, which we shall refer to more in detail later. The Testament concludes with a prophecy in which "Beliar will be bound" by the Messiah and the saints will triumph (1).

JUDAH-----COURAGE, AVARICE AND FORNICATION.

Judah recounts the numerous deeds of bravery and incredible strength which he performed in his youth. He boasted of his purity and had even reproved Reuben for his misdeed with Bilhah. But, through wine, he meets his own downfall; while intoxicated he is ensnared by Bath Shua, and later deceived by his own daughter-in-law, Tamar. Therefore, he warns his children against boastfulness, covetousness, licentiousness and especially against overindulgence in wine; for "wine turneth the mind away from the truth, inspires the passion of lust, and leadeth into error". Judah further instructs his children that Satan is the cause of sin and the Lord is the spirit of truth, and according as one acts in compliance with the one or the other, are his deeds registered in his character, stamping him as good or evil. Choice must be made between these two spirits, and this is possible by exercise of the will. Judah, like the others, closes his Testament with a Messianic prophecy regarding the resurrection of the righteous, the triumph of the poor and the martyrs, and the burning of Beliar and his hosts.

- (1) In this Test. (Ch. 10, 14-17) occur some of the Jewish additions of the 1st cent. B.C., in which is condemned the corruption of the Maccabean priesthood under Jannai.

ISSACHAR-----SIMPLICITY.

Issachar recounts to his children the simplicity and blamelessness of his life. He is the single-hearted husbandman who scorns all luxuries and covets not gold, who is free from envy and malice and greed, who shuns lust and looks forth on life with a single eye, who loves God and his neighbor; who shared his first-fruits with the priest, and with the poor and afflicted and therefore was greatly blessed; he spoke ill of no one, meddles in no one's affairs, and harbored no lustful thoughts; he was happy with his wife and in his work. Therefore he admonishes his children to live the life of the husbandman (1), to walk in simplicity, to refrain from envy and lustful thoughts, to pry into no secrets, to love God and man, to be compassionate with the poor and feeble. He closes with the prophecy that by the practise of these virtues, Beliar will be subdued, and the rule of the wicked will cease.

ZEBULON-----COMPASSION.

Zebulon, like Issachar, (2) is Hasidically represented. He is a fisherman, sharing his catches

(1) In later literature, Issachar and his descendants, are represented as the main students of the law. Cf. Targ. Ps-Jon. and Jerus. Targ. on Gen. 49-15; 1 Chron. 12-32; Cf. Jew. Ency. Eng. VI, 676-7.

(2) Rabbinical conception of Zebulon; a merchant who supports Issachar while he devotes himself to the study of the Torah. Cf. Targ. Jer. to Dt. 33-18.

with the poor and needy, the stranger, and the sick and aged, that God may bless him for his compassion. He recounts to his children the selling of Joseph; recalls his deep compassion when the brothers wanted to kill him; how he refused to share in the money which the brothers got for selling Joseph; how he ever afterward led a life of compassion, giving away his own garment to clothe the naked and so was blessed by God, for, "as a man dealeth compassionately with his fellow-beings, so does God deal compassionately with him". (1) Zebulon therefore admonishes his children to show mercy to every man, to bear no grudge or malice, but to love one another, taking Joseph as an example. Finally, he warns against dissensions in Israel, and longs for the Messianic period, the downfall of Beliar and the triumph of God.

DAN-----ANGER AND FALSEHOOD.

Dan records his fierce anger against Joseph, which, under the influence of Belial, had been aroused in him by his father's favoritism; he confesses that he had desired to kill Joseph. He accordingly exhorts his children to refrain from anger, for it avails nothing; it blinds the eyes to truth and therefore leads to falsehood; it takes possession of the body and will, darkens the mind, and works for destruction. Anger may be aroused by mere words, but it leads to terrible action. "Therefore, my children", says Dan, "depart from wrath and hate lying, that the Lord may dwell among you, and Beliar may flee from you.....love the Lord through all your life, and one another with a true heart".

(1) Cf. Sifre. Dt. 96-Shab. 151-b.

NAPHTALI-----NATURAL GOODNESS.

Naphtali relates how he served his father (1) Jacob as a messenger and comforted him at the loss of Joseph. He speaks of the goodly portion of land that fell to the lot of his tribe (2), and warns his children against an overbearing attitude in time of prosperity. He exhorts them to observe the law of God and flee from the corruptions of Sodom, the idolatrous nations and the fallen angels in the days of Enoch. He narrates how each of the seventy nations worshipped its guardian angel as the deity, but Abraham preferred the one God and Creator; for Michael the guardian angel of Israel had taught him the Hebrew language so that he could learn the true order of things and the wisdom of creation. The Testament closes with an apocalypse referring to the Supremacy of Levi.

GAD-----HATRED.

Gad recalls his great strength which he displayed when as a youth he protected the flocks; he tells how Joseph carried tales to his father, for eating lambs slain by wild beasts (3), and how, on account of this, he was possessed of intense hatred for Joseph,

(1) The text of this Testament is corrupt. A Hebrew Testament of Naphtali was discovered by Gaster in the "Chronicle of Jerahmeel" (Germ. translation by Kautzsch, Apocryphen II, 489-492).

(2) Dt. 33-23.

(3) Cf. Targ. Jer. on Gen. 37-2, Pirke R. El. 38.

and desired to kill him. For eleven months he was stricken with heart-disease, and was saved from death only through his father's prayers and his own genuine repentance. He accordingly warns his children against the spirit of hatred, which, if harbored, fills the heart with poison, and prepares the way for Satan and every evil, leading to impiety and destruction. Love alone, conjoined with a repentant and forgiving nature, can effect the salvation of man. Gad's counsel of love and forgiveness is of a very high order and will occupy our attention later; we will here only quote a characteristic utterance: "Love ye one another in act, in word and in thought.....If one sin against thee tell him in peace, removing the poison of hate, and foster not guile in thy soul (1), and if he confess and repent, forgive him (2); and if he deny it, strive not with him, lest he swear and thus sin doubly.....but give the vengeance unto God (3)". "Envy not the prosperous, for the poor man who is free from envy is rich".

ASHER-----THE TWO CHARACTERS OF VIRTUE AND VICE.

Asher seeks to impress upon his children the truth, as he has learned from experience, that there are two ways of light and darkness, good and evil, truth and error, virtue and vice. These two ways are mutually exclusive and distinct, and must ever be kept so. No compromise is allowed; a quality is wholly good or wholly bad. Doublefacedness serves not God, but Belial. "Follow the truth with singleness of face and flee the spirits of error". "Cleave unto goodness only, for God hath his habitation therein".

(1) Cf. Lev. 19-17; Matt. 18-16.

(2) Cf. Luke 17-3; Yoma 87-a.

(3) Cf. Dt. 32-35; Rom. 12-19.

JOSEPH (1)-----CHASTITY.

Joseph recounts his steadfastness and faithful perseverance in the presence of all obstacles. He tells how his trust in God aided and sustained him in all his trials (2), when he was despised, sold and mistreated and cast in the face of temptation. He recalls his steadfastness while with Potiphar's wife; how he fasted and prayed for her conversion and desired to instruct her in the way of righteousness; when cast into prison he thanked God for his escape from her. "For God loveth him who in a den of darkness combines fasting with chastity, rather than the man who in king's chambers combines luxury with license" (IX-2). "If ye follow after chastity and purity in patience and humility of heart, the Lord will dwell among you, because he loveth chastity". (X-2). Joseph further relates (X-5, XVIII) how he refused to reveal his birthplace and family to the merchants who bought him or to Potiphar, but preferred to be considered a slave, rather than expose his brothers and put them to shame. "Therefore", says he to his children, "love one another and with long-suffering hide each other's faults, for God delighteth in the unity of brethren" (XVII-2).

- (1) It is very probable, as Kohler has pointed out, that we have in this Testament two different aspects of Joseph by two different authors; (1) I-X-4, the same type of chastity as he is represented in the Rabbinic Haggadah (Targ. Jer. on Gen. 49-22; Sotah 36-b; Pirke R. El. 39) (2) X-5, XVIII, as the model of brotherly love; this part is written in simple prose and probably is the earlier. The first part (I-X,4) is written in a strong, poetic style.

- (2) Here, as in the case of Issachar, we have the picture of a Hasid, a persecuted saint.

