

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 255

Exodus 1, Part 1

January 19, 2019

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

Exodus 1 is short in terms of verse count, but there are a surprising number of items in the text that need some comment—so many that we need two episodes! In this episode we look at the language describing Israel's condition under bondage in Egypt long after the time of Joseph. We talk about the reasons the biblical author links his description with Genesis 11:1-9, the Babel story; why the description of the bondage is justifiable historical; how the earlier story of Joseph in Egypt could be congruent with Exod 1:11, and how what pharaoh commanded the Hebrew midwives, Shiphrah and Puah, has been regularly misunderstood.

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 255: Exodus 1, Part 1. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike, how are you doing this week?

MH: Pretty good. For those that don't know by now, there has been, of course, news circulating on the internet for well over a week: my dad did pass away. We had the funeral. I didn't go back to the East Coast to attend, but I videoed a eulogy for it. The whole ceremony... Everybody (Mom, brother, sisters, the whole extended family) was really happy, not only with the eulogy, but just the way the whole thing went. They videoed the whole thing and it was great. So we're on the other side of this. As I mentioned before, my dad was ready to go. I don't have any doubts about that. I'm thrilled for him. Of course, my mom is going to be in a period of transition now, so all of you who have asked, you could continue to pray for her. Her name is Jan. And it's just going to take a while. That's normal. Nothing unusual there. So we'll be checking in on her, checking her state of mind, trying to encourage her and do what we can for her.

TS: Always praying. We appreciate everybody—all of the emails and thoughts that people have sent in. We're about to start our long journey into Exodus.
[laughter]

MH: I know you're looking for a pun there, something about leaving one location and... Maybe for the wilderness wanderings, you can ask where we are in our wanderings, or something like that.

TS: Well, out of the gate, we already have Part 1 of two parts.

MH: Yeah. I don't want listeners to feel like they're in bondage, though. [laughs]

TS: No, we're excited to take this journey. People have been looking for this book for quite a while, so here we are.

MH: Yeah. I'm going to start by reading chapter 1. Up front, this is only going to be Part 1, devoted to chapter 1. We're going to have to spend two episodes in the first chapter. I'll explain why as we get into the content here. I think the easiest thing to do is just to read the chapter and once we get into the content, there'll be a certain point where I'll say, "Hey, this is for Part 2." You'll understand why. So Exodus 1, reading from the ESV:

These are the names of the sons of Israel who came to Egypt with Jacob, each with his household: ² Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, ³ Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin, ⁴ Dan and Naphtali, Gad and Asher. ⁵ All the descendants of Jacob were seventy persons; Joseph was already in Egypt. ⁶ Then Joseph died, and all his brothers and all that generation. ⁷ But the people of Israel were fruitful and increased greatly; they multiplied and grew exceedingly strong, so that the land was filled with them.

⁸ Now there arose a new king over Egypt, who did not know Joseph. ⁹ And he said to his people, "Behold, the people of Israel are too many and too mighty for us. ¹⁰ Come, let us deal shrewdly with them, lest they multiply, and, if war breaks out, they join our enemies and fight against us and escape from the land."¹¹ Therefore they set taskmasters over them to afflict them with heavy burdens. They built for Pharaoh store cities, Pithom and Raamses. ¹² But the more they were oppressed, the more they multiplied and the more they spread abroad. And the Egyptians were in dread of the people of Israel. ¹³ So they ruthlessly made the people of Israel work as slaves ¹⁴ and made their lives bitter with hard service, in mortar and brick, and in all kinds of work in the field. In all their work they ruthlessly made them work as slaves.

¹⁵ Then the king of Egypt said to the Hebrew midwives, one of whom was named Shiphrah and the other Puah, ¹⁶ "When you serve as midwife to the Hebrew women and see them on the birthstool, if it is a son, you shall kill him,

5:00

but if it is a daughter, she shall live.”¹⁷ But the midwives feared God and did not do as the king of Egypt commanded them, but let the male children live.¹⁸ So the king of Egypt called the midwives and said to them, “Why have you done this, and let the male children live?”¹⁹ The midwives said to Pharaoh, “Because the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women, for they are vigorous and give birth before the midwife comes to them.”²⁰ So God dealt well with the midwives. And the people multiplied and grew very strong.²¹ And because the midwives feared God, he gave them families.²² Then Pharaoh commanded all his people, “Every son that is born to the Hebrews you shall cast into the Nile, but you shall let every daughter live.”

Now in the very opening here... The Hebrew wording in the opening is of interest, believe it or not.

These are the names of the sons of Israel who came to Egypt with Jacob, each with his household:

And then you get the list. The reason why this is interesting is that the wording that opens the book is exactly the same as in Genesis 46. If you go to Genesis 46:8-27, there's a much longer genealogy—a much longer explanation. There are lots of individuals in it. But it starts exactly the same way. “These are the names of the descendants of Israel who came to Egypt...” The ESV renders it a little bit differently, but in Hebrew, the wording is exactly the same. That effectively alerts the Hebrew reader that Exodus is a continuation of the Genesis story of Jacob and Israel. It ties the two books together in a literary sense. You say, “Well, isn't that kind of obvious?” Well, it is on one level because in our Bibles Exodus is positioned after Genesis. We read one after the other. But there's more to the idea of continuation than just where something sits. Now Carpenter, in his Exodus commentary (this is the volume in the Evangelical Exegetical Commentary produced by Lexham Press), he says this:

The author's use of the formula “Now these are the names” (v. 1) also parallels the use of the formula “now these are the generations of” (Gen 2:4a; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, etc.), in Genesis as a structural device. [MH: So we have a structural parallel that also ties the books together.] Its use here suggests that God's goals and purposes for his original creation are now being realized in an incipient Israel.

That's kind of obvious, but there's a little bit more to the continuity here than meets the eye. I'm just going to telegraph it here. There are things (we said this in the introduction) in the text of Exodus (in the Hebrew text) that specifically repurpose (connect into, hook into) specific passages in Genesis that aim at talking about the fulfillment of God's original promise to Abraham—that he would have a large family, that he would have many seed, and they would multiply.

