

# The Great Controversy

The Individual's Struggle Between Good and Evil  
in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and in  
their Jewish and Christian Contexts

**V&R** Academic

# Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus / Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments

in cooperation with the “Bibel und Orient” foundation,  
University of Fribourg/Switzerland.

edited by Max Küchler (Fribourg), Peter Lampe (Heidelberg),  
Gerd Theißen (Heidelberg) and Jürgen Zangenberg (Leiden)

Volume 106

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Tom de Bruin

# The Great Controversy

The Individual's Struggle Between Good and Evil in  
the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and in their  
Jewish and Christian Contexts

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek  
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;  
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978 – 3 – 525 – 54035 – 0

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our Website:  
[www.v-r.de](http://www.v-r.de)

© 2015, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen/  
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U.S.A.  
[www.v-r.de](http://www.v-r.de)

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form  
or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any  
information  
storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Printed in Germany.

Typesetting by Konrad Triltsch Print und digitale Medien GmbH  
Printed and bound by Hubert & Co, Göttingen.

Printed on non-aging paper.

# Inhalt

Preface . . . . .	9
Chapter 1 Introduction . . . . .	11
1.1 Literature Survey . . . . .	12
1.1.1 Pre-Modern and Early Modern Views: Grosseteste to Charles . . . . .	13
1.1.2 The 1950s Onwards: A Three-Way Split . . . . .	19
1.1.3 Methodologies of The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Pseudepigrapha Research in Recent Years . . . . .	27
1.2 Exhortation, Genre, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs . . . . .	35
1.2.1 The Form of a “Farewell Discourse” . . . . .	36
1.2.2 The Form of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs . . . . .	42
1.3 The Present Study . . . . .	47
Chapter 2 Admonition and the Great Controversy in the <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i> . . . . .	51
2.1 Exhortation and Commands . . . . .	52
2.1.1 The <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i> as a Collection of Commands . . . . .	53
<i>T. Reu. 1.1; T. Naph. 9.1; T. Sim. 7.3</i>	
2.1.2 The Contents of the Commands . . . . .	56
<i>T. Dan 5.1–3; T. Iss. 5.1–2; T. Jos. 10.1–11.1</i>	
2.2 The Biographical Passages and Their Role in the Admonishment . . . . .	63
2.2.1 Biography in the <i>Testament of Judah</i> . . . . .	64
<i>T. Jud. 14.5–6, 15.3</i>	
2.2.2 The Roles of the Biographical Passages in the Other Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs . . . . .	68
<i>T. Sim. 3.4–5; T. Naph. 1.6–10</i>	
2.3 The Future-Oriented Passages and Their Role in the Admonition . . . . .	72
2.3.1 An Example Continued: Passages Regarding the Future in the <i>Testament of Judah</i> . . . . .	72
<i>T. Jud. 17.2–3, 18.1–2</i>	
2.3.2 The Role of Passages Regarding the Future in the <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i> . . . . .	74
<i>T. Zeb. 9.5–7, 9.8–9; T. Dan. 6.3–7, 6.9–10</i>	
2.4 Virtues and Vices . . . . .	80
2.4.1 Virtues . . . . .	81
<i>T. Iss. 7.6–7</i>	

2.4.2 Vices . . . . .	83
<i>T. Gad 1.9, 3.1, 4.1–2, 4.7</i>	
2.5 The Commandments and the Great Controversy . . . . .	86
<i>T. Levi 19.1; T. Ash 1.3–5; T. Reu. 4.5–11; T. Ben. 3.1–5;</i> <i>T. Dan 4.7–5.1; 6.1–2</i>	
Conclusion . . . . .	94
Chapter 3 Mankind in the Great Controversy according to the <i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i> . . . . .	
3.1 Introduction to the Two Aspects of the Individual's Choice . . .	98
<i>T. Ash. 1.3–9, 2.1, 2.5–6, 3.1–4.1, 4.2–4</i>	
3.2 God and Mankind . . . . .	105
<i>T. Reu. 1.6–9</i>	
3.3 Mankind and the Forces of Evil . . . . .	107
3.3.1 Mankind and the Spirits of Deceit . . . . .	108
<i>T. Reu. 2.1–2, 2.3–3.1, 3.2–7, 3.8</i>	
3.3.2 The Opponent and His Influence . . . . .	114
<i>T. Dan 4.7; T. Ash. 1.8; T. Naph. 8.6; T. Reu. 4.11;</i> <i>T. Zeb. 9.8; T. Dan 5.11; T. Jud. 19.3–4; T. Ben. 7.1–2</i>	
3.3.3 The Spirits of Deceit and Their Influence . . . . .	119
<i>T. Levi 9.9–10; T. Jud. 13.3; T. Sim. 2.6–8, 2.13–14, 3.1–6,</i> <i>4.7–5.1; T. Dan 1.4–9, 2.1–5, 3.1–5, 4.7</i>	
3.4 Each Person's Choice and the Blinding of His Mind . . . . .	139
3.4.1 The Individual's Choice and Mind . . . . .	139
<i>T. Reu. 3.9–15, 4.1–5, 4.6–11, 5.1–7, 6.1–5;</i> <i>T. Jud. 20.1–2; T. Ben. 3.1–2, 4.2, 6.5–6</i>	
3.4.2 The Blinding of a Person's Mind . . . . .	152
<i>T. Dan 2.2–5; T. Jud. 11.1; T. Gad 3.2–3</i>	
3.4.3 The Ultimate Choice of the Individual . . . . .	154
<i>T. Levi 18.8–14, 18.12, 3.2, 4.1; T. Zeb. 10.3; T. Jud. 24.6,</i> <i>25.4–5</i>	
3.5 Conclusion . . . . .	161
Chapter 4 The Great Controversy Theme in the <i>Testaments of the</i> <i>Twelve Patriarchs</i> As Compared To Other Documents . . . . .	
4.1 General Motifs of the Forces of Darkness . . . . .	163
4.1.1 The Opponent's Name and Identity . . . . .	165
<i>Jub. 1.20; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12.12–13; 2 Cor. 6:15; Ques. Bart. 3.12</i>	
4.1.2 The Opponent's Allegiance . . . . .	168
<i>T. Isaac 9.7; Rev. 12:7–9</i>	
4.1.3 The Opponent's Modus Operandi . . . . .	171
<i>T. Job 17.1–4; Acts Pet. 7, 8</i>	

