

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 265

Exodus 4:18-31

March 30, 2019

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Episode Summary

The second half of Exodus 4 presents a series of chronological problems in relation to Moses' movements to and from Sinai and Jethro's home and, ultimately, the journey to Egypt. The section includes the bizarre episode in verses 24-26 where God sought to kill Moses. Why was God angry? How does the circumcision of Moses' son fix the problem? What does it mean that Moses' wife, Zipporah, touched the foreskin of her son to Moses' feet? This episode of the podcast unravels all these questions.

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 265: Exodus 4:18-31. 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. It is warmer here and the newest pug just got neutered this week.

TS: Oh my gosh. That makes me cringe. We talked about getting my dog neutered too, but I can't bring myself to do that, Mike.

MH: We didn't have any trouble doing it. [laughter]

TS: You had no problem with that, huh?

MH: We had no problem with it. [laughs]

TS: I've been around cattle when we brand them and I see what happens, and I think it scarred me as a kid, watching this.

MH: It may have.

TS: I have permanent trauma because of this. [laughter] I don't know. I just... It's a hard thing to do.

MH: He's fine. When we first brought him home, he was a little doped up, so that was kind of funny. [laughs] Some cheap entertainment there. But he's fine. He's himself.

TS: Yeah, well, not really. [laughter]

MH: He still has as much energy, so he's okay.

TS: That's good.

MH: So that's what's new. You asked, "What's new?" Don't ask the question unless you want the answer. [laughs]

TS: Yeah, that's the last time I'm going to ask that question. I need to come up with some different opening. Man. Well, we have something new that we can announce briefly (not all the details). Our Naked Bible Conference is fast approaching, and we finally have a date and a place. That's going to be October 12 at the same place we had it last year: the Omni Park West Hotel in Dallas, Texas. We're bringing it back to Dallas on October 12. I get lots of emails about "When is the next one coming?" So we at least wanted to get that information out so people could start preparing. And as we get the speakers finalized, I'll update the website. Of course we'll let everybody know that. But we wanted to let people at least know the date.

MH: Yeah. October 12, the same place as we had it last year—in Dallas.

TS: Yeah, that place was good.

MH: It was.

TS: Mike, I can't believe it, but over 34 states were represented at our first annual conference, which is crazy.

MH: Yeah, it's important to keep it in the middle of the country somewhere.

TS: Absolutely. If I can ever get Mike not afraid of water, maybe we can go to Hawaii. [laughter]

MH: Yeah, I don't think that's going to happen...

TS: It would be nice to have it in Hawaii, or the Caribbean.

MH: Right at the foot of a volcano. Let's do that, yeah.

TS: Something tropical. That'd be fun maybe. We'll see. Well, baseball is around the corner, so you've got to be happy about that.

MH: Oh yeah. I'm counting the days, man.

TS: Any quick thoughts about Harper in Philly?

MH: I think he's a good fit. I didn't grow up a Phillies fan, even though I'm from Pennsylvania. I was a Pirates fan back in the day. I still like them; I still like the Cubs. I'm not into these rivalries. I'm a Red Sox fan really, for the most part. But when you're in Fantasy, you root for guys (and you root for teams too). So I think he's a good fit.

TS: Is Drenna a Phillies fan?

MH: Not too much. She doesn't follow baseball as much. She's okay with the Phillies, but her real love (she says) is the Yankees. So yes, my wife is a Yankees fan; I'm a Red Sox fan.

TS: Ugh, I'm going to stop asking questions. This podcast is starting off on the wrong foot here.

MH: Yeah. Every year we used to have to go down to Seattle and pay homage to Derek Jeter, but he's been gone for a few years now so we haven't had to do that.

TS: Oh, I feel sorry for you. Yankees and Red Sox in the same house. That must have been brutal over the years.

MH: / was happy last year.

TS: But the 20-30 years before that...

MH: Yeah, well, you know. We don't talk about that. [laughs]

TS: But what we *can* talk about is, hey, we're still in Exodus.

5:00

MH: Yeah, and this kind of goes right into my pug getting neutered. We're kind of in that territory with the bridegroom of blood passage. [laughs]

TS: A lot of people mentioned about this... lots of interpretations of this particular issue.

MH: We'll have to put something in the summary that'll really help with key word searching. [Laughs] We might get a whole new audience. [laughs] Yeah. Well, we're in Exodus 4:18-31. And the whole thing isn't about the bridegroom of blood incident. That's really only three verses in this section (verses 24 through 26). And we've already (based on the last episode) drifted over into this second half

of chapter 4, so we've already touched on a few things in this section of verses (verses 18 through 31). But our focus is going to be those specific verses (24, 25, 26) today. But just so that we're familiar with where we are, I'm going to read the whole section. It begins right after the burning bush story, at least ostensibly. So starting in verse 18, we read:

¹⁸ Moses went back to Jethro his father-in-law and said to him, "Please let me go back to my brothers in Egypt to see whether they are still alive." And Jethro said to Moses, "Go in peace." ¹⁹ And the LORD said to Moses in Midian, "Go back to Egypt, for all the men who were seeking your life are dead." ²⁰ So Moses took his wife and his sons and had them ride on a donkey, and went back to the land of Egypt. And Moses took the staff of God in his hand.

²¹ And the LORD said to Moses, "When you go back to Egypt, see that you do before Pharaoh all the miracles that I have put in your power. But I will harden his heart, so that he will not let the people go. ²² Then you shall say to Pharaoh, 'Thus says the LORD, Israel is my firstborn son, ²³ and I say to you, "Let my son go that he may serve me." If you refuse to let him go, behold, I will kill your firstborn son.'"

²⁴ At a lodging place on the way the LORD met him and sought to put him to death. ²⁵ Then Zipporah took a flint and cut off her son's foreskin and touched Moses' feet with it and said, "Surely you are a bridegroom of blood to me!" ²⁶ So he let him alone. It was then that she said, "A bridegroom of blood," because of the circumcision.

²⁷ The LORD said to Aaron, "Go into the wilderness to meet Moses." So he went and met him at the mountain of God and kissed him. ²⁸ And Moses told Aaron all the words of the LORD with which he had sent him to speak, and all the signs that he had commanded him to do. ²⁹ Then Moses and Aaron went and gathered together all the elders of the people of Israel. ³⁰ Aaron spoke all the words that the LORD had spoken to Moses and did the signs in the sight of the people. ³¹ And the people believed; and when they heard that the LORD had visited the people of Israel and that he had seen their affliction, they bowed their heads and worshiped.