[Isaac] would be the promised seed. And Abraham and Sarah were essentially the new Adam and Eve because God had disinherited (he had abandoned, he had forsaken) humanity at the Tower of Babel event and started over with Abram and Sarah. They were the new human family. They were the new Adam and Eve, and their descendants were to replace that which God had abandoned. That God is committed to this plan is made evident when you get this “these are the generations” thing. And in Genesis, they continue a specific line of people (a specific family line). And then when you get it here, “These are the names of the sons of Israel,” the story is ongoing. God is still committed to it. And that becomes important because in this chapter of Exodus, Egypt (I’m telegraphing here), which is going to be cast as the new force of chaos (the new Babel), is attacking and trying to thwart God’s purposes with his new family and is not succeeding.

In other words, God... The language in the text where it hooks back into Genesis... We’re going to see some specific hooks back into Genesis 11 (the Babel story) in this chapter. It’s telegraphing a theological and historical point—that no matter what the forces of chaos do, God is going to fulfill his promises. He is absolutely committed to them, despite what you see going on around you. It’s a big theme in Exodus (this continuity).

Now as a sidebar to this (because our audience likes these little sidebars), “sons of Israel” in verse 1 refers to the original migrant group of Genesis (back in the Joseph story). However, when you get to verse 7, the same phrase (“sons of Israel”) refers to a much larger group, and so ESV has it translated as “the people of Israel.” So in 1:1, “These are the names of the *sons* of Israel...” Verse 7, “...but the *people* of Israel were fruitful and increased greatly.” Given the same wording in Hebrew and the connection of verse 1 back into Genesis, the subtle point is that God has kept his promise to multiply Abram’s seed. Jacob was the chosen son after Isaac. So the sons of Israel in verse 1 are now seen to be greatly multiplied in verse 7. Verse 5:

⁵ All the descendants of Jacob were seventy persons; Joseph was already in Egypt.

Now that gives us the sort of obvious point that... it puts the sons of Israel in verse 1 back into the Joseph story from Genesis. But there’s something interesting about this as well. And I’m bringing this up because sometimes we get hung up on literalism and numbers. And in this case, one is more legit than the other. So Carpenter notes that the number of people who actually came to Egypt back in the day of Joseph is actually more than 70. That means “70” is probably symbolic, given the use of 70 and multiples of seven elsewhere. You say, “Well, that sounds arbitrary, Mike. How can you just say that it’s more than 70?” Because of what it says in the Hebrew text. Now ESV:

¹These are the names of the sons of Israel who came to Egypt with Jacob, each with his household... ⁵All the descendants of Jacob were seventy persons...

The word “descendants” there in the ESV in Hebrew is יֹצְאֵי (yōtse’ê): “those who came out of,” literally, “out of the body”—out from Jacob himself (the man). “Out of the loins of Jacob” is the idea. So it only refers to Jacob’s direct seed. You have to get over the pre-modern idea of where babies come from in the Semitic (the biblical, the ancient Near Eastern) world. They don’t know anything about a child being the combination of two sets of... genetics. They just don’t know this. That one set of chromosomes combines with the other, and we have a certain number of chromosomes... They don’t know any of that stuff. In the ancient world, they used the planting metaphor. The couple has sex. The man *plants* the seed into the woman, where it grows. Then, she gives birth to a child. This is why (I mentioned this a number of times on the podcast) the Old Testament knows nothing of male infertility; it only knows female infertility. “Well, I planted the seed, so there must be something wrong with *you*.”

It takes you into other areas of theology, but in this case, you can see that these 70 (the descendants of Jacob)... The ones who came out from Jacob (from his loins) were 70 persons. So in other words, who’s not counted? Well, their wives aren’t counted. Any other children that might have accrued (maybe by adoption) aren’t counted. Servants aren’t counted. So the actual group that migrates in Joseph’s day with the 70 that came from the loins of Jacob is actually a bigger group than 70. We don’t often think about that, but what that means is that 70 doesn’t really have a literal correspondence to the caravan (the number of people who came down). It’s actually a subset. This is how it’s perceived. The ones that count in the count are the ones that actually proceeded from the loins of Jacob in the way that they express birth. So it opens the door to thinking differently about 70 and about numbers and about literalism when we read our Bible. In this case, we get clues from the text that we’re actually not talking... Our talk here, how we need to think about Israel in Egypt (or even of that trip in Joseph’s day)... there’s really not this strict correspondence to the number. It’s actually a subset number of the greater aggregate. And 70 of course is used in various different ways.

We’re going to see multiples in the book of Exodus. We’ve seen them in other books, when we did the whole temple thing with Ezekiel’s temple. We did two episodes on that. The numbers there are pretty obviously symbolic. It’s not always the case in Scripture, but it is often the case that the numbers mean something different than what you’d think they would mean, just thinking of this one-to-one literalism—this correspondence idea.

15:00

Now that might matter (here’s some telegraphing) when we start to think about the date of the exodus. That’s all I’ll say for now. Our Part 2 is going to really focus on chronological stuff. But just hold this thought in your head until Part 2 of Exodus 1, because one of the views of the Exodus is going to have to not take

certain numbers literally and the other one is going to insist on taking numbers literally. So just store that away.

Now verse 8... (This is what we do when we do book studies. I'll just skip around. We don't do verse by verse. I want to land on things that are interesting, things that need to be understood, or some of these sidebar issues.)

⁸ Now there arose a new king over Egypt, who did not know Joseph.

It's very easy to be reading in the book of Genesis (37-50 is all about Joseph), and then you get to Genesis 50 and Joseph dies and he's embalmed, and so on and so forth. And then you flip the page and you read this in Exodus, "There arose a new king over Egypt, who didn't know Joseph." It's very easy to think that the king referred to here was the king immediately after the king (the pharaoh) that Joseph worked under. That is not the case. It can't be. Because by the time we get to verse 8, Israel has expanded exponentially. And we know from other passages in the Old Testament (like Genesis 15) that Israel was going to be captive for at least 400 years, depending how you measure when the start began. Paul has a reference to 430 years. And when we get into the chronology of that, maybe we'll rabbit-trail on that sidebar. We'll just wait and see. But what you have here is a long stretch of time between Joseph and the events of Exodus 1. So if we could know (and we really can't, and we'll get into that a little bit today and a lot in Part 2) who the pharaoh was that Joseph served under... Even the era in Egyptian history where Joseph would be placed is hotly debated. We can't assume that the pharaoh of the bondage is the next guy. And if we knew the pharaoh of the bondage, we can't extrapolate backward to the time of Joseph, because we can't just say it's the preceding guy. We've got these round numbers (400 or 430, going with Paul) as to the space of time between the entry of the family leaving Canaan and going into Egypt and this chapter in Exodus 1. Carpenter writes here,

This pharaoh [MH: this king who arose over Egypt who did not know Joseph] was not acquainted with the previous history of Joseph and Israel in Egypt, or, at least, he did not choose to acknowledge Israel and her past relationships to Egypt (cf. Exod 5:1-2; 33:12, 13, 17). But more importantly, he lacked a knowledge of or refused to grant any significance to the close friendships that Joseph and Israel had cultivated with past pharaohs and Egyptians. The writer does not give the king's name, nor are the pharaohs' names given in Genesis.