4.1.4	The Opponent as Ruler of the Unrighteous . . . . .	173
	<i>1QM 1.1–2, 5; Jub. 1.20; John 8:44; 1 John 3:8;</i> <i>Acts Andr. 21</i>	
4.1.5	The Source of the Opponent's Power . . . . .	176
	<i>Acts John 54</i>	
4.1.6	The Opponent's Underlings and Their Origin . . . . .	178
	<i>1 En. 15.8–11; Jub. 10.7–9; Lat. LAE 15.2–16.1;</i> <i>Acts Thom. 33</i>	
4.1.7	The Modus Operandi of the Spirits of Deceit . . . . .	184
	<i>Matt 12.22; Mark 1:23–26, 5:2–4; Luke 8:27;</i> <i>1 Tim. 4:1</i>	
4.2	QS: The Rule of the Community . . . . .	188
4.2.1	Analysis . . . . .	190
	<i>1QS 3.13–8, 3.18–4.1, 4.6–8, 4.9–14, 4.15–26</i>	
4.2.2	Comparison . . . . .	196
4.3	The Shepherd of Hermas . . . . .	200
4.3.1	The Two Aspects of Mankind's Existence . . . . .	202
	<i>Herm. 36.1–4, 36.6–9</i>	
4.3.2	Mankind Versus the Forces of Evil . . . . .	205
	<i>Herm. 37.2, 43.17, 31.4, 6, 92.1–3, 33.1–3, 34.1–4, 34.7</i>	
4.3.3	An Individual's Choice, Double-Mindedness and the Heart . . . . .	217
	<i>Herm 45.2, 2.4</i>	
4.4	Origen . . . . .	223
4.4.1	The Two Aspects of an Individual's Choice . . . . .	224
	<i>Princ. 3.2.4; Com. Rom. 1.18</i>	
4.4.2	Mankind and the Forces of Evil . . . . .	227
	<i>Hom. Jos. 15.1, 6, 5</i>	
4.5	Clement of Alexandria . . . . .	232
	<i>Strom. 4.12.85, 2.20.111, 2.20.116–7</i>	
4.6	Final Conclusions . . . . .	235
Chapter 5 Conclusion . . . . .		241
Bibliography . . . . .		245
Index . . . . .		259





## Preface

This adventure began at the end of 2008, when Jürgen Zangenberg and I discussed PhD options at Leiden. Very soon, four years of intense co-operation ensued, culminating in my graduation in 2013. I owe a massive debt of gratitude to Zangenberg for the many enlightening discussions, his wise guidance, and diligent readings of the many hundreds of thousands of words that I produced in those years. Great respect for ‘my professor’ has turned into a wonderful friendship with my *Doktervater*.

I look back fondly at the four years of monthly meetings with him, Johannes Tromp and Harm Hollander. Hollander guided me in my exploration of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Tromp in ancient Judaism, early Christianity, and (most importantly) critical ‘Leidenesque’ thinking. Great thanks go out to both of them. Elsewhere, Jean-Claude Verrecchia supported me informally, and gave me the chance to build up experience as a lecturer. During the final phase of my thesis, the advice of the reading committee proved invaluable – many thanks to Tobias Nicklas, Rudy Van Moere, and Henk Jan de Jonge, as well as all those mentioned above, for their feedback in this regard.

My employers and colleagues at the Seventh-day Adventist Church also shared in the burden of this study, both financially and in reducing my workload. Special thanks to Jurriën den Hollander, Wim Altink, Gerard Frenk, Leendert Brouwer, and Hans Ponte for their continued support. The Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht publishers and the editorial board of *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus* should also be thanked for accepting and publishing this work.

Final gratitude goes out to my family. Especially to my wife, who endured my quoting of the *Testaments* in far too many a situation: *πονηραὶ εἰσὶν αἱ γυναῖκες*.



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, one of the longest texts of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, are the fictitious farewell speeches of the twelve sons of Jacob. It is our understanding that the twelve testaments come from the same hand, and that in their finished form they derive from the late second century CE. These farewell speeches attempt to convince the audience to follow God's double commandment to love God and love one's neighbour, and the admonition is placed in a grand cosmological struggle between good and evil – a great controversy. In this struggle, each person is urged to constantly strive towards God and away from the opponent, so that he may ultimately receive salvation. These admonishing speeches are generally composed of three types of discourse: exhortatory, biographical, and future-oriented passages. All three of these forms contribute to the exhortation on the double commandment.

This research will examine these twelve monologues with the ultimate goal of recognising the role the text (as a literary product) was intended to play in the setting in which it was composed. After considering the history of research into the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and into the farewell discourse genre, we will conclude that admonition plays a fundamental role in this work. Admonition must therefore be our starting point. In the remainder of this research, we will analyse the reasoning behind the ethical admonition in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, we will look at which conception of mankind is fundamental to this exhortation, and we will also examine other works that show a similar perception of mankind. Our ultimate goal thus has three tiers: an analysis of the admonition, a discussion of the anthropology, and an examination of other works evidencing a similar world-view. In this way we hope to form a more complete understanding of the role the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* played in their setting.

In this initial chapter we will set out to introduce the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and this research. Section 1.1 contains a brief history of scholarly research on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, from its first publication in the West in 1242 to the present day. In this review we will show how the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* have been the object of extensive discussion regarding their provenance. This focus on the heritage meant that little energy has been devoted to analysing the actual contents of the work.

In Section 1.2 we will move on to discuss the form and genre of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, giving a brief analysis of scholarly research on the genre 'farewell discourse.' In this discussion we will see that

there is little agreement about what a farewell discourse entails, effectively rendering such genre labels useless. There is far more consensus concerning the form of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The form of this document will be the starting point of our research, concluding that exhortation is the core of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

Finally, in Section 1.3 we will provide a profile of the method, the purpose, and the significance of this research, and will conclude by outlining the direction the remainder of this research will take.