Now you can already tell that this is a chronological mess. You get the burning bush incident, and on the tail end of that, when Moses is basically saying, "Please find someone else to do this," and God gets angry at him, like we talked about last time... We've had a series of objections, God gives Moses answers to

all the objections, and Moses just flatly says, “I don’t want to go.” God gets angry and then God makes a concession to Moses... And we talked about the concession last time. This is where we get the Aaronic priesthood launched. God brings Aaron into the picture as a concession to Moses. And God actually says (back in verse 14):

“Is there not Aaron, your brother, the Levite? I know that he can speak well. Behold, he is coming out to meet you, and when he sees you, he will be glad in his heart.

Well, between that statement of, “Hey, Aaron’s on his way. He’s coming out to meet you,” we get Moses going back to Jethro to ask him about going... Why didn’t he wait for Aaron? We talked about this last time. And then you get God speaking again to Moses in Midian, apparently at Jethro’s place because it follows his return to where Jethro lives. And then you have all that going on. Then Moses takes off, and then we get the bridegroom of blood incident, where God wants to kill Moses, apparently. And then after that, we’re back to Aaron.

²⁷ The LORD said to Aaron, “Go into the wilderness to meet Moses.”

10:00

Well, I thought he already told Aaron to do that! And then they actually meet up, and then they wind up in Egypt. So chronologically, this is just a mess. And that’s part of the problem. Even if we took out verses 24-26 (just cut them out—we did a Thomas Jefferson or something), you still have a chronological problem because, “Hey, I thought back in verse 14 God had already tapped Aaron on the shoulder, and here in verse 27 he’s doing it again. What in the world’s going on here?” So we have a chronological problem (to say the least). We have the intrusion of this really bizarre episode (the bridegroom of blood). And so the issue is, what in the world do we do with this stuff?

Now I would suggest there are (broadly speaking) two ways to read verses 18 through 31, and I alluded to the first of these in the last episode. Honestly, you have to use your imagination here and admit that you have to infer things or that things might be implied rather than stated. But let’s just jump into it. Either way, there’s a lot to deal with here.

So there are two ways to read this section. The first one is that you could say, “Well, it’s implied in the previous section (the tail end of the burning bush incident) that Aaron is literally on his way, having been tapped or prompted by God to meet his brother Moses (that little phrase “he is coming out to meet you” in verse 14). But we never read, of course, that they actually meet. We talked about this the last episode. So instead, we get the distinct impression from verse 18 and following that Moses just left. After God makes the concession, “Hey, we’ll bring Aaron into the picture here to help you out,” Moses just takes off, regardless of the fact that God said, “Hey, he’s on his way. He’s coming out to

meet you.” Well, apparently, they never meet. Moses leaves. He goes back to Jethro’s place. Now we know that Jethro’s place (where he lived) was *not* at the mountain of God, because of Exodus 3:1, which we spent four weeks on.

Now Moses was keeping the flock of his father-in-law, Jethro, the priest of Midian, and he led his flock to the west side of the wilderness and came to Horeb, the mountain of God.

So Jethro doesn’t live at the mountain. It’s not like the movie *The Ten Commandments*, where the mountain is a few hundred yards away. That’s not the impression you get. So Moses goes back to Jethro’s place. But then in verse 27, we see that Aaron meets Moses at the mountain of God. Apparently (we’re just suggesting one way to look at this), Moses went back to Sinai after returning to Jethro. But that raises two questions. Was it okay for Moses to leave Sinai at the end of the burning bush episode and go back to Jethro and then return to Sinai? We aren’t told. We aren’t told if God was good with that or not. But we can presume that it was okay because Aaron, for all we know, is back in Egypt. He’s still back in Egypt, and it would take a while for Aaron to get to Sinai. The second question it raises: Did God anticipate Moses’ rebellion and call Aaron earlier (so Aaron is basically right around the corner, ready to meet Moses, and then Moses takes off)? We aren’t told that either.

I’ll just throw in a third question here: Did Moses return to Sinai with his tail between his legs in fear? Like he leaves when he’s not supposed to, and he talks to Jethro, and God meets him again... God speaks to him *again*. And then Moses says, “Okay, I have to go back to Sinai. I’m in trouble.” Does he go back fearfully? Is that how we’re supposed to read this? If so, was the threat of verses 24-26 (when God’s ready to kill him) directly related to Moses leaving? Or is that related to something else?

So we have a number of questions here before we even get to the bizarre three verses that we’re going to focus on, because we have a non-chronological thing going on in Exodus 4 that’s really related to the burning bush episode—stuff that happens earlier in chapter 3 and chapter 4 (mostly chapter 4, because that’s where you get the conversation between God and Moses where Moses just basically says, “I don’t want to go,” and God makes the concession there).

15:00 Now there’s another way to read this. Here’s the second way to approach it. The other way to read this is that verses 24-26 are simply a literary intrusion. They have nothing to do with the chronology. It’s placed there because the author isn’t concerned with the chronology of things, but with telegraphing some other point. That’s possible. We’re going to encounter other places in Exodus that are clearly not chronological, even though we tend to think that as we’re reading through a book that everything that’s happening is chronological. There are going to be some places where it’s absolutely clear. For instance, we’re going to hit one

place where they put Aaron's rod before the testimony, and the testimony is a term that's related to the ark of the covenant. But that's in a chapter before the ark of the covenant is even created. It's not even made yet, so it's very obviously not chronological. So we're going to hit stuff like that in Exodus. So this is a possibility—that verses 24-26 are just dropped in there for some other reason other than the chronology, and in so doing it kind of messes up the chronology for us. But let's be honest, even without those verses, there's stuff that messes up the chronology.