BENJAMIN-----PURITY OF HEART.

Benjamin is here, as in Rabbinical literature (1), represented as the one who clings affectionately to his brother Joseph. He speaks to his children of the nobility of Joseph's character; how Joseph overlooked the wicked deed of his brothers and did not want his father to hear of it. Therefore Benjamin sets up Joseph as an example of the good man; and he admonishes his children always to occupy their mind with thoughts of the good and the pure. The good man has no "evil eye"; he is compassionate even to sinners; he loves the upright, does not envy the rich and is merciful to the poor; the evil spirits cannot harm him, but he influences the wicked for good; he looks not on women with lust; he is of the same character as Joseph who could not be defiled by sin any more than the sun can be defiled "by shining on dung and mire". (VIII-3). The Testament closes with an apocalypse based on Gen. 49-27 and Dt. 33-12.

(1) Cf. Gen. Rab. 94-7.

CHAPTER VI.

ETHICAL STANDARDS.

"And now, my children, make your hearts good before the Lord, and your ways straight before men, and ye shall find grace before the Lord and men".
Test. Simeon 5-2.

It cannot be too strongly urged that the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" do not attempt to offer a presentation of ethics in a philosophical or scientific form. The book is not descriptive but narrative and hortatory. Yet there are certain ultimate ethical bases or presuppositions which consistently underlie the entire work and afford us a view of the moral standards and concepts current in its day. These concepts are only implied, not stated in the work. Although there is no attempt to deal with the subtler questions involved, after all, the writer manifests in a broad way a certain philosophical attitude toward the more fundamental ethical problems, enabling us, with proper ethical perspective, to make an approximate estimate of the moral temper of the time. The book marks in many respects a considerable advance over the moral standards of the Old Testament. There is a greater (though of course not yet complete) consciousness of self in relations to other selves. An appreciable increase is apparent in the sense of ethical personality, of the value of the individual in his relations, not to the social body, but to other individuals. The sense of social solidarity, for which the Jewish people have always been peculiar, was still very strong. But we shall see that the document which we are considering, is characterized by a broad humanitarian outlook and by moral principles and standards of a very high order.

We are dealing here, as we have already had occasion to remark, with theological, or, more correctly, religious ethics. For our author, the moral is deeply rooted in the divine. An admirable illustration of this identity of the religious and ethical motives is found in the passage from the Testament of Simeon quoted at the head of this chapter. The good man is the God-like man. The type of ideal goodness and moral perfection is the Hasid, the saint, who in the extremity of distress looks to God for guidance and protection. Thus Joseph (ch. 1) addresses his children:

"I have seen in my life envy and death,
Yet I went not astray, but persevered in the truth
of the Lord,.....

I was beset with hunger, and the Lord himself
nourished me,

I was alone and God comforted me,
I was sick, and the Lord visited me,
In bonds, and He released me,
Slandered, and He pleaded my cause,.....
Envied by my fellow-slaves, and He exalted me".

In a more positive manner, Issachar in the course of summing up his past life, says:

"Guile arose not in my heart,
A lie passed not through my lips;
If any man were in distress, I joined my sighs with his,
And I shared my bread with the poor;
I wrought Godliness, all my days I kept truth;
I loved the Lord,
Likewise also every man with all my heart".

It is at once plain that our author is not concerned in any speculative manner, to seek the why and wherefore of morality. He does not for a moment seek to justify moral conduct, except to refer to God. Thus, for him, morality is axiomatic, an ultimate deliverance of human consciousness; it is immediate and intuitional. It is true the Patriarchs in some cases speak of some misfortune as a direct visitation of God for the violation of the moral law, or less often,

of material well-being as the natural consequence of obeying God's law. But in no case is the utilitarian motive, in the grosser sense, directly advanced. There is not a single evidence of a belief in proportionate retribution throughout the book. On the contrary, there is the strongest kind of a tendency toward the sentiment of "virtue for virtue's sake" (1). The purpose of the author in this regard is unmistakable: Benjamin, in his characterization of "the good man" utters these significant words (T. Benj. 6-23) "He gazeth not passionately upon corruptible things, nor gathereth together riches through a desire for pleasure. He delighteth not in pleasure, he sateth not himself with luxuries.....for the Lord is his portion". Levi addresses his children thus: (T. Levi 2-12) "And from the Lord's portion shall be thy life, And He shall be thy field and vineyard, And fruits, gold and silver". Issachar, in his beautiful description of the man of integrity, says: (T. Issach. 4-2,3). "The single-hearted man coveteth not gold, He overreacheth not his neighbor, He longeth not after manifold dainties, He delighteth not in varied apparel, He doth not desire to live a long life, But only waiteth for the will of God". Thus, God's law and the moral law are identical. The motive of morality is God, or the "fear of God". "Walk in singleness of heart in the fear of God". (T. Reub. 4-1). "Deliverance from envy cometh by the fear of God". (T. Sim. 3-4). "The fear of God overcometh hatred". (Gad 5-4). "He that feareth God and loveth his neighbor cannot be smitten by the spirit of Beliar, being shielded by the fear of God". (T. Benj. 3-4) (2).

(1) We shall show in detail, later, that the doctrine of retributive justice is, with our author, a purely ethical conception.

(2) This expression, "fear of God", which is so often distorted out of its true significance by Christian theologians, is not a term of relentless compulsion, or external coercion,

As a corollary of this our author goes even further and expressly states that the moral law has the same binding and absolute force as the natural law; morality seems to be a component part of the universe, an established order of human relations corresponding to the order of natural phenomena. Thus Naphtali says: "Sun and moon and stars change not their order; so do ye also change not the law of God in the disorderliness of your doings". Also, "God made all things good in their order.....so, my children, let all your works be done in order with good intent in the fear of God and do nothing disorderly in scorn or out of its due season". (T. Naph. 3-2;2-9). Law and morality are thus correlated and interdependent conceptions.

It is clear then, that for our author, God is the ultimate source of ethics and the motive of morality. It will now be observed, as a consequence of this very doctrine, that a strong dualistic conception of morals pervades the document. On the one side is God and morality; on the other is the devil and immorality, and the two are mutually exclusive. A well developed symbolic demonology runs through the Testaments. "Beliar" is the Satan or chief of the evil spirits; he is called the "Prince of Deceit". Throughout he is represented as the opposing principle of God and the source of evil works. God is truth; Beliar is deceit: God is light; Beliar is darkness.

but is interchangeable with "love the Lord", "keep the law of God", etc. The Testaments throughout breathe an intimate relationship of close communion between God and man. The attitude of man to God in the Testaments is one of filial devotion and reverence; and of God to man, one of parental love and mercy. Cf. T. Benj. 9-2, 11-2; T. Dan 5-3,9; T. Jud. 24-2,3; Iss. 7-7; T. Lev. 3-2, 17-2, 18-6,13; Zeb. 9-7, 6-4 and passive. The view of the individual Israelite as a son of God was already current in the second century B. C. Cf. Sir. 23-1, 51-10,

The main function of these evil "spirits" is to tempt men (1). Such are the seven spirits of deceit which lie in wait for youth (T. Reub. 2-1,2). These are the spirits of fornication, insatiableness, fighting, pride, lying, injustice (T. Reub. 3-3,6). Besides these are the spirits of lust, hot desire, profligacy and filthy lucre (T. Jud. 16-1); the spirit of jealousy (T. Jud. 13-3); of envy (T. Sim. 3-1, 4-7); which are spoken of as the poisonous spirits (T. Sim. 4-9); and of anger (T. Dan 2-4). There are also spirits of murder (T. Dan 1-7); of idolatry (T. Naph. 3-3); and lust (T. Jos. 7-4). Each of these spirits has its own particular task; as a whole their function is to oppose and resist the work of God. Accordingly moral goodness and badness are absolute terms, immediately discernible and unmistakable in their character. Thus Asher unequivocally declares (T. Ash. 5-3): "Nor may it be said that truth is a lie, nor right wrong". The good is God, the wicked is Beliar. There is no relative or intermediary position.

We can, in the light of this uncompromising dualism, understand the sharp condemnations of the various vices. Fornication, for example, is immoral not merely as a physical debauchery, but as representing a backsliding from God. "For a pit unto the soul is the sin of fornication, separating it from God and bringing it near to idols". (T. Reub. 4-6). It is in reality spiritual unfaithfulness (2). Adultery and idolatry thus go hand in hand (3).