### 1.1 Literature Survey

Ipsis quoque temporibus, episcopus Lincolniensis Robertus, vir in Latino et Graeco peritissimus, *Testamenta duodecim Patriarcharum* de Graeco fideli interpretatione transtulit in Latinum, quae per multa tempora incognita et abscondita fuerunt per invidiam Iudaeorum, propter manifestas prophetias de Salvatore in eis contentas. ... Nec tempore beati Jeronimi vel alicujus sancti interpretis ad notitiam Christianorum, machinante Iudaeorum antiquorum malitia, potuit quomodolibet devenire. Illum igitur gloriosum tractatum, ad robur fidei Christianae et ad majorem Iudaeorum confusionem, transtulit plene et evidenter episcopus memoratus de Graeco, verbo ad verbum, in Latinum, coadjuvante magistro Nicholao Graeco, clerico abbatis Sancti Albani.<sup>1</sup>

At that same time, Robert, the Bishop of Lincoln, a man most expert in Latin and Greek, accurately translated *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* from Greek into Latin; they had been unknown for a long time and had been concealed by the envious Jews on account of the clear prophecies of the Saviour contained within them. ... Because of the scheming of the Jews with their ancient malice, the text was unavailable to Christians at the time of St. Jerome and the other blessed interpreters. However, this glorious text – strengthening the Christian faith and greatly confounding the Jews – was translated plainly and clearly by the bishop, word by word from Greek into Latin, with the help of master Nicholas the Greek, a clerk of St Albans.<sup>2</sup>

*Chronica Majora* 4.232–3

This is what Matthew Paris wrote in the thirteenth century, remarking on Robert Grosseteste's 1242 publication, which is commonly seen as the introduction of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to the West.<sup>3</sup> Already at

1 Quotations from Matthew Paris's *Chronica Majora* are taken from Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (ed. Henry R. Luard; London: Longman, 1877).

2 This translation has been taken from Ruth Nisse, "A Romance of the Jewish East: The Ten Lost Tribes and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* in Medieval Europe," *Medieval Encounters* 13 (2007): 499–523.

3 See also the extensive discussion of the historical events surrounding this publication and the role

this juncture we can see emerging themes in the role that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* will play in history. Many early interpreters considered the work to be authentically Jewish, taking the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* as proof that the Christian truths were known to the ancient Israelites. This perception also presented an anti-Judaistic and anti-Semitic portrayal: these early interpreters claimed that the Jews hid this work for their own nefarious purposes. Indeed, the social, ideological and political climate in the thirteenth century fundamentally influenced the initial reception of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>4</sup> From the thirteenth century onward, the presuppositions, goals, and ideology of the scholar would consistently influence how this ancient work was and is understood.

Considering the impact of scholarship on the interpretation of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, it is important to consider the critical history of research into this work before attempting to disentangle it from that history. In this section we will examine the history of the research on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. We will divide the examination into three general eras: before 1950, 1950 – 1980, and after 1980. This research takes place in the consensus that seems to be growing in the post-1980s era, and the method of this research thus logically follows from (and will be included in) the discussion of scholarship from 1980 onwards.

### 1.1.1 Pre-Modern and Early Modern Views: Grosseteste to Charles

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* were introduced to the West by Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln. A certain John of Basingstoke had mentioned to Robert Grosseteste that he had heard of many Greek manuscripts unknown to Latin readers.<sup>5</sup> John of Basingstoke was then sent to Athens to retrieve a Greek codex of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* in 1242.<sup>6</sup> Grosseteste translated the work into Latin with the help of Nicholas Graecus, a priest attached to the abbey of St Albans.<sup>7</sup>

that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* played in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, as found in Nisse, “Romance.”

4 Nisse argues that “the medieval Christian reception and transmission of the *Testaments*, as well as other works of biblical apocrypha, are intimately related to shifting attitudes toward Jews not only as textual scholars but also as representatives of the world beyond Europe’s frontiers”; Nisse, “Romance,” 500.

5 Cf. *Chronica Majora* 5.285, and also Henk Jan de Jonge, “La Bibliothèque de Michel Choniates et La Tradition Occidentale Des Testaments Des XII Patriarches,” in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 98; Marinus de Jonge, “Robert Grosseteste and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 118.

6 See *Chronica Majora* 5.285.

7 de Jonge, “Grosseteste,” 118. According to de Jonge, John of Basingstoke’s role becomes clear

In his *Opus Majus*,<sup>8</sup> which was completed in 1267, Roger Bacon takes a clear stand on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>9</sup> Bacon claims that 1 *Enoch*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 3, 4, 5 *Ezra*, and many other books discuss Christian truths more clearly than the canonical works of Scripture.<sup>10</sup> His view was that these books, irrespective of their canonicity, were read and used by the earliest Christians.<sup>11</sup> He thus concludes that we can assign authority to the prophecies concerning Christ within these texts.<sup>12</sup> Bacon's work<sup>13</sup> did not prove to be influential on scholarship for various reasons, including the fact that it was only printed in the late eighteenth century,<sup>14</sup> and therefore contributed very little to academic interest in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>15</sup>

The first scholar in the history of research on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* whose work proved to be seminal was Joannes Grabe, who in addition to being the first to publish the complete Greek text,<sup>16</sup> also (already in

from the early Latin manuscripts. While he is not mentioned by name, "diligentissimos exploratores" are. Also, the date 1242 is given; de Jonge, "Grosseteste," 118.

- 8 Quotations from Bacon's *Opus Majus* are taken from John Henry Bridges, ed., *The "Opus Majus" of Roger Bacon: Edited, with Introduction and Analytical Table* (vol. 1; London: Williams and Norgate, 1900).
- 9 H.J. de Jonge, who maintains that Bacon "ist der erste europäische Gelerhte, von dem uns eine deutliche Stellungnahme zu den Testamenten bekannt ist"; Henk Jan de Jonge, "Die Patriarchentestamente von Roger Bacon Bis Richard Simon (mit Einem Namenregister)," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 6.
- 10 Bacon claims that "in hujusmodi enim libris tanguntur expresse articuli fidei, et longe expressius quam in Canone Scripturae," (Bacon *Opus Majus* 2.14). So also H.J. de Jonge, who interprets Bacon as follows: "in diesen würde deutlicher über die christliche Wahrheit gesprochen als in den kanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments"; de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 6.
- 11 Bacon argues that "hi libri licet non sint in canone scripturae, tamen sancti et sapientes Graeci et Latini usi sunt eis a principio ecclesiae" (These books, despite not being in the canonical scripture, were still used by holy and wise Greeks and Latins since the first church) (Bacon *Opus Majus* 2.14).
- 12 Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 87.
- 13 H.J. de Jonge summarises Bacon's conclusions with regard to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* as follows: "1. Es ist nicht sicher, dass die Testamente die authentischen letzten Worte der Patriarchen enthalten. 2. Ungeachtet der Frage nach ihrer Authentizität ist die Zuverlässigkeit des Inhalts der Testamente durch die kirchliche Benutzung der Testamente verbürgt ... 3. Die Testamente haben nicht weniger Autorität als 1v Esra, Sirach und die Weisheit Salomos." More important, however, is Bacon's assumption that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are "nichtchristliche Zeugen für die Wahrheit des christlichen Glaubens"; de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 9.
- 14 H.J. de Jonge claims that there are "verschiedene Gründe," yet only names the late date of printing (1773); de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 10.
- 15 de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 10.
- 16 Cf. de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 33; H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve*