Now if this is the case (that verses 24-26 are just dropped in there), that would mean that the meeting of verses 27-31 could actually follow verse 17. In other words, God sent Aaron to meet Moses at Sinai, suggesting Moses stayed there a while before going back to Jethro's place. We can imagine that happening. We can imagine verses 27-31 happening at Sinai before Moses goes back to Jethro in verse 18. If the sections of the chapter are loosed from being a strict chronology, then we can move them around. We can play with them a little bit. That might be a way to approach this, but that creates a problem, too. If this is the case, when does Moses actually meet Jethro to ask for permission (verse 18) to go to Egypt as the Lord commanded? And why would God have to speak to Moses again in Midian, reiterating the conversation about going to Egypt that had taken place at Sinai? In other words, if we move the meeting with Aaron (verses 27-31) up to happen right after the burning bush, then that should have been a settled matter. Yeah, maybe that looks good preceding verse 18, but when you get into verse 18 and the conversation happens there, that messes with our minds, too. That just doesn't seem to work, either. We just have a lot of problems here. There's a lot that you have to imagine and infer. And I'm going to do that as we proceed. I'm going to basically say how I would approach this. But on the surface, this is not a simple section. You might think it's a simple section. You might think the only thing that really needs any thought here are verses 24-26 (the bridegroom of blood weirdness), but that's not the case. There are a lot of things going on here that just don't on the surface make sense when you start looking at it. If you made a play of this (if you were going to reenact it), how in the world would you do it? [laughs] You'd run into all sorts of problems.

So what do we do with this? I'll throw one more in. When you get to verse 20, that has Moses taking his sons (plural) and Zipporah when he starts on the trip to Egypt. But Exodus 18:2 notes that at some point, Moses had sent Zipporah back home to Midian. I'll just read you Exodus 18:2:

² Now Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, had taken Zipporah, Moses' wife, after he had sent her home...

When did he send her home? Does it have any relationship to verse 24, which is the beginning of the bridegroom of blood incident? Would that suggest that the bridegroom of blood incident occurs on the way to Egypt, and then on the way, Zipporah and at least one son are in the scene, but then maybe they get sent

back later? Do they ever actually get to Egypt? We don't know. How in the world are we going to explain all of that, then throw in the meeting with Aaron? I'm trying to convey the sense that there's a lot that's confusing here. The chronology of events is really convoluted and problematic. It's hard to know if parts of chapter 4 intend to give us any chronology or not.

Critical scholars look at this kind of stuff and say, "Well, look, the reason this is a mess is because you have different sources. You have different source accounts that were stitched together by an editor (the whole JEDP thing). It's editing on steroids. So it's hard to know how these parts of chapter 4 relate to each other. It's also impossible to know *why* Zipporah was sent back and precisely when. The text isn't really clear on any of those details. We have to imagine events or the purpose of the placement of verses 24-26 and go from there.

20:00 Here's what I would propose, and I'm admitting up-front that it springs from my imagination. I'm trying to take the data and be like a movie director or something. If this was a play or we were going to re-enact this, how would we account for all of the elements in something of a coherent fashion if we were visually seeing what's going on here? I tend to think Moses takes off from Sinai right after the burning bush incident. (I mentioned that in the last episode.) Whether God was happy with that or not, we can't necessarily know. I could see it going either way. I tend to think Moses takes off from Sinai. He could have waited, but he doesn't. He goes to Jethro's place, which is not Sinai, and he starts to have second thoughts, which would be entirely consistent with Moses' character. [laughs] And so that's why God speaks to him again. God actually speaks to him *again*. Verse 19:

¹⁹ And the LORD said to Moses in Midian...

They're in Midian. He's in Midian.

“Go back to Egypt, for all the men who were seeking your life are dead.”

So Moses might have been having second thoughts, "If I go back to Egypt, they're going to kill me." See, that wasn't mentioned earlier. So he may be having second thoughts, and then God has to come and say, "Look, don't worry about it. I'll handle it. Those guys are dead. Get off your butt and go to Egypt." So God speaks to him again while he's in Midian, and then Moses decides to tell Jethro he has to go to Egypt. And he does. Then he starts on the journey with Zipporah and the boys. The boys' names, of course, are Gershom and Eliezer. Their names are given later in Exodus 18:2-4. On the way to Egypt... Here's a key element. (Again, it's just springing from my imagination. I think this could have happened.) On the way to Egypt, he passes by or near Sinai. This is possible if Sinai is to the west of Midian, where Exodus 3:1 says it is. In other words, Moses has to journey around the north tip of the Gulf of Aqaba. He has to go a little bit

north and west, or maybe directly west because we don't know where Jethro lived in Midian. We don't know what part of Midian. Anyway, Sinai, if it's west of Midian, would be on the way to going back to Egypt. So on the way to Egypt, Moses passes by and stops at Sinai. Maybe he says, "Hey, we're going to Egypt, but first I have to meet Aaron at Sinai. And this is when the meeting (the episode of verses 27-31) occurs, God having called Aaron (tapped Aaron) weeks, months ago, because Aaron's in Egypt and he has to make the trip, too, in the other direction.

So it's at this point that Moses and Aaron meet, and they have the conversation they have in verses 27-31. And then together, they head to Egypt. Now God may not be happy. We could say that maybe God thinks Moses should have stayed and waited for Aaron. Despite telling him Aaron was the solution, Moses loses heart. Or the thought of the guys in Egypt trying to kill him surfaced in his mind and he has second thoughts. God has to speak to him again. All that's still up in the air, but at least we have a way to make sense of where Moses is and where he goes (his movements). He finally gets to Aaron at Sinai (at the mountain of God). Because if you look in verse 27:

²⁷ The LORD said to Aaron, "Go into the wilderness to meet Moses." So he went and met him at the mountain of God...

So they finally connect at Sinai, and then they go to Egypt. So that's how I would reconstruct in my mind what's going on here—to create a chronology out of this mess. To have it make sense, you have to infer some things. And I think that's legitimate. You have to do that in a lot of places (especially in narrative) in the Old Testament. There's nothing that I just said that can't work with the text. I can't say that all of that is spelled out in the text, because it's not. If it were, we wouldn't even be having the discussion. But nothing I just gave you there violates any point of the text. So this is what we're trying to do, just trying to make sense out of it.

So now a related question. Does the bridegroom of blood episode happen before or after they meet Aaron at Sinai? If this is something of an intrusion (and we're not told at all)... It has some connection to the itinerary, because verse 24 says, "...at a lodging place *on the way*, the Lord met him and sought to put him to death." So this incident happens either before they meet up with Aaron or after. What is "the way"? Is it the way to Sinai, that I'd imagined, or the way to Egypt? We're not told. So where does the bridegroom of blood episode happen? I would say it happens *before* they meet Aaron at Sinai. And I'm just going to say that my reasons for thinking that will become evident as we proceed here. I'm just going to telegraph it up front so that it's lurking in the back of your mind here. I think that the bridegroom of blood episode happens before they meet up with Aaron at Sinai. And then from Sinai, they go to Egypt. The only thing that might throw this off is verse 27's wording: "The Lord said to Moses." Now Moses should have

25:00

already known what the Lord said about going to meet Aaron. He should have already known that. God has mentioned it before. But maybe the point is that, “Hey, Moses. We’re good now. I’m not angry. I’m not going to kill you. Zipporah has taken care of the problem that was prompting me to think about killing you. So keep going to Sinai. Hook up with Aaron, and then get to Egypt.” I still have to infer that. In other words, God says, “We’re good now, and the plan is still on.”