(1) In T. Levi 3-2, however, they are referred to as spirits of retribution for vengeance on lawless men; in T. Ash. 6-5 it is said that the evil spirit to which a man has succumbed waits for his soul after death in order to torment it. Thus the evil spirits have also a secondary function of punishment.

(2) Cf. Wisd. 14-12.

(3) Cf. T. Sim. 5-3; Kethub 11-b: "most idolaters are adulterers".

This thoroughgoing dualism is logically carried over into psychological dualism, in the realm of man's moral character. Man is constituted in the image of God (1); he is composed of two elements, body and spirit conformable to each other. He is the embodiment of form (the God-idea) in substance (2) (the human body). At creation, man is a composite of two opposing selves. Here the absolute dualism of the author clearly manifests itself. "Two ways (3) hath God given to the sons of men and two inclinations and two modes of actions (4)." The reference here is to the good and evil inclinations (5) which God implanted in man from the beginning. These two principles are mutually antagonistic. Thus: "All things

(1) T. Napht. 2-5.

(2) T. Napht. 2-2. While there is a vague intimation here of Platonic differentiation of form and matter, the tendency is rather toward Aristotelian entelechy. There are occasional references in the Testaments to the weakness of "the flesh", but nowhere a trace of "total depravity" as an out and out doctrine. Both the opposing principles here have their residence, as potentialities, in the whole character or soul.

(3) This is the earliest occurrence of this phrase in Jewish literature. The idea was probably suggested by Jer. 21-8: "Thus, with the Lord, behold I set before you the way of life and the way of death". Cf. Pirke Avoth 2-12,13; we are also strongly reminded of Dt. 30-15,19; see Journal of Philol. XXI 243-258.

(4) T. Ash. 1-3.

(5) This is the oldest reference to the good inclination in Jewish literature; see Porter's "Yetzer Hara" in Biblical and Semitic Studies; Taylor's "Sayings of the Fathers", pp. 37-8, 148-152, 186-192; Charles' Ed. of the Apocalypse of Baruch, pp. 92-3. In the Hebrew Serach 15-14 we read: "God created man from the beginning.....and gave him into the hand of his inclination (/ 75');" Ser. 21-11: "He that keepeth the law, gets the mastery of his evil inclination (/ 75')."

are by twos, one over against the other; there are two ways of good and evil and with these are the two inclinations in our breast, discriminating them". (1). The absolute and antipodal nature of moral and immoral action is thus plainly asserted. The two kinds of conduct are clearly defined: "If the soul take pleasure in the good inclination, all its actions are in righteousness.....but if it incline to the evil inclination, all its actions are in wickedness.....and it is ruled by Beliar". (2) Thus man's moral nature is two-fold and his dominant character is determined according as he inclines to the one or the other principle. Divine prescience is posited (3); yet perfect moral freedom is accorded to man. The determining factor is the will, with which man has likewise been endowed. Exercise of the will is the distinct moral function in making the choice between the two principles which are implanted in man. "Two spirits wait upon man--the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit. And in the midst is the spirit of the understanding of the mind to which it belongeth to turn whithersoever it will". (4) Man is at no disadvantage in this struggle with the evil principle represented by Beliar; for while man comprehends both the opposing principles (the good and the evil) Beliar has power over the evil spirit alone; he cannot sway the good inclination. The ultimate choice lies with man. Thus Levi addresses his children (T. Levi 19-1): "Choose therefore for yourselves, either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord, or the works of Beliar". Each act of man in this process is

- (1) T. Ash. 1-4,5.
- (2) T. Ash. 1-6,8.
- (3) T. Jud. 20-3.
- (4) T. Jud. 20-1,2.

registered in his character; the results of his volitions are written upon his heart (1) (i.e., his character) and are always open to the knowledge of God. The important point to be observed here is that ultimately man's own character is the seat of his moral activity. Thus Naphtali (2-6) says: "As a man's strength, so is his work....and as his soul, so also is his word, either in the law of the Lord, or in the works of Beliar".

We have here a clearly defined position on the moral question. Man at birth is neither good nor bad. Nothing external to him predetermines his character; potentiality of the moral nature and, therefore, perfect human freedom is thus formulated. Man is the master of his own destiny, a creature of his own moral will. In the passages which we have already cited from T. Judah (XX-2,5) (2), we have an admirable expression of man's attitude to good and evil which are personified as the "spirits" of good and evil. The notable factor here is that while these two principles oppose each other, man himself is the final arbiter; it is his will that determines for either. The power of the will is fully emphasized; its exercise in choice and discrimination makes for the fully developed character; by the attainment of "moral wisdom" (3) (acts of virtue conjoined with knowledge and study of the law) man identifies himself with his potentially moral self, i.e., with the good principle or the **רִשְׁוֹן הַטֹּב**; by an opposite course of action, he attaches himself as it were, to the evil principle or the **רִשְׁוֹן הָרָע**. The evil spirits have power only

(1) T. Jud. 20-3. According to Jer. 31-33, God writes His law on the hearts of men, but man can also write these on his own heart according to Prov. 3-3: "Write them on the tables of thy heart".

(2) P. 55.

(3) T. Lev. 13-1,9.

over those who consciously sanction and approve of, and therefore, choose by the exercise of their own will and discrimination, the evil course; in other words, man alone predetermines his own moral self. Thus, those who are inclined to be faithless and wicked are easy prey for the evil spirits; these spirits at first merely tempt men to sin; if the tempted ones yield, then the spirits take full possession of the moral nature, and use ~~its~~ ^{their} victims as ~~its~~ ^{their} own instruments. Thus, for example, man's yetzer ($\gamma\varsigma'$) is blinded by covetousness and fornication (T. Jud. 18-3); it is stirred into anger by envy (T. Sim. 4-8); the youth is blinded by impulse ($\gamma\eta\gamma\varsigma'$) his better nature grows steadily weaker, until his character becomes completely vitiated, when he is an abject slave to passion and vice (T. Jud. 11-1). But, if, on the other hand, man asserts his better nature ($\gamma\omega\eta\gamma\varsigma'$), if he is single hearted and clings to the truth, then the spirits of deceit can wield no power over him nor even come into contact with him; Beliar, the prince of evil, must flee from him, for the righteous rule over these evil spirits and "tread them under foot". In the downward process toward complete moral degeneration three steps are recognized: first, the soul (the will) inclines to perverse actions; next its modes of action are defined; it drives away the good and cleaves consciously to the evil; finally, the result, it becomes a slave of Beliar. This approximates in a wonderful way the view of the ethical process from the modern standpoint in which unrelated impulses are gradually formed into a body of habits which then determine the character.

We have seen that the Testaments recognize the soul in which the function of the will resides, as the seat of moral worth. This determines and stamps the moral character. Freedom, with our author, is freedom as an ethical implication; it is not considered negatively as an abstract liberty of choice, a selection of a line of conduct by pure will. This is absurd because man cannot lift himself above himself. Pure will having no manhood with it, or inner constraint, is worthless as an expression of man. But, as our author would say in modern terms, affirmatively and positively, freedom is the ability of man to be himself in accordance with the highest moral law--God's law,

which he has consciously accepted and recognized as his own. It is not a yielding to the strongest motive; there is no motive apart from the man. The motive is a present state of consciousness and is what it is because the man is what he is. The man is what he is because of two factors: 1st, original equipment at birth (i.e., potential powers) and, 2nd, his own personal reaction (i.e., exercise of will).