1698) introduced the idea that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was composed by Jews in Hebrew, translated into Greek, and then interpolated by Christians.<sup>17</sup> This has since been the majority view up to contemporary times. Grabe based his theory on the notion that certain passages in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* could not have been written by a Christian.<sup>18</sup> Though his specific argumentation for defending the Jewish authorship and Christian interpolation is no longer useful,<sup>19</sup> his introduction of the idea that the final form of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is Christian (and not wholly Jewish as all scholars before him thought) remains influential.<sup>20</sup>

Most scholars in the centuries following Grabe's publication considered the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to be a Christian work,<sup>21</sup> and if it was not considered Gentile-Christian, then it was definitely Jewish-Christian.<sup>22</sup> In the late 1880s scholars reached the consensus that the book was probably a

*Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 21; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 6. The version utilised in this research is the second edition from 1714; Joannes Ernestus Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum: Ut et Hæreticorum, Seculi Post Christum Natum I, II, & III* (vol. 1, Revised.; Oxford: Theatro Sheldoniano, 1714).

17 Grabe introduces this hypothesis as follows: 'quid si igitur dicamus, Testamenta XII Patriarcharum à Judæo olim scripta, à Christiano autem postea interpolata esse' (What if, then, let us say, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* were written by ancient Jews, and were, however, later interpolated by a Christian.) Grabe, *Spicilegium*, 134. See also Slingerland, *Critical History*, 6–7; de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 33–4; Robert A. Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 31.

18 Grabe names three passages which he feels could not have been written by a Christian: *T. Reu.* 6.12, *T. Sim.* 5.4–5, and *T. Levi* 18.6. Grabe's argumentation is as follows: in *T. Reu.* 6.12 the Saviour is said to die in invisible wars, but Christ defeated the opponent in an invisible war with his sacrifice. Secondly, what Christian would write that the Jews will fight with the Messiah, and their castles will be destroyed, as occurs in *T. Sim.* 5.4–5? Finally, which Christian would claim that the voice at Jesus's baptism was Abraham's, as *T. Levi* 18.6 does? See Grabe, *Spicilegium*, 133–4. For a longer discussion of Grabe's argument see H. J. de Jonge's analysis; de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 33–4.

19 H.J. de Jonge maintains that today Grabe's argumentation has 'nur noch wenig Gültigkeit'; de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 35.

20 Cf. Harm W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 3.

21 Slingerland gives numerous names and works: Le Nourry (ca. 1700), Fabricius (1713/1722), Gallandi (1765), Corrodi (1781), Nitzsch (1810), Dorner (1845), Ritschl (1850), Kayser (1851), Vorstman (1857), Hilgenfeld (1858), Langen (1866), Ewald (1868), Sinkler (1869), Geiger (1869), Nitzsch (1870), Reuss (1874), Warfield (1880), Dillmann (1883), and Pick (1885). The discussion in these years mainly appears to revolve around whether the book is Gentile-Christian or Jewish-Christian, pro-Pauline or anti-Pauline, and before the destruction of the Temple or after. See also Emil Schürer, *Geschichte Des Jüdischen Volkes Im Zeitalter Jesu Christi III, Das Judentum in Der Zerstreuung Und Die Jüdische Literatur* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898), 255; Slingerland, *Critical History*, 7–15.

22 See also Slingerland, *Critical History*, 7; Kugler, *Testaments*, 35.



Nazarene Jewish-Christian work.<sup>23</sup> Writing at the turn of the twentieth century, Emil Schürer reviewed previous scholarship and concluded that most contemporary scholars simply argued whether the author of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was a Jewish or a Hellenistic Christian, pointing out that both positions were untenable without first assuming some sort of interpolation.<sup>24</sup> He also reacted to certain fundamental changes to this consensus opinion, which we will discuss after introducing these changes.

In the late 19th century, Friedrich Schnapp published his dissertation, entitled *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*. Later, he contributed the chapter on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to Kautzsch's *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testament*,<sup>25</sup> thereby becoming an influential voice.<sup>26</sup> These publications broke the academic consensus that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* were a Christian work. Schnapp's research approach was to apply literary criticism to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. He highlighted many passages that he considered to be Christian interpolations. Upon removing all these interpolations, however, Schnapp discovered that the remainder was not a cohesive unity. Therefore, he concluded, the work could not simply be a Jewish writing that had been interpolated by Christians. Schnapp then created a new hypothesis of a three-tiered redaction history. Originally, he argued, the text consisted of the sins and virtues of the patriarchs, and the exhortations based upon them. Later, in the second stage, the apocalyptic and messianic Jewish sections were added. Finally, Schnapp argued, Christians altered these messianic sections to more easily interpret them christologically.<sup>27</sup>

Schnapp's complicated hypothesis did not go uncontested. In 1898, Schürer partially agreed with Schnapp, claiming that the second half of Schnapp's thesis was clearly true. Like Schnapp, Schürer also believed the text was adapted by Christians. He did question the first half of Schnapp's argument, however, which deals with the pre-Christian history of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Schürer disagreed with Schnapp's reasoning as to why the passages regarding the future were later additions, arguing that Schnapp's research was not very convincing. Schürer therefore felt that the first two steps of Schnapp's three-tiered hypothesis were inherently incorrect. Schürer did feel that the presence of contradictory passages (both future-related and biographical) argued for multiple Jewish hands, advocating a different identification of the first steps of Schnapp's three-tiered redaction hypoth-

23 Cf. Slingerland, *Critical History*, 15.

24 Schürer, *Geschichte III*, 255.

25 Friedrich Schnapp, "Die Testamente Der 12 Patriarchen, Der Söhne Jakobs," in *Die Apokryphen Und Pseudepigraphen Des Alten Testaments: Die Pseudepigraphen Des Alten Testaments* (ed. Emil Kautzsch; 2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1921).

26 See also Slingerland, *Critical History*, 19; Hollander and de Jonge, *Commentary*, 3.

27 Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte III*, 255–6; Schnapp, "Die Testamente," 459–60; Hollander and de Jonge, *Commentary*, 3.

esis.<sup>28</sup> Despite Schürer's counterpoints, Schnapp's work was so influential that a new consensus, contrary to most opinions of the previous three centuries, was created.<sup>29</sup> This consensus argued for a Jewish original, later edited by Christians.

