

SUPPLEMENTS
TO
VETUS TESTAMENTUM

EDITED BY
THE BOARD OF THE QUARTERLY

G. W. ANDERSON - P. A. H. DE BOER - G. R. CASTELLINO
HENRY CAZELLES - E. HAMMERSHAIMB - H. G. MAY
W. ZIMMERLI

VOLUME XX



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1970

A STUDY OF THE
BIBLICAL STORY OF JOSEPH

(GENESIS 37-50)

BY

DONALD B. REDFORD



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1970

TO PHILIP AND CHRISTOPHER

710030

Rij 17895
Copyright 1970 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ix
Abbreviations	xi
I. THE PRESENT CONTEXT OF THE JOSEPH STORY	1
Preface	2
The Judah-Tamar Interlude	16
The Theophany to Jacob and the Genealogy	18
The Blessings of Jacob	22
The Conclusion to the Book of Genesis	25
II. THE SYNTAX OF THE JOSEPH STORY	28
The Glosses of the Joseph Story.	28
Word Order in the Verbal Clause	32
Word Order in the Nominal Clause	34
Word Order in the Participial Statement	37
The Asyndeton Clause	38
The Bound Clause	38
The Verbal Noun	42
The Uninflected Verbal Morpheme	44
III. LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES	46
Idiomatic Usage	46
Words and Expressions Occurring in Late Hebrew or Aramaic	54
IV. THE JOSEPH STORY AS LITERATURE	66
The Joseph Story a <i>Märchen-Novelle</i>	66
The Unifying Role of Joseph's Dreams	68
Plot Symmetry	71
Irony in the Joseph Story.	72
The Pace of the Action.	74
Recapitulation.	77
Embellishment	85
The Motifs of the Joseph Story	87

V. SOURCE ANALYSIS: ONOMASTICON	106
Onomasticon	107
1. Divine Names and Epithets	107
Excursus: Divine Names in Egyptian Literature	110
2. Names of the Father in the Joseph Story	131
3. Names of the Good Brother in the Joseph Story	132
4. Identity of Joseph's First Master	135
VI. SOURCE ANALYSIS: PLOT AND STYLE	138
Details of the Plot	138
Redundancy	164
Style	171
VII. SOURCE ANALYSIS: CONCLUSIONS	178
The Original Joseph Story	178
The Work of the Genesis Editor	179
The Hero of the Märchen in Folkloristic Adaptations	180
Synopsis of Conclusions	182
VIII. THE EGYPTIAN BACKGROUND OF THE JOSEPH STORY	187
Introduction	187
The Egyptian colouring	189
Conclusions	241
IX. THE DATE OF COMPOSITION	244
Discrepancies in the early Traditions	245
J and E in the story of Joseph	251
Bibliography	254
Indexes	273

INTRODUCTION

It is in the scholarly products of two generations past that one must look for the most detailed and imaginative treatment of the Joseph Story of Genesis. In the works of H. Gunkel and H. Gressmann in *ZDMG* and *EYXAPIΣTHPION*, both of which appeared in the same year (1922), the study of the narrative achieved a degree of careful scholarship which has not been attained since. Such a statement might seem strange coming from the pen of one who disagrees so fundamentally with one of the afore-mentioned scholars; but he cannot disguise his sense of gratitude for the stimulus Gressmann's work has lent his own efforts. Of course in the forty-five years which have elapsed since these two giants wrote there have been numerous valuable additions to the library of studies on the Joseph Story. We may cite for example the work of Von Rad in his Genesis commentary and his commendable introduction to this final section of Genesis, *Die Josephsgeschichte*, or the slimmer contributions of Janssen, Ward and Kitchen in the elucidation of the Egyptian colouring of the narrative. In this latter field of endeavour Vergote's *Joseph en Égypte* will also remain of lasting value, though the writer disagrees in the main with Vergote's conclusions. The most recent study the writer is aware of is Ruppert's *Die Josephserzählung der Genesis*. Ruppert's work presupposes acceptance of the source analysis which the present study rejects (hopefully on empirical grounds), but many of his observations are very stimulating.

Of late "Joseph Studies" have taken a deplorable tack. They show a curious tendency either to use the narrative of Gen. 37-50 as an historical source at its face value, or to return to the discredited and (one had hoped) defunct practice of interpreting it as tribal history. Both tendencies remind me of an attempt to write the history of Sennacherib's reign using only the Ahikar romance as a source. One must first ask the question, what genre of literature am I dealing with; and the answer to that question may preclude any use being made of the text as an historical source. In the present book the absence of an extended section dealing with the Joseph Story as history finds its explanation in the results of the literary and source analysis.

The present work arises out of a reading course in the Pentateuch which the author taught at the University of Toronto from 1962-1966.

To the members of that class goes my warmest thanks for the lively discussions they initiated and for the stimulus of their criticism. The following names comprise the complete roster of that fondly-remembered seminar: B. Gibson, D. Cooper, J. Fellows, P. Krasman, D. Metclafe, J. Mintz, J. Ovadja, R. Barnes, J. Barnes, A. Schochet, A. Wolfish, D. Bacon, E. Dessen, D. Goodman, R. Habinski, J. Prasow, S. Turner, E. Tward, S. Samonsky, J. Allen, D. Bohnen, S. Bornstein, H. Cooper, W. De Filippi, L. George, L. Lerman, S. Lockshin. My deepest appreciation must also be tendered to my colleagues in the Department of Near Eastern Studies of University College and Victoria College in the University of Toronto, each of whom has at some time or other discussed some part of the material contained herein. I should like especially to thank Professors F. V. Winnett and N. E. Wagner (the latter of Waterloo Lutheran University) and J. Van Seters (of Andover-Newton) and P. A. H. de Boer (Leiden) for having read the MS, and for offering their incisive criticisms. Needless to say, none of the views expressed or hypotheses propounded are in any way their responsibility.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>Acta Or.</i>	Acta Orientalia
<i>AJA</i>	American Journal of Archaeology
<i>AJSL</i>	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures
<i>An. Or.</i>	Analecta Orientalia
<i>AO</i>	Der Alte Orient
<i>ASAE</i>	Annales du service des antiquités de l'Égypte
<i>ASTI</i>	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
<i>BA</i>	The Biblical Archaeologist
<i>BAR</i>	Breasted, <i>Ancient Records of Egypt</i> , (5 vols.), Chicago, 1906
<i>BASOR</i>	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
<i>BDB</i>	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> , Oxford, 1907
<i>Bib. Or.</i>	Biblioteca Orientalis
<i>BIFAO</i>	Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale
<i>BSFE</i>	Bulletin de la société française d'égyptologie
<i>Budde Gesch.</i>	K. Budde, <i>Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur</i> , Leipzig, 1906
<i>BWANT</i>	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom alten und neuen Testament
<i>BZAW</i>	Beihefte zur <i>ZAW</i>
<i>CAH</i>	Cambridge Ancient History
<i>CBQ</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
<i>CdE</i>	Chronique d'Égypte
<i>Cornill</i>	C. Cornill, <i>Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament</i> , London-New York, 1907
<i>Introduction</i>	
<i>Dahse TMH</i>	J. Dahse, <i>Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage</i> , Gies- sen, 1912
<i>Davies Amarna</i>	N. De G. Davies, <i>The Rock Tombs of El-Amarna</i> , London, 1903-08
<i>Dillmann Gen.</i>	A. Dillmann, <i>Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded</i> , Edinburgh, 1897
<i>DISO</i>	Ch-F. Jean, J. Hoftijzer, <i>Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest</i> , Leiden, 1965
<i>Driver Gen.</i>	S. R. Driver, <i>The Book of Genesis</i> , London, 1905
<i>EEF</i>	Egypt Exploration Fund
<i>Eerdmans AS</i>	B. D. Eerdmans, <i>Alttestamentliche Studien, I. Die Komposition der Genesis</i> , Giessen, 1908
<i>ET</i>	The Expository Times
<i>Ehrlich</i>	A. B. Ehrlich, <i>Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel</i> , I, Leipzig, 1908
<i>Randglossen</i>	
<i>Eissfeldt</i>	O. Eissfeldt, <i>Einleitung in das alte Testament</i> , Tübingen, 1964
<i>Einleitung</i>	
<i>Eissfeldt Hex. Syn.</i>	O. Eissfeldt, <i>Hexateuch-Synopse: die Erzählung der fünf Bücher Mose...</i> , Leipzig, 1922
<i>G-K</i>	E. Kautzsch, A. E. Cowley, <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> , (2nd ed.), Oxford, 1910
<i>Gunkel Gen.</i>	H. Gunkel, <i>Genesis</i> , Göttingen, 1922
<i>Gunkel Legends</i>	H. Gunkel, <i>The Legends of Genesis</i> , New York, 1964

- Gunkel *Urgesch.* H. Gunkel, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen*, Göttingen, 1921
- HDB J. Hastings (ed.), *A Dictionary of the Bible*, New York-Edinburgh, 1902
- Hempel *Lit.* J. Hempel, *Die althebräische Literatur...*, Potsdam, 1930
- HO B. Spuler (ed.), *Handbuch der Orientalistik, I. Ägyptologie, 2. Literatur*, Leiden, 1952
- Hölscher G. Hölscher, *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel*, Lund, 1952
- Geschichtsschreibung*
- Horovitz *JE* J. Horovitz, *Die Josephserzählung*, Frankfurt, 1921
- Holzinger H. Holzinger, *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, Freiburg-Leipzig, 1893
- Einleitung*
- Holzinger *Gen.* H. Holzinger, *Genesis*, Freiburg, 1898
- HUCA Hebrew Union College Annual
- IB The Interpreter's Bible
- IBD The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary
- ICC The International Critical Commentary
- IFAO L'institut français d'archéologie orientale
- JA Journal Asiatique
- JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society
- JARCE Journal of the American Research Centre in Egypt
- JBL Journal of Biblical Literature
- JBR Journal of Bible and Religion
- JCS Journal of Cuneiform Studies
- JdS Journal des savants
- JEA Journal of Egyptian Archaeology
- JEOL Jahrbuch Ex Oriente Lux
- JESHO Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient
- JNES Journal of Near Eastern Studies
- JQR Jewish Quarterly Review
- JSS Journal of Semitic Studies
- JTS Journal of Theological Studies
- JWH Journal of World History
- Keil-Delitzsch C. F. Keil, F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, I. The Pentateuch*, Edinburgh, 1872
- Kittel *Gesch.* R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I, Gottha, 1923
- Kuenen *Hex.* A. Kuenen, *An Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, London, 1886
- Meyer *INS* E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, Halle, 1906
- MIFAO Mémoires de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale
- MIOF Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung
- MVAG Mitteilungen des vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft
- NBD J. D. Douglas (ed.), *The New Bible Dictionary*, London, 1962
- Noth *UG* M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, Stuttgart, 1948
- OLZ Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
- OTS Old Testament Studies
- PEFQ Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly
- Pfeiffer R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York, 1948
- Introduction*
- PSBA Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology
- RB Revue biblique
- RdE Revue d'égyptologie

- RES Revue des études sémitiques
- RHR Revue de l'histoire des religions
- RT Recueil de travaux
- Rudolph *Elobist* P. Volz, W. Rudolph, *Der Elobist als Erzähler: ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?* Leipzig, 1933
- Ruppert *JEG* L. Ruppert, *Die Josephserzählung der Genesis*, Munich, 1965
- Sachs. AW* Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaft
- Sandmel S. Sandmel, *The Hebrew Scriptures, an Introduction to Their Literature and Religious Ideas*, New York, 1963
- Hebrew Scriptures*
- Sethe *Urk.* K. Sethe, W. Helck, *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, Leipzig, 1906
- SHAW Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Heidelberg
- Simpson *ETI* C. A. Simpson, *The Early Traditions of Israel*, Oxford, 1948
- Skinner *Gen.* J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, (2nd ed.), Edinburgh, 1930
- Smend R. Smend, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen Untersucht*, Berlin, 1912.
- Erzählung*
- Speiser *Gen.* E. A. Speiser, *Genesis*, (Anchor Bible), New York, 1964
- ThR* Theologische Rundschau
- TLZ Theologische Literaturzeitung
- Vergote *Joseph* J. Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, Louvain, 1959
- Von Rad *Gen.* G. Von Rad, *Genesis*, (SCM O.T. Lib.), London, 1959
- VT Vetus Testamentum
- Wellhausen J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs...*, Berlin, 1899
- Comp.*
- Wellhausen J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, New York, 1957
- Proleg.*
- Wiener H. M. Wiener, *Pentateuchal Studies*, Oberlin, 1912
- Pent. St.*
- WO Welt des Orient
- ZÄS Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache
- ZAW Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlichen Wissenschaften
- ZDMG Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
- ZSVG Zeitschrift für semitisch und verwandtes Gebiete
- ZThK Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

CHAPTER ONE

THE PRESENT CONTEXT OF THE JOSEPH STORY

The fourteen chapters with which the Book of Genesis conclude comprise a more or less complete story. One need not have read the first thirty-six chapters of the book to appreciate this charming narrative; but if one has one cannot help but be struck by the contrast between the crude and disjointed tales of the Patriarchs, and the polished, sophisticated novelette about Jacob's youngest son.¹ The suspicion that at some point in the compilation of Genesis the Story of Joseph was incorporated en bloc with but minor alterations is one that arises with the first cursory reading, and grows stronger as one delves deeper.

The common contention that the Joseph Story (and with it the rest of Genesis) has passed through the same redactional hands as much of the remainder of the Pentateuch rests upon the presupposition that in origin the story is earlier than the latest of these redactors, and not a creation of his alone. The case for the prior existence of the narrative in question can be proved if it can be demonstrated that extraneous passages have, in the present form of the Book of Genesis, been interpolated between chapters 37 and 50. But how can "extraneous passages" be identified? What criterion (and it can scarcely be an external one) will enable us to pare away the suspected accretions from the genuine and original Joseph Story? Since it is only by ascertaining the internal structure of the plot that the limits of the piece will become apparent, the present investigation must use the natural contours of the plot as the criterion.

Fortunately the shape of the plot is easy to discern. In Palestine lives the family of Jacob consisting of his wives, daughters and eleven sons. Ten of the sons are grown men; the eleventh, Joseph, is a child. The father favours the youngest brother, and the others grow jealous. To add to their jealousy the lad insists on recounting to them dreams he has had which seem to presage his future greatness. Three things are foreshadowed: 1. Joseph will one day enjoy an exalted status over his family, 2. his brothers will come to do obeisance, and 3. his father and mother will later do the same. In a fit of rage the brothers seize

¹ See below, p. 246.

the boy and sell him into Egypt as a slave, lying to their father to cover their crime.

Thus far chapter 37, and by the time its concluding verse had been written the subsequent course of the plot had been fairly narrowly determined. The reader, arrived at 37: 36 can expect five developments in the plot: 1. the exaltation of Joseph (described in ch. 39-41), 2. the obeisance of the brothers (ch. 42),¹ 3. retribution for the brothers' sin (ch. 42-44), 4. the revelation of Joseph to his family (ch. 45), and 5. his father's homage (ch. 47: 31). The exaltation of Joseph, involving as it does the famine and the measures taken against it, justifies the inclusion of 47: 13-26; and the assurance that Joseph had not merely postponed taking vengeance on his brothers until after his father's death (a possible eisegesis of silences in the earlier part of the story), is provided by 50: 15-21. This section in turn presupposes the existence of passages which mention Jacob's death, thus accounting for the presence of 47: 27-31 and 50: 1-14. The Joseph Story can, therefore, be identified as comprising the following passages: 37: 3-36, 39-45, 46: 28-47: 31, 50: 1-21.

It can be stated, then, that irrelevant or extraneous passages do at present exist in and around the Joseph Story as isolated by considerations of plot.² Since presumably an author will not detract from the effectiveness of his own story by incomprehensibly breaking it up with unrelated material, the thesis we set out to test is at least partly correct: the original author of the Joseph Story and the person (or persons) who broke it up by inserting irrelevant material are distinct. In other words the final redactor of the canonical book of Genesis did not compose the Joseph Story.

There might seem little justification in a book on the Joseph Story for devoting at the outset an entire chapter to what does *not* belong to that narrative; but a moment's reflection will reveal the reason. The unrelated insertions and the setting in which the story now appears show better than anything else how the story was taken by the compiler of Genesis, and the use he made of it. Why was the Joseph Story felt suitable for inclusion, is the question the extraneous material will help answer. It is true that this starting point entails a retrograde order of investigation, from the final (canonical) form of the story back to its origins. But this is the logical direction in which an inductive study must proceed.

¹ Ruppert *JEG*, 90 f.

² Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 56.

PREFACE

Gen. 37: 1, "Jacob lived in the land where his father had resided as an alien, viz. the land of Canaan."

This verse is not an introduction to the Joseph Story, but rather a prefatory remark on the genealogy of Jacob. It must be construed with 36: 1-8 (cf. especially vs. 8), where it is related how Esau was forced to move out of Canaan into Edom for economic reasons. Whereas "Esau lived in Mt. Seir, that is Edom (vs. 8) ... Jacob lived in... the land of Canaan (37: 1)." ¹ Both verses are followed by *'elle(h) tōlēdōt*, "these are the generations."

Gen. 37: 2aα, "These are the generations of Jacob..."

Tōlēdōt, the word commonly rendered, especially in older translations "generations," means "stages in a genealogy, descendants, or progeny."² The phrase "these are the generations of so-and-so" is found eleven times in the Book of Genesis, distributed with relative evenness throughout the fifty chapters. The eleven occurrences are as follows:

1. *Gen. 2: 4*, "These ³ are the generations of heaven and earth when they were created;" preceded by the first creation story (1: 1-2: 3) and followed by the second (2: 4b-3: 24).

2. *Gen. 5: 1*, "This is the Book of the generations of Man on the day when God created, etc.;" preceded by Cain and Abel, a genealogy, and Lamech's Sword-song (ch. 4), and followed by the genealogy of Adam (ch. 5).

3. *Gen. 6: 9*, "These are the generations of Noah;" preceded by a statement that the earth was filled with violence and wrong-doing (6: 5-8), followed by a statement that Noah was righteous, and that (vs. 10) he "became the father of three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth."

4. *Gen. 10: 1*, "These are the generations of Noah's sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth, to whom sons were born after the flood;" preceded

¹ For a similar contrast see *Gen. 13: 12*. In the general context of chapter thirty-six the Genesis editor has tried to effect considerable contrast between Esau and Jacob; cf. 35: 26b with 36: 5b; see further Ruppert *JEG*, 31.

² Much discussion has been devoted to the phrase *'elle(h) tōlēdōt*; see especially K. Budde, *ZAW* 34 (1914), 244 ff.; S. R. Driver, *Gen.*, 19; B. D. Eerdmans *AS I*, 84 f.; O. Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 273; A. C. Graham, *JTS* 41 (1940), 140 ff.; H. Holzinger, *Gen.*, 15 f.; C. Schedl, *ZAW* 77 (1965), 259 ff.; E. Speiser, *Gen.*, xxiv; *idem*, *IBD* III, 236; G. Von Rad, *Gen.*, 68; J. Skinner, *Gen.*, 443; J. Wellhausen, *Proleg.*, 332; A. Malamat, *JAOIS* 88 (1968), 165 ("line").

³ LXX, "this is the book of..."

by the story of Noah and the wine (9: 20-27), and a statement of his age (vss. 28-29), followed by the Table of Nations (ch. 10).

5. Gen. 11: 10, "These are the generations of Shem;" preceded by the Babel story (11: 1-9), followed by the genealogy of Shem (vss. 10-26).

6. Gen. 11: 27, "These are the generations of <Abram the son of> ¹ Terah; Terah was the father of Abram, Nahor and Harran;" preceded by the genealogy of Shem (no. 5, above), followed by the death of Harran (vs. 28), the marriage of the brothers (vss. 29-30), the journey to Harran (vs. 31), and the death of Terah (vs. 32).

7. Gen. 25: 12, "These are the generations of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's maid, bore to Abraham;" preceded by the sons of Keturah, and the death and burial of Abraham (vss. 1-11), followed by Ishmael's genealogy (vss. 12-18).

8. Gen. 25: 19, "These are the generations of Isaac, the son of Abraham; Abraham was the father of Isaac...;" preceded by the genealogy of Ishmael (above), followed by Isaac's age at marriage and the identity of his wife (vs. 20), and the birth of Jacob and Esau (vss. 21-26).

9. Gen. 36: 1, "These are the generations of Esau, that is Edom;" preceded by Isaac's age (35: 28), and death (vs. 29), followed by Esau's wives (36: 2-5), and his migration to Seir (vss. 6-8).

10. Gen. 36: 9, "These are the generations of Esau, Edom's father, in Mt. Seir;" preceded by the migration account (above), followed by "these are the names of Esau's sons," and a genealogy.

11. Gen. 37: 2, "These are the generations of Jacob...;" preceded by the tribes and kings of Edom (above), followed by the Joseph Story.

Eight of these *tōlēdōt*-statements are followed, as would be expected, by genealogical statements or by extended genealogies (viz. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10). Two of the passages (6 and 8) have statements of filiation rather than paternity; but they nonetheless qualify on a formal basis for inclusion among the others. The remaining three, however, are followed by narrative passages, a fact which has lead almost every scholar to postulate an extended meaning for *tōlēdōt*. From "progeny" or "genealogical stages" in the descending line of someone, it is but a short step to "account of the progeny," or "stages in the history"

¹ A probable insertion; cf. 25: 19. See Eerdmans, *AS* I, 22; Budde, *op. cit.*, 249. L. Gautier (*Introduction* I, 69) believed the *tōlēdōt* formula of Abraham had dropped out.

of that person's family. "Family History," indeed, is now an accepted rendering of the word. The only basis, however, for the postulate of such a meaning is the apparent absence of an alternative explanation of the three Genesis passages; all other occurrences in the Bible fit the basic meaning "progeny" quite well. One should be wary, then, of assuming such a derived meaning until it can be shown that no other reasonable explanation of the handful of difficult passages in Genesis can be brought forward.

One of the notable phenomena of Near Eastern society in the first millennium B.C. is the interest taken by families of social standing in their distant ancestry. In Mesopotamia, beginning sporadically in the Twelfth and Eleventh centuries but increasing in popularity in the Seventh and succeeding centuries, the practice was followed of appending to one's name not only one's father's name, but also the name of the remote ancestor from whom one claimed descent.¹ Egyptian genealogical lists occur from the Twenty-second dynasty (c. 965-750 B.C.) well on into Hellenistic times;² and there the fashion was not simply to record a single ancestral patriarch, but to trace the family tree back through numerous scions to a selected ancestor. This sudden superfluity of genealogies which appears around the turn of the first millennium is not to be taken as an indication of the first attempt to *record* family ancestries; as occasional examples show, men who had lived in the second³ or third⁴ millennium B.C. could cite their descent through several generations from a point in time well removed from their own. But while the necessary material on family histories was available in some form, written or oral, the desire was not felt for some reason to boast of one's ancestry.

The Egyptian families of the first millennium B.C. for whom genealogies were compiled were mainly, one might almost say exclusively, priestly. These families jealously guarded their sacerdotal functions, consisting usually of a group of related offices in one or more temples, and made certain that they were passed on to the younger scions of

¹ Cf. W. G. Lambert, *JCS* 11 (1957), 1 ff.

² See L. Borchardt, *Die Mittel zur zeitlichen Festlegung von Punkten der ägyptischen Geschichte...* (Cairo, 1935), 92 ff.; E. Otto, *Die Biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit* (Leiden, 1954), 9 f., 84 ff.; B. Von Bothmer, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period* (Brooklyn, 1960), 80.

³ Cf. the genealogy of Shamshi-adad embedded in the Assyrian King list (A. Poebel, *JNES* 1 [1942], 268 ff.), which must reflect the existence of such a family tree in written or oral form, from Shamshi-adad's time onward.

⁴ Cf. the fantastic list of nomarchs from Meir: A. M. Blackman, *The Rock Tombs of Meir*, III (London, 1915), pl. 10, 11, 29, 33, 35-37

the clan.¹ The increase in family trees around the turn of the first millennium might be indirectly due to the transformation of Thebes from a royal to a priestly seat. The royal family had vacated Thebes before the end of the Twentieth dynasty, and in its new home in the north the monarchy, weakened and discredited could exert little influence over the South. With the lessening in importance of a system in which one maintained one's place in society primarily through royal patronage, families were obliged to fall back on the expedient of advertising their glorious longevity, and their traditional tenure as justification for their monopolies.

The information about filiation that was needed for the reconstruction of a family tree for such families would almost certainly be contained in the official records of the temples in which they monopolized the priesthood. At this point someone may raise the obvious word of caution that the tenacity and accuracy of oral tradition should not be underestimated. Could not the primary source of a man's pedigree have lain in the collective memory of the house, and been transmitted by word of mouth from generation to generation? Such a postulate is not at all unlikely in view of the fact that in some extended family trees the historicity of the earlier generations is sometimes in doubt, a mute witness to the defectiveness of memory unaided by written record,² or to the lengths to which a man would go in claiming a high-sounding ancestry. Two other considerations, however, oblige us to modify this incipient hypothesis. First, in those genealogies in which error appears as one proceeds into the earlier generations, the point at which the document ceases to be reliable comes suddenly. It is as though, having proceeded backwards as far as his records allowed him, the genealogist suddenly by slight of hand, as it were, leaps over to an illustrious family in order to give

¹ Cf. the common phrase in genealogies, *s' mî nm*, "son of the like-titled..."

² Or even when records are available, as an example familiar to the present writer illustrates. My maternal grandfather used to reconstruct, solely on the basis of what he remembered his father and his uncles said, a family tree of eight generations which began at the close of the Eighteenth Century. When, upon catching some of his enthusiasm for things genealogical, I presumed to check him up by recourse to the entries in the family bible, I discovered two clear (though relatively minor) inconsistencies. He denied vehemently that so-and-so was really his great-uncle and not his uncle, and that old Joseph Coe had been his great-great grandfather and not his great-grandfather; and in deference to the patriarch of our clan I was obliged to modify the family tree I had drawn up. Where the truth lay I cannot tell (though I suspect with the family bible); but I sometimes wonder whether in all points this little incident could not be paralleled many times over in the legion of lost family histories in the Ancient Near East.

his ancestry the added glory of a great historical name. In the case of the Memphite genealogy the fifteen latest generations are otherwise attested, and the succession seems to be correct.¹ But between the contemporary of Amenemopet of the Twenty-first dynasty and Ramses II only one name intervenes! Clearly at this point the text becomes suspect. Another good example is the genealogy of Khnumibre, the director of works under the Persians, in the Wady Hammamat.² After the fourth generation (proceeding backwards) there occur eight generations in which the two names Nes-shu and Kha-nehebu alternate with virtually identical titulary. Then in generations 13 and 15 comes the name Hor-em-saf, one of whom must have been the engineer responsible for the Karnak building program of Sheshonk I.³ Following generation 16 we jump (with no connecting "son of") to a neighbouring graffito, wherein are found such Old Kingdom names as Imhotpe and Kanefer, such Nineteenth Dynasty viziers as Rahotpe mixed together. Obviously the genealogy is not reliable prior to the close of the Twenty-first Dynasty.⁴ The second consideration is that most Egyptian family trees drawn up in the First Millennium do not go far back into the second, some only as far as the Twentieth or Twenty-first Dynasty,⁵ some only to the Twenty-second.⁶ From these facts we may conclude the following: (a) that the interest in remote ancestry originated in that period when family monopolies of certain priestly offices began to harden, i.e. during the theocratic state of the Twenty-first Dynasty; and (b) that when a member of an illustrious

¹ Bocharadt, *Mittel*, 101 ff.

² Couyat-Montet, *Les Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât* (Cairo, 1912), Pl. 22, graf. 91-93; Borchardt, *op. cit.*, 95 f.; G. Posener, *La Première domination perse en Égypte* (Cairo, 1936), 98 ff.

³ J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 4, (Chicago, 1906), § 706.

⁴ Similar examples of falsified family trees: that of Nespawttawi, H. Kees, *Das Priestertum im ägyptischen Staat vom neuen Reich bis zur Spätzeit* (Leiden, 1953), 248 ff.; those of two Karnak priests, Borchardt, *op. cit.*, 93 f.; that of Horbity, W. Spiegelberg, *PSBA* 24 (1902), 320 ff.

⁵ E.g. the descendants of Sheben, G. Legrain, *RT* 27 (1905), 75 ff.; Kees, *op. cit.*, 206; the descendants of Buyuwawa, A. Mariette, *Le Sérapéum de Memphis*, III, pl. 31 (Psenhor stela); the descendants of Asha-khet, Legrain, *RT* 30 (1908), 73 ff.

⁶ E.g. the family of Padiamunnebnestawti, R. A. Parker, *A Saite Oracle Papyrus from Thebes* (Providence, 1962), 23; the family of Besenmut, *ibid.*, 26; the family of Djed-mont-efankh, B. V. Bothmer, *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period* (New York, 1960), pl. 31; the family of Ankhefenmut, E. Uphill, *JEA* 43 (1957), pl. 1; the families of Nespakashuty and Hori, Kees, *op. cit.*, 230 ff.; the family of Ankhpichrod, *ibid.*, 256 ff.; the family of Montemhet, *ibid.*, 272 ff.; the family of Ra'et-tefnakht, L. Habachi, *CdE* 42 (1967), 30 ff.

house wished to trace his ancestry further back than the twelfth century B.C., when his family had come into its sinecure, he had scarcely any reliable records to help him. It is inconceivable why purely *oral* traditions of the descent of great families should so utterly fail before a certain date; but it is quite understandable if the genealogist of the first millenium relied almost wholly on *written* records which petered out when he reached the twelfth century.

The primary source for the reconstruction of a pedigree lay most probably in the dedicatory statue inscription. When Herodotus visited Egypt in the mid-fifth century B.C., the priests of Amun at Karnak according to his own account "took me into the great hall of the temple and showed me the wooden statues there... for each high-priest has a statue of himself erected there before he dies. As they showed them to me and counted them up, beginning with the statue of the high-priest who had last died, and going on from him right through the whole number, they assured me that each had been the son of the one who preceded him."¹ The statues Herodotus was looking at were undoubtedly similar in purpose and design to the statues of priests, many of which were recovered from the famous Karnak cache.² The purpose of the inscriptions, which always give prominence to the name and titles of the owner, is clearly indicated by the form of the text. The following formulae may be cited: 1. "an offering which the king gives (to certain gods) that they may give offerings of (certain commodities) to the *ku* of (owner's name and titles);"³ 2. "may he (the god) give life, prosperity and health to (owner's name and titles);"⁴ 3. "revered before (name of god, followed by owner's name and titles);"⁵ 4. "it is his son (name) who causes his name (father's) to live."⁶ The purpose is thus partly commemorative, partly cultic. The genealogical information is appended to the name of the statue owner in the above contexts in the form of a series of appositive phrases, "son of x (with titles), son of y (with titles)," and so on. If the distaff side of the gentleman's ancestry is to be included, it is usually added after the paternal lineage.

¹ Herodotus ii, 145; translated by A. De Selincourt in *The Histories* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1954), 159.

² Legrain, *RT* 27 (1905), 61 ff.

³ Uphill, *op. cit.*; A. Pellegrini, *RT* 20 (1898), 95 f.; Legrain, *RT* 30 (1908), 81 ff.

⁴ Chassinat, *RT* 22 (1900), 9 f.

⁵ *Idem*, *RT* 21 (1899), 66 f.

⁶ Legrain, *RT* 30 (1908), 81 ff.; F. Ll. Griffith, *The City of Onias and the Mound of the Jew* (London, 1890), pl. 22.

What Herodotus saw when he was ushered into the court of the Amun temple is graphically illustrated for us by a type of mortuary relief, which has antecedents in the New Kingdom.¹ The pious son (once apparently a king) is shown before several horizontal registers of standing or seated figures.² We are at once transported into a temple court ringed with a line of statues representing the ancestors of a family, where a faithful scion of the house is making offering. A caption usually identifies the ceremony as "the Performance of the 'Offering-which-the-king-gives' for the ancestors (lit. fathers)." Each standing or seated figure represents a commemorative statue of the type just discussed. None is shown inscribed, but the salient information from the statue inscription, viz. name and titles preceded by "son of," or "his son," is written before or above each figure. The result has the misleading appearance of a genealogy illustrated by portraits of the ancestors. In actual fact the reverse is true: it is a series of portraits glossed by genealogical information.

In Palestine during the first millennium we have evidence of increased activity in the compiling of genealogies. The post-exilic writer of the Book of Chronicles had evidence of flurries of activity during the reign of Jereboam II of Israel (786-746 B.C.),³ and Jotham (742-735 B.C.)⁴ and Hezekiah (715-687 B.C.)⁵ of Judah. But whereas in Egypt and Babylonia the motivating factor was pride in one's social status and ancestry, in Palestine it was administrative efficiency: the state needed accurate lists of tax-payers and draftees.⁶ Thus while priestly genealogies were considered important, necessity rendered the ancestry of the laity of greater relevance. In postexilic times the abundant evidence of P and the Chronicler attests to the importance ascribed to genealogies and to the glories of an ancient lineage. The importance of race, however, had now begun to dominate, and the priestly leaders of the state, while showing no diminution of interest

¹ Specifically the scene of the king or tomb owner making offering to rows of seated statues of deceased royalty: cf. *LD* III, pl. 2a, d; B. Porter and R. Moss, *A Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings*, I² (Oxford, 1960), 384; Prisse d'Avannes, *Rev. Arch.* 2 (1845), pl. 23.

² Cf. the Memphite Genealogy: Borchardt, *op. cit.*, pl. 2; the Copenhagen Genealogy: M. Mogensen, *Le Glyptothek Ny Carlsberg, la collection égyptienne* (Copenhagen, 1930), pl. 109; the Heliopolitan Genealogy: Griffith, *loc. cit.*

³ I Chron. 5: 17.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ I Chron. 4: 41; II Chron. 31: 17 ff.

⁶ Cf. I Chron. 7: 5, 11, 40.

in their own pedigrees,¹ were now equally concerned with fixing the pedigree of the nation.²

Whether reconstructing the lineage of individual or of nation, an ancient genealogist must have found it difficult to eschew the role of chronicler. Most of the genealogical specimens examined heretofore have been in the form of bare tabulated lists, unembellished by any syntactical structures more complex than appositives. What an actual document compiled from such lists would have looked like is well illustrated by the first few verses of I Chron., or Neh. 7: 6 ff. which is actually called a "Book of Genealogies." A genealogist, however, is a quasi-historian, and the historical aspect of his work must always be before his mind: the acts of the people whose names he is listing clamor for inclusion. But to include them means interpolating *sentences*, and once this syntactic construction has been employed the document has become, in however rudimentary a form, a chronicle. Thus in form alone, not to mention content, the genealogy represents the framework of a history.

The first stages in the process of turning a genealogy into a chronicle by degrees of interpolation is well illustrated in the genealogical literature of the ancient Near East. One of the earliest stages is represented by the Memphite Genealogy.³ Before some of the statues⁴ depicted in this relief the writer has included, besides the genealogical formula "son of x (with titles)," the phrase "in the time of king so-and-so." This phrase must be elliptical for some such statement as "he passed his lifetime under..." or even "he was born in the time of, etc.," a parenthetic remark which could handily be reduced to a prepositional phrase. The content is strictly historical, not genealogical, and the syntactic structure is that of a chronicle. The Assyrian King List is a good example of a slightly later stage in the development.⁵ Beginning as a genealogy in purely tabular form, it soon changes to a crude chronicle, consisting of a genealogy as a framework for the whole, interspersed with a series of historical statements.⁶ The latter, on the basis of content, may be classified as follows: (a) totals of groups with a qualifying phrase, (b) statements of the lengths of reign, and (c)

¹ L. Waterman, *AJSL* 58 (1941), 49 ff.

² Cf. E. L. Curtis, *HDB* II, 121.

³ Borchart, *loc. cit.*

⁴ At least twenty-six examples are present; in the lost portion of the relief more may have occurred.

⁵ I. J. Gelb, *JNES* 13 (1954), pl. 14-17.

⁶ See the discussion of Poebel, *op. cit.*, 249, 280 f.

occasional descriptions of usurpations. All this material is primarily concerned with the occupancy of the kingship and is genealogical in general tenor; but it is nonetheless historical. An example of a third and even more advanced stage in the evolution of a chronicle from a genealogy is the first section of I Chron. (ch. 1-8). Here tabulation is still found (cf. 1: 1-4), but side by side with complete sentences such as "x was the father of y," king-lists, and even historical narrative. The latter, unlike the historical statements of the Assyrian King List, are not formulae of fixed form, but uninhibited narrative. In the first eight chapters of Chronicles the historian still uses the genealogy as framework, but it no longer restricts his style.

The literary genre of the genealogy thus appeared an admirable vehicle for history writing.¹ Even in monarchical states where it was accompanied by the related genre of the King List as a frame for the historian, the writer of history could not rid himself of a tedious preoccupation with lineage. In contexts in which the King List could not be employed because the historian was writing about distant, premonarchic times, the choice of the genealogy as a literary framework was an obvious one. Primeval histories especially lent themselves to such treatment. When Sanchuniaton, some time in the seventh or sixth centuries B.C., set about to write the primeval history of the Levantine coast, he quite naturally represented it in terms reminiscent of a lineage; and the expression introducing his theogony in the version of Philo Byblius preserved by Eusebius, viz. "this is their cosmogony,"² shows an awareness of how closely the *form* of the work approximated that of a formal genealogy.³

The unknown editor of the Book of Genesis who lived in the late sixth or early fifth century B.C.⁴ was very much a child of the times.

¹ Our present analysis, however, is purely formal. We do not intend to suggest that the genealogy was the only such vehicle, and by no means that it was the earliest. King lists, prose narrative and annals were equally felicitous forms which the historian could use, and by the First Millennium B.C. these had long since in the countries of the Levant developed into *bona fide* historical genres.

² Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* i, 10: 4; cf. the Hebrew *'elle(b) toledot*.

³ Unless, as F. Løkkegaard suggests (*Studia Theologica* 8 [1954], 57), this phrase has been supplied by Eusebius. But Løkkegaard does not argue the case, and I can see no cogent reason for following him.

⁴ We have consciously eschewed the denomination "P" in this chapter simply because the isolation of framework material in the Book of Genesis justifies the postulate of nothing more than a single compiler, and implies nothing, as the siglum P does, about his theological biases. Nevertheless it will become clear from what is here assigned to the Genesis editor that he is roughly equivalent to the one others choose to call P in the rest of the Pentateuch. The period of his

Faced with the writing of what for the post-exilic Jewish community amounted to a primeval history,¹ he chose the genealogy as the literary form wherein to cast his work. His priestly confreres at Jerusalem could easily provide him with as detailed a genealogy as he could wish; and the one he chose is represented exactly in its pristine con-

activity has long since been considered identified with certainty. A post-Exilic, fifth century, date has, since Wellhausen, boasted a majority of adherents (cf. Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, 188). The view that it was indeed Ezra and the post-Exilic priesthood that were essentially responsible for the *tōlēdōt* *Mōše(b)* has been championed by M. Löhr; see *BZAW* 38 (1924), 29 ff.; *OLZ* 29 (1926), 6 ff. E. Auerbach (*VT* 2 [1952], 334 ff.; contrast Y. Kaufmann, *ibid.* 4 [1954], 307 ff.) has sought to establish the beginning of the Exile as the *terminus a quo*. Although it should be treated as a truism that some at least of the Genesis editor's material is of ancient origin (cf. C. H. Gordon, *HUCA* 26 [1955], 50), nevertheless any tendency to date "P" prior to 586 (cf. Procksch, Jepsen, *ZAW* 46 [1929], 255) seems to be a move in the wrong direction. Not only does the little evidence coming to light suggest that traditions originating even as late as the seventh century were quite garbled by the time they were included in the Book of Genesis (cf. M. Astour, *JBL* 84 [1965], 422 ff.), but the purpose and outlook of the Genesis editor definitely does not suit the Judaean monarchy of the sixth century. The principle themes to which P, in the Tetrateuch, addresses himself almost exclusively are 1. legislation, 2. Yahweh's shrine, 3. the congregation, and 4. the pedigree. No. 1 emerges as a code with strong sacerdotal overtones which is to be valid for the whole community, but which makes no provision for a king. No. 2 turns up as an archetypal tent-shrine, strongly reminiscent of a pre-monarchic sanctuary (cf. M. Haran, *JBL* 81 [1962], 14 ff.). No. 3 is pictured as a group of wilderness wanderers, organized along the lines of the pre-monarchic amphictyony (A. Kuschke, *ZAW* 63 [1951], 74 ff.), who are returning to the Land of Promise after a period of detention abroad. No. 4 takes the form of the Book of Genesis, a primeval history, justifying the claim to the land. Do not these four themes fill precisely the need for encouragement and rationale of the early post-Exilic community in Judah? Cf. K. Elliger, *ZTK* 49 (1952), 141 f.; M.-L. Henry, *Jahvist und Priesterschrift* (Stuttgart, 1960), 20 ff. Whether on the basis of the emphatic bent away from monarchy which P shows we are justified in dating him after the abortive royalist coup of Zerubbabel is a moot point. A. S. Kapelrud has recently argued for an earlier date, around 550 B.C. (*ASTI* 3 [1964], 58 ff.). He believes that Deutero-Isaiah, writing in 539, shows knowledge of the Tetrateuch in its final "P" edition, which must therefore antedate his own work. Actually, the similarity in vocabulary between Deutero-Isaiah and Genesis 1 can be used to prove nothing more than that both Deutero-Isaiah and the Genesis editor were working at about the same time and in the same theological and literary atmosphere; it cannot prove the chronological priority of one over the other. The dependence of Isa. 54: 9-10 upon Gen. 9: 16 (the promise to Noah that there would never again be a flood) is only apparent; we are dealing rather with the reflexion in two separate documents of legendary material which was current among the exiles. Again, Isa. 43: 16-17 and Ex. 14: 28-9 are most probably derivative of an older, common source, perhaps the old poetic version in Ex. 15: 1.

¹ As introduction to the Mosaic Tradition and the Sinai Covenant? Bentzen, *Archiv Orientalni* 19 (1951), 228.

cisness by the introduction to another historian-priest's *magnum opus*, viz. I Chron. 1. For the purposes of his work the Genesis editor made use of a term, *tōlēdōt* "progeny," which was probably foreign to the genuine genealogical vocabulary,¹ and was intended to convey a stilted effect. In six generations the phrase "these are the generations of so-and-so" was inserted:² Adam (5: 1),³ Noah (6: 9), Noah's sons (10: 1, 11; 10), Abraham (11: 27), Abraham's sons (25: 12, 19), and Isaac's sons (36: 1, 9; 37: 2). These were the natural watersheds in the projected history. Into and around the mold thus framed the writer poured his material: Babylonian legends of primordial times, genealogies which he derived from his literary framework, cycles of legends of the Patriarchs, the Joseph Novellette, and the Blessing of Jacob. His finished history he appropriately titled, with the aid of this signature formula, "the Book of Adam's Progeny;"⁴ to which was later added a subsidiary title admirably suited to a primeval history, "the Progeny of Heaven and Earth."⁵

There is thus no reason to postulate for *tōlēdōt* a meaning other than "progeny," for in those three cases in which the word is not followed immediately by genealogical material it is only the union of framework with narrative material by the editor which has produced this situation. *Tōlēdōt* does not qualify the narrative which now follows it, but the simple formula "x begat y" (or the like) which once did. In the anomalous cases such a genealogical formula may still be clearly seen embedded in the following narrative: in Gen. 2: 4 the "genealogy" consists of the various acts of creation (vss. 18 ff.) and the human genealogy of 4: 17 ff.; in Gen. 6 it follows the intervening and irrelevant observation that Noah was righteous (vs. 10). The two doubtful examples (nos. 6 and 8 above, p. 4 f.) also display

¹ Cf. Holzinger, *Gen.*, 15 f.

² In this sense the formula was secondary and editorial; but not secondary to the finished Book of Genesis: cf. Löhr, *BZAW* 38, 6.

³ Was 2: 4a inserted under the influence of 5: 1? Note: (a) both formulas are followed by "in the day when Y/E made/created etc.;" (b) both formulas are followed by a creation account, 2: 4a by a lengthy narrative, 5: 1 by a clipped reference (vss. 1-2). Alternately, one could treat chapters 2-4 and 5 as parallel versions, the latter constituting the original first chapter of the Genesis editor's work, the former a much fuller account, independent in origin, which was later prefixed to chapter 5.

⁴ Cf. Eerdmans, *AS* I, 84 f.

⁵ It is irrelevant here whether the *tōlēdōt*-formula is to be separated from the body of "P" or not (so Von Rad, North: in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* [London, 1951], 56; cf. Humbert, *ZAW* 58 [1940], 39). The view propounded here is that it is the unique contribution of the Genesis editor.

traces of a genealogy once present. In 11: 27 the introduction to the Abraham cycle of tales precludes the immediate statement of his progeny; and so a statement that “Terah was the father of Abram, Nahor and Haran” is thrust in to justify the retention of the formula. In 25: 19 ff. an original “and Isaak was the father of Esau and Jacob” has been replaced by an expanded birth-narrative (vss. 21 ff.) and in compensation the sentence “Abraham was the father of Isaak” has been inserted just after the *tōlēdōt*-formula.

This brings us to a consideration of the occurrence of the formula in 37: 2. It is not correct to describe it as the introduction to the P-version of the Joseph Story;¹ nor as a stock indicator that, Isaak being dead, Jacob becomes technically the leading figure.² As the above discussion clearly shows, it can be understood in no other way than as the introduction to a genealogy; and the block of genealogical material which in this case gives the *raison d'être* to the formula must be Jacob's family-tree of “seventy souls” in 46: 8-27.³ It is now wrenched from its original locus through considerations of chronology: if the Joseph Story is to be included, it must be done before 46: 8-27, for the latter presupposes the coming to maturity, if not old age, of all the principals who in the former are still quite young. The *tōlēdōt*-formula did not migrate to Chapter 46 along with the genealogy because it was closely tied to 37: 1, on the analogy of the statement regarding Esau in 36: 8. Verse 37: 1 could not migrate thither, partly because the conscious contrast with 36: 8 required proximity of the two, and partly because it did secondary duty as an introduction to the geographical setting of the Joseph Story.

Between the *tōlēdōt*-formula and the sentence which he chose to begin the Joseph Story (now vs. 3), the Genesis editor slipped the remainder of vs. 2 as an introduction.

Gen. 37: 2aβ-b, “At the age of seventeen Joseph used to graze⁴ the flocks with his brothers, as boy helper to the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah his father's wives; and Joseph took back a bad account of them to their father.”

¹ Von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch* (Berlin, 1934), 40.

² Driver, *Gen.*, 319.

³ Skinner, *Gen.*, 443 note; cf. Graham, *JTS* 41 (1940), 144. *Gen.* 37: 2a has sometimes been construed with 41: 46 through the intermediary of a (now lost) epitome: cf. W. R. Harper, *Hebraica* 6 (1889), 1 f.; Budde, *ZAW* 36 (1916), 6 f.

⁴ For the nuance of consuetude inherent in the construction *bāyā(b)* with participle, see P. Jouon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique* (Rome, 1947), §§ 121 f.

This passage is usually treated as composite,¹ and it cannot be denied that there seems justification for so doing. Several considerations, however, oblige one to sever this verse completely from the story and assign it *en bloc* to the Genesis writer.² First, the pre-occupation with age and the reference by name to the concubines sets the passage apart from the body of the story, where Jacob's wives are never mentioned by name, and where interest in specific ages is seldom encountered.³ Second, Joseph is described here as a shepherd, a role he does not play in the rest of the chapter; he only gleans with his brothers, and then in a dream (vs. 7). Indeed the story in chapter 37 precludes his being a shepherd, for when his brothers are engaged in this very occupation in vss. 12 ff., Joseph is not with them. Moreover, he wears a garment which is far from suited to the requirements of shepherding (vs. 3).⁴ Third, a reason is given in vs. 2 for the hatred of the brothers which is different from that in the story: the brothers—and in the context this can mean only the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah⁵—hated Joseph because he told tales on them to his father. The Bilhah and Zilpah boys, the writer seems to be saying, were a bad lot. This intentional vilification of the sons of the concubines bears no relation to anything said in the story itself, where they are not even mentioned by name. There the brief strokes of the pen sketch “the brothers,” undifferentiated by matrilineal ancestry, as quick-tempered and jealous, but honest and quick to repent.⁶ The author of vs. 2 is not only sensitive to the individual characterization of Jacob's sons in the earlier parts of Genesis, but seems to be motivated by an inbred disdain for half-breeds. Fourth, the writer of this verse had the complete Joseph Story before him, as the delightful *double entendre* of the sentence *bāyā(b) rō'e(h) 'eṭ 'eḥāw* shows. With the following *baššō'n* there is no doubt about the meaning of the sentence, for 'eṭ must be the preposition. But the odd word order in which semantic object is made to follow the adverbial phrase presents the reader at first reading with the possibility (excluded, of course, when his eye meets *baššō'n*) of understanding 'eṭ as *nota accusativa*. At once the meaning of $\sqrt{R'H}$

¹ See Holzinger, *Gen.*, 219; Smend, *Erzählung*, 99; Rudolph, *Elobist*, 152; Simpson, *ETI*, 125.

² Skinner, *Gen.*, 444.

³ Only 41: 46, 47: 9, 28, all usually ascribed to P.

⁴ Ehrlich, *Randglossen* I, 184 f.

⁵ Dahse's contention (*TMH* I, 156; *ZAW* 28 [1908], 168) that “Leah” has dropped out after “Bilhah” through haplography is unconvincing.

⁶ Cf. Gunkel, *Legends*, 50.

in the metaphorical sense of "to shepherd human flock, to rule"¹ presents itself, and clearly suggests the purport of the dreams which constitutes one of the main themes of the story.

The above considerations show that the writer of the bulk of vs. 2 had the Joseph Story already before him, as well as the birth traditions, that he took an interest in personal relationships superfluous to the story, and that he was concerned about chronology. All this points to the editor of the present Book of Genesis, the same who makes use of the *tōlēdōt*-formula, and is responsible for the inclusion of the genealogical material. To him we may safely assign vss. 1 and 2, and construe them as editorial introduction to the story proper which begins in vs. 3.

THE JUDAH-TAMAR INTERLUDE

That chapter 38 has nothing whatsoever to do with the plot of the Joseph Story is clear from a cursory glance at the contents.² The family of Jacob is nowhere to be found; a brief note in vs. 1 tells us that Judah has left his brothers to make his own way in the world. He settles down in the hill-country which later bears his name, marries, and has three sons. When his eldest dies without issue, and the second also dies while feigning to comply with the Levirate law, Judah decides not to allow his third son to cohabit with his daughter-in-law Tamar. The latter, however, is not to be put off; she disguises herself as a cult prostitute, and becomes pregnant by her own unsuspecting father-in-law, who leaves a token with her in lieu of eventual payment for services. On being condemned to death for her supposed adultery, Tamar turns the tables on Judah by producing the token and identifying him as her paramour. The chapter closes with the birth of Tamar's twins, and how they received their names. The point of the story is thus partly moral (don't try to circumvent your divinely-ordained obligation to perform the Levirate); and partly aetiological (how did the eldest sons of Judah lose their pre-eminence,³ and how did Perez and Zerah get their names?).

The story of chapter 38 has been rightly compared with the theme

¹ Cf. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1913), 257; often in Jeremiah.

² Cf. Gunkel, *Gen.*, 349; *idem*, *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 62; Eissfeldt, *Hex. Syn.*, 26; J. Steinemann, *Les plus anciennes traditions des Pentateuch* (Paris, 1954), 153.

³ Cf. Gunkel, *Legends*, 21; E. G. Kraeling, *Rand-McNally Bible Atlas* (New York, 1956), 91.

of the Book of Ruth.¹ Both Tamar and Ruth share the desire, which is eventually realized in both cases, to raise up heirs for their deceased husbands. Both women, moreover, together with their husbands, belong to the direct ancestry of King David. Could it be that we have in both stories remnants of a cycle of legends dealing with David's descent, the main purpose of which was to show how, although time and again apparently on the verge of dying out, the Judaic line which was to produce the great king survived?

If such an hypothesis explains the existence of Genesis 38, it does not explain its present location in the book. Coming as it does between the rape of Joseph and his initial adventure in Egypt, it disrupts the plot of the story at a crucial point. There is no time span between the end of chapter 37 and the beginning of chapter 39 (as there is between 39 and 40, or 40 and 41) to justify the presence of a digression.² And yet the only reasonable explanation of the present order of the chapters must be chronological:³ chapter 38 could not follow the Joseph Story, since Judah is then in Egypt for the rest of his life, while the setting of 38 is in Palestine. It could not precede the Joseph Story⁴ for Judah is an old grandfather at the close of 38, while at the outset of the Joseph Story he is still a young man. It should here be noted that no matter where chapter 38 be placed an insurmountable difficulty remains. Judah is there pictured as himself an aged patriarch, peacefully settled in Palestine. In the Joseph Story, however, he remains among the brothers and is apparently without wife or children, i.e. is still a young man.⁵ Someone, probably the Genesis editor, has attempted to ameliorate this difficulty by imposing an artificial chronology on the Joseph Story: Joseph was 17 in chapter 37 (vs. 2), 30 when appointed governor of Egypt (41: 46), and (by implication) 37 when the famine began and his brothers arrived in Egypt. Thus between chapter 37 and the arrival of Judah on his first trip to Egypt 20 years elapsed, a period into which the events of chapter 38 could (with no little difficulty for us moderns!) be squeezed.

¹ Cf. Skinner *Gen.*, 452; S. H. Hooke, *In the Beginning* (Oxford, 1947), 121.

² Speiser, *Gen.*, 299; contrast Hölscher, *Geschichtsschreibung*, 52 n. 1; cf. W. Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament* (New York, 1964), 67 f.

³ Kuenen *Hexateuch*, 327; Gordon (*The World of the Old Testament* [New York, 1958], 135) suggests suspense, while Dornseiff finds a parallel to this sort of insertion in the Bellerophon story: *ZAW* 52 (1934), 72 f.

⁴ Pace Holzinger *Gen.*, 227.

⁵ As guarantee for Benjamin (43: 9) he has no sons to offer, as Reuben the eldest has (42: 37).

The fact that the Genesis editor found it necessary to make an attempt to accommodate chapter 38 to the context argues that he could not overcome the difficulty in the most obvious way, viz. by excluding the tale completely from his book. Chapter 38 must have become a traditional part of the material comprising the last 15 chapters of Genesis before the Genesis editor happened upon the scene. He could not reject it, nor could he unite it happily with the Joseph Story; and, as Jubilees indicates,¹ chapter 38 long found no permanent resting place.²

As for the insertion of 38 at exactly this point in the story (and not between 39 and 40, or 40 and 41), one can only protest (a) between chapters 37 and 39 there is a natural pause in the action, and (b) certain coincidental features of chapter 38 bind it to chapters 37 and 39. Among the latter one may note the similarity between Judah in 38 and Jacob in 37: both are patriarchs, both are deceived, both are obliged to give legal recognition to a piece of evidence.³ Between Tamar and Potiphar's wife on the other hand there is a marked contrast; ⁴ the former is an honorable woman faithful to the interests of her husband, while the latter is adulterous, malevolent, and contemptuous of her husband.

THE THEOPHANY TO JACOB AND THE GENEALOGY

Gen. 46: 1-4,⁵ "So Israel set out with all he owned and when he reached Beersheba he offered sacrifices to the god of his father Isaac. God said to Israel in a night vision, and he said (sic) 'Jacob, Jacob!' and he answered, 'I'm here.' Then he continued 'I am the god, your father's god.⁶ Have no fear of going down to Egypt, for it is a great nation that I shall make of you there. I personally shall go down with you to Egypt, and I personally shall surely bring you up again; and Joseph shall put his hand on your eyes.'"

With the beginning of chapter 46 the reader has momentarily taken

¹ Note that Jubilees inserts chapter 38 between 42 and 43.

² The Tamar story did not originate with the Genesis editor, who found it already in written form. It is, moreover, doubtful whether we should equate the author of chapter 38 with the writer of the "J" strands earlier in Genesis, even though the divine name "Yahweh" predominates: cf. Kittel *Gesch.*, 230.

³ Cf. the identical wording *hakkēr nā'* in 37: 32 and 38: 25. On $\sqrt{\text{NKR}}$ "to admit as evidence," see A. D. Tushingham, *JNES* 12 (1953), 153 n. 28.

⁴ Cf. Fritsch, *Interpretation* (Jan. 1955), 23.

⁵ See most recently, H. M. Dion, *CBQ* 29 (1967), 198 ff.

⁶ Cf. Alt, *Der Gott der Vater* (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften* I, 18 f.).

leave of the Joseph Story, the denouement of which has been reached in chapter 45. The tenor of the verses has suddenly reverted to the coarser style of the Patriarchal tales: ¹ we encounter night visions, have our intellects taxed by a theophany (after ten chapters without one), are reminded of the Abrahamic covenant and promise (likewise unmentioned in the Joseph Story), and hear a form of divine address which recalls god's speeches to Abraham.² In several points 46: 1-4 and the Joseph Story contradict each other. First, as an attempt will be made to demonstrate later, the Joseph Story places Jacob's residence in the wilderness environs of Beersheba.³ In 46: 1, however, Israel moves thither, ostensibly for the first time, from some unnamed location. Second, in 46: 1 the patriarch is pictured in the robustness of his prime, breaking camp ⁴ like a nomad, leading his clan to another site where he builds an altar and offers sacrifices. What has become of the feeble old gentleman of the Joseph Story, whose heart faints when he hears good news (45: 26), and who has to make long journeys in a cart (46: 5) because he is too old to walk? ⁵ Third, in vs. 3 Jacob is depicted as fearful of going down into Egypt and in need of reassurance. In 45: 28, however, he has already joyfully expressed his desire to go down. Fourth, in 46: 1-4 it is implied that the trip is understood to be a permanent move, and the promise of numerical increase in Egypt anticipates the Exodus narrative. In the Joseph Story, however, the move to Egypt is represented as a temporary one, to alleviate the rigors of the famine in Canaan.⁶

It is clear, then, that these verses do not belong to the Joseph Story.⁷ They were put here in order to obviate the embarrassing spectacle of the great patriarch quitting the Land of Promise without taking thought for the covenant which would apparently be annulled thereby.⁸ The writer responsible for placing them here may be the Genesis editor; his genealogy (vs. 8-27) and its introduction (vs. 5-7) follows immediately. Whether or not he was also responsible for the

¹ Noth *UG*, 230.

² Cf. 46: 2 with 22: 1.

³ See below, p. 21; Procksch *Gen.*, 380.

⁴ $\sqrt{\text{NS}}$, a root which recalls Abraham's wanderings, but does not occur in the Joseph Story.

⁵ On the difference in nature between the Jacob of the Joseph Story and the Jacob of the rest of Genesis, see Eising, *Jacobserzählung*, 326, 335.

⁶ Cf. 45: 11, 47: 12. See further below, p. 160 f.

⁷ Rudolph *Elobist*, 149, 165; the final clause in vs. 4 appears to be a harmonizing addition.

⁸ E. Jacob, *La Tradition historique en Israël* (Montpellier, 1946), 119.

content is difficult to say. On the basis of the alternation of the names Jacob and Israel, the four verses could be divided between two sources, vs. 1 and 2a (J), and 2b-4 (E).¹ The first is reminiscent of other allusions to Israel (outside the plot of the Joseph Story) which have an interest in the patriarch's itinerary.² The second sounds very like the promises to the patriarchs,³ especially the promise to Isaac given also at Beersheba, and also in the night.⁴ But there is one important difference: except for Gen. 15: 13-16, the earlier promises in Genesis know nothing of the descent to Egypt and the Exodus. The patriarch and his descendants are to possess the land they *now* reside in. In fact, in one of the promises to Isaac⁵ the patriarch is enjoined *not* to go down to Egypt on the very grounds that he and his descendants are going to be given Palestine as an inheritance. The promise to Jacob at Beersheba, however, knows all about the descent and the Exodus, and in this regard it approximates the prediction made to Abraham in Genesis 15. The most likely explanation is that, whatever legendary theophany may underlie Gen. 46: 1-4, it has been extensively reworked by the Genesis editor and consciously patterned after the theophany to Isaac in 26: 24.⁶

Gen. 46: 5-7, "Jacob started out from Beersheba, and the sons of Israel carried Jacob their father, their infants and their wives in the carts which Pharaoh had sent to carry them. They took their cattle and the things they had acquired in the Land of Canaan, that is, Jacob and all his family with him: his sons and grandsons too, his daughters

¹ Procksch *Gen.*, 255; Holzinger *Gen.*, 248; Wellhausen *Comp.*, 61; Dillmann *Gen.*, 434.

² "When he came from Padan-Aram" (35: 9-10) Jacob's name was changed to Israel; Israel moved on "beyond the tower of Eder" (vs. 21); "in that land" Reuben ravished Israel's concubine (vs. 22); Israel moves to Beersheba (46: 1); Joseph meets Israel "in Goshen" (46: 29); Israel lives "in the land of Egypt, in Goshen" (47: 27), and requests to be buried outside Egypt, in Palestine (47: 30).

³ Cf. *Gen.* 12: 1-3; 13: 14-17; 15: 5; 17: 1-8, 15-16; 22: 16-18; 26: 2-5, 24; 28: 3-4, 13-15; 35: 11-12.

⁴ 46: 2b-4

"God said to Israel in a night vision... 'Jacob, Jacob!' and he answered 'I'm here!' Then he continued, 'I am the god, your father's god; have no fear of going down to Egypt, for it is a great nation that I shall make of you there.'"

⁵ 26: 2 ff.; J. Lindblom, *HUCA* 32 (1961), 99.

⁶ Cf. Eising *Jakobserzählung*, 336.

26: 24

"Yahweh appeared to him that night and said, 'I am the god of Abraham, your father; do not fear, for I am with you. I will bless you and multiply your seed for the sake of Abraham, my servant.'"

and his granddaughters and all his family he brought to Egypt with him."

The editorial nature of this passage and the redundant style point to the Genesis editor, who in similar terms described Abraham's migration to Canaan.¹ Nevertheless we are back to the Joseph Story with the beginning of vs. 5, for the carts which Joseph sent in chapter 45 suddenly reappear after an unexplained absence in 46: 1-4. The Genesis editor is probably merely expanding upon an original passage in the Joseph Story.

It should be noted that when Jacob journeys to Egypt he *starts out*² from Beersheba; and the details of chapter 37³ suggest that this is where the writer of the Joseph Story located the patriarch's home-stead.⁴ A later glossator, however, wished to locate the residence in the vicinity of Hebron,⁵ and the reason for this was probably the notice of Isaac's death. Isaac had to be buried at Hebron (cf. 25: 9-10), and this had to be related before the Genesis editor inserted his *tōlēdōt*-formula with the genealogies of Esau and Jacob (cf. the arrangement in chapter 25). This necessitated closing chapter 35 with the burial of Isaac, for which ceremony Jacob had to be gotten to Hebron. Like a dutiful son and heir to the promises he stays there, in the place most heavily charged with patriarchal memories. Consequently he must still have been in residence there when the adventure of Joseph took place. So probably ran the reasoning of the glossator.⁶

But if the Joseph Story was set in Beersheba, a harmonizing statement would have to be made between the end of chapter 45 and 46: 5, telling of the family's migration from Hebron to Beersheba. Verses 5-7 constitute just such a harmonization from the hand of the Genesis editor.

¹ *Gen.* 12: 5.

² *Wāyyāqām*, cf. Speiser *Gen.*, 163.

³ See below, p. 143 f.

⁴ The Joseph Story does not picture Jacob as a nomadic sheikh, as the Patriarchal Narratives do. Jacob remains sedentary, even when good pasturage is wanting, or when famine has struck his neighbourhood. The family subsists through agriculture (cf. Joseph's first dream), as well as livestock-farming. When the family is obliged to travel, they stay in inns (42: 27), not in their own tents. Jacob appears as a member of a landed aristocracy (a stage beyond De Vaux's "semi-sédentaires." *Les Institutions de l'ancien testament* [Paris, 1961], I, 16; cf. *idem*, *RB* 72 [1965], 17). Cf. further below, p. 245 n. 1.

⁵ Kraeling, *op. cit.*, 91; Ruppert, *JEG*, 35.

⁶ I.e. the Genesis editor? This would mean that, on his chronology, Jacob had reached Hebron over twelve years before the death and burial of Isaac: see below, p. 23, n. 2.

Gen. 46: 8-27, the Genesis editor's genealogy of Jacob which, in the genealogical list used as the framework of Genesis, probably began with the words "these are the generations of Jacob," now at home in 37: 2.¹

THE BLESSINGS OF JACOB

Gen. 48,² This chapter is a collection of odds and ends drawn from diverse sources by the Genesis editor, and included here in a desperate effort, one feels, to tie up loose ends before Jacob dies. With chapter 49 it ruptures the smooth flow of the simple death scene in which the aged Israel, after eliciting from his son the promise to take his corpse back to Palestine for burial (47: 29-30), falls lifeless in a seeming act of obeissance, while Joseph weeps uncontrollably (50: 1). This innocuous little vignette has now been distended beyond belief by a host of improbables and mutual inconsistencies.

The block of verses in 48: 1-7 forms a sort of introduction to the two succeeding chapters. Surprisingly Jacob is still alive, although verse 31 of chapter 47 pictures his death scene. Joseph hears (apparently for the first time) of his father's mortal sickness, visits Jacob with his two sons Manasseh and Ephraim, and is subjected to a monologue by the old man. Jacob recounts in a free paraphrase the substance of the theophany at Luz (35: 11-12). His second point, which is the *raison d'être* of the entire piece, is that Joseph's two sons are now to be counted among his own in lieu of Joseph. Is it in explanation of this strange appropriation that he goes on to describe how Rachel (who might have been expected to give him other sons of his own) is now dead and buried?³ This latter recapitulation as well as the notice about the re-affirmation of the covenant at Luz, refer back to ten verses in the core of chapter 35, and betray an awareness of the final form this chapter has taken in the book. The writer, then, of the present section, viz. *Gen.* 48: 1-7, is quite late in date, and must be identified as the Genesis editor. The reason he recapitulates here is not entirely clear, but it may be to have Joseph informed of events which transpired after he had been taken to Egypt.

¹ Above, p. 2 f.

² On this chapter in general, see H. Gressmann, EYXAPIΣTHPION, 6 ff.; Eising *Jakobserzählung*, 351 ff.; B. J. Van der Merwe, in *Studia Biblica et Semitica* (Wageningen, 1966), 226.

³ Cf. Speiser *Gen.*, 359.

The Genesis editor's relentless and mechanical logic might well deem such a scene necessary; and on the inflexible chronology he was obliged to work with ¹ the theophany at Luz and the death of Rachel must have taken place after the events of chapter 37.²

The remainder of chapter 48 probably entered the hands of the Genesis editor as a unit.³ It employs the personal name "Israel" rather than "Jacob," and takes as its main subject the explanation of the historical precedence of Ephraim over Manasseh. But the original writer of these verses was, like the Genesis editor who used his final product, himself working with diverse material.⁴ And he has done a shoddy job of synthesizing it. He begins by telling us that Israel saw the two boys (vs. 8), but later says that the patriarch had become short-sighted through old age (vs. 10). Twice we are told that Joseph made his boys approach their grandfather (vss. 10 and 13). Twice Israel blesses them (vss. 15-16 and 20); and the poetical blessings he utters have nothing to do with the exaltation of the younger over the older brother.⁵ Finally Israel turns to Joseph to promise him a "shoulder" above his brothers, and a string of second person plural forms escapes his lips. Thus the indications are that this section of chapter 48 represents the attempted inscripturation of an aetiological narrative which had already blossomed forth into two or three slightly differing versions.

Unlike the unknown and illiterate authors of the aetiology, however, the present recorder of the tale knew about the Joseph Story. Verses 8, 9 and 11 in fact represent his attempt to adapt the old legend

¹ It is unlikely that the Genesis editor is personally responsible for the ages of the patriarchs. These probably derive from the artificial, post-Exilic, genealogies of the Jerusalem priesthood, which were taken over by him as an historical framework. (Of course if he were himself a priest, as many think, he would have been *ipso facto* committed to using this material, willy-nilly). In fitting the Patriarchal Traditions into this framework, the Genesis editor was setting for himself a *tour de force*, and may not have been altogether unaware of it.

² At Isaac's death Jacob would have been 120 (cf. 25: 26 with 35: 28); he died at the age of 147, after having spent 17 years in Egypt (47: 28). When the events of chapter 37 took place he would have been 108 (130-22 [13 (Gen. 41: 46) + 7 (Gen. 41: 48) + 2 (Gen. 45: 11)]). Hence Joseph was sold into Egypt twelve years before the burial of Isaac!

³ Wellhausen *Comp.*, 61 f.; Eerdmans *AS* I, 69; for parallels to the adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh in ancient cultures, see I. Mendelsohn, *IEJ* 9 (1959), 180 ff.

⁴ See Gunkel *Gen.*, 469 ff.; Simpson *ETI*, 150 f.; Speiser *Gen.*, 359; Holzinger *Gen.*, 252 f.; O. Kaiser, *VT* 10 (1960), 10; R. Weill, *RHR* 88 (1923), 19.

⁵ Vs. 20 may originally have been a blessing of Joseph himself by his father: cf. Holzinger *Gen.*, 253.

to that narrative. The point in the story where he chose to insert the legend is also evident. In vs. 8 Israel notices Ephraim and Manasseh for the first time, *but does not know them*, an odd state of affairs if he had lived in Egypt for seventeen years!¹ In vs. 11 Jacob ejaculates that he had entertained no hope of seeing Joseph alive again, much less any offspring of his. And when, in the subsequent verses the boys come forward for blessing, they are described in terms befitting children. These strange facts show clearly that the first part of the chapter is foreign to the aetiology of the second, for vs. 5 represents the old man as already aware of the two lads' identity. They also show that the reader is not witnessing a death-bed blessing, seventeen years after Jacob's settlement in Egypt,² as the Genesis editor would have us believe, but a scene of Jacob's arrival in Goshen in the second year of the famine. Joseph is there with his two small sons to meet his aged father. Patriarch and son have greeted each other with a show of emotion, and the appropriate benedictory words have been spoken. Now Jacob notices the boys. Who are these, he wants to know; for he as yet knows nothing of Joseph's marital status. They are Joseph's sons, he is told, who have been born to him "here" i.e. in Egypt;³ and a spontaneous blessing of the boys follows naturally. The whole episode as it now appears in chapter 48 probably originally stood (without any intervening verses now lost) after chapter 46: 30; for at that point the scene of arrival stops abruptly, and is continued by the preparations for the audience with Pharaoh. The person responsible for transferring the aetiology to its present location was the Genesis editor, who probably felt that such a blessing was more appropriate to Jacob's death scene. It was probably his hand too which added vs. 21, with its prediction of the Exodus, an interpolation almost identical to Joseph's last utterance in 50: 24, and to be construed with the theophany to Jacob at Beersheba (46: 3-4).

Gen. 49,⁴ The initial reason for expanding Jacob's death scene was the necessity to include this long poem of Jacob's final statements to

¹ Cf. Gunkel *Gen.*, 472. To put this down to the fact that Jacob had not settled in Egypt proper, but in Goshen (Holzinger, *Gen.*, 254) is extremely weak.

² 47: 28. Joseph's sons would have been grown men by that time.

³ *Bāze(h)*, in contrast semantically with an understood *šām*, "there," i.e. in Canaan, whence Jacob had just come. The use of the deictic shows clearly that the scene cannot have been intended for a time seventeen years after Jacob had come and settled in the land!

⁴ See most recently H-J. Zobel, *Stammespruch und Geschichte* (BZAW 95), Berlin, 1965.

each of his sons. The context of such a blessing in ancient Near Eastern tradition is indeed the scene of a man's death; but the latter in chapter 49 does not seem to be set in Egypt. The content of the blessing suggests Canaan, and undoubtedly stems from a different tradition to that of the Joseph Story,¹ one in which Jacob died in Palestine without ever going to Egypt.² Ignoring its original locale, the Genesis editor took the poem,³ preceded it by the aetiological blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh (not mentioned in the poem) drawn from one version of the Joseph Story, and wrote his own preface and conclusion, both of which recapitulate earlier material.⁴

THE CONCLUSION TO THE BOOK OF GENESIS

Gen. 50: 22-26, To his finished work the Genesis editor likewise wrote a conclusion which again recapitulates the promises to the Patriarchs, and predicts a visitation of god with the purpose of leading the Israelites back to Canaan. True to his bent towards recording chronology, the writer dwells on the age of Joseph and the generations of his descendents whom he lived to see born. Joseph's last words, viz. an injunction that the Israelites should carry his corpse back to Palestine for burial when they leave, is an attempt to reconcile the Joseph Story with the fact that Joseph's grave was commonly located at Shechem.⁵

Thus far the discussion has uncovered by empirical means at least two redactional hands in the material within which the Joseph Story

¹ Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 61. Good's contention (*JBL* 82 [1963], 432) that vs. 9-12 are an ironic reflection upon incidents in chapters 37 and 38 has been rightly rejected by Zobel (*op. cit.*, 15, n. 62a).

² Meyer *INS*, 227, 414 f.; see further below, p. 250.

³ Where the poem stood before being placed in its present position is not altogether clear. Burrows thinks it originally stood after the account of Reuben's incest in 35: 22 (*The Oracles of Jacob and Balaam*, 61 ff.). One thing seems certain: it could not until quite late have formed any part of the Joseph Story. In the latter at Jacob's death Joseph is alone (47: 29-31 and 50: 1 ff.); the brothers are not present, and only later learn that their father is dead (50: 15). See below, p. 000 f.

⁴ 48: 1-7; 49: 28-33.

⁵ Jos. 24: 32; Gressmann, ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, 17; Mowinckel, *BZAW* 77 (1958), 143 f. Joseph's embalming and preservation in a coffin in Egypt (surely not "in an Egyptian coffin," as Schultz, *ZAW* 59 [1943], 188), may be an attempt to historicize certain of the Osirian overtones that the figure of Joseph seems to have acquired in Egypt: Horovitz, *JE*, 120 ff.

is at present couched. One we have chosen to call the Genesis editor, and his characteristic style is fairly easy to discern. His framework of *tōlēdōt* formulae imposes upon him an interest in genealogies, ages, etc. Since he is responsible for the present organization of the book, he is sensitive to the order of material, and often recapitulates or anticipates. When obliged to change roles and become author, he has a tendency to be redundant and repetitive. But it would seem that, in the last fourteen chapters at least, he became author only when his role as editor demanded it, in order to bridge gaps in the material he was working with. There is no literary work of his which had a prior existence, no self-contained "P-code;"¹ the present Book of Genesis itself comprises the editor's work of literature.

The other redactional hand is harder to identify, indeed harder to argue the existence of. The only objective criterion in fact on which it may be isolated is the use of the name "Israel" in place of "Jacob;" and it may be asked whether, at this stage in the investigation, one is justified empirically in speaking of the work of one redactor, rather than the block of material remaining when the additions of the Genesis editor and the Joseph Story are removed. When the "Israel"-passages surrounding the Joseph Story are collected, they present a sorry spectacle. Brief, unimaginative notices apprise the reader of the Patriarch's wanderings in southern Palestine and Egypt, while other confused passages deal with the fortunes of certain members of the twelve "sons of Israel."² Some of these traditions are never mentioned again in Biblical literature,³ while others are not consonant with material found among the earlier Patriarchal narratives.⁴ At best this

¹ Eerdmans *AS* I, 33; Humbert, *TbR* NF 6 (1934), 222. One cannot, therefore, speak of a "P" version of the Joseph Story (Von Rad, *Priesterschrift*, 40 f.; G. F. Moore, *The Literature of the Old Testament* [London, 1913], 46). For a good assemblage of the views on the nature of the "P-document," see S. R. Külling, *Zur Datierung der "Genesis-P-Stücke"* (1964), 141 ff.

² Cf. Eising *Jakobserzählung*, 292 ff., also above, p. 20, n. 2. Eissfeldt (*TbR* NF 18 [1950], 108) would see in some of this material (specifically chapters 35: 21-22; 34; 38; 49: 2-7, 23-4) an older Joseph narrative, parallel to 37, 39-48, 50.

³ E.g. the burial of the pagan gods (35: 1-4); the death and burial of Deborah (35: 8); Jacob's drink offering, the only one offered by a patriarch in Genesis (35: 14); Reuben's incest (35: 22, a prose re-write of 49: 4?); Jacob's redeeming angel (48: 16); Jacob's seizure of Shechem (48: 22); the attack by the archers on Joseph (49: 23); the burial of Leah (49: 31); the aetiology of Abel-misraim (50: 11).

⁴ The duplicate account of the founding of Bethel (35: 14-15); the statement that Isaac had sojourned at Hebron, rather than Beersheba as the Patriarchal tales indicate (35: 27); the uncensored intermarriage of Judah with Canaanites (38); a variant account of the capture of Shechem (48: 22, 49: 5-6); a tradition that Jacob

redactor (if he existed) was simply a harmonist, at worst a compiler of traditions; but a more definite statement must await an examination of the "Israel"-passages of the Joseph Story.

What was the reason for the preservation of the Joseph Story by these redactors? One of the main themes of the material in the last sixteen chapters of Genesis is the doings and fortunes of "Israel" in the persons of the twelve eponymous tribal ancestors. There is a snippet of a story about Reuben's incest (35: 22), a story about Judah's offspring (38), the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh (48), Jacob's bequest to Joseph (48: 22), and poetical allusions to many tribal traditions which are otherwise unrecorded (49). In what better context could a well-written novelette about Jacob's favorite son be placed?

It is true that the Joseph Story serves secondarily to embellish the account of Jacob's descent into Egypt which must for chronological reasons be inserted at about this point.¹ But the Joseph Story is far too polished a piece of literature to have been created solely or even primarily for the pedestrian purpose of bridging a gap! As will be pointed out below, it is a *Märchen* of marvellous unity and drama, and the literary interest which surrounds it is sufficient *raison d'être*. It was told for the sake of enjoyment, not historiographical completeness. The tradition of the descent into Egypt was independent of the Joseph narrative, and undoubtedly older; and a redactor could, with equal regard for the logic of historiography, have prefixed the Joseph Story as an introduction to the account of the Bondage in the Book of Exodus. That he did not shows that he was more inclined to be guided by the consideration of the identity of the story's main character, and thus to group it, along with the other tales of Jacob's sons, at the end of Genesis.

was buried in Transjordan (not in "the region of Jordan," as Gemser, *VT* 2 [1952], 353; cf. Hulst, *Oudtest. Stud.* 14 [1965], 166) (50: 11); the divine sanction for the descent into Egypt (46: 3-4).

¹ Cf. Noth (*UG*, 226 ff.) who regards the Joseph Story as a link between the call of the Patriarchs and the call out of Egypt (cf. Hölscher *Geschichtsschreibung*, 53; Hooke, *In the Beginning*, 63 and 98), answering the main question, how did Jacob's sons get to Egypt? Cf. Meyer *INS*, 142; Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, 131; Hempel, *Literatur*, 17; Weill, *RHR* 88 (1923), 22; contrast Jacob, *La Tradition historique*, 113. Sandmel (*Hebrew Scriptures*, 370) thinks P used the story to bridge the gap between the tradition of an eastern origin and the tradition of a wilderness origin. Van Seeters (*The Use of the Joseph Story in Scripture* [Doctoral Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va; 1965], 35 f.) thinks that it fills the gap between patriarchal promise and fulfilment.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SYNTAX OF THE JOSEPH STORY

After a discussion of the context and the secondary use of the story by later editors, the next logical step in our inductive approach to the authorship and literary history of the piece is an investigation of the present state of the narrative. Is it a unified whole, or a composite work? The product of one man's genius, or an amalgum of several authors' contributions? The literary "detective work" required at this stage of the study is well known to Biblical scholarship; but it is rare for the "detective" to produce a foolproof case. The problem usually lies in the equivocal nature of the criteria used for analysis. Scholars once nursed the hope that variant readings in the MT and in the versions, and similar textual unevenness, would provide a reliable clue to the type of authorship and the history of the narrative. But experience has dashed this hope. Again, one might expect the syntax and style of a particular piece of writing to offer themselves as objective criteria for the task of analysis. Failing this, one can always turn to content and, by *a priori* judgment and occasional analogy, try to discern the way in which the piece was put together, though this approach admittedly involves more subjectivity.

The next three chapters comprise a preliminary inquiry into the relative fruitfulness of each of the three sources of clues adumbrated above. While the textual possibilities of the Joseph Story shall not detain us long, syntax and style will occupy us for two chapters, and the appreciation of the content for one. At that point, hopefully, we shall be in a position to enter upon a detailed investigation of the literary history of the Joseph Story, and its authorship.

THE GLOSSES OF THE JOSEPH STORY

The masterly technique displayed by the author of the Joseph Story did not deter some from tampering with the text, and the hand of the glossator can occasionally be detected. The list which follows, if it does not include all glosses, at least enumerates the most obvious. For present purposes a gloss is narrowly defined as an explanatory note or word on a word or phrase already present in the body of the

text. Editorial expansions are not covered by this definition, and are consequently dealt with in a later chapter.

1. 37: 8, 'al ḥālōmōtāw wē'al dēḥārāw, "on account of his dreams and on account of his words," a gloss on "they hated him even more." Suggested purpose: to make explicit the twofold source of the brothers' hatred, viz. dreams and tale-bearing.¹

2. 37: 10, wayēsappēr 'el 'āḥiḥ wē'el 'eḥāw, "and he told his father and his brothers," a gloss on "his father rebuked him." Lacking in LXX.² Suggested purpose: to make the rebuke of Joseph take place in his brother's presence?

3. 37: 14, mē'ēmeq Hebrōn, "from the valley of Hebron," a gloss on "he sent him on his way." For the arguments in favor of treating this phrase as a gloss, see above, p. 21.

4. 37: 21, lō' nakkenū nāpeš, "we shall not commit murder," a gloss on "he took him away from them?" For a discussion of the development of vss. 19-21, see below, p. 139 f.

5. 37: 23, 'et kēṭōneṭ happassim 'āšer 'ālāw, "the sleeved robe (?) that he was wearing," a gloss on "his robe." Suggested purpose: to relate this verse to vss. 3 and 32, and explain why Jacob recognized the garment so quickly.

6. 37: 27, bēsārēnū, "our flesh," a gloss on "our brother." Suggested purpose: to enhance the morality of Judah's motive.³

7. 37: 32, wayēšallēḥū 'et kēṭōneṭ happassim, "they sent the sleeved-robe (?)," a gloss on the following verb "they went,"⁴ later erroneously construed as a hiph'īl, "they brought."⁵

¹ Cf. Horowitz *JE*, 43 f.

² √SPR elsewhere is used consistently only with *lē*; -cf. 37: 9, 40: 8, 9; 41: 8, 12.

³ For √BŠR in the O.T. and in Post-Biblical literature, see the literature cited by J. Scharbert in *Fleisch, Geist und Seele in Pentateuch* (Stuttgart, 1966), 13 n. 17; for the present passage see p. 25.

⁴ Gunkel *Gen.*, 355.

⁵ The inescapable fact is that wayyēšallēḥū and wayyābi'ū are mutually contradictory. In view of this difficulty, and of the use of the full kēṭōneṭ happassim where the context uses simply kēṭōneṭ, it seems justifiable to separate the first four words of this verse and treat them as a gloss on wayyābi'ū. The only other solution would be to modify the translation of wayyēšallēḥū, as Winnett does (*Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies*, 12 [1947], 13). He takes it from an otherwise unattested √ŠLḤ, the equivalent of Aram. *šelāḥ*, "tear, rend." "This solution of the problem is supported by the fact that the story actually requires a tearing up of the coat... It was the torn condition of the garment which suggested to Jacob's mind that his son had been mangled by a wild animal," (*ibid.*).

8. 39: 1, *Pōtīphar sērīs Par‘ō(h)*, “Potiphar, Pharaoh’s officer,” a gloss on “captain of the guard.” See the discussion below, p. 135 f.

9. 39: 1, *’āšer hōrīdūbū šammā(h)*, “who had brought him down there,” a gloss on “Ishmaelites.” See the discussion below, p. 145 f.

10. 39: 10, *lihyōt ‘immā(h)*, “to be with her,” a gloss on “to lie with her.” Lacking in LXX + Copt. Suggested purpose: prudishness.¹

11. 39: 12, 15, *wayyēšē’*, “he went,” a gloss on “he fled.” Lacking in some Hebrew MSS. Suggested purpose: to stress Joseph’s innocence. He did not really flee, since there was no occasion for flight. He merely went outside; he was not guilty.²

12. 39: 20, *mēqōm ‘āšer ‘āsīrē hammelek, ‘āsūrīm*, “the place where the king’s prisoners were incarcerated,” a gloss on *bēt hassōbar*. *Hammelek* is a hapax in the Joseph Story. Suggested purpose: to explain a rare word, and to provide editorial harmonization. See below, p. 146 f.

13. 40: 3, *’el bēt hāsōbar*, “into the prison-house (?),” a gloss on “house of the captain of the guard.” Lacking in Syr. Suggested purpose: naive attempt to avoid ambiguity.³

14. 40: 3, *mēqōm ‘āšer Yōsēp ‘āsūr šām*, “the place where Joseph was incarcerated,” a gloss on “house of the captain of the guard,” probably inserted prior to no. 13. Suggested purpose: editorial harmonization. See below, p. 146 f.

15. 40: 5, *hammašqe(h) wēbā’ōpe(h) ‘āšer lēmelek Mišrayim ‘āšer ‘āsūrīm bēbēt hassōbar*, “the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt, who were incarcerated in the prison-house (?),” a gloss on the subject of the verb “they dreamed;” wholly redundant.⁴

16. 41: 23, *šenumōt*, “blighted,” a gloss on “blasted by the east wind.” Lacking in LXX, Syriac and Vulgate.

¹ Wellhausen *Comp.*, 54; Simpson *ETI*, 131; Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 357; contra, Horowitz *JE*, 106; Ehrlich (*Randglossen I*, 197) believed *liškaš ‘ešlāb* to be a gloss on *lihyōt ‘immāb*. Dahse (*ZAW* 28 [1908], 169) showed that on the evidence of the LXX this verse had undergone “mannigfache Veränderungen.”

² Alternatively *wayyānās wayyēšē’* could be construed as that peculiar type of verbal co-ordination in which the first verb provides the qualitative modification of the action conveyed by the second.

³ Ruppert *JEG*, 61.

⁴ Cf. Dillmann *Gen.* II, 361; Rudolph *Elobist*, 158; Ruppert, *loc. cit.*; Simpson *ETI*, 135; Wiener *Pent. St.*, 32 f. Note how clearly extraneous glosses 13-15 are when the passage is compared with the recapitulation in chapter 41; see below, p. 78.

17. 42: 8, *wayyakkēr Yōsēp ‘et ‘ehāw wēhēm lō hikkērūbū*, “Joseph recognized his brothers, but they did not recognize him,” a gloss on vs. 7a. Suggested purpose: emphatic; to make explicit that there was no recognition on the brothers’ part.

18. 42: 24, *wayēdabbēr ‘ālēm*, “and spoke to them,” a gloss on “he returned to them.” Suggested purpose: to stress that Joseph has completely regained control of himself.

19. 43: 17, *hā’iš*, “the man,” a gloss on the subject of “he brought.” Lacking in LXX, Syr. Suggested purpose: to eliminate the ambiguity of the verse.

20. 43: 18, *lēbitnappēl ‘ālēnū*, “to fall upon us,” a gloss on “to roll himself upon us.”

21. 43: 26, *habbaytāb*, “to the house,” a gloss on “they brought.” Lacking in the Vulgate. Suggested purpose: to clarify the brothers’ movements. They were not yet in the house, and in point of protocol their entry could not precede that of the master of the house.

22. 45: 2, *wayyišma‘ bēt par‘ō(h)*, “and Pharaoh’s house heard,” a gloss on “the Egyptians heard.” The latter referred to those who minutes before had been waiting upon Joseph. The glossator, in anticipation of vs. 16—and with a misinterpretation of it—construes “the Egyptians” as a reference to Pharaoh’s court.

23. 45: 23, *māzōn*, “sustenance,” a gloss on “bread.”

24. 45: 23, *bar*, “grain,” a gloss on “bread.” Since this is what the brothers had originally come for, they must take some back with them.

25. 46: 28, *Gōšēnab*, “to Goshen,” a gloss on “to show the way.” The original text meant to say nothing more than that Judah directed them on the right road *to Egypt*. But the Genesis writer, pre-occupied as he was with grafting in an alien tradition, suggests that Jacob was already aware that God had marked out Goshen for him. See further below, p. 160 f.

26. 46: 31, *wē’et bēt ‘ābīw*, “and his father’s household,” a gloss on “his brothers.” Lacking in the LXX. Added through hypercritical notions of consistency; cf. vs. 31b.

27. 47: 24, *wēlē’ēkōl lētappēkem*, “and as food for your children,” a gloss on “those who are in your households.” Lacking in the LXX.

28. 50: 14, *’ahārē qobērō ‘et ‘ābīw*, “after he had buried his father,” a gloss on “when they saw” of vs. 15. Lacking in the LXX. Suggested purpose: to eliminate doubt as to the chronology of the following incident, which seems to envisage a different situation at the death of Jacob from the preceding verse. See below, p. 163 f.

Only five of the above glosses are intended to explain specific, and rare, words or phrases, viz. 16, 20, 23, 24, 27. By far the majority (nos. 1, 2, 7, 15-19, 21, 22, 26, 28) clarify the plot in a more general way, but none are concerned with anything more than a pedantic smoothing of minor details. Three (3, 8, 25) add onomastic detail, four (4, 6, 10, 11) seem to arise from ethical motives, and five (5, 9, 12-14) are concerned with harmonizing apparently discrepant strands in the story. It is interesting to note that the latter two categories are confined to chapters 37, 39 and the immediate context of 39. In the light of the plethora of inconsistencies in the plot to be found in the first part of the story, this distribution cannot be fortuitous. The same observation applies perhaps to the fact that over one half of the glosses occur in the first three chapters of the story; when the plot had become well launched after the initial *mise en scène*, less opportunity or need existed for explanatory marginalia.

WORD ORDER IN THE VERBAL CLAUSE

The following patterns are found in verbal clauses in the Joseph Story:¹

- A: Verb - Subject - (Object - Compl.)²
 B: Subject - Verb - (Object - Compl.)
 C: Object - Verb - Subject - (Compl.)
 D: Verb - (Subject) - Compl. - (Subject) - Object
 E: Object - Subject - Verb - Compl.³
 F: Verb - Object - Subject - Compl.
 G: Subject - Verb - Compl. - Object⁴
 H: Compl. - Verb - (Subject - Object)
 J: Subject - Compl. - Verb
 K: Compl. - Subject - Verb⁵

¹ In the following lists the examples in which anarthrous participles are found in verb position have also been included. In each case the number of such examples has been noted.

² Compl., Complement, i.e. a prepositional phrase or noun used absolutely with "adverbial" function.

³ All examples show participles in verb position.

⁴ Variant of B, the distinguishing feature being the position of the Complement.

⁵ Variant of H, the distinguishing feature being the position of the Subject; on this pattern, see J. Blau, *VT* 9 (1959), 130.

The following graph shows the occurrence of these ten patterns by percentage.¹

	Ch. 37	Ch. 39	Ch. 40	Ch. 41	Ch. 42	Ch. 43	Ch. 44	Ch. 45	Ch. 46-7	Ch. 47	Ch. 50
A	74 (2/78)	76	75	70 (1/89)	61	65	62	73	79	81	64
B	12 (8/13)	3 (1/2)	6 (3/3)	10 (8/13)	10 (1/10)	7 (3/6)	18 (1/16)	9 (2/6)	7	5	9 (1/5)
C	4	3	3	5	10	6	7	3	7	5	4
D	8	10	10	4	8	12	7	10	2	9	15
E	1	5	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
F	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	4
G	—	1	—	1	1	5 (1/4)	3	—	—	—	2
H	—	1	6	6 (2/9)	8	4	3	5	5	—	2
J	—	—	—	2 (1/2)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
K	—	—	—	1	—	1 (1/1)	—	—	—	—	—

As would be expected A, the normal pattern in prose narrative, predominates throughout. It is found most frequently in chapters where narrative description abounds, e.g. 37, 39, 40, 46 and 47. It occurs least in chapters 42-44 which describe the brothers' dealings with Joseph in Egypt. Here the plot is moving towards its denouement, and the author resorts to emotional dialogue more freely. Those eccentric patterns best suited to the expression of emotion, viz. B, C, D and G, show a corresponding rise in frequency in these chapters. Chapter 39 distinguishes itself from the rest by resorting three times to the E-pattern. Chapter 50 displays a strange drop in the frequency of A, and a relatively high percentage of occurrence for D and F.²

¹ The fractions in some compartments indicates how many examples out of the total show participles in verb position.