Throughout the book, the one great ethical quality, the determining feature of moral conduct, and that which enables man to identify himself with his better nature (*לבוה נש'*) and overcome the temptations and advances of Beliar, is mental purity. This is the positive teaching of the author par excellence. Here also can we discern the inwardness of the author's moral comprehension and ethical doctrines. Purity of the heart is the great moral desideratum and the basis of moral action. It is true that man is only potentially good; yet his *לבוה נש'* represents that in him which is God-given; it is his moral self; it is that which constitutes his protection against the evil angels. Man starts out in life equipped with mental (moral) purity. He has the making of his character in his own hands. His moral freedom is his greatest asset. By means of this he can react in a moral way to the conditions which life presents. By "singleness of heart", the author means cleanness, wholesomeness of thought. This enables man to remain morally pure in the midst of all temptations. Thus the author constantly urges purity of mind as the stoutest weapon against the spirits of evil. "If fornication overcomes not your mind, neither can Beliar overcome you". (1). This is equivalent to saying that if the vicious, unreasoning impulse is checked at its inception by the effort of the mind, i.e., if the thoughts are kept clear of the lower animal desires, by earnest, wholesome occupation allowing no room for them, then the temptation itself is removed, Beliar is cast out, and the

(1) T. Reub. 4-11.

character is saved from the vitiating influence of yielding to the ignoble impulse. Beliar has no power over the pure. "If you wish to be pure in mind guard your senses" says Reuben (6-1). The power of the mind (reflection and reason) to control sense-impressions is here asserted. "Let your mind be unto good", says Benjamin, "for he that hath his mind right seeth all things rightly". "Where there is light in the mind, darkness fleeth away". (Benj. 5-3). "If ye keep silence in purity of heart, ye shall understand how to hold fast the will of God, and to cast away the will of Beliar". (T. Napht. 3-1). "The good mind hath not two tongues of blessing and of cursing.....of hypocrisy and of truth; but it hath one disposition incorrupt and pure". (T. Benj. 6-5). The most significant expression in the book regarding the purity of the mind as an ethical dictum is voiced by Benjamin in these words: "He that hath a pure mind.....looketh not after a woman with a view to fornication; for (if) he hath no defilement in his heart, because the spirit of God resteth upon him. For as the sun cannot be defiled by shining on dung and mire, but rather drieth up both and driveth away the impurity; so also the pure mind, tho' encompassed by the defilements of earth rather cleanseth them and is not itself defiled" (1). This statement is remarkable for the author's grasp regarding the incorruptibility of character; i.e., of an ordered, moral character, and its power of resistance to evil.

Purity of heart, or the spirit of truth (מִטְבַּח טָהוֹר) is identified by our author with the spirit of God. With the exception of Sirach (17-3) our author is probably the first one to quote the statement in Genesis (1-27) (that man was created in the image of God) for an ethical purpose (2). This God-likeness is man's potentially moral self; it is given to him in trust and must be guarded from contamination until it is returned to its divine source.

(1) T. Benj. 8-2,3.

(2) T. Napht. 2-5.

The following notable words are from the (Hebrew) Testament of Naphtali (10-8,9): "God hath poured into man a living soul and a pure spirit from Himself; blessed is the man who does not defile the holy spirit of God which hath been put and breathed into him, and blessed is he who returns it to his Creator as pure as it was on the day when He entrusted it to him".

By this insistence on mental purity, the author clearly recognizes what in modern psychological phraseology we would term ideomotor activity, or the interaction between thinking and doing, judging and acting, or between mind and conduct. The dictum, "actions declare the man" would thus mean for our author that a man's actions (i.e., his habits of action) exhibit his judgments, for when a man judges, he at the same time acts, and the reverse is correspondingly true. Thus our author would say: "As a man thinketh in his heart so does he". This thinking (or judging process) is approving, accepting a certain line of conduct and is therefore itself indispensable factor in the formation of character.

In keeping with this lofty conception, our author lays very great stress on the inner character of moral worth and on the spirit. The intent, the motive, is with him of prime importance. Joseph says, regarding his experience with the wife of Potiphar: "And not even in thought did I incline to her". In describing the moral qualities of the good man, Gad says (T. Gad 5-5): "He will not do wrong to any man even in thought". Herein is contained the principle that lies at the basis of all the commands in the famous "Sermon on the Mount"; (Matt. 5-21 ff), requiring the heart, not merely outward conformance. Our author understands well that morality cannot be achieved through external restraints or the coercion of legalism. It is true, the term, "law of God" occurs frequently in the book, but nowhere is the dry, fruitless formalism of Halacha or even any priestly cult or ceremonialism enjoined. On the contrary, the deep spirituality of his ethical teaching is everywhere given expression throughout the Testaments. Asher in his noteworthy description of "The Two Ways", in no uncertain tones condemns fasting when combined in mock piety with adultery; performance of commandments

when combined with moral worthlessness, and charity combined with cruelty. This "doublefacedness" is represented as a most despicable trait. A man cannot excuse his inner corruptness and depravity by the observance of outward forms and ceremonies. God will not accept the "seeming good" as the genuine good". (T. Gad II, III).

The spiritual inwardness of the book and its emphasis on personality is further illustrated by its teaching as to conscience. This belongs to the two-fold function of the spirit of goodness or truth, which not only inspires to good action but also acts as an accuser within the heart of the sinner. This is contained in the remarkable words of Judah (20-5): "And the spirit of truth testifieth all things and accuseth all; but the sinner is burnt up by his own heart and cannot raise his face to the Judge". The spirit of truth is thus almost equivalent to "conscience" (1) understood not so much as the source of moral obligation, but as the faculty which passes judgment upon actions after they are done. The action of the conscience is also described by Gad (5-3): "He that is just and honorable is ashamed to do what is unjust, being reprov'd not of another, but of his own heart". "Conscience" thus pronounces judgment on our own actions, not on those of others. The sinner is thus arraigned before the bar of his own conscience, and in the court of self-introspection. He may escape the punishment imposed by men or devised by statute, but he cannot stifle the consciousness of sin and the indictment of self-condemnation. Herein, our author has attained a wonderful insight into the moral situation. Reuben (4-3) speaks of his own "conscience" (*ovrelon ois*) troubling him all his life for his incestuous crime. The working of the conscience is further illustrated by its power to manifest itself even on the external features of man.

- (1) This is the first time in Jewish literature that the conscience appears as a developed conception. Cf. Eccles. 10-20.

Note the following significant words from Simeon (5-1): "Joseph was comely and goodly to look upon, because no wickedness dwelt in him; for some of the trouble of the spirit the face manifesteth". "Conscience" in the Testaments is God working in man; it is peculiarly an inner reality; it is the essentially personal element of the power to judge or distinguish between right and wrong. The final judge of our conduct is therefore not man (i. e., anything external) but God. "For good men" says Asher (4-1), "they that are of single-face, though they be thought by them that are double-faced to sin, are just before God".

The author's doctrine of sin, punishment and repentance, affords us a still clearer view of his moral grasp. We have already seen how sin is identified with the spirits of evil ($\gamma\tau\eta\ \gamma\varsigma'$); yet human responsibility is throughout maintained. Sin is the identification of self with the $\gamma\tau\eta\ \gamma\varsigma'$ or Beliar through conscious exercise of the will. But Zebulon (9-7) speaks of the weakness of the flesh and the possibility of being deceived; therefore God's abundant mercy and pardon are ever at hand for the truly repentant sinner, who, persisting in the right, can cast out every spirit of Beliar. Sin, according to the author, may be broadly classed as (1st) *ayroia* (1) and (2nd) *aropia*. The first refers not so much to the failure to recognize a wrong committed as to the failure to acknowledge it. Ignorance in itself, although a plea for pardon, cannot be regarded as an excuse for sin. An example of *ayroia* is the act of Zebulon (1-4,5) in not revealing to his father the crime of his brothers in selling Joseph. This refers both to the sin actually committed and to the wicked deed intended or only in the thoughts. Intent has here a prominent place. Simeon's (2) hatred of Joseph which made him contemplate the sin of murder is regarded by God as much a crime as if he had

(1) Cf. T. Reub. 1-6; T. Lev. 3-5; T. Jud. 19-3.

(2) T. Sim. 2-1.

actually committed the murder; hence punishment is meted out to him accordingly. We have here the original conception, of which the (Apostolic) doctrine is an echo: "He that hateth his brother is-a murderer".

The inner nature of sin was thus clearly in the mind of the writer. In describing the evil effects of specific sins, he lays greatest emphasis on the vitiating and corroding influence on the character. Observe the description of the demoralizing effects of fornication (T. Reuben, 4, 5, 6); of avarice (T. Jud. 18, 19); Gad's vivid portrayal of the vicious effects of hatred (T. Gad 3, 4, 5, Cf. T. Dan 2, 3, 4); and Simeon's picture of the destructiveness of envy, as a poisonous spirit, taking possession of and transforming the whole personality, darkening the mind, lowering the moral tone and souring the entire nature of the victim (T. Sim. 4-8,9; Cf. Gad 7).