Robert Charles's publications in the first two decades of the twentieth century<sup>30</sup> were also monumental in the history of research on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>31</sup> Charles was critical towards the earlier scholars, and claimed that for nearly four centuries the book had been marked as a Christian forgery, with only Grabe claiming a Hebrew original.<sup>32</sup> Charles built on Schnapp's Jewish authorship hypothesis, but like Schürer he rejected Schnapp's theories about the contents of the Jewish interpolations. Charles argued for a date of original authorship between 109 and 106 BCE,<sup>33</sup> by a Pharisee who supported the Maccabean dynasty.<sup>34</sup> At a later stage in the history of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, readers would have become increasingly dissatisfied with the Maccabean high priests, and would have added passages denouncing Levi and Judah.<sup>35</sup> In Charles's opinion, these passages were surprisingly similar to passages in the *Psalms of Solomon*, and

28 Schürer, *Geschichte III*, 258–9.

29 Slingerland, *Critical History*, 19.

30 Robert H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Translated from the Editor's Greek Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908); Robert Henry Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (London: SPCK, 1917); Robert H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Edited from Nine MSS Together with the Variants of the Armenian and Slavonic Versions and Some Hebrew Fragments* (2nd ed.; Oxford: University Press, 1960); Robert Henry Charles, "The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs," in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical Explanatory Notes to the Several Books* (ed. Robert H. Charles; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).

31 Slingerland, *Critical History*, 27.

32 Charles, "Testaments," 482–3. This would seem to be an over-simplistic view of previous scholarship. H.J. de Jonge discusses Charles's opinions in more detail. He points to several authors, including Sgambati and Simon, who maintained "linguistische Argumente für ein hebräisches oder aramäisches Original". But, as discussed above, the number of scholars in those centuries maintaining Christian authorship does vastly outweigh those supporting Jewish authorship; de Jonge, "Patriarchentestamente," 41.

33 Charles, "Testaments," 282, 289.

34 Charles, "Testaments," 281. Charles's 1917 publication of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* includes a twenty-three page introduction by Oesterley. This introduction contains an extensive discussion on "whether the standpoint in the book is either Pharisaic or Sadducean"; Charles, *Testaments*, xviii. Oesterley argues that the work shows traits of both groups, and could be written by a "peace-loving Sadducee to appeal ... for a better understanding between the two parties," or alternatively "a good Jew, neither Sadducean nor Pharisaic, who loved all that was best among his people"; Charles, *Testaments*, xix–xx. Clearly, Charles's Pharisaic authorship hypothesis was not as strongly supported as his general hypothesis of Jewish authorship.

35 Charles names eleven certain first-century additions: *T. Levi* 10,14–16, *T. Jud.* 17.2–18.1, 21.6–23, 24.4–6, *T. Zeb.* 9, *T. Dan* 5.6–7, 7.3, *T. Naph.* 4, *T. Gad* 8.2, and *T. Ash.* 7.4–7. Charles, "Testaments," 290.

were added at about the same time (70–40 BCE).<sup>36</sup> Finally, Charles argued that Christian additions were interpolated in almost every testament at various times.<sup>37</sup> It is especially interesting to note Charles's opinion that while the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* were interpolated by Christians, the translation into Armenian was performed before these interpolations.<sup>38</sup> This assumption was instrumental in Charles's identification of the Christian interpolations, although it was widely critiqued later.<sup>39</sup> According to Charles, these Christian interpolations were minimal,<sup>40</sup> and Charles's method was based on the assumption that a text is Jewish until clearly proven to be Christian.<sup>41</sup> As we will discuss below, in recent years we have seen the development of the exact opposite methodological assumption.<sup>42</sup>

In the years following Charles's publications there was little disagreement within the broad lines that he laid out. His literary-critical method was minimally critiqued, and authors instead disagreed with Charles on questions of authorship, date, and scope of the interpolations. His fundamental outlook that the work was of Jewish authorship went unchallenged.<sup>43</sup>

Two events in the early 1950s dramatically changed these views on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* once more. The first, which was a modification of Charles's theory, was the theory of sectarian (or more precisely Qumranian) Jewish authorship. This theory followed from the earliest findings in Qumran.<sup>44</sup> The second event was a renewal of the pre-Schnapp theory of Christian authorship by M. de Jonge.<sup>45</sup> These two events reopened the discussion of the authorship of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, breaking the consensus up to the present day.<sup>46</sup>

36 Charles, "Testaments," 290.

37 Charles claims that Christian additions "are found in nearly all Testaments and are made at different periods"; Charles, "Testaments," 291.

38 Charles claims that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* "underwent interpolation at the hands of Christian scribes, but happily many of these interpolations had not been made when the book was done into Armenian"; Charles, "Testaments," 283.

39 Charles, "Testaments," 283; Slingerland, *Critical History*, 26–7.

40 Charles counts all additions, both Jewish and Christian, to be about one-twelfth of the work, Charles, "Testaments," 290.

41 Charles maintains that "for the rest the rule is followed that anything that is not clearly Christian can be considered Jewish"; Hollander and de Jonge, *Commentary*, 4.

42 See the discussion of the methodological discussion in recent years in Section 1.2.3 below.

43 Slingerland maintains that "there were disagreements with Charles in questions of authorship, date, and interpolations"; Slingerland, *Critical History*, 40.

44 Cf. Slingerland, *Critical History*, 44–5; Kugler, *Testaments*, 34–5.

45 See also Slingerland, *Critical History*, 47; Kugler, *Testaments*, 35.

46 Kugler, *Testaments*, 31.

### 1.1.2 The 1950s Onwards: A Three-Way Split

From the 1950s onwards there were three dominant views or approaches taken when dealing with the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>47</sup> The first approach built upon the groundwork laid by Schnapp and Charles. The largest group of scholars in this period viewed the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* as Jewish documents interpolated by Christians.<sup>48</sup> The second approach, briefly maintained by a handful of scholars, was a specific variant of the first, where the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* were seen as an Essene writing, again with some Christian interpolations.<sup>49</sup> The third view was quite different, and essentially considered the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* to be a Christian document that incorporates older Jewish sources.<sup>50</sup> We will now examine these three different streams in more detail.

The first school was a very diverse group, united only in its rejection of the Christian authorship hypothesis, with hugely varying views on the actual extent and content of the Christian and Jewish interpolations of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>51</sup> In general, the proponents of this view built upon the arguments of Schnapp and Charles, who propagated the theories of Christian redaction and Christian interpolation respectively.<sup>52</sup> Of the two it was Charles who was followed by most scholars.<sup>53</sup> Because their methodologies and theories vary so greatly, an extensive review and critique of the differing views of each of these authors<sup>54</sup> would not contribute to this study.<sup>55</sup> A sample

47 For a discussion of these three approaches consider John J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. Michael E. Stone; Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section Two: The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 342–4; Kugler, *Testaments*, 31–8.

