

THE TESTAMENT OF LEVI AND "ARAMAIC LEVI"

1. "Aramaic Levi"

At the time the first scrolls from Qumran were being published and studied intensively a number of scholars believed to be able to establish a close link between the author(s) of the Jewish *Grundchrift* of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (= *TXIIPatr*) and the community of Qumran. They came to this conclusion on the basis of parallels in content between the already published documents and the Greek *Testaments* and cherished the hope that soon Aramaic or Hebrew fragments of the original *TXIIPatr* would be discovered among the still unidentified or not yet discovered material. (1)

In the end these scholars were disappointed. The fragments *IQ21*, 1-60 published by J. T. MILIK in the first volume of *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (2) and the fragments belonging to *4Q213 TestLevi^a* and *4Q214 TestLevi^b* published or announced by the same scholar (3) clearly had to be assigned to the Levi-document (related to but by no means identical with *T. Levi*) which was already known from the Cambridge and Bodleian Cairo Genizah fragments published by H. L. PASS and J. ARENDZEN (4) and A. COWLEY and R. H. CHARLES respectively, (5) and from the two

(1) See H. DIXON SLINGERLAND, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*, Missoula MT 1977, pp. 47-90.

(2) D. BARTHÉLEMY, O.P. and J. T. MILIK, *Qumrân Cave I* (DJD I), Oxford 1955, pp. 87-91.

(3) See *Le Testament de Lévi en araméen. Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân*, *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955), pp. 398-406; and *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, Oxford 1976, pp. 23-24. Cf. also *Revue Biblique* 73 (1966), p. 95, n. 2.

(4) *Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi*, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 12 (1900), pp. 651-661.

(5) *An Early Source of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 19 (1907), pp. 566-580. Appendix III of R. H. CHARLES, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908 gives the text of all Genizah fragments together with those of the Greek fragments to be mentioned presently. On p. 254 there is also a very small Syriac fragment.

additions found in the eleventh-century Greek manuscript Athos, Koutloumous 39 (= MS *e*) of *TXIIPatr* at *T. Levi* 2,3 and 18,2.(6) Although of a very different date, the Qumran fragments and the Genizah fragments partly overlapped and clearly represented the same document. Very interestingly, the two columns of a prayer of Levi partly preserved on the fragment published by MILIK in 1955 found a parallel in the first addition to the Greek MS *e*, of which hitherto no Aramaic counterpart was known. MILIK rightly used the Greek material in his reconstruction of the fragmentary text.

It is to be regretted that the 4Q-fragments of "*Aramaic Levi*" (= *Ar. Levi*) have still to be published in full. At the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense 1976 J. T. MILIK told his audience that he was finishing a volume devoted to the *Testament of Levi*, at the same time announcing the existence of more manuscript material.(7) What is available, either from Qumran or from the Cairo Genizah, has been brought together by J. A. FITZMYER-D. J. HARRINGTON,(8) K. BEYER(9) and J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE.(10) Until everything that is known is also published all editions, translations and comments have to remain provisional, at least to some degree.

It is clear that the Greek fragments in MS *e* are an important witness for *Ar. Levi*. While not directly translated from the Aramaic fragments known to us, as is evident from the differences between the two groups of fragments where they overlap, they clearly go back to another Aramaic manuscript of *Ar. Levi*.(11) The Greek is of help in the reconstruction and

(6) See now the apparatus on *T. Levi* 2,3 and 18,2 in M. DE JONGE *et alii*, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, Leiden 1978. Very likely, a small addition in MS *e* to *T. Levi* 5,2, worked into the text, also came from the same source.

(7) See his *Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram* in M. DELCOR (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, Paris-Gembloux/Leuven 1978, pp. 91-106 (especially p. 95).

(8) *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C.-Second Century A.D.)*, Rome 1978, pp. 80-91 (most of the 1Q fragments and the 4Q fragment published by MILIK in 1955).

(9) *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, Göttingen 1984, pp. 188-209 (includes the Genizah fragments, and translations of the Greek).

(10) See their *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza*, *Revue Biblique* 86 (1979), pp. 214-230 (with a list of revised readings based on the study of the manuscripts), followed by their translation of all published material in appendix III of H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, Leiden 1985. They, too, plan a new edition with translation and commentary. CD IV, 15-19 (Hebrew) refers to a writing of Levi that cannot be identified.

(11) See M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Their Text, Composition and Origin*, Assen 1953 (21975), pp. 129-131.

interpretation of the Aramaic text. We have just mentioned the case of the prayer of Levi and may point to the text of Isaac's priestly instructions to Levi, where the addition in MS *e* to *T. Levi* 18,2 provides a Greek text corresponding to four missing columns in the Aramaic. Unfortunately, nothing is known about the date at which the Greek translation was made. Nor do we know how the fragments came in the hands of the Greek scribe responsible for MS *e* (or one of his predecessors) and whether he knew more than he inserted. (12)

It is generally accepted that the various Aramaic and Greek fragments go back to one document. This will have contained a prayer and a vision of Levi (comparable to what we find in *T. Levi* 2-5) and a report on the expedition to Shechem (*T. Levi* 6). There is a reference to a second vision (corresponding to that in *T. Levi* 8), and a very extended counterpart of the priestly instructions found in *T. Levi* 9, but no parallel to *T. Levi* 10. The existing fragments contain an equivalent to the autobiographical account in *T. Levi* 11-12 and break off somewhere in a passage singing the praise of Wisdom and the wise man (corresponding to *T. Levi* 13). After that there is only a small fragment that can be compared with *T. Levi* 14,3-4. (13) Unfortunately, the beginning and the end are missing so that we are not in a position to establish directly the genre of the document represented by all these fragments.