² In regard to the percentage figures for D it should be noted that in each chapter at least one-half the examples involve datives with suffixes.

WORD ORDER IN THE NOMINAL CLAUSE

1. *The Binary Construction*

The basic simplex consists of the direct juxtaposition of two nominal elements, thus in *Front* and *Rear Position*. Hebrew, unlike some Semitic languages, e.g. Egyptian, is surprisingly lacking rigid rules governing occupancy of these two positions; and most syntactic structures found in *Front Position* can also be found in *Rear Position*. The following table, drawn from the examples in the Joseph Story, will illustrate the point.

	<i>Front Position</i>	<i>Rear Position</i>
Noun:	very frequent	very frequent
Pronoun:	40: 10; 41: 28; 41: 44; 42: 6, 14, 27; 44: 14; 45: 3, 4.	41: 31; 42: 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 31, 33, 34; 50: 19.
Demonstrative:	40: 12, 18; 43: 29.	
Phrase:	40: 8, 10, 17; 43: 6, 7; 44: 18; 47: 26; 50: 19.	39: 23; 40: 9, 10, 11, 16, 17; 41: 38; 42: 13, 23, 27, 32, 35; 43: 3, 5, 28, 33; 44: 18, 26; 45: 6; 47: 1, 22, 26; 50: 18.
Adj.	40: 16; 41: 31; 42: 11, 19, 21, 31, 33; 43: 27.	37: 24; 40: 7; 41: 21; 42: 18; (with <i>bay</i>) 43: 7, 27, 28; 45: 3; 45: 26, 28; 46: 30.
Participle with art.		42: 6; 45: 12. ¹
<i>mā(b)</i>	37: 10, 26; 39: 8; 42: 28; 44: 15; 46: 33; 47: 3.	
<i>kammā(b)</i>	47: 8.	
Noun Clause		(with imperf.) ² 37: 15, 20; 44: 16; (with perf.) 40: 16; (with <i>'āšer</i> or <i>ki</i>) 37: 26; 42: 14.

The demonstratives and the interrogatives alone are confined to *Front Position*, and only the relativized participle and the noun clause are restricted to *Rear Position*.

The Binary Construction does not by its form alone reveal the identity of semantic subject and predicate. Context alone indicates that in the following cases the semantic predicate occupies *Rear Position*:

¹ The Hebrew equivalent of a cleft sentence.

² All with *mā(b)*.

1. when a phrase is semantic predicate; e.g. 39: 23 *ba'āšer YHWH 'ittō*, "in that Yahweh was with him;" 43: 3 *bilti 'ābīkem 'ittēkem*, "unless your brother be with you;" 47: 1 *wēhinnam bē'ereš Gōšen*, "and they are now in the land of Goshen;"

2. when an adjective is semantic predicate; e.g. 37: 24, *wēbabbōr rēq*, "the cistern was empty;" 43: 7, *ha'ōd 'ābīkem hay*, "is your father still living?"

3. when a first singular personal pronoun is semantic subject; e.g. 41: 44, *'āni Par'ō(b)*, "I am Pharaoh;" 45: 3, *'āni Yōsēp*, "I am Joseph;"

4. when a substantive is semantic predicate; e.g. 41: 46, *wēYōsēp ben šēlōšim šānā(b)*, "now Joseph was thirty years old;" 46: 32, *hā'ānāšim rō'ē šō'n*, "the men are shepherds."

The interest which naturally attaches itself to the semantic predicate results often in a Binary Construction in which semantic predicate fills *Front Position*:

5. when an interrogative is semantic predicate; e.g. 46: 33, *mā(b) ma'āsēkem*, "what is your occupation?" 47: 8, *kammā(b) yēmē šenē hayyekā*, "how long have you lived?"

6. when a demonstrative is semantic predicate; e.g. 40: 12, 18, *zē(b) pītrōnō*, "this is the interpretation of it" (preceding said interpretation); 43: 29, *bāzē(b) 'ābīkem haqqaṭōn*, "is this your youngest brother?"

7. when a phrase is semantic predicate in a rhetorical question; e.g. 40: 8, *hēlō lē'lohīm pītrōnīm*, "interpretations are god's, are they not?" 50: 19, *hātaḥat 'ēlohīm 'āni*, "am I in god's place?"

8. when a substantive is semantic predicate; e.g. 46: 34, *ki tō'ēbaṭ Mišra(y)im kol rō'ē(b) šō'n*, "for all shepherds are anathema to the Egyptians;" 47: 3, *rō'ē(b) šō'n 'abdekeā*, "your servants are shepherds;"

9. when an adjective is semantic predicate; e.g. 40: 16 (when the baker saw) *ki tōb pātar*, "that he gave a favorable interpretation;"

10. when a nominalized relative is semantic subject; e.g. 42: 6, *hū' hammašbir lēkol 'am hā'āreš*, "it was he that sold grain to all the masses;" 45: 12, *pī hammēdabbēr 'ēlēkem*, "it is my (own) mouth that says it to you;"

11. when a personal pronoun is semantic subject; many examples, e.g. 42: 21, *'ābēl 'āšēmim 'ānaḥnū*, "surely we are guilty;" 42: 14, *mēraggēlim 'attem*, "spies you are!" 43: 12, *'ūlay mišge(b) hū'*, "perhaps it was a mistake."

2. *The Ternary Construction*

This is a sentence type in which, as in the binary pattern, both *Front* and *Rear Positions* are filled by nominal elements, but in which the copula nexus, unexpressed by morpheme in the binary pattern, is provided by a third element in the form of a third person pronoun or a demonstrative.¹

(a) Semantic Subject in *Rear Position*. The Ternary Construction is formally an expansion of the Binary (as exemplified by the last example quoted under no. 11, above), through the suffixing of the semantic subject to the simplex. Thus the expected pattern would be—

Semantic Predicate - Copula - Semantic Subject

—which is found in the following examples in the Joseph Story: 42: 6, *wēYōsēp̄ hūʾ haššallit̄ ʿal hāʾāres*, “now it was Joseph who was the ruler over the land” (semantic subject a noun); 50: 11, *ʾēbel kābēd ze(b) lēMišrayim*, “this is a serious mourning the Egyptians are having!” (Semantic subject a phrase).²

(b) Semantic Subject in *Front Position*. The second means of expanding the basic Binary Construction is by prefixing the semantic subject to the whole. This results in the ternary pattern—

Semantic Subject - Semantic Predicate - Copula

—which is found nine times in the Joseph Story, seven in the context of dream interpretation. Cf. 40: 12, *šēlōšet hassārigīm šēlōšet yāmim hēm*, “the three shoots are three days.”³ The reason for the use of this unexpected pattern is the demand made by the stock formula of dream interpretation. The explanation of a symbol can only follow the statement of that symbol, producing an ascending emphasis; predicate in this case must follow subject.

The formal classification of the Ternary Construction reveals the following facts concerning occupancy of the three positions in the Joseph Story:

<i>Front Position</i>	<i>Middle Position</i>	<i>Rear Position</i>
Noun	Noun	Noun
—	<i>hūʾ hīʾ</i>	<i>hūʾ hīʾ</i>
—	<i>ze(b)</i>	—
—	phrase	phrase

¹ On the copula in Hebrew, see B. Hartmann, *OTS* 14 (1965), 115 ff.

² Cf. also 37: 3, 43: 32.

³ Cf. also 40: 18, 41: 25, 26 (thrice), 37; with phrase as semantic predicate 45: 20, 47: 6.

Classical Hebrew preferred the simple, somewhat primitive, direct juxtaposition of the Binary Construction to the more sophisticated Ternary. In the rest of Genesis, for example, outside the Joseph Story (i.e. in almost forty chapters) only some fourteen¹ examples of the Ternary Construction are found, to over two hundred of the Binary. This situation is the opposite of that which prevailed in classical Egyptian, where, by the time that Middle Egyptian had become established as the literary dialect (late third millennium B.C.), the Ternary Construction had virtually replaced direct juxtaposition² in all but a few cases.³ Can we detect a similar rise in popularity of the construction in the Joseph Story vis-a-vis the rest of Genesis? In the approximately ten chapters under investigation the Ternary occurs thirteen times to less than eighty examples of the Binary. But it is more likely the special demand of the formula of dream interpretation that has influenced these figures.

WORD ORDER IN THE PARTICIPIAL STATEMENT CLAUSE

The Participial Statement is a form of the Binary Construction in which the semantic predicate is an anarthrous participle.

	<i>Front Position</i>	<i>Rear Position</i>
Participle	41: 2, 18, 32 (with <i>ki</i>), 32; 42: 23 (with <i>ki</i>).	37: 7, 9, 13, 16, 19, 25, 30; 39: 3, 3, 6, 20, 23, 23; 40: 3, 6, 17; 41: 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29; 42: 35; 43: 4, 5, 18; 44: 30; 45: 12, 26; 47: 14.
Pronoun	37: 7, 16, 16, 30; 39: 3, 6, 23; 40: 6; 41: 9, 17; 42: 35; 43: 18; 45: 26; 47: 14.	
Pronominal Suffix	41: 17; 43: 4, 5.	

As the table shows, the Participial Statement conforms to the binary pattern in which predicate occupies *Rear Position*; thus, 37: 7, *ʾānaḥnū mēʾallēmim ʾālumim bēfōkē haššāde(b)*, “we were binding sheaves in the

¹ In the pattern Semantic Predicate - Copula - Semantic Subject: 3: 6, 21: 29, 25: 16, 27: 21, 24, 33; 34: 14; in the pattern Semantic Subject - Semantic Predicate - Copula: 23: 15, 31: 43, 48: 5; in the pattern Semantic Subject - Copula - Semantic Predicate: 2: 14, 19, 9: 18, 36: 8.

² Sir A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*³ (Oxford, 1960), § 130.

³ Notably when a pronoun occurs in *Front Position*: *ibid.*, § 125.

⁴ On the construction used here, viz. *hinēni* with participle, see P. Humbert, *Opusculs d'un hébraïsant* (Neuchâtel, 1958), 55 ff.

field;" 40: 17, *wēbā'ōp 'ōkēl 'ōtām*, "and the birds were eating them." In a very few examples the participle occupies *Front Position*; e.g. 42: 23 "(They did not know) *ki šōmēa' Yōsēp* that Joseph was listening;" 41: 32, *ūmēmahēr 'ēlōhīm la'āsōtō*, "and god will soon make it happen."

THE ASYNDETON CLAUSE

In the Joseph Story the asyndeton clause most often fulfills the function of the so-called "adverbial accusative of manner," i.e. it is somehow explicative of the clause which immediately precedes.¹ Thus—

37: 24, *wēbabbōr rēq 'ēn bō mayim*, "the cistern was empty, without water in it."

40: 10, "(And it was like a sudden [?] growth) *'ālētā(b) niššāb hibšilū 'aškēlōtehā 'ānābīm*, up went its bud, its clusters ripened into grapes."

41: 12, "(He interpreted our dreams for us) *'iś kaḥpālōmō pātār*, giving a personal interpretation to each," (cf. 41: 11).

41: 48, "(And he laid up food in the cities) *'ōkel šēdē(h) hā'ir 'āšer sēbībōtehā nāṭan bētōkā*, putting the food from the fields surrounding a city into that city."

43: 9, "(I will be his guarantor) *miyyādī tēbaqqēšennū*, from me you will expect him to be returned."

44: 12, "(So he searched) *baggādōl hēhēl ūbaqqātōn keillā(b)*, beginning with the eldest and ending with the youngest."

In 44: 3-4, at one of the most important turning points in the story, there is a cluster of three asyndeton clauses which do not qualify a preceding statement. Rather they set the time and place of the brothers' final arrest in a most dramatic way: *habbōqer 'ōr wēbā'ānāšim šullēhū hēmmā(b) waḥāmōrēhem hēm yāšē'ū 'eṭ hā'ir lō' hirḥiqū*, "day dawned, and the men and their donkeys were dismissed; they were not far away from the city (when Joseph said to his steward...)"

THE BOUND CLAUSE

1. *With Particles*

(a) *'im*, the "Substitutive Clause" marker

The particle *'im* indicates that the clause with which it is bound parallels an adjacent clause so closely that it could *mutatis mutandis* be substituted for it. Cf. for example—

¹ R. J. Williams, *An Outline of Hebrew Syntax* (Toronto, 1965), 61 (c, ii).

37: 8, "(Are you indeed going to reign over us) *'im māšōl timšōl bānū*, or are you going to rule us, in fact?"

This makes the *'im*-clause an admirable vehicle for conditions. Logically, a conditional sentence makes out that two events are parallel to the degree that they are inevitable concomitants under any circumstances. Juxtaposition is the crudest way of conveying such an idea; cf. Arab. *'inta mabsūt 'ana mabsūt*, "you are happy, I am happy." In such a sentence both clauses are mutually substitutive. My happiness and your happiness are inseparably linked; they both come about together, and one cannot come about without the other. If any subordination were intended by the speaker it would only be appreciated through hearing the words spoken. In more sophisticated speech, when the intent is to stress one of the concomitants at the expense of the other, subordination by some means must be shown. And in Hebrew this is done by indicating the substitutionary potential of the unstressed clause.

Examples of the *'im*-clause construed as protasis with the preceding clause are rare in the Joseph Story, 42: 37 being the only clear one: "(My two sons you may put to death) *'im lō' 'ābī'ennū 'ēlekā*, if I do not bring him back to you;" cf. also 42: 15 (in the abbreviated oath formula), and 47: 16.

Elsewhere the *'im*-clause precedes the clause with which, as apodasis, it is construed: e.g. 50: 4, *'im nā' māšā'ī hēn bē'ēnōkem*, "if I have found favour in your eyes (please speak in Pharaoh's hearing...);" also 42: 16, 19; 43: 4, 5, 9, 11; 44: 2, 3, 26, 32; 47: 6, 29. For 47: 18, see under *biltī*; for 40: 14; 42: 15, 47: 18, see under *kī*.

(b) *Kī*, a noun clause marker¹

This marker precedes and denotes a clause which serves as a nominal element in a larger syntactic structure. Within such a structure a *kī*-clause functions in one of two ways, which are herein dubbed *Internal* and *External*. In its *Internal* function the *kī*-clause is syntactically necessary to complete the meaning of the rest of the structure which, in the larger context, would be incomprehensible without it. In its *External* function the *kī*-clause is explicative of the structure within which it stands, which, however, remains coherent and meaningful without it.

¹ See M. Dahood, *Biblica* 46 (1965), 327; J. Muilenburg, *HUCA* 32 (1961), 135 ff.

Examples of *Internal Function*: as subject of a verb, 42: 21 (“And it did not appear) *ki bā'nū 'el qirbenā(b)*, that they had gone inside them;” cf. also 43: 21, 44: 24, 45: 5, 46: 33; as object of a verb (very common), 37: 4 (“His brothers saw) *ki 'ōtō 'ābaḥ 'āḥibem mikkol 'eḥāw*, that it was him their father loved more than his brothers;” 37: 35, 39: 3, 13, 15, 40: 16, 42: 1, 2, 42: 23, 33, 34; 43: 7, 18, 25, 44: 15, 27, 31, 45: 12, 26, 50: 15; as one of the elements in a nominal statement (in *Rear Position*): 37: 26, *mā(b) beša' kī nabārōg 'et 'āḥinū wēkissinū 'et dāmō*, “of what value is killing our brother and concealing his blood?”; (in *Front Position*), 43: 10, *ki lūlē biḥmahmābēnū kī 'attā(b) šabnū ze(b) pa'āmayim*, “had we not dawdled around, we should now have come back twice over!” Cf. also 42: 16.

Examples of *External function*: as a general characterization of the *External ki*-clause in the Joseph Story it may be said that between it and the rest of the syntactic structure in which it occurs a vague relationship of causality exists. Most often the *ki*-clause sets forth the postulated basis for the validity of the preceding clause(s): e.g. 37: 27, (“Let’s not ourselves lay a hand on him), *ki 'āḥinū bēšārēnū hū* “for he is our brother, our (own) flesh.” Very rarely it states the result of a preceding statement, e.g. 40: 15 (“Here too I have done nothing) *ki šāmū 'ōtī babbōr*, that I should be put in the pit.” Again rarely, the *ki*-clause conveys the truth of a matter, statement of which is necessitated through the denial of the assertion of the preceding clause: e.g., 45: 8, (“it was not you who sent me here) *ki hā'ēlōhim*, but it was god (who sent me here);” cf. 42: 12.

(c) *Mē'āz*, a marker of temporal subordination

One example only is found in the Joseph Story, viz. 39: 5, *wayēbī mē'āz ḥipkād 'ōtō bēḥēṭō...*, “now from the time that he assigned him to his house... (Yahweh blessed the Egyptian’s house).”

(d) *Pen*, a marker of logical subordination

Three examples occur in the Joseph Story: 44: 34, (“for how can I go up to my father if the boy is not with me) *pen 'er'e(b) ḥārā' 'āšer yimsā' 'et 'ābī*, lest I witness the calamity which shall overtake my father!” Cf. also 42: 4, 45: 11.

2. *With Nouns or Pronouns*

(a) *'āšer*, a noun clause marker

Like *ki*, *'āšer* precedes and signals a clause which constitutes a nominal element in a larger structure. Unlike the *ki*-clause, the *'āšer*-

clause in the Joseph Story parallels an attributive adjective in its function: it qualifies a preceding noun or pronoun, or is itself treated as a noun. Examples of *'āšer* introducing an “object”-clause, or preceded by *ya'an*, *'ad*, *'aḥar*, *lēma'an*, *ba'ābūr*, or *'eḡeḇ* are lacking in the Joseph Story. Nor are there any examples of *'āšer*-clauses which might (on the definition given above under *ki*) be classified as *External*, i.e. “purpose” or “result” clauses.¹

It is not necessary to give examples of the attributive function. The following table will suffice:

Attributive	59 exx.
Nominalized Rel.	
Object of Verb	6 exx.
Subject of Verb	3 exx.
After <i>lē-</i>	3 exx.
After <i>'al-</i>	1 ex.
Total	72 exx.

(b) *Ba'āšer*, preposition of “place where” and noun clause marker

There are only two examples of *ba'āšer* in the Joseph Story, both in chapter 39; vs. 9, (“He has not withheld from me anything except you) *ba'āšer 'attī 'ištō*, because you are his wife;” cf. also vs. 23.

(c) *Ka'āšer*, preposition of approximation and noun clause marker

This word signals the reader to place the clause which it introduces side by side with another for comparison. There are thirteen examples in the Joseph Story, usually construed with the preceding clause, thus: 43: 17, (“and the man did) *ka'āšer 'āmar Yōsēp*, as Joseph had said.” The preceding clause may contain a converted imperfect (41: 54, 43: 17, 47: 11, 50: 12, 37: 23, 41: 13, 43: 2, the last three with *wayyēḥī*), a perfect (40: 14, 22), an imperative (44: 1, 50: 6), or a nominal predicate (41: 21).

Once the *ka'āšer*-clause is construed with the clause which follows: 43: 14, (“and as for me) *ka'āšer šākōltī šākōltī*, if I am bereaved, I am bereaved!”

Internally the *ka'āšer*-clause in the Joseph Story shows most often a verb form in the perfect: 37: 23, 40: 22, 41: 13, 54, 43: 2, 14, 17, 47: 11, 50: 6, 12. Twice (40: 14, 44: 1) an imperfect is found, and once (41: 21) a prepositional phrase.

¹ G-K ss 165b, 166b.

(d) *Bēterem*, preposition “place where” and noun

The clause which this word introduces can be construed with either the preceding or the following clause. There are three examples in the Joseph Story: 37: 18, *ūbēterem yiqrab ’ēlēhem*... “and before he reached them (they conspired to kill him);” cf. 41: 50; 45: 28 (“I will go and see him) *bēterem ’āmūf*, before I die.”

(e) *Biltī*, a noun denoting negation

It is found three times in the Joseph Story, all in the so-called limitative use:¹ 43: 3 (“you shall not even see me) *biltī ’ābīkem ’ittēkem*, unless your brother is with you;” cf. 43: 5. In 47: 18 it is followed by *’im* to introduce a clause in which the verb (*niš’ar*) has been elided: (“there is nothing left before my lord) *biltī ’im gēwiy-yāfēnū wē’admāfēnū*, but our bodies and our lands.”

(f) *Ba’ābūr*

There is but one example in the Joseph Story, viz. 46: 34 (“and you shall say ‘your servants have been cattle-men...’) *ba’ābūr tēšēbū bē’ereš Gōšen*, in order that you may settle in the land of Goshen.”

(g) A Demonstrative

Only one example occurs, with *zō(’): 42: 28, mā(h) zō(’): ’āsā(h) ’ēlōhīm lānū*, “what is this that god has done to us?”

(h) *Kōl*

Cf. 39: 4, *wēkol yeš lō*, “everything that he had,” a construction reminiscent of the Chronicler’s usage.²

THE VERBAL NOUN

The so-called “Construct Infinitive” is a verbal noun and, as such, enjoys some of the uses of both categories.

1. In the Bound Construction

In the Joseph Story the verbal noun is found bound to the following free-standing elements which precede it: *’aḥārē(y)*, 41: 39, *’aḥārē(y) bōdīa’ ’ēlōhīm ’ōtēkā ’eṭ kol zō(’):t...*, “since god has revealed this all to you, (there is no one so brilliant and wise as you);” 46: 30, 50: 14; *yōm*, 40: 20, *yōm hulledeṭ ’eṭ Par’ō(h)*, “Pharaoh’s birthday;” *lēma’an*, 37: 22 (“and Reuben said to them...) *lēma’an haššil ’ōtō miyyādām*, in

¹ Williams, *op. cit.*, 53.

² A. Kropat, *BZAW* 16 (1909), 66.

order to save him from them;” cf. 50: 20; *’ad*, 43: 25, (“they got the present ready) *’ad bō’ Yōsēp baššābōrayim*, for Joseph’s coming at noon;” cf. 39: 16; *’al*, 41: 32, *wē’al hiššānōṭ haḥālōm ’el Par’ō(h) pa’āmayim...*, “now about the twofold repetition of the dream to Pharaoh, (that’s because...);” *lipnē(y)*, 50: 16, (“your father commanded) *lipnē(y) mōtō* before his death...”

2. Verbal nouns, prefixed by the inseparable prepositions *kē-* or *bē-*, are found twelve times in the Joseph Story. In each case they are the equivalent in translation of a temporal clause. The following table indicates the occurrences of this construction by chapter, together with alternate ways of showing temporal subordination (except that of parataxis) which are found in the same chapters.

Chapter	<i>kē-</i>	<i>bē-</i>	Other
37	—	—	<i>ka’āšer</i> (23)
39	<i>kēdabbērāb</i> (10) <i>kir’ōṭāb</i> (13) <i>kēšom’ō</i> (15) <i>kabārīmī</i> (18) <i>kišmōa’</i> (19)	—	<i>mē’āz</i> (5)
40	—	—	<i>ka’āšer</i> (14)
41	—	<i>bē’omēdō</i> (46)	—
42	—	<i>bēbō’</i> (15) <i>bēbiṭḥannēnō</i> (21)	Asyndeton (35)
43	—	—	<i>ka’āšer</i> (2) <i>ki</i> (18, 21)
44	<i>kēbō’i</i> (30) <i>kir’ōṭi</i> (31)	—	Asyndeton (4) <i>ki</i> (24)
45	—	<i>bēbiṭwadda’</i> (1)	—
46	—	—	<i>ki</i> (33)
47	—	—	—
50	—	<i>bēdabbērām</i> (17)	<i>’aḥārē(y)</i> (14)

For the verbal noun preceded by the connective marker *lē-*, see under 3 (b), below.

3. Outside the Bound Structure

(a) Without connective marker (*lē-*):

at the beginning of the Joseph Story occur three cases of the verbal noun as direct object of the verb. 37: 4, *wēlō’ yākēlū dabbērō lēšālōm*, “and they could not address him civilly.”¹ Also 37: 5, 8.

¹ Despite Von Rad’s ingenious and semantically satisfying “they could not endure his friendly speech” (*Gen.*, 346), the sporadic occurrence of a direct accusative for a dative (see below, p. 55) seems to necessitate the rendering given above.

(b) With connective marker

A connective marker is used with a verbal noun to link other morphological and syntactic elements to it which are not in the immediate vicinity. It is probably because a plurality of elements is desired to be construed with the verbal noun, that the bound structure or direct juxtaposition is eschewed in favour of the marker.¹

Usually the elements to be linked precede the marked infinitive, when the finite verb precedes; cf. 37: 18 (n. 30), 37: 10, 12, 25, 35; 39: 10, 11, 14, 17; 41: 15, 49, 57; 42: 3, 27; 43: 2, 6, 18, 30; 44: 23, 26; 45: 1, 7, 27; 46: 29; 47: 29; 50: 2 and often. Sometimes a participle precedes; cf. 41: 32, *ūmēmāhēr 'ēlōhīm la'āsōtō*, “and god will soon make it happen,” also 37: 25, 43: 18, 50: 14. Two cases should be noted. The first is a construction in which the verbal noun, linked by marker with a preceding statement, is parallel to *lēma'an* with verbal noun: e.g. 37: 22 (“and Reuben said to them...) *lēma'an haṣṣīl 'ōtō miyyādām labāšībō 'el 'ābīw*, to save him from them (and) return him to his father;” cf. also 50: 20. The second is a case of parallelism between marked verbal noun and converted imperfect, both linked with a preceding finite verb: e.g. 42: 25, (“and Joseph gave orders) *wayēmalē'ū 'eī kēlēhem bār ūlēhāšīb kaspēbem*, to have their containers filled with grain, and to return their money.”

Rarely in the Joseph Story does a marked verbal noun precede the elements linked to it. In each of the three cases in the Joseph Story the reason is that the verbal noun is semantic predicate, and the resultant emphasis placed upon it makes it gravitate to the head of the sentence. 47: 4, *lāgūr bā'āreṣ bā'nū*, “it is to reside in the land that we have come;” cf. also 42: 9, 12.

THE UNINFLECTED VERBAL MORPHEME (“INFINITIVE ABSOLUTE”)

This curious linguistic phenomenon, which may have analogies in other Semitic languages,² is found in the Joseph Story mainly before the verb in the “emphasizing” construction. There are twelve examples, all in direct speech. As one would expect, they cluster in those

¹ Cf. 37: 18, *wayyiṣnakkēlū 'ōtō labāmītō*, “they conspired to put him to death;” the elements to be linked with the verbal noun are (a) the verb—murder is the result of the conspiracy, (b) the subject—“they” are the initiators of both “conspiracy” and “murder,” and (c) the object—“him” is the object of both conspiracy and murder.

² Cf. T. W. Thacker, *The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal System* (Oxford, 1954), 153.

passages which contain an excess of excited dialogue: four in chapter 37, none in chapters 39 through 42, four in 43, three in 44, none in 45 through 47, and one in chapter 50. Exx. 43: 7, *šā'el šā'al bā'īš lānū ūlēmōladtēnū*, “the man kept asking questions about ourselves and our families;” 44: 15 (“did you not realize that) *naḥēš yēnaḥēš 'īš 'āšer kāmōnī*, a man like me could certainly divine?”; 43: 20, *yārōd yāraḏnū battēhillā(h) lišbōr 'ōkel*, “honestly, we came down the first time to buy grain;” also 37: 8, 8, 10, 33; 43: 3, 7; 44: 5, 28; 50: 15.

Only once does the uninflected verbal morpheme take the place of another form of the verb, in this case the perfect (or converted imperfect): 41: 43, *wēnāfōn 'ōtō 'al kol 'ereṣ Miṣrayim*, “thus he set him over the entire land of Egypt.”¹

The assessment leaves the firm impression that the style of writing is on the whole direct and unsophisticated, or better uninvolved (cf. the relative simplicity of word order, the rather limited use of 'āšer in noun clauses, the infrequent occurrence of the uninflected verbal morpheme).² As to the subject of style as a criterion for source analysis, the results are impressive only with respect to chapter 39. On this point, however, we shall have more to say later.³

¹ T. K. Cheyne, *OLZ* 3 (1900), 464.

² However, it must be admitted that the direct and simple style here detected may be in fact the ubiquitous trait of *all* Hebrew prose.

³ Below, p. 171 ff.

CHAPTER THREE

LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES

IDIOMATIC USAGE

There follows a list of words and expressions used in the Joseph Story which, it is hoped, will convey something of the tenor of the writer's vocabulary. The choice has admittedly been somewhat arbitrary; but the inclusion of all *hapax legomena*, words occurring only in the Joseph Story, and obviously rare or unusual words endows the compilation with some significance.¹

1. **amtēḥā(b)**: "sack," or the like (thirteen times), paralleled by *śaq* and *kēlim* elsewhere in the story.² Called by some an "antiquated word,"³ it is usually derived from $\sqrt{\text{MTH}}$, "spread out," with perhaps a secondary meaning of "carry, lift,"⁴ which occurs in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.⁵ The LXX renders consistently *μάροσιππος*, "bag."

2. *'ansē(y) migne(b)*, "cattle-men;" 46: 32, 34.⁶

3. *'āḥu*, "meadow, pasturage;" 41: 2, 18; also Job 8: 11, and in Ugaritic and Aramaic.⁷

4. $\sqrt{\text{PS}}$, "to cease, be used up," of money (*kesep*), occurring in the Pentateuch only in 47: 15, 16; elsewhere only Isaiah and Psalms.

5. *ba'āšer*, only in 39: 9, 23, the only occurrences of the word in the Pentateuch.⁸

¹ An asterisk at the end of the word indicates that the word occurs only in the Joseph Story. An asterisk at the beginning of a word indicates a hypothetical form.

² See below, p. 174. In the light of its occurrence only here, it is not clear how this word can be made out to be "characteristic" of a J-document which is supposed to span the whole Pentateuch; Proksch *Gen.*, 398; Dillmann *Gen.* II, 386.

³ Keil-Delitzsch I, 358.

⁴ So J. C. Greenfield (*ZAW* 77 [1965], 90 ff.) who compares Akk. *matāḥu*; cf. K-B³ (1967), 67.

⁵ M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim...* (London-New York, 1903), 861.

⁶ K-B¹ (1953), 561.

⁷ C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook*, 235 no. 87; Couroyer, *RB* 66 (1959), 588;

J. A. Fitzmyer, *JAOs* 81 (1961), 197.

⁸ Dillmann *Gen.* II, 356; see above, p. 41.

6. *bēt hassōhar**, the jail in which Joseph was kept, only in chapter 39 (vss. 20-23) and in the redactional insertions of chapter 40 (vss. 3, 5).¹ Older commentators² derived the word from a root $\sqrt{\text{SHR}}$, "to be round (?)," and connected it with Akkadian *širu*, "to plaster (a wall) with mud,"³ but this latter connexion seems dubious. One akkadian expression for jail is *bīt esēri*, or *bīt mēseri*, "house of imprisonment,"⁴ which recalls the qualification of the *bēt hassōhar* in 39: 20, viz. "the place where the king's prisoners were incarcerated," wherein the same root $\sqrt{\text{SR}}$ occurs. In Post-Biblical Hebrew a word *sabar* turns up with the meanings "enclosed place," "stable," or "moon." It was also used as a designation of the place where the Sanhedrin met.⁵

The fact that the Hebrew expression is found only in a story set in Egypt has prompted a search for a *Vorlage* in Egyptian. Yahuda's identification of *sōhar* with the toponym *Ḥṣrw*, a frontier town in the north-eastern Delta,⁶ has been shown to be phonetically impossible by Vergote.⁷ A much older identification of *sōhar* with Egyptian *śwhn*,⁸ an identification also beset by phonetic difficulties,⁹ is not often considered to-day. In the introduction to a topographical list of Thutmose III¹⁰ it is stated that the children of the princes captured at Megiddo were brought to, and confined in, the *dmī [n?] śwhn m Ipt-swt*, which Breasted¹¹ renders "the city of Suhen-em-opet." Gauthier¹² characterizes this phrase as the "nom d'un endroit fortifié à Thèbes..." and Barguet¹³ calls it a "prison." But it is difficult to understand how the notion of fortification can be attached to the word, since both the simplex *whn* and its causative *śwhn* mean, not

¹ See below, p. 146 ff.

² Cf. *BDB*, 690(b).

³ C. Bezold, *Babylonische-Assyrisches Glossar* (Heidelberg, 1926), 208(b).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 86(b); *CAD* IV, 334 ff.

⁵ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 960(a); K-B¹ (1953), 650.

⁶ A. S. Yahuda, *The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian* (Oxford, 1933), 38 f.

⁷ Vergote *Joseph*, 27 f.

⁸ W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern* (1893), 268; Sayce, *ET* 10 (1898), 171; rejected by Driver in *HDB* II, 768 (note).

⁹ Chiefly the occurrence of *n* in the Egyptian for *r* in the Hebrew; for the idiosyncrasies of Egyptian *n* in word-final position, see G. Fecht, *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur* (Hamburg-New York, 1960), 12, 204 n. 576; for *r* > *n* see *ibid.*, 9.

¹⁰ Sethe, *Urk.* IV, 780.

¹¹ Breasted *ARE* II, § 402; cf. Maspero, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'orient classique*, II. *Les premières mêlées* (Paris, 1897), 271 (note).

¹² H. Gauthier, *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques...* (Cairo, 1925-32), V, 19; cf. Breasted *ARE* II, p. 170 n. b ("castle").

¹³ P. Barguet, *Le temple d'Amon-re à Karnak* (Cairo, 1962), 19 n. 1.

“fortify,” but the exact opposite, viz. “pull down, demolish.”¹ The Egyptian expression *dm̄ šwbn* should probably not be construed as a proper name, but as a descriptive epithet² of a quarter³ of Karnak, and be translated as “tumbled-down town,” “the run-down quarter,” perhaps a reflexion of the slum conditions which prevailed there at the time. Thutmose’s treatment of the conquered princes thus becomes a cynical act, not a preventative measure, quite in keeping with his general attitude towards the Asiatics on his Megiddo campaign. It was on that campaign, one recalls, that the king had intentionally made the vanquished enemy leaders look ridiculous by depriving each of his horse and obliging him to make his way home on a donkey!⁴ Their sons as hostages thus suffered a comparable indignity upon arrival in Egypt.

But *šwbn* can scarcely be related to Hebrew *bēṭ bassōbar*. Apart from the phonetic difficulties of the equation, the Hebrew seems clearly a *terminus technicus*, while the Egyptian word is merely adjectival in function, qualifying a settlement, not a building. The incident envisaged by the Thutmose text is an abnormal one; prisoners in Egypt were not usually kept in a slum! In Onkh-sheshonqy the Demotic for prison is “house of delay” (*y n hrr*), the place where Onkh-sheshonqy was confined. One might compare the Hebrew *bēṭ hammiš-mār*.⁵

7. √BŠL*, see below, p. 58.

8. *gābia*’, the container by means of which Joseph divined; 44: 2, 12, 16, 17. The word is also used in Ex. 25: 31 ff. and 37: 17 ff., where it describes the “cups” on the lamp-stand, presumably from the period of the Second Temple.⁶ The only other occurrence is in Jer. 35: 5 where *gēbi’im* “filled with wine, and cups (*kēōsōt*)” are set before the Rechabites. Something the size and with the function of a punch-bowl seems envisaged here.⁷

¹ Erman-Grapow, *Wb* I, 345; R. O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford, 1962), 217.

² In which *šwbn* is a passive participle.

³ Note the determinative, O 38 (Gardiner’s Sign List), which is used in words like *qnb*, “corner,” *rrt*, “gate,” and *mrrt*, “street.”

⁴ J. Wilson, *The Burden of Egypt* (Chicago, 1951), 179 f.

⁵ Onkhsheshonqy, 4, 6; S. R. K. Glanville, *The Instructions of ‘Onkhsheshonqy* (London, 1955), I, 12, 69 n. 49.

⁶ For discussion of these difficult passages, see Noth, *Exodus* (SCM O.T. Library; London, 1962), 207 ff.

⁷ See Procksch *Gen.*, 247. L. Koehler derives the word from Egyptian *kbbw*, “libation vessel” (*JBL* 59 [1940], 36). For a possible identification with a known semantic form, see A. M. Honevman, *PEQ* (1939), 80 no. 4.

9. √GLL, in the hithpo‘el, with the figurative meaning “overwhelm;” cf. also Job 30: 14. LXX, *συκοφαντησαι*, “to accuse falsely.”

10. *Dōṭaynāb*, with the Canaanite termination *-ayin*, used in toponyms, only in 37: 17. The Egyptian *Twtyn*¹ shows this to have been the original vocalization.

11. *hinnē(h)*, *passim* in the Joseph Story, especially in the context of the recounting of dreams.²

12. *hinnē(h)*, with implied pronominal suffix as subject of following participle, a common elipsis in Hebrew.³ Cf. 37: 15, *wayyimšā’ēbū ’iš wēhinnē(h) tō‘e(h) baššāde(h)*, “a man found him wandering in the fields...;” also 37: 17, 41: 1; cf. 42: 28.

13. √ZKR, “to remember,” said of humans, is rare in the Pentateuch outside of D and P,⁴ but occurs five times in the Joseph Story: 40: 14, 14, 23, 41: 9, 42: 9. In 40: 14 the converted perfect of the hiph‘il seems to mean not “remind,” but “make known.”⁵

14. *zēkūnim*, in the expression *ben* or *yeled zēkūnim*, “son/child (born to one of) old age;” all examples are in Genesis: 37: 3, 44: 20, and 21: 2, 7.

15. *hōri**, variously rendered “white,” “holed,” “Horite,” “wicker,” etc. Only 40: 16.⁶

16. √HNT*, “to embalm,” and derived noun *hānūtīm*, “embalming;” only 50 2, 3.⁷

17. √HRD, in the sense “exchange terrified glances” (with *’el*): 42: 28; cf. 43: 23 (√TMH).⁸

18. *harṭōm*, which occurs in P, Daniel and the Joseph Story (41: 8, 24), is the designation of a magician, usually of Egyptian nationality. On the derivation from *hry-hb hry-tp*, see below p. 203.

19. √ṬN*, “to load” a beast of burden; only 45: 17.⁹

¹ Thutmose III’s Megiddo list: J. Simons, *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia* (Leiden, 1937), no. 9; for the same termination cf. *yn*, no. 46 in the same list.

² For this stock use of *hinnē(h)*, see E. L. Ehrlich, *BZAW* 73, 76.

³ A. B. Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax* (Edinburgh, 1901), s 100(a); G-K, s 147(b).

⁴ B. S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel* (London, 1962), 45 f.

⁵ J. Begrich, *ZAW* 58 (1940), 12; P. A. H. de Boer, *Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des A.T.* (Stuttgart, 1962), 31.

⁶ K-B³ (1967), 339; *BDB*, 301(a); *DISO*, 84; Ehrlich *Randglossen*, I, 203; Yahuda, *op. cit.*, 91 f.; Speiser *Gen.*, 307.

⁷ For the practice of embalming among the Hebrews, see G. R. Driver, *ZAW* 66 (1954), 314 f.

⁸ Cf. G. R. Driver, *VT Suppl.* 16 (1967), 54 ff.; K-B³ (1967), 337.

⁹ Found in Ugaritic: C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual* (Rome, 1955), 148; text

20. *tārōp tōrap*, to “be torn to pieces” by a wild animal, only 37: 33, 44: 28.

21. *yad*, in the sense of “time,” 43: 34; cf. 47: 24.

22. √YD’ in the hithpa’el, “to reveal oneself,” only 45: 1 and the poem of Num. 12 (vs. 6).¹

23. √YD’ in the niph’al, meaning to “be apparent,” only 42: 21; cf. the obscure passage in Ps. 74: 5.

24. √YHB, in the imperative, meaning “give” (transitive), only in 47: 15, 16 in the Joseph Story.

25. √YRH, in the hiph’il, meaning “to show the way,” apparently only in 46: 28. But there may be a textual corruption here.²

26. *kābēd*, “heavy, serious,” used of a famine in the sense of “severe,” 41: 31, 43: 1, 47: 4, 13; cf. the same use in Gen. 12: 10.

27. *kēhayyōm haʿze(b)*, “on one such day as this,” in accordance with his habitual practice:³ 39: 11. “About this time”⁴ does not convey the flavour of approximation inherent in the *kap*. See below p. 51 f.

28. √KRH, “to hew” a grave out of rock: 50: 5. Cf. 2 Chron. 16: 14.

29. √LHH*, “languish,” only 47: 13 (< √L’H).⁵

30. √LQT, “to glean, gather,” in the sense of gathering in money, only 47: 14.

31. *mētab*, “the best” of land in general, only 47: 6, 11; of fields, Ex. 22: 4.

32. *mēlīs*, “interpreter,” only 42: 23 in the Pentateuch. Elsewhere it means “emissary” (Isa. 43: 27, 2 Chron. 32: 31), or “intermediary” (Job 33: 23).⁶

33. *mispō*, “fodder,” 42: 27, 43: 24; also Gen. 24: 25, 32; Jud. 19: 19. It is difficult to see how this word can be termed “characteristic” of J⁷ in the light of so few occurrences.

34. *mišge(b)**, “mistake, oversight,” only 43: 12.

67, i, 26; common in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic: Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 544; cf. *DISO*, 102.

¹ Skinner *Gen.*, 487.

² See Skinner *Gen.*, 495; Speiser *Gen.*, 345.

³ Honeyman, *VT* 2 (1952), 85 ff.

⁴ K-B¹ (1953), 373; G-K, § 35(n).

⁵ According to K-B¹ (1953), 382, it is derived from √YLH, with the meaning “be in consternation.”

⁶ Gunkel *Gen.*, 445; K-B¹ (1953), 481; for the root in West Semitic, see *DISO*, 138.

⁷ Holzinger *Gen.*, 239.

35. √NHL, in the sense “refresh (with food),” only 47: 14.¹

36. √NHM, in the hithpa’el, in the passive sense “to be comforted,” only 37: 35 and Ps. 119: 52; elsewhere niph’al or pu’al.

37. √NKL in the hithpa’el, “to scheme against someone,” only 37: 18.²

38. √NPL in the hithpa’el, in the reflexive sense “to throw oneself upon,” (paralleled by *hitgōlēl*), apparently only 43: 18.³

39. *sārīs*, “eunuch,” Akkadian *ša rēši*,⁴ in 37: 36, 39: 1, 40: 2, 7, used of the officers of Pharaoh. Elsewhere in the Pentateuch the entourage of Pharaoh is designated by other titles.⁵ Jewish and Apocalyptic sources, however, make out that Potiphar was possessed of a family;⁶ and it seems quite clear from the duties normally undertaken by such officials that the designation was simply an administrative title which cast no reflexions on its bearer’s masculinity.⁷ The word turns up in Aramaic as *sārīsā*,⁸ whence seemingly it passed into Egyptian in the Fifth Century B.C. as *šrs*.⁹ Potiphar’s anger need find no added motivation in his postulated emasculation:¹⁰ Anpu was likewise enraged at Bata, but he was no castrate.

40. *‘al pī*, “according to,” i.e. with specific reference to: 43: 7.

41. *‘erwā(b)*, in the expression “the land’s nakedness,” 42: 9, 12; i.e. the destitute condition of the land beset by famine. Such an expression occurs only here.

42. √‘SH, in the expression *ya‘āšeh Par‘ō(b)*, “let Pharaoh act;” 41: 34; cf. I Ki. 8: 32.¹¹

43. *pī baṭṭap*, in the expression *lēpī baṭṭap*, 47: 12, “according to (?) the little children.” This might suggest that starvation rations were meted out to the entire family for the duration of the famine. But

¹ See G. R. Driver, *Syria* 33 (1956), 73.

² For the occurrence of a direct accusative with this verbal form, see G-K, s 117(w); also below, p. 55.

³ Ehrlich (*Randglossen* I, 223) suggests reading *lēbiṭnakkēl* for *lēbiṭnappēl*, “deal craftily;” see below, p. 55.

⁴ Cf. the references cited in G. Posener, *La Première domination perse en Égypte* (Cairo, 1936), 118 n. 2.

⁵ L. A. Rosenthal, *ZAW* 15 (1895), 279.

⁶ Horovitz *JE*, 86 ff.

⁷ See Vergote *Joseph*, 40 ff. In the second millennium B.C., however, the use of *ša rēši* to denote a eunuch is quite explicit: cf. E. F. Weidner, *AfO* 17 (1956), 264.

⁸ *DISO*, 197.

⁹ Cf. *šrs Prš*, “the Persian official,” Posener, *op. cit.*, 117 f.; S. Morenz, *TLZ* 84 (1959), 406.

¹⁰ C. U. Wolf, in *IDB* II, 179.

¹¹ See Skinner *Gen.*, 468; K-B¹ (1953), 740.

Driver¹ on the basis of the $\sqrt{\text{TPP}}$ which occurs in Akkadian, Aramaic and Arabic and denotes “dripping,” or in cognate nouns “a drop,” “small piece,” renders *ṭap* as anything tiny or small. The expression according to him means “within a drop,” i.e. in full measure.

44. $\sqrt{\text{PTR}}$, “to interpret,” and the derived noun *piṭrōn*, “interpretation, meaning,” see below, p. 58.

45. $\sqrt{\text{SDQ}}$, in the hithpa‘el “to justify, clear oneself (of suspicion),” in the O.T. only in 44: 16; cf. Sir. 7: 5.

46. SWH , as used in 50: 16, with the meaning to commend to someone (not mentioned) a message for a third party; cf. Esther 3: 12, 8: 9.

47. **ṣē‘irā(b)**, “rank/status of being the youngest,” coined apparently in contrast to *bēkōrā(b)*: 43: 33; cf. Dan. 8: 9.

48. $\sqrt{\text{QWM}}$ in the qal, “to arise,” used to describe the commencement of the years of famine: 41: 30.

49. **qōmes*, “handful,” in the expression *liqmāsīm*, “by the handful,” i.e. in superabundance; used in 41: 47 to describe the yield of crops during the seven good years; elsewhere occurring only in Leviticus.

50. *qāṣe(b)*, “end, limit,” in the expression *miqṣē(b) ‘eḥāw* (47: 2), “from the total number of his brothers (he selected five, etc.):” cf. Ezek. 33: 2. Similarly *miqṣōṭ bā‘ām*, “from the whole of the people;” cf. I Ki. 12: 31, where the phrase is used to describe Jereboam’s lack of selectivity in choosing priests.²

51. *qāṣōṭ*, with *dibbēr*, meaning “to speak gruffly,” 42: 7, 30; with $\sqrt{\text{NH}}$, I Sam. 20: 10.

52. $\sqrt{\text{R’H}}$, in the hithpa‘el, meaning “to look at one another (in bewilderment),” only 42: 1. Other examples suggest a nuance of hostility: 2 Ki. 14: 8, 11; 23: 29.

53. *rē‘ū*, “look!” virtually synonymous with *hinnē(b)*:³ 39: 14, 41: 41.

54. $\sqrt{\text{RWM}}$, in the hiph‘il, with object “hand” and “foot,” meaning to carry on any activity whatsoever: 41: 44.⁴

55. *rā‘*, see below, p. 58.

56. $\sqrt{\text{R’B}}$, in the qal, “to be hungry,” with subject “land,” only in 41: 55.

¹ Syria 33 (1956), 70 ff.

² T. J. Meek, *AJSL* 45 (1929), 151.

³ *BDB*, 907(b).

⁴ See Morenz, *TLZ* 84 (1959), 408.

57. *rōpe(b)*, see below, p. 64.

58. $\sqrt{\text{ŠHT}^*}$, see below, p. 59.

59. $\sqrt{\text{SYM}}$, with object “eyes,” in the phrase “to set eyes upon someone,” i.e. to see them, to find them present: 44: 21. Elsewhere the idiom conveys a nuance of advantage or disadvantage to the person thus regarded.¹

60. *šē‘erit*, “remnant left over” in the sense of descendants who have survived a catastrophe: 45: 7 (the only occurrence of the word in the Pentateuch).² For a similar meaning see 2 Sam. 14: 7.

61. $\sqrt{\text{SDP}^*}$, “to scorch, wither, blast,” of the action of east wind on the standing grain, only in 41: 6, 27. The root is known in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.³

62. *tō‘ēhā(b)*, “abhorrence, taboo,” used of the racial exclusiveness of Egyptians vis-a-vis Hebrews, 43: 32, 46: 34.

63. *‘eṭ*, (preposition), in the following anomalous uses:

(a) with $\sqrt{\text{YD}^c}$, 39: 6, *wēlō‘ yāda‘ ‘ittō mē‘umā(b) ki ‘im hallehem ‘āšer hū’ ‘ōkēl*, “he took no account of anything in his (Joseph’s) charge except the food he ate.”⁴

(b) with $\sqrt{\text{ZKR}}$, 40: 14, *ki ‘im zēkartani ‘ittēkā ka‘āšer yīṭab lak*, “but keep me in mind (lit. remember me with you) when things go better for you.”

(c) with $\sqrt{\text{PQD}}$, 40: 4, *wayyiqōd sar haṭṭabbāhīm ‘eṭ Yōsēp ‘ittām*, “the captain of the guard assigned Joseph to them (as servant).”⁵

(d) with $\sqrt{\text{R’H}}$, 43: 16, *wayyar’ Yōsēp ‘ittām ‘eṭ Binyāmin*, “Joseph noted that Benjamin was with them.”

64. Occurrences of the converted perfect or imperfect of $\sqrt{\text{HYH}}$: converted imperfect, 3 m. s. (*wayyēhī*): 37: 23, 39: 2 (thrice), 5 (twice), 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21; 40: 1, 4, 20; 41: 1, 8, 13, 54; 42: 35; 43: 2, 21; 44: 24; 47: 28; 50: 9; converted imperfect, 3 m. pl. (*wayyihyū*): 40: 4; converted perfect, 3 m. s. (*wēhāyā[h]*): 44: 31, 46: 33, 47: 24; followed by (a) noun: 39: 2 (twice), 5, 6, 21, 40: 4, 41: 54, 47: 28, 50: 9; (b) preposition and noun: 39: 2, 7, 11, 40: 1, 20, 41: 1, 8, 47: 24; (c) preposition and infinitive: 39: 10, 15, 18, 19, 44: 31; (d) clause marker: (*ka’āšer*) 37: 23, 41: 13, 43: 2, (*ki*) 43: 21, 44: 24,

¹ *BDB*, 963(b).

² E. W. Heaton, *ET* 59 (1947-48), 134 n. 11.

³ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 1525(b).

⁴ Cf. *BDB*, 86(b), s.v. *‘eṭ*, 3(b); W. Schottroff, *Gedenken’ im alten Orient und im A.T.* (Neukirchen-Vluy, 1964), 163 (“seinerseits”).

⁵ The usual prepositions are *‘el* or *‘al*: *BDB*, 823(b).

46: 33, (*mēʾax*) 39: 5; (e) pronoun: 42: 35; (f) adverb: 39: 20. Occurrence by chapter: 37-1; 39-15; 40-3; 41-4; 42-1; 43-2; 44-2; 45-0; 46-1; 47-2; 50-1.

65. *nāṭā(b) ḥesed*, “to extend favour,” 39: 21; paralleled by *nāṭan ḥēn*.¹

66. *nāsā(b) rōʾš*, “to lift up the head,” used with delightful *double entendre* in chapter 40. In vs. 13 it is to be understood metaphorically as “restore the fortunes of,” but in vs. 19 it must be taken literally, “to lift the head,” i.e. to hang.² I know of no such play on the meaning of the Egyptian *ʿšy tp*, “to raise the head,” which simply denotes the physical act; ³ hence Yahuda’s comparison ⁴ seems irrelevant.

67. *nāṭan kē-*, “to treat (someone) as...,” 42: 30; but perhaps restore with LXX *bēmišmār*, and render “he put us in prison, as (though) we were spies...”

68. *nāṭān qōl*, “to cry aloud;” 45: 2, an idiom found at Ugarit.⁵

69. *šallēm rāʾā(b) ṭabaṭ ṭōbā(b)*, “to repay good with evil,” 44: 4; elsewhere only in the Psalms.

WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS OCCURRING IN LATE HEBREW OR ARAMAIC

For the purposes of the following list a “late” book is defined as one which was written within approximately one-half century of the Exile, during the Exile, or in Post-exilic times. Such a definition covers the following books and parts of books in the O.T.: Leviticus, Deuteronomy, those portions of the Pentateuch indisputably assigned to P, the Deuteronomic framework of the historical Books, Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. The words and expressions which occur only in this body of literature and again in the Joseph Story so impressed certain scholars of the last century that, in order to account for them, a theory of a priestly re-working of the Joseph Story was fabricated.⁶ Little support was forthcoming from the scholarly world

¹ Cf. D. R. Ap-Thomas, *JSS* 2 (1957), 132 ff.

² Speiser *Gen.*, 308; cf. also I. L. Seeligmann, *VT Suppl.* 16 (1967), 270 ff.

³ Erman-Grapow, *Wb.* V, 405: 7.

⁴ Yahuda, *op. cit.*, 61 f.; cf. Bergsträsser and Spiegelberg, *ZSVG* 8 (1932), 19.

⁵ J. Gray, *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra* (Leiden, 1964), 66.

⁶ F. Giesebrecht, *ZAW* 1 (1881), 177 ff.; A. Kuenen, *An Historical-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (London, 1886), 328; Holzinger *Gen.*, 234.

at large, however. Critics pronounced the list of such words too short to form the basis for sound conclusions,¹ and since that time the theory has fallen into abeyance. Actually the number of words and expressions with late affinities is rather larger than is usually imagined, as the list below will show. In as many cases as possible all occurrences have been noted, if not translated.

1. *dabbēr*, with direct accusative of the person *spoken to*:² in the Joseph Story, 37: 4, 41: 9; also—

Num. 26: 3 (P), *wayēdabbēr Mōše(b) wēʿElʿāzār ḥakēhōhēn ʾōṭām bē-ʿarēbōṭ Mōʾāb*, “and Moses and Eleazar the priest spoke to them (the Israelites) in the plains of Moab.”

Deut. 18: 21, *ʾē(y)kā(b) nēdaʿ ʾet ḥaddābār ʾāšer lō ʿdibbērō YHWH*, “how can we identify the message which Yahweh has not spoken to him (a prophet)?”

Jer. 1: 16, *wēdibbartī mišpāṭay ʾōṭām*, “I will speak my judgments to them.”

2. *ʾālum mā(b)*, “sheaf;” in the Joseph Story, 37: 7; also—

Ps. 126: 6, (“he who goes forth weeping, etc.) *bōʾ yābōʾ ḥērin mā(b) nōšē ʾālum mōṭāw*, shall come back with a shout, carrying his sheaves;” cf. also Post-Biblical Hebrew.³ Outside the Joseph Story the root √LM occurs only in Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah and the Psalms.

3. √NKL, “to be crafty;” in the Joseph Story, 37: 18; also—

Num. 25: 18, (“their wives) *ʾāšer nikkelū lakem ʿal dēḥar Pēʿōr*, with which they enveigled you in the matter of Peor.”

Mal. 1: 14, *wēʿārūr nōkēl wēyēš bēʿeqrō zākār wēnōdēr wēzōḥēah māšbāṭ laʿdōnāy*, “cursed be the cheat who has a male in his flock and vows it, but who sacrifices a blemished one to my lord!”

Ps. 105: 25, *ḥāpāk libbām lišnō ʿammō lēḥiṭnakkēl baʿāḥādāw*, “he (Yahweh) turned their (the Egyptians’) hearts to hate his people, to scheme against his servants.”⁴

4. *bōr ʾē(y)n bō mayim*, “a waterless pit (or cistern);” in the Joseph Story, 37: 24. The same expression (almost a stock phrase denoting a dry pit)⁵ occurs in—

Jer. 38: 6, *wayyiqēḥū ʾet Yirmeyāhū wayyašlikū ʾōṭō ʿel ḥabbōr Malkiy-*

¹ Cf. Skinner *Gen.*, 438; Procksch *Gen.*, 218.

² G-K, § 115(c); cf. Phoenician (Eshmun. 6), *DISO*, 55.

³ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 67(b).

⁴ Kuenen, *op. cit.*, 328; Procksch *Gen.*, 218; Gunkel *Gen.*, 358.

⁵ Cf. *bʾrwt myʾ*, “cisterns of water,” *DISO*, 32.

⁶ The same verb is used of Ishmael (Jer. 41: 9), who likewise flung his victims

yābū ... ūbabbōr 'ē(y)n mayim, “they took Jeremiah and threw him into the pit belonging to Malikyahu ... now there was no water in the pit.”

Zech. 9: 11, *šillaḥti 'āširayk mibbōr 'ē(y)n mayim bō*, “I liberated your captives from a pit with no water in it.”

5. *wayyimšēkū wayya'ālū*, “they dragged up (Joseph)...,” 37: 28. The only other passage in which the co-ordination of these two verbs is found is the similar incident in Jer. 38: 13, *wayyimšēkū 'et Yirmeyābū bahābālim wayya'ālū 'ōtō min habbōr*, “they dragged Jeremiah with ropes up out of the pit.”

6. *beša'*, “profit, advantage:” 37: 26 in the Joseph Story; also—

Mal. 3: 14, (“you said, ‘it is pointless to serve god) *ūmā(b) beša' ki šāmarnū mišmartō*, and what is the good of keeping his charge...?”

Ps. 30: 10, *mā(h) beša' bēdāmī bēridī 'el šāḥaṭ*, (to god), “what advantage (scil. to you, god) is there in my blood, in my going down to perdition?”

Job 22: 3, *baḥēpes lēšadday ki ṭiṣdāq wē'im beša' ki ṭattēm dērākekā*, “does it make the Almighty happy if you are righteous, or is it advantageous (scil. to him) if you mend your ways?” Cf. also Ps. 119: 36, Isa. 56: 11.

Elsewhere, both in Pre- and Post-exilic literature *beša'* has the meaning of unjust gain, made through violence or dishonesty.

7. $\sqrt{\text{BK}}$, in the qal with direct accusative, meaning to “bewail (the dead),” in 37: 35, 50: 3. Outside the Joseph Story, Gen. 23: 2 (P), Num. 20: 29 (P), Lev. 10: 6, Deut. 21: 13, 34: 8, Jer. 8: 23. Elsewhere, in early Hebrew, the semantic range of this verb is overlapped by that of $\sqrt{\text{SPD}}$.

8. *ṭabbāḥīm*, “guards, police (?)” in the expression *šar baṭṭabbāḥīm*, “captain of the guard,” in 37: 36, 39: 1, 40: 3, 4, 41: 10, 12. Despite the rendering ἀρχιμαγείρος of the LXX, the functions of the official in question seem to favour the above translation, as do also the occurrences of *ṭabbāḥīm* outside the Joseph Story. These latter include *rab ṭabbāḥīm*, “chief of the *ṭabbāḥīm*,” the title of the Babylonian Nebuzaradan in 2 Ki. 25: 8 ff. and Jer. 39: 9 ff., and the Aramaic *rab ṭabbāḥayyā'*, of Dan. 2: 14. These “butchers” were soldiers under royal command, who carried out policing operations of a military nature.¹

into a pit (cistern, *bōr*) for the technical use of this verb with reference to exposure, see M. Cogan, *JNES* 27 (1968), 133 ff.

¹ The Sumerogram LÚ.GÍR.LÁ, “butcher,” which occurs in an Assyrian letter of mid-seventh century date, has been read *ṭābiḥu* by Landsberger, but this is not above dispute; see J. A. Brinkman, *Orientalia* 34 (1965), 249 n. 1.

9. $\sqrt{\text{SLH}}$, in the hiph'il with intransitive meaning, “to show prosperity:” in 39: 2 (*mašlīah*).

Jer. 5: 28, *dīn lō' dānū dīn yāṭōm wēyašlīhū*, “they (the wicked) do not take up the cause of the orphan, that they may prosper;” also 2: 37, 32: 5.

1 Chron. 22: 11, *'attā(b) bēnī yēbī YHWH 'immāk wēbišlāḥtā*, “now my son! May Yahweh be with you, and may you prosper!”

2 Chron. 18: 11, *'ālē(b) Rāmōt Gilē'ād wēbašlāḥ wēnāṭan YHWH bēyaḏ hammelek*, “go up to Ramoth Gilead and win! Yahweh has delivered it into the king's power.”

2 Chron. 20: 20, *ba'āmīnū binēbī'aw wēbašlīhū*, “believe in his (Yahweh's) prophets, and prosper!” Also 13: 12, 14: 6, 24: 20, 31: 21, 32: 30.

Prov. 28: 13, *mēkasse(b) pēšā'aw lō' yašlīah*, “who conceals his sins shall not prosper.” Also Dan. 8: 12, 24, 11: 36; Isa. 55: 11.¹

10. *ba'āšer*, as a conjunction, with a nuance of cause; in the Joseph Story, 39: 9, 23 (above, p. 41).

Ecc. 7: 2, (“it is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of drinking) *ba'āšer hū' sōp kol hā'ādām*, because this is the end of all mankind.”

Ecc. 8: 4, (“...keep the king's command...”) *ba'āšer dēḥar meleḳ šilṭōn*, for the king's word is absolute.”²

11. *kēḥayyōm haḥḥe(b)*, an expression used to emphasize the normalcy of the period of time the writer has in mind. In the Joseph Story, 39: 11.

Deut. 6: 24, (“and Yahweh charged us to perform all these commandments...”) *lēṭōb lānū kol hayyāmīm lēḥayyētēnū kēḥayyōm haḥḥe(b)*, for our own perpetual good, for keeping ourselves alive, as (we do) this day.” Cf. Jer. 44: 22.

Ezra 9: 7, *...nittannū 'ānahnū mēlakēnū kōbēnēnū bēyaḏ malkē hā'ārāsōt baḥereḥ baššēḥi ūbabbīzā(h) ūbēḥōšet pānīm kēḥayyōm haḥḥe(b)*, “...we, our kings, and our priests have been delivered into the power of the kings of the earth, through sword, exile plunder, and shame, as (it is still) this day.” Cf. vs. 15.

Neh. 9: 10, (By various acts at the time of the Exodus) *watta'as lēkā šēm kēḥayyōm haḥḥe(b)*, “you made a name for yourself, just as (you have) to-day.”

¹ In Jud. 18: 5 probably read with LXX *hātišlāḥ*.

² Dillmann *Gen.* II, 356.

The less emphatic *kayyōm haḥḥe(h)* is also common in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.

12. *mišmār*, in the abstract sense of “confinement, custody, arrest,” common in the Joseph Story: 40: 3, 4, 7, 41: 10, 42: 17, 19, 30. Elsewhere only P.

Num. 15: 34, (“while the Israelites were in the desert they found a man gathering sticks on the Sabbath...”) *wayyannihū ’ōtō bammišmār ki lō’ pōraś mā(h) yē’āse(h) lō*, and they put him in custody, for it was not yet decided what should be done to him.” Cf. Lev. 24: 12.

The same word with the concrete designation “guard” (i.e. a body of men), and once meaning “observances” occurs in Jeremiah, Nehemiah, Job, Chronicles, Proverbs and Ezekiel.¹ An earlier word for “prison” seems to be *bēt mišmeret*: 2 Sam. 20: 3.²

13. √PTR and the derived noun *piṭrōn*, only in the Joseph Story; the former in 40: 8, 16, 22, 41: 8, 12, 13, 15; the latter in 40: 5, 8, 12, 18; 41: 11. But the root is common in Post-Biblical Hebrew,³ and Aramaic (√PŠR).⁴

14. √Z’P, “to be wan, disgruntled, morose, touchy;”⁵ in the Joseph Story, 40: 6.

Dan. 1: 10, (“I feared my lord the king...”) *’āšer lammā(h) yir’e(h) ’et pēnēkem ḥō’āpīm*, lest he see that your appearance was wan...”

Prov. 19: 3, *’imwelet ’ādām tēsallēp darkō wē’al YHWH yiḥ’ap libbō* “a man’s fall ruins his ways, but it is against Yahweh that his heart is disgruntled.” Cf. 2 Chron. 26: 19.

15. *ra’*, meaning “sad, unhappy;” in the Joseph Story, 40: 7; cf. 47: 9.

Neh. 2: 1-2, (“and I took wine and gave it to the king) *wēbayiṭī ra’ lēpānāw wayyō’mer li hammelek maddūa’ pānekā rā’im*, but I was unhappy in his presence. The king said to me, ‘why do you look unhappy...?’”

Prov. 25: 20, *lēb ra’*, “sad-hearted.”

16. √BŠL, “to become ripe,” in Biblical Hebrew found only in the Joseph Story; but cf. Palestinian Aramaic.⁶

17. *sārīg*, “shoot, clinging tendril,” in the Joseph Story, 40: 10, 12.

Joel 1: 7, *ḥāšōp ḥāšāpā(h) wēbišlīk ḥilbīnū sārīgebā*, “they (a foreign

¹ K-B¹ (1953), 578; *BDB*, 1038(a).

² Contrast Gen. 42: 19.

³ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 1255 ff.

⁴ Common in Daniel: K-B¹ (1953), 1114.

⁵ Cf. L. Kopf, *VT* 9 (1959), 254.

⁶ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 199(a).

invader) strip off its (the fig tree’s) bark, and throw it down, and its shoots turn white.”

For the verbal root see Job 40: 17, Lam. 1: 14. √SRG and its derivatives are rather common in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.¹

18. √ŠHT, “to press out (grapes),” in the Joseph Story (and the entire O.T., in fact) only 40: 11; cf. the root √SHṬ which occurs in Post-Biblical Hebrew.²

19. *kēn*, “office,” in the Joseph Story 40: 13, 41: 13.

Dan. 11: 20, (of the accession of a new king) *wē’amaq ’al kannō ma’ābir nōgēs*, “then a sender of the exactor shall succeed to his office;” so vs. 7, 21, 38.³

20. √ZKR, see above p. 49, no. 13.

21. *hulledeṭ*, hoph’al infinitive, in the expression *yōm hulledeṭ*; in the Joseph Story, 40: 20.

Ezek. 16: 4, *bēyōm hūledeṭ ’ōtāk lō’ kāraṭ šārēk ubḥemayim lō’ ruḥaṣt*, “on the day of your birth your navel cord was not cut, nor were you washed in water;” also vs. 5.⁴

22. *ḥarṭōm*, “magician,” in the Joseph Story 41: 8, 24; elsewhere in Exod. 7: 11, 22, 9: 11, 8: 3, 14, 15 (all P), and Dan. 1: 20, 2: 2. See further below, p. 203.

23. *wannaḥalmā(h)*, 41: 11; the first person sing. or plural with final *-ā(h)* is frequent in later books.⁵

24. A verb meaning “to run”, or similar expressions of haste, used of summoning a person into the king’s presence, 41: 14; apparently a standard idiom in late Märchen.

Dan. 2: 25, *’ādaiyīn ’aryōk bēbiṭbēbālā(h) han’el lēDāniyyē’l qōdām malkā*, “then Arioch hastily brought Daniel into the king’s presence.”

II Khamois 2, 33, “they ran and brought him (Setna) at once.”

Onkhsheshonqy 3, 20-21, “They ran for <Onkhsheshonqy son of> Tjanufer, they ran and returned, bringing him before Pharaoh at once.”

25. *qereḥ*, used of the stomach and entrails of animals, in the Joseph Story 41: 21. Elsewhere very common in P:

Ex. 12: 9, (“do not eat any of it [the lamb] raw...”) *ki ’im šēlī ’ēš rō’šō ’al kērā’aw wē’al qirbō*, but roasted over fire, its head, legs and

¹ *Ibid.*, 1022 f., 1026.

² *Ibid.*, 971.

³ Kuenen, *op. cit.*, 328.

⁴ *Ibid.*; Smend *Erzählung*, 103 n. 1.

⁵ G-K, § 49(e).

entrails.” Cf. also 29: 13, 17, 22; Lev. 1: 9, 13, 3: 3, 9, 14, 4: 8, 11, 7: 3, 8: 16, 21, 25, 9: 14.

26. *'ehād*, “one,” in the sense of an unambiguous unity, “(one and the same;” in the Joseph Story, 41: 25.

Job 9: 22, *'aḥaṭ ḥī* ‘*al kēn 'āmartī tām wērāšā' ḥī* *mēkalle*(*h*), “it is all the same. Therefore I say, he puts an end to both upright and wicked.”

Job 31: 15, *ḥālō ḥabbēṭen 'ōšēni 'āsābū wayēkōnēnēnū¹ bāreḥem 'ehād*, “did not the one who made me make him in the belly, and the same one fashion us in the womb?”

Esth. 4: 11, *kol 'iṣ wē'iššā*(*h*) *'āšer yābō' 'el hammelek ... 'āšer lō 'yiqqārē' 'aḥaṭ dāṭō lēḥāmīt*, “as for any man or woman who goes in to the king ... without being summoned, there is but one penalty: execution.”

Dan. 2: 9, ... *hēn ḥelma' lā' tēḥōdē'unnani ḥādā*(*h*) *ḥī' dātēkōn*, “if you do not interpret the dream for me, there is but one and the same penalty for you.”²

27. *sāḥā'*, “satiety,” in the Joseph Story 41: 29, 30, 31, 34, 47, 53.

Prov. 3: 10, *wēyimmāl'ū 'āsāmekā sāḥā' wēṭirōš yēqābekā yiprōšū*, “your graneries will be filled with abundance, and wine will be bursting out of your vats.”

Eccles. 5: 11, *wēḥasāḥā' lē'āšir 'enennū manniāḥ lō liyšōn*, “but the abundance of the rich man will not let him sleep.”

28. *nākōn haddābār*, “the matter is certain,” in the Joseph Story 41: 32.

Deut. 13: 15, *wēḥinnē*(*h*) *'ēmeṭ nākōn haddābār ne'esētā*(*h*) *hattō'ēbā*(*h*) *ḥazō'ṭ bēqirbekā*, “if it is in fact certain that such a detestable thing was done in your midst” (you shall destroy the inhabitants); cf. 17: 4.

29. *piqqādōn*, “deposit,” in the Joseph Story 41: 36.

Lev. 5: 21, (“if a soul sins ...) *wēkīḥēš ba'āmītō bēpiqqādōn*, and deceives his neighbour in the matter of a deposit...;” also in Post-Biblical Hebrew.³

30. *ṭabba'aṭ*, “ring;” in the Joseph Story (41: 42) and Esther (3: 10, 12, 8: 2, 8, 10) “signet ring;” elsewhere (Exod.) “rings (for furniture).”⁴

31. *rāḥīd*, “chain, collar,” in the Joseph Story, 41: 42.

Ezek. 16: 11, *wā'ettēnā*(*h*) *šēmīdīm 'al yādāyik wērāḥīd 'al gērōnēk*, “and I put bracelets on your (Jerusalem’s) arms, and a chain upon your neck” (Yahweh speaking to Jerusalem).

¹ MT, *wayēkunennū*.

² Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 207.

³ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 1207(b).

⁴ Vergote *Joseph*, 116 f.

32. **qōmeš*, “hand, fist,” in the Joseph Story 41: 47.

Lev. 2: 2, (“and he shall bring it [his offering] to the sons of Aaron, the priests) *wēqāmaš miššām mēlō qumšō mišsoltā*(*h*) *ūmiššamnā*(*h*), and he shall take a handful of its flour and oil...,” also 5: 12, 6: 8. The verbal root is likewise confined to P (Lev. and Num.); in Post-Biblical Hebrew it is common.¹

33. *šēš*, “byssos, royal linen” (Egyptian *šš-nšw*); attested in Ezekiel, Proverbs and the P passages in Exodus.²

34. *'ārāšōṭ*, meaning “(foreign) countries,” in the Joseph Story 41: 54. It is very common in Jeremiah (7 times), Ezekiel (23 times), and Chronicles (22 times).³

35. *šallīt*, “ruler,” in the Joseph Story 42: 6.

Eccl. 8: 8, *'en 'ādām šallīt bārūah ... wē'en šilṭōn bēyōm hammāweṭ*, “there is no man who rules the spirit ... and no control over the day of death.”

Ezek. 16: 30, Jerusalem is pictured as a *'iššā*(*h*) *zōnā*(*h*) *šalletet*, “domineering prostitute.”

Eccl. 10: 5, *rā'ā*(*h*) ... *kišēgāgā*(*h*) *šeyyōšā*(*h*) *millipnē*(*y*) *ḥaššallīt*, “an evil ... like a mistake which took its rise with the ruler;” also 7: 19. The verbal root is found also in Neh., Psalms, and Esther,⁴ and in Post-Biblical Hebrew.⁵

36. $\sqrt{\text{BHN}}$, “to test, try, investigate;” in the Joseph Story 42: 15.

Job 7: 18, (“what is man ... that you [god] give him your attention ...) *lirēgā'im tibḥānennū*, and test him moment by moment?”

Zecc. 13: 9, *ūbēḥantim kibḥōn 'et ḥazqāḥāb*, “I will try them as one tries gold” (parallel to $\sqrt{\text{SRP}}$).

Jer. 6: 27, *baḥōn nētattikā bē'ammī mēḥaššēr⁶ wēṭēda' uḥāḥantā 'et darkām*, “I have made you an essayer of my people, a metal refiner; and you shall learn and investigate their ways.”

¹ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 1386 f.; Kuenen, *loc. cit.*

² Vergote *Joseph*, 119 ff.

³ A. Kropat, *BZAW* 16 (1909), 9.

⁴ K-B¹ (1953), 477; Giesebrecht, *op. cit.*, 237; Kuenen, *loc. cit.*; Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 214. Most commentators treat the occurrence in the Joseph Story as a gloss: Holzinger *Gen.*, 239; König *Gen.*, 701 f.; Procksch *Gen.*, 236; Gunkel *Gen.*, 442. A connexion with the Hyksos Salitis seems far-fetched (Keil-Delitzsch I, 354; Sayce, *ET* 10 [1898], 418; Dillmann *Gen.* II, 382), though, if the name is a late fabrication, it may conceal the same root. *Šlyt*, “powerful,” may occur at Ugarit, although the identification is not beyond doubt; see Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual*, 328 no. 1839.

⁵ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 1583(b).

⁶ MT, *mibšār*.

Elsewhere the verbal root is confined to Jer., Ezek., Zech., Job, Psalms, Prov., Chron. and Mal.¹ It occurs also in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.²

37. √DRŠ, in the niph'al; ³ in the Joseph Story 42: 22.

Ezek. 20: 3, ("is it to enquire of me [god] that you are coming? As I live, says Yahweh god) 'im 'iddārēš lākem, I will not let you enquire of me!" Cf. 14: 3, 20: 31, 36: 37, Isa. 65: 1.

1 Chron. 26: 31, ("in the fortieth year of David's reign) *nidrāšū wayyimāšē' bāhem gibbōrē(y) hayil*, an investigation was held, and men of ability were found among them (the Hebronites)."

38. *mēliš*, "interpreter," in the Joseph Story 42: 23.

Isa. 43: 27, 'ābikā hārī'šōn hātā' ūmēlišekā paš'ū bī, "your father was the first to sin, and your intermediaries committed wrongs against me;" cf. Job 33: 23.

2 Chron. 32: 31, ... *bimēlišē(y) sārē(y) Bābēl hammēšallēhim 'ālāw*, "...in the matter of the emissaries of the Babylonian princes who sent to him (Hezekiah)..."

39. √GLL, in the hithpa'el; see above, p. 49.

40. *maṭmōn*, "hidden treasure;" in the Joseph Story, 43: 23.

Job 3: 21, *hammēhakkim lammāweṭ wē'ēnennū wayyāhpērūbū mimmaṭmōnim*, "who long for death which does not come, and who dig for it more than for hidden treasure;" cf. Prov. 2: 4.

Isa. 45: 3, *wēnātatti lēkā 'ōšērōṭ hōšek ūmaṭmūnē(y) mistārīm*, "I will give you the stores of darkness, and the treasures of hidden places;" also Jer. 41: 8.

41. √'PQ, in the hithpa'el, meaning "to restrain oneself," in the Joseph Story, 43: 31.

Esth. 5: 10, ("and Haman was filled with anger on account of Mordecai) *wayyit' appēq Hāmān wayyābō' 'el bēṭō*, but Haman controlled himself and went home."

Isa. 42: 14, *heḥšēfī mē'ōlām 'abriš 'eṭ' appēq*, "For some time I have been silent, I have kept quiet and restrained myself;" cf. also 63: 15, 64: 11.

The same root with the meaning "to force oneself" occurs in 1 Sam. 13: 12.

42. √'MS, "to load up, carry a load;" in the Joseph Story 44: 13.

¹ K-B³ (1967), 114.

² Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 155.

³ J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon* (Leiden, 1959), 22; K-B³ (1967), 224.

Ps. 68: 20, *bārūk 'ādōnāy yōm yōm ya'amōs lānū bā'ēl yēšū'atēnū*, "blessed be the Lord! Daily he carries our load, god is our salvation!"

Neh. 13: 15, *bayyāmim hābēmmā(b) rā'itī bi(y) būdā(b) dōrēkīm gittōṭ baššabbāt ūmēbī'im bā'ārēmōṭ wē'ōmēsīm 'al baḥāmōrim*, "At that time I saw in Judah people treading (grapes in) winepresses on the Sabbath, and bringing grain and loading it on asses;" cf. also 4: 11, Zech. 12: 3, Isa. 46: 1, 3.

43. √YRŠ, in the niph'al, in the Joseph Story, 45: 11.

Prov. 20: 13, 'al *te'ēhab šēnā(b) pen tiwwārēš pēqab 'ē(y) nekā šēba' lāhem*, "do not love to go to sleep, lest you be in want; keep your eyes open, and have plenty of bread;" cf. also 23: 21, 30: 9.

Perhaps the niph'al of this root is a revocalization of √RWS, "to be in want," in order to give the latter overtones of moral shortcoming.

44. √SWH, in the pu'al, "to be commanded," in the Joseph Story, 45: 19.¹

Ex. 34: 34, *wēyāsā' wēdībber 'el bēnē(y) Yisrā'ēl 'eṭ' 'āšer yēšumwe(b)*, "and he (Moses, after receiving Yahweh's commands) used to come out and tell the Israelites what he had been commanded;" cf. also Num. 3: 16, 36: 2 (all P); Lev. 8: 35, 10: 13.

Ezek. 12: 7, *wā'a'as kēn ka'āšer šumwēṭī*, "and I did so, as I had been commanded;" also 24: 18, 37: 7.²

45. 'al *tāhōs 'al*, said of the eye: "do not look fondly upon," in the Joseph Story, 45: 20.

Isa. 13: 18, (of the Medes who are to overthrow the Neo-Babylonian empire) *ūpēri ḥeṭen lō' yērahēmū 'al bānīm lō' tāhūs'ē(y)nām*, "on the fruit of the womb they have no mercy, on sons they do not look with pity."

Deut. 7: 16 ("you shall devour all the people Yahweh your god gives you) *lō' tāhōs 'ē(y) nekā 'ālēhem*, you are not to look upon them favourably;" also 13: 9, 19: 13, 21, 25: 12; Ezek. 5: 11, 7: 4, 9, 8: 18, 9: 5, 10, 16: 5, 20: 17.³

46. √PWG, "to become numb," in the Joseph Story 45: 26.

Hab. 1: 4, ("strife and contention arise) 'al *kēn tāpūg tōrā(b) wēlō' yēšē' lānešab mišpāt*, therefore law is ineffectual, and justice never goes

¹ If correctly read; at various times 'ōtā(b) *šumwēṭī*, "I have commanded it," and wē'attā(b) *šumwē'ōtām*, "you command them," have been suggested: Gunkel *Gen.*, 281. König (*Gen.*, 722), perhaps rightly, favours the reading of MT.

² K-B¹ (1953), 797; Giesebrecht, *op. cit.*, 266 n. 2; Kuenen, *op. cit.*, 328; Procksch (*Gen.*, 252) assigns the verse to P.

³ Skinner *Gen.*, 489.

forth;" cf. also Ps. 38: 9, and perhaps Ps. 77: 3, and 88: 16; common in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.¹

47. *gēwiyā(b)*, "(living) body," in the Joseph Story, 47: 18.

Neh. 9: 37, *wē'al gēwiyōtēnū mōšēlim ūbibhemtēnū*, "they (foreign kings) rule over our bodies and our cattle..."

Ezek. 1: 11, *ūšētayim mēkassōt 'eṭ gēwiyōtēhenā(b)*, "and two wings covered their bodies;" cf. vs. 23, Dan. 10: 6. Elsewhere, in earlier literature, the word is used of a corpse. In Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic it is used of a live creature, or an "inner" body.²

48. *lāmā(b)*, meaning "lest," in the Joseph Story 47: 19; common in Late Hebrew and Aramaic.³

49. *ḥōq*, meaning "stipend, allowance;"⁴ in the Joseph Story 47: 22.

Ezek. 16: 27, (Yahweh to Jerusalem) *wēbinnē(b) nāṭīti yādī 'alayik wā'egra' ḥuqqēk*, "see, I stretched out my hand against you, and lessened your allowance (in punishment)."

Prov. 30: 8, "(give me neither poverty nor riches) *baṭrīpēni leḥem ḥuqqī*, feed me only the bread of my allotment;" cf. 31: 15.

In P this word is commonly used to designate what the prescribed due is for the priests from the offerings.⁵

50. *ḥē*, "behold!"; in the Joseph Story, 47: 23; elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew only Gen. 16: 43. Common in Aramaic.⁶

51. *rōpe(b)*, "doctor," in the Joseph Story, 50: 17.

2 Chron. 16: 12, *wēgam bēḥolyō lō' dāraš 'eṭ YHWH ki bārōpē'im*, "even then, in spite of his sickness, he did not consult Yahweh, but doctors."

52. *'onnā*, "I implore!"; in the Joseph Story, 50: 17.

2 Ki. 20: 3, (Hezekiah to Yahweh) *'onnā YHWH zēkār nā' 'eṭ 'āšer hiṭballakṭi lēpānekā bē'ēmeṭ*, "I implore you, Yahweh! Please remember how I conscientiously behaved before you!" Also Dan. 9: 4, Jon. 1: 14, 4: 2; Ps. 116: 4, 16, 118: 25; Neh. 1: 5, 11.⁷

¹ Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 1138 f.; Giesebrecht, *op. cit.*, 237.

² Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 220 f.; Holzinger *Gen.*, 252; cf. S. Talmon, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961), 361.

³ S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1913), 158; G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1957), 83.

⁴ On this word see J. van der Ploeg, *CBQ* 12 (1950), 252; Z. W. Falk, *JSS* 5 (1960), 350 ff.

⁵ K-B³ (1967), 332, s.v. 3; *BDB*, 349(b), s.v. 4; cf. Holzinger *Gen.*, 250; Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 438(b).

⁶ Dan. 2: 43; Jastrow, *op. cit.*, 328(a).

⁷ In Ex. 32: 31 probably read with the Samaritan *hinnē(b)*.

To this list could be added a number of words and expressions which, although occurring in early books, seem to occur rather more frequently in later Hebrew literature; e.g. *'ōraḥ*, "traveller" (*'ōrēḥā(b)*, "caravan" in 37: 25), in the plural "caravan" in Job. 6: 18, 19; Isa. 21: 13; *biglal*, "on account of" (39: 5), in Gen. 12: 13, 30: 27; Deut. 1: 37, 15: 10, 18: 12; 1 Ki. 14: 16; Jer. 11: 17, 15: 4; Mi. 3: 12; *kē*-with participle in place of a temporal clause (40: 10), cf. Mishnaic Hebrew; ¹ $\sqrt{P'M}$, "to beat, thrust" (41: 8), in Jud. 13: 25, Ps. 77: 5, Dan. 2: 1, 3; $\sqrt{RW\mathfrak{S}}$, in the hiph'il (41: 14), in 1 Sam. 17: 7, 2 Ki. 23: 12, 2 Chron. 35: 13, Ps. 68: 32, Jer. 49: 19, 50: 44; *'al* in an absolute construction, meaning "with respect to" (41: 32), in Ex. 22: 8, Lev. 4: 14, 5: 5, 22, 26, Num. 6: 11, Ruth 4: 7, Neh. 9: 33, 13: 26, Dan. 9: 14; ² *pāqīd*, "deputy" (41: 34), found in Jer., Neh., Chron., Esther, and once in Jud.; *nāṭan (lē)raḥāmim (līpnē[y])*, "to put one in the good graces of" (43: 14), in Deut. 13: 18, 1 Ki. 8: 50, 2 Chron. 30: 9, Jer. 42: 12, Neh. 1: 11, Dan. 1: 9, Ps. 106: 46; $\sqrt{BW'}$ in the hoph'al (43: 18), which is used extensively in Lev., 2 Ki., Jer., Ezek., and Chron.; ³ *mīhyā(b)*, "life-preserver, sustenance" (45: 5), in Jud. 6: 4, 17: 10, Lev. 13: 10, 24, 2 Chron. 14: 12, Ezra 9: 8, 9.⁴

The foregoing examples comprise an empirical statement about the vocabulary of the Joseph Story. One is not justified solely on the basis of this list in concluding that in each case the word, form, or idiomatic expression is of late origin, or exclusively late in use, though in many cases such must be our judgment. It is the cumulative weight of the examples cited that is significant, since it suggests rather strongly that a close approximation exists between the idiom of the Joseph Story and Hebrew usage current during and after the Exile. It would be difficult to assign the cause to an "overlay" of redactional additions: the examples are too many and too evenly distributed for that. A further attempt to interpret this evidence must await the discussion of the date of composition of the Joseph Story, below p. 244 ff.

¹ Holzinger *Gen.*, 233; cf. Also T. J. Meek, *JBL* 79 (1960), 329.

² Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 208.

³ *BDB*, 99(b).

⁴ Cf. Heaton, *ET* 59 (1947-8), 134.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE JOSEPH STORY AS LITERATURE

"Nothing in the Ancient Near East can equal the dramatic portrayal of Joseph's career...", Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 23.

All commentators, no matter how far they diverge on the subject of its origins, are unanimous in their judgment that the Joseph Story is a masterpiece of story-telling, perhaps unequaled in Biblical literature. No apology is needed for so sweeping a statement. One need only investigate the extent to which the Joseph Story itself (and not simply the motifs on which it draws) occurs in midrash and paraphrase in the later literatures of the East to learn that it rapidly became one of the most popular of all Biblical tales.¹ Its lasting popularity betokens something deeper, viz. the profundity of insight and the skill in expression of the genius who authored it. The results of the unknown author's mastery of his craft can be appreciated without consciously reminding oneself of the devices used to effect them. And if the present writer exposes these devices to the glare of investigation, it is only to satisfy his own desire to know something more about the skills of the anonymous dreamer who so long ago conceived this wonderful tale. When, however, the writer reads the story for his personal pleasure, awareness of technique is a hinderance to enjoyment; he must again approach it with the naïvete of a child.

THE JOSEPH STORY A MÄRCHEN-NOVELLE

To understand and appreciate the Joseph Story one does not need to know the names of the characters, nor, with the possible exception

¹ Cf. A. W. Argyle, *ET* 67 (1956), 199 ff.; H. R. Brongers, *De Jozefgeschiedenis bij Joden, Christenen, en Mohammedanen* (Wageningen, 1962); R. Graves and R. Patai, *Hebrew Myths: the Book of Genesis* (New York, 1963); E. Hilscher, *MIOF* 4 (1956), 81 ff.; H. Prebatsch, *Die Josephgeschichte in der Weltliteratur* (Breslau, 1937); Ruppert *JEG*, 239 ff.; S. Raeder, *Evangelische Theologie* 26 (1966), 169 ff.; A. Schulz, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 15 ff.; A. Van Seters, *The Use of the Joseph Story in Scripture* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va; 1965); V. Vikentiev, *Bull. of the Faculty of Arts* (Cairo University, 1955), 111 ff.; J. Zandee, *Vig. Chr.* 15 (1961), 193 ff.

of the Egyptian setting of chapters 39-41, the locale of the tale. Toponyms are very rare;¹ indeed those few which do occur (e.g. Hebron in 37: 14, Heliopolis in 41: 45) are incidental to the plot, and look for all the world like the appendages with which an interested reader who was trying to read history into the story, might have glossed his treasured copy. Personal names are only a little more common. But even in the onomasticon Potiphar (and Potipherah) and Asenath occur but twice each, and Zaphnathpaneach but once; and elsewhere the Egyptian figures are designated by their functions, e.g. "butler," "baker," "captain of the guard," and so on. Even the Israelite principals could, without loss to the story, be called by terms of familial relationship, Jacob by "father," Reuben (and Judah) by "elder brother," Joseph by "youngest brother," etc. Herein the Joseph Story differs markedly from most other prose narratives of the O.T. The so-called "Court History" of David, for example, cannot be read without the personal names and the toponyms, cannot in short be divorced from a specific time, place and family. The same is true of most of the sagas in Judges, Exodus, and Kings.

The Joseph Story shares its characteristics of timelessness and placelessness with a clearly defined group of stories in the ancient Near East. The best examples come from Egypt and include the Shipwrecked Sailor, the Doomed Prince, the Blinding of Truth, and the first part of the Tale of Two Brothers.² Each of these enjoys no special setting, and rarely distinguishes its characters by personal names. In a sense they are "pure story" abstracted from reality. When compared with the familiar categories of the European folklorist, this Near Eastern genre appears to fall midway between the Märchen and the Novella: ³ it partakes of the timelessness of the Märchen, and the "real world" of the Novella, but the element of the marvellous in the former and the specific quality of time and place in the latter, are alike absent.⁴ In Biblical literature we sense the presence of the same type in such stories as Ruth, Esther, Judith, and Tobit; but there, as in

¹ N. H. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis* (New York, 1966), 212.

² Most of these have often been translated; cf. most recently, G. Lefebvre, *Romans et contes égyptiens de l'époque pharaonique* (Paris, 1949); E. Brunner-Traut, *Altägyptische Märchen* (Düsseldorf-Köln, 1963).

³ M. Lüthi, *Volksmärchen und Volkssage* (München, 1961), 9 ff.; S. Thompson, *The Folktale* (New York, 1951), 8.

⁴ Cf. A. Bentzen, (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, I [Copenhagen 1952], 234) who distinguishes between the "chimerical fairytale," popular among Indo-Europeans, and the "short story fairytale," popular among Semites; cf. also E. Jacob, *La Tradition historique en Israël* (Montpellier, 1946), 113.

the Joseph Story, a pre-occupation with the historical setting has begun to take hold,¹ and a "pure story" has taken on in varying degrees the earmarks of a saga.² This "historifying" of the form presents the critic with the problem of trying to decide whether an earlier "non-historified" version ever existed, or whether the original author thought already in terms of an "historified" composition for which he chose only the motif-patterns from the pre-existing Märchen-Novella literature.³ The many plot motifs, often of disparate origins, of this literary genre, pose the additional—and related—problem of the precise meaning of authorship. Did the Joseph Story come into being through the amalgamation into a cycle of separate, pre-existent, stories about a single character, as with fair certainty the Jacob Stories can be said to have done;⁴ or is it a *de novo* composition by a single writer, using current motifs, popular in his own time, which he alone and for the first time adapts to the figure of Joseph? Clearly the appellation "author" is more apt in the second case than in the first. Both problems have long been discussed; but the elusiveness of evidence and the remoteness of the period the literature of which is under discussion, have prevented justifiable dogmatism. One of the tasks in the present study which with modesty we may set ourselves, is to ascertain how the available evidence bears upon these problems. Does it suggest a "pure Novella," or historified tale; the gradual growth of a cycle, or single authorship?

THE UNIFYING ROLE OF JOSEPH'S DREAMS

The Joseph Story differs from the Patriarchal tales, not only in its length (nearly four hundred verses),⁵ but also in its form and treatment. The Patriarchal stories are short snippets of often unrelated tradition; the Joseph narrative is a short story and a united whole.⁶

¹ Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 248.

² Thus Gressmann's "Sagennovelle" (EYXAPIΣTHPION, 49) is a more apt term for the Joseph Story than "Abenteuernovelle" (*ZAW* 30 [1910], 17); cf. also Kirtel *Gesch.*, I, 243 n. 2.

³ Cf. Eissfeldt, *Kl. Schr.*, I, 101 f.

⁴ Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1, (1922), 58 ff.; *idem*, *Legends*, 81; A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (Paris, 1950), 138; even Gunkel, however, admits that the Joseph Story is not a chance growth by degrees, but is a skillful union of material "durch einen bedeutenden Künstler" (*ZDMG* NF 1 [1922], 69).

