THE LISTS OF THE TWELVE TRIBES.

THE twelve "sons" of Jacob, or the twelve tribes of Israel, are mentioned together and by name some twenty times in the Old Testament and once in the New. The contents of these lists vary slightly. At times Levi is one of the twelve, at times not. When Levi is omitted from the list as a tribe apart, the number twelve is completed by dividing Joseph up into Manasseh and Ephraim. This is well known. It is less generally observed that in Genesis we have another early variation: Levi and Joseph both appear, but the twelfth place, subsequently occupied by Benjamin (as yet according to the story unborn), is filled by Jacob's daughter Dinah—a small tribe, as we may conclude, whose misfortunes, related mainly in the form of a personal narrative[1] in Genesis xxxiv., were followed by early extinction.[2] In Revelation vii. the place left vacant by Dan is filled by Manasseh, though Joseph occurs later in the list. Another curious method of completing the number twelve is found in the book of Jubilees xxxviii. 5 ff.; the place of Joseph, who is absent in Egypt, is there taken by Hanoch, the eldest son of Reuben (cf. Gen. xlvi. 9).

The first of the more familiar lists is obtained by combining Genesis xxix. 31–xxx. 24, and xxxv. 16 ff. These are the well known narratives of the births of Jacob's children; and in them the children are naturally mentioned in the exact order of their birth. They are never again mentioned in this order in the Old or New Testament.[3] The twelve children fall into four groups—the children of Leah, of Rachel, of Bilhah, and of Zilpah.

[1] But note that the tribal character of Jacob comes out clearly in *v.* 30.

[2] Cf. Steuernagel, *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan* (1901), p. 3.

[3] Nor so far as I have observed elsewhere, except of course in other stories of the births (Josephus, *Ant.* I. 19[7] 21[3]; Jubilees xxviii. 11 ff., xxxii. 3.

Into the interpretation of the narratives of the births, into the historical conditions which occasioned the theory of the order of births of the tribes and their distribution among different mothers, I do not propose to enter here. The subject has been quite recently discussed afresh by Dr. Steuernagel in the extremely suggestive essay cited above. My purpose is different, and is entirely independent of any particular interpretation of the meaning of the birth stories—be they the stories of the births of individuals or of the early fortunes of tribes.

I intend to limit myself to the examination of certain literary phænomena—the variations, not so much in the contents as, in the *order* of the contents of the various lists. The correct understanding of even this limited subject appears to throw some light on various critical and exegetical matters.

I have already said that the twelve tribes of Israel are never mentioned in the order in which the twelve sons of Jacob are said to have been born. But further, though the twelve tribes are not mentioned more than about twenty times altogether in the Bible, there are some eighteen different orders in which they are mentioned, and we find yet fresh differences of order when we turn to the Pseudepigrapha, Philo and Josephus. There is, indeed, but one arrangement that is ever repeated in the Bible, and that only occurs thrice, viz. in Numbers ii., vii. and x. 14–29.

And yet the arrangement of the names is very seldom, possibly never, haphazard. My purpose is to tabulate the various arrangements, to consider the rules that govern them and to indicate certain conclusions to which they point.

The lists[1] fall roughly into two classes; there are, first,

[1] Some of the lists are confined to the Western tribes. But for our present purpose neither this nor the omission in some of Levi calls for any further specific reference.

lists for the particular arrangement of which the immediate context suggests no reason (grouped below under A). There are also lists (grouped below under B) in which the tribes are divided into two or more groups; in some cases certainly, in others possibly, this division is a determining factor in the arrangement. An obvious instance is afforded by the list of Joshua xxi. 4–7: here the tribes are divided into four groups which are to furnish cities to the four classes of Levites. The first group consists of the tribes resident nearest to Jerusalem, who are to give cities to the *priestly* section of the family of Kohath, the tribes neighbouring on these are to give cities to the remaining Kohathites, while the Northern and Eastern tribes give cities to the other Levitical clans. I have also included under B the orders in which the tribes are mentioned in Joshua xiii. xv. ff. and 1 Chronicles iv.–viii.; these are not lists proper, but are included for the sake of completeness. Since the distinction between the two groups is not sharp, I have numbered the lists throughout.

Included in the tables are certain lists in Philo, Josephus, the book of Jubilees and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.