It is worth noting in passing, that the situation with regard to the *Testament of Levi* is different from that regarding other testaments belonging to *TXIIPatr*. Next to nothing has come to light at Qumran that is related to the other sons of Jacob. In 1956 J. T. MILIK announced a Hebrew fragment containing a genealogy of Bilhah in a longer form than that found in *T. Napht* 1,6-12. In 1976 he published the text of *4QT. Napht* 1 II 4-5 corresponding to *T. Napht* 1,12. (14) As Bilhah is called "my mother", Jacob

(12) On this see also H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 18-19. The first insertion in *e* forms a unity: it gives a prayer of Levi with a short introduction. It is added at a place corresponding to the one it may have occupied in the alternative Greek text it will have belonged to. Did the scribe still know the original context? The same applies to the addition at *T. Levi* 5,2. The third insertion has a proper beginning (corresponding to vs. 11 of the Aramaic fragments and *T. Levi* 9,1), telling about a journey to Isaac, but breaks off unexpectedly with the birth of Levi's son Merari, while the Aramaic continues. Here the one responsible for the insertion very probably had a fragmentary text before him; he inserted it in an awkward place.

(13) See again H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 19-20 with a reserved reaction on further suppositions about the contents of the Levi-document by MILIK (*The Books of Enoch*, pp. 283f.).

(14) See *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956), p. 407, n. 1 and *The Books of Enoch*, p. 198.

“my father” and Dan “(my) brother” (15) it is reasonable to suppose that the fragment represents part of a story told by Naphtali; but it clearly does not provide definitive proof of the existence of a Hebrew Testament of Naphtali at Qumran. (16) It does explain, however, why the Greek *T. Naphtali* has so much information on what is after all a minor detail.

Even more uncertain is the existence of sources of other testaments. In 1978 MILIK described fragments that may have belonged to Aramaic sources behind the *Testaments of Judah and Joseph*. (17) He also connects 3Q7, 6 and 5+3 (18) with *T. Jud* 25, 1 and *T. Jud* 25, 1-2 respectively. Recently, M. BAILLET has (tentatively) added twenty small fragments belonging to 4Q484. (19) In the present writer's view MILIK's reconstructions and his theories about the nature and contents of the Aramaic documents related to these two Greek testaments remain too hypothetical to offer any real evidence of Judah- or Joseph- documents at Qumran related to the Greek testaments. (20)

2. 4QQahat and 4Q'Amram

In 1972 J. T. MILIK published a number of fragments belonging to manuscripts of a document called 4Q'Amram and one belonging to a related document called 4QQahat. (21) Qahat

(15) According to MILIK in his note in *Revue Biblique* 63.

(16) There is no connection between the Hebrew fragment mentioned by MILIK and the medieval *Hebrew Testament of Naphtali* (on this see H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 25-26 and 296-297).

(17) See his *Écrits préesséniens ...*, mentioned in n. 7, pp. 97-102.

(18) Published by M. BAILLET in M. BAILLET, J. T. MILIK and R. DE VAUX, O.P., *Les Petites Grolles de Qumrân* (DJD III), Oxford 1962, p. 99.

(19) M. BAILLET, *Qumrân Grolle 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII), Oxford 1982, p. 3.

(20) 4QJu 1a-b, for instance, is connected by MILIK with *T. Jud* 12, 11-12. Here a brother of Joseph recounts Joseph's encounter with his brothers in Egypt (cf. *Gen* 44, 6-45, 12). K. BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, p. 187 regards Benjamin as the speaker, although he has to admit that the incident is not mentioned in *T. Benjamin* or anywhere else in the *Testaments*. He assigns this fragment to one of the later scrolls of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (p. 186). This too, of necessity, remains hypothetical. It should be noted that J. A. FITZMYER, in a list of Qumran Aramaic texts found on pp. 101-102 of his *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays*, Missoula MT 1975, mentions 4QTBenj, that is a “Testament of Benjamin(?)” belonging to “STARCKY's lot”. Nothing further seems to be known about this fragment.

(21) 4Q *Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène*, *Revue Biblique* 79 (1972), pp. 77-97. See also J. A. FITZMYER-D. J. HARRINGTON, *A Manual of Palestinian*

(Kohath) is a son of Levi and the father of Amram. He is mentioned and exalted in *Ar. Levi* vv. 67-68. Levi saw "that he would have an assembly of all the people and that he would have the highpriesthood. He and his seed will be the beginning (or rule) of kings, a priesthood for Israel". There is a reference here to *Gen* 49, 10 belonging to Jacob's blessing of Judah; Kohath will not only be a high priest but also king. (22) Amram is mentioned in *Ar. Levi* vv. 74-77. He marries his aunt Jochebed, born on the same day as he. The defective v. 76 seems to contain an explanation of his name. STONE and GREENFIELD restore: This one [...] the people from the lo[rd of Eg]lypt. Therefore [...] will be [call]ed [...] exalted. (23) Amram and Jochebed are, of course, the parents of Aaron and Moses, but their two sons are not mentioned. V. 81 makes Levi say that he saw his third generation before he died at the age of 137 (figures restored with the help of *T. Levi* 12, 6; 19, 4).

The fragment 400ahat does not mention the name of the speaker, but because he addresses his son 'Amram, and commands his sons and their sons, it is clear that Kohath is meant. Next we read: "and they gave to Levi, my father, and Levi my father [gave] to me [...] all my books in testimony, so that you might be forewarned by them [...].(24) This suggests a succession of instructions (the verb used is the *pa'el* of *POD*, regularly used in the targums as a translation of *šwh*, see e.g. *Gen* 49, 33) from generation to generation. We may compare here *Ar. Levi* where we find Isaac instructing Levi concerning the priesthood (v. 13). He explicitly refers to Abraham's instructions to him (vv. 22, 50, 57), and once he tells Levi that Abraham instructed him what "he found in the writing of the book of Noah concerning the blood" (v. 57). Of course, Levi will have to hand down Isaac's regulations to his sons, because his offspring will be priests after him (vv. 48-50, cf. 58-61). Next, *Jub* 45, 16 tells that Jacob gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi, to preserve

Aramaic Texts, pp. 92-97 and K. BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, pp. 209-214—who adds a very small fragment that J. A. FITZMYER published in transcription in *Theological Studies* 19 (1958), pp. 225-227 (now in his *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, Missoula MT 1974, pp. 101-105) and at that time ascribed to the Amram document. The text speaks about a person (Aaron?) who "will be the seventh among the men of [his] good will [and ho]nour and will be chosen as priest for ever." One should note that MILIK supposes the existence of a Greek version of 40'Amram, known to early Christian writers.