48 Collins describes this approach as assuming that "the Test. 12 Patr. are Jewish documents interpolated by a Christian"; Collins, "Testaments," 342. Kugler maintains that "the dominant view is that Jews first wrote the *Testaments*, and only later were they redacted to serve the interests of the early Christian movement"; Kugler, *Testaments*, 31.

49 Collins maintains that this view is "a more specific variant of the interpolation theory regard[ing] the Test. 12 Patr. as Essene writings with very few Christian interpolations"; Collins, "Testaments," 342. So also Kugler, who describes the "insistence that the *Testaments*' supposedly Christian passages actually derive from the Jewish authors and keepers of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Essenes"; Kugler, *Testaments*, 34.

50 Collins describes this point of view as maintaining that "the Test. 12 Patr. are Christian documents which drew on Jewish sources"; Collins, "Testaments," 342.

51 Kugler, *Testaments*, 11.

52 Charles, "Testaments"; Schnapp, "Die Testamente."

53 M. de Jonge explains that Charles 'won the approval of the great majority of scholars'; Marinus de Jonge, "The Interpretation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Recent Years," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 184.

54 Consider, besides Charles, Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen Zur Entstehungsgeschichte Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen* (Leiden: Brill, 1970); Anders Hultgård, *L'eschatologie Des*

discussion of some of the more influential publications within this first school of thought will function as representative of the situation as a whole.

*Testaments Des Douze Patriarches: I. Interprétation Des Textes* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Historia Religionum; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977); Anders Hultgård, "The Ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah, and the Saviour Priest in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg; Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980); Anders Hultgård, *L'eschatologie Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches: II. Composition de L'ouvrage, Textes et Traductions* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Historia Religionum; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1981); Jarl H. Ulrichsen, *Die Grundschrift Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen: Eine Untersuchung Zu Umfang, Inhalt Und Eigenart Der Ursprünglichen Schrift* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991); Jacob S. Jervell, "Ein Interpolator Interpretiert. Zu Der Christlichen Bearbeitung Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen," in *Studien Zu Den Testamenten Der Zwölf Patriarchen* (ed. Walther Eltester; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969), 30–61; Howard C. Kee, "The Ethical Dimensions of the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 259–70; Howard C. Kee, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol. 1 Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1983); Peter W. Macky, "The Importance of the Teaching on God, Evil and Eschatology for the Dating of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" (Princeton Theological Seminary, 1969); Johannes Thomas, "Aktuelles Im Zeugnis Der Zwölf Väter," in *Studien Zu Den Testamenten Der Zwölf Patriarchen* (ed. Walther Eltester; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969), 62–150; Christoph Burchard, "Zur Armenischen Überlieferung Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen," in *Studien Zu Den Testamenten Der Zwölf Patriarchen* (ed. Walther Eltester; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969), 1–29; Johannes Thomas, "The Paraenesis of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Between Torah and Jewish Wisdom," in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context* (ed. James Starr and Troels Engberg-Pedersen; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004); H. Dixon Slingerland, "The Testament of Joseph: A Redaction-Critical Study," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 507–16; H. Dixon Slingerland, "The Levitical Hallmark within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 531–7; H. Dixon Slingerland, "The Nature of Nomos (Law) Within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 39–48.

- 55 An interested reader may want to consider the brief discussion in Kugler, *Testaments*, 31–4. Alternatively, a review and critique is available in Marinus de Jonge, "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 182–235; Marinus de Jonge, "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Novum Testamentum* 5 (1962): 311–9; Marinus de Jonge, "Notes on Testament of Levi II–VII," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 247–60. Information can also be found in Slingerland, *Critical History*, 44–90. Bearing in mind that Slingerland's focus is more on the Qumran and Christian redaction theories. Also, consider M. de Jonge's critique of Slingerland in which he mainly states the datedness of Slingerland's work; Marinus de Jonge, "H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 9 (1978): 108–11. Additionally, one could review Hollander and de Jonge's discussion of these authors in Hollander and de Jonge, *Commentary*, 1–9. Finally see also Kurowski's aptly named section 'Interpolation, Redaction oder einfach Spekulation?' in Philipp Kurowski, *Der Menschliche Gott Aus Levi Und Juda: Die "Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen" Als Quelle Judenchristlicher Theologie* (ed. Klaus Berger; Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 52; Tübingen: Francke, 2010), 7–19.

Jürgen Becker's *Untersuchungen Zur Entstehungsgeschichte Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen*, published in 1970, followed many of Charles's text-critical hypotheses.<sup>56</sup> Becker felt that the Armenian version was a strong witness to a pre-Christian version of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>57</sup> Ultimately, Becker saw the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* as the result of three stages. The first stage was the writing of the original version, which contained moral exhortation. This stage can be dated to the third century BCE.<sup>58</sup> The second stage, also Jewish, took place over many years in Hellenistic Judaism. In this stage many passages were inserted, including homiletical material, some future-oriented passages, lists of virtues, and apocalyptic passages.<sup>59</sup> The third stage was Christian, and added the typically Christian materials.<sup>60</sup>

Anders Hultgård published two volumes in 1977 and 1981.<sup>61</sup> He hypothesised that many literary-critical studies have incorrectly assumed that inconsistencies and seams are the result of multiple stages of redaction. He then rightly argued that these literary-critical markers could simply point to the usage of multiple sources by one author.<sup>62</sup> Despite this, Hultgård still used these same markers to make literary-critical decisions. Following Charles (and Becker), he assumed that the Armenian version predates most Christian additions,<sup>63</sup> but Hultgård's hypothesis regarding the stages of redaction are quite different to those of Becker and Charles. According to him, the first stage was a Levi Apocryphon, of which we see evidence in the many Aramaic Levi fragments.<sup>64</sup> This document, focussing mainly on Levi and the priesthood, is Zadokite and influenced the Qumran sect. It can be dated to the second century BCE, and went through a series of undeterminable recensions in the same levitical group.<sup>65</sup> At the turn of the era, a more universalist Jewish group edited the document. This group, of which little can be said, added the

56 Becker, *Entstehungsgeschichte*.

57 Becker, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 44–9.

58 Becker, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 375.

59 Becker, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 373.

60 Becker, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 374.

61 Hultgård, *Interprétation*; Hultgård, *Composition*. See also M. de Jonge and Slingerland's reviews; Marinus de Jonge, "Anders Hultgård, L'eschatologie Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches I. Interprétation Des Textes," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 10 (1979): 100–2; Marinus de Jonge, "Anders Hultgård, L'eschatologie Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches II. Composition de L'ouvrage, Textes et Traductions," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 14 (1983): 70–80; H. Dixon Slingerland, "L'eschatologie Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches (Book)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 470–1.