⁵ Von Rad, *Die Josephsgeschichte* (Neukirchen, 1956), 6.

⁶ Gressmann, EYXAPIΣTHPION, 48 f.; Mowinkel, *BZAW* 77 (1958), 130; Hölscher *Geschichtsschreibung*, 53; Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 49.

And the major factor contributing to this unity is Joseph's dreams, which are told at the outset of the story, and upon which the subsequent action hangs.¹

The dreams of Joseph in chapter 37 are usually considered to have been a feature of the E-version of the tale, while the coat motif is assigned to J.² If this be so, then the J version of the story must have differed radically from what is now before us in Genesis. For in the present narrative the dreams are integral to the plot. They provide the motivation for the brothers' act of violence, and the guide-lines for the entire story, intent, as it is, upon showing how despite the inherent improbability the dreams were literally fulfilled. Indeed, the basic motif underlying the Joseph Story, viz. that of the boy who had a dream of future greatness,³ takes its very designation from the dream, so indispensable is the latter to its composition. Remove the dreams from chapter 37, and the Joseph Story as a coherent whole is reduced to nothing.⁴

¹ Ehrlich *Randglossen*, I, 186.

² Gunkel *Urgeschichte*, 252; Pfeiffer *Introduction*, 169, 174; contrast Horowitz *JE*, 32 ff.; Ruppert *JEG*, 30; *idem*, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 4.

³ Thompson, *The Folktales*, 138.

⁴ Jensen (*Die Joseph-Träume* [BZAW 33 (1918)], 2 f.), who finds close parallels between the Joseph Story on the one hand and the Gilgamesh epic and the Thrinakia episode in the Odyssey on the other, admits that the dreams of the Biblical story find no correspondence in the latter narratives. He takes comfort, however, in this current belief that the dreams belong to E, the later source allegedly, and opines that what is primary, at least in the dreams of the butler and baker, is the element of revelation, which he compares with Enkidu's speech to Gilgamesh from the Underworld: "aber die Offenbarung sind in der Joseph Sage zu Traumdeutungen geworden und im Zusammenhange damit zwei Träume erfunden worden" (*ibid.*, 3). The bovine apparitions of Pharaoh's dream he compares with the Bull of Heaven (*ibid.*), and the Cattle of the Sun in the Odyssey (*ibid.*, 10), and the symbols of Joseph's future elevation in his boyhood dreams with the exaltation of Ishtar over all the other gods (*ibid.*, 4). An earlier form of the Joseph Story existed, he concludes, in which dreams were absent (*ibid.*, 7 ff.), and the principals were divine, not human (*ibid.*, 11). Besides being rather remote, these alleged parallels are fundamentally different in structure and function. Enkidu's revelation to Gilgamesh is information, Joseph's interpretation. Enkidu can speak of the matter only because he has been in the Underworld, Joseph because he is indwelt by the spirit of God. Enkidu's speech is a climax of sorts, for the readers' ears; Joseph's interpretation serves only to bring his ability to the king's attention, and is therefore simply a gimmick to further the plot. The cows of Pharaoh's dream have little to do with the Bull of Heaven. The latter is a monster—the fact that he belongs to the species "bull" is irrelevant—whose real existence is germane to the plot; while Pharaoh's cows are fantasy and function only as signs. The seven years of drought are merely indicated by the cows, but in Gilgamesh they are a prerequisite of the animal's coming into being. The

It has been suggested¹ that the second of Joseph's dreams, viz. that of the celestial bodies doing obeisance, is of non-Israelite origin, and was interpolated into the Joseph Story sometime subsequent to the original composition.² In chapter 41 also it appears that a weak duplication has produced a second dream of Pharaoh (vss. 5-7): the dream of the ears of grain is inferior in concept to that of the cows.³ Both verse 9 of chapter 37 and 41: 5-7 (cf. 22-24a) make poor joins in their respective contexts (cf. especially 37: 9 with 42: 22a), and are most likely secondary expansions of the basic dream motifs. If the suitability of the image suggested the dream of the ears, what suggested the star dream? The concept of celestial bodies paying homage to a great person is a known motif.⁴ Perhaps the duplication in chapter 37 was due to the needs of characterization. Joseph must be made to appear a presumptuous prig, and the portent of his future greatness must be insisted upon to impress upon the reader its certainty.⁵

The more appropriate of the two dreams, then, is the first one, viz. that of the sheaves; and it is probably the more original as well. Since Joseph was to rise to greatness through his prediction of a famine and on his ideas on how to alleviate it, the dream concerns itself with the reaping of grain.⁶ The brothers are not clairvoyant, nor gifted with powers of dream interpretation. But they do not need

similarity in images between Joseph's star-dream and the exaltation of Ishtar depends simply on the universality of celestial objects used metaphorically to suggest pre-eminence. On these and other parallels in motif, see further below, p. 87 ff.

¹ Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 54.

² Gressmann, *EYXAPIETHPION*, 18 f.; E. L. Ehrlich, *Der Traum im A.T.* (Berlin, 1953), 61; on vss. 9-11, see J. Göttberger, *MVAG* 22 (1917), 71 ff; cf. also Jensen, *op. cit.*, 4 f.

³ See below, p. 79 f.

⁴ E.g. Sennacherib: Gressmann, *op. cit.*, 18.

⁵ N. H. Sarna, *op. cit.*, 213; cf. Joseph's words to Pharaoh in 41: 32, where duplication of dreams is interpreted as a sign of the inevitability of the event forecast; Driver *Gen.*, 322. On the tendency towards duplicate dreams in Near Eastern Literature, see C. H. Gordon, *The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations* (New York, 1965), 64.

⁶ So Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 251; *idem Gen.*, 404 f.; Simpson *ETI*, 126; Ehrlich *Randglossen*, I, 185. Since the storing of grain in chapter 41 necessitates that the earlier allusion to it should take the form of an "agricultural" dream, the latter cannot have any significance for the historical development of the Joseph Story; for example, Joseph's dream does not represent a later stage in the development of an oral tradition in which the family of Jacob has now graduated to the status of sedentary farmers, from an earlier role as shepherds: so Gressmann, *op. cit.*, 14 f; cf. O. S. Wintermute, *IBD* II, 982.

to be; the purport of Joseph's dreams is abundantly clear.¹ Their sudden fit of jealousy is perfectly understandable within the context of the story, and it is probably wrong to read any broader meaning into their curt question, "are you really going to rule over us?"² The brothers' reaction to the dreams sets the whole plot in motion, and from this point on all interest focuses on the "if," "when," and "how" of fulfilment.

PLOT SYMMETRY

No one who reads the Joseph Story can help but be struck by the symmetry of the plot. Setting and roles appearing in the development are duplicated with subtle contrasts in the resolution. Thus Joseph and Benjamin are both "sons of old age," both fall at various times in the story into the power of their brothers, and both enjoy the protection of an elder brother. But Joseph is hated, Benjamin loved; Joseph the object of the brothers' malevolence, Benjamin the test of their reform. Again the scene in chapter 45 is at once the duplicate and the contrast to that set at Dothan in chapter 37. The last time Joseph was alone with his brothers he was a weak, powerless lad, and they tore his clothes off and threw him in a pit to die. Now, the first time they meet with him alone since that long ago day at Dothan, the situation is completely reversed. They are the destitute, he the powerful. What is the reason for the statement in 45: 1 that no one stood with Joseph when he revealed himself? To prevent the Egyptians from learning of his relationship to these Hebrews,³ or to prevent them seeing him emotionally upset?⁴ These answers both may be

¹ Cf. Ehrlich *Traum*, 59 and n. 1; Fritsch, *Interpretation* (Jan., 1955), 27; Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 335.

² The use of $\sqrt{\text{MLK}}$, "to rule," is sometimes taken as a conscious allusion to the historical pre-eminence of the House of Joseph in the northern Kingdom: cf. Lods, *Israel*, 178; also C. Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O.T.* (London, New York, 1907), 79; Noth *UG*, 231 n. 570; O. Kaiser, *VT* 10 (1960), 2 ff.; cf. A. Weiser, *The Old Testament, its Formation and Development* (New York, 1961), 124. This seems a little daring, however, since the use of such roots in the motif of the boy who gets to the top of the political ladder is quite understandable. True, in the Biblical account Joseph does not become king (was there perhaps another version of the story in which he did?); but the writer stresses his virtual equality with Pharaoh (41: 40, 44: 18). The motif of the boy who became king has been adjusted slightly to suit the broad requirements of the plot; now the boy merely becomes second-in-command, but $\sqrt{\text{MLK}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{MŠL}}$ are still appropriate.

³ Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 281.

⁴ Eerdmans *AS* I, 68.

partly relevant; but it is a fact that the removal of the Egyptian servants heightens the contrast with the scene in chapter 37. The Egyptians, through whom Joseph indirectly derives his power, leave him, and the situation recalls that encounter fifteen years earlier at Dothan: Joseph is alone with his brothers. How will they treat him after all that has transpired? Realizing the mercy Joseph has shown them, and the lesson he has taught them, how will they react? The keen sensitivity of the author will allow but an understatement, beautiful in its abbreviation, poignant in its innocent expression: "but his brothers could not answer him, for they were dismayed at his presence." That is all. The reader must imagine the rest.

Pursuant to Joseph's revelation of himself the brothers hasten back to their father with the news. Had they not also been the bearers of "news about Joseph" back in chapter 37? Then they came with a blood-stained garment, now they come with carts. In both scenes Jacob is persuaded by the evidence, and—a poignant touch—from the story itself there is no suggestion that Jacob ever learned of the fabrication of the earlier evidence.¹

IRONY IN THE JOSEPH STORY ²

Besides the mechanical skill with which the story is assembled, another element which unites the narrative is irony. The Joseph Story is charged with crushing irony in every aspect. Some of it is only incidental to the plot. For example, when trying to dissuade his brothers from murdering Joseph, Judah reasons "what profit is there in killing our brother and concealing his blood? Come, let's sell him to these Ishmaelites..." (37: 26). In fact his rhetorical question receives the answer he expects, but there turns out to be no profit either in selling him, since in the tale as it is now constructed the Midianites pull Joseph out of the pit and receive the increments of his sale. Again, in the interpretation of the baker's dream Joseph gives an ironic twist to the idiom *nāsā' rō's*, "to lift up the head;" in the interpretation of the butler's dream it meant to re-instate, for the baker it means to hang.³ The irony of the imprisonment of the blameless Joseph on the compromising evidence of his own garment must have

¹ On the secondary nature of 50: 15 ff., see below, p. 163 f.

² For irony in the Joseph Story, see E. M. Good, *Irony in the O.T.* (Philadelphia, 1965), 106 ff.

³ See above, p. 54.

struck everyone. Was it not also the false evidence of another costume of his which deceived his father and cleared his brothers? And was it not also to be apparel which the vizier Joseph gave to his reconciled brothers after the revelation of his identity, as evidence of his favour? ¹ Again, some of the presents Jacob suggested taking to "the man" in Egypt were ironically among the products carried by the caravan which took that same "man" to Egypt as a slave!

One of the distinguishing features of the Joseph Story which sets it apart from all other Patriarchal Tales is the pivot of irony upon which the entire plot turns. Love unwittingly produces hate, and the consequences of both provide the story with what Good calls its "overarching ironic theme." ² The excessive love Jacob entertains for his youngest child stirs up an equal degree of hatred towards Joseph in the hearts of his brothers. This is enhanced when they hear Joseph's dreams. Will you indeed reign over us, exclaim the brothers. Will I and your mother do obeisance to you, gasps his father. Let's kill him, plot the brothers, and (ironically) we shall see what becomes of his dreams! Dreams at home had been a source of endless woe to Joseph; but dreams in Egypt and Joseph's gift of interpretation worked to his advantage. He who only dreamed of sheaves, now dispenses grain to all Egypt; he who once had only to report his brothers' welfare to his father, now holds the welfare of the entire family in his hands. To this exalted expatriot, the grand vizier of Egypt, come the witless brothers. They know him only as "the man," or "the lord of the land," a suspicious and cruel administrator; but Joseph knows them as his brothers. By the customary act of bowing to their betters the brothers unwittingly fulfill the dream. As they had acted in a most unfriendly manner towards him, so Joseph now acts towards them. They will be "tested," he avers, but his words carry a double meaning. Ostensibly the account they gave of themselves is to be tested; unknown to them, it is also their character that is going to be essayed.³ One of the innocent agents in the test is to be Benjamin. Joseph effects a situation which parallels his own abduction: Benjamin is to be left alone in his elder brothers' power for a considerable time. Like Joseph, Benjamin is his father's favorite, and the brothers have as much reason to envy him as Joseph. How will they treat him? The end result of Joseph's contrived situation is to be identical with his

¹ On apparel in the Joseph Story, see L. Ruppert, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 3.

² *Op. cit.*, 106.

³ Von Rad, *Die Josephsgeschichte*, 18.

own experience: Benjamin is to be enslaved, and in order to bring this about Joseph has his cup "planted" in the boy's sack. By thus falsifying evidence Joseph has committed the same violation as that perpetrated by his brothers with his coat!¹ "Why have you returned evil for good?" is Joseph's ironic question, with apparent reference to the theft of the cup (44: 4). And a subsequent remark by Judah, viz. "god has found out your servants' sin" (44: 16) bears a meaning the speaker is quite unaware of. The brothers clearly construe the woe they think is about to fall on them as divine punishment. They are about to be enslaved. And yet the divine retribution does not come. Joseph declines to make slaves of them all. Only the thief need be detained; the rest may go free. But how can this be, for if god has found out their sin, divine punishment in a physical form must befall them! Strangely, this unexpected turn causes them even greater distress. They are anguished at the thought of their brother's plight and their father's sorrow. And so, for a heinous crime which they did commit the brothers go scot-free, while for the crimes of espionage and theft of which they were innocent, they are forced to bear a crushing burden of anguish.

The supreme irony of the narrative, and one which seems debilitating to the plot, lies in Joseph's revelation of the underlying divine plan. God had brought about the entire affair as part of a preconceived design, and it was he who had contrived to turn to good the evil the brothers had intended. With the knowledge that god was the real source of the action, the motivation of the actors themselves appears trivial. To what purpose the cries of Joseph, the grief of Jacob, the earnest persuasion of the brothers, or the concern over Benjamin? The revelation of divine instrumentality turns Reuben into a figure of unintended pathos. His courageous attempt to save Joseph was needless, his anguish at failure pointless, and his subsequent attempt to make amends by offering his own flesh and blood as guarantee for Benjamin at best pitiable. God had manipulated the principals of the drama like so many marionettes.²

THE PACE OF THE ACTION

Apart from the contrasting parallel scenes at both ends of the Joseph Story, there is a clear pattern of duplicate episodes throughout the

¹ D. Daube, *BZAW* 77 (1958), 38.

² For the alleged connexion between such passages as 45: 7-8 and 50: 20 and Wisdom Literature, see below p. 104 f.

narrative.¹ Some of these have been explained as the result of the union of two parallel tales; but the occurrence of pairs runs so deep that a conscious use of duplication by the writer must be postulated, at least in a large number of cases. Thus dreams occur in pairs; ² twice Joseph is confined, once in a pit and once in Potiphar's keep; the brothers make two trips to Egypt; twice request is made that Benjamin accompany them; on two occasions money is secreted in their sacks; on both trips to Egypt the brothers are granted two audiences with Joseph; two invitations (from Joseph and Pharaoh) are extended to the brothers to settle in Egypt. Within dialogues there is duplication: thus twice the brothers explain to Jacob why it is impossible to return without Benjamin; twice Joseph accuses them of spying; twice he is obliged to state his identity, etc.

The general purpose underlying this odd predilection for doublets is probably in most cases emphasis. The certainty of the dreams' fulfilment is thus stressed, as well as the stubbornness of Jacob, Joseph's determination to treat his brothers as spies, Egyptian initiative in making possible Israel's settlement in Egypt, and so on. But a second, and more immediately appreciable effect of duplication is the slowing down of the action.

Plot retardation is one of the staple devices the author uses to heighten suspense. An examination of the story reveals that at certain points the author deliberately reins in his steed, so to speak, and cocks a bemused eye at the poor reader whose brows furrow at the delay. Joseph just reaches the land of his enslavement when a chapter-length digression intervenes, and leaves the anxious reader to cool his heels for thirty verses. And when finally he learns, to his relief, that "Yahweh was with Joseph" so that the latter prospered, he is treated to two occurrences of the standard retarding device of Near Eastern literature, "Now after these things..." (39: 7, 40: 1). The first introduces his imprisonment; the second lifts the reader's spirit by an unexpected agent of hope—the butler. But the chapter ends with that hope dashed; the butler has forgotten Joseph. Chapter 41 commences with another retarding device, the explicit temporal phrase, in this case "after two full years." Thereafter, however, suspense is of negligible importance, and throughout the remainder of the chapter there is never any doubt about the ultimate elevation of the hero. Now interest centers solely on *how* he will achieve this end. Consequently the purport of Pharaoh's

¹ Gunkel *Legends*, 83; König *Gen.*, 694; Gunkel *Gen.*, 401 f.

² On the possibility of secondary origin for some dreams, see above, p. 69 f.

dreams is now the focus of attention. With the forced arrival of the brothers to buy grain the reader attunes himself to the immediate resolution of the plot in the anagnorisis. Yet it is at this point that the writer displays his consummate skill; for between this point and the actual revelation of Joseph to his brothers three chapters intervene! By the skillful use of doublets, one-sided recognition, the deliberate obstinacy of Joseph, the reluctance of Jacob, and the forced return of the brothers to Egypt, the writer postpones the scene of revelation, and creates a tension among the principals which can scarcely be paralleled in literature.¹ And none of the delays is forced, no retardation is unbelievable.

Two further means whereby the pace is slowed, viz. recapitulation and embellishment by expansion, deserve fuller treatment, and are allotted separate discussions below.²

Not only can our brilliant author slacken the speed of his narrative when he chooses, but he also knows how and when to accelerate. The trips of the Midianites and the brothers to and from Egypt, for example, hold no interest for him and are irrelevant to the plot; hence he passes over them in silence and moves on directly to what happens at the destination. Events taking place back at Jacob's homestead which are not germane are likewise eschewed by the author—a striking contrast to later manipulators of the story who, plagued by the demon of chronological completeness, blandly inserted unrelated anecdotes which quite break the spell.³ When the physical action itself is speeded up the writer can suit his syntax to the requirements of the new speed. In 40: 10 a series of short asyndeton clauses conveys some feeling for the fantasy of a dream wherein the blossoming of a vine and the whole fermentation process takes place in a few seconds. Again, in the succession of six converted imperfects in 41: 14 the reader easily senses the haste and excitement which attends the summoning of Joseph by Pharaoh. When the verse begins Joseph is in prison, ignorant of what has been transpiring at court. Then follows vs. 14: "and Pharaoh sent and called Joseph, and they rushed him out of the dungeon, he shaved, changed his clothes and came before Pharaoh," and after fourteen words Joseph has run the gamut from the most miserable surroundings to the most sumptuous court in the land.

¹ Hempel *Literatur*, 17. Of course the present position of ch. 38 is the work of an editor, but the rest of the means to effect retardation are original.

² See p. 71 ff.

³ Gen. 41: 50-2, 46: 8-27, and ch. 49.

RECAPITULATION

A device which has the effect of retarding the action, though this may not always be its sole purpose, is the repetition by one of the characters in a story of something already said or described before.¹ In poetry such recapitulation is to be expected, since a catchy refrain both pleases the ear, and also is a means of unifying the whole. Poetic recapitulation moreover will be verbatim quotation: meter demands such fidelity, and cannot permit any variation at all, much less paraphrase. In prose, however, cognizance can be taken of such prosaic facts as that the reader already knows the narrated event or speech which one character is going to repeat for the benefit of another, and so the mere fact of recapitulation is all that needs to be noted. When the writer of prose does in fact produce the same words a second time in the form of a recapitulation, the reader may suspect that he has some ulterior motive for doing so, other than the aesthetic motive of the poet.

In the Joseph Story recapitulation is employed rather more frequently than the reader would expect, but only in certain restricted areas. In chapter 37, for example, there is no recapitulation. When Joseph repeats his second dream to Jacob that fact alone is expressed (vs. 10). In chapter 44 there is no reason from the standpoint of furtherance of plot to repeat the words Joseph instructs the steward to say to the brothers when he overtakes them. The short statement "when he overtook them he spoke these words to them" (44: 6) is all that is deemed necessary.

In the short chapter 39, by contrast, there is much recapitulation; and here, for the first and only time in the narrative, the device is used in a shoddy fashion. For example, when presenting his reasons for declining Potiphar's wife's invitation, Joseph repeats almost verbatim the narrator's prose comments in the earlier verses (as though perhaps he had read them!):²

39: 6 "...he *took no account* of anything in his charge, and *everything* he had *be put* under his control."

39: 8 "...my lord *takes no account* of what is in my charge in the house, and *everything* which he has *be put* under my control."

¹ Cf. Gunkel *Legends*, 84 f.; J. Muilenburg, *VT Suppl.* I, 99.

² In the parallel translations which follow italics are used to indicate close approximation of wording, or identical wording.

Again, when the wife repeats her version of the encounter, the reader is exposed to *two* recapitulations, one to the servants, the second to Potiphar:

39: 10-12 (narrative)	39: 14-15 (to servants)	39: 17-18 (to Potiphar)
“On one such day he came into the house ... and she grabbed him by his clothes and said, ‘lie with me!’	“See! He <i>brought us</i> a Hebrew to insult us. He <i>came to me</i> to make love to me, but I screamed as loud as I could; <i>and when</i> he heard me yell <i>and</i> scream, he left his clothes with me, and dashed outside.”	The Hebrew servant you <i>brought us</i> came to me to insult me; I yelled and screamed <i>but when</i> he left his clothes with me, and dashed outside.”
But <i>he left his clothes</i> in her hand and dashed outside.”		

Even now we are not finished with the episode, but are treated to another redundant allusion to it in vs. 19: “and as soon as his owner heard the words which his wife spoke to him, ‘thus and so your slave did to me,’ he became angry.” Admittedly the falsity of the wife’s story must be contrasted with the truth, but must the author be so unimaginatively repetitive?

There is nothing like this redundancy in the remainder of the story. The recapitulation by the butler of the prison incident (41: 9-12) in lieu of a statement that he recounted it to Pharaoh, is necessary; since, after he has forgotten for such a long time, the reader wonders about the state of his memory, and perhaps suspects some degree of distortion in his account. But no; the butler remembers perfectly, and gives a glowing account of Joseph.

40: 2 ff. (narrative)	41: 10-12 (recapitulation)
“Pharaoh became exasperated with his two officers, with the chief butler and the chief baker, and he put them in custody in the house of the captain of the guard, into the prison, the place where Joseph was confined... And each of them had a dream in the same night, each a dream with its own meaning, the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt who were confined in prison.”	“Pharaoh became exasperated with his servants and he put me in custody, in the house of the captain of the guard, me and the chief baker. And we had a dream in the same night, myself and he; each a dream with its own meaning was what we had.”

From this point on the butler merely notes the fact that Joseph interpreted the dreams (without describing the dreams themselves),

and that the interpretation was later proven accurate by the turn events took.

If the butler’s recapitulation of the incident in prison can be justified, can the like be done for the repetition of the details of Pharaoh’s dreams to Joseph? Is not the writing at this point approaching the poor taste of chapter 39? No, it still has a considerable distance to go; for the stressing of Pharaoh’s dreams by presenting them twice to the reader in detail is quite necessary, it could be argued, since they introduce the major turning point in the plot, viz. the famine which results in Joseph’s elevation to power and brings his brothers to Egypt. Moreover the dreams are fascinating because of their bizarre denizens, and perhaps the author took a delight—and knew that his readers would also—in their detailed repetition. In any event the author chose to recapitulate, and the results are not nearly so embarrassing as those of chapter 39.

41: 1 ff. (narrative)	41: 17 ff. (recapitulation)
“Now at the end of two full years Pharaoh had a dream in which <i>there</i> he was standing beside the Nile. And from the Nile there were coming up seven fine-looking fat cows, which set about grazing in the reeds; and there were seven other cows coming up after them out of the Nile, bad-looking and lean, and they stood beside the cows on the bank of the Nile. The bad-looking and lean cows ate up the seven good-looking and fat cows. And Pharaoh awoke. Then he went back to sleep and had a second dream and there were seven grain ears coming up on one stalk, fat and good. And there were seven lean gale-blasted grain ears growing up after them. The seven lean grain ears gobbled up the seven fat, full grain ears...”	“There I was in my dream, standing upon the bank of the Nile. And from the Nile there were coming up seven fat, fine-shaped cows which set about grazing in the reeds; and there were seven other cows coming up after them, weak and very badly shaped and scrawny—I have not seen their like for poor quality in all the land of Egypt! The scrawny bad cows ate up the first seven fat cows, and they went inside them. But it was not evident that they had gone inside them, for their appearance was as poor as it was at first. And I awoke. I saw in my dream seven grain ears coming up on one stalk, full and good. And there were seven shrivelled, lean, gale-blasted grain ears growing up after them. The seven lean grain ears gobbled up the seven good grain ears...”

Two observations are in order here. First, the recapitulation of the first dream is expanded slightly by the addition of certain subjective comments by the king on how the spectacle looked to him. Otherwise

the two descriptions differ slightly in choice of adjectives,¹ and in the frequency of their use. Such elegant variation as this is fully explicable on psychological grounds: Pharaoh, like most people recalling a dream, waxes hyperbolic at the memory of the fantastic images.

Second, the re-telling of the dream of the grain ears is almost word-for-word the same as the original narrative, the principal divergence being the addition in the recapitulation of the gloss *šēnumōt*. This lack of original variation in the re-telling must be construed with the poor joins made by the recapitulation of the second dream in its present context (above, p. 70 f.). At the beginning of vs. 22 there is no reference to going back to sleep in MT (as there is in the narrative in vs. 5); and in 24b there is an abrupt change of scene without warning. Some scholars have on the basis of the inferior imagery of the second dream, declared it to be secondary to the basic "swallowing" motif.² One possible explanation of the anomalous character of the second dream is a staged expansion of an original dream motif. 1. The story at first contained but one dream of Pharaoh, that of the cows, which was first recounted, as in the case of the similar dream of Nebuchadrezzar in Daniel,³ in what is now the recapitulation (vss. 17 ff.). 2. A narrative account of the dream was added at the beginning of the chapter in place of an original statement that Pharaoh had a dream which troubled him. 3. The second dream was fabricated under the influence of the dictum that double dreams are an indication of the speed and certainty of fulfilment (cf. 41: 32), while the form it took provided an image appropriate to the fulfilment (under the influence of the dream of the sheaves in chapter 37). It was added to the narrative account at the beginning of the chapter, and here modifications were made in the existing context to accommodate it. 4. But if a second dream was given in vss. 5 ff., it would also have to appear in the recapitulation; and in the process of adding it there, a rather inferior job of accommodating it to the context was effected. Whether such an expansion would have taken place relatively gradually after the original author had finished his work, or whether it could all have occupied a short space of time during the one author's creative activity, is a moot point; but the latter alternative is by no means out of the question.⁴

¹ E. g. *yēpōt tō'ar* for *yēpōt mar'e(b)*.

² Gunkel *Gen.*, 434; *idem.*, *Urgeschichte*, 267; König (*Gen.*, 692 n. 2) is violently opposed to this idea.

³ Though in Dan. 2 it is Daniel, not the king, that narrates the dream.

⁴ We have been guilty above (p. 70) of applying the vague term "secondary"

When the brothers return to Jacob in Canaan after their first trip to Egypt, they tell him about what happened to them there, and reconstruct *verbatim* their conversation with the "lord of the land."

42: 7 ff.
(narrative)

"When Joseph saw his brothers he recognized them, but pretended to be foreign to them, and *spoke with them gruffly* ...

he said to them, 'you are spies! It is to examine the destitution of the country that you have come!' They *said to him*, 'No, my lord... *we are honest men*, your servants *are not spies!*' But he said to them, 'No, but it is the destitution of the country that you have come to examine!' They said, 'Your servants *are twelve*, we are *brothers*, sons of one man *in the land of Canaan*. *The youngest is now with his father, and one is gone.*'

And Joseph *said to them*, '... *this is how* you will be tested ... (19 ff.) *if you are honest men*, leave *your one brother* in prison, in the house where you were imprisoned, and you, *go, take back grain for your starving families*; and you are to *bring your youngest brother to me*, so that what you said may be proven; then you will not die.'"

42: 30 ff.
(recapitulation)

"The man, the lord of the land, *spoke with us gruffly*, and he took us for people spying out the country;

And we *said to him*, 'We are honest men! We are not spies!

We are twelve, brothers, our father's sons; one is gone, and the youngest is now with his father in the land of Canaan.'

And the man, the lord of the land *said to us*, 'this is how I will find out whether you are honest men: let your one brother remain with me,

take something for your starving families, and bring your youngest brother to me, so that I may know that you are not spies, but honest men. Then I shall give your brother back to you, and you shall have free access to the country.'"¹

Such a recapitulation is by no means out of place at this point. One must think of the contrast between Jacob and his sons on the one hand, and the reader on the other, in terms of the relative state of ignorance and awareness of each party. The reader (and Joseph) senses full well the irony of the situation; but Jacob and his sons are

to such expansions. Too often this adjective suggests an addition to a text by an editor; but in a Near Eastern context it may more often be applicable to the extemporaneous embellishment of an oral tale by a reciter, or simply to the modification of a current and popular motif by the author who uses it. On the possible use of the variants in the re-telling of Pharaoh's dreams as a source criterion, see below, p. 148.

¹ On the interpretation of the last clause see E. Speiser, *BAOR* 164 (1962), 23 ff., and most recently B. Landsberger, *VT Suppl.* 16 (1967), 189 f.

bewildered and dismayed, and have no idea of what is going on beyond a slight notion that it has something to do with their sin. The author revels in such a situation, and takes the opportunity to titillate the reader once again with the irony of it all by placing a repetition of the scene on the lips of the innocent brothers themselves! Once before the brothers had come to their father with information; but in chapter 37 this information and the evidence they brought had been fraught with deception. The perceptive reader, aware of the parallel, wants to know whether the rascals will again lie to their aged father. But this time they live up to their own evaluation of themselves; they are "honest men." We sense for the first time in chapter 42, both in the recapitulation and in the brothers' anguish (vss. 21 f.) that they are changed men.

There are slight variations in the brothers' re-telling of the encounter, but no blatant discrepancies. The differences can be accounted for wholly on psychological grounds: the brothers are motivated by the desire to confide in their father, but are anxious not to upset him. Thus they do not tell him that "the lord of the land" is unconvinced by their protestations, nor that he put them in prison for three days. Simeon is not in jail, but merely "remaining with" the man; and the threat that they might be put to death is replaced by a promise that all will be well if they exonerate themselves. Clearly, the brothers have no desire to "bring down" their father's "hoary head in grief to Sheol!"

On their return to Egypt the brothers try to explain how it is that they had not paid for the first lot of grain. The story they tell, though it does not quite agree with the earlier narrative account, is not seriously at variance with it.

42: 27 ff.
(narrative)

"When one man opened his sack to give fodder to his ass at the inn, he saw his money sitting there in the mouth of his sack."

43: 21 ff.
(recapitulation)

"When we came to the inn, we opened our sacks, and there was each man's money in the mouth of his sack."

A diligent harmonist might argue that the passage of several months had blurred the brothers' memory. But the writer's memory would not be blurred. We must ask ourselves whether he had any cogent reason for introducing such a discrepancy, and, if not, whether these

passages are material for source analysis. This question will be resumed in a later chapter.¹

A similar postponement must be made in discussing the longest recapitulation in the story, viz. Judah's speech in chapter 44. Here Judah reconstructs Joseph's first interview with the brothers, and tells how later the brothers remonstrated with their father.

42: 13 ff.
(narrative)

"Your servants are twelve, sons of one man in the land of Canaan; the youngest is now with his father, and one is gone."

(20) Bring your youngest brother to me, that what you said may be proven.'

(29) They went to Jacob their father in the land of Canaan, and informed him of all that had happened to them.

43: 7 ff.
(to Jacob)

"The man *questioned* carefully about us and our family: 'Is your father still alive? Do you have *(another) brother?*' We informed him to the point on these matters.

'Bring down your brother,

(3 + 5) You shall not see me except your brother be with you.'

(2) ... their father said to them, 'go back and buy us a little food...'

'If you are going to send our brother with us, we will go down; but if you are not going to send him we will not go down, for the man said to us, 'you shall not

44: 19 ff.
(to Joseph)

"My lord *questioned* his servants: 'Do you have a father or

(another) brother?'

And we said to my lord, 'We have an old father and a little late-born lad. His brother is dead and he alone is left to his mother, and his father loves him.'

And you said to your servants, 'Bring him down and let me see him.' But we answered my lord, 'the boy cannot leave his father. If he leaves his father he will die.' Then you said to your servants, 'if your youngest brother does not come down with you, you shall not see any more.'

When we went up to your servant, my father, we informed him of my lord's words,

And our father said, 'go back and buy us a little food.'

But we said, 'We cannot go down; if our youngest brother is with us, we will go down,

for we cannot

¹ See below, p. 150 f.

see me except your *brother*
be *with* you.'

(38) My son shall not go down with you, for his brother is dead and he alone is left, and should an accident happen to him on the trip you are going to take, you would bring my hoary head down to Sheol in grief.' "

(9) 'I myself will be his guarantor, from me you will expect him back; if I do not bring him back to you, and set him before you, I will have sinned against you for ever! "

see the man if our youngest *brother* is not *with* us.' And your servant, my father said to us, 'you know that my wife bore me two sons; one left me, and I concluded that he had certainly been torn to pieces, and I have not seen him since.

And you want to take this one too away from me; and should an accident happen to him

you would bring my hoary head down to Sheol in distress...' For your servant became the lad's guarantor vis-a-vis my father: 'If,' I said, 'I do not bring him back to you,

I will have sinned against my father for ever! "

In 46: 31 ff. Joseph informs his family about how he is going to present them to Pharaoh.

46: 31-34
(to family)

"I will go up and tell Pharaoh; I shall say to him, 'My brothers and my father's household which was in the land of Canaan have come to me.

Since the men are shepherds—they have in fact been cattle-men—they have brought their sheep, cattle, and everything they have.'

And when Pharaoh summons you and says, 'what is your occupation?' then you shall answer, 'your servants have been cattle-men from our youth to the present, we and our ancestors too,'

the purpose being that you may settle in the land of Goshen."

47: 1-4
(before Pharaoh)

"And Joseph went and told Pharaoh; he said, 'My father, my brothers, their sheep, cattle, and everything they possess have come from the land of Canaan; just at present they are in the land of Goshen.

From all his relatives he selected five and set them before Pharaoh. Then Pharaoh said to his brothers, 'what is your occupation?' and they answered Pharaoh, 'your servants are shepherds, we and our ancestors too.' They said to Pharaoh, 'We have come to reside in the land, for there is no pasturage for your servants' flocks, for the famine is severe in the land of Canaan; so could your servants settle in the land of Goshen? "

Joseph intends by subtlety and suggestion to effect his family's settlement in Goshen; ¹ so he instructs his brothers as to what he is going to do and what they should say when the time comes to meet Pharaoh. He will announce their arrival and stress the fact that they are cattle-men; then they are to be ushered in, and when asked, are to reiterate their occupation. ² In fact Joseph does not specify occupation, but does mention their livestock. When the brothers come before Pharaoh they not only say their piece but, like country bumpkins, blurt out the purpose of the contrivance, viz. that they should be allowed to settle in Goshen, which Joseph had confided to them, but had not intended them to reveal. It has no adverse affect, however, and the gracious monarch turns to Joseph and says in effect, "have these people looked after." An aura of the bouffo thus surrounds the brothers in this episode; but it appears perhaps by accident. We are undoubtedly misunderstanding the story if we read in at this point a conscious attempt to ridicule the brothers. ³ The reason for the recapitulation in this context is not to show the brothers as stupid farmers, but to elicit admiration of Joseph's clever attempt to enveigle Pharaoh into granting Goshen to the family.

EMBELLISHMENT

A writer, as he writes, becomes progressively confined by his plot. A sort of inevitable literary Karma plagues him increasingly, and as the crisis of the plot he fabricated looms up, the sum total of his free will creation heretofore virtually dictates the action to him. He is also restricted by his plot as to how much he can say at a given point. Any significant turn his story takes is like the passage through a treacherous mountain pass; the writer with single-mindedness gives all his attention to negotiating the track, having no time for the contemplation of his surroundings. But in those parts of his story lying between the restrictive crises, the natural pace slackens and the vista broadens. These are the open spaces which lie beyond the passes, where the view takes in the mountain crests and the deep

¹ Why they should wish to settle in Egypt is not clear from the story; was it not simply a temporary arrangement for the period of famine only? See the discussion on this point, below, p. 160 f.

² This is surely no subterfuge (Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 284 f.), but the truth. The interest in the passage lies in how the stipulation of their specialized training influences the choice of territory wherein they are settled.

³ On the identity of the author of this passage, see below, p. 160 f.

valleys far beneath. In such open spaces the writer can yield to his desire to examine at length the nature of his environs; and quite frequently his outbursts on such occasions will be characterized by hyperbole. This latter tendency is the result of some element of the superlative often inherent in an open space in the plot. For example: a sudden turn in the plot finds the hero of the piece at the top, and the story becomes redundant with superlatives, describing the absolute nature of his power, his unparalleled wisdom, the excessive and consistent adulation of all with whom he comes in contact, and so on. Or again, a crisis in the narrative produces a desperate situation, and superlative expressions again come into play, tumbling over each other in the author's attempt to describe the proportions of the imminent doom. Not only does a nuance of the superlative give rise to such redundant embellishment, but so also do passages which enumerate items, the exact number of which is not important. Thus for example in 45: 23, in a context listing the presents Joseph sent home to his father, an original "bread" has been expanded by the addition of "grain" and "sustenance." Again, in Ex. 1: 10-12, an original remark regarding the enslavement of the Israelites has been expanded by the specific mention of two towns, to which the LXX adds yet another.¹ Expansion by addition is by nature the proclivity of the glossator, and open spaces susceptible of quantitative lengthening are thus often his province. Open spaces which by virtue of their contents invite hyperbolic expansion, on the other hand, are the bailiwick of a redundant commentator. It is not intended to suggest that embellishment always signifies different hands; conceivably the roles of glossator and commentator could be filled by the original author himself.

Happily, the style of the author of the Joseph Story does not tend toward this kind of midrashic embellishment. If anything, the opposite is true, for the characteristic mood of the piece is one of brevity and understatement. Except for chapter 39, "god" is heard only on the lips of the characters in the story; the writer eschews the tedious, moralizing commentary which clutters so much of holy writ. To appreciate the strong emotion with which the narrative is charged, one must either attune his ear to the dialogue, or use his imagination; for emotional reactions of an extreme nature are passed off by the author's description simply and briefly.

¹ Cf. the present writer in *VT* 13 (1963). 414 f.

In some parts of the story, however, the reserved style is strangely absent. Both at the beginning and at the end of chapter 39 Yahweh's ceaseless favour for Joseph and the success he enjoys in consequence thereof evokes a tiring redundancy, as substantially the same point is reiterated again and again. In the telling and interpretation of the dreams in chapter 41 the speakers tend to exaggerate, or to repeat themselves. Thus Pharaoh declares that the emaciated cows of his dream are by far the worst specimens he has ever seen (41: 19); and Joseph twice stresses that Pharaoh's dreams have the same meaning (vss. 25, 26), thrice that a famine is imminent (vss. 25, 28, 32), and twice that it will be unusually serious (vss. 30, 31). The embellishment here is in direct speech, and can plausibly be ascribed by the reader to the tenseness and earnestness of the two principals in a time of impending crisis. But the embellishment in the remainder of the chapter is more embarrassing. In describing Joseph's elevation to power, the writer keeps returning to the scene of investiture, after ostensibly closing his description of it, no less than four times (vss. 41, 44, 45, 46)! A similar repetitive style is unmistakable in the account of Joseph's measures to ensure the grain supply (vss. 47-49), and, especially, in the description of the famine (vss. 53-57). Thereafter, in chapter 42, the reticence and brevity of the "normal" style returns. In 45: 4-15 Joseph has made his point long before he concludes his speech and kisses his brothers; but again the reader can excuse him on the grounds that he is emotionally overwrought.

If a psychological basis for redundancy and hyperbole can be found in direct speech, such a basis is conspicuously lacking when descriptive narrative is in question. What is the reason? Did Zeus nod momentarily? Were two or more parallel versions poorly amalgamated? Or again, has an independent commentator been at work? These questions, bearing as they do on source analysis, will be pondered at greater length in a later chapter.¹

THE MOTIFS OF THE JOSEPH STORY

It is most disillusioning for a reader, once having met and praised a plot in one context, to meet precisely the same plot in a form even more exquisitely wrought in a second context, and to be forced to admit that the latter exemplar is the more original from which the

¹ Below, p. 138 ff.

former was plagiarized. What, for example, are the thoughts of a reader, who has already idolized Lucian's *Ass*, when he reads Apuleius's *Metamorphosis* for the first time? In these hypothetical cases one is confronted, not merely by recurring motifs, but by conscious copying. Nothing quite so traumatic lies in store for the reader of the Joseph Story. Few of the parallels to be cited below are so close that we are warranted in casting a judgment of conscious plagiarism. Rather, it seems, the fund of motifs on which the Joseph Story draws was very much "in the air" at the time of writing, so that any author then living who was a child of the time could scarcely reject them, if he wanted an audience. The present writer, however, in no way wishes to commit himself on the question of plagiarism in the Joseph Story. He simply avers that on the evidence at present available the story shows little evidence of conscious borrowing. But some passages (e.g. chapter 39 and chapter 41) look very suspicious; and one wonders whether some day some new discovery will put us in the position of our dismayed reader who first glimpses Apuleius only after he has become hopelessly enamored of Lucian.

I. *The Motif of the Young Man Triumphant*¹

The motif which provides the underlying framework of the story is that of the youngest brother who, though hated by his brothers and oppressed by fate, comes at last to complete success.² Stories of young men who in one way or another supersede their elders and *ipso facto* (according to popular ancient logic) their betters, are very common in the Ancient Near East.

1. *Younger brother supersedes Elder*

Though born second, a young man distinguishes himself above, and sometimes at the expense of, the first born. Sometimes a prophecy tells that he will accomplish this; e.g. Abel over Cain (Gen. 4); Isaac over Ishmael (Gen. 21); Jacob over Esau (Gen. 25, 27); Ephraim over Manasseh (Gen. 48); Bata over Anpu (Papyrus *D'Orbiney*); Horus over Seth;³ Mursilis over Labarnas (Gurney, *The Hittites*, 171 f.).

¹ Thompson, *Motif-index of Folk-literature* (Bloomington, 1935), V, 5 ff.

² Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 66 ff.

³ In the ancient myth of the conflict between these gods, Seth is the older brother of Horus: F. G. Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth* (Liverpool, 1960), 12.

2. *Youngest brother supersedes Older Brothers*

The youngest son is deemed least likely to succeed and is somehow discriminated against. Often he is at loggerheads with his older brothers. By various means he achieves pre-eminence in some respect, if only in surviving when all his brothers are slain; e.g. Gideon (Jud. 6: 15, "I am the smallest of my father's house"); Jotham (Jud. 9: 5, "the youngest son of Yerubba'al"); Idrimi (Statue Inscription, 7, "my brothers who were older than I...");¹ Hattusilis (Apology, 9, 14 [youngest of four children of Mursilis]);² Hordedef (Westcar Papyrus, VI, 22);³ David (1 Sam. 16: 11). This last bears an arresting resemblance to Joseph.⁴ Like Joseph, David is young, and pastures sheep (1 Sam. 17: 14-15); he is sent by his father on a mission to his brothers (17: 17-18), and his brothers are nettled by his apparent presumptuousness (17: 18).

Apart from a vague resemblance in these examples, the motif of Joseph and his brothers, in its expansion through the addition of the prophecy of future greatness,⁵ and Joseph's dissemblance, stands (on the basis of presently available material) without parallel in the Ancient Near East. There are a great many later reworkings of the explicit motif in the Near East,⁶ and parallels from European folklore;⁷ but most of these are conscious of the Joseph Story.

II. *Dreams*

The principal device used to occasion the brothers' jealousy is the dream which portends Joseph's rise to power. Twice later on in the

¹ S. Smith, *The Statue of Idrimi* (London, 1949), 14; reading with Albright, *BASOR* 118 (1950), 16 n. 14.

² E. H. Sturtevant, G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathie* (Philadelphia, 1935), 64 f.

³ In the Westcar Papyrus three of Hordedef's brothers (including Khafre and Bauefre) precede him in story-telling, which probably means that to the compiler of these tales Hordedef was the youngest of the group. (In the Twelfth Dynasty graffito in the Wady Hammamat Hordedef's cartouche occurs behind those of his brothers Radedef and Khafre, but before that of Bauefre: E. Drioton, *BSFE* 16 [1954], 41). His tale, unlike those of the other three (whom he belittles), is of a contemporary and vital nature, and greatly interests Khufu.

⁴ H. May, *Journal of Religion* 21 (1941), 287; Ruppert, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 6 f.

⁵ Thompson, *Motif-index*, V, 43.

⁶ See above, 66 n. 1.

⁷ Thompson, *The Folktale*, 138 f.; J. Bolte, G. Polivka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen des Brudern Grimm* (Leipzig, 1937), I, 323 ff.

tale he lives up to the nick-name "lord of dreams" which his brothers had contemptuously applied to him, by correctly interpreting dreams of important members of the Egyptian court. A rudimentary classification of dreams in Ancient Near Eastern Literature shows a simple bifurcation between two groups.¹

1. *Dreams of direct revelation*

In this type the god makes plain to the dreamer (usually by word of mouth, less frequently by sign) what he wishes him to know. Dreams of direct revelation were a standard source in Israelite Prophecy.² This was also the dream-type hoped for by those who practised incubation.³ E.g., the dream of Thutmose IV (Sph. Stela, 8 ff.);⁴ the dream of Merneptah (Karnak Stela, 28 ff.);⁵ the dream of Danel (Aqhat i, 17 ff.);⁶ the dream of Lugalbanda;⁷ the dream of Nabonidus (Istanbul stela, vi);⁸ the dream of Ptolemy Soter (Plutarch *De Iside et Osiride*, xxviii); the dream of Abimelek (Gen. 20: 3); Jacob's dreams (Gen. 28: 12, 31: 10-13), etc.

2. *Symbolical or Allegorical Dreams*

Here the message is concealed within the relationship and identity of the various objects in the dream. The spoken word is either secondary, or entirely absent. E.g., the dream of Gudea (Cylinder A);⁹ the dream of Gilgamesh (V, i, 8 ff.);¹⁰ the dream of the chief of Bekhten (Bekhten stela, 24 ff.);¹¹ the dream of the Midianite soldier (Jud. 7: 13 f.); Nebuchadrezzar's dream (Dan. 2: 31 ff.); the dreams of

¹ Vergote *Joseph*, 50 ff; with literature.

² Cf. Num. 12: 8. It is interesting to note that just before the Exile a genuine skepticism about the authority of such dreams appears in Hebrew literature: cf. Deut. 13: 2, Zech. 10: 2 (Driver, *Deuteronomy* [ICC], 151); cf. also Ben Sira, 34: 1-8.

³ On incubation see T. H. Gaster, *Thespis* (Anchor Books, 1961), 330 ff.

⁴ Tr. *ANET*², 449.

⁵ Tr. Breasted, *ARE* III, § 582.

⁶ Tr. *ANET*², 150.

⁷ S. N. Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumur*, 237.

⁸ Tr. *ANET*², 310a.

⁹ G. A. Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumur and Akkad* (New Haven, 1929), 205 ff.

¹⁰ Tr. *ANET*², 82.

¹¹ Tr. *ANET*², 30 f.

Enoch (I Enoch, 83-90);¹ Ezra's dream (IV Esdras, 11: 1-12: 6);² Mordecai's dream (Esth. 11: 5-11).³

The allegorical type requires an interpretation, the symbolical none. Despite the fact that the first has no formal interpretation,⁴ all three pairs of dreams in the Joseph Story belong to the second category. Herein Pharaoh's dreams in chapter 41 differ markedly from royal dreams in native Egyptian literature, which belong exclusively to the first type.⁵ Indeed direct revelation is what one would expect to be vouchsafed to kings and heroes, and hence it carries with it an aura of the epic style. Symbolical dreams on the other hand may be had by anyone who has the imagination to read symbolism into an innocuous little vision of the night; and in consequence it is not surprising to find the symbolical dream part and parcel of the culture of the masses. In literature it attaches itself to the *Märchen* (as here), rather than to the epic or triumphal text.

III. *The Motif of the Spurned Wife*⁶

Stories which centre upon the rejected love of an older woman for a handsome youth are far too popular and diversified in ancient literature to elicit a common plot pattern or a common origin. The motif of Gen. 39, however, shows a particular variation of this universal theme which is unmistakable wherever it is found. The hero stands in a relationship of subservience to another (male) individual. The latter's wife desires the hero and makes advances to him, but is refused.

¹ R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford, 1913), II, 248 ff.

² E. J. Goodspeed, *The Apocrypha, An American Translation* (Chicago, 1938), 84 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, 167.

⁴ The interpretation is implicit in the sequel to the retelling of the dream.

⁵ C. J. Gadd, *Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient Near East* (London, 1947), 73.

⁶ Thompson, *Motif-Index* V, K 2111; M. C. Astour, *Hellenosemitica* (Leiden, 1965), 257 f. It seems to me to invite confusion to compare the self-castration stories of Eshmun and Combaba with the motif here discussed (so Astour, *ibid.*, 258 ff.). The motif of Gen. 39 arises out of what can only be described as a very common situation in human society, and self-castration is an extreme, though completely understandable means of proving innocence. Castration can also have cultic overtones, and it is not to be wondered at that mythology should parallel the human tale with one of its own. But there is not the slightest reason to read myth into the *Märchen*, and Astour is hard put to prove his thesis that "all these heroes (scil. in the stories about the rejected love of women) have this in common, that they belong to the cycle of the 'dying gods' of fertility" (*ibid.*, 259). Are the Greek characters "dying gods"? Is Gilgamesh?

In fear and frustration the wife accuses the hero to her husband of the very act for which she longed; e.g. Anpu and Bata,¹ Bellerophon,² Hippolytus,³ Phrixos,⁴ Peleus,⁵ Tenes.⁶

The hero usually escapes the expected death penalty,⁷ but in the Hebrew and Egyptian examples the means whereby this is effected seems shoddy. The narrative of the Two Brothers progresses plausibly with no recourse of moment to the supernatural, until the husband's reaction to the wife's false story. He then becomes enraged and sets off in pursuit of Bata, determined to kill him. No natural turn of the plot can prevent this, but the story-teller cannot allow it to happen. He must introduce a *deus ex machina*. Re intervenes, and creates a lake filled with crocodiles between the pursuer and the pursued. This gives Bata time to shout an explanation across the water to the frustrated Anpu (which the latter, oddly enough, accepts without question!), and thus rescue the story-teller. But the result is anything but satisfying to the reader.⁸ In the Joseph Story the hero escapes from the situation with an unbelievably light sentence. He is merely put in prison, although parallels make it quite clear that under normal circumstances he would have been put to death.⁹ Attempts to explain the anomaly on the basis of Potiphar's special liking for Joseph, or his distrust of his wife, are unconvincing.¹⁰

The real reason for the awkwardness of these two examples of the

¹ Tr. *ANET*², 23 ff.

² Iliad vi, 155 ff.; H. J. Rose, in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 134.

³ Lietzmann, *apud* Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1913), VIII, 1868 ff; cf further, Gunkel *Gen.*, 422.

⁴ Rose, *op. cit.*, 112 f.

⁵ Apollodorus iii, 13.

⁶ Pausanias x, 14.

⁷ Hippolytus is, however, killed by Poseidon.

⁸ From this point (7/4) on the character of the narrative changes radically. For the use of divine names, see below, p. 113 f. There are also syntactical differences: e. g. no *iw sgm.f* forms before 7/4, but eleven examples of this form following this point in the narrative; ten examples of the rare use of the conjunctive continuing a past narrative before 7/4 (1/5-10): M. Lichtheim, *Polotsky Festschrift* (Jerusalem, 1964), 2; F. Hintze, *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache neuägyptischer Erzählungen*, (Berlin, 1950), 61 f.

⁹ See W. Kornfeld, *RB* 57 (1950), 92 ff; cf. Ani iii, 13: "Be on thy guard against a woman from abroad, who is not known in her (own) town; ... do not know her carnally ... it is a great crime worthy of death ..." (*ANET*², 420); Onksheshonqy xxiii, 6 f.: "Do not make love to a married woman. He who makes love to a married woman is killed on her doorstep" (S. R. K. Glanville, *The Instructions of 'Onksheshonqy [Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the British Museum, II; London, 1955], I, 53).*

¹⁰ Cf. Rudolph *Elobist*, 156 f; Keil-Delitzsch I, 345; Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 199.

motif probably lies in its supplementary nature. The motif was probably never used as a self-contained narrative, but rather as an introductory device with which to begin a composite tale. Hence the dilemma is intentionally left to the solution of him who employs the motif: it is "open-ended" with purpose.

The Egyptian story of Anpu and Bata, being written c. 1215 B.C., is the earliest known example of the motif, and scholars are probably correct in considering it an indigenous Egyptian creation. The story of Potiphar's wife has usually been taken as a borrowing from the Two Brothers,¹ but this seems rather unlikely.² Most probably both are reflections of a common motif, emanating originally from Egyptian folklore, which became very popular all over the Levant.³

¹ G. Ebers, *Ägypten und die Bücher Mose's* (Leipzig, 1868), I, 315; Eerdmans *AS* I, 67; E. Meyer *INS*, 151; Driver *Gen.*, 336; Bentzen, *Introduction*, I, 241; O. S. Wintermute, *IBD* II, 984, *Lods Israel*, 181; Sayce, *ET* 10 (1898), 76 f; Gressmann, *ZAW* 30 (1910), 17; S. B. Frost, *Patriarchs and Prophecs* (Montreal, 1963), 35; Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 49; D. Völter, *Die Patriarchen Israels in Licht der ägyptischen Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1921), 77 n. 3.

² But not because of the minor discrepancies between the two. The most important of these are 1. Bata is the brother of Anpu, while Joseph is the servant of Potiphar; 2. Anpu's wife makes an advance only once, Potiphar's wife several times; 3. Anpu's wife has to fake the evidence, while Potiphar's wife is by accident in possession of Joseph's garment.

³ Among those scholars who have exercised caution in positing this derivation we may cite Holzinger *Gen.*, 232; Horovitz *JE*, 90 ff; Gunkel *Urgeschichte*, 260; König *Gen.*, 685; S. Morenz, *HO* I, 2, 200; Ruppert *JEG*, 57; Wreszinski, *Deutsche Rundschau* 199 (1924), 257. Astour's contention (*op. cit.*, 258) that "the Egyptian story (of Anpu and Bata)... is an adaptation of a Phoenician topic" rests on an alleged "Phoenician element" in the tale. For this he adduces three pieces of evidence (*ibid.*, 186 n. 4): the Lebanese locale of part of the story, the motif of the life of the individual being bound up with the life of the cedar, and the comparison of the Combaba tale with the slandering of Bata. The first may be dismissed forthwith: setting in a foreign land does not prove foreign influence. Sinuhe, The Sailor, the Taking of Joppa and the Doomed Prince all take place in whole or in part beyond the Egyptian frontiers, but the postulate of a foreign element in these stories does not follow *ipso facto*. Likewise the third piece of evidence does not command respect. The story of Combaba is preserved for us in Lucian's *De Dea Syria*, 17 ff, and the probability is that it is a late adaptation of the motif. Astour's belief seems to originate in a misunderstanding of the construction of the Egyptian story. As we have been at pains to show, the first episode of the Two Brothers must be kept separate from the remainder of the tale. Its pace and style are in marked contrast to what follows; (for other distinguishing features see above, p. 92 n. 8 and below, p. 113 f). The episode set in the Valley of the Cedar (for identification see Montet, *Kémi* 16 [1962], 78, and Goedicke, *JE* 52 [1966], 73 f) may derive something from Phoenicia, but this has yet to be demonstrated in the case of the introductory story of Anpu's wife.

IV. *Motifs involving Magicians or Wisemen*

In chapter 41 Joseph has become the wiseman who, through his god-given ability to interpret dreams, sees into the future and saves the nation from disaster. Stories involving wisemen or magicians were very popular in the Ancient Near East.

1. *The Magician as Entertainer*

A wise sorcerer (not always a royal minister, in fact frequently from outside court circles) is called into court at the king's request to relieve the ennui by the performance of some magic trick. In the course of the entertainment he may solve, or at least point the way to a solution of, a problem which has been giving the king annoyance.¹ The story is told merely for the interest which centers upon the magic tricks the sorcerer performs; in no case does he rescue the administration from an embarrassing predicament, nor is his wisdom contrasted with the king's incompetence. This type of tale is probably indigenous to Egypt, and is found especially in Egyptian literature during the classical period (first half of the second millennium B.C.); e.g., King Neb-ka and Ubaoner (Westcar, i, 17 ff.);² king Sneferu and Djadjaemonkh (Westcar, iv, 17 ff.);³ king Khufu and Dedi (Westcar, vi, 22 ff.);⁴ king Sneferu and Neferty (Pap. Leningrad 1116B);⁵ king Amenemhet II (?) and Sehtepibreonkh (fragments in Leningrad).⁶

2. *The Magician as an Object of Ridicule*

The tale is told at the expense of a wiseman versed in magic. The interest centers upon how he is worsted, and on the circumstances of his downfall; e.g. Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta.⁷

¹ Cf. Sneferu's courtesan and her lost ornament in the Westcar Papyrus, tr. A. Erman, *The Ancient Egyptians, a Source Book of their Writings* (ed. W. K. Simpson, translated by A. M. Blackman; New York, 1966), 39 f.

² *Ibid.*, 36 f.

³ *Ibid.*, 38 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 40 ff.

⁵ *ANET*², 444 f; the prophecy Neferty utters is of great historical significance for Egyptians of the Middle Kingdom, but in the story it is delivered simply to entertain the king.

⁶ R. A. Caminos, *Literary Fragments in the Hieratic Script* (Oxford, 1956), pl. 8 ff, p. 24 ff.

⁷ Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumer*, 232 ff; cf. Pantagruel's worsting of Thaumast in Rabelais, *Gargantua* (tr. Putnam), 306 ff.

3. *Bumbling or Timorous Wisemen*

Faced with a more or less serious problem, the king asks the supposedly wise courtiers for advice. They advise caution and a policy based upon temerity. The king opts for coming to grips immediately with the problem, and embarks, in blatant disregard of the advice given, on a daring course of action. The king proves successful; his courtiers' caution is shown to have been cowardly and ill-advised. In this type the wisdom of the king is contrasted with the witlessness of his human advisors. The motif of the bumbling wisemen is indigenous to Egypt; e.g. Kamose and his timorous princes (First Kamose Stela, 2 ff.);¹ Thutmose III and his cautious generals (*Urk.* IV, 649 f.);² Ramses II and his cowardly officers (Poem of Pentawere, 44 ff.).³ A related motif has the king taking council with himself alone and presenting his decision to the court which then breaks into spontaneous praise.⁴

4. "Minister so-and-so, vizier (or the like) in the time of king .."

An historical sage becomes the centre of a work of literature which may or may not contain genuine material, or which may or may not have an historical connection with his person. In this type the king under whom the wiseman served is mentioned (if at all) for no other purpose than to date the piece.

(a) "The Wise sayings of (minister so-and-so)". The old sage on his deathbed imparts the practical wisdom of a lifetime to his son. The historical setting becomes the framework around a collection of aphorisms; e.g., Ptahhotpe⁵ Hordedef;⁶ Amenemope;⁷ cf. also Onkhsheshonky⁸ and Ahikar⁹ wherein the historical setting is expanded by an independent narrative.

¹ *ANET*², 232 f.

² *Ibid.*, 235.

³ Erman, *Ancient Egyptians*, 265 ff.

⁴ See especially A. Herrmann, *Die ägyptische Königsnovelle* (Glückstadt, 1938), *passim*.

⁵ *ANET*², 412 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 419.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 421 ff.

⁸ Cf. Glanville, *Instructions...* (cited above, p. 92, n. 9); Gemser, *VT Suppl.* 7 (1959), 106 f.

⁹ Tr. R. H. Charles, *op. cit.*, 715 ff.; cf. *ANET*², 427 ff.

(b) A legend comprising a short anecdote, suggesting "...a cycle dealing with those human beings who, at one time or other of history, and no doubt with the connivance of Ea, revolted against the gods."¹

5. *The Wiseman as Saviour*

The examples cited heretofore do not involve magicians or wisemen who are indispensable to the well-being of king or country, and hence are not really relevant to the motif of Gen. 41. But a well-defined story-type does indeed exist which pictures the wiseman as the only hope of the kingdom in time of peril, much as the Joseph Story depicts Joseph.

(a) The Appearance of the Saviour. The land has suffered, or is about to suffer, a terrible calamity. In his distress over the situation, and his ignorance of the proper measures to take, the king encounters a wiseman. The advice this person gives, when adopted by the king, proves to be precisely what was required, and the impending catastrophe is averted.

It may be that this theme became common first in West Asian mythology, where it was a natural complement to the motif of the upstart, hero-god. The entire pantheon is frustrated by inability to deal with a monster, when along comes a young braggart of a god, a Baal or a Marduk, and by his strength and wisdom overcomes the monster, albeit at a price. From a mythological setting the motif could have been taken over into stories set on a human plane; e.g., David and Goliath (1 Sam. 17); Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 2); Daniel and Belshazzar (Dan. 5);² Amenophis son of Hapu (Manetho);³ Phritiphantes (Chaeremon);⁴ Djoser and Imhotpe (Sehel Famine Inscription, 4 ff.);⁵ Amenopis and the Potter;⁶ Si-osir (2 Khamois, ii, 28 ff.).⁷

¹ E. Reiner, *Orientalia* 30 (1961), 11.

² It is not necessary to assume that the author of Daniel wrote with the Joseph Story in mind (cf. Gunkel *Gen.*, 434; contrast Montgomery, *Daniel* [ICC], 185); it is more likely that both works, being examples of the same genre and belonging in the same tradition, drew upon a common store of imagery and vocabulary.

³ Josephus, *Contra apionem* i, 26.

⁴ *Ibid.* i, 32; in Lysimachus (*ibid.* i, 34) and Tacitus (*Hist.* v, 3) the role of the wiseman is taken over by the oracle of Amun.

⁵ *ANET*², 31 f.

⁶ See Maspero, *RT* 27 (1905), 22.

⁷ F. Ll. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis* (Oxford, 1900), 161 ff.

(b) "Disgrace and Rehabilitation of a Minister." In this case the saviour of the kingdom is a wise minister whom the king has known, but who has fallen out of favour in the first episode of the story. Usually, when the crisis looms, the king is forced to call forth his disgraced vizier from the dungeon where he has been imprisoned; e.g., Ahikar and a host of derivatives;¹ Joseph (in the odd little epitome of Ps. 105; cf. vs. 17); bilingual Babylonian proverbs (library of Ashurbanipal).² Variants of this theme concentrate on the wrongful imprisonment of the official, and sometimes on his subsequent reinstatement, without mention of his brilliant deed of statecraft. The "rags-to-riches" theme, or its reverse had greater popular appeal than the trick which saved a nation;³ e.g. the imprisonment of Jeremiah (Jer. 37); the restoration of Jehoyakin (2 Ki. 25: 27-30); the disgrace of Tobit (Tobit 1: 16 ff.); the exaltation of Daniel (Dan. 2: 48); the exaltation of Mordecai (Esth. 8: 15); the imprisonment of Onksheshonqy (BM 10508: 4, 5 ff.);⁴ the imprisonment of Hy-hor (Jar Text A, 4).⁵ The currency of the motif seems to be attested by the brief epitome of it in Eccl. 4: 13-14.⁶

¹ See above p. 95, n. 9; also A. H. Krappe, *JAOS* 61 (1941), 281 f.

² Reiner, *op. cit.*, 8; W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford, 1964), 241.

³ S. Talmon, *VT* 13 (1963), 437 f.; Heaton, *ET* 59 (1948), 135; L. A. Rosenthal, *ZAW* 15 (1895), 283; J. C. H. Lebram, *VT* 15 (1965), 170.

⁴ Glanville, *op. cit.*, 12.

⁵ W. Spiegelberg, *Demotische Texte auf Krügen* (Leipzig, 1912), 15.

⁶ Ruppert believes he senses a polemical tone in ch. 41, directed against Egyptian Wisdom (*JEG*, 72 ff.). He detects it in the fact that it is a foreigner, and a young foreigner at that (cf. Ptahhotpe's advice that young men hearken in order to gain knowledge, since none is born wise), that puts Egyptian wisemen to shame with his correct interpretation of the dreams. Moreover Joseph is anything but retiring in his manner towards Pharaoh, a characteristic which Ptahhotpe tries to inculcate in his son. Ruppert compares Late Hebrew Wisdom with its nationalistic overtones. It seems to us that Ruppert is laying too great stress on certain innocent features inherent in the motif itself. For example, the great wisdom and ability of the rehabilitated minister have to be played off against the witlessness of the court wisemen; in the Joseph Story it is pure coincidence that the latter are Egyptians and Joseph an alien. It is unfair to cite Ptahhotpe (late third or early second millennium B.C.) and compare him with the Joseph Story. Ptahhotpe is a document that gives practical advice to all and sundry on how to succeed in life, but the Joseph Story is a short story. If Joseph does not conform to Ptahhotpe's ideal, the same must be said of Si-osir, Onksheshonqy and the rest! But in fact, though verbose and direct, Joseph is by no means indiscreet or impolite in his discourse, and it is misleading to assert that Ptahhotpe's ideal is at variance with Joseph's image in the story.

V. *The Motif of the Famine*

The writer of the Joseph Story arrives at the most crucial juncture of the plot in chapter 41. How is he to effect the two necessary developments which can no longer be delayed, viz. (a) the exaltation of Joseph, and (b) the re-union of the family? The solution he adopts shows his story-telling ability at its highest point; for the self-same famine motif he has chosen to use at one and the same time results in Joseph's advancement and brings his hungry brethren to Egypt for food.¹ Of course this necessitates a slick piece of slight-of-hand; for what produces a famine in Egypt (viz. the failure of the river to flood) does not have the same affect in Palestine.² Nevertheless the writer can fall back upon the notion of a world-wide famine, or at least one which blighted the poet's "world," to make the passage easier and the trick more plausible.

Such world-wide famines, often of seven years' duration,³ are rooted in old fertility myths. Through the death of a god or demon, through divine neglect, or through sheer inability on a god's part to prevent it "famine was severe, nothing was produced ... the waters rose not high. The fields were not watered, there was no digging of irrigation ditches. In all the lands there was no vegetation, only weeds grew..."⁴

Outside the context of the fertility cult the world-wide famine took on an historified form. Herodotus preserves the story of the severe drought in Asia Minor: "...the story is that in the reign of Atys the son of Manes the whole of Lydia suffered from a severe famine. For a time the people lingered on as patiently as they could, but later, when there was no improvement, they began to look for something to alleviate their misery..." But after "eighteen years there was still no remission of their suffering—indeed it grew worse; so the king divided the population into two groups and determined by drawing lots which

¹ Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 64 f.

² Interestingly enough Zech. 14: 17-18 is aware, almost self-consciously so, of this anomalous fact.

³ Cf. the Canaanite seven-year famine tradition in Aqhat C, i, 43 (*ANET*², 153), the Egyptian tradition in the Pseudo-Djoser inscription, 2 (*ibid.*, 31), and the Babylonian tradition in Gilgamesh vi, 104 (*ibid.*, 85). In the latter Ishtar is represented as making preparations for the famine similar to those carried out by Joseph: C. H. Gordon, *The Common Background...*, 69 f, 88. On the number seven in ancient literature, see R. A. Carlson, *David the Chosen King* (Uppsala, 1964), 34; A. S. Kapelrud, *VT* 18 (1968), 494 ff.

⁴ Kramer, *From the Tablets of Suur*, 198 f.

should emigrate and which should remain at home..."¹ One wonders whether a connection exists between the drought Herodotus here describes and the legendary world-wide famine which was supposed to have occurred in the time of Erechtheus:² "Once when there was a great drought, as is generally agreed, which extended over practically all the inhabited earth except Egypt because of the peculiar character of that country, and there followed a destruction both of crops and men in great numbers, Erechtheus, through his racial connexion with Egypt, brought from there to Athens a great supply of grain, and in return those who enjoyed this aid made their benefactor king ... and the Athenians on their part agree that it was in the reign of Erechtheus, when a lack of rain had wiped out their crops, that Demeter came to them with the gift of grain."³ The reference to grain being transported from Egypt to feed the hungry recalls the shiploads of grain sent by Merneptah⁴ and Ammurapi of Ugarit⁵ to relieve the famine in the Hittite land. Could it be that some recollection of this serious crop failure in Anatolia c. 1200 B.C. survived in the legends recorded by the Greek writers?

If one is reviewing possible ingredients for the tradition of the world-wide famine, one should not overlook the Hyksos. The period of Hyksos domination in Egypt, in which the descent of Israel was traditionally placed,⁶ was a time of misery and want for many Egyptians.⁷ In later legend this aspect of the period was enhanced.⁸ It was

¹ Herod. i, 96; tr. by A. de Selincourt in *The Histories* (Harmondsworth, 1954), 52 f.

² Though according to tradition Erechtheus is supposed to have lived some three centuries before Atys: cf. Eusebius, *Hieron. Chron.* (ed. R. Helm; Leipzig, 1913), 44 f.

³ Diodorus i, 29.

⁴ Cf. G. A. Wainwright, *JEA* 46 (1960), 24 ff.

⁵ M. Astour, *AJA* 69 (1965), 253 ff.

⁶ Eusebius placed it in the one hundredth year of the domination of the Shepherds (Helm, *op. cit.*, 33), others in the seventeenth year of Apophis: Erman, *ZAS* 18 (1880), 125 ff.

⁷ Inscription of Beby from El Kab (H. Brugsch, *Thesaurus Inscriptionum Aegyptiacarum* [Leipzig, 1883-1891], 1528): "When many years of hunger came, I gave grain to the townspeople, (to) any who was hungry..."; Kamose describes the destruction he wrought in retaliation for what the Hyksos had done (First Kamose Stela, line 17 f.; *CdE* 30 [1955], fig. 15): "I left it (Avaris) destroyed, without population; I hacked up their towns, I burned their cultplaces, turning them into charred mounds for ever, on account of the destruction they (the Hyksos) had made in Egypt." For the well-known description of Hatshepsut describing the rigours of the Hyksos occupation and its aftermath, see Breasted *ARE* II, § 330.

⁸ See J. Bérard, *RHR* 151 (1957), 221 ff.

in the time of Epaphos (Apophis?), it will be remembered, that the chariot of the sun approached too close to the earth, thus scorching it and producing a severe famine and epidemics.

VI. *Miscellaneous Parallels*

Some dubious parallels to episodes in the Joseph Story must be considered here. Like the male fertility deity (Adonis, Baal, Tammuz), Joseph, son of the "ewe" (Rachel), god of dreams and associated with astral phenomena, is slain by a wild animal (or is said to be), and his blood-stained costume is left as evidence. Down he goes into the Underworld (the pit), whither his mourning sister/wife (now historified in the person of Jacob) determines to pursue him.¹ In Egypt Joseph, a "depotentized" Aqhat, is tempted by Potiphar's wife, a "depotentized" Anat.² Like Khnum and his goddess-companions in the Westcar Papyrus,³ Joseph secretes a precious object among a quantity of grain.⁴ Like the Eloquent Peasant, the brothers are obliged to return again and again to Egypt.⁵ If some of these parallels appear convincing, we should not be drawn into the trap of assuming conscious borrowing.⁶ The author of the Joseph Story, like authors of all ages, had at his disposal a vast store of heterogeneous motifs, the very existence of which he was scarcely conscious of; and if he and the maker of myths should chance to have employed similar patterns, it may be only through the chance of vague similarity in subject matter.⁷

In this connection something should be said about the current practice of linking in some way the Joseph Story of Genesis with the

¹ For the so-called "mythological descriptive method" as applied to the Joseph Story, see H. G. May, *AJSL* 47 (1930), 83 ff; W. F. Albright, *JBL* 37 (1918), 111 ff; *idem*, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (New York, 1957), 241; Völter, *Patriarchen Israels*, 75 ff; A. Jeremias, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East* (New York, 1911), II, 64 ff.

² J. Hempel, *ZAW* 65 (1953), 116.

³ Cf. Erman, *The Ancient Egyptians*, 45 f.

⁴ Gressmann, *ZAW* 30 (1910), 17; Luria, *ZAS* 44 (1926), 118.

⁵ O. S. Wintermute, *IDB* II, 986; Gordon, *The Common Background...*, 113.

⁶ Many scholars have argued against Winckler's theory which, by most moderns, has been quietly laid to rest: cf. Meyer *INS*, 146 ff; F. M. Th. Böhl, *Das Zeitalter Abrahams* (Leipzig, 1930), 38 f; Horowitz *JE*, 115 ff.

⁷ Cf. the present writer in *Numen* 14 (1967), 209 f.

literary genre of Wisdom.¹ Von Rad² noted an arresting similarity in approach to, and treatment of, material, between the Joseph Story and the Davidic "Court History" of 2 Sam., and suggested that the interest claimed to be evinced by the Joseph Story³ in alien cultures bespeaks a period of cultural sophistication in Israel, a period of "the awakening of spiritual self-consciousness."⁴ Such would be the period of David and Solomon, the so-called United Monarchy. In such a period literature shows a new interest in humanity in general, in the development of the genre known as "Wisdom." Wisdom Literature finds its *Sitz im Leben* in the court, and takes as its immediate and practical end, the education of officialdom. The statement of the first clause of the last sentence, according to Von Rad, "needs no discussion." One wishes he had discussed it, for I find it oversimplified. For Ancient Israel the statement is usually treated as a truism, though the argument for it is largely a priori. What do we actually know, after all, of the court of Solomon, where this sudden burst of interest in Wisdom is supposed to have arisen? What do we know of the various strata of Israelite and Canaanite society in the eleventh and tenth centuries B.C. that we are able to declare without discussion that Wisdom arose in a court context?⁵ If Ancient Egypt can provide a valid analogy, we must, it is true, admit that many of the great Wisdom collections were said to have been written by men of the court.⁶ But

¹ Von Rad, *VT Suppl.* 1 (1953), 120 ff; P. A. H. de Boer, *ibid.*, 3 (1955), 57 f; C. T. Fritsch, *Interpretation*, Jan. 1955, 33; J. C. H. Lebram, *VT* 15 (1965), 170 ff; S. B. Frost, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 41 ff; J. Hempel, *Geschichten und Geschichte im A.T.* (Gütersloh, 1964), 194. The present remarks were penned before the writer had an opportunity to examine what J. L. Crenshaw has to say on the subject in *JBL* 88 (1969), 135 ff. With Crenshaw's views I am wholly in accord.

² *Op. cit.*, 120 f.

³ Gunkel *Gen.*, 397.

⁴ Von Rad, *op. cit.*, 121.

⁵ Too much, it seems to me, is made of the Israelite United Monarchy in its aspect as a break with Israel's past. I suspect that, were we to have fuller evidence, we should be astounded by the continuum between that type of Levantine society dubbed "Canaanite" and that which we call "Israelite." David was merely an Israelite who succeeded in ensconcing himself upon a Canaanite throne. We may cite parallels in the persons of Sheshonk I, a Libyan who took an Egyptian throne, the Amorite kings of the Twentieth Century B.C. who established Mesopotamian thrones, and the Chaldaean Merodach-baladan, who seized a Babylonian throne. In these cases there was no serious cultural break in the culture to which the upstart acclimatized himself, though his coming to power was undoubtedly an unparalleled event in the history of the race to which he belonged.

⁶ But Onkhsheshonqy was a priest, and not a member of the court; and in some of the tales cited above (p. 94 ff, under IV) the wiseman is a stranger to the king; and may come from any class: cf. Dedy, the Peasant, David, Daniel.

they after all were the intelligentsia, the writers of the day, and the heroes of popular romances; and to whom would anonymous collections be ascribed but to the class of people of whom story-tellers usually spoke? The proverbial material ascribed to Kagemni, Ptahhotpe and the others undoubtedly did not all originate with them, but as our texts specifically tell us were the creation of, and found their *Sitz im Leben* among, all types of people, even the illiterate.¹ Nor is Egyptian Wisdom aimed at potential officials alone, to offer them practical advice on how to run their offices properly and get ahead; but the effort seems directed toward giving advice to *all* classes. Thus Ptahhotpe addresses not only officials, but messengers, poor men, newly-weds, prospective fathers, “nouveaux riches,” servants and peasants. Ani and Amenemope, with their strong emphasis on piety have no such practical aims as Ptahhotpe, but offer counsel to all and sundry. Onkhsheshongy, on the other hand, reflects the atmosphere of a small town, and seems directed at a rural community.² It would seem more correct to say that the *Sitz im Leben* of Wisdom is the admonition of a younger person by an older, the “man-to-man talk” of a father to a son; it is the family, not the court.

In Egypt we have also a good parallel to the problem which must have faced David or Solomon of how to raise a competent civil service. When scribes of the Egyptian government wished to produce in their pupils a good hand, quick memory, and a literary ability, how did they go about it? They gave them lists of things to copy, along with model letters, arithmetical problems and hieroglyphic inscriptions; and when they desired more subtly to inculcate in them the social graces and good manners, they set them to copy the great works of classical literature—Sinuhe, the Instruction of Amenemhet, the Instruction for Merikare—and the popular, unwritten tales of the story-tellers—The Two Brothers, the Doomed Prince, The Taking of Joppa, Apophis and Sekenenre, etc. But the majority of these were already in existence, and their chief *raison-d'être* was simply entertainment with a slight admixture of the didactic.

Von Rad finds in the figure of Joseph in the Genesis story the type of wiseman which Wisdom Literature describes, *viz.* one who can

¹ The speeches which form the core of the Eloquent Peasant, and which deserve the appellation “Wisdom”, are uttered not by a courtier but by an unschooled farmer! Cf. also the aphorism in Ptahhotpe: “good speech is more hidden than the emerald; yet it is found with slave girls at the grindstone!” (see Erman, *op. cit.*, 56).

² Glanville, *op. cit.*, xivf.

speak and conduct his office well, and who is guided by “Gottesfurcht.” “Es ist das Bild eines Menschen, der seinem Wesen durch Zucht, Bescheidenheit, Kenntnisse, Freundlichkeit, und Selbstbeherrschung eine edele Form gegeben hat, und—möchten wir gleich hinzusetzen: es ist das Bild Josephs!”¹ This quotation from Von Rad seems a propos of Joseph in later folklore and midrash,² but it is hardly relevant to the figure in the Biblical story. Is the presumptuous dreamer of chapter 37 really characterized by good breeding? Is one who blurts out meaningful dreams to jealous brothers “a prudent man who conceals knowledge” (Prov. 12: 23)?³ Is the stubborn, bullying “man, the lord of the land” of chapters 42-44 a model of friendliness or good manners? Is this brow-beating tyrant who plays with his victims like a cat with a mouse, and boasts of his power to divine and of his relationship to pharaoh, a man of modesty? And how can we apply a term like “self-controlled” to a man who becomes violently angry one minute, runs out to cry the next, and finally breaks down completely when he can no longer continue the sham? Joseph once, admittedly, speaks of himself as “fearing god” (42: 18); but this is nothing more than an ironic cut at his brothers. He, an Egyptian to them, and apparently an unjust sort, nevertheless fears god; the tacit question centers on whether they, the brothers, who perhaps have more reason to, also fear god.

Good speech before kings and competent work in one's office recall us to chapter 41, and suggest that at least here the writer has in mind the paragon of the Wisdom Literature, when he speaks of Joseph. But the unmistakable fact is that nowhere in this chapter is Joseph's excellence of speech or superior counsel held up as an object of admiration. Both the butler and Pharaoh are impressed by only one thing, *viz.* that by virtue of *divine inspiration* Joseph can interpret dreams and thus forecast the future. Joseph's suggestions are extremely valuable, and are characterized by wisdom, but *only* because god has revealed it all to him (cf. vs. 39). Divine inspiration takes us out of the practical world of the Wisdom school, and into the realm of the story-teller. By its very nature it is miraculous, a gift of god, not a cultivated virtue. A man so gifted cannot be emulated.

¹ *Op. cit.*, 122; cf. Lachs, *JQR* 51 (1960), 47.

² Cf. for example how Joseph is made out to be a paragon of righteousness and long suffering in Post-Biblical literature (1 Macc. 2: 53, 4 Macc. 18: 11 ff, Ben Sira 49: 15, Wisd. 10: 13-14), and in Patristic Writings (Argyle, *ET* 67 [1956], 199 ff; Zandee, *Vig. Chr.* 15 [1961], 200 ff.).

³ Von Rad, *op. cit.*, 123.

Where in the Joseph Story is the hero depicted as a long-suffering, "silent" man, who can "control his spirit" (*mōšēl bēruḥō*), such as is idolized by Wisdom Literature?¹ In chapter 37, where he indiscreetly reveals his dreams, and bawls when placed in the pit (cf. 42: 21)? In chapter 40, when he complains of his lot to the butler (cf. vss. 14, 15)? In chapters 42-44, where it is he who causes to suffer, and thereby to display these very virtues? If such a question were framed of Joseph's role in chapter 39, however, the answer would almost certainly be in the affirmative; for in the incident involving Potiphar's wife, Joseph does indeed suffer in silence rather than betray his moral ideals. In chapter 39, moreover, the familiar figure in Wisdom Literature of the "foreign woman" (*'iššā[b] nokriyyā[b]*) puts in an appearance in the person of Potiphar's wife.² But, as noted above³ chapter 39 is a clear exemplar of the Spurned Wife motif, found elsewhere in Egyptian and Greek literature; and the other examples of the type show no special connexion with the Wisdom genre. This leads to the suspicion that the motif in chapter 39 has merely been utilized by someone, imbued with the spirit and style of a Wisdom writer, as an "object lesson;" and upon closer examination such appears to be the case. For chapter 39 stands out in the Joseph Story as the only passage embellished with "editorial commentary," and it is precisely in the commentary that Joseph's righteousness, diligence and long-suffering, and the faithfulness of Yahweh are stressed.⁴

If Von Rad is right in discerning the tenor of Wisdom Literature in chapter 39, he is also correct in seeing a close similarity between the theological concept underlying 45: 8 and 50: 20, and the strong tenet of Wisdom, that Man is ignorant of the direction god gives human affairs from behind the scenes (cf. Prov. 16: 9, 19: 21, 20: 24).⁵ Only twice, however, is this idea set forth in the Joseph Story, once in a passage which seems to be a secondary creation (50: 15 ff.), and once in a section showing signs of later embellishment (45: 5 ff.). Both passages smack of overstatement and the obvious, and, as stated above, to the present writer at least are unavoidably denigrating to the story as a whole.⁶

In conclusion, it may be stated that, in the present writer's opinion,

¹ *Ibid.*, 123 f.

² *Ibid.*, 123.

³ P. 91 f.

⁴ See Ruppert *JEG*, 51 ff., and above, p. 86 f., and below, p. 130 f.

⁵ Von Rad, *op. cit.*, 124 f.; Ruppert *JEG*, 66.

⁶ See above, p. 74.

Von Rad's thesis that a connexion exists between Wisdom and the Biblical Joseph Story is a misinterpretation of the evidence. If the person of Joseph in the Genesis narrative is a "Wisdom"-figure, we must describe Si-osir, or Hy-hor, or Phritiphantes or the Potter in the same terms; for they all play the same part, viz. that of "wiseman-hero" in a Märchen told for popular consumption. Such stories are mildly didactic, of course. But their function as simple entertainment looms much larger. In a broad sense Joseph, Si-osir, Hy-hor and the rest do resemble the paragon of virtue described by Wisdom Literature; but this is surely to be ascribed to a common, human ideal, widely disseminated throughout all strata of all ancient Near Eastern Societies. In our opinion the Joseph Story has passed through the hands of one (or several) who has himself been influenced by Wisdom teaching; but there is no reason to believe that the story *per se* originated in, or belongs to, the sphere of Wisdom Literature.

CHAPTER FIVE

SOURCE ANALYSIS: ONOMASTICON

“Eine Quellenscheidung in der Josephsgeschichte ist vielfach ein ganz missliches Ding.”

M. Lohr, *BZAW* 38 (1924), 27.

One gets the distinct impression after perusing the attempts which have been made to outline the literary history of the Joseph Story, that most source analyses have foundered in the later chapters, having successfully negotiated chapter 37. This may in part be ascribed to the chance that chapter 37 contains one of the most blatant discrepancies in the entire Pentateuch, viz. the contradiction surrounding Joseph's sale into Egypt; while the remaining chapters of the narrative offer no such obvious inconsistencies. But the root difficulty lies essentially in not accurately defining what is meant by the term “sources.” If we subjected Tatian's Diatessaron to such an analysis the “sources” we would eventually isolate should rather be called “component strands”; for they had originally comprised several complete works, now dismembered and artificially re-assembled to make up a new whole. The Documentary theorists, or at least those of a former day, seem to have in mind precisely such “component strands” when they speak of “sources”; and in chapter 37, at least, the term seems to apply. But if we analyzed, say, Rabelais' *Gargantua* for similar “sources” we should be disappointed. *Motifs* would appear with regularity, continually pointing the reader to contemporary European folklore, or mediaeval literature, but all thoroughly modified by Rabelais to suit his purposes. “Source analysis” in this case would be reduced to a folklorist's study of motifs. Again, if a textual student were to apply his specialized training to a conflated text of Gilgamesh or a classical work, his persistent probing would reveal simply *variant readings* of a single work. Far from comprising “sources” historically older than the work in question, such readings reflect merely the later textual history of the said work. Finally, let us imagine a student of Post-Biblical Hebrew literature attacking a *midrash*. Ideally he will be able to separate the work into text and commentary. Tatian's work was compilation, Rabelais' creative authorship; he who produced the conflated text

practised redaction, the writer of the *midrash* interpretation and embellishment.

Into which category does the work of the writer of the Joseph Story fall? Or can it indeed be so easily classified? Scholars, concluding from other parts of Genesis that the production of the Patriarchal cycle was basically akin to Tatian's compilation of component strands, have endeavoured to find the same techniques—even the same strands!—in the Joseph Story. But on principle the evidence must not be forced, least of all to satisfy some groundless presupposition. Surely in the case of any literary work the only way of uncovering the truth about its birth and development is by an empirical examination of all the evidence obtainable. It is one of the contentions of the present writer that in the case of the Joseph Story such an empirical analysis has not been allowed to speak for itself. Far too often in the past the haunting spectre of two intertwined strands, lurking elsewhere in the Pentateuch, has driven analysts to conjure up the same ghost whenever the rather rigid criteria of the theory suggest that he is present.

A “source analysis” of the Joseph Story must concern itself with discrepancies of an objective nature. Internal contradictions are most obvious, but anything which detracts from the aesthetic or narrative unity of the piece must also come in for its share of attention. As it happens, discrepancies will be looked for in much the same areas as the Documentary Theorist looks for them, viz. onomasticon, plot details and style.¹

But it is to be hoped that, without the albatross of that hypothesis about our necks, an internally consistent theory of the literary origin and history of the Joseph Story may be achieved, undistorted by the invalid conclusions a burden of presuppositions often brings. Afterwards, of course, the results of the analysis and the tentative conclusions arising therefrom may be compared with the Documentary Theory to see to what extent they resemble each other.

ONOMASTICON

I. *Divine Names and Epithets*

The first and most obvious criterion which offers itself for discussion is the variation in the designation of the deity. The postulate of a basic

¹ For a thumb-nail sketch of the criteria used in source analysis, see A. Bea, *Biblica* 16 (1935), 135 f.; Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 241 ff.; Proksch *Gen.*, 377.

distinction between passages of the Pentateuch which use "Yahweh" and others which use only the epithet "god" (*'ēlōhīm*), has become virtually an article of faith among Biblical scholars. The validity of this criterion is seen to best advantage in the contrast between adjacent passages (e.g. Gen. 8: 20-22 [J], Gen. 9 [E]; Exod. 13: 3-16 [J], 17-19 [E]), or between doublets (e.g., Gen. 12: 10-20 [J], Gen. 20 [E]). But it is doubtful whether it can be used to prove anything more than simple contrast within a circumscribed area. The assumption, for example, that all J or E passages originated in, and therefore can be regrouped into, two unified documents, cannot logically be derived from the empirical observation that parts of the Pentateuch use Yahweh, and other parts use Elohim. The distinction in the appellation of the deity does nothing more than point to the distinction between adjacent sections; it does not automatically prove the unity of all passages which share the use of one term.

In recent years, however, even the modest use of the divine names for purposes of source analysis has come under attack. It has been pointed out, and not without some cogency, that the presuppositions of the Documentary Hypothesis are not borne out by the use of Yahweh and Elohim in the rest of the O. T. Baumgärtel summarized the results of his investigation as follows:¹ "In den geschichtlichen Büchern kommt [Elohim] gegenüber [Yahweh] sehr selten vor, die Propheten vermeiden [Elohim] ganz. Ebenso Prov. Hi. Ru. Thr. Erst die Chronist hat wieder einige [Elohim] die jedoch gegenüber den [Yahweh] kaum in Betracht kommen." Segal, unsatisfied with Baumgärtel's work, set forth a more detailed investigation, on the basis of which he stated several possible reasons for the synonymous alternation of Yahweh and Elohim in the Historical Books, none of which, however, conformed with the Documentary Hypothesis.² He boldly concluded:³ "Now the results of our study ... have proved beyond a shadow of doubt that, contrary to the assertion of the Documentary Theory, the change of the names is not caused by a change of literary source or document." To the present writer this statement is a non-sequitur. What Segal has proven is only that the common noun "god" can, for the sake of "literary variety", sometimes be used as a synonym of the Personal Name "Yahweh." No one disputes this. It would be singular indeed if such a broad and common

¹ F. Baumgärtel, *Elohim ausserhalb des Pentateuch* (Leipzig, 1914), 78 f.

² M. H. Segal, *JQR* 46 (1955), 89 ff.; *idem*, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961), 75 f.

³ *Op. cit.*, 112.

designation as "god" were not found qualifying the name of a deity! But it would also be singular if some writers, either because of the demands of their material, or for some other reason, did not favour the proper noun to the exclusion of the epithet, or vice versa. The evidence in fact proves they did. Qoheleth uses only Elohim, the writer of Ruth only Yahweh. The Book of Deuteronomy favours Yahweh (though often qualified by "your god"), because the whole intent of D is to underline the covenant relationship between the specific, national deity and his people; Leviticus also uses Yahweh almost exclusively, since it contains ritual prescription, purporting to come in origin from the Israelite ethnic deity, Yahweh, and his people. These predilections, or whatever one wishes to call them, become characteristic of the four books, and if the latter were quoted *verbatim* as sources in a third work, would *ipso facto* become criteria for source analysis. The possibility, therefore, cannot be denied; and since the nature of Ancient Near Eastern writing proves such unannounced quotation to have been the rule, not the exception, the employment of occurrences of divine names and epithets in source analysis is entirely justified. Not that the divine names will prove to be an automatic "open sesame"; the ludicrous mistakes of early critics stem from just such an exaggerated confidence in their potential. But cautiously used, within a circumscribed area, they can be at least corroborative.¹

Scholars who have sought to invalidate the divine names as criteria for source analysis, have not replaced the hypothesis they hoped to have destroyed by any other plausible explanation. Cassuto,² in an attempt to explain the apparent absence of the name Yahweh in the Sojourn narratives, put it down to the author's attempt to create the impression that when Israel was in an alien land, far from the land of Yahweh, knowledge of their god was at a low ebb. Segal suggested that Elohim was used in Gen. 1 because by this appellation he was "generally known in the Hebrew-speaking world";³ but Yahweh-Elohim in chapter 2 in order to identify the creator with the god of

¹ Could it be, for example, that the reason why Elohim as an epithet and synonym for Yahweh is found in Samuel and those chapters of Kings dealing with Solomon but thereafter ceases, is because the Deuteronomic historian is from Solomon on working with different sources? In Sam. he seems to be using a history of Saul and David (the "court history"), and in Ki. he speaks specifically of a "Book of the Acts of Solomon" (1 Ki. 11: 41). Thereafter he refers only to the Day-book of the kings of Israel and Judah.