(22) So GREENFIELD-STONE's translation in H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, p. 466 on the basis of Aramaic and (longer) Greek texts. See also their *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi*, pp. 223-224.

(23) So *Commentary*, p. 467 and *Remarks*, pp. 225-226.

(24) I follow here the translation of J. A. FITZMYER and D. J. HARRINGTON.

them and to renew them for his children "till today". (25) *Jubilees* generally emphasizes the continuous line of instruction: see *Jub* 7, 38-39: Enoch-Methuselah-Lamech-Noah; 10, 14.17: Noah-Shem; in 21, 10 Abraham instructing Isaac refers to the books of his forefathers (the words of Enoch and the words of Noah).

Fortunately of *4QAmram* the beginning has been preserved: "A copy of a book of words of visions of 'Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi: Everything [that] he made known to his sons and that he commanded them on the day of [his] death[h]." (26) This year is said to be his 136th year, and the 152nd of Israel's exile in Egypt. Again the verb פִּדּוּ is used, parallel to the 'aphel of הִוּ meaning "to show, to make known". Again there is a succession in instruction, this time clearly connected with the death of the central figure, as in *TXIIPatr.* We may, therefore, call *4QAmram* a "testament", but should note that the opening words of the document themselves speak about "the words of the visions"—the preserved fragments do indeed contain two visions, just as *Ar. Levi* mentions one vision and looks back upon a second. (27)

From this it is clear that *Ar. Levi*, *4QQahat* and *4QAmram* belong together; they contain instructions (and visions) handed down from generation to generation, in priestly circles; in the case of *Ar. Levi* we are sure that they were concerned with specific priestly matters. The structure of the document to which the *Levi*-fragments belong, and its exact nature cannot be determined with certainty. (28) It was written in the first person singular and comes to a provisional close in v. 81, where Levi refers to his death. Then, in v. 82, he mentions a speech in the 118th year of his life, the year in which his brother Joseph died. This speech is explicitly presented as an instruction to the sons of Levi (in vv. 82-84 we find twice פִּדּוּ [and the expression פִּדּוּדְיָ יִדְיָ ל'] and once

(25) Note the different procedure in *Assumption (Testament) of Moses* 1, 16-18 where Joshua as Moses' successor (as leader of the people and as minister in the tent of testimony—see 1, 6-9) has to take "this writing" in order that he may remember later how to preserve the books that Moses will entrust to him. He has to arrange them, to anoint them with cedar and to deposit them in earthenware jars in a place chosen (by God) from the beginning of the world, so that God's name may be called upon until the consummation of days when God will surely visit his people.

(26) So again FITZMYER-HARRINGTON.

(27) On these aspects of the two writings see especially E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, Leiden 1980, pp. 115-118 and A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, Uppsala 1982, pp. 60-62.

(28) See J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, Leiden 1970, pp. 94-95. D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi* (Diss. Mach. Halle-Saale 1969), pp. 84-86, 90-92) and the section in HULTGÅRD'S *L'eschatologie* mentioned in the previous note.

the *haphel* of HWY/HW'), but it has no particular priestly features. It extols truth and wisdom, and Joseph in particular is mentioned as an example; he "taught reading and writing and the teaching of wisdom" (v. 90). What is given in vv. 82ff. (and has also been preserved in an as yet unpublished fragment found at Qumran) seems to have been added later to an already existing document with final instructions and predictions of Levi. It maintains the use of the first person plural, and exhibits a number of "testamentary" features without being a death-bed address. It is uncertain what conclusions can be drawn from this with regard to the missing beginning of the first part of *Ar. Levi*. We shall do wise not to call this part or the entire document a "testament of Levi". (29)

3. Original language, date and provenance of the Levi, Qahat and 'Amram documents

There is something to be said in favour of the theory that *Ar. Levi* goes back to a Hebrew original but it is difficult to achieve absolute certainty. (30) More important is the growing consensus with regard to a preessenian date of these documents. A. HULTGÅRD calls *Ar. Levi* (and *Jubilees*) "zadokite" rather than "essenian". They come from priestly circles around the Jerusalem temple at the end of the third and the beginning of the second century B.C. (31) One of his arguments in MILIK's dating of 4Q'Amram^b in the first half of the second century: this provides a solid *terminus ad quem* of this document which was probably written later than *Ar. Levi* that gives information about a more illustrious priestly ancestor. (32) Michael E. STONE has recently adduced a paleographical argument: he reminds us that 4Q213 *Levi*^a dates from the second century. Moreover, he considers it likely that *Ar. Levi* is a source of *Jubilees*, and regards it as proven

(29) We should also observe that v. 81 as the obvious end of the first part is not a proper ending for a "testament".

(30) So J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE, *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi*, p. 228; hesitant A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* I, Uppsala 1977, p. 30. Older advocates of a Hebrew original are listed by J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen*, p. 73. J. T. MILIK, *Écrits préesséniens*, p. 106 regards Aramaic as the original language of all pseudepigraphic documents discussed in his article; later they were translated into Hebrew. In the case of the Hebrew Naphtali-fragment he remarks that an onomastic misreading allows us to conclude that there was an Aramaic original (p. 97).

(31) *L'eschatologie...* I, pp. 43-45.