This is, however, no irretrievable condition. Repentance and recovery are possible, no matter how depraved the sinner. This also is an inner process. True repentance involves the acknowledgement of the wrong committed, the subjugation of every evil inclination, and a genuine desire to be restored to the former purity, i.e., to regain the לְטוֹרָה "True repentance after a goodly sort, driveth away the darkness, enlighteneth the eyes, giveth knowledge to the soul and leadeth the mind to salvation" (T. Gad 5-6,8) (1). Moreover, in this process God helps the sinner in his efforts to repent (Cf. T. Zeb. 9-4). The saving grace of love is here taught. "The spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long suffering unto the salvation of men". (T. Gad 4-7).

The author's teaching on retribution is surprising for its moral depth and its marked advance on the prevailing thought of its time. Punishment for sin is nothing externally imposed. The writer of the Testaments holds the doctrine of retributive justice.

(1) Cf. also T. Reub. 1-9, 2-1; T. Sim. 2-13; T. Jud. 15-4; T. Jos. 6-6; T. Benj. 5-4.

Sin brings its own punishment in this world. The most striking expression of this teaching is found in Gad (5-10): "For by what things a man transgresseth, by the same also is he punished". We have here, not the doctrine of a definite set of laws covering a definite set of sins; but the author recognizes the profound truth of "moral recoil", i.e., the inevitable law of compensation (punishment following in the wake of sin) operating upon men as irrevocably as the natural law of cause and effect. This is a wonderful advance on the primitive human law of retaliation, of "tit for tat". It is all the more remarkable in the work we are now considering, since the old mechanical view seems to have been literally accepted in the second century B. C. (1). The law of retributive justice is here spiritually conceived and is the forerunner of the New Testament words: "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap", (Gal. 6-7) or, "He that doeth wrong shall receive again the wrong that he hath done" (Col. 3-25). Note these words from Levi (T. Lev. 13-6): "Sow good things in your souls, that ye may find them in your life. But if ye sow evil things, Ye shall reap every trouble and affliction". In positive form we have this law expressed in Zebulun (T. Zeb. 5-3): "Even as a man doeth to his neighbor, even so will the Lord do to him"; similarly (6-6b): "He that shareth with his neighbor receiveth manifold more from the Lord"; in still more positive form (Ibid 8-1,3): "Have, my children, compassion towards every man with mercy, that the Lord also may have compassion and mercy upon you. For in the degree in which a man hath compassion upon his neighbors, in the same degree hath the Lord also upon him" (2)

(1) Cf. Bk. of Jub. 4-31,32; 2 Macc. 5-10, 15-32,33.

(2) Cf. Dt. 13-18. This sentiment (T. Zeb. 5-3) has been attributed to Gamliel II (80-105 C.E.) but it is more probable that Gamliel drew on our author. In Shabb. 151b occurs the following:
 כָּל הַטָּרָח עַל הַבְּרִיּוֹת מִדְּרַחֲמֵי עַלְיוֹן כֵּן הַטָּרָח
 וְכָל שִׂיחָו מִדְּרַחֲמֵי עַל הַבְּרִיּוֹת אֵין מִדְּרַחֲמֵי עַלְיוֹן כֵּן הַטָּרָח

Cf. Jerus Tal. B.K. 6c; Sifre Dt. 9-6: Joseph B.K. IX, 30. In Tanch. B. , 30, Pesikta,

We have seen that the ethical concepts underlying our book are of a remarkably high order and seem to justify the remark of Mr. Charles that this document is "representative of the loftiest ethical standard ever attained by pre-Christian Judaism" (1). We shall now undertake to consider briefly, some of the leading ethical teachings and doctrines of the book.

R.C. 38, 165a, this saying is attributed to Jose b. Haglili (Bacher: *Agada der Tann.*, 2 ed. I, 94, Note, 1903).

(1) Ed. Test. XII Patr. London 1908. / . .

CHAPTER VII.

LEADING ETHICAL TEACHINGS.

The indebtedness of Christianity to Judaism for practically all its fundamental ethical concepts is generally admitted by Christian scholars. Schurer, in the opening lines of his monumental work (1) says: "No incident in the Gospel story, no word in the preaching of Jesus Christ is intelligible apart from its setting in Jewish history and without a clear understanding of that world of thought distinction of the Jewish people". This is especially true with regard to the influence exerted by the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". As long as the old view was held that the "Testaments" were a product of the second Christian century, they were naturally regarded as a literary dependent of the New Testament (2). But with the reversal of this chronological relation, the question of the connection between the Testaments and the New Testament assumes new and vital importance (3). In considering some of the more prominent ethical teachings of the Testaments we shall find a surprising frequency of coincidence in thought and diction with

- (1) History of the Jewish people in the Time of J. C.
- (2) See Warfield, N. Y. Presb. Rev. Jan, 1880, p. 57.
- (3) A comparative study of the two works shows that the Testaments were not only known but profusely used by several of the N. T. writers. See Charles: Hibbert Journ., volume III, p. 569-572; Ed. Test. XII Patr. Lond. 1908.

the teachings of the New Testament (1).

It has doubtless been observed from our summary of the Testaments (pp. 37-49) that the center of the patriarchal narratives throughout is Joseph. Each of the patriarchs confesses his share in the crime of selling their brother Joseph. Joseph's attitude toward them in Egypt is recalled and each of the patriarchs repents his part in the outrage done to their brother. We find, therefore, as it would be natural to expect, that one of the foremost ethical themes of the book is brotherly love. "And now, my children," says Gad (6-1), "love ye each his brother, and put away hatred from your hearts, love one another in deed, in word and in thought". Joseph is made to say (T. Jos. 17-2,3): "Do ye also, therefore, love one another, and with long-suffering hide ye one another's faults; for God delighteth in the unity of brethren and in the purpose of a heart that takes pleasure in love" (2). Our author

- (1) 1 Thess. 2-16 is a verbatim quotation from T. Lev. 6-10. Cf. also Rom. 12-21, ("Overcome evil with good") with T. Benj. 4-3 ("by doing good he overcometh evil"); Rom. 12-19 ("Avenge not yourselves, but leave room for God's wrath") with T. Gad 6-7 ("forgive him.....and leave the vengeance to God"); Cf. 2 Cor. 7-10 ("Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation") with T. Gad 5-7 ("A true Godly sorrow.....leadeth the mind to salvation"). Cf. Eph. 5-6 ("Let no man beguile you with vain words") with T. Naph. 3-1 ("Beguile not your souls with vain words").
- (2) Cf. also T. Reub. 6-9; Sim. 4-7; Zeb. 8-4,6; Dan 5-3; Gad 4-2, 6-1, 7-7; T. Benj. 3-3,4.

evidently recognized the beneficent power of this great principle. In a striking and beautiful manner, Gad (4-6,7) contrasts the destructive power of hatred with the saving grace of love: "As love would quicken the dead, and would call back them that are condemned to die, so hatred would slay the living, and those that had sinned venially it would not suffer to live; for the spirit of hatred worketh together with Satan, through hastiness of spirit, in all things unto men's death; but the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long-suffering unto the salvation of men". Sympathy and compassion are the essence of love. Joseph (17-7) says: "Their children were my children, their life was my life, and all their suffering was my suffering". Love and sympathy exercise great power in breaking the force of the evil spirits, (hatred, envy, jealousy, etc.) and are attained only after the mind has become enlightened through clinging to God. Observe these notable words from Simeon (3-5,6): "If a man flee to the Lord, the evil spirit runneth away from him, and his mind is lightened; and henceforth he sympathizeth with him whom he envied, and agreeth with those who love him, and so ceaseth from his envy". Zebulon's acts of compassion are recalled; how as a fisherman he used to share his catches with the poor, and how in the winter time he would give his own garments to those in distress. Mercy even to beasts is enjoined (1), and alms-giving when conjoined with soundness of heart is commended (2).

(1) T. Zeb. 5-1.

(2) T. Iss. 3-8, Cf. Rom. 12-8. The spirit in which alms are dispensed is here emphasized; the alms-giving which Issachar speaks of is directed by "singleness of heart, by sincerity of purpose," and not by ulterior motives of display and ostentation. Our author thus possessed a very high conception of charity. Cf. 2 Cor. 9-13, 8-2, 9-11---Joseph Ant. VII, 13, 4.