So we don't know who this person was. We don't get any help by appealing back to the Genesis story. We don't know who that guy was, either. But for the sake of our discussion now, there's a long period of time between Joseph and the circumstances of Exodus 1. So it's not just the next guy that all of a sudden didn't like Joseph. No, hundreds of years have gone past. And this guy, as Carpenter says, either doesn't know anything about Joseph or really doesn't care. Now I

want to skip down to verses 11 through 14. I'm going to read them again. The growth of the people has alarmed the pharaoh (whoever he is).

¹¹ Therefore they set taskmasters over them to afflict them with heavy burdens. They built for Pharaoh store cities, Pithom and Rameses. ¹² But the more they were oppressed, the more they multiplied and the more they spread abroad. And the Egyptians were in dread of the people of Israel. ¹³ So they ruthlessly made the people of Israel work as slaves ¹⁴ and made their lives bitter with hard service, in mortar and brick, and in all kinds of work in the field. In all their work they ruthlessly made them work as slaves.

20:00

Now I'm going to focus in on certain parts of this. I'm going to (for the most part) skip the matter of the names Pithom and Rameses. We're going to spend (believe it or not) an entire episode (Part 2) on "Do those two names help us situate, chronologically, the time of the bondage, and thus the time of the exodus, and thus the time of Joseph?" It is (as I said in the introduction) a quagmire. It literally needs its own episode (and it's hard to cram it into one episode) because there's so much data that is either mutually contradictory or works in a variety of views of the chronology (the dating of these events) or is just ambiguous. There's just a lot that goes into it. So that's what our Part 2 is going to be based on.

But for now, I want to just ask you a question. You think about what I just read. What parts of verses 11 through 14 sound familiar, like they might be drawn from the Babel story? "The more they were oppressed, the more they multiplied, and the more they spread abroad." That's verse 12. Spread abroad. That term is used in Genesis 28:14 (the same Hebrew lemma), where it says:

¹⁴ Your offspring shall be like the dust of the earth, and you shall spread abroad to the west and to the east and to the north and to the south, and in you and your offspring shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

It's a direct reference to the promise given to Abraham and Sarah about their seed. They're the new Adam and Eve. They are the chosen ones after the Babel event. You get other Hebrew lemmas that mean "spread out, dispersed, spread abroad" in Genesis 11, specifically Genesis 11:4, 8-9. Reading from the Babel story:

⁴ "Come, let us build ourselves a city and a tower with its top in the heavens, and let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be dispersed [spread out] over the face of the whole earth."

Well here, we're talking about just Egypt, and the people (Abraham's seed) are spreading out. And the whole point is that God's original promise (God's original

desire) that his people spread out everywhere—do as he commanded—that is in operation. We talked a few episodes ago about how the blessing of Jacob to Joseph actually contains a reference to the Gentiles (the seed of Ephraim). If you didn't listen to that episode, you should go back and listen to that. It's in the Day of the Lord episode. All of the seed thoughts (pardon the pun) are in Abram's seed about the people of God (Jew and Gentile) fulfilling God's original wish after the Flood at Babel and way back in Genesis 1: "Be fruitful and multiply (spread out over all the earth), because you're going to have to subdue it and bring it into dominion." All of these things are textual and conceptual clues that are linked together about what God is doing despite the opposition of Egypt, who is going to be portrayed as the new Babel. Mortar and brick that show up here in Exodus 1:14:

¹⁴ **and made their lives bitter with hard service, in mortar and brick...**

The only place where those two lemmas show up with the "spreading abroad" idea (other lemmas)... There are only two places in the Bible where that combination occurs: Exodus 1 and Genesis 11. The writer wants his readers to think not only about, "Hey, God's keeping his promises. Abraham and Sarah were going to have a multitude... And look at that! That's neat!" It is, but he brings along with that the context of Babel. It's intentional. It's deliberate. It's the only other place where these things occur. The writer is casting Egypt as the new Babel—the new referent point of chaos, of opposition to God's will.

25:00

Remember chaos is opposition. It's a metaphor. It's a symbol in ancient Near Eastern thought. But ironically, the harder the new Babel (Egypt) tries to oppress Yahweh's portion, Israel, the larger it grows. Remember Deuteronomy 32:8-9, where the Most High divided up the nations. That's the Babel event. He divided them up. He fixed the boundaries according to the number of the sons of God. But Israel is Yahweh's portion. Jacob is his allotted inheritance. The harder the new Babel tries to oppress Yahweh's portion, the larger it grows. And the message is that Yahweh is fulfilling his promises no matter what the forces of chaos do. Babel, chaos, all the human and supernatural forces combined—everything that opposes God's plan—will not undermine his purposes through his people, the very people through whom one will come (one of those seed, one seed of Abraham). And specifically part of his mission is to reverse Babel, to bring the nations back into the family of Abraham. And all the children of Abraham... You're called a child of Abraham in the New Testament not because of your physical genealogy, your ethnicity. It's not the fact that you're Jewish. "If you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's [seed]..." That's Galatians 3. Just read Galatians 3:27-29. Really the whole chapter, but those are the verses that deliver the punch.

²⁹ **And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring [seed], heirs according to promise.**

It's Christ (the singular seed of Abraham) who reverses all of this. So what the writer's doing in Exodus is, yes, he wants the reader to think about how God is raising up a seed—the seed of Abraham—and that's wonderful. But he's also bringing the Deuteronomy 32 worldview context along with it. He's bringing Babel along with it. There are other really subtle things that, if we were reading in Hebrew, the whole thing about making their lives bitter, it's *marar* (the Hebrew lemma). *Marad* is very close to that, and it means “to rebel”—rebellion. You get that showing up in the account of Nimrod, who is cast as the king of Babel in the Old Testament. You get these little exegetical linguistic tidbits—these possibilities of what might be going on here. There are other ones.