² U. Cassuto, *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem, 1961), 61 f.

³ *JQR* 46, 113.

Israel. Elohim was used in Gen. 9: 1-17 because this passage is addressed to all mankind; but Elohim is used in Gen. 17 because this is for the descendants of Abraham!¹ (Since the latter passage has to do with the covenant act of circumcision, allusion to the covenant deity, Yahweh, might not have been inappropriate). The substitution of Elohim for Yahweh in late Post-Exilic literature may be due to the desire in Judaism to avoid the divine name Yahweh;² (even though in Chronicles and Jonah Elohim and Yahweh interchange freely!). Such weak and subjective alternatives serve only to confirm one's confidence in the general reliability of the divine names as a guide to literary analysis.

Nevertheless, we are in danger here of succumbing to the fallacy of *argumentum ad ignorantiam*; just because the opponents of the theory cannot offer an attractive alternative does not mean that the theory is thereby proven. It would be most helpful to discover an analogous case, in which divine names are a direct and *prima facie* aid in determining the origin or transmission of apparently composite narratives. Preferably such an analogy should come from extra-Biblical literature.

Excursus: THE USE OF DIVINE NAMES IN EGYPTIAN LITERATURE

It is unlikely that a precise parallel will be forthcoming from Ancient Egyptian Literature to the Pentateuchal phenomenon of a single god sometimes named and sometimes designated by a common noun "god". The Hebraic device originated, if not in a monotheistic milieu, at least in a monolatrous one. The Hebrew Yahweh was to his worshippers "the (one and only) god"; hence the wholesale substitution of Elohim for Yahweh, almost as a second name, was a natural one. In Egypt, on the other hand, polytheism prevailed, and while any deity could be called "god" or "goddess," none could lay claim to be *the* god. Nevertheless alternation of a second name or epithet may possibly prove occasionally to be a sign pointing toward correct source analysis. In any event, an investigation of the phenomenon—if it exists at all in Egyptian literature—its scope and significance, could prove illuminating for O. T. study.

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, 97.

In the following pages certain works of Egyptian literature have been examined for their use of divine names and epithets. Märchen, adventure stories, myths and Wisdom texts are the categories which have been singled out for investigation. Poetry has been eschewed, since the rigid demands of metre make it *a priori* unlikely that the works of poets were composite. In any event, alternation of divine names and epithets in poetic texts was something desirable, and consciously striven for. The same conclusion may be drawn regarding stelae, both royal and private, which in many cases show metric form. Texts on stelae served an *ad hoc*, immediate, purpose, like the commemoration of a victory, building project, donation, etc., or the writing of mortuary wishes for a specific individual. Stelae thus did not lend themselves readily to the process of composition by utilizing pre-existent sources. The writer of stelae had rather a store of stock expressions which he used in appropriate places; and multiple designations of the gods were, if anything, a stylistic feature delighted in for its own sake, not accidentally achieved.¹

1. Märchen

(a) The Ship-wrecked Sailor²

Common Noun

Divine Names

- "They thanked god," 5, 143, 167, 176.
- "I offered a burnt offering to the gods," 56.
- "Look, it is god that has kept you alive!" 113.
- "I will have (various goods) brought ... with which every god is propitiated," 142.
- "...like that which is done for a god whom people love in a land far away," 147.

¹ It is significant that most of the examples of Egyptian texts Kitchen cites in an effort to demonstrate the inadequacy of the criteria usually used by O.T. scholars in source analysis, come from stelae or monumental texts: *JEA* 47 (1961), 163; *idem*, *The Ancient Orient and the Old Testament* (London, 1966), 117.

² Text in A. de Buck, *Egyptian Readingbook* (Leiden, 1948), I, 100 f.; translation in A. Erman, *The Ancient Egyptians, a Source Book of their Writings* (Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1966), 29 ff.

(b) The Doomed Prince¹

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
—“He beseeched the gods of his time for a child,” 4/1.	—“Then came the seven Hathors,” 4/3.
—“May god do what is in his heart,” 4/13.	—“As Preharakhty endures...,” 6/12.
—“She swore by god, saying,” 6/12.	—“As Preharakhty endures, by the time Pshu (the sun) has set...,” 6/15.
—“Look! Your god has given one of your fates into my power!” 8/5.	—“When Pshu shone forth,” 7/13.
	—“[Thereupon he] made offering to P[re?], in thanksgiving,” 8/6.

(c) The Blinding of Truth²

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
—“It had the tomb of the god as its scabbard(?),” 2/1, 10/4.	—“The ‘Isle of Amun’,” 9/2.
—“He had the appearance of a child of god,” 4/7.	—“[As Amun endures!],” 10/6, 11/1.

One of the characteristics of Egyptian Märchen, as noted above,³ is the absence of a specific time and place. Personal names and toponyms indeed, all proper nouns, are rare. Consequently divine names are sparse or completely absent, as in the Ship-wrecked Sailor. The Doomed Prince shows a stock oath formula, and a colorful expression denoting sunset. The Blinding of Truth also contains a couple of oath formulae, and one toponym. The seven Hathors are more akin to mediaeval fairies or witches, than to members of a formal pantheon.

¹ Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in Sir A. H. Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories* (Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca, 1; Brussels, 1933), 1 ff.; Erman, *The Ancient Egyptians...*, 16 ff.

² Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 30 ff.; translation in E. Brunner-Traut, *Altägyptische Märchen* (Düsseldorf-Köln, 1963, 40 ff.

³ Above, p. 67 ff.

(d) The Tale of Two Brothers¹

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
—“Indeed, he had the strength of a god,” 1/4.	—“Now when Pshu (the sun) set,” 5/7.
	—“Then his little brother prayed to Preharakhty...,” 6/4.
	—“Thereupon Preharakhty heard his plea, and Preharakhty caused a large body of water to come into being...,” 6/5.
	—“When the Aten shines, I and you shall be tried before him,” 6/9.
	—“When Preharakhty arose...,” 7/3.
	—“Then he took an oath by Preharakhty...,” 7/7.
	—“And Preharakhty said to Khnum...,” 9/6.
	—“Then Khnum made a female companion for him,” 9/7.
—“The <seed of> every god was in her,” 9/8.	—“Then came the seven Hathors...,” 9/8.
—“The seed of every god is in her,” 11/5.	—“A child of Preharakhty,” 11/5.
—“Swear to me by god!” 16/3, 17/10.	—“When Pshu arose...,” 14/6.

The Two Brothers belongs in part to the Märchen genre, and so specific gods should be few or absent altogether. They are indeed few in spite of the length of the list. Three occurrences (6/9, 7/3, 14/6) are stock expressions for sunrise, one (5/7) an expression for sunset; one (7/7) is in an oath formula, and one (11/5) is an exuberant assessment of the girl's origin (not specifically true, even though she was a creature of Khnum). And again the seven Hathors put in an appearance in their role as fortune tellers. Two passages only are left in which gods play an undeniable part; and both are at points of transition in the story. The first occurs at the point of juncture where the introductory episode of Anpu's wife leads into the remainder of the story; the second is the means of setting in motion the plot of the second half of the story. The first calls forth a miracle to save Bata; the second equally effects a miracle to create him a wife. Both passages are patchy and makeshift, and constitute the *deux ex machina* of the story-teller, at the

¹ Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 9 ff.; translation in Erman, *The Ancient Egyptians*, 150 ff.

delicate point of transition between the episode of the adulterous wife and the (originally) separate story of Bata the bull and how he took vengeance upon a faithless spouse.

2. *Adventure Stories*

(a) Sinuhe¹

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
—“The god mounted to his horizon,” R6.	—“...uniting with Aten,” R7.
—“...the limbs of the god coalescing with him who made him,” R7.	
—“The good god Senwosret,” R13.	
—“That able god,” C5.	
—“It was like the design of god!” B43.	
—“That able god,” B44.	—“Like Sekhmet in a year of plague,” B45.
—“He is indeed a god without peer,” B47.	—“Like the power of Weret!” B64.
—“They rejoice over him more than over their (own) god,” B67.	
—“He is a unique one, the gift of god,” B70.	
—“Is god ignorant of what he has ordained?” B126.	—“I gave praise to Montu,” B142.
—“God will always forgive one whom he has censured,” B148.	
—“O whatever god has decreed this fight...!” B156.	—“Embalming bandages in the hands of Tayet,” B192.
—“O good god, lord of the Two Lands!” B206.	—“Beloved of Re, praised of Montu, Amun..., Sobk-Re, Hathor, Atum, Sopdu, Neferbau, Semseru, Horabty, Min-hor, Weret, Nut, Harwere...,” B206 ff.
—“All the gods of Egypt,” B210.	—“The like of Re,” B216.
—“O great god...,” B216.	—“Thy Majesty is Horus...,” B218.
—“The god who ordained this flight,” B229.	—“Re has placed the fear of you throughout the earth,” B231.
	—“Aten shines through love for you,” B233.
	—“Beloved of Re, Horus, Hathor,” B237.

¹ Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in A. M. Blackman, *Middle Egyptian Stories* (Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca 2; Brussels, 1932), 1 ff.; translation in Erman, *The Ancient Egyptians...*, 14 ff.

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Name</i>
—“This god (the king) addressed me in a friendly way,” B253.	—“Beloved of Montu, lord of Thebes,” B238.
—“It was the hand of god!” B262.	—“May Re the Lord of the Two Lands, be gracious to you,” B238.

Sinuhe uses only the generic “god” (often referring to the king) except in passages which are clearly rhetorical. Thus in Sinuhe’s letter, in which the writer is trying to simulate the stilted epistolary style of the Middle Kingdom, divine names are liberally strewn about, especially in the introduction and farewell. In the quasi-poetical passage (B45-B64) in which Sinuhe regales his host with Senwosret I’s prowess as a warrior and ruler, Sekhmet and Weret occur; and in the extemporized hymn of the royal children we find Re. Elsewhere Montu is mentioned in the stock phrase “to give praise to Montu (the war god),” an appropriate act after the defeat of the Amorite champion. Thus the presence of divine names corresponds to the presence of the more stilted style of poetry and letters; while the narrative portions show a predilection for the imprecise “god.”

(b) Wenamun¹

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Name</i>
	—“The house of Amun,” 1/1.
	—“The great august barque of Amonrasonther,” ² 1/2.
	—“The letters of Amonrasonther,” 1/4.
	—“...what Amonrasonther our lord said,” 1/5.
	—“Now the gold belongs to Amonrasonther,” 1/14-15.
	—“[] Amun-of-the-Way,” 3/12.
—“While he was offering to his gods, the god seized one of older boys(?)...,” 1/38.	
—“Bring [the] god up (hither)...,” 1/39.	—“...bring the envoy who conveys him for Amun who despatched him!” 1/40.
—“When it (the darkness) falls, I will embark the god,” 1/42.	

¹ Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 61 ff.; translation in *ANET*², 25 ff.

² I. e. Amun-re, King of the Gods.

Common Noun

—“...while the god remained in the tent,” 1/47.

—“From whom then would they have got back the god?” 1/56.

—“He had me come, bearing the great god,” 2/26.

—“Now look, you have made this great god spend twenty-nine days moored in your harbour,” 2/27.

—“...and you shall receive water of the West, like the gods who are there!” 2/59.

Divine Name

—“Blessings(?) of Amun...!” 1/50.

—“How long is it since you left the place where Amun is?” 1/50-51.

—“...the letters of Amun,” 1/52.

—“The great august barque of Amonrasother,” 2/4.

—“Do Amun’s assignment!” 2/11.

—“Behold, in the heavens Amun utters his voice, and puts Sutekh into his mood,”¹ 2/19.

—“Now Amun made all lands,” 2/19-20.

—“There is no ship on the river which does not belong to Amun!” 2/24.

—“Amonrasother spoke and said to Herihor my lord...” 2/25.

—“You are stationed (here, only) to do the business of the Lebanon with Amun, its owner,” 2/28.

—“But as for Amonrasother, he is the lord of life and health,” 2/30.

—“(Your fathers)... offered to Amun, and you too are Amun’s servant; if you say, ‘indeed I will do it for Amun...’” 2/31-32.

—“Do not covet for yourself the belongings of Amunrasother,” 2/34.

—“...the officers whom Amun has assigned to the north of his land,” 2/35.

—“Amonrasother sent me his envoy, Amun-of-the-Way,” 2/55.

—“...the great august barque of Amonrasother,” 2/56.

—“...to pray to Amun for fifty years of life fore me,” 2/57-58.

—“I cannot imprison the envoy of Amun in my land,” 2/73.

—“...the city where Amun is,” 2/78.

¹ A thunder-storm breaks out.

“God” in Wenamun is used mostly as a designation of the cult image of “Amun-of-the-Way” (1/39, 42, 47, 56; 2/26, 27). The name of the image occurs more rarely, apparently only when a formal statement is required concerning the purpose of Wenamun’s journey (3/12, 2/55). Once “god” refers to divine power (1/38); “gods” is used once of foreign deities (1/38), and once of the dead (2/59). Amun is always called by his name, never alluded to as “god.” When it is necessary to speak of him in his capacity as head of the great temple-estate at Thebes, which was responsible for the mission of Wenamun, then his formal title “Amonre-King-of-the-Gods” is employed (1/4, 5, 15-16; 2/25, 34, 55). The same title must, of course, appear when the state barge is spoken of, viz. “the great august barque of Amonrasother” (1/2, 2/4, 56).

3. *Myths*(a) Isis and Re¹*Common Noun*

—“The spell of the divine god,” 131/12.

—“...who made... gods and men,” 131/13.

—“...she was choicer than a million gods,” 132/1.

—“She planned in her heart to find out the name of the august god,” 132/2.

—“(Where) the great god used to walk according to his heart’s desire,” 132/4.

—“The august god appeared outside,” 132/5.

—“...the gods in the palace being in his train,” 132/5.

—“The divine god caught his breath,” 132/6.

—“...his gods said, ‘What?’” 132/6.

—“The great god stilled his heart,” 132/8.

Divine Names

—“Isis was a wise woman,” 131/14.

—“There was nothing she did not know in heaven and earth, like Re,” 132/1.

—“Now Re entered daily at the head of the crew,” 132/2.

—“Isis mixed it (Re’s spittle) with her hand,” 132/3.

¹ Text in W. Pleyte, F. Rossi, *Papyrus de Turin* (Leiden, 1869-1876), pl. 131 ff.; translation in *ANET*², 12 ff.

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
—“O gods who came forth from me!” 132/8.	
—“...the seed which came into being as a god,” 132/10.	
—“My form is every god,” 132/11.	—“I am called Atum and Horus-of-Praise,” 132/11.
—“Have the gods’ children brought to me,” 132/14.	—“Isis came with her skill,” 133/1.
—“The holy god opened his mouth,” 133/3.	—“Said Isis...” 133/5-6.
—“...who placed the soul of the gods in it,” 133/7.	
—“...whose name the gods do not know,” 133/9.	—“I am Khepri in the morning, Re at midday, Atum who is in the evening,” 133/10.
—“The great god had no case,” 133/10.	—“Said Isis...” 133/11.
	—“Said the Majesty of Re...,” 133/12.
—“The god of gods has hidden it...” 133/13.	—“Tell it to your son Horus,” 133/13.
—“...an oath of god,” 133/13.	
—“The great god revealed his name...”	—...to Isis,” 133/14.
	—“Come out of Re, O eye of Horus!” 133/14.
—“Come out of the inflamed god!” 133/14.	
—“Behold, the great god has divulged his name,” 127/1.	—“Re lives!” 127/1.
	—“...because of the speech of Isis the great...” 127/2.
—“...mistress of the gods!” 127/2.	

Since this is a tale of the gods, it is not surprising that both divine names and generic appellatives should abound, intermingled simply for the sake of stylistic variation. At first glance it might seem strange that Re is mentioned by that name only twice in the narrative.¹ But upon reflection it is evident that the subject matter of the piece has influenced the nomenclature. The writer is aware that the story concerns Re’s *hidden* name, and subconsciously he refrains from using it himself, being content to substitute for it some such locution as “great god,” or “holy god.”

¹ Apart from the incantation at the end, and the two stereotyped phrases in 132: 1 and 133: 10.

(b) The Book of the Cow of Heaven¹

<i>The Maj. of this god</i>	<i>His Maj.</i>	<i>Re</i>	<i>The Maj. of Re</i>
	2	2	
	3 (twice)		
	7 (twice)	8	
		10	
13	12		11
		15	14
17 (twice)			19
			(The Maj. of the king of U. and L. Egypt, Re)
		21	20
22			21 (as 19)
			24 (twice)
			26
			27
29			
	34		
35			
36			
37			
38			
			41 (twice)
56 (twice)			
62			
63			
		71	
		79 ²	
		83	
		86	
		87	
		88 (thrice)	
		89	

The Book of the Cow of Heaven appears to be a composite work on considerations other than those of the use of the divine names and epithets. It begins with a long, mythological saga recounting the destruction of Mankind by the Eye of Re, in the course of which the identity of the Eye with Hathor, the beauties of the town of Yamu, a certain brand of potent festival beer are all accounted for aetiologically (1 to 25). Thereafter the episodes are shorter and the style grows less pleasing. The Book ends with a collection of magic spells, and rubrics

¹ Text in C. Maystre, *BIFAO* 40 (1941), 53 ff.; translation in A. Piankoff, *The Shrines of Tut-ankh-amon* (Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1962), 27 ff.

² From this point on all examples are in spells or rubrics.

giving instructions as to how they are to be used. As can be seen from the table, the free narrative style of the long first episode employs a variety of expressions as designations of the Sun-god: Re, His Majesty, the Majesty of Re, the Majesty of the King of Upper and Lower Egypt Re (in cartouche), and the Majesty of this God. In the less embellished portions of the work, from col. 25 on, the text displays His Majesty or the Majesty of This God (rarely the Majesty of Re) to the exclusion of the simple Re. The latter does occur at the end of the Book, but only in spells and rubrics. Thus the paucity or superfluity of appellatives seems to depend upon the extent to which a passage has received narrative treatment. But while it may be helpful in sketching broadly the literary development of the piece, the alternation of names and appellations is not a mechanical device which reveals underlying "sources".

(c) The Contendings of Horus and Seth¹

<i>Episode</i>	<i>The Eternal Lord</i> ²	<i>Preharakhty</i>	<i>Pre</i>	<i>Atum</i>
1.	1/2, 6, 7, 8	1/12	1/12	
2.				2/2, 3
3.	2/8, 12	2/11		
4.	3/3, 6			
5.	3/7, 4/2	3/10, 10		
6.	4/8, 5/3		4/5	4/12
7.		5/3		
8.	6/3	7/1, 2 7/8, 11		
9.				
10.		8/2, 6, 9		8/3, 5
11.		9/10, 11, 12 10/5, 10		
12.	10/12			
13.				
14.				
15.	14/5, 6, 11			
16.	15/3 15/9	15/1, 2, 3 15/9		
17.				15/11, 12
18.		16/4 16/5	16/5	

¹ Text in Gardiner, *The Library of A. Chester Beatty*, I, (Oxford, 1931); *idem*, *Late Egyptian Stories*, 37 ff.; translation in Brunner-Traut, *Altägyptische Märchen*, 93 ff.; G. Roeder, *Ägyptische Mythen und Legenden* (Zurich, 1960), 25 ff.

² *Nb-r-ḡr*, an epithet of the Sun-god in this text; "god" as an epithet of the same person occurs but twice in the text, viz. 3/13, 4/2.

Like the Book of the Cow of Heaven, the Contendings of Horus and Seth seems to be a composite work. The story concerns the court case of Horus vs. Seth, heard before the Ennead, or council of gods, the Sun-god presiding. The bone of contention is the office of ruler of Egypt, left vacant by the demise of Horus's father, the god Osiris. Broadly speaking, the over-all purpose of the scenes laid in court is to contrast the stupidity and boorishness of Seth with the cleverness of Horus and Isis.

The four names traced through the text in the foregoing table all belong properly to the Sun-god; but in the present story the last, "Atum," is singled out and applied to a separate actor, an august "judge of the supreme court" who is not always present at the trial. The third name, Pre, when it is not merely a shortening of Preharakhty, seems to occur only in epithets. This leaves the "Eternal Lord" and "Preharakhty" as alternating epithets of the same deity. It is difficult to see a pattern here. Certainly it is impossible without doing damage to the undoubted unity of the work, and turning source analysis into a farce, to separate out two "documents" solely on the basis of the alternating names of the Sun-god. Nevertheless, the alternation of names reveals a striking fact. Episodes 7-13 share one thing in common, viz. they occur outside the context of the court trial.¹ Three of them at least (10-12) incorporate very ancient, traditional material, drawn not from the Osiris cycle, but from the older myth of the Battle of Horus with Seth.² These individual duals have at some time been woven into the context of the trial, and re-interpreted as trial by combat. It is in this part of the narrative that the name Preharakhty predominates, and the Eternal Lord is almost never mentioned. It might be argued that the alternation between the two names is an artificial one, based on the writer's predilection for Universal Lord as the formal title of the presiding judge when the scene is laid in court. When the scene shifts outside the court, the scribe unconsciously feels free to use the judge's personal name. Although episodes 5 and 16 apparently give the lie to this hypothesis, it may broadly speaking be true, if we drop the added supposition that it is an artificial distinction originating with the writer of the present story. More likely it is basically a distinction of ancient origin between two blocks of traditional material, one of which dealt with the trial and one with the conflict. Thus, if the use of divine

¹ J. Spiegel, *Die Erzählung vom Streite des Horus und Seth in Pap. Beatty I als Literaturwerke* (Leipziger Ägyptologische Studien 9; Glückstadt, 1937), 42 ff.

² See Griffiths, *The Conflict of Horus and Seth* (Liverpool, 1960), *passim*.

names is not a direct sign of the author's *quoted* sources, it may nevertheless indicate the different genres from which he drew material.

4. *Wisdom Texts*(a) Ptahhotpe¹*Common Noun*

- “...those who listened to the gods,” 32.
- “god's-father, beloved of god,” 2, 43.
- “...this god (the king),” 36.

- “god punishes accordingly,” 100.
- “What god ordains is what comes to pass,” 116.
- “Eating bread is under god's plan,” 142.
- “...and god makes it multiply(?) in your hand,” 162.
- “It is the lonely one (?) whom god creates,” 173.
- “...and your condition will be good vis-a-vis god,” 176.
- “It is god who has made him able,” 184.
- “You raise a son to the pleasure of god,” 198.
- “That means, god has already condemned him before birth,” 217.
- “It is god who creates ability,” 229.³
- “Happy are those whom god has given,” 247.
- “It happens to one favored of god,” 340.
- “It is he (the *ka*?) along with the god, who gives sustenance,” 393.
- “...which have come to you as gifts of god,” 434.
- “One who listens is one whom god loves,” 545.
- “One whom god hates does not listen,” 546.

—“Behold, a good son, such as god gives,” 633.

¹ Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in E. Dévaud, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep* (Fribourg, 1916); translation in Z. Žaba, *Les Maximes de Ptahhotep* (Prague, 1956).

² Var. “him who made it.”

³ Var. “advances (one's) position.”

⁴ Var. “of god.”

Divine Names

—“It (Truth) has not been tampered with since the time of Osiris,” 89.³

—“A son who hears is a follower of Horus,” 588.⁴

(b) Merikare¹*Common Noun*

- “[] like god,” P21.
- “Justify yourself before god,” P30.
- “God is thanked for rewards,” P37.

- “God knows the rebel,” P49.
- “...and god condemns him to a bloody (fate) (?),” P50.
- “[] before god,” P51.
- “He who reaches it (the Afterlife) without having done wrong, shall stay there like a god,” P56.
- “Make [many?] monuments for god,” P63.
- “God knows who acts for him,” P67.
- “...like what is done to one who commits like transgression, by the hand of god,” P70-71.

- “God will attack him who rebels against a temple,” P110.
- “...fear god,” P112.
- “God, who knows character, has hidden it,” P124.
- “Fear god in his way,” P125.
- “Do things for god, and he will do things for you, too,” P129.
- “God is aware of him who acts for him,” P130.
- “...people, the cattle of god,” P131.
- “God knows every name,” P138.
- “...God who knows him,” P140.
- “Those who follow the king are gods,” P140-141.

Divine Names

—“He who comes into the hand of Osiris, goes forward,” P42.

—“Behold the mooring stake is driven in ... from Hebnu to the Ways-of-Horus,” P88-89.

—“He (the Asiatic) has been fighting since the time of Re,” P93.

In Ptahhotpe and Merikare divine names are found only in toponyms, temporal expressions, or stereotyped phrases. Even when Merikare's father describes creation (P 131 ff.), he eschews a specific god's name. Elsewhere, in keeping with the norm in Egyptian Wisdom

¹ Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in A. Volten, *Zwei altägyptische politische Schriften* (An. Aeg. 4; Copenhagen, 1945), 5 ff.; translation in *ANET*², 414 ff.

Literature, the generic "god" is used.¹ In Ptahhotpe it is mostly a circumlocution for "king"; in Merikare it refers normally to an unspecified member of the pantheon. Thus, here the formal designation of the deity is in no way indicative of pre-existent, underlying sources.

(c) Amenemhet²

<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
—“O thou who hast appeared as a god,” 1/2.	—“I was one who produced grain, and was beloved of Nepry (the god of grain),” 2/11-12.
—“...the white crown of the god’s offspring,” 3/9-10.	—“...jubilation in Re’s barque,” 3/10-11.

This Wisdom text, like the Instruction for Merikare, does not have occasion to use “god” in the same way as other examples of the genre. Both Amenemhet and Senwosret, after all, are “gods”, in view of their kingly status. The 2 examples make this clear. In the moral injunctions of the text “god” does not appear, and the two passages which contain divine names are composed in a poetic vein.

(d) Amenemope³

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
Introd.,		—Min Kamutef, 2/15. —Onnophris, 2/16. —Horus, 2/17.
	—God’s-mother, 3/1.	—Min, 3/2, 3. —Horus, 3/4. —Shu and Tefnut, 3/6. —Horus, 3/7.
1.		

¹ Egyptian morality with which Wisdom Literature is concerned is in no way tied to Egyptian theology. The moral requirements the gods make of men do not change from god to god, and hence a text such as this can dispense with divine names. The reader will himself fill in mentally the appropriate name if he chooses. “God” means simply “the god with whom you happen to be dealing at a given point of time.”

² Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in Volten, *op. cit.*, 106 ff.; translation in *ANET*², 418 f.

³ Text (hieroglyphic transcription) in H. O. Lange, *Das Weisheitsbuch des Amenemope* (Copenhagen, 1925); translation (partial) in *ANET*², 421 ff.

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
2.	—“Leave him in the arms of the god,” 5/4. —„Another good deed in the heart of the god,” 5/7.	—Yoh (the Moon), 4/19.
3.	—“The god knows how to requite him,” 5/17.	
4.		
5.	—“...the servant of god,” 6/16.	—“Great of praise is Re!” 7/8.
6.	—“One propitiates god... —“The bushel that the god gives you is better than 5000 dishonest ones,” 8/19-20. —“Better is poverty in the hand of the god than riches in the storehouse,” 9/5.	—“...through the might of Yoh,” 7/19. ...through the might of Yoh,” 8/11. —“Beware of the Eternal Lord!” 8/14.
7.		—“There is nothing that Shaye and Renenut know not,” 9/11. —“When the Aten rises you should pray to him,” 10/12.
8.		—“Praise is accorded Uraeus,” 10/19. —“...and spitting Apop,” 10/20.
9.	—“...the power of god,” 11/5.	—“May Khnum, indeed, enter (?),” 12/15. —“He destroys Shu’s brightness,” 13/3.
10.	—“...the abomination of the god,” 13/16. —“...safe in the hand of the god,” 14/1. —“God hates him who falsifies words,” 14/2.	
11.		
12.		
13.	—“...the abomination of the god,” 15/21.	
14.		
15.		
16.	—“...the power of god,” 18/5. —“...in the presence of the god,” 18/11.	—“Which god is as great as Thot?” 18/2.

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Common Noun</i>	<i>Divine Names</i>
17.		—"The bushel is Re's Eye," 18/23.
18.	—"The god is in his success," 19/14. —"The words men say are one thing, what the god does is another," 19/16-17. —"Wrong-doing belongs to god," 19/20. —"There is no success in the hand of the god," 19/22.	—"The Eternal Lord is its (the ship's) pilot," 20/6.
19.		
20.	—"Truth is god's great reward," 21/5. —"Do not... frustrate god's plan," 21/14. —"Do not discover the might of god on your own," 21/15.	—"...without (taking) Shaye and Renenut (into account)," 21/16.
21.	—"You certainly know not the plans of god," 22/5. —"Rest yourself in the arms of the god," 22/7.	
22.	—(Same as 22/5-7), 23/8-10.	
23.		
24.	—"Man's heart is god's nose," 24/4.	
25.	—"Do not annoy a man who is in the hand of the god," 24/11. —"God is his (man's) builder," 24/14. —"...safe in the hand of the god," 24/20.	—"Safe is Re afar off," 25/5.
26.		
27.		—"Do not vilify one greater than yourself, whom Pre has preferred to you," 25/17-18. —"...the Aten when he rises," 25/19. —"...very bad before Pre!" 25/21.
28.	—"God desires respect for the poor more than honouring the exalted," 26/13-14.	
29.	—"...no abomination in the hand of the god," 26/20.	
30.		

The first and most obvious distinction which comes to one's attention is that between the Introduction and the Body of the Text. A host of deities are mentioned in the Introduction which do not appear again: Min, Kamutef, Horus, Shu, Tefnut, and Isis. In the body of the text cosmic deities like Re, the Moon, Khnum and Thoth are found, together with deities who stand for abstractions, e.g. Shaye and Renenut; but they do not occur as frequently as the generic "god." The reason for the distinction between the use of divine names and epithets in the Introduction and in the body of the text lies in the affinity of the former to the genre of private, commemorative inscriptions, which love to list titles; the latter, on the other hand, belongs to Wisdom Literature, which more often than not eschews a divine name in favour of the generic.

Most of the occurrences of divine names in the body of the text can be put down to the requirements of mythological allusion or stock expressions. Thus the reference in 18/23 is to the cornmeasure, conceived in the form of the holy *wḡst*-eye, and in 20/6 to the sun-boat in which the sun-god sails on the celestial Nile. Shaye and Renenut are used as a rhetorical device, standing for "Fate and Fortune," (9/11, 21/16). The two animals of Thoth, the ibis and the ape, and Thoth himself, are introduced in chapters 15 and 16 because of Thoth's patronage of writing and his discovery of weights and measures, these subjects being the burden of the chapters in question. In some cases a stock expression, aphorism, or quotation may account for the presence of a divine name, as in 7/8 (what the silent man is supposed to say), or 25/5 (perhaps a popular proverb), or again 10/19-20 (another proverb).

Although the examples of the use of divine names and epithets seem to cluster in certain places, the distribution is in no way a guide to automatic and mechanical source division. It merely means that for some reason certain chapters have received a more polished, literary treatment, over and above the prosaic style of Wisdom Literature in general, with its ubiquitous, generic "god."

Summary of Results

Our study has shown that in the main the genre of literature to which a piece belongs controls the choice and use of divine names and epithets. Märchen- and Wisdom-literature use the generic *nṣr*, "god," almost exclusively, the latter displaying occasional divine names when the text has undergone embellishment of a more or less poetical

nature. In the flowery style of poet and letterwriter divine names are more common. Mythological tales, because they are set in the world of the gods, show more divine names, but even here the subject matter may influence the relative frequency of proper nouns.

Can divine names and epithets be used as criteria for source analysis? Actually, the only logical conclusions which may be drawn from the presence or absence of divine names, have to do with literary affinities, and those who wish to draw other inferences will first of all have to make presuppositions. But if the presupposition is valid that difference in literary genre *can* mean difference in authorship or source, then the question may be answered with a cautious affirmative. For example, the Story of Sinuhe is usually viewed as an expanded tomb biography. The author of the story would have begun from a real tomb-stela, on which were written Sinuhe's titles, a brief account of his life, and the treasured correspondence he had had with the king. It is in these letters that most of the divine names occur. Again in the Contendings of Horus and Seth, the compiler of the story would have combined the court episodes with the cycle drawn from the old myth of the Combat; and the writing of the divine names in these sources which he incorporated were not made consistent by him. Thus in his source for the Combat-tales Re-harakhty was the name of the sun-god, but in those of the trial the epithet "The Eternal Lord" was favored. In neither Sinuhe nor the Contendings, however, does the incidence of divine names constitute a criterion which operates mechanically; and without the convergence of other evidence (e.g. content, style, etc.) the above conclusions would be unfounded.

The occurrences of divine names and epithets in the Joseph Story may be tabulated as follows:¹

Chapter	Yahweh	Elohim
37	—	—
39	vs. 2, 3, 5, 21, 23.	vs. 9 (Joseph to wife).
40	—	vs. 8 (Joseph to prisoners).
41	—	vs. 16 (Joseph to Pharaoh). vs. 25, 28, 32 (all to Pharaoh). vs. 38 (Pharaoh to entourage). vs. 39 (Pharaoh to Joseph). vs. 51, 52 (Joseph aloud).

¹ See Holzinger *Einleitung*, 93, 181; *idem*, *ZAW* 31 (1911), 56 f.; the LXX has faithfully transmitted the MT in this regard: Dahse, *TMH*, 89 ff.; De Vaux, *VT Supp.* 1 (1953), 189. In general see J. Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (London, 1914), *passim*.

Chapter	Yahweh	Elohim
42	—	vs. 18 (Joseph to brothers). vs. 28 (Brothers among themselves).
43	—	vs. 14 (Jacob to sons). ¹ vs. 23 (steward to brothers). vs. 29 (Joseph to Benjamin).
44	—	vs. 16 (Judah to Joseph).
45	—	vss. 5, 7, 8, 9 (Joseph to his brothers).
46	—	—
47	—	—
50	—	vs. 17 (brothers to Joseph). vss. 19, 20 (Joseph to brothers).

Elohim is used throughout the story, Yahweh only in chapter 39.² The narrator never uses Elohim in his own narrative or commentary,

¹ *ʿēl šadday* (the only occurrence in "E": so Eissfeldt, *TLZ* 88 [1963], 485 f.); also in Gen. 17: 1, 28: 3, 35: 11, 48: 3, 49: 25. These passages are usually assigned (with the exception of the last), to P, according to whom the Patriarchs knew of god only through this epithet: cf. Rost, *VT Supp.* 7 (1959), 356 f. Although P's, hand does seem evident in the verses in question, the origin of the term is probably much older than the priestly writer. At present little is known of its meaning or primary use. After examining the passages in which it occurs one gets the impression that El Shadday is somehow connected with the land of Palestine, and *ergo* with the Abrahamic covenant: cf. Burrows, *JTS* 41 (1940), 161; G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name of Israel* (Uppsala, 1946), 18 (n. 6 for references). The popular etymology to-day derives the term from Akk. *šadû*, "mountain," (or 'plain': cf. J. Ouellette, *JBL* 88 [1969], 470 f.) (or an Aram. derivative *šadda'û*, so E. Dhorme, *RHR* 141 [1952], 7) used as an epithet: cf. Albright, *JBL* 54 (1933), 180; M. Weippert, *ZDMG* 111 (1961), 42 ff.; L. R. Bailey, *JBL* 87 (1968), 434 ff.; but more than one recent author has rejected this etymology: cf. N. Walker, *ZAW* 72 (1960), 64 f.; E. C. B. MacLaurin, *Abr-Nabraim* 3 (1961-62), 99 f.; Speiser *Gen.*, 124. Although the meaning of *šadû* would admirably fit the Hebrew use of the term, it is by no means beyond the realm of possibility that the original meaning of *šadday* had been wholly lost in P's day. While the present writer is not committing himself, he would like to remind the reader of the Egyptian verb *šdi*, "to save," and the derived *šdy*, "saviour," (Copt. ⲪⲓⲧⲈ), frequently employed with reference to Egyptian gods: *Wb.* IV, 563: 2 ff.; cf. *Hnw šdy* (H. Ranke, *Die ägyptische Personennamen* [Glückstadt, 1935], I, 271 = 331: 3), *Hr šdy* (Pap. Magic Harris, 8/1), *Pth šdw* (Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 141), *Mwt šdt* (*ibid.*, 148: 17), *Wsir p<3> šd* (*Wb.*, Bellegst. zu IV, 563: 11); cf. also the Egyptian personal names of the pattern *šd-wi-* (god's name), "god N saves me," (Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 330), *šd-sw-* (god's name), "god N saves him," (*ibid.*, 331), or *šd-nr-*, "god saves," (S. Morenz, *Ägyptische Religion* [Stuttgart, 1960], 112 n. 124). The adjectival formation, *šdy/w*, becomes virtually a proper noun denoting a god (*Wb.* IV, 563: 10-11; G. Loukianoff, *BIE* 13 [1931], 67 ff.; B. Bruyère, *FIFAO* 20⁸ [1952], 138 ff.; J. Černý, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* [London, 1952], 72), or an image imbued with protective powers (*Wb.* IV, 563: 12). It is not impossible that the epithet *šdy* migrated north from Egypt, and became attached to a cult form of the deity El at home in southern Palestine (cf. Eissfeldt in *JSS* 1 [1956], 36 n. 1, who argues that El Shadday had a permanent cult centre at Hebron).

² W. H. Green, *Hebraica* 7 (1890), 4; A. Bea, *Biblica* 23 (1942), 378; see also the interesting observations of Ruppert in *JEG*, 44 ff.

but reserves it exclusively for the utterances of his characters.¹ On the other hand, Yahweh is never heard upon the lips of a character, only in the comments of the writer, and only in chapter 39. Unlike the rest of the narrative, where the hand of god is evident in the events themselves, and where the author with a fine sense of style leaves this obvious fact unsaid, the writer in chapter 39 is constantly reminding us that "Yahweh was with Joseph" (5 times). Moreover the occurrences of Yahweh in this chapter are confined to the introduction and conclusion, and are therefore in a sense "editorial"; they do not belong to the motif of the spurned wife. It is as though someone who wished to insert a pre-existent tale of Potiphar's wife, embellished it first with his own theological commentary, and then slipped it into its present context.

Thus the only real service the distribution of divine names affords to the source analysis is to separate chapter 39 from the remainder of the story, not only in the matter of divine names used, but also in the manner of their use. In assisting in the division of the Joseph Story into "J" and "E" the names are of no use whatsoever, a remarkable revelation in the light of the fact that the *prima facie* probability of the Documentary Hypothesis lies precisely in the use of the divine names!²

It has been noted already that the Joseph Story approximates most closely that literary genre which is called by the term Märchen.³ In the light of the fact that Egyptian Märchen are characterized by an avoidance of divine names in favour of the generic "god," the present writer deems it probable that this is the reason for the prevalence of Elohim in the Joseph Story, and not some connexion with Wisdom Literature.⁴

¹ A. Van Seeters, *The Use of the Story of Joseph in Scripture*, 48, n. 131.

² Dahse, *TMH*, 120 f.; Rudolph *Elobist*, 148. The alleged reasons for the curious employment of divine names in the Joseph Story advanced by apologists of the Documentary hypothesis are weak in the extreme. According to Simpson (*ETI*, 131) "J₂ has elaborated the simpler story of J₁" in chapter 39; (but why did not one of the J's use Yahweh in chapters 43 and 44, which Simpson supposes also to be from their hand, *ibid.*, 142?). On 41: 38 Procksch (*Gen.*, 228) comments: "dass Pharao [*rā'ah 'ēlōhīm*] nicht [*rā'ah YHWH*] sagt, ist für J nicht auffallend, da Pharao nicht Jahvehverehrer ist"; (but from 39: 3 it would appear that Potiphar, though a non-Yahwist like Pharaoh, *did* know of Yahweh). Again Procksch states regarding chapter 45 (*ibid.*, 252): "dass Joseph selbst nach der Erkennungsszene vor den Brüdern nicht mehr [YHWH] sagt, könnte immerhin so erklärt werden, dass er als ägyptischer Staatsmann keinen 'hebräischen' ... Gottesnamen anrufen kann"; (the brothers had no cause to refrain from using Yahweh among themselves, yet cf. 42: 28).

³ Above, p. 67 f.

⁴ See Couroyer, *RB* 63 (1956), 209 ff.; cf. also Cassuto, *Documentary Hypothesis*, 21 ff.

II. *The Names of the Father in the Joseph Story*

The father in the Joseph Story is often referred to as "their (or his) father," with reference to the brothers or Joseph; but sometimes he is named. The names "Jacob" and "Israel" alternate throughout the story in the following fashion:¹

Chapter - Verse	Israel	Jacob	Versions
37: 1		×	
37: 2		×	Vulg. "his".
37: 3	×		LXX "Jacob".
37: 13	×		MSS ^{LXX} "his father".
(37: 14	×		
37: 34	×	×	Vulg. omits.
42: 1		×	
42: 4		×	
42: 5	×		Vulg. omits, some LXX "Jacob".
42: 29		×	
42: 36		×	
(43: 2		×	×
43: 6	×		×
43: 8	×		1 Heb. MS omits.
43: 11	×		Some LXX omit.
45: 21	×		
45: 25		×	
45: 27		×	Vulg. MSS ^{LXX} omit.
45: 28	×		Some Heb. LXX omit, MSS ^{LXX} read "Jacob".
46: 29	×		
46: 30	×		
47: 7		×	
47: 8		×	
47: 9		×	
47: 10		×	
47: 27	×		
47: 28		×	
47: 29	×		
47: 31	×		
50: 2	×		

In the broad context in which the Joseph Story is now found the reader would expect to find Joseph's father called "Israel," for according to Gen. 32: 28 and 35: 10 this new name had replaced the birth-name "Jacob." Historically the aetiology of chapters 32 and 35

¹ See Wiener, *Pent. St.*, 34 ff.; the variants listed in the last column show fairly clearly that the MT has preserved an original text upon which the versions seem only to be playing a set of variations.

probably represents an attempt to harmonize the ethnic term *Bēnē Yisrāʾel* with the tradition that the progenitor of the twelve tribes was a person called "Jacob." The occurrences of Israel in 42: 5 and 45: 21, in fact, seem to be self-conscious attempts to bolster this harmonization.¹ But the references to the patriarch in passages chronologically later than 35: 10 do not consistently show "Israel," and if anything "Jacob" appears to be more popular.² Naturally the alternation of the names has been accepted as evidence for two parallel, documentary sources, one of which took the aetiologies of chapters 32 and 35 seriously and adhered to the new appellative "Israel;" the other either ignored, or was genuinely ignorant, of the change of name.³ But are the occurrences plenteous enough to warrant such an hypothesis? Could they not be put down to a desire for literary variety on the part of the writer?⁴ Whether the alternation in the names of the father has any relevance to source analysis can be seen only after the like alternation in the roles of Judah and Reuben have been examined.

III. *The Names of the Good Brother in the Joseph Story*⁵

From the standpoint of the plot, the good brother who seeks to help his younger brother in the face of total opposition from the rest, constitutes a single role. In fact this role seems to be an embellishment of the basic motif, sympathetic assistance offered and later frustrated being clearly secondary to the furtherance of the plot. But even though

¹ Cf. A. Besters, *RB* 74 (1967), 7.

² Mowinckel, *BZAW* 77 (1958), 130. Cf. also A. de Pury, *RB* 76 (1969), 5 ff.

³ The hypothesis that the J-document is the former, and E the latter is now a commonplace: Wellhausen *Comp.*, 59; König *Gen.*, 59 n. 1; Gunkel *Gen.*, 354; Simpson *ETI*, 125 ff.; Von Rad *Gen.*, 343.

⁴ A host of subjective theories have been promulgated to explain the alternation, e.g., that the two names are used together for the sake of literary variation (Segal); that Jacob is used of the father of the brothers, Israel when Joseph is mentioned (Dahse); that the names of the father at one time had been abbreviated to Y/, and later expanded sometimes to Jacob, and sometimes to Israel (Dahse); that Jacob is used when sons of Leah and the concubines are referred to, Israel elsewhere (Hummelauer); that Jacob occurs when the patriarch himself is under discussion, Israel when the writer is thinking of the progenitor of the people (Heinisch, Green); see Rudolph *Elohist*, 150 n. 3.

⁵ See among others, the following: G. W. Anderson, *A Critical Introduction to the O.T.* (London, 1959), 23; Dahse *TMH* I, 133; Driver *Gen.*, 321; *idem*, *HDB* II, 767; Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 270; G. B. Gray, *A Critical Introduction to the O.T.* (London, 1913), 38; O. Kaiser, *VT* 10 (1960), 4; Kittel *Gesch.*, I, 231; A. S. Peake, *The People and the Book* (Oxford, 1925), 155 ff.; Pfeiffer *Introduction*, 171 f.; Procksch *Gen.*, 218 f.

he seems superfluous, and even though the plot rides roughshod over him, the good brother would be willingly dispensed with by no one. The pathos and tragic irony with which the sophisticated writer has endowed this role, lifts the entire story out of the commonplace. To create, however, a second role in which a second "good brother" is trying to do exactly the same thing as the first, would be an incomprehensible weakening of this sub-plot. And yet the Joseph Story in its present state shows precisely such duplication. Judah and Reuben alternate in the role of Good Brother - Protector of little Joseph (and later, of Benjamin). A synopsis of their parts is given in the following table:

<i>Reuben</i>	<i>Judah</i>
<p>37: 21-22, deters brothers from killing Joseph; suggests he be put in pit.</p> <p>37: 29-30, returns to pit and is horror-stricken to find Joseph gone.</p> <p>42: 22, interprets straits in which they find themselves as retribution and chides brothers therefor.</p> <p>42: 37, offers his own sons as surety for Benjamin.</p>	<p>37: 26-27, deters brothers from killing Joseph by suggesting they sell him to the Ishmaelites.</p> <p>43: 8-10, offers guilt on his own head as surety for Benjamin.</p> <p>44: 16, offers all the brothers as slaves.</p> <p>44: 18-34, makes an impassioned speech.</p>

The first impression any reader receives from comparing the two brothers, is of the moral and literary superiority of Reuben's role vis-a-vis Judah's. Reuben has the interests of his helpless "kid-brother" truly at heart. He fearlessly deters his fire-eating brethren from murdering Joseph, is torn by grief when his plan to save him is frustrated, and in his anguish unwittingly gives his true intentions away by crying aloud in the presence of the others, "The lad is gone! And me? Where shall I go?" Years later, when standing before Joseph, he is still plagued (as by now his brothers were also) by the frustration he felt, and by the guilt which weighed upon them collectively. And when a second younger brother seemed destined for a similar misfortune, Reuben, wishing to compensate for his earlier failure, offered his own flesh and blood as surety against the return of Benjamin. Contrast Reuben's noble action, motivated by a guilt complex, with Judah's cavalier usurpation of the elder brother's role. Instead of restoring Joseph to his father, Judah can suggest as an

alternative to murder, only sale into slavery; and in place of his own flesh and blood he can only offer his father as surety for Benjamin an eternal sin upon his own head! Later, in his final defense before Joseph, Judah has no qualms about offering all the brothers as slaves in lieu of Benjamin.¹

The alternation in name has long been accepted as a valid criterion for source analysis. Judah belongs to J, Reuben to E, a "Judah"-version thus taking chronological precedence over a later "Reuben"-version.² It is further maintained that the occurrences of Judah and Reuben coincide with the occurrences of Israel and Jacob respectively, although there is clearly no correspondence between either of the groups of names and the divine names Yahweh and Elohim.³ The following table illustrates the alleged coincidence:

Chapter	Israel	Jacob	Reuben	Judah
37: 1		×		
37: 2		×		
37: 3	×			
37: 13	×			
37: 21			×	
37: 22			×	
37: 26				×
37: 29			×	
37: 34		×		
42: 1		×		
42: 4		×		
42: 5	×			
42: 22			×	

¹ On the essentially baser motives of Judah and the inferior literary treatment of his role, see Keil-Delitzsch I, 337; W. R. Harper, *Hebraica* 6 (1889), 17; Procksch *Gen.*, 401; Wiener *Pent. St.*, 45.

² Bentzen *Introduction* II, 48; Budde *Gesch.*, 61 f.; O. Eissfeldt, *Die Genesis der Genesis* (Tübingen, 1958), 36 f.; Hölscher *Geschichtsschreibung*, 179 f.; Gunkel *Legends*, 126; König *Gen.*, 59; Simpson, *IB* I, 749; Smend *Erzählung*, 99 f. There have been occasional dissenters, e.g. W. H. Green, *Hebraica* 7 (1890), 8, 18 f.; Rudolph *Elobist*, 153; cf. Gunkel *Legends*, 127. Horowitz (*JE*, 23) asks pointedly why E, a northern source, picked Reuben, the progenitor of a southern tribe, as his choice for the role. The probable answer is simply that the writer already had the traditional list of eponymous ancestors before him, in their canonical order of birth; and since the plot motif demanded an older, respected, brother to play the part, Reuben the first-born was selected. Why Reuben had in fact been placed by tradition at the head of the list, we probably shall never know with certainty; (on the birth tradition cf. S. Lehming, *VT* 13 [1963], 74 ff.). But it may be simply a reflection of the traditional origin of Israel *beyond Jordan* (cf. E. Bublitz, *ZAW* 33 [1913], 248), and have little to do with any erstwhile political primacy of the tribe which, it must be admitted, is elsewhere seldom attested.

³ Holzinger, *ZAW* 31 (1911), 55.

Chapter	Israel	Jacob	Reuben	Judah
42: 29		×		
42: 36		×		
42: 37			×	
43: 3				×
43: 6	×			
43: 8	×			×
43: 11	×			
44: 14				×
44: 16				×
44: 18				×
45: 21	×			
45: 25		×		
45: 27		×		
45: 28	×			
46: 28				×
46: 29	×			
46: 30	×			

In chapter 37 Israel, Jacob, Reuben and Judah all occur; but to conclude therefrom that the chapter is composite of "J" and "E" is simply to assume what is yet to be demonstrated. In chapter 42 Jacob is used consistently,¹ and here Reuben appears twice to Judah's complete absence. In chapter 43 Israel is used to the exclusion of Jacob, and Reuben is absent while Judah is present. Again in chapter 46 Judah and Israel occur in the same passage. The evidence of the table thus certainly seems to couple the names Reuben and Jacob on the one hand, and Judah and Israel on the other; and the *prima facie* probability is that in the use of these four names we have indeed a valid criterion for division into sources.²

IV. *The Identity of Joseph's First Master*

(a) "Potiphar, the officer of Pharaoh, the captain of the guard," in 37: 36 and 39: 1 (the latter adding "an Egyptian").

(b) "The Captain of the guard," and (with reference to Joseph) "his master," elsewhere in chapters 39 and 40, and in 41: 10, 12.³

¹ Vs. 5 appears to be secondary. Procksch (*Gen.*, 236) ascribes it, probably rightly, to P; cf. Wiener *Pent. St.*, 35.

² Cf. Eerdmans *AS* I, 65; 70, "die Namen Israel und Jakob völlig genügen um die Quellen der Josephsgeschichte zu scheiden"; cf. Wellhausen *Comp.*, 59. A strong skepticism, however, has been maintained by some: cf. Dahse *TMH* I, 129 ff.; Eichrodt, *BZAW* 31 (1916), 104; Rudolph *Elobist*, 149 ff.; Mowinkel, *BZAW* 77 (1958), 130 n. 7.

³ The accepted critical solution is to ascribe (a) to E, and (b) to J: Driver *Gen.*, 333; *idem*, *HDB* II, 767 f.; Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 259; Holzinger *Gen.*, 230; Kuenen *Hex.*, 146; Procksch *Gen.*, 223, 383; Simpson, *ETI*, 131; *idem*, *IB* I, 762; Smend *Erzählung*, 102 f.; Ruppert, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 3.

The discrepant allusions to Joseph's master cannot seriously be accepted as criteria for a division between "J" and "E". The verses in which the name "Potiphar" occurs look for all the world like editorial patches with which an earlier text was glossed. Vs. 37: 36 certainly was added *after* the pristine unity of the Joseph Story had been ruptured by the interpolation of chapter 38, in order to satisfy, at least provisionally, the anxious curiosity of the reader.¹ Vs. 39: 1 in its present form cannot be treated as an integral part of that chapter, coming from the same hand that embellished this common motif; otherwise one would be hard put to it to explain why the personal name is missing from the remainder of the chapter. More likely, this verse has been expanded by the inclusion of "Potiphar, the officer of Pharaoh," and "who had brought him thither,"² a midrash supplied by the same redactor who inserted 37: 36, probably P. The latter had before him the original 39: 1 (without the personal name), but consciously eschewed referring to the Ishmaelites in his own gloss, preferring for reasons of pedantic harmonization to even the score by favoring the Midianites.

This occasional appearance of a personal name is an excellent example of a later attempt to "personalize" the anonymous figures of a genuine Märchen, and is thus akin to historicization. What probably happened in the case of the Joseph Story is this: after initial promulgation of the Joseph Story, popular tradition, enthusiastic to involve itself with such stimulating art, began to historicize the personalities and events, a process which ended with the fantastically detailed treatment of the tale in Judaic folklore.³ Very early, before P wrote, the figure of Joseph became connected with the Egyptian name *P3-di-p3-r'*, "Potiphar"; but the connexion was never explicit. One tradition ascribed the name to Joseph's father-in-law, another to Joseph's master.⁴

¹ Note the use in vs. 36 of *'el Miṣrayim* for the usual *Miṣraymā(b)* of the rest of the story: Horovitz *JE*, 15.

² Cf. Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 354 f.; Driver *Gen.*, 333; Simpson *ETI*, 131.

³ Cf. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, II (Philadelphia, 1910), 3 ff.

⁴ Gressmann (EYXAPIΣTHPION, 34) postulates an Egyptian *Vorlage* in which Joseph himself was a priest of Re, whose enactments in chapter 47 applied originally only to priests. In the present form of the tale, however, the connexion with Heliopolis has become vestigial, and Joseph has now been demoted to the status of son-in-law of the high priest of that city. Luria (*ZAW* 44 [1926], 112) sees in Joseph's marriage to a daughter of Potipherah a reminiscence of an older version of the tale in which Joseph married a daughter of Potiphar his first master. Besides being wholly incapable of proof, and smacking of a scholar's fancy rather than shrewd judgment, such attempts to work back through an assumed literary

An editor, plagued by a bent toward completeness, inserted them both.¹

history of a piece of literature inevitably end up with "Originals" which are ludicrously inferior to the present form of the work. Do masterpieces of literature often arise through the amalgamation of bits of poor quality, or the embellishment of mediocre pieces? It is the writer's impression that something like the reverse process is the rule: an original creation of genius is more often diluted or fragmented into bits and pieces of inferior calibre.

¹ Gressmann (*op. cit.*, 23) suggests that the second tradition is derived from the first, a possibility that can never be demonstrated, it seems to me.

CHAPTER SIX

SOURCE ANALYSIS: PLOT AND STYLE

DETAILS OF THE PLOT

A second criterion which springs to mind in our quest for devices with which to separate the "sources" of the Joseph Story, is internal inconsistency, or discrepancies within the plot.¹ Doublets also fall under this category,² though the existence of genuine doublets may be difficult to prove with certainty, since the arguments must be a priori. Now looseness in the weave of a plot is a common occurrence. Even Zeus nods at times. But we must be careful to distinguish the natural fault in the work of a single author, from the shortcomings of a redactor who has not edited his text with sufficient care. In the light of the evident genius of the writer of the Joseph Story, such mental lapses, we may safely assume, are rare or absent entirely. This does not mean that one should automatically accept plot discrepancies as evidence of editorial "joins" between two "sources." It is just possible that the unevenness at a given point in the plot is the result of an intentional stroke of the author's subtle pen. But each case must be examined empirically and judged on its own merits.

1. *The Reason for the Brothers' Hatred*

(a) Jacob, in an unconscious indication of his favoritism, made Joseph a special garment; and the brothers, jealous of this special love, began to hate their youngest brother: 37: 3-4.

(b) Joseph told his brothers of the dreams he had had, dreams which clearly presaged his rise to a position of power and authority; and pursuant to the narration of the dreams the brothers hated him: 37: 5-10.

In the classical Documentary Hypothesis (a) is ascribed to J, (b) to E;³ but, as pointed out above,⁴ the removal of the dream motif

destroys the entire plot. Consequently there is no other alternative than to accept the dreams as an integral element of the original story. On empirical grounds there is no inconsistency in the reasons given for the brothers' hatred. Rather the reader is presented with a "staged" enhancement of their jealousy: at first they are jealous of Joseph only as a brother who has caught his father's eye; after hearing the dreams the brothers' hatred is augmented by their newfound jealousy of him as an individual, inferior to themselves (as they think), who will one day become great.

Whether the coat-motif should be counted a secondary addition to the plot is another question. Its present function seems clear: it accounts for part of the brothers' hatred, and later enables Jacob to identify easily a garment belonging to his boy. His conclusion from this identification, viz. that Joseph is certainly dead, becomes (for him) an absolute certainty, and enables the author to use this mistaken notion with dramatic effect in his treatment of the character. Such a functional role does not sound "secondary," and I doubt that in fact it is.¹

2. *The Circumstances of Joseph's Encounter with his Brothers*²

(a) The brothers at once decide to kill Joseph (37: 18), but Reuben succeeds in dissuading them (vs. 22); and instead they put him in a pit and go away (vss. 23-24). While they are gone Midianites find Joseph and take him to Egypt (vs. 28a, c); and Reuben returns surreptitiously only to find his brother gone (vs. 29-30).

(b) The brothers throw Joseph into a pit, and sit down to eat. When Ishmaelite merchants appear (vs. 25) Judah suggests selling him to them (vs. 26-27), and they do so.

The basic feature of the passages in which Reuben appears (i.e. [a]) is the pit. Reuben introduces "this pit which is in the wilderness," a locution which suggests that it is the first time it has been mentioned, as an alternative to killing the lad. *Instead of* killing him, urges Reuben,

¹ Since a motif involving a coat turns up also in chapter 38 where it is integral to the story, it could be argued that the coat motif of chapter 37 has been created under the influence of the adjacent story. But it seems more likely that one of the reasons chapter 38 was inserted where it was, was precisely the pre-existent parallelism of the garments; cf. above, p. 18.

² O. T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses* (Philadelphia, 1943), 85; Gunkel *Gen.*, 355; *idem*, *Urgesch.*, 251 ff.; Holzinger *Gen.*, 223 f.; H. G. May, *AJSL* 47 (1930), 91; Simpson *ETI* 126 f.; Smend *Erzählung*, 99; Procksch *Gen.*, 218 ff.

¹ In general see W. R. Harper, *Hebraica* 6 (1889), 9 ff.

² Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 247 f.; Gunkel *Gen.*, 401 f.

³ Cf. Gunkel *Gen.*, 404; contrast Von Rad *Gen.*, 345.

⁴ Above, p. 68 f.

throw him into the pit. The carrying out of this suggestion leads us to expect that the brothers will then leave the pit, and that it will no more figure directly in their doings. In the "Judah"-passages, however, the pit inexplicably turns up again, but occupies a secondary role. The brothers are still at the mouth of the pit, eating their lunch, and according to the gist of Judah's speech (vss. 26-27), have not yet decided what to do with the boy! The pit here is a place of *temporary confinement*, pending a decision on the part of the brothers. Clearly the motif of casting a person into a pit is central to the "Reuben"-passages; in itself it constitutes the decision the brothers have taken, and thus lends the incident logical cohesion. In the "Judah"-passages it has been reduced to an unimportant appendage to the plot. Why? The answer is clear from vs. 27: to make possible the inclusion of the sale of Joseph to the Ishmaelites. The pit is at home in the Reuben-version, at best a needless vestige in the Judah-version.¹

Both Reuben and Judah offer counsel to their brothers on the subject of what to do with Joseph. The context of Reuben's advice is more dramatic: the lad is on the horizon and coming closer by the minute, and now these impulsive madmen have of a sudden taken it into their heads to kill him on the spot! Reuben must think quickly, must deter them at all costs. A large cistern is at hand, one which a man could hardly climb out of unaided. One can almost hear the suppressed tremolo in his voice as in the last few seconds before Joseph's arrival he offers an alternative plan which will enable him later to return Joseph unharmed to his father. Judah's advice, by way of contrast, is not conceived in the heat of a pressing situation. It is rather the reasoned proposal of a well-fed shepherd with his own interests at heart. He has time to ponder and, as he reclines watching a caravan of merchants slowly wending its way towards him, the substance of his counsel is slowly borne in upon his stolid brain. Reuben's advice is clipped and to the point, and is accompanied by vetitives; the latter in desperation he must use, because he has not had time to work up a reasoned argument which will be cogent. Judah's speech, on the other hand, displays just such cogency. It is the profit motive which dominates him, and cannot but be accepted by the brothers.

Judah's utterance in vss. 26-27 is modelled point by point on Reuben's, but it is more wordy. Its dependence on vs. 22 is clear when the two speeches are set side by side:

¹ Cf. Rudolph *Elobist*, 153; also May, *loc. cit.*

	<i>Reuben's Counsel</i> (vs. 22)	<i>Judah's Counsel</i> (vss. 26-27)
General	} "Don't shed <i>blood</i> ! Throw him into this pit which is in the wilderness, but don't lay a <i>hand on him</i> !"	} "What profit is there in killing our brother and hiding his <i>blood</i> ? Come, let's sell him to the Ishmaelites, but don't let our <i>hand</i> be <i>upon him</i> , for he is our brother, our own flesh and blood in fact."
Vetitive		
Alternate		
Proposal		
Specific		
Vetitive		

Three things demonstrate the secondary nature of vss. 26-27. 1. The order general vetitive, alternate proposal, specific vetitive, is precisely what is expected in a hurried, extemporized outburst such as Reuben's: general vetitive to arrest attention, alternate proposal to appear positive, to allay suspicion, and to forestall diverted fury, specific vetitive to capitalize on the momentary indecision of the brothers. In Judah's unhurried appeal to reason and logic this pattern is entirely unnecessary; yet the same order is followed. 2. The verbosity of Judah's appeal is in striking contrast to Reuben's curtness. The last clause, "for he is our brother...", is an enunciation of the obvious, and is semantically redundant. 3. Judah uses some of Reuben's vocabulary, but with less effect. "Don't let our hand be upon him" is reminiscent of, but inferior to "Don't lay a hand on him!"

It is important to note that what has been dubbed the "Judah"-version is not merely a parallel account to the "Reuben"-version, but is dependant upon it. The author of the Judah passages patterned himself on the Reuben passages, and made use of elements in the Reuben-version. In other words, the "Judah"-version is not a parallel redaction of the episode, but an *expansion* of a pre-existent version in which Reuben was the sole protagonist.¹

3. *The Context of Reuben's Advice*

(a) Vs. 21: Reuben delivers Joseph out of the brothers' power *after* he has come up to them, with the stern "We shall not commit murder."

¹ See S. Sandmel, *JBL* 80 (1961), 112. When Reuben has occasion later in the story to refer to the events of 37: 12 ff., he knows nothing of the *sale* of Joseph. His cry in 42: 22, "His blood is required!" shows that he knows no more of what happened to Joseph than he did in 37: 30, and assumes he is dead. This could be glossed over by assuming Reuben to have been absent when the sale was made (a favorite device of harmonizers), and never to have been told of it. In view of the genuine contrition of the brothers in 42: 21 it is hardly likely that he would have remained ignorant for long. It is much more probable that the Reuben-version did not yet know of the Judah-expansion; cf. Wiener *Pent. St.*, 45.

(b) Vs. 22: *before* Joseph arrives Reuben dissuades them from murder, and persuades them to throw him into the pit.

The LXX circumvented the difficulty at least partly by omitting *wayōmer 'ēlēhem Rē'ābēn* in vs. 22, thus making the direct speech of that verse the continuation of vs. 21. Most moderns prefer to emend "Reuben" to "Judah" in vs. 21, and to ascribe the verse to the J source.¹ The difficulty with this procedure is threefold. First, there is no support from MSS or versions for this emendation. Second, even with the proposed emendation the verse is still premature, and must be placed after vs. 23.² Third, if the emendation be accepted, the verse becomes redundant, since Judah again counsels his brothers in vss. 26 f., and *argues* that there is good reason for not killing him. This would have been unnecessary if he had already declared that murder was out of the question.

Vs. 21 remains redundant whether the emendation to Judah be made or not. It is significant that in vs. 21 Reuben uses the first plural *nakkennū*, in contrast to his speech in vs. 22 in which he employs only second plural precatives and imperatives. This observation draws one's attention to vs. 20 in which no less than four first plural forms occur. Vs. 21 must be construed with vss. 19-20, and in them the explanation of vs. 21 will appear. The brothers' speech (vss. 19-20) is awkward in the context of the present story. The Reuben version conceived of only one large cistern in the vicinity, first brought to the readers' attention in vs. 22 by Reuben, who makes use of it in his hastily-conceived plan. Vs. 20 is a clumsy anticipation of vs. 22, which detracts from the originality and ingenuity of Reuben's idea by stating (a) that the terrain was pock-marked with pits, and (b) that the brothers had already thought of throwing Joseph (or his corpse) into one of them. Thus, the writer of vss. 19-20 had the smooth-flowing Reuben version before him, has extracted from it the motif of the cistern, and with a lack of sensitivity for the dramatic effect, has heavily reworked it to the detriment of the story.

Vs. 20 contains the brothers' plan to fabricate the story that a wild beast had eaten Joseph.³ In the context such a plan is illogical. For as soon as the brothers proffer this false information, the immediate and expected reaction of their father will be to say "How do you know?"

¹ Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 338; Driver *Gen.*, 324; Gunkel *Gen.*, 403; Kittel *Gesch.*, I, 227 n. 3; Skinner *Gen.*, 447; contrast Horovitz *JE*, 24 ff.; cf. Rudolph *Elobist.*, 153.

² Gunkel, *loc. cit.*

³ For what follows see Gunkel *Gen.*, 401; Horovitz *JE*, 55 ff.

Vss. 19-20 require some reference at least to the false evidence to be presented, i.e. the garment; but none is present. In the Reuben version the stripping of Joseph was simply an act of robbery:¹ why waste a good coat? It was only later that it occurred to the brothers to use it as false evidence. It is more likely that, given the immediacy of the entire event, considerations of an alibi would not have entered the brothers' minds until sometime later. The proposal in vs. 20 "and we shall say a wild animal has eaten him," is an awkward reduplication of Jacob's deduction in vs. 33, on the basis of the evidence of Joseph's blood-stained costume. In vs. 33 the words are natural: the brothers do not have to suggest them. In vs. 20 they are an incomprehensible anticipation. Thus on two counts vss. 19-20 are anticipatory, and, what is more important, are aware of the plot of the Reuben version.

Vss. 19-20 are best understood as a freely-worked amplification of the terse *wayyitnakkēlū 'ōtō lahāmifō* in vs. 18. They are midrash, not original text. So fiendish do the brothers appear, and so foolproof their design, that some commentator felt obliged to sooth the reader's nerves by epitomizing the subsequent development of the plot; and so he added (vs. 21), "but when Reuben heard, he delivered him out of their hands with the words 'we shall not commit murder!'" But the resultant flow of the plot was woefully disrupted.

4. *The Locale of the Encounter*

(a) The Reuben-version takes place in a wilderness (*midbar*, cf. vs. 22), within the sphere of activity of the Midianites (vs. 28), and close enough to home for the brothers to return from flock-tending after no undue passage of time (vs. 32).²

(b) The Judah-version takes place near Dothan (whither Joseph has come from Hebron, via Shechem), a spot well located for the encounter with Ishmaelites coming from Gilead.³

The Reuben-version is quite consistent; the Judah-version, which knows of and uses the cistern incident, asks us to believe that Dothan was in a wilderness.⁴ That a wild beast should have devoured Joseph

¹ √PST in the hiph'il with the connotation of theft or spoliation; cf. 1 Sam. 31: 9, Ezek. 16: 39, 23: 26, 1 Chron. 10: 9, Job 22: 6.

² Cf. Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 337.

³ Cf. Simpson *ETI*, 126: (a) is J₁, (b) J₂; yet according to p. 127 the prime evidence for (a), viz. vs. 22, is assigned to E! Smend *Erzählung*, 100: (a) is E, (b) J₂; cf. also Procksch *Gen.*, 380.

⁴ So Simpson *ETI*, 127, 132; contrast Driver *Gen.*, 324; Horovitz *JE*, 54. Admittedly *midbar* is the place where cattle are grazed (C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic*

in a wilderness, as the Reuben-version maintains, is a likely enough story, but it taxes the credulity when the setting is transferred to the environs of a large city like Dothan. Moreover, by locating the whole incident in the Dothan area, the Judah-version has unwittingly manufactured geographical difficulties; for, picking up Joseph at Dothan, the Ishmaelites would be obliged to follow the caravan route through Shechem and south through the Negeb, a route which would lead right past Jacob's *Wohnsitz*!¹ Another difficulty occasioned by the transfer of milieu from Beersheba to the Central Highlands is the hostility of the Shechemites. Did they so soon forget what Jacob's sons had done to them (Gen. 34)?² Perhaps the Judah-version also sensed the inherent difficulty in placing the scene of the encounter near Shechem; for it is at this point that Joseph is accosted by the unnamed man who is instrumental in hurrying the boy away from Shechem to Dothan. In the entire Joseph Story there is no more enigmatic episode than this. What is this strange meeting? A vestige of an old theophany?³ Is it introduced only to explain how Joseph got so far away from home, where the brothers could work their will against him?⁴ And how is it that the unknown seems well aware of who Joseph's brothers are? Can this mean that the Judah-version still located Jacob's residence close to Shechem?⁵ And did the man subsequently inform Jacob of his son's losing his way, information which made it easier for the patriarch to postulate a wild animal?⁶

We should perhaps not lay too great stress on the supposed deeper

Handbook [Rome, 1955], 254), but in its usual employment this term was not applied to the Dothan area. Talmon contends (*apud* A. Altmann, *Biblical Motifs, Origins and Transformations* [Cambridge, 1966], 40 ff.) that besides its use to denote unexploited areas used for grazing, and outright desert, *midbar* can refer to thinly populated open spaces adjacent to settlements. This is somewhat misleading, however, since the examples he cites (Gen. 21: 14, Jos. 18: 12, 1 Sam. 24: 1, 2 Chron. 20: 20, 1 Ki. 19: 15) are all of cities which lie close to true steppe or desert. *Midbar* in this case simply refers to that part of the wilderness within the environs of the town.

¹ Cf. Gunkel *Gen.*, 360.

² Driver *Gen.*, 323. According to Simpson (*ETI*, 133) the transference of the locale to the north was due to J₂'s reworking. Burrows (*The Oracles of Jacob and Balaam* [London, 1938], 62) senses the inherent difficulty here, but his solution is to place chapters 37 and 38 before chapter 34. Cf. Jubilees 34: 1 ff., which also appreciates the difficulty, and fabricates an attack on the brothers by the Canaanites, which is ultimately beaten off by Jacob and his servants (cf. Gen. 14).

³ Holzinger *Gen.*, 225.

⁴ Gunkel *Gen.*, 406.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 187.

significance of vs. 15 ff. The writer imagines the sons of Jacob to be wealthy shepherds with large flocks, in the tradition of the early patriarchs, whom any stranger would be likely to know on sight. It is, moreover, a mark of ancient story-telling to disregard inherent probability in minor episodes when the plot must be furthered. Our minor *deus ex machina* in the present passage has but one task: to get Joseph to Dothan. The passage is clearly secondary to the story as a whole, and probably was a harmonist's addition to the Judah-version¹ if not an integral part of that version as already implied.

5. *Who Sold Joseph into Egypt?*

(a) Unknown to the brothers, Midianites find Joseph (vs. 28a), take him to Egypt (28c), and sell him there (vs. 36).

(b) Ishmaelites happen along (vs. 25); the Midianites sell Joseph to them (vs. 28b), and the Ishmaelites take him to Egypt (vs. 39: 1).

The first account is a case of chance discovery, and precisely fits the Reuben-version: Reuben's desperate plan to save Joseph is frustrated by a stroke of the worst luck. The outline of (b) patently belongs with the Judah-version, it being Judah in fact who suggests selling Joseph to the Ishmaelites. But here the Midianites are retained, apparently so as not to do violence to a cherished variant, and become the intermediaries in the sale.

Generations of Bible students have utilized this discrepancy as a show piece for demonstrating the validity of the Documentary Hypothesis.² But it is not a division into "J" and "E" that this criterion

¹ Note the use of *'ānōkei* in vs. 16, and contrast the bulk of the Joseph Story which employs almost exclusively *'āni*: below, p. 173 f.

² G. W. Anderson, *A Critical Introduction to the O. T.* (London, 1959), 23 f.; Kuenen *Hex.*, 39, 146; W. Harrelson, *Interpreting the O. T.* (New York, 1964), 36 ff.; Holzinger *Gen.*, 223 f.; Gunkel *Gen.*, 355, 359; König *Gen.*, 666, 718 f.; A. S. Peake, *A Commentary on the Bible* (London, Edinburgh, 1931), 162; Driver *Gen.*, 325; Bentzen *Introduction*, II, 25, 46; Simpson *ETI*, 127 f.; A. S. Peake, *The People and the Book* (Oxford, 1925), 155; H. H. Rowley, *The Growth of the O. T.* (Oxford, 1950), 18; Driver *Introduction*, 17 f.; Pfeiffer *Introduction*, 169; Speiser *Gen.*, 291; C. R. North *apud* Rowley, *The O. T. and Modern Study* (London, 1951), 80; Von Rad *Gen.*, 359. There have naturally been adamant conservatives whose harmonizing explanations range all the way from Dahse's straight denial that "Midianites" occurred in the original reading of vs. 28 (*TMH* I, 131), to Kitchen's postulate of multiple terms (an alleged stylistic device in ancient Near Eastern literature) for the same nomads (*NDB*, 657; *idem*, *Ancient Orient and O. T.* [London, 1966], 119 f.; cf. Wintermute, *IBD* II, 983). But the passage cited by Kitchen, viz. Jud. 8: 24, is not a stylistic variant, but an identifying gloss, which would hardly

effects. Rather the variations in the ethnic terms show once again that the Judah-version is secondary to the Reuben-version, and actually expanded it. Vs. 15 of chapter 40 is part of the latter,¹ as is also 42: 21-22; 45: 4-5 belongs to the former.²

6. *The Circumstances of Joseph's Imprisonment*

(a) Joseph, accused wrongfully by Potiphar's wife, is put in *prison* by his master, "the place where the king's prisoners were confined" (39: 20); there he attracts the attention, and gains the favour, of the "keeper of the prison" (39: 21), and as a result he is put in charge of all the prisoners (39: 22).

(b) Joseph is not a prisoner at all, but merely a servant of the captain of the guard (41: 12). Two political prisoners are placed in the "house of the captain of the guard" (40: 3), and Joseph is charged by the captain of the guard (not the keeper of the prison) with looking after them (40: 4).³

With the excision of the obviously redundant passages, the binary nature of the narrative in chapters 39 and 40 seems unmistakable.⁴ The contrast between "prison" and "house of the guard," and between Joseph's prisoner-status in one account and his free status in the other (cf. also 41: 10, 12) is so marked that one cannot help but posit two "versions." The best solution is to postulate a basic narrative telling of Joseph's sale by Midianites to the "captain of the guard," of his appointment to be jailor of two important political prisoners, of his interpretation of their dreams, and of his request to one prisoner that the crime of his kidnapping be set right.⁵ Into this narrative an original-

have been necessary had the two words been commonly accepted terms for the same ethnic group. And no harmonist can circumvent the plain fact that in Gen. 37: 28 Ishmaelites and Midianites are distinguished in the mind of the writer.

¹ Cf. König *Gen.*, 689; this verse refers entirely to the events of chapter 37, and does not allude to chapter 39 at all (*pace* Smend *Erzählung*, 102, among others). *Wägam pō(b)* has been inserted to make the protestation of the latter part of the verse harmonize with chapter 39; but *bōr* refers clearly enough to 37: 22 ff.

² Cf. Eichrodt, *BZAW*, 1916, 103. Ruppert (*JEG*, 39) notes the stronger implication in the Reuben-version that the hand of God is at work, in the apparently predominant role played by chance in the frustration of Reuben's design.

³ J is usually seen in (a), E in (b): Driver *Gen.*, 332 f.; Gressmann EYXA-ΠΙΣΤΗΠΙΟΝ, 22 f.; Gunkel *Gen.*, 431; *idem*, *Urgesch.*, 259 f.; Von Rad *Gen.*, 364 f.; Simpson, *IB* I, 762.

⁴ The passages to be excised are 40: 3a, 5b and "from the dungeon" in 41: 14b.

⁵ I.e. by implication that he be allowed to return to his home in "the Land of the Hebrews" whence he had been kidnapped (40: 15); cf. Driver *IDB*, II, 768 note.

ly distinct tale, an example of the motif represented by the Egyptian Tale of Two Brothers, has been worked and remolded to fit the Joseph Story.¹

It has been noted already in our examination of the style of the Joseph Story that chapter 39 can be distinguished with ease from the remainder of the narrative with respect to recapitulation, plot credibility and theology.² In the light of the fact that the motif used in chapter 39 had no ending,³ the adapter was forced to contrive his own ending by having Joseph put in prison. He had to get him there somehow in order to be able to take up the basic narrative of chapter 40, wherein Joseph is in contact with prisoners. Now the Two Brothers ended with the vindication of the younger brother and the execution of the wife; but this would be impossible to fit into a pre-existent narrative in which the subsequent scene found Joseph, i.e. the vindicated younger brother, dealing with prisoners in prison!⁴ Once again it is clear that whoever was responsible for the inclusion of chapter 39 already had the Joseph narrative before him and was merely expanding on it.

In inserting chapter 39 into the pre-existent Joseph Story the unknown redactor had to patch up the join with chapter 40 by expanding the latter at certain appropriate places with glosses. Thus the reference in chapter 40 to Joseph's being still in the house of "the captain of the guard" (vs. 3) must be set right by the addition of the phrase "in the prison where Joseph was confined," and a similar note was inserted in vs. 5.

Wiener⁵ stoutly denied that any such redactional subterfuge had been perpetrated, and asserted that "the Septuagintal evidence entirely disposes of all this. Except in xl. 5, 7 it confirms the Masoretic Text ... and shows that the discrepancy has arisen not as the result of the combination of two stories, but partly through the corruption of a few letters, partly through the work of glossators." The evidence of the LXX which he then proceeds to lay out for the perusal of his readers may be tabulated as follows:

¹ E. L. Ehrlich, *Der Traum im A. T.* (Berlin, 1953), 65 f.

² Cf. *inter alia* the use of *mō'az* (above, p. 40), *ba'āšer* (above, p. 41), *kōl* (above, p. 42), the verbal noun (above, p. 42 f.), the auxiliary *wayyēbī* (above, p. 53), the E-pattern in verbal clauses (above, p. 33); on recapitulation see p. 77 f., credibility p. 92, use of Yahweh, p. 128 f.

³ Above, p. 93.

⁴ Cf. the remarks of Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1, (1922), 63.

⁵ *Pent. St.*, 31 f.

Verse	MT	LXX
40: 3	<i>bēf śar haṭṭabbāhim</i>	ἐν φυλακῇ παρὰ τῷ δεσμοφύλακι. ¹
40: 4	<i>śar haṭṭabbāhim</i>	ἀρχιδεσμώτης
40: 7	<i>bēmišmar bēf ʾādōnāw</i>	ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ παρὰ τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ
41: 10	<i>bēmišmar bēf śar haṭṭabbāhim</i>	ἐν φυλακῇ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ ἀρχιμαγείρου
41: 12	<i>ʿebed lēśar haṭṭabbāhim</i>	παῖς τοῦ ἀρχιμαγείρου.

(A. ἀρχιδεσμοφύλακος)

Wiener says “these readings dispose of the difficulties”; but do they? The keeper of the prison in chapter 39 in the MT is always *śar bēf hassōhar*, and the LXX renders this consistently by ἀρχιδεσμοφυλαξ. But in chapter 40 the LXX readings of the word suddenly vacillate among three words, δεσμοφυλαξ (40: 3), ἀρχιδεσμοφυλαξ (41: 10), and ἀρχιδεσμωτης (40: 4). Can one maintain that the Hebrew *Vorlage* which the LXX was rendering in these three verses was still *śar bēf hassōhar*? If so, why the sudden inconsistency? It is much more likely that the LXX had no *Vorlage* for these three readings, and was in fact adding the word after emending the text. In other words, the harmony which Wiener notes in the LXX reflects, not the pristine smoothness of the original narrative, but the harmonization technique of the LXX translator.

7. *The Re-telling of Pharaoh's Dreams*

Discrepancies between the narrative account of Pharaoh's dreams and their recapitulation have long been noted by scholars;² but the confidence that they can be used as a criterion of source analysis is ill-founded, it seems.³ The differences are minor, and find an adequate explanation, as was pointed out above,⁴ in the desire for literary variety on the part of the author. Is it really very likely that in contexts where simple repetition is called for, a redactor would *quote* from a parallel source? Would he not merely *repeat*? And might not in fact the *occasion* for such recapitulation have already been present when the original author composed, so that a redactor would have had nothing to do with it?⁵

¹ Lucian,

² Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 366; Gunkel *Gen.*, 432; Holzinger *Gen.*, 234; Simpson, *IB* I, 773; Smend *Erzählung*, 103.

³ Cf. Speiser *Gen.*, 316.

⁴ Above, p. 77 f.

⁵ The last, however, the present writer rejects in the case of the re-telling of Pharaoh's dreams. It seems that in fact the extensive recapitulation in chapter 41 is the result of embellishment, but certainly for aesthetic reasons only, not editorial; cf. above, p. 80.

8. *Joseph's Means of Testing his Brothers' Words*

(a) All but one of the brothers are to remain in prison in Egypt, and that one is to return home to fetch Benjamin (42: 15-16).

(b) Only one is to remain in prison; the rest are to return home to get Benjamin (42: 19-20).¹

The present state of this passage in chapter 42, it could be argued, does not constitute a discrepancy, since the alternative in vss. 19-20 is presented as a change of mind Joseph experienced after three days of implied reflection. Yet it is strange that no statement to this effect is made, either by the author or by Joseph. Stranger still that after the explicit injunctions of (a) no favoured brother is allowed to return to get Benjamin, but all are inexplicably incarcerated!

Upon reflexion one will discover the proposed procedure of vss. 15-16 to be hasty and ill-conceived. Who is going to take the much-needed grain back to Jacob and family if nine brothers are imprisoned? And is one brother going to be sufficient protection for Benjamin on the long and dangerous journey? And will the sight of but one surviving brother returning to the homestead be too much of a shock to the nervous old patriarch? In his second, ameliorated, proposal, Joseph seems to have taken these strictures into account, for he prefaces his remarks with a statement that he too fears god, and specifically mentions the matter of the clan's lack of food. It looks as though the present form of chapter 42: 15-20 is original. The apparent unevenness stems from the writer's close observation of his characters, and his uncanny ability to capture their most probable reactions. Thus Joseph's commands in vss. 15-16 are uttered in the heat of his first meeting with his brothers in twenty years, and in his anger (albeit feigned) he is more punitive than is prudent, or even than he perhaps wished to be. Even before dismissing them and putting his suggestion into effect he senses the lack of wisdom in it, and so stalls for time by putting all of them in prison for three days. In the meantime he reconsiders, and realizes that sending only one brother back would cause undue anxiety to innocents. Consequently he summons them once more, and in a calmer mood enjoins upon them a more feasible course of action. From

¹ Cf. Gressmann (EYXAPIΣTHPION, 43 f.), who treats these as two variants of the basic “Kundschafter-Sage,” (b) being earlier and more original than (a). With the remainder of Gressmann's reconstruction of chapters 42-44, however, the present writer finds himself in profound disagreement. Spy- and money-motifs are not surely independent parallels, each of which began with the famine in Canaan.

Joseph's standpoint also his new plan is more desirable. For, any lengthy stay on the part of the brothers in Egypt would increase the likelihood of their learning his true identity by chance.

One brother must, of course, be detained to ensure the return of the others, in case they do not by some odd chance discover their refunded money, or find some other source of food outside Egypt. But from the point of view of the author the detention of one brother is simply a mechanical contrivance, and need not be dwelled upon. That is why Simeon is passed over very quickly both in 42: 24 and 43: 23,¹ not because he is a secondary addition to the plot, or a borrowing from a parallel version.² The fact that it is Simeon that is made the victim can have no historical overtones.³ The simple process of transposing Märchen into Saga necessitated the conjuring up of personal names, and as the second son of Jacob after Reuben, Simeon was the logical choice.⁴

9. *The Discovery of the Money in the Sacks*

(a) The brothers stop at a lodging place, and one brother,⁵ upon opening his sack to feed his donkey, finds his money (42: 27 f.). All the brothers witness this (vs. 28), and later, when relating the incident to Joseph's steward, they declare that they all opened their sacks in the inn—a distortion for which they may be excused in the light of their evident nervousness.

(b) The brothers do not empty their sacks and find their money until they reach home and are in their father's presence (42: 35).

¹ In 43: 14 he would not even be referred to obliquely if Rabin's emendation be accepted, viz. "your surviving brother Benjamin"; cf. *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961), 387 f.

² Joseph tests his brothers' integrity in four ways. The detention of Simeon tests their loyalty to one another; the return of the money tests their honesty; (they had stolen his coat in chapter 37, but had they not now protested that they were honest men?). The demand to see Benjamin tests their present attitude towards the youngest brother; and finally, the hiding of the cup in Benjamin's sack tests their loyalty to this youngest of the family: cf. Gressmann, *op. cit.*, 46 f.

³ Pace E. Nielsen, *Shechem, a Traditio-historical Investigation* (Copenhagen, 1955), 259 f.

⁴ A choice, by the way, which suggests that Simeon was basic to the "Reuben"-version, before the piece fell into the hands of the "Judah"-redactor: cf. Eerdmans *AS*, I, 68 (see also Holzinger, *ZAW* 31 [1911], 59); Eerdmans confines the detention of Simeon to his "Jacob" recension (i. e. our "Reuben"-version). Cf. also Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 385; Driver *Introduction*, 18; *idem*, *Gen.*, 350; Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 219; Holzinger *Gen.*, 240.

⁵ For a defence of the usual translation, see W. Baumgartner, *TbZ* 3 (1947), 474.

Those who espouse the Documentary Hypothesis usually treat (a) as J (or J₂) and (b) as E.¹

Harmonization here is comparatively easy. Only one brother makes the startling discovery on the road, the rest only when they have reached home. Their account in chapter 43 is inconsistent simply because they are under a nervous strain. The initial shock is conveyed by 42: 28, with the brothers' startled "What is this that god has done to us?" The grim possibility that the one brother is not alone, and that the others too will find their money returned, must await realization until they are in the presence of their father. Then, at the most dramatic moment, after the dismal report of the brothers about what went on in Egypt, comes the final, crushing blow: they are all as good as thieves, and all stand in danger of Simeon's fate! From one point of view, then, the "two-staged" discovery of their returned money has a necessary dramatic effect in the narrative.

Two seemingly insignificant facts, however, remain unaccounted for by this satisfying harmonization; first, the present situation of vs. 35 in chapter 42, and second, the strange fact that only one of the brothers' asses had to be fed at the inn. At present vs. 35 breaks awkwardly into the very middle of a conversation separating the end of the brothers' account of what happened to them from Jacob's despairing response.² It seems that the verse is an interpolation; but why? Some redactor must have deemed the text incomplete at this point. Indeed, if (a) were the original text, the incompleteness is obvious: Jacob never learns of the return of the money! But does not this conform to the picture the author has drawn of the patriarch, the feeble old man who knows nothing of what is going on between the brothers and Joseph, and who can only bewep in pitiable fashion the loss of one son after another? He never learns of what the brothers did to Joseph, he never is informed of what transpired on the second trip, and, if our hypothesis is correct, he knows nothing about the refunded money. In the "Judah"-passage of chapter 43, however, Jacob is aware of the returned money (vs. 12). To account for his knowledge verse 35 had to be added to the preceding chapter; but then the statement that all the brothers had followed the example of one of their

¹ Driver *Gen.*, 350 f.; Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 220; Gunkel *Gen.*, 441, 445; *idem*, *Urgesch.*, 272; Holzinger *Gen.*, 239; König, *Gen.*, 706; Procksch *Gen.*, 238; Ruppert *JEG*, 98; Smend *Erzählung*, 104; Simpson, *IB* I, 787 f.; attempted rebuttal of the critical position in Wiener *Pent. St.*, 42; Green, *Hebraica* 7 (1890), 21.

² Cf. Rudolph *Elohist*, 160 f.

number in the inn and opened their sacks (vs. 28) had likewise to be modified (unless this information had always been implied rather than explicit).

If vs. 35 is accepted as an editorial interpolation, as I think it must be, the case for source division falls. The incident involving the inn is integral to the story, and (b) has nothing whatsoever to do with "E".

The "historification" of the Joseph Story, as represented by the form it takes in Genesis, has proceeded to the point of supplying a name for the victim detained in Egypt (i.e. Simeon), but not for the brother who discovered his money in the inn. The most obvious candidate would be Levi, the next brother in order of birth; and in Post-Biblical amplification and midrash on the Story he it surely is.¹

10. *The Entry of the Brothers into Joseph's House*

(a) The brothers are brought to Joseph's house for the meal before they speak with the steward (43: 17).

(b) The brothers are brought to the house after Simeon has been released, and after they have been reassured by the steward (43: 24).²

This is surely no doublet. As Rudolph has pointed out,³ vs. 17 ff. all take place outside the house, as vs. 19b shows. Vs. 17 merely refers to their arrival in the environs of Joseph's house, which occasions their fear; vs. 24 tells of their entry into the building.

11. *How did Joseph "learn" of the Brothers' Father?*

(a) In chapter 42: 11 and 13 the brothers themselves proffer the information that they are the sons of one man, that one of their number is dead, and that they have yet another brother—the youngest—whom they did not bring with them.

(b) In 43: 7 Judah reports to his father "the man questioned us carefully about our relatives, saying, 'Is your father still living? do you have a brother?' And we told him specifically about these things"; and in chapter 44: 19 Judah reminds Joseph, "and my lord asked his servants, 'Do you have a father or brother?'"⁴

¹ Ginsberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, II, 87.

² For the alleged doublet, see Holzinger, *ZAW* 31 (1911), 59; König *Gen.*, 709.

³ *Elobist*, 162.

⁴ The accepted critical solution is to assign (a) to E, and (b) to J (or J₂): cf. Dillmann *Gen.* II, 391; Driver *Gen.*, 353; Gunkel *Gen.*, 443; *idem*, *Urgesch.*, 272;

From the standpoint of the furtherance of the plot, the discrepancy is admittedly of minor significance. Rudolph¹ believes there is no justification for division into sources, and Procksch² posits but a single source. Yet as a clue to source analysis it seems to loom large, in as-much as it is contained in a recapitulation of a part of the story already told. Such recapitulation is common in ancient literatures, and the phenomenon has already been treated in an earlier chapter of the present work.³ Frequently whole blocks of direct speech or descriptive detail will be repeated when the locale or action require it, or when one character is informing another not present earlier. The question to be considered in the present case is, ought the two recapitulations of chapters 43 and 44 to reflect in detail the dialogue between Joseph and his brothers in chapter 42? Parallels suggest indeed that we should expect something approaching verbatim accuracy. But chapter 43 and 44 do not quote the dialogue of chapter 42 verbatim; 44: 19 does not even quote 43: 7 verbatim!

In fact verbatim recapitulation is common in works cast in poetic form: the recurrent refrain has a function here.⁴ But in a prose narrative a more sophisticated audience is not as likely to accept such verbatim repetitions. Does not human memory fail, at least sometimes? Is it not possible that the character might wish to paraphrase his report? Might he not have ulterior motives for paraphrasing, or even for distorting? Perhaps the author himself might wish to relieve the monotony by variation.

Good examples of more or less paraphrased recapitulations may be found in three stories from Egyptian literature, viz. the Shipwrecked Sailor, Sinuhe, and The Contendings of Horus and Seth.

On two occasions the Sailor has occasion to repeat the account of his shipwreck, once to the count, the captain of his ship, and once to the fabulous snake which inhabited the island.⁵

Holzinger *Gen.*, 241; Ruppert *JEG*, 113; Peake, *Commentary*, 163; Procksch *Gen.*, 237, 241; Speiser *Gen.*, 334; Smend *Erzählung*, 104. The passages in question are translated in parallel columns, above p. 81 ff.

¹ *Elobist*, 162.

² *Gen.*, 245.

³ Above, p. 77 ff.