(32) *L'eschatologie...* I, p. 29.

that some datings go back to the ancient calendar that is found in *Jubilees* and in the oldest parts of the Enoch cycle, the *Books of the Luminaries* (1 En 72-82) and the *Book of the Watchers* (1 En 1-36). From this he concludes to a third-century date. (33) P. GRELOT, in a recent article, (34) agrees. He, too, assumes dependence of *Jubilees* on *Ar. Levi*, and regards a third-century date of the latter probable. J. T. MILIK advocates a Samaritan origin and composition "in the course of the third century, if not towards the end of the fourth". (35) In the context of the present article these matters cannot be pursued any further. They had to be mentioned in order to remind ourselves that not all writings preserved at Qumran originated in the sect that regarded them important enough to hand them down.

4. Dependence of T. Levi on Ar. Levi

A number of scholars have carried out a more or less detailed comparison between the *Testament of Levi* in *TXIIPatr* and the extant fragments of *Ar. Levi* in order to determine the relationship between the two documents. (36) Most have concluded that there must be some sort of literary dependence on the part of *T. Levi*; J. BECKER, who denies this, assumes that it goes back to a relatively stable oral cycle of narrative material also reflected in and represented by *Ar. Levi*. The problem, as always, is to account for the agreements as well as the divergencies. Many of

(33) See his *Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins*, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* (forthcoming; the author kindly sent me a copy of his manuscript). On the use of the sectarian calendar in *Ar. Levi* vv. 65-72 see J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE, *Remarks*, pp. 224-225.

(34) *Le Livre des Jubilés et le Testament de Lévi*, in P. CASSETTI, O. KEEL, A. SCHENKER (ed.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy*, Fribourg/Göttingen 1981, pp. 109-133. We cannot discuss here the problem of the relationship between *Ar. Levi* and *Jubilees*.

(35) See, especially, his *The Books of Enoch*, p. 24. He emphasizes the close relationship between *Ar. Levi* and the *Book of the Watchers*. In his *Écrits préesséniens*, p. 96 he writes: "Plusieurs indices, en particulier la toponymie réduite à l'horizon de l'ancien royaume d'Israël, prouvent incontestablement, à mon jugement, l'origine samaritaine du Testament de Lévi." Neither his arguments adduced in connection with *Ar. Levi*, nor those given in connection with Judah material on the following pages, are convincing.

(36) See M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Their Text, Composition and Origin*, pp. 38-52 and *Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII* in M. DE JONGE (ed.), *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Text and Interpretation*, Leiden 1975, pp. 247-260; J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte*, pp. 67-105; D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi, passim* and A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches II*, pp. 93-106.

the divergencies may be explained by the redactional activity of those responsible for *T. Levi* as part of a writing consisting of twelve patriarchal testaments. Also additional material outside *Ar. Levi* (like that preserved in *Jubilees*) may have been used, and, finally, it is quite possible that *T. Levi* goes back to an *Ar. Levi* manuscript, different from that represented by the Aramaic fragments and the *Vorlage* of the Greek fragments (which, as we have seen, also show slight differences).

Among the arguments in favour of literary dependence that of the order of events in both documents is of primary importance. If we compare the reconstruction given above with *T. Levi* we find remarkable agreements. To mention a few points: In *Ar. Levi* we find a prayer and a vision. At first sight the prayer (mainly preserved in the Greek) does not seem to agree with *T. Levi* 2, 4 "and I prayed to the Lord that I might be saved", a very short and at the most a very one-sided extract of the prayer contained in *Ar. Levi*. But when, somewhat later in the story, the angel accompanying Levi tells him that the Most High has heard his prayer (*T. Levi* 4, 2ff.), he clearly refers to other elements of the longer prayer (see e.g. verse 2: "...to separate you from unrighteousness and that you should become to him son and a servant and a minister of the presence").(37) We notice here a tendency in *T. Levi* to shorten the underlying text. This is also noticeable in the account of the Shechem episode of which only unconnected fragments, but clearly of a longer story, have been preserved.(38)

Interestingly, also in *Ar. Levi* there must have been an account of two visions, immediately followed by priestly instructions of Isaac for Levi. Here *T. Levi* 9, 6-14 is very much shorter than *Ar. Levi* represented partly by Aramaic (vv. 12-32) and completely by the Greek fragments (continuing to v. 64). Here the longer text is not free from repetitions and may have undergone expansion.(39) Isaac's instructions find a proper conclusion in the

(37) See my *Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII*, p. 254, referring to D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi*, pp. 16-17.

(38) J. C. GREENFIELD and M. E. STONE, *Remarks*, p. 216 and *Commentary*, p. 461 restore lines 17-18 of Cambridge fragment col a to "[I took counsel with] Jacob my father and Reu[ben my brother]", to be compared with *T. Levi* 6,3 which mentions Reuben besides Jacob, a feature not found elsewhere. In Cambridge col b not only Levi, Simeon and Judah, but also Reuben are mentioned explicitly.

(39) D. HAUPT, *Das Testament des Levi*, pp. 74-75, using earlier suggestions of M. DE JONGE and J. BECKER, divides the existing Greek texts into three sections: vv. 13-30, 31-47 (plus concluding passage 48-50), 51-60 (with again an appropriate ending to which v. 61 was added as a later gloss). In any case direct parallels between *T. Levi* and *Ar. Levi* end with the reference to the kind of wood to be used (*T. Levi* 9,12 par *Ar. Levi* v. 25a). In *T. Levi* 9,13-14 the prescript to salt every sacrifice with salt has a parallel in *Ar. Levi* v. 29 (cf. vv. 26, 37), but both texts may go back directly to *Lev* 2,13.