The author's doctrine of universalism reveals in a striking way, that the ethics of love which he teaches, is no mean or narrow conception, confined to Jews and Palestine. The broad, humanitarian character of our document is here fully manifested. In his teaching of brotherly love, and love of neighbor, the author has not merely in mind love of Jewish brother, or Jewish neighbor. He preaches a broad and all-encompassing universalism. Throughout the integral parts of the book, he has constantly in mind "the Gentiles" (1). Benjamin (9-2) in referring to the new (Messianic) era, speaks of "all the Gentiles" as participating equally with the twelve tribes of Israel in the glory of the "last temple". Our author here has in mind the prophecy of Haggai (2-9). We can readily see how such an expectation would have been, not only possible, but quite characteristic, in the period to which the Testaments belong. The writer, a Pharisaic supporter of the Maccabees in the second century B. C., out of his boundless enthusiasm in this wonderful period of John Hyrcanus' victories, already sees the fulfillment of Haggai's prophecy. Both the twelve tribes and the Gentiles are to worship together. Israel is in readiness; it has already triumphed over heathenism and Hellenism, and the conversion of the Gentiles is now at hand.

This universalistic hope is thoroughly in accord with the profoundly ethical character of the book as a whole. We have already seen that the very foundation of our author's moral concepts, and the starting point of his ethics, is the principle which he quotes from Gen. (1-27): "God created man in His own image". This marks at once the far reach and grasp of the author's ethical conception. We have also seen how moral salvation is achieved not through external statutes, but through character. The law,

- (1) The doctrine of universalism is of course directly connected with the Messianic portions of the book.

according to the writer of the Testaments, "was given to lighten every man". (T. Lev. 14-4). Therefore when God made the law, He intended it to include the Gentiles, who through the example and teaching of Israel, are, ultimately, to be saved. The unmistakable position of the author on universalism is further illustrated in his description of the function of "Michael". He is the guardian angel of the righteous of all nations (T. Lev. 5-7), the mediator between God and man (T. Dan 6-2). In Levi (6-14) the Maccabean priesthood is to exercise this function between God and man, on behalf of the Gentiles. According to the Messianic hymn in T. Lev. 18, the function of intercession was assigned to the Messiah (1). At all events, it is certain that our author included the Gentiles in his plan of salvation. In this he is a follower of Israel's greatest prophets (2). His universalism is a natural outgrowth and logical development of his ethical standard. We can thus more readily accede that when our author dwells upon "love" as a cardinal doctrine in his ethics, the great mass of humanity is

(1) The salvation of the Gentiles is clearly predicted in T. Lev. 4-4; T. Benj. 10-5; T. Lev. 8-14 ("and save mankind"); T. Sim. 6-5; T. Ash. 7-3; T. Naph. 8-3 ("and every race of mankind"); T. Lev. 2-11; T. Benj. 9-2; T. Dan 6-7 ("and all the peoples shall glorify the Lord"); T. Jud. 25-5. The text of T. Sim. 6-4 is corrupt.

(2) Cf. Jer. 4-2, 16-19, 3-17, 12-16, 17; Isa. 2-2, 4, 19-16, 25, 45-14, 49-6; Pss. 22-27, 31, 65-2.

his ultimate aim and object (1).

We are now prepared to consider what is without doubt, the greatest and most distinctive contribution of our author to the ethical thought of his day. The two great commandments in the Old Testament, "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart" (Levit. 19-18), and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Dt. 6-5), when taken separately and isolated from each other, are expressions of only an incomplete part or phase of man's highest moral obligation. In the Testaments, for the first time in Jewish literature, or in any literature, we have these two powerful commandments conjoined and fused into one all-comprehensive dictum of all moral duty. "Love the Lord all your life, and one another with a true heart" (T. Dan 5-3). "Love the Lord and your neighbor--have compassion on the poor and the weak" (T. Iss. 5-2) (2). Love for God and love for one's fellowman are ascribed as the predominant attitude of the "single-hearted man". (1 1 5 0 5). The two kinds of love involve and presuppose each other. Thus love for God manifests itself in love for fellowman by practical deeds of well-doing in sympathetic human relations; and love for man, correspondingly expresses itself in the fulfilling of God's moral law.

(1) Bousset (Die Relig. d. Judenth, 2, p. 154) speaks of particularism and sweepingly states that the humane character of Hellenistic ethics was lacking among the Jews. He cites a verse from Sirach (12-6) to the effect that God "hates the wicked", to prove his point. But Bousset is here doing an injustice to one of the most valuable literary documents of the time of which he speaks. The Test. XII Patr. do not deserve to be lightly overlooked in the interests of sweeping characterizations.

(2) Cf. also T. Iss. 7-6; Benj. 3-3,5; T. Gad 4-6.

Herein is contained the classical expression of the broadest grasp of moral consciousness, the union of religion and morality. For a very long time, until the critical acumen of scholars had torn away the veil of mystery in which our book was enwrapped, the New Testament was accorded the distinction of having been the first literary authority to give expression to this lofty conception (1). It was therefore regarded as one of the unique ethical concepts of Christianity. C. Montefiore in a symposium in the Hibbert Journal (Vol. III, p.649) on the "Impressions of Christianity" from the points of view of the non-Christian religions", pointing out what he, as a Jew, considers "both valuable and original, new and true" in the teachings of the Synoptic Gospels when compared with ordinary and average Judaism, says: "The combination of Dt. 6-4,5 with Levit. 19-18--the love of God with the love of man--in Mark 12-29,31 was surely a brilliant flash of the highest religious genius". Had Montefiore been thoroughly acquainted with the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" and known that it was a distinctively pre-Christian Jewish document, he could hardly have made this statement without radically revising it.

Another teaching of the Testaments, which may also be considered unique, is its doctrine of love even for enemies (2). We have here no exaggerated form of self-effacement or of maudlin sentimentalism, but the expression of an attitude which is at once gentle and vigorous. "If any one seeketh to do evil unto you, do well unto him, and pray for him, and ye shall be redeemed of the Lord from all evil" (T. Jos. 18-2). In his description of the good man Benjamin (4-2,3) says: "The good man hath not an evil eye; he showeth mercy to all men, even though they be sinners. And even though

(1) Cf. Matt. 22-37,39; Mark 12-30,31; here it is ascribed to Jesus; in Luke 10-27, it is attributed to the scribes.

(2) This also is often considered a unique contribution of Christianity.

they devise with evil intent concerning him, by doing good he overcometh evil, being shielded by God". In the same Testament (T. Benj. 5-1,4) occurs the following: "If you have a good mind, then will both wicked men be at peace with you, and the profligate will reverence you and turn unto good.....For if any one does violence to a holy man, he repenteth; for the holy man is merciful to his reviler, and holdeth his peace" (1).

This same ethical quality is more clearly brought out in the author's teaching on forgiveness. This doctrine is wonderful for the beauty and depth of genuine moral insight which it reveals, and, for thorough understanding of man's inner nature, is unsurpassed either in the Old or New Testament. If for nothing else than this alone, the writer of the Testaments deserves to be ranked among the greatest of ancient ethical writers. The generous act of Joseph in forgiving his brethren is emphasised in the Testaments, and, throughout, for this reason, Joseph is set up as an example worthy of emulation. The typical expression on the subject of forgiveness is contained in T. Gad 6-3,7. We cannot refrain from quoting it in its entirety: "Love ye one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him, lest catching the poison from thee he take to swearing and so thou sin doubly. And though he deny it, and yet have a sense of shame when reprov'd, give over re-proving him. For he who denieth may repent so as not again to wrong thee. But if he be shameless and persisteth in his wrong-doing, even so forgive him from

(1) Cf. also T. Ash. 2-2: "A man who showeth no compassion upon him who serveth his turn in evil,.....is evil".