⁴ Cf. *inter alia*, Gilgamesh (*ANET*, 60 ff.), Etana (*ibid.*, 114 ff.), Keret (*ibid.*, 142 ff.), Aqhat (*ibid.*, 149 ff.).

⁵ For sources see above, p. 111 n. 2. Italics indicate variant wording.

To the Count (24-40)

"I went to the 'Mine-land of the Sovereign,'

and I embarked on the sea in a ship 120 cubits long and 40 cubits wide, with a crew of 120 on board, drawn from the best (sailors) in Egypt. No matter where they looked, up or down, their hearts were as imperturbable as (those of) lions; they could predict a storm before it came, or a tempest before it happened.

A storm blew up while we were on the sea, before we could get to land. The wind rose to double its (normal) strength, and with it came waves 8 cubits (high), which the mast broke for me.¹ Then the ship sank, and none of those who were in her survived.

Then I was deposited upon this island by a wave of the sea."

The slight embellishment in the second recapitulation does no harm to the account, and causes no serious inconsistency. Like Pharaoh in retelling his dream to Joseph,² the Sailor becomes slightly more verbose the second time.

In the tale of Sinuhe the actual circumstances surrounding the hero's learning of Amenemhet I's death are reported as follows (R 22 ff.):³ "Now word was sent to the royal children who were in his (the crown prince's) train in this army, and one of them was informed while I was standing within earshot." When, later, Sinuhe reports the same incident to the chieftain Ammusinenshi, it comes out: "when I had returned with the army from the land of Tmehu it was reported to me." Again, when Sinuhe is describing his reaction to the chieftain, he says (B 38 ff.): "my shoulders sagged, my heart was not in my body, it took me on to the road of flight. I had not been a subject of gossip, no one

¹ The sailor crouches for protection under the unstepped mast, as the waves crash over the ship.

² Above, p. 79 f.

³ For sources see above p. 114 n. 1.

To the Snake (89-110)

"It happened that I embarked for the Mine-land on the Sovereign's mission

in a ship 120 cubits long and 40 cubits wide, with a crew of 120 on board, drawn from the best (sailors) in Egypt. No matter where they looked, up or down, their hearts were as imperturbable as (those of) lions; they could predict a storm before it came, or a tempest before it happened.

Everyone of them was imperturbable, with an arm stronger than his companion's—there was no fool among them.

A storm blew up while we were on the sea, before we could get to land. The wind rose to double its (normal) strength, and with it came waves 8 cubits (high), which the mast broke for me.¹ Then the ship sank, and none of those who were in her survived, except me—and here I am beside you!

Then I was brought to this island by a wave of the sea."

had spat in my face, I had not heard a word of abuse, my name had not been heard on the lips of the herald. I do not know what brought me to this foreign land—it was like a divine plan; as though a delta-dweller should see himself in Elephantine, a man of the marshes in Nubia!" In a letter to the king Sinuhe's description has become: "as for this flight which Yours Truly made, I did not plan it, it was not in my heart, I did not devise it; I do not know what drove me from the place. It was something like a dream, as when a delta-dweller sees himself in Elephantine, a man of the marshes in Nubia! I was not afraid, no one was pursuing me; I had not heard a word of abuse, my name had not been heard on the lips of the herald. God decreed this flight...". The discrepancies in Sinuhe's account are slight, but undeniable. To the reader he admits that he only overheard news of the king's death; to the chieftain he said that it had been reported to him. In his own account Sinuhe says he fled because he feared he would be killed in the imminent civil war; to the chieftain he pleads ignorance, and to the king in his fulsome defence he adds to the plea of ignorance that he had not feared anything at all—it must have been an act of god! These inconsistencies, far from betokening different sources used by the writer, can be accounted for within the context of the story, entirely psychologically. Sinuhe was, on one occasion, boasting of his own importance to a barbarian, and on another seeking desperately to clear his name before the king. And, significantly, neither of these motives is made explicit.

The passages in the Contendings of Horus and Seth which we have chosen to translate are those which contain the fabricated story which Isis tells to trick Seth into condemning himself. Isis tells the yarn to the gullible Seth, and the latter repeats it to Re-harakhte after he has realized the nature of the trap Isis had laid for him. The court convened to try the claims of Horus and Seth to the office (*ibwt*) of the deceased Osiris had already considered the advisability of "giving the office of Osiris to Seth, when his (Osiris's) son Horus is (still alive)," i.e. giving the inheritance to a relative instead of the legitimate son and rightful heir (cf. 1/11 f., 4/6 f.); but no decision had as yet been reached.¹

¹ For sources, see above, p. 120 n. 1. Italics indicates variant wording.

Isis to Seth (6/8 ff.)

"Me, I lived with a
cowherd as his wife,
and I bore him a male child.
When my husband died, the lad began
to tend his father's herds.
Now a stranger came and sat down
in my barn;

thus he spoke to my
little boy, "I am going to give you
a beating, and take away your father's
herds, and throw you out."
So he spoke to *him*;
but I would like you to stand up for
him." Thereupon Seth said to her,
"Shall the herds be given to the
stranger, when the man's little boy is
(still alive)?"¹

Once again the recapitulation is longer by virtue of the embellishments which always go with the re-telling a story. But there can be no question of different sources. The embellishments in the recapitulation are intentionally interpolated by the author for the sake of irony. Seth, who has unwittingly pronounced judgment in favour of his arch-rival Horus by protesting the absurdity of depriving an heir of his rightful inheritance, now adds to his own chagrin by suggesting that the imposter receive the additional penalty of a beating! And this to the very judge who was presiding at the trial! Seth is thus depicted as a simpleton and a buffoon, by his expanding to his own disadvantage the account of how he was tricked.

Can the apparent discrepancies in Judah's recapitulation likewise be put down to the author's intent, rather than to source division? One could perhaps argue that, when speaking to his father in chapter 43, Judah was motivated by an unconscious desire to clear himself and his brothers. Jacob assumes that the brothers proffered the information about the family, but in the tense situation Judah, who is impatient to set out for Egypt, cannot admit this. He loudly protests that it was the governor of the land who demanded the information. What could the

¹ To understand this passage one must bear in mind the paronomasia in the words *ḥt*, "office," and *ḥwt*, "herd."

Seth to Reharakhte (7/4 ff.)

"*She said to me*: 'Me, I lived with a
cowherd *who is now dead*, as his wife,
and I bore him a male child

who tends his father's few herds.
A stranger *stopped*

at my barn
in company with my little boy, and I
gave him a meal. Now after a few
days had passed the visitor said to my
little boy, "I am going to give you
a beating, and take away your father's
herds, and they shall belong to me."
So he spoke to *my little boy*, *She said to*
me ...

I said to her,
"Shall *indeed* the herds be given to the
stranger, when the man's little boy is
(still alive)?"¹ *Said I to her*, 'I'll thrash
the visitor with a stick and throw him out,
and your little boy shall be put in his father's
place!'"

brothers do but dutifully answer the questions put to them? Were they to lie? Perhaps Judah has forgotten what actually took place, and on the spur of the moment is reconstructing what he actually believes the sequence of the events was. By the time they come before Joseph again this modified version has become an integral part of their defense.

On the other hand such an explanation does not obviate all difficulties. As we have seen, a psychological explanation can account for variants or embellishments; but can it satisfactorily rationalize discrepancies? One can appreciate the motive for Judah's falsification in the conversation with his father, but would such falsification, deliberate or not, from the *writer's* point of view be appropriate when Judah addressed Joseph? After all, Joseph was there; *he* undoubtedly remembered! He could have cut Judah short by hauling out a transcript and proving that it was the brothers who had, without solicitation from him, given information about themselves. The mere possibility of such an interruption by Joseph is most undesirable from the standpoint of plot development, and even debilitating at this crucial point in the drama. No good author would have introduced an irrelevancy of this magnitude when the resolution of the plot was imminent.

It is, moreover, suggestive that these discrepancies occur in passages where Judah and not Reuben is the spokesman for the brothers. When we compare Judah's description of Joseph's first meeting with his brothers (ch. 43-44) with Reuben's description of the same episode (ch. 42),¹ we cannot help but be struck by a marked difference in literary quality and coherence. The Reuben-account is clear and consistent: Joseph asks his brothers why they have come; the reply is to buy food; he contradicts them by calling them spies; to clear themselves they tell of their family; to prove their statement Joseph demands that they bring Benjamin with them. In Judah's account Joseph inexplicably begins by asking them about their family; the brothers reply willingly, but strangely wax sentimental over their youngest brother, almost as though they knew what demand Joseph was going to make. Then Joseph expresses his desire to see Benjamin. Now in the Reuben-version this request had some point, since it was to be, at least on the surface, the proof of the brothers' truthfulness. But in the Judah-version it is without ostensible reason. The brothers protest that if the boy leaves his father the old man will die, an excuse which actually they could not have made until *after* they returned and learned

¹ Above, p. 83 ff.

of their father's unwillingness to send Benjamin under any circumstances (42: 36-38). Joseph insists that if they do not bring Benjamin he will not even grant them an audience. But this is no way to ensure their return! The brothers do not, in fact, at this time even contemplate returning; it is only after they have eaten all the food they bought and find the famine continuing, that they realize a second trip will be necessary! As in chapter 37, the passages in which Judah appears are inferior to those in which Reuben takes the lead. The former knows and is based on the latter, but has mangled an otherwise logical plot into incoherence.

12. *When did Pharaoh Learn that Joseph's Family had come?*

(a) Pharaoh learned through the rumour which spread after Joseph revealed himself to his brothers (45: 16).

(b) Pharaoh learns from Joseph himself only after the brothers have repaired to Canaan to fetch their father and their households, and have descended to Egypt a third time (47: 1).

The former is usually ascribed to E the latter to J.¹

But there is no contradiction here. In 45: 16 ff. Pharaoh merely hears of Joseph's meeting with his brothers, and out of the goodness of his heart extends, *through Joseph*, an invitation to come and stay in Egypt. Pharaoh does not at that time come face to face with the brothers. Only when, pursuant to his instructions, the whole clan appears in Egypt does the king grant them a formal audience. It is to announce the fulfilment of the king's instructions and the arrival of the clan that Joseph in 47: 1 goes to apprise Pharaoh. That the king should still be ignorant of the brothers' occupation (47: 3) is understandable, for he still knows nothing about them: he has never met them!²

13. *The Preparations for the Transportation of the Family*

(a) Pharaoh commands that wagons be sent to carry Jacob, the wives and children (45: 19, 46: 5 [MT]).

(b) Wagons are sent at Joseph's behest (45: 27, 46: 5 [LXX]).³

¹ Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 280 f.; Holzinger *Gen.*, 245 ff.; Kuenen *Hex.*, 146; Smend *Erzählung*, 106; for a dissident view, Procksch *Gen.*, 252.

² Cf. Rudolph *Elobist*, 163.

³ (a) is usually ascribed to E, (b) to J: cf. Holzinger *Gen.*, 245 ff.; Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 282; others would confine all passages mentioning wagons to E: Procksch *Gen.*, 254; Smend *Erzählung*, 108; cf. Von Rad, *Gen.*, 392.

As the MT now stands the difficulty does not exist; for the idea of the wagons was Pharaoh's (45: 19), and Joseph acts explicitly on the royal command (45: 24).¹ When later reference must be made to them, and that briefly—the delegation of authority cannot be gone over again—it is equally true to say that now Joseph (45: 27) now Pharaoh (46: 5) has sent the carts. Of course, if the phrase *'al pī Par'ō(b)* is omitted from vs. 24 as a gloss (which at first glance seems likely enough) we should have a clear statement, at variance with vs. 19, that Joseph had despatched the carts on his own initiative; and could then conjure up a parallel version. But vs. 24 without the phrase "at Pharaoh's command" is incomplete, for it lacks a statement telling what the carts were to be used for. There seems no alternative to accepting the present state of this episode as internally consistent, although the reader may sense a redundancy which cannot be explained away logically.²

14. *Who First Heard of Jacob's Arrival in Egypt?*

(a) According to 46: 28 ff. Judah, who had been sent on ahead by Jacob, announced the clan's arrival in Egypt, and Joseph went to the border to meet and welcome them.

(b) According to the LXX of 47: 5 ff. it was Pharaoh, oddly enough, who got wind of Jacob's arrival, and relayed the news to Joseph.

The question as to whether the story is self-contradictory depends upon one's acceptance of the text of the LXX. From vs. 5 on the Greek reads as follows: "(5a) Pharaoh said to Joseph: (6b) 'let them live in the land of Goshen, and if you know any capable men among them, put them in charge of my cattle.' Jacob and his sons came to Egypt and Pharaoh King of Egypt heard, and Pharaoh said to Joseph: (5b) 'Your father and your brothers have come to you; (6a) see! The land of Egypt is before you; settle your father and your brothers in the best of the land.'" Usually scholars have accepted the LXX text as more original, and have seen in the 5a-6b segment the end of the J-text, and in 5b-6a the beginning of a P-section.³ It has been assumed that the process whereby the two sources were intertwined has not

¹ Rudolph *Elobist*, 164.

² See further below p. 170 f. for evidence of embellishment in chapter 45.

³ So Holzinger *Einleitung*, xxvii; cf. Kittel *Gesch.* I, 246; Procksch *Gen.*, 258; König (*Gen.*, 737) and Dahse (*TMH* I, 158 f.) are opposed. Cf. also the proposals of Löhr and Smend in *BZAW* 38, 9 and *Erzählung*, 107 respectively.

proceeded as far in the text preserved by the LXX as in the MT. But Rudolph has argued cogently against this.¹ For him the LXX is secondary to the MT. The former has merely rearranged the text because 6b seemed so logical a response to 4. Moreover, if the LXX preserved here an original form of the text, it would have to be conceded that in this case the original is also the inferior. Why should Pharaoh have heard the news before Joseph? Would not the brothers make straight for him as they had done on their earlier trips? It makes more sense, it seems to me, to take "your father and your brothers have come to you" in 5b, not as relayed information, but as a quiet statement of fact, the premise upon which Pharaoh's subsequent decision is based.²

15. *The Purpose of Jacob's Coming to Egypt*

(a) The famine is so severe that for the sake of convenience the clan comes to Egypt to be close to the food supply.

(b) The clan migrates to Egypt with the intention of settling there more or less permanently.

According to 45: 11 and 18 the reason for the family's coming was to sustain themselves during the five remaining years of famine. Nothing is said of the years following the famine. The need is pressing and they must come at once. The reader is left with the expectation that, like Abraham (Gen. 12: 10-20), Jacob and family will quit Egypt for Canaan once the drought is ended. Whether the original version of the Joseph Story concluded with the return to Palestine after the famine is debatable; but it is at least a possibility. There was, however, another strong tradition that Israel had remained in Egypt four centuries, and had dwelled in Goshen. Sensitive to this tradition, the Judah-version adds the episode in 47: 1 ff. to *account for* the changed circumstances which obliged Israel to stay permanently in Egypt. Judah, sent on ahead (46: 28) stops in Goshen, and there the family temporarily encamp, and there Joseph is re-united with his father. The fact that the family are already in Goshen, and the fact that this was a border province with a foreign racial and cultural admixture, prompted Joseph to request that they be allowed to settle there. But for their own security it behooves them to tie themselves closely to the royal house. So Joseph stresses to his brothers that they should specify their occupation as herdsmen when they come before the king. And, as

¹ *Elohist*, 165 f.

² For the dramatic unity of the passage see above, p. 84 f.

Joseph must have realized, the king not only agreed to let them stay in Goshen, but made them overseers of the royal herds. They were no longer alien bedu, but officers of the crown, and when the famine came to an end there could be no question of their returning to Canaan. The entire section, then, from 46: 28 to 47: 6 is essentially the addition of the "Judah"-version.

But P was not satisfied with the *ad hoc* nature of the settlement in Goshen. He makes out that it was already in the mind of Joseph that the family should remain permanently in Egypt; and to that end he must insert a verse in chapter 45, and put it in the mouth of Joseph. The verse in question is 10; that it is from the hand of P is clear, not only from the awkward way in which it breaks into the smooth flow of 9-11, but also from the characteristic verbosity and repetitiveness. One interpolation, however, was not sufficient for P. Verse 3 of chapter 47 did not make it at all explicit that the clan should be allowed to remain in Goshen. Joseph's instructions in 46: 33-34 do not contain any suggestion that he wished the brothers to come out with the bold request of 47: 4, which, it is clear from the whole story up to this point, had not even entered their minds. But P knows god's plan, and he has a predilection for $\sqrt{\text{GWR}}$, "to sojourn," and he does not want his readers to doubt for one moment that the Israelites knew they were going to stay for a while. Verse 4 of chapter 47, then, is also P.

16. *Jacob's Audience with Pharaoh (47: 7-10)*

While this passage does not openly contradict any statement made elsewhere in the Joseph Story, it contains some implausibles in its present context. Jacob does not know when he is going to die, and thus cannot compare his life with those of his ancestors, as he does in vs. 9.¹ The first of Joseph's clan to be presented to Pharaoh are five of his brothers; according to the present arrangement of chapter 47 Jacob is presented *after* his sons, an anomalous procedure in any ancient society!² This can only mean that the episode 46: 28-47: 6 was considered an inseparable unit, and was already present when the substance of 47: 7-10 was conceived. Why was it conceived? Jacob, the progenitor of the Israelite race in Egypt, and not granted an audience with Pharaoh, that fabled potentate! No, such a confrontation must have taken place. For an author or editor the opportunity was too

¹ Smend *Erzählung*, 13.

² Dillmann *Gen.*, II, 423.

attractive to miss, to have Jacob speak with the king and *bless* him. The writer in question must have been P,¹ as the following considerations show: (a) he uses P's favorite term, *mēgūrīm*; (b) he evinces an interest in ages and chronology; (c) he apparently knew of vs. 28 (P); (d) the hiph'ıl of √'MD in the sense of "present" is another favorite of P, and is used frequently in Leviticus; (e) a pedantic completeness appears in the style; e.g. the obvious fact that the audience concluded with Jacob's departure has to be noted (vs. 10; cf. 41: 46, also P).

17. *Jacob's Request for Burial*

(a) To Joseph Jacob makes a request that he be buried "with my fathers ... in their tomb," i.e. the family tomb at Hebron (47: 30).

(b) To Pharaoh Joseph reports his father's instructions as follows: "in the grave which I cut out for myself in the land of Canaan, there you shall bury me," (50: 5).

The first sounds like the Genesis editor's attempt to bring Jacob's burial into line with the interments of the other patriarchs (25: 9-10, 35: 29). The second could then be viewed as the way the earlier version put it: somewhere in the Land of Canaan, perhaps at Shechem or even Beersheba, Jacob had hewn his own tomb, and there he naturally wished to be buried. The writer of the Joseph story had no qualms about removing Jacob's body to Canaan for burial, although from the standpoint of his story it would be more natural for Jacob to be interred in Egypt. The narrative was simply accommodating the very ancient and revered tradition, much older than, and therefore ignorant of, the Joseph romance, that Jacob had lived out his life and had died on Palestinian soil. Pharaoh acquiesced, and so the family repaired to Palestine to bury Jacob, and perhaps to take up residence again at Beersheba. At least such an immediate and permanent return to Canaan may have been implied by the story. That is why the Genesis editor, in the wake of the author of the Judah-version who also had to accommodate the Sojourn and Exodus traditions, felt obliged explicitly to deny the implication by stipulating that only Joseph's brothers went, not their families (50: 8b), and that they returned to Egypt after the burial (50: 14).

Joseph's death was not recounted in the Joseph Story. This was left to the Genesis editor, and it is instructive to see what he made of it.

¹ Cf. Von Rad *Gen.*, 402.

With the pattern of Jacob's death and burial before him, the Genesis editor could have made the family trek a second time to Palestine to bury Joseph. This would have been the most reasonable procedure. But he did not choose such an expedient. Instead, he adopted the most unlikely course of having Joseph's body kept in a coffin in Egypt for five hundred odd years until, after the Israelite Exodus and Conquest it was finally buried at Shechem! Why? Because the Genesis editor had no authorization in his sources to do otherwise. His one source, the Joseph Story, told of only one trip to Palestine with the purpose of burying Jacob; another source, the Exodus tradition, told of a second trip, viz. the Exodus. Between these two egressions from Egypt, the Genesis editor had no evidence for another, and could not invent one!

18. *The Context of Gen. 50: 15-21*

(a) Joseph's brothers, forgiven long since by Joseph (45: 5), accompany Joseph on his trip to Canaan to bury Jacob (50: 8, 12 ff.).

(b) The brothers, not having yet received forgiveness from Joseph, only see "that their father is dead" (vs. 15), and pursuant to this event come before Joseph to crave the forgiveness which, they allege, Jacob had enjoined upon him before his death.¹

The most serious discrepancy in this passage is not the desire for a second forgiveness, but the unaccountable mental lapse suffered by the brothers. It is perhaps understandable that they should be upset by their father's death and thereafter regard Joseph with some apprehension; but how could a writer, having just made the brothers take part in their father's impressive funeral, immediately imply the lack of involvement in the whole proceedings which is clearly betokened by the clause "Now when Joseph's brothers saw that their father was dead..."?

The best solution is to separate vss. 1-14 from 15-21, and treat them as separate in origin. The first three verses of the chapter at least, belong to the Joseph Story *per se* (in its Judah-expansion), but by vs. 7 at the latest the hand of the Genesis editor is evident.² He has inserted an inconsequential aetiology of which he knew, and has surrounded it

¹ The favorite analysis assigns much of 1-14 to J and 15-21 to E: Driver *Introduction*, 17; Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 291 f.; Holzinger *Gen.*, 264 f.; König *Gen.*, 784; Smend *Erzählung*, 110; Speiser *Gen.*, 377 f.; Von Rad *Gen.*, 425. Eerdmans (*AS I*, 69) is among the few who assign the majority of the chapter to a single source.

² Note the repetitive quality of vss. 8 ff. and 12 ff., and the pedantic completeness which vs. 14 provides.

with his usual "padding." Vss. 15-21 come from an author who excluded the brothers from the funeral arrangements and burial of Jacob, and who built his little episode on previous turns in the plot of the Joseph Story itself. The logic behind the creation of this anticlimactic scene lies in the possible eisegesis of Gen. 47: 12, that, although Joseph will look after his father and family, there is no explicit statement that he is not reserving his revenge for the period after Jacob dies.¹

REDUNDANCY

Some verses are singled out by source analysts as "doublets," and are presented as evidence of two sources quoted side by side. The term "doublet," however, with its suggestion of parallelism, seems to prejudice the analysis from the start. About all we are justified in saying from an empirical analysis is that verses such-and-such seem redundant.

The following are some of the more famous "doublets" of the Joseph Story.

1. 37: 13-14, "And Israel said to Joseph, 'Your brothers are grazing at Shechem, are they not? Come now, I'm going to send you to them.' 'I'm ready,' he answered him. 'Go please,' he said to him, 'and see how your brothers are, and report back to me' ...".

The usual division ascribes 13a and 14b to J, and 13b and 14a to E.² This division, however, leaves the purpose of the mission unexpressed in J. Nor would the purpose be so clear that Joseph needed no instruction: was he going to help them, take food to them (as David did to his brothers), or communicate a message? Vs. 14, despite the awkwardness of the join with vs. 13, clearly follows that verse and recounts the instructions Jacob had to give his son before sending him off. Source division here is misleading.

2. 41: 25, 28, "Then Joseph answered Pharaoh, 'the dream of Pharaoh is a unit; what god is about to do he has told Pharaoh ... This is what I'm telling Pharaoh: what god is about to do he has revealed to Pharaoh.' "

Now one would naturally assume that if a parallel version is quoted, it is because it preserves a rather distinctive variant. But if vs. 28 came from a different source than 25b, it is inconceivable why the redactor

¹ Von Rad *Josephsgesch.*, 20.

² Gunkel *Gen.*, 403; Skinner *Gen.*, 446.

should have bothered to quote it, for it says exactly the same thing! The only reason for saying the same thing twice in the present context is for emphasis. But then the *prima facie* probability of two sources disappears; for if the *writer* of 25b is himself desirous of emphasizing a statement, surely he will not achieve such emphasis by picking to pieces a parallel version (mysteriously in existence already!), but will simply repeat himself. The same holds true if the intent to add emphasis lies with a later redactor; in that case he will merely expand the text before him by repetition.

Joseph proceeds in vss. 26-27 to give the key to the interpretation of the dreams by interpreting the four symbols as sets of seven years, and two of the symbols more specifically as years of famine. He then reiterates his statement of 25b. What Joseph is trying to emphasize for Pharaoh here is the nature of the dreams: they concern an imminent act of god. The dreams do not presage the personal fortunes of the dreamer, as in the case of the four earlier dreams in the story.¹ They were granted to Pharaoh only in his capacity of temporal ruler of the land of Egypt, and the symbolism betrays at once the fact that the dreams foreshadow events of national consequence.² Having provided the key to the symbolism and stressed the special character of the interpretation to come, Joseph in vs. 29 launches into that interpretation, and describes in clear language what the dreams foretell. Thus vs. 29 does not introduce a J variant as some think,³ but rather marks the beginning of the formal interpretation.

3. 41: 30-31, "And after them will come seven years of famine, when the bumper crops Egypt had are forgotten, and the famine will exhaust the country. People will not remember the bumper crops in the country on account of that later famine, for it will be extremely severe."

The objections to isolating two sources in these verses⁴ are the same as those levelled against the division of vss. 25 and 28.⁵

4. 41: 33-35.

(a) Joseph recommends the appointment of a "discreet and wise" man over all Egypt (vs. 33).

¹ Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 204 f.

² Cf. Gunkel *Gen.*, 430; *idem*, *Urgesch.*, 267.

³ So Skinner *Gen.*, 468.

⁴ *Ibid.*; Ruppert *JEG*, 68.

⁵ Cf. Rudolph *Elobist*, 158.

(b) Joseph recommends the appointment of several overseers who shall take one-fifth of the produce of the good years (vs. 34).

(c) Joseph recommends that the overseers gather all the food of the good years (vs. 35).¹

The discrepancies have, in large part, been read into the text. The appointment of a chief executive does not necessarily exclude the appointment of assistants; to the ancients, well accustomed to a rigid hierarchical structure, vss. 33 and 34 would involve no inconsistency, and no amplification would be needed. Similarly, the collection of one-fifth of the produce, and the statement of vs. 35 that all the food is to be taken, are not contradictory. The latter, moreover, if accepted literally, would sound ridiculous; what were the Egyptians going to live on during the seven good years if all their grain were taken for provisions against the seven lean years?² Vs. 35 is merely to be accepted as an example of the loose, often redundant, way in which Hebrew emphasizes the intensity, or degree, of an action.³

5. 41: 40, 41, "You shall be over my house, and in accordance with your command shall my people order themselves;⁴ only on the throne shall I be greater than you." And Pharaoh said to Joseph, 'see! I have placed you over all the Land of Egypt!'"

Those who look for doublets in the investiture scene⁵ are following a will o' the whisp; for, as we have pointed out earlier,⁶ this scene could be separated into three or possibly five strands! Such a source division is palpably ridiculous, and should be taken no more seriously than the allegation that the present verses are doublets. Uneven the

¹ Gunkel (*Gen.*, 432; *Urgesch.*, 268) assigns (a) and (b) to E and (c) to J. Procksch (*Gen.*, 228) gives (b) to J and (c) to E. Simpson (*ETI*, 138) thinks (a) to be E and (b) to be J. Cf. also Eichrodt, *BZAW* 31 (1916), 100; Smend *Erzählung*, 102 f. For arguments against a doublet, see Eerdmans *AS* I, 67, and Speiser *Gen.*, 313.

² Cf. Gunkel *Gen.*, 437; Holzinger *Gen.*, 236; König *Gen.*, 695, n. 1.

³ It could be argued that 34b is an editorial expansion in anticipation of 47: 24. In the same way vs. 33 could be an editorial expansion in anticipation of Pharaoh's assessment of Joseph in vss. 39-40.

⁴ From √ŠWQ? See Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 210; Driver *Gen.*, 343; Schulz, *ZAW* 52 (1934), 277. It has been alleged that the expression is a rendering of Egyptian (cf. A. S. Yahuda, *The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relationship to Egyptian* [Oxford, 1933], 7 f.; N. Adcock, *ET* 68 [1956], 383), but this has been rightly denied (T. E. Peet, *JEA* 16 [1930], 158). A more attractive suggestion is that the wording is elliptical for "to kiss the earth"; see König, *JBL* 48 (1929), 342; K. Kitchen, *ET* 69 (1957), 30.

⁵ Cf. among others, Eichrodt, *BZAW* 31 (1916), 100 f.; König *Gen.*, 694; Procksch *Gen.*, 227 f.; Von Rad *Gen.*, 372; Ruppert *JEG*, 69 f.; Simpson *ETI*, 138.

⁶ Above, p. 87.

passages may be, but they cannot be doublets: the imperative "see!", and the perfect "I have placed" in vs. 41 demand the presence of vs. 40 immediately before, and show that 41 is a dependent, though certainly repetitive statement. In the investiture scene embellishment in the form of expansion has run wild. Someone who thought that the distinction of being elevated to the second highest office in the land should not be dismissed in a sentence or two, has in a fit of uncontrolled excitement puffed out an original understatement by adding piecemeal to it as pertinent observations struck him. We are in one of those "open spaces" in the plot where the superlative tenor of the scene invites expansion.

6. 41: 53-57, "Then the seven years of bumper crops which the Land of Egypt had enjoyed came to an end, and the seven years of famine set in, as Joseph had said. There was famine throughout all lands but in the Land of Egypt there was food. And when the whole Land of Egypt was hungry, the people cried to Pharaoh for food; and Pharaoh said to all the Egyptians, 'go to Joseph, and do as he tells you.' The famine was over all the earth. Joseph opened the storehouses and sold to the Egyptians, for the famine was severe in the Land of Egypt. And all the earth came to Egypt to buy, unto¹ Joseph, for the famine was severe throughout the earth."²

It is tedious to read thrice that famine afflicted Egypt, and thrice again that the same famine afflicted the whole world, all within the confines of five short verses! But one can forgive the writer if one realizes that he is straining thereby to emphasize the severity of the drought and also to fill a hole in his story. For the aetiology of chapter 47: 13-26 in all likelihood once followed 41: 54a.³ This is where it logically belongs, but not dramatically. It was probably the

¹ It has become common to treat 'el here as meaning "from," and to conjure up Ugaritic parallels; cf. Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual* (Rome, 1955), 75. In fact it seems more likely that the phrase 'el Yōšēp should be construed as qualifying the verb *bā'ū*, "(the whole earth) came...".

² Procksch (*Gen.*, 230) separates vss. 53-54 from 55; but Rudolph points out (*Elobist*, 159): "Aber auch vs. 55 (der Hunger in Ägypten) enthält keinen Widerspruch zum Schluss von v. 54 (Brot in Ägypten), da die letztere Aussage sich auf das Brot in den Speichern Josefs bezieht." Smend (*Erzählung*, 103) assigns 55 and 56b to J₂, and 54b, 56a and 57 to E. According to Gunkel (*Gen.*, 432; *Urgesch.*, 266 and 268 f.) 54b goes to E and 55 f. to J. Simpson's allotment is as follows (*ETI*, 139; cf. also *IB* I, 781): 53-54 to J; 54b to P; 55 to J; 56a to J; 56b to R^JE.

³ Similarly Gunkel, *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 66; *idem*, *Gen.*, 465; Gressmann, *EYXAPIΣTHPION*, 31; Simpson, *IB* I, 781; but see Procksch *Gen.*, 241, 260; Eissfeldt *Hex. Syn.*, 267*; Ruppert, *JEG*, 143 f.

Genesis editor that realized this, and rightly transferred the aetiology (which formed no part of the original Joseph Story) to its present location, patching up the gap left by its removal with the present redundant phrases. But there is not the slightest evidence here for source division.

7. 42: 3, 5, "Joseph's ten brothers went down to buy grain in Egypt ... So the sons of Israel came to buy grain among those who came¹ for the famine affected the land of Canaan."

The redundancy here can be accounted for only by postulating some editorial re-working. At such a crucial join as this, between the motif of Joseph's elevation to power, and the resumption of the basic tale of Joseph and his brothers, we might well expect an editor to feel that the reader required help from him. In the present case the editor is the Genesis editor, whose hand is betrayed by the expression "the sons of Israel," meaning the brothers, not the Israelites (cf. 46: 5, and above, p. 20 f).² It may also be he who added verse 4, since the reason therein given does not actually appear until later (42: 38).

8. 42: 7, 9-11, 12-14, "... and he said to them, 'where do you come from?' and they replied, 'from the land of Canaan to buy food' ... he said to them, 'You are spies! It is to examine the destitution of the country that you have come!' They said to him, 'No, my lord ... we are honest men, your servants are not spies!' But he said to them, 'No, but it is the destitution of the country that you have come to examine!' They said, 'Your servants are twelve, we are brothers, sons of one man in the land of Canaan. The youngest is now with his father, and one is gone.' And Joseph said to them, 'Like I said before to you, you are spies.'"

Nowhere in the Joseph Story is the inadequacy of the mechanical application of the source-critical method more evident than in the hypercritical division of this passage.³ Source analysis here destroys

¹ This phrase indicates simply that many hungry Canaanites were coming to Egypt in those days, not only the family of Jacob. Did this wording occasion the Rabbinic belief that the brothers had entered the city, at Jacob's suggestion, each by a different gate, thus providing Joseph later with a basis for his feigned suspicion? Cf. R. Graves, R. Patai, *Hebrew Myths: the Book of Genesis* (New York, 1963), 264 f.

² Cf. Procksch *Gen.*, 236.

³ Cf. Simpson's division (*ETI*, 140): J, 9b β -11a, 12; E, 8, 9b α , 11b, 13-14; Holzinger *Gen.*, 239; Ruppert *JEG*, 88; Procksch *Gen.*, 237, 398; Wellhausen *Comp.*, 58 ff.; W. Schottroff, *Gedenken im alten Orient und im A. T.* (Neukirchen - Vluyn, 1964), 113; contrast Speiser *Gen.*, 321.

completely a dramatic effect which was the creation of one mind giving substance to its thoughts through one pen. The brothers, in response to Joseph's question as to their origin, state calmly their place of origin and the purpose of their trip. Joseph, determined to be difficult with them, says in effect, You lie! You are spies come to inspect the destitution of the land! The brothers gulp and begin to breathe hard: what is this? there is some mistake, there must be! They try again, still polite, still in control of themselves. This time to the purpose of their trip and their place of origin they add a word concerning their father together with a polite denial. As though he has not heard, Joseph snaps out his accusation almost in the same words. The brothers are desperate now; they give away in defense of their words information about their family of a personal nature, which they never would have revealed otherwise. But Joseph's ears must be plugged, and the tenor of his terse restatement of the accusation, caustically presented as a conclusion drawn from the brothers' own remarks, is very like the colloquial English "Like I say, you're spies!" The crescendo of this scene is apparent. It is certainly not the product of a mechanical union of sources.¹

9. 45: 3-4, "And Joseph said to his brothers, 'I am Joseph; is my father still living?' But his brothers were unable to answer him for they were overwhelmed in his presence. And Joseph said to his brothers, 'Come close to me,' so they came close. And he said, 'I am Joseph your brother, whom you sold into Egypt.'"

To assign vs. 2 and 3 to E, and 4 (or part of it), to J, as is usually done,² rends asunder a passage as delicate in feeling as any in the Joseph Story. The brothers are completely thunderstruck by Joseph's unexpected revelation. They are speechless, but their manner says plainly: How's that again? what did you say? That Joseph should repeat his words under these circumstances would be the most natural thing in the world! And why should a redactor preserve two variants virtually identical? That Joseph had, only hours before, enquired after his father's health (43: 27) is no reflection on the genuineness of vs. 3; for the question "is my father still alive?" is surely simply a polite mode of greeting and respectful enquiry.³

¹ Cf. Rudolph *Elobist*, 160.

² Cf. Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 280; Holzinger *Gen.*, 245; *idem*, *ZAW* 31 (1911), 59; Ruppert *JEG*, 115 f.; Procksch *Gen.*, 252; Von Rad *Gen.*, 392; Smend *Erzählung*, 107; opposed by Eerdmans *AS* I, 68; König *Gen.*, 717 f. n. 5; Leander, *ZAW* 17 (1897), 196 f.

³ Cf. Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 223.

10. The Source Analysis of Chapter 45: 1-13

The opening of this chapter brings us to the crisis of the plot. At this point there is required a series of turns to smooth the way for the denouement, and to tie up loose ends. The order of the turns does not have very much significance. In logical sequence they might occur as follows: 1. the revelation of Joseph's identity; 2. the forgiveness of the brothers; 3. the enunciation of the theme, i.e. the moral (in this case the acknowledgment of divine providence); 4. instructions regarding the provisioning of the family and the coming to Egypt. In actual fact, in place of No. 2 we find merely a statement by Joseph to reassure his brothers. No statement of apology is offered or required; their actions have been more than sufficient to indicate to Joseph their contrition. The order of these items in chapter 45 is as follows:

1. Revelation (vss. 1-4)
2. Reassurance (vs. 5a)
3. Moral (vs. 5b)
4. [Instructions] (vs. 6)¹
3. Moral (vs. 7)
2. Reassurance (vs. 8a)
3. Moral (vs. 8b)
4. Instructions (vss. 9, 11-13)

Verses 1-4 and 9, 11-13 proceed in orderly fashion; but vss. 5-8 are in some disarray. The moral is repeated three times, the reassurance twice, and sandwiched between is the beginning of the instructions. Twice reference is made to the sale of Joseph, an event peculiar to the Judah-version of the story;² three times it is stated that God sent him to be a sustainer and to keep a remnant alive, a more appropriate interpretation of the chance encounter with the Midianites, and hence probably derived from the Reuben-version. In vs. 8b a synthesis is made: it was not Joseph's brothers that sent him to Egypt, although so it seemed, but in fact it was God working out his plan. The suspicion inevitably arises with the reading that vss. 5-8 are not in their pristine state. The plot here requires an allusion to the circumstances of Joseph's

¹ Vs. 6 is clearly reminiscent of vs. 11; moreover, it is not properly joined to vs. 5: the cause of god's sending Joseph before them is not contained in the bald observation that two years of famine are past and five are yet to come! Vs. 6 prepares the way for, and must be part of, the instructions Joseph gives.

² Cf. Driver *Gen.*, 362; vss. 4, 5.

sale; but since the two versions differ on the episode, the editor is obliged to compromise in order to smooth out the narrative. In his harmonization the editor is at pains to eliminate ambiguity; but in the process he becomes redundant. We are, in fact, in one of those "open spaces" of the narrative where the plot marks time, and where random movements, repetition and free-working are possible.¹ It is altogether likely that the free-working here is due to the redactor responsible for the Judah-version; some (especially vs. 10) may also be the work of the Genesis editor.

STYLE

The history of the Documentary Theory has shown that variation in style is a treacherous criterion to rely upon. We possess too little Hebrew literature to enable us often to declare that such and such a word or idiom is characteristic of this or that writer. The handy lists of typical vocabulary which are set forth in most introductions to the O. T. may be useful in capturing the tone of one of the hypothetical sources of the Pentateuch after it has been isolated on other grounds; but such a table cannot be used for analysis of sources.

What has just been said is a *caveat*, not a counsel of despair. The possibilities of style as a criterion should be examined objectively in an effort to ascertain its limits. It is no good at the outset predicting failure by voicing such negative generalizations as are contained in the following: " 'Style, the formal aspect of the art of communication, is the exercise of personal choice among the possibilities afforded by the medium of expression with the aim of effective communication.' The two factors are individuality, that is the uniqueness of personality, and choice, that is the action of a free agent. These two forbid us to state in any given case what are or what are not the limits of an author's resources ... There is the recognition of the right of every author to avail himself of the literary device known as elegant variation ... it is a corollary of free choice and by its nature unpredictable."² The definition Martin gives here is only partly valid, requiring the further corollary (based on ubiquitous objective study—the reason why is in this case irrelevant) that an author's individuality, his uniqueness as a personality will inevitably limit or direct his choice when-

¹ See above, p. 85 ff.

² W. J. Martin, *Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch* (London, 1955), 12; see P. Humbert, *TbZ* 12 (1956), 564 f.

ever he takes pen in hand. It is a premise of any literary analyst that the limits and direction of an author's choice are capable of close definition through an empirical examination of his works. No one is interested in an author's *resources*, what he may be capable of producing, but in his *performance*, what he has produced; and this involves the critic in objective examination. An author's employment of elegant variation will differ in a specific way from that of a fellow writer simply because his style is uniquely his own.¹

We have already had occasion in chapters 2 and 3 to witness the assistance that an examination of the style of a passage can give to source analysis. On the criterion of style alone chapter 39 stands out clearly from the rest of the Joseph Story.² But chapter 39 is exceptional in the ease with which it may be separated. The remainder of the Joseph Story is not so amenable. As the table of p. 33 will show, the variations in syntax (i.e. word order) throughout the Joseph Story do not present a meaningful pattern, and so cannot be used as a criterion. A similar sterility for purposes of source analysis also affects the employment of clauses. We are thrown back upon vocabulary³ and morphology, but the same problem bedevils our attempt in these fields too, viz. paucity of materials. Is it possible in the scope of less than a dozen chapters to descry two or more sets of favoured words and expressions? Obviously only the most frequently recurring words will be of any use, preferably, moreover, those for which synonyms are also present. Words like *mispō*⁴, *māzōn*, *kilkēl*, or *šēdā(b)*, which occur two or three times only, show nothing.⁴

¹ Martin's attempted rebuttal of the critical position grows less convincing and more distasteful as he proceeds. His remarks, for example, about the grandeur of the O. T. style, its affect as literature upon countless generations, etc. and the non-literary character of the "torso postulated by men like Wellhausen" (p. 21), all smack of the *argumentum ad populum*, besides being quite irrelevant. That Hebrew literature, especially Genesis, has survived because of the reverence paid the religious traditions contained therein by the Hebrews, is at least as valid a statement as Martin's, which assigns the cause to the alleged surpassing literary quality. When he says (p. 22) "Genesis possesses all the characteristics of a homogeneous work ..." one may in all seriousness ask whether he has ever read the book. How could he place the piecemeal nature of, say, chapter 35, the redundancy of chapter 39, the smoothness and simplicity of the Joseph Story, and the epic style of chapter 1 side by side, and in honesty still refer to homogeneity?

² Above, p. 147 n. 2.

³ On vocabulary as criterion, see J. Kräutlein, *Die sprachlichen Verschiedenheiten in den Hexateuchquellen* (Berlin, 1907); Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 243.

⁴ *Mispō* is usually considered characteristic of J, *māzōn* and *šēdā(b)* being favoured by E: Holzinger *Gen.*, 101, 187. But *mispō* and *šēdā(b)* occur but twice in the story (42: 27, 43: 24, and 42: 25, 45: 21 respectively), and *māzōn* once (45: 23), proba-

1. Designations for "food" in the Joseph Story

<i>'ōkel</i> , "food" ¹	<i>bār</i> , "grain" ²	<i>šēber</i> , "grain" ³
41: 35 (twice)	41: 35	
41: 36		
41: 48 (thrice)	41: 49	
(42: 2, LXX; cf. 43: 2)	42: 3	42: 1, 2
42: 7, 10		42: 19
	42: 25	42: 26
43: 2		43: 2
43: 4		
43: 20		
43: 22		
44: 1		
		44: 2
44: 25	(45: 23 [not in LXX])	47: 14

As used in the Joseph Story these three nouns seem to be synonymous. Is it pressing the evidence too much to state that chapter 42 varies its usage more than chapters 43-44, which both lean towards the colourless *'ōkel*? It seems also significant that in chapter 47, where from the subject matter we should expect frequent use of these words, only one appears, and that but once. The favorite designation of food in chapter 47 is *leḥem* (vss. 13, 15, 17, 19).

2. The First Person Singular Pronoun⁴

<i>'āni</i>	<i>'ānōki</i>
37: 10	
	37: 16
37: 30 (twice)	
40: 16	
41: 9, 11, 15, 44	
42: 18, 37	
	43: 9

bly in a gloss (see above, p. 31, no. 23). *Kilkēl* is found only three times (45: 11, 47: 12, 50: 21), and is usually ascribed to E (Holzinger *Gen.*, 185); but what occasion would any writer have to use it earlier in the story?

¹ LXX, βρώματα.

² LXX, σίτος.

³ LXX, σίτος, except 42: 1 (πρῶσις) and 42: 19 (ἀγορασμόν).

⁴ Holzinger *Gen.*, 95.

<i>'ani</i>	<i>'anōki</i>
43: 14	
45: 3, 4	
	47: 30
	50: 5
50: 19	
	50: 21

The Joseph Story consistently uses *'ani*. *'anōki* interestingly enough occurs in passages which on other grounds have been deemed additions to the original story. Coincidence is probably out of the question. The longer form of the personal pronoun is a predilection of the writer of the "Judah"-passages.

3. Words for "sack" in chapters 42-44¹

<i>'amtaḥā(b)</i>	<i>śaq</i>	<i>kēli</i>
(42: 27, LXX)	42: 25	42: 25
42: 27, 28	42: 27	
	42: 35 (twice)	
		43: 11
43: 12		
43: 18, 21 (twice)		
43: 22, 23		
44: 1 (twice)		
44: 2, 8, 11 (twice)		
44: 12		

The usual practice of critics has been to separate vss. 27, and 28 of chapter 42 and group them with chapters 43 and 44 as belonging to a single source; but if, as argued above,² the episode in the Inn is basic to the story and not the contribution of only one version, the evidence of this table favours a less mechanical conclusion. Rather the distribution here must be compared with the one in table no. 1 (above, p. 173). Chapter 42 uses all three words; chapters 43 and 44 only one. Chapter 42 shows variety in its choice of vocabulary; chapters 43 and 44 do not.

¹ Holzinger *Gen.*, 239; *idem*, *ZAW* 31 (1911), 58; Kräutlein, *op. cit.*, 36 and 55 (no. 46); Procksch *Gen.*, 398; Ruppert, *JEG*, 88; M. H. Segal, *Scripta Hierosolimitana* 8 (1961), 88 f. On the word *'amtaḥā(b)* see above, p. 46, no. 1.

² Above, p. 151 f.

4. The Use of *dāḥār*

<i>dāḥār</i>	<i>'aḥar haddēbārīm ba'ēlle(b)</i>	<i>kaddēbārīm ba'ēlle(b)</i>
37: 11, 14	39: 7	
	40: 1	39: 17, 19
41: 28, 32, 37		
		43: 7
43: 18		
		44: 2, 6, 7, 10
44: 18		
	48: 1	

An expression involving the words "these things" sounds weak and makeshift, as though the writer did not wish to put forth the extra effort to be specific and concise. The presence of such inferior locutions should not, perhaps, surprise the reader in chapters 39 and 44 which, on the whole, we have seen to be of less literary merit than the rest of the story.¹

5. Designations of the Land of Egypt²

<i>Miṣraymāb</i>	<i>Miṣrayim</i>	<i>'Ereṣ Miṣrayim</i>
37: 25✓		
37: 28✓		
	37: 36✓	
39: 1✓		
	40: 1✓	
	40: 5✓	
	41: 8✓	
		41: 19✓
		41: 29✓
		41: 30✓
		41: 33✓
		41: 34✓
		41: 36✓
		41: 41✓
		41: 43✓
		41: 44✓
		41: 45 (—)
		41: 48✓

¹ For the expression *wayyēbī aḥar haddēbārīm ba'ēlle(b)* as a connective used by D, see R. A. Carlson, *David the Chosen King* (Uppsala, 1964), 41 n. 2.

² A check beside the reference indicates that the LXX is in agreement with MT. *Miṣrayim* is often used in the Joseph Story for the inhabitants (König *Gen.*, 711, n. 1), but the LXX always preserves the distinction.

<i>Miṣraymāb</i>	<i>Miṣrayim</i>	<i>ʾEreṣ Miṣrayim</i>
		41: 53√ 41: 54√ 41: 55√
41: 57√	42: 1√ 42: 2√ 42: 3√ 43: 2√ 43: 15√	
45: 4√	45: 9 (—) 45: 13√	45: 8√
	45: 25√ (47: 5 twice, LXX)	45: 18 (—) 45: 19√ 45: 20 (—) 45: 26√
		47: 6√ 47: 11√ 47: 13√ 47: 14√ 47: 15√
	47: 21√	47: 27√ 47: 28√
	47: 29√ 47: 30√	
	50: 11√	50: 7√
50: 14√		

It must be noted that the expression “the Land of Egypt” is found in passages which in the present state of the story are not unadulterated examples of the basic Reuben-version. The locution predominates in chapters 41 and 45, both sections having been singled out previously as showing marks of heavy embellishment. It also occurs in vss. 11, 27, 28 of chapter 47, and in vs. 7 of chapter 50, all clearly attributable to P.¹ The aetiology of 47: 13 ff. also uses it; and since the tale probably once stood at the end of chapter 41, this fact must be construed with the predilection for “the land of Egypt” in the episode of Joseph’s rise to power. At least one scholar² has regarded the expression “the land of Egypt” as evidence for a late reworking of the Joseph Story.

¹ Above, p. 161 ff.

² Holzinger *Gen.*, 234.

6. Designations for the King of Egypt¹

The Joseph Story is committed to the word “Pharaoh,” a Hebrew loan word from the Egyptian *pr-ḥ*, “Great House,”² as the ubiquitous appellative of the king of Egypt. “King,” or “King of Egypt” are used with exceeding rarity, the latter only in the introductory verse to chapter 40, the gloss in vs. 5 of the same chapter, and in the “editorial” insertion of the Genesis editor in chapter 41 (vs. 46). In the LXX it occurs again in the disjointed vs. 5 of chapter 47. “King” is found only in the gloss in 39: 20, (and in the LXX also in 45: 21). The Hebraized loan word is basic to the story; the other two expressions betray the glossator.

¹ The usual solution is to make “Pharaoh” a sign of E, and “the king of Egypt” a mark of J (Meyer *INS*, 24; Procksch *Gen.*, 226 f.), a completely erroneous and misleading hypothesis.

² See the materials collected in Vergote *Joseph*, 45 f.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOURCE ANALYSIS: CONCLUSIONS

THE ORIGINAL JOSEPH STORY

The earliest version of the Biblical Joseph Story that can be detected is that in which the role of helpful brother is filled by Reuben alone, and in which the father is called Jacob. The choice of these names is understandable; Reuben is the oldest brother, and Jacob is the original name of the Patriarch. The writer was ignorant of, or at least unimpressed by, the attempt to personify Jacob as the "pre-historic" embodiment of the political organization "Israel" by giving him that name. He was writing a simple, entertaining story, not a piece of politico-historical propaganda. His *Märchen* incorporated several motifs widely used in the ancient Near East, and current in his time; but there is no evidence that he made use of specific exemplars of any motif, that is, in order to introduce them *en bloc* into his text. The story existed in its "historified" form from the beginning. That is to say, the roles were already in the Reuben-version attached to specific names; we have no trace of any earlier form of the tale which approximated a "pure" story, devoid of proper names.¹ This original Joseph Story, heretofore for convenience called the "Reuben-version," is present in chapters 37, 40, 41 (now embellished), 42 and 45 (now embellished). With Jacob's refusal to send Benjamin with Reuben in 42: 38 the Reuben-version in its pristine form seems to drop from sight. But Reuben's request, even though refused, anticipates a second trip to Egypt; and we may with justification assume, from the way in which the plot of chapters 43-44 runs inexorably on in the same tone as in the earlier chapters, that the original Joseph Story with only slight modification is present here also.² The original narrative probably told of the coming of Jacob and his family to Egypt in rather brief fashion, and concluded with some such statement as that in 47: 12.

At some time subsequent to the creation and publication of the story, the process of modification and addition set in. It was a relatively slight interference with the original tale, but the inferior standards

which governed it could only have a weakening effect. The principal aim was to steal some of the glory from Reuben by pitting Judah against him as the really effective "helpful brother." In chapter 37 the original story was expanded to give Judah the honour of actually saving Joseph from death (rather than leaving it to chance, as the original account had it). The rejection by Jacob of Reuben's initial offer at the end of chapter 42 was the signal to introduce Judah once again, the brother "who gets things done." Judah was insinuated at this point by the simple expedient of substituting his name for Reuben's in chapters 43 and 44; and the slight modifications which were made at the same time¹ did nothing but denigrate a good plot.

The modifications here envisaged constitute what we have chosen to call the "Judah-expansion." The person who gave it written form had a predilection for the name "Israel," and used it consistently in the passages where his hero Judah had ousted Reuben. In the first chapter of the present work² a similar preference for "Israel" as the name of the Patriarch was also noted in passages surrounding the Joseph Story, but having nothing directly to do with it. One cannot suppress the suspicion that the writer is the same in both cases, that, in fact, the occurrence of the name "Israel" in the latter part of the Book of Genesis is a valid criterion for source analysis. The writer responsible for the "Judah-expansion," or the "Israel"-redactor, as he may be called, not only simply changed personal names in the extant story, but also himself added episodes, especially at the close of the narrative. In fact the Joseph Story to him probably represented merely the fullest of the traditions he had collected about the careers of the individual sons of Jacob (above, p. 26 f.). He expanded the account of Jacob's arrival by adding the meeting of Israel and Joseph (46: 28-30), the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh (48: 8-20), the death of Israel (47: 29-31), his embalment and burial (50: 1-6), and the second forgiveness of the brothers (50: 15-21). All these episodes share one thing in common: they lack unity or logical connexion with the plot of the Joseph Story *per se*.

THE WORK OF THE GENESIS EDITOR

The Genesis Editor found the Joseph Story in its "Judah-expansion," but there is no reason to believe that he did not also know

¹ Above, p. 67.

² Cf. F. V. Winnett, *JBL* 84 (1965), 16.

¹ Principally the guarantees for Benjamin, and the recapitulation of the first audience with Joseph.

² Cf. above, p. 26 f.

of the tale in its pristine form, the Reuben-version. The Genesis Editor was a compiler, loath to reject anything short of gross theological error. Consequently the Judah-expansion was made the point of departure; parts were re-arranged (e.g. the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh), and new material was added (e.g. chapter 38, and 46: 8-27). The Genesis Editor himself added what he felt to be indispensable, e.g. 46: 1-7, Jacob's audience with Pharaoh (47: 7-10), Jacob's last words to Joseph (48: 1-7, 21-22), Jacob's burial (50: 7-14), and Joseph's death (50: 22-26). He even reworked and otherwise embellished episodes which had been integral parts of the story, e.g. chapter 41.¹ The occasional glosses with which he sprinkled the text (e.g. 40: 1, 5b, 41: 46, 42: 4, 5, 35, 45: 10)² are concerned with smoothing the narrative, and knitting it snugly into the broader context of the Book of Genesis which was taking shape in his hands.

THE HERO OF THE MÄRCHEN IN FOLKLORISTIC ADAPTATIONS

Where in this literary history of the Joseph Story are the episodes of Joseph and Potiphar's wife (chapter 39) and the Agrarian Reforms (47: 13 ff.) to be placed? Both are extraneous to the plot of the Joseph Story,³ and ought to be compared with certain extra-Biblical tales told about Joseph. Ps. 105 reflects such a non-Biblical story, no longer preserved.⁴ In it, as in the Joseph Story, the hero is sent on ahead by

¹ See above, p. 175 f. for his signature formula, "the Land of Egypt."

² It may be that many of the glosses isolated in chapter 2 should also be assigned to the Genesis Editor.

³ Stylistically they are different from the body of the story. Cf. above, p. 147 n. 2 for the peculiar style of chapter 39. The section 47: 13 ff. sets itself off from chapters 41-44 by its slightly redundant style, its preference for *lehem* instead of *'ôkel*, and its preference for the phrase, "the Land of Egypt."

⁴ Ps. 105 (or the larger whole of which it represents a selected part), known in the Chronicler's day, and in part quoted by him in chapter 16 of his first book (A. Weiser, *The Psalms* [London, 1959], 673; Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* [Oxford, 1962], II, 200), must be taken as Post-exilic in date; cf. Oesterley, *The Psalms* (London, 1939), 445; D. Arenhoevel, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 9. M. Wienfeld (*JBL* 86 [1967], 250 f.) notes that Ps. 105 is "permeated with" the Deuteronomistic style. The theme of the Psalm is ownership of the land, and the covenant which gave Israel the right to that land. The concentration upon this claim, and the choice of historical incidents to substantiate it, point, in the present writer's view, to the troublous times following the return from the Exile; cf. W. S. McCullough, *Psalms (Interpreter's Bible, IV* [New York, Nashville, 1955]), 558. See also on this psalm, J. Brinktrine, *ZAW* 64 (1952), 251 ff. In general on this and other Patriarchal traditions in the Psalms, see F. N. Jasper, *VT* 17 (1967), 50 ff.

god to preserve life, and is sold into Egypt as a slave. But in the Joseph Story being a slave was not tantamount to being confined by fetters in prison (cf. Ps. 105: 18); nor in the Joseph Story of Genesis was Joseph confined until a prediction of his came true, pursuant to which he was released (Ps. 105: 19). Nor thereafter did Joseph teach Pharaoh's elders wisdom (vs. 22). The narrative epitomized in Ps. 105 is clearly based on the Joseph Story, but it has reworked the whole in the light of the popular motif of the discredited chief minister.¹ Another mutation of the Joseph Story in extra-Biblical literature, not represented by any single narrative, is the approximation of Joseph to Osiris.² This was a natural confusion, since Osiris like Joseph was a provider of food, albeit in a different sense; and Joseph could easily have been the means in Judaic thought of rationalizing by historicization the pagan myths of the Egyptian fertility god.

The tendency inherent in the two Biblical tales, viz. Joseph and Potiphar's Wife, and the Agrarian Reforms, and the extra-Biblical *midrashim* is one and the same. The character Joseph, the hero of the *Märchen* in Genesis (as distinct from the eponymous ancestor) is being adapted to older literary, mythological, and aetiological works, independent in origin of the Joseph Story, which are set in Egypt. This tendency must be ascribed to the impulse of the Joseph Story's popularity. There is not a trace of it in the older strata of the Pentateuchal, historical or prophetic writings; but in Post-Biblical times it became very strong indeed. A comparable phenomenon exists in the popularity in late Egyptian legend of the figure Sesostris.³ Pursuant to the antiquarian activities of the Saites and (for the Greeks) the writings of Herodotus, popular interest began to insinuate the name of Sesostris into legends, aetiologies and genuine history where it had no business at all. By Roman times any heroic feat, or any permanent betterment of conditions in Egypt was popularly linked with the figure of this legendary conqueror and lawgiver.

The Story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife came into being and achieved written form before it was brought into the Joseph Story. The writer had a tedious, didactic style, quite different from that of the author of the Joseph Story. He was a Yahwist, and loudly proclaimed

¹ Above, p. 96 f.

² For the pertinent facts and literature, see Horovitz *JE*, 120 ff.

³ K. Sethe, *Sesostris* (Leipzig, 1900); G. Maspero, *JdS* 1901, 593 ff., 665 ff.; K. Lange, *Sesostris, ein ägyptische König in Mythos, Geschichte und Kunst*, (Munich, 1954); M. Malaise, *CdE* 41 (1966), 244 ff.

it in his enthusiastic embellishment of a piece he must have found in oral form.

The Agrarian Reforms of Joseph were not penned by the same man, that much seems sure. Nor does it appear that a native Egyptian *Vorlage* lies behind the passage. The tone is one of mild amusement and pride that the present economy and society of Egypt was shaped by a Hebrew. It is a native Israelite aetiology which may reflect, however dimly, the awareness that in the late eighth century Egypt had experienced a legal reform under Bocchoris.¹

Both Gen. 39 and 47: 13 ff. could have been added to the Joseph Story by the same hand which effected the Judah-expansion; but this is not certain. Suffice it to say that they reflect a stage in the development of the narrative contemporary with the Judah-expansion, but certainly prior to the composition of the canonical book.

SYNOPSIS OF CONCLUSIONS

<i>The Original Story</i>	<i>"Judah"-expansion</i>	<i>Later Additions</i>	<i>Genesis Editor</i>
Joseph is his father's favorite child. He has dreams which presage his future greatness, and his brothers are jealous of him (37: 5-11).	Israel makes Joseph a special cloak, and the brothers hate him for it (37: 3, 4).	(by undetermined hands)	
The brothers go off to pasture the flocks <not far from Beersheba>. Jacob sends Joseph to see how they fare (37: 12-14).	The brothers go off to pasture in the central highland. Israel sends Joseph to Shechem ...		—“from the valley of Hebron” (37: 14).
	but the brothers are not there, and a stranger directs Joseph to Dothan (37: 12, 15-17).		
The brothers on seeing Joseph coming, plot to kill him (37:18);		—37: 19-21; an editorial note, later inserted.	

¹ See below, p. 238 f.

The Original Story
but Reuben manages to deter them by suggesting throwing him into a cistern and leaving him. This they do, and after stripping him of his garment, they go back to their chores (37: 22-24).

"Judah"-expansion

Later Additions

Genesis Editor

The brothers sit down to eat near the cistern, and when a caravan of Ishmaelites comes up Judah suggests selling Joseph (37: 25-27).

Midianites take Joseph from the pit, and "they" sell him to the Ishmaelites who take him to Egypt (37: 28b).

Meanwhile Midianites chance upon the pit, find Joseph, and take him to Egypt as a slave (37: 28a, c).

Reuben returns to find Joseph gone and bewails his lot. The brothers fabricate evidence by dipping Joseph's coat in goat's blood, and present it to their father. He draws the obvious conclusion that his son is dead, and is inconsolable (37: 29-35).

—Chapter 38, (Judah & Tamar).

—Chapter 39 (Joseph wrongfully accused of seducing Potiphar's wife).

<Joseph is sold in Egypt by the Midianites to the captain of Pharaoh's guard>.

Pharaoh was displeased by the activities of two of his servants, and puts them in jail in the house of the captain of the guard. The latter charged Joseph with looking after them, and Joseph interprets their dreams for them. Upon liberation, however, the

—40: 1
—40: 3b
—40: 5b

<i>The Original Story</i>	<i>"Judah"-expansion</i>	<i>Later Additions</i>	<i>Genesis Editor</i>
butler forgets all about Joseph (40: 2-23). Two years later Pharaoh has puzzling dreams which neither he nor his wisemen can interpret. The butler now remembers Joseph; and Joseph, when summoned interprets the dreams and predicts the famine. As reward Joseph is made vizier...			
and when famine strikes he has prepared the land for it (chapter 41).	Two sons are born to Joseph before the famine, (41: 40-52).		—Considerable embellishment of chapter 41.
	In exchange for food the people are forced to sell their belongings and finally themselves. Thus Joseph cleverly buys up all the land for Pharaoh (47: 13 ff.).		—Removes 47: 13 ff. to its present locus, and compensates by the embellishment of 41: 53 ff. —42: 4(?), 5.
Pressed by famine, Jacob sends his sons to buy grain in Egypt. Joseph recognizes them, but not they him. He treats them roughly, puts Simeon in prison, and demands that when next they come they bring Benjamin. He also secretly returns their money in their sacks (42: 1-25). When they reach the inn, <all the brothers open their sacks and find their money>. On reaching home they tell their father of what went on in Egypt, but despite Reuben's offer of a guarantee, Jacob refuses to send Benjamin (42: 29-34, 36-38). <When all the food is gone Reuben again	Only one brother opens his sack at the inn; the remainder in their father's presence at home (42: 27-28, 35).		
	When all the food is gone, Judah remon-		

<i>The Original Story</i>	<i>"Judah"-expansion</i>	<i>Later Additions</i>	<i>Genesis Editor</i>
pleads with his father, and at last Jacob agrees. Down go the brothers with Benjamin and are fêted by Joseph; but again Joseph plants money and a cup also in the brothers' sacks (chapter 43).>	strates with his father, and at last persuades him. Down go the brothers with Benjamin, and are fêted by Joseph; but again Joseph plants money in the brothers' sacks, and in addition a cup in Benjamin's sack (chapter 43).	—Glosses in 43: 17, 18, 26.	
<This enables Joseph to hail them back once they have departed and upbraid them for their dishonesty. Reuben makes an impassioned appeal...> and Joseph is moved. He orders his entourage to leave him, and then discloses his identity (45: 1-4), <reassures them and instructs them what to do>. When Pharaoh hears he offers the brothers carts and promises them the good food of the land of Egypt. The brothers return to Canaan and inform Jacob (45: 16-27).	This enables Joseph to hail them back once they have departed and upbraid them for their dishonesty. Judah makes an impassioned appeal (chapter 44).	—Gloss in 45: 2.	
	(Some embellishment... of the reassurance and instructions (45: 4-13).	—Gloss in 45: 23.	—Further embellishment of 45: 4-13.
	Israel declares his intention of going to Egypt (45: 28).		—Jacob's vision and journey to Egypt (46: 1-7). —The Genealogy (46: 8-27).
	Israel sends Judah on ahead, and the family is reunited with Joseph in Goshen (46: 28-30).		
<Jacob and family go to Egypt in the carts and are reunited with Joseph>.			
	Israel then meets Ephraim and Manasseh and blesses them (48: 8-20). Joseph's brothers meet Pharaoh and the king gives them the right to		—(Removes the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh to its present locus.)

<i>The Original Story</i>	<i>"Judab"-expansion</i>	<i>Later Additions</i>	<i>Genesis Editor</i>
	settle in Goshen (46: 31-47: 6).		—Inserts 47: 4. —Pharaoh's audience with Jacob (47: 7-11).
As good as his word, Joseph nourishes his family during the years of famine (47: 12).			
	Israel dies (47: 29-31)...		—Inserts 47: 13 ff. (Agrarian Reforms). —Jacob's last words to Joseph (48:1-7). —Inserts 48: 8-20 (Blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh). —Jacob's bequest (48: 21-22). —Jacob's Testament (chapter 49). —Embellishment of Jacob's burial (50: 7-14).
	...and is buried (50: 1-6).		
Joseph's brothers seek his forgiveness a second time (50: 15-21).			—Joseph's death (50: 22-26).

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE EGYPTIAN BACKGROUND OF THE JOSEPH STORY

The last three chapters have attempted to trace the literary history of the Joseph Story through an inductive approach. It is now time to see whether our postulated literary history of the piece can be confined within chronological limits; and to do this we must set aside the inductive method, and subject the details of the story to a comparison with external data.

INTRODUCTION

The Joseph Story is set in the age of the Patriarchs.¹ According to Exod. 12: 40 f. the Israelites departed from Egypt four hundred and thirty years after Jacob's family had entered the land in the second year of the famine (Gen. 45: 11); and according to 1 Ki. 6: 1 the fourth year of Solomon fell in the four hundred and eightieth year after the Exodus. Although the reigns of the Israelite United Monarchy are incapable of absolute dating, it is generally agreed to-day that the beginning of Solomon's reign fell around the middle of the Tenth century B.C. Albright's date is c. 961 B.C.² On the basis, then, of the Biblical chronology, Jacob entered Egypt in the first half of the Nineteenth century (1871 B.C. on Albright's date for Solomon), and Joseph was sold thither not long after the turn of the Twentieth century. In the Nineteenth century A.D., when Egyptologists in the main still took Manetho's dates seriously, such a phenomenally high date for Joseph caused no alarm. It would have fallen during the Hyksos period of Egyptian history,³ and already in Roman times Christian and Jewish exegetes had asserted that Jacob had come to Egypt in the seventeenth year of the Hyksos king Apophis.⁴ Joseph's sudden rise to power would be plausible, since the Hyksos were semitic-speaking Asiatics like himself; and references to horses would not be anachronistic, because it was the Hyksos who introduced these into Egypt.

¹ For the following, see the thorough discussion of Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* (London, 1950), 57 ff.

² Cf. J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1959), 174 n. 26.

³ Manetho allots 511 years to the Hyksos.

⁴ Africanus: cf. A. Erman, *ZAS* 18 (1880), 126 f.

It is still maintained by many that the descent into Egypt is to be dated to the Hyksos Period. But they cannot hold this view on the basis of the alleged coincidence of Biblical and Egyptian chronology outlined above. For it is now virtually certain that Hyksos rule in Egypt, as the Turin Canon has long been known to declare, lasted little over a century.¹ If Ahmose, the founder of the Eighteenth Dynasty, came to the throne in 1567 B.C.,² and if he expelled the Hyksos between his fifteenth and his twentieth years,³ the establishment of Hyksos power cannot be dated much before 1650 B.C.! If the Biblical chronology is adhered to, Joseph will have come to Egypt in the middle of the Twelfth Dynasty, not the Fifteenth (Hyksos)!

The foregoing discussion suggests that the historicity of the Joseph Story has been already premised; but at this point such a premise would be premature. An empirical investigation must first of all set out to establish when the *sources* for the alleged historical occurrence were written. Modern historians, and even classical historians, often date themselves for the benefit of their readers; but this practice was uncommon in the ancient Near East. The dating of a Near Eastern historical narrative must proceed by devious means. The investigator must take into account the language in which the piece was written, the apparent philosophical or theological bias of the writer, the cultural details with which he filled in the background—in short, anything which might possibly give a clue to the writer's own age.⁴ Even then the results may not be clear cut. The assembled evidence may indicate a wide range of dates, running through several widely-separated periods of time. The explanation of this anomaly would be that, though the writer is dated to the latest period attested, he had access to, and is using, reliable, perhaps written, material from much earlier periods. The other extreme is a piece which reflects consistently only

¹ Turin Canon, x, 21: Sir A. H. Gardiner, *The Royal Canon of Turin* (Oxford, 1959), pl. 3. The Turin Canon is a king list, now fragmentary, written in the reign of Ramesses II (1290-1226 B.C.).

² Redford, *JNES* 25 (1966), 124.

³ *Idem*, *The History and Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty* (Toronto, 1967), 48 f.

⁴ The writer agrees completely with Mendenhall's statement: "It is becoming quite clear that the solution of the problem will come from the treatment of details which seem to be incidental or accidental. Narratives which contain names or specific forms of cultic action, patterns of thought, or other concrete cultural features which can be checked by extra-Biblical sources can thus be controlled, or at least to some extent;" *apud* G. E. Wright, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, 1961), 42.

one period, viz. the writer's own. An important part of our task in the present endeavour will be to ascertain which of these types the Joseph Story approximates.

THE EGYPTIAN COLOURING OF THE STORY

One of the distinguishing features of the Joseph Story is the apparent familiarity of the author with the country in which his narrative takes place. He seems at times to be making a show of his knowledge of Egyptian manners and customs; seems, in fact, to be supplying authentic "background material" to lend his story verisimilitude. This comparative wealth of Egyptian elements¹ which seem to be genuine or at least the expectation of it, is the explanation why, over the past century and a half so many Egyptologists have been attracted to the Joseph Story. The list comprises something of a "Who's Who" of Egyptology, and includes the names of Brugsch,² Ebers,³ Janssen,⁴ Krall,⁵ Lieblein,⁶ Naville,⁷ Rowe,⁸ Spiegelberg,⁹ Steindorf,¹⁰ and Vergote.¹¹ The contribution of the last-named will, in many ways, remain outstanding among Egyptological treatments for many years to come. Vergote has amassed a host of material from both primary and secondary sources, and has presented it in a most lucid manner. The story has been submitted to careful scrutiny, and just about every element which might possibly have an Egyptian origin, has been picked out and illumined by a flood of facts. Though Vergote's main purpose was to provide an Egyptological commentary on the narrative,

¹ There are indeed not many; but when compared with other Biblical stories set in Egypt the scattered details of the Joseph Story seem to constitute a "wealth."

² *Die biblischen sieben Jahre des Hungersnots*, Leipzig, 1891.

³ *Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's*, Leipzig, 1868.

⁴ "Bemerkungen zur Hungersnot im alten Ägypten," *Biblica* 20 (1939), 69 ff.; "Egyptological Remarks on the Story of Joseph," *JEOL* 14 (1955-56), 63 ff.

⁵ "Ueber den aegyptischen Namen Josephs," *Verhandl. d. 7. internat. Or. Congr.*, Wien (Aeg.-Afr. Sect.), 110.

⁶ "Mots égyptiens dans la Bible," *PSBA* 20 (1898), 202 ff.

⁷ "The Egyptian Name of Joseph," *JEA* 12 (1926), 16 ff.

⁸ "The Famous Solar City of On," *PEQ* 1963, 133 ff.

⁹ *Ägyptologische Randglossen zum Alten Testament*, Strasbourg, 1904; *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Monumente*, Strasbourg, 1904; "Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jakob (Gen. 50: 2 ff.) im Lichte der ägyptischen Quellen," *OLZ* 26 (1923), 421 ff.

¹⁰ "Der Name Josephs, Saphenat Pa'neach," *ZÄS* 27 (1889), 41 ff.; "Weiteres zu Genesis 41, 45," *ZÄS* 30 (1892), 50 ff.

¹¹ *Joseph en Égypte*, (Louvain, 1959); abbr. Vergote *Joseph*.

he also gives a translation of the Hebrew text together with brief discussions of sources.

The body of the book leaves little to be desired by those seeking such a commentary; but the final chapter, entitled "Conclusions," has met with opposition from reviewers in the O.T. field.¹ For here Vergote, founding himself upon the belief that most of the Egyptian elements best fit a Ramesside context (i.e. the Nineteenth Dynasty, c. 1303-1200 B.C.), states "that our Genesis text is based upon a more ancient account, dating back to this period (i.e. the Nineteenth Dynasty) meets with no opposition from any evidence. And since it is increasingly admitted that Moses lived under Ramesses II and Merneptah, the tradition which makes him the author of our story merits consideration."² Again, with reference to the elements which betray an alleged familiarity with Ramesside Egypt, Vergote says: "none of these things would have been unknown to an author who, like Moses, 'was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians'."³ His conclusion is that Moses was the author of an earlier account, later used as a source and quoted by J and E, an account little "romanticised, but grounded in a very typical situation."⁴ He finds an analogy in the Iliad: "if we had to find in the early books of the Bible the national epic of the Jewish nation, it is to the Joseph Story that we would be inclined to attribute such a function. Would not he who created this people by liberating them from foreign bondage also have the desire to give them the charter which made them aware of their unity, and assigned each of their members a place?"⁵

The basis for Vergote's conclusion regarding the Mosaic authorship is his contention that the Egyptian elements in the story reflect Ramesside Egypt. If this be so, and if, of course, Moses is to be dated to the Nineteenth Dynasty, Vergote's case is strong. But do the Egyptian elements really reflect Ramesside times? Are the background details specific enough to allow dating to one particular period; or are they the kind of vague generalization which might be made by any ill-informed person concerning a foreign culture at any period?⁶ If the

¹ Cf. H. Donner, *Bib. Or.* 18 (1961), 45 f.; O. Eissfeldt, *OLZ* 65 (1961), 39 ff.; also among Egyptologists, S. Hermann, *ZAS* 89 (1964), 63 f., and *TLZ* 85 (1960), 827 ff.; B. Couroyer, *RB* 66 (1959), 582 ff.; cf. also G. Fohrer, *Einleitung in das A. T.*¹⁰ (Heidelberg, 1965), 143.

² Vergote *Joseph*, 207.

³ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 211.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁶ Cf. Driver, *HDB* II, 770.

details can be pinned down, each to its own period, does a coherent picture emerge of Egypt at one particular point in its history; or are many centuries represented?

Before examining the Egyptian background to the Joseph Story a word of caution is necessary. It has been the practice sometimes in the past to see Egyptian colouring where none is really present.¹ A good example is Joseph's titulary in Gen. 45: 8, "father to Pharaoh, ruler of all his house, ruler of all the land of Egypt."² Scholars have long tried to reconstruct the original Egyptian titles which they assumed lay behind this verse, without putting forward a single convincing suggestion.³ The difficulty lies in the vagueness of the titles, and in the Hebraic ring they emit. The title "ruler of all his house" would be applicable to the office of royal steward in any Near Eastern kingdom.⁴ In Judah itself the royal steward was a prominent official, and exercised extensive influence in politics, as Isaiah's diatribe against Shebna attests.⁵ The epithet "father"⁶ applied to someone who exerts paternal influence over others, is common in the O.T.⁷ There is no title "father to Pharaoh" in Egyptian; and the closest parallel, *it-n'r*, "god's father," is something of an embarrassment to those who have proposed it,⁸ since its meanings do not approach what the Hebrew seems to require, being either a priestly title or an appellative granted to the father-in-law of a king or to the progenitor of a dynasty.⁹ The same caution must be exercised with regard to other titles as well, e.g. the "chief of the butlers," and the "chief of the bakers." There is no reason to follow

¹ The chief advocate of the existence of such chimerae has been A. S. Yahuda; see his *The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian*, (Oxford, 1933), *passim*.

² *'āh lēPar'ō(h) 'ādōn lēkol bēfō* (var. *'al bēfō*, 41: 40; cf. 39: 4 and 43: 19), *mōšāl bēkol 'eres Mišrayim*.

³ Cf. Driver, *HDB* II, 774.

⁴ Cf. König, *JBL* 48 (1929), 345; Donner, *op. cit.*, 45 n. 5.

⁵ Isa. 22: 15 ff.; Procksch *Gen.*, 394; Driver *Gen.*, 343; cf. J. R. Porter, *Moses and Monarchy* (Oxford, 1963), 19.

⁶ Scarcely a Hebraized misinterpretation of Egyptian *wb3*, "butler" (so Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 281), or *ib n nsw* (*Wb* I, 59: 15, an epithet of officials: so J. Offord, *PEFQ* 50 [1918]).

⁷ Cf. the LXX to Esther 3: 13, 8: 12, where Haman is called "father" of the Persian king; Jud. 18: 19 where the Danites request Micah's Levite to be a father to them; 2 Ki. 2: 12 (of Elijah's relationship to Elisha); in Isa. 2: 21 Eliakim the royal steward is called "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the House of Judah." See König, *op. cit.*, 345; Driver *Gen.*, 362; in 1 Macc. 11: 32 Demetrius calls a high officer "father"; König *Gen.*, 720; De Boer, *VT Suppl.* 3 (1955), 57 f.

⁸ Yahuda, *op. cit.*, 23 f.; cf. S. Morenz, *TLZ* 84 (1959), 409.

⁹ L. Habachi, *ASAE* 55 (1958), 167 ff.

Vergote¹ in thinking the Hebrew writer had specifically in mind the Egyptian *wb3*, "butler," and *rhṯy*, "confectioner," any more than any of the exactly identical titles in a number of Near Eastern courts. The writer indeed had no need to look beyond Palestine, for *mašqīm* and *'ōpīm* were prominent in the roster of servants in the Israelite royal courts.² And is there any justification for ransacking lists of Egyptian titles for some equivalent to *šar haṯṯabbāhīm*, "captain of the guard"?³ The epithet is pure Hebrew and not a rendering of some foreign title. The same objection may be voiced against Vergote's belief that the use of *'ādōn*, "lord," and *'abdeka*, "your servants," in the brothers' conversation with Joseph, is a carry-over of Egyptian idiom and a reflexion of Egyptian practice.⁴ A glance at the lexicon will suffice to show that such polite forms of address were by no means unknown in ancient Israel.⁵

Having enunciated this rather obvious *caveat*, let us now examine the Egyptian elements in the Joseph narrative in an attempt to test Vergote's hypothesis that they point to the Ramesside age.

1. Trade in Aromatic Substances

In Gen. 37: 25 the arrival of an Ishmaelite caravan is described: "they (the brothers) looked up and saw a caravan of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, their camels laden with gum, balm and myrrh, en route to Egypt."

Trade between Egypt and Palestine was common from time immemorial, but whether it always involved the products mentioned here is doubtful.⁶ The word *nekō'()*, rendered here "gum," is the "adraganth gum" from the *Astragalus Parnassi*, and is widely mentioned by classical writers (e.g. Dioscoridus and Galenus) as an emulsion or astringent.⁷ In Egypt it is ubiquitous in Greek and Coptic medical

¹ *Joseph*, 35 f.

² Driver, *HDB* II, 773.

³ Cf. the attempts of Vergote (*BSFE* 25 [1958], 5 ff.; *idem*, *Joseph*, 31 ff.), Ward (*Bibliotheca Sacra* 114 [1957], 41 ff.; *Orientalia* 32 [1963], 434), and Kitchen (*NBD*, 658); a good criticism in S. Hermann, *TLZ* 85 (1960), 827.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 161 f.

⁵ The notion (again the brainchild of Yahuda) that even the syntax and vocabulary of the Joseph Story reflects Egyptian idiom, has long since been effectively answered; cf. e.g. T. E. Peet, *JEA* 16 (1930), 157 ff.

⁶ Anati's attempt (*Palestine Before the Hebrews* [London, 1963], 387) to adduce the Joseph Story as proof that "international trade was well developed" at the time of the Patriarchs is a little daring.

⁷ C. Præaux, *CdE* 31 (1956), 138 f.; J. C. Trevor, *IBD* II, 502.

texts,¹ and occurs in the texts in the Ptolemaic temple at Edfu.² Evidence from earlier periods is lacking. The *šerī*, "balm," is probably to be identified with the yellowish resin from the *Pistacia Terebinthus* or the *Pistacia Lentiscus*,³ but on this there is some doubt.⁴ Alfred Lucas, the late authority on these matters, stated that no specimen of resin from the latter has been found in Egypt, and only a few of the former, all of late date.⁵ *Šerī*, in the transliteration *šrm*, may be found in the Edfu texts.⁶ *Lōt*, or *ladanum*, the word rendered "myrrh" above, is mentioned by Pliny and Dioscoridus, the former of whom states that the plants which produce this substance were planted by the Ptolemies in the provinces of their empire.⁷ Though *lōt* has been tentatively identified with Egyptian *ibr* which is found in texts from the Old Kingdom on,⁸ Lucas has encountered but one specimen, and that from the seventh century B.C.;⁹ and significantly, the Egyptian *rdny* which seems clearly to be *ladan(um)*, occurs only in a text of the reign of Taharqa (690-664 B.C.).¹⁰

Trade in aromatic substances between Transjordan and other parts of the Near East is documented from just before the middle of the First Millennium B.C. to Ptolemaic times. Thus trade between Egypt and Gilead in *šerī*, the very product the Ishmaelites are said to have carried, was common enough in Jeremiah's time for the prophet to allude to it as an example of Egypt's futile attempt to heal its sickness: "go up to Gilead and get balm, O Virgin daughter of Egypt! Vainly do you try many remedies; there is no healing for you."¹¹ Ezekiel, in his thumb-nail descriptions of the trade patterns with which he was familiar, mentions *šerī* as one of the commodities which passed in trade

¹ Cf. the literature cited in Vergote *Joseph*, 13 n. 3.

² *Wb.* II, 348: 2; cf. Ebers, *Ägypten und die Bücher Mose's*, 290.

³ Vergote *Joseph*, 12 f.

⁴ Cf. G. E. Post in *HDB* I, 236, who suggested *Balsamodendron Gileadense*; L. Köhler thought of the *Pistacia Mulica*: *ZAW* 58 (1940), 232 ff.; cf. R. K. Harrison, *IBD* I, 344.

⁵ Saite or later: A. Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*³, (London, 1948), 371, 374 f.

⁶ *Wb.* V, 603: 7; Ebers, *loc. cit.*

⁷ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xii, 37.

⁸ B. Ebbell, *ZAS* 64 (1929), 48 f.; cf. P. E. Newberry, *JEA* 15 (1929), 87 f.; R. O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, (Oxford, 1962), 15.

⁹ Lucas, *op. cit.*, 116.

¹⁰ Taharqa's third Kawa stela, line 6 (together with *snr*, "incense"); L. F. MacAdam, *The Temples of Kawa*, (Oxford, 1949), 10 (cf. stela VI, 13-14); also J. Leclant, J. Yoyotte, *BIFAO* 51 (1952), 11.

¹¹ Jer. 46: 11; cf. Jud. 8: 22.

from Gilead to the Phoenician coast.¹ The Zenon Papyri² as well as numerous other Ptolemaic texts, mention incense, myrrh, perfumes etc. coming from Palestine and Transjordan.³ We may also draw attention to the lively traffic in bitumen monopolized by the Nabataeans which was carried on between southern Transjordan and Egypt from at least the fourth century B.C.⁴

2. *The Identity of the Traders*

The Judah-expansion terms the nomadic traders "Ishmaelites." These are but rarely mentioned elsewhere in the O.T.,⁵ and always in books of late recension (Jud., Chron., Psalms). In the original story it was the Midianites who figured here.

The presence of nomadic Arabs around Beersheba, trading with Egypt via the Negeb, suggests *a fortiori* a period of history after the weakening of Judaean control of the south in the late eighth century.⁶ From this time on the Qedarite Arabs began slowly to extend their control westwards towards Egypt. In 671 B.C. when Esarhaddon attacked Egypt, the Arab sheikhs were in a position to assist the Assyrians with supplies during the invaders' trek across the Sinai desert.⁷ When Judah as a kingdom ceased to exist the vacuum left in the Negeb was filled by Edomites and nomads. As they had aided Esarhaddon, so the Arabs brought supplies to Cambyses' Persian forces in 525 B.C., when the attack on Egypt was imminent.⁸ The apogee of Qedarite power was reached during the fifth century, when Gashmu their king counted as his own a broad swath of country stretching from Transjordan through the Negeb as far as the easternmost nomes of the Delta.⁹

¹ Ezek. 27: 17.

² V. Tscherikower, *Mizraim* 4 (1937), 25 ff.

³ For trade routes (itineraries), cf. F. M. Abel, *RB* 32 (1923), 409 ff.

⁴ P. C. Hammond, *BA* 22 (1958), 40 ff.

⁵ Cf. M. Noth, *The Old Testament World*, (London, 1964), 83.

⁶ Bright, *History*, 256.

⁷ Text *apud* J. B. Pritchard, *ANET*², 296.

⁸ Herod. iii, 5-11.

⁹ Redford, *VT* 13 (1963), 418, and the references given there. For "Ishmaelites" in general, see G. M. Landes, *IBD* II, 748 f., and J. Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*, (Leiden, 1959), 45 f.

3. *The Camels of the Ishmaelites*

The Judah-expansion tells us that the Ishmaelites to whom Joseph was sold, were using camels to carry their wares (37: 25). While camels must have been known in the Near East from Pre-historic times,¹ their domestication and wide-spread use for transport came comparatively late. Apart from the camels of the Patriarchs,² and of the Egyptians,³ which can all be dismissed as anachronisms, the earliest Biblical allusions to the beasts occur in literature dealing with the later period of the Judges and the reign of Saul, and have to do with their use by nomads in warfare⁴ and for escape.⁵ Camels used for transport are mentioned in the cycle of legends attached to the name of Solomon, as having formed part of the Queen of Sheba's caravan;⁶ and forty camels bearing gifts were supposed to have been sent by Benhadad of Damascus to Elisha in the late ninth century.⁷ In extra-Biblical sources allusions to camels in the second millennium are not only few in number, but doubtful in the extreme.⁸ Unmistakable references occur first in the reign of Shalmaneser III of Assyria (late ninth century), and have to do with tribute from nomadic Arabs.⁹ Thus to assign the introduction of the domesticated camel into Palestine to the period of the Judges¹⁰ is probably four centuries too early.

4. *The Sale of Joseph*

Some Asiatics of servile status had probably always been present in Egypt from the beginning of her history, but prior to the Eighteenth Dynasty their numbers had not been large. Punitive raids by the Egyptian army had probably been responsible for some,¹¹ but since

¹ Literature on this problem is extensive. For a selection see *K-B I*² (1967), 189. Too often apologists have been content to present evidence of sporadic contact with the camel in the Third and Second Millennium B.C.; but the narratives of Genesis presuppose wide-spread domestication.

² Gen. 12: 16, 24: 35, 30: 43, 32: 8.

³ Ex. 9: 3.

⁴ Jud. 6: 5, 7: 12, 8: 21, 26.

⁵ I Sam. 30: 17; cf. 15: 3, 27: 9.

⁶ 1 Ki. 10: 2.

⁷ 2 Ki. 8: 9.

⁸ W. G. Lambert, *BASOR* 160 (1960), 42 f.

⁹ A. L. Oppenheim and others, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, (Chicago, 1956), V, 35 f.

¹⁰ O. Eissfeldt, "The Hebrew Kingdom," ch. 34 of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, II, (Cambridge, 1965), 17.

¹¹ During the First Dynasty Egypt seems to have experienced some trouble in her relations with Palestine: cf. Sir W. M. F. Petrie, *The Royal Tombs of the First*

during the Old and Middle Kingdoms such raids had been comparatively rare, many of the Asiatics must have arrived in Egypt by other means. Reliefs of the Fifth Dynasty (c. 2500-2350 B.C.) depict boatloads of Asiatics praising the king with uplifted arms as they arrive in Egypt.¹ There is no evidence to suggest that they are captives,² and most likely they are free aliens who, as guests, have been permitted to enter Egypt along with goods from Syria procured through trade. Seminomadic groups from the Negeb filtered into the Delta by the land route after the collapse of the Old Kingdom administration,³ but this avenue of entry was quickly controlled, and under the Thebans of the Eleventh and early Twelfth Dynasty little interest was shown in foreigners who sought residence in Egypt. For some reason this policy changed under Amenemhet III,⁴ and during the Thirteenth Dynasty a fairly sizable foreign element can be detected in the population of Egypt.⁵ How did they get there? Hayes, who rightly rejects

Dynasty, (London, 1900-1), I, pl. 17 30; II, pl. 7: 11; L. Borchardt, *MVAG* 22 (1917), 342 ff.; and the studies of Y. Yadin, *IEJ* 5 (1955), 1 ff., and S. Yeivin, *IEJ* 10 (1960), 193 ff., *idem*, apud H. B. Rosen, *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H. J. Polotsky*, (Jerusalem, 1964), 22 ff. Evidence is largely lacking for the Second through Fifth Dynasties, but towards the close of the Fifth Dynasty, and certainly during the Sixth, the occasion for punitive action on the part of the Egyptians seems to have become more frequent. See W. S. Smith, *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East*, (Hartford, 1965), figs. 13-15; Wenig, 13 ff. (tr. *ANET*², 277 f.); Pepynakht (Breasted, *Ancient Records*, I, p. 163 f.; Sethe, *Urk.* I, 134 f.); G. Jéquier, *Le monument funéraire de Pepi II*, (Cairo, 1938), II, pl. 8. About two centuries later the victorious Thebans seem, after their final victory over the north, to have crossed into Asia, perhaps on several occasions, "to set the fear of Horus" among the local inhabitants: cf. J. J. Clère, J. Vandier, *Textes de la première période intermédiaire*, (Brussels, 1948), 37 f.; R. Anthes, *ZÄS* 65 (1930), 30 abb. 2; G. Daressy, *ASAE* 17 (1917), pl. I; D. Arnold, J. Settgast, *MDIAK* 20 (1965), abb. 2 (facing p. 50). In general on Egyptian relations with Asia, see W. A. Ward, *JESHO* 6 (1963), 1 ff.

¹ Smith, *op. cit.*, fig. 6.

² Smith, "The Old Kingdom in Egypt," ch. 14 of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, I (Cambridge, 1962), 41.

³ So, according to the father of Merikare in his last will and testament to his son: P. Pet. 1116A, lines 91 ff.; A. Volten, *Zwei altaegyptische politische Schriften*, (Copenhagen, 1945), 47 ff.

⁴ It seems to be in his reign that Asiatics begin to appear in some numbers on the expeditions to the Sinai mines: cf. Sir A. H. Gardiner, T. E. Peet, J. Černý, *The Inscriptions of Sinai*, (London, 1952-55), pl. 23, no. 85; pl. 35A, no. 110; pl. 37, no. 112; pl. 38, no. 114; pl. 39, no. 115 (?); pl. 44, no. 103; pl. 51, no. 163 (?); pl. 43, no. 120 (Amenemhet IV); pl. 46, no. 123B (Amenemhet IV); cf. Černý, *Arch. Or.* 7 (1935), 384 ff.

⁵ References in W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zur Vorderasiens*, (Wiesbaden, 1962), 79 ff.; J. Van Seters, *The Hyksos, a New Investigation*, (New Haven, 1966), 87 ff.

the postulate of military campaigns by the Egyptians, can only suggest a brisk trade in Asiatic slaves by the Asiatics themselves.¹ Not only, however, is this suggestion a stop-gap, but the scant evidence we have points in another direction. The Asiatics who appear in the roster of workers at the Sinai mines seem to be there because of their specialized skills. There are donkey drivers (who presumably know the road),² soldiers,³ and even chieftains from Retjenu.⁴ This bespeaks co-operation between Egyptians and Asiatics, not the enslavement of the latter by the former. Moreover, in the relations between Egypt and Asia in the late Twelfth and early Thirteenth Dynasties, it was the Egyptians that took the initiative. Such phrases as "opening up" a foreign land (i.e. for trade purposes),⁵ "opening the door of the land of the Asiatics,"⁶ "traversing the foreign lands to bring precious stones for His Majesty,"⁷ and "managing multitudes in the land of aliens(?)"⁸ show, not only the essential interest of Egypt in the natural resources of neighbouring lands, but also their apparent readiness to organize and administer the foreign labour force. It is quite probable that of their own volition Asiatics from southern Palestine gravitated towards Egypt, which always acted like a magnet on surrounding peoples, and sought employment there without coercion. That many of these should turn up as domestic servants on Egyptian estates is not at all surprising in view of the prevalence of voluntary servitude in ancient times.