Greek version of *Ar. Levi*, but break off suddenly in *T. Levi*; *Ar. Levi* continues with biographic details for which *T. Levi* 11-12 provide a clear parallel. *T. Levi* 10, to be connected with similar passages in *T. Levi* 14-15, 16 all speaking about the future sins and punishment of Levi's sons, is evidently an insertion into an existing context by the author(s) of *T. Levi*.(40)

Very significant is the transition between *T. Levi* 12 and 13 parallel to that between *Ar. Levi* vs. 81 and 82. Here, as we have seen, the Aramaic continues with a new speech by Levi dated in the year of Joseph's death. *T. Levi*, a proper testament, could not conclude the preceding section with a reference to Levi's death, so it appropriately leaves this out here, to return to it in *T. Levi* 19. It could also not refer the following speech to an earlier date. So what is left are two disconnected remarks in *T. Levi* 12, 6-7, at an unexpected place: "And behold, my children, you are a third generation. Joseph died in (my) hundred and eighteenth year." If anything this handling of a difficult text shows that the author(s) of *T. Levi* had a document very like *Ar. Levi* before him (them). There are considerable differences, however, in the following speech(41) which are difficult to explain. The fragment that is probably parallel to *T. Levi* 14, 3-4 shows that *Ar. Levi* contained a prediction of the sins of the sons of Levi.

T. Levi, then, represents an abbreviated and heavily redacted version of the Levi-material, preserved in the various fragments of *Ar. Levi*. We would welcome more evidence—particularly in the case of the two visions, and with regard to the predictions concerning the future (did *Ar. Levi* have anything parallel to the enigmatic *T. Levi* 17 and the much disputed description of the new priest in *T. Levi* 18?), but it is simply not available. What is available, however, also explains why in the framework of *TXIIPatr* *T. Levi* is so different from the other testaments. On the whole, of course, there is a great variety within the general structure of *TXII Patr* that combines the elements of exhortation, biography and prediction in many ways.(42) Also in other cases the presence of related material elsewhere explains special features of a particular testament (see e.g. *T. Judah* and *T. Napht*). *T. Levi*, however, shows by far the most ideosyncracies; these can be adequately explained by the use of an exceptionally rich source of material: *Ar. Levi*.

(40) See my *Levi, the sons of Levi and the Law in Testament Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI* in J. DORÉ, P. GRELOT, M. CARREZ (eds.), *De la Tôrah au Messie. Mélanges H. Cazelles*, Tournai 1981, pp. 513-523.

(41) See e.g. the comparison in H. W. HOLLANDER, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Leiden 1981, pp. 57-62.

(42) See E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, pp. 12-107.

T. Levi forms, undoubtedly, part of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* conceived and executed as a single, coherent writing, employing material and ideas from various sources and various traditions. (43) Comparison between the (again variegated) constitutive elements of the framework of the twelve testaments offers a number of interesting agreements with *Ar. Levi*, *4QOahat* and *4QAmram*—which, however, do not necessarily point to literary dependence. (44) We may mention here the expression “copy of the words of” found in *4QAmram* and in *T. Sim* 1, 1; *T. Levi* 1, 1; *T. Jud* 1, 1; *T. Iss* 1, 1; *T. Zab* 1, 1; *T. Dan* 1, 1; *T. Benj* 1, 1; (45) the frequent use of *entellomai* corresponding to *Ar. pqd* in the Testaments, also at the beginning and the end of a testament (see, e.g., *T. Reub* 1, 1; *T. Sim* 7, 3; 8, 1; *T. Levi* 19, 4; *T. Napht* 9, 1); the mention of the age of the patriarch together with that of the year of Joseph’s death (see *Ar. Levi* 81, 82 compared with *T. Reub* 1, 2; *T. Sim* 1, 1; *T. Zab* 1, 1); the “Lehrer-öffnungsformel” (46) in *Ar. Levi* 83 and similar formulas in *TXIIPatr* (see e.g. *T. Reub* 1, 5; *T. Sim* 2, 1; (*T. Jud* 13, 1); *T. Iss* 1, 1; *T. Zab* 1, 2; *T. Dan* 1, 2; *T. Napht* 1, 5; *T. Ash* 1, 2; *T. Jos* 1, 2). Finally, there is the notion of warning in *4QOahat*, that is also present in a number of statements in *TXIIPatr* in which the patriarchs exhort their offspring to pay heed to their instructions and their predictions, in order to avoid sin and to practice obedience, and to be ready at God’s intervention in the future (*T. Sim* 6, 1; 7, 3; *T. Levi* 10, 1-2; *T. Iss* 6, 3; *T. Dan* 6, 9; *T. Napht* 4, 1; 8, 1-2; *T. Gad* 8, 1; *T. Benj* 10, 4-5; and cf. *T. Ash* 7, 4). *TXIIPatr* as a whole view the “Testaments” of the twelve sons of Jacob in the perspective of the spiritual heritage of the patriarchs before them. Not only does *T. Levi* in 9, 6-8 put much emphasis on Isaac’s instructions to Levi and preserve the reference to Abraham’s instructions to Isaac (9, 12), also in *T. Jos.* 3, 3 Joseph is protected from temptation because he remembers the word of his father Jacob (cf. *Jub* 39, 6-7), prays to the Lord and fasts. Towards the end of the *Testaments*, in *T. Benj* 10, Benjamin’s teaching “instead of any inheritance” is compared to

(43) See E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, p. 258. The existence of individual testaments ascribed to sons of Jacob remains uncertain. The hypothesis that the collection of twelve testaments is the result of a process of gradual growth is untenable.

(44) On what follows see E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, pp. 115-118; A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, pp. 60-62.

(45) In *T. Levi* 1, 1 and *T. Benj* 1, 1 (cf. *T. Zab* 1, 1) the verb *dielheto* follows immediately; in *T. Reub* 1, 1; *T. Napht* 1, 1; *T. Gad* 1, 1 and *T. Jos* 1, 1 the expression “copy of the testament (*dialhēkēs*)” is used.