62 Hultgård, *Composition*, 34–51. See also Kugler's discussion, Kugler, *Testaments*, 33.

63 See Hultgård, *Composition*, 34–51. Consider also M. de Jonge's extensive criticism of Hultgård's methods and assumptions; de Jonge, "Composition."

64 Hultgård, *Interprétation*, 43–5.

65 Hultgård, *Interprétation*, 265.

passages containing a saviour figure.<sup>66</sup> Finally, in the second century, Christians minimally edited the work. Hultgård's work was extensively criticised on account of its subjectivity.<sup>67</sup> This subjectivity seems to be caused mainly by Hultgård's presuppositions and general literary-critical method rather than by a specific fault in his research.<sup>68</sup> Ultimately, this raises the question of whether a literary-critical method actually leads to viable results.

Another author who argued for a Jewish original of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was Jarl Ulrichsen. In 1991 his work *Die Grundschrift der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*<sup>69</sup> was published, in which he argued that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are the result of five stages of literary composition.<sup>70</sup> These five stages are (1) a paraenetical *Grundschrift* written in Hebrew or Aramaic around 200 BCE in Palestine; (2) the addition of prophetic and eschatological-apocalyptic sections between 160 and 63 BCE; (3) miscellaneous Jewish interpolations in the first century BCE; (4) the translation of the text to Greek and addition of other varied passages in the first century CE; (5) the addition of Christian elements and the Christianising of the document from the end of the first century CE onwards.<sup>71</sup> By outlining these steps, Ulrichsen joined all the others in the tradition of accepting a Jewish origin of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Although he accepted this Jewish origin, he still felt compelled to create yet another hypothesis of what the original form was and how the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* became the text we have today.<sup>72</sup> This hypothesis, like the ones before it, failed to

66 Hultgård, *Interprétation*, 322–6.

67 M. de Jonge, reviewing Hultgård's work, writes: "Hultgård heaps supposition on supposition. This volume [volume 2], too, is full of subjective interpretations and dubious conclusions; many hypotheses are attractive, but often they cannot be proved (and therefore not be disproved either) ... there is very little he can offer in the way of solid proof"; de Jonge, "Composition," 70.

68 Slingerland concludes that "Hultgård's work is similar to several studies (including his earlier dissertation) discussed in my monograph on the Testaments, in which the presupposition of Jewish authorship and redaction leads inevitably to the conclusion of Jewish authorship and redaction"; Slingerland, "L'eschatologie," 471.

69 Ulrichsen, *Grundschrift*.

70 Ulrichsen concludes "auf Grund der vorangehenden Untersuchungen läßt sich ein fünfstufiges Modell des Wachstumsprozesses der vorliegenden TP aufstellen, wobei Stufen 2–5 natürlich nicht punktuell, sondern als eine mehr oder minder lange Periode, die sich nicht genau abgrenzen läßt, aufgefaßt werden müssen"; Ulrichsen, *Grundschrift*, 343.

71 Ulrichsen, *Grundschrift*, 343–5.

72 Kugler begins his review of Ulrichsen's work by immediately outlining the largest issue within this school of thought: "Ulrichsen accepts the basic notion that there must have been a Jewish form of the Testaments, but also like his predecessors he feels compelled to create yet another hypothesis regarding the shape of that work"; Kugler, *Testaments*, 33. At this junction it is important to note that Kugler originally identified himself with this school. As he wrote in 1996, "we understand *Testament of Levi* to have existed independently prior to its incorporation into *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*". In his later publication, however, he states "I grew more and more convinced ... that there is no getting back to a pre-Christian *Testaments* (if there ever were one)"; Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic*

achieve wide acceptance either within or outside the proponents of Jewish authorship.<sup>73</sup>

In feeling the need to create a new hypothesis, Ulrichsen was not alone. Each author writing during the period following the 1950s created his own hypothesis, none of which gathered substantial support.<sup>74</sup> Indeed, it would seem that this multitude of literary-critical studies of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* failed to actually solve any issues, instead simply creating more.<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, as will be discussed later in this chapter, it is questionable whether the basic methodological assumptions underlying such a literary-critical study are sustainable.<sup>76</sup> Amongst others, Ulrichsen assumed that an ancient author's text will be internally consistent, which is by no means uncontested.<sup>77</sup> Furthermore, he assumes that it is possible to differentiate between Jewish and Christian writings, an argument that was already contested when Ulrichsen wrote his work.<sup>78</sup> Finally, it seems that

*Levi to Testament of Levi* (Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 9; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996), 4; Kugler, *Testaments*, 7.

73 This is evident from the harsh reviews written by proponents and opponents of Jewish authorship alike, Harm W. Hollander, "Die Grundschrift Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen: Eine Untersuchung Zu Umfang, Inhalt Und Eigenart Der Ursprünglichen Schrift. By Jarl Henning Ulrichsen," *Journal of Theological Studies* 44 (1993): 210–2; Howard C. Kee, "Jarl Henning Ulrichsen, Die Grundschrift Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen: Eine Untersuchung Zu Umfang, Inhalt Und Eigenart Der Ursprünglichen Schrift," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 827–9; H. Dixon Slingerland, "Die Grundschrift Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen: Eine Untersuchung Zu Umfang, Inhalt Und Eigenart Der Ursprünglichen Schrift. By Jarl Henning Ulrichsen," *Critical Review of Books in Religion* 6 (1993): 185–7.

74 M. de Jonge maintains that these scholars' "operations resulted, however, in widely different reconstructions"; Marinus de Jonge, "The Two Great Commandments in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Novum Testamentum* 44 (2002): 371–92.

75 Hollander infers from Ulrichsen's publication that since "all literary-critical studies on the Testaments have failed to solve any of the 'riddles' of the Testaments. It seems therefore wiser – at least for the moment – to analyse the text of the Testaments as it lies before us and to find out the meaning it had for both the author (composer, redactor) and for the receptors"; Hollander, "Die Grundschrift," 212. This more nuanced and pragmatic view of the situation will be defended later in this study.

76 Consider Kee's scathing remarks on Ulrichsen's method: "his form-critical method recalls that of Bultmann who, having noted certain formal patterns in the literature under examination, either relegates to the hand of a clumsy later editor features which he as a modern critic finds intellectually or theologically embarrassing, or interprets them allegorically to fit with his own philosophical predilections. In all the six categories noted above, he treats everything as a late accretion if it is not compatible with an intellectual structure embodying what he regards as timeless moral wisdom"; Kee, "Die Grundschrift," 829.