Now having said all that, I really don’t think that the bridegroom of blood incident (verses 24-26) is actually about Moses’ continued second-guessing or faintheartedness. I think it’s about another problem with Moses. And I think that for a simple reason: whatever the problem is, it’s taken care of by a circumcision. That would really have nothing to do with Moses leaving Sinai or needing a pep talk from God. A circumcision doesn’t fix those things. There’s something going on in verses 24-26 that is an altogether different problem involving Moses, in that that problem *is* taken care of by Zipporah’s quick action in performing the circumcision. Now let’s look at verses 24-26 for the rest of our episode and zero in on the bridegroom of blood stuff. I’m going to read the verses again:

²⁴ At a lodging place on the way the LORD met him and sought to put him to death.²⁵ Then Zipporah took a flint and cut off her son's foreskin and touched Moses' feet with it and said, “Surely you are a bridegroom of blood to me!” ²⁶ So he let him alone. It was then that she said, “A bridegroom of blood,” because of the circumcision.

Now I had (back in 2011—seven years ago) blogged about this. I had mentioned that the last time. What I’m going to give you here is just worded better than what was back on the blog, so I’ve actually swapped some of this discussion in. I more or less wanted to write this out for the sake of the blog because there were some things in there that I thought were just not sufficiently clear. So I’ve tried to dress that up a little bit. So I’m telling you that here on the podcast. But what we’re going to hear now is essentially... You could have read it before already on the blog, but I think the wording is better here. I just took a little more time, for the sake of clarity, to try to dress things up.

The issues are... As we look at verses 24-26, what are the things we need to think about? Well, there’s what in the world is up with placing the foreskin at Moses’ feet? It’s kind of odd that God would want to kill Moses, especially on the heels of calling him and then making a concession for him with the Aaronic priesthood, and then reminding him that he needed to go to Egypt while he was in Midian. It would have to be something that’s pretty significant for Moses, as the person God wants to lead his people, for God to just get this angry and consider killing him. The other issue is that there are certain ambiguities in these three verses in the text—specifically, what certain verbs refer to and who the actors are precisely in this scene. Because I can tell you right now, the ESV (and every

30:00

translation does this—this isn't a slap on the ESV) has inserted names and nouns in places in verses 24-26 where in the Hebrew text there are only pronouns (he, his, and him). The translator has done that to try to make the content of these verses comprehensible. But we need to talk about that, because knowing that certain things are ambiguous in the Hebrew text... Like what does the pronoun refer to when it says "his" or "him"? Is it Moses' son or Moses? They're both masculine, so which one does the masculine pronoun refer to? You have to make an educated or interpretive guess. You have to land somewhere in interpretation. And the translation is going to land somewhere to try to steer us through. But sometimes the choices the translators make are good; sometimes they're not so good. Sometimes they help; sometimes they muddy the waters even more. But we need to think about all these things.

So let's try to approach the stuff we need to think about. Really, there are two trajectories here. First, who is it that the Lord wanted to kill? Now, you would think (and we presumed here for the sake of our discussion) that that's Moses. Most readers would assume it is Moses, since he's mentioned in the preceding verses. But verse 24 actually doesn't name him. We see here "at a lodging place on the way, the Lord met *him* and sought to put *him* to death." We don't get "the Lord met Moses." We get "the Lord met *him*." You say, "Why is that an issue?" Well, Moses is traveling with two boys (his two sons). Could it be that God wanted to put one of them to death? Would that make more sense? Because he just called Moses; why does he want to kill him off now? You actually have this discussion going on. Since it's one of the boys' foreskins that is removed through circumcision... Since the solution of the episode is the circumcision of one of the boys, maybe it's one of the boys that God wants to kill because he's uncircumcised. So who exactly are we talking about? Who's under threat?

The other trajectory is, what does it mean for Zipporah to touch Moses' feet with the foreskin? There are two other factors that are going to be part of this discussion as we try to take things in order. Zipporah knows what to do. She's familiar with circumcision (obviously). She knows that it should be done and she knows how to do it. She knows how it's done. So that's going to become a factor in interpretation as well. So we have ambiguities in there. We have some things we can assume about Zipporah, who is a Midianite woman. Think of the Kenites. The Kenites should be familiar with the worship of Yahweh. And part of the worship of Yahweh... Whether they're the "forgotten" or "lesser" line—the non-elect line from Abraham—they still know about circumcision. So there's something going on there. Zipporah knows it's important. She knows what to do. She knows how to solve the problem. She knows what the problem is, and she takes care of business. And the way she takes care of business is circumcising her son. So we have that much. Is the son the one under the threat? What about this "touching the feet" thing? As we proceed, those are the questions we need to answer.

So let's take things in order. With whom was God angry and why? I would say it seems best to conclude that God is angry with Moses and not his son, Gershom, since Moses is the major character in the wider context and Gershom is known only from Exodus 2:22 at this point (he has nothing to do with the story). So despite the fact that it's the circumcision of the child that fixes the problem (or is it?), is God's anger pacified just by circumcising the boy, or is more needed? We'll get back to that point. But if there's more needed, we can't necessarily conclude that just because the boy is circumcised that he's the problem. So I think that Moses is the one under threat here. That just makes more sense. Scholars have noted that Moses is the center of Yahweh's attention everywhere else in the story. Even in the digressions about Aaron, it's still really about Moses and how to deal with his resistance, his unbelief, his uncertainty. Really, you could call it his rebellion in some sense. So that much seems clear. It's a better option.

But of course, the question of why God is angry with him is still on the table. So I would say the answer to that question has to be inferred from two considerations. 1) The Israelites born in Egypt had been circumcised, although this might still be a problem. They were circumcised according to what God had told Abraham to do. We know from Joshua 5:2-9... I'm going to read you that section, because it's going to become relevant here. This is Joshua. They're getting ready to go into the Promised Land, so it's much later.