The two factors most regularly influential in the arrangement of the various lists are (1) the order of birth, (2) the theory of the "mothers" of the various tribes. In order to bring out the extent of this influence at a glance and to reduce comments on the tables, I have adopted the following symbols for the several tribes, instead of giving the names in full:

L = Leah; l = Leah's handmaid (Zilpah); R = Rachel; r = Rachel's handmaid (Bilhah). The index figure denotes the child according to the order of birth from the same mother in Genesis xxix. 31–xxx. 24, xxxv. 16 ff.; and thus

L^1 = Reuben.	R^{1a} = Manasseh.
L^2 = Simeon.	R^{1b} = Ephraim.
L^3 = Levi.	R^2 = Benjamin.
L^4 = Judah.	r^1 = Dan.
L^5 = Issachar.	r^2 = Naphtali.
L^6 = Zebulon.	l^1 = Gad.
R^1 = Joseph.	l^2 = Asher.

Adopting these symbols, the various lists appear as follows, with the source (JE = Jehovistic, P = Priestly sections of the Hexateuch) whence they are drawn, and the references.

A.

Order.	Source.	Reference.
i. $L^{1234}\ r^{12}\ l^{12}\ L^{56}\ R^{12}$ . .	JE	Gen. xxix. 31–xxx. 24, xxxv. 16 ff.
ii*a*. $L^{123456}\ R^{12}\ r^{12}\ l^{12}$ . . .	P	Gen. xxxv. 23–26 (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* II. 7[4].
b. $L^{123456}\ R^2\ r^{12}\ l^{12}$ . . .	P	Exod. i. 1–5.
iii. $L^{123456}\ r^{12}\ l^{12}\ R^{12}$ . . .	Jubilees	xxxiv. 20; also Test. xii. Patriarchs.
iv. $L^{123456}\ l^{12}\ R^{12}\ r^{12}$ . . .	P	Gen. xlvi. 9 ff. Jubilees. xliv. 13 ff.
v. $L^{123456}\ r^1\ R^{12}\ r^2\ l^{12}$ . .	Chronicles	I. ii. 1 ff.
b. $L^{123456}\ r^2\ R^{1ba2}r^1$ . . .	Chronicles	I. xxvii. 16 ff.
vi*a*. $L^{123465}\ r^1\ l^{12}\ r^2\ R^{12}$ . .	Early poem	Gen. xlix.
b. $L^{123456}\ r^1\ l^{12}\ r^2\ R^2$ . .	Philo	*Dreams*, Bk. II., c. v.; cf. *Alleg.* Bk. I., c. xxvi.
vii. $L^{143}\ R^{21ba}\ L^{65}\ l^1\ r^{12}\ l^2$.	Early song	Deut. xxxiii.
viii. $L^{41}\ l^{12}\ r^2\ R^{1a}\ L^{2356}\ R^{12}$.	Revelation	vii. 5 ff.
ix. $L^{12456}\ R^{1ba2}\ r^1\ l^{21}\ r^2$.	P	Num. i. 5–15.
x. $L^{1245}\ R^{1b2}\ L^6\ R^{1a}\ r^1\ l^2\ r^2\ l^1$	P	Num. xiii. 4–15.
*xi*a*. $L^{12}\ l^1\ L^{456}\ R^{1ba2}\ r^1\ l^2\ r^2$.	P	Num. i. 20–43.
†*b*. $L^{12}\ l^1\ L^{456}\ R^{1ab2}\ r^1\ l^2\ r^2$.	P	Num. xxvi.

* In the LXX. the order is $L^{12456}\ R^{1ba2}\ l^1\ r^1\ l^2\ r^2$.

† In the LXX. the order is $L^{12456}\ l^{12}\ R^1(^{ab})^2\ r^{12}$ = no. iv. Both in Numbers i. 20–43 and xxvi. the Samaritan agrees with M.T. against LXX.

B.