With the beginning of the Egyptian New Kingdom (c. 1550 B.C.) slaves of Palestinian or Syrian origin began to enter Egypt in larger numbers than ever before. As far as we are able to judge this influx was the result of military conquest or annual tribute. The booty from

¹ *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum*, (Brooklyn, 1955), 99. The evidence indicates some military activity towards the close of the Twelfth Dynasty (cf. J. de Morgan, *Fouilles à Dabchour*, I [Vienna, 1895], pl. 20-21; Cairo 20278 ["crushing the foreign countries for the Lord of the Two Lands... quelling the foreign lands"]; Gardiner and others, *Sinai*, pl. 18, no. 54 ["binding (?) Asia for him who is in the palace"]; *ANET*², 230); but, as Hayes has himself seen ("The Middle Kingdom in Egypt," ch. 20 of *Cambridge Ancient History*, I [Cambridge, 1961], 49), this was mainly of a defensive or punitive nature.

² Gardiner and others, *Sinai*, pl. 35A, no. 110; pl. 38, no. 114; pl. 43, no. 120; cf. also pl. 22, no. 81 ("the Asiatic Rua").

³ *Ibid.*, pl. 51, no. 163.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pl. 37, no. 112; pl. 39, no. 115; pl. 44, no. 103; pl. 85, no. 405; pl. 23, no. 85; pl. 24, no. 87; pl. 27, no. 92.

⁵ Cf. Cairo 20086.

⁶ J. Couyat, P. Montet, *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi-Hammâmât*, (Cairo, 1912), pl. 13, no. 43; cf. pl. 5, no. 17.

⁷ Gardiner and others, *Sinai*, pl. 85, no. 405; cf. pl. 18, no. 51; pl. 22, no. 101A.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pl. 18, no. 54.

foreign campaigns always included large numbers of captives. From Thutmose III's seventeen campaigns in Asia we know of over seven thousand captives, put to work as slaves in the temples of Egypt; and this figure may represent only a fraction of the total.¹ Thutmose's son, Amenhotpe II, gives a total of close to one hundred thousand prisoners from only two campaigns.² A Ramesside papyrus, enumerating desiderata for a royal progress, mentions "Canaanite slaves from Palestine, fine youths, and fine Nubians of Kush suitable for wielding sun-shades, shod in white sandals and clad in *sfy*-garments."³ Allusion to "the numerous captivity of His Majesty is common in New Kingdom royal inscriptions. Thus Amenhotpe III in describing his mortuary temple on the west of Thebes, states "its magazines are filled with male and female slaves, children of the chiefs of all foreign lands, of the captivity of His Majesty ... an unknown number, (the temple) being surrounded by the settlements of the Syrians..."⁴ An important fact to note is that during the New Kingdom Asiatic slaves were state property, brought to Egypt through the agency of the king, and *then* assigned to temples and to private individuals. Even those slaves who entered Egypt "in shipments brought by the commandant"⁵ of a border fortress were royal property, since the commandant was an official of the king, and the ships' captains only royal servants. There is little evidence from Egypt of an international slave trade on the part of private individuals.⁶ To whomever the slaves might be assigned, they were all registered

¹ The estimate arrived at involved the addition of the numbers given for each campaign in the Karnak Annals; but as some of these are destroyed, and in the light of the uncertainty that the figures represent *all* the captives, seven thousand appears to be minimal.

² *ANET*², 247; unless the figure constitutes the misplaced census figures for the Egyptian province of Palestine; so Janssen, *JEOL* 17 (1963), 141 ff.

³ Anast. iv, 16, 4-6; Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, (Brussels, 1937), 33; translated in R. A. Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, (London, 1954), 200 f.

⁴ *Urk.* IV, 1649.

⁵ W. Wolf, *ZAS* 65 (1930), 94 (P. Bologna 1086, 10 f.).

⁶ In a list of the benefits which accrue to those who serve Amun, the scribe assures his pupil that "your fisherman will bring fish, your ship will come from Syria laden with every good thing, your barn will be filled with calves..." (Gardiner, *Miscellanies*, 38). While this may indicate some freedom on the part of private individuals in commercial ventures during the New Kingdom, there is no indication that the enormous expense of a traffic in slaves could be born by anyone else than the king. Even in Mesopotamia, where private trading in slaves is attested, the majority of the slave population was made up of prisoners of war or free men who had voluntarily become slaves: I. Mendelsohn, *Slavery in the Ancient Near East*, (New York, 1949), 5; cf. p. 4, "...there were no 'slave merchants' in the Ancient Near East. The demand for slaves was not big enough..."

by the state, and controlled by special state agencies.¹ Once within Egypt slaves could be bought or sold in private business transactions, and documents referring to such sales are not uncommon.² As was true of so many other things, traffic in slaves outside of Egypt was a royal monopoly.

In the Late Period we begin to encounter evidence of an international trade in slaves, not a royal monopoly, in which private citizens are involved.³ The Zenon Papyri well illustrate the private purchase of slaves from dealers in Palestine and Transjordan.⁴ Indeed, to judge from this archive, slaves seem to have been the most important single item of export from Syria.⁵ A decree issued in the twenty-fourth year of Ptolemy Philadelphos (261 B.C.) shows that seizure of freemen, either by *razzia* or kidnapping, was common enough in Palestine to antagonize the local population.⁶ But this widespread commerce in Syrian slaves was not new to the Ptolemaic period, as is attested by Kushite, Saite and Persian slave-sale documents, some of which qualify certain slaves as "men of the north."⁷ So common, in fact, was the traffic in Syrian youths from Saite times on,⁸ that the word for slave in Coptic is Ⲅⲙⲟⲗⲁⲛ, which is derived from earlier Demotic *hm-bl*, "the Syrian boy."⁹ One may compare with this expression the term applied to Joseph by the butler in Gen. 41: 12, viz. *na'ar 'ibri*, "the Hebrew lad."

This evidence of renewed interest in the slave trade dates from about the end of the eighth century B.C., precisely the time when Egypt began to revive its aggressive foreign policy towards Asia. It is during the subsequent hundred years that, according to Deuteronomy 17: 16 the royal practice of selling slaves, or despatching mercenaries to Egypt in order to buy chariotry, became sufficiently common to

¹ W. Wolf, *loc. cit.*

² A. Bakir, *Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt*, (Cairo, 1952), 70 f.; Gardiner, *JEA* 21 (1935), 140 ff.

³ C. Préaux, *L'Économie royale des Lagides*, (Brussels, 1939), 307.

⁴ C. C. Edgar, *ASAE* 18 (1918), 164; 23 (1923), 95 ff., 202.

⁵ V. Tscherikower, *op. cit.*, 16.

⁶ Préaux, *L'Économie*, 313 f.

⁷ Bakir, *op. cit.*, 72, 94 f.; M. Malinine, *RdE* 5 (1946), 128. In the Kushite texts, however, it is possible that "men of the north" refers to inhabitants of the Delta; cf. R. A. Parker, *ZAS* 63 (1966), 113 f.

⁸ Cf. Ebers, *op. cit.*, 294 n. 3.

⁹ W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar*, 59; Bakir, *op. cit.*, 33; cf. such personal names as *Hl-Hnsw*, "servant of Khonsu," H. Ranke, *Die ägyptische Personennamen*, I, (Glückstadt, 1935), 273: 22; *ḥl(t) n(t) Mwt*, "the female servant of Mut," *ibid.*, 367: 4.

warrant a pious prohibition.¹ The preceding two centuries of Egyptian history (i.e. the Libyan Twenty-second Dynasty, c. 927-725 B.C.) had witnessed a hesitant and ill-defined policy towards the Levant which resulted for the most part in Egypt's withdrawal from international dealings involving Asia.² Thus we are fairly safe in stating our conviction that the picture we have sketched is not the result of haphazard preservation of evidence. Evidence does not appear for the period prior to c. 725 B.C. simply because it does not exist.³

5. The Title "Eunuch" (*sārīs*) in Egypt

In citing the term *sārīs* as evidence of Egyptian colouring we may be falling into the trap we cautioned against earlier, viz. construing a detail of the story to be Egyptian, when in fact it is not. It is certainly possible that the glossator responsible for including the term "eunuch" in the story was influenced by the prevalence of such officers at courts with which he was more familiar, Israelite, Syrian, or Babylonian, assuming naturally that a similar post might be found at the court of Pharaoh. But for such an assumption to be a matter of course necessitates a period of history in which there was little difference between the make-up of the courts in Egypt and the composition of those in

¹ It was doubtless such contingents of Judaeans, sent to Egypt by the king either voluntarily or under Assyrian pressure (S. Sauneron, J. Yoyotte, *VT* 2 [1952], 133 f.), who turn up in Saite times as foreign auxiliaries in the Egyptian army: *ibid.*, 131 ff.; Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende*, (Berlin, 1953), 39; Erichsen, *Klio* 34 (1942), 56 ff.; H. Schaeffer, *Klio* 4 (1904), 157 pl. 2; Caminos, *JEA* 50 (1964), 94 f.; H. De Meulenaere, *BIFAO* 63 (1965), 21 ff.

² With very few exceptions the Libyan kings are conspicuous by their absence in Levantine affairs; (for Osorkon II, see H. Tadmor, *IEJ* 11 [1961], 143 ff.). The Asiatic community in Egypt under the Libyans was also at a low ebb; for a settlement of the Shasu south of Memphis in the ninth century, see Caminos, *The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon*, (Rome, 1958), 142, 144; for some evidence of contact between Egyptians and a foreign Syrian enclave in Egypt, see I. E. S. Edwards, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum. Fourth Series: Oracular Amuletic Decrees of the Late New Kingdom*, (London, 1960), II, pl. 3, 33 ff.; 4, 49 ff.; 5, vs. 6 f.; 7, 31 ff.; 13, 67; 16, 10 ff.

³ The price of twenty shekels of silver paid for Joseph is simply the rate stipulated by Lev. 27: 5 for a minor above five years of age. It is unnecessary and misleading to adduce "average" slave prices from Mesopotamia (so K. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and the Old Testament*, [London, 1966], 52 f.). The locale of the story is Palestine, not the Tigris-Euphrates Valley. Even so, it may be pointed out that examples of the sale of sons of a family by other members of the same family in Neo-Babylonian times, range between sixteen and thirty shekels: Mendelsohn, *op. cit.*, 9.

Asia, and in which this fact was common knowledge. The term *sārīs* occurs in Egyptian sources first (and only?) in the Persian period, when high plenipotentiaries of the Persian king resident in Egypt are called *srs n Prs*, "the Persian officer."¹

6. The "Land of the Hebrews"²

Joseph, in describing to the butler how he came to be in Egypt, says (Gen. 40: 15): "I was, in fact, kidnapped from the land of the Hebrews." In the context "Land of the Hebrews" can mean only Palestine,³ and it is significant that a native Palestinian uses the term to identify the country of his origin to an Egyptian. Yet despite Egypt's long familiarity with the Levant, the expression the "Land of the Hebrews" occurs nowhere in New Kingdom lists as a designation of Palestine.⁴

We must await the second half of the first millennium B.C. for the use of the word "Hebrew" as a qualification of the land of Palestine. A demotic omen text in Vienna, which reflects the political situation of the Saite and earlier Persian periods (c. 664-500 B.C.), mentions four countries comprising Egypt's sphere of influence: Asshur (i.e. probably Mesopotamia),⁵ Crete (standing for the Aegean), Amor (Syria), and *ybr*,⁶ i.e. "Hebrew-(land)," i.e. Palestine. From the Ptolemaic texts in the temple of Edfu comes a reference to *šmrḫt 'brtt*, which

¹ G. Posener, *La première domination perse en Égypte*, (Cairo, 1936), 118 f.

² Cf. the present writer in *VT* 15 (1965), 529 ff.

³ So A. Jirku, *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im dritten und zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*, (Leipzig, 1924), 7. Parzen (*AJSL* 49 [1933], 259) denied the allusion was to Canaan, preferring "the original domicile of his (Joseph's) folk." Procksch (*Gen.*, 387) confined the term to Beersheba: cf. the writer's remarks in *VT* 15 (1965), 530 n. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 531.

⁵ The extension of "Assyria" under the form Σορία to the Mediterranean is late: cf. G. Hölscher, *Drei Erdkarten*, (Heidelberg, 1949), 49. *Isḫr* in Demotic does, it is true, usually mean "Syria," rather than "Assyria": cf. G. R. Hughes, *JNES* 10 (1951), 259 f and n. 12. But in the present text *Imr* is the designation of Syria, and thus *Isḫr* must be located elsewhere. It is likely that something of the meaning and range of the older term *Isr*, "Assyria," still clings to the Demotic term in this omen papyrus: Gardiner, *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, I, 191* ff.; also F. Ll. Griffiths, *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the Rylands Library at Manchester*, (Manchester, 1909), III, 318.

⁶ On the basis of *p3 tš n Isḫr*, "the Land of the Assyrian," *ybr* must be treated syntactically and semantically as a gentilic; cf. E. F. Wente, *JNES* 22 (1963), 205. Morphologically it does not seem to be derived from *'ibrī*, but either (a) from **ēber* (in *'ēber nāri*: cf. R. J. Williams, *JNES* 25 [1966], 69 n. 1), or (b) from a back formation from *'ibrī*, on the analogy of *'ēmōri < 'ēmōr*. "Amurru."

Ebbell interprets as Hebrew *mišlahat*, followed by a gentilic *'ibrit*.¹ The two *ḥ*'s in the Ptolemaic writing are reminiscent of the frequent writings of names of countries in Greco-Roman hieroglyphic script. Classical authors too used the gentilic "Hebrew" as a designation of the land of Palestine.² This evidence suggests that, from the Saite period into Roman times, "the Land of the Hebrews" was a meaningful term employed by the Egyptians and other nations as well, to denote Palestine.³

The Biblical use of the term "Hebrew" shows that this gentilic had become by the time the Biblical texts came into being virtually synonymous with "Israelite." Moreover, the evidence proves beyond doubt that, contrary to some scholarly opinion, the gentilic was in use during the Exile and later.⁴ Lewy has sought to show that *'ibri* in the O.T. is not an ethnic term, but a common noun meaning something like "stranger," and is not therefore necessarily synonymous with "Israelite."⁵ With this assessment the Biblical evidence hardly agrees.⁶ In the light of the common Egyptian interest in the country of origin of a slave,⁷ and their practice of appending a gentilic to a slave's name, it would be most unusual if *'ibri* in the Joseph Story were *not* an ethnic term! Exod. 2: 11 also uses the term as a gentilic, in contrast to *'is Mišri*.⁸ In four passages in 1 Sam. "Hebrew" is clearly synonymous

¹ Ebbell, *Acta Or.* 17 (1939), 110.

² Cf. Tacitus *Hist.* v, 2; K. Koch, *VT* 19 (1969), 44, n. 1.

³ This Demotic passage is most valuable in indicating the designation of Palestine in the contemporary vernacular; for in the majority of monumental texts of the First Millennium Palestine and its inhabitants are called by archaic names centuries old. Cf. *HBrm*, G. Lefebvre, *ASAE* 18 (1918), 146; F. Ll. Griffith, *op. cit.*, III, 92 f.; G. Roeder, *Die ägyptische Götterwelt*, (Bern, 1959), 102; H. Gauthier, *Dictionnaire géographique*, IV, 159; W. Spiegelberg, *Die Demotischen Denkmäler*, II, *Die Demotischen Papyrus*, (Strassburg, 1908), no. 31169, ii, 23; *Mntyn*, H. Gauthier, *Le Livre des rois d'Égypte*, III, (Cairo, 1914), 337 f.; MacAdam, *Kawa I*, stela VI, 20 f.; *ʿmmw*, E. Chassinat, *Le temple de Dendara*, (Cairo, 1934-65), V, 54, 60 f.; S. Sauneron, *BIFAO* 60 (1960), 111 f.; P. Derchain, *Le Papyrus Salt 825*, (Brussels, 1965), 168.

⁴ See *VT* 15 (1965), 532 n. 2.

⁵ *HUCA* 28 (1957), 1 ff.; cf. p. 3 '...it appears doubtful that the first chapters of the Book of Exodus or, for that matter, the Joseph Story in Genesis, employ the term Hebrews as an ethnical name *ipso facto* denoting Israelites." Similarly M. P. Gray, *HUCA* 29 (1958), 177.

⁶ See the excellent discussion of Kraeling in *AJSL* 58 (1941), 241 ff.

⁷ Bakir, *op. cit.*, 72.

⁸ Gray, alluding to the addition of *mē'ehāw*, "of his kinsfolk," after *'is 'ibri* in this verse, says (*op. cit.*, 179): "if the racial significance of [*'is 'ibri*] were obvious, then the expression is quite redundant." But the use of "Hebrew" here is surely to be explained as a contrast to the subject, *'is Mišri*: here was an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, one of Moses' own race, in fact! Cf. Koch, *op. cit.*, 53.

with "Israelite" (1 Sam. 4: 6, 9; 13: 19; 14: 11). In 1 Sam. 29: 3 there is nothing to prevent its being similarly understood (though the characteristics of *Habiru* do indeed seem to attach themselves to David's band). Most probably it is here too synonymous with "Israelite," since the Philistine chiefs' objection to David's participation in the battle lay in his *nationality*: as an Israelite he would be more likely to side with the Israelite king, his former master, and turn on his erstwhile allies (cf. vs. 4). In 1 Sam. 13: 3 Saul's purpose in "blowing the trumpet" throughout the land, pursuant to his son's defeat of a Philistine garrison, is to muster his people for an all-out rebellion; and he accompanies his call to arms with a terse "let the Hebrews hear!" As the next verse indicates unequivocally, it seems to me, the people who Saul wanted to hear were none other than the Israelites. 1 Sam. 14: 21 could as easily refer to renegade Israelites as to a separate ethnic element. The *'ebed 'ibri* references are even clearer in meaning. Deut. 15: 12-18 uses the term as a synonym for Israelite, as the appositive *'abeka*, "your brother," shows; if this were a foreign slave, the adjective *nokeri* was ready to hand (cf. 15: 3). The same argument is valid for Jer. 34: 8-9. Exod. 21: 2-6 is not explicit; but no proof can be adduced that *'ibri* is here something other than a gentilic. Lev. 25: 35-43, it is true, seeks to forbid the enslavement of Israelites; but these verses reflect the attempted reforms of a Post-Exilic sacerdotal society, intoxicated with the exalted status of its race, and have no validity at all for Pre-Exilic literature. The prohibition of Leviticus was something new in Jeremiah's time (cf. Jer. 34: 10-11).

7. The *ḥartummim*¹

The Hebrew **ḥartōm*, "magician" (or the like), is usually, and probably correctly, identified with the Egyptian title of "chief lector priest" (*ḥry-ḥb ḥry-tp*).² The Akkadian *ḥartibi* of the seventh century, the Demotic *ḥr-tb*, and the later Greek *φεριτοβ*³ show that at least by the end of the first third of the First Millennium B.C. *ḥry-ḥb ḥry-tp* had been considerably worn down. Although one scholar has shown skepticism towards this unexpected treatment of Egyptian *p*,⁴ we can

¹ See above, p. 49.

² Vergote *Joseph*, 66 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, 68 f.

⁴ T. Lambdin, *Egyptian Loanwords and Transcriptions in the Ancient Semitic Languages*, (Baltimore, 1952), 24 f.; *idem*, *JAOS* 73 (1953), 150 f.

probably document, from Demotic, the phenomenon of $p > b > m$ attested by the Hebrew. In a passage in the Wisdom of Onksheshonqy¹ in which the moralist describes the dire results when Re becomes angry with a country, the following line occurs: "When Pre is angry with a land, he makes its washermen into *hry-tme*." Since the parallels in adjacent lines are "dignitaries (*y.w*)," and "learned men (*sbj.w*)," it is fairly certain that the word in question is *hr-tb*, the ancient "lector priest."² That the text in which it is found dates from the second half of the first millennium B.C. agrees with the fact that in Hebrew literature all occurrences appear to be late.

8. *The Zodiac in Joseph's Dream*

The sun, moon and eleven stars of Joseph's second dream seem to betray a knowledge of the Zodiac.³ If this be so, we are once again led to the second half of the first millennium B.C., when the first genuine references to the Zodiac appear.⁴ The motif of celestial bodies doing homage to a great man is found at the same period.⁵

9. *Vine and Grape-juice in the Butler's Dream*

Belief that dreams conveyed revelation vouchsafed by deity early created an extensive literature of dream interpretation in the ancient Near East.⁶ Our major Egyptian work, the Chester Beatty Papyrus, comes from the Nineteenth Dynasty, and comprises a table of dream

¹ V, 13; S. R. K. Glanville, *The Instructions of 'Onksheshonqy*, (London, 1965), 16.

² See A. Volten, *OLZ* 52 (1957), 127.

³ E. Burrows, *The Oracles of Jacob and Balaam*, (London, 1938), 64 f. Joseph himself would make twelve. Since at this early point in the story there is no question that Joseph was the youngest, i.e. that Benjamin had not yet been born, the only valid reason for the number eleven was to make twelve possible as the total when Joseph himself was added.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 6. Although the linking of constellations with months was practised as early as the end of the Second Millennium (cf. B. L. van der Waerden, *AfO* 16 [1953], 221), the twelve zodiacal signs occur first in a Babylonian astronomical text of 419 B.C. (*ibid.*, 220); cf. M. Cassirer, *JTS* 50 (1949), 173 f.

⁵ Cf. Ahikar (Syr. Armen. text, 6, 16; Gressmann, EYXAPIΣΤΗΠION, 18) where Sennacherib is likened to a god in heaven to whom the sun, moon and stars are subservient; cf. also Nabonidus, greeted by the moon, a star and Jupiter: *ANET*², 310. Stars as symbols of people is an obvious and wide-spread motif; cf. C. H. Gordon, *JBR* 21 (1953), 242.

⁶ A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*, (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 46, 3); Sir. A. H. Gardiner, *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Third Series*, I, (London, 1935), 9 ff.; A. Volten, *Demotische Traumdeutung*, (Copenhagen, 1942).

epitomes, of the allegorical variety,¹ with the appropriate interpretation for each. Often the interpretation seems arbitrary, and the symbols only remotely apt; but this is because the possibility of subject material is so vast. In literature the author can control his subjects' dreams, and fashion the detail of his dream with the necessary interpretation in mind.

In this light there might seem little point in perusing the dream literature for parallels; the Biblical author was guided by his plot, not by a dream book. Nevertheless, some common notions may have influenced his choice. In his work on dreams Artemidorus states that dreams in which vines are seen will be quickly fulfilled,² a belief which is echoed in the interpretation of the butler's dream. Squeezing grapes by hand into a cup is not how Egyptians commonly treated the fruit of the vine. Normally the juice was trodden or pressed out by mechanical means, and then allowed to ferment. Yet in Ptolemaic times unfermented grape juice, squeezed by hand and mixed with water, is described by temple texts as a refreshing beverage to be drunk by the king.³

10. *The Cow as a Symbol for Year in Pharaoh's Dream*

The cows of Pharaoh's dream stand for years.⁴ A not uncommon cryptographic writing of the word for "year" in Ptolemaic inscriptions employs the hieroglyphic symbol of the cow.⁵ For earlier periods no such value is attested for the sign. By what devious ways the cow hieroglyph received this symbolic connexion, is not immediately apparent.

11. *The Celebration of the King's Birthday*

The birthday of a king, like the birthday of a god, may have occasioned some sort of celebration in all periods of Egyptian history;

¹ See above, p. 90 f.

² Artemidorus iv, 1; cf. Dillmann *Gen.* II, 363.

³ See the references in Driver, *HDB* II, 772.

⁴ In the opinion of the present writer the symbolism does not involve any connexion in Egyptian iconography or mythology between cows and inundations; *pace* Heyes, *Joseph*, 14; Vergote *Joseph*, 57 f. Ruppert (*JEG*, 71) also denies a mythological connexion, pointing out that a Hebrew, without recourse to mythology, could have seen a parallel between *pārā(b)*, "cow," and the verb *pārā(b)*, "to be fruitful."

⁵ *Wb.* II, 429; see for examples and literature, A. M. Blackman, H. W. Fairman, *JEA* 29 (1943), 24.

but prior to the first millennium B.C. no evidence has come down to us. Certainly a birthday feast was not so common in ancient Egypt as to give rise to a literary motif. Yet in Achaemenid Persia the celebration of a king's birthday was so fashionable that the festivities to mark the occasion became for the Greeks proverbial of luxury.¹ The festival of the royal birthday remained customary in Hellenistic times,² and it is not surprising that our only evidence of it in Egypt comes likewise from the Hellenistic period. In the Rosetta Stone (Hierog. 10, Greek 46) *τα γενέθλια του βασιλεου* is mentioned, and rendered into Demotic as *p³ brw msy*, and into Egyptian as *brw ms n'r nfr*, "birthday of the good god (the king)."³ As in Gen. 40, so in the case of Ptolemy's birthday celebration, a general amnesty was proclaimed.⁴ It is probable that the practice of marking the monarch's birthday with a feast became popular in Egypt first under the Saïtes, or perhaps the Persians.

12. *The Tradition of the Seven-year Famine*

The period of seven years is found frequently in Near Eastern literature, not only in mythology and legend, but also in apparently reliable historical texts.⁵ A seven-year drought, as Gordon has shown,⁶ appears in the Gilgamesh epic and also in Ugaritic literature;⁷ and the motif itself cannot with any degree of probability be used to date the background of the Joseph Story. Yet it is striking that the only Egyptian inscription in which a famine of seven years' duration occurs, is the Djoser inscription of Ptolemy V, to be dated c. 187 B.C.⁸ This famous rock-cut text, situated at the first cataract on the Nile, purports to be a record from the eighteenth year of Djoser (c. 2600 B.C.) describing the measures taken to relieve a drought which had lasted seven years. As Barguet has convincingly shown,⁹ the text is a forgery,

¹ *Herod.* ix, 110; Plato *Alcib.* i, 121.

² 2 Macc. 6, 7.

³ F. Daumas, *Moyens d'expression du grec et de l'égyptien comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis*, (Cairo, 1952), 220.

⁴ Driver, *HDB* II, 772; a general amnesty was also sometimes proclaimed on the anniversary of the king's accession, a practice which can be traced from the late New Kingdom into Ptolemaic times: H. S. Smith, *JEA* 54 (1968), 209 ff.

⁵ Cf. Redford, *History and Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty, Seven Studies*, (Toronto, 1967), 207.

⁶ *Orientalia* 22 (1953), 79 ff.

⁷ S. E. Loewenstamm, *IEJ* 15 (1965), 121 ff.; see also above, p. 98, n. 3.

⁸ P. Barguet, *La stèle de la famine à Sébel*, (Cairo, 1953).

⁹ *Ibid.*, 11 ff.

and there is no evidence that it is a reworking of an ancient inscription. Whether the seven-year famine motif is likewise an invention of this text, or whether it had some currency in earlier periods of Egyptian literature, is impossible to say. At any rate, this much is sure: a tradition of a famine lasting seven years was circulating in Egypt in Ptolemaic times.

The possibility of forecasting droughts somehow was of prime importance to the ancient Egyptians. A Demotic omen text of Roman date, perhaps from an original of Ptolemaic times (cf. the possible reference to Parthia in line 5), is at pains to predict from the positions of heavenly bodies the fluctuations in future inundations, rises in grain prices due to low Niles, and rainless periods of drought in Syria.¹ On the world-wide famine of the time of Erechtheus, and its possible historical antecedents, we have already spoken (above, p. 99).

13. *The Overseers over the Land*

In 41: 34 Joseph recommends that Pharaoh "appoint overseers over the land, and they shall take a fifth of the yield of the Land of Egypt during the seven years of satiety." The word rendered "overseers" is *pēqādim*, in origin a general term for any person deputized to do a job, whether it be looking after soldiers (2 Ki. 25: 19), performing priestly functions (2 Chron. 24: 11, 31: 13, Neh. 11: 14, 12: 42), or carrying out royal commands (Jud. 9: 28, Esth. 2: 3). With the general meaning "(royal) officer" it is found occasionally in Old Aramaic,² but by the beginning of the fifth century it had become, at least throughout Egypt and the Levant, a *terminus technicus* meaning "governor of a township (*mēdīnāh*)."³ With this meaning the word is ubiquitous in the Elephantine papyri, where it is applied to officials of the next highest rank to the Persian satrap.⁴ They were superior to troop commanders and, interestingly enough, were occasionally delegated to collect pro-

¹ Cf. G. R. Hughes, *JNES* 10 (1951), 258, lines 4, 6 ff., 10, 15. In line 14 there is a statement that "the whole world shall []; grain will be high in price." One expects some such word as "hunger." The thought is close to that of Gen. 41: 54, and 57.

² Sefire iii, 4, 10, 13; cf. *DISO*, 234; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré*, (Paris, 1958), 127 ff.; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, (Rome, 1967), 108, 111, (contrasted with eunuchs, brothers of the king and people).

³ *DISO*, *loc. cit.*; the connexion is explicit in A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, (Oxford, 1923), no. 37, 6; cf. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.*, (Oxford, 1957), no. 6, 1-2, 5.

⁴ Driver, *op. cit.*, 15 f.

duce from an estate.¹ From the fact that no Biblical examples of the term (other than the case under discussion) are older than the late Judaeon monarchy,² and in view of the contemporary appearance of the cognate *paqdu* in Neo-Babylonian,³ with similar meaning, we may safely conclude that we are dealing with a usage that appeared in the seventh century B.C. That the writer of 41: 34 knew specifically the Egyptian provincial system involving *pēqīdīm* that the Elephantine documents reflect, is very likely.⁴

14. *The Investiture of Joseph*⁵

Verse 42 of chapter 41 reconstructs the ceremonial procedure followed at Joseph's investiture: "then Pharaoh took his signet off his finger and put it on Joseph's finger, clad him in linen garments, and hung the gold chain about his neck." Three things are bestowed upon Joseph as symbols of the authority he is receiving, viz. a ring, a linen garment, and a gold collar.⁶ Of course Joseph was undoubtedly showered with other gifts by Pharaoh, including such things as houses, lands, servants, and treasures. But these did not have the symbolic significance of the three items named here, and so play no part in the ceremony.

What parallels exist in Egyptian literature and iconography to this ceremony, and, in particular, are the same three symbols attested? Vergote has reminded us of the honour, called "the gold of favour," which was bestowed upon royal favorites.⁷ Although mentioned in texts before the New Kingdom, it is not until the middle of the

¹ *Ibid.*, no. 11, 4-5.

² Above, p. 65.

³ E. G. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Papyri*, (New Haven, 1953), 33, n. 42.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 34, n. 43. It might be objected that in vs. 34 *pēqīdīm* was used simply because the verb was √PQD; but this is surely the wrong way to put it. The writer felt constrained to use that root (and not √SYM or √SYT in the hiph'il) because he had *already* to do with *pēqīd* as a technical term. A colleague and former student of mine, Dr. A. K. Bowman, has pointed out to me that *pēqīd* in the Third Century B.C. was rendered by Greek *τοπάρχης*. Whether Herodotus's *νομάρχης* is likewise a rendering of this Aramaic term is a moot point, but it is by no means impossible.

⁵ H. J. Heyes, *op. cit.*, 16 ff.; S. Gabra, *Les conseils des fonctionnaires dans l'Égypte pharaonique*, (Cairo, 1929), 41 ff.; Vergote *Joseph*, 116 ff.; J. Vandier, *Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne*, IV, 1, (Paris, 1964), 638 ff.; A. Hermann, *ZAS* 90 (1963), 49 ff.

⁶ On these objects as symbols of investiture (undoubtedly the correct interpretation), see Vergote *Joseph*, 121.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 124 ff., with references.

Eighteenth Dynasty that the presentation of this gold becomes a subject for the artist. The scene in question is the one most frequently compared to the word picture given in Gen. 41. The king is usually shown seated in a kiosk, or looking from a window, upon his favorite who is being adorned by servants or courtiers with bracelets or collars of precious metal. One servant is often shown with one or both hands upon the robe of the favoured one, as though this were a stereotyped way of depicting the donning of a new garment. From the beginning of the Amarna Period the rewarded official is almost always shown with both arms raised.

Of this scene I am able to list some thirty-two examples. The earliest (no. 1) comes from the reign of Thutmose IV, the latest (no. 32) from the close of the Twenty-first Dynasty (c. 930 B.C.).

<i>Official</i>	<i>King</i>	<i>With King</i>	<i>Rewards, How Given</i>	<i>Other Recipients</i>	<i>Reason</i>
1. Amenhotpe Si-se ¹	In kiosk on throne	?	Servant puts on collar, another holds fan	None	Implicit: supervising monuments
2. Kheruef ²	In kiosk in double crown	Hathor and Tiy	Kheruef rewards two pairs of officers, his back to king	Officers	?
3. Khaemhat ³	In kiosk in bag wig, crook, flail	None	Kheruef in cone and collars bows before king	Officers	Good harvest tax
4. Ramose ⁴	Gestures in window, in blue crown	Queen?	One servant puts on collar, another anoints	None	?
5. Parennefer ⁵	In kiosk (lost)	?	One servant puts on collar, another anoints; another holds tray	None	?

¹ N. De G. Davies, Sir A. H. Gardiner, *The Tombs of Two Officials of Thutmose IV*, (London, 1923), pls. 11, 12.

² A. Fakhry, *ASAE* 43 (1943), pl. 40, p. 491 f.

³ W. Wreszinski, *Atlas zur altägyptische Kulturgeschichte*, I, (Leipzig, 1923), pl. 203.

⁴ N. De G. Davies, *The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose*, (London, 1941), pl. 33 ff.

⁵ Davies, *JEA* 9 (1923), pl. 24, p. 138 ff.

<i>Official</i>	<i>King</i>	<i>With king</i>	<i>Rewards, How Given</i>	<i>Other Recipients</i>	<i>Reason</i>
6. Meryre I ¹	Stands in court; vista of ships and villas	Queen, two daughters	Treasurer puts on collars; 3 men bear trays	None	Listening to teaching
7. Panehsi ²	In window, in blue crown	Queen, 3 daughters	King hands collars to courtiers, 3 servants bear trays	None	?
8. Meryre II ³	In window, in blue crown	Queen, 5 daughters	King throws collars to M. himself; queen throws to two daughters	None	?
9. Meryre II ⁴	Standing, kiosk behind king	Queen	3 pairs of kneeling servants cluster around M.	None	?
10. Huya ⁵	In window, in (blue crown)	Queen, two daughters	One servant anoints, another bears ring (?) and staff	None	?
11. Huya ⁶	Same as 10, but king now throws collars	Same as 10	H. stands alone, catching rewards	None	?
12. Pentu ⁷	Stands on ground in (blue crown), temple behind him	Queen	One courtier puts on collar	None	?
13. Pentu ⁸	Stands in walled court; vista of ships and villas	Queen, 3 daughters	One courtier puts on collar, others bear things	None	?

¹ Davies, *The Rock Tombs of El-Amarna*, I, pl. 30.

² Davies, *Amarna* II, pl. 10.

³ Davies, *Amarna* II, pl. 33 ff.

⁴ Davies, *Amarna* II, pl. 41.

⁵ Davies, *Amarna* III, pl. 16.

⁶ Davies, *Amarna* III, pl. 17.

⁷ Davies, *Amarna* IV, pl. 6, 7.

⁸ Davies, *Amarna* IV, pl. 8 (top).

<i>Official</i>	<i>King</i>	<i>With king</i>	<i>Rewards, How Given</i>	<i>Other Recipients</i>	<i>Reason</i>
14. Pentu ¹	On throne, in palace, in bag wig?	None	One courtier puts on collar	None	?
15. Mahu ²	(King not present; M. stands and kneels before temple)	—	(M. is already decked out)	None	?
16. Parennefer ³	Gestures in window, in blue crown	Queen, 3 daughters	One servant puts on collar, one anoints, others bear trays, etc.	None	?
17. Ay ⁴	Blue crown, throws rewards from window	(As in 16)	Ay and wife catch rewards	None	?
18. Neferhotpe I ⁵	Gestures in window, in blue crown (?)	Queen	Two courtiers receive collars, another puts them on, 3 bear trays	Wife	?
19. Haremhab ⁶	(King not preserved)	?	Two servants put on collars; 3 bear trays	None	Success in war?
20. Neferhotpe II ⁷	Gestures in window, in blue crown	None	Officer and two viziers under window two servants put on collars	brother	"At the command of my lord Amun"
21. Paser ⁸	In kiosk, in <i>atef</i> and Osirian costume	Maat and Souls of Pe-Dep	One servant puts on collar, one anoints	None	?
22. Hor-Min ⁹	Gestures in window, in short wig	None	One servant puts on collars, one anoints	None	Unimpeachable conduct

¹ Davies, *Amarna* IV, pl. 8 (bottom).

² Davies, *Amarna* IV, pl. 18, 19.

³ Davies, *Amarna* VI, pl. 4.

⁴ Davies, *Amarna* VI, pl. 29, 30.

⁵ Davies, *The Tomb of Neferhotep at Thebes*, (New York, 1933), I, pl. 9, 10, 14, 16.

⁶ W. Wolf, *Die Welt der Ägypter*, pl. 86.

⁷ G. Bénédite, *Le Tombeau de Neferhotepou Fils de Amenemanit*, (Cairo, 1889), pl. 5.

⁸ Vergote *Joseph*, 132, fig. 7.

⁹ Vigneau, *Musée du Louvre*, I, 90.

Official	King	With king	Rewards, How Given	Other Recipients	Reason
23. Mose ¹	Throws collars from window, in blue crown	None	M. catches rewards below	None	M. has "acted for" the king
24. Mose ²	Stands upon statue of self	None	(Same as 23)	Fellow soldiers	(Same as 23)
25. Apy ³	(From window, in blue crown?)	?	Two rows of bowing grantees between Apy and king	Two rows of men with arms raised	?
26. Amenemope ⁴	Seated in kiosk in blue crown and <i>atef</i>	None	One servant puts on collars, one anoints; king's son before king	None	?
27. Chay ⁵	In kiosk, in <i>atef</i> , and Osirian dress	Maat and Souls of Pe-Dep	Two servants put on collar, and anoint	None	?
28. ? ⁶	In window, in bag wig	None	Two servants anoint	None	Perhaps cf. no. 30 ⁷
29. Penno ⁸	In kiosk, in blue crown	None	Viceroy of Kush and steward convey two vases to P., two servants anoint	None	Putting down a revolt; making statue for king
30. Paser ⁹	In window, in <i>nemes</i>	None	Two servants put on collars and anoint	None	Making statues for king

¹ G. Roeder, *Die Denkmäler des Pelizaeus Museums zu Hildesheim*, III, (Berlin, 1921), abb. 33.

² *Ibid.*

³ Davies, *Two Ramesside Tombs at Thebes*, (New York, 1927), pl. 27.

⁴ G. Roeder, *Die Felsentempel von Bêt al-Wali*, (Cairo, 1938), pl. 30 f.

⁵ B. Porter, R. Moss, *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings*, I, (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1960), p. 39.

⁶ Sir W. M. F. Petrie, *Gizeh and Rifeh*, (London, 1907), pl. 29.

⁷ Before the rewarded official stands a statuette of the king worshipping the baboon. This may be the commissioned work for which he is being honoured.

⁸ R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, (Berlin, 1849-59), III, 230a.

⁹ S. Schott, *Wall Scenes from the Mortuary Chapel of the Mayor Paser at Medinet Habu*, (Chicago, 1957), pl. 1.

Official	King	With king	Rewards, How Given	Other Recipients	Reason
31. Amenhotep ¹	Stands on podium, in blue crown	None	Two servants anoint	None	Collection of good harvest tax
32. Ankhef-en-amun ²	In blue crown, in window	None	Two servants anoint	?	?

It is clear from the above tabulation that the scene was not standardized until the beginning of the reign of Akhenaten (c. 1363-1347 B.C.). Prior to that time its occurrence is sporadic and the composition free, at least to a certain extent. With the Amarna revolution the scene becomes an almost indispensable part of the mortuary repertoire, the component elements become established, and certain stereotyped texts make their appearance. Among the last we may note the following: (a) "many are the things which Amun is able to give in satisfying the heart's craving, O thou beautiful child of [Amun?],"³ (no. 18 above; cf. also nos. 4, 11, 12, 20, and 29; these words are usually addressed by the decorated favorite in reply to the king); (b) "thou createst multitudes of draftees!" (no. 10; cf. also no. 15;⁴ this is addressed to the king by the rewarded official); (c) "grant health to Pharaoh, I. p. h. ! thy beautiful child, O thou Aten! Let him achieve thy lifetime, grant it

¹ G. Lefebvre, *Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d'Amon Romê-Roy et Amon-hotep*, (Paris, 1929), pl. 2; also W. Helck, *MIOF* 4 (1956), 161 ff.

² P. Montet, *La Nécropole royale de Tanis, III, Les constructions et le tombeau de Chéchanq III*, (Paris, 1960), pl. 53, 19 (?); 55, 20, 21; 56, 23.

³ *ḥt rḥ dit.w 'Imn hr i' ib.k*; cf. *Imn dd ḥt.f*, "Amun who bestows his possessions," G. Lefebvre, *Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres*, 6; cf. *Pth dd ḥpsw*, "Ptah who bestows riches," A. El-Mohsen Bakir, *The Cairo Calendar No. 86637*, (Cairo, 1966), pl. II, 3. Davies' "abounding in wealth and knowing who bestows it" (*Amarna* IV, 3) ignores the fact that examples of this standard formula always show a subject after *dit.w* (usually Aten, here Amun, in no. 20 "god": Bénédite, *loc. cit.*). Davies' rendering in any case would require the verb "to give" to be a participle, but the form *dit.w* (*Amarna* I, pl. 8 *di<t>.w*, *Amarna* III, pl. 17 *di<t>.sn*, *Amarna* IV, pl. 6 *dd st* [sic]) is clearly an infinitive with third plural suffix. *Rḥ* must be a relative form with the divine name as subject, meaning "to be able," which use in Late Egyptian takes a following infinitive: A. Erman, *Neuägyptische Grammatik*, (Leipzig, 1933), § 416.

⁴ *shpr.k m ḡmw ḡmw*; cf. no. 15, *shpr.f n ḥḥ n ḡmw*, "he creates (or trains) draftees by the millions." The expression is also found in genuine investiture texts, on which see below. For *ḡmw*, "young men, youths eligible for the draft, soldiers, etc." see Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, (Oxford, 1962), 319; A. R. Schulman, *JARCE* 3 (1964), 59, n. 63.

for ever!" (no. 13; cf. nos. 4, 6, 15; this text is a prayer to the god on behalf of the king); (d) "[may Amun] and Atum [praise you], may the *ku* of the gods of heaven praise you, may the *ku* of the gods of earth praise you, may the *ku* of the gods of Pharaoh, l. p. h., your lord, praise you!" (no. 30; cf. nos. 29 and 31; this is the formula with which, in our examples from the Twentieth Dynasty, the king compliments his favoured officer. A similar formula in Eighteenth Dynasty tomb scenes was employed by the tomb owner in the ceremony of bringing bouquets to the king.)¹

The texts make quite clear how these decorations and presents are to be construed. They are "favours" (*hswt*), "rewards" (*iw'* or *fq3*), or "presents" (*f3w*), and people thus favoured are known colloquially as "people of gold" (*rmc n nbw*). In no. 1 a text above the head of the courtier who is affixing the collars reads, "receiving the favour of the Lord of the Two Lands in the form of gold...". In no. 3 the caption which accompanies the king states, "the king appears upon the great seat to reward (*fq3*) the governors (*brpw*) of South and North."² No. 6 contains a text which reads, "the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, living on truth, the Lord of the Two Lands [Nefer]kheprure Wa-enre (Akhenaten) said <to> the treasurer of silver and gold: 'reward (*iw'*) the Greatest of Seers of the Aten³ in Akhetaten, Meryre...'. The caption to no. 10 tells us that the scene depicts "[rew]arding⁴ Huya, the Superintendent of the king's harim, the treasurer and steward in the House of the King's-Mother." Though no texts accompany the scene in no. 7, elsewhere in the same tomb Panehsi seems to be referring to his decoration by the king when he says⁵ "he gave me gold as favours on the day of rewarding⁶ []". Again, no major texts gloss the scene in Ay's tomb (no. 17), but the conversation of minor

¹ Cf. Davies, *The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose*, pl. 30 (over a figure of Ramose proffering a bouquet to the king): "recitation by him who is attached to Nekhen, prophet of Maat, mayor and vizier Ramose, deceased: 'for thy *ku*, the bouquet of thy father Re-Harakhte, rejoicing in the horizon in his name Shu-which-is-in-Aten. May he praise thee, may he love thee and establish thee, may he give thee millions of recorded years and *sd*-festivals, all lands being beneath thy feet, and may he overthrow thine enemies in death and in life! All joy and all health be thine, whilst thou art ensconced upon the seat of Re for ever!'"

² Cf. also nos. 2, 12, 20, 31.

³ The title of the High priest of the Sun god.

⁴ Restore *iw'*, which suits the traces better than Davies' *dbn* (*Amarna* III, 12, n. 8); in fact the word for the ring the servant is shown carrying is the cognate noun *iw'w*: Faulkner, *op. cit.*, 13.

⁵ *Amarna* II, pl. 21, 3.

⁶ Read *iw'*.

figures is informative. One guardsman seated on a stool says to another, "Who are they shouting about?"; to which the other replies, "Stand up and you'll see the good things that Pharaoh l. p. h. has done for Ay, the god's-father, and Tiy. Pharaoh l. p. h. has given them millions of presents, as well as gold and all sorts of things!" In the same scene a boy informs another soldier that "they are shouting about Ay, the god's-father, and Tiy. They have been made people of gold!"

Clearly, then, this genre of scene is the representation, not of an induction ceremony, but of reward and decoration. The Egyptian words for "reward" imply, as do their English equivalents, that some meritorious service has been rendered by the recipient; and the examples assembled above do not fail to recount the occasion of the reward. In general it would seem to be fair to say that before the Amarna Period, and again in the Twentieth Dynasty, the ceremony was taken seriously, and rewards were handed out for genuine achievements; while from Akhenaten to Ramses II favours were bestowed promiscuously, and at the drop of a hat. In example no. 1 Amenhotpe-se is decorated for his excellent supervision of the manufacture of various objets d'art which the king has commissioned. Amenhotpe stands before the king with a bouquet and behind him are three registers containing an assortment of luxury items, including statues, vases, shrines, fans, jewellery, a harp, standards and chests. Behind this array the scene of reward is depicted, with the following text:¹ "Supervising the monuments which are set forth in the royal presence for the inspection of the Good God. The work is finished as was ordered and as His Majesty wished, to the heart's satisfaction of the Lord of [Karnak?],² in seeking out things that are useful to [his lord?].³ His house⁴ is adorned with (objects of) electrum too numerous to be put in writing, viz. all sorts of vessels without end... (nevertheless

¹ Restored from Four other Eighteenth Dynasty examples: Kheruef (the best preserved), Fakhry, *op. cit.*, 475; Userhet, T. Säve-söderbergh, *Private Tombs at Thebes*, (Oxford, 1957), I, 39, n. 4; Surer, *ibid.*, pl. 36 (badly preserved); the unknown owner of Tomb 226 (badly preserved), Gardiner and others, *The Tomb of Menkheperasonb*, pl. 42. All come from the reign of Amenhotpe III.

² The other four texts read here "of the Two Lands"; but the next phrase in Amenhotpe's text suggests a god, and the list of objects ends with the phrase "the King of the Gods."

³ I.e. Amun? The other four texts diverge from Amenhotpe's at this point, reading "in making very great monuments."

⁴ Presumably the Amun-temple; but the four examples from Amenhotpe III's reign can only refer to the king.

a list of them follows)... So the second prophet of [Amun, Amun]-hotpe went forth praised and loved from the presence of His Majesty.” This scene of the presentation of commissioned works is akin to the ceremony of bringing “greetings” (*nḡt-br*), or “gifts” (*imw*) to the king by a high dignitary, on the occasion of some festival, usually that of the New Year. To the writer’s knowledge the earliest occurrence of the scene of New Year’s gift-giving in the Theban Necropolis is in tomb no. 345;¹ but here the gifts are presented to the owner by his wife and children. From Hatshepsut on the scene of giving such gifts to the king is a *bona fide* motif for the tomb decorator.² Some of the texts couple the gift-giving with the supervision of commissioned works;³ and some indicate that the official was rewarded therefor.⁴ Paser’s rewards were for the same service (no. 30). On the wall in the top register Paser was shown bringing statues of the king (which presumably he had been commissioned to have made) into the king’s presence. Three specific occasions are here commemorated, as the dates indicate: regnal year 2 (of Ramses III), fourth month of Inundation, day 10; regnal year 3, fourth month of Inundation, day 19; and regnal year 18, first month of Growth, day 14. The stock text accompanying this ceremony takes the following form: “bringing a statue into the halls of the king’s palace.” In example no. 3 the rewards are given for the collection of a good harvest tax,⁵ as the caption indicates: “the rewarding of the stewards of the houses of Pharaoh, l. p. h., and the governors of South and North, after the Superintendent of the Graneries had reported concerning them that they had handed in an exceptional harvest in year 30.” Amenhotpe the High Priest was rewarded for the same feat (no. 31): “May Montu praise you, etc. etc., for your successful completion of the harvest tax, dues and imposts of

¹ Amenhotpe, First King’s son of Okheperkare: Porter and Moss, *op. cit.*, I², 413 f.; texts in *Urk.* IV, 107.

² Tomb 73 (*temp.* Hatshepsut), Säve-söderbergh, *op. cit.*, pl. 2, 6; tomb 93 (Kenamun, *temp.* Amenhotpe II), Davies, *The Tomb of Kenamun at Thebes*, (New York, 1930), pl. 11, 13 ff.; tomb 92 (Su-em-nywet, *temp.* Amenhotpe II), Porter and Moss, *op. cit.*, I², 188; tomb 96 (Sen-nefer, *temp.* Amenhotpe II), *ibid.*, 198.

³ Cf. Sen-nefer (text *Urk.* IV, 1417): “Bringing greetings for the New Year, the Beginning of Eternity, the End of the Aeon, together with every fine monument he supervised for His Majesty...”

⁴ Tomb 73 (Säve-söderbergh, *op. cit.*, pl. 6, p. 8, n. 2): “this humble servant was [rewarded] with silver and [gold...] from the king...”; Kenamun (Davies, *op. cit.*, pl. 13): “...entering in with beautiful things to the place where the king is, coming forth pra[is]ed...”

⁵ *Šmw*: see Gardiner, *JEA* 27 (1941), 20; cf. K. Baer, *JARCE* 1 (1962), 30, n. 43.

the people belonging to Amonrasonther¹ (which are) under your charge. You have brought them in complete, in heaps ... and you have had them stored inside the treasury, store-houses and graneries of the house of Amonrasonther.” The reason why Meryre was decorated (no. 6) is less certain, but it may have had something to do with his provisioning of the temple of Aten: “Put gold all around his neck and gold on his feet, for he has hearkened to the teaching of Pharaoh, l. p. h., and has done all that was said concerning these beautiful places which Pharaoh, l. p. h., has made in the *benben*-house in the Aten-house of the Aten in Akhetaten, it being filled with all sorts of good things and much barley and emmer—the Offering table of the Aten!—for the Aten!” Other examples are far less explicit. Thus Neferhotpe in no. 20 was rewarded apparently only because of divine favour: “The god’s-father of Amun, Neferhotpe, was summoned to receive favours of the king, viz. myriads of all kinds of things, silver, gold, clothing, unguents, bread, beer, meat, cakes, at the command of my² lord Amun, who grants favours in the royal presence.” Some hint of the reason in Mose’s case (no. 24) is contained in Ramses II’s words to the army which is looking on: “Now you see what is done for one beloved of His Majesty ... How very well it goes with him who acts for him (i.e. the king!)” The sub-scenes in the examples from the tomb of Huya (nos. 10, 11), which show Huya inspecting the storehouse and artisans at work, may imply that the reward was given for diligent accomplishment of his duties. The presence of Syrian captives in no. 19 likewise suggests that Haremhab’s decoration had something to do with a successful military campaign.

Not only is this not the same ceremony as is envisaged by Gen. 41, but also the insignia are different. The rewarded official receives not one, but many collars of gold; while the ring of Joseph’s investiture does not figure at all in the New Kingdom reward scene. The portrayal of a servant, laying his hands upon the robe of the favorite, is not, in fact, a stylized representation of the costuming of the courtier in a new uniform, but depicts his anointing with unguent. In the detailed scene in Parennefer’s tomb (no. 16) the servant who is engaged in this activity has one hand on Parennefer’s midriff, while the other is extended in the opposite direction into a bowl held by another servant.

While aware of the essential purpose and format of the scene of reward which distinguishes it from the scene of Gen. 41, Vergote

¹ Amunre, King of the Gods.

² Neferhotpe here slips unwittingly into the first person.

nevertheless maintains that from the closing years of the Amarna Period onward, the Egyptian motif took on overtones of investiture.¹ He points out that Tutu in his tomb² is shown being rewarded at the same time as he is being inducted into office. Furthermore he notes that in the examples of Paser (no. 21) and Chay (no. 27) the king is clad in the costume of Osiris, with *atef*-crown, crook and flail, and is accompanied by a goddess. This “*contraste frappant*” with the representations of the king in the other reward scenes leads him to compare the scenes of Paser and Chay with the *investiture* scene in Rekhmire’s tomb,³ where Thutmose III is also costumed like Osiris. “*Si Paser et Tjay reçoivent les colliers d’or au moment de leur entrée en fonction, nous assistons à une nouvelle évolution [de l’or de récompense], qui remonte peut-être au règne d’Echnaton.*” The scene of Tutu constitutes “*le premier pas vers une transformation de l’institution qui allait en faire un apanage de certaines fonctions.*” He concludes that during the Nineteenth Dynasty “*la collation d’un collier pouvait être considérée comme faisant partie de l’investiture du vizir.*”⁴

There appear to be two non-sequiturs in this argument. First, does the fact that Tutu was inducted into office at the same time that he received the collar of gold really mean that that piece of jewellery had become an *insignia* of the conferment of office? Second, is the costume of the king sufficient to identify the scene as one of investiture and not of reward? To assume that a genuine evolution of the ceremony of reward into one of induction took place flies in the face of the evidence of Nebunnef’s investiture scene (*temp.* Ramses II),⁵ where no collars are shown.

Let us examine the three scenes on which Vergote bases himself. In the case of Tutu’s tomb, the scene Vergote speaks of is divided by a doorway into two sections. To the right of the door⁶ the king and queen receive Tutu on thrones set just outside the gate of the palace. The king wears the blue crown. Tutu stands before the king on a lower level, with arms raised. The king’s speech in seven long columns is inscribed before his face: “*What the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, living on Truth, the Lord of the Two Lands [Neferkheprure Waenre] [given life], said [to] the leaders of the army who stand in the presence*

¹ *Joseph*, 133 f.

² Davies, *Amarna* VI, pl. 17-20.

³ Below, p. 223.

⁴ *Joseph*, 134.

⁵ Below, p. 223.

⁶ Davies, *Amarna* VI, pl. 17-18.

of Pharaoh, l. p. h.: ‘My intent is to perform the eminent deed of granting favours one thousand-fold ... [] ... He (the king) has not heard of his (the king’s) favour having been bestowed upon another of his (rank); it shall be done for the courtier Tutu, because of his love for Pharaoh, l. p. h., his lord. Behold, I am granting [*c. one-third column*]² ... overseers of bowmen, infantry commanders, chariotry commanders, king’s-scribes and generals of the army, and all garrison-commanders of every foreign land, inspectors of the domain of Pharaoh, l. p. h., and every Atenservant of the Aten ... [*over one-quarter column*] of Upper and Lower Egypt. Pharaoh, l. p. h., his good lord, commands that all the princes and leaders of the entire land cause that he be given silver, gold, [], clothing, and vessels of copper, they being your³ responsibility, as has been ordained [*nearly one-quarter column*], the way in which Pharaoh, l. p. h., acts towards the great servant of Pharaoh, l. p. h.; no (mere) prince is able to do it for one of his creatures. He is found in [...], he is hearkened to <every> day. See, Pharaoh, l. p. h., his lord, commissions his great princes, and likewise every prince in this entire land whom Pharaoh l. p. h. has created: to him (Tutu) is given silver, gold, clothing, vessels of copper and cattle every year.’ To this Tutu replies in a long and standard paeon of praise. To the left of the doorway is the scene in which the favours are granted.⁴ The king leans out of a window of appearance, while the sun beams down upon him, the queen, and their three daughters. The king addresses Tutu in exactly the same words in which he addressed Meryre when he elevated him to the office of high priest.⁵ We should probably construe the scene to the right of the door as the induction scene proper, the first of the two to be read by the viewer. The action is continued⁶ with Tutu’s giving commands in an enclosure where fat cattle are being lead. The seven columns of text above Tutu’s head record that he himself relayed to the princes the

¹ Cf. W. Helck, *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie, Übersetzung zu den Heften 17-22*, (Berlin, 1961), 356.

² M. Sandman (*Texts From the Time of Akhenaten*, [Brussels, 1938], 78, note), and Helck (*Urk.* IV, 2008), on the basis, I take it, of Davies, *Amarna* I, pl. 8 (Meryre), restore *mk wi hr di<t>.fr b3k tpy*, etc., “*behold, I am appointing him first servant...*” But this phrase occurs already in Tutu’s investiture scene (*op. cit.*, pl. 19), where Meryre’s stock text is reproduced.

³ Plural; the dignitaries named are here addressed.

⁴ Davies, *Amarna* VI, pl. 19-20.

⁵ Below, p. 223.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pl. 18.

royal command that they should give him (Tutu) presents!¹ Tutu concludes with the words, “He does it for me to distinguish me in favours above any (other) whom he favours.”

The reasons for the favours bestowed on Tutu are explicit in the king’s speech. First, no officers of Tutu’s rank have yet received any favours like the other princes; and second, Tutu loves his lord, the king. These favours comprise the usual precious gifts in kind, in the form of an annual stipend,² and new appointment, viz. chief servant of the king. Thus the gift of collars, unguent etc., which the scene on the left of the doorway commemorates, is not the handing over of *insignia*, but simply the granting of additional favours, on a par with the promotion.

What of Paser and Chay? Do their tomb scenes depict induction or reward? Here is the text which accompanies the scene in Paser’s tomb: “[The chancellor, attached to Nekhen, Prophet of Maat, mayor] of the city and vizier, Paser, deceased, says, ‘Hail to [thee, O Ruler] of Egypt, Sun of the Nine Bows, King of Upper and Lower Egypt, Menmare (Sety I), Horus rising in Thebes, [thou art a god who dis]cerns hearts, who knows what is in the body, the Khnum (creator) of Mankind, who builds up the poor, who raises the wretched, [who creates(?)] the lofty, the Nile of [Mankind]; [how prosperous is] he who sets his heart on him! Mayest thou grant that I surpass ... [... since the time of (?)] the ancestors. Confidential things are spoken to me³ without [c. *one-third line*] I was [summoned] into the Sovereign’s presence, (I) saw His Majesty in the holiness [of the palace], the private portals [opened for m]e, while the princes and courtiers stood without. I [entered] into the (royal) presence unannounced, with no one taking precedence over me (?). The praises of the king united with my body because [he loved me (?)], he chose me in preference to myriads, for he knew that I would (act) well on his behalf. I am a courtier of his creation, his teaching is in my body, the counsels of my lord are reckoned in [my] heart. I am [versed] in these things which he did for me. [Ushered in were] [the princes, the courtiers ...].”⁴ The allusions

¹ Cf. the restored text in *Urk.* IV, 2011.

² Cf. no. 31: “The Letter-scribe of Pharaoh was despatched to speak to the Superintendent of Granaries of Pharaoh: ‘give as a favour to the First Prophet of Amun, Amenhotpe, deceased, the grain yield of twenty arurae of land. That shall be his due each year.’”

³ Lit. One says to me what is in the heart.

⁴ After seven effaced columns the inscription continues with standard mortuary epithets.

here are very vague, and tell us little about what is going on. Paser flits from generalities about his sovereign to a thumb-nail description of the audience, and back to stock expressions, this time about his own character. It is exactly the same sort of speech which is found under similar circumstances in the mouth of Ramose,¹ or Parennefer,² or Neferhotpe³ when these worthies were rewarded. Nothing can be based upon the statement that the king had chosen him, since platitudes of this kind are ubiquitous in self-laudatory texts. The key to the explanation of Paser’s reward probably lies in the adjacent scene to the right.⁴ There Paser was shown inspecting sculptors, carpenters, vase-makers and goldsmiths, who are engaged in making objets-d’art. Once he is shown accepting a statuette of Sety I, and congratulating the sculptor on his work, and a second time before scales on which small articles are being weighed. Part of the text which accompanies this second scene reads, “Receiving the offering (?)-vessels of silver and gold, made for the king of Upper and Lower Egypt Menmare (Sety I), and given to the temple of Amun in Karnak.” It is most likely that here we have a late variant of the Eighteenth Dynasty tomb scene wherein commissioned works and New Year gifts are manufactured and presented. Paser’s decoration must then be viewed in the same light as Amunhotpe-si-se’s, viz. as a reward for the superintendence of the work of artisans.

But Vergote’s main obsession seems to be with the costume of the king. The similarity between the monarch’s garb and position in Rekhmire’s tomb and in Paser’s tomb weighs heavily upon him, (though, be it noted, the standing goddess Maat is not found in the Rekhmire example).⁵ But this surely is fortuitous. The king in both scenes is not so dressed because he is presiding at an investiture ceremony; otherwise one could not explain why, in other genuine investiture scenes the king is shown dressed differently. Rather, he is in festive attire to impersonate Osiris, perhaps at a festival. In the tomb of Kenamun, for example, when the deceased brings his gifts at the New Year festival, he finds the king in a kiosk, wearing the *atef*-crown of Osiris (as in Paser’s tomb), and embraced from behind by the

¹ Davies, *The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose*, pls. 34, 36.

² *Idem*, *JEA* 9 (1923), 139.

³ *Idem*, *The Tomb of Neferhotep*, pls. 10, 61E.

⁴ See Porter and Moss, *op. cit.*, I³, 221, and plan on 220 (tomb 106 at [6]).

⁵ Davies, *The Tomb of Rekhmire*, pl. 13.

goddess Maat.¹ In the tomb of Su-em-nut² the gifts are presented to Amenhotpe II, protected by Hathor in a kiosk, and in tomb 226³ to Amenhotpe III, embraced by his mother Mutemwiya. In the anomalous reward scene on the stela BM 588 the king is shown in an odd variant of the *atef*-crown⁴ with the goddess Maat behind him, shielding him with two large wings.⁵ The owners of none of these pictures wished the viewer to construe the scenes in question as induction ceremonies; and there is no ground whatever for putting this construction on the scenes from the tombs of Paser and Chay.⁶

The reason why in this motif the king seeks to impersonate a god is not clear. It could be that the artist is reproducing an actual fact: at such ceremonies the king often did dress up in Osirian costume. But the presence of a goddess in the scene suggests an element of fantasy. It is almost as though the artist is expanding upon, and idealizing, the ceremony of reward, in order to translate it into the realm of the gods. It is not simply the king who is giving the reward, but Osiris in the form of the king. The caption to Paser's scene (written above his head) conveys something of the ambivalent message of the motif: "...Paser, on the West-of-Thebes, praised by the god who is in it (i.e. the West-of-Thebes)."

Having satisfied ourselves that the scene of reward has nothing to do *per se* with the ceremony of induction into office, we may well ask whether investiture is included in the repertoire of Egyptian iconography. And the answer, of course, is in the affirmative. The following nine examples are drawn from the Eighteenth or early Nineteenth Dynasty.

¹ Davies, *The Tomb of Kenamun*, pl. 11. The figure of Maat is now destroyed, but the text identifies her. Cf. also tomb 58 (*temp.* Amenhotpe III): Porter and Moss, *op. cit.*, I², 120 (8).

² No. 92: *ibid.*, 188 (7-8); no. 77: *ibid.*, 150 (5); probably also no. 96: *ibid.*, 198 (6).

³ Davies, *The Tomb of Menkheperasonb*, pls. 41 f.

⁴ Two horns flank the white crown of Upper Egypt.

⁵ J. J. Janssen, *JEA* 49 (1963), pl. 9.

⁶ For another example of the king protected by a goddess, see H. H. Nelson, *JNES* 1 (1942), pl. 4, where Ramses III in *atef*-crown and seated, is embraced from behind by the female personification of the Medinet Habu temple. On the meaning of the scene, see *ibid.*, 130 f. The practice of showing a goddess (Hathor, Maat, Isis, etc.) behind the king in the *atef*-crown when he bestows favours, is probably derived from Osirian iconography; for Osiris is often shown enjoying such protection from a female: cf. A. Calverley, *The Temple of Sethos I at Abydos*, I (London, 1933), *passim*. Cf. also J. Leclant, *Recherches sur les monuments thébains de la XXVe dynastie dite éthiopienne*, (Cairo, 1965), 327.

Owner	King's dress	Appointee	Intermediary	Symbols	Those Present	Time
1. Amoču ¹	<i>Atef</i> , crook, flail; in kiosk	Standing before king	Father	None	Courtiers	Thutmose III
2. Rekhmire ²	<i>Atef</i> , crook, flail; in kiosk	Directly before king	None	Emerges with staff	Council	Thutmose III
3. Kenamun ³	[lost]	Before king?	[lost]	[lost]	Courtiers	Amenhotpe II
4. Nebamun ⁴	Kiosk?	Standing at some distance	King's-scribe	Staff with standard	—	Thutmose IV (year 6)
5. Meryre ⁵	In window, headdress lost	Beneath window on shoulders of officers	None	None	Princess, soldiers	Akhenaten
6. Huy ⁶	—	Various minor Officials	Huya	None	—	Akhenaten
7. Mahu ⁷	[In window]	Standing at a distance; courtiers under window	Courtier	Staff with standard	Police	Akhenaten
8. Huy ⁸	War-crown, crook, flail, ankh; in kiosk	At a distance	Treasurer and seal-keeper	Seal, bouquets	Courtiers	Tutankhamun
9. Nebunnef ⁹	Blue crown, in window	Beneath window	None	Seals, sceptre	Courtiers	Ramses II

¹ Tomb 131; Porter and Moss, *op. cit.*, I², 246 (8).

² Davies, *op. cit.*, I, 15 ff., pls. 13-16.

³ Davies, *op. cit.*, pl. 8.

⁴ Davies, Gardiner, *The Tombs of Two Officials*, pl. 26.

⁵ Davies, *Amarna* I, pl. 7 f.

⁶ Davies, *Amarna* III, pls. 8 ff., 12.

⁷ Davies, *Amarna* IV, pl. 17.

⁸ Davies, Gardiner, *The Tomb of Huy, Viceroy of Nubia in the Reign of Tutankhamun*, (London, 1926), pls. 4, 6.

⁹ K. Sethe, *ZAS* 67 (1931), pls. 1-2.

The investiture scenes have one thing in common with the scenes of reward, and that is that both are concerned with favours bestowed by the king. Hence it is not surprising to find some of the same texts accompanying the induction ceremony as were found in scenes of reward.¹

But here the comparison must end. The gift of collars and jewellery, the happy recipient with arms raised, the joyous departure bearing gifts—these vignettes are absent in scenes which record installation in office. The appointee merely stands quietly before his sovereign, and listens to words of admonition and instruction. Symbols of office are not an essential part of the ceremony, at least to judge from the iconographic details. When they do occur, the most important seems to be a staff of office, in Egyptian *twrit*.² The contexts wherein this word occurs usually denote authority; thus in Anastasi IV, 3: 2 ff.,³ “May Amun take a fancy to you, and may he give you a good office ... you shall rear horses, the gold staff being in your hand.” One such staff has been recovered from Tutankhamun’s tomb,⁴ and the inscription upon it sounds very like a formula which might be used in a ritual of investiture (though here in a mortuary context, and addressed to the king): “Receive thou the staff of electrum in order to follow thy dear father ...”. In at least two cases⁵ high officials are entrusted with the seal(s) of the king or of the god they are going to serve.⁶ Curiously, in some cases the king does not seem to be involved in the ceremony. He deputizes one of his high officials to proceed with the formal induction. The scenes show this plenipotentiary carrying out the king’s command in the royal presence; but there is some indication that we are not to interpret literally. In no. 4 the king’s deputy, in this case an admiral, was informed by letter sent from the palace, and presumably went off to do the king’s bidding at Nebamun’s headquarters, (for the royal command said nothing about presenting Nebamun at court). Are we to construe the formal arrangement of the scene, in which the king watches his delegate confer the office, as a telescoped, partly imaginary depiction of the event?

¹ Specifically the formula “numerous are the things N is able to give...,” and some phrase to the effect that the king creates generations to the uttermost.

² *Wb.* V, 252: 6-8; for discussion, see L. Keimer, *BIFAO* 31 (1931), 229 ff.

³ Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, 37; cf. Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, 139.

⁴ *Urk.* IV, 2060.

⁵ Nos. 8, and 9.

⁶ In the form of rings? See S. Schott, *WZKM* 54 (1957), 181 ff.

The tone of these scenes of induction is in sharp contrast to the tone of Genesis 41. In the Egyptian ceremony all attention is focused on the king. In his unfathomable wisdom the god-king who “searches out the hearts of men,” has selected from a host of candidates the one man who measures up to the requirements of the post. His selection is clearly the right one, and, awe-struck by their sovereign’s supernatural powers of discernment, the courtiers break forth in spontaneous, extravagant praise. The newly-appointed officer joins in the laudation, and thanks the king. His ability is nothing out of the ordinary; he is competent enough to do the job the office requires, but nothing more. He is still human. Besides the omniscience of the king, the texts stress his beneficence to those who love and serve him, his liberality and his kinship with the gods. In Genesis 41, on the other hand, the spotlight is on Joseph. He does most of the talking, and it is he who astounds the courtiers and the king himself with his superior wisdom. Far from being a mere human, he is one “in whom the spirit of god resides.” The king is weak and distraught, and in dire need of help. Joseph is self-assured, and able to give the help required. The two types of literature are poles apart. The induction ceremony of New Kingdom mortuary paintings and reliefs arises out of the milieu of formal, court literature which centres on the person of the king; the induction ceremony of Genesis 41 belongs to the realm of popular Märchen in vogue in the middle of the First Millennium B.C.¹

In keeping with this last fact, it should be noted that the best parallels to Joseph’s installation come from the seventh through second centuries B.C. The following passage is from the mouth of Sargon II (722-705 B.C.): “I clad him in linen and in garments with multi-coloured trim (and put rings on him).”² In the investiture of Necho prince of Sais (c. 665 B.C.) as viceroy of Ashurbanipal in Egypt, the three symbols mentioned in Gen. 41, viz. robe, chain and ring, turn up again. Ashurbanipal says:³ “I made a (treaty) with him, (protected by) oaths which greatly surpassed (those of the former treaty). I clad him with a garment with multi-coloured trimmings, placed a gold chain on him (as the) insigne of his kingship, and put gold rings⁴ on his hands.” Of certain Phoenician malcontents whom Ashurbanipal wished to keep close watch on, he says: “I clad (nine personal names)

¹ Cf. above, p. 94 ff.

² Oppenheim and others, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, II, (Chicago, 1965), 258.

³ Translated by Oppenheim in *ANET*², 295 (a).

⁴ *Šēmeru*: C. Bezold, *Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar*. (Heidelberg, 1926), 263.

in multi-coloured garments, put gold rings on their hands, and made them do service at my court.”¹ In the fascinating Demotic narrative of Rylands IX a newly appointed priest goes to a high official for formal induction, and a ring and linen are again mentioned:² “Nessamtowy son of Pediese went and presented himself before Samtowytefnakht, the master of shipping, and said to him, ‘I am the one whom Pediese appointed to Teudjoy³ to perform divine service for Amun and his ennead.’ Then the master of shipping gave Nessamtowy a golden finger-ring, and said to him, ‘I will not have them give you byssos⁴ because the receipt of Amun’s linen is your job⁵ ...’ ” As reward for telling Belshazzar’s dream, Daniel was invested with the office of “third ruler in the kingdom”:⁶ “Then Belshazzar commanded, and Daniel was clothed with purple, a chain of gold was put about his neck, and proclamation was made concerning him that he should be the third ruler in the kingdom.” In the story of Ahikar (Armen, vers.), as soon as Ahikar learns that his nephew, Nathan, is to be his heir, he makes the boy undergo a sort of investiture in anticipation of his eventually succeeding him in office:⁷ “And when I heard this from the gods, I took Nathan my sister’s son; one year old was he, and I clad him in byssos and purple, and a collar of gold did I bind around his neck; and like a king’s son I decked him out in ornaments.”

15. *’abrēk*

“And he (Pharaoh) made him ride in his second chariot, and they cried out before him *’abrēk* (Gen. 41: 43).” Vergote is undoubtedly right in deriving this word from an Egyptian imperative with prothetic *’alef*, from $\sqrt{\text{BRK}}$, “do obeissance,” which is known to have entered Egyptian as a loan word during the New Kingdom.⁸ It is thus to be

¹ *ANET*², 296(a).

² xiv, 11-14; F. Ll. Griffith, *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri*, III, 92, 237. The date of the incident purports to be the reign of Psammetichus I.

³ A place in Middle Egypt, south of Ehnasya.

⁴ *Šs-nsw*, Hebrew *šēf*.

⁵ I.e. the linen robe used at the investiture will be dispensed with because he, as a priest, has enough linen?

⁶ Dan. 5: 29; cf. Ehrlich *Randglossen*, I, 186 (note); Kuenen *Einleitung*, § 16A, 2; cf. a similar preoccupation with status in the Joseph Story, where Joseph is made the second ruler (Gen. 41: 43).

⁷ R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, II, (Oxford, 1913), 727.

⁸ Vergote *Joseph*, 135-41; see also T. O. Lambdin, *Egyptian Loan Words and Transcriptions*, 8 f., and the literature there cited. The derivation from Akkadian

understood as a command by a herald to the spectators, to prostrate themselves. Kitchen, in his review of Vergote,¹ remarks that “‘Abrech’ is specifically New Kingdom and (is) replaced by *r-t3* [‘to the earth!’] in the Late Period...,” thus suggesting a New Kingdom date for the story. Apart from the facts that (a) *’abrēk* is a reconstruction, and (b) there is no reason for thinking that two formulas could not have been current at the same time, Kitchen’s argument is inconclusive. The texts he seems to be thinking of which employ *r-t3* are the stock reliefs from Bubastis of ninth century date,² which depict the *sed*-festival in the same way as did Old Kingdom reliefs, fifteen hundred years earlier. The language and iconography of these ninth century texts is archaizing, conciously reminiscent of Old Kingdom archetypes, and in no way reflects the vernacular of the early first millennium. Thus the presence of the phrase *r-t3* in these scenes—if indeed it has been correctly read³—is no indication that *’abrēk* had passed out of use. Demotic and Coptic show that imperative forms with the prothetic *’alef* survived

abarikku, revived recently by J. S. Croatto (*VT* 16 [1966], 113 ff.; cf. A. Ungnad, *ZAW* 41 [1923], 204 ff.) is unconvincing. Couroyer’s caution regarding Vergote’s thesis (*RB* 66 [1959], 591 f.) is welcome, and his remarks well chosen.

¹ *JEA* 47 (1961), 162.

² E. Naville, *The Festival Hall of Osorkon II in the Great Temple of Bubastis*, (London, 1892), pls. 2, 3, 11, 23.

³ The concensus seems to be that *r-t3* is a prepositional phrase with a reflexive verb of motion understood: “(cast yourselves) upon the ground!” Cf. Naville, *ibid.*, 10; E. Uphill, *JNES* 24 (1965), 370, 377. But the strange fact is that in the Bubastite reliefs no one is shown obeying the command. Proskynesis is depicted, but not inconjunction with this phrase, and is called *sm-t3 m-b 3h*, “kissing the earth in the royal presence,” Naville, *op. cit.*, pls. 14, 15. Moreover, those figures who are supposed to be shouting the words are usually drawn in pairs, facing one another and gesticulating (*ibid.*, pls. 2, 3, 11), which suggests that what they are saying is in the nature of a private conversation, not a command to the many. The hieroglyphs for “words to be spoken” appear above and between the facing pairs, and certainly indicates that the two are speaking. But the *r-t3*, which is usually taken to constitute their speech, is written twice, once above the head of each man, as though it were an identifying title. Indeed, in three scenes from the Bubastite reliefs the pairs are placed among other officials who are identified by just such supralinear inscriptions: courtiers (*smr*), viziers and prophets (*ibid.*, pl. 2), the staff of the house (*ibid.*, pl. 3), and the *hry P* (*ibid.*, pl. 23). In any case, one would expect the explicit “words to be spoken” to be written vertically *under* the heading-formula; and in two scenes this is the case. In Naville’s plate 3 we have “words to be spoken: presenting the land” (*dit t3*, cf. H. Kees, *ZAS* 52 [1912], 69; H. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, [Chicago, 1948], 87), and in plate 11 “words to be spoken: protecting the land (*s3 t3*).” These must be simply the *incipits* of longer compositions in poetic form, and the pair of officers must be reciters, not servants charged with policing the multitude. Dare we identify their title *iry-t3* with the priestly title at Buto and Sais in the Third Name of Lower Egypt? Cf. H. de Meulenaere, *BIFAO* 62 (1964), 167.

until very late. Consequently there is nothing inherent in the form *'abrēkē* that precludes a late date.

16. *The Egyptian Proper Names*¹

Three Egyptian proper names are given in the Joseph Story: *Pōīīpera'*, the name of Joseph's first master, and of his father-in-law (variant *Pōīīpar*), *'Asēnat*, the name of his wife, and *Ṣapnatpa'nēab*, the name Pharaoh gave to Joseph.

About the identity of the first two there has never been any serious debate. *Pōīīpera'* is the Egyptian *P3-dī-p3-R'*, "He whom Re gives" (Greek, *πετεφρης*),² of which four examples have to date turned up in Egyptian contexts. One is on a stela which can be dated no earlier than Saite times,³ and the second is an Aramaic transcription of the name on an amulet, also dating to the Saite period.⁴ The remaining examples are Demotic, one from the Saite period, and the other from the third century B.C.⁵ Names of the type *P3-dī + DN* ("He whom the god N gives"), because of the presence of the definite article, are not likely to be found before the introduction of Late Egyptian as the fashionable literary dialect during the reign of Akhenaten (1363-1347 B.C.). In fact they are attested only from a later period. Examples begin sporadically in the Twenty-first Dynasty (c. 1085-945 B.C.),⁶ become common

¹ See in general Kitchen, *JEA* 47 (1961), 161; T. E. Peet, *Egypt and the Old Testament*, (London, 1922), 100 ff.; Spiegelberg *Aufenthalt*, 26; Lambdin, *Loan-words and Transcriptions*, 55 ff.

² So as early as Ebers, *Aegypten und die Bücher Moses*, I, 295 f. The recent attempt to derive "Potiphar" from Egyptian *p3 wdpw wr*, "the chief cook," (a postulated title) is highly ingenious, but quite unconvincing: Y. M. Grintz, *Lesbonenu* 30 (1965), 12 ff.

³ A. Hamada, *ASAE* 39 (1939), 273 ff. The stela cannot be dated as early as the Twenty-first Dynasty (*pace* Vergote *Joseph*, 147), since the style of the piece and the personal names which occur thereon (two *P3-dī-DN* names, and a *'Irt-r.w*) point unmistakably to the second third of the first millennium.

⁴ Leibovitch, *ASAE* 43 (1943), 87 ff.

⁵ For references see Vergote *Joseph*, 147 n. 5.

⁶ Cf. H. Ranke, *Die altägyptischen Personennamen*, I, 121: 23. Vergote's claim (*Joseph*, 146) that this type of name originated in the Eighteenth Dynasty is based on the supposed *P3-dī-R'*, which occurs on a funerary cone of the time of Thutmose I (1512-1500 B.C.): cf. G. Daressy, *Recueil de Cônes funéraires*, (MMIFAO 8; Cairo, 1892), 171, 289, and Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 124: 16. Wiedemann (*Ägyptische Geschichte, Supplement*, [Gottha, 1884], 37) and Steindorff (*ZÄS* 30 [1892], 50), however, long ago pointed out that Daressy's reading was in error, and that the correct transcription is *P3-n-R'*, "he who belongs to Re": cf. Sethe, *Urk.* IV, 129(D). The name *P3-dī-B'1* of the New Kingdom (written *P-ḫ-b-ḥ-r*: Ranke, *op. cit.* I 123.8) is in doubt, and may well be another mistaken reading of

in the Twenty-second Dynasty, and enjoy their greatest vogue from the Saite period into Roman times.¹ *'Asēnat* is Egyptian *Ns-nt*, "belonging to (the goddess) Neit," a name form which consists of the element *ny-sw* (fem. *ny-sy*), "he (she) belongs to" followed by a god's name.² Although known from the Old Kingdom, names of this pattern were especially popular from the end of the New Kingdom into Hellenistic times.³ The Hebrew transcription represents a stage in the development of the name in which *n* has been elided, and a prothetic *aleph* added, a phenomenon widely attested in Demotic and Greek transcriptions.⁴ Vergote, in the wake of Spiegelberg, puts greater stock in the occasional writing *Ασεννεθ* in some MSS of the LXX, than in the Hebrew.⁵ On the basis of the *a*-vowel and the doubled *n*, he asserts, we should reconstruct an Egyptian Vorlage *Iw.s-n-Nt* (which has substantially the same meaning). In the Bohairic (Lower Egyptian) dialect this would, in fact, yield *Ασεννεθ*. Several objections may be raised against Vergote's position. First, he assumes that a later Greek translation of the Hebrew preserves a more correct form than the Masoretic original. Could not the LXX translator himself be trying, as we moderns are, to uncover the Egyptian original, with no greater hope of success? Second, he puts great stock in the presence of an *a*-vowel where, in Greek renderings of the *Ns + DN* type, an *e* occurs. But it seems unwise to press the vocalisation of the Masoretetes into service, since in transcribing foreign names they are often far from the vocalisation of the original. The *a*-vowel in "Asenath" in all likelihood appeared under the influence of analogous forms with

P3-n-B'1: *ibid.*, II, 356 (but cf. *P-t-ḫ-b*, in O. Koefoed-Petersen, *Les stèles égyptiennes* [Publ. de la glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg no. 1: Copenhagen, 1948], no. 23, which might be taken as an apocopation of *P-ḫ-b-ḥ-r*). Another possibility is to construe it as a theophorous Semitic name (cf. *Pḫy*, Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 142: 16, a hypocoristicon employing the same root?).

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 121 ff.

² See Vergote *Joseph*, 149 n. 1.

³ Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 173 ff.

⁴ The earliest example known to me is *'Is-Pth* (for *Ns-Pth*, "he who belongs to Ptah": *ibid.*, I, 46: 2) of Saite date (cf. also *'Is-grit*, *ibid.*, I, 46: 31); cf. *'εσορηις* (for *Ns-wrt*, *ibid.*, I, 174: 11), *'εσπιμητις* (for *Ns-p3-mdw*, *ibid.*, I, 175: 1), *'εσπρουθις* (for *Ns-p3-ntr*, *ibid.*, I, 175: 6), *σποτους* (for *Ns-p3-wty-t3ny*, *ibid.*, I, 176: 1), *'εσπταις* (for *Ns-Pth*, *ibid.*, I, 176: 5), *σναχομνευς* (for *Ns-n3-Ḥmnw*, *ibid.*, I, 177: 2), *'εσθωτης* (for *Ns-Gḫwty*, *ibid.*, I, 180: 1); for Demotic examples see Griffith, *Catalogue*, III, 230 n. 1. Gunn, who agrees that the *n* had disappeared by 668 B.C., believed it might still have been present and sounded as late as the Tenth Century B.C.: *JEA* 41 (1955), 84, n. 1.

⁵ See Vergote *Joseph*, 149 f. The usual Greek transcription is *'Ασεννεθ*.

prothetic *aleph*: cf. *ʾabrēk*, *ʾakzāb*, *ʾasmūrā(b)*, *ʾakzār*, etc.¹ Third, he sees the doubled *n* as preserving two *n*'s in the original. In the light of the tendency in Greek transcriptions of Egyptian names to double the *n* (cf. *Ἀμεινεύς* < *Imn-īw*: Ranke *Personennamen* I, 26: 21), this does not appear likely. I can see no compelling reason, then, to leave Sethe's proposed *Ns-nt* in favour of Vergote's *Iw.s-n-Nt*.

The original of *ῤαφαῖα* is not quite so certain, though the form of the name seems clear.² Steindorff long ago identified the Egyptian original as *Gd-p3-nṣr-īw.f-ʿnh*, "God speaks and he lives" (or God says he will live), a birth-name found, like *P3-di* + DN, from the Twenty-first Dynasty into the closing centuries of the first millennium B.C.³ At first sight one of the difficulties with Steindorff's derivation is that, in names of this type, a divine name is invariably found where the late German scholar read the generic "god."⁴ One wonders whether the grouping of the consonants *n* and *t* in the Hebrew is not to be interpreted here, as in Asenath, as the DN "Neit."⁵ This would necessitate understanding *p* as part of a separate word; and in view of the not infrequent occurrence of two god's names in this type of name,⁶ we can only postulate another divine appellation. One thinks of *Hḫ* (Apis), the bull of Memphis who was especially popular in the Late Period, and his name is indeed found in the form of name under discussion.⁷ But the difficulty with *Hḫ* is that, while in Greek tran-

¹ See P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique*², (Rome, 1947), 202.

² For the interpretations of the versions and classical writers see J. G. Lansing, *Hebraica* 4 (1889), 44; Vergote *Joseph*, 142. For a list of scholarly suggestions regarding the Egyptian *Vorlage*, see *ibid.*, 151 f. To be added to Vergote's list are Albright's *P3-smc-n-p3-ʿnh*, "the sustainer of life," (*JBL* 37 [1918], 132), and Leibovitch's *Gf3-n-ḫwy-p3-ʿnh*, "sustainer of the Two Lands, the living one," (*Polotsky Festschrift*, [Jerusalem, 1964], 19 ff.), neither of which corresponds to a name of known type. In the case of Leibovitch's postulate, I wonder whether he has read the inscription on the scarab correctly (*ibid.*, 19, fig. 1); could it not be *Hʿpy n ḫwy*, "Nile of the Two Lands," an attested royal appellation (cf. *Wb.* III, 43: 14)? The difficulty with reconstructions incorporating *ḫf3* and other words for sustenance is that in an Egyptian context they would be more apropos of royalty than of private individuals.

³ Steindorff, *ZAS* 27 (1889), 41 f.; *idem, ibid.*, 30 (1892), 50 ff.; Vergote *Joseph*, 143, n. 1.

⁴ E.g. *Gd-Gḫwy-īw.f-ʿnh*, *Gd-Imn-īw.f-ʿnh*, *Gd-Hr-īw.f-ʿnh*, etc.

⁵ For the personal name "Neit says he will live," see Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 411: 6; Clédat, *RT* 36 (1914), 107.

⁶ *Gd-Imn-Hr-īw.f-ʿnh*, "Amun and Horus say he will live," *ibid.*, I, 410: 2; *Gd-Pth-Hr-īw.f-ʿnh*, "Ptah and Horus, etc.," *ibid.*, I, 410: 12; **Gd-Ṣw-Tfḫwt-īw.f-ʿnh*, "Shu and Tefnut etc.," Vergote *Joseph*, 143, n. 1.

⁷ Cf. Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 411: 11; II, 334: 20.

scriptions it is rendered consistently without the initial laryngeal,¹ in Aramaic it appears with equal consistency displaying both laryngeal (*h*) and a final *yod*.² Unless, then, the transcription in Gen. 41 were derived *via* the Greek, which is unlikely, we should expect a consonantal skeleton Ṣ-Ḥ-P-Y-N-T-P-C-N-Ḥ. As an alternative candidate, one might suggest the name of the goddess *Ipt*.³ *Gd-Ipt-Nt-īw.f-ʿnh* would pretty certainly yield the present Masoretic consonantal text, and would be in keeping with the Egyptian preference for specific divine names in this form of personal name.

Modern scholars have occasionally objected to Steindorff's derivation on the grounds that a name of this type would be inappropriate as a second name given to a foreigner, since it is properly a birth-name bestowed on native Egyptians.⁴ It is argued that Pharaoh must have coined for Joseph a name which was meaningful in the present context of the story, and the *Gd-DN-īw.f-ʿnh* type has no relevant meaning in Gen. 41. With this line of reasoning one can only agree. If and when the events of chapter 41 took place the king must have given Joseph a name appropriate to his role as saviour of the land. But, in view of the fact that the Joseph Story is assigned by the Genesis tradition to the Age of the Patriarchs, it is unlikely that the pseudonym of Pharaoh's choice belonged to a type which only became popular in the first millennium. *ῤαφαῖα* is the choice of the *writer of the Märchen*, and if the meaning of the name had been important to his purpose, he would have either translated it, or selected another appellation which was transparent to his readers. That he did neither of these things suggests that the meaning of the name was not germane to his purposes, and that he was striving merely for an air of authenticity. Searching around for a name to give his hero, he would naturally light upon a name common in his own time, with little regard for the niceties of Egyptian name-giving, of which he was probably ignorant.

Since names of the type *Gd-DN-īw.f-ʿnh* had become virtually extinct by Ptolemaic times, the most likely period for the close acquaintance of the Hebrews with all three names would be the Saite and Persian periods (664-331 B.C.), when each was at the height of its popularity.⁵

¹ Cf. *Ἰπτ*.

² Ranke, *op. cit.*, I, 237: 13 (cf. 388: 2); II, 280: 23, 305: 3.

³ Cf. the late name *Ipt-wrt*, *Ἰπτοῦρις*, *ibid.*, I, 22: 8.

⁴ Cf. the sources and literature in Vergote *Joseph*, 143, n. 2; Kitchen, *JEA* 47, 161.

⁵ Spiegelberg *Aufenthalt*, 26; Lagarde, *Nachr. Gött.*, 1889, 319 ff.

17. *The Accusation of Spying*

When Joseph's brothers first came before him to buy grain, the following conversation took place (Gen. 42: 7 ff.): "when Joseph saw his brothers he recognized them, but concealed his own identity from them, and addressed them harshly: 'whence do you come?' They replied, 'from the land of Canaan to buy food' ... Joseph remembered the dreams he had had, and he said to them, 'you are spies! It is to see the nakedness of the land that you've come!' But they answered him, 'no, my lord. Your servants have come to buy food... (etc.)'" Here Joseph accuses his brothers, not of stealing, or murder, or of any other heinous act, but of being spies. Now Joseph was looking only for a pretext to clap them in prison and keep them in mortal terror. Any accusation would do; the substance was not material to the story so long as it was serious enough to facilitate this turn of the plot. Apparently, then, at the time of writing the charge of spying was a most serious one, and would place anyone in mortal danger.

The word rendered "spies" (*mēraggēlim*) is shown by its occurrence in the O.T. to denote what we might call "intelligence agents," sent out just prior to a major military campaign. Thus twelve *mēraggēlim* were sent out by Moses to reconnoitre the land (Num. 21: 32), two to spy out Jericho (Jos. 2: 1, 6: 23), several by David before a razzia on Saul's camp (I Sam. 26: 4); and Absalom infiltrated numerous *mēraggēlim* throughout Israel just before his insurrection (2 Sam. 15: 10). The cognate verb is used to denote the Danites' espionage activity before their capture of Laish (Jud. 18: 2), and the Ammonite councillors' interpretation of David's embassy prior to the Ammonite war (2 Sam. 10: 3). The mere presence of *mēraggēlim* was thus considered by the ancients a sure sign that invasion was shortly to follow.