35:00

² At that time the LORD said to Joshua, "Make flint knives and circumcise the sons of Israel a second time." [MH: A second time? How can you be circumcised a second time? That's interesting, isn't it?] ³ So Joshua made flint knives and circumcised the sons of Israel at Gibeath-haaraloth. ⁴ And this is the reason why Joshua circumcised them: all the males of the people who came out of Egypt, all the men of war, had died in the wilderness on the way after they had come out of Egypt. ⁵ Though all the people who came out...

So verse 4 is about the kids who were born during the wilderness wanderings. Those boys (now men) need to be circumcised. But verse 5 hearkens back to the previous generation.

...had been circumcised, yet all the people who were born on the way in the wilderness after they had come out of Egypt had not been circumcised. ⁶ For the people of Israel walked forty years in the wilderness, until all the nation, the men of war who came out of Egypt, perished, because they did not obey the voice of the LORD; the LORD swore to them that he would not let them see the land that the LORD had sworn to their fathers to give to us, a land flowing with milk and honey.

So the first part of verse 5 says the people who had come out of Egypt had been circumcised. So they're doing circumcision in Egypt, or before this point. It's the ones afterwards who have not. But then what in the world is this "second time" thing? It's just really odd.

⁷ So it was their children, whom he raised up in their place, that Joshua circumcised. For they were uncircumcised, because they had not been circumcised on the way.

⁸ When the circumcising of the whole nation was finished, they remained in their places in the camp until they were healed.

So in verse 8, they circumcised the whole nation. And then the conquest is going to start.

So what's up with this? How does it inform the issue with Moses? Why is God angry at him? This has to be inferred from two considerations. 1) The Israelites born in Egypt had been circumcised, apparently according to the covenant with Abraham. That's why they were doing it. And 2) We have to consider the circumstances of Moses' birth and childhood. Let's just jump in.

With respect to the first of these items, it may be that the Israelites in Egypt practiced Egyptian circumcision. The Israelites are in Egypt, but what we just read in Joshua says they were circumcising down in Egypt. Maybe this occasion of Joshua doing the circumcision a second time refers to the possibility that the circumcision that they were doing in Egypt was not correct. Egyptian circumcision (which by the way refers to a method, not anything religious—circumcision wasn't being done in honor of some foreign god) refers to a method. And it's possible Moses and other Israelite men were not properly circumcised. The second time in Joshua 5:2 might be an indication of this—that yep, they were, but we have to do it again because it wasn't done right. Having fled from Egypt, God may have expected Moses to correct this before returning to Egypt because Moses is the representative now of Israel. He's the leader of Israel, whether he wants to be or not. Aaron is going to take up the slack, but Moses is the key figure here. And God might be angry with him because he has been circumcised incorrectly and never took care of the problem. Now that's an argument from silence, but any other explanation is as well. So this is what we're dealing with here.

Let me just rabbit trail a little bit about the circumcision thing in Egypt. Archeologists and Egyptologists know that circumcision was practiced in Egypt by the Egyptians. However, Egyptian circumcision did not remove the foreskin. That's how it's possible that you could be circumcised again—if it wasn't done properly. Egyptian circumcision did not remove the foreskin. Rather, the foreskin

was just split. It was left there, but it was split. For this reason, any Israelite born in Egypt who happened to be circumcised in this way had not been circumcised in a manner acceptable to God's covenant. Those who take this trajectory as an explanation for God's anger would suggest that Egyptian circumcision is what's hinted at in Joshua 5:2 about the second time, but also Joshua 5:9, which reads:

40:00

⁹ And the LORD said to Joshua, "Today I have rolled away the reproach of Egypt from you."

Now the reproach from Egypt might be their bondage to slavery, because they're going to go into the land now and have their own land. I get that. But there are some who say that the issue with circumcising them a second time is correcting this Egyptian method, and maybe that is the reproach of Egypt. We're fixing that problem now by having everybody (both the men who came out of Egypt who are still around, and then the second generation that was born on the way in the wilderness wanderings—both groups are circumcised properly now)... So maybe that's what the reproach of Egypt refers to. It's possible. So given the circumstances, the ceremony in Joshua 5 would be a second circumcision for some and a first circumcision for the males born in the wilderness wanderings. Joshua 5:2 is really what this view hangs on—this reference to the second time. So that's one way to look at this. Since other Israelite males were circumcised prior to the conquest (prior to Joshua 5:2-9 at Gilgal, and some a second time), it is reasonable to assume... Since they had to do this—they had to fix this (first and second generations)—it's reasonable to assume that Moses had never been circumcised or he was circumcised according to Egyptian custom. The narrative of Moses' birth and childhood never states that his Israelite parents had him circumcised. Had the boy been marked by Hebrew circumcision, maybe his life would have been in danger in Pharaoh's household. Who knows? We can only speculate whether Pharaoh's daughter had him circumcised in the Egyptian manner after he entered her household. In either scenario, whether Pharaoh's daughter had this done according to the Egyptian custom or whether his Israelite parents just didn't do it, thinking that, "Well, when the baby's discovered, if they see it's an Israelite male, they might kill him, because that's what Pharaoh ordered," either scenario means that Moses did not bear the covenant sign. And that is why God is angry.

Now in his Exodus commentary (this is in the *Word Biblical Commentary Series*), Durham notes this material. This is his discussion over all of this (so you know it's not just Mike here). Durham is going to cite an article by Jack Sasson.

Sasson (JBL 85 [1966] 473–74) has pointed out convincingly that Egyptian circumcision was not only performed on adults, but was, by comparison with Hebrew circumcision, merely a partial circumcision. Indeed, he contends (475–76) that circumcision may well have come to Egypt from North Syria, where it was practiced early in the third millennium B.C. For whatever reasons, the compiler

who set vv 24–26 in their present context had apparently reached a conclusion confirmed by these facts. Perhaps he combined the abnormal circumstances by which the infant Moses had to be hidden away at birth with some knowledge of the Egyptian practice and even a belief that the circumcision of infant boys was a late development in Israel's life. Quite possibly, he too was searching for some reason for Yahweh's serious encounter. Whatever the case, he clearly believed that Moses was uncircumcised and that Yahweh determined to stop him en route to Egypt for that reason.

So this isn't Mike just speculating. This is an explanation for why God is angry that other scholars have come up with, just trying to overview the basis for it.