77 Consider M. de Jonge's claim that "it is by no means certain that modern standards of consistency are applicable here: what clearly strikes us as inconsistent did not hinder the interpolator/redactor, or later readers, who for ages read and transmitted the text as we now have it"; de Jonge, "Two Great Commandments," 378.

78 Consider, for example, Kraft's comment that 'it should not be assumed that a document composed or compiled by a Christian will necessarily contain characteristically "Christian" contents'; Robert A. Kraft, "Reassessing the 'Recensional Problem' in Testament of Abraham," in



Ulrichsen's work was highly hypothetical and rather subjective, which goes a long way to explain the great diversity among the literary-critical studies of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

The second school of thought about the origins of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, in which they are seen as Essene writings, is often thought to have been brought about by the discovery and publication of the Qumran scrolls. In actuality, the first steps towards this theory were made by Eduard Meyer in 1921, when he noted the similarities between the "Renewer of the Law" in the *Testament of Levi* and the "Teacher" in the *Damascus Document*.<sup>79</sup> Slingerland named two other 'preliminary' works that considered the relationship between the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>80</sup> The one, Dupont-Sommer, assumed Qumranian authorship of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*,<sup>81</sup> but the other, Otzen, found no useful similarities between these two bodies of text.<sup>82</sup>

Philonenko also advocated Essene authorship in two articles, published in 1958 and 1959.<sup>83</sup> These articles were later republished together as *Les Interpolations Chrétiennes Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches et Les Manuscrits de Qoumrân*.<sup>84</sup> Essentially, Philonenko tried to show that the Messianic interpolations in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* do not refer to Jesus Christ, but to the "Teacher of Righteousness" found in the Essene writings. He concluded that the relationship between the two is blindingly obvious,<sup>85</sup> and that they must therefore have a common origin.

*Studies on the Testament of Abraham* (ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg; Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 6; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 135.

79 Eduard Meyer, *Ursprung Und Anfänge Des Christentums II: Die Entwicklung Des Judentums Und Jesus von Nazaret* (Stuttgart: Cotta'sche Buchhandlung, 1921), 172.

80 Slingerland names these two works as the first that deal "in a systematic fashion with the constellation of relationships between the Testaments and the Qumran writings"; Slingerland, *Critical History*, 45.

81 André Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux Aperçus Sur Les Manuscrits de La Mer Morte* (L'Orient Ancien Illustré; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953).

82 Otzen concludes that "es lässt sich nicht behaupten, daß Test xii und die neuen Schriften aus derselben Sekte herrühren, denselben historischen Hintergrund haben und dieselben historischen Ereignisse widerspiegeln"; Benedikt Otzen, "Die Neugefundenen Hebräischen Sektenschriften Und Die Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen," *Studia Theologica* 7 (1953): 155.

83 Marc Philonenko, "Les Interpolations Chrétiennes Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches et Les Manuscrits de Qoumrân," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 38 (1958): 309–43; Marc Philonenko, "Les Interpolations Chrétiennes Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches et Les Manuscrits de Qoumrân (suite)," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 39 (1959): 14–27.

84 Marc Philonenko, *Les Interpolations Chrétiennes Des Testaments Des Douze Patriarches et Les Manuscrits de Qoumrân* (Cahiers de la Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 35; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960).

85 Philonenko claims that 'la parenté entre les *Testaments* et les textes du désert de Juda est, en effet, d'une aveugle évidence'; Philonenko, *Interpolations Chrétiennes* (1960), 3.

This theory was short-lived. Indeed, when reflecting back on this second school of thought in 2001, Kugler named no other authors supporting this view, and sees it as wholly untenable.<sup>86</sup> M. de Jonge criticised Philonenko's view extensively,<sup>87</sup> Becker contributed eleven arguments against Philonenko's thesis,<sup>88</sup> and in later years the theory was further disproved, especially considering the dominance of cultic regulations in the Dead Sea Scrolls which are wholly absent from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>89</sup> Charlesworth, writing in 1997, concluded that there was a general scholarly consensus that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* were not written by members of the Qumran sect.<sup>90</sup> Nevertheless, some striking similarities between the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and some of the Dead Sea Scrolls do exist, such as the *Aramaic Levi Document* (which has much in common with the *Testament of Levi*) and the teachings of the two spirits in the *Rule of the Community*.<sup>91</sup>

The third school of thought on the origins of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, arguing for a Christian origin, was instigated by the publication of Marinus de Jonge's doctoral dissertation in 1953.<sup>92</sup> M. de Jonge's thesis was

86 Kugler calls 'the notion that the *Testaments* were composed among the Essenes at Qumran and that the messianic passages refer to the Teacher of Righteousness ... utterly implausible'; Kugler, *Testaments*, 34–5.

87 M. de Jonge is scathing in his critique of Philonenko. Firstly, his method is critiqued in four parts. M. de Jonge argues that similar ideas do not mean common origin, that Philonenko takes texts out of context, that there is Christian influence in passages outside of those discussed by Philonenko, and – as Philonenko himself admits – that the Christology of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is not identical to that of Qumran; Marinus de Jonge, "Testament Issachar Als 'typisches Testament': Einige Bemerkungen Zu Zwei Neuen Übersetzungen Der Testamente Der Zwölf Patriarchen," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 300.

88 Becker, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 149–51.

89 Kugler maintains that "broader publication of the scrolls has demonstrated their authors and keepers to have been particularly fascinated with the details of the law, an interest that lacks prominence in the *Testaments*"; Kugler, *Testaments*, 35.

90 He concludes that "there seems to be a general consensus among contemporary scholars that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* was not written by Qumran sectarians"; James H. Charlesworth, "Seminar Report: Reflections on the Supplements to *Novum Testamentum's* Pseudepigrapha Seminar at Duke on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*," *Novum Testamentum* 23 (1977): 304. M. de Jonge confirms this, stating "the Dupont-Sommer-Philonenko solution was accepted only by very few scholars"; Marinus de Jonge, "The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints," in *Religion (Hellenistisches Judentum in Römischer Zeit, Ausgenommen Philon Und Josephus)* (ed. Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini; Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung Part 2, Principat, 20.1; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1987), 381.

91 The *Aramaic Levi Document* contains several passages that parallel passages in the *Testament of Levi*. Much debate on this document has taken place, but there is still no consensus on the relationship between the *Aramaic Levi* and the *Testament of Levi*. Consider the extensive discussion of the different opinions in Kugler, *Testaments*, 47–52. Consider also our comparison of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* with the *Rule of the Community* in Section 4.2 below.

92 Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study in Their Text, Composition*