the heart, and leave to God the avenging" (1). No nobler or more reasonable conception of true forgiveness could possibly be attained. The most striking element in this teaching is its atmosphere of manly forbearance. It teaches an effective, wholesome attitude toward one who has given offence. There is here no diluted ethics of vapid quietism, or of passive submission. Nor is it the ethics of active, self-assertive resistance. The one who is offended is neither to treat the offender with utter indifference, nor to retaliate upon him with tit for tat. Without animus or motives of revenge he should rather endeavor to restore the relations of amity which the offender had forfeited by his conduct. The process of forgiveness according to our author is this:- when offence is given and anger is aroused, you are first of all to crush the immediate impulse of resentment against the offender, and then, not to let the matter drop there, but quietly and gently to speak to him about the offence. If he acknowledges the wrong and expresses his regret, you are, of course, freely to forgive him. But if he refuses to admit the wrong, you must above all things, not lose your temper, for this would avail nothing; it would only aggravate the matter still further and involve you in a double sin, by goading him into becoming still more churlish, and by yourself yielding to futile rage. In case the offender persists in his attitude of denial, you must at all events reproach him no further, for one of two things is bound to result. He will either have felt conscience-stricken and ashamed when you first reproved him, and, therefore, though not manly enough to openly acknowledge it, will afterward be at peace with you; or else he will not have a sense of shame

- (1) Jesus of the Gospels must certainly have been acquainted with these words. There is a remarkably close parallel both in thought and diction, between his teaching on this subject (Matt. 18-15, 35; Luke 17-3) and the teaching of our author.

and therefore will only continue in his insulting attitude. In this event, since nothing further can possibly be done, you are to forgive him "from the heart" and let the matter rest with God. Our author evidently understands the situation here. He recognizes that it is not always possible to restore the offender to friendly relations; but the offended one can always exercise true forgiveness, even if in a limited sense, no matter what the future attitude of the offender. It is thus always possible, according to our author, for the offended one to rid himself of all personal resentment, and maintain an attitude of sympathy toward his offender, so that there is always a possibility of restoring right relations; in so doing he has performed his full moral duty. Such is the essence of real forgiveness. It consists in the sincere, manly effort to bring back our offender into harmonious relations with us. But the important feature here is that our author does not teach forgiveness in one sweeping command designed to apply to all cases, but he recognizes that a distinction must be made in kinds of true forgiveness, according as the circumstances vary.

Our author shows here a keen grasp of the situation. Charles, referring to the words in T. Gad, quoted above, says: "These verses contain the most remarkable statement on the subject of forgiveness in all ancient literature. They show a wonderful insight into the true psychology of the question". Thus, despite the sweeping characterizations of Christian scholars regarding the period in which our work was composed, we can at least say, that pre-Christian Judaism possessed a lofty system of ethics on the subject of forgiveness. Charles, further (in the Hibbert Journal, V. III, p. 571) uses these significant words: "I confess that until I had studied this passage in the Testaments, I had regarded our Lord's teachings in this matter as unique"

In keeping with this remarkable conception of forgiveness, is the author's teaching of self-mastery. "If any man speak against you do not be moved to anger; if you are commended as good men, do not be uplifted. Do not be carried away either

by self-complacency or dissatisfaction" (T. Dan 4-3). A well-balanced mental outlook is thus one of the cardinal doctrines of the book.

Among the vices which our author warns against are hatred, lying, envy, lust, covetousness and with these he contrasts the virtues of long-suffering, truthfulness, love, purity, generosity, etc. The descriptions of the demoralizing character of hatred, envy, malice and the like, are powerful and graphic. Anger (1), if persisted in, beclouds the mental vision and distorts the whole outlook upon life, and claims its victim as its own. "Anger is blindness and does not suffer one to see the face of any man with truth" (T. Dan 2-2). Envy (2) is similar in its effects. It is bestial. It is apt to dominate the whole mind of man. It suffers him neither to eat nor to drink, nor to do any good thing. So long as he that is envied flourishes, he that envies pines away. Deliverance from envy comes from the fear of God; thereby a man's mind is relieved of its burden and he can sympathize with him whom he envied, and join hands with his well-wishers. Envy is provoked by the prosperity of others, wherefore, exhorts our teacher: "If a man is prospered beyond you do not be grieved, but pray for him that his prosperity may be perfected" (T. Gad 7-1). Hatred is evil for "it constantly mateth with lying" (T. Gad 5-1). A man is "not to keep a ledger-account of the evil done him" by his neighbor (T. Zeb. 8-5) (3).

On the question of temperance and total abstinence, our author gives splendid advice: "Observe, my children, the right limit in wine....if ye drink wine with gladness, be ye modest with the fear of God,

(1) Cf. T. Sim. 3-1,3, 4-8,9; T. Gad 7.

(2) Cf. T. Dan 2,³⁴ 3 and 4, especially 2-4, 3-~~12~~²

(3) Cf. I Cor. 13-5.

for if in your gladness, the fear of God departeth, there drunkenness arises, and shamelessness stealeth in. But if you would live soberly, do not touch wine at all, lest ye sin in words of outrage....and perish before your time" (T. Jud. 16-1,4). Also, "Be not drunk with wine; for wine turneth away the mind from truth and inspireth the passion of lust...and if the occasion of the lust be present, he worketh the sin and is not ashamed" (T. Jud. 14-1,3).

Among the various types of virtue or moral excellence which the patriarchs in the Testaments are made to represent, that of Issachar is perhaps the archetype of the writer. Issachar is the simple-hearted husbandman, the expression of simple and unalloyed goodness. He is the man of naive, primitive virtues, a tiller of the soil, uncontaminated by the excesses and luxuries of the larger, worldly life. He shuns the defilements of society and has contempt for gold and lust. He is the man of "single-heart" or integrity (*ἑπ' ἁδὲς καρδίας* = *725 ας*). The virtue of singleness of heart, or a unified life, seems to have been the favorite moral theme of our author. Issachar, for instance, who embodies this ideal, walks in "singleness of soul" and looks on all things with uprightness of heart; he is free from envy, malice, greed; he does not slander his neighbor, nor try to overreach him. His heart is not set on gain and he freely gives to the needy; he harbors no sensual thoughts, but whatever he does is well-pleasing to the Lord (1). The same doctrine of single minded virtue is also expressed by Benjamin (6-5) who condemns a double standard of life. "The good man hath not two tongues of blessing and of cursing,.....of hypocrisy and truth, but it hath one disposition, uncorrupt and pure." Similarly Judah condemns the man who is a "slave to two contrary passions" (2).

(1) T. Iss. 3, 4.

(2) This strongly recalls Matt. 6-24: "Ye cannot serve God and mammon".

CHAPTER VIII.THE TESTAMENTS AS A TEXT-BOOK OF MORALS.

The ethical doctrines and teachings of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which we have just been briefly considering are manifestly of a remarkably high order, and show that our author was possessed not only of an intimate knowledge of moral nature, but also, of moral principles, which for his time and day, may truly be considered wonderful. The objection, however, will naturally and with perfect justice be raised, that the document in question does not actually represent and express the ethical ideals and norms which were dominant in the period of its composition, since it is only an isolated or esoteric work unknown to the wider masses of people, and therefore, ineffective as an influential and authoritative document. If the assumption on which this statement is based were true, the contention here made would be logical and valid. We could then hardly speak of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs as a literary witness or reflex of pre-Christian Jewish ethics in the strict sense of the term. For a literary document to be considered authoritative at some given period, must have had some currency and recognition. Of course, it would still remain true, that no matter how narrow its influence, or how little known, our book represents some ethical ideals and teachings, which got themselves expressed in a form of writing which in its day was considered the authoritative form. But very fortunately we are enabled to show, through documentary evidence, that the Testaments did have currency and recognition and did wield considerable influence in its own day. Having shown this it will be plain that the Testaments are a genuine Jewish product and that its ethics are Jewish ethics. The fact that the Testaments remained so long in obscurity, and that for centuries it was regarded as a Christian document, proves nothing as to the influence

it once wielded, or the relation it bears to its own time. We have already seen that (p. 4) it was one of many similar Jewish works, which was in the course of time, appropriated by the Church, re-touched and incorporated as a Christian document. The light of modern scholarship reveals beyond dispute the Jewish character and origin of the book. The only question now is, can it be used as evidence in a consideration of the ethical life of the time to which it is related.