Another angle for with this... Let's just go back to Moses' childhood here. Another angle is that it's possible Moses' mother would not have had him circumcised because of the edict. I want to say a little bit more about that. The rationale in that case would have been that maybe an Egyptian who discovers the boy will see him uncircumcised and have mercy on him, or something like that. But there's a problem with that. Pharaoh's daughter knew immediately the baby was a Hebrew. The question is, how did she know? It doesn't have to be because he was circumcised. It could be something as simple as, "Why would anyone else put their kid in a basket and set him afloat on the Nile? It's got to be a Hebrew kid." In the movie, it has him with a Hebrew blanket or something. [laughs] *The Ten Commandments* movie doesn't get into all of this stuff. So the fact that Pharaoh's daughter recognizes this is a Hebrew boy doesn't mean that the Hebrew boy was circumcised. He may not have been. Even if he was, there's no sense in avoiding the circumcision, you would think, because she's trusting God. I think the chances are really good... If the Israelite parents of Moses had had him circumcised, then there's no need for this secondary Egyptian circumcision, which did not remove the foreskin.

45:00

So I think the best bet here... It's all a guess. This is all speculation. I think the best bet is that Moses arrived in Pharaoh's household uncircumcised. Pharaoh's daughter had him circumcised according to the Egyptian custom, which was a partial circumcision, and that was never corrected when Moses fled Egypt and went into Midian. And he's not thinking about Yahweh at all. He's thinking about, "I have to get out of Egypt and basically stay alive and have a nice home here." But God calls him at the burning bush incident. And we're not told... They don't have a conversation about circumcision. But apparently, God is thinking, "Do the math, Moses. You're in Midian. They worship Yahweh here. I'm Yahweh. I'm calling you to go to Egypt. You might want to bear the sign of the covenant people if you're leading the covenant people." But apparently, that doesn't occur to Moses. Or he says, "Well, that's going to hurt!" [laughs] That's entirely consistent with Moses' character here. [laughs] "That's going to hurt. And I don't want to go anyway." So he goes back to Midian. He doesn't talk to Jethro right away. God has to remind him, "You're supposed to go to Egypt." "Okay." And

God even says, “Look, everybody who wanted you dead is dead now. Let’s get this show on the road here.”

Moses moves and they go on their way and they stop at Sinai. They meet Aaron. They’re going to do all that. But when he leaves Midian (and this is my view) and he’s on the way to Sinai (this is before they’ve met Aaron), God gets angry because he has not taken care of the covenant sign of proper circumcision. This is how I would reconstruct things here. I think this is probably the best scenario we can garner and put together, using some inference (using our imagination a little bit) to infer some things about why God would have been angry and how the itinerary works.

The reason why I think this event happens before they meet Aaron is because Aaron is a priest, a Levite. He would know what to do. If it became clear that “God’s going to kill Moses unless we do the circumcision thing,” he would know what to do. And Zipporah would not have had to perform the circumcision of her boy. Aaron would have done that. Again, this is all guess-work. It’s an argument from silence. But I think you can put the things together by making those inferences. So this is my view of what the scenario is.

Now you could ask, “Why didn’t she just circumcise her husband, Moses?” And then they wait a few weeks. Moses is probably a crybaby about that, like he’s a crybaby about everything. So it might take a week or two, or maybe Moses would use it as an excuse to delay the trip even further. And I think that’s the key. I think the reason why it was sufficient for Zipporah to circumcise the child and then touch Moses’ feet (and we’ll get to what feet are) with the foreskin of her son (a circumcision by proxy)... I think that’s probably what’s going on—that it’s a symbolic gesture, or something like that, to have God’s anger against Moses pacified.

So let’s just jump into the rest of it. So I think that’s actually what’s going on, and I think because *she* does it, they’re not in Aaron’s presence yet. Again, I’m fully admitting that I’m just using inferences here and trying to piece together things from the data that aren’t specifically said, but everybody has to do that.

So we’re at the point of asking the question, “Who was circumcised and what did it mean?” Regardless of the fact that we don’t know how to precisely take this stuff because it’s never spelled out, you have a couple of options here. Either Moses was properly circumcised and he neglected to have his son circumcised, in which case God could be in theory mad at either one of them... But if that’s the case, when they circumcised the kid, why doesn’t it end there? Why doesn’t it stop there? Why do you have to touch Moses’ “feet” to make things good with God?

So again, I think the real problem is Moses—his inadequate circumcision. And it’s not just the boy. I think that they don’t circumcise Moses there because that’s

going to delay the trip even longer and God wants him in Egypt. The one thing that does come through clearly if you read chapter 4 is God wants him in Egypt, like *now*. “We’re not going to put this off anymore. I’ve told Aaron to meet you. Let’s go. Go, go, go, go, go. Get out of here!” So I think that is part of the rationale.

Now the Midianites (think back to the Kenite episode), as worshippers of Yahweh, are going to know about circumcision, they’re going to know about Abraham, and they’re going to know about the covenant. They know about the necessary tool (the flint knife there) to do the rite. They know what’s going on here. So this is how I would handle the rest of our little weird sidebar here (verses 24-26). Concerning whether Moses or his son Gershom was circumcised, clarity can be gained in Zipporah’s act of touching the foreskin to the “feet” of Moses. (And I think Moses is the issue.)

Let’s talk about the “feet” before moving on. The Hebrew word for “feet” (*regel*) can refer to feet, legs, or genitals, according to Old Testament usage. This was a euphemism. It was a word that was used as a nice way to refer to the genital area. Every language, every culture, has this sort of thing—euphemistic language for private parts or sexual acts, or something like that. This is what we’re dealing with. For example, in Deuteronomy 28:57, we read, “Her afterbirth” (this is part of law) “that comes out from between her feet and her children whom she bears...” Well, the afterbirth doesn’t really come out between your feet. Well, yeah, the legs are apart, and, “I was there at the birth of my kid, and the afterbirth, and the feet were there, too.” Look, the whole point is that the afterbirth comes out of the genital area of a woman. Go to Ezekiel 16:25, where I think it’s even clearer. This is the somewhat pornographic passage that we covered back in our series on Ezekiel, where the sexual language is really graphic. And we have this verse... I’ll start in verse 23. Judah is being compared to a whore—a prostitute—prostituting herself with other nations—other gods—committing spiritual adultery. Adultery and sexual whoredom were used as metaphors for spiritual unfaithfulness. So we read in verse 23:

²³ “And after all your wickedness (woe, woe to you! declares the Lord God), ²⁴ you built yourself a vaulted chamber [MH: You built yourself a bedroom there and set up a bed] and made yourself a lofty place in every square. [MH: You’re looking for clients at every street corner.] ²⁵ At the head of every street you built your lofty place and made your beauty an abomination, offering yourself to any passerby and multiplying your whoring.