I don't want to rabbit trail too much on this, but there are things that connect the two. One more. Leviathan, of course, is a very well-known symbol for chaos in Canaanite—the dragon. And the Babylonian version of the chaos dragon was Tiamat. Everybody in the ancient world knows this stuff. Yeah, if we were Canaanites, we'd talk about Lotan/Litanu. “And Baal is the one who defeats Litanu and brings order to everything and becomes king of the gods. Wonderful Baal.” All this stuff. If you were a Babylonian, you would say, “Well, the great chaos monster Tiamat (our equivalent of Leviathan), that's who Marduk defeats, and Marduk does the same thing: brings order into the world, and blah blah blah.” Well, guess who else gets called Leviathan in the Old Testament? Egypt. That's not a coincidence. (Not in Exodus; it's in the prophets.) Egypt, not only here in Exodus 1 but elsewhere, is tarred and feathered, as it were, with the same chaos symbology. These things are not accidental. The writers, whether it's the writer of Exodus or one of the prophets, wants his readers in those cases to think about Egypt as a chaos force. And we've got plenty of that right here.

Now to continue on, we need to talk about the nature of the servitude here—the whole issue of the slavery in Egypt. Verse 11, the first part of it:

**¹¹ Therefore they set taskmasters over them to afflict them with heavy burdens.
They built for Pharaoh store cities,**

And then later in the passage:

¹⁴ and made their lives bitter with hard service, in mortar and brick, and in all kinds of work in the field. In all their work they ruthlessly made them work as slaves.

Now Durham has a note here about the store cities that may or may not give us any help with the chronology. But there's also an issue of, is this portrayal historically accurate? So there are a couple of points to cover with respect to the nature of the slavery. Without getting deep into the chronology, which we're going to do next time, I'll just read what Durham says here, and then we'll use

that as a springboard to get into some of the other points of controversy. Durham writes:

30:00

The specific territory the king has in mind [MH: with these storehouse cities] is indicated not only by the accounts in Genesis of Israel's settlement in Goshen (chap. 47) [MH: you have the district of Rameses], but especially by the designation of the supply-cities Pithom and Ra'amses in the MT, to which LXX adds "On, which is Heliopolis." These cities were all in the delta region, and all were associated with the vigorous building and rebuilding projects of the Nineteenth Dynasty...

Now the reason that that's a little bit interesting is Joseph is given a priestess (Asenath the daughter of the high priest of On—Heliopolis) to marry. So the Septuagint actually pegs this district here in Exodus 1:11 as being the same. He associates it with Joseph by virtue of this specific reference to On (Heliopolis) where this woman was from. The other interesting point is that Pithom and Rameses, Durham says (and he's making a bit of an assumption here), were associated with the 19th dynasty. This is the dynasty of Rameses II—Rameses the Great. Now that's all well and good, but as we discuss next time, that is not (in fact it is quite far) from a slam dunk for associating this time period described in Exodus 1 with Rameses II (Rameses the Great). Now I know with Charlton Heston and Yul Brenner, it was Moses against Rameses the Great. I get it. Yul Brenner's dad (Seti I) was the king before Rameses II. So the movie, of course, assumes that the king here for both the bondage and the exodus (which is another mistake) is Rameses II. Even the cartoon (the Spielberg *Prince of Egypt*) makes this assumption. This is the dominant view. And as a proof-text for that, people go to Exodus 1:11 and say, "Look, they're building stuff for Rameses. Who else can that refer to?" We'll get to that in Part 2.

Let's segue to a bit of another note [Durham].

In this note (verse 11), the king is called "Pharaoh" for the first time in the ongoing narrative of the book.

We're in chapter 1, so it takes 11 verses, but the king is identified as Pharaoh.

The Hebrew term *par-oh* (פַּרְעֹה) is a transliteration of the Egyptian word *Pr-ʿ3* (per-a-a), which referred originally to the royal palace or the king's court but came by the time of Akhenaten to be used also as a respectful royal title for one individual. Eventually, by the Nineteenth Dynasty, *Pr-ʿ3* (pharaoh) was used as it is here in Exodus 1 (Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, 75).

Sir Alan Gardiner, famous Egyptologist (the guy who wrote *Gardiner's Egyptian Grammar*), has an article on this. And he's right. That's what the data are. "Pharaoh" is only used to refer to households (administrations). Think of our modern equivalent of "White House." The phrase "White House" can refer to an administration or a single individual, depending on how it's used. "Well, the White House said today that..." Well, if it was President Trump saying that, well, we can do that math. That's the way *Pr-'3* (pharaoh) was used from the 18th-19th dynasty onward. The term becomes used for an individual.

Now if you're thinking already about the chronology issue, you're thinking, "Good grief. How can we possibly hold, then, to the early date of the exodus?" If you don't know what these terms are, here's a little parenthesis. When we get into chronology next week, I'm going to be talking about the early date and the late date for the exodus. The early date is 1446 B.C. That's 18th dynasty. It's prior to this time. 1446 B.C. is a number that comes from 1 Kings 6:1, where it says, "in the fourth year of Solomon..." And basically everybody agrees that Solomon got to the throne around 970 B.C., so his fourth year is 966. The fourth year of Solomon is the 480th anniversary of the exodus from Egypt. So you just do the math. 966-480 (because we're going backward) equals 1446 B.C. What could be simpler? Well, a whole lot of things can be simpler, [laughs] as we'll see next week.

35:00

The late date, though, wants to put the exodus in the time of Rameses, roughly 200 years later. You say, "Well, how can they do that, if 1 Kings 6:1 gives us the math?" Well, they would say, "480, interestingly enough, is 12 times 40. Forty is a generation. Maybe it just means 12 generations, and we don't have an exact chronology. Generations can be less than 40 years. A generation is really when a male reaches adulthood and starts having children, and 40 is a symbolic number throughout the Old Testament that's well-known." So they don't take the number literally, and they feel comfortable with that because they want the exodus to be during the time of Rameses II because of verses like this (Exodus 1:11). And also because of the Egyptological data about a term like *Pr-'3* (pharaoh) only used of an individual like it is here in Exodus 1:11 from the 19th dynasty onward. We're going to get into all of this next week. But that's just telegraphing.

