

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Scripture* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_scripture-01.php

xxviii, 8, 9). Against this solution there are two difficulties: Firstly, in that case the Saviour would have appeared to them before Mary Magdalen (see account above). Secondly, it is clear that they spoke to the disciples only of a vision of Angels (Luke xxiv, 23).

Attempts have been made to insert this appearance into the account of Saint John about the appearance to Mary Magdalen. But that passage is so compactly concerned with her that there is no room anywhere for such an insertion (John xx, 16, 17). The following would seem a fair solution: Saint Matthew has left a gap between verses 8 and 9 which could be filled by a conjecture, based on the ordinary reaction of human nature. When the women had been snubbed by the disciples they would not be inclined, even if custom had permitted it, to remain in that chilling atmosphere, and even their guest quarters had then no special attraction for them. On the other hand, the garden of Calvary had become for them a most sacred spot, and they might even secretly hope to find the Angels still there. On their return to it, perhaps at the entry into the garden, Jesus met and greeted them, saying: "All Hail." (This solution has been suggested by the Memorial Altar to the holy Women in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.)

LAMBERT NOLLE, O.S.B.

IN DEFENCE OF DAN

In the Mass for All Saints we have a lesson from the Apocalypse, ch. vii, giving the names of the tribes of Israel whose members have attained to the happiness of heaven. Dan is omitted. There is an old tradition, mentioned by Mgr. Knox in his New Testament, that Antichrist was expected to come from that tribe and that for this reason Dan was omitted. There are however two other peculiarities about the list that seem to call for elucidation: Ephraim also is omitted although his brother Manasses is included; Joseph too, their father, is named although elsewhere he does not appear in the list with his sons, except to record the fact that he is their father.

It is interesting to explore the Bible for lists of the sons of Jacob or of the tribes of Israel and to try to account for their variations. There are at least thirteen such lists in the Old Testament and by copying them out in parallel columns one is able easily to compare them. The first point that strikes one is that no two lists tally exactly though some features are common to all, or nearly all. The one that concerns the present issue is as follows:—In six of them Dan, Nephthali, Gad and Aser, the sons of Jacob's serving women, follow one another, not always in the same order but always in the same block of four. In five

other lists Dan is associated with Aser and Nephthali only, Gad having been separated from them for a specific reason.

To return to the Apocalypse—is it not possible that St John, who in his synagogue days had heard these lists read again and again in the Sabbath portions of the Law, remembered these four names together and inscribed them so that Dan occurred where Manasses now stands? If we substitute Dan for Manasses we get a perfect list of the Twelve Tribes, Manasses and Ephraim being included in the tribe of Joseph as they always are when Levi is counted as one of the Twelve. It is true that the manuscript evidence is slight, but we may note the fact that a Coptic version has Dan in place of Manasses.

How account for the alteration? Some accident may have happened to the scroll, completely deleting the name Dan, and an early copyist may have filled the gap with the first missing name that came to his mind. It has also been suggested that a scribe copying the text, wrote Man in place of Dan, and that this was later developed into Manasses.

Reading the name Dan in verse 6 we see how St. John apparently called up the names from memory in pairs. First, two of Lia's sons, Judah the greatest and Ruben the eldest: then the two pairs of the serving women: then the rest of Lia's—Simeon and Levi, who have a whole story to themselves, and Issachar and Zabulon. Last but not least, the best beloved sons of the beloved mother, Joseph and Benjamin. The verse numbering obscures this arrangement by dividing the list into four verses with three ill-assorted sons in each.

It has been said, in support of the existing text, that John may have omitted the name more or less at random simply in order to keep to the number twelve. But surely if any name were to be omitted it would be Manasses, since he was already included under Joseph? And against the view that John omitted Dan because the tribe was reprobate, it may be observed that this does not tally with Ezechiel xlvi, 32, where one of the gates on the east side of the city is allotted to him.

The lists referred to are in:—Gen. xxxv, xlix; Ex. i; Num. i, ii, x, xiii, xxvi; Deut. xxxiii; I Par. ii, xii, xxvii, Ezech. xlvi, Apoc. vii.

G. V. SANDERSON.