Now ESV’s “offering yourself” is literally in the Hebrew “spreading your *regel*” (feet). It’s exposing your genitals—spreading your legs. We get the idea. The woman in Ezekiel 16 who does this doesn’t want some man to come by and touch her feet (like her real feet with toes), okay? That’s not what’s going on

there. This is euphemistic language for the sexual, genital area. You get the same with Ruth 3:4. Naomi tells Ruth, “When Boaz lies down, observe the place where he lies. Then go and uncover his feet and lie down. And he will tell you what to do.” This is when Ruth wants to (and she gets the message across pretty well)... She uncovers his genital area. They’re wearing these long skirt things. She just flips it open. They don’t have underwear, folks, in the Bible days. (That’ll probably become a meme now.) They don’t have underwear. So she exposes him. Why does Ruth do this to Boaz? It’s a marriage proposal. “I want you to marry me. I want to have your children. You need to redeem me. We’re related. It’s the law of the kinsman redeemer.” She wants him to take her in and she wants to become his wife. And we get the whole thing about, “Well, there’s somebody that’s in line ahead of me. Got to take care of that kinsman thing according to the laws of Deuteronomy. Blah blah blah. There’s nothing sexual as far as intercourse that happens in the Ruth scene, because that would have been a violation of the kinsman law and Boaz doesn’t do that. They go through the legal procedure before he can marry her. But she makes her intent—her wish—very obvious. She exposes him and then lays down. And it’s like, “Okay, message understood.” They have the conversation about what to do next.

But the whole point is that here the reference to the “feet” is the genital area. Durham notes this. This isn’t just Mike going to crazy town here. This is common Old Testament scholarship. This is nothing new. You’d find this in serious commentaries written by various people. Durham thinks this makes good contextual sense, as far as Exodus 4:24-26. Put it this way: the act of touching the foreskin of Moses’ son... Zipporah performs the circumcision, takes the foreskin, and touches Moses’ feet. The act of touching the foreskin to the “feet” (i.e., Moses’ own genital area) is not part of normal circumcision. We don’t read that as part of a procedure for circumcision. So there’s some special circumstance. And of course, the circumstance is that Moses’ own circumcision is not adequate. He has to be approved. He has to be looped in to the covenant relationship by proxy. He has to have this taken care of, like, now. And then get to Egypt, like, now. It consequently only makes sense if Zipporah has circumcised her son, Gershom, and then symbolically transferred that circumcision to Moses by taking the foreskin and touching Moses’ genitals with it. Under the circumstances, Moses would have been incapacitated had they done this to him, and they were already on the way to Egypt. So apparently, if you read through verse 26, God was satisfied by the ritual act, and Zipporah had saved her husband’s life. That’s what’s going on here.

In regard to the phrase “bridegroom of blood,” the phrase is obviously associated with the marital relationship (the word “bridegroom”). So why use the term? What’s the bridegroom of blood? What’s the significance of the phrase? Moses’ status as a “bridegroom” must have some importance here. And Durham says:

Zipporah, the only person available to perform the rite [MH: And I agree with that, because I don't think they'd met Aaron yet.], seizes the mandatory flint cutting tool ([Josh 5:2–9](#); cf. Sasson, *JBL* 85 [1966] 474) and circumcises not Moses, who would have been temporarily incapacitated by the surgery (cf. [Gen 34:18–31](#)) at a crucial time when he could no longer delay his journey, but her son. For the child, who was not to make the journey to Egypt in any case, the effects of the circumcision would be less problematic. To transfer the effect of the rite, Zipporah touched the severed foreskin of her son to the genitals of Moses, intoning as she did so the ancient formula recalling circumcision as a premarital rite: “For a bridegroom of blood you are to me!” This ancient phrase, as Mitchell [VT 19 [1969] 94–105, 111–12) has demonstrated, is a phrase of marital relationship.

Let me try to decipher some of that. Circumcision was a pre-marital ritual, performed on a male infant (well before the boy is going to get married). As the sign of the covenant, circumcision identified men as Israelite for the sake of Israelite women. They were only supposed to marry fellow Israelites. So when you got your man, or it's your honeymoon night, the fact that he's circumcised is important because then you know you're marrying within the covenant bounds. This is why circumcision (one of its meanings) has to do with marriage—that the marriage is legit. It's within the Israelite community. So it ensured that the married couple were both Israelites and that there was no forbidden intermarriage taking place.

We have to assume that Zipporah had learned and embraced the idea that the God of the mountain she knew of by virtue of her proximity to it in Midian (they had heard of Yahweh and they knew where the mountain was... it's not next door, but they knew where it is)—that this was the God of the Israelites (the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) and he was the true God. So Zipporah apparently knows that and believes it. This is particularly coherent if the Kenite connection involves the worship of Yahweh (which we talked about at length). Zipporah's marriage to Moses linked her to the Israelite people (she's marrying Moses now) and their covenantal relationship to Yahweh. Under normal circumstances, her husband would have been a circumcised Israelite man. That apparently isn't what's going on here between the two of them. This ritual of circumcision by proxy made Moses her “bridegroom of blood.” It legitimized him as an Israelite man that she could marry and be secure in marrying within a covenant relationship with Yahweh. And so part of the ritual act of touching the foreskin of Gershom to Moses' genital area “atoned” for this oversight. So Zipporah saves Moses (and here's the kicker—we'll end with this): Zipporah saves his life. How? By performing a priestly act. That's interesting in and of itself, because she's a woman. A woman plays the role of a priest in this scene, and God accepts that. The circumstances are unusual, but there it is. This is why I think the incident occurred before Moses linked up with Aaron. Had Aaron been there, he's a Levite and he likely would have done this.

