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.