Order.	Source.	Reference.
xii. L^{456} | $L^{12}\,l^{1}$ | R^{1ba2} | $r^{1}\,l^{2}\,r^{2}$	P	Num. ii., vii.,
xiii. $L^{2345}\,R^{12}$ | $L^{1}\,l^{12}\,L^{6}\,r^{12}$	Deut.	xxvii. [x. 14–29.
xiv. $r^{1}\,l^{2}\,r^{2}\,R^{1ab}\,L^{14}$ | $R^{2}\,L^{256}\,l^{1}$	Ezek.	xlviii. 1–7, 23–29.
*xv. $L^{42}\,R^{2}\,r^{1}\,R^{1ab}\,L^{65}\,l^{2}\,r^{2}$	P	Num. xxxiv.
†xvi*a*. $L^{1}\,l^{1}\,R^{1a}$ | $L^{4}\,R^{1ba2}\,L^{265}\,l^{2}\,r^{21}$ . . .	P	Josh. xiii. xv. ff.
b. | $L^{42}\,R^{21ba}\,L^{56}\,l^{2}\,r^{21}$	Joseph.	*Ant.* V. i. 22.
c. | $L^{42}\,R^{21(ab)}\,L^{6}\,l^{2}\,r^{21}$	Judg.	i. 17–34.
xvii. $L^{42}R^{2}$ | $R^{1b}r^{1}R^{1a}$ | $L^{5}l^{2}r^{2}R^{1}$ | $L^{1}l^{1}L^{6}$	P	Josh. xxi. 4–7 ‡; cf. 1 Chron. vi. 54 ff.
xviii. $L^{421}\,l^{1}\,R^{1a}\,L^{35}\,R^{2}\,r^{2}\,R^{1ab}\,l^{2}$	Chron.	I. iv.–viii.
xix. $L^{4}r^{2}l^{1}$ | $L^{3}r^{1}L^{2}$ | L^{156} | $L^{2}R^{2}$ Hanoch	Jubilees	viii. 5 ff.

In spite of the many variations, the arrangements under A are, without any reference to the passages whence they are drawn, obviously governed by certain principles or conform to certain rules. Any such rules are much less obvious in B, though not altogether, as a matter of fact, without influence. The more effective principles governing the B lists are, as noted above, to be found in the several contexts.

For convenience of reference, I number the sections into which I throw my comments on the lists.

1. The order of birth is not in general the main principle governing the order in which the tribes are mentioned, for the simple order of birth nowhere occurs except in the story of the births (i.). It is, however, an important secondary principle.

2. On the other hand, the "mothers" of the children or tribes have a primary influence on the arrangement.

* $l^{1}\,L^{1}$ are to be found in Numbers xxxii.

† The order given above is that of the sections devoted to the several tribes. In xvi. 4 (Hebrew text, not LXX.) the order is R^{1ab}; xvi*b*. is Josephus's order in reproducing the matter of Joshua xiii. xv.ff.

‡ In *vv.* 8-40 the same order is repeated, except that in the third division R^{1b}, and in the fourth L^{6} come to the beginning.

The children of the handmaids are either grouped together in almost any order, which is the general rule, or, as in iv. and the Greek variant of xi*b*., follow the children of the respective mistresses. The children of Leah are grouped together and the children of Rachel. Within the Leah and Rachel groups the order of birth is very, but within the handmaid group much less, if at all, influential.

3. The most important illustration of the superiority of the influence of the "mothers" over the order of birth is seen in the strong tendency in the Old Testament to remove Rachel's children from the end of the list. In the Old Testament they *never* occupy this position, to which they belong by order of birth, except in the story of the births and in Genesis xlix.; curiously enough in the later lists of the New Testament, Philo, Jubilees, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, they revert to this position (iii., vi*b*., viii.; cf. also xix.).

4. Within the two chief maternal groups (Leah and Rachel), the order of birth regularly prevails. It has been broken probably by mere textual accident in one or two cases, by the influence of contrary principles which are still manifest in others, and for reasons which cannot with any certainty be conjectured in one or two others.

Deviations from the Order of Birth within the Leah Group.

The order $L^{12}(^{3})^{456}$ is broken in only three of the fifteen lists arranged under A.

(*a*) Zebulon exceptionally precedes Issachar in vi*a*. and vii. Philo, in a list (vi*b*.) otherwise agreeing with vi*a*., restores the usual order Issachar, Zebulon.[1] Deuteronomy xxxiii., containing list vii., shows literary dependence on

[1] Apart from the lists the order Zebulon, Issachar is found in the Song of Deborah, Judges v. 14 f.

