again we have two recensions S1 and S3, but the one may be on the whole reasonably described as an abbreviation of the other.

The relations of the above authorities are too complicated to be treated of here in detail, but they are represented on the subjoined diagram.

*Original Language.—*Apart from Grabe, till within the last fifteen years no notable scholar has advocated a Hebrew original. Nitzsch, Dillmann, Ritschl and Sinker are convinced that the book was not a translation but was written originally in Greek. To Kohler and Gaster belongs the honour of re-opening the question of the Hebrew original of the. Testaments. Only the latter, however, offered any linguistic evidence. In his article@@1 on the question he sought to establish a Hebrew original of all the Testaments and to prove that the Hebrew text of Naphtali which he had discovered was the original testament, and that the Greek Naphtali was a late and corrupt reproduction of it with extensive additions from other sources. But he failed in establishing either thesis. The subject was next taken in hand by R. H. Charles, who in a pre­liminary form in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (i. 241, 1899), and later, with considerable fullness, in his edition of the Greek text of the Testaments (1908), brought to light a number of facts that put the question of a Hebrew original beyond the range of doubt. We will now place a few of the grounds before the reader.

(*a*) *Hebrew constructions and expressions are to be found in every page. Though the vocabulary is Greek the idiom is frequently Hebraic and foreign to the genius of the Greek language.* Thus in T. Reub. vi. II, *iv* αύτφ ⅛λtξατo = 1π□ 1□. In T. Jud. XX. 4, *iv στηθtι bτriωv abτov*—an utterly , unmeaning phrase—becomes intelligible on retroversion—ιosjι 2½, “ on his very heart.” In T. Benj. x. 11 κατoικ⅛τeτe íir’ iλτi5ι *iv iμol=',* ye shall dwell *securely* with me”; for here ∈ιr, iλιriδι, as several times in the Septuagint, is a wrong rendering of ntn⅛.

(*b*) *Dittographic renderings in the Greek of the same Hebrew ex­pression; also dittographic expressions in the Greek implying ditto­graphs in the Hebrew.* See Introduction to R. H. Charles's Text, § 11.

(c) *Paronomasiae which are lost in the Greek can be restored by retranslation into Hebrew.* There are over a dozen of such instances.

(d) *Many passages which are obscure or wholly unintelligible in the Greek become clear on retranslation into Hebrew.* Of the large body of such passages (see *op. cit.* § 12) we will give only one. In T. Jud. ix. 3, we have the following impossible sentence, where Esau is referred to: ⅞pc⅛ *veκpbs iv 6peι ∑ιelp, κal mpevòµevos iv ,Avovlpaμ tπiθavev.* Here a fragment of the Hebrew original, which has happily been preserved, reads ∏⅛∏J, “ wounded,” where the Greek has wκpδi = π⅛□ι, which is manifestly a corruption of the former.

In all the above cases there is no divergence among the MSS. and Versions. Yet the restorations are so many and so obvious that our contention might be taken for proven. But there is stronger evidence still, and this is to be found where the MSS. and Versions attest different texts, α standing generally in opposition to *ß,* A (=Armenian Version), and S ( = Slavonic Version). By means of this evidence we are able to prove not only that our book is from a Hebrew original, but that also the Hebrew existed in two recensions, Hα and Hß, which are the parents respectively of α and *ß* (see diagram above).

α and *ß* are not, strictly speaking, Greek recensions; for their chief variations go back to diverse forms of text already existing in the Hebrew Η» and Hß. For the considerable body of evidence supporting this conclusion see the Introduction to R. H. Charles’s Text, § 12. A couple of the many passages in which the variations in *a* and *ß* are due to variations in Ho and Hß will now be given. In T. Benj. xii. 2 *a* reads *Ικοιμήθη ΰχνψ κaλψ* and *ß* A S1 *Λ,πi()aυe . . . lv ^tτ∣pii κaλφ.* Here *Ικοιμήθη* and *iτiθave* may be taken as render­ings of the same Hebrew word, but Cτpψ καλ⅛>=.-ι□ιu *nrv2,* an un­doubted corruption of π□ib πrr3 =“ at a good old age.” The same corruption invaded both Hebrew recensions in T. Zeb. x. 6; T...Dan. vii. 1; T. Ash. viii. I; T. Jos. xx. 4, whereas in T. Iss. vii.. 9 both recensions were right. In the late Hebrew text of Naph. i. I the correct Hebrew phrase is found. Again in T. Ash. vi. 6 α reads *elσφtpeι alrróv els* fω⅛>> *αιώνιον* and *ß* A S1 *πapaμυθeιτaι alrróv iv* fw⅛. Here *πapaμvθeιτaι =* θro-, a corruption of *rι∏y = flσφtpeι.* It. is the soul of the righteous that is here spoken of, and *a* rightly says that the angel of peace “ leads him. into eternal life. The rightness of Η» is confirmed by T. Benj. vi. I, which reads *ò y&p &yye\os τηs dρηvηs òò·qyeì* t⅛p *ψυχήν alιτov.*