So we've got here a situation where (let's agree for the sake of this episode) the Israelites have tough lives. They're in bondage. Can we just move on now? Well, we could, except that there's a lot of bickering about this description. There are critical scholars out there who will say, "Look, the only people in Egypt that could rightly be called slaves are military captives, prisoners of war. They were made slaves." They would say major Egyptian monuments (now catch my wording here, I'm being deliberate here)—and the wonderful examples are the pyramids—were built by trained, skilled laborers. They were native Egyptians who were like masons. This is what they did. And when the pyramids were built (and other significant monuments) you actually had people move into the area.

They built towns to sustain the worker population. They were well-fed. This is a job you wanted, because you basically got more food than anybody else. You were waited on in that respect. You had to be maintained. You had to be physically vigorous and strong. So this was a good life to work for Pharaoh as a mason, as somebody who did... “Yeah, the labor is hard, but hey, it’s a building project. There’s going to be another one after this. It’s job security. We’re good.” They were not slaves. And all of that’s true. Of course, the assumption is that we classify Pithom and Rameses as “monuments” or major building projects that were looked upon in the same way as the pyramids and certain temples were. So that’s a big assumption. But it’s often made. You get scholars that just want to pick at what’s going on there, as though to say the description of the Israelites as slaves is incorrect. What’s incorrect is the assumption that foreigners, therefore, were never put under hard labor—forcible, hard labor. To be honest with you (and we’ll get into some of the data here), that might be actually worse than a slave situation. There are indications that what we’re dealing with is a little bit different here. It’s not a work crew, but it’s not really a prisoner of war kind of situation either. So let me just mention Sarna here. I have loaded this article into the podcast article archive that you can access if you’re a newsletter subscriber. In regard to this idea of some objecting to the recounting of the bondage by saying the picture doesn’t fit, Nahum Sarna has a nice article on this. It goes through the data pretty well. Sarna is with the consensus. He’s going to assume this is Rameses II—his time. He writes this:

For his vast building program Rameses II preferred to conscript foreigners in the area, rather than native Egyptians. Such was reported by the Greco-Roman historian Diodorus Siculus (first century B.C.E.), who apparently relied on trustworthy Egyptian sources (Diodorus of Sicily I:56). The enslavement of the Israelites falls into the category that Diodorus describes. It was not domestic bondage, the type in which an individual becomes the chattel of a private master and lives in his household, although this type of slavery is well attested to in Egypt. There is no evidence that the Israelite women were enslaved or that slavery involved the dissolution of the family unit. [MH: If you were a P.O.W., you don’t have any hope of that.] In fact, one text [MH: in the Bible] shows that the Israelites could live next door to or even in the same house as Egyptians and maintain social relations with them.

Each woman shall borrow from her neighbor and the lodger in her house objects of silver and gold, and cloth clothing, and you shall put these on your sons and daughters, thus stripping the Egyptians. (Exodus 3:22; compare 11:2 and 12:35)

Now the point is that when that prophecy is given in Exodus 3 (that’s the burning bush scene), there’s a reference made to Israelite women being neighbors to

40:00

Egyptians. That isn't the normal POW slave lifestyle there. It's just not the same thing.

What we are dealing with is state slavery, the organized imposition of forced labor upon the male population for long and indefinite terms of service under degrading and brutal conditions. The men so conscripted received no reward for their labors, they enjoyed no civil rights, and their lot was generally much worse than that of a household slave.

So what Sarna is basically pointing out (you can read the whole article) is there were different kinds of slaves in Egypt. It's not just POW's. So when you see these kinds of arguments made to delegitimize the description of Exodus 1, they just don't hold up under the data. So the description of the bondage is not something that is non-historical.

Let's talk a little bit about another issue here: the dramatic growth of the population. We mentioned this a little bit, about how the earlier reference to the 70 was a subset, and now you have the people of Israel expanding dramatically throughout Egypt. There's an issue here if we just asked the question, "Is there anything in Egyptian history or Egyptian texts where we have large numbers of Semitic people living in Egypt, and specifically in the area of Goshen, which is the eastern delta region? Is there anything like that? Yes, there is. So we have a dramatic growth of a Semitic population in Goshen (in the delta area) and that has led most scholars to identify the Hyksos period as the backdrop period to the bondage. Now let me just unpack that a little bit. *Hyksos* is actually a Greek term. It's the Greek version of the Egyptian phrase *hekau khasut*, which means "rulers of or from foreign lands." Now there was a period in Egyptian history where you had a numerically significant concentration of Semitic people living in the delta region in Egypt. That period is known as the Second Intermediate Period. It's the 16th to the 18th dynasties in Egypt. In other words, it's before Rameses.

Try to get this mental picture in your head. If you think the Pharaoh of Exodus 1 and the exodus story is Rameses, then preceding him there was this period when you had lots of Semites living in Goshen. And they were hated by the native Egyptians. They were foreign rulers (rulers from foreign lands). You actually had Hyksos pharaohs in two of these dynasties. They actually got to that position where they... Egypt was breaking down. If you look at Egyptian history, you have kingdoms (Old Kingdom, Middle Kingdom, New Kingdom) and in between each of those, you have these intermediate periods (that's what scholars refer to them as). If it's an intermediate period, it's a time of chaos in Egypt. There's no single pharaoh. There's no central authority. You might have five or six pharaohs. You have a bunch of guys running around saying, "We're the Pharaoh." And they're not asking for votes, either. They're trying to take over turf, or they're content to just control districts of Egypt. Egypt is fragmented in the

intermediate periods, and it takes a strong hand (a strong force) to reunite the entire country and usher in a new rule.

45:00

So that's why you get the Old Kingdom (that's the pyramid age), then things break down, and you have the First Intermediate Period. Then you had the Middle Kingdom, where things are consolidated again, and that breaks down eventually, and you have the Second Intermediate Period (that's the Hyksos period). Then after that, you've got the New Kingdom (dynasties 18, 19, and 20). This is when (somewhere in there) the biblical events of the bondage and the exodus are thought to occur. So if we look at the Hyksos period, the consensus view among Egyptologists and biblical scholars is that the period of the bondage is at the very end... It actually is sort of an aftereffect of the Hyksos period. So for a few hundred years earlier than this, what happens in Egyptian history, according to the Egyptian records, is the Hyksos are finally dealt with. Egypt is consolidated and the Hyksos are literally driven out of the country. They go into the Negev and into Canaan, and all those kinds... They are literally driven out. They're not chased (like in the Exodus story). They are driven out, because they're hated. And any that were left in Egypt, they enslaved, because they hated them. So the consensus view is that the period of the bondage follows the Hyksos period. It's part of a reaction against the hated Hyksos Semites. So the consensus view tends to put Joseph somewhere in this Hyksos period because Joseph was a Semite. He had to have lived during the Second Intermediate Period, the time of the Hyksos.