(46) On this term see E. VON NORDHEIM, *Die Lehre der Allen* I, p. 93.

that of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as well as (implicitly) to that to Enoch, Noah and Shem (see vv. 4, 6). (47)

5. Consequences for the interpretation of T. Levi

The result reached in the previous section is of limited value for the interpretation of the present *T. Levi* because so many details remain uncertain. After all, we have carried out a comparison between a Greek document that in its present form dates from the second half of the second century A.D. and an Aramaic one of the second half of the third century B.C., and much may have happened in between. Apart from the many difficulties confronting those who want to reconstruct a Jewish *Vorlage* of the Testaments which in any case must have undergone a thorough Christian redaction, (48) there is much uncertainty as to the form of the *Aramaic Levi* tradition which the author of the *Testaments* had at his disposal (Different from that in *Ar. Levi*? With additions from other sources? Already in a Greek form?). One may, of course, try to bridge the gap between *T. Levi* and *Ar. Levi* by putting the composition of *TXIIPatr* in (substantially) their present form early. A. HULTGÅRD, for instances ascribes it to anti-Hasmonean circles in the first half of the first century B.C. (before 63 B.C.), assuming a number of later «rééditions» (including a fairly incisive one when the document was translated into Greek) and a final Christian redaction. (49) Such an approach, however, underestimates the extent of the Christian redaction (if, indeed, we should speak of Christian redaction and not of Christian composition), and assumes too easily the existence of an original Aramaic version of the entire *TXIIPatr*. (50)

(47) See also my *The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus, Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985), pp. 157-170.

(48) See H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 67-85 and M. DE JONGE, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Christian and Jewish, Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 39 (1985), pp. 265-275.

(49) See his *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, pp. 214-238. Compare now also E. SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* III 2 (rev. and ed. by G. VERMES, F. MILLAR and M. GOODMAN), Edinburgh 1987, pp. 767-781, esp. 774f. (remains vague as to details of the history of composition and redaction).

(50) See my review of HULTGÅRD's second book in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 14 (1983), pp. 66-80, esp. pp. 78f., and H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 27-29.

We shall have to admit that very little is known (and can be known) with certainty about the possible intermediate stages between *Ar. Levi* and *T. Levi*.

This may be illustrated by a short analysis of *T. Levi's* views on the priesthood of Levi and that of his sons, and of its expectation of an ideal priest in the future.(51)

In *Ar. Levi*, Levi is a priest who receives detailed instructions concerning sacrifices (vv. 13-61). According to *e's* addition at *T. Levi* 5,2 he expiates the sins of the earth as servant of the Lord. Here, in the Prayer of Levi (vv. 6,18) and in the final passages of the priestly instructions (vv. 48-50; 58-61) his seed joins him in his office, and shares in the eternal blessing connected with the priesthood. At the same time all emphasis in the Prayer of Levi is on Levi's holiness, purity, wisdom and knowledge; he prays to be protected against the unrighteous spirit and from fornication and pride. The holy spirit may grant him "counsel and wisdom and strength" (vv. 7-8). Also Isaac's priestly instructions begin with an exhortation to remain holy and to shun sexual impurity (vv. 16-18). Levi's final prayer is: "Make (me) a participant in your words to do true judgment for all time, me and my children for all the generations of the ages" (v. 18); v. 59 in the priestly instructions ends with "blessing will be pronounced by your seed upon the earth". In the appended instructions pronounced by Levi in the year of Joseph's death all emphasis is on reading, writing and teaching of wisdom. Here Joseph is the great example for Levi's children (vv. 82-95).

Ar. Levi (together with the Qahath-and 'Amram-documents) clearly originated in priestly circles which stressed the instructional functions of the priesthood.(52) There is more, however. Levi is a central figure in the events at Shechem; and in Bodleian fragment *a* supplemented by *IQ21*, fragments 1, 3 and 4 his kingdom of the priesthood (to be connected with the greatness—or "anointing"—of eternal peace)(53) is mentioned beside the kingdom of the

(51) For this see also my *Notes on Testament Levi II-VII* (see note 36), *Levi, the sons of Levi and the Law in Testament Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI* (see note 40), *Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?* in J. W. VAN HENTEN c.s. (eds.), *Tradition and Reinterpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, Leiden 1986, pp. 150-162, as well as the notes on the relevant passages in H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*.

(52) See M. E. STONE, *Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age* in P. D. MILLER c.s. (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion (Fs. F. M. Cross)*, Philadelphia 1987, pp. 575-586, and earlier, A. HULTGÅRD, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches I*, pp. 15-45.

(53) See J. C. GREENFIELD-M. E. STONE, *Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi*, p. 218. Contrast Gersam: "I saw in my dream, that he and his seed will be cast out of the highpriesthood" (v. 64).

sword. We have already noted that Kohath and his offspring will be highpriest *and* king (vv. 67-68). The priestly ideal found here is clearly that of a priest-warrior-king.

Many of the points just mentioned are also found in the Greek *T. Levi*, in the context of instructions, warnings and predictions directed to the sons of all twelve patriarchs. There are also many, essential, differences.

For obvious reasons Levi's priestly function receives much emphasis in the visions recorded in *T. Levi* 2-5 and 8; his offspring shares in his blessing and his duties. In 8,3 we read: "From now on become a priest of the Lord, you and your seed for ever" (cf. 8,16 and also 8,17 "from them will be highpriests and judges and scribes"). Among the many gifts that Levi receives in 8,1-10 are understanding, truth, faith and prophecy and judgement; in 4,2-3 Levi, separated from unrighteousness (cf. 2,3-4) is said to be God's "son and a servant and a minister of his presence" who "will light up a bright light of knowledge in Jacob" and "will be as the sun to all the seed of Israel". In this blessing, again, Levi's seed will share—but "until the Lord will visit all the nations in the tender mercy of his son for ever" (4,4). The same limitation is found in 5,2(54), and in a difficult passage in 8,11-15 we hear that a king arising from Judah "will establish a new priesthood after the fashion of the Gentiles for all the Gentiles". He will be "a high prophet from the seed of Abraham our father".