Genesis xlix. containing vi*a*.[1] List vii. may therefore be regarded as influenced by vi*a*.; and at the same time as proof that the order in vi*a*. is, if not original, at least early —earlier, that is to say, than Deuteronomy xxxiii. (about 800 B.C.). It is still of course possible that the order Zebulon, Issachar has arisen from an accidental transposition of the verses at a still earlier date. If not, in view of the generally marked agreement of vi*a*. with other lists in which the order of birth is clearly influential, it appears probable that the arrangement of the tribes in Genesis xlix. points to an alternative theory of the relative ages of the tribes according to which Zebulon was older than Issachar and all the sons of Leah older than the sons of any of the other mothers. We cannot trace back the theory of Genesis xxix. 31 ff. with certainty beyond the latter part of the seventh century B.C.; for, since the story of the births is derived partly from E, partly from J, it is not necessary that the order in the composite narrative should correspond to that in both or even in either of those sources; it may have been adopted by the editor from only one of them or established by himself. Henceforward, however, the order adopted in JE seems to have exercised undisputed influence; for though the recurrence of L^{65} in two lists grouped under B (xv. xvi*a*.) is not quite easy to explain, it is hardly due to the reason just suggested for this order in Genesis xlix. and Deuteronomy xxxiii.

(*b*) In viii. Judah (L^4) stands first, though the remaining sons of Leah follow one another in regular order. Here the pre-eminence of Judah (as likely to be emphasized by a Christian as by a late Jewish writer) accounts for the variation. Cf. xii., xix.; also perhaps xv.–xviii., and see below, § 10.

(*c*) List vii. is very anomalous. On the order L^{65}, see above under *a*. But beyond this Simeon is omitted and

[1] See e.g. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, notes on *vv*. 13–16, 22.

Levi placed after Judah. The general explanation of the omission of Simeon, viz. that at the time of the poem that tribe had been absorbed in Judah, might pass. But what of the position of Judah before Levi? It cannot be due, as in the case of viii. (see above under *b*), to the pre-eminence attached to Judah; for Reuben still stands first, and, on the usual interpretation, the poem is of *Israelitish* not of Judæan origin. A somewhat obvious but scarcely satisfactory explanation would be that Judah takes the place of the tribe it has absorbed. I prefer to conclude that either the present order is due to early and *extensive* disarrangement of the text,[1] or that Deuteronomy xxxiii. presents the one thoroughly anomalous and inexplicable list of the tribes found in the Old Testament.

5. *Deviations from the Order of Birth in the Rachel Group.*

Of the fifteen lists in A, seven give the order R^{12}, four others the equivalent R^{1ab2} or R^{1ba2}; in two (ii*b*. vi*b*.) from the necessities of the case R^{2} only is mentioned. Thus only two exceptions to the order R^{12} occur. Besides these the alternation of the order R^{1ab} R^{1ba} must be considered. Under B, xii. xiii. being unaffected by any incompatible principle, retain the order R^{12}. When the tribes are enumerated according to actual geographical order from south to north the order of course becomes R^{21} (so xv. xvi*b*.; cf. xvii.), Benjamin lying south of Joseph (=Ephraim and Manasseh). To turn to the exceptions under A:

(*a*) List vii. offers the only simple instance of the order

[1] If at all, the text must be corrected more thoroughly than in Bacon's translation (*Triple Tradition of Exodus*, pp. 314, 269–273), which is based on the suggestions of earlier scholars and adversely criticized in Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 397 f. For though in his translation the order L^{123465} (as in Gen. xlix., list vi*a*.) reappears, Rachel's children still remain, as in the present Hebrew text, sandwiched between Leah's eldest and youngest, and Benjamin still altogether anomalously precedes Joseph (cf. § 5*a*).

R^{21}. This exceptional order is one of several striking anomalies occurring in the present text of Deuteronomy xxxiii. and discussed above (§ 4*c*).

(*b*) In x. we have a curious and, in these lists,[1] unique arrangement R^{1b21a}. It is highly probable that this arrangement is purely accidental and that in the original text of Numbers xiii. the order was regular—R^{1ab2} See below (§ 7*a*).