The question to be answered with regard to the passage in the Joseph Story is, at what period of Near Eastern History could an accusation of spying be meaningfully employed in a context such as this? When would the impending invasion of Egypt from the direction of Canaan be such a commonplace that a ruler, searching for the most damning crime to pin on an Asiatic coming into Egypt, would naturally think of espionage? The answer surely is not difficult. From the middle of the seventeenth century B.C.¹ to the twelfth Palestine belonged to the

¹ It might be inferred from such literature as the Execration Texts that the Egyptians of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Dynasties (Twentieth to Eighteenth Centuries B.C.) were apprehensive about their northern frontier, and feared in-

Egyptian empire, ruled first by the Hyksos, and subsequently by the Egyptians themselves. During the first half of the first millenium B.C. Palestine was the home of a number of weak states who, far from hostile to Egypt, actually looked to her for help. From the seventeenth to the seventh century, then, the idea of imminent invasion from Asia would have made no sense. But from c. 700 B.C. to 343 B.C. the reverse was true. Egypt during this period was faced directly across the isthmus of Suez by three empires in succession, the Assyrian, the Neo-Babylonian, and the Persian, each hostile to Egypt and bent on making her a subject state. The political situation envisaged by Joseph's accusation fits very well into this period of three and one-half centuries.

18. *Joseph's Oath*

During the ensuing exchange with his brothers Joseph has occasion to utter the oath "as surely as Pharaoh lives!" The term "Pharaoh" (Egyptian *pr-ḥ*, "Great House") was an expression used to designate the king from the Eighteenth Dynasty into Roman times. During the New Kingdom, however, the official oath formula used by the courts did not employ "Pharaoh", but rather "king" (*nsw*), "the ruler" (*ḥꜣḥ*), or "lord" (*nb*),¹ and usually ran as follows: "as surely as Amun endures, and as the king endures." The verb "to live" could be found in place of "to endure." "Pharaoh" replaces "king" or "ruler" in the oath first during the ninth or eighth centuries, and becomes common from the seventh on.²

vasion from that quarter (on these texts, cf. Sethe, *Die Achtung feindlicher Fürsten*, [APAW, 1926]; G. Posener, *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie*, [Brussels, 1940]; *idem*, *Syria* 43 [1966], 277 f.). The texts, however, include Nubians, Libyans and even Egyptians among those cursed, and cannot therefore be used *per se* to prove any concern out of the ordinary for the northern frontier. They merely reflect a curious practice of the Egyptians in their relations with aliens which dates back to the Old Kingdom; cf. PT 249b (for references see J. A. Wilson, *The Burden of Egypt*, [Chicago, 1951], 156, n. 5). The fact that the Egyptians seemed to have welcomed the arrival of Asiatics in Egypt during the Thirteenth Dynasty suggests that, far from fearing a threat from the north, they had become complacent about their frontiers. The Execration Texts bear witness to an Egyptian desire to maintain free access to routes through the territory of unruly chieftains (cf. Ward, *Orientalia* 30 [1961], 143). In any event, few scholars today would be inclined to date Joseph to the Twelfth or Thirteenth Dynasties.

¹ Gardiner, *JEA* 21 (1935), pl. 16, 15.

² A. Bakir, *Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt*, 63 f. On the oath in general in Ancient Egypt, see Wilson, *JNES* 7 (1948), 129 ff. Vergote denies that our sources are full enough to draw these conclusions. He points out (*Joseph*, 163) that on Wilson's categorizing of the oath formula, the oath type of the Joseph Story would fall

19. *The Payment for the Corn*

The brothers pay for the grain they receive with *kesep*, “money.”¹ Now it is true that this word very early came to have the meaning “medium of exchange,” long before the Lydians issued the first coins. Yet the contexts in which the term occurs in the Joseph Story suggest that the writer is thinking of coined money. The payment is small enough (in volume) to be stuffed into the mouth of a sack. It is, in fact, kept in a “pouch” (*šērōr kesep*), a term which elsewhere occurs with the meaning “money pouch” only in Prov. 7: 20, and Hag. 1: 6, at a time when coined money was certainly in circulation. In Egypt and Palestine this could not have been before the close of the sixth century.²

under Wilson’s II A, Promisory Oaths made “under various circumstances but apparently not in connection with any juridical process” (*op. cit.*, 131). Of these Wilson has collected only thirteen examples (nos. 63-75). Moreover, of Wilson’s one hundred and fifteen examples of oaths, fully sixty-two are from juridical contexts, and twenty-eight are oaths taken by gods or kings. In fact, Vergote asserts, there are only nine examples “datant du Nouvel Empire et émanant de particuliers en dehors de toute contrainte juridique” (*Joseph*, 166 f.), and thus valid comparative material for the oath of Joseph. “Peut-on, dans ces conditions, raisonnablement prétendre que l’état de notre documentation épuise toutes les possibilités et qu’il donne une image adéquate de la situation sous le Nouvel Empire?” (*ibid.*, 167).

But Vergote’s argument is misleading in that he relies too heavily on Wilson’s categories. As Wilson himself admits, his classification is somewhat arbitrary, promoting “ease of reference” (*op. cit.*, 129). Wilson’s study emphasizes strongly that, whether taken inside or outside a court, an oath was essentially the same thing, viz. an assertion that such-and-such a statement has been in the past (and still is), or would be in the future, true. A more meaningful classification for purposes of comparison with the Joseph Story would be along the lines of literary genres. Those examples which employ a rigid formula come in the main from transcripts of actual court cases, while those which show freedom of formulation generally come from literary texts wherein gods, kings and fictional characters are wont to speak asseveratively. Now on this bifurcation the oath of Joseph must be classed with the first group. For, although not in a court of law, Joseph is thinking in juridical terms, and the situation he envisages entails proving the brothers’ statement false, if and when they fail to bring Benjamin; and this of necessity would somehow take place in the context of the legal process (cf. Wilson’s example no. 88, p. 144, which, although not taken in court, implies a juridical setting). Thus there are actually plenty of examples from the New Kingdom with which Joseph’s oath may be compared. Cf. also Couroyer, *RB* 66, 589.

¹ On this word and cognates, see W. Eilers, *WO* 2 (1957), 322 ff.

² Cf. Vergote *Joseph*, 168 ff. for discussion and references. This is not to deny that media of exchange approaching the form of coined money may have existed prior to the Sixth Century in Egypt; but the context of the story militates strongly in favour of coinage. If the New Kingdom occurrences of *šty* (or *šn*) do betoken the presence of pieces of stamped silver in circulation at the time (Vergote, *Joseph*, 169 f.), which in the absence of any examples of these objects must remain con-

20. *The Racial Exclusiveness of the Egyptians*

Twice the Hebrew writer comments on the racial exclusiveness of the Egyptians. In 43: 32, in describing the meal at Joseph’s house, he explains the peculiar seating arrangement by saying “for the Egyptians cannot eat with the Hebrews, for that is detestable to the Egyptians.” Similarly an explanatory gloss is appended to Joseph’s instructions to his brothers that they should tell the king they are herdsmen, in order to be assigned a home in Goshen away from the settlements of the native Egyptians, “for all shepherds are detestable to the Egyptians (46: 34).” This latter statement seems to be a reflection of the age-old fear and hatred the Egyptians entertained for the bedu of the desert.¹ The remark in 43: 32 was added, not in the interests of antiquarianism, but as purely descriptive of a contemporary phenomenon: Egyptians (of my own time, implied the writer) do not mix with Hebrews (i.e. Israelites).² Such a situation, at least insofar as the Hebrews are concerned, can only have prevailed at a time when Egyptians and Hebrews had for some time been coming into close contact. This fits the Saite and Persian periods, when racial tensions in Egypt were especially strong,³ but certainly not the New Kingdom, when there can scarcely be said to have existed a Hebrew people in the sense the writer uses.

jectural, are we to believe that the brothers would have used such “coins” to pay for a few paltry sacks of grain? The *šty* had a high value, and was used when major sales were negotiated involving large sums (Gardiner, *ZAS* 43 [1906], 44); the price of a sack (*šr*) of emmer wheat in Ramesside times was only from one to four deben of copper (one *šty* = eight copper deben): J. Černý, *JWH* 1 (1954), 908. Where the sacks are concerned, the narrative touches the fantasy which is characteristic of all *Märchen*. We are not for one moment to take seriously the implication that Jacob’s ravenous clan was supplied for months on end from the contents of twelve sacks, transported from Egypt upon the backs of twelve asses!

¹ Cf. Herodotus’s statement regarding the attitude of the Egyptians towards swineherds: ii, 47.

² On “Hebrew” as an ethnic term, see above, p. 202 f. Albright’s use of the Joseph Story in connexion with his contention that donkey-caravaneers were greatly despised by Egyptians (*Yabweh and the Gods of Canaan*, [New York, 1969], 72, n. 42) is unfortunate from several standpoints. It is still far from proved that ‘*ibri* and ‘*apiru* are to be equated, much less that either or both originally meant “donkey caravaneers.” Undoubtedly the ‘*apiru*, whoever they were, were despised by the Egyptians (though taking it for granted in 1961 [*BASOR* 163, 42, n. 28] does not make it a certainty in 1969 [cf. *Yabweh and the Gods*, *loc. cit.*]); but this was simply because they were *Asiatics*, not because they had any occupational connexion with donkeys, caravans or dust.

³ Cf. F. K. Kienitz, *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende*, (Berlin, 1953), 50.

21. *Joseph's Agrarian Reforms*

Genesis 47 contains a fascinating aetiological story which describes how all the land of Egypt came to be the possession of Pharaoh. It was Joseph, says the Hebrew writer, who bought all the land for Pharaoh from private owners when they had nothing more to sell to obtain state-owned grain. "Only the land of the priests he did not acquire; for the priests had a fixed stipend from Pharaoh, and they lived on the fixed stipend that Pharaoh gave them. Consequently they did not sell their land. Joseph said to the people, 'Now I have bought you and your lands for Pharaoh.¹ Here is seed for you; you are to sow the land. When harvest comes you are to give one-fifth to Pharaoh, four-fifths remaining for yourselves, as seed for the field and as food for you and your dependents...' So Joseph made it a statute concerning the land of Egypt which has remained in force until this day: to Pharaoh goes the fifth—with the exception that the priests' land alone did not pass into Pharaoh's possession" (Gen. 47: 22-26).

To which period of Egyptian history does this description apply?² If we summarize the passage simply as an explanation of how the entire land came to be the property of the king, then it is applicable to any period; for, from the First Dynasty to Ptolemaic times the king was, in theory, the sole owner of the land of Egypt. But the Hebrew writer apparently has specific conditions in mind. He is describing an Egypt in which the people are virtually slaves to the crown, burdened with a harvest-tax amounting to one-fifth of the crop. The only land over which the king has no control is temple land, and as an implied consequence the priests are exempt from taxation. Moreover they receive a salary from the king. Three kinds of land-tenure are thus envisaged: privately-held land (no longer in existence, according to the writer), royal land, and temple land.

We should beware of accepting the writer's description of Egyptian society at its face-value. Just as his explanation of the origin of Pharaonic land-tenure is incorrect, so may be his description of it, at

¹ On the legal background of this act, see R. Yaron, *RIDA* 6 (1959), 163.

² It has occasionally been used as evidence for the economic situation in Egypt under the Hyksos; cf. E. Drioton (*Cahiers d'histoire égyptienne*, 3 [1950], 197) who sees in it a reflexion of a return by the Hyksos, whose authority had up until then been precarious, to the old prerogatives of Egyptian kings who owned all the land of Egypt. There is no evidence to support this view, however, and the evidence at hand suggests to the contrary that much of the land was in the hands of a feudal aristocracy.

least in part. For example, contrary to the Hebrew writer's belief, during every period of Egyptian history some free land-owners can be found, no matter how few or how impoverished.¹ It is very doubtful whether such private land-owners or their land, were completely independent of the king and his government; they still had to pay taxes, and probably could be forced to give up their land. The specific privileges and obligations of such "free-men of Pharaoh's land" were well known to the Egyptians. But to an outsider these peasants, burdened as they were with taxes, forced labour and military duty, would *look like* slaves; would in fact be indistinguishable from true slaves or serfs. Thus the Hebrew writer's description should not turn us aside into a pointless search for a period in which no freehold existed, and in which everyone was in fact as well as theory the king's serfs and chattels. The fine points of Egyptian society and land tenure were not known to the Hebrews.

Regarding the tax of one-fifth of the harvest little can be said.² Our sources for taxation in ancient Egypt are simply too few to enlighten us on the percentage of the harvest taken by the state at different periods. In the Twentieth Dynasty, to judge from the data given in the Wilbour Papyrus, the most frequent tax assessment was a standard five corn-measures³ on each arura,⁴ which Gardiner calculates could represent as much as one-quarter or as little as one-eleventh of the total yield.⁵ It would be attractive, though probably a flight of fancy, to construe the Biblical "one-fifth" as a garbled recollection of this common fixed rate. In Ptolemaic times the harvest tax was comparatively severe, amounting to four artabas per arura, or about one-third to two-fifths of the total yield.⁶

¹ K. Baer, *JARCE* 1 (1962), 25. For Egyptian *nmbw*, "free man," lit. "orphaned one," see Thompson, *JEA* 26 (1940), 68 ff.; Bakir, *Slavery*, 48 ff.; W. Helck, *Zur Verwaltung des mittleren und neuen Reichs*, (Leiden, 1956), 122 f. For the qualification *nmbw n'* "privately owned," applied to land, see Baer, *op. cit.*, 26, n. 10.

² Cf. a 20% tax on slave purchases in Ptolemaic times: Préaux, *op. cit.*, 308; a tax of 10% is known from the Late Period on fishermen, hunters, etc.: Barguet, *Stèle de la famine*, 30; for a 10% tax on imports see G. Roeder, *Die ägyptische Götterwelt*, (Bern, 1959), 92 f.; Kienitz, *op. cit.*, 46; Posener, *Revue de Philologie* 21 (1947), 118; cf. also the 20% protective tariff on wool: Edgar, *ASAE* 23 (1923), 75.

³ On the ambiguity of the term thus rendered, see Gardiner, *The Wilbour Papyrus*, (London, 1948), II, 60 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 198.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 72. Baer (*op. cit.*, 33) believes the tax on land to have been about one-tenth of the crop, but he is skeptical of Gardiner's interpretation of the Wilbour Papyrus as a document of tax assessment, preferring to construe it as a record of rents due to the various land-owning institutions from their tenants (*ibid.*, 41).

⁶ C. Préaux, *op. cit.*, 133 f.

Some light can be shed on the Biblical assertion that the priesthood retained ownership of its own land,¹ and was untaxed. Edgerton has pointed out that in most periods we have evidence that priests were taxed.² Certainly this is true of the Ramesside age. The famous Papyrus Wilbour (c. 1160 B.C.) groups temple estates along with other types of property as taxable by the state.³ And Gardiner, the editor of said papyrus, has assembled a number of passages from New Kingdom letters and other miscellanies which prove that priests were indeed taxed.⁴ The schoolboy texts of the New Kingdom which glorify the calling of the scribe, point out that the priest was often tied to agricultural pursuits on the land just like the peasant.⁵ And the charters of immunity from forced labor, which the kings of Egypt were wont to grant temple estates, show that the priesthood, without the protection of special decrees, occupied no privileged position vis-a-vis the rest of the populace of Egypt.⁶

The taxation of the estate of the god Amun was maintained under the first three kings of the Twenty-second Dynasty (c. 930-860 B.C.), and only alleviated under the fourth king, Osorkon II.⁷ From the Saite period comes the unequivocal statement of Rylands IX, 6, 16 which reveals that during the Twenty-sixth Dynasty, except under extenuating circumstances, the temples of Egypt were not taxed: "when that evil time came the great temples of Egypt were made to pay taxes, and this town was burdened with heavy taxes; the people could not pay the taxes with which they were burdened, and they went away. And behold, though discharge has been made to the great temples of Egypt, they have until now continued to come to us with the demand, 'produce your taxes!'"⁸ The Saite kings made every effort to conciliate the priesthood, and made lavish endowments to all

¹ The picture for the New Kingdom is clouded by the fact that civil officials belonging to the king's government are found administering temple land: Gardiner, *Wilbour*, II, 21 f.

² W. F. Edgerton, *JNES* 6 (1947), 156 f.

³ But cf. above, p. 237, n. 5.

⁴ *Wilbour* II, 202.

⁵ Anast. ii, 7, 6; Gardiner, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, 17; translated in Caminos, *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, 51.

⁶ Cf. R. Weill, *Les décrets royaux de l'ancien empire égyptien*, (Paris, 1912); W. C. Hayes, *JEA* 32 (1946), 3 ff.; F. Ll. Griffith, *JEA* 13 (1927), 193 ff.; H. Goedicke, *Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich*, (Wiesbaden, 1967).

⁷ Cf. Naville, *Festival Hall*, pl. 6.

⁸ Griffith, *Catalogue*, III, 80.

the gods, especially Neit, the patron of the capital.¹ Both Herodotus and Diodorus specifically state that the priests of Egypt were exempt from taxation;² and from Ptolemaic times comes evidence that the priesthood received a "salary" (σύνταξις) from the state.³ Such state subsidy was probably already a fact during the fourth century, since Tachos temporarily suspended it to finance his war with the Persian empire.⁴

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Biblical passage reflects the ideal situation which obtained under the Saïtes and later. The identical assessment by other foreigners cannot be ignored. Though, as Gardiner has suggested,⁵ it may well have been "an administrative ideal to which the Pharaohs did lip service," the exemption of the Egyptian priesthood looked to outlanders like a statute which was rigidly adhered to. Josephus, who had Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* before him, was aware that the social phenomenon described by the Biblical writer was the same as that which prevailed during the Late Period of Egyptian history; for he states that the reforms inaugurated by Joseph were still in force in Egypt "until their later kings."⁶ The Anti-Jewish polemic in Ptolemaic Egypt produced some fantastically garbled reconstructions of the Hebrew Sojourn and Exodus. One of these, represented in the writings of Lysimachus and Tacitus,⁷ confuses the famine of Joseph with the conditions in Egypt prior to the Exodus,⁸ and dates the latter to the reign of Bocchoris (717-711 B.C.). One wonders whether the account of Joseph's agrarian reforms represents a dim reflection of the momentous reforms brought about by this king and his descendants, the Twenty-sixth Dynasty,⁹ and thus marks an early stage in the tradition which links his illustrious name with the Sojourn in Egypt.

¹ Kienitz, *op. cit.*, 51 ff. Note that one, and perhaps two, of the Egyptian names in the Joseph Story are compounded with the name of this goddess.

² Herodotus ii, 168; Diodorus i, 28, 73.

³ Préaux, *op. cit.*, 49.

⁴ Kienitz, *op. cit.*, 119.

⁵ *Wilbour* II, 202.

⁶ *Ant. Jud.* ii, 7, 7.

⁷ Josephus, *Contra Apionem* i, 34; Tacitus *Hist.* v, 3 (where the legend is attributed to "very many authors").

⁸ Chacremont also confused the generation of the Sojourn with that of the Exodus by making Moses and Joseph contemporaries: Josephus *Contra Apionem* i, 32.

⁹ E. Drioton, I. Vandier, *L'Égypte* (Paris, 1962), 544 f.

22. *The Embalming of Jacob*

On Jacob's death Joseph had his body given to the physicians for embalming. The embalming lasted forty days, the mourning seventy (Gen. 50: 2-3). Although Greek writers imply that there was a distinction between doctor and embalmer,¹ in Demotic texts from Ptolemaic and Roman times those who prepare the corpse for interment are often called "doctors" (*šim*).² In earlier times the embalmer is the *wt*-priest, "the wrapper," and he is assisted by a *bry-hb*, "lector priest," to ward off malevolent powers during the period of embalming by his incantations.³

The period of seventy days is probably to be construed as the entire period between death and interment.⁴ The earliest reference to the seventy days comes from the Eighteenth Dynasty,⁵ and sporadic examples can be cited from the Nineteenth, Twentieth and Twenty-first Dynasties.⁶ But the majority come from the Saite, Persian and Ptolemaic periods, when the "seventy days" was a commonplace of

¹ P. Ghalioungui, *Magic and Medical Science in Ancient Egypt*, (London, 1963), 67.

² Spiegelberg, *OLZ* 26 (1923), 423 f. I can see no evidence that "the Chief of Doctors in the Place of Truth," whom Spiegelberg cites from a New Kingdom shawabti, was in fact an embalmer. The term *st-m3't*, "Place of Truth" (i.e. the Necropolis), does not automatically connect a function with mortuary practices. There were large numbers of Necropolis workmen on the west of Thebes, and they surely required medical attention. Would not such a physician, who simply ministered to the people of the Necropolis and probably lived there himself, be called "doctor in the Place of Truth"? On the rendering of *rōp'im* by ἐνταφιασταί, see S. Morenz in *Mullus. Festschrift Theodor Klauser*, I, (Münster, Westfalen, 1964), 257.

³ Vergote (*Joseph*, 199) construes the reference to "doctors" as opposed to some other word for "embalmers" as an indication that Joseph intentionally had his father embalmed in an extraordinary manner to avoid the pagan religious rite of the Egyptians. Ingenious as this hypothesis is, it runs counter to the consistent temper of the Joseph Story, which blandly ignores the difficulties inherent in the encounter of Hebrews and pagans.

⁴ According to Shore and Smith (*Acta Orientalia* 25 [1960], 290, n. 24) the seventy days represents the period during which the star Sothis is invisible, construed as the total number of days which elapsed between the death and resurrection of Osiris.

⁵ The tombs of Djehuty and Antef: Davies, *Studies in Honour of F. Ll. Griffith*, (London, 1932), 289; *idem*, with Gardiner, *The Tomb of Amenemhet*, (London, 1915), 56.

⁶ E. Chassinat, *RT* 21 (1899), 73 (Nineteenth Dynasty); J. Černý, *ZÄS* 72 (1936), 113 (Twentieth Dynasty); L. Habachi, *ASAE* 47 (1947), pl. 33 (Twenty-first Dynasty); cf. also L. Borchardt, *Statuen und Statuetten*, II (Cairo, Catalogue générale), nos. 604, 606.

mortuary literature.¹ The forty days of the Genesis passage probably corresponds, if not to Hebrew practice,² to the actual period of embalming when the corpse was treated with natron.³ It seems to be an approximate figure, finding parallels in "more than 30,"⁴ "32,"⁵ "35,"⁶ and "36" day periods⁷ for the same process, all from Saite or Ptolemaic texts.

23. *The Literary motifs of the Joseph Story*⁸

Central to chapters 40 and 41, which deal with Joseph's rise to power, is the theme of the wiseman who comes forward when the king is at his wits' end, and saves the monarch and the kingdom from a terrible fate. Stories of wisemen and magicians possessed of miraculous powers were very popular in Ancient Egypt, especially during the Middle Kingdom (c. 2100-1700 B.C.). But in these tales, as we have seen,⁹ far from acting the part of deliverer of the land, the wiseman is nothing more than an entertainer. The closest parallels to Joseph's role as saviour come from Demotic, and from the contemporary literatures of Western Asia. For the motif of the wiseman wrongfully imprisoned and subsequently re-instated, parallels are again forthcoming only from the second third of the first millennium B.C.¹⁰

CONCLUSIONS

Two conclusions seem justified by our examination of the background detail. First, the Hebrew writer was not so well acquainted

¹ Spiegelberg, *op. cit.*, 421 f.; A. Rowe, *ASAE* 38 (1939), 189; Rylands IX, 10, 10 (Griffith, *Catalogue*, III, 85); Habachi, *op. cit.*, 279; *Belegstellen zu Wb.*, II, 305: 16; Spiegelberg, *ZÄS* 54 (1918), pl. IV(a), 1.10 (seventy-two days); I Khamois, 4, 25 (Griffith, *Stories of the High-priests of Memphis*, [Oxford, 1900], 29 f.); Herodotus ii, 90; Diodorus i, 72; L. F. MacAdam, *Kawa*, I, 58 (seventy days implicit).

² Vergote *Joseph*, 200, and n. 2.

³ Griffith, *Stories*, 29 f. (note); A. Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, 337.

⁴ Diodorus i, 91.

⁵ K. Piehl, *Inscriptions hieroglyphiques*, (3e ser.), pl. 28.

⁶ I Khamois, 4, 25 (above, n. 1).

⁷ Griffith, *loc. cit.* In a Ptolemaic papyrus the thirty-fifth day (of the period of seventy days) is set aside for "mourning rites": A. F. Shore, H. S. Smith, *op. cit.*, pl. 5, 17.

⁸ For the following, see above, p. 87 ff., where the literature is cited.

⁹ Above, p. 94, under IV, 1.

¹⁰ Above, p. 96 ff.

with Egypt as has often been imagined. Not a few of the supposed Egyptian parallels, especially titles, vanish under close inspection. On the other hand there are indications here and there that the writer was familiar with the Judaeon royal court.¹ And second, those Egyptian elements which do appear to be genuine cannot be dated with any degree of likelihood before the seventh century B.C.² Of course anyone who draws this second conclusion lays himself open to the charge of being unduly influenced by the *argumentum e silentio*. Time and again Vergote is forced to argue that absence of evidence for the Ramesside age does not mean that such evidence never existed. Only the chance of preservation makes the Joseph Story appear to fit the Late Period best. Given the inherent conservatism of Egyptian culture, is it not likely that many of the elements of the narrative which appear to be late, were already features of Egyptian civilization seven centuries earlier? Such argumentation is irrelevant and smacks of wishful thinking. The same line of reasoning could be used to argue that Joseph belonged to the Pyramid Age: if seven centuries, why not seventeen? The word of caution against the argument from silence would perhaps be justified if the Ramesside Age were a virtual blank in our knowledge, as for example the Hyksos Period is. But the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties are, comparatively speaking, a richly documented period of Egyptian history; and the simple fact is that there are no details in the Joseph Story of which it may be said with confidence, this belongs *only* to the Ramesside Age. On the other hand, several episodes in the narrative, and the plot motifs themselves, find some parallel in Saite, Persian, or Ptolemaic Egypt. It is the sheer weight of evidence, and not the argument from silence, that leads to the conclusion that the seventh century B.C. is the *terminus a quo* for the Egyptian background to the Joseph Story.

If we assign the third quarter of the fifth century B.C. as the *terminus ante quem*, we are left with a span of two and one half centuries, comprising in terms of Egyptian history the Saite and early Persian periods. Although "head counting" is not part of scholarship, it is perhaps interesting to note that before the turn of the present century Steindorff, Griffiths and Lagarde had already, on much slimmer

¹ Above, p. 191 f.

² If it be objected that many of the details we have investigated are insignificant, one can only protest that they are nevertheless useful indicators of the writer's own date. See above, p. 188, n. 4.

evidence than is now available, assigned the background of the Joseph Story to the Saite Period.¹

¹ Steindorff, *ZÄS* 30 (1891), 52; Griffith, *Stories*, 29 f.; Lagarde, *Nachr. Gött.*, (1889), 319 ff.; cf. also Cornill *Introduction*, 84 (with reservations).

with Egypt as has often been imagined. Not a few of the supposed Egyptian parallels, especially titles, vanish under close inspection. On the other hand there are indications here and there that the writer was familiar with the Judaeen royal court.¹ And second, those Egyptian elements which do appear to be genuine cannot be dated with any degree of likelihood before the seventh century B.C.² Of course anyone who draws this second conclusion lays himself open to the charge of being unduly influenced by the *argumentum e silentio*. Time and again Vergote is forced to argue that absence of evidence for the Ramesside age does not mean that such evidence never existed. Only the chance of preservation makes the Joseph Story appear to fit the Late Period best. Given the inherent conservatism of Egyptian culture, is it not likely that many of the elements of the narrative which appear to be late, were already features of Egyptian civilization seven centuries earlier? Such argumentation is irrelevant and smacks of wishful thinking. The same line of reasoning could be used to argue that Joseph belonged to the Pyramid Age: if seven centuries, why not seventeen? The word of caution against the argument from silence would perhaps be justified if the Ramesside Age were a virtual blank in our knowledge, as for example the Hyksos Period is. But the Nineteenth and Twentieth Dynasties are, comparatively speaking, a richly documented period of Egyptian history; and the simple fact is that there are no details in the Joseph Story of which it may be said with confidence, this belongs *only* to the Ramesside Age. On the other hand, several episodes in the narrative, and the plot motifs themselves, find some parallel in Saite, Persian, or Ptolemaic Egypt. It is the sheer weight of evidence, and not the argument from silence, that leads to the conclusion that the seventh century B.C. is the *terminus a quo* for the Egyptian background to the Joseph Story.

If we assign the third quarter of the fifth century B.C. as the *terminus ante quem*, we are left with a span of two and one half centuries, comprising in terms of Egyptian history the Saite and early Persian periods. Although "head counting" is not part of scholarship, it is perhaps interesting to note that before the turn of the present century Steindorff, Griffiths and Lagarde had already, on much slimmer

¹ Above, p. 191 f.

² If it be objected that many of the details we have investigated are insignificant, one can only protest that they are nevertheless useful indicators of the writer's own date. See above, p. 188, n. 4.

evidence than is now available, assigned the background of the Joseph Story to the Saite Period.¹

¹ Steindorff, *ZÄS* 30 (1891), 52; Griffith, *Stories*, 29 f.; Lagarde, *Nachr. Gött.*, (1889), 319 ff.; cf. also Cornill *Introduction*, 84 (with reservations).

CHAPTER NINE

THE DATE OF COMPOSITION

Arguments have been advanced for dating the Egyptian colouring of the Joseph Story to the Saite Period, or thereabout. What bearing, if any, does this conclusion have on the date of the composition of the narrative itself? The investigation is now bordering on the broader question of the nature of literary composition and transmission in the ancient world. Exactly what is the background detail an index of, the date when the story was composed, or merely the date of the final redaction? Is it possible for a narrative to be passed on orally (or for that matter in written form) over centuries, while in the process all traces of its ancient origins are obliterated and only the latest stage of accretions remains? Or will such an ancient tale in its latest form display a stratified deposit of all the centuries through which it has passed? If the former is the case it would be possible to maintain, as many do at present,¹ that the Joseph Story is one of ancient origin which has been repeatedly re-edited over the centuries, and yet still accommodate the late date to which the evidence of the Egyptian background points by asserting that in Gen. 37-50 we have the very latest edition which has driven out all trace of earlier material.

It is difficult to combat such an hypothesis except by recourse to analogy. There are sufficient examples from the ancient Near East of texts of which we have but a late copy, whose antiquity is proven beyond a shadow of doubt by internal evidence. One could cite the Memphite Theology, preserved in a copy of the seventh century B.C., and numerous Ptolemaic temple inscriptions which show great antiquity. Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*, the only connected account we possess of the Osiris myth, is full of ancient material. The Book of Judges, to cite but one Biblical example, though manifestly written at a late date, contains genuine legends of great age. Somewhere in each of these literary works, in motif, onomasticon or incidental detail, the

¹ Cf. Albright, *JBL* 37 (1918), 130 f.; *idem*, *BAOR* 118 (1950), 20; D. N. Freedman, *apud* G. E. Wright, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, (New York, 1965), 269; J. M. Holt, *The Patriarchs of Israel*, (Nashville, 1964), 182; Wright, *ET* 71 (1960), 293; *idem*, *Biblical Archaeology*², (London, 1962), 53 ff.; R. Weill, *RES* 1937, 205.

antiquity of the piece shows through, whatever anachronistic detail may have accumulated later. A priori it is inconceivable that an ancient legend or theological treatise should in the course of the centuries be stripped of all trace of its true age.

It is significant that in the Joseph Story one can discern no ancient substratum pointing to an earlier period in the transmission of this particular tale.¹ This statement does not ignore the theory elaborated by Albright and May that behind Gen. 37 lies an old fertility myth;² but it is yet to be proved that there is an historical connexion between such a myth and the opening episode of the Joseph narrative, in other words, that the writer consciously reworked the myth. Nor does the statement ignore the genuine antiquity of Gen. 39, which shows the same theme as the Egyptian Two Brothers; yet Gen. 39 is the one episode in the present narrative which can with ease be shown not to be an integral part of it, but rather an interpolation.³ We have tried to point out that the Egyptian detail reflects the Saite period, or later. In agreement with this dating is the vocabulary of the story, which displays well over fifty words or expressions elsewhere found in literature of Exilic or Post-exilic date.⁴ There are no archaisms, nor even a conscious attempt to archaize.

DISCREPANCIES IN THE EARLY TRADITIONS

But the absence of an ancient substratum becomes most apparent when one notes how alien the Joseph Story is to the early historical traditions of Israel, and how ill it fits into its Patriarchal setting. It is

¹ The standard retort that "the Joseph Story has been modified and modernized in the course of transmission" (Freedman, *loc. cit.*) is unacceptable. If it were "modernized" to the point of eliminating all ancient material, on what evidence can we postulate an ancient origin? The postulate becomes nothing more than the product of wishful thinking. Gressmann (EYXAPIETHPION, 12 ff.) tried to show that the Joseph Story reflects stages in the settlement of the early Hebrews, one tradition in the narrative depicting Jacob's family as semi-nomadic shepherds, and another as farmers. This, it seems to me, is an erroneous idea which stems from a misunderstanding of the picture drawn of Jacob in the story. Jacob is there pictured as a typical member of the landed gentry: he owns land from which he derives crops, and he owns sheep which his sons pasture for him. He is very like Nabal, who has flocks (1 Sam. 25: 2), and by implication farm land as well (vs. 18). See above, p. 21, n. 4.

² Albright, *JBL* 37 (1918), 111 ff.; H. May, *AJSL* 47 (1930), 83 ff.; cf. J. M. Allegro, *ZAW* 64 (1952), 251, n. 5.

³ Above, p. 146 ff.

⁴ Listed above, p. 54 ff.

puzzling that until such moderns as Noth, Von Rad and others, this fact had received little attention, and Old Testament critics blandly carried the "J" and "E" sources right through the Joseph Story with little awareness of the difficulty.¹

The differences between the Joseph Story and the context in which it is found are many and striking.² First the narrative of the Joseph Story shows marked traces of single, rather than composite authorship. The unity of the story, the organization and development of the plot, the use of suspense and pathos, the portrayal of character, and the keen awareness of human nature, all betray the presence of one writer of surpassing ability.³ By contrast the earlier Patriarchal narratives are uneven in style, often rambling or discursive in tone, and obviously heterogeneous in content. Admittedly, character portrayal is a forte of the illiterate story-teller, but plot development is not, as examples of tales with a long oral history clearly show. Second, the preoccupation of folklore with pseudo-historical explanation and cult topography, hallmarks both of Gen. 12-36, is absent from the Joseph Story. The interest in aetiology which the Patriarchal tales everywhere evince, is found in only three secondary passages in the Joseph Story, viz. 41: 51-2 (the naming of Joseph's sons), 47: 13-26 (the agrarian reforms), and 50: 11 (the burial of Jacob).⁴ Unlike the stories of Abraham and Jacob, the Joseph Story is not concerned with cult centres. Hebron,

¹ R. N. Whybray's observations in his article "The Joseph Story and Pentateuchal Criticism," *VT* 18 (1968), 522 ff., are long over-due. His plea (p. 528) for a re-examination of "the whole question of the documentary hypothesis, at any rate as it concerns this part (i.e. the Joseph Story) of the Book of Genesis" should prompt all scholars concerned with the Pentateuch to re-open an investigation closed far too soon.

² Gressmann, *op. cit.*, 48; Gunkel *Urgesch.*, 247 f.; Von Rad, *BWANT* IV, 26, 52; Böhl, *JEOL* 17 (1963), 126; N. H. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis*, (New York, 1966), 211. The union of the Joseph Story with the Patriarchal narratives has been described as the most obvious of the oversimplifications in the construction of the Pentateuch: B. Vawter, *apud* J. P. Hyatt, *The Bible and Modern Scholarship*, (Nashville, New York, 1965), 64.

³ By calling the author of the Joseph Story a "writer" we are casting a judgment, not so much on whether or not he was literate, but rather on the atmosphere in which he created. We are opining that his creation was slow, careful, and more or less private, in contrast to the teller of tales before an audience who is obliged to create in public and extemporaneously. The creation of the "writer" is deliberate and reasoned; the creation of the story-teller intuitive. It is the latter who belongs in the stream of oral transmission; the former seeks to commit his work to writing, either by his own efforts or by dictation, as soon as possible.

⁴ A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, (Paris, 1950), 151.

Shechem and Dothan are alone mentioned, and that briefly.¹ Third, the theological outlook of the writer of Gen. 37-50 is different from that of the Patriarchal narrator. He does not mention the Covenant or the Promise, ubiquitous in the earlier chapters of Genesis.² He is not interested in supplying the reader with comment on matters theological, as the Patriarchal author was. In fact, with the glaring exception of chapter 39, the writer nowhere uses YHWH, and when *'ēlōhīm* is used it is always in the direct speech of the characters of the story. He lets the story convey his message without trying to ram it down the readers' throats at every turn of the plot. Unlike the god of the Patriarchs, who often speaks to mortals or confronts them in human form, the god of the Joseph Story never intervenes directly, but rather works behind the scenes in and through men and events.³ Fourth, the religious and racial exclusiveness of the Israelites, so evident in the stories of the Patriarchs,⁴ is not to be found in the Joseph Story. Joseph does not hesitate to mix with Egyptians; of course he has no choice. But he even marries an Egyptian girl, and is not condemned for it by the writer.⁵ Joseph is able to communicate with the Egyptians on moral issues by appealing to the universal sense of right and wrong. Both he and the Egyptians speak of "god" with no further qualification, and there is no disapproval expressed at the thought that Joseph, a pious Israelite, is moving among outright idolators!⁶

Fifth, the events of the Joseph Story do not dovetail either with the immediate context of the Patriarchal and Exodus narratives, or with the details of Israel's traditional history. In Gen. 34 the brothers of

¹ E. Jacob, *La tradition historique en Israël*, (Montpellier, 1946), 113; Gressmann, *ZAW* 30 (1910), 30, n. 40; Eissfeldt, *Die Genesis der Genesis*, (Tübingen, 1958), 55; Von Rad, *VT Supp.*, I (1953), 120.

² *Idem*, *ET* 72 (1961), 214; B. W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1957), 186.

³ Hölscher *Geschichtsschreibung*, 131; S. H. Hooke, *In the Beginning*, (Oxford, 1947), 114 f.; S. Sandmel, *The Hebrew Scriptures*, 369; Driver *Gen.*, xlv.

⁴ Cf. the Abimelech stories (Gen. 20, 26; especially 20: 11); Abimelech speaks to and about YHWH (20: 4, 26: 28), but lays no claim to personal attachment; it is a case rather of a pagan acknowledging the favour the Israelites' god showers upon Israelites. Cf. the taking of a wife for Isaac (Gen. 24), made difficult by Abraham's reluctance to take a pagan girl from the neighbourhood (vss. 3-4); the same consideration influenced Jacob's parents (26: 34 f., 27: 46, 28: 1, 6). Cf. Jacob's abhorrence of foreign gods (35: 2).

⁵ But note how Post-Biblical literature, fully aware of the implications, tries desperately to get around the embarrassing point by making Asenath a Hebrew! See M. Philonenko in *Initiation*, (Studies in the History of Religion, X; Leiden, 1965), 147 ff.

⁶ Cf. Procksch, *Gen.*, 223; B. Gemser, *Oudtest. Stud.*, 12 (1958), 5.

Joseph are of such an heroic stature that they can take on an entire Canaanite city single-handed, and slaughter its inhabitants to a man. The cowering brothers of the Joseph Story, who allow themselves to be browbeaten and incarcerated by Joseph and his personal servants, have nothing in common with these mighty men.¹ According to the Jacob cycle, Rachel died before her husband came to Hebron (Gen. 35: 19); yet in the Joseph Story she is still living.² According to the Patriarchal narratives Ishmael belonged to the generation immediately preceding that of Joseph; but in chapter 37 his descendants are already a numerous people, engaged in an occupation they were not to know until well along in the First Millennium.³ In the Patriarchal tales the writer is often sensitive to the fate of the tribes of whom the sons of Jacob are the eponymous ancestors, and many of the brothers stand out as individuals. In the Joseph Story, with the exception of Reuben (later Judah), Benjamin and Joseph himself, the brothers have paled away to become mere "extras." In the Joseph Story Benjamin is but a child, so young that his father will not allow him to accompany his brothers to Egypt; yet according to the tradition preserved in Gen. 46: 21, when the family of Jacob moved to Egypt only months later, Benjamin took along ten sons! In the first year of the famine Reuben has two sons (42: 37); one year later he has four (46: 9).⁴ According to a secondary passage in the Joseph Story (41: 50-2), Joseph's two sons were born in Egypt of an Egyptian mother, and presumably died there before the Exodus. The old tradition preserved in the Chronicler, however, represents Ephraim as living on Palestinian soil (1 Chron. 7: 21-3), and Manasseh as intermarrying with Aramaeans (1 Chron. 7: 14). Outside the Joseph Story there is not the slightest trace of an Egyptian origin or Sojourn for these two tribes!⁵

¹ Haggadic literature was aware of the difficulty, since it inserted in Judah's speech in chapter 44 a threatening reminder to Joseph of the deeds of strength accomplished by the brothers in times past: see G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, (Leiden, 1961), 11 ff.

² Cf. Procksch *Gen.*, 217, 249 f., 379; contrast Ehrlich *Randglossen* I, 186; Simpson *ETI*, 126; Goettsberger, *MVAG* 22 (1917), 78; Dillmann *Gen.* II, 336. Driver (*Gen.*, 322) supposes Rachel died later in the lost E-version.

³ Procksch *Gen.*, 219; Gunkel *Gen.*, 359; for an ingenious defence, see Keil-Delitzsch, I, 337.

⁴ Gunkel *Gen.*, 446.

⁵ The geographical distribution of the "Joseph Tribes" in Palestine conforms well with an Aramaean origin, since it seems to presuppose a movement from the north-east to the south-west, originating somewhere in Golan or beyond. That the Joseph Story should play so cavalierly with this long-standing tradition by implying that in fact Ephraim and Manasseh were half-Egyptian, and came from

In conjunction with the foregoing evidence one must note the virtually complete silence of the rest of scripture on the subject of the Joseph Story.¹ The romanticized hero of the Genesis story almost never appears elsewhere in the Old Testament outside Genesis and the first chapter of Exodus. The name "Joseph" indeed occurs; but it is used most often to denote (a) the eponymous ancestor of the "House of Joseph," (b) the father of Ephraim and Manasseh, (c) the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh collectively, (d) the northern tribes collectively, or (e) the northern kingdom, Israel.²

Egypt, shows how unhistorical the narrative really is. Those who wish to postulate an Egyptian origin for these tribes, and thus read even a modicum of tribal history into the Joseph Story (cf. C. F. Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, [London, 1921], 87; L. Gry, *RB* 14 [1917], 515 f.; O. Kaiser, *VT* 10 [1960], 2 ff.; H. H. Rowley, *From Joseph To Joshua*, [London, 1950], 141; M. W. M. Roth, *ZAW* 75 [1963], 302 f.; H. Seebass, *Der Erzpater Israels*, [Berlin, 1966], 38, n. 132, 46, n. 173), have to justify this use of *Märchen* material by independent evidence, which so far they have not done. To say that "the exquisite tale of Joseph and his brethren... must surely have been founded on the living tradition of Israel in Egypt prior to the Exodus" (Segal, *JQR* 52 [1961], 47; cf. *idem*, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 [1961], 99 f.) is to voice a wish, not an argument.

¹ Except in certain late psalms; cf. 105 for example: A. Weiser, *The Psalms*, (London, 1959), 673 ff.; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms*, (London, 1939), 445; see also above, p. 180, n. 4. In the obscure 81: 5 the antiquity of a "statute" (an allusion to the covenant relationship?) is somehow connected with Joseph's "going forth over Egypt" (cf. Gen. 41: 46). Attempts to find oblique references to the Joseph Story in prophetic books are unconvincing: cf. Horowitz *JE*, 21. In Amos 2: 6 the prophet is excoriating Israel for present social evils, not for the legendary sin of eponymous ancestors; the sale of the "righteous" can be no reference to the events of Gen. 37. It seems exceedingly doubtful that Jer. 9: 3 bears an allusion to the tale-bearing of Gen. 37: 2, a possibility that Ackroyd considers: *VT* 13 (1963), 254. The mourning of Rachel for her children (Jer. 31: 15) has no parallel in the canonical Joseph Story; although, given the fact that in the Reuben-version Rachel was still alive, such an episode would have been neither inconsistent nor inappropriate. But the location at Ramah, as well as the specification of the reason—from vss. 16-18 it appears that one of the children is Ephraim (here the Northern Kingdom) who has gone into exile—suggests that Jeremiah had legendary material in mind different from the Joseph Story. Did Jeremiah know of a euhemerized fertility tale set in Benjamin, which has not survived? That Isa. 19: 5-10 has anything at all to do with Gen. 41: 1-8 is doubtful in the extreme (cf. Ruppert *JEG*, 75 f.). These verses are simply a poetic description of one of the commonest sources of anxiety to dwellers in Egypt, viz. a low Nile.

² Cf. Herrmann, *ZAS* 91 (1964), 72 f. Von Rad (*BWANT* IV, 26, 3 ff.) and Noth (*UG*, 227) point out that the cult credo does not know of Joseph; Argyle (*ET* 67 [1955], 199) is amazed that the prophets do not mention him either. In contrast to the silence of the Old Testament on the subject of the romanticized Joseph, Apocryphal, Pseudepigraphical and Rabbinic literature make much of him: cf. D. Arenhoevel, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 8 ff.; A. M. Goldberg, *ibid.*, 11 ff.; H. Sprödowsky, *Die Hellenisierung des Geschichte von Joseph in Ägypten bei Flavius Josephus*, (Griefswald, 1937); Lachs, *JOR* 51 (1960), 47 ff.; L. H. Feldman,

The evidence which has been amassed in the preceding pages—the background detail, the anomalous context, the lack of an ancient substratum, the silence of the rest of the Old Testament—all speaks with one voice. One can only conclude that the reason why the historical books and the Prophets say nothing of the Joseph romance is because the narrative was not yet in existence when they were written;¹ in other words, the chronological limits assigned above to the background of the story, c. 650-425 B.C.,² are quite probably valid for the date of composition as well. This time span puts us into the period when the Diaspora with all its consequences was a reality. Do we hear a faint echo of the Exile in the story of a boy, sold as a slave into a foreign land, whither shortly his clan journeys to join him, themselves to enter into a state of servitude to a foreign crown?³

Undoubtedly by the time it had reached the stage of the “Judah-expansion” the Joseph Story had been placed in the Patriarchal milieu, and used to amplify the account of the Descent. But it seems doubtful whether the writer of the original, “Reuben”-version had the Descent and Sojourn in mind. As pointed out earlier,⁴ no inherent feature of the plot necessitates a stay in Egypt after the famine is over. Stories with parallel situations always have the refugees return to their homeland when the food supply is restored,⁵ and there is no reason to think that the writer of the Joseph Story deviated from this norm. One persistent tradition made Jacob live out his life, die, and be buried on Palestinian soil;⁶ while another of equal tenacity recounted his descent into Egypt with a small family. The latter achieved a priority of sorts

CW 56 (1962), 287. Note that the personal name “Joseph” does not become popular in Israel before the Exile: Noth, *Die israelitische Personennamen*, (Stuttgart, 1928), 60, n. 2.

¹ Scarcely that it was unknown to them!

² Above, p. 242.

³ Among those who have suspected a hint of the Diaspora in the story, cf. Luria, *ZAS* 44 (1926), 94 ff.; J. Hempel, *Literatur*, 17; Heaton, *ET* 58 (1946), 82. One is reluctant to press the argument from silence too far, but one wonders whether the contrast between the sophistication of the narrative and the militant nationalism of the Post-exilic community, and the discrepancies between Hebrew tradition and the details of the story, point to a place of origin away from the great centres of Hebrew tradition. Dare we suggest the cosmopolitan atmosphere of the Palestinian coast?

⁴ Above, p. 160 ff.

⁵ Cf. Abraham (Gen. 12); Naomi and Ruth (Ruth 1: 6); Elijah (1 Ki. 17: 9, 18: 1).

⁶ Gen. 50: 11-14; B. Gemser, *VT* 2 (1952), 349 ff.; A. R. Hulst, *Oudtest. Stud.* 14 (1965), 166.

by being included in the cult credos,¹ but it did not entirely oust its rival, as the presence of both in canonical scripture shows. Thus lack of unanimity in the tradition regarding the death of Jacob and the nature of the Descent probably explains why the writer of the original Joseph Story could flout what was later considered to be an unshakable tradition, viz. that upon the Israelites' descent into Egypt under Jacob they stayed there several centuries, and bring his characters back to the Land of Promise after the famine was over. Thus it may perhaps be misleading to maintain that the Joseph Story was composed in answer to the question, how did Israel get to Egypt?² The “Judah-expansion” and the final redaction of Genesis do indeed answer this question; but the original Joseph Story seems to be nothing more than the Hebrew version of the common motif of the boy who dreamed great things.

J AND E IN THE STORY OF JOSEPH?

The great work of history published by the Genesis writer divides itself on the basis of content into three parts: 1. stories of primaevae times, 2. stories of the Hebrew Patriarchs, 3. stories of the sons of Jacob.³ There is no reason *a priori* to expect the same written sources which the Genesis editor used to appear in all three parts, unless it can be shown that the organization of the material on this tripartite pattern is an innovation much earlier than his time.

Now a major presupposition a source critic must make is that consistency of style and outlook is a characteristic of the individual writer. If his isolated source⁴ displays more than one style he must conclude either (a) that he has erroneously grouped two separate sources together, or (b) that this source is itself quoting, or at least relying heavily upon, an earlier work. In the latter case he will expect to find the style of the source which contains the quotation surrounding and framing the material it is quoting. If he does not detect this frame,

¹ Deut. 26: 5. It may well be the correct tradition; cf. the presence of West Semitic names, compounded with the element *y'qb*, in Egypt in Hyksos times: A. Alt, *Die Herkunft des Hyksos in neuer Sicht*, (Berlin, 1961), 5, n. 3; S. Yeivin, *JEA* 45 (1959), 16 ff.; J. von Beckerath, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten*, (Glückstadt, 1965), 134 f. It is surely not too daring to identify the historical figure behind the legendary Jacob in Genesis with one of these half-forgotten Hyksos chiefs.

² Noth, *UG*, 227 f.; Hooke, *In the Beginning*, 118; W. Gross, *Biblica* 49 (1968), 322.

³ Gressmann, *ZAW* 30 (1910), 16.

⁴ By “source” here we mean written strands, reproduced *verbatim* in the text; cf. above, p. 106 ff.

he must draw the first conclusion. In the third part of Genesis it behooves the critic who wishes to carry the "J" and "E" of the Patriarchal narratives right through to chapter 50 to show at least a thread of continuous style running through the two sections. Even if large parts of the supposed "J" or "E" in Gen. 35-50 be admitted to be *verbatim* quotations from an earlier source, a basic *Grundschrift*, the "J" or "E" framework of the material quoted should be evident. If it is not, there is no reason to assume the presence of either source.¹ One of the negative results of the present study is the failure to detect any evidence which would lead one to postulate the existence of such a framework.

But a critic may retort that in fact what we have called the "Reuben"-version is essentially what he has been calling E, and our "Judah-expansion" is his J. Broadly speaking this is correct; but if he has in mind "J" and "E" in the context of the Pentateuch as a whole, as most scholars have, such a protestation is useless. For J is still dated by the majority of scholars no later than c. 800 B.C.,² and E scarcely a century later;³ while a strong modern tendency is to put J, or the postulated *Grundschrift*, back in the United Monarchy.⁴ All the evidence examined above, on the other hand, both Biblical and extra-Biblical, clearly favours a date between the mid-seventh and mid-fifth centuries B.C.

¹ It is axiomatic that if one wishes inductively to assess a writer's style and his spiritual background and purpose, the works of others which he quotes *verbatim* will be of extremely limited value. If one analyzes one of Toynbee's extensive quotations, say of Bergson, one will gain some insight into Bergson's style and outlook, but next to nothing of Toynbee's. And similarly, if one is bent on eliciting the characteristic style and beliefs of a "J" writer, one will achieve nothing by studying the sources "J" is supposed to be quoting from. Thus statements to the effect that "E" has a predilection for dreams, with examples drawn from the Joseph Story, or that one of "J's" characteristic words is *'amtēbōt*, because it occurs in the "J" portions of the Joseph Story, are invalid; for they assume what they are in effect trying to prove, i.e. that "J" and "E" are found in the Joseph Story, and they take no cognizance of the possibility that "J" and "E", were they present, might be quoting *en bloc*!

² S. Mowinckel, *ASTI* 2 (1963), 6.

³ Cf. Eissfeldt *Einleitung*, 258; Budde *Geschichte*, 61 f.; L. Ruppert, *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 2.

⁴ Ruppert, *ibid.*; L. Rost, *ZThK* 53 (1956), 4 f.; J. Bright, *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*, (London, 1956), 42; *idem*, *A History of Israel*, (Philadelphia, 1959), 65; B. J. Van der Merwe, *Studia Biblica et Semitica*, (Wageningen, 1966), 229, n. 2; M.-L. Henry, *Jahvist und Priesterschrift*, (Stuttgart, 1960), 8; cf. Herrmann, *op. cit.*, 73: "ihre in novellistisch-breite Zusammenhänge gestellte Ausprägung, wie sie im Schlussteil der Genesis erscheint, verdankt sie erst der schriftstellerischen Kunst der frühen Königszeit"; B. Mazar, *JNES* 28 (1969), 77: "in my view, it is much more within reason that the way of life and the ethnic and socio-political picture reflected in the patriarchal accounts generally correspond to the end of the period of the Judges and the beginning of the monarchy."

for the composition of the Joseph Story.¹ Moreover, even though it is currently fashionable to treat E on a par with J as a second exemplar of a common original, J is still dated before E. The internal evidence of the Joseph Story, however, makes the "Reuben"-version the original, self-contained narrative, and reveals the "Judah"-version to be, not a parallel, independent account (much less a earlier one chronologically speaking!), but a mere expansion of the original, wholly dependent on it and without prior existence. The present writer sees no alternative to rejecting the view that "J" and "E", as they have come to be conceived by the majority of scholars, are present in the Joseph Story. The only hand which can with certainty be detected throughout the entire Book of Genesis is a priestly one, viz. that of the Genesis editor.²

¹ It behooves those who favour a date for the commencement of Hebrew historiography during the United Monarchy to reconsider the concrete evidence. The impression one all too often receives is that at present such an hypothesis is supported by nothing more than *a priori* judgment and wishful thinking.

² Whether the "Judah"-expansion is paralleled by similar phenomena elsewhere in the Book of Genesis is a problem beyond the scope of the present work. But the present writer must note in passing that the "Judah"-expansion sounds very like the redactional embellishment which Professors Winnett and Wagner credit elsewhere in Genesis to "Late J" (or "C"): cf. F. V. Winnett, *JBL* 84 (1965), 1 ff.; N. E. Wagner, *A Literary Analysis of Genesis 12-36*, (Doctoral dissertation, Toronto; 1965). *Idem*, "Pentateuchal Criticism: No Clear Future," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 13 (1967), 225 ff.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED

- Abel, F. M., "La liste géographique du papyrus 71 de Zénon," *RB* 32 (1923), 408 ff.
- Ackroyd, P., "Hosea and Jacob," *VT* 13 (1963), 245 ff.
- Albright, W. F., "Historical and Mythical Elements in the Story of Joseph," *JBL* 37 (1918), 111 ff.
- , "Some Important Recent Discoveries: Alphabetic Origins and the Idrimi Inscription," *BASOR* 118 (1950), 11 ff.
- , *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, Baltimore, 1956.
- , *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, New York, 1957.
- , "Abram the Hebrew: a New Archaeological Interpretation," *BASOR* 163 (1961), 36 ff.
- , *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, New York, 1969.
- , Review of Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, *BASOR* 164 (1961), 38.
- Allegro, J. M., "A Possible Mesopotamian Background to the Joseph Blessing of Gen. XLIX," *ZAW* 64 (1952), 249 ff.
- Allis, O. T., *The Five Books of Moses*, Philadelphia, 1943.
- Alt, A., *Der Gott der Väter*, Stuttgart, 1929 (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I, [München, 1959], 1 ff.).
- , *Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht*, Berlin, 1961.
- Anati, E., *Palestine Before the Hebrews*, London, 1963.
- Anderson, B. W., *Understanding the Old Testament*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1957.
- Anderson, G. W., *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, London, 1959.
- Anthes, R., "Die Vorführung der gefangenen Feinde vor den König," *ZÄS* 65 (1930), 26 ff.
- Ap-Thomas, D. R., "Some Aspects of the Root HNN in the Old Testament," *JSS* 2 (1957), 128 ff.
- Arenhoevel, D., "Die Gestalt des Joseph in der Überlieferung des Alten Testaments," *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 8 ff.
- Argyle, A. W., "Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching," *ET* 67 (1955-56), 199 ff.
- Arnold, D., Settgest, J., "Erster Vorbericht über die vom Deutschen archäologischen Institut Kairo in Asasif unternommenen Arbeiten," *MDIAK* 20 (1965), 47 ff.
- Astour, M., "New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit," *AJA* 69 (1965), 253 ff.
- , "Sabhah and Sabteca, Ethiopian Pharaoh Names in Genesis 10," *JBL* 84 (1965), 422 ff.
- , *Hellenosemitica. An Ethnic and Cultural Study in West Semitic Impact on Mycenaean Greece*, Leiden, 1965.
- Auerbach, E., "Die Babylonische Datierung im Pentateuch und das Alter des Priester-Kodex," *VT* 2 (1952), 334 ff.
- Baer, K., "The Low Price of Land in Ancient Egypt," *JARCE* 1 (1962), 25 ff.
- Bakir, A., *Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt*, Cairo, 1952.
- Bailey, L. R., "Israelite 'El Šadday and Amorite Bēl Šadē," *JBL* 87 (1968), 434 ff.
- Bakir, A., *The Cairo Calendar, no. 86637*, Cairo, 1966.
- Barguet, P., *La stèle de la famine à Sébel*, Cairo, 1953.
- , *Le temple d'Amon-re à Karnak*, Cairo, 1962.
- Barton, G. A., *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, New Haven, 1929.
- Baumann, E., "𐤊𐤏 and seine Derivate," *ZAW* 28 (1908), 22 ff.
- Baumgärtel, F., *Elohim ausserhalb des Pentateuch*, Leipzig, 1914.
- Baumgartner, W., "'Nicht Quellen, sondern Syntax'," *ThZ* 3 (1947), 473 f.
- Bea, A., "Der heutige Stand der Pentateuchfrage," *Biblica* 16 (1935), 175 ff.
- , review of H. Eising, *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Jakobserzählung*, *Biblica* 23 (1942), 375 ff.
- Beckerath, J. von, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten*, Glückstadt-New York, 1965.
- , review of W. Helck, *Materialien zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Neuen Reich*, *OLZ* 61 (1966), 225 ff.
- Begrich, J., "Söfer und Mazkir," *ZAW* 58 (1940), 1 ff.
- Bénédite, G., *Le tombeau de Neferhotpou, fils d'Amenemait*, Cairo, 1889.
- Bentzen, A., "Bemerkungen über neuere Entwicklungen in der Pentateuchfrage," *Archiv Orientalni* 19 (1951), 226 ff.
- , *Introduction to the Old Testament*, (2nd. edition), Copenhagen, 1952.
- Bérard, J., "De la légende grecque à la Bible. Phaéton et les sept vaches maigres," *RHR* 151 (1957), 221 ff.
- Bergsträsser, G., Spiegelberg, W., "Ägyptologische und semitische Bemerkungen zu YAHUDA's Buch über die Sprache des Pentateuchs, II," *ZSVG* 8 (1932), 1 ff.
- Besters, A., "'Israël' et 'fils d'Israël' dans les livres historiques (Genèse-II Rois)," *RB* 74 (1967), 5 ff.
- Bewer, J. A., *The Literature of the Old Testament*, (3rd edition), New York-London, 1962.
- Bezold, C., *Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar*, Heidelberg, 1926.
- Blackman, A. M., *The Rock Tombs of Meir*, III, London, 1915.
- , *Middle Egyptian Stories*, Brussels, 1932.
- , with H. W. Fairman, "The Myth of Horus of Edfu, II," *JEA* 29 (1943), 2 ff.
- Blau, J., "Adverbia als psychologische und grammatische Subjekte/Praedikate im Bibelhebraeisch," *VT* 9 (1959), 130 ff.
- Böhl, F. M. Th., *Kanaanäer und Hebräer. Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte des Volkstums und der Religion Israels auf dem Boden Kanaans*, Leipzig, 1911.
- , *Das Zeitalter Abrahams*, Leipzig, 1930.
- , "Babel und Bibel (II). Die Patriarchenzeit," *JEOL* 17 (1963), 125 ff.
- Boer, P. A. H. de, "The Counsellor," *VT Suppl.* 3 (1955), 42 ff.
- , *Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testament*, Stuttgart, 1962.
- Bolte, J., Polivka, G., *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen des Brudern Grimm*, Leipzig, 1937.
- Bonnett, H., "Die Bedeutung der Räucherungen im ägyptischen Kult," *ZÄS* 67 (1931), 20 ff.
- Borchardt, L., *Statuen und Statuetten von Königen und Privatleuten*, (Cairo Museum, Catalogue général), Cairo, 1911-36.
- , *Die Mittel zur zeitlichen Festlegung von Punkten der ägyptischen Geschichte und ihre Anwendung*, Cairo, 1935.
- Bothmer, B. V., *Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period*, Brooklyn, 1960.
- Breasted, J. H., *Ancient Records of Egypt*, (5 vols.), Chicago, 1906.
- Bright, J., *Early Israel in Recent History Writing*, London, 1956.
- , *A History of Israel*, Philadelphia, 1959.
- Brightman, E. S., *The Sources of the Pentateuch*, New York, 1918.
- Brinkman, J. A., "Ur: 721-605 B.C.," *Orientalia* 34 (1965), 241 ff.
- Brinktrine, J., "Zur Übersetzung von Ps. 105 (104): 18: בְּרִיךְ בְּאֵה נִפְשׁוֹ," *ZAW* 64 (1952), 251 ff.
- Brongers, H. A., *De Jozefsgeschiedenis bij Joden, Christenen en Mohammedanen*, Wageningen, 1962.

- Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs, C. A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1907.
- Brugsch, H., *Thesaurus Inscriptionum Aegyptiacarum*, Leipzig, 1883-91.
- , *Die Biblischen sieben Jahre des Hungersnoth*, Leipzig, 1891.
- Brunner-Traut, E., *Altägyptische Märchen*, Düsseldorf-Köln, 1963.
- Bruyère, B., "Sur le dieu Ched," *FIFAO* 20³ (1952), 138 ff.
- Bublitz, E., "Ruben, Issakar und Sebulon in den israelitischen Genealogien," *ZAW* 33 (1913), 241 ff.
- Buck, A. de, *Egyptian Readingbook*, I, Leiden, 1948.
- Budde, K., *Geschichte der altthebräischen Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1906.
- , "Ellä toledoth," *ZAW* 34 (1914), 241 ff.
- , "Noch einmal 'Ellä toledoth,'" *ZAW* 36 (1916), 1 ff.
- Burney, C. F., *Israel's Settlement in Canaan. The Biblical Tradition and its Historical Background*, London, 1921.
- Burrows, E., *The Oracles of Jacob and Balaam*, London, 1938.
- , "The Meaning of El Šaddai," *JTS* 41 (1940), 152 ff.
- Calverly, A. M., *The Temple of King Setbos I at Abydos*, vol. I, London, 1933.
- Caminos, R., *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, Oxford, 1954.
- , *The Chronicle of Prince Osorkon*, Rome, 1958.
- Capart, J., "Encore un mot au sujet de la décapitation dans l'Égypte ancienne," *OLZ* 3 (1900), 52 ff.
- Carlson, R. A., *David, the Chosen King*, Uppsala, 1964.
- Cassirer, M., "The Date of the Elohist in the Light of Genesis xxxvii. 9," *JTS* 50 (1949), 173 f.
- Cassuto, U., *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch*, Jerusalem, 1961.
- Černý, J., "Semites in Egyptian Mining Expeditions to Sinai," *Archiv Orientalni* 7 (1935), 384 ff.
- , "Datum des Todes Ramses' III und der Thronbesteigung Ramses' IV," *ZÄS* 72 (1936), 109 ff.
- , *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, London, 1952.
- Charles, R. H., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. II. Pseudepigrapha*, Oxford, 1913.
- Chassinat, E., "Textes provenant du Sérapéum de Memphis," *RT* 21 (1899), 56 ff.; 22 (1900), 9 ff.
- , *Le temple de Dendara*, (6 vols.), Cairo, 1934-65.
- Cheyne, T. K., "אֲבִירָה וְנִתְיָהוּ; Phinehas, Putiel," *OLZ* 3 (1900), 464 ff.
- Childs, B. S., *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, London, 1962.
- Clédat, J., "Notes sur l'isthme de Suez," *RT* 36 (1914), 103 ff.
- Clère, J. J., Vandier, J., *Textes de la première période intermédiaire et de la XIème Dynastie*, Brussels, 1948.
- Cogan, M., "A Technical Term for Exposure," *JNES* 27 (1968), 133 ff.
- Cornill, C., *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, (London-New York, 1907).
- Couroyer, B., "Quelques égyptianismes dans l'Exode," *RB* 63 (1956), 209 ff.
- , review of Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, *RB* 66 (1959), 582 ff.
- Couyat, J., Montet, P., *Les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques et hiératiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât*, Cairo, 1912-13.
- Cowley, A., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford, 1923.
- Crenshaw, J. L., "Method in Determining Wisdom Influence upon 'Historical' Literature," *JBL* 88 (1969), 129 ff.
- Croatto, J. S., "'Abrek' 'intendant' dans Gén. XLI, 41, 43," *VT* 16 (1966), 173 ff.

- Curtis, E. L., article on "Genealogy" in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, (ed. J. Hastings, et al.), II, (New York-Edinburgh, 1902), 121 ff.
- Dahood, M., "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography III," *Biblica* 46 (1965), 311 ff.
- Dahse, J., "Textkritische Studien II," *ZAW* 28 (1908), 161 ff.
- , *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage*, Giessen, 1912.
- Danell, G. A., *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*, Uppsala, 1946.
- Daressy, G., *Recueil de cônes fuméraires*, Cairo, 1892.
- , "Chapelle de Mentouhotep III à Dendérah," *ASAE* 17 (1917), 226 ff.
- Daube, D., "Concerning Methods of Biblical Criticism," *An. Or.* 17 (1949), 88 ff.
- , "Rechtsgedanken in den Erzählungen des Pentateuchs," *BZAW* (Berlin, 1958), 32 ff.
- Daumas, F., *Moyens d'expression du grec et de l'égyptien comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis*, Cairo, 1952.
- Davidson, A. B., *Hebrew Syntax*, Edinburgh, 1901.
- Davies, N. de G., *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna*, (6 vols.), Cairo, 1903-08.
- , "Akhenaten at Thebes," *JE A* 9 (1923), 132 ff.
- , *Two Ramesside Tombs at Thebes*, New York, 1927.
- , *The Tomb of Kenamun at Thebes*, New York, 1930.
- , "Tehuti: Owner of Tomb 110 at Thebes," *Studies Presented to F. Ll. Griffith*, (London, 1932), 279 ff.
- , *The Tomb of Nefer-hotep at Thebes*, New York, 1933.
- , *The Tomb of the Vizier Ramose*, London, 1941.
- De Pury, A., "Genèse xxxiv et l'histoire," *RB* 76 (1969), 5 ff.
- Derchain, P., *Le papyrus Salt 825*, Brussels, 1965.
- Dévaud, E., *Les maximes de Ptahhotep*, Freiburg, 1916.
- Dhorme, E., review of A. S. Yahuda, *The Language of the Pentateuch...*, *RB* 38 (1929), 441 ff.
- , "Le nom du dieu d'Israël," *RHR* 141 (1952), 5 ff.
- Dillmann, A., *Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded*, II, Edinburgh, 1897.
- Dion, H. M., "The Patriarchal Traditions and the Literary Form of the 'Oracle of Salvation'," *CBQ* 29 (1967), 198 ff.
- Donner, H., review of Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, *Bib. Or.* 18 (1961), 44 f.
- Dornseiff, F., "Antikes zum A.T.," *ZAW* 52 (1934), 57 ff.
- Drioton, E., "L'organisation économique de l'Égypte ancienne," *Cahiers d'histoire égyptienne*, ser. III (1950), 197 ff.
- , "Une liste de rois de la IVe dynastie," *BSFE* 16 (1954), 41 ff.
- Driver, G. R., "A Hebrew Burial Custom," *ZAW* 66 (1954), 314 ff.
- , "Two Problems in the Old Testament Examined in the Light of Assyriology," *Syria* 33 (1956), 70 ff.
- , *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Oxford, 1957.
- , "Hebrew Homonyms," *VT Suppl.* 16 (1967), 50 ff.
- Driver, S. R., article on "Joseph" in *A Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. J. Hastings, et al.), II, (New York-Edinburgh, 1902), 767 ff.
- , *The Book of Genesis*, (4th ed.), London, 1905.
- , *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, (2nd ed.), Oxford, 1913.
- , *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, New York, 1956.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré*, Paris, 1958.
- Ebbell, B., "Die ägyptischen Drogenamen," *ZÄS* 64 (1929), 48 ff.
- , "Die ägyptischen aromatischen Harze des Tempelinschriften von Edfu," *Acta Or.* 17 (1939), 89 ff.
- Ebers, G., *Aegypten und die Bücher Mose's*, I, Leipzig, 1868.
- Edgar, C. C., "Selected Papyri from the Archives of Zenon," *ASAE* 18 (1918), 159 ff.; 225 ff.; 22 (1922), 209 ff.; 23 (1923), 73 ff.; 187 ff.

- Edgerton, W. F., "The Government and the Governed in the Egyptian Empire," *JNES* 6 (1947), 152 ff.
- Edwards, I. E. S., *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Fourth Series. Oracular Amuletic Decrees of the Late New Kingdom*, London, 1960.
- Eerdmans, B. D., *Alttestamentliche Studien I. Die Komposition der Genesis*, Giessen, 1908.
- Ehrlich, A. B., *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel I. Genesis und Exodus*, Leipzig, 1908.
- Ehrlich, E. L., *Der Traum im alten Testament*, Berlin, 1953.
- Eichrodt, W., *Die Quellen der Genesis von neuem untersucht*, Leipzig, 1916.
- Eilers, W., "Akkad. *kaspum* 'Silber, Geld' und Sinnverwandtes," *WO* 2 (1957), 322 ff.
- Eising, H., *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Jakobserzählung der Genesis*, Emsdetten, 1940.
- Eisler, R., "Der bunte Rock Josephs," *OLZ* 11 (1908), 368 ff.
- Eissfeldt, O., *Hexateuch-Synopse*, Leipzig, 1922.
- , "Stammesgeschichte und Novelle in den Geschichten von Jakob und von seinem Söhnen," *EYXAPIETHPION*, I (1923), 56 ff.
- , "Die neueste Phase in der Entwicklung der Pentateuchkritik," *TbR NF* 18 (1950), 91 ff.
- , "El and Yahweh," *JSS* 1 (1956), 25 ff.
- , *Die Genesis der Genesis*, Tübingen, 1958.
- , review of Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, *OLZ* 55 (1960), 39 ff.
- , "Achronische, anachronische, und synchronische Elemente in der Genesis," *JEOL* 17 (1963), 148 ff.
- , "Jahwe, der Gott der Väter," *TLZ* 88 (1963), 481 ff.
- , *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, (3rd ed.), Tübingen, 1964.
- , "The Hebrew Kingdom," chapter 34 of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. II, Cambridge, 1965.
- Elliger, K., "Sinn und Ursprung der Priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung," *ZThK* 49 (1952), 121 ff.
- Erichsen, W., "Erwähnung eines Zuges nach Nubien unter Amasis in einem demotischen Text," *Klio* 34 (1942), 56 ff.
- , *Demotisches Glossar*, Copenhagen, 1954.
- Erman, A., "Zur Chronologie der Hyksos," *ZAS* 18 (1880), 125 ff.
- , *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, (5 vols. with reference vols.), Leipzig-Berlin, 1926-55.
- , *The Ancient Egyptians, a Source Book of their Writings*, (introduction by W. K. Simpson), New York, 1966.
- Fakhry, A., "A Note on the Tomb of Kheruef at Thebes," *ASAE* 42 (1943), 447 ff.
- Falk, Z. W., "Hebrew Legal Terms," *JSS* 5 (1960), 350 ff.
- Falkner, R. O., *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford, 1962.
- Fecht, G., *Wortakzent und Silbenstruktur. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache*, Hamburg-New York, 1960.
- Fensham, F. C., "A Cappadocian Parallel to Hebrew KUTÖNET," *VT* 12 (1962), 196 ff.
- Fitzmyer, J. A., "The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire I and II," *JAOS* 81 (1961), 178 ff.
- , *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, Rome, 1967.
- Fohrer, G., *Überlieferung und Geschichte der Exodus: eine Analyse von Ex. 1-15*, Berlin, 1964.
- , *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, (10th ed.), Heidelberg, 1965.
- Fowler, H. T., *A History of the Literature of Ancient Israel*, New York, 1912.

- Frankfort, H., *Kingship and the Gods*, Chicago, 1948.
- Freedman, D. N., "Old Testament Chronology," *apud* G. E. Wright (ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, (New York, 1965), 265 ff.
- Fritsch, C. T., "'God was with Him,'" *Interpretation* 9 (1955), 21 ff.
- Frost, S. B., *Patriarchs and Prophets*, Montreal, 1963.
- Gabra, S., *Les conseils de fonctionnaires dans l'Égypte pharaonique*, Cairo, 1929.
- Gardiner, Sir A. H., *The Library of A. Chester Beatty, I*, Oxford, 1931.
- , *Late Egyptian Stories*, Brussels, 1933.
- , *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Third Series (Chester Beatty Gift)*, London, 1935.
- , "A Lawsuit arising from the Purchase of Two Slaves," *JEA* 21 (1935), 140 ff.
- , *Late Egyptian Miscellanies*, Brussels, 1937.
- , "Ramesside Texts Relating to the Taxation and Transport of Corn," *JEA* 27 (1941), 19 ff.
- , *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, (3 vols.), London, 1947.
- , *The Wilbour Papyrus*, (3 vols.), London, 1948.
- , *The Royal Canon of Turin*, Oxford, 1959.
- , *Egyptian Grammar*, (3rd ed.), Oxford, 1960.
- , with N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Amenemhät*, London, 1915.
- , with N. de G. Davies, *The Tombs of Two Officials of Tutmosis IV*, London, 1923.
- , with N. de G. Davies, *The Tomb of Huy, Viceroy of Nubia in the Reign of Tutankhamun*, London, 1926.
- , with N. de G. Davies, *The Tombs of Menkheperasonb, Amenmosë and Another*, London, 1933.
- , with T. E. Peet and J. Černý, *The Inscriptions of Sinai*, (2 vols.), London, 1952-55.
- Gaster, T. H., *Thespis. Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East*, New York, 1961.
- Gautier, L., *Introduction à l'ancien testament*, I (2nd. ed.), Lausanne, 1914.
- Gauthier, H., *Le livre des rois d'Égypte*, III, Cairo, 1914.
- , *Dictionnaire des noms géographiques contenus dans les textes hiéroglyphiques*, (7 vols.), Cairo, 1925-31.
- Gelb, I. J., "Two Assyrian King Lists," *JNES* 13 (1954), 209 ff.
- Gemser, B., "Be'ēber hajjardēn: in Jordan's Borderland," *VT* 2 (1952), 349 ff.
- , "God in Genesis," in *Studies in the Book of Genesis*, (Leiden, 1958), 1 ff.
- , "The Instructions of 'Onksheshonqy and Biblical Wisdom Literature," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1959), 102 ff.
- Ghalioungui, P., *Magic and Medical Science in Ancient Egypt*, London, 1963.
- Giesebrecht, F., "Zur Hexateuchkritik: der Sprachgebrauch des hexateuchischen Elohisten," *ZAW* 1 (1881), 177 ff.
- Ginzberg, L., *The Legends of the Jews*, II, Philadelphia, 1910.
- Glanville, S. R. K., *The Instructions of 'Onksheshonqy*, London, 1955.
- Goedicke, H., "Considerations on the Battle of Kadesh," *JEA* 52 (1966), 71 ff.
- , *Königliche Dokumente aus dem Alten Reich*, Wiesbaden, 1967.
- Goettsberger, J., "Zu Genesis 37, 9-11," *MVAG* 22 (1917), 71 ff.
- Goldberg, A. M., "Joseph in der Sicht des Judentums der Antike," *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 11 ff.
- Good, E. M., "The 'Blessing' on Judah, Gen. 49: 8-12," *JBL* 82 (1963), 427 ff.
- , *Irony in the Old Testament*, Philadelphia, 1965.
- Goodspeed, E. J., *The Apocrypha, an American Translation*, Chicago, 1938.
- Gordon, C. H., "The Patriarchal Age," *JBR* 21 (1953), 238 ff.

- , "Sabbatical Cycle or Seasonal Pattern?" *Orientalia* 22 (1953), 79 ff.
- , *Ugaritic Manual*, Rome, 1955.
- , "Homer and the Bible: the Origin and Character of East Mediterranean Literature," *HUCA* 26 (1955), 43 ff.
- , *The World of the Old Testament*, New York, 1958.
- , *The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations*, New York, 1965.
- Graham, A. C., "Hebronite Tradition Behind P in Genesis," *JTS* 41 (1940), 140 ff.
- Graves, R., and Patai, R., *Hebrew Myths: the Book of Genesis*, New York, 1963.
- Gray, G. B., *A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, London, 1913.
- Gray, J., *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*, (2nd ed.), Leiden, 1964.
- Gray, M. P., "The Hâbirû-Hebrew Problem in the Light of the Source Material Available at Present," *HUCA* 29 (1958), 135 ff.
- Green, W. H., "The Pentateuchal Question. III. Gen. 37: 2-Ex. 12: 51," *Hebraica* 7 (1890), 1 ff.
- Greenfield, J. C., "The Etymology of נחמן ," *ZAW* 77 (1965), 90 ff.
- Gressmann, H., "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen," *ZAW* 30 (1910), 1 ff.
- , "Ursprung und Entwicklung der Joseph-sage," *EYXAPIETHPION* 1 (1923), 1 ff.
- Griffith, F. Ll., *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis*, Oxford, 1900.
- , *Catalogue of the Demotic Papyri in the Rylands Library at Manchester*, (3 vols.), Manchester, 1909.
- , "The Abydene Decree of Sety I," *JEA* 13 (1927), 193 ff.
- Griffiths, J. G., *The Conflict of Horus and Seth*, Liverpool 1960.
- Grintz, Y. M., "Potifar-The Chief Cook," *Leshônenu* 30 (1965), 12 ff.
- Gross, W., "Jakob, der Mann des Segens," *Biblica* 49 (1968), 321 ff.
- Gry, L., "La bénédiction de Joseph (Gen. XLIX, 22-27)," *RB* 14 (1917), 508 ff.
- Gunkel, H., *Die Sagen der Genesis*, Göttingen, 1901.
- , "Jakob," *Preussische Jahrbuch* 176 (1919), 339 ff.
- , *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen (das erste Buch Moses)*, Göttingen, 1921.
- , *Genesis*, (W. Nowack, *Göttinger Handkommentar zum A.T.*; 5th. ed.), Göttingen, 1922.
- , "Die Komposition der Josephgeschichte," *ZDMG* NF 1 (1922), 55 ff.
- , *The Legends of Genesis*, New York, 1964.
- Gunn, B., "The Decree of Amonrasonther for Neskhons," *JEA* 41 (1955), 83 ff.
- Gurney, O., *The Hittites*, Harmondsworth, 1965.
- Guthe, H., *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Leipzig-Tübingen, 1899.
- Habachi, L., "A Statue of Osiris Made for Ankhefenamun, Prophet of the House of Amun in Khapu, and His Daughter," *ASAE* 47 (1947), 261 ff.
- , "God's Fathers and the Role they Played in the History of the First Intermediate Period," *ASAE* 55 (1958), 167 ff.
- Hamada, A., "The Stela of Putiphar," *ASAE* 39 (1939), 273 ff.
- Hammond, P. C., "The Nabataean Bitumen Industry at the Dead Sea," *BA* 22 (1959), 40 ff.
- Haran, M., "Shiloh and Jerusalem," *JBL* 81 (1962), 14 ff.
- Harkavy, A., "Les mots égyptiens de la Bible," *JA* 6 (ser., 15, 1870), 178 ff.
- Harper, W. R., "The Pentateuchal Question. III. Gen. 37: 2-Ex. 12: 51," *Hebraica* 6 (1889), 1 ff.
- Harrelson, W., *Interpreting the Old Testament*, New York, 1964.
- Harrison, R. K., article on "Balm," in *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, I, 344.
- Hartmann, B., "'Es gibt keine Kraft und keine Macht ausser bei Gott.' Zur Kopula im hebräischen," *OTS* 14 (1965), 115 ff.
- Haupt, P., "Lea und Rachel," *ZAW* 29 (1909), 281 ff.

- Hayes, W. C., "Royal Decrees from the Temple of Min at Coptos," *JEA* 32 (1946), 3 ff.
- , *A Papyrus of the Late Middle Kingdom in the Brooklyn Museum*, Brooklyn, 1955.
- , "The Middle Kingdom in Egypt," chapter 20 of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. I, Cambridge, 1961.
- Heaton, E. W., "Sojourners in Egypt," *ET* 58 (1946), 80 ff.
- , "The Joseph Saga," *ET* 59 (1947), 134 ff.
- Heinisch, P., "Der Wechsel der Namen Jakob und Israel in der Genesis," *Z. f. Theologie und Seelsorge* 6 (1929), 115 ff.
- , *The History of the Old Testament*, St. Paul (Minn.), 1952.
- Helck, W., "Die Inschrift über die Belohnung des Hohenpriesters *Imn-htp*," *MIOF* 4 (1956), 161 ff.
- , *Zur Verwaltung des mittleren und neuen Reichs*, Leiden, 1958.
- , *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie, Übersetzung zu den Heften 17-22*, Berlin, 1961.
- , *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasiens*, Wiesbaden, 1962.
- Helm, R., *Die Chronik des Hieronymus (Hieronymi Chronicon)*, in *Eusebius Werke*, VII, Leipzig, 1913.
- Hempel, J., *Die althebräische Literatur und ihre Hellenistisch-Jüdisches Nachleben*, Potsdam, 1930.
- , "Glaube, Mythos, und Geschichte im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 65 (1953), 109 ff.
- , *Geschichten und Geschichte im Alten Testament bis zur persischen Zeit*, Gütersloh, 1964.
- Henry, M.-L., *Jahvist und Priesterschrift*, Stuttgart, 1960.
- Hermann, A., *Die ägyptische Königsnovelle*, Glückstadt, 1938.
- , "Jubel bei der Audienz," *ZÄS* 90 (1963), 49 ff.
- Herrmann, S., "Joseph in Ägypten: ein Wort zu J. Vergotes Buch 'Joseph en Égypte'," *TLZ* 85 (1960), 827 ff.
- , "Israel in Ägypten," *ZÄS* 91 (1964), 63 ff.
- Hilscher, E., "Der biblische Joseph in orientalischen Literaturwerken," *MIOF* 4 (1956), 81 ff.
- Hintze, F., *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache neuägyptischer Erzählungen*, Berlin, 1950.
- Hölscher, G., *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel: Untersuchungen zum Jahvisten und Elohisten*, Lund, 1952.
- , *Drei Erdkarten, ein Beitrag zur Erdkenntnis des hebräischen Altertums*, Heidelberg, 1949.
- Holt, J. M., *The Patriarchs of Israel*, Nashville, 1964.
- Holzinger, H., *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, Freiburg-Leipzig, 1893.
- , *Genesis, (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A.T., I)*, Freiburg, 1898.
- , "Nachprüfung von B. D. Eerdmans, Die Komposition der Genesis II," *ZAW* 31 (1911), 44 ff.
- Honeyman, A. M., "The Pottery Vessels of the Old Testament," *PEQ*, 1939, 76 ff.
- , "The Occasion of Joseph's Temptation," *VT* 2 (1952), 85 ff.
- Hooke, S. H., *In the Beginning*, Oxford, 1947.
- Hoonacker, A. Van, "Was Josef's beker (Genesis 44) een Tooverbeker?" *Isidoor Teirlinck Album*, (Louvain, 1931), 239 ff.
- Horowitz, J., *Die Josephserzählung*, Frankfurt, 1921.
- Hughes, G. R., "A Demotic Astrological Text," *JNES* 10 (1951), 256 ff.
- Hulst, A. R., "Der Jordan in den alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen," *OTS* 14 (1965), 162 ff.
- Humbert, P., "Die neuere Genesis-Forschungen," *TbR* NF 6 (1934), 147 ff., 207 ff.
- , "Die literarische Zweifelt des Priesterkodex in der Genesis," *ZAW* 58 (1940), 30 ff.

- , review of Martin, *Stylistic Criteria...*, *TbZ* 12 (1956), 564 ff.
- , *Opusculs d'un bébraisant*, Neuchatel, 1958.
- Jacob, E., *La Tradition historique en Israël*, Montpellier, 1946.
- Janssen, J., "Bemerkungen zur Hungersnot im Alten Ägypten," *Biblica* 20 (1939), 69 ff.
- , "Egyptological Remarks on the Story of Joseph," *JEOL* 14 (1955), 63 ff.
- , "Eine Beuteliste von Amenophis II und das Problem der Sklaverei im Alten Ägypten," *JEOL* 17 (1963), 141 ff.
- , "An Unusual Donation Stela of the Twentieth Dynasty," *JEA* 49 (1963), 64 ff.
- Jasper, F. N., "Early Israelite Traditions and the Psalter," *VT* 17 (1967), 50 ff.
- Jastrow, M., *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, London-New York, 1903.
- Jean, Ch.-f., Hoftijzer, J., *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest*, Leiden, 1965.
- Jensen, P., "Israel in Ägypten?" *OLZ* 28 (1925), 420 ff.
- Jepsen, A., "Zur Chronologie der Priesterkodex," *ZAW* 46 (1929), 251 ff.
- Jéquier, G., *Le Monument funéraire de Pépi II*, Cairo, 1938.
- Jeremias, A., *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, (2nd ed.), New York, 1911.
- Jirku, A., *Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im dritten und zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*, Leipzig, 1924.
- , "Doppelte Überlieferungen im Mythos und im Epos von Ugarit?" *ZDMG* NF 35 (1960), 20 ff.
- Josephus, *Contra Apionem*; Tr. W. Whiston, in *The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus*, (Philadelphia, no date), 858 ff.
- Joüon, P., *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*, (2nd ed.), Rome, 1947.
- Kaiser, O., "Stammesgeschichtliche Hintergründe der Josephsgeschichte: Erwägungen zur vor- und Frühgeschichte Israels," *VT* 10 (1960), 1 ff.
- Kapelrud, A. S., "The Date of the Priestly Code (P)," *ASTI* 3 (1964), 58 ff.
- , "The Number Seven in Ugaritic Texts," *VT* 18 (1968), 494 ff.
- Kaufmann, Y., "Der Kalendar und das Alter des Priesterkodex," *VT* 4 (1954), 307 ff.
- Kautzsch, E., Cowley, A. E., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, (2nd ed.), Oxford, 1910.
- Kees, H., *Das Priestertum im ägyptischen Staat vom neuen Reich bis zur Spätzeit*, Leiden, 1953.
- Keil, C. F., Delitzsch, F., *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, I. The Pentateuch*, Edinburgh, 1872.
- Keimer, L., "L'arbre fr.t... est-il réellement le saule égyptien (*salix safsaf* Forsk.)?" *BIFAO* 31 (1931), 177 ff.
- Kienitz, F. K., *Die politische Geschichte Ägyptens vom 7. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert vor der Zeitwende*, Berlin, 1953.
- Kitchen, K. A., "The Term *Nšq* in Genesis 41: 40," *ET* 69 (1957), 30.
- , review of Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, *JEA* 47 (1961), 158 ff.
- , article on "Joseph," in J. D. Douglas, *The New Bible Dictionary*, (London, 1962), 656 ff.
- , *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, London, 1966.
- Kittel, R., *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I, Gottha, 1923.
- Klostermann, A., *Der Pentateuch*, Leipzig, 1893.
- Koch, K., "Die Hebräer vom Auszug aus Ägypten bis zum Grossreich Davids," *VT* 19 (1969), 37 ff.
- Koefoed-Petersen, O., *Les siècles égyptiens*, Copenhagen, 1948.
- Köhler, L., "Hebräische Etymologien," *JBL* 59 (1940), 35 ff.

- , "Hebräische Vokabeln, III," *ZAW* 58 (1941), 228 ff.
- , Baumgartner, W., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, (two vols.), Leiden, 1953-67.
- Kohler, L., "Beobachtungen am hebräische und griechische Text von Jer. c. 1-9," *ZAW* 29 (1909), 1 ff.
- König, E., *Die Genesis*, (3rd ed.), Gütersloh, 1925.
- , "Die sprachliche Gestalt des Pentateuchs in ihrer Beziehung zur ägyptischen Sprache," *JBL* 48 (1929), 333 ff.
- Kopf, L., "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibel wörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959), 247 ff.
- Kornfeld, W., "L'adultère dans l'Orient antique," *RB* 57 (1950), 92 ff.
- Kraeling, E. G., "The Real Religion of Ancient Israel," *JBL* 47 (1928), 133 ff.
- , "The Origin of the Name 'Hebrews,'" *AJSJL* 58 (1941), 237 ff.
- , *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*, New Haven, 1953.
- , *Rand McNally Bible Atlas*, New York-Chicago-San Francisco, 1956.
- Kräutlein, J., *Die sprachlichen Verschiedenheit in den Hexateuchquellen*, Berlin, 1907.
- Krall, J., "Über den ägyptischen Namen Josephs," *Verhandl. d. 7. internat. Or.-Congress, Wien*, 1888, (Ägypt.-afrikan. Section), 110.
- Krappe, A. H., "Is the Story of Ahikar the Wise of Indian Origin?" *JAOS* 61 (1941), 280 ff.
- Kropat, A., *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, Giessen, 1909.
- Külling, S. R., *Zur Datierung der "Genesis-P-Stücke"*, Kampen, 1964.
- Kuenen, A., *An Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, London, 1886.
- Kuschke, A., "Die Lagervorstellung der priesterschriftlichen Erzählung," *ZAW* 63 (1951), 74 ff.
- Lachs, S. T., "An Egyptian Festival in Canticles Rabba," *JQR* 51 (1960), 47 ff.
- Lagarde, P. De, "Der Titel des Patriarchen Joseph," *Gött. gelerbt. Anz.*, 1889, 319 ff.
- Lambdin, T. O., *Egyptian Loan Words and Transcriptions in the Ancient Semitic Languages*, Baltimore, 1952.
- , "Egyptian Loan Words in the Old Testament," *JAOS* 73 (1953), 145 ff.
- Lambert, W. G., "Ancestors, Authors and Canonicity," *JCS* 11 (1957), 1 ff.
- , "The Domesticated Camel in the Second Millennium—Evidence from Alalakh and Ugarit," *BASOR* 160 (1960), 42 f.
- , *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, Oxford, 1964.
- Landes, G. M., article on "Ishmaelites," in *IBD*, II, (New York-Nashville, 1962), 748 ff.
- Landsberger B., "Akkadisch-Hebräische Wortgleichungen," *VT Suppl.* 16 (1967), 176 ff.
- Lange, H. O., *Das Weisheitsbuch des Amenemope*, Copenhagen, 1925.
- Lange, K., *Sesostris, ein ägyptische König in Mythos, Geschichte und Kunst*, Munich, 1954.
- Lansing, J. G., "The Egyptian Name of Joseph," *Hebraica* 4 (1888), 44 f.
- Leander, P., "Einige Bemerkungen zur Quellenscheidung der Josephsgeschichte," *ZAW* 17 (1897), 195 ff.
- Lebram, J. C. H., "Nachbiblische Weisheitstraditionen," *VT* 15 (1965), 167 ff.
- Leclant, J., *Recherches sur les monuments thébains de la XXVe dynastie dite éthiopienne*, Cairo, 1965.
- Lefebvre, G., "Statue de Zedher le sauveur," *ASAE* 18 (1918), 113 ff.
- , *Inscriptions concernant les grands prêtres d'Amon Romé-Roy et Amonhotep*, Paris, 1929.
- , *Romans et contes égyptiens de l'époque tharaonique*. Paris. 1949

- Legrain, G., "Renseignements sur les dernières découvertes faites à Karnak," *RT* 27 (1905), 61 ff.
- , "Le dossier de la famille Nibnoutirou," *RT* 30 (1908), 73 ff., 160 ff.
- Lehming, S., "Zur Erzählung von der Geburt der Jakobsöhne," *VT* 13 (1963), 74 ff.
- Lepsius, R., *Denkmaeler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, Berlin, 1849-59.
- Lewy, J., "Origin and Signification of the Biblical Term 'Hebrew'," *HUCA* 28 (1957), 1 ff.
- Lichtheim, M., "Notes on the Late Egyptian Conjunctive," in *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H. J. Polotsky*, (Jerusalem, 1964), 1 ff.
- Lieblein, J., "Mots égyptiens dans la bible," *PSBA* 20 (1898), 204 ff.
- , *Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de l'ancienne Égypte*, Leipzig, 1910-14.
- Leibovitch, J., "Une amulette égyptienne au nom de Putiphar," *ASAE* 43 (1943), 87 ff.
- , "Un titre curieux de Thoutmosis III," *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H. J. Polotsky*, (Jerusalem, 1964), 17 ff.
- Lietzmann, H., article on "Hippolytos," in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, VIII, (Stuttgart, 1913), 1865 ff.
- Lindblom, J., "Theophanies in Holy Places in Hebrew Religion," *HUCA* 32 (1961), 91 ff.
- Lods, A., *Israël des origines au milieu du viii^e siècle*, Paris, 1930.
- , *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, Paris, 1950.
- Löhr, M., *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem I. Der Priesterkodex in Genesis*, Giessen, 1924.
- , "Zum Hexateuchproblem," *OLZ* 29 (1926), 4 ff.
- Løkkegaard, F., "Some Comments on the Sanchuniaton Tradition," *Studia Theologica* 8 (1954), 51 ff.
- Loukianoff, G., "Le dieu Ched, l'évolution de son culte dans l'ancienne Égypte," *BIE* 13 (1931), 67 ff.
- Lucas, A., *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, (3rd ed.), London, 1948.
- Lüthe, M., *Volksmärchen und Volkssage*, Bern-Munich, 1961.
- Luria, S., "Die ägyptische Bibel (Joseph- und Mosesage)," *ZAW* 44 (1926), 94 ff.
- Lutz, H. F., "The Egyptian Archetype of Saphⁿnath Paⁿneah and Psontomphanex," *University of California Publications in Semitic Philology*, 10 (no. 15; 1945), 289 ff.
- MacAdam, M. F. Laming, *The Temples of Kawa*, I, London, 1949.
- MacDonald, D. B., *The Hebrew Literary Genius*, Princeton, 1933.
- MacLaurin, E. C. B., "Shaddai," *Abr Nabaraim* 3 (1961-2), 99 ff.
- Mahler, E., "Zu Genesis XLI," *ZDMG* 61 (1907), 625 ff.
- Malaise, M., "Sésostri, Pharaon de légende et d'histoire," *CdE* 41 (1966), 244 ff.
- Malamat, A., "King Lists of the Old Babylonian Period and Biblical Genealogies," *JAOs* 88 (1968), 163 ff.
- Malinine, M., "Une vente d'esclave à l'époque de Psammétique Ier," *RdE* 5 (1946), 119 ff.
- Mariette, A., *Le Sérapéum de Memphis*, Paris, 1882.
- Martin, W. J., *Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch*, London, 1955.
- Maspero, Sir G. C. C., *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique. II. Les premières mêlées*, Paris, 1897.
- , review of K. Sethe, *Sesostris*, in *Jds* 1901, 593 ff., 665 ff.
- May, H. G., "The Evolution of the Joseph Story," *AJSJL* 47 (1930), 83 ff.
- , "Pattern and Myth in the Old Testament," *Journal of Religion* 21 (1941), 285 ff.
- Maestre, C., "Le livre de la vache du ciel," *BIFAO* 40 (1941), 53 ff.