In *TXIIPatr* Levi's central position in Israel is acknowledged; he is exalted as a perfect servant of the Lord. But the time of his priesthood is limited (5,2); when he declares God's mysteries to man "he will proclaim concerning him who will redeem Israel" (2,10) and he has to instruct his sons concerning Jesus Christ (4,5). The ideal new highpriest described in chapter 18 who will also be king and "will light up the light of knowledge as by the sun of the day" is nowhere said to be of Levi's seed (18,3). But Levi will rejoice when he appears, together with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (18,4). (55) As to Levi's sons all emphasis is on their future sins against Jesus-Christ, as is clear in 4,4-6 and the three consecutive Sin-Exile-(Return)-passages in chapter 10, 14-15 and 16, supplemented by another complicated description of the vicissitudes of subsequent generations of priests in chapter 17 ending with another S.E.R.S. sequence in vv. 8-11 (followed by the description of new punishment and the appearance of the new

(54) Cf. *T. Reub* 6,8 where Levi is said to function as priest, teacher and judge "until the consummation of times (, the times) of the anointed highpriest of whom the Lord spoke".

(55) In *T. Jud* 24,1 (cf. 22,2f.) the future king is said to be from Judah.

priest in chapter 18). Levi's sons should function as "the light of heaven, as the sun and the moon" (14, 3), but they will be "darkened through ungodliness"—as will become evident when they wish to kill "the light of the law..., given... to enlighten every man" (14, 4). Their opposition against Jesus Christ (who in 16, 2 is described as "a man who renews the law in the power of the Most High") reveals their failure. The temple will be destroyed (15, 1; 16, 4, cf. 10, 3), instructions will be unmasked as "commandments contrary to the ordinances of God" (14, 4). Many more sins are mentioned similar to those found in other invectives against priests in Jewish literature; to a great extent they are the sins for which the other sons of Jacob are warned or reproached. But the real purpose of the repeated predictions in the present *T. Levi* is the announcement of the sins of Levi's sons against Jesus Christ and the definitive disqualification of the priesthood as such—for which the patriarch himself is not to be blamed (10, 2; cf. 14, 2). He tells his sons beforehand what will happen, (56) announces the new priest Jesus Christ and looks forward to rejoicing with the other patriarchs at his appearance. (57)

We should add that *T. Levi* 9 gives only a poor extract of Isaac's priestly instruction to Levi, stressing the warning against *porneia* (cf. *Ar. Levi!*), but introducing already a reference to the sins of Levi's seed (v. 9, cf. chapter 10, etc.). *T. Levi* 13, though in many respects different from its counterpart in *Ar. Levi*, follows it in not speaking about any specific priestly functions. In v. 1 Levi commands his sons "you fear our Lord with your whole heart and walk in simplicity according to all his law", just as, in 19, 1, he urges them to choose "either darkness or light, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar"—a choice confronting everyone who wants to serve God in righteousness.

Returning to the description of Levi himself for a moment, we note that also in *T. Levi* he is depicted as a warrior-priest, executing God's judgment on Shechem (5, 3-4 following on vv. 1-2; 6, 8), acting out of zeal for the Lord, like Phinehas (6, 3, cf. *Num* 25). In accordance with this are a number of "royal" attributes given to Levi during his investiture (8, 4.7.9), and the picture of Levi as waging the war of the Lord in future, found in *T. Sim* 5, 4-5 (cf. *T. Reub* 6, 11-12 clearly Christian in its present

(56) Significantly, *T. Levi* 1, 1 stresses the element of prediction in this testament ("...according to all they would do and that would befall them until the day of judgment").

(57) In all likelihood Levi is "the first who is anointed to the priesthood" who is extolled in 17, 2. We should note that many of the expressions used here suggest that this first anointed priest is regarded as a type of Christ.

form (58). In *T. Levi* itself, however, the one "who will redeem Israel" to be announced by Levi (2, 10) will come from Levi and Judah (v. 11)—in accordance with the view found in many other passages in *TXIIPatr.* (59) We should note that, contrary to what is said in the account in *Ar. Levi*, Levi goes to Isaac with his brother Judah (9, 1), who in his own testament (*T. Jud* 17, 5) records: "Abraham my father's father blessed me, to be king over Israel; and Isaac blessed me in like manner." This is in accordance with *Jub* 31 (see especially vv. 5-11 and vv. 18-20) and represents, therefore, a parallel ancient tradition.

The tribes of Levi and Judah occupy an important place in Israel according to *TXIIPatr.* Therefore, in *T. Levi* many things could be taken over from *Ar. Levi*; this testament extols its patriarch as priest, teacher of the law, judge and leader. In the conflict with Shechem he acts out of his zeal for the law of the Lord. Levi's sons were destined to follow in their father's footsteps. Alas, when Jesus Christ came, as a new priest not from the tribe of Levi, as the true leader of Israel and the nations and, indeed, as a "renewer of the law", they rejected him, just as their father had foretold.

The present *T. Levi* is thoroughly Christian, but at the same time it acknowledges the special position of Levi and his tribe, the sacrificial cult (though it pays very little attention to it) and the temple in Jerusalem in the time before the arrival of Jesus Christ. It sees clear parallels between Levi and Jesus Christ, but does not establish a link between the new priest and the tribe of Levi, and at one place it connects Israel's redeemer who is, in fact, the one who will save "the whole race of men" (2, 11) with Levi and Judah. A. HULTGÅRD has posited two editorial stages between *Ar. Levi* and the present Christian document, one looking out for an ideal priesthood and Davidic kingship (and even expecting a Davidic Messiah at some places), and one expecting a (nearly) angelic saviour priest as messianic figure. (60) The exact delineation of these intermediate stages, here and elsewhere, is a hazardous undertaking, and it is by no means certain that they ever existed.

(58) Cf. *T. Reub* 6, 7-8.

(59) On this see my *Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?* (see note 50), *passim*.

(60) See also his *The Ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah, and the Saviour Priest in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, in J. J. COLLINS and G. W. E. NICKELSBURG (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism. Profiles and Paradigms*, Chico 1980, pp. 93-110.