1:00:00

Without getting into the whole women in ministry issue, which if you're unfamiliar with me and my podcast or the blog, about five or six years ago, I went through a blog series with my friend John Hobbins, who is a... We met in the doctoral program at Wisconsin. John is a Methodist pastor and his wife is also a pastor at the same church. So John proposed to me one day, "Hey, let's you and I blog back and forth about the women in ministry issue." And I said to him, "Okay, your mission here is to make me care." And the reason I said that is because I can argue both sides of this really well. And that alone tells me that... If you can argue both sides really well, ultimately you get down to things like the nonuse of accents in capital uncial script in Greek manuscripts. I'm not kidding. It gets that granular to decide this whole issue. So to me, this is something that, "Look, you'd have to be omniscient to know for sure where to land on this." So to me, this is a conscience issue, which is why I said, "Make me care." Whatever decision you make, you make it before the Lord, and whatever it is, do a good job (or not)." This is how I would approach it with my own daughter, if I had a daughter that said, "I feel called to the ministry." This is exactly what I would tell her. "I don't know that this is the right decision, but I'm not going to get in your way. It's between you and the Lord and the providence of God. If this is what the Lord wants you to do, good, and do a good job. Now don't screw up." That kind of thing.

So beyond that, it's such a difficult issue. It's so granular. Anybody who tells you that there's nothing to see here and argue about is just wrong. They're just wrong. Things that you think are clear, like the 1 Timothy 3 "husband of one wife" thing, trust me. [laughs] You take that over the same description to deacons, and guess what? You have a female deacon in 1 Corinthians. Now what do you do with that? "Well, that must have been the deacon's wife." Oh really? Where does it say that? "Well, it doesn't, but that's what I think because I need to think that, because this is the view I want to defend." Exactly! Exactly. This is where this debate goes. It goes to picking the things that you want to accentuate to defend your view. I think the best thing to do here is to just be honest and say, "Look, I can argue both sides of this really well. It's amazingly granular at the end of the day. And at the end of the day, we have to guess." So I'm not going to disfellowship you on the basis of my guessing, even if I think the guessing is good. I'm just not going to do that. I like to say, I will let some other ministry fight Christians. I'm not going to do that.

Let's circle it back here. I think it's interesting though... You can't use Exodus 4:24-26 to say, "Egalitarianism (that is the view that women can be ordained) is biblical. Look at what Zipporah did." That's an overuse of the data. The circumstances are really unusual. But on the other side (the complementarian side, which says women cannot be ordained and should not be in ministry), they routinely neglect things like this—where God himself is good with a woman performing a priestly function. It's just there in the text. Now that doesn't mean that their view is overturned, either. You have to say that this is a proof of one

thing to overturn the other. It becomes a little piece (a little cog, one of many items) in this whole discussion (the women in ministry discussion). So you can go look on the website. If you put “drmsb.com” and “Hobbins” and “women in ministry” in Google, you’re going to find our little back and forth. It was fun. I think it was entertaining and useful for some people. But to me, there’s just built-in ambiguity to the whole issue. It’s very difficult.

So I think extreme forms of complementarianism ought to at least take note of what’s going on here in Exodus 3:24-26. Zipporah does what she does. It’s a priestly role, and God is good with it. But that’s about all you can say. You can’t really build a view on that or overturn somebody else’s view. We have to be honest with the limitations of the data and just be good with that. So I’ll let some other ministry beat up Christians on either side. I’ll let them do that. But I’m just not going to do that. There are more interesting and better things to do with my time. And I think there are better things for you to do with your time than trying to take something that’s ambiguous and pretend at the end of the day that it’s not. Because it is. Be warmed and filled, pick the view that you prefer, but be honest with the other side and say, “I’m here because I prefer this for this, that, and the other reason, but you are still a brother. I am not going to look at you as any lesser because you don’t take this particular issue the way I do.” This is the way I approach prophecy and any number of things. These things are what they are. I think we should study them. We should try to think well about them. But more important than that is that we should treat each other like not only fellow imagers, but brethren—brothers and sister in the Lord—even when we come to disagree over things.

That was just a little bit of a sidebar. But I think the passage is interesting just as a contributing point to that bigger theological discussion. So we’re at the end of Exodus 4 here, and that means next time we will jump into chapter 5.

TS: Alright, Mike. Well, we’ll take your educated guess over most, so it works for us.

MH: [laughs] That’s what it is.

TS: We’ll take it. And again, my whole deal is, it’s okay to not know. You don’t have to know every single little thing. And that’s okay.

MH: This is going to be an illustration totally lost on most people, but here’s what it makes me think of. If you’re listening out there and you’ve ever seen the movie *Searching for Bobby Fischer*, there’s a scene in there where the guy is taking his son, who’s this chess prodigy, to a chess club to eventually make him a chess grand master or something like this. And there’s this scene where there’s this [laughs] guy who comes up to the instructor. He interrupts the conversation between the instructor and the kid. And he’s trembling with excitement. “I captured a pawn!” [laughs] That was it. It’s like it took him weeks against these

fellow players who are just at this elevated level. *He got a pawn.* Okay... That's what this reminds me of—these sorts of discussions where they're so difficult. And to think that you've accomplished something by capturing the pawn, you really haven't. There's a whole lot more to the game than just this one pawn. So I always think about that kind of obsessiveness that you're so dedicated, like you've got to find the answer to this thing. "The authorship of the book of Hebrews." That's kind of an academic joke now, for people who lose their minds and maybe their careers. They get obsessed with these questions like "Who wrote the book of Hebrews?" And at the end of the day, I'm sorry, but you just can't know. There's no way to know for sure. So take all that energy and that skill and that training and put it into things that you can know better, or ministry. Just let it go. Let it be what it is.

1:10:00

TS: I love chess references. My son last year was eight. We entered a chess tournament for the first time ever, and he beat a local high school chess member in four moves. So that was a very proud moment for me. I had taught him chess (I love chess) when he was five. He's not a grand master, don't get me wrong. But hey, to beat a high school kid as an eight-year-old in your first tournament in four moves... That was a very proud father moment for me.

MH: [laughs] I'm sure that did something for his self-esteem, too.

TS: Yeah, that was awesome. Bobby Fischer. Love those references!

MH: These kinds of obsessions... I always think of that guy who captured a pawn.

TS: Do you play chess?

MH: I know how to play, but I haven't played in years. I'm not a chess player of any... I can't assign any meaning to the statement that I play chess. I know how to move the pieces.

TS: Well, we need to play sometime. That'd be fun. Alright, Mike, well, we're looking forward to chapter 5 (and maybe 6 as well).

MH: Yeah. We might get it in. It just depends. We're going to get into the Pharaoh's hard-heart stuff, so that might take us across a couple of chapters. But we'll see.

TS: Alright, sounds good. Looking forward to it. I just want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.