(*c*) The orders Manasseh, Ephraim (R^{1ab}) and Ephraim, Manasseh (R^{1ba}) appear to have been pure alternatives, though there is a very decided preference for the latter.[2] Either order may be explained by the order of birth. For while Manasseh was actually, Ephraim was fictitiously, the firstborn son of Joseph (Gen. xli. 51, xlviii. 17 ff. J E). As a matter of fact in the fifteen A lists R^{1ba} appears four times certainly (v*b*. vii. ix. xi*a*.) and a fifth time if the present text of x. is accepted; R^{1ab} once (xi*b*.) certainly and twice if the emendation of x. suggested below (§ 7*a*) be adopted. Some[3] indeed think that P was not influenced by J E's story of Jacob's preference for Ephraim, and always used the order Manasseh, Ephraim. In view, however, of the large number of cases[4] in which, in our present text of P, the order Ephraim, Manasseh appears, this seems highly improbable. And in any case it is unsound to argue that "the priestly

[1] The order occurs, however, in Ps. lxxx. 2, where the tribes in question are mentioned alone.

[2] Thus in J E we have Manasseh, Ephraim in Gen. xli. 51, xlviii. 1; but Eph., Man. in Gen. xlviii. 13 f. 20, l. 23; Josh. xvii. 17. In P Man., Eph. in Gen. xlvi. 20; Num. xxvi. 28–35, xxxiv. 23 f.; Josh. xiv. 4, xvi. 4; but Eph., Man. in Gen. xlviii. 5; Num. i. 10, 32–35, ii. 18–20, vii. 48–54, x. 22 f. (xiii. 11); Josh. xvi. 5–xvii. 6, xvii. 10, xxi. 5 (and hence xxi. 20–25). Elsewhere Man., Eph. in Judges i. 27–29; 1 Chron. xxxiv. 6–9; Ps. lx. 7 (=cviii. 8); but Eph., Man. in Deut. xxxiii. 17; Judges xii. 4; 1 Chron. vi. 67–70, ix. 3; 2 Chron. xv. 9, xxx. 1, 10, 18.

[3] E.g. Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*[2] p. 132; Dillmann on Josh. xvii. 1; Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch*, ii. 463, n. 2. Mr. Hogg in *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 1314, with n. 2 expresses himself more cautiously.

[4] As cited in the footnote last but one.

writer never recognizes the pre-eminence of Ephraim," since he gives Ephraim the place of honour among the children of Rachel in the camp and marching order (Num. ii. 18, x. 22). In considering lists under B it should be remembered that a *geographical* order (from south to north) gives R^{1ba}.

6. *The Order of Birth in the Handmaid Groups.*

These two small groups are not even kept distinct from one another, nor are they quite always grouped together (§ 2). The variations of l^{12} r^{12} are answerable for by far the larger number of the variations in the entire lists. In other words, the arrangement of these four tribes with reference to one another is the least fixed element in the whole. The only approach to rule appears to be that the younger brother is not to precede the elder brother by the same mother. This rule, if rule it were, is broken only thrice (under A)—in ix. and x. (both P) and v*b*. (Chr.). Another exception would be produced if Dan were restored for Manasseh in Revelation vii. 6 (list viii.; cf. § 7*d*).

7. *Variations from the Law that the Children of Leah are grouped together and the Children of Rachel together.*

In the simple order of births (i.) Leah's children fall into two groups divided from one another by the children of the handmaids. In the remaining fourteen lists, the Leah group is five times broken; the Rachel group only once, or, if we take account of the peculiar case of viii., twice.

(*a*) In x. there are three anomalies: the Leah group is broken up, the Rachel group is broken up, and the order of birth within the Rachel group is disregarded (§ 5*b*). All three anomalies can be removed at one and the same time by a single simple transposition in the text of Numbers xiii., viz. by placing *vv*. 10 f. before *v*. 8. I should therefore,

even were there no independent indication, such as actually exists,[1] that the text of the passage has suffered in transcription, have very little doubt that the actual original order of the verses in Numbers xiii. was 10, 11, 8, 9, and that the original list was identical with xi*b*., except that l^1 still stood at the end.

(*b*) On vii., see above, § 4*c*.

(*c*) In xi*a*. and *b*. Leah's two eldest are separated from her three youngest sons by the eldest son of her handmaid. In itself this is most extraordinary; but it is, I believe, to be explained by the influence of xii., and by that *alone*. The order in list xii., as I explain below (§ 10), can be fully accounted for.