6. Levi and the Law. T. Levi 19

As we have seen, Levi's commandments to his sons in chapter 13 are of a very general nature. They have to live righteously and to acquire true wisdom, studying the law of God unceasingly. Observing this they will be honoured; and, like Joseph, they will be at home even in a strange country. The descriptions of the future sins of Levi's offspring are of a general nature too; they represent a specific priestly variant of enumerations of similar sins elsewhere.(61) The principal sin is the opposition against Jesus Christ as "one who renews the law in the power of the Most High" (*T. Levi* 16,3), the one who is "the light of the law ... for every man" (14,4). The exhortations in *TXIIPatr* (like those in Wisdom literature) generally bring out what those who observe God's law have in common with other human beings who want to live responsibly.(62) Elsewhere I have pointed out that also JUSTIN and IRENAEUS speak about the essentials of God's law in general, Hellenistic-Jewish terms and that they see the Law of Moses as an extra legislation for Israel only; they regard Jesus as one who anew brings out what really matters in man's relation with God and with his neighbour.(63)

We may ask, however, how *T. Levi* 19 fits in with this picture. In v. 1 the patriarch formulates the final choice to be made by his sons as that between darkness and light, and between the law of the Lord and the works of Beliar; this is in line with the dualistic ethical teaching of *TXIIPatr* and is influenced by passages like *Deut* 26, 16-19; 30, 11-20; *Josh* 24, 15. Unexpectedly, however, at this point the sons of Levi are introduced in the first person plural: "And we answered our father saying: Before the Lord we will walk, according to his law" (v. 2). V. 3 continues: "And our father said: 'The Lord is witness, and his angels are witnesses, and I am witness, and you are witnesses concerning the word of your mouth.' And we said: '(they are all) witnesses'." Vv. 4-5 return to the third person with a description of the patriarch's death and his burial by his sons in Hebron, just as in the other testaments.

(61) On this see now K. W. NIEBUHR, *Gesetz und Paränese*, Tübingen 1987, pp. 97-102.

(62) See H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 41-47 going back to H. W. HOLLANDER, *Joseph as an Ethical Model in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *passim*.

(63) See my *The Pre-Mosaic Servants of God in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Writings of Justin and Irenaeus* (see note 47) and cf. H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*, pp. 67-76.

Vv. 2-3 are in keeping with v. 1 in that they solemnly underscore the (general) obligation to walk according to God's law. But does not the use of "we" and "our" in this context (which is found nowhere else in *TXIIPatr* and must for that reason be original (64)) suggest that *T. Levi* wants to be regarded as a testament of Levi for Levites? Do not, then, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* still bear a levitical stamp? (65)

The use of the first person plural may be a form element taken over from *Josh* 24, 14-22, but why the author did not simply change to the third person plural outside direct speech is not clear. Attention has been drawn to the «we» passages in the *Acts of the Apostles* and similar use of the first person plural in early Christian apocryphal *Acts of Apostles* and *Acts of Martyrs*. (66) But would the author have used this device unless he regarded himself as in some way standing in the succession of the sons of Levi? HULTGÅRD has suggested that this section represents an adaptation of a (lost) part of *Ar. Levi*. (67) But why was it kept in this form by the author(s) of the present testament?

It is possible that Christian priests identified themselves with the levitical priests of the old covenant. (68) Alternatively, we

(64) The variants involving a change to the third person plural in MS *g* and in MSS *dchij* are clearly secondary. J. BECKER, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*, p. 283f. regards 19, 1-3 as one of the many later additions to the original Testaments.

(65) In his article *The Levitical Hallmark within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984), pp. 531-537 DIXON SLINGERLAND has discussed this passage in detail. His criticism of others (R. H. CHARLES and J. BECKER in particular) is more convincing than his simplistic solution that "The Testaments is a product of Israel's levitical circles." On p. 536 of his article he speaks of "the general levitical partiality of the Testaments as a whole", a thesis defended by him in a second article *The Nature of Nomos (Law) within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986), pp. 39-48. Here the author, without paying any attention to the relationship between *T. Levi* and *Ar. Levi*, maintains that that "there is nothing here (that is: in *T. Levi* 9 and *T. Levi* 14, 5) to suggest that the Testaments has lost interest in or rejected the cult" (p. 47). He also draws untenable conclusions from *T. Iss* 2, 5; 3, 6; 5, 3-4 (see H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary on T. Iss* 2, 5).

(66) So A. HILHORST in his review of H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary in Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986), pp. 252-255. He mentions (besides a variant reading in *Protev. Jac.* 19, 2) *Aclus Petri cum Simone* 4, "non esse qui nos confortaret", *Acta Johannis* 18 (*panlōn hēmōn akouonlōn*) and *Marl. Pionii* 10, 5; 18, 13; 22, 2; *Passio Frucluosi* 3, 5.

(67) See his *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* II, pp. 121-122.

(68) See the question formulated on p. 112 of my *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*: "Does this indicate that the author was a converted Jew, belonging to the tribe of Levi, or was he a priest and did he consider himself in that quality a legitimate successor to the Levites?" The first suggestion cannot be substantiated and is, on the whole, unlikely; for the second one see the note on *T. Iss* 2, 5 in H. W. HOLLANDER-M. DE JONGE, *Commentary*.

may point to JUSTIN's description in *Dial.* 116, 3 of the Christian community as "the true highpriestly race of God". The Christians are the ones who (as priests) bring pure offerings to the Lord among all the nations, according to *Mal* 1, 11. In TERTULLIAN, *De Baptismo* VIII, 1 the anointing with chrism after baptism is directly connected with Moses' anointing of Aaron. (69) In *Hom. in Leviticum* IX, 9 ORIGEN declares: "omnes enim, quicumque unguento sacri chrismatis delibuti sunt, sacerdotes effecti sunt", and he refers to *1 Pet* 2, 9. The second solution seems the more probable one. The Christians responsible for the present *T. Levi* saw themselves as the true servants of the true highpriest announced by Levi in chapter 18.

M. DE JONGE.

(69) Cf. CYRILL OF JERUSALEM, *Cal. Myst.* III, 6 adding a reference to the royal anointing of Solomon by the highpriest.