Hα and Hß, however, differed mainly from each other in words and phrases, as we infer from *a* and *ß.* In some passages, however, the divergence is on a larger scale, as in T. Lev. ii. ^-iii. Not­withstanding these divergences, however, the great similarities be­tween α and *ß* oblige us to assume that the translator of Hß used the Greek version of Hα, or vice versa. That the former is the more likely we shall see presently. To the above we have a good parallel in the Book of Daniel; for the variations of its two chief Greek Versions—that of the Septuagint and of Theodotion—go back to variations in the Semitic.

*Date of the Original Hebrew.—*“ The date of the groundwork of the Testaments is not difficult to determine. Thus Reuben (T. Reub. vi. 10-ll) admonishes his sons: *llpòs ròv Aeυl iyylσaτe b> τaπeιvφσeι κapδlas iμωv ïva δiξησβe elAoylav in* toû *στόματοι abτoι> . . . δτι iv al>τ<ρ* iξeλiξατo Kôptos *βaσι∖el>eιv ivi>τrιov iravròs* τού λαού. Here a high-priest who is also a king, is referred to. Such a combination of offices naturally makes us think of the Maccabean priest-kings of the 2nd century b.c. The possibility of doubting this reference is excluded by the words that immediately follow :—*κal προσκυνήσατε tò σπipμa alrrov 0τι bπip υμών άποθανεΐται iv τroh'eμoιs óparoîs κal iap<Lτoιs' κal iv iµîv iστaι βaσibds αιώνιοι. A* similar statement is made in T. Sim. v. 5. Thus the high-priest is not only a high-priest and civil ruler, but also a warrior. That the Maccabean high-priests are here designed cannot be reasonably doubted. But the identifica­tion becomes undeniable, as further characteristics of this priestly dynasty come to light. It was to be a new priesthood and to be called by a new name (T. Lev. viii. 14 *lepaτelav viav . . . όνομα καινόν).* Now the Maccabean high-priests were the first to assume the title ‘ priests of the Most High God ’—the title anciently borne by Melchizedek. But the praises accorded in this book could not apply to all the Maccabean priest-kings of the nation. As it was written by a Pharisee, it could not have been composed after the breach arose between John Hyrcanus and the Pharisees towards the close of the 2nd century b.c. Thus the period of composition lies between 153, when Jonathan the Maccabee assumed the high-priesthood, and the year of the breach of John Hyrcanus with the Pharisees; some time, therefore, between 153 and 107. But the date can be determined between closer limits. To one member of the Maccabean dynasty are the prophetic gifts assigned in our text (T. Lev. viii. 15) in conjunction with the functions of kingship and priesthood. Now, in all Jewish history the triple offices were ascribed to only one individual, John Hyrcanus. Hence we con­clude that the Testaments were written between 137 and 107.” But the limits of the date of composition be fixed still more definitely. For the text refers most probably to the destruction of Samaria, T. Lev. vi. ιι. In that case the Testaments were written between 109 and 107 B.c.

*Date of the Greek Version.—*The *a* Version seems to have been translated first, indeed before a.d. 50; for it is twice quoted by St Paul. The first passage is in Rom. i. 32 ού *μόνον airrí πou>vσιv άλλά κal σvveυioκovσιv τdis πράσσουσιν* which is taken almost verbally from T. Ash. vi. 2, δτι *ol διπρόσωποι δισσωs* tκoλiσorταt *(rd. άμαρτάνουσι) ότι κal πράσσουσι τό κακόν κal σweυδoκoυσι rois πρ&σσονσιν.* Since *bg,* A omit the words *ότι . . . πράσσουσιν,* we conclude that, though it is now found in α, *adef,* Sl, it was originally wanting in *ß* and probably also in Hß. For as we have already seen (see diagram above) *aef* were early influenced by α, and *d* is conflate in character. Hence in reality the passage was pre­served only by α originally.

The second passage is the -well-known one in 1 Thess. ii. 16, *iφθaσev ói iπ, abrol·s* ⅛ δ∕>7⅞ ( + toû *θew* DEFG *it,* Vulg. *go)* fíî τlλ05, which is borrowed from T. Lev. vi. 11, *iφθaσev ói ( + iπ, ß) abτoi>s ⅛ ópyh* toû *θew «Is τlλos.*

Here *ß* reads *Kvplov* for toû øeoû. The *iπl* is omitted by α through a simple scribal error.

On the ground of the above quotations we assume, therefore, that *a* was used by St Paul, and that H“ was therefore translated into Greek at latest before a.d. 50.

@@@1 “ The Hebrew Text of one of the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs ” *(Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Archaeology,* December 1893, January 1894).