(*d*) In connexion with viii., commentators on Revelation chap. vii. have spent most of their energy in speculating on the cause for the absence of Dan. But there are other features in the list demanding attention and, if possible, explanation. The peculiarities are as follows: (1) Judah heads the list; (2) the Leah group is broken up by the insertion in their midst of three children of handmaids and Manasseh; (3) Manasseh, cut off from the rest of the Rachel group, occupies the place of Dan and occurs *not in place of, but as well as Joseph*. The reason of (1) is patent—the pre-eminence of Judah, cf. § 4*b*; (2) could be removed by placing verses 5 and 6 after 8*a*, which would at the same time unite Manasseh (R^{1a}) with Joseph and Benjamin (R^{12}). As to (3), Manasseh is either an original and intentional or a secondary (intentional or accidental) substitute for Dan. In the latter case, adopting the transposition just suggested, the original list closely resembled Philo's (vi*b*.). In spite of the practical

[1] See e.g. Dillmann or Paterson (in the Polychrome Bible) on the passage. Mr. Hogg also discusses the text in a fresh and suggestive manner in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 2581, n. 1. Merely to place *v*. 11 before *v*. 8, leaving 10 where it stands (as, for instance, Dr. Paterson does) is but half to perceive the problem. It removes two of the anomalies noted above, but leaves the third.

unanimity of the evidence for the reading Manasseh,[1] and of the fact that the absence of Dan can be tolerably accounted for by the belief that Antichrist was to come of that tribe, a systematic study of the lists of the tribes can hardly fail to awaken the suspicion—it can be nothing more—that Manasseh is an error, and that Dan was not really absent from the original list. Certain it must remain that had the writer wished to omit Dan, he might yet have completed the number twelve, and still bowed to prevailing custom if, also omitting Joseph, he had included Ephraim as well as Manasseh in his list and prefixed these two immediately to Benjamin.

8. Within the Old Testament there is a decided tendency to throw the handmaid tribes all together to the end of the lists. In the New Testament and extra-biblical literature the youngest tribes—Rachel's children—occupy this position. But for two cases (v*a*. *b*.), exceptions to the tendency in the Old Testament (A lists) can be explained: in i. the pure order of births prevails, possibly also in vi*a*. (cf. § 4*a*); in iv. another obvious and intelligible principle has been at work (§ 2); on xi*a*. see below, § 10. Even in some of the geographical lists (B) the tendency is perhaps to be detected in the fact that Dan, though described as a midland tribe, is named with northern (handmaid) tribes in xvi*a*. *b*. *c*. Perhaps we are hardly justified in assuming that the tendency was so strong as never to be resisted except for clear reasons such as exist in the cases mentioned, and v*a*. *b*. may form instances of unreasoned departure from the rule.

9. The lists grouped under B, as already remarked above, are affected by principles directly or indirectly indicated in the contexts whence they are drawn. The geographical position of the tribes affects the order in several—most

[1] The Memphitic version reads Dan. But the early existence of the reading Manasseh is attested not only by the earliest MSS., but also by the express reference of Origen to the absence of Dan; see Tischendorf's note, *ad loc.*

notably in xvii., but also in xvi. and xviii. Further, xv. seems quite clearly governed by the same principle, for this list enumerates the western tribes only, the eastern tribes having been previously dismissed (in Num. xxxii.); and the western tribes in this order—first, the two southern tribes, then the four midland, and then the four northern. The geographical principle—the adoption of which is intelligible in the context—is clear in spite of Manasseh preceding Ephraim (cf. § 5*c*) and Zebulon, Issachar (§ 4*a*).

10. List xii. represents the order in which the tribes encamped and marched in the wilderness. The principles governing the lists under A (see §§ 1–3) are still effective, but their effect is modified partly by the necessities of the case and partly by the influence of another principle. The necessities of the case, i.e. the symmetrical arrangement of the camp, required the division of the twelve tribes into four groups of three. The twelve tribes in this case consist of five Leah tribes (Levi being excluded), three Rachel tribes, and four handmaid tribes. The three Rachel tribes constitute one of the groups, the three youngest sons of Leah another group; three of the handmaid tribes another, while the fourth is constituted of Leah's two eldest sons and the eldest son of her handmaid (Gad); i.e. the main principle effective elsewhere (§ 2) exercises here also the utmost influence that the necessities of the case allow; the tribes having the same mother are as far as possible grouped together, and within each group the order of birth prevails.

The new principle affecting this order is the desire to place the more honourable tribe in the more honourable position. The place of honour is on the east of the tabernacle—a position occupied in the inner cordon by the more honourable section of the Levites, viz. the priests (Num. iii. 38). This is occupied by Judah and two of his brother tribes; the least honourable position—the northern—falls

to the three handmaid tribes; the second in honour to Reuben, Leah's firstborn; and the third to the Rachel tribes. The relative value of the positions can be gathered from the order of the march and the positions round the tabernacle of the four divisions of Levi (Num. chap. iii.).