We must first of all, again briefly notice that the work as a book of ethics is purely objective in character, not subjective as a formulation of ethical principles. It is cast in the form which was the vehicle in its day for expressing ethical maxims and moral exhortations, namely--the Haggadic form. Our work is a true and striking example of Haggada. It is a mistake to regard the haggada as simply a collection of tales for entertainment only. True, one of the characteristic features of the haggada is that of entertainment in order to attract and hold the attention and make vivid the thoughts or suggestions it wants to convey. But the real, definite purpose of the haggada was, without any doubt, ethical. The moral significance of the haggada is everywhere apparent; it was the old-time method of driving home a moral truth. The fact that it had also the feature of entertaining does not in any respect detract from its ethical value, but, on the contrary, enhances it. It was the method of making impressive ethical lessons and maxims, just as today we would tell our children a story that has a "moral" to it. Now the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" as haggada may be viewed in exactly the same light, for they really consist of stories of an ethical character, in which the chief events in the lives of the Biblical heroes are embellished and enriched and treated from an edifying and homiletical point of view. Now from the very nature of the Testaments (as haggada, or ethical tales) what could be more natural than to suppose that they were used as such? It is clear on the very surface that the Testaments have a definite ethical purpose in view and that they are the vehicle for the

expression of ethical thought and moral exhortation; it is but a single step from this to the conviction that the Testaments were actually used for that purpose. We said before that there was documentary evidence in support of this contention. Dr. Kohler was the first scholar to point out and note the significance of this important evidence. He shows (1) that the haggada is referred to in the Talmud as a text-book of ethics, and that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are specifically referred to in exactly the same way, (showing, i.e., that they were used for ethical purposes). It will be recalled that the Testaments place peculiar emphasis on chastity. The Talmudic passage spoken of above directs that the president of the high court of justice, when trying a woman suspected of unchastity, should urge on her the duty of confession, and recite to her "words of the haggada, historical facts which occur in the earlier writings, as the story of Reuben regarding Bilhah and of Judah regarding Tamar". This tradition is preserved in B. Sotah 7b; Jer. Sota 16d; Sifra Nu. 5-19, ~~ph.~~ §19 (Cf. Maccoth 11b and Sifra Dt. 33-6): the high court of justice says to the "Sotah":

דברי הגדה מעשים שאירעו בכתובים הראשונים
 כגון מעשה ראובן בבילה ומעשה יהודה
 בתמר אשר חכמים יגידו אלו ראובן ויהודה

Now the important fact in connection with this matter is that nowhere else in Jewish literature do the confessions of Reuben and Judah occur but in the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs". What other, then, can these "early writings" (~~כתובים ראשונים~~) be than the Testaments? The coincidence is especially clear when we consider that the Testaments answer exactly to the idea of exhorting the accused woman to confess her sin, just as Reuben and Judah had done before. It is needless to urge this matter further; but I believe that if there was nothing else in favor of our contention, this single, documentary evidence

see *op. cit.* p. 61
 (misplaced)

(1) J.Q.R., vol. 5, 1892-3, Art. "Pre-Talmudic Haggada" pp.400-401.

(this page out of its place)

is alone sufficient to prove that our book was not an isolated literary production, unrelated to the life and culture of its time.

In connection with the topic of this chapter it will be well to consider an important ethical feature of the book. This is the emphasis which the author places upon the value of instruction, or the constant transmission of traditional culture from generation to generation. I think it is not far amiss to say that this has always been eminently characteristic of Jewish life and history. Here in the Testaments, the function of teaching is viewed as an ethical duty. It is part and parcel of the complete moral life. Thus, Levi exhorts his children (T. Lev. 13-2): "And do you also teach your children letters that they may have understanding all their life". Reuben (4-1) says: "Expend your labor on good works and on study". Instruction and influence in the home is with the author of prime importance. This is beautifully, but simply, expressed in connection with the story of Joseph's temptation. The wicked importunities and advances of the Circe-like wife of Potiphar leave Joseph unmoved; he resists all her alluring charms and bewitchery, in virtue of one thing,--the thought of his father, Jacob. This abides with him constantly like a protecting angel. Thus, in narrating this incident Joseph says (3-3): "But I remembered the words of my father Jacob and going into my chamber I.....prayed unto the Lord"(1). The influence of home and early training is here concretely and graphically expressed.

- (1) Jub. 39-6 in the same connection has: "But Joseph did not surrender his soul, but remembered the words which Jacob his father used to read from amongst the words of Abraham." Cf. Jub. 20-4, 25-7. Sotah 36b, Gen. Rabb. 87, in narrating the same incident says that the spirit of Jacob appeared to Joseph while under the temptation and commanded him to remain steadfast.

In conclusion, I would briefly recapitulate the guiding ethical principle running through the whole work. We have seen that morality with our author is not simply a matter of conduct on its human side alone. It is rather as perfect an adjustment of human relations as possible, in accordance with and ultimately based upon the divine law. The relation between man and man is but a corollary of the divine relation between God and man. In keeping with this, morality, for our author, consists not alone in deeds of goodness, but also and fundamentally in the knowledge of the laws underlying moral perfection, i.e., God's law. In other words, law and morality are combined into one reality. The law is not to be deemed as something external, for after man has consciously accepted and assimilated this law, he voluntarily directs his conduct in accordance with it. Knowledge and study of the law combined with conduct as directed by that law, is therefore a cardinal principle with our author. In modern terms we would call this the harmonious union of theory and practise, or knowing and doing. This combination of law and morality (or of knowledge of the moral law and the practise thereof) in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs may properly be termed "ethical wisdom" (1). An admirable illustration of this is contained in the beautiful tribute to "wisdom" (Levi 13-7,9) than to quote which nothing could form a more fitting conclusion to an appreciation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs:

"Every one that knoweth the law of the Lord shall be honored,
And shall not be a stranger whithersoever he goeth,
Yea, many friends shall he gain
And many men shall desire to serve him
And to hear the law from his mouth".

(1) So, Bousset, *Relig. d. J.*, p. 154. Other Jewish works of "ethical wisdom" are *Serach*, *Proverbs*, the later *Pss.*, *Bk. of Tobit*, *Pirke Avoth*, et al.

"Work righteousness, therefore, my children, upon the earth,
That ye may have it as a treasure in heaven.
And sow good things in your souls,
That ye may find them in your life.
Get wisdom in the fear of God with diligence;
For though there be a leading into captivity,
And cities and lands be destroyed,
And gold and silver and every possession perish,
The wisdom of the wise naught can take away,
Save the blindness of ungodliness, and the callousness
of sin.
For even among his enemies shall wisdom be a glory
to him,
And in a strange country it shall be a fatherland,
And in the midst of personal foes, shall prove a
friend.
Whosoever teaches noble things and does them,
Shall be enthroned with kings".

for if in your gladness, the fear of God departeth, there drunkenness arises, and shamelessness stealeth in. But if you would live soberly, do not touch wine at all, lest ye sin in words of outrage...and perish before your time" (T. Jud. 15-1,4). Also, "Be not drunk with wine; for wine turneth away the mind from truth and kindleth the passion of lust...and if the occasion of the lust be present, he worketh the sin and is not ashamed" (T. Jud. 14-1,3).

Among the various types of virtue or moral excellence which the patriarchs in the Testaments are made to represent, that of Issachar is perhaps the archetype of the writer. Issachar is perhaps the hearted husbandman, the expression of simple and unalloyed goodness. He is the man of naive, primitive virtues, a tiller of the soil, uncontaminated by the excesses and luxuries of the larger, worldly life. He shuns the defilements of society and has contempt for gold and lust. He is the man of "single-heart" or integrity (εὐλόγους καρδίας = 125 α α).

The virtue of singleness of heart, or a unified life, seems to have been the favorite moral theme of our author. Issachar, for instance, who embodies this ideal, walks in "singleness of heart" and looks on all things with uprightness of heart; he is free from envy, calice, greed; he does not slander his neighbor, nor try to overreach him. His heart is not set on gain and he freely gives to the needy; he harbors no sexual thoughts, but whatever he does is well-pleasing to the Lord (1). The same doctrine of single-minded virtue is also expressed by Benjamin (4-5) who condemns a double standard of life. "The good man hath not two tongues of blessing and of cursing,....of hypocrisy and truth, but it hath one disposition, uninterrupted and pure." Similarly Judah condemns "the man who is a slave to two contrary passions" (2).

(1) T. Iss. 7, 4.

(2) This strongly recalls Matt. 6-23 "Ye cannot serve God and mammon".