Now if you accept all that, you cannot hold to the early date of the exodus because you have to have Joseph in Egypt before the exodus. If the exodus is in 1446 B.C., that means Joseph is around earlier and that ain't anywhere near the Hyksos period. If you think Joseph belongs in the Hyksos period, then you have to hold the late date, the nonliteral number. The time of Rameses, 1250 or so, the exodus... You have to reject the early date, which is based on the literalized math given in 1 Kings 6:1. So that's what we're dealing with here. Now the idea (just to go over this a little bit more) is not that the Israelites were to be equated totally with the Hyksos. The Hyksos are a conglomeration of ethnic groups, specifically (mostly, predominantly) Semites. They infiltrated into the land over a long period of time. This is Sarna's article. I'll quote a little bit from it:

The idea is not that the Israelites were to be equated with the Hyksos themselves. Hyksos were "a conglomeration of ethnic groups. who infiltrated into the land over a long period of time in ever-increasing numbers, probably coming from Canaan. By about 1720 B.C.E. they were fully in control of the eastern Delta of the Nile and had established their capital at Avaris... The Hyksos constituted the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Dynasties, adopting the style and bureaucratic institutions of the traditional pharaohs. Gradually, Semites replaced Egyptians in high administrative offices.

So Sarna believes that Joseph belongs in this period. That makes good sense with the late date. It's impossible for the early date. The whole notion of *Pr-3* (Egyptian for pharaoh) only being a New Kingdom (18th-19th dynasty onward—in other words, after the Hyksos period), that goes with the late date, too. Things are looking good for the late date here, which is why we need to spend a whole episode on the current chronological issues, because the late date has problems. So don't just be clicking your heels if you're a late-dater and saying, "Well, problem solved. End of story." No, it's a whole lot more complicated than that.

Now in regard to Joseph, let's just talk about him a little bit. If Joseph is part of this Hyksos period—if the Hyksos period is what we're looking at here in Exodus 1 (the tail end of it)—the question is pretty simple. Does Joseph fit what's said about him in the Hyksos period? Does he fit? Or for the early date, would he fit in the period prior to the Hyksos period, prior to the Second Intermediate Period (that would be the Middle Kingdom)? Does Joseph fit there better? Which era does Joseph fit in, and which does he fit better? Those are two related but different questions. The short answer is you can make him fit in either, depending how you take certain things, especially if you want to support the early date—if you're convinced of that. You can get Joseph in the Middle Kingdom and feel good about it. You really can. Questions like, "Does it make sense to have a Semite rise to the height of power like Joseph did in a period other than the Hyksos period?" This is how the debates go.

50:00 So just to say a little bit about this, some of the elements of the Joseph story seem to fit the Hyksos context (Second Intermediate Period) pretty well. There's a large Semitic presence there, including a power base, obviously. But there are some pretty serious disconnections. The biblical text, for instance, nowhere states that Joseph was one among many Semites in rulership. See, if you're dealing with the Hyksos context, basically everybody in the administration is a Semite. Is that really the picture that emerges from the Joseph story? Well, not so much.

Another one: Joseph, when he meets Pharaoh, he has to shave and put clean clothing on. Why shave if Pharaoh was a Semite or used to Semites? "There were lots of Semites running around here. They grow beards." Seems to be a native Egyptian context. Now, you could argue on the flip side, "Well, the Hyksos wanted to be like the Pharaoh, so they just kept the rules." Yeah, you can argue that. But it's an oddity. It can go either way.

Another example: Joseph is given a daughter of the priest of On (Heliopolis) to marry. You can probably tell by the Greek name of the city Heliopolis that the city was dedicated to a solar (sun) deity. However, the Hyksos didn't worship the sun. They worshipped Set. If Joseph is given the daughter of the priest of Heliopolis (the solar deity), that doesn't sound like the Hyksos period. That sounds like a native Egyptian... some other period, because it's a solar deity.

Another one: archeological work has produced evidence of high-ranking Semites in Egypt earlier than the Hyksos period. David Rohl (we'll come back to Rohl, especially next week) is the *Patterns of Evidence* guy that they build a lot of that video off of—his work. Rohl uses this evidence (in particular, a statue without a face; it's been defaced). There is evidence of Semites that were high-ranking in the delta area. They were rich; they had beautiful houses. It's pretty obvious that they were high servants of Pharaoh. There's a statue of a mushroom type hairstyle that's of particular interest here. That's a hairstyle that's used of Asiatics (that's the Egyptian term for Semites and other foreigners). There's a particular statue with this mushroom hairstyle, and you can see that hairstyle in other Egyptian art in a 12th Dynasty palace (that's Middle Kingdom). Now it suggests that the palace in which this was found belonged to a Semite. Why else would you make a statue of a Semitic guy? Must have been his palace. Rohl actually believes that the defaced statue *is* a statue of Joseph. Now that says too much. Basically, you just can't prove that, but at the very least, it shows a high-ranking Semite in Egypt (in the delta) before the Hyksos.

What about Joseph's titles? Do they jive with the Middle Kingdom, or must they be Hyksos? Well, there's plenty of evidence, archaeologically and textually, for Semites in the Middle Kingdom generally, before the Hyksos (e.g., the Beni Hasan mural). Joseph is called the "overseer of the house" under Potiphar. The Egyptian term... That's evidently a Hebrew translation or transliteration, in this case, of *hry-pr*, which means literally "he who is over the house." The terminology does show up in Middle Kingdom Egyptian texts.