The tribes occupying the most honourable position are naturally mentioned first, and hence the desire to give pre-eminence to Judah (cf. § 4*b*) leads to Leah's three youngest sons in this list preceding the two eldest. The placing of the handmaid tribes on the north is probably fully intended and thought out. But it is a nice question whether the writer intended to prefer Reuben and the two tribes associated with him to Ephraim and the other two sons of Rachel, or whether, having secured the best position for Judah, he was content to be governed by the old principle of keeping the Leah tribes all together before the Rachel tribes.

This list is repeated in giving the order of the march (Num. x. 14–29), and with less obvious reason in the account of the offerings of the tribal princes (Num. vii.).

The influence of this list is seen elsewhere. For to this influence I feel compelled to attribute the position of Gad in Numbers i. 24, xxvi. 15 (list xi.). In such lists as xi*a.b.* regarded by themselves, the position of Gad is altogether anomalous and quite inexplicable, whereas in xii. (Num. ii.) it most naturally originates, as I have just shown, from the very necessities of the case. We must explain the otherwise inexplicable by the explicable: the list in Numbers i. 20–43 is substantially the list of i. 5–15 modified in one particular, by *imitation* of Numbers ii. For this reason I must regard the argument in the Oxford Hexateuch (note on Num. i. 1) that i. 20–47 and ii. are *independent* expansions of the main Priestly work as groundless. i. 20–47 cannot be explained by i. 5–15 only; and if the author of i. 5–15 wished to establish a camp order, the order in chap. ii. is that

at which he would most naturally arrive. In other words, there is no reason, in the varying order of the tribes, for doubting that Numbers i. 5–15 and ii. proceed from the same hand; but i. 20–47 is dependent on ii. and therefore probably by another hand.

The very anomalous position of Gad in i. 24, xxvi. 15 was perceived by the Greek translators, and the reason for it not being understood, they restored a more regular text by placing Gad after Benjamin. For no one probably, if we did not possess the evidence of the Samaritan, which here agrees with the Hebrew text, would be prepared to argue that the Greek order is the original.

11. It is less easy to feel confident about the principles governing Ezekiel's distribution of the tribes (xiv.). On the whole, I am inclined to differ from Dr. Davidson (note on Ezek. xlviii.) and to think that the placing of the handmaid tribes at the extremities of the country, and therefore furthest from the holy centre is intentional. The influences of the old principle of grouping the Leah tribes together may be seen in the connexion of the three tribes Simeon, Issachar, and Zebulon. The feature of the list hardest to understand is the position of Benjamin.

12. The principle governing the division of the tribes to curse and to bless (xiii.; Deut. xxvii.) I do not understand, nor the reason for placing the children of Leah's handmaids between the eldest and the youngest of her own sons. On the other hand, the order in the first division is entirely in accordance with general principles.

In conclusion, I will briefly summarize the results scattered over the preceding comments.

1. The text of Numbers xiii. is to be amended by prefixing *vv.* 10 f. to 8 f.

2. The arrangement of Deuteronomy xxxiii. is very suspicious; if not original, the present text is the result of very extensive disarrangement.

3. The text of Revelation vii. 5–8, presenting as it does a list containing *three* striking anomalies, is open to some suspicion. It is not improbable that 5 and 6 originally stood after 8*a* : and it is possible that Manasseh is a primitive error, or substitute for Dan.

4. The New Testament, Pseudepigraphical and Philonian lists agree in placing the children of Joseph at the end, and thus differ from the normal Old Testament lists.

5. The orders Manasseh, Ephraim and Ephraim, Manasseh appear to have been used indifferently by all writers—by the Priestly as well as by the Jehovistic writers of the Old Testament, but with a general preference for the latter.

6. Numbers i. 20–43 and xxvi. presuppose Numbers ii., and on the ground of the order in which the tribes are mentioned may be regarded as proceeding from a different hand; but there is on this ground no reason for doubting that Numbers i. 5–15 and Numbers ii. are from the same hand. Similarly the unnatural use of the order found in chap. ii. in chap. vii. supports the view generally adopted that chap. vii. is secondary.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.