- Mazar, B., "The Historical Background of the Book of Genesis," *JNES* 28 (1969), 73 ff.
- McCullough, W. S., *Psalms, (Interpreter's Bible, IV)*, New York-Nashville, 1955.
- Meek, T. J., "Aaronites and Zadokites," *AJSJL* 45 (1929), 149 ff.
- , "Translating the Hebrew Bible," *JBL* 79 (1960), 328 ff.
- Meinhold, J., "Die jahwistischen Berichte in Gen. 12-50," *ZAW* 39 (1921), 42 ff.
- Mendelsohn, I., *Slavery in the Ancient Near East*, New York, 1949.
- , "A Ugaritic Parallel to the Adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh," *IEJ* 9 (1959), 180 ff.
- Mendenhall, G., "Biblical History in Transition," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, (New York, 1965), 27 ff.
- Merwe, B. J. Van Der, "Joseph as Successor of Jacob," in *Studia Biblica et Semitica*, (Wageningen, 1966), 221 ff.
- Meulenaere, H. De, "Cultes et sacerdoce à Imaou (Kôm el-Hisn) au temps des dynasties saïte et perse," *BIFAO* 62 (1964), 151 ff.
- , "La statue du général Djed-Ptah-iouf-anh (Cairo JE 36949)," *BIFAO* 63 (1965), 19 ff.
- Meyer, E., "Der Stamm Jakob und die Entstehung der israelitischen Stämme," *ZAW* 6 (1886), 1 ff.
- , *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, Halle, 1906.
- Mogensen, M., *La Glyptothek Ny Carlsberg: la collection égyptienne*, Copenhagen, 1930.
- Montet, P., *La Nécropole royale de Tanis. III. Les constructions et le tombeau de Chéchanq III*, Paris, 1960.
- Montgomery, J. A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, (ICC), New York, 1927.
- Moore, G. F., *The Literature of the Old Testament*, London, 1913.
- Morenz, S., "Die ägyptische Literatur und die Umwelt," in *Handbuch der Orientalistik. I. Ägyptologie, 2. Literatur*, (Leiden, 1952), 194 ff.
- , "Joseph in Ägypten," *TLZ* 84 (1959), 401 ff.
- , *Ägyptische Religion*, Stuttgart, 1960.
- , "Ägyptische Spuren in den Septuaginta," in *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser*, I, (Münster Westfalen, 1964), 250 ff.
- Morgan, J. De, *Fouilles à Dabchour*, I, Vienna, 1895.
- Mowinkel, S., "'Rahelstämme' und 'Leastämme'," in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran*, (Berlin, 1958), 129 ff.
- , *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, Oxford, 1962.
- , "Israelite Historiography," *ASTI* 2 (1963), 4 ff.
- Müller, W. M., *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern*, Leipzig, 1893.
- , "Ägyptologisch-Biblisches," *OLZ* 3 (1900), 325 ff.
- Muilenburg, J., "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," *VT Suppl.* 1 (1953), 97 ff.
- , "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle ׀ in the Old Testament," *HUCA* 32 (1961), 135 ff.
- Naville, E., *The Festival Hall of Osorkon II in the Great Temple of Bubastis*, London, 1892.
- , "The Egyptian Name of Joseph," *JEA* 12 (1926), 16 ff.
- , Griffith, F. Ll., *The City of Onias and the Mound of the Jew: the Antiquities of Tell-el-Yâbdiyeh*, London, 1890.
- Nelson, H. H., "The Identity of Amon-re of United-with-Eternity," *JNES* 1 (1942), 127 ff.
- Newberry, P. E., "The Shepherd's Crook and the so-called 'Flail' or 'Scourge' of Osiris," *JEA* 15 (1929), 84 ff.

- Nielsen, E., *Shechem, a Traditio-historical Investigation*, Copenhagen, 1955.
- Nötscher, F., "Heisst KABÖD auch 'Seele'?" *VT* 2 (1952), 358 ff.
- North, C. R., "Pentateuchal Criticism," in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, (London, 1951), 48 ff.
- Noth, M., *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der Gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*, Stuttgart, 1928.
- , *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, Stuttgart, 1948.
- , *Exodus, a Commentary*, London, 1962.
- , *The Old Testament World*, London, 1964.
- Oesterley, W. O., *The Psalms*, London, 1939.
- , Robinson, T., *Hebrew Religion, its Origin and Development*, London, 1930.
- Offord, J., "Archaeological Notes on Jewish Antiquities, L. Coptic Terms and the Old Testament," *PEFQ* 50 (1918), 137 f.
- , "The Princes of the Bakers and the Cup-bearers," *PEFQ* 50 (1918), 139 ff.
- Oppenheim, A. L., *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*, (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 46/3).
- , and others, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, IV, Chicago, 1958.
- Otto, E., *Die biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, Leiden, 1954.
- Ouellette, J., "More on 'El šadday and Bēl šadē,'" *JBL* 88 (1969), 470 f.
- Parzen, H., "The Problem of the Ibrim ('Hebrews') in the Bible," *AJSL* 49 (1933), 254 ff.
- Palache, J. L., *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon*, Leiden, 1959.
- Parker, R. A., *A Saite Oracle Papyrus From Thebes*, Providence, 1962.
- , "King Py, a Historical Problem," *ZAS* 93 (1966), 111 ff.
- Paton, L. B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther*, (ICC), New York, 1908.
- Peake, A. S., *The People of the Book*, Oxford, 1925.
- , *A Commentary on the Bible*, London-Edinburgh, 1931.
- Peet, T. E., *Egypt and the Old Testament*, London, 1922.
- , review of Yahuda, *The Language of the Pentateuch...*, *JEA* 16 (1930), 157 ff.
- Pellegrini, A., "Glanures," *RT* 20 (1898), 86 ff.
- Petrie, Sir W. M. F., *The Royal Tombs of the First Dynasty*, London, 1900.
- , *The Royal Tombs of the Earliest Dynasties*, London, 1901.
- , *Gizeh and Rifeh*, London, 1907.
- Pfeiffer, R. H., *Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York, 1948.
- Philonenko, M., "Initiations et mystères dans Joseph et Asenath," in *Initiation*, (Studies in the History of Religions, X; Leiden, 1965), 147 ff.
- Piankoff, A., *The Shrines of Tut-ankh-amon*, New York, 1962.
- Pleyte, W., Rossi, F., *Les papyrus de Turin*, Leiden, 1869-76.
- Ploeg, J. Van der, "Studies in Hebrew Law," *CBQ* 12 (1950), 248 ff.
- Poebel, A., "The Assyrian King List from Khorsabad," *JNES* 1 (1942), 247 ff., 460 ff.; 2 (1943), 56 ff.
- Porter, B., Moss, R., *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*, I, (2nd ed.), Oxford, 1960.
- Porter, J. R., *Moses and Monarchy*, Oxford, 1963.
- Posener, G., *La première domination perse en Égypte*, Cairo, 1936.
- , *Princes et pays d'Asie et de Nubie*, Brussels, 1940.
- , "Les douanes de la Méditerranée dans l'Égypte Saïte," *Revue de philologie* 21 (1947), 117 ff.
- , "Les textes d'envoûtement de Mirgissa," *Syria* 43 (1966), 277 ff.
- Post, G. E., article on "Balm," in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, (ed. J. Hastings, et al.), I, (New York-Edinburgh, 1902), 235 ff.

- Prašek, J. V., "The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East," *ET* 16 (1904), 68 ff.
- Préaux, C., *L'économie royale des Lagides*, Brussels, 1939.
- , "Les prescriptions médicales des ostraka grecs de la Bibliothèque Bodléienne," *CdE* 31 (1956), 135 ff.
- Prebatsch, H., *Die Josephgeschichte in der Weltliteratur*, Breslau, 1937.
- Procksch, O., *Das Nordhebräische Sagenbuch: die Elohimquelle*, Leipzig, 1906.
- , *Die Genesis*, (Kommentar zum A.T.... ed. E. Sellin), Leipzig, 1913.
- Rabin, C., "Etymological Miscellanea," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961), 384 ff.
- Rad, G. Von, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, Berlin, 1934.
- , *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs*, Stuttgart, 1938.
- , "Josephsgeschichte und ältere Chokma," *VT Suppl.* 1 (1953), 120 ff.
- , *Die Josephsgeschichte*, Neukirchen, 1956.
- , *Genesis*, (SCM: The Old Testament Library), London, 1959.
- , "History and the Patriarchs," *ET* 72 (1960), 213 ff.
- Raeder, S., "Die Josephgeschichte im Koran und im Alten Testament," *Evangelische Theologie* 26 (1966), 169 ff.
- Ranke, H., *Die altägyptischen Personennamen*, (2 vols.), Glückstadt, 1935-53.
- Redford, D. B., "Exodus 1: 11," *VT* 13 (1963), 401 ff.
- , "The Land of the Hebrews in Genesis 40: 15," *VT* 15 (1965), 529 ff.
- , "On the Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty," *JNES* 25 (1966), 113 ff.
- , *The History and Chronology of the Egyptian Eighteenth Dynasty, Seven Studies*, Toronto, 1967.
- , "The Literary Motif of the Exposed Child (cf. Ex. ii, 1-10)," *Numen* 14 (1967), 209 ff.
- Reiner, E., "The Etiological Myth of the 'Seven Sages'," *Orientalia* 30 (1961), 1 ff.
- Riessler, R., "Zu Rosenthal's Aufsatz Bd. XV, S. 278 ff.," *ZAW* 16 (1896), 182.
- Robinson, T. H., *A History of Israel*, I, Oxford, 1932.
- Roeder, G., *Die Denkmäler des Pelizaeus Museums zu Hildesheim, III. Kunst und Altertum*, Berlin, 1921.
- , *Der Felsentempel von Bêt el-Wali*, Cairo, 1938.
- , *Die ägyptische Götterwelt*, Zürich, 1959.
- , *Ägyptische Mythen und Legenden*, Zürich, 1960.
- Rose, H. J., article on "Bellerophon" in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, (London, 1949), 134.
- Rosenthal, L. A., "Die Josephsgeschichte mit den Büchern Ester und Daniel verglichen," *ZAW* 15 (1895), 278 ff.
- , "Nochmals der Vergleich Ester, Joseph-Daniel," *ZAW* 17 (1897), 125 ff.
- Rost, L., "Zur geschichtlichen Ort der Pentateuchquellen," *ZThK* 53 (1956), 1 ff.
- , "Die Gottesverehrung der Patriarchen im Lichte der Pentateuchquellen," *VT Suppl.* 7 (1960), 346 ff.
- Roth, W. M. W., "Hinterhalt und Scheinflucht der stammespolemische Hintergrund von Jos. 8," *ZAW* 75 (1963), 296 ff.
- Rowe, A., "New Light on Objects Belonging to the Generals Potosimto and Amasis in the Egyptian Museum," *ASAE* 38 (1939), 157 ff.
- , "The Famous Solar City of On," *PEFQ* 1962, 133 ff.
- Rowley, H. H., *From Joseph to Joshua. Biblical Traditions in the Light of Archaeology*, London, 1950.
- , *The Growth of the Old Testament*, Oxford, 1950.
- Rudolph, W., Volz, P., *Der Elobist als Erzähler: ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?* Leipzig, 1933.

- Ruppert, L., *Die Josephserzählung der Genesis*, Munich, 1965.
- , "Göttliches und menschliches Handeln Form und Inhalt der Josephsgeschichte," *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), 1 ff.
- Säve-Söderbergh, T., *Four Eighteenth Dynasty Tombs*, Oxford, 1957.
- Sandman, M., *Texts from the Time of Akhenaten*, Brussels, 1938.
- Sandmel, S., "The Haggada Within Scripture," *JBL* 80 (1961), 105 ff.
- , *The Hebrew Scriptures, an Introduction to their Literature and Religious Ideas*, New York, 1963.
- Sarna, N. H., *Understanding Genesis*, New York, 1966.
- Sauneron, S., Yoyotte, J., "Sur la politique palestinienne des rois saïtes," *VT* 2 (1952), 131 ff.
- Sauneron, S., "Les possédés," *BIFAO* 60 (1960), 111 ff.
- Sayce, A. H., "An Archaeological Commentary on Genesis," *ET* 10 (1898), 75 ff.; 171 ff.; 418 ff.; 551 ff.
- Schäfer, H., "Die Auswanderung der Krieger unter Psammetich I und der Söldneraufstand in Elephantine unter Apries," *Klio* 4 (1904), 152 ff.
- Scharbert, J., *Fleisch, Geist, und Seele in Pentateuch*, Stuttgart, 1966.
- Schedl, C., "Worte und Zahlen. Neuer Zugang zu den Genesisquellen," *ZAW* 77 (1965), 259 ff.
- Schott, S., *Wall Scenes From the Mortuary Chapel of the Mayor Paser at Medinet Habu*, Chicago, 1957.
- , "Wörter für Rollsiegel und Ring," *WZKM* 54 (1957), 177 ff.
- Schottroff, W., "Gedenken im alten Orient und im alten Testament," Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964.
- Schulman, A. R., "Some Observations on the Military Background of the Amarna Period," *JARCE* 3 (1964), 51 ff.
- Schulz, A., "Eli'ezer?" *ZAW* 52 (1934), 274 ff.
- , "Drei Anmerkungen zur Genesis," *ZAW* 59 (1943), 184 ff.
- Schunck, K.-D., *Benjamin: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Geschichte eines israelitischen Stammes*, Berlin, 1963.
- Schwarz, J., "Notes sur l'archéologie des LXX," *RdE* 8 (1951), 195 ff.
- Seale, M. S., "The Glosses in the Book of Genesis and the JE Theory," *ET* 67 (1956), 333 ff.
- Seebass, H., *Der Erzvater Israels*, Berlin, 1966.
- Seeligmann, I. L., "Zur Terminologie für das Gerichtsverfahren im Wortschatz des biblischen Hebräisch," *VT Suppl.* 16 (1967), 251 ff.
- Seeters, A. Van, *The Use of the Story of Joseph in Scripture*, (Doctoral Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.).
- Segal, M. H., "El, Elohim and Yhwh in the Bible," *JQR* 46 (1955), 89 ff.
- , "The Composition of the Pentateuch: a Fresh Examination," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961), 68 ff.
- , "The Religion of Israel Before Sinai," *JQR* 52 (1961), 41 ff.
- Selincourt, A. De, *Herodotus, The Histories*, Harmondsworth, 1954.
- Sellin, E., *Geschichte des israelitisch-judäischen Volkes*, I, Leipzig, 1924.
- Seters, A. Van, *The Hyksos, A New Investigation*, New Haven-London, 1966.
- Sethe, K., *Sesostris*, Leipzig, 1900.
- , *Urkunden des alten Reichs*, (*Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, I), Leipzig, 1932-33.
- , Helck, W., *Urkunden der 18. Dynastie*, (*Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*, IV), Leipzig, 1906-58.
- , "Die Berufung eines Hohenpriesters des Amon unter Ramses II," *ZÄS* 44 (1907), 30 ff.
- , *Die Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten*, Berlin, 1926.

- , "Die Türteile *bnt* und 'rj.t,'" *ZÄS* 67 (1931), 115 ff.
- Shack-Schackenburg, H., "Genesis 41, 45," *ZÄS* 30 (1892), 49 f.
- Shore, A. F., Smith, H. S., "A Demotic Embalmer's Agreement (Pap. Dem. B.M. 10561)," *Acta Or.* 25 (1960), 276 ff.
- Sidersky, D., "Le songe de pharaon," *JA* 1921, I, 175.
- Simons, J., *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*, Leiden, 1937.
- , *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*, Leiden, 1959.
- Simpson, C. A., *The Early Traditions of Israel*, Oxford, 1948.
- , *Introduction and Exegesis in The Book of Genesis*, (*The Interpreter's Bible*, I), New York-Nashville, 1952.
- Skinner, J., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, (2nd. ed.; ICC), Edinburgh, 1930.
- , *The Divine Names in Genesis*, London, 1914.
- Slaby, J., "Gn. 41, 41-42 und die altägyptischen Denkmäler," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 16 (1924), 18 ff.
- Smend, R., *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht*, Berlin, 1912.
- Smith, H. S., "A Note on Amnesty," *JEA* 54 (1968), 209 ff.
- Smith, S., *The Statue of Idrimi*, London, 1949.
- Smith, W. S., "The Old Kingdom in Egypt," Chapter 14 of *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. I, Cambridge, 1962.
- , *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East*, Hartford, 1965.
- Speiser, E. A., "The Verb *SHR* in Genesis and Early Hebrew Movements," *BASOR* 164 (1961), 23 ff.
- , "Man; Ethnic Divisions of," in *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, III, 235 ff.
- , *Genesis*, (The Anchor Bible), New York, 1964.
- Spiegel, J., *Die Erzählung vom Streite des Horus und Seth in Pap. Beatty I als Literaturwerke*, Glückstadt-Hamburg-New York, 1937.
- Spiegelberg, W., "Die Enthauptung in alten Ägypten," *OLZ* 2 (1899), 364 ff.
- , "The Hieratic Text in Mariette's *Karnak*, pl. 46; a Contribution to the History of the Veziers of the New Empire," *PSBA* 24 (1902), 320 ff.
- , *Ägyptologische Randglossen zum Alten Testament*, Strasbourg, 1904.
- , *Die Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Monumente*, Strasbourg, 1904.
- , *Die demotischen Denkmäler, II. Die demotischen Papyrus*, (Cairo, Catalogue général du musée égyptien), Strasbourg, 1908.
- , *Demotische Texte auf Kriegen*, Leipzig, 1912.
- , "Demotische Kleinigkeiten," *ZÄS* 54 (1918), 111 ff.
- , "Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jakob (Gen. 50: 2 ff.) im Lichte der ägyptischen Quellen," *OLZ* 26 (1923), 421 ff.
- Sprödowsky, H., *Die Hellenisierung der Geschichte von Joseph in Ägypten bei Flavius Josephus*, Greifswald, 1937.
- Stade, B., "Lea und Rahel," *ZAW* 1 (1881), 112 ff.
- , *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, I, Berlin, 1887.
- Staples, W. E., "Cultic Motifs in Hebrew Thought," *AJSJL* 54 (1937), 44 ff.
- Steindorff, G., "Der Name Josephs Saphenat-Pa'neach," *ZÄS* 27 (1898), 41 ff.
- , "Weiteres zu Genesis 41, 45," *ZÄS* 30 (1892), 50 ff.
- Steinmann, J., *Les plus anciennes traditions des Pentateuque*, Paris, 1954.
- Steuernagel, C., *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan*, Berlin, 1901.
- Stoebe, H. J., "Gut und Böse in der jahwistischen Quelle der Pentateuch," *ZAW* 65 (1953), 188 ff.
- Stricker, B. H., "La prison de Joseph," *Acta Or.* 19 (1943), 101 ff.
- Stuhlmüller, C., review of Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, in *CBQ* 21 (1959), 363 ff.

- Sturtevant, E. H., Bechtel, G., *A Hittite Chrestomathie*, Philadelphia, 1935.
- Tadmor, H., "Que and Musri," *IEJ* 11 (1961), 143 ff.
- Talmon, S., "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 8 (1961), 335 ff.
- , "Wisdom in the Book of Esther," *VT* 13 (1963), 419 ff.
- , "The 'Desert Motif' in the Bible and in Qumran Literature," in *Biblical Motifs, Origins and Transformations*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 31 ff.
- Thacker, T. W., *The Relationship of the Semitic and Egyptian Verbal Systems*, Oxford, 1954.
- Thompson, Sir H., "Two Demotic Self-dedications," *JEA* 26 (1940), 68 ff.
- Thompson, S., *Motif-Index of Folk-literature*, vol. V, Bloomington, 1935.
- , *The Folk Tale*, New York, 1951.
- Trevor, J. C., article on "Gum," in *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, II, 502.
- Tscherikower, V., "Palestine Under the Ptolemies," *Mizraim* 4 (1937), 9 ff.
- Tushingham, A. D., "A Reconsideration of Hosea, Chapters 1-3," *JNES* 12 (1953), 150 ff.
- Ungnad, A., "Joseph, der Tartan des Pharao," *ZAW* 41 (1923), 204 ff.
- Uphill, E., "The Stela of 'Ankhefenmut,'" *JEA* 43 (1957), 1 f.
- , "The Egyptian Sed-Festival Rites," *JNES* 24 (1965), 365 ff.
- Vandier, J., *Manuel d'archéologie égyptienne*, vol. IV, no. 1; Paris, 1964.
- Vaux, R. De, "A propos du second centenaire d'Astruc: réflexions sur l'état actuel de la critique du Pentateuque," *VT Suppl.* 1 (1953), 182 ff.
- , *Les institutions de l'ancien testament*, (2 vols.), Paris, 1961.
- , "Les patriarches hébreux et l'histoire," *RB* 72 (1965), 3 ff.
- Vawter, B., "Response to Arvid S. Kapelrud's 'The Role of the Cult in Old Israel,'" in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible and Modern Scholarship*, (Nashville-New York, 1965), 64 ff.
- Vergote, J., "Bible et Égyptologie: la fonction de Potiphar," *BSFE* 25 (1958), 5 ff.
- , *Joseph en Égypte: Génèse ch. 37-50 à la lumière des études égyptologiques récentes*, Louvain, 1959.
- Vermes, G., *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, Leiden, 1961.
- Vikentiev, V., "Le dernier conte de Shahrazade..., et ses sources anciennes," *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Cairo*, 1955, 111 ff.
- Volten, A., *Demotische Traumdeutung*, Copenhagen, 1942.
- , *Zwei altägyptische politische Schriften*, Copenhagen, 1945.
- Völter, D., *Die Patriarchen Israels im Licht der Ägyptischen Mythologie*, Leipzig, 1921.
- Waerden, B. L. Van der, "History of the Zodiac," *Afo* 16 (1953), 216 ff.
- Wagner, N. E., *A Literary Analysis of Genesis 12-36*, (University of Toronto Doctoral Dissertation; Toronto, 1965).
- , "Pentateuchal Criticism: No Clear Future," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 13 (1967), 225 ff.
- Wainwright, G. A., "Merneptah's Aid to the Hittites," *JEA* 46 (1960), 24 ff.
- Walker, N., "A New Interpretation of the Divine Name 'Shaddai,'" *ZAW* 72 (1960), 64 ff.
- Walle, B. Van de, "Les songes d'Horus' mentionnés dans Dion Chrysostom," *CdE* 18 (1942), 264.
- Ward, W. A., "Egyptian Titles in Genesis 39-50," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 114 (1957), 41 ff.
- , "The Egyptian Office of Joseph," *JSS* 5 (1960), 144 ff.
- , "Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean in the Early Second Millennium B.C.," *Orientalia* 30 (1961), 22 ff.; 129 ff.
- , "Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean from Predynastic Times to the End of the Old Kingdom," *JESHO* 6 (1963), 1 ff.

- , "Notes on Some Semitic Loanwords and Personal Names in Late Egyptian," *Orientalia* 32 (1963), 413 ff.
- Waterman, L., "Some Repercussions from Late Levitical Genealogical Accretions in P and the Chronicler," *AJSL* 58 (1941), 49 ff.
- Weidner, E., "Hof- und Harems-Erlasse assyrischer Könige aus dem 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.," *Afo* 17 (1956), 257 ff.
- Weill, R., *Les décrets royaux de l'ancien empire égyptien*, Paris, 1912.
- , "L'installation des Israélites en Palestine et la légende des Patriarches," *RHR* 87 (1922), 69 ff.; 88 (1923), 1 ff.
- , "Le poème de Keret et l'histoire," *JA* 229 (1937), 1 ff.
- , "La légende des patriarches et l'histoire," *RES* 1937, 145 ff.
- Weinfeld, M., "Deuteronomy—the Present State of Inquiry," *JBL* 86 (1967), 249 ff.
- Weippert, M., "Erwägungen zur Etymologie des Gottesnamens 'El Saddaj,'" *ZDMG* 111 (1961), 42 ff.
- Weiser, A., *The Psalms*, (SCM Old Testament Library), London, 1959.
- , *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, New York, 1961.
- Wellesley, K., *Tacitus, The Histories*, Harmondsworth, 1964.
- Wellhausen, J., *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testament*, Berlin, 1899.
- , *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, New York, 1957.
- Wente, E. F., review of Gardiner, *The Kadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*, *JNES* 22 (1963), 204 ff.
- Whybray, R. N., "The Joseph Story and Pentateuchal Criticism," *VT* 18 (1968), 522 ff.
- Wiedemann, A., *Ägyptische Geschichte*, Gottha, 1884.
- Wiener, H. M., *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, London, 1912.
- , *Pentateuchal Studies*, Oberlin, 1912.
- , "The Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch in the Light of Textual Criticism," *OLZ* 30 (1927), 1 ff.
- Williams, R. J., *An Outline of Hebrew Syntax*, Toronto, 1965.
- , review of R. A. Parker, *A Vienna Demotic Papyrus on Eclipse- and Lunar Omina*, *JNES* 25 (1966), 68 ff.
- Wilson, J., "The Oath in Ancient Egypt," *JNES* 7 (1948), 129 ff.
- , *The Burden of Egypt*, Chicago, 1951.
- Winckler, H., *Abraham als Babylonier, Joseph als Ägypter: der weltgeschichtlicher Hintergrund der biblischen Vätergeschichten*, Leipzig, 1903.
- Winnett, F. V., "A Brief Comment on Genesis 37: 22," *Bulletin of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies* 12 (1947), 13.
- , "Re-examining the Foundations," *JBL* 84 (1965), 1 ff.
- Wintermute, O. S., "Joseph Son of Jacob," in *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, (New York-Nashville, 1962), II, 981 ff.
- Wolf, C. U., "Eunuch," in *The Interpreter's Bible Dictionary*, (New York-Nashville, 1962), II, 179 f.
- Wolf, W., "Papyrus Bologna 1086: ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des Neuen Reichs," *ZAS* 65 (1930), 89 ff.
- Wreszinski, W., "Die Kinder Israel in Ägypten," *Deutsche Rundschau* 199 (1924), 251 ff.
- , *Atlas zur altägyptische Kulturgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1923-40.
- Wright, G. E., "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: History and the Patriarchs," *ET* 71 (1959-60), 292 ff.
- , (ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, New York, 1965.
- , *Biblical Archaeology*, (2nd ed.), London, 1962.

- Yadin, Y., "The Earliest Record of Egypt's Military Penetration into Asia," *IEJ* 5 (1955), 1 ff.
 Yahuda, A. S., *The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian*, Oxford, 1933.
 Yaron, R., "Redemption of Persons in the Ancient Near East," *Revue internationale des droits de l'Antiquité* 6 (1959), 155 ff.
 Yeivin, S., "Ya'qob'el," *JEJ* 45 (1959), 16 ff.
 —, "Early Contacts between Canaan and Egypt," *IEJ* 10 (1960), 193 ff.
 —, "The Exodus," *Tarbiz* 30 (1960-61), 1 ff.
 —, "The Ceremonial Slate Palette of King Narmer," *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics in Honour of H. J. Polotsky*, (Jerusalem, 1964), 22 ff.
 Žaba, Z., *Les maximes de Ptahhotep*, Prague, 1956.
 Zandee, J., "Iosephus contra Apionem: An Apocryphal Story of Joseph in Coptic," *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961), 193 ff.
 Zimmermann, F., "Some Textual Studies in Genesis," *JBL* 73 (1954), 97 ff.
 Zobel, H.-J., *Stammespruch und Geschichte*, Berlin, 1965.

INDEXES

SUBJECT INDEX

- Abel 3, 88
 Abel-misrayim 26 n. 3
 Abimelek 90, 247 n. 4
 Abraham 4 n.1, 13f, 110, 129 n.1, 160, 247 n. 4, 250 n. 5
 Abram 4
 Absalom 232
 Achaemenid Persia 206
 Adam 13
 Adonis 100
Aegyptiaca 239
 actiology 163, 167, 182, 246
 Agrarian reforms 181f, 236ff
 Ahikar 95, 97, 204 n. 5, 226
 Ahmose 188
 Akhenaten 213ff, 223, 228
 Akhetaten 217
 allegorical dreams 90f
 Amarna Period 209, 213, 218
 Amenemhet 124, 154
 Amenemhet II 94
 Amenemhet III 196
 Amenemope 95, 102, 124ff, 212
 Amenemopet 7
 Amenhotpe II 198, 222f
 Amenhotpe III 198, 215 n. 4, 222
 Amenhotpe 213, 216, 220 n. 2
 Amenhotpe, First King's Son 216 n.1
 Amenhotpe Si-se 209, 215, 221
 Amenophis son of Hapu 96
 Ammonite war 232
 Ammurapi of Ugarit 99
 Ammusinenshi 154
 amnesty 206 n. 4
 Amocu 223
 Amonrasonther 115f, 217
 Amor 201 n. 6
 amphictyony 11 n. 4
 Amun 112, 114ff, 117, 198 n. 6, 213f, 221
 Amun, oracle of 96 n. 4
 Amun, temple of 8f
 Anat 100
 ancestry, interest in 5ff
 Ani 102
 Ankhaf-ef-en-amun 213
 Ankhfenmut 7 n. 6
 Ankhpichrod 7 n. 6
 Anpu 51, 88, 92f, 93 n. 2, 113
 Antef 240 n. 5
 ape 127
 Apis 230
 Apop 125
 Apophis 99 n. 6, 100, 187
 Apuleius 88
 Apy 212
 Aqhat 98 n. 3
 aromatic substances, trade in 192ff
 Artemidorus 205
 Asenath 67, 247 n. 5
 Asha-khet 7 n. 5
 Ashurbanipal 97, 225
 Asia, imminence of invasion from 232f
 Asiatics in Egypt 195ff
 Asshur 201
 Assyria 201 n. 5
 Assyrian King List 10f
atef-crown 218, 221f, 222 n. 6, 223
 Aten 113f, 125f, 213f, 217, 219
 Athens 99
 Atum 114, 118, 120f
 Atys, son of Manes 98, 99 n. 2
 Ay 211, 214f
 Baal 96, 100
 Babel 4
 barque of Amun 116f
 Bata 51, 88, 92f, 93 n. 2, 113f
 Beersheba 19ff, 24, 26 n. 4, 144, 162, 194, 201 n. 5
 Beby 99 n. 7
 Bekhten, Chief of 90
 Bellerophon 17 n. 3, 92
 Belshazzar 96, 226
 Benhadad 195
 Benjamin 71, 73, 75, 133f, 149, 150 n.1., 2, 157f, 178, 204 n. 3, 233 n. 2, 248, 249 n.1
 Besenmut 7 n. 6

- Bethel 26 n. 4
 Bilhah 15 and n. 5
 birthday, king's 205f
 Blinding of Truth 67, 112
 Bocchoris 182, 239
 brevity of style 86
 Brothers,
 anguish of, 82
 alone with Joseph 71f
 hatred towards Joseph 73
 heroic proportions of 248
 jealousy of 89f
 obedience of 2
 Bull of Heaven 69 n. 4
 butler 75, 78
 Buto 227 n. 3
 Buyuwawa 7 n. 5
- C 253 n. 2
 Cain 3, 88
 Cambyses 194
 camels 195
 Canaan 3, 21, 24 n. 3, 25, 149 n.1, 158,
 160ff, 163, 168, 201 n. 3, 232
 Canaanites 26 n. 4
 Canaanite slaves 198
 captain of the guard 146f
 carts 21
 castration 91 n. 6, 92
 Cattle of the Sun 69 n. 4
 celestial bodies 70
 Chaeremon 239 n. 8
 chariot of the sun 100
 Chay 212, 218, 220, 222
 chronicle 10f
 Chronicler 9
 chronology 17, 23 and n. 2
 circumcision 110
 coffin 25 n. 5
 coined money 234 and n. 2
 Combaba 91 n. 6, 93 n. 3
 concubines 15
 Copenhagen Genealogy 9 n. 2
 copula 36
 Covenant 12 n.1, 19, 247, 249 n.1
 Court History 101
 Cow of Heaven, Book of 119
 cow, hieroglyph of 205
 cows in dreams 205
 Crete 201
 cult prostitute 16
 cup 74, 150 n. 2
- D 49, 109
 Danel 90
 Daniel 97, 226, 96, 101 n. 6
 David 17, 67, 89, 96, 101f, 109 n.1, 232
 David's Band 203
 Deborah 26 n. 3
 decorations, reasons for 214f
 Dedy 101 n. 6
 Demeter 99
 Demetrius 191 n. 7
 Deutero-Isaiah 11 n. 4
 Deuteronomy 109
 Descent 250f
 Diaspora 250 and n. 3
 Diodorus 239
 Dioscoridus 192
 discrepancies in the plot 138ff, 148ff
 divine names and epithets 111, 128f
 Djadjaemkh 94
 Djed-mont-efankh 7 n. 6
 Djehuty 240 n. 5
 Djoser 206, 96
 doctor 240 and n. 2, 3
 Documentary Theory 171
 donkey drivers 197, 235 n. 2
 Doomed Prince 67, 93 n. 3, 112
 Dothan 71f, 143f, 143 n. 4, 145, 247
 doublets 164ff
 dreams 15f, 68ff, 73, 75, 77, 79f, 87,
 89ff, 138f, 148ff, 165, 204f
 drink offerings 26 n. 3
 duplication
 of dreams 70
 of episodes 74ff
 of setting and roles 71f
 dying gods 91 n. 6
- E 69 and n. 4, 108, 129 n.1, 130, 132 n.
 2, 134 and n. 2, 135 and n. 3, 136, 138,
 145, 146 and n. 3, 151f, 158 and n. 3,
 168 n. 3, 172 n. 4, 177 n.1, 190, 246,
 251ff
 Edfu 193, 201
 Edom 3f
 "Egypt, Land of" 175f, 180 and n. 3
 Ehnasya 226 n. 3
 Elephantine 155
 papyri from 207f
 Eliakim 191 n. 7
 Elijah 191 n. 7, 250 n. 5
 Elishah 191 n. 7, 195
 Elohim 108ff, 128ff, 130 n.2, 134
 Eloquent Peasant 100

- El Shadday 129 n.1
 embalming 49 n. 7, 240
 Enkidu 69 n. 4
 Enoch 91
 Enmerkar 94
 Ephraim 22ff, 25, 88, 248, 249 n.1
 epic style 91
 Erechtheus 99, 207
 Esarhaddon 194
 Esau 3f, 14, 88
 Eshmun 91 n. 6
 Eternal Lord 120f, 125f, 128
 eunuch 51, 200f
 Eusebius 11, 99 n. 6
 Execration Texts 232 n.1
 Exile 11 n. 4, 54, 65, 90 n. 2, 202, 250
 Exodus 19f, 27, 162f, 239
 expansion of text 86
 Ezra 11 n. 4, 91
- family history 4f
 famine 51f, 87, 98ff, 149 and n.1, 160,
 165, 167, 187
 "father" (as title) 191
 fertility myths 98, 245
 "food," words for 173
 "freemen of Pharaoh's Land" 237
- Gashmu 194
 genealogies 5ff
 Book of, 10
 format of, 10f
 Genesis
 divisions of 251
 editor of *passim*
 final redaction of 2
 style of 172 n.1
 Gideon 89
 Gilead 143, 193
 Gilgamesh 69 n. 4, 90, 91 n. 6, 106,
 206
 glosses 29ff
 god-king, wisdom of 225
 Golan 248 n. 5
 gold collar 208, 218, 224f
 "gold of favour" 208
 Goliath 96
 Goshen 24 n.1, 85, 160f, 235
 Good Brother, role of the 132ff
 grape juice 204f
 Gudea 90
- Hagar 4
- Ham 3
 Haman 191 n. 7
 Haremhab 211, 217
 Harran 4, 14
 harvest tax 236ff
 Harwere 114
 Hathor 114, 119, 222 and n. 6
 Hatshepsut 99 n. 7, 216
 Hattusilis 89
 Hebnu 123
 Hebrews 203, 235
 Land of the 146 n. 5, 201f
 Hebron 21, 26 n. 4, 67, 129 n.1, 143,
 162, 246, 248
 Heliopolis 67, 136 n. 4
 Heliopolitan Genealogy 9 n. 2
 Herihor 116
 Herodotus 8f, 98, 181, 235 n.1, 239,
 Hezekiah 9
 Hippolytus 92
 Horabty 114
 Hordedef 89 and n. 3, 95
 Hor-em-saf 7
 Hor-min 211
 Horus 88 and n. 3, 114, 118, 121ff, 124,
 127, 155
 Horus and Seth, the Contendings of
 120f, 128, 155f
 Huy 223
 Huya 210, 214, 217, 223
 Hyksos 99, 187f, 233, 236 n. 2, 242,
 251 n.1
- ibis 127
 Idrimi 89
 Imhotpe 7, 96
 incubation 90
 inn 150ff
 investiture 87, 166f, 208ff
 Isaac 4, 13f, 20f, 26 n. 4, 88
 Ishmael 4, 55 n. 6, 248
 Ishmaelites 30, 136, 139, 143ff, 145 n.
 2, 194f
 Ishtar 98 n. 3
 Isis 222 n. 6
 Isis and Re, the Myth of 117f
 Israel 20, 23, 26, 75, 131f, 134f, 134 n.
 2, 160, 168, 179
 "Israelite" as gentile 202f
 Israelite Prophecy 90
 Israelites 25, 85, n.1, 187
- J 46 n. 2, 50, 69, 108, 130, 132 n. 3,

- 134f, 135 n. 3, 136, 138, 142, 145, 146 n. 3, 151, 158 and n. 3, 159, 164f, 166 n.1, 168 n. 3, 172 n. 4, 177 n.1, 190, 246, 251ff
- Jacob 67, 72f, 75ff, 81, 90, 100, 131f, 134f, 138f, 144 n. 2, 151, 156, 178, 187 as sedentary landowner 19, 21 n. 4, 245 n.1
- arrival of 158ff
- audience with Pharaoh 161f
- Blessing of 13, 23ff
- death of 23ff, 25 n. 3, 162f, 250f
- Descent into Egypt 27
- contrasted with Esau 3 n.1
- embalming of 240
- genealogy of 3
- in Ch. 48 22ff
- residence of 19, 144
- sons of 145, 150
- wives of 15
- Japheth 3
- Jehoyakin 97
- Jereboam II 9
- Jeremiah 97, 249 n.1
- Jericho 232
- Joseph
- absent outside the Joseph Story 249 n. 2
- as personal name 249 n. 2
- as shepherd 15
- body kept in coffin 163
- contrasted with Benjamin 71, 73f
- death of 25 n. 5, 162f
- depotentized Aqhat 100
- divine inspiration of 103, 225
- eaten by wild beast 142ff
- exaltation of 2
- forgives brothers 163, 170
- garment of 15, 72f, 93 n. 2, 138f, 139 n.1, 143, 150 n. 2
- hated by brothers 138f
- House of 71 n. 2, 249
- in Ch. 39 104
- innocence of 30
- in Post-Biblical literature 103 n. 2
- in prison 146f
- in Ps. 105 180f
- price paid for 200 n. 3
- revelation of 2
- titles of 191f
- shot at by archers 26 n. 3
- tests brothers 149f, 150 n. 2
- use of the name outside the Joseph Story 249
- as wiseman of Wisdom Literature 102ff
- Yahweh's favour for 87
- Joseph Story
- absence of archaism in 245
- absence of cult topography in 246
- alleged modernization of 245 n.1
- alleged Ramesside context of 190f
- as bridge between Patriarchs and Bondage 27, 251
- chronology of 187f
- contrasted with Patriarchal narratives 73, 245ff
- crisis in plot 170f
- date of writing of 250
- doublets in 138, 152
- dramatic effect of 168f
- Egyptian colouring of 189ff, 242
- historical development of 70 n. 6
- historification of 136, 150, 152
- indictive approach to 2
- interest of, in alien cultures 101
- length of 68
- literary motifs of 241
- literary relationship to Daniel 96 n. 2
- masterly technique of 28, 246
- moral of 170
- origin of 68
- plot of 1f
- popularity of 66, 89
- priestly reworking of 54f
- rarity of personal names in 67f, 136
- recapitulation in 77ff, 153ff
- single authorship of 246
- silence of the rest of the O.T. on 249
- theological outlook of 247
- transmission of 244ff
- use of divine names in 128ff, 130 n. 2
- Joseph Tribes, origin of 248 n. 5
- Josephus 239
- Jotham 9, 89
- Jubilees 18 and n.1
- Judaeen Monarchy 11 n. 4, 208
- Judaeans, contingent of 200 n. 1
- Judah 16ff, 67, 72, 74, 132ff, 134 n.1, 140, 156ff, 159f, 248
- contrasted with Reuben 133f, 140ff, 179
- Judah (kingdom) 11 n. 4, 191, 194

- Judah expansion see "Judah Version"
- Judah Version 140f, 141 n.1, 143ff, 146, 150 n. 4, 151, 157, 160f, 163, 170f, 179f, 181f, 194f, 250ff
- Judith 67
- Kagemni 102
- Kamose 95, 99 n. 7
- Kamutef 124, 127
- Kanefer 7
- Karnak 7f, 48, 198 n.1
- Kenamun 216 n. 2, 4, 221, 223
- Keturah 4
- Khaemhat 209
- Knafre 89 n. 3
- Kha-nehebu 7
- Khepri 118
- Kheruef 209
- Khunm 100, 113, 125
- Khnumibre 7
- Khufu 89 n. 3
- Labarnas 88
- Laish 232
- land, ownership of 236ff
- Leah 15 n. 5, 26 n. 3, 132 n. 4
- lector priest 203f
- Levi 152
- Levirite law 16
- Leviticus 109, 162
- Libyan kings 200 and n. 2
- Libyans 232 n.1
- linen garment 208, 225f
- Lucian's Ass 88
- Luz 22
- Lydia 98
- Lydians 234
- Maat 221f
- Märchen* 67f, 111ff, 127f, 130
- magicians, motifs concerning 94ff
- Mahu 211, 223
- Manasseh 22f, 25, 88, 248
- Marduk 96
- Medinet Habu 222 n. 6
- Memphis 200 n. 2, 230
- Memphite Genealogy 7, 9 n. 2, 10
- Memphite Theology 244
- Merikare 123f, 196 n. 3
- Merneptah 90, 99, 190
- Merodach Baladan 101 n. 5
- Meryre I 210, 214, 217, 219, 223
- Meryre II 210
- Mesopotamia 198 n. 6, 200 n. 3, 201
- meter 77
- Micah 191 n. 7
- Midianites 72, 76, 136, 137, 143, 145 and n. 2, 146, 194
- midrash* 106
- Min 124, 127
- Min-Hor 114
- money 149 n.1, 150f
- Montemhet 7 n. 6
- Montu 114f
- morality, Egyptian 124 n.1
- Mordecai 91, 97
- Mosaic tradition 12 n. 1
- Mose 212, 217
- Moses 190, 202 n. 8, 232, 239 n. 8
- Mt. Seir 3f
- Mursilis 88
- Mutemwiya 222
- Nabataeans 194
- Nabonidus 90, 204, n. 5
- Nahor 14
- Naomi 250 n. 5
- Nathan 226
- Nebuchadrezzar 80, 90, 96
- Nebamun 223f
- Nebka 94
- Nebunnef 218, 223
- Nebuzaradan 56
- Necho 225
- Necropolis 204 n. 1
- Neferbau 114
- Neferhotpe 211, 217, 221
- Neferty 94 and n. 4
- Negeb 144, 194, 196
- Neit 230, 239
- Nespakashuty 7 n. 6
- Nes-shu 7
- Nessamtowy 226
- New Year's festival 216 n. 3, 221
- Noah 3f, 11 n. 4, 13
- Nubia 155
- Nubian slaves 198
- Nubians 232 n. 1
- Nut 114
- oath, form of 233 and n. 2
- Odyssey 69 n. 4
- older brothers, superseded by younger 88f
- omen text 207
- Onkhsheshonqy 59, 95, 97 and n. 6,

- 101 n. 6, 102, 204
 Onnophris 124
 oral tradition, currency of 6
 Osirian overtones 25 n. 5, 181
 Osiris 121ff, 155, 240 n. 4
 king as 218f, 221f
 myth of 244
 Osorkon II 238
- P 9, 11 n. 4, 13, 26 and n.1, 49, 54, 58,
 61, 64, 129 n. 1, 136, 159, 161f
 Padiamunnebnestaw 7 n. 6
 Palestine 201f
 Panchsi 210, 214
 Pantagruel 94 n. 7
 Parallelism 164f
 Parennefer 209, 211, 217, 221
 Parthia 207
 Paser 211f, 216, 218, 220ff
 Patriarchal narratives
 contradictions in 26
 J and E in 251f
 style of 19
 pedigree 10
 Pediese 226
 Peleus 92
 Penno 212
 Pentu 210f
 Perez 16
 Pharaoh 177, 233
 Philistines, Chiefs of 203
 Philo Biblius 11
 Phoenicia 93 n. 3
 Phritiphantes 96, 105
 Phrixos 92
 Pit 139ff, 142
 Pliny 192f
 Plutarch 244
 Post-exilic community 11 n. 4, 12, 250
 n. 3
 Potiphar 66, 75, 78, 92, 135f
 Potiphar's wife 18, 77f, 92, 93 n. 2,
 100, 130, 146, 180f
 Potipherah 136 n. 4
 pouch 234
 Preharakhty 112f, 120f, 128, 155
 priesthood 23 n.1
 exemption from taxation of 239
 genealogies of 6ff
 land tenure of 236ff
 status of 8ff
 taxation of 238f
 Primaeval History 11
 pronoun, first person singular 173f
 Proverbs, Babylonian 97
 Psammetichus I 226 n. 2
 Psenhor 7 n. 5
 Pseudo-Djoser 98 n. 3
 Pshu 112f
 Ptahhotpe 95, 97 n. 6, 102, 122
 Ptolemies 193
 Ptolemy, birthday of 206
 Ptolemy Philadelphos 199
 Ptolemy Soter 90
 Ptolemy V 206
- Qedarite Arabs 194
 Qoheleth 109
- Ra'et-tefnakht 7 n. 6
 Rabelais, *Gargantua* 106
 Rachel 22, 248, 249 n.1
 racial exclusiveness 235, 247
 Rahotpe 7
 Ramah 249 n.1
 Ramose 209, 214 n.1, 221
 Ramses II 95, 190, 215, 217f, 223
 Ramses III 216
 Re 92, 114f, 117ff, 120f, 123ff, 126, 204
 Rekhmire 221, 223
 Renenut 125ff
 repetitive style 87
 Retjenu 197
 Reuben 17 n. 5, 26 n. 3, 67, 74, 132ff,
 134 n. 2, 139ff, 141 n.1, 150, 157f, 178,
 248
 Reuben version 140f, 143ff, 146 and
 n.2, 150 n. 4, 157, 170, 178ff, 252f
 revelation in dreams 90
 ring 208, 225f
 Rosetta Stone 206
 Ruth 250 n. 5
 Book of, 17, 109
 Rylands IX 226, 238
- Sais 227 n. 3
 Salitis 61 n. 4
 Samtowtefnakht 226
 Sanchuniaton 11
 Sargon II 225
 satrap 207
 Saul 109 n.1, 195, 203, 232
 Saviour, Wiseman as 96f
 scribes, training of 102
 seal 224
sed-festival 227

- Sekhtepibreonkh 94
 Sekhmet 114f
 Semseru 114
 Sennacherib 204 n. 5
 Sen-nefer 216, n. 2, 3
 Senwosret 124
 Sesostris 181
 Seth 88 and n. 3, 121, 155f
 Sety I 221
 Seven Hathors 112f
 Seven Years, period of 206f
 Shalmaneser III 195
 Shamshi-adad 5 n. 3
 Shasu 200 n. 2
 Shaye 125ff
 sheaves 70
 Sheba, Queen of 195
 Sheben 7 n. 5
 Shebna 191
 Shechem 25, 26 n. 3, 4, 143f, 162f, 164,
 247
 Shem 3f
 Sheshonk I 7, 101 n. 5
 Shipwrecked Sailor 67, 93 n. 3, 111,
 153f
 Shu 124f, 127
 Simeon 82, 150 n. 4, 151f
 Sinai mines 196 n. 4, 197
 Sinuhe 114f, 128, 154f
 Si-osir 96, 97 n. 6, 105
 slave trade 197ff
 slaves, price of 200 n. 3
 Sneferu 94 and n.1
 Sobk-re 114
 Sojourn 162f, 239
 Narratives of 109
 Solomon 187, 195
 Sopdu 114
 Sothis 240 n. 4
 Source Analysis, criteria for 107
 "sources," definition of 106ff
 spies 149 n. 1
 spurned wife, motif of the 91f
 spying, accusation of 232
 staff of office 224
 stars as symbols 204 and n. 5
 statue inscription 8f
 steward 150
 style, definition of 171
 use in source analysis 172, 251f
 Su-em-nywet 216 n. 2, 222
 syntactical patterns, eccentric 33
 syntax 172
- Tachos 239
 Tacitus 239
 Taharqa 193
 Taking of Joppa 93 n. 3
 Tamar 16ff, 18 n. 2
 Tammuz 100
 Tatian, *Diatessaron* 106
 tax, percentages of 237 n. 2, 5
 Tayet 114
 Tenes 92
 Terah 4, 14
 ternary construction 36f
 Tetrateuch, main themes of 11 n. 4
 Teudjoy 226
 Thebes 117
 theophany 144
 Thot 125, 127
 Thrinakia 69 n. 4
 Thutmose I 228 n. 6
 Thutmose III 48, 95, 198, 218, 223
 Thutmose IV 90, 209, 223
 Tefnut 124, 127
 Tiy 215
 Tmehu, land of 154
 Tobit 67, 97
 toponyms 67
 Transjordan 27 n. 4, 193f, 199
 tribes, fate of 248
 Turin Canon 188 and n. 1
 Tutankhamun 223f
 Tutu 218ff
 Two Brothers, tale of 67, 92f, 93 n. 3,
 113, 147, 245
- Ubaoner 94
 Ugaritic parallels 167 n. 1
 United Monarchy 101 n. 5, 252f
- Valley of the Cedar 93 n. 3
 vetitive 141
 vocabulary 171ff
- Wady Hammamat 7
 wagons 158f
 Wenamun 115ff
 Weret 114f
 wilderness 143f
 wiseman 241
 Wisdom, Egyptian 97 n. 6, 122ff
 use of "god" in 127f
 Wisdom, Hebrew 97 n. 6, 101ff, 130
- Yahweh 108ff, 128ff, 130 n. 2, 134

Yeruba'al 89	Zenon papyri 194, 199
Yoh 125	Zerah 16
younger brother, motifs of the 88f, 133	Zerubbabel 11 n. 4
	Zilpah 15
Zaphnathpaneach 67	Zodiac 204 n. 4

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES

<i>Genesis</i>	<i>Genesis</i>	<i>Genesis</i>
1-2 109	21 : 2, 7 49	35 : 10 131f
2 : 4 3, 13	21 : 14 143 n. 4	35 : 11, 12 20 n. 3, 22, 129 n. 1
2 : 14 37 n. 1	21 : 29 37 n. 1	35 : 14 26 n. 3, 4
2 : 19 37 n. 1	22 : 16-18 20 n. 3	35 : 19 248
3 : 6 37 n. 1	23 : 2 56	35 : 21, 22 25 n. 3, 26 n. 2, 3, 27
4 3	23 : 15 37 n. 1	35 : 27 26 n. 4
4 : 17ff 13	24 : 3-4 247 n. 4	35 : 29 162
5 3	24 : 25, 32 50	35 : 26b 3 n. 1
5 : 1 3, 13	24 : 35 195 n. 2	35 : 28-29 4
6 : 5-8 3, 13	25 21	36 : 1-8 3f, 13
6 : 9 3	25 : 1-11 4	36 : 5b 3 n. 1
6 : 10 3	25 : 9-10 162	36 : 8 14, 37 n. 1
8 : 20-22 108	25 : 12 13	36 : 9 4, 13
9 108	25 : 12-18 4	37 21, 26 n. 2
9 : 1-17 110	25 : 16 37 n. 1	37 : 1 3, 14, 131, 134
9 : 16 11 n. 4	25 : 19 4, 13f	37 : 2 3f, 13f, 17, 57, 131, 134, 249 n. 1
9 : 20-27 4	25 : 20-26 4, 14	37 : 3 16, 36 n. 2, 49, 131, 134, 138
10 4	26 : 2-5 20 n. 3	37 : 4 40, 43, 55
10 : 1 3, 13	26 : 24 20 n. 3, 4	37 : 5 43
11 : 1-26 4	26 : 28 247	37 : 5-10 138
11 : 27 4, 13, 14	26 : 34f 247 n. 4	37 : 7 37, 55
11 : 28-32 4	27 : 21, 24, 33 37 n. 1	37 : 8 29, 39, 43, 45
12 : 1-3 20 n. 3	27 : 46 247 n. 4	37 : 9 37, 57, 70
12 : 10-20 108, 160	28 : 1 247 n. 4	37 : 10 29, 34, 44f, 77, 173
12 : 16 195 n. 2	28 : 3 129 n. 1	37 : 11 175
13 : 3-16 108	28 : 3-4 20 n. 3	37 : 12 44, 141 n. 1
13 : 12 3 n. 1	28 : 6 247 n. 4	37 : 13 37, 131, 134, 164
13 : 14-17 20 n. 3	28 : 12 90	37 : 14 29, 131, 164, 175
13 : 17-19 108	28 : 13-15 20 n. 3	37 : 15 34, 49, 144f
14 144 n. 2	30 : 27 65	37 : 16 37, 145 n. 1, 173
15 : 5 20 n. 3	30 : 43 195 n. 2	37 : 17 49
15 : 13-16 20	31 : 10-13 90	37 : 18 42, 44 and
16 : 43 64	31 : 43 37 n. 1	
17 110	32 : 8 195 n. 2	
17 : 1 129 n. 1	32 : 28 131	
17 : 1-8 20 n. 3	34 26 n. 2, 144 and n. 2	
17 : 15-16 20 n. 3	34 : 14 37 n. 1	
19 : 18 37 n. 1	35 21	
20 108	35 : 1-4 26 n. 3	
20 : 3 90	35 : 2 247 n. 4	
20 : 4 247 n. 4	35 : 8 26 n. 3	
20 : 11 247 n. 4		
20 : 26 247 n. 4		

<i>Genesis</i>	<i>Genesis</i>	<i>Genesis</i>
n. 1, 51, 55, 139	39 : 6 37, 53, 77	40 : 19 54
37 : 19 37, 142f	39 : 7 53, 75, 175	40 : 20 42, 53, 59
37 : 20 34, 142f	39 : 8 34, 77	40 : 22 41, 58
37 : 21 29, 133f, 141ff	39 : 9 41, 46, 128	40 : 23 49
37 : 22 42, 44, 133f, 139ff, 142f, 143 n. 2, 146 n. 1	39 : 10 30, 43f, 53, 78	41 98, 208ff
37 : 23 29, 41, 43, 53, 57, 139, 142	39 : 11 44, 50, 53, 57, 78	41 : 1 37, 49, 53, 79, 175
37 : 24 34f, 38, 55, 139	39 : 12 30, 78	41 : 1-8 249 n. 1
37 : 25 37, 44, 65, 139, 145, 175, 192	39 : 13 40, 43, 53	41 : 2 37, 46
37 : 26 34, 40, 56, 133f, 139ff, 142	39 : 14 44, 52, 78	41 : 3 37
37 : 27 29, 40, 133, 139ff	39 : 15 30, 40, 43, 53, 78	41 : 5 37, 80, 175
37 : 28 56, 139, 143, 145 and n. 2, 175	39 : 16 43	41 : 6 37, 53
37 : 29 134, 139	39 : 17 44, 78, 175	41 : 8 49, 53, 58f, 65, 175
37 : 30 37, 133, 139, 141 n.1, 173	39 : 18 43, 53, 78	41 : 9 37, 49, 55, 173
37 : 32 29, 143	39 : 19 43, 53, 175	41 : 10 56, 58, 135, 146, 148
37 : 33 45, 50, 143	39 : 20 30, 37, 53, 177	41 : 11 58f, 78, 173
37 : 34 131, 134	39 : 21 53f, 128, 146	41 : 12 38, 56, 58, 78, 135, 146, 148, 199
37 : 35 40, 44, 51, 56	39 : 22 146	41 : 13 41, 53, 58f
37 : 36 2, 51, 56, 135f, 136	39 : 23 34f, 37, 41, 46, 128	41 : 14 59, 65, 76, 146 n. 4
n. 1, 145, 175	40 147f	41 : 15 44, 58, 173
16ff, 26 n. 2, 4, 27, 136, 139 n. 1, 144 n. 2	40 : 1 53, 75, 175, 180	41 : 16 128
45, 104, 129f, 130 n. 2, 147f, 172 and n. 1, 180ff, 245	40 : 2 51, 78	41 : 17 37, 79f
30, 51, 56, 135f, 145, 175	40 : 3 30, 37, 47, 56, 58, 146 and n. 4, 147f	41 : 18 37, 46
53, 128	40 : 4 53, 56, 58, 146, 148	41 : 19 37, 87, 175
37, 40, 128, 130 n. 2	40 : 5 30, 47, 58, 146 n. 4, 147, 175, 177, 180	41 : 21 34, 41, 59
42, 191	40 : 6 37, 58	41 : 22 37, 80
40, 53, 65, 128	40 : 7 34, 51, 58, 147f	41 : 22-24 70
	40 : 8 34f, 58, 128	41 : 23 31, 37
	40 : 9 34	41 : 24 49, 59, 80
	40 : 10 34, 58, 65, 76	41 : 25 36 n. 3, 37, 60, 87, 128, 164f
	40 : 11 34, 38, 59	41 : 26 36 n. 3, 87, 165
	40 : 12 34ff, 58	41 : 27 53, 165
	40 : 13 54, 59	41 : 28 34, 37, 87, 128, 164f, 175
	40 : 14 39, 43, 49, 53, 104	41 : 29 37, 60, 165, 175
	40 : 15 40, 104, 146	41 : 30 52, 60, 87, 165, 175
	40 : 16 34f, 40, 49, 58, 173	41 : 31 34, 50, 60, 87, 165
	40 : 17 34, 37f	41 : 32 37f, 43f, 60, 65, 70 n. 5,
	40 : 18 34f, 36 n. 3, 58	

<i>Genesis</i>	80, 87, 128, 175	<i>Genesis</i>	176
41 : 33	165, 166 n. 3, 175	42 : 4	40, 131, 134, 180
41 : 34	51, 60, 65, 165f, 166 n. 3, 175, 207f	42 : 5	131f, 134, 135 n. 1, 168, 180
41 : 35	165f, 173	42 : 6	34ff, 61
41 : 36	60, 173, 175	42 : 7	7ff, 52, 81, 168, 173, 232
41 : 37	36 n. 3, 175	42 : 8	31
41 : 38	34, 128, 130 n. 2	42 : 9	34, 44, 49, 51
41 : 39	42, 103, 128, 166 n. 3	42 : 9-11	168
41 : 40	71 n. 2, 166 and n. 3, 167, 191	42 : 10	173
41 : 41	52, 87, 166f, 175	42 : 11	34, 152
41 : 42	60, 208	42 : 12	40, 44, 51
41 : 43	45, 175	42 : 12-14	168
41 : 44	34f, 52, 87, 173, 175	42 : 13	13, 34, 152
41 : 45	87, 175	42 : 14	34f
41 : 46	35, 43, 87, 162, 177, 180, 249 n. 1	42 : 15	39, 43, 61
41 : 47	52, 60f	42 : 15-16	149
41 : 47-49	87	42 : 16	34, 39f
41 : 48	38, 173, 175	42 : 17	58
41 : 49	44, 173	42 : 18	34, 103, 129, 173
41 : 50	42	42 : 19	34, 39, 58, 173 and n. 3
41 : 50-52	76 n. 3, 248	42 : 19-20	149
41 : 51	128	42 : 20	20ff, 81
41 : 51-52	246	42 : 21	21f, 34f, 40, 43, 50, 82, 104, 141 n. 1
41 : 52	128	42 : 21-22	146
41 : 53	60, 167 n. 2, 176	42 : 22	62, 70, 133f, 141 n. 1
41 : 53-57	87, 167	42 : 23	34, 37f, 40, 50, 62
41 : 54	41, 53, 61, 167 and n. 2, 176	42 : 24	31
41 : 55	52, 167 n. 2, 176	42 : 25	44, 172 n. 4, 173f
41 : 56	167 n. 2	42 : 26	173
41 : 57	44, 167 n. 2, 176	42 : 27	21 n. 4, 27ff, 34, 44, 50, 82, 172 n. 4, 174
42 : 1	40, 52, 131, 134, 173 and n. 3, 176	42 : 28	34, 42, 49, 129, 130 n. 2, 151f, 174
42 : 2	40, 173, 176	42 : 29	131, 135
42 : 3	44, 168, 173,	42 : 30	30ff, 52, 54, 81

<i>Genesis</i>	151f, 174, 180
42 : 36	131, 135
42 : 36-38	158
42 : 37	39, 133, 135, 173, 248
42 : 38	84, 168, 178
43 : 1	50
43 : 2	41, 43f, 53, 131, 173, 176
43 : 3	34f, 42, 45, 135, 173
43 : 4	37, 39
43 : 5	34, 37, 39, 42
43 : 6	34, 44, 131, 135
43 : 7	34f, 40, 45, 51, 152, 175
43 : 8	131, 135
43 : 8-10	133
43 : 9	38f, 84, 173
43 : 10	40
43 : 11	39, 131, 135, 174
43 : 12	35, 50, 151, 174
43 : 14	41, 65, 129, 174
43 : 15	176
43 : 16	53
43 : 17	31, 41, 152
43 : 18	31, 37, 40, 43f, 51, 65, 174f
43 : 19	152, 191
43 : 20	45, 173
43 : 21	40, 43, 53, 174
43 : 22	173f
43 : 23	49, 62, 129, 174
43 : 24	50, 152, 172 n. 4
43 : 25	40, 43
43 : 26	31
43 : 27	34, 169
43 : 28	34
43 : 29	34f, 129
43 : 30	44
43 : 31	62
43 : 32	36 n. 2, 53, 235
43 : 33	34

<i>Genesis</i>	50, 52
44 : 1	41, 173f
44 : 2	39, 48, 173ff
44 : 3	38f
44 : 4	43, 54, 74
44 : 5	45
44 : 6	77, 175
44 : 7	175
44 : 8	174
44 : 10	175
44 : 11	174
44 : 12	38, 48, 174
44 : 13	62
44 : 14	34, 135
44 : 15	34, 40, 45
44 : 16	34, 48, 52, 74, 129, 133, 135
44 : 17	48
44 : 18	34, 71 n.2, 135, 175
44 : 18-34	133
44 : 19	152
44 : 19ff	83
44 : 20	49
44 : 21	53
44 : 23	44
44 : 24	40, 43, 53
44 : 25	173
44 : 26	34, 39, 44
44 : 27	40
44 : 28	45, 50
44 : 30	37, 43
44 : 31	40, 43, 53
44 : 32	39
44 : 34	40
45 : 1	43f, 50, 71
45 : 1-13	170
45 : 2	31, 54, 169
45 : 3	34f, 169, 174
45 : 4	34, 169, 174, 176
45 : 4-5	146
45 : 4-15	87
45 : 5	40, 65, 129, 163, 170
45 : 5ff	104
45 : 6	34, 170 and n. 1
45 : 7	44, 53, 129, 170
45 : 7-8	74
45 : 8	40, 104, 129,

<i>Genesis</i>	170, 176, 191	<i>Genesis</i>	161, 235
45 : 9	129, 170, 176	47 : 1	34f, 158, 160
45 : 9-11	161	47 : 1-4	84
45 : 10	161, 171, 180	47 : 2	52
45 : 11	40, 63, 160, 170 n. 1, 172 n. 4, 187	47 : 3	34f, 158, 161
45 : 11-13	170	47 : 4	44, 50, 160f
45 : 12	34f, 37, 40	47 : 5	159f, 176f
45 : 13	176	47 : 6	36 n. 3, 39, 50, 159f, 176
45 : 16	158	47 : 7	131
45 : 17	49	47 : 7-10	161, 180
45 : 18	160, 176	47 : 8	34f, 131
45 : 19	63, 158f, 176	47 : 9	58, 131, 161
45 : 20	36 n. 3, 63, 176	47 : 10	131
45 : 21	131f, 135, 172 n. 4, 177	47 : 11	41, 50, 176
45 : 23	31, 86, 172 n. 4, 173	47 : 12	51, 164, 173 n. 4, 178
45 : 24	159	47 : 13	50, 173, 176
45 : 25	131, 135, 176	47 : 13-26	2, 167, 180 and n. 3, 182, 246
45 : 26	19, 34, 37, 40, 63, 176	47 : 14	37, 50f, 173, 176
45 : 27	44, 131, 135, 158f	47 : 15	46, 50, 173, 176
45 : 28	19, 34, 42, 131, 135	47 : 16	39, 46, 50
46 : 1-4	18ff, 20 and n. 4, 24, 27 n. 4	47 : 17	173
46 : 1-7	180	47 : 18	39, 42, 64
46 : 5	158, 168	47 : 19	64, 173
46 : 5-7	19ff	47 : 21	176
46 : 8-27	19, 22, 76 n. 3, 180	47 : 22	34, 64
46 : 9	248	47 : 22-26	236
46 : 21	248	47 : 23	64
46 : 28	31, 50, 135, 159f, 162	47 : 24	31, 50, 53, 166 n. 3
46 : 28-30	179	47 : 26	34
46 : 28- 47 : 6	161	47 : 27	131, 176
46 : 29	44, 131, 135	47 : 27-31	2
46 : 30	24, 34, 42, 131, 135	47 : 28	53, 131, 176
46 : 31	31	47 : 29	39, 44, 131, 176
46 : 31-34	84	47 : 29-30	22, 25 n. 3
46 : 32	35, 46	47 : 29-31	179
46 : 33	34f, 40, 43, 53, 161	47 : 30	162, 174, 176
46 : 34	35, 42, 46, 53,	47 : 31	2, 131
		48	22ff, 27
		48 : 1	175
		48 : 1-7	22, 180
		48 : 3	129 n. 1
		48 : 5	24, 37 n. 1
		48 : 8	23f
		48 : 8-20	179

Genesis

48 : 9ff 23
 48 : 13 23
 48 : 15-16 23, 26 n. 3
 48 : 20 23
 48 : 21-22 180
 48 : 22 26 n. 3, 4, 27
 49 24f, 27
 49 : 2-7 26 n. 2
 49 : 4 26 n. 3
 49 : 5-6 26 n. 4
 49 : 9-12 25 n. 1
 49 : 23 26 n. 3
 49 : 23-24 26 n. 2
 49 : 25 129 n. 1
 49 : 31 26 n. 3
 50 26 n. 2
 50 : 1 25 n. 3
 50 : 1-6 179
 50 : 1-14 2, 163
 50 : 2 44, 49, 131
 50 : 3 49, 56
 50 : 4 39
 50 : 5 50, 162, 17
 50 : 6 41
 50 : 7 163, 176
 50 : 7-14 180
 50 : 8 162f, 163 n. 2
 50 : 9 53
 50 : 11 26 n. 3, 4,
 36, 176, 246
 50 : 11-14 250 n. 6
 50 : 12 41, 163 and
 n. 2
 50 : 14 31, 42ff, 162,
 163 n. 2, 176
 50 : 15 25 n. 3, 40,
 45, 104, 163
 50 : 15ff 72 n. 1
 50 : 15-21 2, 163f, 179
 50 : 16 43, 52
 50 : 17 43, 64, 129
 50 : 18 34
 50 : 19 34f, 129, 174
 50 : 20 44, 74 n. 2,
 104, 129
 50 : 21 173 n. 4, 174
 50 : 22-26 25, 180
 50 : 24 24

Exodus

1 : 10-12 86
 2 : 11 202

Exodus

7 : 11, 22 59
 8 : 3, 14,
 15 59
 9 : 3 195 n. 3
 9 : 11 59
 12 : 9 59
 12 : 40f 187
 14 : 28-29 11 n. 4
 15 : 1 11 n. 4
 21 : 2-6 203
 22 : 4 50
 22 : 8 65
 25 : 31ff 48
 29 : 13,
 17, 22 60
 32 : 31 64 n. 7
 34 : 34 63
 37 : 17ff 48

Leviticus

1 : 9, 13 60
 2 : 2 61
 3 : 3, 9, 14 60
 4 : 8, 11 60
 4 : 14 65
 5 : 5 65
 5 : 12 61
 5 : 21 60
 5 : 22, 26 65
 6 : 8 61
 7 : 3 60
 8 : 16, 21,
 25 60
 8 : 35 63
 9 : 14 60
 10 : 6 56
 10 : 13 63
 13 : 10, 24 65
 24 : 12 58
 25 : 35-43 203

Numbers

3 : 16 63
 6 : 11 65
 12 : 6 50
 12 : 8 90 n. 2
 15 : 34 58
 20 : 29 56
 21 : 32 232
 25 : 18 55
 26 : 3 55
 36 : 2 63

Deuteronomy

1 : 37 65
 6 : 24 57
 7 : 16 63
 13 : 2 90 n. 2
 13 : 9 63
 13 : 15 60
 13 : 18 65
 15 : 3 203
 15 : 10 65
 15 : 12-18 203
 17 : 4 60
 17 : 16 199f
 18 : 12 65
 18 : 21 55
 19 : 13, 21 63
 21 : 13 56
 25 : 12 63
 26 : 5 251 n. 1
 34 : 8 56

Joshua

2 : 1 232
 6 : 23 232
 18 : 12 143 n. 4

Judges

6 : 4 65
 6 : 5 195 n. 4
 6 : 15 89
 7 : 12 195 n. 4
 7 : 13f 90
 8 : 21 195 n. 4
 8 : 22 193 n. 11
 8 : 24 145 n. 2
 8 : 26 195 n. 4
 9 : 5 89
 9 : 28 207
 13 : 25 65
 17 : 10 65
 18 : 2 232
 18 : 5 57
 18 : 19 191 n. 7
 19 : 19 50

Ruth

1 : 6 250 n. 5
 4 : 7 65

I Sam.

4 : 6, 9 203
 13 : 3 203
 13 : 12 62

I Sam.

13 : 19 203
 14 : 11 203
 14 : 21 203
 15 : 3 195 n. 5
 16 : 11 89
 17 : 7 65
 17 : 14f 89
 17 : 17f 89
 20 : 10 52
 24 : 1 143 n. 4
 25 : 2, 18 245 n. 1
 26 : 4 232
 27 : 9 195 n. 5
 29 : 3 203
 30 : 17 195 n. 5
 39 : 9 143 n. 1

II Sam.

10 : 3 232
 14 : 7 53
 15 : 10 232
 20 : 3 58

I Kings

6 : 1 187
 8 : 32 51
 8 : 50 65
 10 : 2 195 n. 6
 11 : 41 109 n. 1
 12 : 31 52
 14 : 16 65
 17 : 9 250 n. 5
 18 : 1 250 n. 5
 19 : 5 143 n. 4

II Kings

2 : 12 191 n. 7
 8 : 9 195 n. 7
 14 : 8, 11 52
 20 : 3 64
 23 : 12 65
 23 : 29 52
 25 : 8ff 56
 25 : 19 207
 25 : 27-30 97

I Chron.

4 : 41 9 n. 3
 5 : 17 9 n. 3
 7 : 5, 11,
 40 8 n. 6
 7 : 14 248

I Chron.

7 : 21-23 248
 10 : 9 143 n. 1
 22 : 11 57
 26 : 31 62

II Chron.

13 : 12 57
 14 : 6 57
 16 : 12 64f
 16 : 14 50
 18 : 11 57
 20 : 20 57, 143 n. 4
 24 : 11 207
 24 : 20 57
 31 : 13 207
 31 : 17ff 9 n. 5
 31 : 21 57
 32 : 30 57
 32 : 31 50, 62
 35 : 13 65

Ezra

9 : 7 57
 9 : 8f 65
 9 : 15 57

Nehemiah

1 : 5 64
 1 : 11 64f
 2 : 1f 58
 4 : 11 63
 7 : 6ff 10
 9 : 10 57
 9 : 33 65
 9 : 37 64
 11 : 14 207
 12 : 42 207
 13 : 15 63
 13 : 26 65

Esther

2 : 3 207
 3 : 10 60
 3 : 12 52, 60
 3 : 13 191 n. 7
 4 : 11 60
 5 : 10 62
 8 : 2, 8 60
 8 : 9 52
 8 : 10 60
 8 : 12 191 n. 7
 8 : 15 97

Esther

11 : 5-11 91

Job

6 : 18, 19 65
 7 : 18 61
 9 : 22 60
 22 : 6 143 n. 1
 23 : 3 56
 30 : 14 49
 31 : 15 60
 33 : 23 50, 62
 40 : 17 59

Psalms

30 : 10 56
 30 : 10 56
 38 : 9 64
 68 : 20 63
 68 : 32 65
 74 : 5 50
 77 : 3 64
 77 : 5 65
 81 : 5 249 n. 1
 88 : 16 64
 105 180f and n. 4,
 249 n. 1
 105 : 17 97
 105 : 18,
 19, 22 181
 105 : 25 55
 106 : 46 65
 116 : 4, 16 64
 118 : 25 64
 119 : 36 56
 119 : 52 51
 126 : 6 55

Proverbs

2 : 4 62
 3 : 10 60
 7 : 20 234
 12 : 23 103
 16 : 9 104
 19 : 3 58
 19 : 21 104
 20 : 13 63
 20 : 24 104
 23 : 21 63
 25 : 20 58
 28 : 13 57
 30 : 8 64
 30 : 9 63

<i>Proverbs</i>		<i>Ezekiel</i>	
31 : 15	64	1 : 11, 23	64
		5 : 11	63
<i>Eccles.</i>		7 : 4, 9	63
4 : 13-14	97	8 : 18	63
5 : 11	60	9 : 5, 10	63
7 : 2	57	12 : 7	63
7 : 19	61	14 : 3	62
8 : 4	57	16 : 4	59
8 : 8	61	16 : 5	59, 63
10 : 5	61	16 : 11	60
		16 : 27	64
<i>Isaiab</i>		16 : 30	61
2 : 21	191 n. 7	16 : 39	143 n. 1
13 : 18	63	20 : 3	62
19 : 5-10	249 n. 1	20 : 17	63
21 : 13	65	20 : 31	62
42 : 14	62	23 : 26	143 n. 1
43 : 16-17	11 n. 4	24 : 18	63
43 : 27	50, 62	33 : 2	52
45 : 3	62	36 : 37	62
46 : 1, 3	63	37 : 7	63
54 : 9-10	11 n. 4		
55 : 11	57	<i>Daniel</i>	
56 : 11	56	1 : 9	65
63 : 15	62	1 : 10	58
64 : 11	62	1 : 20	59
65 : 1	62	2 : 1	65
		2 : 2	59
<i>Jeremiah</i>		2 : 3	65
1 : 16	55	2 : 9	60
5 : 28	57	2 : 14	56
6 : 27	61	2 : 25	59
8 : 23	56	2 : 31f	90
9 : 3	249 n. 1	2 : 43	64 n. 6
11 : 17	65	2 : 48	96
15 : 4	65	8 : 9	52
31 : 15	249 n. 1	8 : 12, 24	57
34 : 8-11	203	9 : 4	64
35 : 5	48	9 : 14	65
37	97	10 : 6	64
38 : 6	55	11 : 7, 20f,	
38 : 13	56	36	59
39 : 9ff	56	11 : 38	59
41 : 8	62		
41 : 9	55 n. 6	<i>Joel</i>	
42 : 12	65	1 : 7	58
44 : 12	57		
46 : 11	193f	<i>Amos</i>	
49 : 19	65	2 : 6	249 n. 1
50 : 44	65		
		<i>Jonab</i>	
<i>Lam.</i>		1 : 14	64
1 : 14	59		

<i>Jonab</i>	
4 : 2	64
<i>Micab</i>	
3 : 12	65
<i>Hab.</i>	
1 : 4	63
<i>Haggai</i>	
1 : 6	234
<i>Zech.</i>	
9 : 11	56
10 : 2	90 n. 2
12 : 3	63
13 : 9	61
14 : 17-18	98 n. 2
<i>Mal.</i>	
1 : 14	55
3 : 14	56
<i>IV Esdras</i>	
11 : 1-	
12 : 6	91
<i>Tobit</i>	
1 : 16ff	97
<i>Wisdom</i>	
10 : 13-14	103 n. 2
<i>Sir.</i>	
7 : 5	52
34 : 1-8	90 n. 2
49 : 15	103 n. 2
<i>I Macc.</i>	
2 : 53	103 n. 2
11 : 32	191 n. 7
<i>IV Macc.</i>	
18 : 11ff	103 n. 2
<i>Enoch</i>	
83-90	91
<i>Jubilees</i>	
34 : 1ff	144 n. 2

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS AND PHRASES

' <i>abrēk</i>	226f	<i>bāyā(h)</i>	14 n. 4
' <i>ādōn</i>	192	<i>bāyā(h) rō'e(h)</i>	' <i>et eḥāw</i> 15
' <i>ābū</i>	46	<i>bulledeṭ</i>	59
' <i>eḥād</i>	60	<i>binnē(h)</i>	49
' <i>akzāb</i>	230	<i>wayyāḥi'ū</i>	29 n. 5
' <i>ōkel</i>	173	<i>wayyāqām</i>	21 n. 2
' <i>akzār</i>	230	<i>wayyēšallēbū</i>	29 n. 5
' <i>al tāḥōs 'al</i>	63	<i>zēkūnim</i>	49
' <i>el Mišrayim</i>	136 n. 1	ZKR	49, 53, 59
' <i>el šadday</i>	129 n. 1	Z'p	58
' <i>ālumā(h)</i>	55	חַנְט	49
' <i>im</i>	38f	<i>ḥōq</i>	64
' <i>amtāḥā(h)</i>	46, 174, 252 n. 1	<i>ḥōri</i>	49
' <i>ēmōri</i>	201 n. 6	חַרְד	49
' <i>āni</i>	173f	<i>ḥarṭōm</i>	49, 59, 203f
' <i>ānōkī</i>	173f	<i>ṭabbāḥīm</i>	56, 148, 192
' <i>onnā'</i>	64	<i>ṭabba'aṭ</i>	60
' <i>anšē(y) miqne(h)</i>	46	ט'ן	49
' <i>ōpim</i>	192	<i>ṭārōp ṭōra'</i>	50
' <i>PS</i>	46	<i>yad</i>	50
' <i>PQ</i>	62	YD'	50, 53
' <i>ārāšōṭ</i>	61	YHB	50
' <i>Asēnaṭ</i>	228ff	<i>y'qb</i>	251 n. 1
' <i>SR</i>	47	<i>yēpōṭ ṭō'ar</i>	80 n. 1
' <i>iš Mišri</i>	202 n. 8	YRH	50
' <i>iššā(h) noḥriyyā(h)</i>	104	YRS	63
<i>ašmūrā(h)</i>	230	<i>ki</i>	39f
' <i>et</i>	15, 53	<i>kāḥēd</i>	50
<i>ba'ašer</i>	46, 57, 147 n. 2	<i>kēḥayyōm baḥḥe(h)</i>	50, 56
BḤN	61	<i>kayyōm baḥḥe(h)</i>	58
BK'	56	<i>keilkāl</i>	172 and n. 4
<i>bēnē Yiśrā'el</i>	132	<i>kēlim</i>	46, 174
<i>beša'</i>	56	<i>kēn</i>	59
<i>baššo'n</i>	15	<i>kesep</i>	234
<i>bār</i>	173	KRH	50
<i>bōr</i>	55, 146 n. 1	LHH	50
BRK	226	<i>libyōṭ 'immāb</i>	30 n. 1
BŠR	29 n. 3	<i>leḥem</i>	173
BŠL	48, 58	<i>lōṭ</i>	193
<i>bēṭ hammišmār</i>	48	<i>lāmā(h)</i>	64
<i>bēṭ hasōḥar</i>	47, 148	LQT	50
<i>bēṭ mišmereṭ</i>	58	<i>liškaḥ 'ešlab</i>	30 n. 1
<i>gāḥia'</i>	48	<i>mēgūrim</i>	162
<i>gēniyyā(h)</i>	64	<i>miḏbar</i>	143 n. 4
GLL	49, 62	<i>māzōn</i>	172 and n. 4
GWR	161	<i>mēṭāb</i>	50
<i>dāḥar</i>	175	<i>maṭmōn</i>	62
DRŠ	62	MLK	71 n. 2
<i>Dōṭaynāb</i>	49	<i>mēliš</i>	50, 62
<i>hē'</i>	64	<i>mišpō'</i>	50, 172 and n. 4
HYH	53	<i>Mišrayim</i>	175f

Miṣraymāb 136 n. 1
mēraggēlim 232
mišge(h) 50
 MŠL 71 n. 2
mišlaḥat 202
mišmār 58, 148
mašqim 192
 √MTH 46
 √NHĪL 51
 √NHĪM 51
nāṭā(h) besed 54
nēkōt 192f
 NKL 51, 55
nākōn baddāḥār 60
nakkennū 142
 NKR 18 n. 3
nokri 203
 NS' 19 n. 4
na'ar 'ihri 199
 NPL 51
nāsā(h) rōš 54, 72
nāṭan kē- 54
nāṭan qōl 54
 SHR 47
 SPR 29 n. 2
 SRG 59
sāris 51, 200f
'eḫed 'ihri 203
'aḫdeka 192
**'eḫer* 201 n. 6
'ihri(t) 202f, 235 n. 2
'al pi 51, 159
 'MD 162
 'MS 62f
'erwā(h) 51
 'SH 51
pi haṭṭap 51
 PWG 63
Pōṭipera' 228ff
 PQD 53, 208 n. 4
pēqādim 207f, 208 n. 4
piqqadōn 60

INDEX OF ARAMAIC WORDS AND PHRASES

mēdināb 207
rab ṭabbāḥayyā' 56
šadda'u 129 n. 1

pārā(h) 205 n. 4
 PŠT 143 n. 1
 PŠR 58
 PTR 52, 58
šedā(h) 172 and n. 4
 SDQ 52
 SWH 52, 63
 ŠLH 29 n. 5, 57
šēnumōt 80
šē'irā(h) 52
Šapnatpa'nēab 228ff
šēri 193
 ŠRP 61
šērōr kesep 234
 QWM 52
**qōmeš* 52, 61
qāse(h) 52
qereḫ 59
qāšōt 52
 R'H 52f
rē'u 52
rāḫid 60
rūaḫ 'ēlōhim 130 n. 2
 RWM 52
ra' 52, 58
 R'B 52
rōḫ'im 53, 64, 240
 RWS 63
šāḫā' 60
 ŠHT 53, 59
 ŠYM 53
šaq 46, 174
šāriḡ 58
šē'eriš 53
šēḫer 173
 ŠDP 53
šallit 61
šallēm rā'ā(h)... 54
šōš 61, 226 n. 4
tōlēdōt 3ff, 21, 26
tō'ēḫā(h) 53
tōrā(h) 11 n. 4

sārisā' 51
telah 29 n. 5

INDEX OF UGARITIC WORDS

šlyt 61 n. 4

INDEX OF AKKADIAN WORDS AND PHRASES

abarikku 226 n. 8
bīt esēri 47
bīt mēseri 47
Ḫabirū 203, 235 n. 2
ḫarṭibi 203
ṭābiḫu 56 n. 1

matāḫu 46 n. 4
sīru 47
paqdu 208
ša rēši 51 and n. 7
šadū 129 n. 1
šēmeru 225 n. 4

INDEX OF EGYPTIAN WORDS AND PHRASES

Ḫwt 155, 156 n. 1
Ḫt 156 n. 1
iw' 214 and n. 4, 6
'Iw. š-n-Nt 229f
ib n nšw 191 n. 6
ibr 193
'Imn-iw 230
inw 216
iry-t3 227 n. 3
'Irt-r. w 228 n. 3
'Is-Pth 229 n. 4
'Is-grit 229 n. 4
it-ntr 191
'Imw 202 n. 3
wb3 191 n. 6, 192
wbn 47
wt 240
wḡ3t 127
p3 wdpw wr 228 n. 2
P3-n-B'l 228 n. 6
P3-n-R' 228 n. 6
p3 ḫk3 233
P3-sn'-n-p3-'nh 230 n. 2
P3-dt-R' 228 n. 6
P3-dt-B'l 228 n. 6
P3-dt-p3-R' 136, 228ff
Pr-'3 233
Pčy 228 n. 6
P-ḫ-b-ḫ-r 228 n. 6
fq3 214
Mntyw 202 n. 3
nb 233
Nb-r-ḡr 120 n. 2
nmḫw 237 n. 1
nšw 233
Nš-wrt 229 n. 4
Nš-p3wty-t3wy 229 n. 4
Nš-p3-mdw 229 n. 4
Nš-p3-ntr 229 n. 4
Nš-Pth 229 n. 4
Nš-n3-Ḫmmw 229 n. 4
Nš-Nt 229f

Nš-Ḫwty 229 n. 4
ntr 127
nḡt-ḫr 216
rm' n nbw 214
rḫ 213 n. 3
r-t3 227 and n. 3
riḫty 192
rdny 193
brw mš ntr nfr 206
Ḫ'py-n-t3wy 230 n. 2
Ḫp 230
ḫry P 227 n. 3
ḫswt 214
Ḫ3rw 202 n. 3
ḫrpw 214
ḫ3r 234 n. 2
ḫry-ḫb 240
ḫry-ḫb ḫry-tp 49, 203f
št-m3't 240
s3-t3 227 n. 3
šwbn 47f
šmr 227 n. 3
šn-t3 m-b3ḫ 227 n. 3
šntr 193 n. 10
šrfy 198
šrš 51, 201
š'ty 234 n. 2
šmw 216 n. 5
šmrḫt 'brtt 201
šš-nšw 226 n. 4
šdī 129 n. 1
qbbw 48 n. 7
twrit 224
Twtyn 49
dit. w 213 n. 3
dit t3 227 n. 3
Č3rw 47
čšy tp 54
ḡ3mw 213 n. 4
Č3-n-t3wy-p3-'nh 230 n. 2
ḡrm 193
**Ḫ'Ḫ-Ipt-Nwt-iw. f-'nh* 231

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Ĝd-Imm-iw. f-ḥb</i> 230 n. 4 | <i>Ĝd-Hr-iw. f-ḥb</i> 230 n. 4 |
| <i>Ĝd-Imm-Hr-iw. f-ḥb</i> 230 n. 6 | * <i>Ĝd-Šw-Tjmw-ḥw. f-ḥb</i> 230 n. 6 |
| * <i>Ĝd-p3-nḥr-ḥw. f-ḥb</i> 230 | <i>Ĝd-Ĝḥwty-ḥw. f-ḥb</i> 230 n. 4 |
| <i>Ĝd-Pth-Hr-ḥw. f-ḥb</i> 230 n. 6 | |

INDEX OF DEMOTIC WORDS AND PHRASES

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>Išwr</i> 201 n. 5 | <i>hr-tb</i> 203f |
| <i>y.w</i> 204 | <i>Hl-Hnsw</i> 199 n. 9 |
| <i>ybr</i> 201 and n. 6 | <i>ḥm ḥl</i> 199 |
| <i>y n ḥrr</i> 48 | <i>šnw</i> 240 |
| <i>p3 hrw msy</i> 206 | <i>sb3. w</i> 204 |
| <i>p3 tš n Išwr</i> 201 n. 6 | <i>t3 ḥl(t) n(t) Mwt</i> 199 n. 9 |
| <i>ḥry-tme</i> 204 | |

INDEX OF COPTIC WORDS

- | | |
|---------------|-----------|
| ⲱⲓⲧⲉ 129 n. 1 | ⲑⲁⲣⲟⲗ 199 |
|---------------|-----------|

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|
| ἀγόρασμον 173 n. 3 | μάρσιππος 46 |
| Ἄμεννευς 230 | νομάρχης 208 n. 4 |
| ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ 148 | πετεφρης 228 |
| ἀρχιδεσμώτης 148 | πᾶσις 173 n. 3 |
| ἀρχιμάγειρος 56 | σῆτος 173 n. 1, 2 |
| Ἄσεννεθ 229 | σναχομνευς 229 n. 4 |
| βρῶματα 173 n. 1 | σποτους 229 n. 4 |
| δεσμοφύλαξ 148 | συκοφάντησαι 49 |
| ἐνταφιάσται 240 | σύνταξις 239 |
| ἐσοηρις 229 n. 4 | Συρία 201 n. 5 |
| ἐσθωτης 229 n. 4 | τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ βασιλέως 206 |
| ἐσπημητις 229 n. 4 | τοπάρχης 208 n. 4 |
| ἐσπνουθις 229 n. 4 | φεριτοβ 203 |
| ἐσπταις 229 n. 4 | |