Jim Hoffmeier from Wheaton is in the evangelical tradition. He's an Egyptologist. He was trained in Toronto. He cites the Brooklyn Papyrus (35.1446), which is dated late (it's very late) in between 660 and 330 BC. But everyone in Egyptology puts that in the Middle Kingdom because of its content and its writing style. It matches the writing style of Middle Kingdom documents. Genesis 40:41 has Pharaoh declaring to Joseph, "only as regards the throne will I be greater than you." Hoffmeier notes that many take this to mean Joseph was elevated to the position of vizier, the highest-ranking official in the realm. Most would argue that Joseph's duties, however, do not match the vizier's. There are famous studies on this. Hoffmeier references them (studies done by Ward and van den Boorn). Hoffmeier points out that their research focuses on material from the New Kingdom, not the Middle Kingdom. Middle Kingdom viziership is not as well known (there just isn't as much data), so Hoffmeier says that this office for Joseph cannot be ruled out. He also points out that foreigners did hold lofty positions, including the viziership. There are Semites that actually were elevated to the level of vizier. There's one in the New Kingdom: Seti I. He named a Syrian the "Great Chancellor of the entire Land." The guy was a Semite. He's a Syrian. He's not a native Egyptian; he's from Syria. He's the "Great Chancellor of the entire Land." Isn't it interesting that Seti I (which of course the movie has as the father of Rameses II)... But you can't have Joseph and Moses butt up against

each other chronologically, so don't make too much hay out of that, because it just doesn't work. But I thought I'd mention it.

55:00 Another example would be that under Hatshepsut (this is the famous woman pharaoh), she named a Semite as her vizier. You can read Hoffmeier. His book, *Israel in Egypt*, is chock full of data like this. You can read his take on this. He has other examples as well. Another instance we could cite: Genesis 45:8. Joseph is referred to as "a father to Pharaoh," No such title is known in Egypt. Is that a problem? Well, it depends how you look at it. Nearly all Egyptologists consider that phrase (a father to Pharaoh) to be a Hebrew placeholder for "a father to the god," which is well-known in Egypt. You say, "How does that work?" Well, it would refer to a chief adviser to pharaoh, who is (in Egyptian thinking) a god. The biblical writer apparently thought that the actual Egyptian phrase was either offensive or maybe confusing to his own readers. So instead of writing that Joseph was called "a father to the god" (to an Israelite, that's not going to make any sense or it might be offensive), he changed it to "a father to Pharaoh." Pharaoh is a god, so one works just as well as the other. Wenham notes this:

In other passages [in the Hebrew Bible], priests and prophets are spoken of as "father to" [somebody else, even though they're not literal fathers. It's] because like real fathers they instructed their "sons." It is often surmised that the underlying Egyptian title ("father of the god")... was given to a variety of high officials, such as clergy, who advised [Pharaoh].

So it's really a common title, if you understand it that way. So in short, there is no obstacle to having Joseph in the Middle Kingdom (the early date can work), but nothing that rules out Joseph in the Hyksos period conclusively. (So the late-daters are happy, too.) This is what you get when you're dealing with this kind of material.

So in Exodus 1, yes, we encounter a Pharaoh. We encounter the names Pithom and Rameses, which we'll talk about next week. We encounter contexts that... Okay, we've got slavery. Everything descriptively about Exodus 1 can work well, not only historically... It affirms the broad general historicity of the account. In other words, do the details of the account jive historically with details from what we know of the culture of the place that the story describes? And the answer is yes.

This takes us back to our introductory discussion of "What is history? What's historiography? What does historical mean? What's mythic history?" All these questions. Oftentimes in the Bible, if you're latched on to a specific name like Moses and you say, "Well, I can't believe that this account is historical (this story about the guy Moses) unless I find the name 'Moses' in some other text," that's really misguided. What you ought to be asking is, "Does the story about this guy Moses fit in all its details with the place that Moses was said to be doing stuff?"

And the answer here in Exodus 1 is, “Yeah.” There’s nothing in Exodus 1 that renders it as unhistorical or even as difficult. You’ve got the slavery issue. It’s not just POWs; there are other kinds of slaves. You’ve got the Pithom and Rameses thing. You’ve got at least the delta. (We’ll talk about the names next time.) You’ve got Semites in the delta. That can work, of course, with the Second Intermediate Period (right before the New Kingdom, when these events are taking place) or even earlier, in the Middle Kingdom. The titles can work. The only outlier in what we’ve discussed so far is “pharaoh” itself (*Pr-ʿ3*), 18th dynasty and beyond. But that would be an issue... I’m saving that until next time. Exodus 1 certainly can be viewed as historical. There’s no obstacle to it.

1:00:00

Now I want to hit on two other things before we quit for this episode, and that is... I’m just going to mention this. You can go elsewhere to other things I’ve done about this. Inevitably, there are going to be some listeners that think, “Well, the Israelites built the stuff for Pithom and Rameses, and I’ve seen the movie. Did they build the pyramids? Did they build the Great Pyramid and Giza and all that?” No, they didn’t. Chronologically, by either view (either the early or late date for the exodus), that cannot work by the Bible’s own math (how old people were, x number of years between two people). It can’t work. Now, I’ve actually blogged this. The best place to go, though, is to go to Google and put in “Did the Israelites build the pyramids?” and then the website “FringePop321.com.” You’ll be taken immediately to an essay about this. I wrote it... I actually developed it a little bit more because of the Ben Carson thing. If you remember way back to the earlier presidential election, somebody came up with something that says that one of the presidential candidates (Ben Carson) believed that the Israelites built the pyramids. (And he does. He’s totally wrong. It just can’t work.) Now, I also made a FringePop video about this, so if you go to YouTube, FringePop321, you’ll find a video on this. That’s all I’m going to say about it. No, Exodus 1 is not evidence that the Israelites built the pyramids.

Let’s move on to verses 15 through 22 for the last element here of this episode. I’ll read a little bit of it again.

¹⁵ Then the king of Egypt said to the Hebrew midwives, one of whom was named Shiphrah and the other Puah, ¹⁶ “When you serve as midwife to the Hebrew women and see them on the birthstool, if it is a son, you shall kill him, but if it is a daughter, she shall live.” ¹⁷ But the midwives feared God and did not do as the king of Egypt commanded them, but let the male children live. ¹⁸ So the king of Egypt called the midwives and said to them, “Why have you done this, and let the male children live?” ¹⁹ The midwives said to Pharaoh, “Because the Hebrew women are not like the Egyptian women, for they are vigorous and give birth before the midwife comes to them.”

That whole thing. Now we've talked in an earlier episode of the podcast (specifically episode 210) about the ethics of deception. Does God use deception? And the answer is, "Yes, he does." God himself uses deception to punish and thwart evil. So if you want a whole episode on that, go to episode 210 and listen to that. So I'm not going to get into that issue here. We've already covered it.

