

taking special interest in them. The steward is thematic and dominant and the brothers are called "the men" in accordance with the steward's viewpoint. Even in v15 -- which is part of the 'steward span' -- the brothers are so called even though the steward does not come on the scene until in the following verse. The brothers remain "the men" in the narrator's recounting of the convivial feast with Joseph (cf. 43:33) and in the events of the morning after (44:40). They are not referred by overt name in the intervening episodes. Finally, when Joseph makes himself known to them (chap. 45) they are again "his brothers."

Such adaptation of the narrator's way of referring to a person to the viewpoint of another participant in the story is easy to document both in English and in Hebrew. For the latter, note Gen 12: 14,15 (Sarah > "the woman"); Ruth 3:8 (where Boaz > "the man" and Ruth > "a woman"); I Sam 28:13 (Saul > "the king").

The narrator's art is also seen in reference to alternation between the divine names *'ēlohîm* and YAHWEH in this story. All the uses of the latter are found in the two troughs of the story -- immediately after Joseph is sold as a slave to Potiphar and after his degradation from the stewardship consequent the false accusation of Potiphar's wife. If -- as the story itself tells us -- this is a narrative whose controlling idea is the providence of God, is it any accident that, at the two darkness hours of Joseph's life the narrator tells us that "Yahweh was with Joseph." This divine name, featuring God in his more personalistic and covenant-keeping aspects, is found five times in 39:2-5 and three times in 39:21-23. Resort to the macrostructure as a control is clearly a sufficient reason for the occurrence of Yahweh here as opposed to *'ēlohîm* in all the other passages of the story (many of which picture Joseph interacting with Egyptians).

All this brings us to the discussion of Israel/Jacob. Here we are faced with two names for the same person. Why, after the change of name in 35:10 is not Jacob consistently called Israel -- as Abram becomes consistently Abraham after his change of name? My suggestion here is that "Jacob" emphasizes more Joseph's father as a suffering, feeling human being, while "Israel" accords better with passages where his dignity and office are in view. In emphasizing his role as clan-head we find, universally in the story "the sons of Israel" (not "sons of Jacob").

Elsewhere, note: (1) We find "Israel" in Gen 37:3,13 before the sale of Joseph into Egypt, but "Jacob" in 37:34 where he mourns the loss of his favorite son. (2) In 42:1-4 we find "Jacob," where perhaps this name is fitting in describing the measures taken by a man to obtain food for himself and his family. Note also that "Jacob" (v4) fears to send Benjamin, Joseph's brother. (3) Likewise, in the dialogue ensuing in the brothers' return from their first trip to Egypt. "Jacob" is presented again to us as a frustrated, troubled, somewhat petulant old man. (4) In the dialogue which is found in 43:1-14, after a neutral reference to Israel/Jacob as "their father" we find "Israel" in vv 6,8, and 11. While the emotional outburst in v6 might lead us to expect "Jacob" rather than "Israel" here, we must look at the dialogue as a whole. The dialogue comes to a stalemate of sorts in v7, is redirected by Judah in v8 (he takes personal responsibility for Benjamin), and is taken in hand by their father in v11, i.e., as soon as