I do want to get into the issue of this term "the birthstool." You say, "Good grief. What could possibly be interesting about that?" Ah, yes. Well, here we go. The term translated "birthstool" (basically all your English translations have something like this)... The Hebrew is אֲבָנִים (*'obnayim*). That term is used in Jeremiah 18:3 for the potter's wheel. Remember the famous passage in Jeremiah of a potter fashioning the clay, and God's the potter, and he makes us, and all that stuff? That's important, what I just said. It's used in Jeremiah 18 for that imagery—the potter's wheel imagery.

Now I have news for you. The Hebrews (and the Egyptians, for that matter) didn't use potters' wheels to have babies on. They just didn't. I'm going to reference an article here. (I've put this in the podcast article archive that you can get if you're subscribed to the newsletter). There's a (2003) article by Scott Morschauser called "Potters' Wheels and Pregnancies: A Note on Exodus 1:16." It's very interesting. Literally, in the Hebrew text, if we were looking at this in Hebrew and translating just the words that are there, it would not read the way it does in ESV or other translations. It would say, "When you serve as a midwife to the Hebrew women, and see the birthstool..." You say, "That doesn't make any sense. Why would I as a midwife go to an Israelite house and just look at the birthstool?" Of course it doesn't make any sense. So translators insert "them" into the translation so it does make sense, and "you see them (i.e., the Israelite women) on the birthstool." That isn't actually what the text says. So you have a grammatical problem ("you see the birthstool") and then this whole use of the same term... It's an unusual term. It doesn't occur much, but it does occur in Jeremiah 18:3 for a potter's wheel. What are we looking at here? There's another oddity. The midwives make up an excuse. "Well, the Hebrew women are delivered before the midwife gets there." Now the oddity is, given that this pharaoh in Exodus 1 has been portrayed as pretty ruthless and heartless, why would that answer be satisfactory at all? He doesn't retaliate against them. Why not? It just doesn't make sense. The whole way we understand this doesn't quite make sense. So Morschauser writes this:

Why would either a premature or unattended birth annul the main thrust of the royal command? If one accepts the usual interpretations of v. 16, the excuse offered by Shiphrah and Puah would not have solved their dilemma. The absence of a midwife would hardly have freed the women from their duty to their sovereign [MH: You kill the boy]: they still would have the information necessary to carry out their task. However, the next stage in this process, wherein the ruler

1:05:00

ratchets up the pressure and demands that his subjects drown the Hebrew infants, makes it probable that the midwives' mission had been formulated in a different fashion. Apparently, their order had been to eliminate the males prior to their birth, but once delivered, they were to be permitted to survive.

And that explains why Pharaoh has to just tell the populace, "You've got to get rid of the boys." Now what Morschauser suggests is that the phrase "upon the *'obnayim*," or "you see the *'obnayim*," that whole thing... He believes (and this is going to sound a little bizarre, but it actually makes some interesting sense) that that is the Hebrew equivalent of an Egyptian idiom based on a very particular religious metaphor. Think of the potter's wheel here. Morschauser writes this:

The "potter's wheel" is regularly linked to pregnancy in ancient Egyptian religious literature and art [MH: not for the literal women, but in a different way]. The implement (Eg. *neḥep/neḥeb*) was associated with the creator-god, Khnum, a ram-headed deity who was depicted as an artisan. In mythopoetic texts, Khnum would mold and shape each human being at conception "upon his wheel," with the potential child being granted the physical and psychological traits that would define it as an individual—obviously including characteristics of gender. During this time of fashioning, the developing infant was said to be "upon the potter's wheel" (*ḥer neḥep*), from which it would hopefully be delivered hale and healthy. What is significant, is that the metaphor refers to a gestating fetus prior to parturition.

We suggest that the Hebrew is an adaptation of the idiom *ḥer neḥep* and refers to a child still forming in the womb that has not yet come to full term...

So the point would be when you look at the child... The pharaoh is telling them, "Now look, you go visit the house, and you're doing a prenatal examination. What's inside the womb there is upon the potter's wheel of Khnum. Khnum is forming what's inside there." He's a pharaoh, he's an Egyptian. This is Egyptian religion. When you undertake this prenatal examination...

"If it is a son, then terminate him; if it is a daughter, she shall live." Such a procedure would have been within the scope of ancient Egyptian knowledge and practice. Medical texts contain prognostic recipes for determining the sex of an unborn child, as well as prescriptions for ending a pregnancy through draughts and potions.

In other words, abortion. The Egyptians had abortifacients. They had a means to determine the gender of a fetus still in utero. So that is what Morschauser theorizes. And I think it makes good sense, especially with the Egyptian metaphor about Khnum forming the contents of the womb on the potter's wheel. And *'obnayim* in the actual text in Exodus 1 is the word for potter's wheel. So

what's going on here is that Pharaoh basically says, "Go into the house. Give them the prenatal exam. Determine the gender. If it's a boy, you kill him." But what Shiprah and Puah say is, "Look, we went to the house, but they'd already had the kid." And then Pharaoh says, "Okay." But then he ratchets it up later. His plan isn't working, again. [laughs] The forces of chaos are not able to accomplish their purposes here. The seed of Abraham is still growing. And then he gets desperate. He says, "Look, I'm just going to command..." General edict. Command all his people. Verse 22:

²² Then Pharaoh commanded all his people, "Every son that is born to the Hebrews you shall cast into the Nile, but you shall let every daughter live."

He just gets desperate because they're giving birth before the prenatal exam. Now I think it's kind of interesting. You could do a number of things with this in regard to the whole abortion issue because that's really what's in play here. It's not a live birth. That isn't the issue until after the fact. It's a point, I think, that basically every English translation misses. And I think Morschauser's work way back in 2003 is really useful here because it resolves the oddities and the incongruities of the passage.

1:10:00

So that's our treatment of Exodus 1 (Part 1). There was a lot to cover there, but there's going to be a lot to cover just with the chronology. So we had to take that out, because that's really dense. The weeds are dense. It's a quagmire. Here I am using metaphors myself for the mess that this is. But I'm hoping that you already see why it's necessary to split this up into two. But there's lots of interesting stuff there that a close reading of Exodus 1 can yield to you.

TS: Alright, Mike. It seems like we're getting history, we're getting chronology, we're getting a little bit of everything.

MH: A little bit of esoteric Egyptian religion. [laughs]

TS: That's great. We love it. And we still have Part 2 to go. So looking forward to that next week, Mike. Well, I'll just go ahead and wrap it up. And we appreciate everyone that voted on Exodus, because it's going to be a good one. With that, I just want to thank everybody else for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.